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ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the Japanese interest in eugenics, the science of "improving" the human race by controlling heredity, between 1883 and 1945. Using private and public writings of eugenics enthusiasts and government documents, I attempt to explain why and how Japanese adopted and adhered to eugenics ideology, despite its inherent "racism." I also explore women's active participation in eugenics politics and its ideological implication. My biographical and institutional approach intends to contextualize individual motives and thought. Chapter 2, which follows the introduction, describes educator Naruse Jinzô's initiative. He founded a women's college in 1901 by convincing the public that women needed to be trained mentally and physically in order to produce and nurture "fit" children. Chapter 3 features a botanist, Yamanouchi Shigeo, who actively introduced eugenics theories in the 1910s and organized Japan's first eugenics society in 1917. Chapter 4 concerns feminist Hiratsuka Raichô, who led a movement to establish a eugenics marriage law beginning in 1919. Chapter 5 focuses on a medical journalist named Gotô Ryûkichi, who began publishing Japan's first eugenics journal, Yûseigaku [Eugenics], in 1924, just as the U.S. passed a law to exclude Japanese immigrants. Although being well aware of American race politics and the contemporaneous and prominent role of American eugenicists in the law, he still initiated
ties with them. And finally, Chapter 6 examines Japan's leading eugenicist, Nagai Hisomu, and his part in promoting eugenics ideas among women by organizing an all-women eugenics society in 1935. This chapter also shows the growing interest of the state in eugenics in the 1930s and early 1940s.

This study can be seen to have a three-fold significance. First, I point out that Japan's first substantial eugenics legislative effort was initiated by women, who were still denied political rights in 1919. This challenges the general interpretation which traces the origin of the 1940 National Eugenics Law to the 1933 Nazi sterilization law. Although it emphasized women's role as mother and their place at home just like the official ideology of "good wife, wise mother," eugenics, by underscoring women's biological "fitness," helped discredit women's subordinate status as prescribed by that ideology.

Second, I try to analyze eugenics initiatives from the prewar perspective based on the paradigm theory proposed by historian of science Yonemoto Shôhei. My case studies indicate that marginal groups of people—"racially" marginal Japanese and socially marginal women—tried to improve their status by adopting certain eugenics ideas. This contradicts the influential Marxist perception of eugenics in postwar Japan, that of tool of the privileged to control and oppress the physically, mentally, and socially marginal.

Lastly, a contextualized analysis suggests that Yamanouchi's "softer" (quasi-Lamarckian) perspective may be a reflection of a Japanese desire for scientific assurance to reject the notion of a permanently inferior status, a response that may have been shared by other non-Western peoples.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

"Eugenics" is a term coined in 1883 by Francis Galton (1822-1911) to describe the idea that human genetic stock, like animal and plant stocks, could be improved by selective breeding. He had been promoting this hereditary view, using the terms "viriculture" and "stirpiculture," since the 1860s.¹

There were two approaches to controlling heredity: "positive eugenics" and "negative eugenics." While the former intended to maximize the procreation of the eugenically meritorious stocks, the latter aimed to minimize the proliferation of the eugenically "undesirable" strains. One way to foster positive eugenics was to teach and encourage the "fit" people to select high-quality mates and multiply, at the same time discouraging them from choosing to have fewer children in favor of better lifestyles. Birth control, more commonly practiced among the "better" stocks than the less educated and

poor, was considered dysgenic, contributing to "race suicide."\(^2\) Negative eugenic measures included abortions, birth control, castrations, marriage restrictions, and quarantine.

Another useful set of distinctions is that of "restricted eugenics" and "inclusive eugenics." While "restricted eugenics" is concerned with controlling diseases strictly defined as hereditary, "inclusive eugenics" encompasses both genetic and not-directly-genetic factors. Although medical professionals had shown that diseases like tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and leprosy were infectious, many discussed these diseases, which often flourished within the same family, in hereditary terms. Some scientists also interpreted alcoholism and criminality, the direct causes of which could have been environmental, as biological. They argued that susceptibility to these diseases and problems were inherited--a sophisticated contention that is scientifically viable even today. Intellectuals in the early twentieth century blamed these so-called "racial poisons" for causing degeneration.\(^3\) Reflecting how people understood the phenomenon of

\(^2\) An American, Edward A. Ross, coined the term, "race suicide," in 1901. For more on "race suicide," see Haller, Eugenics, 79 and endnote 6 en p. 217.

heredity, these diseases and problems were an integral part of eugenics discourse. The term “inclusive eugenics” thus indicates the discourse addressing both “strictly genetic” and “not-directly-hereditary but imagined to be hereditary” issues under the umbrella term “eugenics.”

When people discussed eugenics, they sometimes mentioned “euthenics.” Euthenics was defined as the science of improving the human species through control of environmental factors. Some claimed that they could improve the quality of the population by providing better medical care, sanitation, and physical education. The Lamarckian notion of inheritance, that changes caused in an organism from the outside could be transmitted to future generations, legitimized euthenic approaches. These concepts, positive and negative eugenics, restricted and inclusive eugenics, and eugenics and euthenics, characterizing different types of eugenics are not mutually exclusive. Many were used in an overlapping fashion.

Eugenics--now associated with the brutal “final solution” of Nazi Germany and often dismissed as a pseudo-science--was then considered not only scientific but

Kenkyūjō kiyō 3 (1996), especially 155-158.

4 Historian of science, Matsubara Yōko, examines various eugenics bills and laws in pre- and post-World War II Japan and distinguishes whether they were intended to restrict potential and actual patients of hereditary diseases (idenbō gentei shugi) or patients of hereditary and non-hereditary diseases (hi-idenbō kakuchō shugi). Here I adopt Matsubara’s frame of analysis. See her “Meiji-matsu,” 155-169; “Minzoku yūsei hogo hōan to Nihon no yūsei-hō no keifu,” Kagakushii kenkyū 201 (1997), 42-50; and “Bunka kokka no yūsei-hō: Yūsei Hogo-hō to Kokumin Yūsei-hō no dansō,” Gendai shisō 25.4 (1997), 8-21.


6 For instance, David G. Horn finds evidence that an Italian social scientist equated “euthenics” with “positive eugenics” in 1939. See Horn, Social Bodies, 62-63 and 141.
altruistic. Eugenics’ utopian goals of perfecting society by eliminating such problems as disease, poverty, alcoholism, and criminality, were certainly appealing to many people around the world, regardless of their political convictions. Eugenics discourse was internationally prevalent, not anomalous. Japan was no exception, and Japanese interest in eugenics is the main concern of this study.

1.2 National Eugenics Law

In March 1940, both the House of Representatives and the House of Peers of the Japanese Diet passed the ethnic national eugenics protection bill prepared by the Ministry of Health and Public Health. The bill was promulgated as the National Eugenics Law (Kokumin Yūsei-hō) in May, and the following year in July, several months before the outbreak of the Pacific War, the Japanese government put this


sterilization law into effect. The purpose of the law was to improve the quality of the population by preventing people with serious hereditary diseases from procreating while encouraging healthy people to reproduce (Article 1).

In terms of negative eugenics, those who had hereditary mental diseases, hereditary feeblemindedness, seriously abnormal characters of a hereditary and antisocial nature, serious hereditary physical defects causing difficulties in functioning in society, and serious and non-curable bodily malformations of a hereditary nature, were subject to such “eugenics operations” as vasectomies for men, tubal ligations for women, and abortions for pregnant women (Articles 2 and 3).\(^\text{10}\) Since patients of infectious diseases like tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and leprosy were not subject to “eugenics operations,” the National Eugenics Law was undoubtedly what one would call a form of “restricted eugenics.”\(^\text{11}\)

In most cases, hereditary disease patients (their spouse and/or parents if patients were not mentally competent) were supposed to apply to the local prefectural governor for permission to have a sterilization operation. This voluntary (nin‘i) procedure was supplemented by consensus (dōi) or compulsory (kyōsei) applications prepared by certified medical doctors (Articles 4-7). A prefectural governor decided whether or not to approve applications upon consulting with the local eugenics review committee (Yūsei

\(^{10}\) In addition, those who were predisposed to the aforementioned diseases were also subject to the eugenics operations if their (legal or common-law) spouses were also predisposed to the same diseases (especially consanguineous marriage) and those who had already had a child with the above mentioned diseases and were likely to have children with the same diseases were also subject to the eugenics operations.

\(^{11}\) Matsubara, “”Minzoku yūsei hogo hōan,” 47.
Shinsakai) comprised of ten or fewer appointed medical experts. If patients were
dissatisfied with the decision, they could appeal to the Minister of Health and Public
Welfare, who in turn would make a decision after hearing opinions from experts in the
central eugenics review committee (Articles 8-12). The state set aside money to finance
the costs of most eugenics operations (Article 14).

On the positive eugenics side, the National Eugenics Law tightened the existing
law that prohibited abortions (Article 15). Under the new law, healthy citizens—those
who had no hereditary diseases or genes of such diseases—seeking to avoid the obligation
to reproduce faced fines and possible imprisonment (Article 18). The state required any
other actions involving abortions and sterilizations to be reported to the appropriate
authorities in advance (Article 16).^{12}

Between 1941 and 1947, 538 people (217 men and 321 women) received eugenics
operations. Although the National Eugenics Law was technically in effect until a
successor Eugenics Protection Law was promulgated in 1948, the number of operations
declined significantly from 1944, reflecting the intensification of wartime mobilization.

---

^{12} For the text of the National Eugenics Law, see “Kokumin Yūsei-hō,” Kōseishō Imukyoku, Isei
hyakunenshi, vol. 2, (Shiryō-hen) (Tokyo: Gyōsei, 1976), 297-300. For literature explaining the content
of the law, see Kōseishō Yobōkyoku, “Kokumin Yūsei-hō ni tsuite,” Naimu kōsei jihō 5 (1940), 306-311;
Dai Tōji, Kokumin Yūsei-hō (Tokyo: Kyōiku Tosho, 1941), especially 83-213; and Yoshimasu Shūfu,
Inone Eiji, Kamide Hiroyuki, and Takemura Shingi, Yūseigakushū (Tokyo: Nankōdō, 1961), 182-188. For
historical narratives about the enactment of the law, see Hiroshima Kiyoshi, “Gendai Nihon jinkō
seisakushi shōron (2): Kokumin Yūsei-hō ni okeru jinkō no shitsu seisaku to ryōsei seikaku,” Jinkō
mondai kenkyū 160 (1981), 61-77; Saitō Chiyo, “Mienai <michi>: Yūsei Hogo-hō no keifu o tazunete mita koto,
kangaeta koto,” Agora 28 (1983), 4-73; Noma Shinji, “Kenzen’ naru Dai Nihon teikoku: Kokumin
Yūsei-hō seitei o megutte,” Hisutoria 120 (1988), 43-65; Katō Hiroshi’s Fukushiteki ningenkan no
shakaishi: Yūsei shisō to hikō, seishiryō o tōshite (Kyoto: Köyō Shobō, 1996), 404-424; Matsubara,
“Minzoku yūsei hogo hōan;” and Fujino Yutaka, Nihon fashizumu to yūsei shisō (Kyoto: Kamogawa
Shuppan, 1998), Chapters 4 and 6.
which prioritized more immediate concerns over the improvement of the future gene pool, coupled with the political, economic, and social confusion that followed Japan’s surrender in August 1945.\textsuperscript{13}

Whether enforced or not, enactment of the National Eugenics Law clearly indicates the fairly extensive and serious nature of eugenics ideology and activity in Japan prior to 1940.\textsuperscript{14}

1.3 Japan: Historical Context

In the mid nineteenth century, Russia, Britain, the United States, and France began pressing decentralized Japan, ruled by the Shogunate (military government), to open up the country. This provoked intense domestic discussions about whether or not Japan should abandon its tightly restrictive foreign policy, and about who should rule. Before reaching consensus, however, the Shogunate, controlled by the Tokugawa family, gave in to Commodore Matthew Perry and signed an “unequal” treaty with the United

\textsuperscript{13} As for statistics, Kôseishô Imukyoku, ed. Jisei hachijûnenshi, (Tokyo: Insatsu-kyoku Chôyôkai, 1955), 828. The number of abortions and sterilizations for non-genetic medical reasons, involving such diseases as pulmonary tuberculosis, pleurisy, myoma of the uterus, and chronic hepatitis,—procedures permitted under Article 16—was far greater than the number of eugenics sterilizations. Just between 1941 and 1945 (excluding 1943; the data is unavailable), 44,986 people (399 men and 44,587 women) had either abortions or sterilizations. See Yoshimasa, Inôe, Kamidé, and Takemura, Yûseigaku, 187-188.

States in 1854. The anti-Shogun forces, dismayed by this act of weakness, finally prevailed, and a new government was formed under the Emperor in 1868.

This event, known as the Meiji Restoration, launched the nation into a sweeping political, economic, social and cultural modernization modeled after Western systems. One of the most important goals of the Meiji leaders was to make Japan a wealthy and strong nation capable of renegotiating the unequal treaties that the Tokugawa Shogunate had signed with the United States, Britain, Russia, and the Netherlands. The Japanese managed to achieve this goal by the end of the nineteenth century. Japan rapidly transformed itself from an isolated agrarian society to one of the most advanced industrialized nations in the world in half a century. As in many other countries undergoing industrialization, many social problems emerged, including miserable conditions for urban workers, tension between management and exploited workers, and the spread of tuberculosis and venereal diseases. Policy makers and social reformers were seriously searching for possible solutions to these problems; eugenics was considered one such possible solution.

At the same time, Japan emerged as Asia’s only imperial power, expanding its control over Taiwan, Korea, southern Sakhalin, the South Pacific islands, and parts of northeastern China. The Japanese interpreted their military victories in the Sino-Japanese War (1895), Russo-Japanese War (1905), and World War I (1918) in a social-Darwinistic
way, and began to feel superior to other Asians and equal to Westerners.\footnote{For example, an influential intellectual Fukuzawa Yukichi coined the term, “Leave Asia, Enter Europe (datsu-A nyū-Ō)” as early as 1885. In an anthropomorphic fashion, he argued that Japan should dissociate itself from Asian countries like China and Korea, which were backward and unwilling to modernize, and try to join the club of “civilized” Western nations. See Fukuzawa Yukichi, “Datsu-A ron,” in Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū, ed. Keiō Gijuku, vol. 10, (1885; reprint, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960), 238-240. See also Banno Junji, “‘Tōyō meishu shugi’ to ‘datsu-A nyū-Ō ron,’” chap. in Kindai Nihon no taigai taido, ed. Saiō Seizaburō and Roger Dingman (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1974).} This notion was, however, not always shared by the Westerners, who sometimes lumped the Japanese into a category with other Asians.

Although Japanese leaders cooperated with other countries to preserve international peace following World War I, in 1931 the Japanese Army, dissatisfied with the official policy, ignored the civilian leaders and began attacking Manchuria (northeastern China). As the Japanese military takeover of China’s strategic cities continued, the tension between Japan and the United States grew and culminated in the Pacific War (1941-1945). Americans did not want Japan to be too strong a hegemonic power in Asia and the Pacific. Since the prolonged war against China (1931-1945) and expanding colonial territories demanded more soldiers and colonists, the Japanese government became much more concerned with population policies. Eugenics enthusiasts seized the moment and advocated the importance of quality and quantity with regard to the country’s future generations. It was in this context that Parliament decided to establish the National Eugenics Law in 1940.
1.4 Historiography

The study of eugenics in Japan, despite the relatively limited attention it has received to date, is well worth pursuing for many reasons. Historian of Russian science Mark B. Adams, for example, suggests that various notions about eugenics drawn from the Anglo-American cases can be challenged by studies about eugenics movements elsewhere. A comparative history of eugenics thus has the potential to force a reconceptualization of existing interpretations of what eugenics was and why it attracted so many people across national boundaries despite radically different social, economic, political, “racial,” and cultural conditions. This work is one response to Adams’ important proposal. Rather than undertaking an explicitly comparative history, however, the study concentrates on understanding the history of eugenics in Japan. A recent essay by the Chinese historian Frank Dikötter also underscores such an effort. He states:

Eugenics was a fundamental aspect of some of the most important cultural and social movements of the twentieth century, intimately linked to ideologies of “race,” nation, and sex, inextricably meshed with population control, social hygiene, state hospitals, and the welfare state. Until recently, however, the historiographical focus on the most extreme expressions of race improvement in Germany, Britain, and the United States tended to perpetuate a one-sided

---

representation, which ignored the multifarious dimensions and extraordinary appeal of eugenics to individuals of very different social backgrounds, political convictions, and national affiliations....

This study is thus an attempt to provide information to aid in understanding the international phenomenon of the eugenics movement in the first half of the twentieth century.

Only a few scholars have made the Japanese experience with eugenics a major focus of inquiry. Until social historian Fujino Yutaka’s Nihon fashizumu to yūsei shisō [Japanese fascism and eugenics thought] was published in April 1998, historian of science


Suzuki Zenji’s *Nihon no yûseigaku: Sono shisô to undô no kiseki* [Eugenics in Japan: The trajectory of its ideas and activities] had been the only monograph concentrating on Japan’s eugenics past.19

Suzuki’s 1983 book is based on his earlier research, published in various articles in the late 1960s and 1970s.20 Suzuki envisioned a joint and systematic research project on eugenics in Japan with historians of biology Tsukuba Hisaharu and Nakamura Teiri in the 1960s.21 Suzuki, however, abandoned the plan when Tsukuba and Nakamura turned to


21 Suzuki, *Nihon no yûseigaku*, 195. Tsukuba may be the pioneer investigator in historical studies of eugenics in Japan. Before Suzuki published his first article on eugenics, Tsukuba had written an essay, “Yamamoto Senji to Nagai Hisomu: Bâsu kontôrû to umeyo furayeyo no taiketsu,” *Bungei shunjû* 44.1 (1966), 308-314. See also Tsukuba Hisaharu and Suzuki Zenji, “Yûseigaku to Fukuzawa Yukichi,” *Igakushi kenkyû* 24 (1967), 1225-1229; and Nakamura Teiri, “Koya Yoshiio to minzoku seibutsugaku,”
other research subjects after producing a few pieces. Suzuki continued to study the history of eugenics science, movement, and thought independently in the 1970s.\footnote{22}

The early 1980s saw a resurgence of interest in the history of eugenics. While Japan was still under American occupation after the Pacific War (World War II), the National Eugenics Law was recast as the Eugenics Protection Law in 1948. The 1948 law, with subsequent revisions, legalized sterilizations and abortions for those likely to have children with hereditary diseases as well as those who could not afford to rear children. Because of widespread poverty in the immediate postwar years, Japanese women gained relatively easy access to abortion. As the economic condition of the country improved, however, religiously-motivated conservatives attempted to restrict abortion twice, first in the early 1970s and then in the early 1980s. Feminist interest in the pre-history of the Eugenics Protection Law explains the renewal of eugenics studies in the early 1980s.\footnote{23} Suzuki’s earlier studies were put together and published as a book in Seihutsugaku to shakai (1967; reprint, Tokyo: Misuzu Shobō, 1970), 171-184.


1983 in this context. Yet, eugenics remained largely an obscure subject until the end of the 1980s. This may be because of the institutionally-marginal status of the history of science in the Japanese academy, as well as hesitation to deal with a stigmatized subject associated with the Nazi final solution, an influential concern in other countries also.

The late 1980s marked the beginning of a new era, however, as many more scholars, whose major focus of inquiry was something other than eugenics in Japan, began shedding light on Japan’s eugenics past from diverse perspectives. These scholars include Fujime Yuki, Suzuki Yûko, Yonemoto Shôhei, and those who have been influenced by Michel Foucault. The first example of these recent studies is the meticulous research of women’s historian Fujime Yuki. She shows the presence of eugenics ideology in the birth control movement in the interwar years. Because of its promise in alleviating economic, physical, and mental strain in mothers, activists believed that birth control would be a way to produce and raise “fitter” children. Birth control could help free a woman’s body and mind from the agony of pregnancy and birth. Birth control, thus, had tremendous implications for women’s liberation. She suggests that women activists’ emphasis on motherhood led them to eugenics ideology, and then to ethnic national ideology (minzoku


24 Morris Fraser Low, “The Butterfly and the Frigate: Social Studies of Science in Japan,” Social Studies of Science 19 (1989), 315. Few universities have a department of the history of science. This means there are few posts and scholars working in the field. It is also possible that non-historians of science considered eugenics too “scientific,” while historians of science believed the subject to be “too pseudo-scientific.”

eisei [Japanese translation of German term ‘Rassenhygiene’]26 shisō) of the Japanese empire. According to Fujime, women activists gained access to power and received officially sanctioned motherhood protection by emphasizing that their reproductive ability was beneficial to the state based on eugenics (and also ethnic national) ideology. But these women did not understand that this approach would not lead to women’s liberation in a real sense. Because eugenics lacked the notion of human rights, it would inevitably fail to liberate all people, men and women.27

Suzuki Yūko and Yenemoto Shōhei offer two important perspectives from the late 1980s. In her 1989 two-volume work on modern Japanese women, Suzuki discusses the eugenics ideas of Japan’s leading feminist, Hiratsuka Raichō. Suzuki argues that it is

26 As Richard Siddle points out, official English title of the journal Minzoku eisei, published by the Minzoku Eisei Gakkai (Kyōkai) was “Race Hygiene.” Siddle, “The Ainu,” 144. Kevin M. Doak demonstrates, however, that many Japanese intellectuals often consciously differentiated the terms “jinshu (race, biological)” and “minzoku (ethnic nation, biological and cultural).” To maintain the original nuance, suggest the significance of particular choice of words, and avoid unnecessary confusions, throughout this study I will translate the Japanese terms as follows: “minzoku (ethnic nation),” “kokumin (nation),” “jinshu (race),” and “shuzoku (racial stock). See Doak, “What Is a Nation and Who Belongs?: National Narratives and the Ethnic Imagination in Twentieth-Century Japan,” American Historical Review 102.2 (1997), 283-309. Michael Weiner also notes that the term minzoku has often been translated as “race” in English but the minzoku has been believed as both biological and cultural, see his “The Invention of Identity: Race and Nation in Pre-War Japan,” in The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives, ed. Frank Dikötter (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1997), 96-117.

necessary to see the negative, and thus often neglected, side of Hiratsuka, who was
considered instrumental to moving women’s liberation forward in Japan. Suzuki laments
that Hiratsuka’s thought lacked sympathy for the socially weak and was fraught with
discriminatory opinions vis a vis the lower class and colonized peoples. Though
compilers of Hiratsuka’s collected works had previously noted the existence of
Hiratsuka’s eugenics ideas, Suzuki was the first to illuminate this aspect of Hiratsuka and
analyze its implications for the history of Japanese feminism. 28 Similarly, Yonemoto in a
book examining Nazi race hygiene calls attention to the gap between reality and most
historical interpretations of the eugenics experience. With the intention of averting
possible future Nazi-like atrocities, intellectuals with a post-World War II consciousness
have constructed a particular view of eugenics from a presentist, accusatory perspective.
Yonemoto proposes a new intellectual framework based on Thomas Kuhn’s paradigm

---

28 Suzuki Yūko, Joseishi o hiraku, vol. 1, Haha to onna: Hiratsuka Raichō, Ichikawa Fusae o iku ni
(Tokyo Mirai-sha, 1983) and vol. 2, Yokusan to teikō: Ima, onna no shakai sanka no hōkō o tou
(Tokyo Mirai-sha, 1989). In short essays attached to volumes of Hiratsuka’s collected works, Kobayashi Tomie
and Yoneda Sayoko had already pointed out Hiratsuka’s eugenics ideology in the mid 1980s. See
Kobayashi Tomie, “Kaisetsu,” Hiratsuka Raichō chosakushū, ed. Hiratsuka Raichō Chosakushū Henshū
chosakushū, ed. Hiratsuka Raichō Chosakushū Henshū linkai, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1983), 367-
382; and Yoneda Sayoko, “Kaisetsu,” Hiratsuka Raichō chosakushū, ed. Hiratsuka Raichō Chosakushū
Henshū linkai, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1984), 411-436. See also Yoneda Sayoko, “Hiratsuka
Raichō no ‘sensō sekinin’ ron jōsetsu,” Rikishi hōron 552 (1996), 46-56. Another women’s historian,
Kondō Kazuko, examines the state policy of “give birth and multiply” policy in wartime Japan. In her
study of prenatal policy, she discusses the National Eugenics Law and eugenics marriage promoted by the
state and compares the Japanese case with the German one. Although her study is an important attempt to
place women’s history in the history of eugenics, the time period she focuses allows her little room to
investigate prior conditions leading eugenics mobilization of women. Like Suzuki and Fujime, Kondō
generally sees the state essentially oppressive in its effort to control women’s bodies. See her “Onna to
sensō: Bosei/kazoku/kokka,” in Onna to Otokो no iku: Nihon joseishi sai kō, vol. 5, Semegiau onna to
otoko Kindai, ed. Okuda Akiko (Tokyo: Fujiwara Shoten, 1995), 481-515. In her article examining the
relationship between women and the nation state, feminist sociologist Ueno Chizuko analyzes how various
scholars have interpreted women’s wartime support. See Ueno, “‘Kokumin kokka’ to ‘jendā’: Josei no
theory for analyzing past eugenics movements without their being beclouded by postwar consciousness. I will discuss this later.

The influential French theorist Michel Foucault has also attracted attention to eugenics in recent years. According to Foucault, the bourgeoisie in modern Europe established a control system to regulate such things as bodies, sexuality, and reproduction of the proletariat to achieve capitalist goals, and eugenics was part of the system by which the bourgeoisie ensured its hegemony over the proletariat. Influenced by this notion of “biopolitics” and other provocative Foucaultian observations, some scholars began seeing eugenics as an exciting research site where these constructed categories of “class,” “race,” and “gender” all converged. For instance, Tomiyama Ichirō, writing in 1994, found that anthropologists in the late nineteenth century helped to construct the Japanese notion of kokumin (nation). After identifying what ethnic minorities such as the Ainu, Ryukyuans (residents of present-day Okinawa), and outcastes (burakumin) were by measuring them, the anthropologists defined the Japanese nation as people who did not fit in the categories of these ethnic minorities.

---


30 Michel Foucault, *Sei no rekishi* [Histoire de la sexualité], vol. 1, *Chi e no ishi* [La volonté de savoir], translated by Watanabe Moriaiki (Tokyo: Shunchōsha, 1986), 147-167 and 171-189.

Though we have benefited from these studies written from different perspectives since the late 1980s, only a few devote their energy to investigating Japan’s eugenics experience as a central theme. I shall review these scholars’ research, and more specifically, Suzuki Zenji’s pioneer work, as well as more recent projects conducted by Fujino Yutaka and Matsubara Yoko, in more detail.

In 1967, Suzuki took up the subject because he was interested in the Japanese response to the introduction of foreign scientific ideas, including eugenics. His work deals with Japan’s eugenics discourse and institutionalization efforts between the 1880s and 1950s, a time period he divides into four parts: 1) race improvement views held by popularizers of Western ideas in the 1880s and 1890s; 2) introduction of eugenics in the first two decades of the twentieth century; 3) eugenics movements in the 1920s and the first half of the 1930s; and 4) legislative efforts of the eugenics sterilization law and

Feminizumu no shuchō, no. 3 (Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 1996), 163-217 (on German feminism and eugenics).
beyond from the late 1930s through the 1950s. He observes that the race improvement views of the first period did not become influential, possibly because basic ideas of genetics did not exist to support the claims made. Takahashi Yoshio’s peculiar “whitening” theory promoting intermarriage between the “yellow” and “white” races was rejected by nationalists.32

Eugenics was then reintroduced after 1900. This reintroduction coincided with the discovery of Mendel’s writings from the 1860s and was followed by the emergence of Mendelian experimental biologists in Japan. During the second period, in contrast to Britain, there was no conflict between Galtonism (emphasizing statistics) and Mendelism. The silk worm geneticist Toyama Kametarô, for instance, argued that knowledge of the Mendelian laws and biometrics (statistics) were both necessary to perfect the science of eugenics. Although there were some who showed interest in eugenics principles, most geneticists remained indifferent. Affiliated to departments of botany, zoology, or agriculture, they lacked the resources necessary for human genetic research. Another reason for this rather lukewarm early reception of eugenics, Suzuki finds, was the racial makeup of Japan. Since the Japanese population was much more “racially” homogeneous than the American counterpart, Japanese geneticists were less motivated to take up eugenics as a research subject.

Suzuki characterizes the third phase as the period of institutionalization, driven by popular eugenics movements led by people like Gotô Ryûkichi, Ikeda Shigenori, and

birth control activists. Here, Suzuki also discusses the eugenics ideas of Koizumi Makoto, who was trained in zoology and parasitology (medicine). According to Suzuki, Koizumi’s evolution view was sympathetic to the Lamarckian notion of inheritance of acquired characteristics because of Koizumi’s belief in the evolutionary theory of orthogenesis.\textsuperscript{33} Suzuki was, however, unable to provide definite evidence that linked Koizumi’s eugenics view to his evolution view. The fourth phase witnessed the enactment of the National Eugenics Law, under which sterilizations were conducted. Suzuki notes that people’s interest in eugenics declined as the war intensified, and the law stopped functioning properly after Japan’s surrender in 1945. He concluded that, in Japan, eugenics thought was spread mainly by popular movements without much of a scientific basis.\textsuperscript{34}

Suzuki’s work has served as the foundation for subsequent eugenics studies in Japan. Reflecting his training in botany, he was well-versed in the evolutionary theories that influenced various eugenics ideas. Since he covered eugenics discourse between, and initiatives of, twenty-five or so individuals in a small introductory book of less than two hundred pages, inevitably there was much left unanalyzed. Observations of an insightful but speculative nature, with a limited amount of empirical data, were scattered throughout his text.

\textsuperscript{33} Orthogenesis is a theory which sees that the progressive evolution of certain organisms in a restricted direction throughout successive generations is independent of outside influences and natural selection.

\textsuperscript{34} This summary is based on Suzuki, \textit{Nihon no viseigaku}, and his earlier articles introduced in footnotes 20 and 21.
Fujino Yutaka, beginning in 1994, raised eugenics studies in the Japanese context to the next level by substantiating Suzuki’s undocumented claims through careful examination of such original sources as parliamentary records and Home Ministry documents. His previous study, focusing on a history of leprosy, revealed the existence of eugenics thought in various control measures against this non-genetic disease.

Sterilizations of lepers existed outside the legal institutions. In his articles, published between 1994 and 1997, and in his 1998 book, Fujino examines a wide array of eugenics related topics ranging from social movements, institutionalization, policy-making, discourse of the Amu minority and outcastes. His unifying theme was a belief that eugenics ideology was linked to fascism. Postwar consciousness propels Fujino, and he reveals many detestable actions carried out in the name of eugenics in Japan. His goal was to confront the horrible historical experience—considering many have avoided to do so, this is a step forward—and draw a lesson from the mistakes of the past. In this postwar intellectual framework, Fujino depicts eugenics as inevitably evil.

---

35 Fujino Yutaka, Nihon fashizumu to ūsei shisō: Hansen byō o neguru jisshōteki kenkyū (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993). Also see “Nihon fashizumu to byōsha, shōgaisha: Danshu to gyakusatsu,” Kikan sensō sekinin kenkyū 12 (1996), 48-55. Japan’s eugenics sterilization began at a Tokyo sanatorium for lepers in 1915. Only after the sterilization, were lepers allowed to marry within the sanatorium. Though there was no law legitimizing the procedure, the Home Ministry and the Ministry of Health and Welfare, which were fully aware of the routine sterilization at the sanatorium, overlooked it for years.


37 Fujino is particularly critical of the eugenics notion that some people’s lives are worth living, while others are not. For example, see Fujino, ūsei shisō to fashizumu, 3, 46, 369, and 459.
His studies are particularly illuminating in that they cover not only “restricted” but also “inclusive” eugenics. (However, he does not employ these terms.) He sees eugenics policy as part of a comprehensive medical policy under a fascist state. The National Eugenics Law was only a fragment of the whole picture. Examples of “inclusive” eugenics will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 6 of this dissertation, where we deal with women’s struggle to control infectious diseases such as venereal disease and tuberculosis.

Historian of science Matsubara Yōko proposes new analytical concepts in understanding the history of eugenics in her attempt to traces the origins and development of Japan’s eugenics laws. She questions the general perception which uncritically identifies the origin of the 1941 National Eugenics Law with the 1933 Nazi sterilization law. Re-examining parliamentary documents and comparing the provisions of laws and unsuccessful bills, she theorizes that there were two different approaches to sterilization: “restricted” and “inclusive.” As noted, while the “restricted” approach advocating sterilizing people with hereditary diseases, the “inclusive” approach, based on the concept of “degeneration,” hoped to regulate reproduction of those with both hereditary and non-hereditary diseases. Although the “restricted” bill was adopted and became the National Eugenics law, the “inclusive” view was revived and incorporated into the 1948 Eugenics Protection Law.38 By inventing these two categories, she successfully incorporates findings by Fujino and myself; we have pointed out that discussions on

38 Matsubara, “Meiji-matsu,” “Minzoku yūsei hojo hōan,” and “<Bunka kokka>.”

22
infectious diseases like leprosy and tuberculosis existed in the eugenics discourse prior to the enactment of the National Eugenics Law and that Japanese eugenics legislative efforts actually predate the Nazi law.39

Overall, the historical literature on Japanese eugenics shows several defining characteristics. There are general characteristics of literature on eugenics in Japan: first, emphasis on the Nazi-Japanese connections, particularly the similarity between the Nazi sterilization law and the National Eugenics Law;40 secondly, emphasis on evilness of eugenics and sympathy towards the “inferior” victimized by the application of eugenics policies;41 thirdly, limited integration of women’s eugenics thought and initiatives into the history of eugenics,42 fourthly, emphasis on restricted eugenics represented by the


40 Fujino, Nihon fashizumu to Yūsei shisō, 17-50. Matsubara Yōko discusses this general view in her “Minzoku yūsei hogo hōan,” 42.

41 In this point of view, sympathizers of eugenics or ethnic national hygienic ideas are criticized for their role as insensitive victimizers towards the “unfit,” poor, and colonized. For example, see Fujime, “Senkanki Nihon no sanji chōsetsu undō,” 97; Suzuki Yūko, Joseishi o hiraku, vol. 2, 32-36, and Kondō, “Onna to sensō,” 500-502. Yoneda Sayoko sees that Suzuki Yūko writes history from an accusatory perspective. See Yoneda, “Hiratsuka Raichō no sensō sekinin,” 48.

42 There are some exceptions. In her perceptive gendered analysis, “Seishoku no jiyū to sanji chōsetsu undō: Hiratsuka Raichō to Yamamoto Senji,” Rekishi hyōron 503 (1992), 92-107, Ishizaki Nobuko compares eugenics ideas of feminist, Hiratsuka Raichō, and male birth control movement activist, Yamamoto Senji. Rather than essentializing eugenics as evil or hopeless, Ishizaki argues that while Hiratsuka, as a less politically and socially privileged woman, tried to use the state authority to protect women, Yamamoto advocated individual choice and free from state intervention in his eugenics argument. Sociologist Katō Shūichi analyzes “race improvement” ideas and notions of gender relationship focusing on the discourse of monogamy in modern Japan. See his “Aiseyo, umeyo, yori takaki shūzoku no tame ni: Ippu ippu sei to jinshu kairyo no seijigaku,” in Shirizu sei o tou, vol. 3, Kyōdō, ed. Ōba Takeshi, Kanegae Haruhiko, Hasegawa Mariko, Yamazaki Kaoru, and Yamazaki Tsutomu (Tokyo: Senshū Daigaku Shuppankyoku, 1997), 201-253. Together with Kondō Kazuko’s “Onna to sensō,” they contribute to make such issues as women’s presence, initiative, and gender roles, visible in the history of eugenics.
National Eugenics Law,\textsuperscript{43} and lastly, the lack of attention to the issue of “race” in Japan's dealings with the West. Perhaps, the tendency for so many Japanese medical students travelled to Germany for advanced training,\textsuperscript{44} and the wartime alliance of the Axis powers including imperial Japan and Nazi Germany, explain the emphasis on Nazi-Japanese connections.\textsuperscript{45}

Another likely reason why eugenics was not much studied in Japan prior to the late 1980s has to do with the enormous influence of Marxist philosophy in the Japanese academic community. Japan’s post-1945 Marxist scholarship, influential in history, economics, natural sciences, and other disciplines, sees Japanese militarism, fascism, and imperialism as the tragic final stage of a capitalist system which was destined to break down. In this intellectual framework, prewar and wartime ideologies and institutions such as “feudalism,” ultranationalism, militarism, imperialism, and the emperor system were considered irrational and unscientific, and responsible for heightening the tension between the state and people, and between classes.\textsuperscript{46} Postwar historical consciousness, which

\textsuperscript{43} Fujino Yutaka points out this without using the term, “restricted eugenics,” in his Nihon fashizumu to yūsei shisō, 38.

\textsuperscript{44} James R. Bartholomew, The Formation of Science in Japan: Building a Research Tradition (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). This view also shows a possible bias that medicine, but not other life, behavioral, or social sciences, is most closely related to eugenics.

\textsuperscript{45} Italy was also one of the Axis powers. Fujino Yutaka finds an evidence of Japanese indifference to Italian eugenics: Japanese officials saw Italians put too much emphasis on quantity and neglected quality. See Fujino, Nihon fashizumu to yūsei shisō, 27.

Yonemoto Shōhei describes as presentist and accusatory, has been particularly strong in Japan because of the dominant role of the Marxist intellectual framework.

Historians of women have correctly perceived the possible role of eugenics in early Japanese feminist ideas. Yet, they focus their analysis on important but somewhat narrowly-focused themes in women’s history, such as women’s liberation, motherhood ideology, equality vs. difference, and women’s war support. As a result, they have not interpreted their findings in the general context of the history of eugenics. Others have dismissed female agency, probably because they do not think that women were adequately trained in science, and they tend to see their eugenics discourse, often “inclusive,” as pseudo-scientific, and thereby not worth examining. For example, Suzuki Zenji reproduced the cover of the 1916 Japanese version of Francis Galton’s Hereditary Genius (1869) translated by a woman named Haraguchi Tsuruko; but he never explained who she was, what she did, and why she undertook this initiative. This dissertation answers these questions. Social welfare expert, Katō Hiroshi, on the contrary, does discuss a woman journalist Kitamura Kaneko and her anti-sterilization view. Katō’s arguments are based on his belief that eugenics was inherently arrogant, inconsiderate, and abusive towards the mentally handicapped. Katō’s writing is another example of the


47 Yonemoto, Iden kanri shakai, 38-41.

literature written from the moral-judgmental perspective. In this framework, Kato is concerned with whether or not one’s idea is perceived as commendable from the postwar value system of embracing different kinds of people. Sex or gender is not particularly problematized in his study.⁴⁹

Because of its emphasis on restricted eugenics, the National Eugenics Law attracted much attention from scholars. Many of them present statistical data of sterilizations conducted under the law and tend to argue that the law had a limited impact on society because of the relatively small numbers of sterilizations. As a result, they tend to imply that Japan’s eugenics experience was minor. If one simply compares the numbers of sterilized people under the law in Germany and Japan, it is not hard to draw this kind of conclusion.⁵⁰ This view, however, overlooks the pervasive nature of inclusive eugenics discourse and its significance.

The discussion of “race” in Japanese history has taken place at two locations: one at the site of Japanese interaction with Westerners and the other at the point of Japanese interaction with Asians. While the former dealt with “yellow” Japan’s relationship with the “white” West, the latter was largely concerned with the Japanese perceptions of ethnic minorities and colonial subjects in the Greater Japanese Empire. Recent scholarship illuminates intriguing eugenics episodes on the “racial” differences between the Japanese and Asians. For example, sociologist Oguma Eiji focuses on the discrepancy

---


⁵⁰ For example, see Ōta Tenrei, *Nihon sanjii chōsetsu hyakunenshi*, 80; Suzuki Zenjī, *Nihon no viseigaku*, 166; and Yonemoto, *Iden kanri shakai*, 189-190.
between Japan’s colonial policy that promoted assimilation through intermarriage between the Japanese and Koreans, and the Nazi-advocated eugenics ideal of maintaining racial purity. Tomiyama Ichirō examines Japanese anthropological research as a means of ensuring Japanese self-identity by “scientifically” measuring and representing the subjugated peoples in the peripheries of the empire. Similarly, Fujino Yutaka examines the Japanese eugenics policy and discourse about the Ainu minority resident in Hokkaidō. Fujino also points out that Japan’s outcaste class, known as “burakumin,” were discussed by some eugenicists as a putative “race” biologically different from, and “inferior” to, the mainstream Japanese.

---


54 Fujino, Nihon fashizumu to yūsei shisō, 395-413; “Buraku mondai to yūsei shisō;” and “Hisabetsu buraku.”
Unlike Japanese-Asian eugenics discourse, Japanese-Western counterpart has not been studied extensively. Historian Matsuda Kaoru points out that Japanese students who had studied blood type theories in the West must have noticed white “racial” prejudice towards the “yellow,” but little has been written about it. This relative

---


56 Matsuda Kaoru, “‘Ketsuekigata to seikaku’ no shakaishi: Ketsuekigata jinruigaku no kigen to tenkai,” revised 2nd ed. (Tokyo: Kawade Shobō Shinsha, 1994). For a wide array of recent popular and academic articles that deal with Japanese fascination with blood-type analysis of human temperament, see Matsuda, note 1 and 2 and pp. 110-111. In English, see Kosaku Yoshino, “The Discourse on Blood and Racial Identity in Contemporary Japan,” in The Construction of Racial Identities in China and Japan: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives, ed. Frank Dikotter (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1997), especially 207-209. As for European bloodgroup research, see Weindling, Health, Race and German Politics, 464-469. John W. Dower illuminates the racial dimension of the Pacific War in the context of the conflict between “white” (Americans) and “colored” (Japanese) peoples. However, eugenics is not his main focus. In his discussion of social Darwinism, Unoura Hiroshi insightfully argues that Japanese elites had to modify the Western theory of social Darwinism in order to overcome the notion of Japanese inferiority inherent in the theory. See Unoura Hiroshi, “Shinkaron to naichi zakkyoron: Shinkaron juyō no ichisokumen,” Kitazato Daigaku Kyōōbu kiyō 22 (1988), 82-97; and “Kindai Nihon ni okeru shakai Dainizumu no juyō to tenkai,” in Kōza shinka, vol. 2, Shinsha shisō to shakai, ed. Shibatani Atsahiro, Nagano Kei, and Yōsuke Takeshi (Tokyo: Toyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1991), 119-152. As noted, Suzuki Zenji discusses Takahashi Yoshio’s whitening theory and the negative response by the president of Tokyo University, Katō Hiroyuki. Though Suzuki notes that Katō rejected Takahashi’s proposal arguing that it was not an acceptable method to improve the Japanese, Suzuki does not mention whether or not Katō dismissed the ideas of race improvement entirely. Furthermore, Suzuki introduces Unno Kōtoku’s adherence to eugenics despite the noton of the Japanese inferiority. Yet, with limited empirical data, Suzuki interprets these examples of Katō and Unno more as an issue of nationalism than as an issue of race. Suzuki, Nihon no viseigaku, 33-38 and 59. See also Weiner, “The Invention of Identity.” In his discussion of social Darwinism, Weiner very briefly touches on Takahashi’s whitening theory for Japanese race improvement and the use of blood type research to identify the Ainu and the aboriginal population of Taiwan. (p. 108)
neglect poses the rather remarkable question as to why some Japanese promoted the very field of study which was based on the premise of their own biological inferiority.

1.5 Questions, Case Studies, and Significance

Though the existing scholarship has added to our knowledge of eugenics in Japan, I will focus here on issues of gender and race that have not been addressed to any extent. Why did the Japanese adhere to Western eugenics despite the notion of Japanese “racial” inferiority? How did Japanese women come to participate in eugenics politics? Since important political decisions were almost always made exclusively by elite men in this male-dominated society, the significant participation of women in the public discourse of eugenics requires careful explanation. This dissertation seeks to provide answers to these questions.

To explore the complexities of how Japan internalized eugenics thinking, I will review the careers of five eugenics activists, four men and one woman. All made important contributions to the popularization and institutionalization of eugenics. Their experience and the different disciplines represented by them demonstrate a fairly wide range of eugenics perspectives in Imperial Japan (1868-1945).

Chapter 2, which follows this introduction, describes educator Naruse Jinzō’s eugenics initiative. He founded the Japan Women’s College in 1901 by convincing prospective financial supporters that women needed to be trained mentally and physically in order to produce and nurture “fit” children. Chapter 3 deals with an
American-trained botanist, Yamanouchi Shigeo, who actively introduced eugenics theories from a scientist’s perspective in the 1910s and founded Japan’s first eugenics organization in 1917. Chapter 4 is concerned with feminist Hiratsuka Raichō, who led a movement to establish Japan’s first eugenics law beginning in 1919. Chapter 5 focuses on a medical journalist named Gōtō Ryūkichi, who began publishing Japan’s first eugenics journal, Yūseigaku [Eugenics], in 1924; just at the time the United States passed a law to exclude Japanese immigrants. Though well aware of American race politics and the contemporaneous and prominent role of American eugenicists in the formulation of this particular law, he still initiated ties with them. And finally, Chapter 6 examines Japan’s leading eugenicist, Nagai Hisomu, and his part in promoting eugenics ideas (especially concerning marriage) among women by organizing an all-women eugenics society in 1935. This chapter also shows the growing interest of the state in eugenics in the 1930s and early 1940s. The concluding chapter discusses principal findings of these case studies.

Let me elaborate on the central concerns of “race” and gender. First, it is not difficult to imagine that eugenics movements might have been absent in Japan because the “white”-dominated racial hierarchy often associated with eugenics would damage Japanese self-esteem. This educated guess makes sense because the Japanese have been known for their selective adoption of foreign ideas and institutions for centuries. And their “Yamato” race ideology identified themselves as best, based on the putatively continuous lineage of the imperial family. The Japanese, however, accepted eugenics.

---

57 Oguma, Tan’itsu minzoku shinwa, 240.
One discovers the kind of “racially” humiliating experiences some Japanese eugenics activists encountered yet still continued to adhere to eugenics. The issue of “race” and “ethnicity” was not a simple matter in Japan. While feeling dominated by Westerners, the Japanese acted as the dominant partner against their own “ethnic” minorities and colonial subjects. Chapter 6 briefly touches on Nagai Hisomu’s role as a leader of the Ainu investigation committee in the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and thereby calls attention to the complexities of “racial” hierarchy in Asia and the Japanese people’s unique dual status in the international racial hierarchy during the era of high imperialism. However, to maintain focus, our discussion will concentrate on Japanese responses to Western eugenically-oriented racial prejudice.

The other major theme of the dissertation is gender. Existing studies of the history of Japanese eugenics have paid little attention to women, to gender roles, or to the official “good wife, wise mother” ideology. Considering the fact that eugenics involved reproduction, impossible without women, the general omission of their presence in the historiography is peculiar and in need of correction. In Chapters 4 and 6, I attempt to position women in the history of eugenics in Japan. Chapter 3 touches on both “race” and gender in a less direct manner by focusing on botanist Yamanouchi Shigeo, who struggled to define eugenics not only as a biologist but also as an educator.

My research approach can be best described as biographical, institutional, and intellectual. In case studies, I do not merely analyze the content of the activists’ written works regarding eugenics. I showcase their educational backgrounds, various publication
activities, encounters with eugenics in the West or in Japan, motives for promoting eugenics thought, and means of financing their initiatives. I thus examine their lives in order to contextualize their ideas. Through this biographical-institutional approach, it is possible to show rather interesting networks among the eugenics enthusiasts, networks which may not be visible otherwise. (For example, both Yamanouchi and Nagai taught as lecturers at Naruse’s Japan Women’s College, of which Hiratsuka was an early graduate.)

Each chapter differs slightly in the proportions of biographical and institutional information, depending on the kinds of sources employed. Sources include prescriptive literature published by eugenics enthusiasts; their diaries, letters, memoirs, and other writings, parliamentary records; and documents of the Ministries of Education, Home Affairs, Health and Public Welfare, and Foreign Affairs. In-house documents and publications held in archives at Japan Women’s University (formerly College), Tokyo Women’s Medical University (formerly College), and Tsukuba University (formerly Tokyo Teachers’ College) have also been helpful. In addition, I use a small amount of interview material.

This study can be seen to have a four-fold significance. First of all, in the context of women’s history, I point out that Japan’s first substantial eugenics legislative effort was initiated by women, who were still denied political rights in 1919. This challenges the general interpretation which traces the origin of the 1940 National Eugenics Law to the 1933 Nazi sterilization law. In a country where the notion of the “predominance of men over women (or danson johi)” ruled, this initiative was rather extraordinary. I
analyze the impact of eugenics ideas on women and on gender roles as well. This inquiry yields a striking conclusion: In spite of the emphasis on motherhood and women’s place at home, resonant with the official ideology of “good wife, wise mother,” the Western science of eugenics rejected the idea that women should have only a subordinate status. In other words, ideologically speaking, eugenics empowered women and helped them develop self-esteem, confidence, and consciousness about their bodies, and thereby had a potential to challenge the very ideology which supported the patriarchal social structure of the state.

In the context of the history of science, Japanese eugenics attracted little scholarly attention until recently. As is often the case in the history of scientific knowledge, historians of science in Japan preferred studying science at the center of knowledge production (Western Europe and the United States) to examining science in Japan.58

Unlike these scholars, I argue that, although eugenics did not originate in Japan, the very process of importing eugenics from the West to Japan is worth exploring for anyone interested in notions of race and gender among other topics.59

58 Low, “The Butterfly and the Frigate,” 318. In her analysis of Latin American eugenics, Nancy Stepan similarly observes as follows: “The European bias of the history of ideas is well known, but it is especially strong in science. Latin America is often ignored altogether or it is treated as a consumer and not a contributor of ideas....The implicit assumption is that intellectual historians of Latin America are studying only an attempt to imitate or reproduce a European activity in an ‘alien’ or ‘unscientific’ setting. The intellectual gaze always moves from a center outward, toward a problematic ‘periphery.’” See her book “The Hour of Eugenics,” 3. As for the significance of (semi-) colonial science, see historian of science Katô Shigeo, “Shanghai Shizen Kagaku Kenkyūjo no setsuritsu kōsō: Taisho-ki ni okeru kagaku to tagai bunka taisaku no ichisokomen,” Nenpō kagaku, gijutsu, shakai 6 (1997), 1-34, especially 2-3. See also Sharon Traweek, Beamtimes and Lifetimes: The World of High Energy Physicists (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1988).

59 In her study Stepan deals with race, gender, and the notion of nation in the scientifically peripheral and racially mixed Latin America, see her “The Hour of Eugenics”.
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Thirdly, this dissertation can contribute to modern Japanese history in the broadest sense. Just as in other countries, eugenics has been a taboo subject in Japan because of its association with the notorious Nazi Holocaust. As described above, postwar historical consciousness makes it harder to deviate from the standard interpretation which depicts eugenicists and eugenics sympathizers as evil oppressors and various groups of people in the “unfit” category as victims. One scholar, however, has argued that scholars should investigate why so many people were attracted to ideas which could be so obviously dangerous. Modifying this same scholar’s paradigm theory, this dissertation tries to interpret various eugenics initiatives not from the postwar perspective, but from the prewar perspective. This approach allows me to dissociate myself from the dominant postwar intellectual framework. Thus, I can challenge the top-down structural view which sees eugenics as a tool of oppression used by the state. Rather, I find some “marginal” people actively embraced and used eugenics ideology as a strategy for moving up in the status hierarchy.

---

61 Yonemoto, Iden kanri shakai, 5-41.
62 Ibid., 29-41. Yonemoto calls the two sides of the new paradigm “negative paradigm” and “positive paradigm.” “Negative paradigm” shows what should not be done and is different from the old paradigm. Although his theory is much more sophisticated than the simple dichotomy of “old” and “new” paradigms, in order to avoid confusions with important concepts in this study, negative and positive eugenics, I simply use the terms “prewar (old) paradigm” and “postwar (new) paradigm” here.
63 Though he does not state his use of these paradigms, Sugiyma Takeshi’s brief analysis of prewar eugenics ideology avoids a postwar-consciousness-driven conclusion. Sugiyma argues that eugenics should be remembered as scientific rationalism not as a deviant science existed during the (deranged) war. See his “Senzen Nihon no yūsei shisō: Sono ronri to rinri,” Karada no kagaku, 191 (1996), 75-80.
Lastly, my dissertation suggests an interesting hypothesis that can be tested in the comparative history of eugenics. My project indicates that, instead of rejecting eugenics ideas that often contained racial prejudice, the Japanese accepted eugenics precisely because they wanted to close the putative mental and physical gap between the “whites” and themselves by promoting the science of “race improvement” in the name of modernization, Westernization, and industrialization. As I shall point out, although Mendelism represented the mainstream among Japanese biologists, the “softer” or less biologically-deterministic (quasi-Lamarckian) perspective existed in Yamanouchi’s eugenics thought and in those of some other scholars. This perspective, though not typical of Japan’s eugenics discourse, might have been one example of a creative response to the white-dominated racial discourse of the period because it allowed greater political and intellectual self-esteem for a non-western people. I suspect this ironic response to modernity may not be unique to the Japanese but may well have been shared by other non-“white” societies.
CHAPTER 2

NARUSE JINZÔ (1858-1919): INCORPORATING “PROTO-EUGENICS” INTO WOMEN’S HIGHER EDUCATION

2.1 Introduction

The traditional historiography of eugenics in Japan has not extensively explored the role of women. Does this mean that they were indifferent to or seldom involved in eugenics? No, there were many signs of women’s interest in eugenics through. Eugenics bordered the public and private spheres of influence. Under the official ideology of “good wife, wise mother,” Japanese women were encouraged to take charge of private aspects of life, including reproduction and nurturing. In this context, producing “fit” children in a literal sense (reproduction) and figurative sense (nurturing) became women’s concerns.

We do not know, however, how women first encountered eugenics ideas. Did they learn eugenics thought from the West? Were eugenics ideas imposed on women by the government, which was engaged in the war with China and promoted the “give birth and multiply” policy in the 1930s? Were not Japanese women supposed to be lacking higher education? When and how did they become acquainted with eugenics?

This chapter attempts to answer these questions by exploring the life of Naruse Jinzô, the founder of the Japan Women’s College. In his quest to convince the authorities
and the public that higher education for women was indeed necessary in a male-dominated society, Naruse appropriated a eugenics rationale and identified his school as an institution designed at the end of the nineteenth century to produce physically and intellectually "fit" women who would improve the Japanese race. He argued that "fit" mothers would produce "fit" Japanese, indispensable for the nation in an era of intense international competition for imperial expansion. Naruse then proposed to create a department of race improvement (jinshu kairyō gakka) in his school. Naruse's promotion of "race improvement" ideas, while accepting the notion of a white-dominated racial hierarchy, offers an example of how non-Western people reacted to the international eugenics movement. After outlining his background and eugenic aspiration, I shall put his initiative in the context of the history of eugenics discourse in Japan.

2.2 Training and Background

Naruse Jinzô was born in 1858. He was the eldest son of a not-so-wealthy lesser samurai family in a branch domain of Chôshû called Yoshiki, in today’s Yamaguchi prefecture. His father, Kozaemon, served as a secretary for the Chôshû domain until about the time of the Meiji Restoration (1868). Kozaemon and his wife Utako had three children: a daughter, Hisako; and two sons, Jinzô and Susumu.

Jinzô was exposed to traditional samurai ethics and Confucianism in his early training at home and later at an official domain school. Ironically, the Meiji Restoration, brought about by the initiatives of Chôshû and a few other domains, took away the basis
of Kozaemon’s livelihood, since the new Meiji government ended the hereditary privileges of the samurai class, including employment and a stipend from the domain. As a result, he began operating a small private school in 1872. There he taught standard subjects such as traditional Chinese classics, calligraphy, Fukuzawa Yukichi’s writings introducing Western ideas, and Western arithmetic. Jinzô assisted his father with teaching at this private school for a while. Jinzô, then still in his teens, became a pharmaceutical assistant for a local Western medical clinic, where he taught himself physics and chemistry. In 1875, he entered a normal school, newly established by the central government, in Yamaguchi. After a year and a half of training, he graduated and accepted a job as a local elementary school principal.¹

In his childhood, he experienced the deaths of his close family members. By the time he was seven, both his grandmother and mother had died.² Utako had been sick after the birth of the third child. When he was sixteen, in 1874, he lost both his brother and his father.³ By this time, his sister had already married and moved away. Perhaps partially because of loneliness in the midst of deaths in the family, and his curiosity towards the modern world represented by the West, Naruse was drawn to Christianity. Meeting with Sawayama Paul (1852-1887) in 1877 had a pivotal impact on Naruse’s future. A Protestant preacher, Sawayama, who had once been a pupil of Naruse’s father, happened

---

² Ibid., 12 and 21-22.
³ Ibid., 35.
to be visiting his hometown of Yoshiki. With the help of an American missionary, he had spent three years studying at Northwestern University and Garrett Biblical Institute near Chicago.⁴

Soon Naruse decided to quit his teaching job and moved to Osaka where Sawayama Paul’s Naniwa Church stood. Naruse hoped to work closely with the spiritual man. In Osaka, Naruse was baptized by Sawayama.⁵ Naruse’s enthusiasm for absorbing knowledge from the Bible impressed foreign missionaries. He found Christianity useful and fundamental for modernization. He was appointed head teacher of Baika Women’s School, affiliated to the Naniwa Church. This was his first involvement in education for women, and it would become his calling. Naruse divided his time between teaching (mathematics, science, education, and psychology) and administration. In Osaka, Naruse married a Christian convert, Hattori Masue, a former Baika student, in 1879.⁶

Teaching at Baika, his interest in educating women grew, and he began developing his own views. In 1881, he published his first book, Onna no tsutome [The duty of women]. In this work, Naruse argued that women in Japan had been treated with little respect partly because they were considered “stupid.” Few men were willing to treat women as their equal partners. In Naruse’s opinion, women’s ignorance came from the


⁵ Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 47.

⁶ Ibid., 58-72. For the mission of the Baika School for Girls, see Naruse’s discussion on woman’s education in “A Modern Paul in Japan,” 566-569.
limited opportunity for formal education, not from their biological limitation. Women who had moral, mental, as well as physical training would be indeed useful for nation building, because the household was a basic unit of society and produced future citizens and wealth. Without properly trained women at home to teach, protect, and nurture children and manage domestic affairs efficiently, it would take much longer to achieve the government goal, “rich nation, strong army.” He noted that uncivilized countries in which people did not recognize the values of women tended to leave women uneducated and treat them like slaves or commercial objects.7 Despite national efforts for modernization, if Japan did not pay attention to educating women, Japan would remain “half-civilized” because women made up half the population.8

His ideas were based on the Christian ideals of mutual respect of a husband and a wife in the family. He accepted physical differences (especially women’s reproductive ability) between men and women but denied the hierarchy between them. This book emphasized the importance of providing women with physiological knowledge; such knowledge would ensure mothers’ as well as children’s health. Naruse’s view reflected the ideal modern housewife in the Christian “home.” At the time, this desirable husband-

7 Naruse Jinzō, “Onna no tsutomé,” Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 4. Japanese prostitutes overseas may have been in Naruse’s mind. Like other intellectuals, he probably saw them as an embarrassment for Japan which aspired to become a modern and civilized nation. For an oral history of girls from poor families sold to South East Asia to become prostitutes in prewar Japan, see Yamazaki Tomoko, Sandakan hachiban shōkan: Teilhen joseishi joshi (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1972).

8 Naruse, “Onna no tsutomé,” 12.
wife relationship was often portrayed in a Western-influenced journal, *Jogaku zasshi* [Journal for school girls], which as a Christian girl's school teacher, Naruse himself must have read regularly.\(^9\)

He resigned from the teaching position at Baika in 1882 in order to dedicate himself to missionary works, first in Yamato Kōriyama in Nara and then in Niigata. In Niigata, he also established a church-affiliated school for girls. Responding to the public demand, the church founded another school for boys.\(^10\) The growing interest in English, Christianity, and science was a reflection of the desire of country's elite to be modern and civilized.

By the late 1880s, however, Japanese intellectuals began seeing Westernization as excessive, superficial, and irresponsible, and they began raising the issue of Japanese identity. In this reactionary intellectual climate, things associated with the West went out of favor. Naruse Jinzō experienced a sharp decline of interest in his school, which eventually closed.\(^11\) In his search for the meaning of his efforts, Naruse decided to study in the United States in late 1890. Since he had not made much money—he made six yen in Nara and twelve yen in Niigata per month\(^12\)—and he spent most of his own money for

---


\(^10\) Watanabe, *Naruse sensei*, 72-93.

\(^11\) Ibid., 107-108.

\(^12\) When Sawayama Paul returned from the U.S. in 1875, the government offered a job which would pay him 150 yen monthly. Instead, Sawayama took a job of minister whose monthly salary was about 7 yen. In 1883, Naruse received 6 yen per month when he began working in Kōriyama, Nara. His salary of
church needs, Naruse did not have much saved. Yet, many people, impressed by his hard
work, offered him help. Among the generous were Naruse’s fellow American
missionaries and some Christian converts in Niigata.\footnote{12 yen in Niigata was that of 1884. Although the statistics before 1879 are not available, between 1879
and 1884, inflation was not a significant factor, at least in the city. See Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 49, 79,
and 85; Nakai Kazuyo, “Dai-ni-bu Niigata Kyōkaishi: Meiji-heien (1),” Kata 1 (December 1984), 87. See
also Figure 5-1, Consumer Price Index (City) in Takayanagi Mitsutoshi and Takeuchi Rizō, eds.,
Nihonshi jiten, 2nd ed. (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1974), 1298.}

As soon as he got on board a ship sailing to America, however, Naruse Jinzō
realized the gap between the Japanese perception of themselves and the Westerners’
perception of the Japanese.\footnote{13 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 104.} Japan’s success in modernization and some imperialist
moves\footnote{14 See a letter from Naruse Jinzō, Massachusetts, USA, to Shiraki (Asô) Shôzō, 6 February 1891, in
“Shokan,” Naruse Jinzō chosakushû, vol. 1, 258.} made many Japanese feel that their country belonged to the club of modern
nations, not the group of traditional countries subject to Western domination. Yet,
Naruse noticed that Westerners tended to see Asia monolithically and in their view Japan
was still only a part of “backward Asia.” In a letter to his friend in Japan, Naruse
explained that he was bothered by the lack of respect towards his country and a failure to
distinguish between Japanese and Chinese.\footnote{15 Following the 1868 Meiji Restoration the new centralized government introduced a series of
political modernization such as a cabinet system (1885), Constitution (1889), a Diet (parliamentary)
system (1890), etc. As for colonial expansion, Japan secured Kuril Islands off Hokkaidō as a result of
negotiations with Russia (1875), forced Korea to open diplomatic relations with Japan (1875), and
incorporated Ryûkyû as one of Japan’s prefecture (1879).} Naruse wrote an essay about his voyage
across the Pacific and sent it to Jogaku zasshi. He observed that there were passengers
and crew members from such countries as Japan, China, Italy, Spain, Britain, and the

\footnote{16 A letter from Naruse to Shiraki, 6 February 1891, “Shokan,” in Naruse Jinzō chosakushû, vol. 1,
258.}
United States. While some came from the middle to upper classes, others were from the lower classes. Naruse noted that the community on board was like a small world. He noticed that the Japanese were the weakest, shortest, thinnest, and poorest among the passengers. And only Japanese passengers were suffering from severe sea sickness. Except for a diplomat’s family, all the upper class cabins were occupied by Westerners. By talking to some crew members, he found out that Westerners received 40 to 250 dollars per month while Chinese crew members were paid about 15 to 25 dollars per month, which was much better than the average monthly wage of Japanese workers on land.  

Naruse was particularly worried about Japan’s future because, among the Japanese passengers, students, in particular, were physically unfit. Before the turn of the century, students who were given opportunities to study abroad were often elites of the society. Naruse believed that it would be damaging to nation building if the future leaders of the country would die young because of their weak constitutions and limited financial resources. It is not hard to imagine that Naruse thought about his mentor, Sawayama Paul. Because of his weak health, typical of his family, Sawayama, who was described as the “young man of extraordinary qualities of mind and heart,” died at the age of thirty-five in 1887. Sawayama, who had refused to take a high-paying government

---

18 Ibid., 218.
19 See Naruse, “A Modern Paul in Japan,” 617. He suffered from fever, headache, cough, general feebleness, with occasional hemorrhages of the lungs. A doctor diagnosed his illness as consumption. See Sawayama’s letters quoted in “A Modern Paul in Japan,” 595-598 and 610-611. For his family’s health conditions, see 598 and 600.
job, was extremely poor.\(^{20}\) In the essay, Naruse suggested two possible solutions to rectifying the problem. One was biological, and the other was economic: “jinshu kairyō” or race improvement; and a general enrichment of the country. In his discussion on race improvement, he mentioned the importance of education for women and stressed the harm of early marriage among his compatriots. After talking to Americans and Chinese on the ship, he discovered that unlike the Japanese, who tended to marry young, those foreigners waited until they grew physically mature and had saved enough money to support a family comfortably. And Naruse believed that without sufficient preparation on the part of parents, their children tended to be underdeveloped.\(^{21}\)

The choice of the word “jinshu kairyō,” and his emphasis on the prevention of early marriage to strengthen the Japanese race, seem to reflect Naruse’s familiarity with the book, Nihon jinshu kairyōron [On the improvement of the Japanese race], by Takahashi Yoshio, published in 1884.\(^{22}\) Here Takahashi discussed how to improve the Japanese race and proposed different approaches to achieve the goal. He supported his arguments with theories of many Western scholars, including those of Francis Galton. Although this British scholar had invented the term “eugenics” in 1883, Takahashi, without referring to the term, simply used examples of hereditary genius in Galton’s

\(^{20}\) See footnote 12.

\(^{21}\) Naruse, “Taiheiyo kōkaichū no shokan,” 218-219.

Takahashi’s "nurture" approaches were concerned with physical education and domestic matters such as clothing, diet, and housing. What was unusual about this work was Takahashi’s biological or "nature" approach to strengthening the racial stock. After presenting the statistical data of physical size among different nationals, Takahashi showed that an average Japanese was shorter and lighter than an average Westerner; and the cranial size of the Mongoloid was smaller than that of the Caucasoid, implying that the former’s mental capacity might be inferior to the latter’s. As a quick remedy for the "undesirable" physical and mental capacities of the Japanese, Takahashi encouraged internmarriage between the Japanese and "whites."  

Takahashi’s view was met by nationalistic reactions involving Japan’s leading intellectuals, including a professor of philosophy at Tokyo University, Inoue Tetsujirō, and the president of the same institution, Katô Hiroyuki. The debate over the Japanese version of “whitening” took place in the context of Japan’s aspiration for equality with the West. Along with the establishment of tariff autonomy and elimination of extraterritorial jurisdiction, the Japanese were discussing whether or not they should allow Westerners to live with the Japanese outside of the designated treaty ports where Westerners had been confined (naichi zakkyo mondai). Pro-Westernization people, including Japanese Christian converts, supported mixed-residence. Takahashi, a protégé

---


24 Takahashi, "Nihon jinshu kairyō ron."
of the leading popularizer of Western ideas, Fukuzawa Yukichi, belonged to this group. (Although mixed-residence was not his main concern, Fukuzawa himself expressed his ideas of race improvement in his 1886 work, *Nihon fujinron* [On Japanese women].)²⁵

Inoue and Katō were more cautious than Takahashi and argued that, from a perspective of social-Darwinism, the Japanese, as the less civilized people, were likely to lose to more advanced Westerners commercially as well as biologically.²⁶ According to Unoura Hiroshi, pro-mixed residence arguments, which were popular between 1883 and 1886, began being severely criticized in the late 1880s reactionary intellectual climate that caused the decline of Naruse’s church and school in Niigata.²⁷

It is intriguing to note that Naruse was aware of his own marginality; he saw himself as one of the small, weak, and poor elites on board. He noted that he suffered from sea sickness for the first three days. In his letter to his wife, Masue, written a couple of months later, he noted that he had married her too early and been (physically, mentally, and financially) unprepared for that.²⁸ Later, when he discussed the

---


improvement of national physique ( kokumin taikaku no kairyō), he also stated that the author, being short and thin, realized the acute necessity of improving the constitution of the Japanese while living in the United States for three years. 29

As soon as he arrived in San Francisco, he faced grim reality: strong racial prejudice against the Japanese and other nonwhite people in the United States. Anti-Chinese feeling on the Pacific Coast had been deep-rooted. By 1882, in the state of California workers' fear of the Chinese was strong enough to pass an act that suspended the immigration of Chinese laborers for twenty years and reaffirmed the inadmissibility of Chinese to citizenship. Though the Chinese were singled out in this act, some movements targeted not only Chinese but also other "Mongoloid" people. 30 Naruse's diary entries revealed his knowledge of verbal and physical abuses aimed at his compatriots on the West Coast. For example, when he and other Japanese took a walk at night in San Francisco, his friend was hit on the head. He wrote that the Japanese were not favorably regarded and were even looked down on there. 31 In the Midwest, people were generally ignorant about Japan, its people and culture. Some Americans mistook


31 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 111.
him for German or Turkish. But most thought that he was Chinese. Naruse was particularly bothered by the fact that some slighted him by calling him “Boy” or “John.”

At the end of his long trip, however, Naruse was warmly received by the family of his old missionary friend, Horace H. Leavitt, who had returned home from Japan and become a minister in Somerville, near Boston, Massachusetts. Soon Naruse was enrolled at the Andover Theological Seminary and began commuting from the Leavitt’s home. At the Seminary, he received a one-year scholarship and learned sociology from Professor William Jewett Tucker. Tucker was an active scholar who had established the department of sociology at the seminary, taught sociology classes, and began publishing Andover Review. He was also a controversial Congregationist minister because he accepted Darwin’s evolution theories.

Tucker paid special attention to Naruse. Their interactions were not just academic, but also personal. When Naruse was not physically well, the Tucker family took care of Naruse. Taking courses from Tucker must have been a stimulating and eye-opening experience for Naruse. Theories developed by social thinkers August Comte

---

32 Ibid. The notebook containing this part of his diary is missing from the Japan Women’s University archives. See “Kaisetsu,” Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 664-671. In his letter to Shiraki (Asô) Shôzô, he noted similarly unpleasant incidents. See a letter from Naruse to Shiraki, 6 February 1891, Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 258.


34 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 126.
(1798-1858) and Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) had been most influential in America in the 1880s; even during the time when Naruse studied there, in the early 1890s, these theories were the basics of the new American discipline of sociology.\(^{35}\)

Twenty years later, Naruse recalled his encounter with sociology as something that had changed his fundamental views: before knowing "science" he had been an enthusiastic Christian believing in metaphysical and theological philosophies; but now scientific approaches, like identifying a problem, hypothesizing explanations, and proving hypothesis by experiment and data, made his old views obsolete.\(^{36}\) He became determined to take advantage of (social) scientific approaches to achieve his career objective. In his diary of February, 1891, Naruse wrote as follows:

**MY CALLING**
It is not a teacher, minister, nor scholar. It is a social reformer, educator for women, counsellor for their parents, pioneer, and inspirer.

**WHAT I SHOULD DO IN MY LIFE**
My purpose is to pursue my calling to promote the status of women; to grant them virtue; to give them power, knowledge, and discipline; to help them create an 'ideal home'; to build their character; to enrich others by saving people from disease and poverty; ...and to help them create an ideal society. (Including race improvement)\(^{37}\)

It is apparent that Naruse believed "race improvement" would be an effective approach to fulfill his dream of making Japan a better society through women's education. As we

---

\(^{35}\) Yamamoto, "Naruse Jinzô no shakaigakuteki sekai," 83.

\(^{36}\) Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 161-162.

have already seen, he wrote about “jinshū kairi” in his essay on his Pacific voyage.\textsuperscript{38} Moreover, he copied the part, “What I Should Do in My Life,” and put it again in his diary on August 10.\textsuperscript{39} As we will see, he adhered to this idea and tried to incorporate the element of “race improvement” in the curriculum of a university that he was to establish after returning to Japan.

To make the most of his time in the United States, he took courses and contacted people useful for this purpose. In addition to sociology, he studied pedagogy (especially for women), theology, English literature, and social work. He met prominent scholars, educators, businessmen, and religious leaders personally.

Despite the exciting promises, Naruse soon received disturbing news from home. His wife, Masue, whom he had left behind, fell seriously ill. She was no longer able to support herself by teaching sewing and English. Worse yet, she needed substantial money for medical care, including an operation. Naruse Jinzō, who himself was financially dependent on his friends, did not have much extra money to send his wife. Although, in his earlier letter to Masue, he had asked her opinion about his possibly staying in America for over four years since he thought the degree would help him accomplish his goal, pursuing a degree was not an option under these circumstances.

---

\textsuperscript{38} Naruse, “Taiheiyo kōkaichi no shokan,” 217-220. This article was probably written in January or early February.

\textsuperscript{39} See his diary entry on August 10, 1891 in “Nikki: Meiji 24 nen 4 gatsu gejun yori dō 25 nen 1 gatsu 27 nichī made,” in Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 504. Here he used the term “jinrui kairi” or “human improvement.”
Fortunately, Naruse’s close friend in Japan temporarily paid medical bills for Masue and her relatives looked after her. Even though strong pressure was put on Naruse to return home to join his sick wife, at the same time he was obliged to show that studying abroad was indeed meaningful for him to the generous people who believed in him and gave him this opportunity. Only after acquiring knowledge based on scientific investigations, he thought, could he succeed in establishing an institution of higher education for women.\textsuperscript{40} With the news that Masue was recovering, Jinzö decided to stay for another year in Boston. He sent money home which he made by writing:

Occasionally he contributed essays about his life in the U.S. to Japanese journals; and he published a biography of Sawayama Paul in English in 1893.\textsuperscript{41} It was received very well and went through at least twenty editions.\textsuperscript{42} He also often gave talks at churches and received some honoraria.\textsuperscript{43}

During and after the Spring semester at the Andover Theological Seminary, Naruse Jinzö began visiting such universities and colleges as Wellesley, Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar, Bryn Mawr, Harvard, and Chicago, and meeting administrators and

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{40} Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 121-124. See also a letter from Naruse Jinzö, Massachusetts, U.S.A., 23 October, 1891, to Matsumura Kaiscki and Shiraki Shōzō, in “Shokan,” Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 261. See his determination to take advantage of the study abroad opportunity in preparing for the establishment of a university for women in Japan in his letter to his wife, a letter from Naruse Jinzō, Massachusetts, U.S.A., to Naruse Masue, 14 February, 1891, “Shokan,” in Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 255.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{41} Naruse sent $138 to Masue on September 8, 1892. See his diary in Naruse Jinzō, “Nikki Meiji 25 nen (1892) 5 gatsu yori Meiji 26 nen (1893) 5 gatsu made,” in Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 537.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{42} About the biography of Sawayama, see Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 128-131. The biography, “A Modern paul in Japan,” is in Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 560-632.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{43} See, for instance, his diary entries on July 2, 3 , 5, 6, 17, 31, and August 7, 1892 in Naruse Jinzō, “Nikki Meiji 25 nen (1892) 5 gatsu yori Meiji 26 nen (1893) 5 gatsu made,” in Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 545-551.}
professors there. In Fall 1892, he transferred from the Seminary to Clark University. Clark was one of the institutions founded in the late nineteenth century, modeled after German universities, committed to scientific investigations.\textsuperscript{44} In 1889, a few years before Naruse’s arrival, Clark University had opened as one of the first American schools dedicated to graduate education. Under the leadership of its aspiring president, G. Stanley Hall (1846-1924), Clark was promoting positivistic, research-oriented education. Hall was a prominent educational psychologist who was concerned about the racial decline of Anglo-Saxons. However, he believed that progress in education and science would improve racial stock. He thus recognized women’s important role as child bearers in the biological evolution of the human race.\textsuperscript{45} It is not clear how many of these ideas had been already incorporated into Hall’s research and teaching when Naruse was studying with him. After all, the term “eugenics,” which had been coined by Francis Galton in 1883, did not become widely used until around 1904. Naruse noted that Hall gave useful advice to the Japanese student. Naruse’s later writings reveal Hall’s influences on the Japanese educator’s thought. Although Naruse was encouraged to complete a Ph. D. thesis on his topic of higher education for women, he did not pursue a degree because of Masue’s poor health.

\textsuperscript{44} About Clark University and G. Stanley Hall, see, for example, Laurence R. Veysey, \textit{The Emergence of the American University} (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 124, and 165-170.

2.3 Establishing a College for Women

2.3.1 Campaign

Upon completing the studies he had planned, Naruse Jinzō went back to Japan, where his wife was anxiously waiting, in January 1894. He became principal of the Baika School for Girls in Osaka. He soon realized that the school, in its formative years, had created its own culture based on Christianity; therefore it would be difficult to implement the “scientific” approaches he had learned in the United States. By this time, the founder of Baika and Naruse’s mentor, Sawayama Paul, was no longer alive. Naruse concluded that he needed to establish a brand new institution. In this context, he began a public campaign explaining his vision of an ideal higher education for women.46 In summer 1895, with the help of Asô Shôzô (1864-1949), another young Christian educator, Naruse completed the book, Joshi kyōiku [Women’s education], which was published in the following year.

This book was comprised of five chapters. In the first, Naruse presented the overview of his arguments. He criticized the existing educational system for women, which emphasized the practical arts of sewing and handicraft and the traditional arts of tea ceremony and flower arrangement. Mastering these arts served as cultural dowries by enhancing the desirability of daughters as brides. But it helped little to make women intelligent partners for men. He respected the official ideal of womanhood, “good wife, wise mother (ryôsai kenbo),” which the government began promoting after the Sino-

---

46 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 166-168.
Japanese War (1894-1895). But in order to make a true “wise mother, good wife (kenbo ryōsai),” who could contribute to Japan’s nation-building, he continued, higher education for women would be crucial. He proposed to educate women not only as women, but also as humans and Japanese nationals. Because of this conviction, he championed liberal education (futsū kyōiku), based on intellectual, moral, and physical training.

In the chapter focusing on intellectual training, Naruse lamented that Japanese women were far less educated than their Western counterparts. He disapproved of the commonly-held views that education for women would simply masculinize women, that they were physically and mentally incapable of learning sophisticated matters, and therefore that it would be harmful for them to study beyond their capacities. Naruse was familiar with the fact that there were in Europe and North America a number of women’s colleges and co-ed universities, that had begun admitting academically qualified female students. Despite prejudices similar to those in Japan, many Western women proved they were capable of learning in many fields.

He tried to legitimize his idea with the latest theories of American scholars whom he had personally met, incorporating as many “scientific” ideas as possible. One such

---

idea was the concept of heredity (iden). Quoting G. Stanley Hall’s view in favor of the
inheritance of acquired characteristics, Naruse stressed that pregnant mothers’ experience
would influence their fetuses greatly.48

In his short section in which he discussed the relationship between intellectual
training and heredity, Naruse noted that both heredity (the biological factor) and
education (the social factor) shaped human characteristics. While the former could restrict
the effect of education, he believed that good education could also refine hereditary
elements. In other words, education would lead to the improvement or evolution of the
human species (jinnui no hattatsu, shinka). Since maternal influences were greater than
paternal ones on the mental and physical characteristics of descendants, it was obvious,
Naruse argued, that women’s education should be the priority of the emerging modern
nation.49

Here he accepted the view that the Japanese, as latecomers to modernization
(compared to the western Europeans and north Americans), were currently “racially”
inferior to the Westerners. Yet, this disadvantaged situation could be altered by
ameliorating women’s mental capacities through education. This was a combination of

48 Naruse, “Joshi kyōiku,” 41. As for G. Stanley Hall’s view towards the acquired characteristics, see
Pickens, Eugenics and the Progressives, 136.

49 Naruse, “Joshi kyōiku,” 65. More on his discussions on issues related to heredity, see pp. 71-73,
75, 91, 96-97, 99-100, 140, 144.
the "nature" and "nurture" forces. The optimism towards education and the acceptance of the inheritance of acquired characteristics were, however, still generally the norm in the end of the nineteenth century.  

As for moral education, Naruse Jinzō's views in *Women's Education* seem eclectic; they were influenced by Confucianism, Christianity, and heredity views. While women tend to be kind, merciful, calm, warm, patient, obedient, emotional, and loving, they can also be selfish, vengeful, cruel, and immature. As a society became more civilized, he contended, the number of women with more desirable moral traits could be increased by sexual selection and moral education. Sexual selection is the evolutionary process by which, for example, certain "manly" characteristics in mates are favored by females, thus these characteristics are more likely to endure. Naruse valued obedience as the most important moral attribute in women. He did recognize this attribute could easily become negative if it led to poor self-esteem, dependency, or little individual thinking. He hoped to educate women to be obedient, modest, graceful, merciful, and unselfish. At the same time, in his view, the ideal women for the future of Japan were farsighted and mentally strong, equipped with a clear sense of purpose. Moral education would ensure that women obtain these virtues, Naruse thought. He believed that morality should be based on universal values. Despite his Christian background, he did not adopt any

---

50 Hamilton Cravens and John C. Burnham, "Psychology and Evolutionary Naturalism in American Thought, 1890-1940," *American Quarterly* 23 (1971), 637-638. Cravens and Burnham discuss the impact of a German biologist August Weismann's biologically deterministic "germ-plasm" theory on the transformation of psychology from "a handmaiden of philosophy" to "an experimental natural science" beginning in the 1890s.
specific religion to be embraced in the proposed school. By this time, he had developed a pantheistic view of character:

[T]he concept of characters ascribed to all human activities and is the source of values on all aspects of life. We are developed out of the spirit of the universe. Human beings are valued for the manifestation in them of the infinite life.

In the next chapter Naruse expressed his view on physical education. During his sojourn in the U.S. he picked up the current physical education theories from Dudley Allen Sargent of Harvard University and Luther H. Gulick of the YMCA training school at Springfield, Massachusetts. Both saw physical education as a scientific discipline. For example, Sargent emphasized the hygienic aspect of physical education. He was a promoter of physical education to the “fair sex” as well. Gulick aimed to combine and thereby strengthen the mind, body, and spirits of young men. Sargent’s theories were compatible with eugenics and he later joined the Eugenics Society of the United States of America. Gulick participated in a national conference on race betterment in 1914.

---

51 Ibid., 91-118.
52 Quoted in Kuni Nakajima, Naruse Jinzo, 78.
53 Their help was acknowledged in Naruse’s Joshi kyōiku. See Naruse, “Joshi kyōiku,” 32.
54 About the role of Sargent and Gulick in the history of physical education, see Chapter 22 of Deobold B. van Daleen, Elmer D. Mitchell, and Bruce L. Bennett, A World History of Physical Education: Cultural, Philosophical, Comparative (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1953). Sargent emphasized the hygienic aspect of physical education as the most important among the four aims of physical training, see p. 389. About his ideas about physical education for women, see pp. 395 and 413.
57 Luther H. Gulick, “The Social Program,” Proceedings of the First National Conference on Race Betterment January 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 1914, ed. Secretary of Race Betterment Foundation (Battle Creek, MI: Race Betterment Foundation, 1914), 422-430. He was not only a leader in physical education but also a nephew of a missionary, Orramel Hinckley Gulick, whom Naruse had personally known in Japan.

57
In the chapter on physical education, which seemed to be closely related to his earlier interest in “race improvement,” Naruse Jinzō argued that (urban middle class) women should build up their constitutions through physical exercise. Like his American teacher, G. Stanley Hall, Naruse believed that sound minds can exist only in sound bodies.\textsuperscript{58} He wanted women to do exercises because women, as the mothers of the Japanese people, would have the greater impact on the next generation and yet, they were generally smaller and weaker than men. Although men had been engaged in martial arts, which helped them build their bodies, supposedly women of respectable families had never been encouraged to exercise, especially under the sun. Because of this kind of assumption, he saw women were more responsible for the physical “unfitness” of the Japanese.\textsuperscript{59} In Naruse’s opinion, women were the victims of traditions and the paucity of good physical education programs.

He wrote that the Japanese in early Meiji period were not only smaller than the Westerners and the Chinese\textsuperscript{60} but also generally smaller than their own ancestors.\textsuperscript{61} In

\textsuperscript{58} Pickens, \textit{Eugenics and the Progressives}, 134.

\textsuperscript{59} Naruse, “Joshi kyōiku,” 119-122. Of course, farm men and women, the majority of the Japanese population at the time, had no choice but to work outside year around and got much exercise out of their farming routine if we will call it “exercise.” Since Naruse was from the samurai background and aimed at the establishment of a university for women mostly from middle to upper class families, his arguments reflected his middle class biases in his generalization of the division of labor and social roles based on gender.

\textsuperscript{60} In this context, he discussed the concept of “wa”; because of the smaller size of the Japanese, it was reasonable for Westerners to mix up the two different Chinese characters, both phonetically pronounced “wa”; one was used to describe the Japanese and the other meant dwarf(s). See Naruse Jinzō, “Joshi kyōiku,” \textit{Naruse Jinzō chōskushū}, vol. 1, 120. See one such Westerner, British anthropologist Alexander Francis Chamberlain’s 1896 observation, quoted in Sabine Frühstück, \textit{Die Politik der Sexual Wissenschaft: Zur Produktion und Popularisierung sezologischen Wissens in Japan 1908-1941} (Vienna: Institut für Japanologie Universität Wien, 1997), 22-23 (Note 3). As for the Chinese notion of the Japanese as “dwarf slave,” which Naruse incorrectly claimed misleading, see Toyoshima Shizuhide, “Wa to iu na no iware: Kodai Chūgokujin no Wajinkan,” \textit{Rekishi hyoron} 526 (1994), 74-91; and Frank Dikötter, \textit{The
order to reverse this lamentable atavistic trend, he proposed the physical improvement of
the Japanese ethnic nation (Wa minzoku taikaku no kairyō); and in this context he
suggested the improvement of women’s physique (joshi taikaku kairyō).62

His chapter also touched on the issue of beauty. Naruse explained that Japan was
going to recast the world civilization by its unique approach to adopting elements from
Eastern and Western sources as well as from new and old civilizations selectively. He
hoped that Japanese women would be the first in the world to undertake a conscious
effort to make their bodies both healthy and beautiful. One way to obtain beauties of the
body, such as balanced proportion, healthy skin colors and conditions, was to exercise.
At the time, healthy women who were strongly-built and exposed to the sun had been
often pejoratively called “servant-face (gejo zura)” women and considered less attractive
than fragile and pale women. According to Naruse, this kind of general preference of men
had promoted physical degeneration of the Japanese ethnic nation. That was why his
contemporaries were smaller and weaker than their forebears. From a perspective of
sexual selection, Naruse felt that men’s standard of “good looking women” should be
radically reconceptualized.63 Consistent with his earlier statement, he emphasized the

Discourse of Race in Modern China (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 62, 136, 138, 140, 149,
and 240.

61 Naruse Jinzō, “Joshi kyōiku,” Naruse Jinzō chosakushū, vol. 1, 120. The observation that early
Meiji Japanese were physically inferior to their ancestors can be also found in Fukuzawa Yukichi, “Nihon
fujinron,” Fukuzawa Yukichi zenshū, vol. 5, 463-466. Fukuzawa, in this 1886 work, saw his
contemporary women of middle to upper class families tended to be weak and unhealthy. The Tokugawa
definition of respectable womanhood robbed upper class women of much freedom. Many restrictions to
conform to the norm made women unable to leave the house, be active, and do exercises.


63 Naruse, “Joshi kyōiku,” 120-121 and 146-147. The concept of sexual selection was also explored
in Takahashi Yoshio’s Nihon jinshu kainvōron, 51.
negative effect of early marriage: it could halt physical maturing of teenage girls, and babies born from the underdeveloped mothers would have higher chances to be sickly and frail. Since the harm had been experimentally proven, Naruse added, it would be desirable to restrict early marriage by revising certain parts of the Civil Law. The final chapter was concerned with vocational training. He did not entirely dismiss domestic arts such as embroidery, calligraphy, sewing, and cooking. Naruse criticized the custom of upper class women who let servants handle all aspects of life and despised work as lowly. The Japanese educator thought this kind of attitude reinforced women’s dependency and helplessness.

Naruse’s book was provocative because he viewed women as worthy of learning academic subjects and capable of scientific inquiry in a society where the notion of the “predominance of men over women (danson johi)” prevailed. Providing physical education for women was another controversial aspect. He justified his cause by emphasizing his version of “scientific” race improvement measures vital to the survival of Japan in an era of imperial expansion. His book was effective because it showed amply examples of women’s education in the West. Furthermore, it suggested ways to modify

---

64 Naruse, "Joshi kyōiku," 147.
65 Ibid., 148-155.
66 According to Watanabe Eichi, such newspapers and journals as Tokyo Nichinichi, Rikugō zasshi, and Jogaku zasshi, responded to Naruse’s Joshi kyōiku. See Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 172-173.
67 Ibid.
women’s education based on these Western examples because direct importation of these ideas were not expected to work well in Japan, where culture and traditions were very different from those in the West.

In Naruse’s mind, intellectual and physical education were closely related. In his 1897 speech, “Joshi kyōiku shinkisaku” [A measure to promote women’s education], Naruse expressed his view:

I strongly feel that it is necessary to provide higher education for women—giving them medical and hygienic knowledge—in order to improve the current [situation] concerning heredity in Japan, and strengthen the Japanese nation... Many problems come from the fact that [women are] not well-informed medically. We need to employ a teacher with some medical background and offer physical education for women.68

He noted that society could be improved by a combination of education and heredity (iden); but the most important factor influencing heredity was marriage, which itself could be influenced by education. Educating women about how to marry better would make a difference in improving heredity.69

Advocating these principles outlined in Women’s Education, Naruse Jinzō launched a fundraising campaign to establish an institution which would provide higher education for Japanese women. Initially, he set a goal of raising 300,000 yen in order to build a women’s university in Osaka. He began contacting individuals in the upper strata of Japanese society, including Prime Minister Itō Hirobumi. Perhaps Naruse’s coming from Yamaguchi, or having the Chōshū connection, served favorably in gaining access to

69 Ibid., 184.
the political leaders. Itō was a perfect example of Chōshū prominence in Meiji politics. Itō introduced Naruse to Minister of Education Saionji Kinmochi in his cabinet. Saionji agreed to put his name on the list of hokkinnin (proposers) for the plan. Yet, he frankly rejected government sponsorship for a women’s university because the nation had put a priority on men’s education. Thus, women’s higher education was left in the hands of private individuals.

With the support of such top political figures of post Sino-Japanese war Japan, Naruse was able to see many influential people. These included such important politicians as Prince Yamagata Aritomo (former Prime Minister, also from Chōshū), Prince Ōkuma Shigenobu (future Prime Minister and the founder of Waseda University) and Prince Konoe Atsumaro (Speaker of the House of Peers), and wealthy zaibatsu families including the Iwasaki (Mitsubishi), the Mitsui, the Sumitomo, and the Kônoike (Sanwa). 70

To concentrate on his fund raising, Naruse resigned from his duties at Baika in summer 1896. In December Naruse had a pamphlet printed which described the plan to establish a university for women and distributed it to prospective supporters. There he repeated his conviction:

Half of the human race consists of women. Their potential for supporting and promoting society is more important than is commonly understood. Therefore, the success or failure of women could greatly influence the destiny of the nation. 71

70 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 179-186; and Nakamura Masao, ed. Nihon Joshi Daigakkô wanjû-nen shi. (Tokyo: Nihon Joshi Daigakkô, 1942), 44-73.

71 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 189. English translation quoted from Kuni Nakajima, Naruse Jinzo. 77.
Although many individuals supported Naruse, there also existed strong criticisms as well as indifference. Many justified their antagonism towards the plan based on cultural reasons. Just as Naruse had expected, some argued that women were not capable of understanding strictly academic subjects, while others maintained that higher education for women was not necessary because their calling was limited to the management of the household. Another group of people was afraid that women with knowledge might lose traditional female virtues such as gracefulness, gentleness, and obedience. There were different views on possible sterilizing effects: For example, some believed that intensive studying might ruin women's health, which would lead to the decline of the ethnic nation (minzoku no suitai); and others feared that higher education might masculinize women, who might seek an independent life and avoid marriage altogether. Indirect opposition can be found in the argument that higher education for women was meaningful, but it was too early to implement considering the level of Japanese civilization at the time.\(^\text{72}\)

In addition to these conservative opinions, there was another factor holding back Naruse's fund raising campaign. A few years after the Sino-Japanese War, Japan's economy began experiencing recession; and even the rich could not easily afford to provide much money. Naruse and his supporters adjusted to the situation. With the money they had already raised--150,000 yen, or about half the goal--from over seven

\(^{72}\) See Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 192-194. More about negative response towards the idea of providing higher education for women can be found in pp. 213-214.
hundred people, they decided to go ahead and build a school system for women, which would be comprised of a university, a preparatory school for university entrance (yōka), and a higher school.

Naruse and others also discussed the pros and cons of Osaka as the school site. Despite the fact that Naruse spent his youth in Osaka and many of his supporters were from that area, most foresaw the benefit of placing the new university in Tokyo. Tokyo, as the capital of Meiji Japan, was the center of government, business, and academic activities of the nation. Even Osaka people agreed that it might be a better location. Taking advantage of land in Tokyo donated by the Mitsui family, they began building school structures there. Upon completion, the university opened in April 1901.73

Higher education for women had already become available with the 1874 establishment of Joshi Shihan Gakkō (Normal School for Women, publicly funded)74 followed by three other private schools, all of which opened in 1900: Tsuda Eigaku Juku

---

73 Ibid., 203-210.

74 It was designed to train female elementary school teachers by the Ministry of Education. The school was publicly funded. It has become today’s Ochanomizu Joshi Daigaku. In addition, another national school, Tokyo Ongaku Gakkō (Tokyo Music School) accepted some female students before the turn of the century. See Tsuda Juku Rika No Rekishī O Kiroku Suru Kai, ed., Tsuda Juku rika no rekishi: Josei no iiritu to kagaku kyōiku (Tokyo: Domesu Shuppan, 1991), 18.
Tôkyô Joshi Igakkô (Tokyo Women’s Medical School),
Naruse’s Nihon Joshi Daigakkô (Japan Women’s College, established in 1901), thus differed from these schools in emphasizing comprehensive liberal education rather than a particular specialty. In terms of size and sophistication of organization, Naruse’s Japan Women’s College was far ahead of other private women’s schools—Tsuda Eigaku Juku, Joshi Bijutsu Gakkô, and Tôkyô Joshi Igakkô—which were established as a mere one-room institution around the turn of the century.

Naruse Jinzô’s vigorous campaign and self sacrifice for five long years made it possible to make his dream come true. Despite the rewarding result, however, he lost

---

75 Founded by Tsuda Umeko in July 1900. Tsuda was one of the first five women sent to study in the United States by the Meiji government. When she left for the United State in 1871, Tsuda was only six years old. After finishing secondary education there, she returned home in 1882. She then went back to America to study biology at Bryn Mawr College in 1890. She worked with Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan, who would receive a Nobel prize in his genetics research in 1933, and co-authored an article on the orientation of the frog’s egg with him in 1894. Though she was offered a research position by the college, she decided to return to Japan to improve the social standing of women there. See Tsuda Juku, Tsuda Juku rika no rekishi, 128-146.

76 It was founded in October 1900 by Yokoi Tamako and Satô Shizu. This is today’s Joshi Bijutsu Daigaku. See Tsuda Juku, Tsuda Juku rika no rekishi, 19; and Kanamori Toshie and Fujii Harue, Ohn no kyôiku 100 nen (Tokyo: Sanseidô, 1977), 34.

77 Founded by a woman medical doctor, Yoshioka Yayoi in December 1900. In Meiji Japan, educational opportunities for women were very restricted. After her alma mater, Saisei Gakusha, closed its door to female students, Yoshioka opened a private medical preparatory school for women. Compared with the scale of Naruse’s school, her school was very small. She started it in a six-mat tatami room in her clinic with four students. It took eight years to produce the first student who passed all the qualifying exams. For details, see Yoshioka Yayoi Joshi Denki Hensan linkai, ed. Yoshioka Yayoi den, revised ed. (Tokyo: Kashiwa Shôbô, 1976), 217-255.

78 As for self sacrifice, for example, he lived an extremely frugal life despite the fact that he was in control of a considerable amount of money donated for the cause. See Watanabe, Nanuse sensei, 197-200.
his wife Masue. She died in September 1900, unable fully to recover from her chronically poor health.79

2.3.2 Programs: Home Economics and Physical Education

In spite of its name, Nihon Joshi Daigakkô was not technically a university. Until the University Act (Daigakurei) was enacted in 1918, private schools, which claimed that they were providing “university” education, were not accredited by the Ministry of Education as universities. Only Imperial Universities in Tokyo, Kyoto, Tôhoku, and Kyûshû were entitled to call themselves “daigaku” or university by law. A year after the promulgation of the College Act (Senmon Gakkôrei) in 1903, Nihon Joshi Daigakkô was certified as a “senmon gakkô” or college.80 Although some private and public (but not “Imperial”) “senmon gakkô” for men, such as Waseda and Keiô, became “universities” in 1918, women’s “senmon gakkô” had to wait until 1948 to attain university status.81 Although the number of girls who graduated from secondary schools increased rapidly, Imperial Universities remained closed to women until Tôhoku University began admitting


81 Monbushô, Gakusei hyakunen, vol. 1, Kijutsu-hen, 398-699; and Nihon Joshi Daigaku Naruse Kinenkan, Nenpyô, 38.
women in 1913. The gap between women’s aspirations for higher education and the limited opportunity was filled by the opening of schools such as Japan Women’s College and Tsuda Women’s English School.\(^{82}\)

Response to the 1901 opening of the Japan Women’s College was very positive. The number of applicants far exceeded that which the school officials originally anticipated. More than two hundred twenty were admitted to the College and to the College’s preparatory school.\(^{83}\)

Perhaps the most distinct characteristics of the College were heavy doses of science education within the home economics program and an emphasis on physical education. Naruse Jinzô managed to implement what he outlined in his book, *Women’s Education*. Japan Women’s College consisted of three faculties: home economics, Japanese literature, and English literature. Among the three, the *Kasei Gakubu*, or the faculty of home economics, was a novel concept. The Japanese term, *kaseigaku* (literally, it means the science of house keeping or home management) was coined by the Japan Women’s College.\(^{84}\) It was defined as an applied science indispensable for managing home affairs. It was interdisciplinary, drawing knowledge from natural history, physiology, hygiene, physics, chemistry, horticulture, psychology, ethics, pedagogy,

\(^{82}\) In her autobiography, one of the most prominent woman activists in modern Japanese history, Hiratsuka Raichô, describes the limited opportunity for women who wanted further education when she graduated from a higher school for girls in 1903. See Hiratsuka Raichô, *Genshi josei wa tairô de atta*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1971), 136.

\(^{83}\) About the number of students admitted to each department, see Nakamura, *Nihon Joshi Daigakkô vonjû-nen shi*. 82.

\(^{84}\) Nakamura, *Nihon Joshi Daigakkô vonjû-nen shi*, 100.
juvenile studies, art history, sociology, law, and economics. Since all students, regardless of their major, were required to take twelve hours of core courses over the three years—ethics, sociology, psychology, pedagogy, juvenile education, home education, juvenile studies, and juvenile literature—the real difference between the literature curriculum and the home economics curriculum seems to have been the latter’s stress on natural science. Home economics majors were required to take twelve hours of physiology, hygiene, physics, and chemistry classes, while these courses were elective for literature students.

Faculty members who were originally recruited to teach natural science classes were remarkably prominent. Through an introduction from a school supporter, Naruse’s righthand man, Asō Shōzō, first contacted pharmacological chemist Nagai Nagayoshi (1845-1929), a professor at Tokyo University, Faculty of Medicine, and asked Nagai if he could teach applied chemistry classes for home economics majors. Nagai liked the College’s educational philosophy; not only accepting the position, he recruited his friends, Miyake Shū (1848-1938) and Ōsawa Kenji (1852-1927), to teach other science courses. While Miyake was a pathology professor of Tokyo University and at one time served as Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, Ōsawa was a physiology professor and succeeded Miyake’s deanship in 1890. All three had studied in Europe in the 1860s and

---

85 Ibid., 101.
86 See the curriculum charts in Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonjū-nen shi, 75-79.
1870s and held doctoral degrees in medicine. Japan Women’s College thus attracted a number of prominent scientists as regular lecturers who were simultaneously holding full professorships at Tokyo University and other leading institutions.88

Other teaching staff in science included zoologist Watase Shōzaburō (1862-1929), who was hired to teach natural history. Unlike Nagai, Miyake, and Ôsawa, who belonged to the Faculty of Medicine, Watase belonged to the Faculty of Science at Tokyo University (he was promoted to full professor in 1901). His training also differed from the other three because it was done in the United States. He studied cytological histology at Johns Hopkins University between 1886 and 1890. Under the supervision of William Keith Brooks (1848-1908), he completed his dissertation and received a Ph. D. in 1890. Upon graduation, he got a lecturer position at Clark University in Massachusetts. Three years later, he moved to the University of Chicago and taught cytology and comparative histology until returning to Japan in 1899. When Naruse studied at Clark in 1892, Watase was teaching there. The fact that Watase was a Christian may have also helped them get closer.89

88 This was a common academic practice known as naishoku or moonlighting. See James R. Bartholomew, The Formation of Science in Japan: Building a Research Tradition (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988), 84-86, 260, 227, and 230. Nagai Nagayoshi’s annual salary for his instruction at the Japan Women’s College in 1901 was 300 yen or 25 yen per month. See Tsuji Isao, “Nihon Joshi Daigaku sōritsu tōji no kyōin soshiki,” 43. The range for the annual salary of full professors at Tokyo University in 1898 was about 1,300 to 1,900 yen. See Bartholomew, 84.

If the quality of science professors was outstanding, so was that of the facilities. Although in the beginning the facility for chemistry experiments was limited in equipment and scale, by 1908 private donations made it possible to build a sophisticated science laboratory on campus. No other private universities—despite the fact that they had Faculties of “Science” or “Science and Engineering” rather than a Faculty of “Home Economics”—had such a fine lab. Only nationally funded Imperial Universities had comparable facilities.\(^\text{90}\)

A physiology textbook prepared by Ōsawa for his classes at the Japan Women’s College reveals the content of Japan’s earliest modern science education aimed at women students. The book was over five hundred pages and explained such concepts as chemical elements of organisms, the integumentary system, the muscular system, neural control, reproduction and development, gas exchange, circulation, respiration, nutrition, digestion, the lymphatic system, major organ systems, and solution-water balance. In his discussions on reproduction and development, Ōsawa also dealt with evolution theories and heredity.\(^\text{91}\)

Some students absorbed scientific knowledge and went on to research-oriented careers. For instance, Tange Ume (1873-1951) came to the Japan Women’s College to

---


\(^{91}\) See Ōsawa Kenji, *Seirigaku 1921-1932*, Nihon Joshi Daigaku kōki, no. 9. Publication information is not available. This text book is held at the Nihon Joshi Daigaku Library (Main Campus) under the call number, G641 Hih. See also, Ōsuka (Alumni Association of the Japan Women’s University), ed., Ōsawa Kenji, *dictated, Seirigaku (kōgi yomoku)*, (Tokyo: Kanda Seibido, 1914). According to historian Nakamura Masao, the latter was published as a part of the College’s extension programs which started in 1908. Nakamura, *Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonjū-nen shi*, 152-155. More on Ōsawa’s publications, see Nihon Seirigaku Kyōshitsu Henshū linkai, ed. *Nihon seirigaku kyōshitsu*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nihon Seirigakkai, 1983), 276.
major in home economics as soon as it opened in 1901. By 1903, Tange was helping Professor Nagai Nagayoshi as a student lab assistant.\textsuperscript{92} When Tōhoku University decided to allow formal admission to women in 1913, Nagai encouraged Tange to take entrance examinations.\textsuperscript{93} She and two other women passed the exams with excellent marks. After completing her graduate work there, Tange went back to her alma mater to teach food chemistry.\textsuperscript{94} She later received the first doctoral degree in agriculture as a woman in 1940 for her research on Vitamin B\textsubscript{2}.\textsuperscript{95}

During his stay in the United States, Naruse had been impressed by American women who effectively managed the home based on solid scientific knowledge. He believed science education for women would be crucial in modern societies. How could he institute a science program without offending men and women who supported the view that only men needed higher education and thought women should be confined to the home?

Providing strong science education under the term “home economics” that was often associated with women, avoiding the need to create a faculty of science (rigakubu), appears to have been a strategy to circumvent the persistent opposition to higher education (particularly science education) for women. Since Naruse believed in equal

\textsuperscript{92} Hiratsuka, \textit{Genshi}, vol. 1, 145.


\textsuperscript{94} Nakamura, \textit{Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonjū- nen shi}, 238 and 300.

\textsuperscript{95} Tsuda Juku, \textit{Tsuda Juku rika no rekishi}, 21 and 23 (Note 4).
partnership between a husband and a wife while he took their differences in physical characteristics and social roles for granted, he “naturally” identified the science program at the College with motherhood. He wanted to educate women to become effective collaborators with men and nurturers of children in the household.

The other strength of the College curriculum was physical education. Regardless of their major, all students were required to take three credit hours of physical education classes every year. These classes covered four elements: calisthenics and Swedish gymnastics, games and play (e.g. tennis, baseball, cricket, hockey, basketball, and modified traditional Japanese games), \(^{96}\) educational exercises (e.g. riding bicycles and naginata [or halberding]), and deportment exercises. \(^{97}\) In addition to these regular classes, the school held an annual athletic meeting (undôkai) in the fall which became one of the greatest attractions in Meiji and Taisho Japan. \(^{98}\) Students, faculty and staff members, spectators, and journalists all cheered the marching performance of bicyclists, the ball game by bicyclists, and the Japanese-style basketball game. It was probably almost impossible to see women in traditional Japanese clothes riding modern bicycles.

\(^{96}\) These included oihaeke (from hanetsuki) and chidori kyoôsô.

\(^{97}\) Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Dainigakkô vonjû-nen shi, 102-103. The elements of deportment education included: the Delsartian system exercises, women’s rituals (gorei) and tea ceremony.

\(^{98}\) Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Dainigakkô vonjû-nen shi, 106. The Meiji era lasted between 1868 and 1912, and the Taisho era between 1912 and 1926.
elsewhere.\textsuperscript{99} Perhaps the secret of the overwhelming popularity of the event can be ascribed to taboo-breaking women’s outdoor exercises.

The College also organized physical exercise-oriented extracurricular activities. There were four categories: 1) department exercises; 2) educational exercises; 3) competition exercises (kyōgi taisō); and 4) horticulture/stock farming (engei bokuchiku). There were four exercise clubs. The Deportment Exercises Club focused on the Delsartian system and dance exercises. The Delsartian system was developed by a French vocal and dramatic teacher, Francois Delsarte, and it was very influential when Naruse Jinzō spent time in the United States. The system focused on the rhythmic and aesthetic aims of exercises. The Educational Exercises Club had two divisions: bicycling and naginata. Students who belonged to the Competition Exercise Club concentrated on playing tennis, basketball, field hockey, and golf. It is interesting to find horticulture and stock farming as one of the categories of physical exercises. The basic idea was that club members would learn about Nature by working outside tending animals and plants.\textsuperscript{100}

The most popular among students was the bicycle division of the Educational Exercises Club. One student, who lived in an on-campus dormitory, wrote in her diary as follows:

More than twenty dormitory residents hurried out to practice riding bicycles. As soon as one put her foot on one pedal, she fell down. As soon as the other enjoyed a short ride, she, too, rolled over and her white shank became

\textsuperscript{99} Students still wore typical school girls’ outfits of the era: bound long hair, long sleeved top, hakama skirt, and boots. The hakama is a pleated and divided skirt adapted from traditional men’s formal wear. See Nakamura, \textit{Nihon Joshi Daigakkō yonjū-nen shi}, 107.

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 105-107.
visible. Embarrassed, she tried to get up. Yet, the bottom of her hakama skirt got stuck somewhere, and she was unable to get up. She got confused and made quite a fuss. If we had shown these things to the people of the old days, how could they have criticized us? Even people of our time won’t stop grumbling about us.\textsuperscript{101}

As noted above, Naruse Jinzō’s purpose in promoting exercise was to improve the physical size and fitness of the Japanese.\textsuperscript{102} Naruse tried to prevent his students from getting injured or falling sick by training their bodies on a daily basis. To achieve these goals, he developed the so-called “hygiene exercises.” Naruse adopted exercises to help treat physical problems such as scoliosis, articular rheumatism, underdeveloped muscles, podagra, and diseases concerning stomachs, lungs and hearts. These were the “therapeutic exercises.” Naruse’s view on physical education was closely related to beliefs common in the field of medicine.\textsuperscript{103}

Japan Women’s College’s stress on physical education was unique and innovative in that it was the pioneer program, instituted when exercise for women was not culturally accepted. Some of the sports introduced at the College had not been played even in schools for boys; and the purposes of the program were hygienic and medical.\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{101} Quoted in Nakamura, \textit{Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonjō-nen shi}, 88-89.

\textsuperscript{102} Ishikawa Etsuko and Baba Tetsuo, “Naruse Jinzō no taiiku kan,” \textit{Nihon Joshi Daigaku kiyō Kaisei Gakubu} 29 (1982). Ishikawa and Baba are physical education specialists at the Japan Women’s University.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid, 43-44.

\textsuperscript{104} There were others including Minister of Education Mori Arinori and President of Tokyo Teachers’ College Kanō Jigorō who emphasized physical education around that time. In the 1880s and 1890s, Mori promoted military drill in secondary schools and normal schools in order to promote military style disciplines and cultivate characters. Mori was also concerned with physical fitness. Kanō founded the Kōdōkan school of judo and emphasized physical education at his home institution. He was active in promoting Japan’s participation in the Olympic games. For more information about earlier leaders of physical education in Japan, see Suzuki Hiroo, “Ningen Kanō Jigorō: Sono kyōiku seishin,” and “Kindai
The two distinct programs—home economics and physical education—were both based on Naruse’s understanding of the importance of science in women’s education. The distinctive curriculum coupled with Naruse’s integrity, enthusiasm, vision, and organizational skills, impressed some liberal contemporaries.\(^{105}\)

2.3.3 Department of “Race Improvement”

Japan Women’s College continued to grow in its first decade. By 1905, two years after its establishment, the fund increased from its original 150,000 yen to 185,000 yen and the school land expanded from 21,750 square yards (or 5,500 tsubo) to 29,650 square yards (or 7,500 tsubo).\(^{106}\) Every year new extensions were added to the existing school buildings.

Perhaps the most significant year in the early history of school expansion was 1905. In October of the previous year, Naruse Jinzô published a critique of the education system of the day. It was written with a specific purpose. A successful businessman Baron Morimura Ichizaemon (1839-1919), who had just established the private foundation Hômeikai, asked Naruse if he knew a worthy cause to extend financial aid to,

---

\(^{105}\) For example, see Yamanouchi Shigeo, “Naruse sensei to Jadoson sensei no kaiken,” Katei shûhô 511 (April 1919).

\(^{106}\) Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 207-208 and 214. Tsubo is a Japanese unit for land. One tsubo equals 3.954 square yards.
from the Hômeikai. Linking world imperialist competitions and education, Naruse wanted to convince the millionaire that higher education for women would indeed deserve serious investment. Though it was not explicit in this essay, his social Darwinist vision of women’s role would lead him to further emphasize their biological significance. Ultimately, Naruse would propose to incorporate eugenics into women’s higher education in the form of a department of “race improvement.”

In his article prepared for Morimura, Naruse discussed Japan’s place in the world. Japan was in the middle of the war against Russia about ten years after the 1895 victory over China. Although Japan emerged as a legitimate world power, military might was not enough to ensure further victories in the ever intensifying imperialist competitions. He emphasized the importance of cultivating commercial fitness (global economic competitiveness), mental fitness (especially in the Western sense of “science”), and social and moral fitness. He argued that moral renewal had to follow political renewal (or the 1868 Meiji Restoration). In other words, educational reforms had to be pursued in order to attain social and moral fitness in this second “restoration” (dai-ni ishin). The Japanese ought to realize the importance of education as a means to improve the quality of future human resources in Japan, he wrote. In the context of education as moral

---

reform, Naruse reemphasized the importance of women’s education because of their role as mothers and nurturers of children. The essay was effective and Morimura agreed to donate 90,000 yen.108

 Aside from the College expansion, Naruse organized a group of leading intellectuals of the day. In June 1912, Naruse established a peace organization called Association Concordia (Kiitsu Kyôkai). It was designed to unite humans across class, national, racial, and religious boundaries that divided people all over the world, by promoting concord and cooperation. While Naruse wanted to teach fundamental principles common to any religion at the Japan Women’s College, the Association Concordia was the institutional setting where scholars, educators, and businessmen discussed universal values shared by all people and methods to improve human lives and society. Besides Naruse, the Association’s core members included such individuals as Ukita Kazutami (Waseda University; historian and journalist), Anesaki Masaharu (Tokyo University, scholar of religion [Buddhism]), Inoue Tetsujirô (Tokyo University, philosopher; he had criticized Takahashi Yoshio’s proposal to improve the Japanese race through mixed marriage with the Caucasians), Nakajima Rikizô (Tokyo University, ethicist), Sidney Gulick (Dôshisha University, professor of theology and science), and Shibusawa Eiichi (prominent banker).

 Naruse felt strongly that this movement would have to be international to achieve its goal of world peace. His world tour to recruit members outside Japan for the

108 About Morimura Ichizaemon and the Hômcikai, see Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Daigakkô vonjû-nen shi, 110-116 and 524-527; and Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 214-217.
Association began in the summer of 1912 and lasted until March 1913. He visited the United States first and then Europe. During his trip, he contacted over one hundred and seventy individuals and received their support. Among them were David Starr Jordan of Stanford, Harry Pratt Judson of Chicago, G. Stanley Hall of Clark, John Dewey of Columbia, and Ernst Haeckel of Jena, Germany. Although the 1914 outbreak of World War I halted the Concordia movement as an international effort, the Association continued to be active in Japan. One of the aspects of its activity was members' interest in social reform through biological approaches. For instance, as we will see in Chapter 3, an Association member and botanist, Yamanouchi Shigeo, twice gave a lecture on eugenics, one in 1914 and the other in 1916. Among the publications of the Association, there was a translation of *The Social Problem: A Constructive Analysis*, a 1915 work by a sociologist at the University of Missouri, Charles A. Ellwood. In this book, Ellwood analyzed three types of social problems: biological, economic, and moral.  

Meanwhile, Naruse was appointed to membership of the Advisory Board on Education (Kyōiku Chōsakai) by the government in 1913. The board was to review problems of the existing education systems, especially that of higher education, and propose alternative measures to secure the efficiency of Japan's modern education. Naruse tried to promote higher learning for women and upgrade some colleges (senmon

---
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gakkō) to university (daigaku) status, providing the former would meet certain 
standards.110 As noted above, university status had hitherto been granted only to a 
handful of Imperial Universities.

Naruse continued to aspire to transform Japan Women’s College from a college to 
a university. In order to meet the requirement for university status, which was still under 
discussion, Naruse took the initiative: a research division was added to the home 
economics programs111 and the curriculum was revised.112

In the fall of 1917, the Advisory Board was replaced by the Provisional Council 
for Education (Rinji Kyōiku Kaigi). Naruse was reappointed a member of the Council. 
He continued to focus on the same issue.113 In 1918, he published a pamphlet, “Joshi 
kyōiku kaizen iken” [Advice on the improvement of women’s education], and distributed 
it to other Council members. This was written to convince reluctant members to support 
the cause of women’s education. Using expressions like “women who link the nation’s 
past, present, and future,” “women who contribute to the evolution of the race,” and 
“women who produce the nation’s children,” Naruse argued that mothers who were 
“reproductively fit” should be physically healthy and mentally mature. He presented the 
demographic data of the Japan Women’s College graduates and asserted that, in general, 
educated women were healthier, reproduced physically and mentally superior babies, and

110 Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonjū-nen shi, 169; and Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 286-288.
112 Ibid., 177-186.
113 Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 286.
reared them in good health. In this way, he refuted the commonly held claim that highly educated women would have a dysgenic impact on the nation.114

In the “Advice,” Naruse elaborated on “a comprehensive plan for a women’s university.” The ideal university, the purpose of which was to develop character as well as educate the mind, would have three academic divisions: home economics (sciences), religion (humanities), and medicine. Concerning the medical division, he noted that today’s materialism ruined the good tradition of medicine in Japan. New doctors were motivated not by compassion but by greed and fame. They often left vulnerable women, young, and poor patients unattended. He believed that women doctors would be better-suited than their male counterparts to deal with these kinds of patients if they would specifically study the psychology and physiology of women and children.115 Naruse continued that:

Women doctors would be perfect for promoting hygienic knowledge among women, improving hygiene at home, schools, and society, improving the race (jinshu no kairyou), protecting children and mothers for the nation, and preventing the spread of infectious diseases. They could serve as members of committees on hygiene, train [hygienic] inspectors, and lead women’s education. All these functions would be women’s contribution to national efficiency. Medicine for women would be a meaningful profession. Specialties best fit for female doctors would be pediatrics, gynecology, and research on food for patients. Other departments that should be established in support of medicine would be 1) Home and Social Hygiene, 2) Physical Education, 3) Nursing, and 4) Race Improvement (jinshu kairyō gakka).116


115 Ibid., 439-440.

116 Ibid., 440. More on the comprehensive plan for women’s university, see Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonjū-nen shi, 222-244, and Watanabe, Naruse sensei, 301.
In one instance, Naruse called the department the "jinshubyō kairyō gakka (racial diseases improvement department)" but did not explain what he meant by this term.\textsuperscript{117} By this time, Charles B. Davenport’s \textit{Heredity in Relation to Eugenics} (1911) had been translated into Japanese and published as \textit{Jinshu kairyōgaku} [The science of race improvement] in early 1914. By 1917 the Japanese term \textit{jinshu kairyō}, which Naruse had consistently used since the 1890s, began being used as an equivalent of eugenics. Thus, the proposed department of "\textit{jinshu kairyōgaku}" can be translated as the department of eugenics.\textsuperscript{118}

Taking his own "Advice," which was originally prepared for the Provisional Council for Education discussions, Naruse Jinzō announced a plan to change the curriculum of the Japan Women’s College greatly so that it would qualify as a university. Though he died too early in 1919 to see this happen, Naruse’s successors Asō Shōzō and Inoue Hideko partially implemented the plan in the early 1930s. Yet a research institute and an improved curriculum, including the addition of eugenics courses, were not enough to make the college a university. As noted, prejudice against women’s education was too great, and the school Naruse founded had to wait until 1948 to be granted university status.

\textsuperscript{117} Naruse Jinzō, "Joshi kyōiku kaizen iken," 456.

\textsuperscript{118} According to a high school teacher, Kaneko Tadakazu, “Eugenics” had been translated into such Japanese terms as “\textit{jinshu kairyōhō}” and “\textit{minzoku kaiōngaku}.” But since 1918 or 1919, when some people established a group to study eugenics and named it “Dai Nihon Yūseikai,” more people began using the term “\textit{yūseigaku}.” See his article, "\textit{Yūseigaku no kigen},” \textit{Yūseigaku} 32 (October 1926), 15. Actually the group was established in 1917.
2.4 Eugenics Enthusiasts among Faculty and Students

Naruse was never a scientist working on eugenics problems or a theorist of eugenics. He was an educator and social reformer: civilizing women, who were left out of Japan's modernization frenzies, and improving their social status, were his missions. In his quest to provide higher education for women, Naruse stressed the critical role of women as the mothers of future leaders needed by an aspiring, up-and-coming nation. In order to gain scientific legitimacy for his case, he began using social Darwinistic, proto-eugenics race improvement arguments in the 1890s. (Eugenics did not become a widely-accepted term in Japan until the early twentieth century.) As the science of eugenics, coupled with major breakthroughs in genetic studies, including the 1900 rediscovery of the Mendelian laws of heredity, spread to many parts of the world in the beginning of the twentieth century, the term jinshu kairyô (race improvement), which Naruse had been using for decades, began to be used as a Japanese translation for "eugenics."

These (proto-)eugenically-inspired principles of Naruse Jinzô were clearly reflected in the recruitment effort of the Japan Women's College. It attracted a number of prominent scientists as regular lecturers. As we have seen, Ōsawa Kenji, physiology professor of Tokyo University, was one of them. He taught physiology at the Japan Women's College between 1901 and 1921. In his youth, he had spent almost eight years in Europe, first in Germany and then in France, studying physiology, medical chemistry, and other related subjects in the early Meiji years (1870-1874 and 1878-1882), primarily
on government scholarships. By 1909, having been informed of the degenerating effect of alcohol on the human body from Western medical literature and other sources, Ōsawa began supporting Christian reformers’ temperance legislation. In 1909, he wrote a book for women, Tsûzoku kekkon shinsetsu [A popular new theory on marriage]. In this book, he explained basic genetic theories with examples such as hereditary diseases in consanguineous and miscegenetic marriage. He also dealt with non-hereditary diseases causing degeneration such as alcoholism, tuberculosis, and syphilis.\textsuperscript{119} He promoted marriage between the biologically “fit” and wanted to regulate dysgenic marriage. He also articulated the idea of requiring health documents for legal marriage.\textsuperscript{120}

Besides Ōsawa, Japan Women’s College’s lecturers who were eugenics enthusiasts included Matsumoto Matatarô (psychology, 1903-06, 1916-43), Yamanouchi Shigeo (natural history, 1915-1927), Nagai Hisomu (physiology and ethnic national hygiene [eugenics], 1921-1939), and Koya Yoshio (social and ethnic national hygiene, 1931-2).\textsuperscript{121} Yamanouchi was an American-trained plant cytologist who actively introduced eugenics ideas from a biologist’s perspective in the mid-1910s. He was a core member in establishing Japan’s first eugenics organization, Dai Nihon Yûseikai (Greater

\textsuperscript{119} As for Japan’s early “degeneration” discourse, see Matsubara Yôko, “Meiji-matsu kara Taisho-ki ni okeru shakai mondai to ‘iden,’” Nihon bunka kenkyûjo kîshô 3 (1996), 155-169.

\textsuperscript{120} In his 1910 article, Ōsawa suggested that sterilization might be an effective way to improve the physical characteristics (taishitsu kairyô). See Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no yûseigaku, 92.

Japan Eugenics Society) in 1917. Nagai Hisomu was a German-trained physiologist who succeeded to Ōsawa’s positions both at Tokyo University and Japan Women’s College. He was best known as the founder of the Minzoku Eisei Gakkai (Association of Ethnic National Hygiene), which was inspired by the German notion of Rassenhygiene and established in 1930. Matsumoto, who was interested in “racial” differences in mental capacities, and Koya, who conducted biometrics research and founded the Minzoku seibutsugaku [Journal of race biology] in 1936, worked closely with Nagai in organizing and maintaining the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene. Nagai and Koya taught a lecture-lab course entitled “Genetics and Eugenics” beginning in the late 1920s. I shall examine Yamanouchi Shigeo’s eugenics thought in Chapter 3 and Nagai Hisomu’s commitment to the eugenics cause in Chapter 6.

Being exposed to the ideas of President Naruse Jinzō and faculty members who were ardent supporters of eugenics, some students at the Japan Women’s College were

122 For an analysis of Yamanouchi’s writings published in the 1910s, see Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no viseigaku, 85-90.

123 About Nagai Hisomu and eugenics, see Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no viseigaku, 93-97 and 144-168.

124 Matsumoto was a Yale-trained psychologist. He also received additional training at the University of Leipzig under Wilhelm Wundt, founder of experimental psychology, between 1898 and 1900. He taught at Kyoto University and Tokyo University. As a chair of the Japanese Association of Psychology and editor of its official journal, he was an influential figure in the field. In his 1912 article, he translated the English term “eugenics” into “yūrō shuzokugaku” (or science of superior stock). See Matsumoto Matatarō, “Yūrō shuzoku no shōchō,” Shinri kenkyū 1.1 (1912), 5-32. When Nagai established the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, Matsumoto served as a councillor or hyōgiin.


126 Nakamura, Nihon Joshi Daigakkō vonji-nen shi, 234-238.
also drawn to this science of race improvement. For example, Matsumoto Matatarô’s student Arai (Haraguchi) Tsuru (1886-1915) pursued her graduate degree in psychology at Columbia University in the United States. There she was supervised by Professor Edward Thorndike (1874-1949), an educational psychologist as prominent as G. Stanley Hall. Like Hall, Thorndike, who taught genetic psychology at Columbia, was known as a committed eugenicist. After she received her Ph.D. for her study “Mental Fatigue” in 1912, she returned to Japan and translated the bible of eugenics, Francis Galton’s *Hereditary Genius*, which her American adviser openly admired. Before her premature death at the age of twenty-nine in 1915, she had just begun testing children’s intelligence.

Wada (Kôra) Tomiko (1896-1993), another student of Matsumoto, attended Haraguchi’s funeral and made up her mind to follow in her footsteps. She studied psychology at Columbia and Johns Hopkins Universities. At Columbia, she worked closely with Thorndike. Upon returning, she taught first at Kyûshû University and then

\[\text{---}
\]

\[\text{---}
\]


at the Japan Women’s College. When Nagai Hisomu established the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, she joined it and played an active role in organizing women’s participation in the eugenics movement.

Hiratsuka Raichō (1886-1971), who had majored in home economics at the Japan Women’s College, later led a movement to establish a eugenic marriage law using eugenics reasoning between 1919 and 1922. Hiratsuka received advice from Professor Ōsawa Kenji in this effort.

Takanashi (Tanaka) Takako (1886-1966) attended the College before transferring to Stanford University. After receiving her masters degree in social work at the University of Chicago, she returned to Japan and accepted a position at the Japan Women’s College in 1918. Between 1933 and 1963, she directed the Tokyo Metropolitan Marriage Consultation Office. In the late 1930s, she took part in government discussions on establishing a marriage eugenic law separate from a sterilization law.

Despite the fact that women’s involvement in eugenics causes has not been extensively explored in the history of eugenics in Japan, there are signs of women’s interest in eugenics thought. These Japan Women’s College graduates’ noticeable roles in various eugenic-related activities were not accidental. The College encouraged involvement and offered courses taught by leading eugenics enthusiasts in Japan.

---


131 Her name was listed among other members in the official publication of the Association, Minzoku eisei 1.1. (1931), 99.
Hiratsuka Raichō’s eugenics movement will be discussed in detail in Chapter 4. Kōra Tomiko’s and Tanaka Takako’s involvement in eugenics issues will be touched upon in Chapter 6.

As we have seen in this chapter, Naruse Jinzō’s personal observation of the inferior status of the Japanese in the white-dominated racial hierarchy, his desire to close the physical gap between the whites and the Japanese, and his aspiration to establish an institution of higher education for women in the social Darwinistic era led him to the concept of “jinshu kairyō” or race improvement. It grew out of his understanding of an ideal Western family: A wife, equipped with hygienic knowledge and home management skills, was a respected partner of her husband, and together they would raise intelligent, moral, and healthy children. As he aimed at improving the fitness of women and encouraging them to reproduce well, Naruse’s eugenics could then be characterized as positive eugenics. He was also influenced by the writings of Japanese popularizers of Western ideas, Takahashi Yoshio and Fukuzawa Yukichi, who introduced the idea of “race improvement” and discussed it in the context of women’s social status. His understanding of race improvement was deepened as he took classes from, and had conversations with, American scholars and educators including William Tucker, G. Stanley Hall, Dudley Sargent, and Luther Gulick. Although Naruse had a modest amount of scientific training, his quasi-eugenic notions, such as they were, owed far more to sociology, psychology, education, and physical education than to biology. He did not accept the notion of some foreign eugenicists that Japanese men or women were mentally
inferior to Westerners permanently. However, he did notice that Japanese men and
women were often physically inferior to Westerners. While Naruse used biological terms,
he was not completely biologically deterministic. He believed that education and
especially physical exercise for women, who were even more slight than men, would
improve bodies of women and their future offspring, and in that sense, the quality of the
entire Japanese ethnic nation. This belief indicates that he accepted the notion of the
inheritance of acquired characteristics. His race improvement idea was then based on
euthenic convictions. Although Naruse was chagrined by the presumed “inferior” status
of Japanese in Western discourse, he continued to adhere to some eugenics principles
primarily because it was useful to his cause of promoting higher education for women. In
other words, he was able to accept eugenics ideas by shifting emphasis from “race” to
“gender;” it would be the first step for racial equality, the true aspiration of the country.

Naruse Jinzō envisioned incorporation of eugenics into the curriculum at the Japan
Women’s College during the 1910s. It may be said that Naruse’s most important
contribution to eugenics was in creating an institution where eugenics enthusiasts could
gather, exchange ideas, and promote these ideas to women.
CHAPTER 3

YAMANOUCHI SHIGEO (1876-1973):
EUGENICS AT THE BORDER OF BIOLOGY AND EDUCATION

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explores works written by Yamanouchi Shigeo (1878-1973), who was trained in plant cytology in the United States and later became one of the most active popularizers of eugenics ideas in the 1910s. In addition to his main employment at Tokyo Teachers' College, Yamanouchi taught natural history at Naruse Jinzô's Japan Women's College. It should be noted that this scientist disseminated the latest eugenics knowledge among the educated, including women, in Japan. This chapter aims to put Yamanouchi's eugenics thought into context by shedding light on his little-known career as a scholar and educator. I also attempt to explain why his life has been excluded from the history of botany despite his achievements in phycology (the branch of botany that deals with algae). In this process, I explore an example of the Japanese reaction to the scientific paradigm change from soft to hard heredity.

The French evolutionist Jean Baptist de Lamarck (1744-1829) developed a theory that changes in heredity are linked to changes in habit, especially use and disuse of organs, based on the prevailing notion that organisms could transfer acquired characteristics to the
next generation. During most of the nineteenth century, this so-called "Lamarckism" was uncontroversial. Even Charles Darwin (1809-1882), whose theory of evolution by natural selection (1858) reconceptualized the old heredity view, accepted the principle of inheritance of acquired characters. The followers of Lamarck or Lamarckians believed improvements in such social factors as education, housing, and public health would benefit both current and future generations.

The founder of eugenics, Francis Galton (1822-1911), however, rejected the notion that acquired characters are heritable, but his claim lacked experimental evidence until the German cytologist August Weismann (1834-1914) provided such evidence in 1883. Weismann argued that germ plasm (sperm and egg cells) could not be affected by the environment, and were completely isolated from somatic (or body) cells, which could. Because germ plasm alone was passed onto their children, parents could not change heredity no matter how hard they worked at improving their minds and bodies.1

Weismann’s doctrine of the “continuity of the germ plasm” and the Mendelian laws which were rediscovered in 1900 reinforced each other in explaining the phenomenon of heredity.2 The “Mendelian-Weismannite” view represented a hard or biologically-


deterministic approach to heredity and found many adherents in Britain, the United States, and Germany, as well as in Japan in the twentieth century.\(^3\)

In this context, Yamanouchi Shigeo’s eugenics ideas seem to represent a paradox because they were developed by a Mendelian cytologist who was sympathetic towards Lamarckian notions of inheritance of acquired characters.\(^4\) Two other scholars have analyzed Yamanouchi’s eugenics writings to determine whether his emphasis was put more on the biological, “nature,” than on the social, “nurture.” Historian of science Suzuki Zenji, who examined Yamanouchi’s three monographs and a few articles published in the 1910s, correctly observed the ambivalence in the botanist’s writings. Suzuki was unable to determine whether Yamanouchi supported the inheritance of acquired characteristics or not.\(^5\) Historian of education, Takagi Masashi, who analyzed several

\(^3\) Paul, *Controlling Human Heredity*, 41. More on the soft and hard heredity views, see Daniel J. Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 66. As for Japan, see Suzuki Zenji, *Nihon no yūsei gaku: Sono shisō to undō no kiseki* (Tokyo: Sankyō Shuppan, 1983), 71. There were countries where Mendelism was not the norm in their eugenics thought. As for non-Mendelian eugenics (influences of Lamarckism and Lysenkoism), see, for example, chapters on France (by William H. Schneider), Brazil (by Nancy Leys Stepan), and Russia (by Mark B. Adams) in Mark B. Adams, ed., *Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil, and Russia* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); and Nancy Leys Stepan, *“The Hour of Eugenics”: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991).

\(^4\) Although the intense dispute between Galtonism and Mendelism existed in Britain, there was no apparent tension between them in Japan. Suzui Zenji points out that the tension in Britain resulted from personal antagonism between such eugenacists as Galton, W.F. Weldon, and Karl Pearson and Mendelian geneticists including William Bateson. According to Suzuki, their differences were more methodological. He also notes that some Mendelists like C.W. Saleeby were interested in eugenics and joined the Eugenics Education Society. See Suzuki, *Nihon no yūsei gaku*, 62-65. For more on the tension in Britain, see Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics*, 43-44. Moreover, Suzuki states that eugenics and the notion of the inheritance of acquired characteristics are not compatible. See Suzuki, *Nihon no yūsei gaku*, 77. In his English article, Suzuki states, “Since eugenics attaches importance to heredity rather than to environment, another influence was the fact that the theory of inheritance of acquired character tended to be aegated based on the establishment of Mendelism.” See Zenji Suzuki, “Geneticists and the Eugenics Movement in Japan,” *Japanese Studies in the History of Science* 14 (1975), 158.

articles that Yamanouchi contributed to an education journal from the mid 1910s to the mid 1920s, stated that he was biologically deterministic and rather slighted the validity of education. Except for these two brief accounts analyzing Yamanouchi's eugenics discourse, he was largely excluded from the history of biology, biological education, and eugenics. There have been no detailed accounts of his scientific training and work, his eugenics view, nor any explanation of why his view represented such a curious combination of biological and social factors.

Here, new materials, including Yamanouchi's scientific writings published in the United States and private documents, enable me to reconstruct his life to a much greater extent than ever before. These sources indicate that this botanist was trained and conducted research at various internationally-renowned institutions, published actively, and lived an extraordinarily long life. Why, then, was his life so obscure? I hypothesize that his peculiar view of evolution, which did not deny the inheritability of acquired characteristics, was seen as "unscientific," and, as a result, he was shunned by the mainstream biologists who were orthodox Mendelian-Weismannites.

---

6 Takagi Masashi, "'Taishō demokurasu'-ki ni okeru 'yūseiron' no tenkai to kyōiku: Kyōiku zasshi no naiyō bunseki no shikaku kara," Nagoya Daigaku kyoiku gakubu kiyō (Kyōiku Gakka) 36 (1989), 167-177.
3.2 Training and Scientific Works as Botanist (1876-1913)

Yamanouchi Shigeo was born to a samurai family from Yamagata (northern Japan) in 1876. When he was two years old, he was adopted by the family of a Shinto priest, Yamanouchi Tomori. It is said that Shigeo was known for his brightness even in his early age. After graduating from the Shōnai Middle School in Yamagata at the age of eighteen in 1894, despite pressure from his father to follow the hereditary profession of Shinto priest, he moved to Tokyo and studied natural history at the Tokyo Teachers' College. He then pursued graduate studies at the same institution and received the

---

7 He was born to the Hirano family but adopted by the Yamanouchi, not an uncommon practice at the time. See Uchio Naoji, ed., Jinji kōshinroku, 14th ed., (Tokyo: Jinji Kōshinjo, 1943), ya-52; and Shōnai Jinmei Jiten Kankōkai, Shinpen Shōnai jinmei jiten (Tsuruoka, Yamagata: Shōnai Jinmei Jiten Kankōkai, 1986), 642. (Hereafter cited as JK and SJ respectively.) In one English source, his year of birth is recorded as 1878. For example, see “Yamanouchi, Dr. Shigeo,” American Men of Science: A Bibliographical Directory, 2nd ed. (New York: Scientific Press, 1910), 528. (Hereafter this is cited as AMS.) Subsequent editions of AMS continued to list his date of birth as 1878. I choose 1876 because the majority of sources including another English source uses this date. See, “Yamanouchi, Shigeo,” Journal of the New York Botanical Garden 12 (June 1911), 146. (Hereafter this is cited as JNYBG.)

8 The Yamanouchi was not from the samurai class but was the commoner. About the history of the Yamanouchi family and Tomori’s c.v., see Tsuruoka Machiyakuba, compiled, “Kensha ika shinkan kakeisho, rrekisho tsuzuri,” handwritten MS [photocopy], Tsuruoka-shi Kyōdo Shiryōkan, 1892. I am indebted to Mr. Akizo Ryō of the Tsuruoka City Archives who brought my attention to this document.

9 This college was originally founded as Shihan Gakkō by the Meiji government in 1872. The genealogy of the school is as follows: Shihan Gakkō (1872-1873); Tokyo Shihan Gakkō (1873-1886); Kōtō Shihan Gakkō (1886-1902); Tōkyō Kōtō Shihan Gakkō (1902-1952); Tokyo Bunriika Daigaku (1929-1953); Tokyo Kyōiku Daigaku (1943-1978); and Tsukuba Daigaku (1978-present). Note that some schools coexisted as separate entities without fully being integrated. In this paper, in order to avoid unnecessary confusions, I will use Yamanouchi’s own translation of his alma mater “Tokyo Teachers’ College” without following the name and structure changes described above. SJJ, 642. At the time, students could major in 1) physics and chemistry; 2) natural history; or 3) humanities at the Tokyo Teachers’ College. It required three years to complete the curriculum. For the specifics of the curriculum of Tokyo Teachers’ College, including course requirements for natural history majors, see a Ministry of Education edict issued in 1886, “Kōtō shihan gakkō no gakkō oyobi sono eido,” in Monbushō, Gakusei hyakunen-shi, Shirō-hen (Tokyo: Teikoku Chihō Gyōsei Gakkai, 1973), 176-177.
equivalent of a masters degree in science. He was employed as an assistant in botany and instructor in biology at his alma mater between 1898 and 1900. Yamanouchi was then promoted to assistant professor in botany.

For further training, he left Japan for the United States in 1904 and attended Columbia University for a year when he was offered a President's Fellowship there.

10 In one reference he received an M.S. degree in 1898. See AMS, 2nd ed. (1910), 528. Many other sources indicate that he graduated from the non-traditional course track (senka) in 1900. According to his vita, he entered Tokyo Teachers' College as a "regular-track" science major in 1895 but left before completing his B.S. degree in November 1895 because of illness. He then came back to school five months later as a senka student and finished course work in botany. While continuing his studies, he was appointed as an assistant in botany in September 1895. It was in March 1897 when he graduated as a senka student whose course work covered pedagogy, zoology, botany, physiology, and geology. See "Jinbutsu chōsa hyō: Yamanouchi Shigeo," handwritten Ms [photocopy], "Tsrnoaka hyakunen no jinbutsu to jiseki" chōsa hyō tsuzuri," Tsrnoaka Shiritsu Kyōdo Shiryōkan, Tsrnoaka (hereafter c.v.). For the undergraduate and graduate curriculum at Tokyo Teachers' College as of 1900, see Chart 4 (1900) of the "Gakkō keitō-zu" in Gakusei hyakunen-shi, Shiryō-hen, 340. The definition of senka varies. For example, rather than studying all the require subjects, the senka students concentrated on certain subjects. See Isono Naohide, "Tokyo Daigaku rigakubu dōbutsugaku kyōshitsu no rekishi," Mizukamakiri wa tobu, by Takewaki Kiyoshi (Tokyo: Gakkai Shuppan Sentā, 1985), 155. For example, zoologist Oka Asajirō entered Tokyo University (senka) in 1886. In his case, he was not eligible to enter the university as a regular student because he was not a graduate of certain preparatory schools (daigaku yobimono, this was later replaced by the higher schools or kōdō gakkō). See Tsukuba Hisaharu, "Oka Asajirō 1868-1944," Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden, edited by Kihara Hirosi, Shirotō Yoshito, and Isono Naohide (Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha, 1988), 205-206. Since Yamanouchi claimed that he had already received M.S. in 1898, his senka affiliation might have meant that he continued his postgraduate studies beyond what the institution normally offered to traditional students (M.S. course).

11 AMS, 2nd ed., 528; and JNYBG 12 (June 1911), 146.

12 AMS, 2nd ed., 528; and JNYBG 12 (June 1911), 146. While Yamanouchi was at the Tokyo Teachers' College, Japan's first professor in botany at the Tokyo University and the founder of the Tokyo University Biological Society as well as the Tokyo Botanical Society, Yatabe Ryōkichi (1851-1899) taught at the institution beginning in 1895 (he had been forced out of Tokyo University in 1891). Yatabe became president of the Tokyo Teachers' College in 1898 but his career was cut short by his premature death in 1899. Yamanouchi might have been influenced by Yatabe and Saida Kōtarō (one of Yatabe's first students at the Tokyo University) in his earlier training at the school. While Yatabe was American-trained, Saida studied plant pathology in Germany. Both explored cryptogamic plants: Yatabe on ferns and Saida on ferns and fresh water algae. Yatabe lectured in English. Ueno Masuzō, "Yatabe Ryōkichi," Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden, 86-93, and Kimura Yōjirō, "Meiji, Taishō-ki no shokubutsugaku," ibid., 10-23. For courses Yamanouchi was in charge, see Kaibō 1 (1903), 71, and 75-76. For excursion trips, led by Yamanouchi and other professors, to collect research materials, see, for example, Kaibō 2 (1904), 21-24; and Hakubutsu gakkaishō 18 (1914), 51.

13 JNYBG 12 (June 1911), 146. His second wife recalled that Columbia University offered him a scholarship judging from his earlier works. Although he would have liked to study in Germany, his mentor Kanō Jigorō of Tokyo College convinced him to take advantage of the opportunity. See Yamanouchi Sada, Letter from (Tokyo) to the Tsruoka-shiritsu Kyōdo Shiryōkan, Yamagata, 1973 (?)
While he was at Columbia, he conducted his research at the New York Botanical Garden. The Garden was known for its algae collection. Perhaps informed by other scholars there of a research opportunity, Yamanouchi spent the summer of 1905 at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, occupying a Carnegie research table at the prestigious Marine Biological Laboratory (MBL). His research on Polysiphonia Violacea, a red algae, in the elite biologist club setting was supervised by the laboratory’s head instructor in botany.

Attached handwritten Ms [photocopy] to the “Tsuruoka hyakunen no jinbutsu to jiseki’ chōsa hyō tsuzuri,” Tsuruoka Shiritsu Kyōdo Shiryōkan, Tsuruoka. I thank Mr. Akihō Ryō for helping me locate this document.

14 For instance, see Marshall A. Howe, “The Collections of Algae,” JNYBG 9 (July 1908), 123-130. Yamanouchi’s name was mentioned: “In addition to the specimens obtained by the Garden expeditions or by purchase, many have reached our herbarium in the past few years through exchanges. American (and sometimes foreign) material has been received in this way from W. F. Farlow, F. S. Collins, W. A. Setchell, D. A. Saunders, J. Macoun, W. D. Hoyt, and others; Japanese specimens from K. Okamura and S. Yamanouchi;...” See pp. 127-128. Okamura Kintarō was an expert on algae and taught at Tokyo College of Fishery (Tokyo Suisan Kōshū). About him, see Kuronuma Katsuzō, “Okamura Kintarō 1867-1935,” Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden, 158-163.

15 A possible source of information could be marine zoologist Yatsu Naohide. When Yamanouchi came to New York, Yatsu was pursuing his Ph.D. under E. B. Wilson at Columbia University and used facilities at the New York Botanical Garden. Before receiving his Ph.D. in 1905, he had done research at Woods Hole. In 1905, he went to the Zoological Station in Naples, Italy, the laboratory that Yamanouchi would later visit in 1908. See “Yatsu, Naohide,” JNYBG 12 (June 1911), 146; and Takewaki Kiyoishi, “Yatsu Naohide 1877-1947,” Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden, 275. Columbia’s geneticists such as Wilson and T. H. Morgan were frequent visitors of the MBL.

Shigeo Yamanouchi, “The Life History of Polysiphonia Violacea (Preliminary Note),” Contributions from the Hull Botanical Laboratory 83, Botanical Gazette 41.6 (June 1906), 425; Shigeo Yamanouchi, “The Life History of Polysiphonia Violacea,” Contributions from the Hull Botanical Laboratory 87, Botanical Gazette 42.6 (December 1906), 402-403; and JNYBG 12 (June 1911), 146. The Carnegie Institution of Washington granted $10,000 a year for three years beginning 1903. See James D. Ebert, “Carnegie Institution of Washington and Marine Biology: Naples, Woods Hole, and Tortugas,” Biological Bulletin 168 (Supplement) (June 1985), 179-180. As for the breakdown of the grant use, a MBL archivist, Jean Monahan wrote to me, “I did, however, find a report that the ‘Carnegie Institution, then newly organized, gave a grant of $4,000.00 for the expenses of the year 1902, and subscribed for twenty investigators’ rooms for three years (1903, 1904, 1905) at $500.00 a year each, thus furnishing $10,000.00 a year during this period...’ I am grateful to Ms. Monahan for her help.

17 For example, historian of science Philip J. Pauly writes as follows: “As a resort club, the MBL was extremely effective in structuring the experience that defined biology, and also in creating and maintaining an American biological elite.” See his “Summer Resort and Scientific Discipline: Woods Hole and the Structure of American Biology, 1882-1925,” The American Development of Biology, edited by Ronald Rainger, Keith R. Benson, and Jane McInerney (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 123. As for a Japanese zoologist’s observation of the life in the MBL, see Minoura Tadayoshi, Woods Hole, MA, to Komai Taku, Tokyo, 19 June, 1915 and 21 August, 1915, published in
Bradley M. Davis, professor of botany at the University of Chicago.\textsuperscript{18} In fact, the MBL had a strong tie with the University of Chicago. The MBL director, Charles Otis Whitman (1842-1910), was also the chair of the zoology department at Chicago.\textsuperscript{19} Then Yamanouchi moved to the Midwest when he was offered another fellowship from the University of Chicago, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1907.\textsuperscript{20} He worked on the algae collected at the MBL and continued his cytological research under John Merle Coulter (chair, department of botany, 1851-1928) and Charles Joseph Chamberlain (specialized in botany and animal physiology, 1863-1943).\textsuperscript{21} Taking advantage of the newly established and well-funded facility at Chicago, the Hull Botanical Laboratory, he became an expert in plant morphology and plant physiology.\textsuperscript{22}

---

\textsuperscript{18} About the program in botany and Bradley M. Davis at the MBL, see Frank R. Lillie, \textit{The Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), 144-146. Regarding Davis’ relationship with John Merle Coulter, the chair of botany at the University of Chicago, see Andrew Denny Rodgers III, \textit{John Merle Coulter: Missionary in Science} (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1944), 149-150, 158-159, 170, 174, 178, and 188.

\textsuperscript{19} For discussions of academic and possible financial ties between Chicago and the MBL, see Jane Maienschein, “Whitman at Chicago: Establishing a Chicago Style of Biology?,” \textit{The American Development of Biology}, 151-182.

\textsuperscript{20} The Doctors in Botany of the University of Chicago, \textit{A Record of the Doctors in Botany of the University of Chicago 1897-1916 Presented to John Merle Coulter Professor and Head of the Department of Botany by the Doctors in Botany at the Quarter-Centennial of the University June, 1916 Chicago [Reprinted from the Single Presentation Copy]} (Chicago: n.p., 1916), 30. Text-fiche. (Hereafter, cited as RDBUC.) About a fellowship, see “The Life History of polysiphonia Violacea,” \textit{Botanical Gazette} 41.6, 425.


\textsuperscript{22} About the estate of Charles J. Hull contributed to the University of Chicago, see Maienschein, “Whitman at Chicago,” 161-162. About the 1896-1897 construction of the Hull Botanical Laboratory, see Rodgers, \textit{John Merle Coulter}, 152, 158, 160, and 164.
Rather than going home after receiving the highest degree, Yamanouchi continued his active scholarship as a technical assistant in botany at Chicago. Between 1906 and 1913, he published thirteen articles in the *Botanical Gazette*, a respected journal in the field edited by Coulter, his adviser. A few works summarized ongoing projects as preliminary research notes, and the rest explained findings of his cytological investigations on algae and ferns in detail. In these works, he was concerned with different forms of reproductive processes. For example, in his first major work, he proved that there is an alternation of a sexual plant (gametophyte) with a tetrasporic plant (sporophyte) in the life history of one red alga, Polysiphonia, by providing detailed illustrations of these processes for the first time. By doing so, he supported Bradley Davis' thesis that the chromosome reduction (meiosis) in the life history of red algae would be found during tetraspore formation.

Most of his subsequent scientific works also focused on the plant morphology of chromosomes, in connection with the theoretical problem of alternation of generations. After his investigation of Polysiphonia was completed, he moved on to such plants as Nephrodium (fern), Fucus (brown alga), Cutleria (alga), and

---

23 RDBUC, 30.

24 Yamanouchi, "The Life History of Polysiphonia Violacea," *Botanical Gazette* 42.6, 401-449. Yamanouchi explained the German plant biologist Eduard Strasburger's discovery: "STRASBURGER'S paper...entitled 'The periodic reduction of the number of chromosomes in the life history of the living organisms' was the first presentation of the significance of sporogenesis and reduction phenomena in relation to alternation of generations in plants. His conclusions were based upon the discoveries that nuclei in the sporophyte generations of higher plants have double the number of chromosomes found in the nuclei of the gametophyte generations, and that the reduction of this double number takes place at the period of sporogenesis. This theory has been well established so far as groups of plants above the thallophytes are concerned, and the period of chromosome reduction has been found to be always associated with sporogenesis..." Theories about the reduction period among lower plants, however, were not established and a subject of scholarly debate. Davis observed that chromosome reduction of some lower plants, species of red algae, also took place at the time of tetraspore formation. See especially, pp. 430-431 of the aforementioned Yamanouchi paper.
Osmunda (fern). The collection of materials for these projects involved not only local trips to the Hull Botanical Garden and other parks in Chicago, but also required national or international trips. For instance, he revisited the Woods Hole Marine Biological Laboratory in spring 1908 and traveled to another world-class biological research institute, the Zoological Station in Naples, Italy. As he had done at Woods Hole in 1905, he occupied a Carnegie research table at the Station, between October 1908 and May 1909.


27 The opportunity to study in Italy was given by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. See the handwritten Ms [photocopy], Yamanouchi’s detailed c.v. in “Tsuruoka hyakunen no jinbutsu to jiseki chosa hyo tsuzuri,” pp. 225-228. He noted materials collected in Italy in Yamanouchi, “Cytology of Cutleria and Aglaophenia: A Preliminary Paper,” Botanical Gazette 48.5, 380; “The Life History of Cutleria,” Botanical Gazette 54.6, 441 and 445; “The Life History of Zanardinia,” Contributions from the Hull Botanical Laboratory 179, Botanical Gazette 56.1 (July 1913), 2; and two articles published in Japanese “Zanarudenia no seikushi (yoho),” Shokubutsugaku zasshi 288 (1911), 9-11; and “Sangamo no seikushi,” Shokubutsugaku zasshi 318 (1913), 279-285. See also SJ, 642. Yamanouchi acknowledged Drs. Salvatore Lo Bianco, Anton Dohn, and Reinhart Dohn at the Station. For Yamanouchi’s own observation of people and facilities of the Zoological Station, see Yamanouchi sensei, “Nepurusu no rinkai jikkenjo,” Kaihō, 12 (1910), 11-14. The station was established by a German zoologist Anton Dohn, in 1874. He invented the research table system to maintain the station. After his death in 1909, the directorship was held by his son, Reinhart. Lo Bianco was a legendary self-taught scholar and conservator. In 1909, a professor of zoology at the University of California reported that “A feature of the Naples station is the ‘table’ system of support. The station undertakes for $500 per annum to provide research privileges for one person throughout the year. Tables are not rented for less than a whole year...It is this feature of the Naples station which has made it from the beginning an international institution and has drawn investigators to it from practically all civilized lands.” See Charles Atwood Koford, “The Biological Stations of Europe,” United States Bureau of Education Bulletin 4 (1910), 13. Yamanouchi’s name is listed as an American investigator for the year 1909. Likewise, zoologist Yatsu Naohide occupied one of the American tables in 1906. See ibid., 17. Nagasawa Rokurō translated and
How did his fellow botanists regard Yamanouchi’s scholarly production? Even to this day, his works remain as classics of the life histories of algae and continue to be cited by younger generations of scholars.\textsuperscript{28} In 1957, George F. Papenfuss, a botanist at the University of California, Berkeley, wrote an article describing “Progress and Outstanding Achievements in Phycology during the Past Fifty Years.” It was prepared for a symposium commemorating the fiftieth birthday of the Botanical Society of America. In the article, Papenfuss stated: “As it will be possible in this paper to point to only a few of the landmarks, I shall confine myself to important contributions to knowledge of the morphology of some of the major groups of algae and to the effects that this new knowledge has had on the classification of these plants.”\textsuperscript{29} Considering the briefness of Papenfuss’ paper as well as that of Yamanouchi’s active research career, Papenfuss’

\textsuperscript{28} According to almost all the issues of the \textit{Science Citation Index}, his works have been cited between 1945 and 1994. Exceptions are editions covering scientific publications in 1969, 1987, and 1989.

\textsuperscript{29} George F. Papenfuss, “Progress and Outstanding Achievements in Phycology during the Past Fifty Years,” \textit{American Journal of Botany} 44.1 (January 1957), 74.
extensive treatment of Yamanouchi's works seems to indicate their significance. As for the studies dealing with Phaeophycophyta or brown algae, Papenfuss described the Japanese botanist's research as follows.

By 1906 the details of sexual reproduction had been studied in only six genera of brown algae: Fucus, Zanardinia, Cutleria, Ectocarpus, Giffordia and Dictyota. Fucus had been shown by Strasberger (1897) to be diploid and Yamanouchi in 1909a established that meiosis occurs during the first two divisions of the primary nucleus of the oogonium and antheridium. Fucus thus was shown to have a life history analogous to that of animal and this appears to be true of all Fucales.

Reinke (1877, 1878) had obtained evidence indicating that Zanardinia shows an alternation of isomorphic generations and he (1878) and Falkenberg (1879) were of the opinion that Cutleria showed an alternation of heteromorphic generations, with Cutleria representing the gametophytic generation and another brown alga, long known by sporophytic generation. Yamanouchi (1909b, 1911, 1912, 1913) furnished cytological proof of the correctness of Reinke and Falkenberg's interpretations of the life histories of Zanardinia and Cutleria.  

As for the Rhodophycophyta (red algae) studies, Papenfuss explained Yamanouchi's investigations as follows:

The nuclear cycle, especially the place of meiosis in the life history, had as yet not been studied. Yamanouchi exactly fifty years ago (1906a. b) first worked out the nuclear history and showed that in Polysiphonia the plants which bear tetrasporangia are diploid and that meiosis occurs in the tetrasporangium. The confirmatory cultural evidence was supplied by Lewis in 1912. Thus at last was determined the long-misunderstood role of the tetrasporangia in the life history of the red algae. 

Altogether, seven of Yamanouchi's studies were examined. In fact, Yamanouchi was second to none in terms of the number of works represented in Papenfuss' review. Of

---

30 Ibid., 75. Similar assessment of Yamanouchi's 1912 work on Cutleria can be found in Kathleen M. Drew, "Life Histories in the Algae with Special Reference to the Chlorophyta, Phaeophyta, and Rhodophyta," Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 30.4 (November 1955), 370. Drew was a botanist at the University of Manchester, U.K.

31 Papenfuss, "Progress," 76.
course, not all the cited works were positively reviewed. Yet, all of Yamanouchi’s works were portrayed as pioneering cytological investigations discrediting the old interpretations of algae which had generalized the life histories of the algae and ignored their diversity.\textsuperscript{32}

In addition to original works, he published twenty-four reviews of recent cytological works on algae and ferns written in various languages including English, German, French, Italian, and Japanese during his first two sojourns in the United States (1904-1909 and 1911-1913). To reestablish his appointment at the Tokyo Teachers’ College—his initial leave of absence had expired after two years of study abroad in 1906—he returned to Japan in 1909 following his research at the Zoological Station at Naples, Italy. His research in Italy was written up as an article, “Zanarudenia no seikushi” [The life history of Zanardinia Collaris] which was published in a botanical journal in Japan.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{32} For Papenfuss’ fuller treatment of the progress and achievements in phycology, covering all the groups of algae and the longer period, see George F. Papenfuss, “Classification of the Algae,” A Century of Progress in the Natural Sciences 1853-1953 (San Francisco: California Academy of Sciences, 1955), 115-224. Here Papenfuss indicated what kind of general views Yamanouchi challenged and what kind of works were produced based on Yamanouchi’s pioneer works. Referring to Yamanouchi’s 1906 works on Polysiphonia, Papenfuss wrote “From the cytological work of Yamanouchi, Lewis (1909), and many later investigators, it is now well established that the majority of red algae above the Nemalionales possess three generations: a haploid gametophyte, a diploid carposporophyte which is permanently attached to and largely parasitic on the gametophyte, and a diploid, free-living tetrasporophyte (p. 184).” Papenfuss received a Ph.D. from John Hopkins in 1933 and was never a direct student nor colleague of Yamanouchi at Chicago. For Papenfuss’ academic background, see AMS (1955), vol. 2, 855. Examples of other scholarly comments on Yamanouchi’s works include those of J.A. Nannfeldt and C. J. Chamberlain. Nannfeldt describes Yamanouchi’s finding as follows: “The alternation between a gametophytic and a sporophytic generation had long been known in ferns and mosses, as had the existence of different kinds of reproductive bodies in algae; but no regular pattern could be discerned in the latter group. In 1904 J.L. Williams established the alternation between two externally similar generations in a brown alga, and two years later S. Yamanouchi, found it in a red alga, the formation of tetraspores being preceded by meiosis.” See J. A. Nannfeldt, “Svedelius, Nils Eberhard,” Dictionary of Scientific Biography, edited by Charles Coulston Gillispie and others, vol. 13 (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1976), 165. One of Yamanouchi’s advisers, Chamberlain acknowledged that “various papers by Yamanouchi from 1909 to 1913, particularly the paper on Cutleria” described the origin and development of the ‘eye spot’ in detail. See Chamberlain, “The Origin of the ‘Eye Spot,’” Botanical Gazette 57 (May 1914), 444.

\textsuperscript{33} Yamanouchi Shigeo, “Zanarudenia no seikushi (yohō),” Shokubutsuzaku zasshi 288 (1911), 9-11.
He decided to submit his previous published works including the latest one in Japanese for a degree equivalent to Ph.D. to the Japanese Ministry of Education. In July 1911, he was granted a doctoral degree in science (rigaku hakushi). By this time, however, he was no longer in Japan. He left Japan in March because he received a two-year scholarship from the Ministry of Education to study abroad; although the official statement read that Yamanouchi was assigned to study pedagogy in botany in the United States and Britain, it was virtually an extension of his leave of absence. The Ministry allowed him to continue his research at Chicago and guaranteed his job at home.

In the same summer, the University of Chicago held a course of lectures on heredity and eugenics. The aim of the course was to “summarize advances in knowledge in variation, heredity, and evolution and its relation to plant, animal, and human

---


35 He was given the rigaku hakushi degree on July 25, 1911 by the education minister. For details, see Monbushō, “Gakui juyo,” Kanpō 8439 (8 August 1911), 157; “Gakui juyo,” Tōyō gakugei zasshi 360 (September 1911), 484; “Oā Naoe shi syōbi Yamanouchi Shigee shi no gakui shōju,” Shokubutsu gakusaku zasshi 295 (1911), 330-332; and “Yamanouchi Shigee sensei no gakui jūyō,” Kairō 14 (1912), 89-92. He was the 90th doctor of science (rigaku hakushi) in Japan. In addition to those who studied in biology, it was given to scholars in other disciplines such as physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, geography, mathematics, and anthropology. Among the 93 scholars who received this degree in Meiji years (1888-1912), 28 are positively identified with non-biological fields and 31 are with biology. Considering the fact that he was one of the first fifty or so biologists with the highest degree in Japan and his research achievements, his virtually invisible status in the history of botany or biology is striking. Iseki Kurō, ed., Dai Nihon hakushiroku, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Hattensha, 1921), 42; Nose Iwakichi, ed., Nihon hakushiroku (Tokyo: Kyōiku Gijyō Kenkyūjo, 1956), 785. To identify scholars’ discipline, I used Kihara Shōshi, et. al., Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden, Nihon Shokubutsu Gakkai Hyakunenshi Henshū linkai, ed., Nihon no shokubutsu gakusa 100-rei no ayumi, and Itō Shuntarō, Sakamoto Kenzō, Murakami Yōichirō, eds. Kagakushi gijutsushi jiten, Shukutsatsu ed. (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1983).

36 Monbushō, “Ryōgakusei shuppatsu,” Kanpō 8334 (7 April 1911), 198; and Watanabe Minoru, Kindai Nihon kaisai ryōgakuseishi, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1978), 1116, 1118, and 1218. It seems the Ministry of Education granted the fellowship because it did not want to terminate Yamanouchi’s appointment at the Tokyo Teachers’ College when he expressed interest in accepting University of Chicago’s offer to teach and do research there between 1911 and 1912. See “Yamanouchi Shigee sensei no gakui jūyō,” Kairō 14 (1912), 89.
improvement and welfare.”

John Merle Coulter, with whom Yamanouchi had worked closely in the past, took the initiative in organizing the course. He also served as one of the five professors who elaborated on the theme, along with William Ernest Castle, Charles Benedict Davenport, Edward Murray East, and William Lawrence Tower.

Yamanouchi had come back to Chicago to assume a position of assistant in botany for the academic year of 1911-1912. Because “the lectures were not intended for those trained in biology, but for a general university audience, interested in the progress of genetics as a matter of information rather than of study,” in normal circumstances it was unlikely that Yamanouchi would have attended the summer lectures on heredity and eugenics. On the other hand, considering that he was on a government assignment to learn pedagogy, he could have been interested in participating from that perspective. Available sources, unfortunately, do not indicate whether Yamanouchi was physically at Chicago in the summer of 1911. Yet, he must have felt the excitement of the event relating discoveries in plant and animal heredity to that of humans from his adviser and biology colleagues at the University of Chicago: He would become interested in these subjects.

37 The content of these lectures were later published as a book. See William E. Castle, John M. Coulter, Charles B. Davenport, Edward M. East, and William L. Tower, Heredity and Eugenics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1912).

38 See Rogers, John Merle Coulet, 261. Castle was a Harvard zoologist famous for his widely read textbook Genetics and Eugenics, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916), first published in 1916. At the time East was an assistant professor of experimental plant morphology at Harvard. Tower was an associate professor of zoology at the University of Chicago. All three were known as geneticists, too.

39 RDBUC, 30. While teaching botanical cytology to graduate students two hours a week, Yamanouchi continued his research on red algae in Chicago. See “Honkō dayori,” Kaihō 14 (1912), 115.

and would begin writing about them extensively soon after. After completing his two
year study-abroad term, Yamanouchi returned to Japan in early 1913\textsuperscript{41} and seemingly put
an end to his career as an active researcher at least for a while. Upon returning, he
resumed his professorship at the Tokyo Teachers’ College.

Before turning to his activities in Japan, I would like to bring readers’ attention to
two points. The first is concerned with the question of Mendelism. How was
Mendelism received in the American and Japanese academia in the early twentieth
century? After Mendel’s laws were rediscovered independently by three scholars--Carl
Correns, in Germany; Erich Tschermak, in Austria; and Hugo de Vries, in Holland—in
1900, Mendelism became an immediate sensation in the United States and England.
Evolutionists, including biologists, agricultural breeders and plant scientists, applied it
successfully. But others were reluctant to accept it universally for all plants and
animals.\textsuperscript{42}

Daniel J. Kevles noted that, in the United States, the accomplished biologist
Charles B. Davenport analyzed the Mendelian inheritance of human eye, hair, and skin
color in 1907. Davenport was a faculty member at the University of Chicago from 1899
until 1904 when he left Chicago to head a newly established station for the experimental

\textsuperscript{41} He returned to Japan on April 19, 1913. Monbushô, “Ryûgakusei kichô,” Kanpô 245 (26 May
1913), 589 and Watanabe, Kindai Nihon kajizai ryûgakuseishi, vol. 2, 1116; SJJ, 642-643; and Tezuka,

\textsuperscript{42} Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, 43. More on this subject, see, for instance, Diane B. Paul and
Development of Biology, 281-310.
study of evolution at Cold Spring Harbor. During his tenure at Chicago, he traveled to England and visited the founders of a new science of eugenics, Francis Galton and Karl Pearson. By the time Yamanouchi arrived in the United States, Davenport had launched his career as the leading eugenician at Cold Spring Harbor. A few years after the 1903 establishment of an American Breeders’ Association, he became secretary of the Association’s Section on Eugenics. In summer 1911, he made a brief trip back to Chicago in order to participate in the course of lectures on “Heredity and Eugenics.”

After Davenport’s departure in 1904, how did other biologists at Chicago feel about Mendelism? When Charles O. Whitman, the chair of zoology department at the University of Chicago died, professor of zoology at Tokyo University, Ishikawa Chiyomatsu (1860-1935), wrote the obituary for his former teacher at Tokyo in its formative years:

As for Mendelism, although the professor [Whitman] was not absolutely against it, he seems to have had substantial doubt about it. He told me that by carefully investigating the mutation and hybrids of pigeons, it did not look that Mendelism was the great truth. When I visited Chicago [in March 1909], all the departments

---

43 James D. Ebert documents the ironic financial decisions made by the Carnegie Institution. Because Whitman, director of Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, resisted the Carnegie Institution’s takeover of the MBL to solve its financial problems, the institution gave the money to Davenport, who proposed to build a Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor, instead. See Ebert, “Carnegie Institution of Washington,” 180. As a result, Davenport left Chicago.

44 Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, 44-45.

45 In 1879, Whitman succeeded the zoology professor at Tokyo, Edward Morse (1838-1925). Whitman taught four students including Ishikawa during the two years at Tokyo University.
in biology were engaging in testing Mendelism at the University of Chicago. At the center of these research projects stood Professor Whitman.\textsuperscript{46}

Yamanouchi’s research took place in this atmosphere. It is worth noting that although Yamanouchi’s main theoretical concerns lay elsewhere (alternation of generations) and views regarding heredity were not articulated in his original research conducted overseas, there was no sign of his disputing the notion of the Mendelian framework of heredity, either. By the time Yamanouchi began studying at Chicago, such biologists as W.S. Sutton (1876-1916), Theodor Boveri (1862-1915), and Hugo de Vries (1848-1935) had already cytologically observed that the behavior of Mendelian genetic factors corresponded to the behavior of chromosomes in cell divisions. Thus, the discipline of cytology stood on the Mendelian premise. Like many other biologists both in the United States, Yamanouchi’s cytological research took place within the Mendelian framework.\textsuperscript{47}

Yet, his future papers, which he would write in Japan, would question a Mendelian premise: inheritability of acquired characteristics. The issue raised in these papers reflected the Chicago biologists’ general attitude towards Mendelism.


\textsuperscript{47} For his own words explaining the relationship between cytology and the Mendelian premise, see for example, Yamanouchi, Saimō to idea, 221; and “Jiken kagaku no kokoromi,” Kyōiku gakujutsukai 34.1 (1916), 3.
As in the United States, Mendelism became influential in Japan by the early twentieth century. Japan’s genetics began with Toyama Kametarō’s experimental work on silkworms—the first to prove that the Mendelian laws of inheritance also apply to the animal kingdom—which began in 1900. Prior to this experiment, German biologist August Weismann’s germ-plasm theory had been promoted by Ishikawa Chiyoumatsu, who studied under Weismann between 1886 and 1889. Various experimental works seem to have supported the Mendelian-Weismannian view of inheritance, and it quickly became accepted by many biologists in Japan.

Secondly, just before Yamanouchi’s return to Japan, he received a guest from home, the founder and the president of the Japan Women’s College, Naruse Jinzō. As we have seen in Chapter 2, in June 1912 Naruse had established a peace organization, Association Concordia (Kijitsu Kyōkai). In summer 1912, Naruse left for the U.S. and Europe to persuade like-minded people overseas to join the movement. During Naruse’s stay in Chicago for over a month, Yamanouchi facilitated Naruse’s meetings with various people of importance in the city, including University of Chicago President Harry Pratt

---

Judson and John D. Rockefeller.\textsuperscript{49} Contact with Naruse would stimulate Yamanouchi’s sensitivity towards ethics and women’s issues. This appears to have made an impact on Yamanouchi’s eugenics ideas after he returned to Tokyo.

3.3 Yamanouchi as Eugenist/Educator (1913-1927)

3.3.1 The Association Concordia

In April 1913 Yamanouchi Shigeo returned to Japan, shortly after the Meiji emperor had died, ushering in a new era, Taisho. After defeating the Czar’s empire (1905), the Japanese became more confident and assertive in their relationships with Westerners. The victory over Russia provided the opportunity for Japan to expand its empire by annexing southern Sakhalin (1905) and Korea (1910). The Taisho period (1912-1926) was often characterized by the term “democracy.” People who had traditionally been outside of political power structure began asserting themselves. Culturally, the beginning of the era coincided with the gradual end of knowledge as a monopoly of the elites, thanks to the expansion of education and printed media.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{49} Yamanouchi, “Naruse sensei to Jadoson sensei no kaiken.” Naruse successfully collected support from over one hundred seventy people, mostly university professors. The Association began losing focus after the death of Naruse in 1919. See Nakajima, “Kiitsu kyōkai shōkō (2),” 47-76. Judson replaced the first president of the University of Chicago William R. Harper after the latter’s death in 1906. According to Yamanouchi, when Naruse visited the university, it had just completed the library commemorating Harper. The first meeting of Naruse and Harper took place in the president’s office in this library. More on their meetings in Chicago, see Naruse Jinzō, “Ôbei ryokō hōkoku,” Kiitsu kyōkai kaihō 2 (July 1913), 91-111.

\textsuperscript{50} Of course, democracy is a relative term and the Taisho era was not a clear-cut democratic period. For a balanced treatment on state control and democracy during the Taisho period, see Sheldon Garon, The State and Labor in Modern Japan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987) and Andrew Gordon, Labor and Imperial Democracy in Prewar Japan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).
Even after he left Chicago, the *Botanical Gazette* continued to publish Yamanouchi's original works in English, which he had submitted earlier.\(^{51}\) He also began presenting his research conducted overseas in Japanese. "Life History of Corallina Officinalis Var, Mediterranea," was first presented at an annual meeting of the Tokyo Botanical Society, Japan's premier academic organization in the field, and was published in *Shokubutsugaku zasshi* [Botanical magazine] later.\(^{52}\) He developed close and amicable relationships with Japan's leading geneticists and botanists such as the professor in genetics at Tokyo University, Fujii Kenjirô (1866-1952); a professor in agriculture at Tokyo University, Miyake Kiichi (1876-1964); and an instructor in botany at Tokyo University, Makino Tomitarô (1862-1957).\(^{53}\)

---


\(^{52}\) Yamanouchi Shigeo, "Sangomo no seiikushi," 279-285. This article was later translated as "Life History of Corallina Officinalis Var. Mediterranea" by Clarence C. Bausman and published in the *Botanical Gazette* 72.2 (August 1921), 90-96. Corallina officinalis is a kind of red algae. This study was based on his research in Naples, Italy.

\(^{53}\) Yamanouchi Sada, Letter. Fujii Kenjirô (1866-1952) studied plant morphology and cytology under Eduard Strasburger and Karl Eberhard Goebel in Germany and fossology and plant anatomy under D. H. Scott in Britain between 1901 and 1905. Then he returned to his alma mater Tokyo University as an assistant professor (jokyō) in botany in 1905. In 1918, the first chair for genetics was endowed at Tokyo University by Osaka financiers, Fujii was named its professor. Fujii's expertise lay in genetics based on plant cytology. Yasui Kono, often called "Japan's first woman scientist," worked with Fujii closely at the Botanical Garden had studied at the University of Chicago under Yamanouchi's advisers John M. Coulter and Charles J. Chamberlain before going to Harvard to work with E. C. Jefferey, in 1915. About Fujii, see Shinotō Yoshito, "Fujii Kenjirô 1866-1952," *Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden* 216-222. For more details on Yasui, see Shinotō Yoshito, "Yasui Kono 1880-1971," ibid., 361-367. Like Fujii, another Japanese plant cytologist and geneticist, Miyake Kiichi (1876-1964), studied with Strasburger after receiving his Ph.D. from Cornell University in 1902. Miyake was appointed as a faculty member in agriculture at the Tokyo University. His research subjects included the reproductive processes of marine algae and genetic studies of morning glory. Unlike Fujii, however, Miyake primarily worked at a laboratory in the Komaba campus before he secured a space for experimentation at the Koishikawa Botanical Garden when the Faculty of Agriculture (Nōgaku-bu) moved to the Hongō campus. The Koishikawa Garden was located near the Honōgō campus and the Tokyo Teachers' College. See Tabuchi Kiyoo, "Miyake Kiichi 1876-1964," *Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusha shōden* 269-272. About Makino, an
Parallel with the shift in languages, his intellectual activities began changing in scope. Perhaps because the Tokyo Teachers’ College was an institution set up to train primary and secondary school teachers, its research facilities were limited; and, perhaps because the government designated him to be a specialist in botanical pedagogy, as evidenced by his fellowship from the Ministry of Education, Yamanouchi was now less involved in original research. He began preparing a monograph, Saibō to iden [Cells and heredity]. It described the emerging field of cytology and the genetic implications of its discoveries—including eugenics—for general readers. In a chapter on heredity and eugenics (jinshu kairyōgaku), Yamanouchi simply defined eugenics as the application of plant and animal breeding techniques to humans. He explained that a eugenics laboratory at University College London was founded by Francis Galton and there research on the heredity of mental and physical characteristics among humans had been conducted. After describing basic rules of heredity observed in plants and animals in a Mendelist fashion, he showed some examples of human heredity such as the colors of eye, hair, and skin; obesity; albinism; and night blindness. In the conclusion of this chapter, based on

accomplished plant taxonomist with little education, see Nakamura Hiroshi, “Makino Tomitarō (1862-1957).” Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakushi shōdō, 146-153.

54 For an example of poor research facilities at the Tokyo Teachers’ College, see Tsukuba Hisaharu’s statement in his “Kaisetsu,” Kindai Nihon shisō taikei, vol. 9, Oka Asajirō shū (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1974), 438. Yamanouchi’s colleague at the Tokyo Teachers’ College, Oka, however, kept conducting research without junior professors or assistants to help him. For his research achievements, he was admitted to the Imperial Academy in 1925. Professors at the Tokyo Teachers’ College who were in charge of “natural history” in Taishō years included botanist Saidai Kōtarō (1859-1924), zoologist Oka Asajirō (1869-1944), anthropologist Šatō Denzō (1880-1928), and zoologist Takakura Usamaro. See Suzuki Hiroo, Tōkyō Kyōiku Daigaku hyakunenishi (Tokyo: Nihon Teshō Bunka Kyōkai, 1978), 158. Also see Hakubutsu gakukai zasshi 60 (March 1937) commemorating the achievements of Professors Oka, Takakura, and Sasaki Yūtarō (agricultural education).

55 Yamanouchi, Saibō to iden, 209.
negative eugenics principles, Yamanouchi noted that, biologically, a person with a certain undesirable, abnormal genetic traits should avoid consanguineous marriage, and instead marry someone normal. This would avoid abnormality among offspring. He added that sociologically, marriage or reproductive restrictions might be considered for couples when both partners suffered from problems, including low intelligence, sexual offenses, alcoholism, and criminality.56

The book, comprised of twenty chapters, was highly regarded as the only original, readable work on the subject of heredity written by a Japanese scholar in Japanese. As for books dealing with a similar theme, translations of R. H. Lock’s Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity, and Evolution and J. Arthur Thomson’s Heredity were available. In addition, agricultural specialist Minami Sadaharu published Iden shinkaron [Genetic evolutionary theories], but this appeared to be based on H. E. Walter’s Genetics in terms of its organization and content. The only other original work by a Japanese was plant geneticist Ikeno Seiichirō’s Zikken-idengaku [Experimental genetics], which was written in Japanese but in an unreadable Roman transliteration.57

In April 1914, a month before the publication of his first book, Saibō to iden, Yamanouchi Shigeo was invited to give a talk on heredity at a meeting of Naruse Jinzô’s

56 Ibid., 209-221.

57 For a review of these works, see N.S. sei, (pseudonym) “Shitsugi otō: Tei 12 iden ni kansuru Nihonbun ao ryōsho o shiritashi (Muneishi),” Dōbutsugaku zasshi 27 (March 1915), 172. Writing in Roman transliteration—or in Esperanto, experimented with in the 1930s—were efforts to overcome the language barrier between Japanese and Western languages expressed phonetically in alphabets.
Association Concordia.\textsuperscript{58} It should be noted that the reconciliation of Eastern and Western civilizations (Tôzai ryô burmei no chôwa) became a major theme among Taisho intellectuals. Many saw Japan as the only “modern, civilized” nation in the East capable of bridging the two civilizations. Based on its political, economic, industrial, and military accomplishments, Japan felt it should belong to the club of modern nations together with those of Western Europe and North America.\textsuperscript{59}

Japan’s sudden emergence as a military power capable of defeating major empires like China and Russia fueled America’s uneasiness towards Japan’s possible imperial ambitions. Augmented by a growing tension on the West Coast, American discrimination against Japanese immigrants intensified. Thus, the issue of “race” became a frequent subject of discussions at the Association Concordia meetings that Yamanouchi attended.


\textsuperscript{59} Mamiya Kunio analyzes Ôkuma Shigenobu’s view towards race and civilization in the intellectual framework of the East-West reconciliation. See his “Ôkuma Shigenobu to ‘imin mondai,’” \textit{Shakai kagaku tôkyû} 124 (March 1997), 385-404. Ôkuma established the Greater Japan Civilization Society (Dai Nihon Bunmei Kyôkai) in 1908. Its members included active Association Concordia members such as Inoue Tetsujirô and Shibasawa Eichi. The main function of the Greater Japan Civilization Society was to translate major academic books, including many in natural sciences, into Japanese. The translation of Charles B. Davenport’s \textit{Heredity in Relation to Eugenics} (1911) was published as \textit{Jinshu kairôron} by the Society in 1914. For a study regarding the Society’s emphasis on natural sciences, see Mizoguchi Hajime, “Dai Nihon Bunmei Kyôkai no shizen kagakusho ni tsuite,” \textit{Kagakushû kenkyû} 146 (1983), 99-106. For more on the Society, see Sôtô Yoshimaru, “Dai Nihon Bunmei Kyôkai shi shiron,” \textit{Waseda Daigakushi kiyô} 21 (March 1989), 177-212.
In July 1913, two members—Christian zoologist Gotō Seitarō (1867-1935) and Naruse—recommended Yamanouchi to the Association Concordia membership committee. Since Yamanouchi’s membership was accepted in September, he began regularly attending the monthly meetings of the Association. In the March 1914 meeting, Baron Shibusawa Eiichi, a senior member who supported the organization financially, asked other members to elaborate on three issues: 1) whether morality exists in harmony with production and profit making; 2) whether morality evolves as civilization evolves; and 3) to what degree education can change human characteristics determined by Nature. In response to the third question, Yamanouchi summarized certain chapters from his Saibō.

60 Both Gotō and Naruse were from today’s Yamaguchi prefecture and converted to Christianity in their youth. After attending at Dōshisha in Kyoto for a couple of years, Gotō transferred to the First Higher School in Tokyo. The graduation of such a school was a prerequisite for the admission to the Tokyo University. After graduating from the university and worked for the university as a scientific English instructor for three years, he went to Johns Hopkins University and studied Coentara under William Keith Brooks (1848-1908) for a year beginning 1894. He also studied Echinodermata at Harvard. He received a doctor in science (rigaku hakushi) in 1895. Upon returning to Japan, Gotō became a professor at the First Higher School. He kept the job until 1909 when he accepted a position as a professor at the Tokyo University. As for biographical information on Gotō, see Dobutsugaku zasshi 48 (October 1936), 385-436. This volume was dedicated to Gotō as a memorial number for the late Professor S. Gotō. See also Gotō Shigeru, “Gotō Seitarō 1867-1935,” Kindai Nihon seibutsu gakusya shōden, 200-203. The relationship between Gotō and Yamanouchi is significant in the context of eugenics as well. Gotō published a book whose central theme was eugenics and, like Yamanouchi, Gotō was a member of the International Congress of Eugenics. As for his book Seibutsugaku to viseigaku [Biology and eugenics] (1919) and Jinru iseibutsugaku no mondai ni san [A few problems in human biology] (1931), see Ezaki Teizō, “Gotō Seitarō hakushi no kyōkasho, kōgiroku,” Dobutsugaku zasshi, v. 48, 411: Gotō, “Gotō Seitarō,” 202; and Suzuki, Nihon no viseigaku, 90.

61 For the process of his membership acceptance, see SEDS, v. 46, 482, 486-7. For example, according to the SEDS documents, he attended twenty-eight meetings between 1913 and 1924. (SEDS, vol. 46, 486-7, 488, 491, 495, 498, 499, 509, 576, 579, 589, 589, 589, 614, 617, 618, 620, 622, 629, 630, 642, 646, 647, 654, 656, 658, 669, 670, 676, 678.) Aneasaki Masaharu commented that around the spring of 1914 the Association experienced its peak. (SEDS, vol. 46, 426.) It is reflected by the fact that Yamanouchi attended eighteen of the twenty-eight meetings during the first three years of his joining the association. (Of course, Shibusawa Eiichi documents do not cover the attendance of all the Association Concordia meetings. Especially, after the death of Shibusawa in 1931, this collection of documents does not deal with the Association Concordia unless there were activities commemorating Shibusawa’s contributions to the organization.)

62 SEDS, vol. 46, 500-509.
to iden manuscript and presented his view from a biological standpoint in the April meeting. He explored various evolution theories held by Jean Baptiste de Lamarck, Charles Darwin, August Weismann, Hugo de Vries, Gregor Mendel, and also discussed eugenics ideas by Francis Galton and Karl Pearson. He explained that Weismann's germ-plasm theory, which denied the inheritance of acquired characteristics thereby emphasized biological determinism, and Lamarck's interpretation, which allowed environment and education to influence the development of human characteristics, had been contested. According to the knowledge from experimental biology available to that day, Yamanouchi believed that either theory could be true. His uneasiness towards outright biological determinism was expressed in his comment on Galton. "It seems to me that Mr. Galton and others put too much emphasis on heredity and take influences from the outside world too lightly." His reservation came from his awareness that studies on human inheritance had just started and not much had been known.

In December, Naruse Jinzō asked Yamanouchi to give another lecture on heredity and the responsibility of young people. Its content was later printed in the weekly

---

63 For example, Yamanouchi seems to have used the contents of Chapters 16-19 of the Saibō to iden. Figure 41 in the book (between pp. 190 and 191) was used in the article based on the Association Concordia lecture, see Yamanouchi Shigō, "Iden," Kiitsu Kyōkai kaihō 6 (November 1915), 48.

64 Yamanouchi, "Iden," Kiitsu Kyōkai kaihō 6, 32.

65 As for Francis Galton's evolutionary view similar to Weismann's, author Pat Shipman writes, "Galton had arrived at a similar, if vaguer concept, of the 'stirp' or root element that transmitted characteristics from parent to offspring. No acquired traits could be inherited if Weismann or Galton were correct, since these would not affect the germ plasm." See her The Evolution of Racism: Human Differences and the Use and Abuse of Science (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994), 117.

66 Yamanouchi, "Iden," Kiitsu Kyōkai kaihō 6, 56.

67 Ibid., 58. The content of this lecture was later printed. For its entirety, see Yamanouchi, "Iden," Kiitsu Kyōkai kaihō 6, 24-58.
newspaper of the Japan Women’s College. In this lecture, Yamanouchi discussed the debate of “nature” vs. “nurture.” He pointed out that there were examples of smart children born to not-so-smart parents or vice versa and this kind of phenomenon could not be fully explained by biological determinism. When he talked about eugenics or jinshu kairyō (lit. race improvement), he mentioned that one’s good genes could not reach their potential without his or her effort, education, and other outside factors. Once born, it was young people’s obligation to fully develop their genetic potential. Their other obligation was to choose “fit” mates to produce “fit” children in order to strengthen the “ethnic nation” or minzoku.68 This was a positive eugenics argument.

His tie with Naruse Jinzō grew stronger beyond the Association Concordia connection. Naruse hired him to teach natural history, home natural history, and home bacteriology at the Japan Women’s College.69 While keeping his main job at the Tokyo Teachers’ College, Yamanouchi began teaching at the Japan Women’s College in 1915.70 Perhaps because of this appointment, Yamanouchi joined the Woman Problem Study Group (Fujin Mondai Kenkyūkai), organized by Naruse’s close associate Asō Shōzō,

---

68 Although Yamanouchi used the “jinshu kairyō” for a headline describing the content of one segment of his talk, the actual word he used in the body was “minzoku kairyō.” For the content of this lecture, see Yamanouchi Shigeo, “Iden to seinen no sekinin,” Katei shūhō 297 (11 December 1914), 3 and Katei shūhō 298 (18 December 1914), 4.

69 Yamanouchi’s relationship with Naruse remained cordial until Naruse’s death in 1919. Yamanouchi visited Naruse a couple of times while Naruse was in his death bed. Yamanouchi later recalled that he was impressed by Naruse’s vision, enthusiasm, and compassion. See Yamanouchi, “Naruse sensei to Jadoson hakase no kaiken.”

70 Yamanouchi taught at the Japan Women’s College until 1927. See a handwritten manuscript, Shomuka, “Nihon Joshi Daigakkō kyōshokuin Meiji 34-Shōwa 19,” (Tokyo: Nihon Joshi Daigakkō, 1978), 63. I am grateful to Ms. Moroi Sakiko, librarian at the Japan Women’s University, Mejiro campus, for locating this document. Perhaps as an outgrowth of his lectures at the college, he published a textbook-like work Katei seibutsugaku [Home biology] (Tokyo: Sōbunkan) in 1924.
established in 1916. In one meeting, Yamanouchi gave a lecture on eugenics. Although the content of this talk was not very different from that of his other presentations, what was significant was that Yamanouchi acknowledged the great importance of eugenics to women’s lives.

Both Yamanouchi and Naruse attended the Association Concordia meetings regularly. Yamanouchi gave another talk for its members on the ethical obligation of the entire human race to practice eugenic marriage and reproduction. This talk was formulated to fit the general theme of the Association’s interest in the unity, peace, and cooperation of the world. Yamanouchi discussed the unselfish lifestyles of worker

71 “Fujin Mondai Kenkyūka no eakaku tairyaku” and “Fujin Mondai Kenkyū kain,” Fujin mondai 1.1 (October 1918), 2-7.

72 Yamanouchi Shigeo, “‘Yūzenikkusu’ ni tsuite (2),” Fujin mondai 1.3 (December 1918), 350. Yamanouchi’s connection with the Japan Women’s College was more than his close association with Naruse, Yamanouchi’s wife Yaeko, whom he married in 1911, was a graduate of Naruse’s college. He married in February 1911 when he went home to Yamagata for the first time he left for Tokyo in 1895. His stepfather had arranged it. By threatening that he would commit suicide if the adopted son would not marry the girl whom the father chose, the father forced his son to marry her on the day he went home. While he was 32 years old, she, Yaeko, was 28. She was from a wealthy family in Tsuruoka where the Yamanouchi family lived. After graduating from the Japan Women’s College, Yaeko became a teacher at a school for girls in Sendai. Yamanouchi’s mentor Kanō Jigorō wanted him to marry his 18 years old daughter, but because of his protégé’s sudden marriage, Kanō’s plan was unfulfilled. See Yamanouchi Sada, Letter; and “Yamanouchi sensei,” Kaihō (in-house publication of Tokyo Teachers’ College’s Natural History Program) 13 (1911), 86. Naruse, “Jado roku hakase shōkai no ji,” Katei shihō 286 (September 1914), reprinted in Naruse Jinzō Chosakushū, ed. Naruse Jinzō Chosakushū shuin, vol. 3 (Tokyo: Nihon Joshi Daigaku, 1981), 723. As an alumna, Yaeko responded to the campaign quickly and donated 108 yen for the cause of expanding the Japan Women’s College into a comprehensive university. This fund-raising effort was fueled by President Naruse’s death in March 8, 1919 because making his college into a university was his life-long dream. Yaeko was listed as Yamanouchi Yae in this list of donors. See “Sōgō daigaku kikin kinfu mōshikomi hōkoku (Dai san kai),” Katei shihō 507 (14 March 1919), 10. Mr. and Mrs. Yamanouchi had a daughter Haruko who was born in 1915. Yaeko died after a long battle against tuberculosis in 1934.

73 Yamanouchi explained that Usawa Sōnei gave a lecture on the common obligations of human beings at an Association’s monthly meeting two month before. Anesaki Masaharu, one of the leaders of the Association, asked Yamanouchi if there would be a phenomenon of human’s universal obligations from the viewpoint of biology. Yamanouchi answered that there might be some. Anesaki requested Yamanouchi to talk about that subject in the upcoming meeting. See Yamanouchi Shigeo, “Seibutsugakuyō yori mitaru jirui to rentai sekinin,” Kiitsu Kyōkai, ed., Kiitsu kyōkai sōsho, vol. 1 Shakai dōtoku no kyōdō sekinin (Tokyo: Hakubukan, 1916), 47. Yamanouchi’s lecture was delivered
bees, a queen bee and a few male bees for the survival of their group. Led by their natural
instincts, some lose their lives to defend the well-being of the group. Then Yamanouchi
turned attention to humans. Taking the example of the lamentable spread of venereal
diseases among the civilized, Yamanouchi called for each individual’s responsible action to
prevent the “unfit” or “unhealthy” from mingling with the “healthy,” thereby lowering
the standard of the biological state of humans. The implication of our leading an eugenic
life would not be confined to the rise and fall of one nation, he argued, rather it would
have much to do with the welfare of the entire human race.\footnote{Yamanouchi, “Seibutsugakujō yori mitaru jinrui to rentai sekinin,” 71.}
It is, he stated, our common responsibility to live eugenically.\footnote{Ibid., 47-73.}
He thus emphasized negative eugenic principles.

Besides presenting a biological perspective for the Association of Concordia and
the Women Problem Study Group meetings, Yamanouchi talked about eugenics in front of
a more specialized audience. In his 1916 lecture at the Faculty of Medicine, Tokyo
University, he noted that the possible inheritance of a pregnant mother’s experiences by

\textit{in April 27, 1916 and Usawa’s in February 28, 1916. See Nakajima, “Kiitsu Kyōkai shōkō (2),” 50. It is
interesting to note that Yamanouchi published another book on biological impact of wars: Seishoku to
senso, Jiji Sōsho, no. 22 (Tokyo: Fusanbō, 1915) around the same time. In a way, this reflected his
involvement in a peace organization like the Association Concordia. Usawa was a lawyer with a doctoral
degree in law. He was a member of the House of Representatives. He was also known as an educator.
Haktō, 1913), 1127; and “Uzawa Fusaaki,” Shūgin and Sangin, eds. Gikai seido hyakunenshi, vol.
10, Shūgin gin meikan (Tokyo: Ōkurashō insatsukyoku, 1990), 86. Although the Who’s Who in Japan
lists his name as “Uzawa” and the Gikai seido hyakunenshi lists it as “Fusaaki,” I am following the
pronunciation “Usawa” in the Association Concordia member list published in English. See “List of
Members,” Report of the Association Concordia of Japan, Extra Number (Tokyo, May 1915), 34.}
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her child could not be totally denied, considering that environmental factors began influencing the development of a person as soon as he or she was conceived.\footnote{See Yamanouchi, “Jinrui no iden” [Human heredity], Kyōiku gakujutsukai 34.2 (November 1916), 224-225 documenting his lecture at the 44th popular lecture of psychology, held at the forensic medicine seminar of medical college, Tokyo University. It was also published as “Jinrui no iden,” Shinri kenkyū 11.1 (January 1917), 1-8. See also Jinrui no shinkai [Evolution of humans] published from Kokushi Kōshūkai in 1922.}

During the mid 1910s, when Yamanouchi Shigéo was explaining eugenics to the public through various media, the Association Concordia often invited distinguished guests from the U.S. to their meetings. In early 1915, as representatives of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Shailer Mathews, Baptist theologian from the University of Chicago, and Sidney Gulick, a founding member of the Association Concordia, visited Japan. They had an opportunity to speak to members at the February monthly meeting and to converse with some of them over a dinner held at senior Association Concordia member Baron Shibusawa Eiichi’s residence.\footnote{SEDS, vol. 46, 579-582; and vol. 39, 105-123. Their visit to Japan was documented in Sandra C.Taylor, Advocate of Understanding: Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1984), 114-115.} Because of the Chicago connection, Yamanouchi, though he was only a regular member, was invited to Shibusawa’s private dinner, too.

Reflecting the Association’s mission to ease tension between Japan and the United States, frank discussions at these meetings centered around American racial prejudice against Japanese immigrants. The issue was not remote nor foreign to
Yamanouchi who had spent several years in the United States. For instance, in the year when he received his Ph.D., racial tension between Americans and Japanese students in Chicago was reported.\textsuperscript{78}

The presence of Sidney L. Gulick in the Association Concordia was also significant. He served as a missionary in Japan and later as a theology and science professor at Dōshisha University in Kyoto. He then moved back to the United States and became an advocate of international understanding opposing the anti-Japanese immigration policies.\textsuperscript{79} As we will see in Chapter 5, he represented Japan’s interest in U.S. race politics. By the 1915 visit to Japan, Gulick had already taken part in debates against American eugenics enthusiasts who supported exclusionist law proposals. Thus, while Yamanouchi was developing his eugenics views, he was constantly—directly and indirectly—exposed to intellectual currents directly concerned with racial equality and the issue of the East-West reconciliation.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{78} “Shikago gakusei jikea,” Kyōiku jiron 810 (October 15, 1907).

\textsuperscript{79} About his effort not to discriminate against any particular race in U.S. immigration laws, see Taylor, Advocate of Understanding. For Gulick’s role in the Association Concordia, see p. 77.

\textsuperscript{80} As for the issue of race, see the Association’s statement at the time of its establishment in SEDS, vol. 46, 430 and 431. More on discussions on anti-Japanese immigration in the United States and racial prejudice at various Association Concordia-related meetings, see ibid., 482, 488, 494, 577-578, 597, 606, 609, 648, 649, 651, 654-5, 658, 664, and 730. The harmony between Eastern and Western civilizations was one of the most important themes of the Association, for samples of the discussions concerning this issue, see ibid., 407, 408, 431, and 492.
3.3.2 The Greater Japan Academic Society

The Greater Japan Academic Society (GJAS or Dai Nihon Gakujutsu Kyōkai) was one of those organizations which addressed the issue of the East-West reconciliation. As an educator, in 1915 Yamanouchi was involved in the founding of the Society, which was an outgrowth of the Education Society (Kyōiku Gakkai). The GJAS was organized mostly by the faculty members of Tokyo Teachers’ College and began publishing the journal Kyōiku gakujutsukai [Education world] which had been published by Dōbunkan since 1899. The journal was particularly well-respected among secondary school teachers. After the publisher Dōbunkan went bankrupt in the early Taisho years, the editor in chief at the time, Amako Tomaru, obtained the right to continue publishing the journal. This change forced some members of the Education Society to establish a new organization and reconceptualize its raison d’être. This is how the

---


82 Nakajima, Fūsetsu hachijūnen, 4-5, and 60.

83 Ibid., 60.

84 Dōbunkan, established in 1896, had taken responsibility for publishing the journal edited by the Education Society, since 1899. The Dōbunkan was a successful publisher known for its works in commerce and education. Yet, it went bankrupt in 1912 perhaps because of overextending its business to publishing a costly encyclopedia series. Though the advertisement company, Hakuhōdō, helped revive Dōbunkan—the process was complete by 1916—, Dōbunkan obviously experienced downsizing. In this context, the Kyōiku gakujutsukai was transferred to Amako’s new company Monasu. See Nakajima, Fūsetsu hachijūnen, 4, 59-60; and 81-82; and Suzuki Toshio, Shuppan: Kōfukyōka kōbō no isseiki (Tokyo: Shuppan Nyūsusha, 1970), 137, 151-152, and 157-8; and Sezai and Furuta, eds. Kagaku tetsugaku bunken mokuroku, Part I, 238.
Greater Japan Academic Society came into being. The mission statement reflected growing national pride in a country that had defeated two empires—China in 1895 and Russia in 1905—and was now participating in World War I as an emerging world power.

Since the Meiji Restoration, like abundant water fills [a container], the currents of Western Civilization have filled the Japanese Empire. [Japanese] scholars had simply repeated Western [theories] and taught the Japanese [public] in the names of Westerners. [These Japanese scholars] did not have their own opinions and there were few people who had clear visions. However, after the two wars against China and Russia, the cry for the revival of Tōyō shugi (Easternism) has intensified and a climate of independence has arisen...In this way...a number of new studies have been launched....Gathering the essence of today's scholars' research and publishing their works will be a worthwhile enterprise. Our war against Germany made Japanese stop tending to depend on Germany and other foreign countries. It will therefore be most important to establish intellectual independence....That is why we have established this society....

June 1915
President, The Greater Japan Academic Society
Doctor of Arts, Doctor of Law, Katō Hiroyuki

Yamanouchi Shigeo was one of the five officers (komon) under former president of the Tokyo University and the Imperial Academy of Japan, Katō Hiroyuki (1836-1916).

Katō was also well-known for his desire to apply social Darwinism to Japan’s

---

85 The Education Society did not turn itself into the Greater Japan Academic Society. The Education Society (in fact, its successor Education Study Society) continued to exist and work with Dōbunkan. See works edited or authored by the Education Study Society even after the establishment of the Greater Japan Academic Society in the list of books published by Dōbunkan. Nakajima, Fūsetsu hachi-jūnen, 363-380.


87 Since Katō’s academic career began in his pre-Meiji studies of German language, it is likely Fujishiro, Yamaguchi, and Endō who studied various fields of humanities, and social and behavioral sciences through German at the Tokyo University might have had a contact to recruit Katō. About Katō, see Tabata Shin’ōbu, Katō Hiroyuki, Jinbutsu Sōsho (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Köbunkan, 1959), 148-187. As for Katō’s political and religious views in English, see Winston Davis, The Moral and Political Naturalism of Baron Katō Hiroyuki, Japan Research Monograph, no. 13 (Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1996).
constitutional politics. 88 Along with Inoue Tetsujirō, Katō had criticized Takahashi Yoshio’s advocacy of mixed residence in Takahashi’s 1884 book on Japanese race improvement. Other officers—all were professors of various institutions—were German literature scholar Fujishiro Teisuke (1868-1927), German language expert Yamaguchi Kotarō (1867-1917), child psychologist Takashima Heisaburō (1865-1946), and sociologist Endō Ryūkichi (1874-1946). By the end of 1917, both Katō and Yamaguchi had died, and two senior scholars were added as officers: authority in forensic medicine Katayama Kuniyoshi (1855-1931) and philosopher Inoue Tetsujirō (1855-1944). 89 Considering that Katō was already eighty years old at the time of the GJAS establishment, it is likely that de facto leadership was exercised by the original five officers. Despite their various fields of expertise, they all shared an interest in pedagogy.

Both Fujishiro and Yamaguchi were influenced by German philosopher and educator Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841). Endō, who was particularly close to Yamanouchi Shigeo, put his knowledge of educational sociology into practice when he established and ran the Sugamo Higher School of Commerce (today’s Chiba University of Commerce). 90 Takakura and Yamanouchi were affiliated with the Tokyo Teachers’ College, the center


89 See the advertisement section of Ishikawa Chiyomatsu’s Ningen no shinka, Dai Nihon Gakujutsu Sōsho 7 (Tokyo: Dai Nihon Gakujutsu Kyōkai, 1917). It was printed on December 5 and published on December 8. Yamaguchi died on January 23, 1917.

90 For the relationship between Yamanouchi and Endō, see Yamanouchi Sada, Letter. Endō was famous for his “Eastern humanism (Tōyō jinbun shugi),” which seems to have been well-reflected in the mission statement of the GJAS. See Kon Morimoto, “Endō Ryūkichi,” Nihon jimmei daijiten, vol. 7, Gendai (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979), 129.
of pedagogical studies in the country. The concept of “departure from Germany” (i.e. terminating dependence on Germany) may have been formulated by scholars in German studies. Respect for the East may have come from Endō, who was known for the idea of “jinbun Tōyō shugi” (Easternism in humanities).

As for Yamanouchi, he seems to have played a greater role in the publication of a GJAS series. For example, his monographs Idenron [On heredity] in 1915, and Jinrui no iden [Human heredity] in 1917, were a part of a series, Dai Nihon Gakujutsu Sôsho, published by the Society. In fact, the Idenron was the first. According to the advertisement of the series, Yamanouchi was supposed to write another book entitled Kagaku to shûkyô [Science and religion]. Having three titles in the series is highly significant in measuring his commitment to the GJAS. Among the forty-six titles of the series--combining the ones already published and the others projected--no author but Yamanouchi had more than two.

The Idenron received a positive review in the respected academic journal Tôyō gakugei zasshi. The subject of heredity had begun drawing people’s attention, the reviewer noted, because it had social implications. Unlike conditions in the West where readers were overwhelmed by an outpouring of works on heredity written by those who

---

91 Yamanouchi would also serve in the Ministry of Education. For example, he was appointed government school inspector (shigakukan) in 1918 and member of the Textbook Investigation Committee (Kyôkasho Chôsakai) in 1920. As a school inspector, he often travelled to Japan’s colonial Korea and Manchuria. About the government school inspector system and the committee, see Monbushô, Gakusei hyakugen-shi, Kijutsu-ken, 422-424 and 537.

92 “Rigaku hakushi Yamanouchi Shigeo shi Idenron,” Tôyô Gakugei zasshi 411 (December 1915), 57.

93 Advertisement at the back of Yamanouchi, Jinrui no iden, n.p.
were not familiar with biology, Japan, he continued, was fortunate to have Yamanouchi's book, for it was written by a trained biologist qualified to discuss heredity. After describing the organizational structure of the book, the reviewer commented that Yamanouchi's treatment of examples from both zoology and botany made it well-balanced. Rich examples of scientific works distinguished the Idenron from the existing general works on heredity, he added.94

Yamanouchi's eugenics view was clearly spelled out in Jinrui no iden. His emphasis on race improvement through environment and education was based on his observation that many people, due to a poor environment and lack of, or limited, education, underutilized their talents and lived without reaching their genetic potential.95 This view was based on Lamarckism: inheritance of characteristics acquired through changes in habit; in particular use and disuse of mental and physical characteristics. He presented examples that historically great men tended to be born to older parents. These examples made him hesitate to embrace the theory denying inheritance of acquired characteristics uncritically because they seemed to indicate their children were smarter as a result of longer training of the parents; compared with their younger counterparts, the older parents were presumed to have worked to improve their minds for additional years.96 As I shall describe in the next section, his choice of these examples focusing on the age of great men's parents reflected his theoretical interest in heredity.

---

94 "Rigaku hakushi Yamanouchi Shigeo shi Idenron," 57.
95 Yamanouchi, Jinrui no iden, 322-334 and 342-343.
96 Ibid., 97-157.
After commenting on environment and education, Yamanouchi then turned to biological factors and indicated that humans could also be improved by controlling heredity. Possible measures included eliminating family lines with genetic diseases, making the “fit” marry the “fit”; and protecting the “fit” variation caused by mutation.\textsuperscript{97} Besides the “nurture” and “nature” aspect, there was another characteristic of his eugenics claim: The obligation to improve racial stock (shuzoku) was more important than individual freedom.\textsuperscript{98} This element was obviously shaped by his participation in the Association Concordia discussions.

3.3.3 Questioning the Inheritability of Acquired Characteristics

Other than publishing monographs, Yamanouchi frequently wrote articles for the JGAS’s journal for educators, Kyōiku gakujutsukai, between 1915 and 1924.\textsuperscript{99} One such article published in 1916 was entitled “An Antithesis of the Germ-Plasm Theory: On the Hereditability of Acquired Characteristics.” Here Yamanouchi introduced the so-called gradient theory held by University of Chicago zoology professor Charles M. Child (1869-1954). Working on the regeneration of planarian, the organism of a lower order, the zoologist noticed a gradation in the rate of physiological processes along the axis in such organisms. The gradient theory can be explained as follows:

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 343.

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., 341.

\textsuperscript{99} For the list of Yamanouchi’s papers in this journal, see Note 6 in Takagi, “‘Taishō demokurashi,’” 176.
In this gradient Child believed he had found the mechanism of correlation by which the mass of cells that constitute an animal is maintained as a unified whole of definite form and construction.” The chief factor in correlation is antero-posterior dominance, i.e., each level dominates the region behind and is dominated by that in front.\textsuperscript{100}

In his 1915 work, Child further developed his theory adding that size, form, structural pattern, and correlation of activities were all maintained by transmission of change along the axis.\textsuperscript{101} Child then expanded his application of the concept to other materials, plant and animal, adult and embryonic. He applied the concepts of the gradient theory to the phenomena of aging and rejuvenescence and wrote down his ideas based on experimental work in \textit{Senescence and Rejuvenescence}. Having read Child’s recent works, Yamanouchi found that they might discredit an influential evolution theory held by German biologist August Weismann, the aforementioned germ plasm theory. Yamanouchi challenged Weismann’s concept by pointing out that Child’s observations suggest germ cells are susceptible to aging just as bodily cells are. Child saw that two old germ cells could be rejuvenated by a conjugation. In other words, germ cells can be affected by environment; and germ cells and bodily cells are not totally isolated. In this way, acquired characteristics could be passed on from one generation to the next. In his paper, Yamanouchi raised the possibility of denying the widely-accepted notion of non-inheritance of acquired characteristics, supported by Weismann’s germ-plasm theory.


For readers who had more scientific training, Yamanouchi wrote other articles. For instance, one explained Child's research in a more elaborate manner and the other discussed H. M. Benedict's study on grape leaves, which supported Child's theory experimentally because Benedict found signs of senile changes in embryonic cells in plants.\(^{102}\)

Scientific skepticism towards non-inheritance of acquired traits would be shared by Yamanouchi's adviser, Coulter. Coulter wrote, "The bulk of available evidence, however, seems to be against the inheritance of acquired characters, but there are a number of biological facts that seem too difficult to explain in any other way. In animals the mechanism may seem to make the inheritance of acquired characters impossible; but the situation in plants is distinctly different."\(^{103}\)

Far from being "unscientific," Yamanouchi's argument was based on cutting edge scientific discoveries, and his view was shared by other biologists like Coulter.\(^{104}\) Based

---

\(^{102}\) Yamanouchi Shigeo, "Vaisuman no seishokushitsu ni hantai suru iken," *Hakubutsu gakkaishi* 22 (1916), 7-10; and "Shokubutsu saibō no zenshinteki rōsui," *Hakubutsu gakkaishi* 24 (1917), 13-16.


\(^{104}\) Yamanouchi Shigeo, "Kaimu purazumu setsu ni hantai suru ichi gakusetsu: Kakutoku sei no iden ni tsuite," *Kyōiku gaku* 33.5 (August 1916), 1-4. I am grateful for Professor Okamoto Kōichi of Waseda University who extended his help in my obtaining this article.
on this theoretical conviction, he used the examples of great men and their older parents. He also argued in favor of taikyô, or prenatal care of an unborn child through attention of a pregnant woman to her own mental health.\(^{105}\)

3.3.4 Senior Colleague Oka Asajirô’s Eugenics View

At his home institution, Tokyo Teachers’ College, Yamanouchi was not alone in popularizing evolutionary theories and eugenics ideas. His senior colleague Oka Asajirô (1868-1944) also had been introducing evolutionary theories to the Japanese public.\(^{106}\) A German-trained zoologist, Oka Asajirô was the author of the bestseller Shinkaron kôwa [Lectures on evolution theories], which was originally published in 1904 and reprinted many times over a long period.\(^{107}\) His Darwinist view was different from the mainstream Mendelian-Weismannite interpretation of evolution. He firmly believed that acquired characteristics could be inherited. In the early 1890s, Oka studied under August Weismann when the latter was formulating the germ-plasm theory. Oka, however, was not able to accept the theory; imagining the existence of the clear border between bodily cells and germ cells as Weismann argued was against Oka’s fundamental belief in


\(^{106}\) For example, Professor of Education at the Tokyo Teachers’ College, Ototake Iwazô (1892-1953), was interested in measuring the mental ability of school children and providing a differentiated curriculum according to their mental “fitness.” See Takagi Masashi’s analysis, “1900 nen dai – 1920 nen dai no Nihon ni okeru “teinôji, yûshûji” kyôiku no shisô: Ototake Iwazô no kyôiku kan, nôruokukan no bunseki o tôshite,” Nagoya Daigaku kyôiku gakubu kiyô (Kyôiku Gakka) 37 (1990), 115-125. Not only these faculty members but some graduates, including the co-founder of the Greater Japan Eugenics Society Ichikawa Genzô, were also eugenics enthusiasts.

“borderless distinction.” Oka explained it as follows: There were two kinds of leeches: one with three stripes and the other with only one stripe in the back. These two seemed to be totally different. Yet, if one collected many leeches and observed, he or she could find so many examples of “in between” characters of the two. For example, in the back of one leech he found the central stripe much darker than two other stripes which were almost unrecognizable. There was another leech which seemed to have only one stripe but if one looked at it closely there were two fine lines along the stripe. Thus, he saw the distinction between the two kinds of leeches (one with three stripes and the other with one stripe) but the clear border between the two did not exist. Looking for an adviser who could understand his way of seeing the natural world, Oka left for Leipzig to study with Karl Leuckart. Based on his “borderless distinction” theory, he rejected Weismann’s germ-plasm theory as well as Mendelian laws of inheritance (including the premise of “unit character”).

As a biologist interested in the evolution theory, Oka was familiar with Western eugenics. He even joined the British Eugenics Education Society in the mid 1910s. In his 1919 book, Oka introduced eugenics as the science of improving a nation (kokumin) by applying animal and plant breeding techniques to humans. According to its founder, Francis Galton, Oka continued, eugenics was a study of what humans could do to improve or diminish the mental and physical capacities of human beings. Then he noted

---

that a research institution of human heredity was established by Galton. "As soon as the term was coined, eugenics spread to many parts of the world. There is no country among the so-called civilized nations (bunmeikoku) where books and magazines with titles containing 'eugenics' do not exist."

Although Oka accepted eugenics principles and believed that it was a good idea to promote eugenics in order to improve the quality of population, he expressed a pessimistic view about the actual impact of eugenics policies. In his opinion, technological advances had separated humans from other organisms and natural selection no longer worked for humans. Thus, humans could expect only degeneration. Eugenics might have been able to slow down this process, but most likely it would be impossible to stop degeneration and improve the quality of the population. He also added that heredity was not the only factor which was responsible for producing "bad," "stupid," or "diseased" people. Because he did not expect much from eugenics, he only foresaw that promoting eugenics might cause unnecessary disappointment or opposition.\(^\text{110}\) Except for writing about it in this manner, Oka was never actively involved in any institutionalization of eugenics in Japan.

If we compare Yamanouchi’s eugenics view to that of Oka, we notice similarities as well as differences. Obviously, both Oka and Yamanouchi questioned Weismann’s germ-theory, which denied the inheritability of acquired characteristics. Both explained why they hesitated to accept the germ-plasm theory in scientific terms. Their theoretical

\(^{110}\) Oka, Saishin idenron, 528-534.
understandings of evolution to support these claims were, however, very different. While Oka disapproved of the Mendelian-Weismannite orthodoxy altogether, and stood by the Darwinist explanation of evolution (Darwin accepted Lamarck's explanation of acquired characteristics), Yamanouchi tried to discredit only the rigid interpretation of Weismann's germ-plasm theory by elaborating on Charles Child's gradient-rejuvenescence theory within the Mendelian framework of heredity. Oka, who was dubious of the effect of eugenics policies, did not support eugenics enthusiastically. Yamanouchi was pessimistic in a different way. He thought maintaining peace among humans might be extremely difficult because it would be against the natural instincts of organisms for survival. If wars and conflicts were an inevitable part of life, it might be good to strengthen racial stock by eugenics. Thus, Yamanouchi did not dismiss eugenics and was interested in further studying recent works on eugenics and explaining their basic concepts for the educated public.

It is significant that Tokyo Teachers' College had two biologists opposing the mainstream Mendelian-Weismannite notion of noninheritance of acquired characteristics. This probably had much to do with the fact that the normal school's reason for existence, that there was value in education, was threatened by biological determinism.

---

111 See his view in the chapter on war and peace in Seishoku to sensō, 117-137. See also Yamanouchi Shigeo, "Idenjō yori mitaru kokuminsei," Kyōiku gakujutsukai 37.5 (1918), 1-6.
3.3.5 The Greater Japan Eugenics Society

Another organization that Yamanouchi established was the Greater Japan Eugenics Society (Dai Nihon Yūseikai) (1917). Co-founders were Ichikawa Genzō, a principal of a school for girls, Kaneko Tadakazu, a natural history teacher there, and Abe Ayao a geneticist and education official. They intended to study and popularize eugenics in order to achieve race improvement (jinshu kaizen), by conducting hereditary investigations of the Japanese, offering lectures, publishing works, furnishing a library, holding exhibitions, and offering counseling services on eugenics. Those who were interested in joining were asked to pay an annual fee of one yen. In return, they were to receive a newsletter published twice a year.\(^{112}\)

Many eugenics associations established later acknowledged that the Greater Japan Eugenics Society was the first of its kind. Yet, the Society was often described as a failure. The group was unable to achieve their objectives and soon dissolved.\(^{113}\) One legacy of this group was its role in promoting “yūseigaku” as a preferred translation for eugenics to other alternative translations such as “zenseigaku (science of good birth),” “zenshugaku (science of good stock),” “kokumin kaizengaku (science of national improvement),” “minzoku eiseigaku (ethnic national hygiene),” “minshu kaizengaku (science of ethnic stock improvement),” “jinshu kairyōgaku (science of race

\(^{112}\) About the Greater Japan Eugenics Society, see “Dai Nihon Yūseikai,” Jinsei 13.7 (July 1917), 263-264; and descriptions in “Nihon Minzoku Eisei Gakkai no sōritsu,” Minzoku eisei 1.1 (1931), 94-95; and Gotō Ryūkichi, “Yūsei undō ni chokumen shite,” Yūsei undō 1.1 (November 1926), 64-66. Ms. Matsubara Yōko informed me of the article in Jinsei.

\(^{113}\) See “Nihon Minzoku Eisei Gakkai no sōritsu,” Minzoku eisei 1.1, 95; and Gotō Ryūkichi, “Yūsei undō ni chokumen shite.”
improvement).” “jinrui kairyōgaku (science of human improvement),” “jinshu kaizōron (theory of race reconstruction),” and “yūseiron (theory of wellborn).” 114

Furthermore, these founding members continued their interest in eugenics and were to be involved in subsequent initiatives to organize institutions to promote eugenics research and popularization. For instance, as we shall see in Chapter 5, in the mid 1920s, Ichikawa,115 Kaneko,116 Abe,117 and Yamanouchi all responded to medical journalist Gotō Ryūkichī’s request to support Gotō’s plan to transform his Japan Society of Eugenics (Nihon Yūsei Gakkai) into a full-fledged research foundation.118 Kaneko was particularly active in contributing articles to Gotō’s eugenic journal. Ichikawa gave a lecture on eugenics during the exhibition on ethnic national hygiene held at the Red Cross Museum in Tokyo in 1928. Three of the Greater Japan Eugenics Society

114 Shunjūsei (Gotō Ryūkichī), “Yakugo ‘yūseigaku’ raisan,” Yūseigaku 33 (November 1926), 14. Suzuki Zenji notes that scholars who had used other translations began using the term “yūseigaku” by 1919. See his Nihon no yūseigaku, 75 and 77.

115 Like Yamanouchi, Ichikawa graduated from the Tokyo Teachers’ College. See Suzuki Hiroo, Tōkyō Kyōiku Daigaku hakunenshi, 788. Ichikawa was the principal of the Tokyo First Higher School for Girls. He was interested in the application of eugenics principles to the society, particularly to women. His book published in 1935 showed women how to lead meaningful life. It included a chapter dedicated to explain how important it was for women to be aware of the basics of eugenics. See Ichikawa Genzō, Nyūgaku, seishinuki, kekon, yūseigaku, haka no sakkyōku: Josei bunka kōwa (Tokyo: Meiji Tosho, 1935; reprint, Tokyo: Nihon Tosho, 1984). The chapter on eugenics is on pp. 205-240.


117 As for Abe, see Suzuki, Nihon no yūseigaku, 69, 107, 147, 151, and 164.

118 Contacted by Gotō, they agreed to support the initiative. For Ichikawa and Kaneko, see “Zaidan hōjin Nihon Yūseigaku Kyōkai sōritsu hokkinin shimei,” Yūseigaku 18 (July 1925), 30. For Yamanouchi and Abe, see “Dai ni, setsuritsu-an fu sansein,” Yūseigaku 19 (August 1925), 31 and “Dōjin no ken,” Yūseigaku 21 (October 1925), 30-31. Yamanouchi was also a supporting member of the Japan Eugenics Movement Association (Nihon Yūsei Undō Kyōkai) established by Ikeda Shigenori in 1926. See “Nihon Yūsei Undō Kyōkai sanjoin,” Yūsei undō 1.1 (November 1926), 118. As for Ikeda’s eugenics movement, see Fujino Yatake, “Yūsei undō no tenkai,” chap. in Nihon fushizumu to yūsei shisō (Kyoto: Kamogawa Shuppan, 1998), 79-112.

133
founders—Yamanouchi, Abe, and Kaneko—were listed as active members of the International Congress of Eugenics in the early 1930s. Even before the publication of the list, Abe was apparently interested in organizing a Japanese eugenics society that could meet the guidelines for joining the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations. Abe was instrumental in convincing Nagai Hisomu to establish the Japan Association of Ethnic National Hygiene (Nihon Minzoku Yūsei Kyōkai) in 1930. In essence, the Greater Japan Eugenics Society was a seedbed for the institutionalization of eugenics in Japan.

3.3.6 University of Chicago Connections

Yamanouchi Shigeo’s other publications indicate various aspects of his intellectual activities. For example, he edited a collection of travel essays by Frederick Starr (1858-1933) in 1919. Starr was an anthropology professor at the University of Chicago.

---

119 International Congress of Eugenics, A Decade of Progress in Eugenics: Scientific Papers of the Third International Congress of Eugenics held at American Museum of Natural History, New York, August 21-23, 1932 (Baltimore: William & Wilkins, 1934), 511-531. It is also intriguing that Christian zoologist Gotō Seitarō who (together with Naruse) introduced Yamanouchi to the Association Concordia was a member of the International Congress of Eugenics. (p. 515)


121 Senjika Nihon bunka dantai iiten (1939; Tokyo: Özorasha, 1990), 102-104. Actually the Association was orginally established as gakkai or society. As I will discuss in more details in Chapter 5, he supported Gotō Ryūkichi’s effort as a contributor (dōjin) and later renewed Gotō’s campaign to establish the Japan Foundation of Eugenics (Nihon Yūsei Gakkai) in 1929. See Suzuki, Nihon no yūsei gakku, 151. For more about Nagai Hisomu’s initiative, see Chapter 6.
and visited Japan fifteen times before he died in a hospital in Tokyo. This ethnologist traveled widely to different parts of the United States and Mexico, the Philippines, Korea, and Africa.122 Whenever the American anthropologist arrived in Japan, Yamanouchi received him at the Yokohama port.123 In the introduction to Starr’s book documenting his pilgrimage tours of Japan and Korea, Yamanouchi wrote about the eccentric professor famous for wearing Japanese clothes. Before moving to the newly-founded University of Chicago in 1892, Starr had taught college level biology elsewhere and worked as an ethnologist for the American Museum of Natural History in New York (1889-1891). For the 1904 St. Louis Exposition, Starr brought back Ainu people from northern Japan to present them as an “ethnic” minority in the country.124 Anthropological efforts to measure differences and similarities of various “ethnic” groups “scientifically” and link people in the past with those in present times had much to do


123 F. Starr, Ofuda ariga (Shikoku, Kyūshū, Chōsē, Tōhoku, Fuji no maki), edited by Yamanouchi Shigeo (Tokyo: Kan'ao Bun'endō, 1919), 1. For the close relationship between Starr and Yamanouchi, see Yamanouchi Sada, Letter.

124 Starr had contact with the Japanese anthropologist Tsuboi Shōgorō (1863-1913). In fact, in 1909 and 1910, Tsuboi arranged for Starr to rent a house near Tokyo University where Tsuboi taught. Tsuboi was trained in biology and interested in the origin of the Japanese “race” (Nihon jinshu). His theory of the Japanese race as a mixed race was based on research on the Ainu and others. Concerning Tsuboi, see Kudō Masaki, Kenkyüshitsu: Nihon jinshuron (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1979), especially Chapter 2 (pp. 80-135); Oguma Eiji, Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen: <Nihonjin> no jijazō no keiji (Tokyo: Shin'yōsha, 1995), especially Chapter 4 (pp. 73-86). Kudō identifies Tsuboi as one of the leaders of medical anthropology in Japan. See Kudō Masaki, “Ikakei jiarugaku no seiritsu to sono tokushitsu,” Tōhoku Rekishishirōkan kenkyū kiyō 4 (1978), 1-18.
with eugenics and evolution theories. Close friend Starr’s ethnological investigations might have been a constant reminder to Yamanouchi of the “white”-dominated racial hierarchy.  

Yamanouchi also participated in the making of an illustrated botanical encyclopedia. He collaborated with the Tokyo Natural History Study Group (Tōkyō Hakubutsugaku Kenkyūkai) and compiled reference material that covered over 2,600 wild plants including algae or seaweeds. And earlier, in 1921, he published a guide to teaching experimental botany and zoology to elementary school students. His other writings explored the relationship between humanities (education, religion, ethics, sociology, and anthropology) and sciences.  

Like Yamanouchi, his adviser, Coulter, wrote encyclopedias and textbooks. Coulter, a son of a missionary family, also authored many articles on science and religion for Christian journals such as Homiletic Review, Biblical World, and Christian  

125 F. Starr, Ofuda angvā, 1-7.  
128 His various writings seem to indicate that he was synthesizing knowledge in humanities and social sciences. Some of his criticism towards humanists and social scientists who missed important points by overlooking insights from sciences are revealing. For example, see Yamanouchi Shigeo, “Iden to kyōju,” Kyōiku gaku jutsukai 32.1 (1915), 2-4; “Bankin no seibutsugaku,” Kyōiku gaku jutsukai 36.5 (1918), 1-8; “Idengakujō yori mitaru kokumin sei,” Kyōiku gaku jutsukai 37.5 (1918), 1-6; “Idengakujō yori mitaru kokumin sei (shōzen),” Kyōiku gaku jutsukai 37.6 (1918), 30-34; and “Seibutsugakujō yori mitaru kyōku no gainen,” Kyōiku gaku jutsukai 49.5 (1924), 55-67. We find similarities between Yamanouchi’s publications and those of his adviser at Chicago John Merle Coulter’s scope of publications. Some of Coulter’s earliest works were encyclopedic in nature: Catalogue of the Phaenogamous and Vascular Cryptogamous Plants of Indiana (1881), Manual of the Botany (Phaenogamia and Pteridophyta) of the Rocky Mountain Region, from New Mexico to the British Boundary (1885), and New Manual of Rocky Mountain Botany (an expansive revision of the 1881 work, 1909).
Unlike Coulter, Yamanouchi was not a Christian but a believer in Shinto. However, he was involved in a religious/ethical studies organization, the Association Concordia, and intended to publish a book with the title Kagaku to shūkyō (Science and Religion). The mentor and the protégé had similar research interests, educational goals, and ethical concerns which kept them in touch. When he was offered an opportunity

---

129 These articles include “What Biology Has Contributed to Religion” (1913), “Jesus’ Attitude toward a New Religious Movement” (1914), “The Religion of the Scientist” (1920); “Is Evolution anti-Christian?” (1921), and “Evolution and its Explanations” (1922). In 1924, he even published a book Where Evolution and Religion Meet. Coulter was also articulate in expressing his views on the interface of biology and education in certain education journals: “The mission of science in education” (1900, 1915), “Some problems in education” (1901, 1908), “Botany as a factor in education” (1904). As for the analysis of his writings exploring the relation between religion and science, see Rodgers, John Merle Coulter, 292-297. It should be noted that Coulter believed that orthogenesis deserved more attention. (p. 296) Suzuki Zenji, in his examination of zoologist Koizumi Makoto’s eugenics view, noted that Koizumi who was sympathetic towards orthogenesis and critical of the tendency to slight the Lamarckian theory of gradual evolution. See Suzuki, Nihon no ruseigaku, 134-137.

130 Even in the 1943 who’s who publication, Yamanouchi identified his religion as Shinto. See JK, 14th ed., ya-52.

131 Coulter, accompanied by his wife and daughter, planned to see his former student on his way to China in 1923. Unfortunately, however, they arrived in Japan just after the Great Earthquake hit Tokyo and damage was too serious for them to enjoy sightseeing in Japan. Instead they went to Korea before Coulter began his education inspection tour of China. On the way back from China, however, the Coulter family stopped at Japan in the middle of reconstruction and stayed there for a month. Yamanouchi paid all the expenses including accommodation at the Imperial Hotel and trips to the country’s old capital cities, Nara, Kyoto, and Kamakura. Yamanouchi also arranged a lecture by John Coulter at an Association Concordia meeting held on February 21, 1924. The American botanist talked about “the new spirit.” “After the world war,” Coulter noted, “our mind began turning to cooperation.” “In the sphere of science,” he continued, “we now conduct research based on the spirit of cooperation instead of competition.” “It is the mission of education to further develop this newly emerging spirit and lead the new generation of the human race.” In his opinion, the purpose of education was not limited to passing on knowledge to students, but was also for developing genuine personal character. That was only possible by providing education which could overcome individual self interest, promote a spirit of cooperation, and develop human ties beyond national boundaries even among those with different ideas. That was the only way to cultivate the new spirit, and it would bring happiness. The lecture began around 4:30 in the afternoon and continued over dinner served about 7 pm. Even after Coulter left, those remaining kept exchanging ideas along with the concept of “the new spirit.” This meeting featuring Coulter’s lecture yielded active, productive, and energetic discussions. See Yamanouchi Sada, Letter. Also I am grateful to Ms. Maeda Mariko, niece of Sada, for showing me valuable privately owned pictures in which the Coulter family and Dr. Yamanouchi stood in front of the Imperial Hotel. Also a faculty news section of the Tokyo Teachers’ College natural history journal reported that Yamanouchi was busy attending Professor Coulter. See “Yamanouchi sensei,” Hakubutsu gakkai shi 31 (1924), 122; and SEDS, vol. 46, 674-676. See also Rodgers, John Merle Coulter, 298.
to teach and do research in the United States through the Chicago connection, Yamanouchi accepted it. In spring 1927 he resigned from the Tokyo Teachers' College and Japan Women's College.132

Thereafter, Yamanouchi began spending every summer in the Marine Biological Laboratory at Dry Tortugas, Logger Head Key, Florida, which had been established by the Carnegie Institution in 1904. He usually went back to Japan, where his family remained, in the fall before returning to Chicago to teach classes in winter and spring quarters as a research associate.133 The Japanese scholar's annual routine of extensive travelling continued until the war between Japan and the United States broke out at the

132 While Yamanouchi enjoyed seeing his adviser for the first time in ten years, the Japanese student had experienced a tragedy a few months earlier. The botanical laboratory at the Tokyo Teachers' College, which survived the Great Earthquake in September, burnt down in a campus fire in November 1923. The department of botany lost much of its equipment, herbariums, and library collection. It was reported that Professor Yamanouchi suffered the worst damage, losing almost everything in his office to this fire. In the following years, he made heroic efforts to raise money to refurbish the botanical laboratory and rebuild the natural history program in general. For example, when the natural history students organized to show a movie on evolution, he volunteered to give a lecture before and after the film. This event was successful and made a substantial amount of money. Moreover, Yamanouchi donated the royalty of his 1926 book, Sei to iden (Tokyo: Kyōritsu Shuppan). See "Yamanouchi sensei," Hakubutsu gakkaishi 32 (1925), 94; "Eiga Evolution jōei ni tsuite," Hakubutsu gakkaishi 33 (1926), 100-102; "Yamanouchi Shigeo: (Rihaku, Tōkyō Kōshi sōkubutsugakusu kyōshitsu)," Hakubutsu gakkaishi 34 (1927), 76; and "Hakubutsu Gakkai kihonkin oyobi sonota ni tsuite," Hakubutsu gakkaishi 34 (1927), 82-83. Prior to the publication of Sei to iden, Yamanouchi had published a book on human evolution, Jinrui no shinka.

133 "Yamanouchi Shigeo sensei o mukeete," Hakubutsu gakkaishi 39 (1930), 97-99; Yamanouchi Shigeo. "Dorai Torūtōgasu," Hakubutsu gakkaishi 50 (1933), 4-5; "Kankeisha dōseiroku," Shōnaikan hōkoku 32 (1928), 62, 65; "Kankeisha dōseiroku," Shōnaikan hōkoku 33 (1929), 50; Yamanouchi Shigeo, location?, to Shōnaikan, Tokyo?, n.d. (Fall?) 1930, reprinted as "Yamanouchi Shigeo shi tsūshin," Shōnaikan hōkoku 34 (1930), 96-97; and Yamanouchi Shigeo, Tokyo?, to Shōnaikan, Tokyo?, n.d. (Fall?) 1931, reprinted as "Yamanouchi Shigeo shi tsūshin," Shōnaikan hōkoku 35 (1931), 78. The Shōnaikan was the dorm set up to accommodate elite students from the former feudal domain of Shōnai in which Yamanouchi's native city of Tsuruoka was/is located. The Shōnaikan functioned as the center of a network among the Tokyo-educated (including former dorm or non-dorm residents) from the region. I am grateful to Mr. Akiho Ryō for bringing my attention to the Shōnaikan-related materials. As for Yamanouchi's research associate position at the University of Chicago, see AMS, 6th ed. (1938), 1585. See also SJJ, 643. At Chicago, the rank of "associate" was higher than Yamanouchi's former position "assistant." But the "associate" was lower than the ranks of "instructor," "assistant professor," "associate professor," and "professor." See, for example, the promotion pattern of professor of zoology at Chicago, Charles M. Child, in Hyman, "Charles Manning Child," 77. For more on the Marine Biological Laboratory at the Dry Tortugas, Florida, see Ebert, "Carnegie Institution," 180-182.
end of 1941. At the time, Yamanouchi was in Washington D.C. in order to arrange the publication of his work. Instead of publishing this book, the content of which we do not know, he was forced to return to his native country. As a scholar, he was privileged to escape from internment and was able to get on a ship with Japanese diplomats, military officers, and other dignitaries in the U.S. In South Africa, the passengers were exchanged with the subjects of U.S. and other Allied American states living in the Japanese empire.\footnote{As for his trip back from the U.S. to Japan, see “Yōkoso okaeri, Hinomaru no minato e; Asamamaru, Konde Verude-gō Shōan nyūkō,” Tōkyō nichichi shinbun, 10 August 1942, 2; and “Kō o kaba hahaha no demo, seifū awatete dan’atsu su, kaisen ga umu Beikoku no higeki,” Yomiuri hōchi shinbun, 12 August 1942, 2. When he was interviewed by a journalist in Singapore, Yamanouchi related his observations of the American society at war in the latter article. For more on the exchange ships, see Shōwa Nyūsu Jiten Hensan linkai, ed., “Nichibei kōkanzen,” Shōwa nyūsu jiten, vol. 8, Shōwa 17 nen-Shōwa 20 nen (Tokyo: Mainichi Komyunīkēshōntsu, 1994), 872-674.} After his return to Japan in 1942, Yamanouchi lived his life in retirement for nearly three decades, until he died at the age of ninety-six in 1973. Considering that Yamanouchi’s diverse publications parallel those of Coulter, and considering his renewed research opportunity in Chicago, Yamanouchi’s forgotten status in the history of biology and biological education seems all the more peculiar.

3.4 Implications

Yamanouchi Shigero’s view of race improvement was thus that of “nurture AND nature” but not “nature OR nurture,” his emphasis on the influences of environmental and educational elements over human development was deviant from the Mendelian-Weismannite orthodoxy. Was his view seen as “unscientific” by his colleagues? As we have seen, he explained his view in a very scientific manner using Charles Child’s...
gradient-theory and other counter-evidence which might be inexplicable if germ cells were completely isolated from bodily cells. What Yamanouchi questioned was not the overall Mendelian framework but August Weismann’s germ-plasm theory. His books expressing his own interpretation were generally reviewed positively. He was not shunned by colleagues, he maintained good relationships with prominent geneticists and botanists including Fujii Kenjirō, Miyake Kiichi, and Makino Tomitarō. I believe his unusual anonymity in the history of Japanese biology, despite the quality of research early in his career, had much to do with the fact that he left Japan in 1927. Without completing his teaching career at the Tokyo Teachers’ College, his achievements were never honored by his former students. His extreme longevity—he died at the age of ninety-six in 1973—was a negative factor in remembering him: Few Western or Japanese colleagues who knew him as a researcher outlived him to contribute any memoir about him.

In addition to his emphasis on social or eugenic factors in inheritance, his interpretation of race improvement contained ethical elements. His career as an educator and his affiliation with the Association Concordia appear to have shaped his unique eugenics view. First, when he was introducing eugenics ideas to the Japanese public, his primary identity was not that of researcher but educator. He was a professor of Japan’s leading normal school, Tokyo Teachers’ College. Its mission was to train secondary school teachers. For him to accept absolute biological determinism was to deny the foundation of education as a discipline. In this sense, he had much more incentive to explore the possibility of inheritance of acquired characteristics than other biologists.
Secondly, the Association Concordia was a peace organization in which intellectuals, including philosophers and religious scholars, gathered and searched for the common ground where different groups of people divided by religions, races, and nations could stand in harmony. Yamanouchi's concept represented a biological viewpoint of the Association's general discussion theme, ethical obligation of individuals to the public good.

The Association's strong commitment to racial equality and his friendship with physical anthropologist Frederic Starr also might have influenced him to develop his particular view. Since eugenics was often associated with the "white"-dominated racial hierarchy, this science was not necessarily an easy thing for the Japanese to adopt without some modifications. No matter how stunning, rapid or creative Japan's modernization may have been, the Japanese could never become "white." Instead of rejecting eugenics, however, some Japanese, including Yamanouchi, who popularized eugenics ideas and co-founded the Greater Japan Eugenics Society, chose to promote eugenics precisely because they wanted to close the putative mental and physical gap between the "whites" and themselves by the science of "race improvement." He thus took initiative to bridge the intellectual gap between the East and West through the Greater Japan Academic Society. Providing opportunities to stimulate Japanese scholars' original thinking, the underutilized aspect of their minds, the Greater Japan Academic Society helped them reach their genetic potential.
For the Japanese in general, embracing eugenics meant rejection of permanently lower status in the existing “racial” hierarchy. On the other hand, these aspirations for upper mobility and biological determinism were not compatible. Yamanouchi’s “softer” (quasi-Lamarckian) perspective may have offered a solution to this frustrating situation and allowed greater political and intellectual self-esteem for the Japanese.¹³⁵

¹³⁵ Similar modification is observed in the Japanese reaction to social Darwinism, see Unoura Hiroshi’s “Kindai Nihon ni okeru shakai Dāwinizumu no juyō to tenkai,” in Kōza shinka, vol. 2, Shinka shisō to shakai, ed. Shibatani Atsuhiro, Nagano Kei, and Yōrō Takeshi (Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppankai, 1991), 119-152. See alsoTomiyama Ichirō, “Kokumin no tanjō to ‘Nihonjinshu,’” Shisō 845 (1994), 46.
CHAPTER 4

HIRATSUKA RAICHÔ (1886-1971):
JAPANESE FEMINISTS AND
MARRIAGE RESTRICTION LEGISLATION

2.1 Introduction

As we have seen in the previous chapters, educator Naruse Jinzô "engendered" eugenics by perceiving women more directly responsible for the small and weak physique of the Japanese;¹ he established women's social role using race improvement arguments; and leading eugenics enthusiasts, including botanist Yamanouchi Shigeo, taught at Naruse's Japan Women's College. Because these eugenics enthusiasts frequently wrote about and gave lectures on this science of controlling heredity, and because these ideas were readily accessible to Naruse's students, eugenics was no longer an unfamiliar subject to educated men and women by the late 1910s. Women's access to knowledge is a key to understanding Japan's first effort to establish a eugenics law. The movement was led by Hiratsuka Raichô (1886-1971), a noted writer and feminist, between 1919 and 1922.

¹ This view seems to be well-supported by Naruse's contemporaries. See, for instance, Yatsu Naohide, "Jinrui toku ni Nihonjin no kairyô ni tsuite," Tôyô gakugei zasshi 403 (5 April, 1915), 242-243. Experimental zoologist Yatsu expressed the importance of scientific physical exercises, especially for women.
Unregulated male heterosexuality faced a formidable challenge from the short-lived but influential feminist group, the New Woman Association (NWA, Shin Fujin Kyōkai). Hiratsuka, one of the NWA’s founders, had come to embrace eugenics as a way of strengthening Japan’s racial stock. But Hiratsuka proposed a gendered regulation of bodies, seeking to control male sexuality and access to marriage through testing for venereal diseases, while assuming the bodies of women not in the sex trades would likely be free of the sexually transmitted diseases she saw as destructive to the Japanese population. Thus, she viewed male and female bodies as dimorphic where disease was concerned.

Hiratsuka’s notion of eugenics foregrounded gender, but her plan of attack strongly challenged established gender norms. Men were believed to have more powerful sexual desires that need not be regulated by the state. Others at the time argued that regulation should take the form of control of female sexuality through brothels. Hiratsuka’s struggle to enact legislation requiring premarital testing of men for syphilis flew in the face of men’s unregulated sexuality. Moreover, by working with the Diet, the legislative arm of the state, Hiratsuka placed women squarely in politics. While

---

2 Diseases like syphilis, gonorrhea, and chancre were commonly known as “karyūhō” (red-light district diseases) in Taisho Japan (1912-1926). In most cases, however, I translate the term as “venereal diseases” in this chapter because “V.D.” was the term specifically used in the Western “racial poisons” (jinshudoku) discourse at that time.


continuing to be denied the right of the franchise during the time in which Hiratsuka led
the NWA, she and her colleagues worked through the Diet as if they were, in a sense, part
of the state. This, together with their bold assertion of female agency, constituted another
challenge to gender norms. This chapter examines NWA publications, autobiographies of
its leaders, parliamentary documents, contemporary magazine articles, and other sources
in an attempt to analyze Japan’s first organized effort, led by women, to establish a
eugenics legal context for marriage.5

---

5 Historian of science, Saitō Hikaru, mentioned Hiratsuka’s eugenics thought in the late 1910s. He
saw it as a sign of the popularization of eugenics knowledge. See his “Nijū nendai, Nihon, yūseigaku-
no ichi kyokumen,” Gendai shisō 21.7 (1993), 134. Several women’s historians have analyzed
Hiratsuka’s views more extensively. Generally speaking, their attention is paid to issues relevant to
women’s history: equality vs. difference, women’s participation in war efforts, and reconceptualization of
Japanese feminism, etc. Though some of these studies are in-depth or thought-provoking, putting
Hiratsuka’s eugenics thought in the larger context of the history of eugenics in Japan has not been dealt
with. See, for instance, Suzuki Yūko, Joseishi o hiraku, vol. 1, Haha to onna (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1989)
and vol. 2, Yokusa to teikō (Tokyo: Miraisha, 1989); Fujime Yuki, “Senkanki Nihon no sanji chōsetsu
undō to sono shisō,” Rekishi hyōron 430 (February 1986), 79–100; “Sanji chōsetsu undō,” Ōsaka chihō
shakai rōdō undōshi, Senzen hen, vol. 2, supervised by Watanabe Tōru and Kimura Toshio (Tokyo:
rekiishigaku: Kōshō seido, dataizai taisei kara Baishun Bōshi-hō, Yūsei Hogo-hō taisei e (Tokyo:
Rekishi hyōron 503 (March 1992), 92–107; Miyake Yoshiko, “Kindai Nihon joseishi no saisōzō no tame ni.
Tekisuto no yomikae,” Shakai no hakken, Kanagawa Daigaku Hyōron, ed. Kanagawa Daigaku Hyōron
Henshū Sennō linkai, no. 4 (Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobō, 1994), 63–128; and Ueno Chizuko,
Although it does not deal with Hiratsuka Raichō, Ōbayashi Michiko examines birth control movements
and eugenics thought from a woman’s historian’s perspective. See her “Sanji chōsetsu undō to yūsei
shisō,” Nihon fujin mondai konwakai kaihō 46 (August 1987), 2–10. Suzuki Yūko points out that
Hiratsuka’s eugenics and motherhood ideologies have been deemphasized by women’s historians probably
because shedding light on such aspects of Hiratsuka might hurt her image as an icon of women’s liberation
for achieving political, economic, and social equality with men. See Suzuki Yūko, vol. 1, 18–9; and
180–3; vol. 2, 20 and 35–6. For an interesting analysis of Hiratsuka Raichō and other elite women’s
identity formation analyzing their relationship with the state, see Hirota Masaki, “Kindai erito josei no
aidentiti to kokka,” Jendā no Nihonshī, edited by Wakita Haruko and Susan B. Hanley, vol. 2, Shitai to
whether some elite women’s views were confined within the state ideology of “good wife, wise mother” or
not.
4.2 Developing Eugenic-Feminist Consciousness

Hiratsuka Raichō, the central figure in this chapter, was born in Tokyo in 1886. Upon finishing high school, she pursued the highest form of education available for women at that time by attending the Japan Women’s College.⁶ Although she was forced to major in home economics by her father, outside of her college curriculum she studied English and read various Eastern and Western philosophy books. She first attracted public attention in 1908 when she attempted to commit suicide with a young married writer.⁷ The event attracted further publicity when he wrote about it in a novel. Its image tarnished by the event, the Japan Women’s College “excommunicated” its recent graduate, and Hiratsuka’s name was removed from the school’s alumnae directory.

In 1911, Hiratsuka founded the Seitōsha (Bluestocking Society) to stimulate women’s talent.⁸ The Society’s magazine Seitō published literary works by female writers for female readers. Though the Society’s scope was originally limited to literary activities, the members became more interested in fujin mondai (issues relating to women).⁹ The magazine provided a place for discussion on such controversial topics as

---


⁷ As for this so-called Shiobara incident, see Hiratsuka, Genshi, vol. 1, 211-287. Also see Hiratsuka’s biography by Kobayashi Tomie, Hiratsuka Raichō: Ai to hangyaku no seishun (Tokyo: Ōtsuki Shoten, 1977), 133-212.


love-marriage, the value of virginity and chastity, and the pros and cons of abortion.\(^{10}\)

The government often suppressed publication of the magazine, claiming the content was too radical.\(^{11}\)

Hiratsuka’s decisions in her personal life were equally controversial. She rejected the existing marriage system and began practicing “community living” with a young painter, Okumura Hiroshi in 1914.\(^{12}\) A daughter and a son to whom she gave birth were therefore illegitimate children whose last name was “Hiratsuka,” their mother’s name. Her experience of being pregnant, giving birth, and rearing children led her closer to some Western works. She was particularly inspired by the ideology of the Swedish feminist Ellen Key (1849-1926), who advocated the protection of motherhood based on eugenics reasoning.\(^{13}\) Many of Key’s works, including *The Century of the Child*, *Love and Marriage*, *The Woman Movement*, Rahel Varphagen, Younger Generation, and *Love and Marriage*.


\(^{11}\) Hiratsuka retired from her editor in chief position; she was replaced by Iō Noe in 1915. Within a year the Bluestocking Society discontinued publication of *Seitō*.

\(^{12}\) Hiratsuka, *Genshi*, vol. 2, 469-588.

Ethics, were available in Japanese translation. Hiratsuka herself published the translation of Key’s *Love and Marriage* in the *Seitô* as a series starting January 1913. She also printed the Swedish feminist’s articles translated by Yamada Waka (1879-1957) in the journal. Hiratsuka then translated and published *The Renaissance of Motherhood* as a book in 1918.

Ellen Key was read more widely in Germany than in her native Sweden. In a 1915 book, *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia*, an American observer, Katherine Anthony, explained that in 1905 the “Bund für Mutterschutz (Alliance for Motherhood Protection)” was organized in Berlin based on Ellen Key’s *Mutterschutz Idee* (motherhood protection ideology). (Thus they used German) “Its purpose was stated to be the reform of sexual ethics and the protection of motherhood.” The Bund proposed “to equalize the legal rights of husband and wife, to legitimize ‘free unions,’ and bring state support to unmarried mothers.” (Note that “unmarried” Hiratsuka had “illegitimate” children born out of her “free union” with Okumura Hiroshi.) The new sex

---


18 Anthony, 90.

19 Cott, 47.
code proposed by the Alliance was called the New Ethics (Die Neue Ethik). "[T]he New Ethicists are practical evolutionists....For the old ascetic conscience, they would substitute the modern eugenic conscience."  

Volitional breeding must take the place of accidental breeding, quality of offspring must take the place of blind numbers. Here we recognize the teachings of the new eugenics movement as well, whose principles are one with that phase of the women movement which seeks to liberate and empower the mother in women.  

The concepts used to legitimize the motherhood protection ideology included "science," "progress," "enlightenment," and "civilized modern states."  

In the introduction to the English translation of Key's Love and Marriage, Havelock Ellis, a famous British reform eugenicist in his own right, wrote, "She now shows that eugenics and love--the social claims of the race and the individual claims of the heart--are not opposed but identical."  

Key extolled eugenics in The Renaissance of Motherhood (1914):  

During all these passionate conflicts about sexual morality, we are, on the whole, quietly and constantly advancing in regard to the elevating of future generations. A more rational care of children has already been introduced, a forward step demonstrable by the decrease of infant mortality. Further advance may be recognised in the fact that many women and men now break an engagement of a marriage when they find out that either party suffers from some

20 Anthony, 93.
21 Ibid., 94.
22 Ibid.
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hereditary disease. Increasingly numerous are the men and women who abstain from erotic relationship when they know themselves victims of such heredity. To be sure the great majority are still ignorant, or unscrupulous, in regard to the commands of eugenics. But public opinion is fast developing in this respect and is already beginning to influence conventions, which in turn will influence the laws.\textsuperscript{24}

Eugenic ideas resonated with Hiratsuka’s conceptions of feminism. Earlier in the decade, she had launched the Seiō movement by daringly stating that “in the beginning (genshi), women were in fact the sun.” This feminist manifesto thus suggested the ancient identification of women with Nature and underscored the prominence of the imperial ancestor, the Sun Goddess, in the national origin myth. In contrast to women in the ancient period, Hiratsuka lamented, Taishō women had a diminished status. Key’s vision for the rebirth of motherhood through eugenics enlightenment was, therefore, attractive to Hiratsuka, who began to seek ways to scientifically legitimate her feminist effort to reclaim the lost power and prestige of women. Hiratsuka began translating the word “race” into the more temporal Japanese term “shuzoku (racial stock or lineage)” instead of the spatial “jinshu (race)” by 1919.\textsuperscript{25} The concept of “racial stock” was useful for linking Japanese women past, present, and future.

\textsuperscript{24} Ellen Key, \textit{The Renaissance of Motherhood} (New York and London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1914), 80.

Hiratsuka began her quest for scientific ways to reclaim women’s lost power by evaluating post-World War I social conditions for women in Japan. Even before the war, many young Japanese women from poor families throughout the country had been recruited to work in textile factories. Crammed into dormitory rooms, working long hours with inadequate rest, and ill-nourished by company cafeteria food, these women and girls were easy victims of tuberculosis. Because they returned to their village homes to recuperate or die, this practice in effect was slowly sterilizing the once healthy rural population. After actually observing the miserable working conditions of factory women in Nagoya, Hiratsuka, like Key, called for state protection of motherhood using eugenics arguments. Hiratsuka debated the state’s role in economic support of mothers

---


28 For more about Key and Hiratsuka, see Genshi, vol. 2, 424-431, 490-494, and 542-523. Also see Kobayashi, “Kaisetsu,” Hiratsuka Raichō chojūkushin, vol. 2, 414-22. As for state protection, see Hiratsuka’s articles “Fujin rōdō mondai to shuzoku mondai,” and “Seago no fujin mondai: Fujin rōdō mondai to shuzoku mondai.” The first was originally published in 1918 and the latter was in 1919.
in a famous four-person series of polemical essays by feminist poet Yosano Akiko (1878-1942), socialist feminist Yamakawa Kikue (1890-1980), maternalist feminist Yamada Waka, and Hiratsuka.

Debate alone did not satisfy Hiratsuka Raichō; she wanted to apply Ellen Key’s ideology to society. According to Key’s Mutterschutz Idee, it would be possible to discourage the “unfit” from procreating by legally regulating marriage. Ruth Bré, another leading member of Germany’s Alliance for Motherhood Protection, “urged that health certificates be required as a condition for marriage and that the laws concerning contagious disease should be changed.” It appears that Hiratsuka soon realized that applying this

---

29 Yosano instinctively saw a danger in linking reproduction with state power. She had earlier expressed her honest feeling in her poem, “Kimi shinitamau koto naka [Brother, Do Not Die],” that she (and her family) would prefer her brother’s survival in the Russo-Japanese war (1904-5) to Japan’s victory over Russia. She writes, “Whether the fortress of Port Arthur falls or does not fall, is it any concern of yours?” Quoted in Mikiso Hane, Modern Japan: A Historical Survey (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1986), 177.

30 This debate known as bosetsu hogo ronsō is well documented in a source collection edited by Kouchi Nobuko, Shiryō bosetsu hogo ronsō (Tokyo: Domesu Shuppan, 1984). Hiratsuka herself reflects the debate in her autobiography, Genshi, vol. 4, 22-37. For scholars’ analyses, see for example, Nishikawa Yūko, “Hitotsu no keifu: Hiratsuka Raichō, Takamure Itsue, and Ishimure Michiko,” Bosetsu o tou, ed. Wakita Haruko, vol. 2, Rekishi to keisei henshin (Tokyo: Jinbun Shoin, 1985), 162-191; Suzuki Yūko, Joseishi, 49-67; Barbara Molony, “Equality versus Difference: The Japanese Debate over ‘Motherhood Protection,’ 1915-50,” Japanese Women Working, ed. Janet Hunter (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), 122-148; Laurel Rasplica Rodd, “Yosano Akiko and the Taishō Debate over the ‘New Woman,’” Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 175-198. Eight years after the heated debate over motherhood protection, a historian Takamure Itsue published Ren’ai sōsei (The genesis of love). In this work, Takamure classified the feminist movements in the world into four categories: 1) women’s right movement in Britain and the United States which is based on equality; 2) maternalism in Scandinavia and Germany based on difference; 3) neo-woman’s rights movement in Russia based on equality and scientific socialism; and 4) neo-maternalism in Japan. According to her, neo-maternalism was based on individual differences and went beyond scientific socialism (what she called “jitai shugi” or “unitism”). She gave an extensive critical reading of Ellen Key’s ideology. But her advocacy for neo-maternalism (shin iosei shugi) in Japan indicates her idea as an extension rather than a dismissal of Key’s ideas. See Takamure Itsue, “Ren’ai sōsei,” in Takamure Itsue zenshū, vol. 7, Hyoronsha ren’ai sōsei (Tokyo: Rironsha, 1966), 9-10, 76-111; Nishikawa, “Hitotsu no keifu,” 175-82. I am indebted to Professor E. Patricia Tsurumi for bringing Takamure’s ideas to my attention.

31 Anthony, 89.
kind of “negative eugenic” law to factory women would hurt their chances to marry and reproduce. The action could jeopardize women rather than helping them. She therefore had to shift her direction.

While her idea derived at times from other feminists’ ideas, what distinguished Hiratsuka from other sympathizers of feminist causes was her capacity to put ideas into action. Together with Ichikawa Fusae, who had been a local newspaper correspondent in Nagoya and had taken Hiratsuka to investigate the working conditions of factory girls in the area’s textile mills, Hiratsuka organized the New Woman Association (NWA) in late 1919.\(^\text{32}\) Responding to Hiratsuka’s request, another alumna of Japan Women’s College, Oku Mumeo, soon joined the two as the third leader of the group.\(^\text{33}\) The NWA focused attention on two issues: 1) revision of the Police Regulation Law (chian keisatsu-hô) that prohibited women from engaging in political activities; and 2) enactment of a law to prevent men afflicted with venereal diseases from getting married, based on eugenics reasoning. The second cause was undoubtedly a manifestation of Hiratsuka’s commitment to Ellen Key’s Mutterschutz Idee, modified to reflect Hiratsuka’s concern

---

\(^\text{32}\) Ichikawa Fusae was another leading feminist in Japan. She was active in labor movements and women’s suffrage movements. In postwar years, she was elected as a member of the House of Councillors (Sangin) and fought against political corruptions. See her autobiography, Ichikawa Fusae jiden: Senzenhen (Tokyo: Shinjuku Shobô, 1974).

\(^\text{33}\) In addition to her contribution to revise the Police Regulation Law described in this paper, Oku participated many women’s movements including a consumer movement and a women’s settlement movement. Before joining the Association, Oku had been interested in improving the conditions for factory women. For Hiratsuka’s recruitment of Oku, see Oku’s autobiography, Oku Mumeo jiden: Nobi aikaakato (Tokyo: Domesu Shuppan, 1988), 45-47. Also see Ichikawa Fusae, “Sôritsu yori Josei dômei hakkain made (Jô).” Josei dômei ! (October 1920), 46, Ichikawa Fusae jiden, 53-54. Hiratsuka commented on the personality of Ichikawa and Oku in her Genshi, vol. 4, 124-126.
for avoiding harm to infected factory workers. Instead of promoting a negative eugenic law against women with tuberculosis, Hiratsuka now targeted men with venereal diseases.

At the time, social problems like tuberculosis, venereal diseases, leprosy, criminality, prostitution, and alcoholism, were known as “racial poisons” in the Western eugenics discourse. And Hiratsuka’s former teacher at the Japan Women’s College, Ōsawa Kenji, had extensively discussed these problems in a series printed in the newspaper Hōchi shinbun. The series was later published as a book on scientific marriage in 1909. The prevention of venereal diseases and tuberculosis became the top priority of health policy in post-World War I Europe, notably in France. Concern about the spread of venereal diseases was particularly strong in Japan.

---


35 See the chief of Home Ministry’s Bureau of Public Health Ushio Keinosuke’s view in “Seigaa iinkai dai-ni bunkakai giroku (sokki) dai-yonkai, Taishō 9-nen 2-gatsu 23-nichi [The second petition committee procedures (stenography) the fourth meeting, February 23, 1920],” in Dai yönūnikai, Teikoku Gikai Shūgijin iinkai giroku, Taishō 8, 9-nen [The 42nd Imperial Diet sessions, The House of Representatives committee meeting procedures, 1919-1920], reprinted in Teikoku Gikai, Shūgijin iinkai giroku, vol. 23 (Kyoto: Rinsen Shoten, 1983), 617. Hereafter Teikoku Gikai, Shūgijin iinkai giroku is abbreviated as TGSIG. Also see Nagai Hisomu, “Saikin no dasersō to jinshu eisei (shōzen),” in Tōyō gakugei zasshi 464 (May 1920), 232.

4.3 Politicization of Venereal Diseases

4.3.1 Preparing Petition

As for the anti-V.D. proposal, Hiratsuka decided to submit a petition to the 42nd Imperial Diet session in mid-December 1919.37 Having studied the existing marriage restriction laws against people with venereal diseases in such countries as Mexico, Norway, and different states in the United States, she wrote a petition draft. She then sought advice from such experts as Hozumi Shigetô and Hirayama Rokunosuke.38 The former was a civil law professor of Tokyo University, the latter an attorney. Taking professional advice into consideration, Hiratsuka’s original petition read as follows:


38 Ichikawa Fusse iiden, 55. Contact with the New Woman Association might have stimulated his interest in studying Scandinavian marriage laws. In his article on the eugenic marriage restriction law in Norway enacted in may 1918, Hozumi compared it with the 1915 Swedish law. He disclosed that he was curious to see what kind of marriage laws “the country of Ibsen” and “the country of Ellen Key” had. See Hozumi Shigetô, Rikon seido no kenkyû (Tokyo: Kaizôsha, 1924), 617. His study on the Norwegian law was originally published in Kökka gakkai zasshi (December 1921) and (January 1922).
A Petition Regarding Marriage Restriction against Men with Venereal Diseases

Petition Items

We humbly petition that you add the following clauses in an appropriate place in the marriage regulations of Chapter 3, Collateral Relatives, Civil Law Code.

* A man who is currently infected with venereal diseases is not allowed to marry.
* A man who wants to marry must prove that he is not infected with venereal diseases by submitting to his prospective wife a health certificate prepared by a physician.
* This document with a marriage registration document must be submitted to a family registration officer (kosekiri).
* If it is revealed after marriage that a husband has concealed the fact of his infection with venereal diseases, the marriage can be annulled.
* If a husband becomes infected with venereal diseases or a wife is infected with them through her husband, a divorce can be requested by the wife.
* If a wife is infected with venereal diseases by her husband, she is entitled to request that he pay her living and medical expenses until she is completely cured, as well as an appropriate amount of compensation.39

The NWA appended three reasons for its submission of the petition. This explanatory material, together with the petition draft, was printed and sent out to other reform activists and intellectuals by late January 1920. Over two thousand endorsed the proposal with their signatures and seals (shomei).40

40 Ibid., 31.
At that time, petitions could become law by following a multi-step process: submission by a Diet member to his House’s petition committee; discussion and vote on adoption by that committee; submission to the entire House as a legislative proposal; and voting in both Houses.\(^{41}\)

Hiratsuka asked Miyake Shû\(^ {42}\) (1848-1938) to present the petition to the House of Peers and prevailed on Tomita Kôjirô (1872-1938) and Yamane Masatsugu (1857-1925) to sponsor it in the House of Representatives.\(^ {43}\) Ichikawa Fusae recalled that the New Woman Association first approached Kenseikai party member Tomita through personal connections and asked him to present both the Police Regulation Law petition and the anti-V.D. disease petition.\(^ {44}\) It was Tomita who probably suggested that Hiratsuka and Ichikawa see Miyake and Yamane as the most appropriate Diet members to present the anti-V.D. petition. While teaching at Tokyo University, a French-trained pathologist, Miyake, was an active member of various organizations popularizing hygienic concepts.\(^ {45}\)

---

\(^{41}\) More about the rules concerning the petition process, see “Seigan no juri,” in Shûgiin Sangiin, ed. Gikai seido hyakunenshi. (Tokyo: Ôkurashô Insatsukyoku, 1990), vol. 1, Gikai seido-hen, 43-44.

\(^{42}\) His first name is also known as Suguru and Hiizu.


\(^{44}\) See Ichikawa, “Chîan keisatsu-hô dai go-jô shûsei no undô (jô),” in Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 26. According to Ichikawa, Kamichika Ichiko (1888-1981), who happened to visit Hiratsuka, introduced Mr. and Mrs. Nakamizo Tamakichi. Kamichika boarded with them at the time. Nakamizo was a book store owner. He was also a prominent supporter of the Kenseikai Party and he introduced one of the party’s Diet members, Tomita Kôjirô. Tomita gave Ichikawa some advice about how to petition properly. Kamichika knew Hiratsuka because she had participated in the Bluestocking Society’s literary movement earlier. See Ichikawa Fusae iden, 55.

\(^{45}\) About his life, see Fujikawa Yû, “Miyake Suguru sensei shôden,” in Fujikawa Yû chosakusain, ed. Fujikawa Hideo, vol. 10 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1982), 202-208.

157
chief concerns included the promotion of public health awareness and the improvement of hygienic conditions in Japan. Interestingly, Miyake had authored a book on home hygiene for female readers as early as 1901. Like Miyake, the Lower House member Yamane had a medical background. After graduating from Tokyo University, he studied in Europe. His specialization was forensic medicine. He later became the president of a private medical school in Tokyo, Tôkyô Igaku Senmon Gakkô. Like Miyake, Yamane was a member of the Chûô Eiseikai (Central Hygiene Commission). Among the books Yamane published and translated, one book specifically dealt with venereal diseases. In fact, together with dermatologist Doi Keizô, Yamane had founded the Japan Venereal Diseases Prevention Association (Nihon Karyûbyô Yobôkai) in 1905. Miyake’s name was listed among the enthusiastic supporters of the Association. When the Home Ministry organized an Investigation Committee on Health and Hygiene (Naimushô Hoken Eisei Chôsakai) in 1916, he led the third division which had jurisdiction over the venereal

---


49 “Nihon Seibyô Yobô Kyôkai setsuritsu no riyû,” in Nihon fujin mondai shiryô shûsei, 126 and in Nippon kagaku gijutsushi taisei, vol. 25, 152. Other supporters included Ōsawa Kenji, Katayama Kuniyoshi, and Kitasato Shibasaburô.
diseases (Dai San Bukai [Karyūbyō]).\textsuperscript{50} Thus both Miyake and Yamane were medical experts interested in the promotion of public health issues. While Yamane had been very active in the suppression of V.D., Miyake seems to have recognized the potential role of women in hygiene. Along with his colleagues Nagai Nagayoshi and Ôsawa Kenji, Miyake, in fact, taught classes at Hiratsuka’s alma mater, Japan Women’s College, in its early years.\textsuperscript{51} The two men seemed well-suited indeed to support the New Woman Association’s anti-V.D. campaign in Parliament.

These Diet members suggested that Hiratsuka revise the justification for an anti-V.D. law. They particularly urged her to elaborate on why the proposed law should only restrict men.\textsuperscript{52} As a result, the part containing the reasons in her final petition draft turned out to be three times longer than the original one, while retaining the eugenics argument. Thus the petition that was actually submitted to the Lower and Upper House petition committees read as follows:

\textbf{Reasons}

* Today the spread of venereal diseases, whose growing impact is threatening civilized societies, is doing tremendous harm to individuals, the society, and the racial stock (shuzoku). We do not need to wait for doctors’ explanations or various statistical investigations because the tragedy is constantly in front of us. Facing this kind of national disaster, the nation is rightfully obliged to take actions to alleviate the damage from a social hygiene or racial stock


\textsuperscript{51} Tsuji Isao, “Nihon Joshi Daigaku sôritsu tōji no kyōn soshiki ni kansuru kenkyû,” Nihon Joshi Daigaku kiyô (Ningen Shakai Gakubu) 3 (1992), 40.

\textsuperscript{52} Hiratsuka, “Karyūbyō danshi,” Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 31.
hygienic point of view. In the West, [governments] have already enacted various laws to prevent venereal diseases and spent a large sum of money to enforce them. It is very regrettable that the situation in our country has not been dealt with effectively.

* According to what we hear, the health investigation committee is currently drafting a V.D. prevention law. We hope that it will be promulgated as soon as possible. In addition to this kind of general regulation, we, from a women’s perspective, are fully aware of the need to regulate marriages of men with these diseases in order to protect housewives and children from the poisonous damage (gaideku) of the diseases. The reason for this is the family tragedies we often encounter and cannot disregard. Upon marrying a man with venereal diseases, a daughter of a good family who was healthy and a virgin before marriage, can be subjected to misfortunes to herself, her innocent children, and her otherwise happy family. Housewives today are totally helpless and without any legal protection from such afflictions caused by their own husbands.

* Needless to say, men are not solely responsible for bringing venereal diseases into the home. We, however, do not find it necessary to regulate women, especially contemporary Japanese women, in the same way as we regulate men. These are the reasons:

1) Statistics show that the total number of patients with the aforementioned diseases between 1912 and 1915 totaled 336,059. Among them, 273,223 were men and 98,836 were women. If we put this in terms of percentages, men accounted for 70.59 percent and women 29.41 percent. For non-married patients, the disparity between male and female patients was even greater. And even more so if we exclude prostitutes from the category of unmarried females. After all, most female patients were infected by their husbands after marriage. Many more men [than women] transmit the germs of these diseases into the home. It is not necessary to regulate women legally because the number of women [infected with the diseases] is relatively small.

2) Moreover, considering our customs and their dangerous nature, [medical] checks of the bodies of non-married women may not be as easily instituted as those on men. Since single women [excluding] with these diseases are many fewer, we do not see the need to undertake such inspections.

3) Even though the number of victims among unmarried women is higher in a particular region or in a particular class, we cannot generalize about this kind of peculiar phenomenon.

4) Men tend to lead a sexually dissolute life, and most men today are given to self-indulgence. While almost all the female carriers of the diseases are limited to prostitutes, men in general are the transmitters and carriers. Physicians can
verify this because many fewer men are infected by their wives than women by their husbands.

5) This law not only aims to protect women at home but also to punish men’s sexually loose life. It has a moral meaning as well.

Regulating marriage of men with venereal diseases thus means protecting the home from germs. This means protecting married women and at the same time protecting future children. This will result in improving the [quality of] the people who are the real source of the nation’s power. [Supporting this cause] is a service for the race, which is an obligation as well as a mission for both men and women.

End.53

This explanation for the anti-V.D. legal petition consists of four major points.

The first emphasizes the serious degenerative impact of the spread of venereal diseases to civilized societies. The NWA leaders called, from a race hygienic or eugenics perspective, for responsible action by the state to stop the further spread of V.D. After pointing out the existence of V.D. prevention laws in the West, they lamented the situation in Japan where few steps to suppress the diseases had been taken. The civilized societies were used as a synonym for the West, while Japan was depicted as a country at the edge of civilized societies and uncivilized societies. Conversely, there was a saying that “civilization is syphilisation.”54 V.D. usually spread rapidly in urban settings and in the military. Since urbanization and military conscription were attributes of Western-style modernity—industrialization and imperial expansion—one might argue that the prevalence

53 Ibid., 31-32.

of the sexually transmitted diseases in Japan was a sign of the society’s modernity. On the other hand, Japan’s negligence in controlling these diseases contrasted with the progressive laws enacted by “civilized” nations. Thus, Hiratsuka was able to make use of legislators’ consciousness of Japan’s image in Western eyes as a method of persuasion. After all, the country’s modern history had been characterized by the efforts to become “civilized” in the eyes of Westerners by meeting the criteria of “civilization” defined by the West. Eugenics was made out to be one of these criteria.\textsuperscript{55}

The second part of the rationalization referred to the on-going crusade against V.D. in Japan and distinguished this from Hiratsuka’s campaign. While the health and hygiene investigation committee’s effort to suppress V.D. would be non-gendered, Hiratsuka’s movement was a gender specific attempt to prevent husbands from bringing the diseases home.\textsuperscript{56} None of the Western anti-V.D. laws which Hiratsuka had studied were as gender-specific as her plan was.\textsuperscript{57} As a matter of fact, most treated men and


\textsuperscript{56} Historian Narita Ryūichi analyzes such topics as the body, sex, health, and diseases by paying special attention to gender. After reviewing the existing literature on hygiene in Japan, he notes that “research on ‘gendered hygiene’ remains rare.” See Narita Ryūichi, “Women and Views of Women within the Changing Hygiene Conditions of Late Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Japan,” U.S.-Japan Women’s Journal, English Supplement 8 (1995), 66. For his works on “gendered hygiene,” see, for example, “Eisei kankyō no henka no naka no josei to eiseikan,” Josei Shi Kō Kenkyūkai, ed., Nihon Josei Seikatsu Shikō, vol. 4, Kindai (Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1990), 89-124 (translated as the aforementioned “Women and Views of Women” by Gretchen Jones); “Eisei shikiki no teikaku to ‘bi no kusari’: 1920 nendai, josei no shintai o meguru ichi kyokumen,” Nihonshi Kenkyū 366 (February 1993), 64-89; “Sei no tōryō: 1920 nendai no sekushuariti,” Jendā no Nihonshi, vol. 1, 523-564.

\textsuperscript{57} The New Woman Associations’ Social Study Group headed by Hiratsuka examined the marriage restriction laws of several U.S. states, plus Norway, Germany, and Mexico. It also looked at a law plan drafted by a female parliament member in Czechoslovakia, and reports presented at the 17th V.D. prevention conference in Germany. See Shakaib u Kenkyūkai, “Karyūbyō kekkon seigen ni kansuru Ōbei shokoku no genkō hōsei,” Josei dōmei 3 (December 1920), 44-47; See also Hiratsuka, “Karyūbyō to
women equally. Exceptions were two American states, North Dakota and Oregon. North Dakota subjected to marriage restrictions all potential spouses, male and female, in unions in which the bride was under forty-five years of age and, therefore, presumed fertile. In contrast, the Oregon state law issued on February 16, 1913 required only men to prove they were not afflicted with V.D. by submitting a health document prepared by a certified physician. The majority of the Western marriage restriction laws which Hiratsuka’s group examined were egalitarian on the basis of gender. To make a medical check of reproductive organs feasible in Japan, Hiratsuka picked a gender-specific Oregon law—which was by no means typical of the marriage restrictions laws she had studied—as a model and modified it.

Her rationalization for the petition contained quantitative and qualitative reasons for restricting men. Hiratsuka noted men’s more frequent sexual indulgence, which often caused family tragedies related to V.D. In addition to providing statistical data, demonstrating that men were responsible for bringing the venereal diseases home, Hiratsuka argued against testing women on cultural grounds. For women, a gynecological check in these circumstance had the connotation of rape or loss of virginity. She suggested that there were females with venereal diseases, mostly prostitutes; V.D. was thus class- and location-specific.

zenshugakuteki kekkon seigen-ho,” Josei domei 2 (November 1920), 37.
58 Shakaibu Kenkyukai, “Obei horei,” Josei domei 3 (December 1920), 44.
59 Ibid., 45.
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Finally, she stressed the eugenics significance of the proposed law, the protection of housewives and their children would improve the quality of the nation (kokumin) and strengthen national power (kokuryoku). It would also serve the racial stock (shuzoku), viewed as an obligation of both men and women.

4.3.2 Initial Parliamentary Debate

The New Woman Association’s first parliamentary attempt went reasonably well. The Lower House Second Petition Committee seriously discussed the anti-V.D. petition paying respect to Hiratsuka and her supporters. This committee dealt with petitions under the jurisdiction of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs, and Agricultural and Commercial Affairs. (Before the establishment of the Ministry of Health and Welfare (Kōseishō) in 1938, the Home Ministry had taken care of health issues.) On February 23, 1920, Hiratsuka’s petition was introduced by a member of the House of Representatives, Arakawa Gorō (1865-1944). Like Tomita, Arakawa belonged to the majority party, the Kenseikai. He summarized the petition drafted by the NWA emphasizing its eugenics goals. He then requested that the committee adopt the petition.

60 Hiratsuka, “Karya-ya danshi,” Josei dōmei 1 (October 1920), 32-33. Arakawa did so in place of Tomita Kojirō who had to miss this committee meeting due to a schedule conflict. Tomita had another meeting to attend.


Saitō Kiichi (1863-1928) responded negatively to Arakawa’s request. Saitō belonged to the opposition party, Rikken Seiyūkai. Saitō himself had medical training. After graduating from a medical college in Yamagata prefecture, he studied pathology at Tokyo University. He received a doctoral degree in medicine from a German university.\(^{63}\) He noted that many more men became afflicted with venereal diseases after marriage, so that restricting marriage in the way that the NWA proposed would not achieve the expected goal. He also criticized the petition for imposing the health certificate only on men because he believed many poor women, who earned their family’s living by prostitution, had V.D., too. He concluded that some kind of measures were necessary and suggested further study.\(^{64}\)

The chief of the Home Ministry’s Bureau of Public Health, Ushio Keinosuke, maintained that the government had also been concerned with the issues raised by the petition.\(^{65}\) For example, the officially sponsored Health and Hygiene Investigation Committee (chaired by Yamane Masatsugu) was conducting research about how to prevent the spread of venereal diseases, although effective methods had not been developed yet. The Bureau was planning to send an expert to Europe; there he was supposed to take part in an international conference on V.D. and study anti-V.D. systems in different European countries. After presenting the on-going as well as future research

\(^{63}\) About Saitō, see Sakagami, Gekidō no Nihon seiji shi, vol. 2, 1723.

\(^{64}\) TGSIG, vol. 23, 616-7.

\(^{65}\) Ushio was not a physician but rather had legal training. He was at the petition committee meeting as a committee member from the government (seifu ichi). About his training, see Ijiri Tsuneichi, ed., Rekidaikenkan roku (Tokyo: Hara Shobō, 1967), 118. I am grateful to Dr. James Bartholomew for this reference.
plans against V.D., Ushio emphasized the complicated nature of venereal diseases and their preventive measures. Prior to instituting such measures, important questions had to be answered: Should women be exempt from the medical check? Are doctors able to make a reliable diagnosis? How should physicians treat people who become infected with V.D. after marriage? If a divorce were to result from this law, would it not have a negative impact on Japan’s traditional family system? In the United States, Ushio continued, marriage restriction laws prevented not only people with V.D. but also those who had mental diseases or who had committed serious crimes from marrying. There were also sterilization laws restricting the ability of the “unfit” to procreate. Like Saitô, Ushio called for more careful research before taking any action against the diseases.  

The committee decided to send this petition as a documentary reference (sankô sófu) to the Lower House. Thus although it was not adopted, it was discussed as a serious matter rather than dismissed as a frivolous petition proposed by radical women with no knowledge of hygiene or parliamentary procedures. At one point the chair reminded the committee members that this petition would affect many men, and was supported by Hiratsuka and more than a thousand people.  

---

66 TGSIG, vol. 23, 617. Similar view was expressed in his 1921 essay, “Seibyô yobô mondai ni tsukite,” in Nippon kagaku gijutsushi taikei, vol. 25, 150-151. Editors of the Nippon kagaku gijutsushi taikei, vol. 25 observe that unlike some enthusiasts, the Home Ministry did not show much interest in taking the initiative in correcting this problem. (p. 141) Although by this date lab tests had made diagnosis somewhat more reliable, the difficulty of diagnosis was still a major barrier.

67 TGSIG, vol. 23, 616-7. Also see Hiratsuka, “Karyûbyô danshi,” Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 32. Originally a Kenseikai party member, Tomita Kôjirô was supposed to introduce this petition. Since he was unable to attend this meeting, a fellow Kenseikai member Arakawa Gorô presented the petition to the committee. Early in the meeting Arakawa also introduced the New Woman Association’s other petition regarding the revision of the Police Regulation Law for Tomita. See TGSIG, vol. 23, 612-3.

68 TGSIG, vol. 23, 617.
discourse regarding the petition, it is noticeable that no one questioned the sponsors’ eugenics goals. What provoked discussion, however, was the method. Particularly, committee members reacted against the gendered aspect of Hiratsuka’s plan, since this might affect the life of many men, perhaps including themselves. Prior to the NWA’s anti-V.D. campaign, most enthusiasts publicly promoting eugenics causes had been highly educated middle-class men exposed to Western scientific discourse. They had never been in a position where they themselves might be considered “unfit” and subject to restrictions. 69 Realizing their endangered place in this plan, Saitō tried to replace Hiratsuka’s men-unfit/women-fit logic by middle-class-fit/lower-class-unfit logic. In this way, middle class males could escape possible classification as eugenically “unfit.” The petition never made it to the main floor of the Diet, however, as Prime Minister Hara Takashi dissolved the Diet the next day for reasons unrelated to the eugenics petition. 70

In spite of the disappointing interruption, the petition movement enjoyed much media attention. As expected, many men expressed antipathy. Many articles, by men and women, were published in the next several months in response to the NWA’s

69 For the background of eugenics enthusiasts in Japan prior to 1919, see Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no yūseigaku, 22-97.

petition against V.D. The authors (and magazines) included Yosano Akiko (Taiyô), Yamada Waka (Fujin to shinshakai), Endô Kiyoko (Hôchikoku), and Hozumi Shigetô (Tôyô gakugei zasshi, Hentai shintô, and Fujin no tomo).\footnote{Hiratsuka, “Karyûbyô danshi,” Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 34.}

The Diet dissolution gave the New Woman Association members much needed time to organize better. The leaders--Hiratsuka Raichô, Ichikawa Fusae, and Oku Mumeo--officiated at a plenary meeting of the Association that adopted a platform and rules and elected directors. At the end of March 1920, they held a well-attended inauguration ceremony in Tokyo. Their first task following the event was to support candidates who were sympathetic to feminist issues in the reelection campaign.\footnote{The Association endorsed twenty-three candidates not because of party affiliation but because of their attitudes towards the aforementioned petitions. All of them supported at least one of the petition causes. The women had several campaign strategies: 1) to inform all members of the Association to support these candidates; 2) to inform a local newspaper that the Association endorse a certain candidate from that particular region; and 3) to visit their Tokyo offices to express support; 4) to publish a recommendation statement for each candidate; 5) to put a recommendation ad in a local newspaper of the candidate’s election district; and 6) to send a recommendation statement to a location where political debates take place and ask someone to read it aloud. The New Woman Association asked each candidate what kind of support strategies they wished and it acted accordingly. Arakawa did not request strategies 4, 5, and 6 saying that he was strong in his district and did not need any additional support from the Association. See Ichikawa Fusae, “Senkyô no ôen,” in her article, “Sôritsu yori Josei dômei hakkan made (jô),” Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 49-51.} While Arakawa Gorô was reelected, Tomita Kôjirô was not. All in all, sixteen out of twenty-three candidates the Association endorsed were elected in the general election in May.\footnote{Ichikawa, “Sôritsu yori,” Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 50.}

Since the next Diet assembly scheduled in summer 1920 was a special session (tokubetsu gikai), the women activists originally decided to concentrate on research rather than engaging in petitioning once again. Yet shortly before the opening of the 43rd Diet
session, they changed their minds. Although they did not have time to collect signatures and seals this time, they asked Arakawa Gorō (Kenseikai), Nemoto Shō (Seiyūkai), and other members of Representatives to submit the anti-venereal disease petition to the Lower House on June 30. On July 12, Nemoto Shō (1851-1933) introduced the petition to the committee.

Born in Mito (or present-day Ibaraki prefecture) in 1851, Nemoto was trained in Confucian classics and English. A Christian convert, Nemoto, later went to the United States and graduated from the University of Vermont where he began facilitating the communication between American and Japanese temperance activists. When he returned to Japan in 1889, working closely with Christian diplomat Andō Tarō and the Japan Women’s Christian Temperance Union (Japan WCTU, Nihon Kirisutokyō Fujin Kyōfūkai) members, Nemoto became an enthusiastic advocate of the temperance cause.

---

74 Ibid., 50.


76 TGSIG, vol. 25, 325. Both Hiratsuka and Ichikawa mistakenly recorded that this committee discussion took place on July 16. See Hiratsuka, “Karyūbyō danshi,” Josei dōmei 1 (October 1920), 35; and Ichikawa, “Kyōkai nisshō shō,” Josei dōmei 1 (October 1920), 53. Ichikawa probably used Hiratsuka’s information as a source.

77 For example, see Nemoto Shō, trans., “W.C.T.U. in Japan,” Union Signal (25 May, 1887), Mary Allen West, “Work in Japan,” Union Signal (29 December, 1892), and Nemoto Shō, “Good News from Japan,” Union Signal (14 November, 1895). The first article was published when Nemoto was still in the U.S. See also Nihon Kirisutokyō Fujin Kyōfūkai, ed. Nihon Kirisutokyō Fujin Kyōfūkai hyakunen-shi (Tokyo: Dōmesu Shuppan, 1986), 50 and Katō Junji, Nemoto Shō-den: Minejensha inshū kōshiki-hō o tsukutta hito (Nagano: Gingo Shobō, 1995), 167-171. I am grateful to Ms. Yasutake Rumi for sharing her knowledge about the World WCTU and Japan WCTU with me.
He toured around Japan deploring the physical and moral harm of excessive drinking. As early as 1886, preceding her visit to Japan, the first round-the-world WCTU organizer, Mary Leavitt, had sent an article on heredity of alcoholic poisons (shudoku no iden), which was translated and published in a journal for girls, Jogaku zasshi. By 1897, the Japan WCTU created a division in charge of issues related to heredity (idenbu). When physiologist Ōsawa Kenji’s lecture on the degenerative harm of alcohol and preventive measures was printed in the newspaper Hōchi shinbun in 1907, Nemoto, editor of the temperance magazine Kuni no hikari [Light of our land], was quick to reprint the article to justify the temperance claim using “scientific authority.” Since 1898, Nemoto had been elected a member of the House of Representatives ten times. Between 1901 and 1922, he submitted nineteen times a bill to restrict minors from drinking alcohol. Although the Lower House had begun approving the temperance bill since 1908, the Upper House kept rejecting it. It was finally passed by both Houses and became a law in 1922. During the time of frustration, Ōsawa, as a medical expert, gave a speech in support of the temperance bill; the physiologist cautioned the reluctant members of the House of Peers that unrestricted drinking would have a negative impact on the Japanese nation (kokka).

---

78 The World WCTU, based in the United State, sent Leavitt. See Mary Leavitt, “Shudoku no iden,” Jogaku zasshi 28 (5 July, 1886), 257-259 and Mary Leavitt, “Shudoku no iden (sono nii),” Jogaku zasshi 29 (15 July, 1886), 273-274. About Leavitt’s visit to Japan, see Nihon Kirisutokyō Fujin Kyōfūkai hyakunen-shi, 35-36. There were frequent articles on WCTU activities in Jogaku zasshi, see ibid., 65. Since Naruse Jinzō was a Christian and wrote articles for Jogaku zasshi, it was likely that Naruse was exposed to Leavitt’s view.

79 Nihon Kirisutokyō Fujin Kyōfūkai hyakunen-shi, 136.

80 Ōsawa Kenji, “Shugai to kinshe hōhō,” Kuni no hikari 167 (10 May, 1907), 20-22.

81 Katō, Nemoto Shō-den, 177-208.
people (jinmin), and race (jinshu) in 1910. Considering his relationships with the woman temperance activists and Ōsawa Kenji, and familiarity with the concept of “racial poisons,” Nemoto’s support for the NWA’s anti-V.D. petition was logical.

However, unlike Arakawa Gorô, who had introduced the petition by emphasizing the eugenics reasons in February, Nemoto stressed the gender issue; he believed that existing laws and social institutions served men’s interests rather than women’s. Nemoto implied that adopting the NWA’s V.D. restriction would correct such social injustice in a small but significant way. Perhaps this was a persuasive argument for Nemoto, a cosmopolitan who was sympathetic to feminist and moral causes. But other Diet members were put off by it. For example, Matsushita Teiji (1875-1932) asked Nemoto to define the venereal diseases. Nemoto answered, “I suppose the person who asked this question has no experience with venereal diseases. They include what we call syphilis, a disease arising in the private parts.” Actually Matsushita was a former medical professor at Kyoto University. He had extensive training in the fields of hygiene and bacteriology and received a doctoral degree in medicine from Halle University in Germany.

Following Nemoto’s response, Matsushita medically defined V.D. He dismissed Nemoto’s as well as the New Woman Association’s explanation as amateurish:

---


The venereal diseases (karyūbyō or the red light district diseases in Japanese) do not mean only syphilis. The diseases, medically speaking, slightly differ from [Mr. Nemoto’s definition]. The kinds of V.D. vary according to people and time periods, what we currently call V.D. are syphilis, gonorrhea, and soft chancre (ranshitsu kakan). The transmission of syphilis is not limited to the red light districts (karyūkai). Also gonorrhea is very commonly found in Japan. You have just said that mainly men infect others, however, the fact is that both men and women can get the disease by taking a bath or sharing plates. I do respect the intention of the people who submitted [the petition], but it was proposed by those who have little medical knowledge. I, therefore, suggest that we do not adopt it.\textsuperscript{84}

He also raised a question whether a medical check by a physician would be feasible. In his opinion, this could be done if the venereal disease were advanced in nature. He maintained, however, that even physicians cannot always tell whether one is afflicted with chronic V.D. or not.

Matsushita thus discredited the petition scientifically. Nemoto, however, tried to regain legitimacy:

\begin{quote}
The person who has just asked a question originally pretended he had known nothing. Yet, he turned out to be as knowledgeable as a physician or someone with an advanced degree. At any rate, he has just explained clearly why this petition is necessary. It is not enough to talk about this matter. It is too late if one becomes afflicted. The point is that we should prevent such a thing from happening. The ways one explains diseases may vary, but we all know what was at stake. Thus I urge that you all promptly adopt [the petition].\textsuperscript{85}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{84} TGSIG, vol. 25, 325.

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid. Nemoto, the veteran Diet member who had already been elected ten times, did not know who Matsushita was or what his professional status was because the latter was a freshman member just elected for the first time in May 1920.
But his request was not answered in the way he hoped. Other members joined the discussion and expressed negative views toward the petition. Takada Unpei (1873-1957), for instance, displayed a male-chauvinistic attitude directly.\textsuperscript{86}

I believe [the petition] is being proposed by some women who want to revise the fifth clause of the Police Regulation Law. If we adopt this, it will lead to a predominance of women over men (joson darpi), allowing any woman, even those with V.D., to marry without restrictions while men are restricted in marrying. As I think this is such a selfish petition, I choose not to adopt.\textsuperscript{87}

This emotional rather than rational opinion may have been characteristic of views held by many men in Japan. Takada had a limited education with an agricultural background. He ascended in the national politics through different levels of local politics in Tochigi prefecture. Asaka Chôbei (1883-1945) and Shimizu Ichitarô (1865-1934), followed Takada. Both of them had studied law at Tokyo University.\textsuperscript{88} Representative Asaka called for further investigation because the petition proposed to restrict the existing marriage system in Japan. His argument had a cultural-deterministic tone similar to that of Takada. Asaka contended: "These kinds of restrictions exist in the West. These, however, are individualistic countries in which women predominate over men. By contrast, ours is a country which maintains the family system."\textsuperscript{89} Shimizu was an observer and did not have a vote in the committee. He nevertheless supported the ideas

\textsuperscript{86} Shûgiin, Sangiin, eds., Gikai seido hyakunen-shi, vol. 10, 374.

\textsuperscript{87} TGSIG, vol. 25, 325.

\textsuperscript{88} Gikai seido hyakunen-shi, vol. 10, 18 and 314.

\textsuperscript{89} TGSIG, vol. 25, 325.
expressed by Takada and Asaka: “I believe if we adopt this petition the number of divorces will be innumerable in Japan. Since this would cause a great marriage revolution.... I hope you will not adopt it.”  

Except for the presenter, Nemoto Shô, no one supported the petition, and it was rejected at the Lower House committee level. The primary reason for its rejection was its gendered aspect, requiring only men to submit a medical certificate before marriage. While Matsushita Teiji questioned the petition as scientifically unsound, others such as Takada Unpei, Asaka Chôbei, and Shimizu Ichitarô all tried to distinguish Japan from the West culturally. Intriguingly, however, none of their objections focused on the petition’s eugenics arguments. The authority of international eugenics discourse reached its peak during the early interwar years. The key words of Taisho Japan were “minshu shugi (democracy),” “kaizô (reform),” and “seimei (life).” The NWA’s lobbying on behalf of a eugenic marriage restriction law, in other words, epitomized the progressive

---

90 Ibid.


92 See the summary of discussions at the petition committee, Hiratsuka, Hiratsuka Raichô chosakushû, vol. 3, 183-185.

93 For example, Deborah Barrett finds that international eugenics conferences flourished in the 1920s and early 1930s. Barrett, “Global Quality: Eugenics as an International Social Movement,” Unpublished paper prepared for the joint meeting of the Society for the History of Technology (SHOT) and Society for Social Studies of Science (4S), Charlottesville, Virginia, 18-22 October, 1995, 17. Stefan Kuhl also observes the dominant role played by mainline eugenicists in the 1920s. He sees that the 1930s was the period when eugenics transformed from mainline to socialist eugenics. According to Kuhl, despite the demise of the mainline eugenics caused by such reasons as the emergence of geneticists dissociating themselves from eugenics, the death and retirement of leading eugenicists, and its connection with the much criticized Nazi racial policies, sterilization in the United States for eugenics purposes increased during the 1930s. Kuhl, The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 79-84.

94 For example, see “Tokushû: Taishô seimei shugi,” Bungei (Fall 1992), 245-321.
spirit of the time. Western eugenics was associated with fundamental reforms of human society, progress, modernity, and civilization, were not something the educated in Japan could easily reject in 1920.95

Earlier that day (July 12, 1920), before the rejection in the Diet committee of the NWA’s eugenics petition, the Association’s petition to revise the Police Regulation Law had been adopted by the same committee.96 As a result, the NWA was busy drafting a bill which was to be discussed at the Lower House. This prevented them from taking the time and energy to submit an anti-V.D. petition to the Upper House.97 Thus, as in the previous 42nd session during which the Diet was dissolved, the V.D. prevention proposal failed to be discussed in the House of Peers petition committee.

4.3.3 Public Response

With the mixed results of their petition efforts, the women continued to maintain their focus and actively pursued their goal. They successfully sponsored a formal lecture series that summer.98 One of the featured speakers was Hozumi Shigetō, a civil law expert and Tokyo University professor.

---

95 Regarding American eugenics movement, a prominent historian of nativism John Higham describes as follows: “...the eugenacists’ dedication to a positive program of ‘race improvement’ through education and state action gave the movement an air of reform, enabling it to attract the support of many progressives while still ministering to conservative sensibilities.” See Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism 1860-1925, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1988), 150.

96 TGSG, vol. 25, 322-323; Ichikawa Fusae, “Chīna Keisatsu-hō dai-gojō shūsei no undō (chû),” Josei dōmei 2 (November, 1920), 26-27. Ichikawa mistakenly recorded that the petition for the revision of the Police Regulation Law was adopted on July 16th.

97 Hiratsuka, “Karyūbyō dansu,” Josei dōmei 1 (October, 1920), 36

98 Hiratsuka, Genshi, vol. 4, 108-109; and Ichikawa Fusae, Ichikawa Fusae iden, 78.
He was a grandson of Shibusawa Eiichi (1840-1931), one of the Japan Women’s College’s greatest financial supporters and the College’s third president. Hozumi’s sister was married to Shibusawa’s nephew. Perhaps because of these family ties, Hozumi joined organizations closely related to the Japan Women’s College: its first president Naruse Jinzō’s Association Concordia (Kiitsu Kyōkai) and second president Asô Shôzô’s Women Problem Study Group (Fujin Mondai Kenkyūkai). Botanist Yamanouchi Shigeo’s frequent lectures and printed articles for these two organizations must have made Hozumi familiar with the concept of eugenics and its implications to women. From a legal expert’s point of view, he upheld the basic idea of marriage regulations, aiming to discourage the “lower orders” from procreating.99

To popularize their principles further, the NWA began publishing Josei dômei [Women’s alliance] in October 1920.100 Many female teachers in public schools throughout Japan responded to these efforts. Not only corresponding with the activists in Tokyo, but participating in regional seminars, and subscribing to the journal, these women began organizing local branches of the New Woman Association in their own areas. In November, however, one such local group in Hiroshima was suppressed by the prefectural authorities, who tried to prevent female teachers from joining the

99 About the half of his lecture is documented in Hozumi Shigeto, “Hikaku kon’in-hô ron,” in Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), supplement 1-4; Josei dômei 2 (November 1920), 55-60; Josei dômei 3 (December 1920), 56-61; Josei dômei 5 (February 1921), 47-52; Josei dômei 6 (March 1921), 62-67; and Josei dômei 8 (May 1921), 28-31. Ichikawa Fusae, “Kyōkai nisshi shô,” in Josei dômei 1 (October 1920), 53.

100 Hiratsuka, Genshi, vol. 4, 127-139; Ichikawa Fusae jiden, 78-80.
Association. Pressured by the media, the prefectural authorities made a defensive statement: although they would prohibit their teachers from being involved in any political endeavor, they would allow them to participate in the anti-V.D. law movement for it was social rather than political. This so-called Hiroshima incident was well covered by influential national newspapers including *Asahi shinbun* and *Kokumin shinbun*. This event scared many local teachers away from active participation in the NWA. On the other hand, it helped to disseminate information on the Association’s efforts to institute a eugenic marriage restriction law. Furthermore, the NWA announced a plan to organize a Marriage Rejection Alliance against Men with Venereal Diseases (*Karyūbyō Danshi Kyokon Dōmei*). It called for women’s voluntary but active commitment to eugenics principles by refusing to marry men with V.D. The controversial program became a popular topic in the Taisho media; for instance, monthly magazines like *Chūō kōron* and *Kaizō*, both read by educated people, devoted much space to leading intellectuals’ views of eugenics.

Many writers acknowledged that this movement raised public awareness of eugenics principles. For example, social hygienist Teruoka Gitō viewed this movement

---

101 As for the so-called Hiroshima incident, see *Josei dōmei* 4 (January 1921) and *Josei dōmei* 5 (February, 1921), 43-40. *Josei dōmei* 4 is almost entirely devoted to this matter.


favorably.\textsuperscript{104} He believed that the NWA’s anti-V.D. law campaign and the Marriage Rejection Alliance would have a positive impact on the fate of the racial stock (shuzoku) by elevating the sexual and marital morality of the people. Teruoka was particularly impressed by the fact that, unlike most social movements in Japan, Hiratsuka’s efforts appeared soundly based on scientific and quantitative data.\textsuperscript{105} A well-known medical historian, Fujikawa Yū, commented on the Marriage Rejection Alliance from a reproductive hygienic (seisyoku eisei) perspective. Considering the wide-spread existence of sexual relations outside the marriage institution, he wrote, women’s voluntary rejection of men with V.D. might not make a significant difference in society. Yet, he saw the movement as meaningful in that the awakened women called for sexual desire hygiene (seiyoku eisei).\textsuperscript{106}

Some questioned the female-centered nature of the Alliance and offered an alternative. A Buddhist activist and social critic, Takashima Beihō (1875-1949), suggested that both men and women should reject marriage to anyone with undesirable health problems including tuberculosis and mental diseases.\textsuperscript{107} As his article titled “Men Too Have a Right not to Marry Women” indicates, Honma Hisao (1886-1981) shared this

\textsuperscript{104} About Teruoka’s racial hygienic view, see Miura Toyohiko, Teruoka Gihō: Rōdō kagaku o tsukutta otoko, Minkan Nihon gakusha, no. 31 (Tokyo: Ribuopōto, 1991), 171-174.

\textsuperscript{105} Teruoka Gihō, “Minzoku eisei no risō to yūseigakuteki shuzoku kaizen no risō,” Kaizō (February 1921), 97-102.

\textsuperscript{106} Fujikawa Yū, “Seishoku eisei’ no shakaiteki kerschi kara,” Chuō kōron (February 1921), 49-50.

\textsuperscript{107} Takashima Beihō, “Otoko no mata onna ni taishite kyokon no kenri ari,” Chuō kōron (February 1921), 52-55.
view with Takashima.\textsuperscript{108} Honma was an English literature scholar who translated Ellen Key’s \textit{Younger Generation}. Like Takashima and Honma, Christian social reformer Abe Isoo, active in birth control and temperance movements, proposed an expanded eugenics measure that encouraged both men and women to refuse to marry anyone with venereal diseases. He differed from Takashima and Hoama, who opposed the gender-specific aspect of the proposed plan, because he thought women should reject men who drank, since alcoholism also had a degenerative effect. From a reformist perspective, Abe believed that some problems would require gender-specific approaches, while others would not.\textsuperscript{109}

There were other critics who saw the Alliance as a class issue. For instance, the anarchist Itô Noe (1895-1923)—the only female critic except Hiratsuka Raichó given a voice in \textit{Kaizô} and \textit{Chûô kôron}—criticized the movement because it separated middle class women from their lower class sisters. Itô, who had once worked for Hiratsuka in the Bluestocking movement, fiercely criticized Hiratsuka, claiming that she selfishly intended to protect the women of her class, while alienating other women who were forced to do sex work because of family poverty.

Marxist literary critic, Eguchi Kiyoshi (Kan) (1887-1975) agreed with Itô’s view on the class matter. He argued that Hiratsuka’s cali for “motherhood protection”

\textsuperscript{108} Honma Hisao, “Otoko ao tachiba to shite,” \textit{Chûô kôron} (February 1921), 55-61. Although Honma was asked to comment on the Marriage Rejection Alliance, he was basically criticizing the female-centered aspects of the anti-V.D. law petition submitted by the New Woman Association to the Diet. Honma suggested that both men and women exchange medical documents certifying their reproductive fitness.

\textsuperscript{109} Abe Isoo, “Kyokon Dômei wa danjo ryôsei ni saiwaisu,” \textit{Chûô kôron} (February 1921), 70-77.
contradicted her effort to improve women’s status in Japan. He believed that women’s liberation could not be attained through an emphasis on gender difference. Thus he criticized the Mutterschutz Idee as a hindrance to the emancipation of women. He argued that it assumed that women needed to be protected, thereby admitting that women were inferior to men. He also tried to minimize the significance of the Alliance. He maintained that it was conventional wisdom to avoid marrying someone with V.D. or any health problem if possible. Thus, the Alliance would make little difference. Perhaps, he speculated sarcastically, its real objective was the legitimation of spinsters!\(^{110}\)

The engendered nature of the Women’s Alliance against Men with V.D. provoked a response from the media, which contributed to the dissemination of eugenics thought in Japanese society. Carefully examining the kinds of support and criticism they received, the feminist leaders revised the petition for the next Diet session with the help of Hozumi Shigetō and Ōsawa Kenji.\(^{111}\) As a result, the new petition was less charged gender-wise and more inclusive, in that women would have to submit a health certificate if required.

---


\(^{111}\) Hiratsuka Raichō, “Karyūbyō to zenshugakuteki kekkon seigen-hō,” Josei dōmei 2 (November 1920), 35-41. On October 24, Hiratsuka and Ichikawa visited Dr. Hozumi concerning the revision of the anti-V.D. marriage restriction law petition. See “Kyōkai ni shi ni shi,” Josei dōmei 2 (November 1920), 61. Hozumi Shigetō’s view towards eugenics and marriage restriction laws can be observed in his writings such as “Yūseigaku to kon’in-hō,” Tōyō gakugei zasshi 462 (March 1920), 7-22; and “Yūseigaku to ressha kinkon-hō,” Kaizō (February 1921), 91-97. Ōsawa Kenji’s article originally published in the journal Sei (Sexuality) (November 1920) was reprinted in Josei dōmei. It expresses his disappointment upon learning the rejection of the anti-V.D. law petition. See Ōsawa, “Karyūbyō danshi kekkon seigen-hō hiketsu no fujōri,” Josei dōmei 3 (December 1920), 47-48.
and common-law marriages without legal sanction (ijitsukon) could also be covered. The new petition was sent out for signatures and seals. This time, they received support from about 2,500 people including 1,000 men.\(^{112}\)

4.3.4 End of the Campaign

Rather confident with these preparations, the New Woman Association turned in the revised petition to the 44th regular session of the Imperial Diet. On January 29, 1921, the Lower House members, Arakawa Gorō (Kenseikai Party), Nemoto Shō (Seiyūkai Party), Chūma Okimaru (Kenseikai), and Kagawa Yasuada (Kenseikai) submitted the petition on behalf of the NWA.\(^{113}\) While Arakawa and Nemoto had been involved in the petition in the previous sessions, the female lobbyists were successful in recruiting more sympathetic Diet men with medical backgrounds\(^{114}\) Chūma Okimaru (1871-1936) had been a medical practitioner serving both civilian and military hospitals since graduating from Tokyo University. He was newly elected from Hyōgo prefecture

---

\(^{112}\) About the statistical information of petition supporters, see Ichikawa Fusae, “Sanshu no seigan no chōinsha chōsa hōkoku,” Josei dōmei 5 (February 1921), 41-44.

\(^{113}\) “Dai yonjīyon gikai to kyōkai no undō,” Josei dōmei 5 (February 1921), 1.

\(^{114}\) For Diet members with medical backgrounds, see “Seiyūkai shozoku ika giin kesshin ikaga?” Ikai jihō 1284 (1 February 1919), 222-223.
after the February 1920 dissolution by the premier, Hara Takashi. Kagawa Yasutada (1872-1940) was also a first term Diet member who had been practicing medicine in Toyama prefecture.

At the February 7 petition committee meeting, Chôma presented the case to the other committee members. He explained that this petition had been rejected in the previous session because of its gender bias, so the petitioners revised it to make it more egalitarian. He used the authority of the medical profession by saying that he, as a medical practitioner, had often witnessed tragedies caused by widespread venereal diseases. Their profound negative impact not only on contemporaries but also on the future population demanded that the Diet take prompt preventive measures. He further explained the modifications: Rather than requiring a man to show the medical check document directly to a prospective bride or her family, the new plan proposed that he acquire a license from a municipal office by submitting documentation to it. Women were not required to do the same, but if asked by a future husband, the prospective wife would have to supply the health document. Chôma also mentioned that the revised petition tried to improve its effectiveness by requiring the submission of the medical document from common-law couples.

115 About Chôma, see Sakagami, Gekidô no Nihon seisshi, vol. 2, 1921.

116 Ibid., 1529.


118 Ibid., 119.
Following Chûma’s introduction, Kagawa expressed his support by emphasizing how prevalent these diseases were among the general population and their dreadful effect on future generations.¹¹⁹ One member renewed opposition based on cultural differences between the West and Japan.¹²⁰ Chûma intelligently pointed out that any parent could benefit from this plan because it would protect his or her own daughters. He also pointed out that recent progress in medicine made it easy to cure syphilis.¹²¹ Although there was an opinion that the proposed plan was not yet gender-neutral,¹²² the general atmosphere of the committee discussions started out on a positive note.¹²³

Further deliberations one week later were less promising. Supporter Arakawa Gorô emphasized the eugenics purpose of the petition to protect the nation and the racial stock (shuzoku) from degenerating. But some committee members were still unhappy about the fact that men and women had different medical certificate requirements and suggested that there might be other ways to control the spread of V.D. Others raised questions about how long a medical document would be valid. Arakawa reminded the members that details could be adjusted after this petition was adopted and asked them to

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ This was Nakashima Moritoshi’s view. See TGSIG, vol. 28, 119.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² This was the view of Yoshiki Kiyoshi (1881-1944). See TGSIG, vol. 28, 120.

¹²³ Ibid.
judge it based on eugenics principles. In the end, the petition was rejected at the Lower House committee by a narrow margin.\textsuperscript{124} Despite the disappointing result, the NWA members expressed gratitude for the serious discussions.\textsuperscript{125}

Nevertheless, the members of the women’s group remained optimistic because their other petition on the Police Regulation Law appeared to be achieving success. The petition was adopted and forwarded from the committee level to the Representatives and Peers. Although the Lower House passed it, the Upper House rejected the plan on the last day of the session, March 25, 1921.\textsuperscript{126} This was a major blow to the whole feminist movement led by the NWA because their energetic but overworked leaders lost focus. Hiratsuka, strained physically, psychologically, and financially, fell ill. The NWA publication \textit{Josei dōmei} began apologizing for the delay of proposed articles because Hiratsuka was unable to write.\textsuperscript{127} Her illness was so serious that she had to withdraw from public activity. Personal relations among leaders—especially between Hiratsuka and Ichikawa—turned sour. As a result, Ichikawa resigned as a director of the NWA in June.

\textsuperscript{124} See “Seigan inkai dai-ni bunkakai giroku (sokki) dai-sankai,” TGSIG, vol. 28, 137-139; “Giin no karyūbyō kekkon seigen ni tsuite no tōron,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 6 (March 1921), 38-46. There were three members in favor in the eight (including the chair) member committee. See TGSIG, vol. 28, 127 and 139. \textit{Ichikawa Fusae iden}, 90.

\textsuperscript{125} “Giin no karyūbyō kekkon seigen ni tsuite no tōron,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 6 (March 1921), 46.

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid. Also see Hiratsuka, \textit{Genshi}, vol. 4, 158-160; and \textit{Oku Muneko iden}, 57-58.

\textsuperscript{127} For example, see “Henshūsitsu yori,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 6 (March 1921), 78; Hiratsuka Raichō, “Goisatsu,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 7 (April 1921), 61; “Henshūsitsu yori,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 7 (April 1921) 65; and “Hiratsuka Raichō-shi no kōkaijō,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 8 (May 1921), 15.
Thus, the group lost its two most experienced members and their ability to draft petitions, lobby, publish the journal, and manage financial and clerical matters of the NWA.

The remaining members, however, continued their efforts. They resubmitted their petitions to the 45th Diet session in 1922. And it was they who oversaw the passage of the revision of the Police Regulation Law. They celebrated when the law came into effect in May. It was a significant first step for female suffrage in Japan. But the Association began disintegrating without strong leadership. Hiratsuka, still recuperating away from Tokyo, decided to disband the New Woman Association by the end of 1922.

The fate of the anti-V.D. petition was uncertain. The NWA announced its intention to submit three petitions including the revised anti-V.D proposal in the 45th Diet session; they were supposed to submit it in early January and ask familiar Diet members, Miyake Shū (House of Peers) and Nemoto Shō (House of Representatives), to present the case. In spite of this rather concrete plan, no Diet records documented discussion on the matter. Neither Hiratsuka Raichō, Ichikawa Fusae, nor Oku Mumeo...

---

128 Ichikawa Fusae iiden, 96-98, and Oku Mumeo iiden, 61-63.
129 Ibid., 98; and Hiratsuka, Genshi, vol. 4, 164-167.
131 “Dai yonjūgo gikai ni seigansho o teishutsu shimasu!” Josei dōmei 12 (January 1922), 1-8; and “Jigyōbu,” Josei dōmei 12 (January 1922), 51.
recorded the outcome. Most likely the NWA prioritized other petitions. After the loss of two strong leaders, the others needed to concentrate on the revision of the Police Regulation Law. Moreover, no other member of the NWA had been so determined to promote this eugenics cause for women. After all, it was an embodiment of Hiratsuka's personal commitment to Ellen Key's motherhood ideology. Unlike the petition for the revision of the Police Regulation Law, the petition to revise the Civil Law to restrict men with venereal diseases from getting married never passed. This movement, or Japan's first organized effort to establish a eugenics law, is nonetheless suggestive in different ways.

4.4 Implications

4.4.1 Significance in Women's History

Students of women's history would stress the female perspective of the initiative. We generally see the wartime pronatal policy associated with the 1940 National Eugenics Law as evidence of state efforts to objectify the female body to reproduce more babies and better "fit" children. Historian Sheldon Garon notes that "when it comes to

---

132 The petition to revise the Police Regulation Law was discussed and adopted by the House of Representatives Committee on February 6, 1922. See "Seigan iinkai dai-ni bunkakai giroku (sōki) dai-nikai," in Dai yonjūgokai, Teikoku Gikai Shūgijin iinkai giroku, Taitō 10, 11-nen, in TGISG, vol. 32, (1985), 82. It was sent to the regular session of the House of Representatives and then to the House of Peers. Both Houses passed the bill and the Police Regulation Law was finally revised in favor of women in 1922. Regarding the process, see Association's new leader Sakamoto Makoto's article. "Chikai dai-gojō shūsei undō no gaikō," in Josei dōmei 14 (June 1922), 5-12. Their energy taken for this effort and personal business, the women were unable to edit and publish the February, March, and May issues of the NWA official publication, Josei dōmei. See also Oku Mun'ei jiden, 68-69.

133 For example, see Suzuki Yūko, Joseishi o hiraku, vol. 1, 18-19 and 174-192; Yoneda Sayoko, Hiratsuka Raichō no 'sensō sekinin' ron joshō," Rekishi hyoron 552 (April 1996), 50-51 and note 16; Ogino Miho, "Jinkō ninshin chūsetsu to josei no jiko ketteikenshū: Dai-ni-ji Sekai Taisen go no Nihon,"
scholarship on women’s movements and women in politics, the history of Japanese women has, for the most part, been written in terms of resistance to state power and ideology.”\textsuperscript{134} This image of the “objectified” female body and “victimized” women does not reflect the eugenics movement by women during the Taisho period. Contrary to the prevailing view, this particular case shows that women actively chose to influence state policy by strategically appropriating certain aspects of eugenics rhetoric. The scheme of formulating the eugenic marriage restriction law in this organized manner was unprecedented, and at least some men followed the example set by women.

It also shows that Hiratsuka’s feminism was Janus-faced. While questioning differential treatment of men and women in a political and legal arena on one hand, she acknowledged the importance of physical differences between men and women on the other. Glorifying the female ability to bear and nurture children, she called for state protection for women in the name of eugenics. Her use of “motherhood protection” ideology, pushing women to the “traditional” female sphere, may be seen as counterproductive by some people who narrowly define feminism as women’s effort to attain equality. Yet, I see clear continuities in her commitments to women’s causes linking her Bluestocking literary movement, revision of the police regulation law effort, and the marriage restriction law campaign against men with venereal diseases.

Hiratsuka consciously used the temporal term “shuzoku” hoping to remind Taisho women of the close relationship with Nature and sociopolitical power and prestige once enjoyed by women in the beginning of Japanese history. She also changed her focus from factory women suffering from tuberculosis to housewives suffering from their husbands’ V.D. Some Western countries had adopted eugenics marriage laws restricting individuals with tuberculosis from getting married. It seems that Hiratsuka deliberately avoided targeting women factory workers. Instead she concentrated on another gender-specific “racial poison” harmful to the general population, venereal diseases. The fact that she “engendered” eugenics appears to indicate that her ultimate objective was the improvement of women’s well-being but not improvement of the racial stock per se. She failed to recognize that V.D. was, in fact, doubly “engenderable”: While she saw middle class housewives as “fit” and their husbands as “unfit,” her opponents saw men as “fit” and prostitutes as “unfit.” Hiratsuka refused to include prostitutes and other poor women forced to engage in the sex trade in her category of “women” by marginalizing them as a minority.\footnote{Regarding poor women who had to be engaged in prostitution as prostitutes or coffee house waitresses, see Yamazaki Tomoko, Sandakan Hachiban Shōkan: Teihen jo-seishi joshō (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1972); Fujime Yuki, “Senkanki Ōsaka ni okeru ‘sekkyakufu’ to sono undō,” Shirin 73.2 (1990), 121-141; and Miriam Silverberg, “Nihon no jokyu wa burūsu o utatta,” translated by Shōyama Noriko, Jendā no Nihonshì, vol. 2, 585-607. It is ironic that some of these poor women organized various labor movements inspired by Hiratsuka Raichō’s middle class-centered women’s movements. See Fujime, “Senkanki Ōsaka ni okeru ‘sekkyakufu’ to sono undō,” 126-127.} V.D. was thus not only a gender-specific, but also a class-specific “racial poison.”

Considering that Hiratsuka was situated at the cross-section of women’s issues and eugenics, it is intriguing that she never addressed other issues such as the
biological-deterministic notion of female criminality prevalent in Western eugenics discourse. She used eugenics rhetoric rather selectively. Eugenics was her strategy, but not her objective. In this sense, if we are to call her a feminist, we have to recognize the duality of a feminism that was concerned with women's equality with men as well as differences from men.

Hiratsuka's use of a eugenics rationale may cause difficulty in interpreting her life, at least for some. She seemed determined to question norms imposed by her father, Japan Women's College, government officials, and society as a whole. Why, then, did she sanction state power to protect mothers? As mentioned earlier, Hiratsuka was interested in solving women's problems in general but also a very specific one: Middle class women suffered from venereal diseases brought into the home by their husbands. As Barbara Molony points out, the motherhood ideology of European origin was not very different.

---

136 In the West, eugenicists argued that prostitutes were born to be prostitutes because of their criminal "genes." For example, Richard Dugdale published his study of the Jukes in 1875. It shows that a large group of prostitutes, criminals, and social misfits had a single ancestry. The Italian criminologist Cesare Lombroso developed the theory of female biological criminality in his La donna delinquente in 1893. When Hiratsuka led the anti-V.D. campaign, these works had already been introduced to the Japanese public through translations. As for Lombroso and female biological criminality, see David G. Hearn, "This Norm Which is Not One: Reading the Female Body in Lombroso's Anthropology," chap. in Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture, ed. Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urls (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), 109-129. As for translations, the leading American eugenicist Charles B. Davenport's Heredity in Relation to Eugenics was translated into Japanese in 1914. Davenport describes the classic study of the Jukes. See Davenport, Jinshe kairyōgaku (Tokyo: Dai Nihon Bunmei Kyōkai, 1914), 272-275. Lombroso's biological deterministic theory of criminality had been introduced in Japan by the late Meiji period. For example, Terada Seiichi (1884-1922) wrote Lomburōzo hanzainin ron (Lombroso's theory on criminals), Fujin to hanzai (Women and crime), and Kagaku to hanzai (Science and crime). A journal of psychology, Shinri kenshū, often printed the translation of Lombroso's articles: Yamamoto Mannosuke, "Seirai hannin," Shinri kenshū 1.5 (1912), 1-18; and Terada Seiichi, "Lomburōzo no keiji jinrinjukusetu," Shinri kenshū 7.1 (1915), 81-107. Particularly, Terada's Fujin to hanzai (Tokyo: Dai Nihon Bunmei Kyōkai, 1916) introduced the idea of Lombroso's La donna delinquente.
from the “good wife, wise mother” ideology endorsed by the Japanese state.\textsuperscript{137} Actually, the former was discussed within the dominant discourse of the latter.\textsuperscript{138} Both stressed women’s “difference” from men as mothers and wives; and they both tried to give significance to women’s child-bearing and nurturing roles at home. The basic differences between the two were explained on the basis of the eugenics notions and the new sexual ethics of the motherhood ideology. Hiratsuka did openly criticize the “good wife, wise mother” ideology.\textsuperscript{139} Yet, the paradox of Hiratsuka’s sudden glorification of state power


\textsuperscript{138} Barbara Molony, “Equality versus Difference,” 125-126.

suggests that she sensed that the juxtaposition of the two ideologies was the most effective way to win over the Japanese public, who had been exposed to the “good wife, wise mother” ideology.\textsuperscript{140}

4.4.2 The Context of Eugenics Ideas and Movements in Japan

To appreciate the implications of this first organized eugenics movement in Japan even further, we should situate it in the context of a series of eugenics movements in prewar Japan. From this perspective, Hiratsuka’s campaigns are mutually consistent. First, her college education at the Japan Women’s College was significant. As we have seen in Chapter 2, the school had been founded by Naruse Jinzō in 1901. He noted the importance of providing women with proper scientific knowledge in health, since physically “fit” women would be more likely to produce “fit” children (future soldiers and mothers). By linking women to the Meiji government’s slogan, “Enrich the nation, strengthen the army (fûkoku kyôhei),” he was trying to legitimize his effort in higher education for women.

\textsuperscript{140} Hiratsuka’s comparison of ancient women with the Sun Goddess, the primogenitor of the imperial line, is another example of this paradox and juxtaposition. This feminist strategy was later adopted by Takamura Isse. Ehara Yumiko points out that, in order to be included in mainstream discussions, the politically dominated sometimes have to borrow logic shared by the dominant. Thus the former’s expressions may not reflect what the dominated actually think and contain contradictory factors. See her “Yûsei shisô to feminizumu: Ichinokawa ronbun o meguite,” in Seishoku rïjï totte jenâ (Tokyo: Keisô Shôbô, 1996), 344-345. Similar point is made by Oguma Eiji and Kôno Nobuko about Takamura. See Oguma, Tan’itsu minzoku shinsô no kigen: <Nihonjin> no Inga-zô no keifu (Tokyo: Shin’yôsha, 1995), 198; and Kôno, “Onna to nashonarizumu,” Jôyô 59 (January 1996), 35. Hirota Masaki calls the state in Hiratsuka’s eugenics discourse “shuzoku kyôdôtai” or “racial stock” community.” See Hirota, “Kindai erito jôset no aidenjû to kokka,” 220-221. Ishizaki Nobuko’s insightful and gendered analysis suggests that this was the limitation of women’s eugenics; these women, whose social status was lower than that of men, needed to depend on the higher authority, state power, to justify their claim. See Ishizaki, “Seishoku no jiyû.”
Physiologist Ōsawa Kenji taught at the Japan Women’s College. As we have seen, Ōsawa gave advice to Hiratsuka Raichō to improve her petition in 1920.\textsuperscript{141} When the Nihon Karyūbyō Yobōkai—an association intended to prevent venereal diseases from spreading—was established by Yamane Masatsugu and others in 1905, Ōsawa assumed the vice chairmanship.\textsuperscript{142} Hiratsuka entered the College in 1903 and took Ōsawa’s physiology classes.\textsuperscript{143} In his writings, Ōsawa promoted marriage between the “fit” while condemned dysgenic marriage, and he articulated the idea of requiring health documents for legal marriage.\textsuperscript{144} Tokyo University professor of hygiene, Miyake Shū, whom Hiratsuka asked to introduce the anti-V.D. law petition to the House of Peers petition committee in 1920, also taught at the Japan Women’s College.

Besides Ōsawa (who taught at Japan Women’s College from 1901 to 1921), the College’s lecturers included quite a few eugenics enthusiasts. As noted, one graduate, Arai Tsuru continued her studies in psychology at Columbia University where she was supervised by a committed eugenicist Edward Thorndike. After she received her Ph.D., she returned to Japan and translated the founder of eugenics, Francis Galton’s \textit{Hereditary Genius}. Hiratsuka and Arai were contemporaries at the Japan Women’s College; both

\textsuperscript{141} For Ōsawa’s view on the New Woman Association’s eugenic marriage law cause, see his “Karyūbyō danshi kekkon seigen no hiketsu no fujō,” \textit{Josei dōmei} 3 (December 1920), 47-48.

\textsuperscript{142} “Nihon Seibyō Yobō Kyōkai setsuritsu no riyū,” \textit{Nippon kagaku giyutsushi taikei}, vol. 25, 151-152.

\textsuperscript{143} Hiratsuka, \textit{Genshi}, vol. 1, 144. The textbook based on his lectures on physiology was later published from the Japan Women’s College. See Ōsawa Kenji, \textit{Seirigaku, 1921-1932}. Publication information is not clear. Japan Women’s University Library, G041 Nih.

\textsuperscript{144} Ōsawa Kenji, \textit{Tsūzoku kekkon shinsetsu}. It had been previously published as a series “How to marry to be happy” in the daily newspaper \textit{Hōchi shinbun}.
entered there in 1903 at the age of seventeen. Although neither of them recorded any particular interaction between them, it is likely that they knew each other’s name and face, for the school was quite small. Probably an alumnae network and media coverage kept them updated on each other’s activities and accomplishments since both became famous as pioneers in their respective fields.

The early history of Japan Women’s College shows that the institution stressed the significance of women’s reproductive and nurturing abilities and tried to make them more valuable by providing what would then have been seen as a remarkably sophisticated level of science education. The curriculum of home economics was particularly strong in physiology, hygiene, and eugenics. One suspects that Naruse Jinzō’s extraordinary interest in women’s issues and race improvement (jinshū kairyō) had some impact on the evolution of former home economics major Hiratsuka Raichō’s thinking.

Nagai Hisomu (1876-1957), a physiology professor at Tokyo University, succeeded Ōsawa as a lecturer at the Japan Women’s College in 1921. He later founded Japan’s most prominent and credible eugenics organization, the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, in 1930. This organization would lead efforts to enact the 1940 National Eugenics Law (Kokumin Yūsei-hō). The traditional account of how this sterilization law came into effect largely ignores the preceding effort by the New Woman

---

Association, the movement for an anti-venereal disease law. What Hiratsuka proposed was not sterilization but a marriage regulation law. Yet both sterilization laws and marriage regulation laws are forms of negative eugenics, of discouraging the “unfit” from procreating. It is reasonable to ask whether there was any visible sign of continuity between the feminist movements of the early 1920s and the enactment of National Eugenics Law enactment in 1940.

Actually there was a significant connection. Hozumi Shigetô, who had advised Hiratsuka on revision of the anti-V.D. law petition, Nagai Hisomu, and Yamanouchi Shigeo, established the National Marriage Guidance Society (Kokumin Kekkon Hodôkai) in the mid 1920s. This group intended to promote “rational” marriage and to encourage a higher level of sexual morality among the Japanese. To join the Society, one was required to submit a health document certifying that he or she did not have such diseases as V.D. and tuberculosis which would do harm to married life. The Society was planning to submit a marriage law plan to the 1925-1926 Diet session. In terms of leadership (Hozumi Shigetô), objectives (eugenic marriage-restriction laws), and approaches (lobbying, promotion of medical document exchange before marriage), there were direct links between the NWA effort and initiatives taken by the National Marriage Guidance Society.

---

146 For example, see Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no yûseigaku, 143-186; On page 160, Arakawa Gorô was mentioned but his former involvement in the anti-V.D. law campaign was not explored. Yoshimasa Shûfu, “Waga kuni yûsei undô no enkaku,” Yûseigaku no riron to iissai: Tokyu ni seishin igaku to no kankei ni oite (Tokyo: Nankôdô, 1940), 216-222; and Ota Tenri, “Kokumin Yûsei-hô,” Nihon sanjû choôsetsu hakumenshi (Tokyo: Shuppan Kagaku Sôgô Kenkyûjo, 1976), 76-80. Matsubara Yôko acknowledges earlier efforts including Hiratsuka’s movement and anti-leprosy eugenics legislation debates. See her “Minzoku yûsei hogo hōan to Nihon no yûsei-hô no keifu,” Kagakushi kenkyû 26 (1997), 42-50.

147 About the National Marriage Guidance Society, see “Kekkon baikai o shui ni seyo,” Yûseigaku 15 (April 1925), 44-45; Gotôsei, “Kakkoku no yûseigaku undô (sono 2),” Yûseigaku 50 (April 1928), 6.
Society. Nagai Hisomu in particular represented a link between the National Marriage Guidance Society and the National Eugenics Law. As we will see in Chapter 6, in 1935 Nagai would organize the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society (Nihon Yūsei Kekkon Fukyūkai), hoping to involve more women in the eugenics cause.

Second, among women there was a renewal of the anti-V.D. marriage restriction campaign in 1930. Prominent women who were against birth control--Hosokawa Misao, Yamada Waka, Takeuchi Shigeyo, Ichinohe Itsuko, Kōra Tomiko, and Hiratsuka Raichō--formed a new organization called the Motherhood Education Association (Bosei Kyōiku Kyōkai). Though many details are unclear, one of its aims was to prohibit people afflicted with venereal diseases from getting married.¹⁴⁹

Third, Diet members who had supported the New Woman Association’s anti-venereal disease campaign later submitted eugenics bills that were to lead the way for enactment of the 1940 National Eugenics Law. For example, Chūma Okimaru (Rikken Minsei Party)¹⁵⁰ proposed a eugenics marriage restriction law to the 58th Imperial Diet.

¹⁴⁸ Consider another example: In 1924 an organization called the Association of Social Education (Shakai Kyōiku Kyōkai) was to propose a more comprehensive eugenics marriage bill which tried to restrict individuals with tuberculosis, epilepsy, leprosy, or venereal disease from marrying. This Association enjoyed the leadership of such educators as Nagai Ryūtarō and Miwada Momichi. Hozumi Shigeto was also involved in this movement. See “Kekkon o gaisuru shippei no kyūshū. Kekkon ma ni shindansho kōkan; Shānpō seitei o kengi su,” Yūsei 2 (February 1924), 10; and Shunjūsei (Gojō Ryūkichi’s pen name), “Hitsuyō o sakebarette kita kekkon hōan,” Yūsei 5 (May 1924), 3-7.

¹⁴⁹ “Sanji seigen hantai-ha ga Bosei Kyōiku Kyōkai setsuritsu,” Yūsei 76 (June 1930), 34. Hiratsuka joined a group promoting birth control, Nihon Sanji Chōsetsu Renmei, in 1931. This behavior appears contradictory.

¹⁵⁰ The Kenseikai Party was reorganized and became the Rikken Minsei Party in 1927.
in May 1930.\textsuperscript{151} Diseases to be restricted under this plan included V.D., mental diseases, alcoholism, tuberculosis, and leprosy. Historian Fujino Yutaka argues that Chûma’s 1930 proposal marked the beginning of legislative efforts for the National Eugenics Law.\textsuperscript{152} Considering the fact that the two Diet members, Arakawa Gorô and Yagi Itsurô, who would introduce sterilization bills to the Diet in the 1930s supported Chûma’s earlier proposal, Fujino’s observation seems accurate. Arakawa had introduced Hiratsuka’s plan to the House petition committee in 1920 and 1921. Following news of the 1933 Nazi sterilization law, Arakawa submitted a eugenics sterilization bill (Arakawa plan) to the Diet committee in 1934 (the 65th Diet Session) and 1935 (the 67th Diet Session).\textsuperscript{153}

When he introduced the National Eugenics Protection Bill (Minzoku Yûsei Hogo Hô-an) on March 6, 1934, Arakawa acknowledged the continuity, without specifically referring

\textsuperscript{151} He had helped introduce the New Woman’s revised petition for the marriage restriction law against men afflicted with V.D. in the 44th Diet in 1921. “Shôwa 5-nen 5-gatsu tsuitachi teishutsu, Kengi dai nijûhachi-gô, taikanja kekkan seigen-hô seitei ni kansuru kengian,” 57-58 Teikoku Gikai Shûgijin jôsô kengi ketsu: dôgi shitsumen 1929-30, 1-5; “Taikanja no kekkan seigen-hô,” Yûseigaku 76 (June 1930), 31; and Fujino Yutaka, Nihon fashizumu to iryô: Hansen-byô o meguru jisshôteki kenkyû (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993), 37. I am indebted to Ms. Matsubara Yôko who pointed out the connection between Chûma and this eugenics marriage restriction law proposal.

\textsuperscript{152} Fujino Yutaka, Nihon fashizumu to iryô (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1993), 37.

\textsuperscript{153} Yoshimasu, Yûseigaku no riron to jissai, 76-77.
to the NWA campaign, by stating that he had been studying the issue of eugenics legislation for more than ten years.\textsuperscript{154} He later cooperated with the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene.\textsuperscript{155}

Integrating the women’s reform effort against venereal diseases into the history of eugenics, eugenics thought, and eugenics movements provides a new perspective. There are three possible reasons why this movement has not been treated as a legitimate eugenics movement in the existing history of eugenics in Japan: 1) Hiratsuka’s petition was gender-biased; 2) the women’s initiative was discredited as “unscientific,” and 3) venereal diseases by 1920 had already been proven to be infectious rather than genetic in origin.

The first was the principal reason for the effort’s failure. But as some have pointed out, ironically, the engendered nature of the movement attracted media attention and thus helped to disseminate the ideas of eugenics.\textsuperscript{156} It might be fair to say that Hiratsuka had a greater impact on the popularization of eugenics principles than scholars

\textsuperscript{154}“Kenkō hoken-hō chū kaisei hōritsu-an hoka ikken iiinkai giroku (sokki), daishachikai,” in Dai rokujīgakai, Teikoku Gikai Shūgōin iiinkai giroku, Shōwa 8, 9-nen, in TGSIG, Microfilm, Reel 15 (Kyōto: Rinsen Shoten, 1991), 205.

\textsuperscript{155} Yoshimasu, 76-77. At least by 1934, Arakawa and Nagai, though both were from Hiroshima prefecture, had not been in close contact, see TGSIG, Microfilm, Reel 15, 205. Yagi, who did not participate in Hiratsuka’s campaign, submitted his bill to the 70th and 73th Diet sessions in 1937 and 1938. See Matsukara, “Minzoku yûsei hōo hoant to Nihon no yûsei-hō no kēfu.”

\textsuperscript{156} For example, a Diet man, Chūma Okimaru, noted the extensive media coverage and academic as well as popular response to the anti-V.D. marriage restriction law petition, see TGSIG, vol. 28, 119. Hiratsuka herself welcomed other anti-V.D. measures proposed by groups such as Meiji Ilkai and Dai Nihon Igakkai Sokai (Dai Nihon Shiritsu Eiseikai) saying that her plan often provoked unnecessary opposition from men just because it was submitted by women. See Hiratsuka, “Karyūbyō to zenshugakuteki kekkon seigai-hō,” Josei dōmei 2 (November 1920), 37. It is also significant that the activities of the National Marriage Guidance Society--male initiative--did not attract sensational media coverage.
who had published either scholarly or popular books on eugenics. Her efforts directly and indirectly led to the enactment of the 1940 National Eugenics Law. The ramifications of the women’s reform effort were not insubstantial. What is important to note is that Hiratsuka for the first time saw “(middle class) women” as “Self/biologically fit” while reducing men to the “Other/biologically unfit” status by problematizing venereal diseases.

Prior to her organized effort, eugenics popularizers had been educated middle class men who saw themselves as “Self/mentally and physically fit.” Hiratsuka Raichō unsettled the existing gender hierarchy by upsetting the boundary between the “biologically desirable” and “biologically undesirable.”

The second reason for the existing historiographic biases is that male activists were unwilling to acknowledge that women in fact pioneered the organized legislation effort to enact a eugenics law. Arakawa was proud of his long-time commitment to the cause of eugenics legislation; yet he did not want to attribute his involvement in the cause to Hiratsuka and her supporters. Although Gotô Ryûkichi, who founded Japan’s first

---

157 Other examples of unsettling established gender roles in Taisho Japan are discussed in Jennifer Robertson, “Gender-Bending in Paradise: Doing ‘Female’ and ‘Male’ in Japan,” Genders 5 (Summer 1989), 50-69; and Donald Roden. “Taisho Culture and the Problem of Gender Ambivalence,” in Culture and Identity: Japanese Intellectuals during the Interwar Years, edited by J. Thomas Rimer (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990), 37-55. Both use the 1914 establishment of an all-female theater Takarazuka Revue as examples to illustrate their points. While both Takarashienne and Hiratsuka rejected the traditional gender roles prescribed by men, there was an obvious contrast between them. As opposed to the Takarashienne’s outright resistance to the “good wife, wise mother” ideology (Robertson, 61), Hiratsuka was much more ambivalent towards it. As we have discussed, sometimes she publicly denounced it. Yet, her eugenics motherhood ideology appropriated certain aspects of the “ryōsai kenbo” framework to entice the support of the state.
eugenics journal, was convinced that a eugenics marriage restriction law would be necessary, he ignored the women’s role in eugenics legislation efforts in his articles in the mid-1920s.  

The third reason is more complicated. Let us remember the definition of “eugenics”: the science of improving human stock by giving “the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable.” Until fairly recently, existing literature on Japanese eugenics was inclined to see eugenics primarily as a precursor of genetics. As historian of science Matsubara Yōko suggests in her 1996 work, scholars informed of today’s genetic knowledge tend to see the early twentieth century “heredity” views of infectious diseases as scientifically crude. This may have contributed to the underrepresentation of non-heredity diseases in the history of eugenics.

Hiratsuka Raichō’s anti-V.D. law plan was clearly based on the negative eugenics premise of scientific thinking in her day. Social historian Fujino Yutaka, in his 1993 study of the history of Hansen’s disease (leprosy) control in Japan, also points out that this disease was a target of various eugenics regulations—quarantine, marriage restriction, and sterilization—even after it was proven to be infectious rather than genetic in nature.  

---

158 See, for example, Shunjüsei (Getō Ryūkichi) “Kōhō ishikai to ju mono: Fu seri dai ichi-gō gian sōan,” Yūseigaku 3 (March 1924), 31-32; and “Hitsuyō o sakebarette kita kekkon ho-an,” Yuseigaku 5 (May 1924), 5-7.

159 Kevles, *The name of Eugenics*, ix.


161 Fujino, *Nihon fasizumu to iryō*, especially 29-54 and 236-254.
As Fujino and I demonstrate, however, infectious diseases like leprosy, venereal diseases, and tuberculosis were, in fact, an integral part of eugenics concerns in Japan well into the late 1930s. Inclusive eugenics was an important part of eugenics discourse in Japan.

Tracing the pursuit of anti-venereal disease marriage restriction laws in Taisho Japan is significant to a reconsideration of established opinion in Japanese history, women’s history, and the history of science. As noted, the history of eugenics in Japan was placed within the postwar Marxist intellectual framework where it came to be associated with the evils of Nazism. As Yonemoto Shôhei indicates, this often obscured obvious differences between the German and Japanese eugenics movements and contributed to presentist moral judgments.\textsuperscript{162} To understand the history of Japanese eugenics in a different context, I propose to modify Yonemoto’s paradigm theory.\textsuperscript{163} In prewar Japan, eugenics was not imagined as evil, negative, or dangerous. Rather, it attracted perhaps naive but progressive and reform-minded people as a possible solution to social problems that a modernizing nation was facing.\textsuperscript{164} These observations have been extremely hard to make because historians have been afraid of being labeled as rightists who justify fascism.\textsuperscript{165} Though the examination of the postwar activities of Hiratsuka Raichô and other women who led the anti-V.D. movement is beyond the scope


\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 5-41.


\textsuperscript{165} For example, see Nakayama Shigeru, “Kagaku: Kono ozomashiki mono,” \textit{Shisô no kagaku} 62 (1985), 8-9; Yonemoto Shôhei, “Yûseigakushi kenkyû no gendai teki shiten,” \textit{Rekishi to shakai} 4 (June 1984), 133-155; and \textit{Iden kanri shakai}, 24-28 and 196-197.
of this chapter, it can be noted that their interest in issues concerning international peace, ecology, and consumer protection can be understood as a continuation of the prewar reformist activities. Something like ecological feminism seems to link these women’s involvement in some prewar through postwar movements, though they belonged to the two different “prewar” and “postwar” paradigms.¹⁶⁶ The women’s collaboration with the state in promoting pronatal, including eugenic, policies was not an aberration from the otherwise progressive careers of these feminist pioneers.

CHAPTER 5

GOTÔ RYÛKICHI (1887-D. UNKNOWN):
THE JAPAN EUGENICS SOCIETY AND U.S. RACE POLITICS

5.1 Introduction

Only a few years after the feminist effort failed to pass a eugenics law restricting the marriage of men infected with venereal diseases, Japan saw another eugenics movement in 1924. It was initiated by Gotô Ryûkichi, who established the Japan Eugenics Society (Nihon Yûsei Gakkai) and began publishing Yûzenikkusu/Yûseigaku [Eugenics: 1924-1943], Japan's first journal dedicated to eugenics issues.¹ In the same year the U.S. Congress enacted a general immigration law.² Historian of Asian Americans Ronald Takaki notes that its provision prohibiting the entry of "aliens ineligible for citizenship"³ was designed to single out the Japanese "for special discriminatory

---

¹ The journal was originally published as Yûzenikkusu beginning in January 1924. But in April 1925, it was renamed as Yûseigaku, the Japanese equivalent of "eugenics." To avoid unnecessary confusion, I will consistently use the journal title Yûseigaku.

² The bill was signed on May 26, 1924. This law was also known as the Immigration Restriction Act, the Johnson Act, the Johnson-Reed Act or the National Origin Act.

³ Since "white persons and persons of African descent" were eligible for naturalization, "aliens ineligible to citizenship" meant Asians. See Roger Daniels, Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850 (Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1988), 139.
treatment” because other Asians had already been excluded by prior legislation. One of the reasons given for the law in America was “biological,” certain national groups were considered as “racially undesirable.” There were American eugenicists who worked closely with “Anglo-Saxon supremacist” exclusionists and “scientifically” endorsed the 1924 immigration law arguing that an increase in “low-standard immigrants” would lead to degeneration of the “more valuable, older-stock Americans.” Despite the bothersome “racist” notions associated with eugenics, Gotô not only promoted eugenics but contacted some of these American eugenicists asking for advice in organizing his eugenics society in the very same year. On the other hand, he reacted emotionally against the anti-Japanese immigration law.

In his study on the racial dimension of the Pacific War (1941-1945), historian John W. Dower points out that for the Japanese in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Westernization meant “learning” that the Japanese were racially inferior, which was empirically verifiable. Japanese scientists and intellectuals then faced the dilemma of ignoring arguments or repudiating their teachers. The Western science of eugenics definitely made Gotô Ryûkichi face this dilemma. Did Gotô ignore eugenics arguments, then? No; he actively promoted them. Did Gotô repudiate American eugenicists? No; instead, he solicited them for advice.

---

4 Ronald Takaki, Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans (Boston, Toronto, and London: Little, Brown, 1989), 209. Although it was not directly related to the 1924 law, the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act was the first federal statute to bar entry to a group specifically for reasons of race.

In order to understand Gotô’s seemingly contradictory behavior and the nature of his race discourse, this chapter examines the contents of the **Yuiseigaku** during its formative years (1924-1930) and explores Gotô’s background, his initiative in establishing the journal, and his aspiration to expand his one-man editorial office into a full-fledged institution for eugenics research and education. U.S. race politics, which led to the enactment of the 1924 anti-Japanese immigration law, will also be examined. Naruse Jinzô and Yamanouchi Shigeo, who had studied in the United States in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, must have personally experienced the general racial prejudice against Asians that culminated in this law. Gotô’s effort to institutionalize eugenics was, in a way, a renewal of what Yamanouchi Shigeo and others envisioned when they founded Japan’s first eugenics organization, Greater Japan Eugenics Society, in 1917. Gotô’s plan was also a precedent for Nagai Hisomu’s Japan Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, which would be created in 1930.7

---

6 I choose 1930 as the end of the time period focused in this chapter because it was around the publication of the journal got going financially and it was the year when the Society (later Association) of the Ethnic National Hygiene was established.

7 Other eugenics journals which followed Gotô’s **Yuiseigaku** included Ikeda Shigenori (Rangi)’s **Yuisei undô** (Eugenics Movement) (1926-1930), the Japan Association of Ethnic Racial Hygiene’s **Minzoku eisei** (Ethnic National Hygiene) (1931-present), and the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society’s **Yuisei** (Well-born) (1936-1939). Ikemi Takeshi, self-claimed protégé of Nagai Hisomu, established an Institute of Ethnic National Science (Minzoku Kagaku Kenkyûjo) in 1940 and edited a few issues of a journal **Minzoku bunka** (Ethnic National Culture), which the Institute had bought out. Even in postwar years, Ikemi continued to publish a newsletter **Minzoku Kagaku** (Ethnic National Science). Ikemi had helped Nagai establish the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society in the mid-1930s. Ikeda was a German-trained elite journalist working for the Hôchi newspaper. For an analysis of Ikeda’s popular eugenics movement, see Suzuki Zenji, **Nihon no yûseigaku: Sono shisô to undô no kiseki** (Tokyo: Sankyô Shuppan, 1983), 114-125, and Fujino Yutaka, “Yuisei shisô to minshû: Ikeda Shigenori to yûsei undô,” **Minshôshi kenkyû 49** (May 1995), 41-60. As for the Japan Association of Ethnic Racial Hygiene and the **Minzoku eisei**, see Suzuki, 144-151, and 157-164. Regarding the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society and the **Yuisei**, see Chapter 6.
5.2 Background

Despite his significant role in the diffusion of eugenics ideas in Japan by establishing the country’s first and long-lasting eugenics journal, details of Gotô Ryûkichi’s life have remained obscure. His name cannot be found in major national and regional directories nor in a history of grassroots movements in the Kansai area where Gotô’s active career took place. For example, historian of science Suzuki Zenji writes of, “a Gotô Ryûkichi who was a private person (or a person without an official appointment) in Kôbe (Kôbe no minkan-jin de aru Gotô Ryûkichi naru jinbutsu).” Yet, by carefully reading Gotô’s writings, I have been able to identify some pieces of information which reveal his background. Among them, a series of articles entitled “The Genesis of Takeshi [Takeshi no oitachi no ki]” is particularly useful. Upon his first son Takeshi’s birth, Ryûkichi tried to analyze Takeshi’s eugenics “fitness” by tracing the family genealogy.

---

8 I have consulted Jinji kôshinroku, 12th to 17th ed. (Tokyo: Jinji Kôshinjo, 1939-1953), Taishô jinjirôkku (1942-3) (reprinted as Shôwa jinmei jiten (Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Sentâ, 1987)), different local Who’s Who publications, including those held at the Osaka Furitsu Chûô Toshokan, various reference books about authors, and Osaka chihô shakai rôdô undôshi, Seizenden, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Yûhikaku, 1989). The Osaka chihô contains information about local eugenics consultation offices operated in Osaka. Gotô’s office was located in eastern Kôbe close to Osaka. Gotô’s other journal Kansai jî’s office was located in Osaka. I am indebted to Professor Tachikawa Kenji of Toyama University for bringing this work to my attention.

9 Suzuki’s limited attention to Gotô can be also observed in his consistent use of a wrong character for “ryû.” For Suzuki’s description on Gotô Ryûkichi and the Japan Eugenics Society, see his Nihon no yuseigaku, 104-8. In English, see his “Geneticists and the Eugenics movement in Japan,” Japanese Studies in the History of Science 14 (1975), 157-164. In this article, although he does not mention Gotô’s name, Suzuki discusses the Japan Eugenics Society, see pp. 160-162.

10 Gotô used the characters “sôseiki” which was the direct translation of “Genesis” but made readers pronounce the term “oitachi no ki.”
The Gotō family had been engaged in craft making for generations in Bungo (present-day Ōita prefecture) on the southern island of Kyūshū. Gotō Ryūkichi was born there on March 26, 1887. His paternal grandfather was a craftsman, and the family owned a house, fields, and forested lots. His wife (Ryūkichi’s grandmother) came from a peculiar community known as an alcoholic hamlet (inshū buraku) where villagers were exposed to heavy drinking for generations. Despite her “alcoholic” blood, she had no visible mental nor physical disorder. They had four sons, of which Ryūkichi’s father was the eldest. Although he had no special education, he became a rather successful carpenter. He married a woman who was taller than himself. Her father (Ryūkichi’s maternal grandfather) was engaged in traditional Chinese medicine and was known for his skills in gynecology and obstetrics. Ryūkichi’s parents had seven children—all boys—and Ryūkichi was the fourth. The sons who grew to maturity also grew taller than their father; this physical characteristic was, according to Gotō Ryūkichi,

---


12 Gotōsei (Gotō Ryūkichi), “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (1),” Yūseigaku 30 (August 1926), 22.

13 Ibid., 22-25; and Gotōsei (Gotō Ryūkichi), “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (2),” Yūseigaku 31 (September 1926), 22.

14 Ibid., 22-23. Her fourth son, or Rhūkichi’s paternal uncle, however, was alcoholic.

15 Gotōsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (2),” 22.

16 Ibid., 23.

17 Gotōsei (Gotō Ryūkichi), “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (3),” Yūseigaku 32 (October 1926), 28.

18 Ibid.

19 See the genealogical diagram in Gotōsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (1),” 23; and “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (3),” 28.
inherited from their mother.  Ryūkichi did well in school and he graduated from a middle school (chūgakkō) at the age of twenty; he then became a substitute teacher at a local elementary school. After a few years, he began working for a garrison hospital in Ōita.

Several tragedies struck the Gotô family. When his father was in charge of building the first prefectural middle school in the town, he was cheated by a contractor. As a result, he became indebted and was obliged to sell his properties, including the house and land. At the time, none of the children was mature enough to earn substantial income for the family. Thus, the once relatively well off Gotô family was reduced to poverty. The sixth son died of epidemic dysentery at age six, and the second died of acute meningitis at age twelve. Four family members—the eldest son, the grandmother, the father, and the fifth son—all died of laryngeal tuberculosis (kōtō kekkaku). Ryūkichi’s eldest brother was a military veterinarian in charge of horses. After serving in the Russo-Japanese War, he was assigned to work on a stock farm in Hokkaidô, the northern island of Japan. Perhaps the cold climate there did not agree with him, being born and reared in Kyūshû, which is noted for its mild climate. Ryūkichi suspected that

21 Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (3),” 29.
22 Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (4),” Yûseigaku 33 (November 1926), 27.
23 Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (2),” 23.
24 Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (3),” 28.
25 Gotô Ryūkichi, “Kekkaku mondai,” Kansai nii (May 21, 1931), reprinted in Isei ronsô (Osaka: Kansai Iijisha, 1936), 22. Details of the grandmother’s death was not given but she was seventy-four at the time.
his brother had contracted tuberculosis in Hokkaido. The brother died around 1914.  

Both his father and his younger brother (fifth son) attended him at his death bed, where they in turn contracted the fatal disease. The father died seven years after the eldest son’s death and the fifth son died, three years after the father’s death, around 1922.  

While he was constantly in contact with many terminal tuberculosis patients at the military hospital, Gotô Ryûkichi recalled that his father’s death was the catalyst that led him to eugenics. In the mid-1910s, scholars like Yamanouchi Shigeo and Nagai Hisomu began writing about eugenics quite extensively, and in 1919, as noted in Chapter 4, feminists led by Hiratsuka Raichô tried to establish a eugenics marriage law. In this context, Gotô found eugenics a possible solution to the daunting problem of tuberculosis, which he called the disease of the poor (binbôbyô). During the epidemic, mortality rates rose sharply along with industrialization, urbanization, and improved transportation. Gotô called for attention to the latest statistics, which showed that 113,200 Japanese died of tuberculosis and other related diseases in a year. According to him, eugenics was the only fundamental approach for preventing the further spread of the

---

26 Gotô, “Kekkaku mondai,” Issi ronsô, 22.

27 Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (3),” 29; and “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (4),” 26-28.


29 Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (4),” 27.

disease because susceptibility to tuberculosis, though the disease itself was not hereditary but infectious, was scientifically proven to be hereditary.\textsuperscript{31} In other words, Gotô’s eugenics view was inclusive.

He believed that factors such as tuberculosis patients’ will to live longer, religious faith, and improvement of social support systems\textsuperscript{32} and education, were not enough to save their lives. He argued that it was necessary to incorporate “scientific” elements to achieve the goal of “ethical Creation and evolution (rinriteki sôzô shinka).” To do so, one needed to “choose certain hereditary characteristics” consciously. “Blending science (kagaku), instinct (hon’nô), and faith (shinkô)” would mean “a human participation in God’s Creation towards eternal evolution.”\textsuperscript{33} As the choice of words such as “Genesis” and “Creation” indicate, Gotô, at that time, seems to have been influenced by Christianity.

His younger brother’s death: in the early 1920s only reinforced Ryûkichi’s determination to promote eugenics. When Ryûkichi heard that his brother was dying in Mokpo in colonial Korea and that his wife had deserted him, Ryûkichi went there and

\textsuperscript{31} “Kantô,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 5 (June 1924), 1.

\textsuperscript{32} What it meant by the term “shakai soshiki no kairyô,” which I translate “improvement of social support systems,” was not explained in the text. In his later writing, “Poverty and eugenics,” he discussed the subject but did not go into specifics because he wanted to avoid being marked as a Communist (shugiha). See Shunjûsei (Gotô Ryûkichi), “Bînbô to yûseigaku: Shakai soshiki no kairyô to jinshu kairyô,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 56 (October 1928), 2-6.

\textsuperscript{33} Gotôsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (4),” 27-28. More on his view of eugenics as a combination of science and religious faith, see “T.M shi ni kotaete,” 12.
took care of his close sibling for two months until he died at age thirty. It was quite likely that Ryūkichi himself was wondering if he himself had contracted tuberculosis because of this experience.34

5.3 Journal Publication and Plan for the Japan Foundation of Eugenics

By the mid-1910s, Ryūkichi had left Kyūshū and begun his career as a medical journalist in the Kansai area (where metropolitan cities such as Kyoto, Osaka, and Kōbe are located). Considering that his maternal grandfather was a local doctor and Ryūkichi had worked for a garrison hospital, the field of medical journalism seemed to suit him well. After ten years of experience, during which he published a historical narrative regarding the formation of the Kansai medical practitioners’ organization and shortly after lost his brother in Korea, the thirty-six year old Gotō Ryūkichi founded a monthly magazine, Yūseigaku, in 1924.

Gotō was confident that eugenics would catch on because it would offer an ideological foundation for the country, which was in need of direction due to mounting problems, including a limited food supply, rapid population growth, ineffective public health policies, and ethnic national (or racial) pride deeply hurt by racial prejudice against the Japanese.35 At first, the objective of the journal was to achieve social reform through studies of heredity, fecundity, sexual desire, love and marriage life. By mid-1924, it

34 Gotōsei, “Takeshi no oitachi no ki (4),” 28.

35 “Nihon Yūseigaku Kyōkai no zaidan hōjinka kito ni saishi Kansaiishi taikai raikai no shoken ni nozomu,” Yūseigaku 16 (May 1925), 30; Gotōsei, “T.M shi ni Kotaete,” 12; and “Yūseigaku no jidai,” Yūseigaku 50 (April 1928), 1.
narrowed its focus to studies of heredity and fecundity and added its commitment to ethnic national hygiene (minzoku eisei). Gotô promoted rational marriage and reproduction based on eugenics principles and even attempted to draft his own eugenics marriage restriction legal plan. He was particularly in favor of the prenuptial exchange of medical documents.\textsuperscript{36} Despite his lack of gendered notions, Gotô’s emphasis on marriage eugenics was obviously influenced by the earlier movement of Hiratsuka Raichô.

Gotô’s personal socioeconomic background was unusual for a person with such ambitions as publishing a journal and starting a large scale research center devoted to eugenics. In the United States and Britain, professional biologists and social scientists, who were mostly middle-class, white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, led eugenics enthusiasm.\textsuperscript{37} Eugenicists such as Francis Galton, Karl Pearson, and Charles Davenport were typical examples. Eugenics research and publication both inside and outside the Anglo-American contexts were in the hands of well-educated individuals from the middle-class, affiliated with research institutions (at least what has been studied). The Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie, “the first journal dedicated to eugenics anywhere in the world,” was founded by a German medical scientist, Alfred Ploetz in 1904.\textsuperscript{38} In

\textsuperscript{36} For example, see Shunjûsei (Gotô Ryûkichi), “Hitsuyô o sakebarettekia kekkon hô-an,” Yûseigaku 5 (June 1924), 5-8; “Kekkon w Nihon no shôrai,” Yûseigaku 18 (July 1925), 7-13; Gotôsei (Gotô Ryûkichi), “Minpô ni okeru kou’in: Toku ni yûseigakuteki kentai,” Yûseigaku 43 (September 1927), 6-10; and Shunjûsei (Gotô Ryûkichi), “Kekkon seigen hōan no hantaihika,” Yûseigaku 51 (May 1928), 2-6.


Russia, Nikolai Konstantinovich Kol’tsov created an Institute of Experimental Biology in 1914, where research on eugenics was conducted seriously by Iurii Aleksandrovich Filipchenko who had training in zoology and comparative anatomy.39

In Japan, the first attempt to institutionalize eugenics was made by scholars including Yamanouchi Shigeo and Abe Ayao, who organized the study group called Greater Japan Eugenics Society. While Tokyo Teachers’ College professor Yamanouchi had both American and Japanese doctoral degrees in botany, Abe was a plant geneticist who co-founded the Japanese Breeders’ Association (Nihon Ikushu Gakkaï), in 1915. Nagai Hisomu was also said to be part of the Greater Japan Eugenics Society.40 Nagai was a Tokyo University professor of physiology who had actively promoted eugenics ideas beginning in the 1910s.

Gotō Ryūkichi, unlike these qualified “eugenics enthusiasts,” lacked advanced academic training, was not engaged in academic research related to eugenics, and did not have a prestigious academic position nor an important government appointment.41

---

39 Mark B. Adams, “Eugenics in Russia 1900-1940,” in The Wellborn Science, 159-160. In a non-Western context, Nancy Leys Stepan states, “The founding of the first Brazilian eugenics society in early 1918 (and one in Argentina a few months later), only ten years after the equivalent British society and six years after the French, suggests how attuned scientists in the region were to European developments.” In Latin America, too, trained scientists were involved in institutionalization of eugenics. See her “The Hour of Eugenics”: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991), 36. In Republic China, however, “...eugenics never achieved a significant degree of institutional organization....” See Frank Dikötter, The Discourse of Race in Modern China (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992), 165.


41 He wrote: “I am not good enough to call myself researcher and I don’t have a presumptuous imagination that I am a social educator. I’ve just had an opportunity to skim through works in the field [of eugenics] because I happened to be involved in [the publication of] a medical journal....” He expressed that
Ironically, compared with the mental “fitness” of these elite eugenics leaders, the founder of Japan’s first eugenics journal felt he was far from “well-born.” Indeed he sarcastically described himself as “ressei (or inferior-borne),” adopted a pen name “Resseishi (a person of inferior-birth),” and called his movement “ressei undo (dysgenic movement)”; he was self-conscious about his marginality. Goto asserted that it was the instinct of the weak (jakusha) to seek any kind of improvement: Eugenics was the science which would lead to desired improvement.\textsuperscript{42,43}

At first, hierarchy-conscious\textsuperscript{44} Japanese did not respond to Goto Ryûkichi’s “scientific progressivism” favorably. The journal sold many fewer copies than expected, and he became further indebted every month.\textsuperscript{45} He asked editors of other journals to

\begin{flushright}
someone like him might not be able to make an even small difference by himself, but if he would assist scholars, intellectuals, or visionaries who were busy with other things, a modest change might be possible. See Goto, “T.M shi ni kotaete,” 12. In his letter to a woman doctor, Maeda Sonoko, he wrote “I have no authority but I... just want to dedicate my life to this science by rendering what little service I can.” See a letter from Goto Shunjû, Hyôgo, to Maeda Sonoko, (Tokyo), 26 August 1924, in “Zasshi Yûzenikkusu sha yori,” Nihon jokkai zasshi 23 (December 1924), 15-16.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{42} Goto used other pen names as well. These included “Gotosei” and “Shunjusei.” There are numerous occasions Goto used the terms “ressei,” “Resseishi,” “Resseibô (boy of inferior birth)” and “ressei undo.” See, for instance, (no title), Yûseigaku 27 (May 1926), 31; Goto, “Takeshi no oitachi no kii (1),” 8, 23, (no title), Yûseigaku 32 (October 1926), 34, (no title), Yûseigaku 33 (November 1926), 34; “Ressei undo,” Yûseigaku 34 (December 1926), 30; “Ressei undo,” Yûseigaku 35 (January 1927), 36; “Ressei mangeroku,” Yûseigaku 36 (February 1927), 24; Resseibô, “Shusa mondô,” Yûseigaku 37 (March 1927), 49-52; “Henshû dayori,” Yûseigaku 38 (April 1927), 42; “Ressei mangeroku,” Yûseigaku 39 (May 1927), 26; and (no title), Yûseigaku 39 (May 1927), 34.

\textsuperscript{43} “Ressei undo,” Yûseigaku 34 (December 1926), 30.

\textsuperscript{44} This may well be a legacy of Confucian traditions in Japan. These hierarchies include men over women, the older over the younger, the educated over the non-educated, the public sector (kan) over the private sector (min), a teacher over students, a boss over subordinates, etc. Interestingly, the Consul General of Japan in Tokyo. According to him, “official contempt for the common people” was a prevalent trait among the Japanese. This is another variation of the kan over min hierarchy. See “Japanese Traits,” Eugenical News 1.11 (November 1916), 82-83.

\textsuperscript{45} For example, in 1926 he stated that his goal was to increase the number of the members (subscribers) up to 500 and the journal had been losing money from the beginning. See (no title), Yûseigaku 31 (September 1926), 11.
arrange a publication exchange program, hoping that this would expose his journal to their readers and increase the number of subscribers.\textsuperscript{46} He tried to recruit subscribers from medical practitioners in Kansai by making hundreds of free copies available at their annual meetings.\textsuperscript{47} He also sent free copies to many eugenics-minded scholars begging them to contribute articles to the journal.\textsuperscript{48} They, however, questioned Gotô’s credibility and often ignored his repeated requests. They preferred to publish in more professional journals or mainstream media.\textsuperscript{49} Monetarily, there was little incentive for them: Gotô was unable to offer much compensation for a submission.\textsuperscript{50} Consequently, Gotô’s journal carried many articles that had been originally presented or published elsewhere.\textsuperscript{51} Other articles were written by non-specialists—who did not engage in research in eugenics-related fields—including Gotô himself.

\textsuperscript{46} For instance, see “Kou kôkan attarashi shuppanbutsu,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 11 (December 1924), 49; “Shakai to shuppankai,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 19 (August 1925), 42; and “Kizô to kôkan,” \textit{Nihon joikai zasshi} 22 (June 1924), 58.

\textsuperscript{47} In 1924 Gotô donated 500 copies while making 1,000 copies available in the following year. See “Hôkoka dai-ichigô hôjin undô no keika,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 19 (August 1925), 29-30.

\textsuperscript{48} “Chûkan hôkoku hôjin undô sono go no keika,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 20 (September 1925), 31; and (no title). \textit{Yuiseigaku} 27 (May 1926), 31.

\textsuperscript{49} Gotô was dissapointed by the lack of support from elite eugenists and intellectuals. See “Hachimen reiryû,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 9 (October 1924), 34; “Beikoku yori no kippô,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 11 (December 1924), 22; and “Yuzenukkusu no rekishiteki kôshin,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 14 (March 1925), 6.

\textsuperscript{50} “Henshû dayori,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 25 (March 1926), 30. He commented that without paying, it would be very difficult to obtain good original articles. See “Kyôkai sonogo no keika,” \textit{Yuiseigaku} 23 (December 1925), 6.

\textsuperscript{51} For example, Nagai Hisomu’s “Seimei ni kansuru shisô no hensen,” was originally presented at the 14th Annual Meeting of the Medical Society of Kansai. See \textit{Yuiseigaku} 6 (July 1924), 5-7. Yanaibara Tadao's “Jakusha hogô no bunka-teki kiso,” was reprinted from \textit{Bunka no kiso}. See \textit{Yuiseigaku} 15 (April 1925), 20-23. Teruoka Gítô’s “Eiseigaku no shiteitô kenkai ni tsuite,” had been previously published in \textit{Shakai igaku zasshi} 463. See \textit{Yuiseigaku} 21 (October 1925), 24-28.
According to his plan, the journal would be comprised of three types of articles: academic articles, socio-philosophical essays, and popular miscellaneous articles.\textsuperscript{52} Obviously, his biggest problem was the shortage of “hard” articles based on scientific research. The issues published in the first year carried a translation series of India’s manual of erotic love, \textit{Kamasutra}, though the editors did not dare to print certain sexually explicit passages.\textsuperscript{53} Other pages were used to introduce readers’ amateurish poems, which had very little to do with eugenics.

Gotô originally counted on funds which a certain individual had verbally committed prior to the establishment of the journal. Unfortunately they never materialized. Instead, he continued the publication with his own money.

Eventually Gotô came up with an excellent idea to break the vicious cycle of low credibility, weak content, limited readership, and insufficient funds. With the help of close friends capable of writing English, Gotô wrote the following letter to the leading American eugenicist, Charles B. Davenport, the director of the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor, NY.\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{52} (no title), \textit{Yûseigaku} 31 (September 1926), 11.

\textsuperscript{53} The series “Indo seihen Kàmasutora” was carried in \textit{Yûseigaku} 1 (January 1924) through \textit{Yûseigaku} 10 (November 1924). Though it was not directly related to eugenics, it was relevant to the studies of sexual desire, love, and marriage life, which were included as subjects to be explored by the journal when the series started.

Dear sir,

Since we read the Japanese translation of your “Heredity in Relation to Eugenics”, we have been very much interested in the subject, and continued to study it.

We take this opportunity to pay our full-hearted respects to you [sic]. Recently several of us have begun to publish a monthly magazine the “eugenics” in order to spread the knowledge in Japan.

Would [sic] you [sic] be kind enough to let us take the liberty of writing to you [sic], hoping sincerely your help and encouragement in a [sic] respects [sic], as we have little experience in this line of magazine business?

......

I am your faithful R. Goto.

June 15th, 1924

Upon learning that his book had been translated into Japanese and had generated interest among the people in the East, Davenport was quick to respond and willing to give practical advice to Gotô in his effort to organize a better eugenics society. Davenport also agreed to exchange publications mutually. In his letter, he referred to “Dr. Laughlin [sic].” Harry H. Laughlin was Davenport’s right-hand man at Cold Spring


57 A letter from Charles B. Davenport, (Cold Spring Harbor, NY, USA), to R. Goto, Hyōgo, 2 July 1924, in “Yūzenikkusu no rekishiteki kōshin no ichi,” Yūsei 14 (March 1925), 6. The receipt of Davenport’s letter was first reported in the October 1924 issue of the journal, see “Hachimen reiryū,” 34.

58 Ibid.
Harbor, and assistant director of the Eugenics Record Office at the time of this correspondence.\textsuperscript{59} Gotô received a letter from Laughlin as well; it was intended to respond to questions Gotô had asked in his letter to Davenport.\textsuperscript{60}

Gotô published part of their exchange of letters as a series “Historic Correspondence over Eugenics” in the journal beginning February 1925. The letters from preeminent U.S. eugenicists certainly had a “legitimizing” effect on Gotô’s enterprise. They were notably successful in applying eugenics theories to human society. Their proposed eugenics measures—immigration restrictions, marriage restrictions, and sterilization—enjoyed popular and legislative support in the United States and served as a model for many eugenicists elsewhere.\textsuperscript{61} The \textit{Yûseigaku} began publishing the translation of current news and articles from the Eugenics Record Office’s \textit{Eugenical News} and other pamphlets periodically sent by Davenport and his colleagues. Gotô proudly reported that the \textit{Eugenical News} printed a couple of small articles regarding the Japan Eugenics Society.\textsuperscript{62} In his letter to Dr. Maeda Sonoko, he explained that he was pleasantly surprised that the Carnegie Institution in the United States (Davenport’s Station for the Experimental Study of Evolution and Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring Harbor were

\textsuperscript{59} Kevles, \textit{In the Name of Eugenics}, 102; and a letter from Harry H. Laughlin, (Cold Spring Harbor, NY, USA), to Gotô Ryûkichi, Kyôgo, 8 July 1924, in “Nihon Yûsei Gakkai no rekishiteki kôshin no ni,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 15 (April 1925), 6. The receipt of this letter was first reported in “Beikoku no hanzai shiken: Idengakujô no jûyô mondai,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 9 (October 1924), 7.

\textsuperscript{60} A letter from Laughlin to Gotô, 8 July 1924, in “Nihon Yûsei Gakkai no rekishiteki kôshin no ni,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 15 (April 1925), 6.


part of the Carnegie Institution of Washington) was willing to keep sending important reference books and documents on eugenics. Goto confided that his journal was planning to print translations of these valuable materials one by one.63

By taking full advantage of support from these American eugenicists, Goto unfolded his grand plan to the public in mid-1925. The publisher of the Yuseigaku, the Japan Eugenics Society, was initially an entity without an organization; it was Goto’s one-man editorial office at home.64 Readers sometimes asked questions about the regulations, membership, and activities of the Society.65 Sensing the need for a better organization in order to further promote eugenics, Goto undertook an effort to transform his society into a foundation equipped with branches for scientific research, genealogical research, publication, and consultation.66 In February 1925, he began drafting a blueprint for the institutionalization of the Japan Eugenics Foundation (Nihon Yuseigaku Kyokai).67 He called for support from scholars whose expertise was closely related to

63 A letter from Goto to Maeda, 26 August 1924, in Nihon joikai yasashi 23 (December 1924), 15.

64 Goto confessed that the Society was concentrating on the journal publication at the moment but he intended to develop the society into a full-fledged eugenics research institution. See “Henshū dayori,” Yuseigaku 11 (December 1924), 52.

65 “Hachimen reiryū,” 34.


eugenics by sending out the printed platform of the foundation. He estimated that perhaps a couple of million yen was necessary to carry out the plan, but he set an immediate goal of 300,000 yen. He then asked for donations from those who were interested in the cause and tried to increase the number of subscribers and advertisers. In addition to Gotô’s personal visits to prospective contributors for possible donations, each subscriber was supposed to pay four yen per year. Some people came forward and contributed a total of several hundred yen by summer 1925. Yet, the gap between the ideal and the reality was again much greater than Gotô had anticipated.

By summer, however, Gotô was able to mobilize eugenics sympathizers. He printed the names of about seventy proposers (hokkinin) for the establishment of the foundation. These individuals included researchers in medicine, zoology, sociology, agriculture, hygiene; medical practitioners, hygiene bureaucrats; lawyers; social workers; and journalists. Yamanouchi Shigeo and the co-founders of the Greater Japan Eugenics Society members, such as Abe Ayao (geneticist), Ichikawa Genzô (educator), and Kaneko Tadakazu (educator), were willing to list themselves as proposers (hokkinin). Tokyo University professors including Nagai Hisomu (physiology), Miyake Kiichi (plant genetics), and Ishikawa Chiyomatsu (zoology) were also among the proposers.

---

68 “Nihon Yūseigaku Kyōkai no daiichi sensen dōhō minzoku no shōrai o urenu mono wa kitare,” Yūseigaku 15 (April 1925), 33; and “Kifukiin boshū zaidaa hôjin seisuritsu shakin,” Yūseigaku 21 (October 1925), 28.

69 His personal funds were about to run out and he was constantly afraid of not being able to publish the next issue. For example, see “Henshū dayori,” Yūseigaku 14 (March 1925), 52; “Henshū dayori,” Yūseigaku 15 (April 1925), 52; “Hôjin undō no keika ni kanshite goaisatsu o mōshiagenasu,” Yūseigaku 16 (May 1925), 68; and “Kinkoku,” Yūseigaku 24 (February 1926), 24.

70 “Hôkoku dai-ichigô hôjin undô no keika hôkoku,” Yūseigaku 19 (August 1925) 32.
Geographically, Gotō drew much support from western Japan (about seventy from western cities such as Kyoto, Osaka, and Kōbe as opposed to seventeen from Tokyo). Since Gotō’s editorial office was located in the area and he had been acquainted with local medical practitioners, strongest support from the Kansai area seemed natural. Along with thirty others, Yamanouchi, Kaneko, Abe, Nagai, and Ishikawa all agreed to contribute to the journal. For several months, Gotō continued his painstaking effort to gain support for his eugenics movement.

The foundation campaign was a failure, but the journal was strengthened. While it got more individuals involved, it never generated enough money to establish a full-fledged research center with eugenics-popularizing functions. Actually, many of the newly recruited contributors remained nominal supporters and never wrote a piece for the journal. Gotō openly stated that he would love to have Nagai Hisomu’s original writings. Yet, the journal became more accepted by specialists, and the number of subscribers rose. Gotō was able to convince more researchers to publish their original works in his journal. For example, one of the pioneers in the field of eugenics science, Unno Yukinori (Kōtoku) (1879-1955), began contributing essays to the journal. A Christian and self-claimed scholar of evolution theories, Unno published Nihon jinshu kaizōron [On the reconstruction of the Japanese race] in 1910 and Kōkokusaku to shite

---

72 “Hōin undō sono go no keika,” Yūseigaku 21 (October 1925), 30-31.
73 “Atarashii shuppanbutsu,” Yūseigaku 10 (November 1924), 17.
no jinshu kaizō [Race reconstruction as a means of restoring the nation] in 1911.

Following the publication of these two books, he left Japan to study sociology at the University of Chicago for a year. 74 By the end of the decade, however, Unno announced his skepticism towards the effectiveness of eugenics measures. 75 When Gotō began the journal, Unno was teaching social work, social policy and sociology at Bukkyō University in Kyoto. 76 Unno responded to Gotō’s request and began writing a few essays. 77 Moreover, Nakadate Kôkichi, who was working for a public health section of the Southern Manchurian Railways, submitted his dissertation to the Keiô University and received his Ph.D. in medicine in late 1925. 78 According to Gotō, this was probably the first dissertation focusing on the subject of ethnic national hygiene: Nakadate measured body sizes and constitutions of Japanese children both in Japan and Manchuria and Chinese children in Manchuria and compared their patterns of growth. 79 By adding the

74 Since Yamanouchi Shigeo was also in Chicago between 1911 and 1913, it was possible that they were acquainted with each other as fellow Japanese students or researchers at the university. But available sources do not indicate they had a close relationship.

75 Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no yûseigaku, 95-97.

76 Bukkyō University, a Buddhist institution, was later renamed as Ryûkoku University.

77 Sakai Yasuharu, “Unno Kōtoku no shôgai to bunken,” Ryûkoku Daigaku ronshû 389 and 390 (combined issue) (1969), 479-491. Unno Kōtoku, “Seizonken to sanijken,” Yûseigaku 17 (June 1925), 7-10; Unno Kōtoku, “Kodomo no kazu to kodomo no shitsu,” Yûseigaku 19 (August 1925), 7-19; Unno Kōtoku, “Yûseigaku no honshitsu to kaigen,” Yûseigaku 20 (September 1925), 7-12; Unno Kōtoku, “Yûseigaku ni kanshite waga kokumia ni tsugu (1),” Yûseigaku 21 (October 1925), 7-12; and Unno Kōtoku, “Yûseigaku ni kanshite waga kokumin ni tsugu (2),” Yûseigaku 22 (November 1925), 7-11. According to Sakai, Unno completely stopped writing about eugenics after 1926. More on Unno, see Katô Hiroshi, Fukushiteki ningenkan no shakashi: Yûsei shisô to hikô, seishinbô o tôshite (Kyoto: Kôyô Shobô, 1996), 379-381. Katô, however, incorrectly assumes that Unno wrote two books on eugenics after returning from the United States.

78 “Minzoku eisei no hakushi renbun,” Yûseigaku 22 (November 1925), 12.

79 Ibid.
Japanese pupils who were growing up in Manchuria, the study intended to evaluate both hereditary and environmental factors in school children’s physical maturing process. Gotô, representing the Japan Eugenics Foundation, asked for his permission to print this work. Nakadate agreed, and the excerpts of his research began being published in June 1926 as a series.

A new approach can also be observed in the March 1927 issue of *Yûseigaku*. It featured articles on a single theme: the negative effects of alcohol. The Japan Eugenics Society attached a form for readers to fill out concerning the drinking habits of their extended families. Based on the Society’s own genealogical data collection, modeled after the example of the American Eugenics Record Office, the journal began publishing reports on the dysgenic effects of drinking in June. The volume featuring “eugenics and alcohol” was followed by other special editions exploring such topics as “Criminality and its Heredity” (July), “Deviant Personality” (August), “Marriage and Heredity” (September), “Eugenics: Past and Present” (October), and “Beauty and Health” (November).

Translations of useful articles and information, some original research works, essays by better-known eugenicists, and interesting special editions attracted more readers. The circulation improved from fewer than 500 copies in 1926 to 2,000 in

---

80 Ibid., and “Kyôkai no sôritsu unô,“ *Yûseigaku* 22 (November 1925), 6. He set up a preparation office for the Foundation (Zaidan Hôjin Nihon Yûseigaku Kyôkai sôritsu kari jumusho) and sometimes used the name Japan Eugenics Foundation (which would be established soon in his mind).

81 Nakadate Kôkichi, “Zai-Man Hôjin to Ni-Ssi-jin to no hatsuiku hikaku,” *Yûseigaku* 28 (June 1926), 13-17; *Yûseigaku* 29 (July 1926), 15-17; *Yûseigaku* 30 (August 1926), 19-21; *Yûseigaku* 31 (September 1926), 9-11; *Yûseigaku* 32 (October 1926), 11-14; *Yûseigaku* 33 (November 1926), 11-14; “Ni-Ssi gakudô no taishitsu chôsa,” *Yûseigaku* 34 (December 1926), 22-24; “Ni-Ssi gakudô no keitai to taishitsu to no kankei hikaku,” *Yûseigaku* 35 (January 1927), 5-7; “Ni-Ssi gakudô no shippei chôsa.” *Yûseigaku* 36 (February 1927), 5-7; and *Yûseigaku* 38 (April 1927), 25-28.
However, advertisements increased only slightly from approximately 8.5 pages in 1924 to 11.5 pages in 1929. While he charged 45 yen for a one-page ad in 1924, he charged 50 yen in early 1927. Intriguingly, he cut the fee drastically in June 1927; now, a one-page ad would cost 40% less at 30 yen. Most advertisers were Osaka-based pharmaceutical companies, which tried to market their products including serums, vaccines, vitamin pills, and drugs for para relief, asthma, bronchitis, and venereal diseases. In the late 1920s, advertisement for other journals such as Tsūzoku igaku [Popular medicine], Kodomo no seiki [The century of children], and Haha to ko [Mother and children] began being printed. At the beginning, Gotô was forced to rely on advertisement income, but the advertisement fee cut in 1927 indicates that the financial situation of the journal was somewhat stabilized by the increase in subscribers and some donations resulting from the effort to make the society a foundation in 1925.

Gotô envisioned establishing an extensive eugenics research foundation with divisions in academic and genealogical research, publication, and consultation. Though it never materialized—primarily because of a lack of financial resouces, Gotô did make some organizational changes in the Japan Eugenics Society. In 1928, he created separate

---

82 (No title), Yūseigaku 31 (September 1926), 11. Although the number of the subscribers was less than 500 in 1926, Gotô kept sending journal copies to more than 300 individuals and organizations in hope of their turning to be subscribers one day. See “Chūkanshokokuhōjin undō sono go no keika,” Yūseigaku 20 (September 1925), 30; and Shunjūsei (Gotô Ryūkichi), “Binbō to yūseigaku,” 2.

83 However, some special issues—often new year issues—had more advertisement pages.

84 For example see advertisement pages in Yūseigaku 59 (January 1929), 4-Kō, 5-Kō, and 30. Gotô was against birth control for non-eugenics purposes, see the special edition criticizing birth control (Sanji seigen hihangō), Yūseigaku 47 (January 1928). See also his cynical writing against birth control in “Sanji seigen gojitsudan,” Yūseigaku 35 (January 1927), 18.
divisions apart from the publishing division: Dairibu (Office of Agency) and Sōdanbu (Office of Consultation). The Office of Agency marketed contraceptive devices such as pessaries and condoms as well as a celluloid calendar called jutai goyomi (a conception calendar) for their manufacturers.\textsuperscript{85} The Consultation Office would answer questions about birth control for those who might have hereditary mental or physical problems.\textsuperscript{86} It also extended its service by recommending good doctors to those who needed them.\textsuperscript{87} Gotô tried to diversify his operations and improve the Japan Eugenics Society/Foundation.\textsuperscript{88}

In 1928, he noted that the era of eugenics had arrived much earlier than he had anticipated\textsuperscript{89} perhaps because the Japanese Red Cross Museum in Tokyo organized a large-scale exhibition on ethnic national hygiene in May. The Red Cross, with the assistance of governmental offices, universities, hospitals, and other experts, visually presented population statistics, heredity laws, hereditary diseases, degeneration caused by infectious diseases, and genealogies of some Japanese families producing many talented individuals. Although Gotô was not involved in organizing this event, its contents were exactly what he had been promoting. Once a week, a speaker delivered a

\textsuperscript{85} For example, see advertisements of the Office of Agency in Yūseigaku 38 (April 1927), 48; and Yūseigaku 57 (November 1928), 22.

\textsuperscript{86} See an advertisement of the Consultation Office in Yūseigaku 38 (April 1927), 4.

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 47.

\textsuperscript{88} According to the ads, the Offices of Agency and Consultation belonged to the Japan Foundation of Eugenics but the journal was still published by the Japan Society of Eugenics.

\textsuperscript{89} "Yūseigaku no jidai," Yūseigaku 50 (April 1928), 1.
lecture on ethnic national hygiene. A popular lecture series was something that Gotô always wanted to organize. The Red Cross exhibition was well-attended: in addition to invited guests, who included journalists and educators, about six hundred fifty people visited the museum every day during the three-week period. Since the president of the Red Cross was a member of the imperial family, Gotô must have felt that what he had promoted finally received the official seal of approval.90

In January 1929, Gotô established a second journal, Kansai jiji, or Kansai Medical News. It was a general medical news publication that seems to have sold fairly well among medical practitioners in the area.91 The success was a mixed blessing: it generated money,92 a part of which might have been used to support Yûseigaku in case of financial difficulties; on the other hand, the new bimonthly publication took a fair amount of time and energy from the once dedicated eugenics editor.93

---

90 As for the 1928 Red Cross Museum exhibition on ethnic national hygiene, it was held between May 1 and 21, see Sankókanbo 3 (Minzoku Eisei Tenrankan gô) (June 1928). The museum held other exhibitions on such related topics as mental health (1928), women’s health (1931), marriage hygiene (1933), and Japanese ethnic national hygiene (1939). Information on these topics was further disseminated taking advantage of the Red Cross Museum’s loan collections, many local organizations such as schools, hospitals and department stores held lesser-scale exhibitions on these themes, see Tanaka Satoshi, Eisei tenrankan no yokubô (Tokyo: Seikyûsha, 1994), 24-28 and 32-34.

91 This journal was published twice a month. By the end of 1929, the number of paid subscribers became seven hundred fifty. It seems that he printed 6,500 copies for each issue but they were not sold out. See “Henshû kôki,” Kansai jiji 24 (20 December 1929), 34.

92 Ibid.

93 Ibid.; and (no title), Yûseigaku 73 (May 1930), 36; and (no title), Yûseigaku 75 (July 1930), 36. See also “Yoteki,” Yûseigaku 206 (April 1941), 24.
5.4 Eugenics and Immigration: U.S. Race Politics

5.4.1 Introduction

Gotô used the authority of American eugenicists to gain additional support from elite Japanese eugenicists for his eugenics movement. In 1925, he began the campaign for the foundation immediately after publicizing his correspondence with Charles Davenport and Harry Laughlin. These American eugenicists, who were willing to help Gotô, were involved in the development of immigration policies excluding the “racially undesirable.” To put Gotô’s solicitation for advice and subsequent reaction in perspective, we will examine American nativism towards Asians and the roles that Davenport and Laughlin played in the formulation of 1924 Immigration Act which prohibited Japanese immigration while permitting the annual entry of nearly 30,000 immigrants from Ireland, Italy, and Poland.94

The tension between the United States and Japan over the race issue was not a new phenomenon. Especially on the West Coast, which had a larger number of Japanese immigrants, initiatives had been taken to exclude Japanese laborers, to segregate “whites” from “Asiatics” in public schools, and to deny land ownership to Japanese immigrants.

---

beginning about 1900. As the number of laborers from Japan grew, some white workers saw the Japanese as a threat in the competition for employment, for they were “willing” to work for lower wages. As a result, the antagonism between the two “racial” groups intensified.\(^5\) The regional race antipathy led to national and even international discussions. Under these circumstances, the Gentlemen’s Agreement was forged from negotiations between President Theodore Roosevelt and the Japanese government in late 1907 and early 1908, with the understanding that Japan would voluntarily restrain its laborers from emigrating to the United States by not issuing passports.\(^6\) Prior to the agreement, Japan had won a war against China in 1895 and another against Russia in 1905. It also concluded a prestigious diplomatic alliance with Britain, whose national power was at its height, in 1902. Japan had begun expanding its empire by colonizing such Asian territories as Taiwan, Southern Sakhalin and Korea. The Gentlemen’s Agreement was significant: By avoiding a written law similar to one imposed on China by the United States, Japan maintained the pride of a major world power.\(^7\) The Agreement was, however, followed by California’s restrictive land law of 1913, which

---


\(^6\) Roger Daniels describes the nature of the so-called Gentlemen’s Agreement: “As this was an executive agreement, it required no congressional ratification, and, although its terms were generally known, the notes themselves were not published until 1939.” See Daniels, *Asian America*, 125. About the controversy of this arrangement, see Roger Daniels, *The Politics of Prejudice: The Anti-Japanese Movement in California and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), 102-103; Sandra C. Taylor, *Advocate of Understanding*: *Sidney Gulick and the Search for Peace with Japan* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1984), 160-161; Wakatsuki Yasuo, *Hainichi no rekishi: Amerika ni okeru Nihonjin imin* (Tokyo: Chūō Koronsha, 1972), 179-182.

\(^7\) About Japan’s pride as a major nation and American sensitiveness not to hurt this pride, see Wakatsuki, *Hainichi no rekishi*, 158 and 168; Daniels, *Asian America*, 141; Taylor, *Advocate*, 80, and 216.
made it illegal for aliens ineligible for citizenship (i.e. Asians) to own real property.98

This affected the livelihood of the Japanese who wished to settle in the U.S.

5.4.2 Racial Equality at the Paris Peace Conference

In response to the repeated humiliations of these discriminatory treatments, the
Japanese government decided to insist on the principle of equality among races in
international relations at the 1919 Paris (Versailles) Peace Conference after World War
1.99 Viscount Ishii Kikujirō, the Japanese ambassador to the United States, personally
contacted U.S. President Woodrow Wilson, the architect of the League of Nations and the
champion of justice. Moreover, Ishii made a public address before the Japan Society in
New York on March 14, 1919, arguing that Japan must have racial equality in the League

98 Takaki, Strangers, 200-205. Other anti-Asian legislation included the Asiatic-barred-zone provision
of the general immigration law of 1917. See Husband, “Report of the Commissioner General of
Immigration,” 29-30. By this provision, immigrants from a designated geographical area which covers
Asia were banned except Japanese and Filipinos. While the Japanese were exempt because of the
Gentlemen’s Agreement, the Filipinos were American nationals after the 1898 Spanish-American War.

99 For unpublished sources at the Foreign Ministry Archives, see “Kokusai Renmei jinshu sabetsu
teppai,” 3 Files (2.4.2.2.). About a fifth of these documents are available in print as Gaimushō, “Pari kōwa
kaigi ni okeru jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai ikken,” Nihon gaikō mono 1919 vol. 3, part 1 (Tokyo:
Gaimushō, 1971), 436-515. For studies on this subject, see Saitō Takashi, “Pari kōwa kaigi to Nihon,”
Kokusai seiji 6 (1958), 105-117; Ieki Masaru, “Pari heiwā kaigi to jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai,”
Kokusai seiji 23 (1963), 44-58; Mamiya Kunio, “Okuma Shigenobu to jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai:
1919 nen Pari kōwa kaigi to no kanren ni oite,” Waseda Daigaku Shi 21 (1989), 213-237; Wakatsuki,
Hajinichi no rekishi, 137-154; and NHK “Dokyumento Shōwa” Shuzai-han, ed., Dokyumento Shōwa:
Sekai e no tōjō, vol. 1, Benjatsuyu no nisshōki: Ittōkoku Nippon (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1986). In
English, see Paul Gordon Lauren, “Human Rights in History: Diplomacy and Racial Equality at the Paris
Peace Conference,” Diplomatic History 2.1 (1978), 257-278; and Harris Bras’ unpublished paper, “At the
Parting of the Ways: The United States, Japan, and the Racial Equality Amendment at the Versailles Peace
Conference, 1919.” Paper Prepared for the Midwest Conference on East Asian History and Culture,
Columbus, Ohio, April 25-27, 1997. Recently I have learned that Naoko Shimazu’s Japan, Race, and
delегates demanded “equality among races,” what the Japanese wanted was basically the elimination of
Western racial discriminations against the Japanese; and the Japanese diplomats were not so eager to ally
with other “racial” minorities such as African Americans, Liberiаns, colonial subjects in the Dutch East
Indies, and native Canadians for this cause. See Asahi Shinbunsha, ed Nihon gaikō hiroku (Tokyo: Asahi
Shinbunsha, 1934).
of Nations.\textsuperscript{100} Contrary to his intention to "generate public support and put pressure on Wilson,"\textsuperscript{101} however, his speech was negatively viewed as interference by Japan in American domestic affairs. Various senators argued that such a principle might cause a revision in American immigration policies and aggravate the situation in the Pacific states.\textsuperscript{102} Sensing the volatile nature of the issue, the Japanese delegate asked to amend the Preamble to the Covenant, only to "lay down a general principle as regards the relationship at least between the nationalities forming the League but not to "encroach on the internal affairs of any nation."\textsuperscript{103} Yet, Japan's proposal was used as fuel in attacks on President Wilson by Republican senators in the U.S.\textsuperscript{104} In Paris it won the majority of votes of the League of Nations Commission on April 11.\textsuperscript{105} However, Wilson announced that the amendment could not be adopted because it had failed to receive unanimous support. Since there had been precedents of items adopted without unanimous approval, Wilson's ruling was seen as arbitrary, questionable, and

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{100} For his speech and response to it, see documents 383-6, 391, and 412 in Gaimushō, "Pari kōwa kaigi ni okeru jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai ikken," 473-479, 482-483, and 511-513.
\textsuperscript{101} Lauren, "Human Rights in History," 267-268.
\textsuperscript{102} Document 383 in Gaimushō, "Pari kōwa kaigi ni okeru jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai ikken," 473-475.
\textsuperscript{103} Document 406 in Gaimushō, "Pari kōwa kaigi ni okeru jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai ikken," 502.
\textsuperscript{104} Document 412 in Gaimushō, "Pari kōwa kaigi ni okeru jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai ikken," 511-513.
\end{flushleft}
uncharacteristic of him. In Japan, politicians, intellectuals, and the masses all shared disappointment, frustration, and resentment. Some people organized groups to protest such international race policies.\textsuperscript{106}

5.4.3 Immigration Restrictionists and Eugenics

In the United States the theory of eugenics had already been linked to immigration issues by the early twentieth century. One of the American cities that had been receiving an overwhelming number of “new immigrants” from southern and eastern Europe was Boston. Not being Nordic or Anglo-Saxon, the so-called “new immigrants” were not welcomed by most elite Americans from the old stock. It was in this city where three young men of the Harvard class of 1889 formed the Immigration Restriction League in 1894.\textsuperscript{107} Its leaders included Prescott F. Hall and Robert DeCourcy Ward. Meanwhile eugenics found an institutional base in the American Breeders’ Association. It was established by agricultural breeders and university biologists who were interested in

\textsuperscript{106} About the Jinshu Sabetsu Teppai Kisei Dōmei (Alliance for the Abolition of Racial Discrimination), see documents 356, 360, 361, 362, 379, 391, and 399 in Gaimushō, “Pari kōwa kaigi ni okenu jinshu sabetsu teppai mondai ikken.” About the Kōwa Mondai Yūshiki Taikai (Volunteer meeting on the Peace Conference), see documents 393 and 399 in the same Gaimushō publication.

\textsuperscript{107} About the establishment of the League, see Barbara Solomen’s Ancestors and Immigrants: A Changing New England Tradition (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), 82-102. See also Ladmerer, “Genetics,” 61-62.
Mendelian genetics in 1903. A few years later Charles B. Davenport became secretary of the Association’s Section on Eugenics, chaired by biologist and chancellor of Stanford University David Starr Jordan.\textsuperscript{108}

Davenport was a man of exceptional organizational skills. After receiving a Ph.D. in 1892 from Harvard, he taught biology at his alma mater and at Chicago. Then he persuaded the Carnegie Institution of Washington to support research in experimental biology. Receiving a generous endowment, Davenport came to assume the directorship of the newly established Station for Experimental Evolution at Cold Spring Harbor on Long Island in 1904. Furthermore, in 1910 he succeeded in securing a large amount of money from a philanthropist.\textsuperscript{109} It was used to found a Eugenics Record Office next to the Station. Davenport, as resident director of the Office, appointed Harry H. Laughlin superintendent.

\textsuperscript{108} Solomon’s Ancestors, 147. In his memoir, David Starr Jordan describes how he came to serve as chairman of this section. His view on eugenics and immigration/emigration can be found in a speech delivered in the home of the Duchess of Marlborough, London. “The Eugenics of War: Its Effect Principally on Heredity, and Wholly Pernicious—Military Training Cannot Compensate because It Has No Effect on the Germ Plasm,” American Breeders’ Magazine 4.3 (1913), 140-147. Jordan would become a chair of a committee at the Second Race Betterment Conference which would be held at San Francisco in August 1915. See “Race Betterment Conference,” Journal of Heredity 6.7 (July 1915), 313.

Frances Hassencahl, who has analyzed the rhetoric of Harry H. Laughlin, focusing on his role in the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, finds that in the spring of 1911, "Prescott Hall wrote to his old classmate from Harvard, Charles Davenport, asking for information on the work of the Eugenics Record Office and expressing his interest in sterilization and immigration control." On December 29, 1911, the Eugenics Section of the American Breeders' Association met in Washington, D.C. There, one of the Boston restrictionist leaders, Robert Ward, read a paper, "Our Immigration Laws from the View Point of Eugenics." It began with provocative questions: "How far do our present immigration laws enable us to exclude those aliens who are physically, mentally, and morally undesirable for parenthood; those whose coming here will tend to produce an inferior rather than a superior American race; those who, in other words, are eugenically unfit for race culture?" Renewed contacts among some members of the Harvard class of 1889 and Ward's strong message appears to have led the Section to organize a permanent committee on immigration which aimed at effecting legislation to select immigrants with desirable heredity. While exclusionists were attracted by

110 See Letter, Prescott F. Hall to Charles B. Davenport, May 14, 1911, Davenport Papers, quoted in Frances Hassencahl, "Harry H. Laughlin, 'Expert Eugenics Agent' for the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 1921 to 1931" (Ph. D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1970), 165.


scientific legitimation of their argument, scientists saw the union of conservative immigration legislation and eugenics as “a golden opportunity to get people in general to talk eugenics.”

Their expertise and initiative in immigration restriction and their personal connection with Davenport made Prescott Hall and Robert Ward “natural” leaders of the Immigration Committee of the American Breeders’ Association’s Eugenics Section. In 1914, Hall took the position of chairman, while Ward had been secretary since the founding of the committee in 1912. In early 1914, the American Breeders’ Association renamed itself the American Genetic Association to describe its activities better.

5.4.4 The 1914 Conference on Race Betterment

The year 1914 also saw the first national conference organized by the Race Betterment Foundation. It was founded and endowed by John H. Kellogg, Superintendent of the Battle Creek Sanitarium in Michigan. The conference drew many prominent figures working in the field of eugenics, including Davenport, Laughlin, and Ward. The organizers invited a number of physicians, university professors, social workers, journalists and Christian ministers. Various issues were addressed; among which

---

113 Letter, Irving Fisher to Charles B. Davenport, March 2, 1912, Davenport Papers, quoted in Hassencahl, “Harry H. Laughlin,” 166. Irving Fisher was a Yale economist and public health advocate. He was known for his leadership in the American Eugenics Society.
was “Eugenics and Immigration.” Two speakers dealt with the subject specifically. One was Ward and the other was Sidney L. Gulick (1860-1945), an enthusiastic member of Naruse Jinzō’s peace organization Association Concordia. 114

A professor of Climatology at Harvard University and leader of the Immigration Restriction League, Robert Ward gave a paper entitled “Race Betterment and Our Immigrant Laws.” He defined the concept of “national eugenics” as encompassing the prevention of breeding by unfit natives and the prevention of the immigration of the unfit alien. The disturbing fact was, he argued, that the selection of immigrants was in the hands of profit-oriented steamship agents and brokers in Europe, Asia, and Africa rather than in the hands of the American government. He then called for firm immigration legislation in order to determine the character of the American race of the future. 115

Along the same line, in his earlier writing, Ward had lamented the presumed low quality of the “new immigrants” who were brought to the United States by transportation companies. In his discussion, he extended his disdain not only to the “strains of Latin, or of Slav,” but also to those “of Asiatic blood.”

It is clear that the race migration now going on from Europe and Asia to the United States is to a considerable extent not a “natural” movement, but an “artificial selection,” as it were, of some eugenically undesirable elements of the


old-world populations. It is evident that a dangerously large fraction of our present immigration is as unfit on the farm as in the city; that it is of low vitality and poor physique; and often diseased and mentally deficient.  

He then continued:

The days of a dominant Anglo-Saxon immigration are over, forever. From a trickling rivulet, forty years ago, when it furnished less than one per cent of our alien arrivals, Southern and Eastern European immigration has increased until it now numbers about 70 per cent of the total. It has become a flood, and the flood is increasing. Asia is contributing more each year.

At the Battle Creek conference, a paper “Race Betterment and America’s Oriental Problem” by Sidney Gulick followed Ward’s presentation. At the time, Gulick was affiliated with a Protestant university, Dôshisha, in Kyoto, Japan. He was a missionary and scientist-theologist. He came from a prominent American missionary family. Three generations of Gulicks spread the Christian faith in the Pacific and East Asia. Once he wrote, “my missionary tendency is I suppose somewhat hereditary.” Sidney’s uncle, Oramel Hinckley Gulick, had done missionary work in Niigata, Japan in the mid 1880s just before Naruse Jinzô was sent there. Though he was not a missionary, Sidney’s younger brother, Luther Halsey Gulick, had met Naruse. Luther was the physical

\[116\] Robert DeC. Ward, “Eugenic Immigration: The American Race of the Future and the Responsibility of the Southern States for its Formation, the ‘Survival of the Fittest,’” American Breeders’ Magazine 4.2 (1913), 98. This was originally read at the ninth annual meeting of the American Breeders’ Association, Columbia, South Carolina, January 24, 1913.

\[117\] Ibid., 99.

\[118\] Quoted in Taylor, Advocate, 16.
education expert from whom Naruse Jinzō learned medico-hygienic aspects of exercises in the 1890s. In the Race Betterment conference, Luther co-presented a paper with his wife.\textsuperscript{119}

After graduating from Dartmouth College and Union Theological Seminary, Sidney joined the family in Japan as a young missionary. That was where his interest in the theory of evolution was stimulated by another uncle, John Thomas Gulick (1823-1923), who also spent over three decades in China and Japan as a missionary. John was an evolutionist well-known for his studies on land snails. He published his papers in such prominent journals as Nature, Journal of the Linnean Society (London) and Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London. He met and communicated with the leading evolutionists of the era: Charles Darwin and Alfred Russell Wallace.\textsuperscript{120} He also corresponded with Francis Galton, the founder of eugenics in the late 1890s.\textsuperscript{121}

In 1906, Sidney began teaching theology at Dōshisha University after having received further training in the United States and Germany. While at Dōshisha, he taught

\textsuperscript{119} In the paper, he stressed the necessity of “measures by which we [might] better the race” rather than concentrating on measures preventing race degeneration. See Luther H. Gulick and Mrs. Luther H. Gulick, “The Social Program,” Race Betterment Foundation, ed., Proceedings, 422-430. By 1914 Luther had moved from Massachusetts to New York where he was a medical doctor. See also Taylor, Advocate, 86.


\textsuperscript{121} See Manuscript Number 142/2B, University College London Library, A List of the Papers and Correspondence of Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911).
not only theology but also the theory of evolution.\textsuperscript{122} He explored the compatibility between religion and science; with the help of a Japanese assistant he published works in Japanese: \textit{Shin shinkwaron} [Cosmic evolution] (1910), \textit{Jinrui shinkwaron} [Human evolution] (1913), \textit{Kwagaku gairon} [General discussions and a classification of human knowledge] (1913).\textsuperscript{123}

A need for better medical treatment brought Sidney back to the United States in 1913. It was then that agitation against the Japanese intensified on the West Coast.\textsuperscript{124} Soon he learned that his health problem was not serious. He then undertook a campaign against the exclusionists from a Christian peace activist viewpoint. He began touring across America in an attempt to redress the growing race suspicion against the Japanese being promoted by the yellow journalism of the Hearst newspapers. In December he spoke with William P. Dillingham, the Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and presented his views.\textsuperscript{125} The paper in the Race Betterment Conference in January 1914 was delivered in this context.

\textsuperscript{122} Taylor, \textit{Advocate}, 9-16, 42, 48-50; and Shigeru Yoshiki, "Sidonî Gyûrikku ni tsuite: Hainichi hōan e megutte," \textit{Kirisuto-kyô shakai mondai kenkyû} (Dôshisha Daigaku jinbun Kagaku Kenkyûjo), 34 (March 1986), 3. I thank Professor Nakajima Kuni of Japan Women's University to have brought this article to my attention.

\textsuperscript{123} Sidney L. Gulick, \textit{American Democracy and Asiatic Citizenship} (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918), iii; and Shigeru, "Sidonî Gyûrikku," \textit{4}. The translation of each work was provided by Gulick himself. It was not necessarily a literal one.

\textsuperscript{124} Taylor, \textit{Advocate}, 73-74; and Shigeru, "Sidonî Gyûrikku," \textit{5}.

His address was a summary of his book, *The American Japanese Problem: A Study of the Racial Relations of the East and the West* (1914). With his firsthand experience, he challenged and discredited the general assumptions that the Japanese were not only the source of economic competition but also immoral, dirty, and inassimilable beings. Although he emphasized the social and cultural assimilability of the Japanese, his attitude towards intermarriage (which he associated with biological assimilation) was ambivalent. Though recognizing the need for immigration restriction in general, his views differed from those of Robert Ward and other exclusionists. He noted that a new immigration law should be fair to people from all lands regardless of their native-language. The solution he offered was a quota system:

An immigration law should be enacted allowing an annual immigration from any single mother-tongue group of, say, five per cent of those already here and naturalized, including their American-born children. Such a law would allow practically unlimited immigration from Great Britain, Germany and Scandinavia; it would curtail somewhat immigration from South Europe, and allow only a very small number of immigrants from Japan and China.  

In other words, any foreigners including Chinese and Japanese, he believed, should be granted naturalization upon qualification. He urged equal treatment because the existing law singled out and humiliated Asians, and this might destroy peaceful and

---


friendly diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Asian countries. It is certainly significant that by introducing the concept of “mother-tongue,” he intended to undermine the existing statute which was making Asians ineligible for citizenship.

At least in the proceedings which recorded discussions following the presentations, Ward did not make any comments regarding Gulick’s suggestion. One can, however, learn the exclusionist position in his response to the program suggested by Gulick’s League for Constructive Immigration Legislation. In 1918 Gulick once again proposed publicly that the U.S. repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, end the “Gentleman’s Agreement” with Japan, and have only one general immigration law. His plan called for equal treatment of all aliens, admitting Chinese and Japanese on the same terms as all other nationalities. Unlike Gulick, Ward had no sympathy for the Japanese or international cooperation. In his letter to the Journal of Heredity editor, Ward expressed his view against Gulick’s proposal:

While the number of Orientals to be admitted would necessarily be very small, for a time, under the proposed limitation to a certain percentage, these numbers would soon automatically increase. Furthermore, the percentages to be admitted could easily be raised. The Gulick plan also involves the naturalization of the Oriental. It is these portions of the [Gulick’s] league’s program which are strongly opposed by many persons who thoroughly believe in the restriction of

---

128 His conviction is consistent and evident in many of his works. For example, see Sidney Gulick’s Should Congress Enact Special Laws Affecting Japanese?: A Critical Examination of the “Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization” Held in California, July 1920. (New York: National Committee on American Japanese Relations, 1922), 92.


130 For details of his argument, see Gulick, American Democracy and Asiatic Citizenship. Sandra C. Taylor documents Gulick’s crusade for non-racist immigration reform against exclusionists. See especially Chapters 7, 8, and 9 of Advocate.
immigration; and those who are interested in eugenics, and in the future character 
of the American race, may well bear these facts in mind. The Gulick plan 
proposed to put the thin edge of a wedge under the door which our national policy 
has built against Oriental immigration.\textsuperscript{131}

The attitude of Robert Ward’s colleague, Prescott Hall, towards the “Oriental” 
immigration that is summarized in his 1919 article, “Immigration Restriction and World 
Eugenics:”

Eugenics among individuals is encouraging the propagation of the fit, and limiting 
or preventing the multiplication of the unfit. World eugenics is doing precisely the 
same thing as to races considered as wholes. Immigration restriction is a species 
of segregation on a large scale, by which inferior stocks can be prevented from 
both diluting and supplanting good stocks.\textsuperscript{132}

He continued:

Just as we isolate bacterial invasions, and starve out the bacteria by limiting the 
area and amount of their food supply, so we can compel an inferior race to remain 
in its native habitat, where its own multiplication in a limited area will, as with all 
organisms, eventually limit its numbers and therefore its influence. On the other 
hand, the superior races, more self-limiting than the others, with the benefits of 
more space and nourishment will tend to still higher levels...

\begin{quotation}
\textit{The lower types among men progress, so far as their racial inheritance 
allows them to, chiefly by imitation and emulation...}
\end{quotation}

It is important, therefore, that nothing in the constitution of the League of 
Nations should limit the right of any nation to decide who shall be admitted into 
its life...\textsuperscript{133}


\textsuperscript{132} Prescott F. Hall, “Immigration Restriction and World Eugenics,” \textit{Journal of Heredity} 10.3 (March 
1919), 126.

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid., 126-127. The March issue came out on April 25, 1919. The Japanese delegates in Paris 
first proposed the racial equality cause in February 14. Ambassador Ishii gave an address on this matter in 
New York in March 14.
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Hall was evidently referring to Japan’s racial equality proposal at the Paris Peace Conference and implied that the Japanese were one of the lower races. His posture regarding Asian immigration was more clearly expressed in his private letter to Charles Davenport, who insisted on an inspection of immigrants abroad and a study of immigrants’ heredity on a world-wide scale as priorities. Rather than investing time, money, and energy in such a grand project, Hall wrote back that they should concentrate their efforts on getting a bill through which would “heavily favor the Nordics....After immigration of Asiatics, Alpines, and Meds [Mediterraneans] has been diminished, the Nordic countries would be the easiest in which to apply your plan.”

5.4.5 Charles Davenport and the Selective Immigration Policy

What Prescott Hall criticized was the so-called “selective immigration” policy favored by Charles B. Davenport. Maintaining that “no race per se, whether Slovak, Ruthenian, Turk or Chinese, is dangerous and none undesirable,” Davenport supported the view that the immigration problem could not be solved by excluding on the basis of race or native country. Despite his faith in the selective immigration, however, Davenport generalized the temperament of particular “races” according to their native countries and explicitly discussed their desirability and undesirability in his 1911 work, *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*. For instance, Davenport described the Germans as

---


“thrifty, intelligent and honest.” “They have a love of art and music, including that of song birds, and they have formed one of the most desirable classes of our immigrants.”\textsuperscript{136}

By contrast his view of Hebrews (Jews) was negative:

Statistics indicate that the crimes of Hebrews are chiefly “gainful offenses,” especially thieving and receiving stolen goods, while they rarely commit offenses of personal violence. On the other hand, they show the greatest proportion of offenses against chastity and in connection with prostitution, the lowest of crimes. There is no question that, taken as a whole, the hordes of Jews that are now coming to us from Russia and the extreme southeast of Europe, with their intense individualism and ideals of gain at the cost of any interest, represent the opposite extreme from the early English and the more recent Scandinavian immigration with their ideals of community life in the open country, advancement by the sweat of the brow, and the upbringing of families in the fear of God and the love of country.\textsuperscript{137}

In other words, despite his opposition to immigration restrictions based on nationalities, Davenport shared “the native white Protestant’s hostility to immigrants and the conservative’s bile over taxes and welfare” and expressed these feelings “in biological language.”\textsuperscript{138}

5.4.6 Nordic Supremacists

The Cold Spring Harbor scientists’ close connections with the Nordic supremacists such as Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard offer further insight. The book reviews of the respective authors’ controversial works in \textit{Eugenical News}, a

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., 214.

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 216.

\textsuperscript{138} Kevles, \textit{in the Name of Eugenics}, 51.
monthly publication of the Eugenics Record Office in 1917 and 1920, are suggestive. First, the article “The Great Nordic Race” examined Grant’s The Passing of the Great Race (1916). The book argued for the superior physical and temperamental qualities of the Nordic race, and expressed the author’s concern with the new immigration which would undermine Nordic dominance in the United States. The reviewer appreciated Grant’s “biologically racist” view and wrote, “the book does a great service in pointing out akin that racial characteristics are much more determinative of behavior than any environment that acts on inadequate racial characteristics.”139 In the other article, “The Color-Races,” an unidentified reviewer examined Stoddard’s The Rising Tide of Color against White World-Supremacy (1920). The reviewer said that the theme of the book was supplementary to Grant’s book. Stoddard’s thesis was that the different primary races were “no longer segregated in different parts of the world comparatively pure;” rather they became mobile. Stoddard called attention to “the irresistible spread of the brown and yellow races, the demands for free migration on the part of the Japanese and Hindus.”140 Then the reviewer analyzed the eugenics aspects of Stoddard’s argument and concluded by quoting a part of Madison Grant’s introductory essay to the book:

[D]emocratic ideals among a homogeneous population of Nordic blood, as in England or America, is one thing, but it is quite another for the white man to share


140 “The Color-Races,” Eugenical News 5.9 (September 1920), 71. Consider the global context of racially marginal peoples’ initiatives. For instance, “blacks” in the United States migrated North in large numbers and the leader of Indian independence, Mohandas Gandhi was leading a movement against racial discrimination in South Africa in the 1910s. The Yellow Scare coincided with these other movements which were threatening the “white” dominance. Reading these events by “color” or from a racial thereby biological perspective also reflects the intellectual current of the era.
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his blood with, or intrust his ideals to, brown, yellow, black, or red men. This is suicide pure and simple, and the first victim of this amazing folly will be the white man himself.  

The reviewer criticized the politicians because they did not realize the “existence of racial differences” and suggested that they had not acted properly to restrict the entry of undesirable races into the United States.  

Madison Grant was a wealthy New York lawyer of an old and aristocratic ancestry. Being an amateur but lifelong student of biology, he knew Davenport well.  

Historian Mark Haller notes that Grant might have picked up the ideas of racial hierarchy dominated by Nordic supremacy from his biologist friends like Davenport or from his readings of European anthropologists. Grant became a national vice-president of the Immigration Restriction League in 1909 and worked in different eugenics committees with Prescott Hall and Robert Ward. The discussions of the book reflect the “racial” assumption shared by these Boston restrictionists.


142 It should be noted that Stoddard’s book was promptly translated and already became available to the Japanese readers by 1921. Lothrop Stoddard, Yūshokujin no bokkō, trans. Nagase Hōyū (Tokyo: Seikyōsha, 1921). Nagase was a military officer who had a Ph. D. (The book is also titled as Yūhoku jinshū no bokkō.) Nagase wrote that whether or not one would agree on the conclusion of the book, it would be worth reading it for the Japanese. The translator identified the Japanese as the leader of the colored races and considered Stoddard’s descriptions about them quite accurate. According to him, before this translation was done, several newspaper and magazines had introduced the book. See Nagase Hōyū, “Yakōsha yori,” in Lothrop Stoddard, Yūshokujin no bokkō, 162. I am indebted to Ms. Terazawa Yūki for bringing this translated work to my attention. See also Suzuki, Nihon no rireigaku, 45.  


144 Haller, Eugenics, 150.  

145 Solomon, Ancestors, 201.
Lothrop Stoddard's thoughts did not come independently, either. Stoddard was a multi-talented individual with different titles including Harvard Ph.D in history, lawyer, journalist, and eugenicist. Most importantly he was a disciple of Grant. According to Haller, "[t]he works of Grant and Stoddard, despite their inconsistencies and absurdities, won not only wide popular interest but also a good measure of scientific approval... Grant's Nordic doctrines, in the 1920's were repeated before Congressional committees and in popular magazines until they became an important facet of American thought." There was a strong tie between the eugenics scientists in Cold Spring Harbor (Davenport and Laughlin) and the Nordic supremacists (Grant and Stoddard). When the Second International Congress of Eugenics was held at the American Museum of Natural History, New York in 1921, Davenport gave a presidential address. Laughlin was a chairman of the Exhibits Committee. While Grant was a treasurer of the Congress, Stoddard was a chairman of the Publicity Committee.

146 Haller, Eugenics, 149.
147 Ibid., 151. Also see Stoddard's acknowledgement regarding Grant in Stoddard, The Rising Tide, vii.
149 Ibid.
150 Ibid.
151 Ibid.
relationships continued into the next decade. The names of Davenport, Grant, and Laughlin were all listed as publication committee members of the Third International Congress of Eugenics which was held in the same location in 1932.152

5.4.7 Harry Laughlin and the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization

Perhaps Princeton-trained biologist Dr. Harry H. Laughlin was more involved in the formulation of anti-Japanese immigration laws than Davenport. In the spring of 1920, Laughlin went to Washington D.C. to present eugenics petitions and there he was appointed “expert eugenics agent” of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.153 The majority chairman of the committee was Congressman Albert Johnson, “Republican of Washington, a rough-hewn, heavy-drinking politico with a hatred of radicals, Japanese, and open-door immigration policies.”154

In the early 1920s he began presenting restrictive immigration bills. The Johnson plan became the foundation of the 1924 Immigration Act, which excluded Japanese

152 A Decade of Progress, i.

153 “Analysis of America’s Modern Melting Pot,” Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 67th Congress, 3rd Session (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1922), 729. For details about his role in the Committee, see Hassencahl, “Harry H. Laughlin.”

immigrants. Thus the law was often called the Johnson Act. An American intellectual historian, Thomas F. Gossett observes that Johnson was greatly impressed by The Passing of the Great Race and “consulted with Grant both in New York and in Washington on the form which bills against immigration should take.” When the American Eugenics Society was founded in 1923, Johnson joined its Committee on Selective Immigration which was chaired by the Nordic race supremacist, Madison Grant. While Robert Ward was the vice-chairman, Laughlin was the secretary of that committee. It issued a report at the end of 1923 which “added up to an endorsement of the permanent immigration restriction bill.” The relationship between the politician and Cold Spring Harbor eugenicists was mutually satisfying. While “the scientific men obviously thought of him [Johnson] as a hero” and showed their respect for his leadership in restrictive immigration policy by electing him president of the Eugenics

155 For Johnson’s role in the enactment of the 1924 Immigration Act, see Wakatsuki, Hainichi no rekishi, 174-177; and Ludmérer, “Genetics.”

156 For example, see Ludmérer, “Genetics,” 61.


161 Gossett, Race, 406. Laughlin described him as “the great American watchdog whose job it is to protect the blood of the American people from contamination and degeneracy.” See Ludmérer, “Genetics,” 75.
Research Association at Cold Spring Harbor in 1923, the eugenicists represented by Laughlin supplied "scientific" evidence which would boost the credibility of the Congressman's legislation efforts.

Laughlin stood confidently behind the House Committee. He glorified the objectivity and value-neutral nature of science. When he presented the study, "Europe as an Emigrant-Exporting Continent," he told his audience: "I am here simply as a scientific investigator to present the facts to the gentlemen of the committee, with the hope that the facts and their analysis might be of use." Despite his claim of disinterested scientist, there was a sign that Laughlin "served to justify action previously decided upon by the committee decision-makers" even in connection with his view towards the restriction of Asian immigration. In his study "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," Laughlin investigated the "socially inadequate" groups in 445 state institutions housing the feeble-minded, insane, criminals and delinquents, epileptics, blind, deaf, deformed and dependent. This research was conducted for and under the auspices of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the 67th Congress, and published in the Hearings before that Committee. The nativity and racial groups surveyed included not only

162 "Annual Meeting of the Eugenics Research Association," Eugenical News 8.7 (July 1923), 53.
163 The relationship between Laughlin and Johnson was much more formal than that between Johnson and Grant, see Hasencahl, "Harry H. Laughlin," 208. About the correspondence between Johnson and Laughlin, see page 3.
165 Hasencahl, "Harry H. Laughlin," iv and 364.
166 "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," 723-831.
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native-born white, foreign-born white, and “Negro,” but also “Indian, Chinese, Japanese, and all other.” 167 His statistics analyzing all types of social inadequacy found the Japanese racial group the second least socially inadequate among the thirty-two groups studied. 168 Actually the Japanese ranked higher (more desirable) than the group of native white (both parents native-born). China ranked fifteenth, one notch higher than Northwestern Europe whose immigrants were often regarded favorably. Yet, his conclusion glossed over these findings about “new immigrants from Asia” and stated:

The outstanding conclusion is that, making all logical allowances for environmental conditions, which may be unfavorable to the immigrant, the recent immigrants, as a whole, present a higher percentage of inborn socially inadequate qualities than do the older stocks. 169

Concerning things related to Asian immigrants, he did not speak much during this Hearings session. He only recommended that special racial studies of the Japanese and

167 Ibid., 732.

168 “All types included feeblemindedness, insanity crime, epilepsy, tuberculosis, blindness, deafness, deformity and dependency.” “Institutional quota [was] determined by proportioning numbers constituting the whole institutional population found by special institutional survey, among the several nativity groups and alien races according to their relative numbers found in the whole population of the United States by the Census of 1910.” “The ratio or quota fulfillment for each nativity group or race [was] found by dividing the actual number of institutional inmates of the particular group or race by the quota allotted to the particular group or race.” “Thus, if the percent or quota fulfillment [was] greater than 100, the particular group or race [had] exceeded its quota in supplying social inadequates in state and federal institutions in the United States. If it [was] less than 100, the particular quota lacks fulfillment by such proportion as the particular percent [was] less than 100.” Switzerland was the least socially inadequate (53.34%) followed by Japan (57.81%), Native White (both parents native-born) (84.33%), and American Negro (86.16%). According to this study, the worst groups were from Ireland (208.84%), Mexico (209.62%), Bulgaria (227.27%), Spain (400.00%), and Serbia (600.00%). China ranked the 15th with the quota fulfillment rate of 125.23% which was better than that of favorably regarded immigrants from Northwestern Europe (130.42%). See “Analysis of America’s Modern Melting Pot,” a chart between pages 750 and 751.

169 See “Analysis of American Modern Melting Pot,” 755. The “older American stocks” referred to the Nordic or Anglo-Saxon type. The “new immigrants” were people who did not belong to such a type. Theoretically Asians were in this category but in general the term indicated immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. See “Report of the Committee on Selective Immigration of the Eugenics Committee of the United States of America,” 23; and Kevles, In the Name of Eugenics, 73-4.
Chinese as well as those of Oriental and Occidental race mixtures on the Pacific coast be made.¹⁷⁰ Laughlin chose not to question the general assumption of eugenicists, “the inferiority of Negro and Oriental blood.”¹⁷¹ In this way, he silently supported the premise of the proposed law to exclude the Japanese. Despite his claim of unbiased opinions based on scientific research and commitment to the ideals of the selective immigration policy, Laughlin interpreted statistics and catered to the conclusions which would please the Nordic supremacists and Boston exclusionists.¹⁷²

5.5 Gotô Ryûkichi and the American Eugenicists

5.5.1 Gratitude and Respect

The establishment of Gotô Ryûkichi’s eugenics journal (January), the enactment of the U.S. immigration law excluding Japanese immigrants (May), and the initial correspondence between Gotô, Charles Davenport, and Harry Laughlin (June and July) all happened in 1924. What were the nature of this correspondence? Was the race issue addressed? Was Gotô aware of the American eugenicists’ involvement in immigration politics? If so, how did he react to it?


¹⁷² Hassencahl, Ludmerer, and Kevles all see that “scientific facts” were socially constructed using Laughlin’s statistical data. Ludmerer writes that “Laughlin’s conclusions were based upon a biased interpretation of statistical evidence and the eugenic assumptions about biology.” See his “Genetics,” 68. Kevles also discredits Laughlin’s scientific objectivity: “Actually, he twisted the facts (often he had found proportionately more native- than foreign-born in asylums) and indulged in blatant prejudice (recent immigrants, he said, might themselves be healthy, but they carried bad recessive genes, which would sooner or later out).” Kevles, in the Name of Eugenics, 105.
In his initial letter, Gotô asked specific questions focused on the institutionalization of eugenics, but none was on the race matter. Davenport's response was as follows:

July 2, 1924

Mr. R. Goto
Japan Eugenics Society,
667 Morigu, Kôroen, Hyôgo, Japan

Dear Sir,—

I am delighted to learn of your interest in eugenics and of the organization of a Japanese Eugenics Society.

I had not learned of the translation of my "Heredity in Relation to Eugenics" into Japanese. I should be pleased to obtain a copy, if you will have the publisher send it to me with a bill for it, [sic] Also we should be glad to exchange your "Eugenics" for the "Eugenical News", published at this place.

We should be glad to assist you in any way that we can. In response to your request, we are sending you a paper by Dr. Lauphlin [sic] on the organization of the Eugenics Record Office, an account of the Department of Genetics which includes the Eugenics Record Office. We are also sending you a number of your schedules.

We should be glad in return to receive what you have published.

Sincerely yours,
Chas, [sic] B. Davenport173

Laughlin's letter to Gotô described various pamphlets that he sent to Japan. He mentioned the name of the "Eugenics Society of the United States of America" as one principal American organization beside the Eugenics Record Office. He did not explain,

however, that himself, Congressman Albert Johnson, Robert Ward (vice chairman) and
Madison Grant (chairman) were all involved in the Selective Immigration Committee of
the very American Eugenics Society.\footnote{174}

Gôtô Ryûkichi was grateful for the American eugenicists' benevolent gesture. For
example, he compared Davenport's quick and helpful response to his request with the
response of the elite eugenic enthusiasts in Japan; Gôtô had asked support from the
Japanese specialists in return for sending complimentary copies of his journals every
month, but they had ignored his requests.\footnote{175} A Waseda University professor, Kita
Sôichirô, was studying physical education theories at different universities in the United
States in 1926. In a letter to Gôtô, May 26, 1926, Kita wrote “The day after tomorrow I
will visit Long Island to see Dr. Davenport, for whom you have the highest respect.”\footnote{176}
After learning that Davenport's \textit{Heredity in Relation to Eugenics} had been translated into
Japanese, both Davenport and Laughlin asked Gôtô to send a copy. Since the translation
had been published ten years before, it must have been out of print and hard to obtain.
Gôtô wrote a small article in the May 1926 issue of \textit{Yûseigaku} asking those who owned

\footnote{174} A letter from Laughlin to Gôtô, 8 July 1924, in “Nihon Yûsei Gakkai no rekishiteki kôshin no ni,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 15 (April 1925), 6. In this letter, Laughlin wrote, “Besides the Eugenics Record Office, the Eugenics Research Association,...and the Eugenics Society of the United States of America,...are the principal American organization.” Mark Haifer explains that the Eugenics Society of the United States of America was renamed as the American Eugenics Society in 1925. See Haifer, \textit{Eugenics}, 74.

\footnote{175} Gôtô, “Yûzenikkusu no rekishiteki kôshin no ichi,” \textit{YSQ} 14 (March 1925), 6.

\footnote{176} A letter from Kita Sôichirô, New York, to Gôtô Ryûkichi, Hyôgo, 26 May 1926, in “Kôshin kei,” \textit{Yûseigaku} 29 (July 1926), 23.
the book to consider selling it to him at a reasonable price. Gotô wanted to send it to the
library of Laughlin's Eugenic Record Office to show his appreciation for their help and to
fulfil his obligation as a partner in an exchange program.\textsuperscript{177}

5.5.2 Suspicion

To what degree did Gotô know the role of eugenicists in the formulation of the
anti-Japanese immigration law? In his 1930 article in the Kansai jii, Gotô pointed out
that, although many Japanese were unaware of it, the exclusion of Japanese immigrants in
the U.S. was theoretically based on the science of eugenics.\textsuperscript{178} Gotô did receive the July
1924 issue of the Eugenical News, which contained a brief description of the Japan
Eugenics Society.\textsuperscript{179} The issue also reported news about the annual meeting of the
Eugenics Research Association in June held at the Eugenics Record Office at Cold Spring
Harbor in a featured article. It noted: "Honorable Albert Johnson, Chairman of the
Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives, was
president of the organization [Eugenics Research Association] during the year which has
just ended."

\textsuperscript{177} "Jinshu kairyōgaku' sho o motomu," Yûsei gaku 16 (May 1925), 29. Charles B. Davenport's
\textit{Hereditiy in Relation to Eugenics} (Henry Holt, 1911) was translated by Nakaseko Rokurô and Yoshimura
Daijirô as \textit{Jinshu kairyōgaku} and published by the Greater Japan Civilization Society (Dai Nihon Bunmei
Kyokai) in 1914.

\textsuperscript{178} Gotô Ryûkichi, "Nihon Minzoku Eisei Gakkai naru," Kansai jii (5 September 1930), reprinted in
Gotô, \textit{Isei ronsô}, 28. See also similar comment, "Kokkutsu o osorete Kanada no hatichi," Yûsei gaku 50
(April 1929), 37.

\textsuperscript{179} "'Eugenics' in Japanese," Yûsei gaku 17 (June 1925), 6.
During this time there was particular need for close coordination between eugenicists and those concerned with the matter of national immigration, because it is agreed by statesmen, economists and biologists that probably no greater single factor than immigration determines, for good or bad, the future character of the American people....During the Chairmanship of Representative Johnson, the Congress of the United States has passed the critical point in history which marked the passing of the dominating factor of economics and established for the future American policy the basic elements of racial values and family stock quality.

The members and guests of the Association assembled at the appointed time, and the meeting was formally called to order by Dr. Charles B. Davenport, representing the Executive Committee. \(^{180}\)

The information above must have been sufficient for someone like Gotô to understand that the champion of anti-Japanese immigration legislation, Albert Johnson, was at the heart of an eugenic organization which enjoyed Davenport's leadership.

Even before the enactment of the 1924 immigration law, in the second issue of the Yûseigaku (February 1924), Gotô covered an address by Henry Fairfield Osborn, "The Approach to the Immigration Problem through Science." \(^{181}\) Osborn was a prominent paleontologist serving as President of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. \(^{182}\)

---

\(^{180}\) "Annual Meeting of the Eugenics Research Association," 57. The description of the Japan Eugenics Society can be found in "Notes and News," 64. Both articles were in Eugenical News 9,7 (July 1924).


museum, Osborn, as its president, worked closely with Charles Davenport and Harry Laughlin. Osborn's address was presented at the National Immigration Conference held in New York City on December 13 and 14, 1923. There he introduced an episode: When American ships arrived "loaded with everything needed in the hour of dire extremity"—referring to the aftermath of the Great Earthquake which had hit Tokyo in September 1923—the Japanese thought Americans "were coming to take military and naval advantage of their distress." Osborn contended that the Japanese national character exemplified by such deep-seated suspicion, was different from the American counterpart. He interpreted what today we would call "cultural differences" and "cultural assimilability" in biological terms and argued that "certain races of peoples are not predisposed by heredity to adopt American ideals and conditions of life." He believed that "we should be guided in our immigration laws and activities to see that no elements are allowed to enter here which would threaten our civilization should they become preponderant in any part of the country." In his speech, Osborn referred to the new findings discussed in the International Congress of Eugenics.

---

183 Laughlin, "Historical Background of the Third International Congress of Eugenics," 3.
184 National Industrial Conference Board, Proceedings, i.
186 Ibid., 49.
187 Ibid., 47.
188 Ibid., 50-51.
5.5.3 Rage and Self-Reflections

After summarizing Osborn’s view, Gotô lamented that “Americans were not as humane as God,” and the Japanese should be criticized for showing mistrust. The June issue of the Yūseigaku, responding to the news that U.S. President Calvin Coolidge signed the modified Johnson bill on May 26, 1924, revealed the more fervent view of the editor:

Wake up! A great war has been declared by the anti-Japanese immigration law....All of us have to be...determined. Be ready to stand up...fiercely at any moment in the foremost difficulty of our nation.

On his part, he dehumanized the Americans by calling them “Yankee-monkeys” who were “a scratch team of the immoral rascals of the white race.” Their rudeness—they did not know basic diplomatic courtesy—could be attributed to the country’s “immature stage of development.” The monkey analogy was repeated in the following month. This time, the journal argued to exterminate and bury the monkeys away from the world because they were “racially poisoned,” “unjust,” and “inhumane.” It should be noted

189 “Jinruigakuteki hainichiron,” 20.

190 “Henshūshin yori,” Yūseigaku 5 (June 1924), 34.

191 Ibid.

192 “Beikoku o hōmure!” Yūseigaku 6 (July 1924), 1. Gotô’s expressions indicate his familiarity with Protestant literature. Blaming American “injustice” and “inhumanity” reflects the contemporary media expressions against the 1924 Immigration Act. See Wakatsuki, Hainichi no rekishi, 181. In his analysis on the Yellow Peril discourse, Hashikawa Bunzō points out that the Japanese often reacted against the Western racial hierarchy emotionally but “fortunately” never developed any “scientific counter racial theory of their own.” See his Kōka monogatar (Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1976), 164. In his analysis of racism in the Pacific War context, John W. Dower points out that “[t]he war words and race words which so dominated the propaganda of Japan’s white enemies—the core imagery of apes, lesser men, primitives, children, madmen, and beings who possessed special powers as well—have a pedigree in Western thought that can be traced back to Aristotle, and were conspicuous in the earliest encounters with the black peoples of Africa and the Indians of the Western Hemisphere.” He continues, “The Japanese, so ‘unique’ in the rhetoric of World War Two, were actually saddled with racial stereotypes that Europeans and Americans
that these emotionally-charged militant expressions were prepared about the same time that Gotô was writing a letter to Charles B. Davenport and asking for advice.

Gotô’s writings, however, often ended with some self-reflections. The Japanese, he argued, should not forget their priority. If they were biologically inferior, they should do something about it. The solution, he emphasized, would be a scientific faith in eugenics.

In another column, the editor pointed out that Japanese products were being excluded all over the world. “In the United States, even humans made in Japan were being excluded.” “Yet, before cursing the Americans, the Japanese should reflect on themselves.” “The Japanese people--those who mass-produce children of inferior quality--consider the option of practicing eugenic life.” Using the same rhetoric devised by American eugenicists who equated the high fecundity with the undesirable stocks which would supplant the desirable, Gotô promised a rewarding future for the Japanese.


194 “Henshūshitsu yori,” Yūseigaku 5 (June 1924), 34. About the relationship between the high degree of sexual fertility and racial undesirability, see “Biological Aspects of Immigration,” Hearings before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, 60th Congress, 2nd Session (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1921), 8.

195 “Kantō,” Yūseigaku 6 (July 1924), 1. Gotô seems to have believed that women infected with tuberculosis tended to be fecund. See “Kantō,” Yūseigaku 5 (June 1924), 1.
After all, the tension between Japan and the U.S. over the past decades deeply hurt Japan's national pride, and it was an extraordinarily disturbing subject. The passage of the 1924 Immigration Act elicited various dramatic reactions. One of them was that a young man committed suicide in front of the American Embassy in Tokyo in protest of the law.\textsuperscript{196}

In another editorial commentary, Gotō wrote, "A nation (kokumin) without emotion is a nation who will lead its country to ruin." "Now, the Japanese nation is feeling the strongest emotions to the degree we had never experienced before." He commended his people's discretion for not turning these emotions into actions that could be taken as a pretext for war by enemies. Rather than regretting the consequences of thoughtless actions, he argued, they needed to combine emotions, will power, and intelligence so that they could improve their national efficiency.\textsuperscript{197} Here he revealed his strategy of converting the Japanese rage and humiliation over the race issue to the adoption of eugenics, scientific ways of improving the Japanese race.

Thus, using the authority of American eugenicists and the Japanese reaction to the U.S. immigration policy simultaneously, Gotō tried to promote eugenics and hoped to expand his operation. Considering that the journal itself was in constant danger of collapse due to lack of money, Gotō was remarkably ambitious. As noted earlier,

\textsuperscript{196} For example, see Wakatsuki, \textit{Hainichi no rekishi}, 182.

\textsuperscript{197} "Kokumin no kangekisei," \textit{Yûseigaku} 7 (August 1924), 1.
although by the end of the 1920s he was able to get his publishing business financially secure, Gotô’s plan for the Japan Foundation of Eugenics stagnated. There was, however, a renewed effort led by Abe Ayao in 1930.

5.6 Establishment of the Japan Society of Ethnic National Hygiene

Abe was a geneticist and educator affiliated with Taipei University in Japan’s colony of Taiwan. He had started the study group, the Greater Japan Eugenics Society, with Yamanouchi Shigeo, Nagai Hisomu, and others in 1917. He had agreed to support Gotô’s campaign as a proposer and contributor in 1925. Although his contribution to Gotô’s effort was not substantial, his interest in eugenics was serious. He attended a meeting of the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, held in Rome in September 1929. This experience made him determined to establish a Japanese eugenic organization which would meet the criteria for joining the Federation. In May 1930, Abe announced his plan to create a Japan Society of Eugenics (Nihon Yûsei Gakkai) that would pursue scientific studies of the heredity of Japanese people; get involved in legislation by framing social, population, and colonization policies; and become a resource organization for the nation’s public health, social work, and education enterprises. The name of the proposed organization was exactly the same as Gotô’s. Abe might have intended to reinvigorate Gotô’s earlier “foundation” campaign by taking advantage of the existing structure, journal, and staff member(s) of the Japan Eugenics Society. Gotô

---

198 “Nihon Yûsei Gakkai setsuritsu no kiun to Yûseigaku Dantai Kokusai Renmei no jôkyô,” Yûseigaku 77 (July 1930), 17-22.
showed strong support and reported Abe’s plan in the *Yūseigaku*. Abe’s network was better connected to the elite eugenic enthusiasts than was Gotô himself. Like Gotô, Abe personally visited and asked influential scholars in various parts of Japan to take part in the organization. Japan’s most outspoken supporter of eugenics Nagai Hisonu was one. Abe’s effort was much more successful than Gotô’s had been. The new organization came into existence within months. It, however, chose the name *Nihon Minzoku Eisei Gakkai* (Japan Society of Ethnic National Hygiene) instead of the *Nihon Yūseigaku*, proposed by Abe, and placed its headquarter at Nagai Hisomu’s office in Tokyo.

Even though Gotô was appointed a local councillor (chihô riji) in the new organization, the choice of the name was a clear indication that elite eugenic enthusiasts wanted to dissociate themselves from Gotô. Indeed, the first issue of the *Minzoku eisei* [Ethnic national hygiene], the official publication of the new organization, explained the term “*yūseigaku* (eugenics)” had been appropriated and abused in various ways and the Society decided to use the German term “*Rassenhygiene*” which was “equivalent to and

---

199 Ibid.


201 The Japan Society of Ethnic National Hygiene (*gakkai*) would be renamed as the Japan Association of Ethnic National Hygiene (*kyōkai*) after attaining the “*zaikan hôjin*” status in 1935.
used interchangeably with eugenics.” Minzoku eisei is thus the translation of Rassenhygiene, although, technically speaking, “minzoku” means “ethnic nation” and “jinshu” means “race.”

Kyoto University zoologist Komai Taku, who had studied under American geneticist Thomas H. Morgan, was invited to an organizational meeting for the Society of Ethnic National Hygiene, but was unable to attend it. He wrote a letter apologizing for missing the meeting. This letter seems to represent how elite eugenicists felt about Gotô’s eugenic movement and reveals what it meant by “appropriations” and “abuses” of the term “eugenics.” Komai stated “[S]ince eugenics is closely related to society, eugenics can be easily abused by business-minded people, such as those who sell contraceptive devices, those who are engaged in suspicious pseudo-medical operations, and others who talk or write about erotic matters.” Considering that Gotô’s journal had carried a year-long translation series of Kamasutra and one of the Japan Eugenics Society’s division, the Office of Agency, took orders of pessaries and condoms, part of Komai’s criticism was directed towards Gotô’s operation. This explains Komai’s earlier behavior: During Gotô’s “foundation” campaign in 1925, Komai had once agreed to be a sanseinin.

202 “Nihon Minzoku Eisei Gakkai no soritsu,” Minzoku eisei 1.1 (March 1931), 94-95. Similar view which equates “yuseigaku (eugenics)” and “minzoku eisei (ethnic national/race hygiene),” see Gotôsei, “Minzoku eisei shisetsu ni kansuru ichikôsatsu,” Yuseigaku 49 (March 1928), 35. Despite these interpretations, the definitions of these two terms were actually different. For example, historian of science Sheila Faith Weiss explains as follows: “It should be noted that the German term Rassenhygiene (race hygiene) had a broader scope than the English word eugenics. It included not only all attempts aimed at “improving” the hereditary quality of a population, but also measures directed toward an absolute increase in population.” See the first footnote in her “The Race Hygiene Movement in Germany: 1904-1945,” 8. Suzuki Zenji also comments on the Minzoku eisei’s interchangeable use of the two terms and the general differences of the two terms, see his Nihon no yuseigaku, 150-151.
(sympathizer) for the prospective foundation but soon withdrew his support.203 “To establish and popularize eugenics on a solid foundation,” Komai continued in the letter, “we should be careful about these things.” He urged organizers to gather around competent, credible, and enthusiastic scientists and maintain a serious research-oriented society.204

Indeed, the Japan Society of Ethnic National Hygiene was founded as an alternative to Gotô’s eugenic organization. Gotô, however, continued to publish his eugenic journal targeted to non-specialists until 1943, when the wartime government forced many publications to consolidate in order to reduce paper consumption drastically. But after 1930, Gotô’s Yûseigaku appears to have lost its passion for the eugenic cause, so characteristic of the editorial comments in its formative years.205

5.7 Implications

Because of its timing, Gotô Ryûkichi’s eugenic movement launched in 1924 foregrounded race. Although eugenics was a constant reminder that “the racial inferiority of the Japanese was empirically verifiable,” unlike Japanese scientists and intellectuals who chose to ignore arguments or attempted to repudiate their teachers in other contexts,

203 “Sanseinin no ken,” Yûseigaku 21 (October 1925), 31; and “Kyôkai no sôritsu undô,” Yûseigaku 22 (November 1925), 6.

204 “Komai Taku shi shokan,” Yûseigaku 80 (October 1930), 5. (Details such as date and locations of the correspondence were not documented.) The Osaka meeting was held on July 16, 1930. Abe brought Nagai Hisomu there and asked the participation of Kansai eugenic enthusiasts in his movement.

205 Especially after late 1930, editorial comments of the journal seldom contained exclamation marks, Christian-influenced words, complaints about the difficulty over the journal publication, etc. Gotô seems to have entrusted other editors to be in charge of the Yûseigaku.
Gotō not only accepted eugenic science but also adopted it. Even though he seemed well aware that American eugenicists had helped lawmakers push forward anti-Japanese immigration policy, Gotō contacted these very American eugenicists. His first letter to American eugenicists was prepared exactly when he expressed his outrage against the U.S. immigration law in mid-1924. Examination of his background and career demonstrates that this seemingly inconsistent behavior was not contradictory at all for Gotō.

Because of his lack of advanced training and credible professional status, Gotō had difficulty associating with those he considered elite eugenicists in Japan. Despite his repeated requests, they were generally not willing to support his journal. It was likely that Gotō, out of desperation, wrote to American eugenicists just as he had done to Japanese eugenicists. To Gotō’s surprise Charles Davenport and Harry Laughlin wrote him back promptly and sent him various eugenic literature which he could translate and introduce to Japanese readers.206

Gotō was grateful to Davenport and Laughlin and used their prestige to launch a campaign to organize a eugenic foundation in Japan. At the same time, he wanted to share his faith in eugenics with more Japanese by turning their strong emotional energy against the U.S. immigration law. In this context, he designated his effort as “the movement of

---

206 The American eugenicists who were not enthusiastic about the influx of Japanese immigrants had no problem of offering help to the Japanese as long as their eugenic movement was contained within Japan. In this sense, Davenport’s and Laughlin’s movement to popularize eugenics which included the efforts in the International Eugenics Congress and the International Federation of Eugenic Organizations, was international in a sense it allowed the alliance of eugenic organizations representing different countries. In other words, the international eugenic movement was the collective of different “racial,” “ethnic” or “national” improvement without mixing their blood. Gotō, who was not seriously interested in immigrating himself, did not have any realistic problem about the U.S. immigration policies. Like most Japanese, his problem with them was more ideological.
inferior birth (ressei undô).” He believed that eugenics could be a mass movement because most people, who were not ideally well-born, would instinctively follow it because it was natural for them to want to improve themselves.

From the perspective of Gotô’s purpose, what looked like a contradictory behavior was actually quite consistent. Yet, there remains the question of whether he was torn between international and domestic race discourses. The international or Western eugenic discourse, exemplified by the discussions over U.S. immigration policies, placed the Japanese lower in the racial hierarchical ranking than the Japanese accorded themselves, based on their nation’s military and economic power at the time. In contrast, it has been often believed that prewar Japan embraced the imperial ideology that stressed the racial superiority of the Yamato people for their blood ties with the divine emperor and resulting homogeneity. In his recent study on various prewar discourses of the Japanese nation, however, sociologist Oguma Eiji finds that the view of “Japan as the country of a homogeneous nation” was largely a post-World War II construction. Many prewar intellectuals traced the origin of the Japanese race to different ethnic groups from various parts of Asia and pointed out its heterogeneous ancestry. They were also aware of the danger of claiming preservation of racial purity when the government was promoting assimilation of different ethnic groups within Japan’s multi-ethnic empire.²⁰⁷ In his writings between 1924 and 1930, Gotô occasionally used the term “Yamato

race"208 and sometimes linked it to the prestige of the unbroken line of emperors.209 Yet, he seldom portrayed it as “homogeneous” or “pure-blooded.” He was skeptical about “the Yamato race as a superior race” theory.210 He even urged readers to join his eugenic movement to make the Yamato race superior.211 Thus, there was no apparent conflict between the international and domestic discourses of race in Gotô’s mind. In this way, he overcame the dilemma of ignoring the racial inferiority of the Japanese or repudiating Western scientists who verified such a notion.

What motivated Gotô to take on eugenics also deserves emphasis. Gotô became particularly interested in the “science” of eugenics because of his family’s history of tuberculosis. He lost several members of his family to tuberculosis of the larynx and believed susceptibility to this disease was hereditary. Disappointed by the inability to cure tuberculosis or prevent its spread by social institutions, religion, or will power, he turned to “science.” By the early 1920s, Japan had experienced Hiratsuka Raichô’s eugenic marriage restriction legislative movement which made eugenics a widely-discussed subject in popular media. Though he had never been trained in health sciences at a university level or studied abroad, the self-trained local medical journalist had no problem

---

208 “Inshûka kekkon kinsši hōan,” Nüseigaku 13 (February 1924), 39; and “Kansai Isti Taikai o shukufuku shite ikai saïô no shinkishi o teishō su,” Nüseigaku 26 (April 1926), 29.


211 For example, see “Kantô no ji,” Nüseigaku 26 (April 1926), 4.
in getting information about eugenics written in Japanese. His knowledge became strong enough to convince him to initiate a eugenic movement, longer-lasting and much more substantial than any other movement before.

It is relevant to compare Gotô’s initiative with Hiratsuka’s. As one of the socially marginalized sex, Hiratsuka looked for state authority to institutionalize her notions of eugenics. Being outside of the elite eugenicists’ circle, Gotô also needed higher authority to give him credibility. In his case, he turned to the international eugenic community. Both cases represent the desire of the socially marginal, who were imagined to be biologically (mentally or/and physically) inferior, to move up by adopting the science of eugenics. While Hiratsuka upset the existing gender hierarchy by problematizing the venereal diseases among middle class men and women, Gotô questioned the monopoly of eugenics by the elite eugenicists who tended to see themselves as biologically desirable. His interpretation of eugenics as the “science of inferior birth” was encompassing at two levels: the Japanese, who were portrayed as “unfit” in the American race discourse, and Gotô, representative of ordinary Japanese not considered mentally “fit,” certainly not qualified enough to start a eugenic movement, could be involved in social applications of eugenics. Consciously selecting “desirable” mates, and avoiding “undesirable” mates, knowing what kinds of “dangerous” genes were in the family blood, people who were not exactly “well-born” could contribute to improving the biological “fitness” of the family and the Japanese nation.
Considering the fact that he married in 1924 (the year he started the journal) and had four children by 1931, however, it is hard to imagine that Gotô thought himself not qualified to procreate, the definition of the “unfit.” He observed to the fact that he and his surviving brothers were tall, well-built, and healthy. Perhaps it is necessary to add another category to the “fit” and “unfit.” In addition to the “fit” who are encouraged to maximize reproduction, and the “unfit” who are encouraged to minimize it, the majority of the population fell into the “norm.” Although Gotô himself called his movement “the movement of inferior birth,” what Gotô meant by the “inferior” was actually the “norm.” What he wanted to achieve, then was the healthier reproduction of the norm, the majority of people.

\[\text{\small\textsuperscript{212}}\] Gotô had two sons, Takeshi and Shôgo, and two daughters, Sayoko and Chizuko. He seems to have been willing to have more children. See “Kinga shinnen,” Yûsei gaku 119 (January 1934), 36.
CHAPTER 6

NAGAI HISOMU (1876-1957):
GENDER, STATE, AND MARRIAGE EUGENICS

6.1 Introduction

Nagai Hisomu (1876-1958) was probably the most prominent leader among eugenicists in Japan. In his early career, Nagai, like Gotô Ryûkichi, had to struggle to gain support from the public and officials who were indifferent to eugenics. Unlike Gotô, however, Nagai enjoyed credibility and prestige which came from his advanced study in Germany, his academic positions, and his government appointments. He had access to the mainstream media and strong networks among influential individuals. These factors, as well as Japan's involvement in a war against China (1931-1945), which evolved into the Pacific War (1941-1945), helped Nagai achieve much more than Gotô. By the late 1930s, Nagai's eugenics initiatives had established a professional association and journal, secured government funding for research, mobilized women, contributed to the creation of a government office in charge of eugenics, and drafted a legal sterilization plan, that led to the enactment of the 1940 National Eugenics Law. All of these achievements could have
been more difficult or perhaps impossible if there had not been a foundation of eugenics awareness slowly built by people like Naruse Jinzō, Yamanouchi Shigeto, Hiratsuka Raichō, and Gotō Ryūkichi.

Rather than stressing his activities with the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, the last case study is concerned with Nagai’s effort to promote eugenics among women, because it was an extension of earlier eugenics movements, especially by Naruse and Hiratsuka, which helped to redefine gender norms in Japan.¹

More precisely, this chapter focuses on a eugenics organization, established by Nagai in 1935, the leadership and membership of which appears to have been restricted to women, and explores questions regarding gender and eugenics. Were women passive agents in his eugenics movement? What motivated some women who cooperated with Nagai? Wartime pronatal policies have been generally interpreted as something that reinforced the dominant state ideology of “good wife, wise mother (ryōsai kenbo),” because they emphasized the role of women as mothers and nurturers and tied them to

the home. Was the modern science of eugenics compatible with official gender values based on Confucianism and the emperor system? What was the long-term impact of women's exposure to eugenics thought in Japan?

In order to answer these questions, I examine the history of Nagai’s unique all-women eugenics organization mainly through its official journal, **Yūsei** [Wellborn] (1936-1939). After outlining the society's origin, structure, purpose, and activities, I shall analyze how Japanese women were positioned in the larger context of eugenics activities, highlighting Nagai’s pursuit of a state initiative in eugenics policy making.

The Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society (hereafter, abbreviated as EMPS; **Yūsei Kekkon Fukyūkai**) has not been a subject of intensive scholarly inquiry. Its existence has been acknowledged by few scholars. For example, historian Ishizaki Nobuko compares Hiratsuka Raichō’s eugenics thought to that of a male leader of the proletarian birth control movement, Yamamoto Senji (1889-1929). She briefly mentions that some feminist leaders, who had supported the birth control movement, joined the EMPS. She uses the EMPS to illustrate her point that their eugenics view emphasized state power rather than individual freedom, just as did that of Hiratsuka.² Kondō Kazuko, whose research focuses on women, peace activism, and international relations, writes about wartime eugenics marriage discourse. In her study of women and war, Kondō examines Japan’s wartime mobilization of women through population policies and compares it to state control over sexuality in Germany. Despite the subject, however, the

EMPS is not referred to in her article. Neither Ishizaki nor Kondō go into the details of the history and implications of the EMPS. In his 1998 book, social historian Fujino Yutaka examines the EMPS in much more substantially than ever before. He concludes, however, that the EMPS leaders popularized “unscientific” hereditary views among the nonspecialists in order to promote eugenics policies.

The lack of strong female initiative—the EMPS was established and run by male medical doctors—and its secondary nature as an affiliate of a larger male-dominated eugenics organization may explain it has been of limited interest to women’s historians and scholars of the history of the eugenics movement. The high degree of women’s participation in the EMPS is particularly intriguing considering when the EMPS existed. The late 1930s was a crucial period, when eugenics finally began receiving attention from the formerly reluctant state and (some) women began to get involved in formulating state pronatalist—often eugenic—policies.

---


5 Fujino Yutaka, Nihon fashizumu to yūsei shisō, 170-176. For his discussions on marriage eugenics, see pp. 164-170 and 331-342.
As in Chapter 4, the contribution of this chapter is to position women in the history of eugenics. In essence, this chapter argues that the EMPS played a role in reinforcing women’s inclination to take charge of “marriage eugenics.” This would develop into what I call “women’s eugenics” in wartime Japan. “Women’s eugenics” emphasized marriage and reproduction and focused on infectious diseases in the private sphere of influence. By the 1940s, the seed of eugenics thought, planted by Naruse Jinzô half a century earlier, grew into an intellectual force that would later redefine the role of women in Japanese society.

6.2 The Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society (EMPS)

6.2.1 Origin and Leadership

The Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society was created as an affiliate of the Japan Association of Ethnic National Hygiene (Nihon Minzoku Eisei Kyôkai)6 in Tokyo, November 11, 1935.7 As noted above, the latter had been founded by Tokyo University physiologist Nagai Hisomu, geneticist Abe Ayao, and others in 1930. As part of an effort to promote public awareness of eugenics marriage, in June 1933 the Association had opened a Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office (Yûsei Kekkon Sôdanjo) in the

---

6 Its official English name was the Association of Race Hygiene without reflecting the Japanese term, minzoku. As noted in Chapter 5, the Association was originally established as a society (gakkai) and renamed association (kyôkai) upon obtaining the foundation status in 1935.

Shiraki-ya Department Store in Tokyo. The Association and the Japanese Red Cross co-organized an Exhibition on Marriage Hygiene and designated November 11 as "the day to recognize the importance of marriage (kekkon kyōchō-bi)." The Association of Ethnic National Hygiene decided to establish the EMPS on the third annual "day of marriage" in 1935. Several scholars through personal networks recruited women of prominence to join the cause. Nagai Hisomu’s influence was evident since the contact address of the newly founded Society was his office: the Physiology Laboratory, Faculty of Medicine, Tokyo University.

The EMPS was unique in that originally almost all the officers and members were women. As kaichō Nagai Hisomu himself presided over the officers, all of whom were

---


9 One of the reasons why November 11 (the Japanese would call November the 11th month) was chosen was that the Chinese character used to express the number eleven looks like the character “earth.” Since earth is the foundation of the growth of beautiful flowers which are often used as a metaphor of the fit child growing up with good genes and care, the number eleven is appropriate for the day stressing the importance of eugenics marriage. See Nagai Hisomu, “Aisatsu,” Yūsei 1.10, 5. As for the exhibition, see Sekijū ichidai hakubutsukan no 12, Kekken Eisei Tenrankai gō (December 1933). Many women’s organizations and disease prevention societies participated in this successful event which drew a total of 24,664 people.

10 See “Nihon Yūsei Kekkon Fuyūkai no seisuritsu,” and “Dai san-kai kekken eisei kyōchō no tsudoi,” in Minzoku eisei 4 (1935), 510. According to these articles, the central members who planned the establishment of the EMPS were Nagai Hisomu, Kayō Nobunori, Tamiya Takeo, Takeuchi Shigeo, Koya Yoshie, and Saiō Shigesaburō. Ikemi Takeshi, the self-claimed protege of Nagai, writes his memoir about his involvement with the EMPS establishment. See Ikemi Takeshi, ed., Nihon no aron no shinpo (Tokyo: Ikemi Gakuen, 1987), 2 and 742. More on an account explaining the origin of the EMPS and related efforts to promote eugenics marriage, see Yoshimasa Shōfu, Yūsei eisei no riron to iissai: Toku ni seishin igaku to no kanketsu ni ote (Tokyo: Nankōdō, 1940), 273-274.

11 Yūsei 1.1 (March 1936), 28.
women: the two vice presidents (fuku kaichō), eleven advisers (komon), and fourteen secretaries (kanji). There were three types of women: professionals, wives of prominent men; and daughters from distinguished families.

For example, one of the vice presidents was Nagai’s wife, Hanayo. She was not only married to him but a daughter of Hayashi Tarō, Reserved Lieutenant General of the prestigious Imperial Army. Another vice president, Takeuchi Shigeyo (1881-1975) was the first graduate of Tokyo Medical College for Women founded by Yoshioka Yayoi (1871-1959). Takeuchi was one of the founding members of the EMPS. While practicing gynecological and obstetric medicine, she pursued a doctoral degree under Nagai Hisomu’s supervision. Using the techniques of biometrics, Takeuchi completed her research entitled “A Study on the Constitution of Japanese Women” in 1933.

Below vice presidents, there were advisers. Among them were women educators such as Inoue Hideko (1875-1963), the president of Japan Women’s College, and Yoshioka Yayoi, physician and president of the Tokyo Medical College for Women. Unlike these self-made women, others were from upper-class families. Hatoyama Kaoru (1888-1982) was an educator, the wife of political leader Hatoyama Ichirō; and the daughter of Terada Sakae, a member of the House of Peers. One writer describes Hatoyama Kaoru as “the wise wife who made a prime minister” and someone who

---

12 “Nihon Yūsei Kekkon Fukyūkai kaisoku tekiyō,” Yūsei 1.1 (March 1936), n.p.


“supported four generations of a political family.” Another adviser, Hozumi Nakako, was the wife of a Tokyo University professor, Shigetô, who supported Hiratsuka Raichô’s feminist effort to establish a eugenics marriage restriction law. Nakako was a sister of Count Kodama Hideo. The Hozumis were noted for eminent legal scholars in their genealogy. Hozumi Nakako’s fellow adviser, Nagayo Tamako, was the daughter of Harvard-educated wealthy industrialist Morimura Isamu, and the wife of pathologist Nagayo Matarô. The Nagayo family was known for producing prominent men in the field of medicine.

In the EMPS organizational hierarchy, there existed secretaries under these vice presidents and advisers. Both Ide Hiroko and Yamamoto Sugi were physicians. Kôra Tomiko was a psychologist with a Ph.D. from Columbia University. Kôra was an alumna and faculty member at Japan Women’s College. Kayô Kikue, Saitô Fujiko, Kojima Tokiko, and Tamiya Yoshiko were the wives of medical advisory staff at the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office.

The establishment of the male-initiated all-women eugenics organization should be credited to the strong desire of Nagai Hisômu, who sought state patronage for eugenics. Nagai was born in Hiroshima in 1876, the second son of thirteen children. His father Keisuke preferred educating his bright young son in Chinese classic studies in a private school, rather than exposing him to the new Western-style public school system. Later, however, following the advice of a prominent educator, Keisuke transferred Hisômu to

---

public schools. Hisomu graduated first in his class, both in the local primary and middle schools. Because of his academic achievements, he was admitted to the First Higher School in Tokyo without the entrance examination. After finishing the First Higher School, virtually a preparatory school to Tokyo University, despite his love of literature Nagai entered Tokyo University’s College of Medicine (Tokyo Ika Daigaku) reflecting the desire of his family. His college friend recalled that although Nagai’s maternal uncle was a wealthy industrialist, Nagai himself tended to suffer from a lack of money as a student. His financial situation can be explained by the fact that Nagai had many siblings. Upon graduation, he chose to pursue physiology, and he was sent by the government to study at Göttingen University between 1903 and 1906. His adviser was Max Verworn, and he did research the metabolism of animals in hibernation. In 1911, he was granted the degree of Doctor in Medicine (igaku hakushi) from Tokyo University for a thesis based on projects he conducted in Germany.

He had a successful career in terms of employment: assistant professor at Tokyo University under Professor Ōsawa Kenji, 1906-1915; Professor of Physiology at Tokyo

19 Wakabayashi, “Nagai sensei no purofuru.”
20 Koike, “Nagai Hisomu hakushi no fu o kiite.”
University, 1915-1937, plus Dean of Medicine, 1934-1937. After retiring, he was professor and Dean of Medicine at Taipei Imperial University in colonial Taiwan, 1937-1939. He served as an adviser to the Dean of Medicine at Peking National University while northern China was under Japanese occupation, 1939-1945. Although Nagai climbed the academic ranks smoothly, his dedication to eugenics made the professorship in hygiene more desirable to him. When Nagai’s colleague, the professor of hygiene Yokote Chiyonosuke, retired in 1931, Nagai is said to have requested the vacated position unsuccessfully.22

In addition to his main employment, he served as lecturer to at least two different women’s colleges. Succeeding Ōsawa, who had supported Hiratsuka Raichō’s eugenics legislative effort, Nagai taught physiology and eugenics at the Japan Women’s College between 1921 and 1939.23 Records show that he was also in charge of physiology at Yoshioka Yayoi’s Tokyo Medical College for Women in the 1920s and 1930s.24 Prior to his official affiliations with these colleges, he had already been active in educating women. For example, he often contributed articles on eugenics to a journal dedicated to enlightening women in the field of hygiene [Fujin eisei zasshi] beginning in the mid-1910s.25 Moreover, he joined the Women’s Problems Study Group (Fujin Mondai


25 For example, see Nagai Hisonori, “Taisetsu naru shusei kettō,” Fujin eisei zasshi 324 (1916), 8-14.
Kenkyūkai), which was organized by Naruse Jinzō’s close associate at Japan Women’s College, Asō Shōzō. The group benefitted from the participation of more than one hundred men and women, mostly scholars, educators, and social activists. Its diverse topics related to various women’s issues and often included elements of eugenics.26

Nagai Hisomu was a prolific writer, publishing more than twenty books and numerous essays before his death in 1957. In addition to physiological works, most of which were textbooks, he wrote books in which he explored the boundaries between science and philosophy, this is where his interest in eugenics developed. His philosophical background was both Eastern and Western. His close friend, Koike Shige, noted that Nagai’s thought was influenced by Confucian scholar Rai San’yō (1780-1832).27 Rai was a historical figure from Nagai’s home, Hiroshima, and was known for his Chinese-style poems and historical analyses. The Confucian thinker’s works were said to have inspired radicals, who wanted to overthrow the existing Shogunate and reinstitute the emperor as a political power in the late Tokugawa period. As for Western philosophy, Nagai’s adviser, Verworn, contributed to the intellectual growth of Nagai; the German physiologist told his young Japanese student to study philosophy in order better to understand life and the universe.28 Subsequently, Nagai became acquainted with the ideas of natural philosophers of ancient Greece such as Demokritos and Empedokles, and

27 Koike, “Nagai Hisomu hakushi no fu o kiite,” 73.
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latter day thinkers including G. W. Leibniz (1646-1716) and G. F. W. Hegel (1770-1831). In Nagai’s view, these philosophers were important because, based on their ideas, natural scientists such as J.B. Lamarck (1744-1829), Charles Darwin (1809-1882), Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919), and T. H. Huxley (1825-1895) developed new theories for explaining evolution. It should be noted that Nagai lamented the lack of interest in philosophy in Japan, and attributed it to the weakness of the natural sciences there.\(^\text{29}\)

Nagai Hisomu’s publications included Igaku to tetsugaku [Medicine and philosophy, 1908], Seimeiron [On life, 1913], Seibutsugaku to tetsugaku to no sakai [The border between biology and philosophy, 1916], Jinseiron [Ethology, 1916], and Yûseigakugairon [Introduction to eugenics, 1936]. His writing was noted for its elegant style accentuated by graceful quotations from Chinese classics. Some of his works, especially the Seimeiron, became best sellers.\(^\text{30}\) Although the original Seimeiron dealt with issues related to eugenics to only a limited degree, a revised edition, published in 1915, added more than thirty pages on human heredity and race improvement.\(^\text{31}\) Examples used to illustrate the laws of heredity relevant to eugenics were works in German and English. These indicate that Nagai’s interest in eugenics grew significantly between 1913 and 1915 and was based on scientific sources but not his original research.

---

\(^{29}\) "Tetsugaku naki Nihon no kagaku," in Nagai Hisomu, Seibutsugaku to tetsugaku no sakai. 31-40. For the analysis on the philosophical dimension of Nagai’s thought, see Kobayashi, “Seirijakuteki tetsugakushi tenbō.”


\(^{31}\) Suzuki Zenji, Nihon no yûseigaku, 94.
Together with books by Yamanouchi Shigeo and others, Nagai’s *Seimeiron* helped make knowledge of eugenics more accessible to the educated public (including women) in the mid-1910s.

Nagai Hisomu believed reproduction was a noble task in which men and women shared equal responsibility. In addition to disseminating information about how to reproduce desirable children, he envisioned a government role in instituting eugenics policies. As early as 1916, at the first meeting of the Home Ministry’s Health and Hygiene Investigation Committee (*Hoken Eisei Chōsakai*), Nagai, who had just become a full professor at Tokyo University a year earlier, suggested that the government seriously consider eugenics issues as one of its research subjects. Another committee member flatly rejected this proposal saying that eugenics was too lofty. This member then suggested that they prioritize other issues which needed direct and immediate action and indicated that the continued study of rural hygiene and statistics would cover what Nagai wanted to achieve.\(^{32}\)

As we have seen, when Hiratsuka Raichō, using eugenics reasoning, in 1920, proposed a law to restrict venereally diseased men from getting married the chief of the Home Ministry’s Bureau of Public Health was not enthusiastic, either. He did, however, respect the reformist goal of eugenics science. He commented that applying eugenics measures to society required further research. Even later, after Japan’s military ally, Nazi

---

Germany, implemented various eugenics policies, and eugenics gained momentum in the 1930s, Japan’s eugenics bills were submitted not by the bureaucrats, but by some representatives of the Diet. Non-bureaucratic initiatives had little chance to become law; and few legislative efforts initiated by Diet members succeeded.\textsuperscript{33}

Under these circumstances, Nagai Hisomu needed much wider popular support to convince the state to take on eugenics policies. He was well aware that reproduction (and improvement of the biological quality of the Japanese) could not be carried out without women’s cooperation. Having taught at Japan Women’s College and Tokyo Medical College for Women, he knew that educated women would be interested in eugenics marriage and reproduction. It was under these circumstances that he decided to organize a eugenics society consisting mainly of women. Indeed the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office director, Kayô Nobunori, recalled that journalists representing women’s magazines showed overwhelming interest in expert eugenics marriage guidance at the opening of his office. Many reporters rushed to cover the story about the establishment of the EMPS as well.\textsuperscript{34} Through the anti-venereal disease campaign and various birth control movements in the 1920s, many middle-class and working-class women had already been exposed to eugenic ideas. Therefore, creating a female eugenics organization could mobilize both media and women and help disseminate eugenics ideas even further.

\textsuperscript{33} See a Diet member Yagi Issurô’s speech on his sterilization plan at the 75th Diet session in 1938. Quoted in Saitô Chiyo, “Mienai <michi>: Yûsei hogo-hô no keifu o tazunete mita koto, kangaeta koto,” \textit{Agora} 28 (June 1983), 23-24.

\textsuperscript{34} Kayô, “Yûsei kekken sôdanjo,” 32.
6.2.2 Membership and Finance

There were more than 1,500 people (most of them women) at the EMPS inauguration ceremony in December 1935. According to the society's rules, only women were allowed to become regular members (sei kaiin), by paying an annual membership fee of one yen. Men could, however, become "supporting members (sanjo kaiin)" by paying the same amount of money. (There were several other "special" member categories with various levels of dues.) There were over 500 members. These included prominent women activists such as a Japan Women's Christian Temperance Union leader, Moriya Azumako, birth control movement leader Baroness Ishimoto (Kaiō) Shidzue, female suffragist Ichikawa Fusae, and maternalist Yamada Waka. The total income received from membership fees was about 2,000 yen. In addition, the Society

---

35 "Nihon Yusei Kekkon Fukyūkai hokkaishiki no keikyō," Yusei 1.1, 26.

36 Concerning the member rules, see "Nihon Yusei Kekkon Fukyūkai kaisoku tekiyô," Yusei 1.1, p.p.

37 "Kaiin hōmei roku," Yusei 1.3 (May 1936), 20. Here I use the term "maternalists" as a translation of boesi shugusha to describe feminists who try to improve women's status by emphasizing differences between men and women. Among those differences, women's reproductive ability is a particularly important issue.

38 The breakdown of the number of members are as follows: 1) regular members (including male supporting members) 408; 2) special members (tokubetsu kaiin) 67; 3) lifetime regular members (shūshin futsu kaiin) 48; and 4) lifetime special members (shūshin tokubetsu kaiin) 14. The membership fee for these categories were: 1) regular members one yen per year; 2) special members five yen per year; 3) lifetime regular member one time fee of ten yen; and 4) lifetime special member one time fee of fifty yen. Since some members changed status and their names were listed more than once, the actual number of the society members was probably slightly less than the total of members in the four categories (537). The total of their membership fee at the time of their joining the Society would be thus slightly less than 1,923 yen. Members included the officers. In addition to members, the Yusei listed 69 councillors (hyōgin). For the list of members, see Yusei 1.3 (May 1936), 20-23, 26; 1.4 (June 1936), 20-22; 1.5 (July 1936), 23; 1.9 (November 1936), 21; and 2.1 (April 1937), 19.
received donations totaling 1,210 yen from ten individuals.35 Other income sources included funds from advertisements in their journal Yūsei. In the beginning, five companies each placed one-page ads in the twenty-eight page monthly magazine. Then the number of advertisers increased, and on average the journal had seven pages of advertisements. The marketed products included Nagai Hisomu's books on eugenics, a multi-volume educational movie "Crossroads of Marriage (Kekkon Jūji-gai),"40 toothpaste, and pharmaceutical items. The Shiraki-ya department store also placed an add regularly. Like the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office, the EMPS was probably run by unpaid staff. The Society was thus able to operate on membership revenues, donations, and advertisement fees under the umbrella of its parent organization, the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene.

For the fees they paid, members were entitled to enjoy certain benefits. For example, they received an emblem and the monthly journal Yūsei. Also, members and their family and friends could receive free consultation at the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office, a service that cost three yen for nonmembers.41

35 Except for Kosaka Jinnō who donated 500 yen in memory of his deceased son, all other donors were women. Six out of these nine women were vice presidents and officers of the Society. See "Tokushi kiñ," Yūsei 1.1, 28.

40 About the content of the films, see Ishihara Fusao, "Minzoku eisei sōritsuji nō tsuioku," Minzoku eisei 30.1 (1964), 2.

6.3.3 Publication of the Journal Yūsei

The major member benefit was probably receiving the monthly journal Yūsei. Yūsei began publication four months after the inauguration ceremony. In the first issue (March 1936), the editor, male psychiatrist Yasui Hiroshi, explained the essence of eugenics marriage to the female readers:

*The purpose of marriage is the well-being of family and the prosperity of descendants.
*To achieve the well-being of family and the prosperity of descendants, one has to be selective regarding the quality of his or her spouse. Women whose fate is often determined by marriage need to be particularly careful.
*The marriage customs based on superstitions and traditions will be things of the past.
*Rational selection based on eugenics is desirable for modern people and should replace the old forms of marriage.
*Choosing a spouse of good quality, avoiding one of poor quality, and ensuring the physical and mental fitness of descendants is a source of the well-being of immediate, as well as extended, family in a smaller context. It is also the foundation of the betterment of state (kokka) and ethnic nation (minzoku) in a larger context.

*Popularization of eugenics marriage, which aims at family well-being and the ethnic national cleansing (minzoku jōka), is the effort of highest moral value.\(^{42}\)

In general, the journal explored the topics of longevity, health, and the extraordinary talents of individuals. The journal also depicted fertility in a positive manner while questioning the validity of eugenics arguments held by some birth control enthusiasts. Birth control might function dysgenically rather than eugenically; the "eugenically desirable," who were often informed and could afford costly contraceptives,

\(^{42}\) Yasui Hiroshi, "no title," Yūsei 1.1 (March 1936), 1.
might restrict the number of offspring to avoid additional child rearing costs. Because their readers presumably belonged to the educated middle-class, and were often believed to possess desirable mental qualities, the journal promoted “positive eugenics.” The goal was to maximize the chances of procreation of the “fit” in a two-step process. First, as Yasui stressed, a “eugenically desirable” individual had consciously to choose a spouse of similarly “superior” quality. Then the “fit” couples were encouraged to produce as many children as possible.

Opposite to positive eugenics was negative eugenics. Negative eugenic measures included quarantine and sterilization of the “undesirable.” The journal writers discouraged their readers from marrying men who had such “ethnic national poisons (minzoku doku)” as venereal diseases, tuberculosis, leprosy, and drinking problems themselves or in their families. In particular, the journal used much space describing the supposedly dysgenic effect of venereal diseases and tuberculosis. Inclusive eugenics was an important part of the Ōsei discourse.

Though discouraging marriage to eugenically “unfit” men, the Ōsei encouraged women to marry disabled veterans. Though their bodies may have been damaged and appeared “unfit,” the genes of these veterans were intact and truly “fit.” The editor stressed the physical and mental quality of handicapped soldiers. They served the country because they were physically superior and had noble minds. The discontinuity

---

43 Yasui Hiroshi, “Sanji seigen to Ōsei undō no sabetsu,” Ōsei 1.5 (July 1936), 8-11. For eugenicists’ view on birth control, see Hiroshima Kiyoshi, “Gendai Nihon jinkō seisakushi shōron: Jinkō shishitsu gaien o megutte (1916 nen-1930 nen), Jinkō mondai kenkyū 154 (April 1980), 59-60. For an analysis of various intellectuals’ views on birth control movement and eugenics ideology, see Ōbayashi, “Sanji chōsetsu.”
of their blood lines, he argued, would soon cause an unfortunate decline in the nation’s population quality. The editor praised the courage of young women who decided to marry these disabled veterans.44

The journal reprinted articles or columns from general newspapers and added comments from the eugenic point of view. For example, there was an article about twenty-two year old Tokuda Eiko, who killed her elder brother, a dental school student, in 1935. Rather than focusing on the fact that it was fratricide for insurance fraud, the editor noted that Eiko was eugenically informed. In her confession, she revealed her frame of mind:

The Mendelian Law would not allow the birth of good human beings from parents who were alcoholic and sexually dissolute. Eugenically speaking, it cannot be denied that even if there were no effect on their children, the curse of the parents’ genes would appear in the grandchildren’s generation. Those who have parents as undesirable as ours should not produce any descendants. Doing so means poisoning the society. Because of this, I have never been interested in repeated offers of marriage nor have I been romantically involved with anyone. When my mother consulted me about killing the ill-behaved brother (furyô no anî), I did not hesitate to support her plan since getting rid of an inferior human would serve the society and help my poor mother....My father was vicious when he was drunk. He was also a philanderer. He had a shallow cruel personality. My maternal grandfather was also violent when he was drunk and did not care about the family. Thus, my grandmother divorced him when my mother was three. There is no way that we, offspring of these parents, will have desirable descendants.45

44 “Senshô gunjin ni totsuge,” Yûsei 2.12 (February 1937), 19; “Shitsumei gunjin to hakui no tenshi,” Yûsei 3.3 (May 1938), 17; “Hakui yûshi no tsue to tairiku hanayome,” Yûsei 3.6 (August 1938), 11-12; and “Machi no kekkon sôdanjo,” Yûsei 4.1 (March 1939), 19.

45 “Nikushin goroshi no hanzai shiriri,” Yûsei 1.1, 27. A much longer version of her confession was printed in newspaper. See “Jikkei bôsatsu no shintei o tatsu; aise tsu yo ni utaeru nikushin aizô no kyokuchi hen,” Tokyo Asahi shinbun, 15 January 1936.
Her eugenics perspective might have had much to do with the fact that Eiko’s father practiced medicine and, more importantly, that she herself had attended Naruse Jinzō’s Japan Women’s College as a home economics major.\(^{46}\) The editor of Yûsei felt that although the crime itself should be condemned, he could not help sympathizing with the simple-hearted girl (who was burdened by a dysgenic fate beyond her control).

In the next issue of Yûsei, psychologist Saitô Shigesaburô took up this case again. He strongly disapproved of the fact that Eiko chose murder to solve her problem. Saitô defined eugenics as the science of preventing the inferior (genes) from spreading. It had to be stressed, Saitô continued, that “eugenics measures had to be most humane.” “People who kill others to do away with undesirable genes are those who do not understand what eugenics really is.” Then he explained alternative preventive measures such as marriage counseling, birth control (use of contraceptive devices), and sterilization (but not castration) for the socially misfit. Saitô also discussed a case in which a husband suffocated his wife by rolling her in a futon mattresses. It was reported that the husband committed this crime because he was frustrated by the fact that she wanted to practice continence. It was reported that the wife was afraid of reproducing eugenically “unfit” children not only because she was his cousin, but because their parents and their grandparents were all consanguineously married. Here again, Saitô believed that the death

---

\(^{46}\) “Nazo sagashi Nichidaisei nikushin satsujin jiken,” **Yomuuri shinbun** (Tokyo), 18 December 1935.
of an innocent woman could have been prevented if she or her husband had been aware of alternatives to sexual abstinence even after the dysgenic marriage took place.47

Besides news commentaries, the journal contributors examined the contents of marriage consultation columns in daily newspapers. Yüsei also carried an original marriage advice series. Many discussions were concerned with questions about marriage between cousins. The Yüsei editor, Yasui Hiroshi, sometimes criticized other consultants as genetically ill-informed and irresponsible.48 In Yasui’s opinion, hereditary diseases tended to occur in consanguinity because blood-related parents were much more likely than mates at random to join undesirable recessive genes in their offspring. Based on this view, he advised his readers that it was best to avoid any consanguinity because recessive genes were not always detected by the investigation of phenotypical diseases in the family.49

Yüsei writers paid attention to local initiatives in reforming conventional marriage customs as well. Many local women’s associations promoted better management of domestic affairs. Economizing on sumptuous wedding ceremonies was one of their goals. Some groups began integrating eugenics concepts into their marriage reform programs.50

47 Saitô Shigesaburô, “Machi ni koboruru yûsei no shizuku,” Yüsei 1.2 (April 1936), 16-18. These tragic murder cases indicate that women were influenced by the eugenically-inspired birth control movement, see Fujime, Sei no rekishigaku: Kôshô seido, dataizai taisei kara Baishun Bôshi-hô, Yüsei Hogo-hô taisei e (Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan, 1997), 245-281.

48 For example, see “Ayanareru kekkon sôdan,” Yüsei 2.3 (June 1937), 8-10; and “Ketsuzoku kekkon rasan ron no ichirei,” Yüsei 3.8 (October 1938), 13-14.

49 Yasui Hiroshi, “Ketsuzoku kekkon o zetsumetsu shiezaru,” Yüsei 3.7 (September 1938), 2-12.

For instance, Fujioka Ruriko, the daughter of the Wakayama prefectural governor, was an enthusiastic advocate of a local marriage reform group. Together with her mother, she tried to show how women could rationalize marriage customs. In her own engagement and wedding ceremony, she eliminated unnecessary luxuries, including the exchange of engagement rings. What impressed eugenicists most was her exchanging medical documents with her fiancee.\footnote{51} This kind of private initiative was supplemented by local administrative policies. Some prefectures and municipalities instituted or encouraged the exchange of health documents before marriage as well.\footnote{52}

The journal also reported events organized by the EMPS. In June 1936, a branch of the EMPS in Odawara was founded. For its inauguration ceremony, the EMPS president Nagai Hisonu and two other medical advisers of the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office came to speak in front of an audience of approximately nine-hundred, the majority of them school girls. Obstetrician and gynaecologist Satō Yoshimi talked about ethnic national hygiene focusing on tuberculosis. In his lecture, he mentioned that Soviet leader Joseph Stalin once stated, “Although Japan considers itself as one of the three major world powers and a power in charge of Asia, its degree of cultural maturity is significantly low. For instance, Japan has a great many patients suffering from tuberculosis.” Satō also discussed the disease from the perspective of national defense.

The primary reason that soldiers were discharged from the military was their being

\footnote{51} “Chiji reijô no kekkon kaizen jissen,” \textit{Yûsei} 1.1, 28; and “Wakayama ken kekkon kaizen dômei,” \textit{Yûsei} 1.9 (November 1936), 22.

\footnote{52} For example, see “Shi cisei shikenjo no kenkô shômeisho,” \textit{Yûsei} 1.7 (September 1936), 22; and “Kyôto-fu no seisô yobô reikô, kekkon ni shûndansho kôkan,” \textit{Yûsei} 1.9 (November 1936), 22.
infected with tuberculosis. He then described a recent trend in the deterioration of soldiers’ physical quality. He went on to explain what kind of positive and negative eugenics measures concerning marriage, reproduction, and nurturing had been taken in such countries as Italy and Germany. Ongoing discussions regarding sterilization bills in the Japanese Diet were also mentioned. Satō’s lecture appeared to stimulate school girls’ sense of commitment to bettering the country.

President Nagai’s lecture on marriage hygiene followed that of Satō. Because the effects of heredity are stronger than those of the environment, he emphasized, one should carefully choose whom to marry. In order to make a right decision, one should look at the hereditary fitness of the families of candidates. As for the physical condition of a future spouse, the most important things to check were venereal diseases and tuberculosis. The Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office and the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society which he himself established served as tools to enable people to make a scientifically sound judgment for eugenics marriage. The organizers of the ceremony showed the movie “Crossroads of Marriage,” a visual representation of the points in the lectures.53

6.3.4 Biological Fitness of Woman

The Yūsei discourse presented the image of women as biologically equal to or even superior to men. Vital statistics showed that more male children were born than females; yet boys were more likely to die early. The average life expectancy of women

---

was longer than that of men, so women were better “fit” for survival than men. In different articles and lectures, Nagai Hisomu tried to explain this difference between men and women from a genetic point of view. There are two types of sex determining chromosomes, X and Y; while a woman has two X chromosomes, a man has one X and one Y. Nagai theorized that the X chromosomes might contain genes that had more to do with survival. Having two Xs, women were then more likely to live longer. Nagai also introduced a study by a European psychologist whose research seemed to indicate that children’s intelligence correlates more with that of the mother than that of the father. Nagai presented a German geneticist’s hypothesis to explain this phenomenon by saying that the X chromosomes might carry genes influencing the level of intelligence. If this hypothesis were true, male children’s intelligence would have been influenced solely by their mother.54

In one of his essays entitled “Great Names in History and Their Lineages,” Nagai Hisomu highlighted wise and capable wives and daughters in the genealogies of prominent military generals and scholars in Japan. He implied that without contributions from maternal genes, the excellence of these families could easily have been ended much earlier. He then denied the traditional patriarchal notion that whoever the mother was, the characteristics of the father would be inherited according to the notion that “women were

54 Nagai Hisomu, “Yūsei kekkon ni tsuite 2,” Yūsei 2.12 (February 1938), 2-16
only borrowed wombs (onnna no hara wa karimono).” The Mendelian laws of heredity had already proven that maternal genes affect the quality of offspring at least as much as paternal ones do and perhaps even more.55

On a different occasion, Nagai spoke in front of female college students and presented his philosophical view that life is not made up of “men OR women” but rather of “men AND women.” While some argued that women’s smaller physical size implied that women were underdeveloped beings just like children, others believed that women’s smooth skin, slenderness, lesser amount of hair, and pink lips indicated that they are farther away from beasts than men in their stage of evolution. Nagai also contrasted two interpretations of women’s lighter brain weight. While some claimed that this indicated women’s lower intelligence compared to that of men, others disagreed with such a notion on the basis that women’s brain weight in proportion to their body weight was heavier than that of men. Nagai himself contended that it was not productive to debate which sex is superior to the other and criticized the adherents of the “predominance of men over women (danson johi)” view. Biologically speaking, their bodies differ to accomplish equally worthy but different tasks. In his opinion, men are driven to free themselves from hunger in order to preserve themselves. They are hunters, destroyers, and givers. On the other hand, women are driven by love and instinct to preserve their racial stock (shuzoku). They are more constructive than destructive and receivers. Women are also more willing to sacrifice themselves. In sum, men and women are different; while men are

55 Nagai Hisomu, “ijin to kettō,” Yūsei 1.3 (May 1936), 2-10.
more dynamic and egoistic, women are more static and altruistic. The two sexes are meant to supplement each other in order to fulfill their lives. This view emphasizing biological differences between the two sexes was reminiscent of the view held by Hiratsuka Raichô and other feminists who valued motherhood. Yet like most of these maternalists (bosei shugisha), Nagai was somewhat critical of those who advocated equal political rights for both men and women (joken shugisha).  

Another perception shared by both the maternalist feminists and the Yûsei eugenicists is that of women as victims of unrestricted male sexuality. The editor of Yûsei, Yasui Hiroshi, identified gonorrhea as the principal cause of infertility. Referring to the old saying “a wife who is unable to reproduce after three years of marriage should leave,” he estimated that a considerable number of women might have been divorced because of sterility. Statistically nearly half of these women became infertile because of gonorrhea acquired from their own husbands. He condemned the old custom as truly unfair to women. Nagai Hisomu noted that the same disease turned many pure virgins into patients.  

He and the Yûsei eugenicists excluded economically deprived women forced to engage in the sex trade from their vision of ideal Japanese womanhood. After all, the intended audience of the Yûsei eugenicists was middle-class women.

---

56 Nagai Hisomu, “Josei no tokuchô,” Yûsei 2. 6 and 7 (combined issue) (October 1937), 2-13.
57 Yasui Hiroshi, “Seibyô to kekkon,” Yûsei 2.10 (December 1937), 2-8.
6.3 Reorganization of the EMPS and State Eugenics Measures

Nagai Hisomu retired from the deanship of the faculty of medicine at Tokyo University in 1937. He assumed the same position at Taipei University in Japan’s colonial Taiwan for two years, then moved to China to serve as an adviser to the Peking National University Medical College. He continued to promote eugenics principles wherever he was. For instance, he hosted the 8th annual meeting of the Japanese Association of Ethnic National Hygiene in Taiwan in 1939.

Prior to his departure from Tokyo, Nagai had been involved in the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai), which was created in 1932 in response to concerns about the stagnation of scientific infrastructure and research funding. He managed to organize a committee that conducted ethnic national hygienic research on Japan’s ethnic minority, the Ainu, between 1933 and 1938.\(^5\) In addition to directing the Ainu research committee, Nagai served as chair of a subcommittee on eugenics studies (Yūsei Gakubu Jinkai) within another committee of the Society for the Promotion of Science studying national physical fitness issues (Kokumin Tairyoku Mondai Kōsakai, 1936-1942) headed by army surgeon Koizumi Chikahiko.\(^6\) Nagai’s close association


with eugenics sympathizer Koizumi was significant because Koizumi masterminded the creation of the Ministry of Health and Public Welfare and supported Nagai’s plan to institute a eugenics section in the Ministry.\(^6^1\)

Despite his persisting commitment to eugenics and occasional returns to Tokyo, his absence in the capital was soon felt by the eugenics organizations he had created. Without his charismatic personality, it was difficult to maintain them. Many staff donated their time because Nagai personally asked them for help in operating these organizations.

First, the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office at the Shiraki-ya Department Store—the office had stopped functioning and existed only nominally by this time\(^6^2\)—was closed and moved to Takeuchi Shigeyo’s clinic. Then, the Shiraki-ya Department store withdrew its advertisement from Yūsei. The Shiraki-ya had offered space free of charge because one of its executives was well-acquainted with Nagai.\(^6^3\) Some other advertisers

---


\(^6^2\) Kayō, “Yūsei kekkon sōdanjo,” 32.

\(^6^3\) Ibid., 31.
followed suit. The number of subscribers who did not renew their membership increased. With a shrinking budget, the pages of Yūsei decreased by one third from about thirty pages to twenty pages.

By late 1937, the EMPS underwent a major structural change. It eliminated the positions of advisers (komon) and secretaries (kanji) and established the new position of councillors (rijii). Eleven former advisers, including educators Yoshioka Yayoi and Inoue Hideko and upper class women Hatoyama Kaoruko, Hozumi Nakako, and Nagayo Tamako, were no longer officers. The majority of secretaries (twelve out of fourteen), however, remained in the EMPS under the new councillor title. The most significant change was that the society now allowed men to serve as officers. While the prior administration was all female except for President Nagai Hisomu, the new administration added eleven men. Many of them were medical advisers to the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office. The 1937 reorganization involved, in fact, the EMPS takeover of the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office and an attempt to revitalize the Office. At the same time, the takeover meant the professionalization of the EMPS.\textsuperscript{64}

The EMPS reorganization coincided with the government's growing interest in controlling population through marriage and reproduction. These Yūsei eugenicists seized the moment and extended their influence into the government. Then they began actively participating in national politics. Beginning in the 1930s, Diet members Arakawa Gorô and Yagi Itsurô submitted sterilization bills several times. In Spring 1934, Yagi contacted

\textsuperscript{64} Despite these organizational changes, the journal Yūsei was continued to be edited by Yasui Hiroshi.
the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, and medical men in the Association began preparing their own bill, which was completed by the end of 1936. In addition to Nagai, two other EMPS councillors, Kayō Nobunori (internalist) and Yoshimasu Shūfu (psychiatrist), drafted the bill. This bill and its modification were submitted in 1937 and 1939 to the Diet by the representatives, but they were not passed.

Meanwhile, with strong initiatives from the military, the Ministry of Health and Welfare (Kōseishō) was established in 1938. It was then that a separate section dealing with eugenics (Yūsei) was created in the Ministry. Bureaucrats in this Eugenics Section organized a study group that discussed various ethnic national hygienic issues (Minzoku Eisei Kenkyūkai). Among the committee members involved in the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office were a number of professors: Miyake Kōichi (Tokyo University, psychiatry), Tamiya Takeo (Tokyo University), Yoshimasu (Tokyo University), Koya Yoshio (Kanazawa Medical College, public hygiene), and Kawakami Riichi (Keiō University, ophthalmologic genetics). Considering the initiative taken by Nagai Hisomu, the inclusion of his close associates in the group was not surprising. The new sterilization bill prepared by the group was submitted to the Diet as the government’s proposal (seifu-an, prepared by bureaucrats) and the National Eugenics Law, based on that bill, was promulgated in May 1940.65

The EMPS councillors greatly contributed to the process: two drafters of the 1937 bill (Kayō and Yoshimasu) and four drafters of the 1940 bill (Kawakami, Koya, Tamiya, and Yoshimasu) came from this group. When the National Eugenics Law was enacted, the Ministry of Health and Welfare established an official eugenics marriage consultation office in Tokyo and appointed the Yūsei editor, Yasui Hiroshi, as its director. At the Minzoku Eisei Kenkyūkai, Nagai and his fellow eugenicists were no longer mere lobbyists, but became part of the state, formulating national eugenics policies. Nagai’s longtime pursuit of state patronage for eugenics finally materialized in this study group where bureaucrats and eugenicists met. The border between private eugenics and official eugenics became totally obscured.

Another characteristic of the new EMPS leadership was that there were four married couples who served as councilors (Kayō Nobunori and Kikue; Kojima Saburō and Tokiko, Saitō Shigesaburō and Fujiko, and Tamiya Takeo and Yoshiko) other than President Nagai Hisomu and Vice President Nagai Hanayo. The partnership of husband and wife among the EMPS councillors reflected a philosophical state of mind, life’s make-

---

66 As for this process, see Matsubara Yoko, “Minzoku yūsei hogōhō an to Nihon no yūsei-hō no keifu,” Kagakushi kenkyū 201 (Spring 1997), 42-50.

67 About its activities in the first three months, see Yasui Hiroshi, “Yūsei kekkō sōdanjo,” Yūseigaku 202 (December 1940), 16-17; Yūseigaku 203 (January 1941), 19-20; Yūseigaku 205 (March 1941), 10, 17-18; and Kondō, “Onna to sensō,” 495-498. Yasui Hiroshi wrote a book on eugenics marriage in 1941. He observed that many people became obsessively afraid of marrying because of possible hereditary diseases. That trend was against state policy aimed at population growth. The purpose of the book was to explain the basics of eugenics marriage and remove unnecessary fears. See his Yūsei kekkō (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1941).

68 See, for example, the new officer list in “Nihon Yūsei Kekkōa Fukyūkai kaisoku tekiyō,” Yūsei 2.10, n.p.
up of man AND women, and presented a new image of spousal partnership. The newly-structured society, which opened its door to male leaders, now began promoting eugenics marriage awareness among men, too.\textsuperscript{69}

Some remaining female officers were active in disseminating concepts of eugenics marriage utilizing their own networks. For example, American-educated psychologist Kôra Tomiko became involved in eugenics activities at the Satô Institute for New Home Life (Satô Shinkô Seikatsukan) in Tokyo. This institute tried to provide scientific and practical knowledge for the management of domestic affairs, especially for women who would become leaders of local women's groups. There Kôra developed a training program to turn graduates of higher schools for girls into ideal brides. She incorporated eugenics education into the curriculum. In the spring of 1938 she invited several EMPS councillors as speakers. While Yasui Hiroshi talked about the concepts of eugenics, Kawakami Riichi explained genetic principles with special emphasis on hereditary diseases, often caused by consanguinity. Yoshimasu Shûfu spoke on the hereditability of mental diseases and sterilization as a possible eugenics solution to the problem. Kayô Nobunori prepared lectures on marriage hygiene, noting the danger of tuberculosis and venereal diseases. Takeuchi Shigeyo's sex education class concluded the lecture series organized by Kôra for the Satô Institute students. The government's study group on ethnic national hygiene (Minzoku Eisei Kenkyûkai) was inaugurated at the Satô Institute in November 1938.\textsuperscript{70}

\textsuperscript{69} "Waseda Daigaku ni okeru yûsei kôenkai," Yûsei 2.12 (February 1938), 17.

\textsuperscript{70} "Shinkô Seikatsukan no yûsei kyôiku," Yûsei 3.3 (May 1938), 11; "Minzoku eisei kenkyûkai no tanjô," Yûsei 3.10 (December 1938), 19; and "Hijô ûkyokûsha ni oeru minzoku eisei mondai," Minzoku eisei shiryô 5 (March 1939), 1-22. For Kôra's activities at Satô Institute, see her autobiography, Ahinsâ o
Kōra was then chosen as the only woman representative in the central committee of the government-controlled Imperial Rule Assistance Association (Taisei Yokusankai) in December 1940. She proposed the establishment of a bureau of women (fujinkyoku) within the Association. One of the divisions she envisioned was a section on health. The bureau helped existing major women’s associations unite as the Greater Japan Women’s Association (Dai Nihon Fujinkai). It cooperated with the state in a 1942 campaign for national health (kenmin undō) emphasizing promotion of marriage and prevention of tuberculosis and venereal disease.71

Like Kōra, Takeuchi Shigeyo was promoting the ideas of eugenics marriage in her own way. In early 1938, together with Koya Yoshio, she represented the EMPS and spoke on eugenics and women at Waseda University in Tokyo. In front of predominantly male students at one of Japan’s leading private universities, Takeuchi defined eugenic women as those who were healthy and capable of transmitting desirable genes to the next generation. Like Nagai Hisomu, she dismissed the existing view portraying women as mere borrowed wombs. “Today’s educated (or scientifically informed) men like yourselves,” she urged, “should choose your future spouse more critically from the eugenic standpoint.”72

---


On a separate note, as a leader of other women’s groups trying to prevent venereal diseases and tuberculosis, she promoted the exchange of medical documents. For example, in 1937 the Coalition of Japanese Women’s Associations (Nihon Fujin Dantai Renmei) was created by unifying eight existing urban middle-class women’s groups including Takeuchi’s own Japan Society of Female Doctors (Nihon Joikai), the Japan Women’s Christian Temperance Union (Japan WCTU), the Women’s Peace Society (Fujin Heiwa Kyôkai), and the League for Woman Suffrage (Fusen Kakutoku Dômei). As chair of a committee for the prevention of venereal diseases in the Coalition, Takeuchi organized the National Maidenhood League (Kokumin Junketsu Dômei). It was reported that the League submitted petitions for venereal disease prevention to the House of Representatives and the House of Peers. The League recommendations included marriage restriction of V.D. patients, exchange of health certificates before marriage, medical checks of pregnant women, health tests of newborn babies, investigations of what caused sterility and stillbirth, and the abolition of state-sanctioned prostitution. When the Tokyo Women’s Society for the Prevention of


Tuberculosis (Kekkaku Yobō Tōkyō Fujin Iinkai) was founded in 1936, Takeuchi helped its leaders, Ushizuka Naoko and Yoshioka Yayoi, who were the EMPS advisers at that time.75

It should be noted that Takeuchi Shigeyo took part in the government ethnic national hygiene study group with fellow EMPS eugenicists. When the topic was concerned with eugenics marriage in one of the meetings held in September 1939, Takeuchi enthusiastically expressed her opinions. Statistics showed that about 20 percent of married women were infected with syphilis. She suspected that many of these women had been syphilis-free prior to their marriage. There was a serious problem for women unable to prove this. Takeuchi thus provided another reason why the exchange of medical documents was important. Besides checking one’s prospective husband’s health status, having a certificate would protect her reputation from the unreasonable accusation that she had been already venereally diseased prenuptially. Another point Takeuchi brought up in the discussion was the shortening of secondary education for girls so that they could marry at a younger age. In addition to Takeuchi, two other women, Tanaka Takako and Kawasaki Natsu, were also present at this meeting. EMPS eugenicists Yasui Hiroshi, Kawakami Riichi, and Yoshimasu Shūfū, presented their views on the subject. The study group members felt that Japan very much needed a eugenics marriage restriction law. Before the enactment of such a law, they decided they should begin with

75 “Kekkaku yobō Tōkyō fujin iinkai,” Yūsei 1.7 (September 1936), 27. Ushizuka Naoko was the wife of Toratarō, mayor of Tokyo then. See also “Kekkaku yobō fujin iinkai kaigō,” Joikai 283 (1 October, 1936), 3; and Takeuchi Shigeyo, “Kekkaku yobō undō ni kaerimite waga Shisei kaiin ni nozomu,” Joikai 284 (1 November, 1936), 18.
nonlegal eugenics measures. The immediate actions recommended by the group included
the promotion of earlier marriage and the avoidance of consanguinity, supported by such
socioeconomic and educational plans as marriage finance, establishment of local eugenics
marriage consultation offices, and eugenics marriage education for schoolgirls, members,
and go-betweens.  

Takeuchi Shigeyo’s participation in government health policy-making was not
limited to her joining the discussions of the ethnic national hygiene study group. When
the Ministry of Health and Welfare was being created, the Society of Female Doctors
chose Takeuchi as its representative. The Society requested the participation of female
members in committees making policies on women’s and children’s health issues. This
effort was supported by various women’s groups (in the form of the Coalition of
Japanese Women’s Associations). The state authority responded to this kind of
pressure from women. The 1937 Maternal and Child Protection Law was enacted,
followed by the government-sponsored Precious Children Battalion (Kodakara Butai)
campaign: While the law offered state assistance to needy mothers and their children, the
campaign encouraged childbearing, commending women for extraordinary fertility and

---

76 Kōseishō Yōbōkyoku, “Yūsei kekkon zadankai,” Nairu kōsei jihō 4.10 (1939), 1302-1304.
Kawasaki Natsu (1889-1966) was an educator and Tanaka Takako (1886-1966) established a city marriage
consultation office in Tokyo. Tanaka was known as a niece of industrialist Shibusawa Eiichi. After
receiving a masters degree in sociology from the University of Chicago, she taught at Japan Women’s
College. In 1919 she attended the International Labor Organization’s general assembly held in New York.
Kondō Kazuko notes Tanaka’s participation in a eugenics marriage discussion session in 1939, see Kondō,
“Onna to sensō,” 497.

offering scholarships to their children. By March 1939, Takeuchi was appointed committee member overseeing control of national physical fitness by the Ministry of Health and Welfare (Kôseishô tairyoku kanri iin). In November 1940, Takeuchi presented her statistical study on the Japanese women’s constitution at a major conference, organized by the Population Problem Foundation (Zaidan Hôjin jinkô Mondai Kenkyûkai), which was created within the Ministry of Health and Welfare’s Social Bureau (Kôseishô Shakaikyoku). When the ministry’s Eugenics Section organized a council on eugenics marriage guidance (Yûsei Kekkon Shidô Kyôgikai), Takeuchi Shigeyo, along with other medical experts, was invited. Based on recommendations made by the members, the council decided to publish a guide book to be distributed to marriage consultation offices, public health offices, and other interested organizations.

In 1940, the National Physical Fitness Law (Kokumin Tairyoku-hô) was enacted. This law and the National Eugenics Law (which imposed stricter prohibitions of abortion with the exception of medically-certified dysgenic reproduction cases) were often described as the two statutes for enforcing the “give birth and multiply (umeyo.

78 The Ministry of Health and Welfare’s institutional history also acknowledge women’s initiatives in the legislation of the Maternal and Child Protection Law. See Kôseishô gojûnenshi, (Kijutsu henshin), 370.

79 Nihon Joishi Henshû Ikinkai, Nihon joisha, 314.


policy. The National Physical Fitness Law required physical examinations of
minors under the age of 20. In addition to measuring their physical size and capacity,
medical authorities checked whether the minors were infected with diseases. The result of
the examination and how problems, if any, were treated were to be recorded annually. In
1940, about two million male imperial subjects between the ages of seventeen and
nineteen were examined. Among diseases, tuberculosis and venereal diseases were closely
monitored. If they were patients, they were required to take certain measures to
re recuperate. Some young men who were diagnosed as underdeveloped (kinkotsu hakujaku)
were sent to an obligatory one-week training session for body improvement. 82 By 1942,
the law was expanded to cover better the age group that was most infected with
tuberculosis; now males under age 25, rather than only those under 20, were subject to
this law. 83

In 1941, the National Eugenics League (Kokumin Yüsei Renmei) was created in
the Eugenics Section of the Ministry of Health and Welfare. The purpose of the League
was promotion of eugenics marriage. The suppression of venereal diseases was clearly
stated as one of its three other missions, along with promotion of eugenics fecundity and
the prevention of birth control. 84

82 About the training, see “Kenmin shurenjo,” Nippon kagaku gijutsushi taikei, vol. 25, 252-255.

83 As for various national health policies related to eugenics thought, see Fujino Yutaka, “Nihon
fashizumu to byōsha, shōgaisha: Danshu to gyakusatsu,” Kikan sensō sekinin 12 (Summer 1996), 49-51.
The government priorities over these policies could be assessed in the budget distribution plan, see

84 The National Eugenics League published a book on eugenics measures with many visual charts, see
Kaseishō Yobōkyoku, ed. Kokumin yūsei zukai (Tokyo: Kokumin Yūsei Renmei, 1941). By this time,
the Eugenics Section was integrated into the Prevention Section (Yobōkyoku). More on the league, see
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The change of climate surrounding eugenics was obvious. When she completed her doctoral thesis in 1933, Takeuchi Shigeyo's position was still relatively marginal, and in the mid-1930s she was seeking patronage for eugenics and official political recognition of women. By the end of the decade, however, she was often requested to represent women in national political discussions relating to women's health.85

In wartime Japan, state health policies treated men and women differently. For example, the state examined only young men, not women.86 In spring 1942, the Bureau of Population Policies (Jinkōkyoku) of the Ministry of Health and Welfare launched a new campaign for national health, which the Greater Japan Women's Association supported. The objectives of this campaign included the following: increase of birth rate through promotion of marriage; protection of mothers and children; rationalization of


86 This was the case perhaps because of budget constraints and conscription purposes.
food, clothing, and housing, and suppression of V.D. and T.B. through blood testing of women. \textsuperscript{87} Reflecting the time when intensifying war efforts drafted able young men, the logical target of this campaign was women still at home. The state began requiring every pregnant woman to register so that she and her children would receive proper care and attention from the authorities.\textsuperscript{88} At least for the time being, state health policies were quite gender-specific.

With the partial enforcement of the National Physical Fitness Law, more men's official medical records became readily available. Thus, ascertaining the eugenics fitness of one's future husband became much easier. Although the Japanese Ministry of Health and Public Welfare instituted the mandatory national health examination system, the prerequisite for eugenics marriage, many healthy young men themselves were not available for marriage. Ironically, the dream of eugenics marriage thus remained largely unfulfilled.

By mid 1939, the journal \textit{Yūsei} stopped publication without announcing its discontinuity. We do not know whether the EMPS continued to exist. It was likely that the EMPS leaders including the \textit{Yūsei} editor Yasui Hiroshi, who was appointed to head the government Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office in 1940, became more involved in state policy-making, which left them little time to keep the EMPS from disintegrating.

\textsuperscript{87} Kōsei shō Jinkōkyoku. "Dai Tōa sensōka ni okeru kenmin undō no jissai ni tsuite," \textit{Naimu kōsei jihō} 7.5 (1942), 1346-1349.

\textsuperscript{88} Kōsei shō gojūnenshi. (Kijutsu hea), 370-371 and 458-460.
Perhaps it was more accurate to say that the EMPS efforts were taken over by the government, which then instituted various policies and created various offices promoting the eugenics welfare of the state.

6.4 Implications

The history of the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society serves as a link between Hiratsuoka Raichô’s eugenics marriage restriction legislation movement in the 1920s and the wartime state pronatal policies. In Chapter 4, I examined Hiratsuoka’s anti-V.D. campaign. I have pointed out the existence of continued efforts to establish a eugenics law after that time. In doing so, I have shown origins of Japan’s eugenics other than the 1933 Nazi sterilization law.

Historian of science Matsubara Yôko investigates the origins of the 1940 National Eugenics Law and identifies two different eugenics approaches: the inclusive and the restricted. According to her, the advocates of the former tended to be non-experts who wanted to apply eugenics principles to both hereditary and nonhereditary diseases. Feminist Hiratsuoka Raichô and Diet member Arakawa Gorô (who had a background in education) fall into this category. In the 1934 and 1935 Arakawa plans, the improvement of Japan’s national population quality was to be realized not only by sterilization but also by abortion and marriage restriction. Sterilization was to be applied not only to those who had mental and physical hereditary diseases, but also to the social misfit (criminals), various drug addicts, “hysterics,” and people with tuberculosis and leprosy.
Arakawa proposed marriage restrictions on certain people including syphilis and gonorrhea patients. It would become mandatory to obtain marriage permission by submitting a health certificate.

The supporters of the restricted eugenics were more likely to be medical experts engaged in genetic research. They wanted to apply eugenics sterilization only to those who had genetic diseases than activists without medical backgrounds. The list of the diseases to be considered for eugenics operations in the 1940 law resembled those in the sterilization law of medically advanced Nazi Germany. Matsubara’s careful examination reveals that the 1940 National Eugenics Law was based on “restricted” bills submitted to the Diet in 1937 and 1938.⁸⁹

The compilers of a large published collection of documents dealing with the history of science and technology observe that after the 1937 retirement of Nagai Hisomu from Tokyo University, the emphasis of the journal Ethnic National Hygiene (Minzoku eisei), published by the Association of Ethnic National Hygiene, shifted from the popularization of eugenics ideas to the introduction of original research.⁹⁰ This observation seems to support Matsubara’s emphasis on the scientification of eugenics based on the participation of genetic experts.

---


Though he does not use the term “restricted” eugenics, social historian Fujino Yutaka basically points out that Matsubara is overconcerned with “restricted” eugenics, focusing on the National Eugenics Law, and deemphasizes the fact policy makers used the term eugenics freely when they discussed non-genetic policies. Excluded from that law were other eugenic-related institutions and policies. For instance, the government-sponsored eugenics marriage consultation office was created, the National Physical Fitness Law was enforced, and other state pronatalist programs were instituted.\(^9^1\)

Taking into account the findings of these eugenics studies, I do not consider Nagai’s retirement from Tokyo University in 1937 as the end of education-oriented eugenics and the beginning of research-oriented eugenics. Rather, I find that his retirement coincided with the division of functions among the eugenics organizations he created. The 1937 reorganization of the EMPS exemplified this point, incorporating the Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office and the male medical advisers of the Office as new councillors. These male eugenicists in the new EMPS overlapped with what Matsubara calls “genetic experts” who were a driving force in the “scientification” of sterilization bills. Despite input from the new male officials, the journal editor of the Yûsei continued to expose readers to the ideals of eugenics marriage outside the shadow of tuberculosis and venereal diseases. The experts’ concerns with marriage eugenics and nonhereditary diseases were not confined to the Yûsei literature. For instance, in 1939 members of the Ministry of Health and Welfare’s study group on national ethnic hygiene themselves saw

\(^9^1\) Fujino, “Nihon fashizunyu to byôsha, shôgaisha,” 48-55.
that non-genetic factors should be dealt with in the official eugenics measures. In 1939, they identified five ethnic national eugenics (minzoku yūsei) measures: 1) education; 2) research; 3) prevention of the spread of “ethnic national poisons” (syphilis, alcohol, and narcotics); 4) promotion of eugenic fertility; and 5) genetic health measures (quarantine, marriage of “fit”, abortion, castration, and sterilization). Even among the members of the study group, loaded with putative experts like Yoshimasu and Kawakami, who actually drafted the adopted restricted eugenics sterilization plan, nonhereditary elements remained integral to their ideas of eugenics. The National Eugenics League created in the Eugenics Section of the Ministry of Health and Welfare was another example of state interest in marriage eugenics without excluding nonhereditary elements; and Kawakami was its founding member.

The key to understanding the paradoxical expert adherence to inclusive eugenics is the condition of the nation’s health. Unlike some Western countries, Japan was still struggling with malnutrition, high infant mortality, and infectious diseases like tuberculosis and venereal diseases. The deteriorating physiques of army conscripts compared to those of their earlier counterparts made government officials think that it

---

92 “Minzoku yūsei to wa aani ka.” Minzoku eisei shiryō 9 (August 1939), 10-29.

93 Yoshimasu saw the marriage and reproduction of the venereal diseased would harm state and human specie (jinru). For Yoshimasu’s basic view on the ideals of marriage eugenics consultation. Yoshimasu Shūfu, “Kekkon sōdan to kekkon sōdanjo no kikō ni tsuite (shōzen),” Minzoku eisei 4.3 and 4.4 (combined issue) (1935), 284-288. He published the book containing the revised version of the Minzoku eisei article in 1940. Except for a few factual changes, his 1940 view was the same as the 1935 version. See his Yūseigaku no riron to jissai, 306-310.

94 Yoshioka Yayoi, “Kokuryoku hatten te kokunin no kenkō” Joikai 304 (1 July 1938), 4; and Yonemoto Shōhei, Iden kanri shakai: Nachisu to kinnirai (Tokyo: Kōbundo, 1990), 185-186.
should take eugenics measures to improve the quality of population. Yet, at that time Japan could not afford to depress birth rates, because population growth had already been falling and the military needed constant replenishment of soldiers in the prolonged war.

Common sense appeared to dictate the wartime eugenics policies. The National Eugenics Law had to be restricted; considering the pervasiveness of national diseases, applying sterilization to a great number of patients would inevitably lead to population decline.\(^9\) The exclusion of diseases such as tuberculosis and venereal diseases, and leprosy from the law did not indicate that the government abandoned “biological” treatment of these diseases. These issues had to be addressed separately outside of the National Eugenics Law, as Fujino Yutaka suggested. The marriage eugenics which the EMPS promoted was located in this external arena of the sterilization law, primary purpose of which was actually a tighter control of abortion.

In spite of men’s leadership, I would call marriage eugenics “women’s eugenics”\(^9\) because it challenged the existing gender norms by changing women from passive agents, waiting to be chosen by men, to active agents who would choose men. Historical continuity and the high degree of women’s presence also support this view.

---

\(^9\) Between 1941 and 1945, 454 individuals (192 men and 243 women) were sterilized because of eugenics reasons under the law. In theory, these sterilizations were voluntary but not forced procedures. See statistical data in Yoshimasu Shūfu, Inoue Eiji, Kamide Hiroyuki, and Takemura Shingi, \textit{Yūsēgaku} (Tokyo: Nankōdō, 1961), 187.

\(^9\) Compare this “women’s eugenics” with the concept of “women’s medicine” proposed by medical doctor Moriguchi Fumi. She called for the establishment of a new field in medicine, “women’s medicine,” because separate scientific investigations on women’s bodies would be necessary to resolve various issues including the appropriate application of marriage policies. She wrote that “women’s medicine,” which would form “marriage medicine” along with eugenics, would become a basic principle of ethnic national policies. See her “Seisaku to kagaku (Joshi igaku no teishō ni tsuite),” \textit{Joikai} 364 (1 July 1943), 2-3. For more on “women’s medicine,” see “Tōkō Jo Gakkai no hatteneki kaishō ni tsuite,” and “Nihon Joshi Igaku Kenkyūkai setsuritsu shushi,” \textit{Joikai} 363 (1 July 1943), 9.
The major player who ensured its continuity was Nagai Hisomu. Feminists like Hiratsuka spearheaded the shaping of “women’s eugenics.” She “engendered” eugenics by categorizing middle-class women as “fit” and venereally-diseased men as “unfit.” Besides proposing the eugenics marriage restriction law, she also called for women’s voluntary rejection of marriage to men infected with V.D. She proposed the prenuptial exchange of health certificates so that women could choose “fit” men. She justified her attempt to control unregulated male sexuality by appropriating the language of science. Nagai had witnessed Hiratsuka’s movement, which was effective in disseminating eugenics ideas because, for better or worse, its bold assertion of female agency attracted media attention. Later, he decided to mobilize women by organizing a female-centered eugenics organization, perhaps anticipating public reaction to the novel gender hierarchy. This time, a man of science strategically borrowed the special power of women who were breaking the boundaries of the prescribed gender role. In addition to putting across his eugenics message, especially among school girls and female college students, he hoped the willing participation of some women, who would like to improve their own status and the well-being of their daughters, would promote voluntary exercise of eugenics marriage. Even in male eugenicist Nagai’s eugenics campaign, women were expected to play the role of “choosers” in tying knots. The “women’s eugenics” launched by the feminists was thus renewed. In fact, with his scientific authority, academic networks, and strategic use of the charismatic word of the era, “minzoku (ethnic nation),” Nagai legitimized

“women’s eugenics” and expanded it by drawing influential supporters. Even conservative female leaders like Yoshioka Yayoi and Inoue Hideko, who had been critical of Hiratsuka’s effort, began accepting “women’s eugenics.” At least, they were willing to list themselves as advisers when the EMPS was established. Takeuchi Shigeyo’s position in the national political scene was a reflection of the collective desire of some women who wanted their voice to be heard in policy-making affecting their own bodies.98

There were certain characteristics of “women’s eugenics.” First, the emphasis was more on marriage and reproduction than on quarantine and sterilization. Second, it was more concerned with infectious diseases than hereditary diseases or inclusive-eugenics-oriented. Third, women’s eugenics could be exercised voluntarily without a formal legal institution. It took place more in the private sphere than in the public sphere. Middle-class women took charge of “marriage eugenics” precisely because their officially-sanctioned role as wives and mothers at home was best fit to carry out the tasks.

Is it fair to call “women’s eugenics” unscientific because it dealt with nonhereditary diseases? (Note that “Eugenics” is generally defined as the science of

---

98 It is difficult to assess whether women were forced to support the war or did so of their own volition. Nishikawa Yūko observes the ambivalence among women; see her “Sansō e no keisha,” 236-237. As far as the Association of Female Doctors was concerned, however, generally its members were extremely proud that their representative Takeuchi Shigeyo was chosen to work for the state. See “Takeuchi Shigeyo joshi: Taisei Yokusenki ni sanka,” Joikai 340 (1 July 1941), 8. It is also important to note that there were certainly many women, often poor, who wanted to limit the number of their children against government policy. See Kondō, “Onna to sensō,” 506-508. Yet, I believe, for many women, the ideas of marrying a healthy man, having a family free from T.B. and V.D., and receiving financial and medical help in raising children from the government might have sounded quite appealing. The important thing was many women were possibly exposed to the ideas of “women’s eugenics” through local women’s associations which belonged to the Greater Japan Woman Association.
improving human race by controlling heredity.) I am inclined to say no. Consider, for example, the presence of expert geneticists in “women’s eugenics,” discussions of inheritability of bodily traits susceptible to certain infectious diseases, and the government designation of “ethnic national poisons” as one of its eugenics priorities.

Take, for example, tuberculosis. In the circumstance of not having any effective cure, the best approach to containing the national disease was its prevention. Measures promoted by “women’s eugenics” supporters—discouraging women from marrying men with T.B. while encouraging them to marry healthy men and have as many children as they could—was not necessarily unscientific at that time. Our presentist assumptions of what constituted eugenics, emphasizing genetic aspects, have obscured wartime eugenics discourse since we have tended to ignore obvious elements concerning non-hereditary diseases. In the wartime nation, where major threats to national health were tuberculosis and venereal diseases along with malnutrition, the non-hereditary elements could not be avoided in efforts to improve the quality of the population.

Before concluding, I would like to comment on the relationship between “women’s eugenics” and the official ideology of “good wife, wise mother.” The latter defined women as managers of domestic affairs and nurturers of children. It was commonly held that this ideology was a norm which the Japanese state had imposed on

---

99 For an effective cure, tuberculosis patients had to wait until the 1950s use of the antibiotic streptomycin. See Fukuda Mahito, Kekkaku no bunkashi: Kindai Nihon ni okeru vanai no imōji (Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai, 1995), 71-79 and 317-318. William Johnston describes the Japanese government’s attempt to implement mass inoculation of BCG (Bacille Calmette Guerin) vaccination starting in 1944. It was soon halted by the war. See his The Modern Epidemic: A History of Tuberculosis in Japan (Cambridge, MA and London: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1995), 258-269 and 284.
women through education since the end of nineteenth century. Two of the most important characteristics of this ideology were women’s subordinate position in the patriarchal imperial-family-system and in the Confucian notion of female “virtue.” The leading American scholar of the ryōsai kenbo ideology, Kathleen S. Uno, observes a major shift within the same ideological framework: In the context of rising militarism in the 1930s, more emphasis was put on women as the bearers, than as the socializers, of children.\footnote{Kathleen S. Uno, “The Death of ‘Good Wife, Wise Mother’?,” in Postwar Japan as History (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford: University of California Press, 1993), 299-500.}

Under the larger shift described by Uno, a different kind of change was taking place. The Yūsei literature emphasized women’s biological fitness and even suggested their biological superiority to men in some aspects. For instance, eugenicists believed that women’s genes were as influential as men’s and argued that women’s infertility was often caused by men’s sexual diseases. Eugenicists thus denied existing notions that women were just “borrowed wombs” not affecting male lines and that infertile women deserved divorce from men. As far as biology was concerned, they rejected the notion of the predominance of men over women. Modern Western scientific knowledge thus seemed to challenge the submissive and obedient female role in the gender hierarchy supported by the age-old philosophical Confucianism.\footnote{Watanabe Yoko examines the relationship between science and “good wife and wise mother” ideology in Yoshioka Yayoi’s thought in her “Sōryokusen taiseika,” 193-200.} Underneath the surface of the same emphasis on motherhood and women’s place at home, womanhood was being radically redefined. This aspect of “women’s eugenics” helped many women develop self-esteem, confidence,
and consciousness of their bodies. As the tragic Tokuda and futon murder cases demonstrated, some women strategically used “scientific” authority, referring to eugenics reasoning, in order to justify their defiance of male authority in the family. In a sense, they were upsetting the existing gender norm and asserting their reproductive choice.

This kind of attitude might have contributed to the advent of postwar feminists. While Japan was still under American occupation (1945-1953), the 1940 National Eugenics Law was recast, in 1948. Under the new name of “Eugenics Protection Law (Yūsei hogo-hō),” this measure—with subsequent revisions—legalized and encouraged sterilizations and abortions for those thought likely to have children with hereditary diseases. In 1996, the Eugenics Protection Law was revised and renamed the Maternal Body Protection Law (Botaihogo-hō). This change removed from the 1948 statute eugenic-inspired language intended to prevent the birth of “inferior” offspring. Preceding the revision, a number of Japanese women had called international attention to the anachronism that, in their country, eugenics ideology continued to function in a legal sense even into the 1990s. They did so on two different occasions: at an international conference on population and development held in Cairo, Egypt, in 1994; and at a world

102 Scholars who analyze the relationship between Japan’s two “eugenics” laws include Yonemoto Shōhei, Ogino Miho and Matsubara Yōko. Both Yonemoto and Ogino emphasize that the Eugenics Protection Law was an extension of the National Eugenics Protection Law in that both were attempts by the state to control population quality and quantity in the name of eugenics. Matsubara contrasted the two laws focusing on what was regulated. On the other hand, Matsubara stresses the disjointed nature of the two laws. She sees the National Eugenics Law restrictive to genetic diseases and the Eugenics Protection Law inclusive and argues that the Eugenics Protection Law revived the prewar tradition of inclusive eugenics. See Yonemoto Shōhei, Iden kanri shakai: Nachisu no kinmirai (Tokyo: Kōbunshō, 1989), 190; Ogino Miho, “Jinkō rinshin chūzetsu to jisei no jiko kettei,” Boso kara jisedai ikuseiryoku e, ed. Hara Hiroko and Tachi Kaoru (Tokyo: Shin’yōsha, 1991), 118; and Matsubara Yōko, “<Banka kokka> no yusei-hō: Yūsei Hogo-hō to Kokumin Yūsei-hō no dansō,” Gendai shisō 25.4 (April 1997), 8-21.
women’s conference held in Beijing, China in 1995. The Japanese government responded to the resulting outpouring of external criticism and changed the controversial law quickly.\textsuperscript{103} Prior to this, women had resisted government pressure to revise the Eugenics Protection Law in the 1970s and 1980s.\textsuperscript{104}

Postwar women's interest in eugenics ideology and laws derived from the fact that their lives could be greatly affected because eugenics involves reproduction. Their activism was driven by their growing desire to take control over their own bodies. Equipped with new concepts of reproductive rights, they succeeded in getting rid of eugenics elements from the Eugenics Protection Law in 1996.\textsuperscript{105} Though their agenda was totally different, their strategy was a familiar one. This time, they used international authority, instead of scientific or state authority, to achieve their goal. What was at stake was again their own bodies.

\begin{itemize}
\item[]\textsuperscript{105} Kozy Amemiya finds that “Japanese pro-choice women refer to a woman’s ‘right to self-determination’ (jiko ketteiken) in reproduction but “are careful to qualify this notion as limited by the individual’s relationship to the state.” See her “Women’s Autonomy,” 115. More on this subject, see Ehara Yuniko, ed. \textit{Seishoku giuutsu to jenda}, Feminizumu no shuchō, no. 3 (Tokyo: Keisō Shobō, 1996).
\end{itemize}
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

As previously noted, one can subdivide eugenics into many different categories, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. In this dissertation, I have used three sets of subcategories: positive and negative eugenics; restricted and inclusive eugenics, and eugenics and eugenics. While positive eugenics encouraged the “fit” to reproduce, negative eugenics discouraged the “unfit” from procreating. Restricted eugenics was designed to control hereditary diseases; and inclusive eugenics was concerned with diseases that were both genetic and not-directly-genetic (infectious). The distinction between eugenics and eugenesics depends on whether or not one would accept the neo-Lamarckian notion of inheritance of acquired characteristics. Proponents of eugenics, which was more biologically-deterministic, generally rejected the view that improvement of environment would affect the genetic quality of future generations. Supporters of eugenics, however, argued that environmental factors, such as better public health and education, would contribute to the amelioration of the human race.

Examination of the careers of five eugenics activists reveals a variety of eugenics approaches. For example, educator Naruse Jinzô, in his effort to promote higher education for women, maintained that better-trained women would contribute to race
improvement. At his college for women, he wanted to create fitter women by providing them knowledge of efficient home management and child care, and strengthening their bodies through vigorous physical exercises. He optimistically believed that women who received higher education, would pass desirable genetic qualities on to the next generation. Thus, his race improvement ideas contained elements of positive eugenics and eugenics.

Botanist and educator Yamanouchi Shigeo shared Naruse’s optimism based on the belief that acquired characteristics could be inherited. Unlike Naruse, however, Yamanouchi was unable to accept this belief uncritically. As a cytologist trained in the United States in the early twentieth century, he was familiar with the emerging influential August Weismann’s theory which denied the transmission of acquired traits. Experimental biologists began to realize that this new theory, coupled with the Mendelian laws of inheritance, was helpful in understanding the observable phenomenon of inheritance.

Yamanouchi was a transitional biologist between the Lamarckian and the Mendelian paradigms of heredity. Though he accepted the basic ideas of Mendelism, he questioned Weismann’s theory and suggested that acquired characteristics might be inherited, employing Charles M. Child’s gradient theory. Yamanouchi was interested in the Lamarckian notion of use and disuse of organs as a way of inducing physiological changes that could eventually become inheritable. If one used the brain to learn new things, he or she would be smarter. Older parents who had additional time to learn knowledge or skills than younger ones, then, would be likely to have smarter or more
talented children. In order to prove this premise, Yamanouchi discussed a number of historically great people, who were born to older parents. He was a Mendelian cytologist sympathetic towards the Lamarckian principle of transmission of acquired characters. His eugenics view, emphasizing environment, especially education, reflected his theoretical view.

Another characteristic of Yamanouchi’s eugenics ideas was ethics. He stressed that humans needed to prioritize the public interest in improving racial stock over individual freedom. He suggested that people of undesirable genetic makeup should refrain from reproducing. Thus, I would classify his eugenics thought as quasi-euthenics plus negative eugenics.

Feminist Hiratsuka Raichō’s eugenics view was straightforward. She wanted to establish a negative and inclusive eugenics law that would prevent “unfit” men infected with contagious, but not hereditary, venereal diseases from getting married.

Gotō Ryūkichi, publisher of a popular eugenics journal, was responsible for disseminating various eugenics ideas in Japan. Among them, the six subcategories of eugenics were all represented. Gotō began his eugenics movement after several of his close family members died of tuberculosis. He was scared by the possibility that he himself would become a victim of this epidemic. At the core of his eugenics popularization campaign, there existed his personal desire to suppress the spread of

---

1 Yamanouchi himself commented that he spent a disproportionate amount of space for this discussion of inheritance of acquired characteristics in the book, Jinrui no iden [Human heredity]. Yamanouchi Shigeo, Jinrui no iden (Tokyo Dai Nihon Gakujutsu Kyōkai, 1917), 6.
tuberculosis in a scientific, effective way. Because Gotô's original eugenics plan aimed at controlling tuberculosis, which was proven to be infectious, I consider Gotô's eugenics inclusive.

Physiologist Nagai Hisomu established the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society in 1935, and fostered eugenics consciousness among women in Japan during the war with China (1931-1945). As a result, he legitimized and promoted what I call "women's eugenics." Adherents of "women's eugenics" attempted to control heredity through marriage, but paid little attention to such measures as quarantine and sterilization. Eugenics marriage had two aspects: choosing the "fit" and avoiding the "unfit" as partners for reproduction. "Women's eugenics" embraced tenets of both positive and negative eugenics. Followers of "women's eugenics" tried to determine whether or not a future husband was infected with tuberculosis or venereal diseases first. In this sense, "women's eugenics" was inclusive. Together with the 1940 National Eugenics Law, which was based on restricted eugenics, Japan's wartime eugenics policies were aimed at hereditary diseases as well as epidemics in order to improve national health conditions. Efforts by the five eugenics enthusiasts between the late nineteenth century and 1945 reveal many diverse approaches to the improvement of the gene pool in Japan.

In Chapter 1, I have pointed out five commonly-held views in the existing literature on eugenics. The first characteristic is the general emphasis on Nazi-Japanese connections. Scholars often trace the origins of the National Eugenics Law to the 1933
Nazi sterilization law. They rarely discuss prior eugenics legislative efforts as a precursor to the National Eugenics Law. In contrast, I have shown the connection between Hiratsuka’s eugenics initiative and later legislative efforts. More specifically, in the 1930s, Diet members like Arakawa Gorô and Chûma Okimaru, who had introduced Hiratsuka’s marriage eugenics bill to the House of Representative committee between 1919 and 1922, renewed their eugenics legislative efforts. These bills were eventually merged with the initiatives of the Ministry of Health and Public Health and led to the enactment of the National Eugenics Law. Hiratsuka’s bill and the 1940 Law were different in that the former was an inclusive marriage restriction law plan, while the latter was a restricted sterilization law. But both intended to improve the quality of the Japanese race through a negative eugenic approach. Hiratsuka’s eugenics campaign, despite its failure, deserves a special place in the history of eugenics legislative efforts in Japan.

I suspect presuppositions linking German and Japanese medicine may be behind the emphasis on Nazi-Japanese connections. If so, the evidence presented in the dissertation indicates the need to reconsider this view. For instance, initial promoters of race improvement ideas, such as Takahashi Yoshio, Fukuzawa Yukichi, Naruse Jinzô, and Unno Kôtoku, were not trained in medicine or science. Takahashi and Fukuzawa were promoters of Western ideas in Meiji period (1868-1912). Naruse was a sociologist or social psychologist. All three of them advocated the improvement of women’s bodies to pursue race improvement in the late nineteenth century. Unno, who had read many
theories of evolution, wrote his first book, dedicated to discussions on eugenics, *Nihon jinshu kaizôron* [On the reconstruction of the Japanese race], in 1910. In the 1920s, Unno, a professor of social work, sometimes contributed to Gotô Ryûkichi’s eugenics journal. Their (proto-) eugenics utterances preceded discussions of eugenics begun by biologists and medical men, including Yamanouchi Shigeo and Nagai Hisomu in the mid-1910s.²

Naruse and Yamanouchi studied in the United States, but not in Germany, and were exposed to race improvement and eugenics ideas. Hiratsuka Raichô studied at the Japan Women’s College, which had a hand-picked faculty who understood the significance of eugenics in promoting higher education for women. In addition, Hiratsuka read feminist eugenics prescriptive literature written and translated into English. Even a limited number of case studies show that eugenics inspiration did come from countries other than Germany. Further studies will reveal patterns of the importation of ideas.

The second characteristic is the image of eugenics as inherently inhumane and cruel. Scholars who present this view are often conscientious and worried about historical distortions that minimize the brutality of eugenics ideology to people who were labeled as “unfit.” In Japan, this post-World War II consciousness is particularly dominant in the discipline of history, heavily influenced by Marxist scholarship. As historian of science Yonemoto Shôhei points out, this approach, which is often presentist and morally

---

judgmental, may contribute to a widening of the gap between reality and historical representation. As an alternative, he proposes to see eugenics using the paradigm theory. Using this theory, which argues that there were two different paradigms, prewar and postwar, I have accepted that a set of values, which were totally different from ours today, existed during the prewar period, when champions of eugenics ideas in my case studies were active. Although I do share the postwar consciousness, adoption of the paradigm theory allowed me to explore prewar eugenics history without imposing today’s values on prewar individuals.

I portray pre-1945 eugenics movements as a reflection of adherents’ desire to perfect the society in a promising scientific fashion. Some tried to regulate men’s unrestricted sexuality, which often caused tragic marital disputes, while others simply wanted to control diseases and social problems, such as poverty, alcoholism, and crime, to ensure health, safety, and happiness for the majority of the people.

I have noted the limited integration of findings of women’s historians into the history of eugenics as another characteristic in the historiography. I demonstrate the prominence of the Japan Women’s College in Japan’s eugenics discourse. The founder of the College, Naruse Jinzō, understood the strategic value of emphasizing women’s reproductive ability for the state in order to gain financial support. He designed the curriculum to make students fitter and recruited teaching staff who could assist his goal. In this environment, the physiologists Ōsawa Kenji and Nagai Hisomu as well as the botanist Yamanouchi Shigeo taught eugenics principles and the significance of this science
to young aspiring women. It is no accident that women like Hiratsuka Raichō, Haraguchi Tsuruko (psychologist), Kōra Tomi (psychologist), Tanaka Takako (social worker), and Tokuda Eiko (murderer), who adhered to certain eugenics ideas publicly, all studied at the College. One need not wonder why Hiratsuka and other feminists, not men, led Japan’s first eugenics legislative effort in the late 1910s—though this episode challenges the general perception of Japanese women, who were supposed to be subordinate and domestic beings—considering that Naruse had begun preaching race improvement ideas, especially appealing to women, since the late nineteenth century. Though existing studies on Hiratuska’s eugenics thought unequivocally identify the origin of her idea with the Swedish feminist Ellen Key, I contend that Hiratsuka’s education at the Japan Women’s College between 1903 and 1906 was another important factor shaping her feminist-eugenics consciousness.

Although Naruse categorized middle-class women as “unfit” needing to be improved, Hiratsuka rejected this inferior status. In her eugenics movement, Hiratsuka targeted gender-specific problems of venereal diseases exclusively and redefined middle-class women as “fit” and men with syphilis and gonorrhea as “unfit.” In this way, she successfully challenged the notion of women as mere victims.

Nagai Hisomu established the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society and promoted eugenics ideas among women. In this effort Nagai Hisomu renewed “women’s
eugenics" initiated by Hiratsuka. I have shown similarities between the two campaigns led by Hiratsuka and Nagai and emphasized that these common traits indicate a historical continuity.

Messages contained in "women's eugenics" did not seem to be contradictory to the official ideology of "good wife, wise mother" that emphasized women's place at home and roles as reproducers and nurturers. Despite the similar emphasis of women's eugenics and the official ideology, the former could be potentially subversive. This was so because advocates of women's eugenics encouraged women to distinguish the "fit" and the "unfit" critically and choose the eugenically desirable for their future husbands. Nagai and his fellow officials at the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society explained that a mother was at least half responsible for the genetic makeup of her children. This notion denies the traditional patriarchal understanding that women were just "borrowed wombs" with no impact on the characteristics of children. Nagai and his colleagues, considered scientific authorities of the day, also illustrated women's biological fitness. The image of women who would play a passive, subordinate, and obedient role in the hierarchical gender relationship prescribed by the official ideology could not coexist with the image of decision-making women who believed in their greater biological significance in reproduction.

Women's historians often contend that women eugenics supporters were collaborators of the prewar and wartime state and failed to liberate themselves because they depended on the state, which oppressed people, both men and women. I declare,
however, that eugenics could serve as a destructive force vis-à-vis the officially-endorsed gender relationship, which was a backbone of the patriarchal society. In this way, one can reconceptualize eugenics, even without state endorsement, as partly responsible for true women’s liberation.

The fourth historiographical characteristic is concerned with historians’ general inclination to represent restricted eugenics as legitimate eugenics. Whether we are aware of it or not, we tend to judge ideas and events in the past according to what we know today. Thus, some dismiss inclusive eugenics as unscientific, ignoring the earlier perception of what could be inherited. Hiratsuka, Goto, and promoters of women’s eugenics hoped to control the spread of infectious diseases, but activists clearly expressed their concerns in eugenics terms.

The national health of pre-1945 Japan was threatened by tuberculosis, venereal diseases, high infant mortality and malnutrition, but not by genetic diseases. It seemed reasonable for the Japanese to tackle such imminent problems by controlling marriage and reproduction according to eugenics notions. As historian of science Suzuki Zenji observed, the limited participation of biologists, especially geneticists, in movements aiming to apply eugenics principles to society may have been a factor in the widespread inclusion of non-hereditary diseases in Japanese eugenics discourse. Historians ought to reexamine what prewar people considered eugenics from a more open-minded perspective and then begin analyzing why inclusive eugenics discourse prevailed.

---

Lastly, few scholars have studied the Japanese-Western discourse concerning “race” focusing on the history of eugenics. My case studies show that the Japanese had to tolerate Westerners’ ideas of Japanese “racial” inferiority while adopting eugenics ideas from the West. Naruse Jinzō directly experienced American “racial” prejudice against non-Anglo Saxons (especially nonwhites) in the late nineteenth century. Participating in the Association Concordia, which promoted the reconciliation of Eastern and Western civilizations, Yamanouchi Shigeo faced growing tension, “racial” and otherwise, between Japan and the United States in the 1910s. The mission of the Greater Japan Academic Society, which was established by Yamanouchi and others, demonstrated the founders’ frustration regarding the paucity of original scholarship by the Japanese. Gotō Ryūkichi observed American eugenicists’ involvement in the 1924 anti-Japanese immigration legislation. Nagai Hisomu saw Japanese science as lacking the philosophical traditions necessary to understanding life and the universe through systematic inquiry, and felt the mental activities of the Japanese were inadequate compared to those of Westerners.

As Naruse noted, physically Westerners were almost always taller and heavier than the Japanese. The Japanese had to ask themselves if the putative mental and physical superiority of the Westerners was temporary or permanent. Most Japanese hoped that it was temporary; some tried to close the gap as quickly as possible by using the science of race improvement.

In this ironic response, eugenics enthusiasts had to reinterpret eugenics so that it did not hurt their own self-esteem. A contextualized analysis in Chapter 3 suggests that
Yamanouchi’s “softer” (quasi-Lamarckian) perspective on inheritance may have been a reflection of a Japanese desire for scientific assurance in rejecting the notion of a permanently inferior status. We already know that evolutionary views held by the zoologist Oka Asajirō and the parasitologist Koizumi Makoto⁴ were sympathetic toward the inheritance of acquired characteristics, and both discussed eugenics. In order to test this hypothesis, we need to explore this “softer” view much more extensively.

Other Japanese accepted eugenics and redirected their feelings of inferiority onto others. Naruse, for example, contended that women were responsible for the physical “unfitness” of the Japanese. Nagai assigned the role of investigator to the ethnic Japanese in the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science research project on Japan’s ethnic minority, the Ainu people. The “softer” perspective and the displacement of their victimhood are a few illustrations of how creative the “racially” marginal were in the process of adopting eugenics. I have provided numerous examples useful for reconceptualizing the prevalent views in the existing literature and attempted to fill the gap by exploring subjects which have not been addressed heretofore.

Eugenics initiatives in Japan represented diverse perspectives. Eugenics was not confined to a single community of medical or biological researchers. Non-life-scientists like Naruse, Hiratsuka, and Gotô were well-informed and contributed greatly to

---

disseminating the idea. Most eugenics enthusiasts examined here, except for Yamanouchi, developed their initial interest in eugenics not because they had done research in eugenics, or had had direct contact with Western eugenicists, but because they had read literature containing eugenics ideas. Some read scientific or feminist literature published in Western languages, while others read translated or adapted materials in Japanese. The cases of Hiratsuka, a woman, and Gotô, a man of limited education, reveal that writings dealing with eugenics reached outside regular scientific and academic circles. These examples offer some insight into how some people actually responded to prescriptive literature.

In this study I have mainly examined Japanese prescriptive literature, which was written to persuade readers to lead eugenics lives. I have tried to provide some information that indicates the number of journals subscribers to Gotô's Yûseigaku and the Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society's Yûsei [Wellborn].

Eugenics was used to pursue two contradictory goals. While Naruse and Yamanouchi seem to have been interested in world peace, Nagai Hisomu stressed the importance of eugenics in winning the war. The Association Concordia that Naruse founded and to which Yamanouchi belonged, was a group pursuing international cooperation by easing the tensions arising from differences among various groups of peoples. Improving the Japanese "race" was in a sense an attempt to lessen these "racial" differences by making the "inferior" Japanese as "fit" as Westerners. Applying eugenics to war was, in fact, Nagai's strategy. Nagai, who was convinced that state involvement was necessary to make eugenics useful to human society, was long frustrated by the
unenthusiastic response of government officials. He was able to gain state support only by appealing to a sense of wartime insecurity in the 1930s, but still the process was not easy.

The subject of agency in the institutionalization of eugenics is an important subject as well. Historian of science Matsubara Yōko challenges the prevailing view that the National Eugenics Law was passed effortlessly in 1940 in a wartime fascist state. Her research shows that the bill was diluted as a result of persistent opposition, especially from clinical psychiatrists. As Matsubara’s study indicates, resistance in the House of Representatives, as well as the House of Peers, forced the Ministry of Health and Welfare to revise the law plan substantially.\(^5\) While Matsubara’s finding illuminates the complicated picture of the opposition within the “state,” social historian Fujino Yutaka’s research shows that even within the Ministry of Health and Welfare many officials took an extremely cautious attitude towards the sterilization law.\(^6\) My research displaying the reluctance of Home Ministry bureaucrats and the same Ministry’s Health and Hygiene Investigation Committee to support eugenics efforts and research initiatives in the 1910s and 1920s emphasizes the complexities of intra-state power dynamics. This poses a question as to who constituted the state: bureaucrats, members of the Japanese Diet, university professors employed by the state, or private individuals participating in

---


government committees? This requires rethinking of our oversimplified common view of state control over the people in the Japan’s particular top-down political and social structure.

In this dissertation, I choose to focus on two issues: “race” and gender. As noted, the framework of analysis that emphasizes state oppression and victimization of the diseased and handicapped sheds light on only one aspect of the story. The principal finding of my case studies is that marginal groups of people--“racially” marginal Japanese and socially marginal women--tried to improve their status by adopting certain eugenics ideas. This notion of marginal people’s agency contradicts the general perception of eugenics, that of tool of the privileged to control and repress the physically, mentally, and socially marginal, and opens up a new interpretation of eugenics, which can be adopted by the “non-fit” with creative modifications. These modifications include the displacement of victimhood and possibly the “softer” perspective of inheritance.
APPENDIX:

CHRONOLOGY

1854  Japan signs an unequal treaty with the U.S.
1858  Naruse Jinzô born
1868  Meiji Restoration
1876  Yamanouchi Shigeo born
      Nagai Hisomu born
1877  Naruse baptized
1881  Naruse publishes *Onna no tsutome* [The duties of women]
      Fukuzawa Yukichi writes about Francis Galton’s proto-eugenics ideas
1883  Galton coins the terms “eugenics”
1884  Takahashi Yoshio publishes *Nihon jinshu kairyōron* [On the improvement of Japanese race], whitening theory
1886  Hiratsuka Raichô born
1887  Gotô Ryûkichi born
1890-94  Naruse studies in the United States
1894-95  Sino-Japanese War
1896  Naruse publishes *Joshi kyôiku* [Women’s education]
1901  Naruse establishes the Japan Women’s College
1901-1921  Ôsawa Kenji teaches physiology at the Japan Women’s College
1903-1906  Nagai studies in Germany
1903-1906  Hiratsuka, home economics major at the Japan Women’s College
1904  Ôsawa publishes *Taishitsu kairyōron* [On the improvement of physical characteristics]
1904-05  Russo-Japanese War
1907  Yamanouchi receives Ph.D. from University of Chicago (in the USA, 1904-1910, 1911-1913, and 1927-1943)
      Ôsawa’s article on the degenerative harm of alcohol reprinted in a temperance magazine
1908  Hiratsuka’s suicide attempt
1909  Ôsawa publishes *Tsûzoku kekkon shinsetsu* [A popular new theory on marriage]
1910  Unno Kōtoku publishes *Nihon jinshu kaizōron* [On the reconstruction of the Japanese race]

1911  Yamanouchi receives a doctoral degree in science (*rigaku hakushi*)
University of Chicago, summer lecture series on heredity and eugenics

1912  Naruse organizes the Association Concordia (AC)
International Eugenics Conference (1st), London, UK

1912-1913  Naruse travels to North America and Europe (AC)
1912. su  Naruse visits Yamanouchi in Chicago

1912-1916  *Seitō* [Bluestocking], a literary journal for women, established by Hiratsuka

1913-1927  Yamanouchi teaches botany at the Tokyo Teachers' College
1913.9  Yamanouchi becomes a member of AC
1913  Hiratsuka begins translating Ellen Key's *Love and Marriage* into Japanese
1914  Race Betterment Conference, MI, USA; Robert DeCourcy Ward and Sidney Gulick
Yamanouchi's first AC lecture (on heredity, introduces eugenics)
Yamanouchi publishes *Saibō to iden* [Cells and heredity]
Davenport's *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics* translated into Japanese

1914-1918  World War I

1915-1927  Yamanouchi teaches natural history at the Japan Women's College
1915  Greater Japan Academic Society established (Yamanouchi)
Yamanouchi publishes *Idenron* [On heredity].
Nagai begins advocating eugenics in *Seimeiron* [On life], 3rd revised ed.

1916  Yamanouchi's second AC lecture (ethical obligations of humans to live eugenically)
Yamanouchi questions the germ plasm theory in an article
Galton's *Hereditary Genius* translated into Japanese by Haraguchi Tsuruko

Nagai proposes state-sponsored eugenics research at the Home Ministry’s Health and Hygiene Investigation Committee (*Hoken Eisei Chōsakai*), but rejected

1917  Yamanouchi publishes *Jinrui no iden* [On human heredity], discusses "use and "disuse" of organs, sympathy to the inheritance of acquired characteristics

1917  Yamanouchi co-founds the Greater Japan Eugenics Society

1918  Naruse publishes "Joshi kyōiku kaizen iken" [Advice on the improvement of women's education] and proposes a comprehensive plan for women's university
Naruse plans to create the department of race improvement at the Japan Women's College

Hiratsuka participates in the famous motherhood debate (eugenics idea)
1919 Naruse dies
Japan’s proposal for racial equality rejected at the Paris Peace Conference
New Woman Association (NWA) established
1919-22 Hiratsuka’s anti-V.D. eugenics marriage restriction campaign (inclusive)
1920-22 Jossei dōmei [Women’s alliance] (NWA’s journal) published
1921 Hiratsuka’s Marriage Rejection Alliance
International Eugenics Conference (2nd), New York, USA
1921-1939 Nagai teaches physiology at the Japan Women’s College
1924-1943 Gotō publishes Yūsei gaku [Eugenics] (1st issue, 1924.1)
1924.5 the U.S. Immigration law passed; Gotō reacts emotionally against it
1924.6 Gotō-U.S. eugenicists “correspondence” begins
1925.2 Gotō begins printing “correspondence”
1925.4 Gotō begins the foundation campaign
1926-30 Ikeda Shigenori publishes Yūsei undō [Eugenics movement]
1927 Population and Food Problem Investigation Committee (Jinkō, Shokuryō Mondai Chōsaikai), research on eugenics
1929 Conference of International Federation of Eugenic Organizations (8th), Rome, Italy; Abe Ayao attends
1929-1943 Gotō publishes Kansai jū [Kansai medical news]
1930-pres. Association of Ethnic National Hygiene (Minzoku Eisei Gakkai)
1930 Red Cross Museum holds an exhibition on ethnic national hygiene
Chūma Okimaru proposes a eugenics marriage restriction law (inclusive)
1931-pres. Journal: Minzoku eisei [Ethnic national hygiene]
1931 Manchurian Incident, war with China begins (-1945)
International Eugenics Conference (3rd), New York, USA
1932 Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS, Nihon Gakujutsu Shinkōkai) created
1932 the Nazi sterilization law
1933 Red Cross Museum and Association of Ethnic National Hygiene hold an
exhibition on marriage hygiene
1933 Takeuchi Shigeyo receives a doctoral degree in medicine (Nagai, supervisor)
1933-1938 JSPS study on the Ainu, directed by Nagai
1933-39 Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office (EMCO, private) (Yūsei Kekkon Sōdanjo)
1934 Arakawa Gorō submits a eugenics sterilization bill (inclusive)
Women’s League for the Legislation of Motherhood Protection Law
(Bosei Hogo-hō Seitai Sokushin Fujin Renmei) established
1935-39 Eugenics Marriage Popularization Society (EMPS) (Yūsei Kekkon Fukuūkai)
1935  Arakawa submits a eugenics sterilization bill (inclusive)
Tokuda fratricide case (Tokuda Eiko)

1936  Futon suffocation case
Tokyo Women’s Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis (Keikkaku
Yobō Tōkyō Fujin Jinkai)

1936-39  Journal: Yūsei [Wellborn]; editor Yasui Hiroshi
1936-42  Nagai chairs a JSPS subcommittee on eugenics studies
1937  Nagai retires, moves to Taiwan (1937-1939)
Maternal and Child Protection Law (Boshi Hogo-hō)
reorganization of the EMPS (incorporation of EMCO, male officers)
Arakawa, Yagi Itsuo, and Nagai’s group submit a eugenics sterilization bill
(restricted)

1938.1  Ministry of Health and Public Welfare (MHPW) founded
Eugenics Section in the Bureau of Disease Prevention
1938.2  Takeuchi Shigeyo’s lecture on “eugenic women” at Waseda University
1938.sp  eugenics lectures organized by Kōra Tomi at the Satō Institute
1938.11  MHPW’s Ethnic National Hygiene Study Group (Minzoku Eisei
Kenkyūkai) inaugurated at the Satō Institute
1938  Yagi and Nagai’s group submits a eugenics sterilization bill (restricted)
1939-1944  Nagai in Peking, China
1939  Precious Children Battalion plan announced
1939  Takeuchi organized the National Maidenhood League (Kokumin Junketsu
Dōmei); marriage restriction of V.D. patients, and exchange of
health certificates
Takeuchi in an Ethnic National Hygiene Study Group meeting about
eugenics marriage
a restricted eugenics sterilization bill submitted
1940  Ethnic National Hygiene Study Group drafts a eugenics sterilization bill
(a government plan, restricted)
National Physical Fitness Law: physical exam, including T.B., of men
National Eugenics Law: abortion banned except of genetic disease cases,
restricted
a government sponsored Eugenics Marriage Consultation Office
established; director Yasui
1940.12  Kōra: the only woman representative in the central committee of the
Imperial Rule Assistance Association (Taisei Yokusankai);
proposed a section of health within a bureau of women; unification
of women’s associations as the Great Japan Woman Association
(Dai Nihon Fujinkai)
1942  MHPW Campaign for National Health (Kenmin Undō) supported by the
Great Japan Woman Association
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1945  war ends
1948  Eugenics Protection Law
1957  Nagai dies
1971  Hiratsuka dies
1973  Yamanouchi dies
1996  Maternal Body Protection Law
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