A Companion to the Anthropology of Japan

Edited by Jennifer Robertson

Blackwell Publishing 2005

CHAPTER 21 Biopower: Blood, Kinship, and Eugenic Marriage

Jennifer Robertson

"Blood" has been a familiar metaphor in Japan since the turn of the 19th century for "shared heredity" or "shared ancestry," and even for the essential material imagined to constitute *the* "Japanese race." In Japan and elsewhere in the industrializing world, race was conceptualized both as a mix of discrete biological and cultural characteristics and as the specific group, nation, or human type that possessed and manifested those characteristics. Moreover, it was at this time that the nascent "science" of eugenics provided a framework within which blood became a cipher for specifically modern ideas of "disciplinary bio-power."[1] Blood remains an organizing metaphor for profoundly significant, fundamental, and perduring assumptions about Japaneseness and otherness; it is invoked as a determining agent of kinship, *mentalité*, national identity, and cultural uniqueness. And blood type is the basis for a very popular "sanguine horoscopy," in addition to other systems of fortune-telling and personality analysis based on East Asian cosmology.

The link between blood and nationality is certainly not unique to Japan, but it is inflected in ways that distinguish the Japanese phenomenon from others. My most general objective in this chapter is to layer into a coherent and demystifying narrative the cacophonous popular debates and welter of folk and scientific assumptions specifically about "Japanese" – and the Japaneseness of – blood and bodies. I shall address two large themes that bleed into each other, so to speak: the application of eugenic principles and propositions in fusing kinship and biology, and the normalization through popular eugenics of "ethnic national endogamy" as a dominant and modern cultural ideal.[2]

I must emphasize at the outset that "the popular" and "the scientific" did not inhabit opposite ends of a continuum of credibility. In fin-de-siècle Japan, eugenics – the reproduction of the "fit" – constituted a synergism of theory, ideology, and practice that blurred and even fused any hypothetical boundary between the street and the laboratory. This blurring and fusion were symptomatic of "eugenic modernity," by which I mean the application of scientific concepts and methods as the

primary means to constitute both the nation and its constituent subjects.[3] As my cited references attest, established scientists used the mass media to foster an appreciation of race betterment through regulated procreation, and impresarios organized traveling hygiene exhibitions and eugenic beauty contests (the judges for which included some of the same scientists). Through eugenics, science was popularized, and the public was prevailed upon to cultivate a modern attitude of scientific curiosity.[4]

The new scientific order in Japan was introduced under the aegis of nationalism and empire-building. Beginning with the colonization of Okinawa in 1874 followed by that of Taiwan in 1895, Korea in 1910, Micronesia in 1919, Manchuria in 1931, North China by 1937, and much of Southeast Asia by 1942, the state consolidated through military force a vast Asian-Pacific domain, the so-called Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (*daitōa kyōeiken*), a rubric coined in August 1940. Although empire-building forms the backdrop of this chapter, my focus is on colonizing practices pursued and implemented *within* Japan among the Japanese people, who constituted a proving ground for such practices throughout Asia and the Pacific. If East Asian prosperity was the euphemistic metaphor for Japanese dominance abroad, "family" was the operable image at home. The concept of a family-state (*kazoku kokka*) system was invented by late 19th-century ideologues to create a familiar and modern community – the nation – where one had not existed before. Some ideologues stretched out the family metaphor and likened nationality to membership in an exceptional "bloodline" (*kettō*).[5]

Bones, Flesh, Seeds, and Blood

According to cultural historian Nishida Tomomi, it was during the 17th through 19th centuries that "blood" (*chi*, *ketsu*), equated in earlier periods with death and ritual pollution, gradually acquired a positive metaphorical meaning of "life force" and lineage. It also became the main criterion of nationality, which, ever since the promulgation of the first constitution in 1890, continues to be based on the principle of *jus sanguinus*.[6] Before the 17th century, the dominant symbolism of blood was negative, located as it was in the ritually polluted female body; menstruation and parturition were classified in Shinto and Buddhism as "dirty" and especially dangerous to males (Nishida 1995:18–19). In addition to banishing females from certain "sacred" sites and spaces, males could avoid "blood poisoning" by undertaking Shinto purification rituals.[7]

Nishida surmises that the terms *ketsuen* (blood relationship), *kettō* (blood line), and *ketsuzoku* (blood relatives), indicative of an affirmative meaning of blood, were coined around the mid-19th century when they began to appear in a wide range of literary sources. The Japanese dictionaries compiled by Jesuits in the late 16th and early 17th centuries did not define blood in terms of heredity or lineage (Nishida 1995: 206–209). Before blood acquired its new, positive meaning, heredity was denoted by the term *kotsuniku*, or bone-flesh, where "bone" (*kotsu*) referred to paternity, and "flesh" (*niku*) to maternity (Nishida 1995:32–35).[8] Another term in use since at least the 10th century to identify paternity specifically was *tane* (seed). From the late 19th century onward, the Japanese-style term *hitodane* (literally, "person [*hito*] seed [*t(d)ane*]") was used to denote heredity in the sense of "germ plasm," as then

understood. Thus, the phrase *tane ga kawaru* ("seed changes") refers to children with the same mother and a different father (Nishida 1995:35).[9]

Nishida notes that in Japan, unlike in China, "blood relations" (qua heredity) were not privileged over other types of social intimacy, such as adoption, which continues to be widely practiced in Japan (Nishida 1995:18, 65, 76). Important to realize in this connection is the fact that adoptions were and are arranged for pragmatic reasons, most commonly to secure a male to occupy the *situs* of household (*ie*) successor. They were not undertaken for personal or emotional needs, objectives that can be realized without actual co-residence and even through *post mortem* adoption and ghost marriages (Lebra 1993:125; Van Bremen 1998).[10] An increasingly positive interpretation of "blood" was accompanied by the normalization of patrilineality as the dominant rule of household succession. Moreover, within the framework of the Meiji constitution, "blood" was the basis of and for a person's civic and legal provenance and attendant rights. Until its codification, patrilineality was especially characteristic of pre-modern samurai, or warrior, households in particular, which comprised less than 8 percent of the population of roughly 27 million persons during the Edo (or Tokugawa) period (1603–1868), and specifically the 1720s (Honjō 1936:21; see also chapter 22 in this volume). Although bona fide membership in the samurai class was determined by the paternal "seed," intra-class adoption was also widely practiced.[11] The Meiji Civil Code sanctioned both the patriarchal household as the smallest legal unit of society and father-to-son succession as the most general, normative pattern of household continuity – a pattern referred to as "samuraization." Today, by contrast, under the auspices of the postwar constitution individuals are legal entities in their own right and succession a subjective arrangement. Although equal inheritance is mandated in the postwar constitution, the majority of Japanese continue the earlier practice of male primogeniture. Furthermore, as in the pre-modern period, sons need not be the biological offspring of fathers; rather, the terms "father" and "son" denote gender roles and social (including adoptive) statuses and not necessarily a biological relationship (although they may *connote* one).

Despite the normalization of patrilineality as an extension of the Meiji state's authority, eugenicists were unanimous in stressing the importance of reckoning kinship bilineally in order to build what they believed to be a scientific foundation from which to launch their collective project of bettering the Japanese race and creating a foundational generation of New Japanese. They also critiqued sharply the deleterious consequences of patriarchy and patrilineal ideology on the health and hygiene of girls and women. For example, writing in January 1945, Tōgō Minoru, a eugenicist, bureaucrat, and colonial administrator, echoed his predecessors in declaring that the physical and mental health of females had been woefully neglected under the feudal and androcentric regime of the Tokugawa shogunate (Tōgō 1945:34). Although early feminists supported many aspects of the eugenics movement, such as birth control and modern, scientific approaches to pregnancy and childbirth (see Otsubo 1999 and chapter 28 in this volume), the eugenicists' critique of patriarchy and patrilineal ideology was not motivated by overtly feminist concerns.

The (non-feminist) gynocentric, maternalist bent of these early eugenics associations was reflected in the postwar Eugenic Protection Law of 1948, which, in addition to preventing "the birth of eugenically inferior offspring," aimed to "protect maternal health and life." The 1948 law was replaced with the Maternal

Protection Law of 1996, from which references to "eugenically inferior offspring" were omitted and a singular emphasis placed on the protection of motherhood and maternal health (Norgren 2001:145, 155). The historical debates about blood and recent legal developments concerning maternity help us to understand why in Japan (unlike in Germany, Israel, and the United States), "eugenics" is neither an avoided nor a negatively charged term.[12]

Mixed Blood versus Pure Blood

The concept of "pure blood" as a criterion of authentic Japaneseness began circulating in public discourse by the 1880s in many venues and media. "Purity" referred metaphorically to a body – including the national body – free from symbolic pollution and disease-bearing pathogens, as well as to genealogical orthodoxy. As a newly dominant concept, "pure-bloodedness" also effectively tightened what historically had been a loose sense of consanguinity. Although intellectual and ideological rivals, the founders of eugenics associations were nevertheless alike in seeking to improve *the* Japanese race by making bloodline synonymous with household succession (cf. Lebra 1993:125). Their emphasis on the necessary bilineality of a national genealogy consisting of "pure bloods" was not represented in the Meiji Civil Code, which instead privileged male primogeniture and Japanese paternity, or the "male seed," as the sole criterion of nationality and citizenship. This criterion was retained in the postwar Civil Code until 1985, when the nationality law was changed as a result of legal pressure brought by feminists to have the "blood" of Japanese females recognized as an independent and authentic agent of Japanese nationality and citizenship.

In contrast, bilineal kinship continues to supersede all other modes of reckoning the familial, legal, social, and political status of Burakumin ("outcastes") and spirit-animal possessors, that is, persons or households thought to control, or to be controlled by, supernatural animals.[13] In the Tokugawa period, their symbolic pollution and marginality was imagined to be "infectious," and later, with the conflation in eugenic discourse of blood and heredity, inherited and inheritable. In these cases, the new "affirmative" meaning of blood as life force and lineage did not replace the earlier, "negative" meaning of blood as a polluting substance, but rather congealed as both a coeval and a mutually constitutive system of belief (or prejudice). These tenacious popular beliefs, including the dangers of "female blood," represent another or an alternate world of local practices revolving around the negative valences of blood.

By the same token, the blood type fads today represent both a continuation and a distortion of 19th-century scientific ideas about bodies and blood that were embraced by leading intellectuals and introduced to the public at the turn of the century through a centralized education system and burgeoning mass media. (Although many of these ideas are no longer perceived as "scientific" they nevertheless persist in various guises.) The specific field of science that took up the "positive" meaning of blood as its subject was eugenics and race science, and it fueled a discourse that had permeated all aspects of everyday life in Japan by 1900. The public sphere shaped by the discourse of eugenics and race science was premised on a future-oriented vision of a racially improved nation-state, one peopled by taller, heavier,

healthier, and fertile men and women whose anthropometrically ideal bodies would serve as the caryatids of the expanding Japanese empire.

At this juncture it is necessary to backtrack in order to review the beginnings of the imperial New Japan. The defeat of the involuted shogunate and the restoration of the emperor Meiji in 1868 within a German-style parliamentary system ushered in unprecedented social reforms based on a policy of selective and controlled Westernization. Among these reforms was the creation of a nation informed by the utopian ideology of the family-state system, noted earlier. People who had had primarily identified themselves and who were identified by region, domain (*han*), locality, and fixed social and domestic status, had to imagine themselves first and foremost as "Japanese." These layers of identity were contained by the new, umbrella-like category of *kokumin*, or "citizen," in the sense of subject of the imperial nation-state, itself imagined as having an organic, corporeal form (*kokutai*). Eugenicists and nationalists believed that New Japan (*shin'nippon*) could "compete successfully with the West in international affairs" and pursue an imperialist agenda of expansion and colonization only if it were peopled with New Japanese. Just how New Japanese could and should be created was the subject of a heated and divisive debate among the ideologues of blood that has shaped the discourse of eugenics to this day.

Eugenics, a term coined by Francis Galton in 1883, was translated into Japanese as the romanized *yuzenikkusu* and as the neologisms *yūseigaku* (science of superior birth) and *jinshukaizengaku* (science of race betterment). These terms were used synonymously with two terms coined a little earlier: "race betterment" (*minzoku/jinshu kairyō*) and "race hygiene" (*minzoku/jinshu eisei*).[14] *Minzoku* and *jinshu*, the two Japanese words for "race" in both the social and phenotypical senses, for the most part were used interchangeably, although *jinshu* remains the more clinical, social-scientific term (cf. *Rasse*) and *minzoku* the more popular and populist term (cf. *Volk*).[15] When prefixed with names, such as Nippon and Yamato, *minzoku* signified the conflation of phenotype, geography, culture, spirit, history, and nationhood. All of these semantic and semiotic inventions were part of the ideological agenda of the Meiji state and were incorporated into the postwar constitution of 1947, which retained the definition of nationality and citizenship as a matter of blood, or *jus sanguinus* (as opposed to *jus solis*).

Eugenics, in the sense of instrumental and selective procreation, was hardly a new concept in fin-de-siècle Japan. Historically and mytho-historically, as well as across classes and statuses of people, the maintenance of genealogical integrity was a key strategy of household succession. Integrity in this historical context was understood as continuity; that is, the successful augmentation or replacement of household members from one generation to the next through strategically arranged marriages and adoptions.[16] Eugenics, in contrast, was equated with broad societal and nationalist goals, such as the propagation of New Japanese and the rationalization of marriage, with respect to both partner choice and the betrothal ceremony. Introduced under the auspices of "eugenic" was a new national premium on "pure blood" and "wholesome" (*kenzen*) heredity as a necessary condition of race betterment and modern nation-building. Heredity (*iden*) was understood in a general sense as whatever one received from one's parents and ancestors, making them morally as well as medically culpable should their offspring be less than wholesome. Japanese race scientists thus also worked to reform marriage and sexual practices more generally

because it was through sex, regulated by the institution of marriage – as well as licensed prostitution – that either positive or negative eugenic precepts, or both, were most effectively implemented.[17]

Positive eugenics refers to the improvement of circumstances of sexual reproduction and thus incorporates advances in sanitation, nutrition, and physical education into strategies to shape the reproductive choices and decisions of individuals and families. The effects of biology (genetics) and environment are conflated. In this connection, "eugenic" was often used in the early 20th-century Japanese literature as both an adjective meaning, and a euphemism for, "hygienic" and "scientific." Negative eugenics involves the prevention of sexual reproduction, through induced abortion or sterilization, among people deemed unfit. "Unfit" was an ambiguous term that included alcoholics, "lepers," the mentally ill, the criminal, the physically disabled, and the sexually alternative, among other categories of people. Some traditional or premodern categories of stigmatized alterity, such as the Burakumin, were recast in scientific terms and deemed uneugenic, while others, such as horoscopic identity, were dismantled as "superstitions and folk beliefs" (*meishin*) of no eugenic consequence, although they could impede the implementation of scientific practices.[18]

Eugenics provided an avenue for the application of science to social problems, including public health, education, and hygiene. The fields of eugenics and public health shared much jargon and many assumptions, attitudes, and aims, not only in Japan, but in other countries as well (cf. Wikler 1999:192). What Martin Pernick notes about early 20th-century America pertains equally well to Japan, namely, that "eugenic methods often were modeled on the infection control techniques of public health": "infections were caused by germs; inheritance was governed by germ plasm. In both cases, 'germs' meant microscopic seeds. Both types of germs enabled disease to propagate and grow, to spread contamination from the bodies of the diseased to the healthy" through the medium of blood, a metaphor for heredity and a vehicle for infection (Pernick 1997:1767, 1769). Like their international counterparts, Japanese eugenicists tended to collapse biology and culture, and, consequently, held either explicitly or implicitly Lamarckian views on race formation and racial temperament. Thus, even those who were environmentally inclined also assumed that complex phenomena, such as the "uniquely Japanese *ie* (household) system," were "carried in the 'blood,' if only as 'instincts' or 'temperamental proclivities'" (Ikeda 1927a, 1927b; Stocking 1968:25). The melding of biology and culture, nature and culture, is also evident in the interchangeability of *jinshu* (race) and *minzoku* (ethnic nation), and in the prescriptions for race betterment.

Through networks of modern institutions and industries, such as the army, schools, hygiene exhibitions, immigration training programs, the press, fashion, advertising, popular genealogies, and so forth, the Japanese people were encouraged to think in totally new and different ways about their bodies. They were to think of their bodies as plastic, in the sense of capable of being molded, and as adaptable, pliable, and transformable through new hygienic regimens of nutrition and physical exercise. For males, these regimens were part of their military training beginning in 1873, when a modern conscription army was established, replacing the hereditary warrior (samurai) class that epitomized the Tokugawa period. Females, exempt from military service, were exposed to these regimens at the many private-sector schools

and academies that competed to enroll girls and women whose education was more or less neglected by the Meiji government, at least initially. Clothing also fell under the eugenic gaze. Whereas boys and men were encouraged to wear crewcuts and Western-style outfits to symbolize the modernity of New Japan, girls and women were to represent through costume and hairstyle a nostalgically re-imagined traditional Japanese culture, although they were urged to loosen the normally tightly cinched *obi*, or sash, of their kimono, and to simplify the traditional chignon to facilitate the regular cleaning and combing of their hair. All Japanese were advised by public health agents to learn how to walk properly, to use chairs whenever possible, and to avoid kneeling for long periods of time, which was thought to cause bowed legs and pigeon-toedness (Irizawa 1939 [1913]:17–21, 34, 61). The desirable corporeal results and aesthetic effects of these new hygienic practices were perceived as transmittable by blood through "eugenic marriages" (*yūsei kekkon*), as elaborated below.

In Japan, the discourse of eugenics clustered around two essentially incommensurable positions concerning blood: the "pure-blood," or *junketsu*, position, and the "mixed-blood," or *konketsu*, position. The proponents of each position acknowledged the "mixed-blooded," or multiethnic, ancient history of Japan, an idea developed in the late 19th century by the German physician and genealogist Erwin von Baelz, who had spent 30 years in Japan (1876–1906) studying the racial origins of the Japanese people. Von Baelz, applying the then dominant teleological evolutionist paradigm, proposed that the so-called Yamato stem-race, associated with the imperial household and its allegedly unbroken lineage stretching back over 2,500 years, had, by the sixth century, conquered and subjugated the different racial groups coexisting on the islands. These groups, he maintained, were assimilated selectively and slowly, so that by the 19th century, "Yamato blood" was a refined and superior substance (Hayashida 1976:24). Japanese pundits favoring the pure-blood position were keen on preserving the eugenic integrity of the pristine Yamato stem-race; those promoting the mixed-blood position, enumerated the eugenic benefits of hybrid vigor through the mixing of Japanese and non-Japanese blood (Robertson 2001a).[19]

The "mixed-blood" position was first articulated in an 1884 essay, *Nippon jinshu kairyōron* (A Treatise on the Betterment of the Japanese Race), penned by the Keio University-educated journalist Takahashi Yoshio. Invoking a Social Darwinist scenario, Takahashi argued that Japan was undergoing a transition from a "semi-civilized" to a "civilized" status represented, in his view, by northern European countries and their taller, heavier, and stronger populations. This "civilized" status could be expedited through the marriage of Japanese males and Anglo females, or, as he phrased it, the "mixed marriage of yellows and whites" (*kōhaku zakkon*).[20] Mixed-blood marriages, Takahashi hypothesized, would create a taller, heavier, and stronger, in short "a physically superior Japanese race, thereby making it possible for the Japanese to compete successfully with Europeans and Americans in international affairs" (Suzuki 1983:32–34, 39).

The "pure-blood" position was advocated by Katō Hiroyuki, a veteran politician, imperial advisor, and chancellor of Tokyo University. Katō's scathing critique of the mixed-marriage plan was published in 1886 in both an academic journal, *Tōyō gakugei* (Oriental Arts and Sciences) and the *Tōkyō nichinichi shinbun*, a leading daily newspaper. To summarize, Katō first of all objected to the notion that the Japanese were

less civilized than Europeans.[21] Second, he argued that interbreeding "yellows" and "whites" would create a completely new hybrid category of person whose political and social "status" would be unclear and perplexing. Miscegenation, Katō concluded, would result in race *transformation* and not race betterment, and would, over the course of several generations, seriously dilute the pure blood – or racial and cultural essence – of the Japanese. He declared emphatically that whereas mixed-blood marriages between yellows and whites would insure the "complete defeat" (*zenpai*) of Japan by Westerners, pure-bloodedness would insure for eternity Japan's distinctive racial history, culture, and social system (Fujino 1998:385; Katō 1990 [1886]:33, 40–47; Suzuki 1983:35–38).[22]

Although the pure-blood position emerged fairly quickly as the dominant one, the pros and cons of both positions were hotly debated in the eugenics literature through 1945, and continue today in other guises. For example, in an article published in the May 1911 issue of *Jinsei–Der Mensch* (Human Life), the first eugenics journal published in Japan, zoologist Oka'asa Jirō scoffed at the proposal of "white–yellow marriages," dismissing it as one example of the "maniacal fascination with the West" (*seiyōshinsui*) that defined the early Meiji period (Oka'asa 1915:2).[23] Over 25 years later, in 1939, political theorist Ijichi Susumu published an article in *Kaizō* (Reconstruction), a popular, generally liberal, literary periodical, advocating the intermarriage of Japanese males and "carefully selected" Manchurian females. He referred to his proposal as a "racial blood transfusion" (*minzoku yūketsu*), and argued that "mixing superior Japanese blood with inferior Manchurian blood would stimulate the development and civilization of inferior peoples by producing hybrid offspring who would mature as natural political leaders" (Ijichi 1939:86).[24] Ijichi's ideas in turn were rebuffed by Tōgō Minoru, noted earlier, whose ideas about blood circulated widely during the 1920s through the 1940s. Tōgō reiterated Katō's objections to mixed-blood offspring, arguing that they constituted a "new race" (*shinminzoku*); miscegenation by definition could only fail to produce the cultural objective of colonial assimilation, namely Japanization (*nipponka*). Mixed marriages between Japanese and non-Japanese Asians, he asserted, would effectively corrupt and "dissolve the soul [*tamashii*] of the pure Japanese race and national body" and thwart the imperial expansion of the Japanese people (Tōgō 1936:142–144; 1945).[25]

I realized, in the course of my research on blood ideologies, that the central tenet of the "pure-blood" position was anchored in a centuries-old construction of radical otherness transposed into a new vocabulary. Although he used mathematical charts and invoked modern science, Katō Hiroyuki's argument for preserving blood purity was strikingly similar to the persistent "one-drop" folk theory regulating marriages between symbolically pure and polluted Japanese. Briefly, according to this theory, Burakumin and spirit-animal possessors are labeled "black stock" (*kurosuji*) and their opposites are labeled "white stock" (*shirosuji*). The term *suji* ("stock" or "line") is very close to the 19th-century meaning of blood as an inheritable biological *and* cultural substance, but its affective range is much broader and the transmission process analogous to infection and contamination. Miscegenation among black and white "stockholders" would turn both a "white stock" person and that person's entire household "black" (Ishizuka 1983 [1972]:75–77; 112–115; Yoshida 1977 [1972]:58–60, 87–91). Katō seemed to define the nation in terms of *shirosuji*, a

"white stock" lineage that could be irrevocably sullied – or turned "black" – by the mixing of Japanese and non-Japanese blood.

Blood Marriages

The central focus in the Japanese eugenics movement concentrated on the physiques and overall health of girls and women. Japanese eugenicists argued that the physical development of Japanese girls and women had been neglected for centuries, resulting in their physiological inferiority. The need to grow the population in order to generate the human capital with which to fund nation- and empire-building motivated agents of the Japanese state and private sectors alike to focus their undivided attention on improving the bodies of females, who were, after all, the biological reproducers of the nation (cf. Fujo shinbun 1935; McClintock 1994). This part of the nationalist and imperialist enterprise was supported by some of the leading Japanese feminists, whose agenda of popularizing methods of birth control and promoting maternal health was incorporated into the discourse of eugenics, as I noted earlier (see also Norgren 2001; Otsubo 1999). In this connection, note that the early 20th-century (1940) *and* postwar (1948 and 1996) eugenics legislation and laws alike have been understood as measures to protect the reproductive health of mothers. "Maternal protection" (*bosei hogo*), in fact, is one of the many euphemisms for eugenic practices today.

Generally speaking, the pronatalist state encouraged the improvement of the conditions surrounding female reproductivity instead of advocating sterilization as a way to reduce the reproduction of the unfit. The Welfare Ministry (Kōseishō), established in 1938, inaugurated a "propagate and multiply movement" (*umeyo fuyaseyo undō*), which included the staging of healthy-baby contests throughout the country. Especially fertile mothers were eulogized in the mass media as comprising a "fertile womb battalion" (*kodakara butai*). The ministry also organized awards ceremonies, many of which were staged at department stores, where such mothers, babies in tow, were presented with certificates honoring their reproductive success.[26] Already in 1930, the Education Ministry (Monbushō), together with the *Tōkyo* and *Ōsaka asahi* newspaper companies, had inaugurated an annual nationwide contest to identify the top ten – of 260,000 contestants – "most healthy, eugenically fit children in Japan" (*nippon'ichi no kenkō yūryōji*). Contestants were selected from elementary schools throughout Japan and underwent further screening at the prefectural level before the finalists were selected by a central committee. In addition to a female and male winner, four pairs of runners up were selected, along with five pairs of semi-finalists. Photographs of the scantily clad winners were published in the daily press along with charts detailing their physical measurements, medical histories, educational backgrounds, and maternal and paternal genealogies (Tōkyo asahi shinbun 1930:8–9; see also Ōsaka asahi shinbun 1931:11).[27] Eugenicists referred to this contest as a new (*shin*) *nenjū gyōji*, a term for the "annual events" comprising the agricultural calendar. In doing so, they sought to naturalize and traditionalize the incorporation into everyday life of eugenic practices as central both to the persistence of historical cultural practices and to the corporeal development of Japanese children (Yūsei 1937:8–9).

Worries about the anthropometric status of women and children were equaled by and linked to worries among a majority of eugenicists about the "high rate" of consanguineous marriage in Japan. One of the most prevalent topics in the four eugenics journals that I have scrutinized – *Jinsei–Der Mensch*, *Yūsei undō* (Eugenic Exercise/Movement), *Yūsei* (Superior Birth), and *Yūseigaku* (Eugenics) – was the "detrimental consequences" of "marriages among blood relatives," or *ketsuzoku kekkon*.[28] Much was made of how consanguineous marriages, mostly between first cousins, amounted to 5 to 6 percent of all registered marriages (Furuya 1941:117; Yasui 1940:14). It is not always clear from the Japanese literature what was the standard in relation to which this percentage constituted a "high rate." The statistics provided by Ethel Elderton, a Galton Research Scholar writing in 1911 and much cited by her Japanese colleagues, may offer a useful cross-cultural comparison. Elderton concluded that the percentage of first-cousin marriages "among all classes in England" was around 3 percent, although she found a "very high percentage" of cousin marriages, 7 to 11 percent, in cases of deaf-mutism and albinoism (Elderton 1911:24–28).

Using population and registered-marriage statistics compiled by the Japanese government between 1933 and 1943, I calculated that 5 percent would amount to an annual average of somewhere between 24,000 and 33,000 registered marriages (Jinkō mondai kenkyūkai 1933–43). The actual percentage of consanguineous marriages is actually much higher since many – in some cases over a third or more – marriages were not registered. Unfortunately, the number of unregistered, common-law marriages, or *naien*, for this period is not available, much less information as to what percentage of them were among "blood relatives" (Civisca 1957). Some villages, such as Narata and Yūshima in the Minamikoma district of Yamanashi Prefecture, were known as "blood-marriage hamlets" (*ketsuzoku kekkon buraku*) because the vast majority of inhabitants had married their first cousins, half-cousins, second cousins (*hatoko*), uncles, or nieces. These two villages were the subjects of a survey initiated in September 1943 by the Welfare Ministry, the results of which were published in 1949 (Shinozaki 1949). Imaizumi Yoko, a demographer employed by the same ministry, notes that the proportion of consanguineous marriages in Japan averaged 16 percent in the 1920s (Imaizumi 1988:235). Curiously, the American anthropologist John Embree elected *not* to explore the phenomenon of the "frequent cousin marriages" that he encountered while conducting pioneering fieldwork in rural Kyushu during the late 1930s. He did, however, note that "missionaries" of the eugenic marriage campaign were active in the area, and that the practice of consanguineous marriage was "being discouraged by more educated people on the questionable theory that it is biologically harmful" (Embree 1939:88).

The countrywide practice of consanguineous marriage reflected the premium placed on what I call the "strategic endogamy" practiced during the 250 years of relative isolation maintained by the xenophobic Tokugawa shogunate. By "strategic endogamy" I am referring to the transaction of marriages exclusively among and within certain categories of people defined by social status and geographical location; in Japan, "blood marriages" were not limited to elites. Familiarity was another desirable criterion, as it was popularly assumed that marriages between blood relatives were more stable and diplomatic in that they were free from disruptive anxieties about unknown or hidden factors.

Eugenicists in Japan and elsewhere argued among themselves over the negative and positive benefits of inbreeding among blood relatives. A minority in Japan pointed to Galton's thesis of "hereditary genius" and other seemingly positive examples of consanguinity, including the ancient Athenians (cf. East and Jones 1919:226–244). Applying quasi-Mendelian logic, they argued that, in order for inbreeding to be risk-free, the blood of each party must be absolutely pure (Mizushima and Mitake 1942; Taguchi 1940:33–35). The catch, of course, was that pure-bloodedness, while good in theory, was never completely ascertainable. The majority of Japanese eugenicists believed that the transmission and manifestation of diseases and defects were expedited and multiplied through inbreeding. They echoed and cited their foreign counterparts, such as Ethel Elderton, in linking a host of disorders and diseases to the hereditary transmission of faulty germ plasm (*iden*) – the word "gene" was not coined until 1908. In Elderton's words,

> The real danger of cousin marriage lies not in the existence of patent defects in the stock. Nor can we recommend cousin marriage because the stock has certain patent valuable characteristics. Behind the obviously advantageous quality may exist the rare but latent defect. The danger of cousin marriage lies in the probability that the germ plasm of each individual contains numerous latent defects, each of which is rare in the community at large, and each of which is of small danger to the individual or the offspring unless the mating is with another individual whose germ plasm contains one or more of the same latent characters. (Elderton 1911:38)

These "latent defects" included sterility, mental illness, alcoholism, feeblemindedness, physical deformities, disabilities, dementia, deaf-mutism, myopia and blindness, "deviant" sexuality, and proneness to tuberculosis, syphilis, and criminal behavior. Obviously, not all of these conditions are inherited, and those that are may be hidden in "normal-looking" carriers.

The vocabulary and vectors of eugenics were also used to pathologize and contemporize historical constructions of radical otherness, as in the case of Burakumin and spirit-animal possessors. Their stigmatized status was eugenically respun as the consequence of defective germ plasm. Curiously, of the several articles I read by eugenicists dismantling superstitions surrounding marriage practices, not one made an argument *against* the systematic discrimination against Burakumin in all arenas of Japanese society. Moreover, eugenic discourse was instrumental in creating a caste-like category of "stigmatized other." Not only were those Japanese who exhibited a newly identified hereditary defect ostracized, but their households were also marked as eugenically unfit. Whereas historically, symbolically impure groups were allowed to marry and reproduce among themselves, persons and groups classified as eugenically unfit, such as persons with Hansen's disease (leprosy), were quarantined, exiled, and prevented from marrying (unless sterilized) and reproducing.[29] Eugenicists such as Taguchi Eitarō expressed alarm that, although "genetically defective" and "feebleminded" individuals constituted only 2 percent of the population, they reproduced at two to three times the rate of "normal and ordinary" (*futsū*) individuals. Taguchi even invoked Gresham's Law in arguing for the passage of the 1940 National Eugenics Law (Taguchi 1940:35).[30]

The imperial state and its agencies chose early on to pursue a eugenics-dictated agenda that called for the eradication of the apparently widespread practice in Japan

of consanguineous marriage. Beginning in 1883, numerous "hygiene exhibitions" (*eisei tenrankai*) were staged countrywide, sponsored first by a Buddhist temple, the Hongan-ji in the Tsukiji district of Tokyo, and subsequently by the Japanese Red Cross and, after 1938, by the Welfare Ministry. By the late 1920s, the theme and content of many of these exhibitions were based on public opinion polls; the relationship between heredity and marriage practices proved to be one of the most popular themes (Fujino 1998:140–141). The sensationalistic and sometimes grotesque exhibits – such as a realistic wax model of a man's face riddled with syphilitic lesions – along with numerous articles in the popular press, drummed home warnings about the deleterious effects of both unregulated sex and inbreeding. Schoolchildren, along with the general public, were encouraged to attend the lectures that accompanied the exhibitions. Presented by doctors and university professors, these "blood talks" greatly simplified eugenics for the lay public, who apparently attended by the thousands. The speakers harshly censured superstitions and folk customs related to marriage, such as matchmaking based on horoscopy, the sexegenary cycle, and the five elements (wood, fire, water, earth, metal). But their sometimes facile presentations of hereditary diseases helped to spawn new superstitions based on popularized science, such as the attribution to consanguinity of a host of non-hereditary conditions such as leprosy, tuberculosis, and symbolic pollution and marginality (Fujikawa 1929; Fujino 1998:141–142; Kōseisho eisei kekkon sōdansho 1941).

Eugenic Marriages

The tenacious persistence of "blood marriages" despite private and state efforts to condemn their transaction provoked intensified efforts to eliminate that tradition. One of the first lines of offense was the "eugenic-marriage counseling centers" (*yūsei kekkon sōdansho*) that were first opened in Tokyo and regional cities in 1927. The earliest centers were sponsored and staffed by Ikeda Shigenori's Japan Eugenic Exercise/Movement Association. A year earlier, Ikeda had founded the Legs and Feet Society (Ashi no kai) as a means of popularizing eugenic principles. Like the earlier German Wandervogel and Czech Sokol movements that inspired Ikeda, the Legs and Feet Society sponsored, through its Tokyo and regional branches, collective hygienic regimens, nutrition lessons, group hiking, and wholesome folk-dancing in the countryside as ways to improve the bodies and minds of young Japanese so that they could "properly oversee the nation's global expansion" (Fujino 1998:83–86; Ikeda 1927a; Okada 1933).[31]

Ikeda regarded the ostracism and sterilization of the unfit as a crude and simplistic approach to the project of race betterment. Citing the evolutionary categories proposed by Lewis Henry Morgan in *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity* (1871), Ikeda argued that monogamous marriage practices, together with the systematization of physical education, was the golden key to improving the Japanese race and modernizing Japan (Ikeda 1925:31–38, 386). Article after article in his journal, *Yūsei undō*, emphasized that "monogamy was the foundation of eugenics" and that a eugenically sound marriage insured the development of a prosperous, physically fit, and moral society (e.g. Ikeda 1929:19; Miwata 1927). Ikeda and his colleagues

followed Francis Galton in emphasizing the dialectical relationship between eugenics and marriage:

> Eugenic belief extends the function of philanthropy to future generations, it renders its actions more pervading than hitherto, by dealing with families and societies in their entirety, and it enforces the importance of the marriage covenant by directing serious attention to the probable quality of the future offspring . . . [and] brings the tie of kinship into prominence . . . (quoted in Pearson 1909:45)

Dismissing as bunk the folk belief that the familiarity shared by married blood relatives insured household diplomacy and stability, Ikeda lectured throughout Japan on the need to shift the basis of and for desirable familiarity between females and males from close kinship per se to the modern alternative of equal coeducation and shared hobbies. In his lectures and essays, Ikeda repeated the slogan of his association, "superior seeds, superior fields, superior cultivation" (*yoi tane, yoi hatake, yoi teire*) which, he explained, was a metaphor for "superior genes (or germ plasm), superior society, superior education" (*yoi iden, yoi shakai, yoi kyōiku*) (Ikeda 1927a). Civic and educational institutions, not consanguineous households, were promoted by him as ideal sites for revising the terms of interpersonal familiarity and ultimately insuring marital success among persons unrelated by blood. Ikeda argued that a desirable intimacy among strangers could be facilitated through educational programs and leisure activities, such as those offered by the Legs and Feet Society, that replaced pervasive folk beliefs about "shared blood" as a key criterion of and for affinity and harmony (Fujino 1998:88).

A number of the eugenic marriage-counseling centers, including Ikeda's, were opened in department stores – such as Shirokiya in the elegant Nihonbashi section of Tokyo – in order to make information about social and race hygiene, and associated behaviors and practices, easily available to consumers. Women especially were targeted, for "female citizenship" was defined not in terms of legal rights but in terms of procreation and consumption (Robertson 2001a and 2001b; Yūsei 1936c). Modern scientific – specifically hygienic and eugenic – knowledge was dispensed as a commodity. Because consumption was inextricably associated with the body and its cosmetic, nutritional, and sartorial enhancement, the link between women's consumer citizenship and eugenics was naturalized by the state and commercial sector alike.

The staff of the eugenic marriage counseling centers also provided matchmaking services, introducing potential spouses to each other based on the autobiographical health certificates they had completed and filed at the centers. According to the health profile (*shinshin kensahyō*) of a eugenic couple appearing in *Shashin shūhō* (Photograph Weekly) in April 1942, by which time the centers were well established throughout Japan, the ideal woman was 154 cm tall, weighed 51 kg, and had a chest size of 80 cm.[32] The ideal man was 165 cm tall, weighed 58 kg, and had a chest size of 84 cm. Both were free from disease and had "normal" genealogies. As the quintessential eugenic couple, they were committed to observing the "ten rules of marriage," which were: choose a lifetime partner; choose a partner healthy in body and mind; exchange health certificates; choose someone with normal "germ plasm" and wholesome heredity and ancestry; avoid marriage with blood relatives; marry as soon

as possible; discard superstitions and quaint customs; obey your parents; have a simple and economical wedding; and, reproduce for the sake of the nation. The health profile was accompanied by photographs of the couple and their health certificates, scenes of a simplified, eugenic marriage ceremony, and a cartoon of the desired outcome of eugenic marriage counseling; namely, a family of eight children (Shashin shūhō 1942:8–9).

Not only were women the primary audience for eugenic marriage counseling, they were also encouraged early on to undertake meticulous hygienic and eugenic surveillance work in their official gender role of good wife, wise mother. Married women were recruited by eugenicists to undertake the ethnographic surveys of their marital and natal households necessary to establish genealogical, or blood, orthodoxies within families as a foundational step toward race betterment. In 1887 the hygiene section of the Home Ministry established the Greater Japan Women's Hygiene Association (Dai nippon fujin eiseikai) in Tokyo under whose auspices married women in particular were organized as blood-marriage whistleblowers. An Osaka branch was established three years later (Fujino 1998:388). Encouraged to regard themselves as amateur ethnographers, the women were instructed to collect as much information as possible on the life histories of living and deceased relatives. The households and relatives of prospective marriage partners and their extended families were to be similarly scrutinized in order to prevent inbreeding.

By the early 1930s, detailed "eugenic marriage" questionnaires were printed in or inserted into popular magazines for public consumption, and the accompanying instructions underscored the slippery nature of questionnaires in general. The amateur ethnographers were reminded that, because there was often a huge difference between what people say they do and what they actually do, they could not take anything at face value and were obliged to maintain a healthy skepticism (Takada 1986 [1937]:394, 401, 514). By and large, the questionnaires were designed to foster a modern, anti-traditional attitude of scientific-mindedness.[33]

Ikeda Shigenori was convinced that these marriage questionnaires would not only insure the eugenic fitness of spouses but also help avoid class differences that could disrupt and even destroy a marriage. Moreover, he explained, they would be augmented by information from a eugenic couple's children. Ultimately, the goal was to create a database of individuals and their entire households – and ultimately "all Japanese households" – which would enable eugenicists to conduct in-depth surveys of any given family's genealogy (*kakei*) (Ikeda 1928:61). Because, Ikeda declared, the government did not yet have an institutional framework for administering a comprehensive eugenic marriage counseling office – the Welfare Ministry was established in 1938 – the Japan Eugenic Exercise/Movement Association was prepared to undertake this service (Ikeda 1928:61).

Ikeda's eugenic marriage counseling activities, which included the "mixers" sponsored by the Legs and Feet Society, "blood purity"-testing clinics, the eugenic marriage questionnaires, and the public hygiene exhibitions among other things, illustrate the extent to which scientific culture was popularized and popular culture "scientized" by social engineers keen on modifying and modernizing the behavior of the Japanese people. Additionally, articles and advice columns on eugenic themes appeared frequently in national daily newspapers and popular magazines. Eugenicists contributed regularly to the media, and the eugenics journals *Jinsei–Der Mensch*,

Yūsei, *Yūsei undō*, and *Yūseigaku* all included columns and articles devoted to summarizing the coverage of eugenics themes in the daily press (e.g., Yūsei 1936a, 1936b).

Eugenic Marriages as National Strategy

In addition to concerns, real and imagined, about the negative consequences of inbreeding among blood relatives, it occurred to me that the state – that is, the repertoire of agencies and institutions that reinforces and reproduces dominant ideologies and normalizes everyday practices (cf. Corrigan and Sayer 1985) – had another investment in the eradication of consanguineous marriages. What eugenics offered was a motive and rationale for the imperial state to more closely engineer and orchestrate the sexual, gendered, marital, and reproductive practices of its subjects. Nation-states have always maintained a vested interest in the sexual and social reproduction of the population, and New Japan was no different in this regard. In fact, in some respects, the imperial state was following a powerful precedent set by the Tokugawa shogunate, which had brokered and controlled all marriages and adoptions among the vassal *daimyo* as one means of insuring their subordination.

The imperial state differed from this precedent in two major ways. First, the patrilineal orthodoxy undergirding the Tokugawa regime extended to the prevailing ethno-embryology, which is best described as male monogenesis, or the notion that the female body serves as a vessel to contain the active life-producing agent supplied by the male alone. With the popularization of eugenics came an explanation of sexual reproduction that emphasized the critical and equal contributions of females and males to heredity. The imperial state thus recognized the importance taking both maternity and paternity into account in promoting the creation of New Japanese, despite the persistence of patrilineality as the singular criterion of nationality and citizenship.

The second major difference between the Tokugawa regime and the imperial state was the global scope of the underlying ideological agenda of New Japan, which was informed by the utopian ideology of the family-state system that characterized Japanese nationalism. By promoting eugenic marriages, the imperial state and its agents aimed to redefine historical and traditional boundaries of endogamy (*dōzoku kekkon*) and exogamy (*zokugai kekkon*). The state sought to replace one type of kin group endogamy with another system that I shall call "eugenic endogamy," which basically amounted to the introduction of "universal exogamy" among theoretically pure-blooded Japanese. Eugenic endogamy, in short, was at the foundation of the family-state system, or state familism. In seeking to instill in its subjects an awareness of the New Japan and their Japanese nationality, the state aimed to dissolve the boundaries that engendered local affinities – boundaries that were intricately shaped by historical and traditional endogamous practices based on kin group, pedigree, class, region, and "superstitions and folk beliefs."

An article published in 1889, in the journal of the Great Japan Association for the Betterment of Public Customs and Morals (Dainippon fūzoku kairyōkai), is one of the earliest calls for the practice of universal exogamy in Japan. In it, the author drew attention to the allegedly higher percentage of deformities and mortality among the

offspring of couples related by blood.[34] Citing and agreeing with Katō Hiroyuki's opposition to "mixed marriages," the author recommended what they termed both *shūshi kōkan*, or "exchange of seeds," and *man'en kekkon*, or "marriage between widely dispersed individuals":

> marriage partners should be selected not from the narrow parameters of blood relatives within a village or circumscribed regions, but from all over Japan. A man from Satsuma [in the south] should marry a woman from the north; a woman from Shikoku [in the south] should marry a man from Niigata [in the north]. (Sakamoto 1889:8)

Forty years later, Ikeda Shigenori reiterated the pressing need for a new geography of marriage in his arguments for the establishment of eugenic matchmaking centers, which would have the effect of "greatly expanding the circle [*han'i*] of eligible spouses" (Ikeda 1928:60).

From a perspective *inside* Japan, universal exogamy was advocated; from a vantage point *outside* of Japan, eugenic or national endogamy was promoted – that is, the principle that Japanese should marry other pure-blooded Japanese comprising the imaginary national family based on eugenic criteria that replaced traditional endogamous practices. Limited exceptions were also made for politically strategic purposes, such as arranged marriages between members of the Japanese aristocracy and their Korean, Manchurian, and Mongolian counterparts. Arguments in favor of so-called "mixed-blood marriages" and "hybrid vigor" continued as part of the public discourse of eugenics, and have remained a foil for assertions today about the cultural and racial uniqueness of *the* Japanese.

Epilogue

I have reviewed the Japanese ideologies of blood that came into prominence in the twinned contexts of nation-building and imperialism. The Japanese people themselves were the proving ground of colonialist schemes in Asia and the Pacific for the reason that they needed to be claimed and remolded as a national community and recruited into the imperial enterprise as a supporting cast. The popularization of eugenics, race hygiene, and eugenic endogamy as elements of quotidian life was a (bio)powerfully effective method of national mobilization. In Japan, ideologies of blood vacillated between the two incommensurable theoretical positions of pure-bloodedness and mixed-bloodedness. Scrutinized from another perspective, we can see that these positions themselves were premised on competing notions of either the vigor or the vulnerability of *the* Japanese as agents of cultural encounter and transformation.

These positions were also refracted in the condemnation of consanguineous marriages and the promotion of universal exogamy within Japan among pure-blooded Japanese. The tension between these positions persists today in many popular forums.[35] Manichean arguments are waged in the mass media about whether or not the Japanese were imperialist aggressors, anti-colonial liberators of Asia, or victims of Western imperialism – tautological and essentially moot arguments that, since 1945, have worked to erode memories and records alike of tangible historical events.

Scientists have been no less willfully amnesiac: Matsunaga Ei, a geneticist writing in 1968 on birth control policy in Japan, made the preposterous and fallacious claim that "no eugenic movement has ever existed in this country" (Matsunaga 1968:199; see also Robertson 2005). Similarly, postwar demographers and biologists writing on consanguineous marriages in Japan somehow overlook or ignore the active role of the state and eugenics associations in fostering a negative image of inbreeding and instead attribute the decline in such marriages to an agentless "loss of traditional values" (Schull and Neel 1965:19). Moreover, the journal *Minzoku eisei* (Race Hygiene), launched in 1931, continues to be published, despite the disturbingly fascist allusions of the title.

It is clear that eugenic formulations – "blood prints" – about Japanese nationality remain suspended in a *continuous present* where they shape and support political social, cultural, and esthetic perceptions of ethnic and racial identity.[36] Only by recognizing and researching historical patterns of social engineering and nation-building, and only by remaining alert to their contemporization and to the continuous presence of their past, can we begin to frame a critical discourse of first- and second-wave eugenics both relevant to Japan and possessing comparative potential.

NOTES

1 "Disciplinary bio-power," as elaborated by Michel Foucault (1978, 1979), refers to a state's or dominant institution's politicization of and control over biology and biological processes, including recreational and procreational sexual practices, as a powerful means of assimilating and claiming people as subjects. Although the applications of bio-power can be positive or negative, Foucault focuses especially on the misuses and perversions.

2 This chapter is a changed, abridged, and differently titled version of Robertson (2002), and is part of a much longer chapter in my book in progress, *Blood and Beauty: Eugenic Modernity and Empire in Japan* (Berkeley: University of California Press). That chapter includes material on imperial assimilation policy as a technology of "blood," which I do not include here.

3 Jennifer Terry makes a similar point about the relationship between science and (homo)-sexuality in the United States (Terry 1999:11–13).

4 See Robertson (2001a, 2001b) and Mizuno (2001). Beginning in the 1910s and blatantly obvious by 1940 was the prolific use of *kagaku* (science) in the titles of popular magazines, such as *Kagaku sekai* (Science World), *Kagaku gahō* (Science Illustrated), *Kodomo no kagaku* (Science for Children), *Kagaku no nippon* (Science Japan), and *Shashin kagaku* (Photography Science), to name but a few magazines.

5 As Tessa Morris-Suzuki notes, "the imagery of the family was particularly apposite because it created the ideal framework for asserting the paramount place of the emperor in Japanese society" as the head of the family-state. The familial conception of the nation-state profoundly influenced the nascent idea of the uniqueness of *the* Japanese as a distinct race (Morris-Suzuki 1998:84–85).

6 Until 1985, paternal "blood," or patrilineality, was the *de jure* condition of nationality and citizenship, which in Japan, as in Germany, is *jus sanguinus* (unlike in the United States, where it is *jus solis*). That year, maternal "blood" was legally recognized as an agent of nationality and citizenship.

7 Historically, in some regions of Japan females were required to spend the period of their menses in a menstrual hut located at some remove from the main house (Segawa 1963). Many Japanese today are reluctant to acknowledge the equation of blood and symbolic pollution as one factor influencing the widespread corporate practice of allowing (until a few years ago) monthly "menstruation leaves." Today, Shinto priests rationalize as a precautionary measure the banishment of all females, regardless of celebrity or political rank, from the sumo ring, certain sacred mountains, and road construction sites on account of their polluted and dangerous bodies that can provoke destructive forces.

8 Note that *niku*, as in *nikumanjū* (flesh bun), has been a slang word for female genitals since at least the early 17th century. There is no apparent vulgar equivalent for *tane*.

9 The history of "blood" symbolism in Japan runs contrary to Foucault's Eurocentric theory that an "*ancien regime* of blood" endured as a descent ideology forming the foundation of a modern racialist and racist system of heredity. Moreover, in modern Japan, "blood" symbolism was collapsed with, and was not replaced by, sexuality and race (Foucault 1978:147–148; see the discussion with respect to Germany in Linke 1999:36–37).

10 Although Lebra here is referring in particular to the adoption practices of the modern Japanese nobility (which she presents in terms somewhat timeless), adoption was deployed pragmatically by all classes and status groups since at least the fourth century, when Japan first appears in Chinese dynastic histories. The *ie*, or household, is a corporate group and an economic unit of production that perpetuates itself from generation to generation beyond the life span of any single member of the group. Prior to the postwar constitution, the *ie*, and not the individual, constituted the smallest legal unit of society. The *ie*, which is lead by a househead who is regarded as the caretaker of the group, may vary over time in composition from a childless couple to several generations, although only one married couple per generation may claim membership in an *ie*. As I note in the body of the article, succession tends to be on the model of male primogeniture; younger sons form branch *ie*, and daughters marry out.

11 Also, wealthy merchants, who controlled the de facto monetary economy during the Edo period, could purchase swords that only samurai could, theoretically, own and which, therefore, were akin to sartorial markers of samurai status.

12 The association of eugenics with maternal health has overshadowed its invocation as scientific grounds for the ostracism, exile, and even sterilization of persons suffering from Hansen's disease and other conditions erroneously assumed to be hereditary, who were thus treated as pariahs.

13 Early in the Edo period, the Tokugawa shogunate codified a status hierarchy that classified people into four endogamous groups – samurai (*shi*), farmers (*nō*), artisans (*kō*), and merchants (*shō*). Above these groups were the members of the imperial household and the Buddhist and Shinto clergy, and below the four groups were people grouped into two categories of sub-humanity, the "non-people" (*hinin*) and, at rock bottom, the "filthy" (non-)people (*eta*). The *hinin* constituted a heterogeneous group comprised of beggars, prostitutes, itinerant entertainers, fortunetellers, fugitives, and criminals. Among their ranks were also individuals who had fallen out of the "real people" categories for one reason or another. *Eta* is a word of uncertain origin. In the Edo period, it referred to families of outcastes who performed tasks considered to be ritually or symbolically polluting, including the slaughtering of animals and disposal of the dead. The *eta* were "quarantined" in specific, undesirable locations, such as dry river beds, and forced to wear special clothing to mark their outcaste status; in some localities were mandated to wear a patch of leather on their sleeves, whereas in others, they were tattooed, as were some *hinin*. In 1871, as part of its modernization programs, the new Meiji imperial

government, whose supporters overthrew the shogunate, passed an edict officially abolishing all status discrimination. The four-part status hierarchy was leveled and reconstituted under the rubric "commoners" (*heimin*) – although aristocrats remained such – and the non-people and *eta*, were recategorized as "new commoners" (*shinheimin*), whose creation marks the beginning of the Burakumin, or literally "village people," a Meiji period name that emphasized their endogamous constitution. Moreover, the prefix "new," in "new commoner," did not eradicate but rather contemporized the centuries long practice of discriminating against persons historically categorized as subhuman.

14 The blurred semantics of "eugenics" and "race hygiene" also typified debates about "applied biology" in Germany before and during the Third Reich; see Proctor (1988).

15 *Jinshu* is the Chinese-style (*onyomi*) pronunciation of this compound ideograph; the Japanese-style (*kunyomi*) pronunciation is *hitodane*, or "human seed." My perusal of the early eugenics literature suggests that *hitodane* was the pronunciation used (indicated by the frequent inclusion of syllables [*furigana*] printed alongside the ideographs in texts) for the English term "germ plasm." Also, whereas *jinshu* is used for "race" in the biological (phenotypic) sense, *minzoku* denotes social race, or ethnicity.

16 Embree (1939:81–88, 88–89) suggests that consanguineous marriages tended to involve patrilineal parallel-cousins while adoptions tended to involve brother's sons or the sons born by women before their marriage. In his words: "The family system is patrilineal in pattern but, through the customs of adoption, often matrilineal in practice" (ibid.:85).

17 For definitive research on the history of sexology in Japan, see Frühstück (2000 and 2003).

18 Among the most tenacious superstitions is that of the *hinoeuma*, or zodiacal sign of the fiery horse that cycles every 60 years. Females born in the year of the fiery horse are, according to this "superstition," headstrong and predestined to harm males, and thus are eschewed as marriage partners.

19 Having published already on the vicissitudes of the "pure-blood" and "mixed-blood" positions, I will only briefly summarize them here in order to reduce redundancy and to allow more room to explore related phenomena; see Robertson (2001a).

20 "Marriage" was used as a euphemism for "procreative sexual intercourse."

21 Michael Weiner (1997:7) states incorrectly that Takahashi's ideas were shared by Katō.

22 Incidentally, von Baelz himself did not support mixed-blood marriages, and proposed instead a "negative" eugenics approach to race betterment by segregating the fit from the unfit (Fujino 1998:388). He did not follow his own advice, however, and married a Japanese woman, Hana, with whom he had two children. Similar arguments about the pros and cons of the pure-blood and mixed-blood positions were waged in China, where one advocate of mixed marriages attempted to strengthen his case by claiming that the Japanese government had sanctioned the practice of intermarriage between "whites" and "yellow," which of course was not accurate (Dikötter 1992:88); see also Dikötter (1998) for additional general information about the discourse of race and eugenics in China. Although aware of their Chinese counterparts, a number of whom visited and studied in Japan, Japanese eugenicists did not cite their work, favoring in contrast the publications of Europeans and North and South Americans. Doubtless Japanese imperial aggression in China since the Sino-Japanese wars (1894–95) also had a negative effect on scholarly exchanges between Japanese and Chinese nationalists and eugenicists. See also Stefan Tanaka (1993) for an informative analysis of the status of China in Japanese scholarship during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Ann Stoler's perceptive article on the cultural politics of "mixed bloods" in French Indochina and Netherlands East Indies offers useful comparative material. However, she neither mentions nor addresses the influence of the international discourse of eugenics and race hygiene on French and Dutch colonial administrators, and glosses specific and distinctive French and Dutch

colonial strategies as "European." Perhaps their eschewal of miscegenation justifies their melding here, but the notion of an internally coherent "Europe" is problematic. Where, for example, do Spain and Portugal fit within the rubric "Europe," two arguably "European" colonial powers that *did* pursue miscegenation as a means of assimilation? The argument against miscegenation made by the Dutch legalist J. A. Nederburgh in 1898 parallels Katō's argument, made 12 years earlier, for preserving the purity of Japanese blood. It would have been interesting to know from what body of literature and contemporary debate Nederburgh was drawing (Stoler 1995:138). As an aside, Japanese writers apparently enjoyed musing about the conceptual problems associated with and the fate of "Dutch mixed-bloods" (e.g., Kaizō 1942; Kitahara 1943; Ōya 1943).

23 One of the main vehicles for popularizing eugenics among the fin-de-siècle Japanese public was the journal *Jinsei* (Human Life), founded in 1905 by Fujikawa Yū, an internist and medical historian. It was discontinued in 1919. Fujikawa was among the dozens of Japanese medical students who studied in Germany at the turn of the century and who were keen on applying European ideas about eugenics and race hygiene to the general project of "improving the Japanese race." *Jinsei*, subtitled *Der Mensch* (The Human), was modeled after German eugenicist Alfred Ploetz's *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* (Journal for Racial and Social Biology), founded a year earlier. The contents were divided into 16 categories which reflected the prevailing synthesis of Darwinian and Lamarckian theories and assumptions: biology, social anthropology, historical anthropology, physical anthropology, legal anthropology, comparative psychology, psychology, national psychology, cultural history of medicine, social hygiene, race hygiene, law, sociology, education and pedagogy, religion, and statistics.

24 Years earlier, some colonial administrators had considered a similar policy with respect to Korea and Koreans under the tautological rubric *dōbun dōshu no minzoku*, or "people of the same culture and race" – "tautological" because the alleged sameness was proposed by Japanese colonial ideologues who supported assimilation, or *dōka*, literally "same-ization," that is, Japanization. Support for assimilation and pacification through intermarriage waned as Korean hostility toward the occupiers grew more intense, especially after the anti-Japanese uprising of 1919. The very few "mixed marriages" that were officially condoned were those strategically arranged between Japanese and Korean royalty (Duus 1995:413–423). Ijichi's views paralleled the dominant position of the state's assimilation policy toward the aboriginal Ainu of Hokkaido, who, since the Meiji Restoration of 1868, had been categorized as "proto-Japanese." Assimilation, it was believed, would accelerate their evolution as "civilized people" (e.g., Takakura 1942).

25 Although published in 1945, Tōgō here reiterates a eugenic argument first made in his books on colonial administration published two decades earlier (e.g., Tōgō 1922, 1925).

26 Similar events, such as "better baby contests" were staged in early 20th-century United States at state fairs and other public forums.

27 Females averaged 11.9 years of age, 156 cm in height, and 45 kg in weight. The respective statistics for males were 11.10 years, 158 cm, and 46.5 kg (Tōkyo asahi shinbun 1930:8–9).

28 Another term used for consanguineous marriage was *kinshin kekkon*, or "marriage between close relatives." Beardsley et al. (1959:323) and Embree (1939:84–85, 88–89) suggest that patrilineal parallel cousin marriages were typical, while Joy Hendry (1981:124–125) indicates that there was no preference for either parallel or cross cousins, noting that first-cousin marriages have been discouraged since the end of World War II. All suggest that consanguineous marriages likely forged easier and closer household ties.

29 The Leprosy Prevention Law was formulated and informally activated in 1907, formally adopted in 1953, and abolished in 1996. In the spring of 2001, the Kumamoto District Court ruled that the government should pay ¥1.82 billion in reparations to the plaintiffs.

For various reasons, the government of Prime Minister Koizumi decided not to appeal the ruling (Kakuchi 1998; Oba 1996; Schriner 2001), although it remains to be seen how the former exiles will be "repatriated."

30 Gresham's Law refers to an observation in economics that "when two coins are equal in debt-paying value but unequal in intrinsic value, the one having the lesser intrinsic value tends to remain in circulation and the other to be hoarded or exported as bullion" (Gresham's Law 1985:536). A brief word about blood type is useful here in connection with overlapping notions of blood and purity. Although today the pseudo-scientific fiction that the Japanese constitute a "blood type A race" is widely invoked in the mass media, knowledge about specific blood types was not deployed as a eugenic tool in the discourse of race betterment. There were competing attempts among Japanese scientists to classify the so-called races of the world on the basis of the pattern of distribution of the A, O, B, and AB blood types. However, unlike in Nazi Germany, a specific race was not singled out for isolation and extermination in a diabolical scheme to purify "Japanese blood." By the same token, comparatively few involuntary sterilizations were performed in Japan following the passage of the National Eugenics Law in 1940. Between 1941 and 1945, 15,219 persons (6,399 females and 8,820 males) were targeted for involuntary sterilization, of which 435 persons (243 females and 192 males), or about 29 percent, were actually sterilized, over half of whom were women (Suzuki 1983:166; Tanaka 1994:164). From 1955 through 1967 in Japan, about 9,500 persons, two-thirds of whom were female, were involuntarily sterilized; about 432,000 persons, 97 percent of whom were female, underwent voluntary sterilization during this time (Health and Welfare Statistics Association 1987:104). From 1907 through 1957, over 60,000 persons (more than half of them females) were sterilized in the United States. One ultranationalist critic of sterilization argued that the "divine origins" and purity of the "Yamato race" raised serious philosophical doubts about the validity of that procedure: "one must not," he asserted, "equate a divine people with livestock" (Makino 1938:18–21; see also Suzuki 1983:163; Takagi 1993:46). Moreover, the militarily strategic need to raise the population by one-third in twenty years, from 73 to 100 million persons, together with an emphasis on bigger, taller bodies over enhanced intellectual ability, effectively diminished support for sterilization as a eugenic strategy (Suzuki 1983:162–163; Takagi 1993:46). Other critics of sterilization, such as sexologist Yasuda Tokutarō, stressed instead the importance of the physical and social environment on human development and also the complexity of human motives to reproduce or not (Suzuki 1983:162–3).

31 Unlike the Wandervogel and Sokol movements that inspired it, the Legs and Feet Society was a coed organization from the start. The Wandervogel was later absorbed into the Hitlerjugend. Born in January 1892 in Nikaho town (Yuri District, Akita Prefecture), Ikeda Shigenori attended college in Tokyo. Following his graduation from Tokyo Foreign Language University (Tokyo Gaigodai), he was employed by Kōdansha, a prominent publishing house, to edit the magazine *Taikan* (Outlook). He later joined the *Hōchi shinbun*, a major daily newspaper, and served as a special correspondent to Germany from 1919 to 1924, where he earned doctorates in eugenics and women's history. He was transferred to Moscow in 1925 before returning to Japan and founding the Eugenic Exercise/Movement Association and a eugenics journal, both of which were aimed to foster among the general public an interest in incorporating hygienic and eugenic practices into everyday life practices. The journal ceased publication in January 1930. Ikeda rekindled his journalism career the following year by assuming the editorship of the *Keijō nippō* (Seoul Daily News) based in Seoul, Korea. He returned to the *Hōchi shinbun* as an editor in 1938, and from 1941 through the end of the war worked for Naval Intelligence (Kaigun hōdōbu). After the war he became a prominent "social commentator" (*hyōronka*), known for his entertaining essays on a wide array of topics.

32 This ideal female body was somewhere between the measurements of the 1931 Miss Nippon and her "average" counterpart. Miss Nippon was nearly 159 cm in height compared to the average female's 148.5 cm, her chest measured 79 cm compared to the average female's 74 cm, and she weighed 52.5 kg, compared to the average female's 46.5 kg (Robertson 2001a:23–24).

33 For a detailed description of these questionnaires, see Robertson (2002).

34 The author, Sakamoto Shunpū, was the Akita Prefecture correspondent for the Great Japan Association for the Betterment of Public Customs and Morals.

35 Space precludes me from discussing these here; they are included in my book in progress (see note 2 above).

36 Similarly, Uli Linke argues that in contemporary Germany, "a retrograde archaism of national state culture is continuously repositioned in the present" (Linke 1999:239).

REFERENCES

Beardsley, Richard, John Hall, and Robert Ward. 1959. Village Japan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Civisca, Luigi. 1957. The Validity of Naien. Tokyo: Sophia University Press.

Cooper, Michael. 1965. They Came to Japan: An Anthology of European Reports on Japan, 1543–1640. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Corrigan, Philip, and Derek Sayer. 1985. The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution. London: Basil Blackwell.

Dikötter, Frank. 1992. The Discourse of Race in Modern China. London: C. Hurst/Stanford University Press.

——1998. Imperfect Conceptions: Medical Knowledge, Birth Defects, and Eugenics in China. New York: Columbia University Press.

Dower, John. 1986. War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War. New York: Pantheon.

Duus, Peter. 1995. The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895–1910. Berkeley: University of California Press.

East, Edward, and Donald Jones. 1919. Inbreeding and Outbreeding; Their Genetic and Sociological Significance. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott.

Elderton, Ethel. 1911. On the Marriage of First Cousins. London: Cambridge University Press.

Embree, John. 1939. Suye-mura: A Japanese Village. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1978. The History of Sexuality, vol. 1: An Introduction. Robert Hurley, trans. New York: Vintage Books.

——1979. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Alan Sheridan, trans. New York: Vintage Book.

Frühstück, Sabine. 2000. Managing the Truth of Sex in Imperial Japan. Journal of Asian Studies 59(2):332–358.

——2003. Colonizing Sex: Sexology and Social Control in Modern Japan. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fujikawa, Yū. 1929 Meishin no hanashi (Discussion of Superstitions). *In* Katei kagaku taikei (Outline of Household Science), vol. 13. pp. 289–325. Tokyo: Katei Kagaku Taikei Hankōkai.

Fujino, Yutaka. 1998. Nihon fuashizumu to yūsei shisō (Japanese Fascism and Eugenic Thought). Kyoto: Kamogawa Shuppan.

Fujo shinbun. 1935. Kokumin to hansū jogai (Half the Citizens are Excluded). Fujo shinbun, January 27.

Furuya, Yoshio. 1941. Kokudo–jinkō–ketsueki (Homeland–Population–Blood). Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha.

Gresham's Law. 1985. *In* Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary. p. 536. Springfield, MA: Merriam Webster.

Hayashida, Cullen. 1976. Identity, Race and Blood Ideology of Japan. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Washington.

Health and Welfare Statistics Association. 1987. Tokyo: Health and Welfare Statistics Association.

Hendry, Joy. 1981. Marriage in Changing Japan: Community and Society. London: Croom Helm.

Honjō, Eijirō. 1936. Tokugawa jidai no jinkō mondai (The Population Problem during the Tokugawa Period). Yūseigaku 147(May):21–26.

Ijichi, Susumu. 1939. Kōateki konketsuron (Treatise on Asian Mix-Bloodedness). Kaizō 3:82–88.

Ikeda, Shigenori. 1925. Bunmei no hōkai (The Collapse of Civilization). Tokyo: Hōbunkan.

——1927a. Yūsei nippon no teisho (Discourse on Eugenic Japan). Yūsei undō 2(1):2–3.

——1927b. Yūsei undō to chihō jichitai (Eugenic Exercise/Movement and Local Governments). Yūsei Undō 2(1):4–7.

——1928. Kekkonsha no mimoto chōsahyō (Background Survey of Marriage Candidates). Yūsei undō 3(9):58–61.

——1929. Yūseigakuteki shakai kairyō undō ni tsuite (On the Eugenic Social Reform Movement). Yūsei undō 4(10):19.

——1956. Ikite yakutatsu hanashi no mimibukuro (An Earful of Stories Useful for Living). Tokyo: Hokushindō.

——1957. Ikite yakutatsu hanashi no mimibukuro – Zoku (An Earful of Stories Useful for Living – Continuation). Tokyo: Hokushindō.

Imaizumi, Yoko. 1988. Parental Consanguinity in Two Generations in Japan. Journal of Biosocial Science 20:235–243.

Irizawa, Tatsuyoshi. 1939 [1913]. Ikaga ni shite nipponjin no taikaku o kaizen subeki ka (What Can Be Done in Order to Improve the Physiques of the Japanese People). Tokyo: Nisshin Shoin.

Ishizuka, Takatoshi. 1983 [1972]. Nihon no tsukimono (Possession in Japan). Tokyo: Miraisha.

Jinkō mondai kenkyūkai. 1933–43. Jinkō mondai (Population Problems). Tokyo: Jinkō Mondai Kenkyūkai.

Kaizō. 1942. Daitōaken no bunkateki shomondai (Various Cultural Problems Facing the Great East Asian Sphere). Kaizō 4:70–94.

Kakuchi, Suvendrini. 1998. Rights-Japan: Leprosy Patients Demand End to Isolation. www.oneworld.org/ips2/sept98/05_15_010.html.

Katō, Hiroyuki. 1990 [1886]. Nippon jinshu kairyō no ben (Discussion of the Betterment of the Japanese Race). *In* Katō hiroyuki bunsho (Collected Writings of Katō Hiroyuki), vol. 3. Ueda Katsumi et al., eds. pp. 33–47. Tokyo: Dōhōsha Shuppan.

Kitahara, Takeo. 1943. Uki kuru (Advent of the Rainy Season). Tokyo: Buntaisha.

Kōseisho eisei kekkon sōdansho. 1941. Kekkon to meishin (Marriage and Superstition). Kōshū eisei 59(9):14–26.

Lebra, Takie Sugiyama. 1993. Above the Clouds: Status Culture of the Japanese Nobility. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Linke, Uli. 1999. Blood and Nation: The European Aesthetics of Race. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Makino, Chiyozō. 1938. Danshuhō hantairon (An Argument against a Sterilization Law). Yūseigaku 15(4):18–21.

Matsunaga, Ei. 1968. Birth Control Policy in Japan: A Review from Eugenic Standpoint [*sic*]. Japanese Journal of Human Genetics 13(3):189–200.
McClintock, Anne. 1994. Closing Remarks. Yale Journal of Criticism 7(1):239–243.
Minzuno, Hiromi, 2001. Science, Ideology, Empire: A History of the "Scientific" in Prewar and Wartime Japan. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
Miwata, Motomichi. 1927. Atarashii kekkon kikan (A New Marriage System). Yūsei undō 2(6):29–32.
Mizushima, Naoso, and Mitake, Katuso. 1942. Naisen konketsu mondai (The Problem of Mixed-Bloods in Korea). *In* Jinkō seisaku to kokudo keikaku (Population Policy and a Strategic Plan for the Homeland). Nakayama Yoshio, ed. pp. 20–21.Tokyo: Jinkō Mondai Kenkyūkai.
Morris-Suzuki, Tessa. 1998. Reinventing Japan: Time, Space, Nation. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
Nagai, Hisomu. 1936. Aisatsu (Greetings). Yūsei 1(10):unpaginated.
Nishida, Tomomi. 1995. "Chi" no shisō – Edo jidai no shiseikan (Philosophy of "Blood": Conceptions of Life and Death in the Edo Period). Tokyo: Kenseisha.
Norgren, Tiana. 2001. Abortion Before Birth Control: The Politics of Reproduction in Postwar Japan. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Oba, Satsuki. 1996. Abandoned by Heaven. Time (international edn) February 5.
Oka'asa, Jirō. 1915. Jinshukairyō wa jikkō ga dekiru ka (Is It Possible to Implement Race Betterment?). Eisei sekai 2(3):2–4.
Okada, Sadako. 1933. Atarashii oyakusho (A New Government Office). Kaizō 6:86–91.
Ōsaka asahi shinbun. 1931. Risō no yūryōji (Ideal Superior Children). Ōsaka asahi shinbun, June 7:11.
——1932. Nippon'ichi yūryōji (The Most Superior Children in Japan). Ōsaka asahi shinbun, May 31.
Otsubo, Sumiko. 1999. Feminist Maternal Eugenics in Wartime Japan. US–Japan Women's Journal (English Supplement) 17:39–76.
Ōya, Sōichi. 1943. Jawa no senden katsudō (Javanese Youth Activities). Tokyo shinbun November:13–15.
Pearson, Karl. 1909. The Scope and Importance to the State of the Science of National Eugenics. 2nd edn. London: Dulau.
Pernick, Martin. 1997. Eugenics and Public Health in American History. American Journal of Public Health 87(1):1767–1772.
Proctor, Robert. 1988. Race Hygiene: Medicine Under the Nazis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Robertson, Jennifer. 2001a. Japan's First Cyborg? Miss Nippon, Eugenics, and Wartime Technologies of Beauty, Body, and Blood. Body and Society 7(1):1–34.
——2001b. Les "Bataillons fertiles": Sexe et la citoyenneté dans le Japon Impérial (Fertile-Womb Battalions: Sex and Citizenship in Imperial Japan). *In* New Critical Approaches to Twentieth-Century Japanese Thought. Livia Monnet, ed. pp. 275–301. Montreal: University of Montreal Press.
——2002. Blood Talks: Eugenic Modernity and the Creation of New Japanese. History and Anthropology 13(3):191–216.
——2005. Dehistoricizing History: The Ethical Dilemma of "East Asian Bioethics." Critical Asian Studies 37(2).
Sakamoto, Shunpū. 1889. Kon'in no chūi: ketsuzoku haigu (Marriage Advice: Blood Marriages). Dai nippon fūzoku kairyōkai kaishi 14:7–8.
Satō, Tadayoshi. 1943. Daitōa kyōikuron (Educational Treatise on Greater East Asia). Tokyo: Kyōiku Kagakusha.

Schriner, Kay. 2001. Leprosy Court Case Shakes Japan. www.disabilityworld.org/05-06_01/leprosy.html, September 18.

Schull, W. J., and J. V. Neel. 1965. The Effects of Inbreeding on Japanese Children. New York: Harper & Row.

Segawa, Kiyoko. 1963. Menstrual Taboos Imposed Upon Women. *In* Studies in Japanese Folklore, Richard Dorson, ed. pp. 239–250. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Shashin shūhō. 1942. Kore kara no kekkon wa kono yōni (How Marriages Should Be Transacted Henceforth). Shashin shūhō 218(April 29):18–19.

Shinozaki, Nobuo. 1949. Ketsuzoku kekkon buraku no jinruigakuteki chōsa gaihō (Summary of an Anthropological Survey of Blood-Marriage Hamlets). Jinruigaku zasshi 60(3):97–100.

Stocking, George. 1968. Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology. New York: Free Press.

Stoler, Ann. 1995. "Mixed-Bloods" and the Cultural Politics of European Identity in Colonial Southeast Asia. *In* The Decolonization of Imagination: Culture, Knowledge and Power. Jan Nederveen Pieterse and Bhikhu Parekh, eds. pp. 128–148. London and New Jersey: Zed Press.

Suzuki, Zenji. 1983 Nihon no yūseigaku – sono shisō to undō no kiseki (Japanese Eugenics: The Legacy of Eugenic Thought and the Eugenics Movement). Tokyo: Sankyo Shuppan.

Taguchi, Eitarō. 1940. Kokumin yūseihō to jinkō seisaku (The National Eugenics Law and Population Policy) 58(5):33–35.

Takada, Tomekao. 1986 [1937]. Dare ni mo dekiru kekkon chōsa no himitsu (Secret Tips to Enable Everyone to Conduct a Marriage Survey). *In* Kinsei shomin seikatsushi: ren'ai, kekkon, katei (Life History of Premodern Commoners: Love, Marriage, Family), vol. 9. pp. 393–446. Tokyo: Zōichi Shobō.

Takagi, Masashi. 1993. Senzen Nihon ni okeru yūsei shisō no tenkai to nōryokukan, kyōikukan (Views on IQ and Education in the Development of Eugenic Thought in Prewar Japan). Nagoya daigaku kyōikugakubu kiyō 40(1):41–52.

Takakura, Shin'ichirō. 1942. Ainu seisakushi (History of Ainu Policy). Tokyo: Hyōronsha.

Tanaka, Satoshi. 1994. Eisei tenrankai no yokubō (The Ambition of Hygiene Exhibitions). Tokyo: Seikyūsha.

Tanaka, Stefan. 1993. Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Terry, Jennifer. 1999. An American Obsession: Science, Medicine, and Homosexuality in Modern Society. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Tōgō, Minoru. 1922. Sekai kaizō to minzoku shinri (Global Reconstruction and Ethno-National Psychology). Taipei: Taihoku dōjin.

——1925. Shokumin seisaku to minzoku shinri (Colonial Strategy and Ethno-National Psychology). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

——1936. Jinkō mondai to kaigai hatten (The Population Problem and Overseas Development). Tokyo: Nippon Seinenkan.

——1945. Dai tōa kensetsu to zakkon mondai (The Construction of Greater East Asia and the Problem of Miscegenation). Shin jawa 2(1):30–34.

Tōkyo asahi shinbun. 1930. Kenkō yūryōji (Healthy, Superior Children). Tōkyo asahi shinbun, May 6:7–9.

Van Bremen, Jan. 1998. Death Rites in Japan in the Twentieth Century. *In* Interpreting Japanese Society. Anthropological Approaches. 2nd edn. Joy Hendry, ed. pp. 131–144. London: Routledge.

Weiner, Michael. 1997. "Self" and "Other" in Prewar Japan. *In* Japan's Minorities: The Illusion of Homogeneity. Michael Weiner, ed. pp. 1–16. London: Routledge.

Wikler, Daniel. 1999. Can We Learn from Eugenics? Journal of Medical Ethics 25:183–194.

Yasui, Hiroshi. 1940. Rippa na kodomo wa kenzen na kekkon kara (Splendid Children Result from Healthy Marriages). Shashin shūhō 144(November 27):14–15.

Yoshida, Teigo. 1977 [1972]. Nihon no tsukimono (Possession in Japan). Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.

Yoshino, Kosaku. 1997. Bunka nashonarizumu no shakaigaku: gendai Nihon no aidentitei no yukue (The Sociology of Cultural Nationalism: the Direction of Modern Japanese Identity). Nagoya: Nagoya Daigaku Shuppankai.

Yūsei. 1936a. Shinbun ni arawareta yūsei mondai (Eugenics in the Daily Newspapers). Yūsei 1(5):18–22.

——1936b. Shinbun ni arawareta yūsei mondai (Eugenics in the Daily Newspapers). Yūsei 1(9):15–16.

——1936c. Yūsei kekkon sōdansho annai (Guided Tour of the Eugenic Marriage Counseling Office). Yūsei 1(1):20.

——1937. Nippon'ichi no yūryōji no hyōshō (Statistical Profile of Japan's Most Superior Children). Yūsei 2(5):8–9.

Yūsei undō. 1928. Shimin no junketsu dē ni tassū fujin no sanka (Women Turn out in Large Numbers for "Citizens' Blood Purity Day"). Yūsei undō 3(12):21.