

**Self and the City: A Modern Woman's Journey.
Miyamoto Yuriko in the Soviet Union and Europe
1927–1930**

Jill Dobson

**Submitted for the degree of PhD
School of East Asian Studies
The University of Sheffield**

August 2014

Abstract

As the daughter of liberal-minded and affluent parents, the writer Miyamoto Yuriko (1899–1951) had unusual freedom for a young Japanese woman in defining herself. Her pivotal three years in Soviet Russia and Europe in 1927–1930 brought about her conversion to communism in the Stalinist era and changed the course of her life. The fundamental question of this thesis is how travel can transform an individual's sense of self. I address this by using the concept of positionality to analyse how Miyamoto Yuriko presented her experience of travel across several genres of self-writing. Drawing on Chloe Starr's (2013) approach to different genres of self-writing as individual components of an overarching narrative, I take as my source material Yuriko's various accounts of her three years abroad: the autobiographical novel *Dōhyō* (Roadsigns) (1947–1950), two key essays from her *Sobieto kikō*, 'Mosukuwa inshōki' (Record of Moscow Impressions, 1928) and 'London 1929' (1930), and Yuriko's diaries from this period. By reading these accounts, written at different times in different genres, against and through each other, I will analyse the variations and commonalities to produce a more detailed and nuanced picture of the relationship between Yuriko's travels and her self-conception. In my analysis of travel as a transformational experience, I draw on cultural geography to explore the interaction of place and self, in particular, the city. Historically I situate Yuriko's travels in the context of opposed models of modernity – the newly formed Soviet Union and 'Old' Europe – and the different implications of these modernities for women.



Photograph from the first issue of *Nyonin geijutsu* (1928), (left to right) Chūjō Yuriko, Narumi Kanzō, Evdokia Nikitina, Yuasa Yoshiko, Akita Ujaku. Courtesy of Nihon Kindai Bungakukan.

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Literature Review	9
3. Critical and Contextual framework	17
4. Methodological Approach	35
5. <i>Dōhyō</i> : The Retrospective, Coherent Self	47
6. The <i>Sobieto kikō</i> : The Modern(ist) Self in the City	101
7. The Diaries: The Fragmented, Private Self	130
8. Conclusion	192
References	198
Appendix: Chronology	229
Acknowledgements	233

1. Introduction

The writer Miyamoto Yuriko (1899–1951) was in no way a typical woman of her time. After a precocious love marriage in her early twenties to an older man, she left him to live with another woman. A cosmopolitan traveller in a period when few Japanese had opportunities to go abroad, she was comfortable speaking foreign languages. As a writer who made an early debut in a prestigious mainstream journal, she lived and worked as a modern, independent woman. As the daughter of an affluent middle-class family coming to maturity in the 1920s, she had unusual freedom in defining and developing herself, and yet rejected her background to become an ardent communist when the left in Japan was being harshly suppressed. Unlike her female contemporaries in the socialist-anarchist milieu, Sata Ineko (1904–1998) and Hirabayashi Taiko (1905–1972), Yuriko had every advantage in starting out as a writer, and yet chose a path that led to multiple imprisonments, publication bans, a 12-year separation from her second husband, and premature death just as her career was flowering anew in the postwar period.

The subject of this thesis is Miyamoto Yuriko's pivotal three years in the Soviet Union and Europe in 1927–1930, which brought about her conversion to communism in the Stalinist era and changed the course of her life. Yuriko's works in general have not received much attention in English-language scholarship, and the works associated with her Soviet and European sojourn have not been closely studied in parallel in either English- or Japanese-language scholarship.

The fundamental question of this thesis is how travel and displacement can transform an individual's sense of self. I approach this by using the concept of positionality to analyse how Miyamoto Yuriko presented her life-changing experience of travel and residence in Soviet Russia and Europe across different genres of self-writing produced at different times in her life. When she followed her friend and companion, the student and translator of Russian, Yuasa Yoshiko (1896–1990), to Moscow in December 1927, Yuriko was an established writer with no formal political affiliations. Her debut work, 'Mazushiki hitobito no mure' (A Flock of Poor Folk), published to acclaim in the journal *Chūō kōron* in 1916, demonstrated a sympathetic awareness of the plight of poor peasants, but had no ideological

underpinnings. Yuriko's first long, autobiographical novel, *Nobuko*, published serially in *Kaizō* (1924–1926), explored the struggles of an individual woman to escape social and family strictures and find personal fulfilment. However, as a writer published in the two leading journals *Kaizō* (Reconstruction) and *Chūō kōron* (Central Review),¹ she had avoided the label of 'woman writer' (*joryū sakka*), which served to segregate writing by women from the male mainstream by characterising it as unintellectual and sentimental (Ericson 1997, Copeland 2006). When Yuriko returned to Tokyo in November 1930, she was a committed communist who immediately joined the All-Japan Proletarian Arts League (NAPF) and put her literary skills to work writing laudatory 'introductions' to the Soviet Union. Yuriko did not become a communist because of social injustice she witnessed in Japan or because Marxism was a major intellectual current in 1920s Japan: she was transformed by the experience of travel and residence in several foreign cities that represented competing models of modernity.

As a writer, she left various records of this experience, public and private, fiction and non-fiction. Drawing on Chloe Starr's (2013) approach, I consider the autobiographical novel *Dōhyō* (Roadsigns) (1947–1950), two key essays from Yuriko's travel writings (known as her *Sobieto kikō*), and her diaries as individual components, inflected by genre, of an overarching life-narrative.² By reading these different accounts against and through each other, I will analyse the variations and commonalities in her representation of her time in the USSR and Europe to produce a more nuanced, layered picture of Yuriko's transformative travels. In doing so, my study will also illuminate the relationship between genres of self-writing. The self represented in each is necessarily influenced by the form itself, as well as the different motivations and audiences (real or imagined) for each one and the temporal distance between the life events narrated and the act of narration. The

¹ *Chūō kōron* and *Kaizō* were the two major current affairs monthlies in my period of study, both with circulations of around 100,000 (Kasza 1988: 44). Not only did they have a reputation for being liberal-left and open to foreign ideas, but they served as a significant mainstream platform for proletarian and leftist works. Both were forced to close down in mid-1944 for failing to respond to government editorial 'guidance' (Rubin 1984: 262-270; Kasza 1988: 229-231).

² In researching this thesis, I drew on the diaries and *Sobieto kikō* volumes of the 1979–1986 *zenshū*, which was the only edition available to me in the UK when I began my PhD. I was able to access the relevant new critical essays in the 2000–2004 *zenshū* at Waseda University library in 2011–2012.

slippages between different versions of the self demonstrate that the 'self' is not fixed but contingent and often highly mutable. Multiple versions of the self-as-written may confirm, 'correct' or challenge each other as they serve different purposes at different stages in a writer's life.

I will start with Yuriko's retrospectively constructed and public self-narrative of transformation, the novel *Dōhyō*, written 20 years after the events it describes. The linear ideological and geographical journey taken by the protagonist Nobuko retrospectively validates and celebrates Yuriko's commitment to her chosen cause throughout the long war years, which was vindicated by the defeat of the Japanese militarist regime and the resurgence of left-wing activism suppressed during the war years. I will demonstrate how Nobuko's growing political awareness is embedded in her journey through several key cities, starting and ending in Moscow, which includes key encounters and episodes that act as clear 'roadsigns'. Intrinsic to Nobuko's political development is her search for a fulfilment as a woman and as a writer. I will highlight how her various positionalities – gender, class, nationality, family, sexuality, profession, political beliefs – are foregrounded, intersect and sometimes clash at different points in the novel, culminating in her final self-identification at the novel's close.

Proceeding to the next layer of analysis, I consider two key essays, 'Mosukuwa inshōki' (Record of Moscow Impressions, 1928) and 'London 1929' (1930), to show how Yuriko's shifting sense of self was explicitly contextualised within her experience in these two cities. I will examine these essays, written while Yuriko was still abroad, for what they can tell us of her subjectivity at two intermediate points in her transformative journey, before her emotional loyalty to Russia was consolidated by affiliation to the Japanese communist movement.

Finally, I will examine the diaries, which have no overarching narrative thread. Following Lejeune's approach (2009), I will focus on recurring themes to piece together what the diaries tell us when read alongside the crafted and coherent accounts of *Dōhyō* and the two articles.

I situate my analysis of Yuriko's self-definitional journey within two key material and discursive contexts. First, in approaching travel as a transformational experience, I draw on cultural geography to explore the interaction of place and

self, in particular, the city. Secondly, I view Yuriko's narratives in the context of modernity and its implications for women. In the 1920s and 1930s, Soviet Russia represented a new form of modernity opposed to the capitalist model of Japan and Europe, one that seemed to offer unprecedented possibilities of liberation and equality for the modern woman. For Yuriko, who had chronicled her search for personal fulfilment in her first novel *Nobuko*, the modernity embodied by the Soviet Union offered a broader vision: a society in which a writer transcended individual careerism to work for the greater good, and in which a woman could play a public role and pursue her vocation without sacrificing what Yuriko regarded as necessary and natural, a heterosexual relationship in which a woman retained her femininity.

2. Literature Review

As a canonical writer, Miyamoto Yuriko is the subject of much scholarly work in Japanese, less so in English-language scholarship. In this section, I will map out the various approaches to Yuriko, situating her within literary scholarship in both languages and concluding with how my own contribution will augment existing work.

Japanese-language scholarship

In Japan, Yuriko is now known principally as the author of *Nobuko*, the autobiographical, 'bourgeois' novel she wrote before her conversion to communism. This was included in a 2010 mass paperback, *Shiranai to hazukashii Nihon no meisaku. Arasuji 200 hon* (Outlines of 200 Great Japanese Works Everyone Should Know) (Nihon no meisaku iinkai 2010). Despite Yuriko's status as a canonical author, however, her works are out of print in paperback (*bunkobon*) and are only available in the academic *zenshū* (collected works) edition (MYZ 1979–1986) or online via aozorabunko.jp. A new edition of the *zenshū* was released in 2000–2004, which included new critical essays and letters discovered after the publication of the previous *zenshū*, proof that her work is still valued and promoted within the academy.

Within the voluminous scholarship on Miyamoto Yuriko, the lines of debate divide in general into left-wing and mainstream critics, for whom Yuriko is a canonical figure in the proletarian literary movement,³ and since the 1980s, feminist scholars, who criticise Yuriko for subjugating the early feminism apparent in *Nobuko* to male-dominated communism. In the next section, I will outline these two main currents.

³ The proletarian literary movement (PLM) arose in the early 1920s alongside the rise of the Japanese Communist Party, and was effectively ended by 1934, following police suppression of the left and the murder of PLM writer Kobayashi Takiji (1903-1933) in police custody in 1933. Yuriko was one of the few PLM writers who did not recant her beliefs (*tenkō*). See Shea (1964); Iwamoto (1974); Lippit (1980); Karlsson (2008, 2011).

Mainstream (male) critics

Yuriko's canonical status within the proletarian literary movement was consolidated very quickly after her death in January 1951. Her husband Miyamoto Kenji (1908–2007) became embroiled in factional disputes within the Japanese Communist Party⁴ and as a result, Yuriko was posthumously criticised as a 'petit bourgeois' writer by the opposing faction (Iwabuchi 1996: 236; Keene 1998: 1001). The laudatory biocritical material written on Yuriko by Kenji (Miyamoto 1976 [1952]) and the chief ideologist of the proletarian literary movement, Kurahara Korehito (1902–1999) (1953, 1976 [1966]) is a response to this criticism. In this material, her shortcomings as a socialist realist writer are forgiven in face of her status as an iconic figure in the communist movement. The official narrative created of Yuriko's life by her male left-wing supporters echoes the narrative created by Yuriko herself as Nobuko in *Dōhyō*, as a heroic, compassionate woman who made the linear, one-way ideological journey from bourgeois humanism to Stalinism.

One of the foundational references for scholars of Miyamoto Yuriko is the work of Yuriko's near-contemporary, the left-wing critic Honda Shūgo (1908–2001) (1976, 1994 [1951]), a member of the postwar *Kindai Bungaku* (Modern Literature) group, established in opposition to the theoretical dogmatism of the prewar proletarian literature movement (Keene 1998: 970–971). Honda's political alignment is reflected in his appraisal of Yuriko: while admiring her achievements as a writer, he also notes her flaws, namely, her lack of objectivity with regard to the Soviet Union and to her fictional alter-ego Nobuko.

A common theme in left-wing writing on Yuriko right through to the present is to defend her against criticism (by non-Marxists) that she only wrote about the positive aspects of the USSR, claiming that it was not possible for her to perceive the darker reality of Stalinism as a foreigner in Russia at that time (Katō 1981; Tsuda 2001; Hasegawa 2006).

⁴ Kenji had supported the Cominform's January 1950 criticism of the JCP's parliamentary strategy – Party leader Nosaka Sanzō's 'lovable party' line. When the JCP obeyed Stalin's directive to become militant, it lost public support, and was suppressed by the Occupation authorities, the so-called Red Purge. Ironically, it was Kenji who led the JCP back into the mainstream when he became leader in 1958, abandoning calls for revolution in favour of 'smiling communism' (Scalapino 1967; Kim 1976; Barshay 1988: 239; Koschmann 1993).

Feminist criticism

A contemporary of Yuriko who identified as Marxist but maintained a critical perspective on the (male) left leadership (Coutts 2013: 10), the writer Hirabayashi Taiko wrote a long biocritical essay (1979a)⁵ on Yuriko that departs from the male left-wing approach to examine Yuriko's life as a complex and fallible woman writer rather than as a communist saint, a critical approach that would be taken up by later feminist scholars. Overall, Hirabayashi acknowledges Yuriko as a great writer in the history of Japanese women writers, although concludes that it is 'impossible' to say she is a proletarian writer. This is underscored by Hirabayashi's assessment of *Nobuko*, a novel she declares to be of no interest whatsoever to the proletarian literature movement, as her best work – a judgement that has been largely confirmed by the fact that it is the only novel by Yuriko that a Japanese person in the twenty-first century is likely to have read.

More recently, feminist writers have taken a critical approach to Yuriko as a feminist within socialism. Iwabuchi (1996) focuses on how the early feminism of *Nobuko* is relegated by Marxism in Yuriko's post-'*tenkan*' (communist conversion) literary works. Although one of the attractions of Soviet socialism for Yuriko was the apparent equality of women alongside special legal and economic protections afforded them as mothers, she completely accepted the Marxist view that women's oppression was inherent in the class structure and that only the realisation of socialism would bring about their liberation. Similarly, disillusioned former communist Kondo (2002: 177) claims that in her total acceptance of Soviet society, Yuriko lost her 'sharp critical spirit and became blind' (*surudo i hihan seishin o ushinatte mōku ni natte*).

One aspect of Yuriko's relegation of feminism as analysed by Iwabuchi (1996: 298-326) and relevant to my study is her distorted representation of her relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko, who is presented for the most part in a negative light. Yuriko's retrospective privileging of heterosexual relationships over same-sex relations is taken up by other feminist critics such as Sawabe (1990, 2001) and Ōgata (2006). Ōkawa (2001) draws on the work of Iwabuchi and Sawabe in her

⁵ First published in *Bungei shunjū*, in June 1972, after her death in February that year.

study of Yuriko's use of the word 'nature/natural' (*shizen*) to affirm a male-centred society and heterosexual relationships, and the difference between the sexes. In *Dōhyō* the USSR is presented as an ideal society in which women can be liberated while retaining their 'naturalness'. The association of socialism with heterosexual 'nature' and motherhood and capitalist/bourgeois decadence with same-sex love is a theme I will draw out in my analysis of *Dōhyō*.

Alongside the most recent work by feminist critics, Yuriko's enduring place in the mainstream/left-wing canon up to the present day has been regularly confirmed by volumes edited by the Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai,⁶ and articles in the journal *Minshu bungaku*, the journal of the postwar Democratic Literature movement founded by former members of the proletarian literature movement.⁷ In April 2006 the scholarly journal *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō* ran a special edition, 'Miyamoto Yuriko no atarashisa' (The Freshness of Miyamoto Yuriko), the title a reminder to scholars of 'national literature' that Yuriko remains a vital and relevant writer.

As my research focuses on Yuriko's attempt to develop an autonomous, creative subjectivity and agency as a woman, I have found the feminist criticism more useful than the Marxist scholarship, in which Yuriko's positionality as a woman is subordinated to her socialist credentials. I will touch upon relevant aspects of this criticism over the course of this thesis.

English-language scholarship

Miyamoto Yuriko's status as a proletarian writer and a leading figure of the left, rather than as a 'woman writer', has ensured her steady, if not prominent, presence in English-language scholarship on what is a largely male canon of Japanese literature in translation (see Coutts 2001). Her place in the canon has been acknowledged by her repeated inclusion in compendiums and general overviews of Japanese literature aimed at the English reader, such as *Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai* (1939, 1970), Gluck (1963) and Keene (1978, 1984), from which most other women

⁶ A research group dedicated to the study of Miyamoto Yuriko and her fellow PLM writer, Kobayashi Takiji, most famously the author of *Kanikōsen* (Crab Cannery Ship, 1929).

⁷ Including Nakano Shigeharu, Korehara Kurehito and Yuriko herself.

writers are generally absent. Her absence from two major English-language anthologies of Japanese literature produced to cater to the postwar interest in Japanese culture – *Modern Japanese Literature* (Keene 1956) and the UNESCO-sponsored *Modern Japanese Short Stories* (Morris 1962) – reflects the choices of Cold War-era American translators and publishers who privileged Japanese literature that was ‘aesthetic’ and ‘exotic’ rather than overtly politicised and left-wing (Fowler 1992), even if this only represented a part of the actual Japanese canon. Given these political factors, it is not surprising that far more of her work was translated into Russian and languages of the former eastern bloc, as shown by the list in *Modern Japanese Literature in Translation. A Bibliography* (Kokusai Bunka Kaikan 1979: 181), which includes Uzbek, Bulgarian and Czech as well as Russian and German translations. The government-run publishing house of the former Soviet Union published huge quantities of translated literary works by leftist writers from around the world – and even paid them royalties (Fitzpatrick 2008: 16).

Yuriko’s canonical presence has been maintained into the post-cold war era. She is included in general biographical dictionaries of Japanese novelists (e.g., Lewell 1993) and international literary dictionaries (e.g., Mikals-Adachi 1997 in the 375-volume *Dictionary of Literary Biography* series), works that influence how Japanese literature is viewed in the West, given that few non-Japanese are in a position to survey the originals for themselves. She is one of the very few ‘woman writers’ discussed in any depth in Miyoshi (1991), a work notable for its critical approach to the impact of US-Japan power relations on the reception of Japanese literature. She appears in two current major compendiums, *The Columbia Companion to Modern East Asian Literature* (Sokolsky in Mostow 2003) and *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Japanese Literature Vol. 1* (Rimer and Gessel 2005), where she is represented as a ‘Marxist’ or ‘proletarian’ writer. The latter volume features a translation of the early short story ‘Hikari no nai asa’ (A Sunless Morning, 1923) (Miyamoto and McDonald 2005). Despite winning the Mainichi Prize for *Banshū heiya* (The Banshū Plain, 1946) and *Fuchisō* (The Weathervane Plant, 1946) in 1946, Yuriko was not chosen for in-depth analysis in Orbaugh’s study of Occupation (1945–1952) literature; only one-tenth of fiction published in this

period was by women, and the most prolific of them were Hirabayashi Taiko, Hayashi Fumiko and Sata Ineko (2007: 351-52).

Alongside Yuriko's enduring status as a canonical left-wing writer, from the 1970s onwards, feminist scholars 'discovered' Yuriko as a proto-feminist who championed the interest of women within socialism and wrote about her attempt to live beyond the prescribed boundaries of female existence. Biocritical essays, sometimes accompanied by translated extracts or short stories, appeared in anthologies and dictionaries of women writers (Tanaka 1987; Mamola 1989; Lyons in Arkin and Schollar 1989; Lippit and Selden 1991; Morita 1994; Mulhern 1994; Schierbeck 1994; Fairbanks 2002), and in the journal *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* (now *Critical Asian Studies*) (Miyamoto and Nee [de Bary] 1975; Miyamoto and Lippit 1978 [reproduced in Lippit and Selden 1991]; Miyamoto and de Bary 1984; Phillips 1987) and *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese* (Miyamoto and de Bary 1984–85). In summary, to date, the fictional works that have been translated, partially or in full, are 'Hikari no nai asa', *Nobuko* (1928), 'Koiwai no ikka' (The Family of Koiwai, 1934), *Banshū heiya* (1946) and *Fuchisō* (1946). Only one essay from the *Sobieto kikō*, 'The Present Situation of Soviet Literary Circles' (1931), has been translated and published, as part of an MA thesis (Miyamoto and Sipos 2002).

Gossman (1995) claims Yuriko as a feminist writer within the socialist movement, while Kobayashi (1991), echoing in milder form views held by Japanese feminist scholars, regrets that Yuriko's class consciousness developed at the expense of her feminism. Claremont's (2009) study of the two feminist journals *Seitō* (1911–1916) and *Nyōnin geijitsu* (1928–1932) focuses on Yuriko and anarchist Itō Noe (1895–1923) as contributors. The most recent work on Yuriko appears in Wilson (2013), which emphasises her role as a cultural critic in the post-war period and includes translations of three of her postwar articles, 'Josei no rekishi – bungaku ni sotte' (Women's History: Following in the Footsteps of Literature) (*MYZ* 1980, Vol. 13: 160-186), 'Onnarashisa to wa' (What Is Womanliness?) (*MYZ* 1980, Vol. 15: 155-157) and 'Chikyū wa mawaru' (The Earth Still Moves) (*MYZ* 1980, Vol. 16: 408-410) – a part of Yuriko's vast opus that has not previously been translated or studied in English. The paucity of translated work to act as an entry-point for

students of Japanese to Yuriko's writings may explain why so little research is done on her in English.

While biocritical material on Yuriko is plentiful and easily located, in-depth analysis is relatively rare. The critical work most relevant to my own research is that which touches on Yuriko's attempts, through her autobiographical writing, to represent her search for holistic emotional and intellectual fulfilment as a modern woman in face of ongoing social, political, legal and gendered constraints. Lippit (1978, 1980) presents Yuriko as a writer 'who placed women's concerns at the centre of her literature and integrated them with the socialist movement of her time'. In Wilson's analysis (1997), Yuriko's autobiographical fiction represents her own attempts to 'unread' the 'male text' of an acceptable, subsidiary female existence as wife and mother, and write a 'female text' to replace it. Wilson suggests that, even though Yuriko campaigned for female rights in the public realm, in her intimate life she was unable to 'unread' her role in the male text, taking a subordinate role to her husband Miyamoto Kenji, the 'parent ship' to her 'child boat' (2007: 48). Bowen-Struyk's study of the story 'The Family of Koiwai' (2004) analyses how Yuriko presents the family as a revolutionary unit based on ideological partnership between husband and wife – the ideal she apparently achieved with Kenji. In a similar vein, Cullen refutes the conventional view that Yuriko's refusal to commit *tenkō* (recant her communist beliefs) was based on marital loyalty, claiming instead that since Yuriko and her husband had a relationship based on shared ideological commitment, their joint refusal to *tenkō* should be seen as 'simultaneous and similar, rather than hierarchical' (2010: 88). All these critics highlight, in one way or another, as I do in this thesis, the fact that Yuriko's search for personal fulfilment as a woman became inextricable from broader social and political questions of female equality and agency.

For Yuriko, socialism offered women not only economic and political equality, but the possibility of intimate relationships based on equality. Her desire for such a relationship is a constant theme running through all her autobiographical fiction, reflecting the focus, in Suzuki's study (2010), on the role of romantic relationships in the formation of modern female subjectivity. Suzuki argues that women negotiated the process of modernity through means of a new concept of

love: 'the experience of love led to the attainment of an identity resonant with a changing Japan... love was a critical concept within the cultural imaginary and vital for the construction of both woman and nation' (2). Love marriage (*ren'ai kekkon*) was seen as 'an expression of selfhood' (68), the ideal vehicle for both spouses to achieve full development of their personalities and potential. Suzuki notes that this ideal was particularly important for women, 'who hoped to achieve a modern self through this expression of agency, equality and self-cultivation' (69). While Suzuki focuses on Yuriko's examination of her first failed marriage in the novel *Nobuko*, it provides a useful prequel to my own: 20 years later, as I will show, in *Dōhyō*, *Nobuko* is still searching for the ideal relationship, one in which fulfilment is premised on political compatibility and shared purpose – and heterosexuality.

Yuriko's three-year sojourn in Soviet Russia and Europe was a major stage in her ongoing attempt to live a fulfilled and meaningful life as a woman. However, studies of *Nobuko* situate her as a proto-feminist, while studies of her proletarian and postwar works take her communism as a given. I will build on existing English-language work by exploring her hitherto overlooked travelling years in depth, drawing on all her Soviet writings – *Dōhyō*, selected essays and her diaries – as components of an over-arching life-narrative in order to analyse her public and private representations of this critical transitional period.

In this thesis, I introduce a fresh approach to a canonical figure who has been neglected in English-language scholarship, focusing on the different writings in which she represented and assigned meaning to her unusual and transformative experience of travel in the Soviet Union and Europe in the late 1920s. In doing so, I hope to illuminate the subtle yet dynamic relationship between experience, place and self that is revealed by the transmutation of experience into narrative.

3. Critical and Contextual Framework

A study of self-writing necessarily begins with a concept of the 'self'. This thesis takes a conception of the self as not fixed and essential but dynamic and contingent, as formulated within the context of feminist theorising of female identity. I will use this conception of the self in my analysis of how the experience of travel can function as a transformative practice. In doing so, I will cross disciplines, referring to recent writing in cultural geography. In my contextual framework, I make reference to modernity as a phenomenon with particular gendered implications, and to the city as the material and spatial embodiment of modernity, a space that allowed new opportunities for agency and experience.

The dynamic and contingent self

My foundational theoretical premise is the female self as occupying multiple and shifting subject positions, in other words, as dynamic and contingent. The concept of 'woman', an entity with a distinctively female subjectivity, is central to feminist theory.⁸ However, in the 1980s poststructuralist theory problematized and deconstructed notions of stable, essentialised identities, forcing feminists to redefine their position (see Raddeker 2007: 152-199). A key debate within Anglophone feminism at this time was how to theorise the female self while avoiding the patriarchal essentialism that construed women as eternal object, a set of 'feminine' characteristics, the 'other' to the free-willed male subject. In other words, how could a feminist claim subjecthood as a woman and foreground 'women' as a political collectivity without endorsing the notion of the essentialised woman?

⁸ Linda Alcoff (1988, 2006) offers a genealogy of feminist theorising of female identity, starting with cultural feminism's appropriation of an idealised essential femaleness in the 1970s, represented by writers such as Adrienne Rich, Mary Daly, Robin Morgan and Susan Brownmiller, and moving on to the questioning of all essentialised categories by post-structuralists (e.g., Derrida, Lacan, Foucault), an approach which, while liberating women from any essential feminine, also negated the basis for any possible feminist politics. Susan Stanford Friedman (1996) discusses how the privileging of gendered identity has played out in feminist literary criticism, and concludes, like Alcoff, with a proposal for a multifaceted conceptualisation of identity – what she calls a 'geographics of identity' – that recognises but does not over-privilege gender.

Linda Alcoff approaches the problem by proposing a ‘concept of gendered identity as positionality’ (1988: 422). She describes this as follows:

The essentialist definition of woman makes her identity independent of her external situation: since her nurturing and peaceful traits are innate they are ontologically autonomous of her position with respect to others or to the external historical and social conditions generally. The positional definition, on the other hand, makes her identity relative to a constantly shifting context, to a situation that includes a network of elements involving others, the objective economic conditions, cultural and political institutions and ideologies and so on. (1988: 433)

In other words, an individual can occupy multiple, even contradictory, subject positions. A woman may experience more oppression on account of her race or religion than her gender; alternatively, a woman’s class or ethnicity can counter-balance the disadvantages she experiences as a female in certain contexts. This theorisation of identity as positional can also be referred to as ‘intersectionality’.⁹ For consistency, I will use the term ‘positionality’ throughout.

This concept of self as positional and dynamic rather than fixed and essentialised opens up analytical space in which to examine the transformational effects of experience. Alcoff asserts that ‘human subjectivity in all its forms emerges within historicised experience ... The fluid historical context in which we negotiate our identities is a context in which we are both subjects of and subjected to social construction’ (2006: 146). In other words, positionality is interactive: ‘a human subject is both positioned in the world and exercises choice by taking up (and discarding) positions in response to that’ (Raddeker 2007: 163).

In this thesis, while I foreground Yuriko’s historically specific positionality as a Japanese woman in the first half of the twentieth century who sought

⁹ This term was coined by legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw in the late 1980s. Its use in relation to questions of identity has since spread beyond legal studies to the arts and humanities in general (see Nash 2008). It was the subject of extensive debate at the conference ‘Troubling Gender: The Question of Multiple Identities’, 24th May 2013, ICOSS, University of Sheffield (see <http://troublinggender.wordpress.com/>).

personal and worldly fulfilment *as a woman*, I take into account her other positionalities; for example, her class status as affluent and educated, and her professional status as a published (woman) writer and intellectual. Specifically, I examine how these positionalities were foregrounded and challenged by the process of travel and, conversely, what determining role they played in Yuriko's transformative experiences.

The travelling/displaced self

In this section I discuss my approach to how the dynamic and contingent self experiences travel, which I define as the movement of the self across a border that renders the self foreign or 'Other'. These borders can be, for example, national, cultural, or linguistic.

Crang writes on the role of travel within geography as a discipline 'centrally concerned with producing information on "other places"' (2005: 34). The actual experience of travel – the embodied practice of engaging with the environment – grants authority via experience to the knowledge thus produced (Crang 2005: 35). *How* the traveller travels – as a merchant, a pilgrim, refugee, diplomat, soldier, 'explorer', tourist, to name a few possibilities – influences the kind of experience produced.

I contend that travel can produce knowledge not only about places external and foreign to the self, but about the self, who is removed from her usual material and discursive environment and radically repositioned. For example, a traveller's class status may be foregrounded by the fact of being able to travel at all, or by the mode of travel (as a tourist staying in five-star hotels; as a migrant worker); conversely, it may be erased, because certain markers of class, such as accent or style of speech, are only evident to other people from the same national-linguistic group.

Travel is a destabilising and potentially transformative experience: the shock of cross-cultural encounter and physical and cultural displacement; linguistic alienation; the simplification of an individual's usual nuanced identity into that of 'foreigner'; the enforced de-familiarisation of simple daily practices and the necessary renegotiation of the self in a new environment. A traveller does not

merely observe her surroundings from a position of virtual quarantine but necessarily interacts with the 'foreign' environment and is acted upon by it. In her study of women's travel writing, Siegel encapsulates this transformative dynamic: 'Whether travel writers record the collision of their identity with a new culture or not, travel necessarily brings about change. Travellers might lose their sense of identity altogether or conversely, find their sense of self sharpened by the journey ... although travel writers, to some degree, construct their own persona, the process of travel constructs them in return' (2004: 7).

This dialectical process of self-definition brought about by travel and encounter with the foreign 'Other' has become a core concept of identity across the humanities and social sciences (Oakes and Price 2008: 354). Any discussion of 'East-West' cross-cultural encounter necessarily invokes mention of Said's seminal work *Orientalism* (1978), which applies the binary of 'Self' and 'Other' to the relationship between the Western/European powers and their colonies, an approach that has been widely used in postcolonial scholarship exploring how the Orientalist discourse of superior Western 'Self' and inferior non-Western 'Other' was used to justify European imperialism. The 'Other' embodied what the European 'Self' was *not* (e.g., foreign, female, dark-skinned, 'uncivilised') and thereby existed as both as a negation and a binary opposite against which the (usually male) European 'Self' was continually defined, and by which it justified its domination of the 'Other'.

As part of the 'Orient', Japan's relationship with Orientalism was – and still is – complex. Although Japan was never colonised by Western powers and rapidly achieved industrial and military equality through an intensive government-led program of modernisation in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it was perceived by the West in terms of Oriental tropes: a 'fairy tale' land of tea houses and flower-like geisha, as portrayed in the novels of Pierre Loti (1850-1923) and the opera *Madame Butterfly* (1904), exotic and feminised, not taken seriously as a 'masculine' Western country (Minear 1980: 514-516). Even after its defeat of Imperial Russia in 1904–05, Japan was not admitted to the ranks of great powers. Its attempts to have a clause on racial equality inserted into the founding charter of the League of Nations (1919) was rejected and it was subject to treaties that placed unequal limitations on its naval power (Tipton 2008: 94-95, 127-128).

The failure of Japanese government attempts to have the Japanese people recognised by the Western powers as 'honorary whites' was finally, humiliatingly, enshrined in the 1924 US Immigration Act, which excluded Japanese as undesirable non-whites. Some scholars see this as the turning point, after which Japan turned away from the West and followed the path of imperialist Pan-Asianism (Koshiro 1999: 11). Thus, as a country that had proved itself a modern nation, with an effective military and efficient factories, and yet was still regarded as culturally and ethnically 'Other' and therefore unequal, Japan in the 1920s occupied an intermediary space between West and 'Other'/Orient.

Said describes Orientalism as a one-way process: the West imagining (and thus dominating) the non-West. However, the binary of Self and Other is not stable or static: the definition of Self against Other – and vice-versa – is an ongoing relationship, a dialectical process. From the coming of Perry's 'Black Ships' in 1853, Japan as a nation was contesting the inferior, exoticised identity assigned it by Western powers, working to redefine itself on Western terms, as an equal (see Koshiro 1999: 10-11). However, the process of Japanese self-definition did not involve a straightforward rejection of this exoticised identity. Iwabuchi (1994) describes what Miller (1982) has called Japanese 'self-Orientalisation', in which Western Orientalist discourse has been used to construct a homogenous Japanese national identity, defining Japan against the West. As the West 'imagined' the idea of Japan, so Japan imagined a 'West' that best suited its self-definition, regardless of the actual West: 'The relationship between the West's Orientalist discourse on Japan and Japan's discourse on itself is characterised by a profound complicity. Both tend to use the Other to essentialise the Self and to repress the heterogeneous voices within' (Iwabuchi 1994: 2-3). The Meiji project to recreate Japan as a modern nation involved the deliberate invention of tradition; for example, the establishment of State Shinto as Japan's 'traditional' religion, (Hardacre 1989). Central to this, the Confucian values of the samurai class – who only comprised 6% of the population – were deemed quintessentially 'Japanese' (Iwabuchi 1994: 2). Loyalty, diligence, unquestioning respect for hierarchy, and the subservience of women became values by which the entire

Japanese nation was defined; they were formalised in the Meiji constitution (1898) and inculcated through the new education system.

Thus, a Japanese in the Taishō and prewar Shōwa era was subject to not only Western Orientalist discourses about Asia and Japan, but Japanese discourses about 'Japaneseness' that both reacted to and utilised Western discourses. Some Japanese exploited Orientalist tropes and played the exotic to their own advantage, effectively 'self-Orientalising', such as the Franco-Japanese writer Yamata Kiku (1897–1975), whose literary career, in French, was based on her self-styling as '*une japonaise*' and her adoption of French literary tropes of *japonisme* that emphasised the exotic and the aesthetic (see Ames 2008). The painter Fujita [Foujita Leonard] Tsuguharu (1886–1968) became known in France for his 'Japanese' sensibilities. Eventually, the exoticism that had initially opened the way for him in Paris became a trap and he was criticised in France for any attempt to move on from his trademark *japonisme* – while being criticised for it in Japan (Birnbaum 2007). Thus, self-Orientalisation carried risks as well as rewards as a strategy of self-positioning between and across cultures. While Yuriko was very much aware of how Japanese women could choose to 'perform' themselves as Japanese to foreigners (as in her description of Countess Mitsuko Coudenhove-Kalergi in Vienna, *Diary*, 13 May 1929, p. 427), she did not present herself in terms of Orientalist tropes of an idealised Japanese feminine. In other words, she did not 'self-Orientalise' in the manner of Yamata Kiku. Rather, she wrote about herself as a modern, cosmopolitan woman who wore and purchased fashionable Western clothes in her travels and refers to American and European writings as often as to modern Japanese works. The Yuriko of the diaries and the Nobuko of *Dōhyō* was at ease exploring the cities of Europe and speaking foreign languages. As I will highlight in my discussion of her positionality as Japanese, although Yuriko had the habits and material expectations of an upper-class Japanese woman, 'Japan' was not her constant, conscious frame of reference. In her observation and judgement of the cities of capitalist Europe, her point of comparison was in fact Soviet Moscow, and she identified primarily as a Russophile admirer of the Soviet Union. The binary evident in Yuriko's point of view is not that between herself as

'Oriental' and the West, but between Soviet communism and Euro-American capitalism.

For Minear, writing in response to Said in 1980, the case of Japan undermines the relationship posited by Said between Orientalism and imperial domination: 'Will to power, perhaps; arrogance and condescension, certainly; but actual domination, no' (515). He suggests instead that 'the pursuit of knowledge involves the attempt to appropriate the reality of a subject, and is therefore aggressive; the subject is reduced, almost by necessity, to the status of object' (515-516); and that the study of other cultures therefore invokes this aggression:

The ultimate context for Said's Orientalism and our studies of Japan may be *cross-cultural perception in general*, rather than European and American perceptions of the 'non-Western' world. With or without power in its favour, Japan has a long tradition of racist and ethnocentric behaviour; what nation does not? Perhaps European and American ideas about the 'non-Western' world are exceptional only in that during the past several centuries Europe and America have had the military power to put them into action. the Japanese case suggests, contrary to Said, that those power relations may not be the ultimate reason why we divide reality into 'us' and 'them', why we weight the scales in favour of the home team. (516, my emphasis)

For a Japanese visitor to Soviet Russia in the 1920s, the first decade following the revolution, the relationship between the 'West' and 'the Orient' as described by Said did not apply. There was no colonial power relationship overshadowing Yuriko's presence in Soviet Russia. The geopolitical rivalry in Manchuria and Korea that had marked the relationship between Tsarist Russia and Imperial Japan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century had been replaced by a wary neutrality as the fledgling Soviet government retired from the international stage, beginning with its withdrawal from the First World War in March 1918. In the process of modernisation, both Russia and Japan had experienced comparable ambivalence towards Westernisation and nostalgia for disappearing national

tradition. Both were aware of the need to 'catch up' to the West (Ferguson 2008: 18). The development of a modern national identity in the nineteenth century called into question foundational notions of 'Japan' and 'Russia' and to what extent a native form of modernity could be filleted out of 'Westernisation'. Post-revolutionary Russia dispensed with capitalism and took a radical new path to modernity; Japan in the interwar years distanced itself from the West, which refused to accept Japan on equal terms, and took on an aggressively Asian destiny, as a coloniser (Young 1998). While European Orientalist-racist assumptions still informed how an individual Japanese was viewed by Russians in this period, Russia had forfeited its identity as a Western/European great power and was developing a new, unprecedented identity as the world's first socialist nation and an alternative model of modernity to the capitalist imperialism on which Orientalism was founded. Thus, in both broad geopolitical terms and with particular regard to Miyamoto Yuriko's self-presentation, 'Orientalism' in the sense described by Said is not relevant to the present study.

Nevertheless, the process of travel and encountering the foreign 'Other' had a particular role in Japanese self-definition in the modern era. For Japanese in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, foreign travel was intrinsically allied to the process of modernisation. Travel in or out of the country had been forbidden for 200 years under the Tokugawa regime's *sakoku* (closed country) policy. Japan was forced out of its seclusion by the arrival of the US Navy, in the form of Commander Matthew Perry's 'Black Ships' in 1853. The foreign 'West' represented a standard of 'civilisation and enlightenment' which a modernising Japan was hastening to meet in order to be treated as an equal by these technologically more advanced nations (Beasley 1995: 22-34, chapter 6; Tipton 2008: 25-29, 46-51). Travel to Western countries, to observe and study, began in the late Tokugawa (*bakumatsu*) period and continued into the Meiji era (1868–1912) (Fessler 2004). The first Japanese females to travel abroad in this period were five children sent by the government to the United States to study in 1872; one of them, Tsuda Umeko (1864–1929), returned home to pioneer higher education for women (Kelsky 2001: 37-45; Tipton 2008: 50-51).

By the early twentieth century, private travel abroad by Japanese had increased in line with the country's industrialisation, wealth and education, such that, by the Taishō period (1912–26), a middle-class professional such as the Cambridge-educated architect Chūjō Seichirō could take his teenage daughter Yuriko with him to New York. In Japan, as in other industrialised countries, in the 1910s and 1920s, the ability to travel – faster, further, in relative comfort – was part of the essence of modernity, and it was not restricted to men. Nonetheless, it was still rare for Japanese women of this period to travel so widely and for extended periods of time (Hasegawa 2006: 170).

Overall, by the 1920s, for Japanese, travel as the explicit practice of observing and studying foreign/Western modernity for national benefit had been largely superseded by autonomous travel for individual purposes. However, although national self-definition as a modern industrial and imperial nation-state had been largely consolidated by Japan's victory over China (1894–95) and Russia (1904–05) and its acquisition of Taiwan (1895) and Korea (1910), the process of defining a new, modern individual Japanese self in the space between 'Western' and 'Japanese', 'traditional' and 'modern', took longer. Travel was part of this self-definitional process, as evident in literature from Meiji through Taishō and even to the present day: Hutchinson and Williams note the predominance in Japanese literature 'of essentialised representations of other nations and places ... in order to come to some overall definition of what it means to be Japanese' (2007: 3). Thus, writing about the experience of foreign travel, in itself, was a reflection on what it meant to be a modern Japanese person.

Modernity

The overarching historical and cultural context of Yuriko's experience of the cities of Soviet Russia and Europe was modernity. The standard descriptions of modernity, a much debated concept, encompass 'the complex constellation of socioeconomic phenomena which originated in the context of Western development but which have since manifested themselves around the globe in various forms: scientific and technological innovation, the industrialisation of production, rapid urbanisation, an ever-expanding capitalist market, [and] the development of nation states' (Felski

1995: 13). This thesis diverges from the conventional narrative by regarding modernity as a phenomenon with multiple manifestations in specific geographic and historical contexts, as described by Konishi (2013: 6). In the newly forged Soviet Union, a vast, only recently (1862) de-feudalised society, modernity was being unshackled from capitalism in a unique, anti-capitalist narrative of modernisation. As Susan Buck-Morss (2000) points out, the utopian dream of industrial modernity came in two parallel forms – socialism and capitalism – although in the post-1989 world, the hope embodied by socialism in the early twentieth century is usually overlooked.

Being modern in Japan

Modernity in Japan is conventionally identified as starting, symbolically, with the arrival of Commander Perry in 1853 and, practically, with the comprehensive modernising reforms implemented by the Meiji government from 1868 onwards, covering industry, education, government, the military, science and technology, even down to how people dressed and lived, seeing the replacement of the male *chon-mage* (topknot) and blackened teeth on women for European grooming styles.¹⁰ The high point of Japanese modernity was the 1920s, described by Gardner as ‘the time when many of the hallmarks of modernity – urbanisation, the experience of simultaneity, the proliferation of new media, the transformation of gender roles – occupied the centre of national attention’ (2006: 8). By this time, modernity was no longer simply equated with Westernisation but had become indigenous, the top-down state-driven development of the Meiji era replaced by more diffuse and organic social, material and cultural experiences of the *modan* (Tipton and Clark 2000). As Mackie points out, ‘being modern in Japan in the 1920s involved the embodied practices of everyday life’ (2000: 196): how people worked, dressed, travelled, ate and shopped; and their ‘consumption’ of culture in the form of cheap books, mass-produced magazines, radio and cinema (Gardner

¹⁰ Some historians make the point that the process of modernisation was already underway in Tokugawa Japan, based on criteria such as increased urbanisation, levels of literacy, and the development of a middle class, a capitalist money economy, transport and communications networks, and mass culture, thus laying the foundations for the rapid transformation of the Meiji period (Starrs 2012: 17).

2006: 22-23). It was also reflected in the spaces they occupied, 'which were newly constituted or whose meanings changed through time' (Mackie 2000: 196), such as the department store or the railway station, often built by the same company (such as Odakyu, Hankyu, Keio) to dovetail the activities of commuting and consuming (Young 1999), and the modern café (Tipton 2000). Yuriko's experience of different modern cities as a traveller, as recorded in her self-writings, took place on trains and trolleybuses, in department stores, cafes, cinemas and boulevards, all quintessential modern spaces.

One aspect of modernity of particular relevance to Yuriko, and which has attracted attention from feminist scholars (e.g., Felski 1995) is its profoundly gendered nature. Modernity called into question traditional gender roles and representations, generating new life opportunities for women, such as paid work outside the home, that in turn generated new female subjectivities. This was in spite of a (male) tendency to identify modernity as a public, masculine quality, while 'woman embodied a [domestic] sphere of atemporal authenticity seemingly untouched by the alienation and fragmentation of modern life' (Felski 1995: 16). In fact, women were active participants in modernity. Felski (1995: 18, 21) rejects both the 'progress narrative', in which women's lives are considered to be unequivocally improved by modernisation, set in stark contrast against the backward and benighted past, and the 'counter-myth' of an 'edenic, non-alienated golden past', and goes on to explore the 'different ways in which women drew upon, contested or reformulated dominant representations of gender and modernity in making sense of their own positioning within society and history'.

A fundamental aspect of Yuriko's time abroad was her experience of socialism and capitalism as competing, parallel models of modernity, which enabled her to compare how women were positioned within different modern societies. In the following section, I will outline the implications of modernity for women in Japan and Russia.

The modern Japanese woman

Yuriko's self-narratives must be understood in the material and discursive context within which Japanese women were positioned at this time. This context was the

status quo against which Yuriko compared the situation – rhetorical and actual – of women in the Soviet Union. Yuriko’s journey to Russia and Europe in 1927 as an ‘unaccompanied’ female – albeit the companion of another woman – freed her from the political and legal constraints that delimited the existence of a woman in Japan.

The ‘woman question’ (*fujin mondai*) was the subject of much debate in the 1870s. In early Meiji, the Japanese woman epitomised – to social reformers and Westernisers such as Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835–1901) – what was ‘backward and shameful’ about Japan. The low status of Japanese women mirrored the low, feminised status of Japan in the world, the standard by which (Japanese) civilisation was judged (by the West). Improving the status of Japanese women would raise the status of Japan to that of a ‘civilised’ nation (Copeland 2000: 10-11). However, the astonishing, apparently high status of Western women observed by *bakumatsu* and Meiji-era Japanese male travellers abroad was not founded in legal or political rights. American and European women may have appeared in public with their husbands and have seemed to enjoy relationships based on romantic love, but in fact in this period they had no more civil rights than their Japanese contemporaries (Sievers 1983: 1-2; Copeland and Ortobasi 2006: 7).

In 1872 elementary education was made compulsory for both girls and boys (Copeland 2000: 11). For Meiji reformers, the education of women was a means of national advancement; it was not introduced for the benefit of women. The purpose of women’s education was to produce ‘good wives, wise mothers’ (*ryōsai kenbo*), not women who would work alongside men as equals in the public sphere (Mackie 2003: 25).

A gendered Meiji subjecthood (Mackie 2005) was codified in law through the Constitution (1890) and the Civil Code (1898). While the Constitution did not explicitly mention women, they were excluded from the franchise and their relationship to the state was ‘mediated through the patriarchal family system’ (Mackie 2003: 5-6). The Emperor was the ultimate patriarch in the newly imagined Japanese family-state (*kazoku kokka*) and it was the duty of the male head of household to ensure his family’s loyalty (Mackie 2003: 22-23). In both their

immediate and national families, women had obligations but no rights (Mackie 2003: 6, 22). Under the Meiji constitution, women were legally contained and defined far more comprehensively than under the Tokugawa Shogunate, which did not have the same political reach to apply centralised patriarchal norms across the nation and at every level of society (Nolte and Hastings 1991: 151-152). In the Tokugawa period, a variety of marriage and family systems had coexisted. The Meiji Civil Code effectively applied the patriarchal samurai family order to all sectors of society. A married woman had the legal status of a minor and no right to own, manage or inherit property (Mackie 2003: 22-23).

From the Meiji era onwards, many Japanese women were opposed to their state-decreed role within modern Japan and were active in demanding political freedoms, beginning with their involvement in the Movement for Freedom and People's Rights (*Jiyū minken undō*) in the 1870s (Sievers 1983; Mackie 2003). However, women were barred from any kind of political activity by a series of laws. The 1890 Law on Assembly and Political Association (*Shūkai Oyobi Seiha Hō*) forbade women from attending political meetings or joining political groups (Nolte and Hastings 1991: 154-155). This was reconfirmed by Article 5 of the 1900 Public Peace Police Law (*Chian Keisatsu Hō*). The right to attend and speak at political meetings was won in 1922, after two decades of campaigning by women's groups (Mackie 2003: 5-6; Tomida and Daniels 2005: Appendix). However, the right to join political organisations was only granted by the occupying powers in 1945, along with female suffrage (Nolte and Hastings 1991: 155; Mackie 2003: 5-6).

While full citizenship was denied them, the effects of education, economic activity and the development of new urban lifestyles brought about significant changes in women's lives and subjectivities not foreseen by Meiji statesmen. In the early twentieth century, women from all walks of life were consciously refashioning themselves, pursuing the Taishō-era ideal of the cultivation of the modern self (Suzuki 2010: 6-7). Female identity was dynamic, a work-in-progress, like modernity itself. In the 1910s, the 'New Woman' – politically aware, high-minded, intellectual – was embodied by the group of women who published the journal *Seitō* (1911–1916), founded by the feminist Hiratsuka Raichō (1886–1971) (Ericson 1997: 39-41; Lowy 2007). In her study, Sato (2003) identifies three key

new, specifically urban, female identities that emerged in the interwar period: the professional working woman (*shogyō fujin*), the middle-class housewife (*shufu*) and the audacious, crop-headed 'Modern Girl' (*mōga*). The *mōga*, who superseded the 'New Woman' – in popular and critical imagination if not in reality – was perhaps the most contentious emblem of Japanese modernity in the 1920s, who embodied anxieties over the disturbing social changes accompanying the *modan*, symbolising mass culture and consumerism, decadence and sexual depravity (Silverberg 1991; Mackie 2000; Sato 2003).

One aspect of the evolving modern female subjectivity was a new ideal of relationships: the 'love marriage' as a route to personal fulfilment (Suzuki 2010). Introduced to a Japanese female readership through translations of the Swedish feminist Ellen Keys and expounded in the writings of Hiratsuka Raichō, the *ren'ai kekkon* did not suddenly replace the traditional form of arranged marriage, but as an ideal it became entrenched in the new discourse on relationships, which now included women as active participants and accepted their right to satisfaction and fulfilment (Suzuki 2010: 67-68, 178 n. 46). As a young woman, Yuriko failed to find individual fulfilment through a love marriage to an older man, an experience she reconstructed in her first novel *Nobuko*. The search for socially and politically embedded meaning in tandem with emotional satisfaction is the over-arching theme of *Dōhyō*. In this sequel to *Nobuko*, the protagonist is portrayed as actively seeking out and choosing a new kind of existence, an unimaginable undertaking for the cloistered court ladies and diarists of Heian (794-1185) Japan or the family-bound women of the *bakufu* era.

Soviet Russia as a gendered alternative modernity

As I have outlined in the previous section, in the 1920s, a middle-class Japanese woman, despite her access to the material benefits of modernity and her scope to explore new ways of living, was politically and legally a non-person. Yuriko's alter-ego Nobuko is shocked to discover, on deciding to divorce her husband Tsukuda, that she has no legal identity as a wife and depends on his consent for the divorce (*Dōhyō*, Vol. 2, p. 111). This demonstrates the extent to which, for an educated

and intelligent woman, a comfortable lifestyle and permissive family could obscure her lack of basic civil rights.

By contrast, the position of Soviet women at this time was the most advanced in the world, as detailed by Lapidus (1978: 54-61). The civil and political rights granted to women by the Kerensky Provisional Government were extended by the Soviet government to full citizenship in its first few years. All legal impediments to a woman's freedom of movement and residence were removed. New property and inheritance laws dethroned the man from his place as the head of the household, a position that could legally be occupied by a woman. Women could hold property and assume active public roles, such as participation in rural communes. Labour legislation was enacted to encourage women to undertake paid work – for equal pay. Civil registration of marriages in which both partners were regarded as equal replaced religious oversight. Illegitimate as well as legitimate children were recognised. The Family Code of 1926 recognised common-law partnerships. Divorce was made easy to obtain and abortion was legalised. Alongside this new legal equality, the role of women as mothers was accorded special protection. Childbearing was regarded as a social duty. Female Party members such as Alexandra Kollontai and Vera Lebedeva argued for the importance of motherhood to the state and the state's obligation to care for women and children, echoing in many ways the arguments of Japanese maternalist feminists in the same period (Mackie 2003: 56-57; Sato 2003: 23-25; De Bary et al. 2005: 498).

In her informational, evangelising articles on the Soviet Union, Yuriko emphasised repeatedly the rights and protections afforded women and children. That the situation of actually existing Soviet women did not always match the official discourse could, in the first decade or so of the Soviet Union's existence, be explained away, as with so many other discrepancies between ideal and reality, as 'socialism under construction' (Fitzpatrick 2008: 17). A full description of the situation of women, rhetorical and real, in the Soviet Union is beyond the scope of

this thesis.¹¹ What I wish to point out here is that the legal and political discourse of women-as-citizens and the public enactment of this discourse – in model nurseries, plays, Party meetings, workplaces – witnessed by Yuriko in the Soviet Union in the late 1920s represented an ideal in the process of apparently being transformed into achievable lived reality. What she perceived, experienced and read about women in newspapers and official publications (when her Russian was sufficiently advanced) in the Soviet Union is a key theme shaping her self-narratives of travel and transformation. As I will show, these perceptions created, for Yuriko, the belief that in a socialist society, she could find the freedom and personal fulfilment that, for all her advantages, she could not achieve as a woman in Japan.

The modern city

Most of Yuriko's time abroad was spent in various cities, which represented different models of modernity. To illuminate the particular interaction of city, as the spatial embodiment of modernity, and the self, I will draw on cultural geography, which in recent years has paid particular attention to urban space and subjectivity.

This thesis will adopt an approach, outlined by Sewell (2011), that takes into account both the materiality of a city and the practices within it: an analysis of the interaction between the physical, imagined and experienced cultural landscapes. The physical landscape represents a 'concretisation of cultural values'; the imagined landscape 'the landscape as conceived of and understood by individuals within a group' and the experienced landscape is that encountered through the embodied practices of daily life. Sewell names ideology as one form of imagined landscape, 'the ideal structure of activities in space for which planners and other experts strive' (2011: 597). This is particularly relevant to Soviet Moscow in the 1920s, a city being re-imagined as the capital of the world's first socialist state. Ideology is counterbalanced by 'the filter through which individuals make sense of the space around them', another form of imagined landscape

¹¹ For further details on the situation of women in the Soviet Union, see Atkinson et al. (1978), Clements (2012), Clements et al. (1991), Edmondson (2001), Ilić (2103) and Lapidus (1978).

(Sewell 2011: 597). Similarly, Bridge and Watson argue that cities are ‘not simply material or lived spaces, they [are] spaces of the imagination and representation’; the city is both imagined and affects the imagination (2011: 277). These concepts are invoked in a special edition of *Japanese Studies* (2011 31:3) with the theme of urban space, demonstrating how urban geographies can combine ‘personal memory with shared historical meanings’ (Mackie 2011a: 329) and ‘how emotional investments change individuals’ experiences of life in the city’ (Bowen-Struyk 2011: 316). As I will show in this thesis, an individual’s experience of a city occurs in the context of the meanings ascribed to it, historical and emotional, which in turn generate new experiences, new memories, and therefore new meanings.

Cities have a central role in the experience of modernity. The German sociologist George Simmel (1858–1918) wrote in the early twentieth century about the effect of the city on mental life (Johnson 2000: 200; Bridge and Watson 2011: 279). Walter Benjamin (1892–1940) is frequently invoked by contemporary scholars of the city for his detailed descriptions of the delights of Paris in the *Arcades Project* (1927–1940). Both writers foregrounded the modern city as an environment that had particular emotional effects on the individual and provided unique kinds of experience, a theme I pursue in this thesis. Before her departure for Russia, Yuriko lived her adult life in Tokyo, a city which embodied Japanese modernity in the 1920s, as recorded in the detailed, quirky street sketches of ‘modernologist’ Kon Wajirō (1888–1973) and explored in the work of Miriam Silverberg (1991, 1998, 2006), who highlighted the role of women as active participants in urban modernity in the novel roles of café waitress and so-called ‘modern girl’. The primacy of the city in the Japanese experience of modernity was reflected in film (Wada-Marciano 2008) and in literature, both modernist and proletarian (Lippit 2002; Maeda 2004). As the embodiment of Japanese modernity, the rapidly evolving metropolis of Tokyo represented a bewildering break with the past, resulting in a sense of dislocation and ‘cultural homelessness’, a term used by critic Kobayashi Hideo in his 1933 essay. However, as Tyler points out, the disintegration and chaos of the modern city was paralleled by a rapid reintegration; in this positive view, the modern city is a ‘seat of liberation,

engagement and liberation' (Unno 1983 quoted in Tyler 2008: 13). The disorientating change and tempo of the modern city, while destabilising, also offered new experiential and self-definitional opportunities, described by Lippit as 'a sense of fluidity in the boundaries of subjectivity, conceived in terms of ethnicity, national identity, gender and class' (2002: 7). As I will argue, this applies even more so the foreign city, where the travelling self is confronted by a multitude of cross-cutting differences that destabilise habitual positionalities.

Cities were central to Yuriko's experience of the Soviet Union and Europe. Although she travelled within the Soviet Union with Yuasa Yoshiko, most of her time was spent in cities: Moscow, Leningrad, Warsaw, Berlin, Vienna, Paris, and London. In analysing how Yuriko represented her transformational experience of travel, I will draw attention to the meanings she assigned to different modern cities, as variously refracted through three genres of self-writing and her dynamic positionalities.

4. Methodological Approach

In my analysis of how Yuriko represented her transformative experience of travel and the modern city, my source materials are her self-writings, published and private, contemporaneous and retrospective. In doing so, I take Chloe Starr's (2013) approach of viewing different life-narratives by the same person as parts of an over-arching life-narrative that can be read through and against each other, revealing the multiple and dynamic positionalities of the self as it is written. In this thesis, I consider Yuriko's diaries, personal essays and autobiographical fiction together as a meta-oeuvre composed of various positionalities and temporal viewpoints. I believe this approach is particularly suited to Yuriko who as a writer who drew extensively and directly on her own life for material. She reworked periods of her life as fiction, in both the Nobuko sequence of novels (*Nobuko*, *Futatsu no niwa* [1948], *Dōhyō* [1947-50]) and the Hiroko sequence (*Fuchisō*, *Banshū heiya*, both 1946), as well as keeping a diary from the age of 14 until her death at 51 and producing personal essays that foregrounded her own experience. It could be argued that her foremost subject was herself.

In studying Yuriko's varied life-writings, I am not interested in sifting out biographical 'truths'. My focus is on how she *represented* this experience across genre and time. In conceptualising the relationship between life experience and life-writing, I draw on the work of Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson (1998, 2010). Life-writing is influenced, among many things, by the author's conscious and unconscious motivations, the unreliable workings of memory, and the particularities and limitations of each genre. It is not simply the transcription of experience, of what 'happened' to the subject or what she observed. Experience is mediated by the subject's positionality at the time of the experience and *also at the time of writing*. An individual who writes about her own life is not so much recording a historical 'truth' based on the authority of her own unique experience as she is presenting or performing herself within an intersection of contexts, discourses and positionalities. As Smith and Watson point out, making sense of life-writing 'requires reading practices that engage the narrative tropes,

sociocultural contexts, rhetorical aims and narrative shifts within the historical or chronological trajectory of the text' (2010: 13). Even if the form of writing is private, as in the case of a diary, self-narration is 'the product of complex and possibly contradictory pressures' (Dryburgh 2013: 111): the diarist is still writing within certain cultural norms and expectations, and the 'self' presented in the diary will reflect this. While I accept Joan Scott's (1991) claim that the narrated self does not exist independently of discourse, I do not believe that it is entirely subordinate to discourse either. Even within the discourse of totalitarian societies, there is space for identity to be negotiated, as shown by Spakowski (2013) in her study of the autobiographical writings of Chinese political women. In my analysis of Yuriko's self-writing, I take into account the interrelated contexts of modernity, travel and the city, and the matrix of Yuriko's multiple positionalities.

In the process of being written down, the dynamic and contingent self is shaped within the context of genre, as I will discuss.

Women's self-writing and genre in Japan

Since the 1980s, women's self-writing has been a particular focus of scholarship in the Western academy (see Smith and Watson 1998: introduction; Loftus 2004: 2–7). One key assumption of this work is that since the normative 'self' of discourse is by definition (white, elite) male, women exist as the marginalised 'other', making female writing inherently subversive in that it assumes the male prerogatives of subjecthood and speaking. Thus, in Western feminist scholarship, women's self-writing is seen to have a particular role in the development of female subjectivity (see, for example, Bunkers 1987; Cooper 1987; Spender 1987; Walters 1987; Blodgett 1989). Walters comments that while men are motivated to write in order to 'present a finished product, to display a self', women's writing is often more exploratory: 'Women... may write to discover who they are; an act on the whole less necessary for men who do not deal with so deep a conflict between what they naturally feel and what the culture expects of them' (1987: 89). The practice of keeping a diary in itself has been seen by feminist scholars as an assertion in the worth of a woman's self, in face of cultural norms that decreed modesty and self-

effacement for women, 'balm for the ego denied status, power or praise' (Blodgett 1989: 66-67; also Walters 1987: 88).

How relevant is such Western scholarship to Yuriko as a Japanese woman? As an individual, she was unusually blessed by doting, liberal parents who had the wherewithal to provide her with books, education, and opportunities for travel, allowing her to develop her talents and selfhood in a way that was highly unusual for a woman in Japan at this time. It was not until her divorce from her first husband, the scholar Araki Shigeru, that Yuriko personally came up against the Confucian attitude to women inscribed in the Meiji Constitution and Civil Code, under which women were deemed legally and politically incompetent. The outcome of this experience was the novel *Nobuko*, Yuriko's first literary exploration of a woman's search for selfhood and independent subjectivity in the context of Japanese society. Despite her unusual freedoms and her professional success as a writer, there were still limits to what Yuriko could achieve *as a woman*. In *Dōhyō*, she continued this search, widening it from an individual perspective to that of the status of women more generally. Her idealisation of the possibilities of communist/Soviet womanhood was based on a rejection of the discourse of Japanese womanhood within capitalist society. Thus, even for the privileged Yuriko, her subjectivity as a woman was ultimately limited, and her self-writing documents her attempt to overcome these limits and to explore new possibilities. The trajectory of the protagonist Nobuko across two novels – *Nobuko* and *Dōhyō* – is one of determined self-development. In this sense, I contend that Western scholarship that emphasises the role of self-writing in the development of female subjectivity is relevant to Yuriko as a Japanese writer, even though the genre context and canonical status of women's writing in Japan is different. In the following section, I will make explicit Yuriko's literary context as a Japanese woman writer who produced different genres of self-writing, which in themselves had a particular status within the literary tradition.

Women's self-writing in Japan, in the words of Janice Brown, 'both confirms and confounds Western notions of women's autobiography as marginalised literature' (1993: 18). In the Japanese literary tradition, women's courtly diaries of the Heian era are part of the classical canon; as such, women's self-writing has a

status for which there is no Western equivalent. Walker notes, 'a comparison with the Western literary tradition reveals that the Japanese literary tradition presents a case, possibly unique in literary history, of a literary tradition in which autobiographical literature appears very early, is a dominant genre ... and furthermore, is shaped from its beginnings and dominated for a crucial time, by women' (1994: 219). In his study of Japanese women's life-writing, Loftus points out that an educated twentieth-century Japanese woman writing her autobiography would necessarily be aware of her foremothers, describing this legacy as 'a powerful enabling force in Japanese women's self-writing' (2004: 21).

Despite this legacy, being a woman writer in Japan in the late nineteenth and much of the twentieth-century had its own particular constraints. Copeland describes how the great female canon in fact served to limit women writers in the Meiji era (1868–1912): to be acknowledged as following in this tradition, women writers could not engage with the issues of modernity or deviate from the elegant, feminine style deemed proper for women (2000: 4-5). In the early twentieth century, much of Japanese women's writing was categorised as *joryū bungaku* and defined as characterised by a particular style (non-intellectual, lyrical, emotional), and thereby of lesser literary worth than a man's work (Ericson 1997; Copeland 2006; Copeland and Ortabasi 2006).

This category was not rigidly imposed, however, and not all women writers were contained within it. Those who wrote in a more intellectual or 'masculine' fashion, such as Miyamoto Yuriko and Hirabayashi Taiko, were acknowledged to fall outside it (Ericson 1997: 13). When Yuriko's debut short story, 'Mazushiki hitobito no mure' (A Flock of Poor People, 1916), was at first rejected by *Fujin kōron*, the women's edition of *Chūō kōron*, for being too complex for its readership, she took this as a compliment, an early indication of her ambition to be part of the masculine literary mainstream. The story was praised by the eminent critic Tsubouchi Shōyō (1869–1935) as 'not womanish' and published in the mainstream *Chūō kōron* (Ericson 1997: 21; also Hirabayashi 1979a), an impressive debut for a writer of either sex. Yuriko continued to publish there and in *Kaizō*. Her assured place in the literary main(male)stream may well explain her lack of direct involvement with feminist journals such as *Nyonin geijutsu*

(Women's Arts, 1928–1932), which came into existence while Yuriko was in Moscow and ceased publication five years later, when she was putting all her efforts into the proletarian literary movement. After her return from the Soviet Union, she was part of male-dominated proletarian literary movement, which became her canonical home, as I have outlined in the literature review. During the war years, she was censored and silenced by the militarist government as a communist writer, not as a woman. In this sense, Western feminist theories about women's marginalised or silenced voices are not relevant to Yuriko: while legally and politically she had no rights as a woman until the Meiji order was overturned during the Occupation period, as a *woman* writer, she was never marginalised or silenced. From her very first publication she was part of the male-dominated literary mainstream. Her works were not categorised under the limiting definitional rubric of *joryū bungaku*. Her status as a serious writer was emphasised by her husband Miyamoto Kenji after her death, when he sought to establish her legacy as a proletarian writer within the mainstream male canon, not as a 'woman writer' (Ericson 1997: 5).

Turning now to genre, the two canonical forms of self-writing within Japanese literature are the diary (*nikki*), a tradition that went back to the Heian period, and the I-novel (*shishōsetsu*), which developed out of the naturalist movement in the first decade of the twentieth century. Yuriko wrote in both these genres in recording and recreating her experience in the Soviet Union and Europe.

Diary literature/ nikkibungaku

While in both Western and Japanese literary traditions, diaries are a feminised form, a fundamental point of difference is that in the West, diaries have been regarded as a 'minor, non-literary' form (Hogan 1991; Rak 2009: 23), while the *nikki*, translatable as 'fictionalised memoir' or 'poetic memoir', holds a 'central, privileged' status in the Japanese canon (Walker 1994: 208-209, 214). While the very first diaries were court records, kept in Chinese by men, and the first personal diary was the male-authored *Tōsa nikki* (*Tōsa Diary*, ca 935), it was the women of the Heian court who fully developed the genre in this period (Miner 1969: 11; Walker 1994: 218). The great works of female-authored Japanese diary literature

include *Kagerō nikki* (The Gossamer Years, ca 974), *Murasaki Shikibu nikki* (The Diary of Murasaki Shikibu, ca 1010), *Sarashina nikki* (As I Crossed the Bridge of Dreams, ca 1060), *Izumi Shikibu nikki* (The Diary of Izumi Shikibu, ca 1008) and Sei Shōnagon's *Makura no sōshi* (The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon, ca 1000). The literary predominance of women had declined by the end of the thirteenth century (Miner 1969:12), following the rise of military government and samurai values, but the Heian diaries retained their pre-eminent place in the canon (Keene 1993: 837).

The long Japanese tradition of diary-keeping continued to the modern period (Keene 1993: 8; Miner 1969: 14), becoming a popular practice in the later nineteenth century, with the appearance of commercially produced printed and bound *nikki* (Nishikawa 1999: 243). The first purpose-designed notebooks were issued by Hakubunkan in 1895, replacing the traditional format of brush and ink on paper that was then folded and bound (Nishikawa 1999: 250). Following Lejeune's (2009) emphasis on how the material aspects of diary-keeping influence the practice, I posit that the introduction of pro-forma notebooks imposed a new uniformity on diary-keeping. As anyone who has received the gift of a diary will know, there is a set space for each day, which enforces terse entries and limits meandering reflection. A pro-forma diary enforces chronological discipline: each blank page stands as a reproach to the neglect of its keeper. Unlike the retrospectively written Heian-era diaries, in which events are reconstructed and dates are hazy (Nishikawa 1999: 242,244), the modern diary is kept contemporaneously to events, dated like a newspaper and having a similar claim to simple facticity (as opposed to truth, which is more complex) as a record of events as they happen. In this way, the appearance of pro-forma notebooks brought Japanese diary-keeping closer to the Western tradition, foregrounding the passing of countable time by tying the narrative firmly to calendar dates.

The rise of pro-forma diaries brought about a new kind of gendering in Japanese diary-keeping. Commercial diaries were produced specifically for women, designed to develop their identities as housewives; these included ledgers for household accounts and appendices of information deemed relevant to running a household (Nishikawa 1994: 252-253). However, parallel to this was the emergence of a new literary forms of the diary written by women who consciously drew on the

classical tradition while adapting it to express a dynamic, distinctly modern kind of female subjectivity. I will draw here on the two main exemplars. First, the iconic Meiji-era writer, Higuchi Ichiyō (1872–1896), whose posthumously published diaries modelling the literary style of her literary foremothers while using the form to develop a sense of self, a very modern concept, especially for a woman of this era (Sato 2003; Suzuki 2010). Her diary was both a record of household business and events (e.g., names of visitors, presents exchanged, financial transactions and expenses, birthdays, temple fairs), in other words, a ‘house diary’ such as was traditionally kept by the male head of household, prefiguring the pro-forma ‘household diary’ (*katei nikki*) aimed at women (Nishikawa 1999), and also a personal account of her struggles to develop as a woman and a writer, including her relationship with the writer Nakarai Tōsui (1860–1926). Nishikawa concludes, ‘By keeping a diary, Ichiyō observed her conduct objectively, resolutely proceeded to the next stage in her life by her own volition, and grasped the meaning of her existence, its isolation and challenges, which had deviated from gendered norms when she decided to become an author’ (1999: 248). In other words, through the practice of keeping a diary, Ichiyō represented herself as having agency, as making choices and decisions, an active subject in her own life. Despite the classical references, Ichiyō’s subjectivity as shown in the diary was very modern.

The second famous exemplar of a modern female diary, several generations forward, was the literary debut of Yuriko’s contemporary, Hayashi Fumiko (1903–1951). Serialised in the feminist literary journal *Nyonin Geijutsu* (Women’s Arts, 1928–1932) from October 1928 to October 1930, *Hōrōki* (Diary of a Vagabond), drew in many ways on the classical tradition: in its inclusion of poetry and letters, a mostly anonymous protagonist, the use of classical grammar, the ‘mirroring’ of incidents in classical diaries, and the loose dating (Ericson 1997). Unlike the courtly diaries, which portrayed a world in which women’s lives were constrained by ritual and sequestration, Hayashi presented a female self who was a tough, resilient denizen of the Tokyo *shitamachi*, living off her wits, physically mobile, moving continually between low-paid jobs, shabby lodgings and shabby men, sometimes despairing but fundamentally optimistic. The utter novelty of this vibrant, lower-class, female voice made *Hōrōki* a bestseller. Hayashi rewrote sections in sequels

and new editions, treating her ostensible life story as a mutable fictional text rather than as fixed historical/autobiographical fact, taking a playful approach to those who criticised her lack of veracity (Ericson 1997: 63).

I have mentioned the diaries of Ichiyō and Hayashi, both of them published to great acclaim, to demonstrate that the female diary as a genre was dynamic from late Meiji into early Shōwa. Other women writers were experimenting with the classical form, adapting it to express a particularly modern sensibility, one which, unlike that of the cloistered Heian ladies, existed in the wider world and sought to challenge the limits placed on female experience.

Yuriko's diaries for my period of study take the form of dated entries in both notebooks and pro forma diaries, including an English Letts-brand diary for 1930 (Ōmori 1980). There is no deliberate narrative thread or conscious linking. The diary reads as a chronological but disjointed record of encounters, incidents, observations, activities and feelings; in Lejeune's words, a 'series of dated traces' (2009: 179). In order to draw meaning from these fragments, I will follow Lejeune's approach and sift for patterns. Since it is not possible for a diarist to record everything, a diary is marked by both selectivity and discontinuity; it is 'methodical, repetitive and obsessive in the tapestry of your [the diarist's] life, you follow very specific threads, and only a small number of them' (Lejeune 2009: 179). Culley makes the same point, that the diary 'is always in process, always a fragment', and that the importance of incremental repetition requires paying attention to what is repeated when reading a diary (1985: 220; also Hogan 1991: 100). Lejeune comments that to understand someone else's diary, to understand its patterns and omissions, you must 'read a lot of it for a long time' (2009: 181). In approaching Yuriko's travel diaries, I chose to start a year before her departure, 1927, to 'read my way in' mid-stream to a long life text¹² that contains no narrative linkages. To make sense of the diary of someone who is not only personally unknown to the reader, but also removed in time, place and culture, requires a kind of archaeological sifting of Culley's 'fragments', and the fragments, however carefully

¹² The diaries take up three volumes of the *zenshū* and encompass the years 1913-1951.

reformed, like pieces of pot or bone taken from a dig, only constitute in themselves a larger fragment of a life.

Although a diary is ostensibly a private and personal form, a scholar of life-writing must take into consideration whether a diary was actually designed to be shown to other people or even published, as Keene speculates in the case of Higuchi Ichiyō's diaries (1989). Unlike Western diaries, which were originally and primarily confessional, Japanese diaries had a high status as a poetic form, and could serve as a vehicle to demonstrate the writer's knowledge and skill with regard to classical forms. As discussed above, Hayashi Fumiko, a mostly self-educated proletarian writer, used *Hōrōki* in such a way, including short poems and classical references.

However, it is my belief that Yuriko did not write her diaries to be read in the raw by third parties. There is no mention of any diary-sharing between Yuriko and Yuasa Yoshiko, her almost-constant companion during the period under study, and, given Yuriko's candour about her relationship in the diary, it is highly unlikely that she intended Yoshiko to read it, as it would surely provoke yet more of the violent arguments Yuriko so hated. Additionally, Yuriko's diaries appear as 'raw material', not a polished narrative like Higuchi Ichiyō's diary, or even polished fragments, in the way of a Heian court diary. As a writer with a high regard for her own abilities, it is unlikely that Yuriko would wish to show, or would imagine showing, her rushed, note-like, highly prosaic diary to anyone else. If an audience can be imagined, in the case of Yuriko, it is the prospective audience reading later, polished versions of her life, of which the account in the diary is the very first, rough and incomplete, draft.

Diaries have the status of non-fiction. As Lejeune points out, since diaries are written in 'real time', they cannot be made up in the sense that there can be no advance plotting or manipulation of events (2009: 201-210). However, this does not mean that diaries are a transparent record of 'truth'. The diarist selects what to include and what to exclude. As Blodgett points out, the diary is a mode of self-presentation first and foremost, and diarists exclude for *themselves* what they do not wish to see or accept (1989: 59-65). In this way, the diary operates as a filter, 'a piece of lacework or a spider web... apparently made up of more empty space than

filled space' (Lejeune 2009: 181). The fragments left for the archaeologist-reader to decode have effectively been pre-selected. However, what is left out or changed can be as revealing as what is included: 'Any utterance in an autobiographical text, even if inaccurate or distorted, is a characterisation of its writer' (Smith and Watson 2010: 15). My parallel reading of Yuriko's other life-writing alongside the diaries will allow me to identify lacunae and discrepancies, useful indications of how she wished to present herself – privately as well as publicly. In reading Yuriko's diaries, I pay attention to the particular 'fragments' that shed light on her complex positionality as Japanese woman who is actively seeking a new way of life and therefore, a new self, and how her experience of travel was mediated by her various positionalities – and vice versa.

The I-novel/ shishōsetsu

In the context of Japanese literature, the creation of fictional worlds was traditionally regarded as a frivolous pursuit; in the Tokugawa period (1600–1868), *gesaku* (light novels) were regarded merely as entertainment for the common people, not serious literature (Fowler 1988: 23). As explained by Fowler, in the Japanese language, only what is personally experienced or observed can be expressed directly and 'authentically'; anything else is a 'fabrication' and therefore of lesser literary value (1988: 7-9). Even as Western literary influences were being absorbed in the Meiji era, this ambivalence towards fiction continued, as reflected in the novelist and critic Kume Masao's (1891–1952) oft-quoted dismissal of Western classics such as *War and Peace* and *Madame Bovary* as mere 'popular fiction' (Keene 1998: 511; Lippit 2002: 8).

The I-novel (*shishōsetsu*), an outgrowth of the Japanese naturalist movement, became established in the 1910s–1920s as a uniquely Japanese genre (Fowler 1988; Hijiya-Kirschner 1996; Suzuki 1996). Defined against the fictiveness and impersonality of the Western novel, a *shishōsetsu* drew on the writer's own experience, eliding the distinction between the narrator and the writer, a 'self-referential, unmediated work' (Orbaugh 2003: 138) in which the narrator/author shared episodes of his (more rarely *her*) personal life with the reader. The prototypical I-novel is held to be Tayama Katai's *Futon* (1907), the tale of a married

writer's obsession with his female protégé setting the confessional tone for I-novels in the 1920s. An I-novel could be narrated in the third person, as long as the protagonist was identifiable as the author (Fowler 1988: 4). As the reading public expanded in the 1920s, the intimacy between the *bundan* (literary world) and its readership was lost, and the confessional nature of the I-novel was superseded by a general understanding that *a version* of the writer's life was being represented (Orbaugh 2003). As Orbaugh points out, the I-novel was *crafted*; certain writers, such as Hayashi Fumiko, returned to the same material and reworked it repeatedly.

In his study, Fowler states that women writers did not come to the *shishōsetsu* form until the 1930s (1988: xxix), a claim firmly refuted by Brown (1993: 17). Fowler's portrayal of the socially withdrawn, politically passive *shishōsetsu* author/narrator completely ignores its female practitioners – such as writers in the feminist journal *Seitō*, Hirabayashi Taiko, Hayashi Fumiko, and of course Yuriko herself – whose works took a wider social and political viewpoint and challenged the prevailing order (Brown 1993: 21-23). As a form of self-writing in which the re-telling of personal experience was not bound by the 'truth claims' of a Western-style autobiography, the I-novel genre could be used by women writers to present versions of their life narratives in which they claimed agency and took a central role, as did Yuriko in her 'Nobuko' sequence which finished, prematurely, with *Dōhyō*.

Yuriko was not the only female writer in this period who wrote and rewrote her life story across genres. Her contemporary Hirabayashi Taiko drew on autobiographical material for her short stories, such as *Seiryōshitsu ni te* (In the Charity Ward, 1927), based on her experience of giving birth to a child who died soon after from malnutrition, later 'updating' and refining her public representation of her life in diary form, in *Sabaku no hana* (Flowers in the Desert, 1955-57). I have already mentioned Hayashi Fumiko's semi-fictional lyrical diary, *Hōrōki*. Sata Ineko's autobiographical story *Kurenai* (Crimson, 1936) described her difficulty, as a woman writer, finding time for her own work alongside the domestic burdens of wifedom and housekeeping (see Tanaka 1987, Loftus 2004). The act of reworking their life stories allowed women writers the freedom to imagine multiple selves and multiple possibilities within a newly modern society that itself was dynamic, thus claiming

not only ownership of their self-representation, but also the authority to revise it in line with their changing circumstances and perspectives, as they saw fit.

Conclusion

This thesis takes as its focus of study three forms of Yuriko's self-writing based on her experience of travel in the USSR and Europe. I will take into account the particular nature of the diary and the autobiographical or I-novel as key genres within the Japanese canon.

I argue that although Yuriko was not marginalised or silenced as a *woman* writer within a tradition that valorised certain forms of women's writing, her quest for private and public fulfilment as a woman, as detailed in her autobiographical novels, makes Western feminist theories about the role of self-writing as a mode of subject formation relevant to my study. In the following three analytical chapters, I will explore in turn how Yuriko represented her transformational travels in each genre, using the concept of positionality to highlight aspects of her self-conception that were challenged, foregrounded or left untroubled by her experiences of different models of urban modernity in the period 1927-1930.

5. *Dōhyō*: The Retrospective, Coherent Self

Dōhyō (Roadsigns) was written over three years, 1947–1950, published serially in the journal *Tenbō* (Prospect, 1946–1951). The novel's theme is the progression of Yuriko's alter-ego Nobuko from sensitive, questing humanitarian to fervent Stalinist, which also offers her new purpose as a writer and the possibility of equality and emotional fulfilment as a woman. The development of Nobuko's subjectivity is traced geographically through her experience of living in Moscow and travelling through several major European cities, a retrospective recreation of Yuriko's own travels in 1927–1930.

Dōhyō as I-novel

The critic Honda (1994) values *Dōhyō* as a detailed and wide-ranging literary account of a Japanese person's experiences abroad that was unprecedented in Japanese literature at the time of its publication. The I-novel typically dealt with personal experience on a claustrophobically small scale; in its sheer geographical range and number of characters, *Dōhyō* exploded the boundaries of the genre and placed its female protagonist in the broad current of history. This conforms to Brown's analysis that, unlike the typical male I-novel, those produced by women writers were almost always socially and politically engaged (1993: 23). In turn, this is supported by Loftus's study of self-writing by Japanese women in which he observes that all five of his subjects – politically active women of Yuriko's generation¹³ – foregrounded their public lives and 'affairs of the world' in their biographies and relegated their relationships and domestic lives to the background (2004: 274). Thus, Yuriko was not alone in taking the wider world rather than the domestic sphere as the stage for her life story.

Dōhyō was Yuriko's last novel, described by the author as the concluding 'concerto' in a series that began with the 'aria' of *Nobuko* and continued with the 'quartet' of *Futatsu no niwa* (Two Gardens, 1946) (Nishizawa 1994: 482). This oft-quoted authorial description represents the 'Nobuko' series of novels as elements

¹³ Loftus's subjects include Yuriko's contemporary in the PLM, Sata Ineko, and the communist Fukunaga Misao (1899-1992).

of a larger autobiographical project in which Yuriko reconstructed key periods of her life and retrospectively assigned meanings to events and relationships, creating a coherent, novelistic pattern out of the raw material of lived experience. In my analysis, I understand the titular ‘roadsigns’ to refer to the various encounters and experiences that serve as guides on Nobuko’s journey, intellectual as well as geographical, towards socialism. The ‘Nobuko’ chronicle was separate from the ‘Hiroko’ sequence of *Banshū heiya* (The Banshū Plain, 1946) and *Fuchisō* (The Weathervane Plant, 1946), which focused on her relationship with her second husband Kenji, a leading figure in the communist movement. In this way, Yuriko used the I-novel genre to rework her life experiences with different emphases and intent (see Orbaugh 2003; Starr 2013).

The relationship between the fictional self presented in *Dōhyō* and Yuriko’s actual life events was contested. Hirabayashi Taiko (1979a: 110, 114) describes Yuriko as a writer who could only write from life and *Dōhyō* as a ‘travel diary novel’. Yuriko herself refuted such an interpretation. According to a note written on the completion of *Dōhyō*, Yuriko denied that it was autobiographical: she wanted to ‘universalise’ her experience and thus consciously adapted events in her depiction of the development of Sasa Nobuko (Iwabuchi 1996: 235; Miyamoto 1976: 324). However, the use of precise dates throughout *Dōhyō* – such as the statement that two women arrived in Warsaw on the afternoon of 30 April 1929 (*Dōhyō*, Vol. 2, p. 176),¹⁴ the same date given for Yuriko and Yoshiko’s arrival in Warsaw in the chronology in the collected works (*MYZ*, Vol. 30, p. 45) – and Yuriko’s attribution of her own publications to Nobuko (e.g., ‘A Record of Moscow Impressions’) – signals the novel’s autobiographical verity even while it presents itself as a *shōsetsu* rather than *jiden* (autobiography) through the use of alternative names for real people. Even this gesture towards fictionalisation is ambiguous, the name-changes serving to point up rather than to hide the model’s identity; for example, the exiled communist leader Katayama Sen (1859-1933) becomes ‘Yamagami Gen’. In the view of her contemporary, Hirabayashi Taiko, Yuriko was incapable of writing ‘objective’ (*kyakkanteki*) fiction and therefore, in Hirabayashi’s view, her

¹⁴ All references to *Dōhyō* are from the Miyamoto Yuriko meisaku raiburarī edition, Shin Nihon Shuppansha (1994), 3 volumes, hereafter referred to as ‘DH’. All translations are my own.

experiences as portrayed in her novels, including *Dōhyō*, ‘completely conformed to the facts’ (*pittari jujitsu ni soku shite shimatta*) (1979a: 110-111). The only person in a position to truly judge to what extent *Dōhyō* was ‘crafted’, Yuasa Yoshiko, commented later in life, ‘It was maybe 70% truth and 30% fiction’ (*makoto nanabun, fikushon sanpun to iu tokoro de arō ka*) (Yuasa 2003: 7). The ambiguity of autobiography presented as fiction is possibly more confusing for a Western than a Japanese reader, who understands that an account of a writer’s life can be simultaneously factual and fictive. In writing *Dōhyō*, Yuriko was telling a particular story about herself, and within the I-novel convention, she could craft the facts to fit her chosen narrative, in this case, a narrative of political enlightenment that was intended to be universally relevant even as it adhered closely to the facts of her own life – as she chose to remember and reconstruct them. In later chapters, I will compare the ‘fictional’ account of *Dōhyō* to the non-fiction, contemporaneous version presented in her diaries and travel articles.

In her diaries for 1947–50, the period in which she wrote *Dōhyō* serially for publication in the journal *Tenbō*, Yuriko only refers briefly to the novel, often merely in the single-word entry ‘work’ (*shigoto*), sometimes with the added detail of a page count and where she is up to in the narrative (e.g. ‘Leningrad’) (*Diary*, 31 Jan 1948, p. 291; 3 February 1948, p. 220).¹⁵ She does not mention referring to her old diaries as a source or aide-memoire, nor does she reflect critically on the process of turning her life-story into a novel. The entries are brief, generally only a few lines, presenting a picture of a woman struggling in poor health, lonely and isolated in the country, and missing her husband, Miyamoto Kenji, who is frequently away in Tokyo on Party business. Kondo refers to comments by Hirata Toshiko, a *Tenbō* editor at that time, mentioned as a visitor in the diary (e.g., 23 July 1948, p. 241; 21 August 1948, p. 255), about Kenji’s influence over the book and how he made Yuriko rewrite it repeatedly before it was published (2002: 285–286). However, while Yuriko mentions ‘rewriting’ or ‘correcting’ (*kakinaosu, naoshi*) the manuscript of *Dōhyō* (e.g., 16 May 1948, p. 234; 5-6 December 1948, p. 279) she does not specifically mention Kenji as a source of editorial pressure. The extent of

¹⁵ The diaries for this period are in Vol. 25 of MYZ.

what Kondo refers to as Kenji's 'censorship' (*ken'etsu*) is not discoverable through Yuriko's diary alone, and is a subject for further research, if appropriate sources are identified.

In my analysis of *Dōhyō* I will show how the protagonist Nobuko's positionalities are foregrounded in the context of the various key modern cities as Yuriko experienced and imagined them. This invokes the two central paradoxes of Yuriko's life and self-representation. The first is the paradox of a privileged middle-class woman who devoted her life to communism and the proletariat. Unlike the writer Arishima Takeo (1878–1923), a socialist of privileged background who gave away his lands to his tenant farmers but who ultimately could not reconcile his origins with his political beliefs and committed suicide, Yuriko's own upper-class status, as a well-off, well-educated woman whose parents, and then siblings, largely supported her political and literary lifestyle, did not provoke any sense of contradiction or crisis as evident in her self-writings. In one of the lengthy diary entries written during her illness in early 1929, Yuriko refers to Arishima as a man who attempted to experience life directly, 'throwing away' (*suteru*) his family and property, but was, in the end, unable to similarly abandon his upper-class gentleman's moral ideas (*jōryūteki shinshiteki dokutoku kannen*) to become a 'bad man' (*warui otoko*) (25 March 1929, p. 358). In the same entry she refers to the difficulty of living to the full (*zenpukuteki ni ikiru koto*) and admiringly quotes an Ozaki Shirō¹⁶ haiku in which the addressee is exhorted to become a 'worse woman' (*omae mo motto warui onna ni naru beshi*) (p. 358). On her return to Japan, Yuriko had no hesitation about becoming involved in the proletarian literary movement, then under intense police pressure, nor joining a banned political party (the JCP), going to jail for her beliefs and refusing to recant. Although as a woman, she did not have property to renounce in the manner of Arishima, she lived her political beliefs fully, to the point of being 'bad', as a politically active, publicly visible woman who did jail time, almost as far as one could go against middle-class Japanese conventions of polite female behaviour.

¹⁶ Ozaki Shirō (1898–1964): writer and one-time husband of the writer and designer Uno Chiyo (1897–1996).

The second paradox is that of Yuriko as a woman who rebelled against the suffocating restrictions placed on women by Japanese society and the patriarchal family system, only to privilege the male-dominated communist movement and proletarian liberation over women's concerns, drawing the criticism of later feminist scholars (e.g., Kobayashi 1991, Iwabuchi 1996). Despite the proto-feminism of *Nobuko*, Yuriko never prioritised the 'Woman Question'. In her 20s, she regarded the Seitō group feminists with scorn (Yuasa Yoshiko quoted in Sawabe 1990:204); as a mature woman and loyal communist, she wrote in a letter to her husband Kenji that the insistence of Seitō and anarchist women on women's rights was wrong (Kondo 2002: 234), echoing the standard Party view that the battle for women's suffrage was merely a bourgeois distraction. As I will show, in *Dōhyō*, Yuriko's positive representation of the rights and status of Soviet women through the eyes of her alter-ego Nobuko is underlined by an insistence on traditional femininity and heterosexuality within the greater, over-arching discourse of communism.

In this chapter, I will track the emotional and intellectual stages of Nobuko's journey as they are enacted geographically and chronologically: her first year in Russia, her year abroad in Europe and her final year back in Russia. I will preface this by describing Yuriko's relationship to Russia, which began long before she arrived in Moscow in December 1927 and had a decisive impact on how she experienced the Soviet Union.

Yuriko and Russia

As a precocious teenager, Yuriko was a keen reader of Russian literature in translation, consuming the entire works of Tolstoy along with Turgenev and Chekhov (Hirabayashi 1979a: 93). Her enthusiasm for Russian literature continued into adulthood. In her diary of 1927, she writes that she has finished reading Dostoevsky's *The Devils*, 'truly a work of genius' (*yahari tensai no saku*) that portrays a 'mysterious, profound Russian existence' (*kikai na, iya ni fukai, Roshiateki sonzai*) (20 January 1927, p. 152), a view of Russia that reappeared a year later in 'Record of Moscow Impressions'.

As a young woman, in 1922 she was involved in relief work for the Russian famine during the Civil War period following the 1917 Bolshevik revolution

(Phillips 1987: 57). As a reader of *Chūō kōron* and *Kaizō* Yuriko would have been well aware of events in Russia and the debates that gripped that Japanese intellectual classes in the 1920s, even if she had no connection to the left at this point in her life. It was Yuasa Yoshiko who introduced Yuriko to Marxism, through Bukarhin's *The ABC of Communism*, and first taught her Russian. Yoshiko had begun her own study of Russian at a time of expanding career opportunities for Russian specialists in government, the military, business (in particular, the South Manchuria Railway Company), academe and journalism (Berton, Langer and Swearingen 1956: 32). After Japan's resumption of diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia in 1925, 'almost every major Japanese policy-making or operating agency needed Russian researchers, translators and interpreters' (35), careers not open to women. Yoshiko's decision to leave her editorial post with *Aikoku fujin*, the journal of the Aikoku Fujin Kai (Patriotic Women's Association, founded in 1901) (Mackie 2003: 30-31) and go to Russia to further her language skills, with the aim of becoming a professional literary translator, reflected the cultural status of Russian literature and the limits within which a determined, intelligent woman could make a career as a Russian linguist at this time. The original impulse to go to Russia was Yoshiko's; it was only after much hand-wringing, detailed in the 1927 diary, that Yuriko decided to accompany her, rather than bear a long separation.

In her biographical essay on Yuriko, Hirabayashi Taiko emphasises the importance of Yuriko's pre-existing love of Russia in mediating her lived experience of the Soviet Union. She comments that as someone brought up on Russian literature, Yuriko admired the 'goodness' of the Russian people rather than the Soviet Union, and was struck not by the appearance of Moscow as the capital of Soviet Russia but as the 'actual scene' (*jitsu fūkei*) of the world she had known and loved since reading Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and other Russian writers. For Yuriko, Soviet Russia was manifest through the prism of 'dear Russia' (*natsukashii Roshia*) represented by these writers (Hirabayashi 1979a: 107, 112). For all her later 'theorising' (*iroirona riron o kumitateta*), in essence, Yuriko was a woman who fell in love quickly, and she fell for Russia 'at a glance' (*hitome de aishite shimatte ita*), intuitively and through her senses (Hirabayashi 1979a: 119), an observation borne out in this chapter and the next.

First encounter: Moscow and Leningrad (December 1927–April 1929)

Sensory infatuation: the 'entrails' of Moscow life

The first stage of Nobuko's journey is presented as a sensory infatuation with Moscow – and by extension, Russia. Her initial impressions are conveyed in richly described detail that consolidate her emotional connection to 'Russia' through its literature, a romantic, imagined Russia that she does not at first distinguish from contemporary Soviet Russia.

On her first night, Nobuko looks out the window of the room at the Hotel Passage to the snow-covered construction site surrounding the new Central Post and Telegraph Office. Seeing the young sentry lifting his face to catch the falling snow, Nobuko feels that she understands his love of snow and how it feels on his face, a sense of commonality that prefigures her identification with the Russian people (DH, Vol. 1, p. 6). While her companion Yoshimi Motoko (modelled on Yuasa Yoshiko) chats with their male compatriots, Nobuko's gaze is constantly drawn, almost childishly, to the snowy scene out the window, which stirs up her emotions (p. 10). During the long train journey across Siberia, she had been moved by the desolate beauty of the snowy wastes (p. 11). Snow itself is not a novelty to Nobuko, but the amount that falls and the unique 'Russian' scene, the life of Moscow under all this snow, 'arouses a premonition' (*yokan o kakitateru*) (p. 11). On their first visit, via horse-drawn sleigh, to the Moscow headquarters of VOKS (the Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, which oversaw and managed visits by foreigners), aspects of street scene are photographically described: the snow collecting on the cab-driver's fur-trimmed hat and on the fur collars of the women's coats, the iced-over shop windows, men wearing padded jackets, women wearing brown shawls over their heads, boys spitting chewed sunflower seeds on to the snow, the smell of horse-dung (p. 14). The scene is that of the exotic Russia of nineteenth-century novels, with no references to the modern Soviet Union.

The sensory and instinctive nature of Nobuko's impressions is emphasised by her experience of a performance at the Moscow Art Theatre (MXAT) not long

after their arrival. As they walk home in the snow, she is still trembling from its impact, a ‘freshness that hurts her skin’ (*shinzen de, hifu o itamu yō ni*) (p. 35). While Motoko discusses the play in technical terms with their acquaintances Akiyama Uichi¹⁷ and Segawa Tadao,¹⁸ Nobuko’s reactions are emotional, not intellectual (p. 40). After the men leave, she sits up late, looking out over the snowy night streets, illuminated by arc lamps. Moscow’s vitality and its vitalising effects on Nobuko are made explicit:

From the first day of living in Moscow, Nobuko’s heart was drawn [*hikitsukerarete itta*] into the day and evening of this place Her sensitivity [*kanjusei*] was intensified; she could not help being stimulated by everything she saw [*shigeki o ukezu ni irarenakatta*]. From her own limited little world, Nobuko was drawn into the life of Moscow, a city overflowing with a strange vitality [*kawatta kiryoku*]. (p. 42)

After their first few days in Moscow, the two women move to a different room, which overlooks the decrepit roof of the old covered bazaar from which the hotel gets its name. The view of snow falling through the dark hole of the steel frame and being swallowed up contrasts against the sleepless, flood-lit construction of the new central post office, representing the energy of new Soviet Moscow (pp. 43-44). Similar contrastive metaphors are used when, later, Nobuko briefly takes up a room in a new cooperative complex in the suburbs near the Novodevichy convent. In this ‘snow-covered wasteland’ (*yuki ni tsutsumareta arano*), amid the ‘Russian desolation of the surrounding scenery’ (*gururi no fūkei no Roshiafū na sabisha*), a whole new town has appeared, so new that there are still no shops, only rows of kiosks, revealing ‘the energy and bustle of the new Soviet way of life’ (*Sobieto shinseikatsu no nigiwai to kakki*) (DH, Vol. 2, pp. 80-81). The relentless forward tempo of socialism-under-construction is contrasted against the moribund, frozen past, represented by the convent.

¹⁷ Modelled on the leftist writer and Esperantist Akita Ujaku (1883–1962).

¹⁸ Modelled on Russia scholar and translator Yonekawa Masao (1891–1965).

Nobuko's vivid perception of the contrast between the austere history embodied in the city and the vigorous present is illustrated by her visit to the market where main shopping street Tverskaya meets the Kremlin walls. The Red Square is visible through the gates (DH, Vol. 1, pp. 97-99). Yuriko the narrator describes the goods and services for offer in the street stalls – pumpkin seeds, apples, shoe polishing, postcards, 'primitive' (*genshiteki*) and colourful silk scarves from the Caucasus – and the crowds of people – Red Guards in their military greatcoats, men and women in leather coats, old ladies wearing traditional headscarves and carrying baskets (p. 97). Through the arch, the crowds diminish and the market scene is replaced by a severe midwinter view of the of Red Square. Apart from a few figures crossing via the footpaths stamped in the snow, the square is empty. The most moving landmark is the stone dais, the Lobnoye Mesto (Place of Skulls), said to be the execution block used in pre-revolutionary days, where the 'thick peasant necks' (*futoi nōmin no kubi*) (p. 98) of rebels such as Stenka Razin¹⁹ and Pugachev²⁰ were lopped. Gazing on this stone dais, Nobuko imagines the 'cries of the Russian people' (*Roshia no minshū no umeki*) in an era when they could not even write their names (p. 98). This view, the gold spires visible over the Kremlin walls, the churches, and the expanse of snow, gives Nobuko the 'impression of a tempestuous epic poem' (*hageshii jojishi no kanmei*) (p. 99). The urban landscape, by embodying the history of the people who inhabit it, acts as an emotional prompt for the sensitive viewer:

In any country, a city square such as this is tied to the story of the people's history [*minshū no rekisihi no monogatari*]. Thus, squares are interesting and alive with pathos [*aware*]. Looking out over the profound harmony and beauty of the snow-covered Red Square, Nobuko empathised with the human passion [*shitsuyo na kekki*] that persistently rose to action and was continually repressed [*osaeraretsuzuketa*]. (p. 99)

¹⁹ Stepan (Stenka) Razin was Cossack rebel who led an uprising in 1670-71. After his defeat, he was hung, drawn and quartered in Red Square (Hosking 2001: 171-72)

²⁰ Emelian Pugachev, another Cossack rebel, led another famous, failed uprising in 1773-75 (Hosking 2001: 229-31).

The daily reality of the market traders and shoppers around the gate, the actual, contemporary people of Moscow, and the physical reminders of the oppressed people of the past, coexist side by side for Nobuko, whose powers of sympathetic imagination and susceptibility to sensory impressions generate a compelling emotional attachment that as yet has no connection to the concepts or terminology of Soviet Russia.

Nobuko's sensory infatuation with Russia is accompanied by a desire to fit in, despite her positionality as a middle-class foreigner. She declares her desire to learn Russian as quickly as possible (p. 27). Soon after this, she takes a dislike to the pretty black hat she has worn from Japan and downgrades to a small brown one more in tune with her new surroundings. In order for the hat to fit properly, she has to cut her hair, like every modern Moscow woman who wears a sensible little hat rather than the more traditional woollen shawl (p. 46). However, for all her enthusiasm for Soviet Russia and these practical attempts to shift her positionality, Nobuko's lack of proletarian credentials keep her from properly belonging. After what she perceives as disrespectful treatment from the writers Boris Polnyak²¹ and Vera Kember,²² Nobuko thinks that a Japanese working woman, if she had managed to come to Russia, would have been treated better. Such a woman, regardless of her nationality, would be 'linked to the Soviet workers in their entirety' (*Sobietio no rōdōsha no zentai to tsunagatte iru*) (p. 161). Nobuko understands that it is natural that various workers' organisations have ignored her overtures; she has nothing to teach them and they do not need her. Nobuko feels herself to be extraneous to the great humming machine that is Soviet Moscow, and this exclusion hurts. However she directs her hurt and anger towards Polnyak and Kember, non-workers who 'curry favour' (*kobiru*) with the proletariat (p. 161). She has a similar moment of outrage in Leningrad, when, at the Smolny, the administrator of the Women's Section tells her superior that the two Japanese visitors are not Party members. A

²¹ Modelled on symbolist writer Boris Pilnyak (1894–1938), whose ambivalent attitude to the communist regime and socialist realism caused repeated controversy throughout his career. He eventually fell from favour in 1937 and was executed as a counter-revolutionary. In her article 'The Present Situation of Soviet Literary Circles' (*MYZ* Vol. 9, 308-348), Yuriko describes Pilnyak as the leader of the 'fellow traveller' writers, who 'betrayed' the proletariat by writing about collectivisation in a 'counter-revolutionary way'. See also Struve (1972: 39-42, 223-28).

²² Modelled on Vera Inber (1890-1972).

distinction is made here between the snooty, slim ‘intellectual woman’ (*chishiki fujin*) in elegant skirt and blouse who makes this offensive comment, and her superior, a warm-hearted *sarafan* (kaftan)-wearing woman, Anna Simova, who welcomes them as guests without any bureaucratic cavil. She is described approvingly as having a ‘simple appearance’ (*maru de soboku na gaiken*), like a woman who was a ‘neat, dexterous laundress’ (*kimochi no sappari shita sentaku jōzu no onna no yō ni*), possessing a natural warmth and freshness, qualities that for Nobuko embody the true nature of Soviet society, as opposed to the inauthenticity, coldness and social airs of people like the administrator and certain writers (pp. 281-283). Simplicity, naturalness and warmth are also qualities ascribed to Nobuko, so that her ‘merging’ with new Russia has an element of inevitability, making her occasional exclusion all the more the cause of chagrin.

Nobuko’s desire to completely, physically, immerse herself in the new Soviet reality is expressed further through a change of lodging. After three months, Nobuko and Motoko are weary of hotel life and they seek private lodgings in order to experience ‘the simmering life of Moscow, right down to the bottom’ (*gota gota nitate iru Mosukuva seikatsu no soko made furete ikitagatta*) (p. 163). The motif of ‘going in deep’ is repeated in graphically physical terms. Returning on the bus from viewing a house on the outskirts – which they reject for being too far away for late-night theatre – Nobuko thinks that their life is gradually approaching the ‘entrails’ (*zōfu*) of the life of Muscovites, which cannot be understood only from the central areas of Tverskaya and Red Square (p. 164). When they move into the flat of Engineer Rybakov in the Ostozhenka neighbourhood, Nobuko feels they are finally able live a ‘truly normal Moscow life’ (*hontō ni heibon na Mosukuwa kurashi*) (p. 190). This ‘normality’ or ‘averageness’ is embodied by the fact that there is no samovar to boil water for tea at the Ostozhenka flat. Nobuko had always associated the samovar with ‘Russian’ life, but in modern, Soviet Moscow, everyone uses ordinary aluminium kettles on a gas or coal range to make their tea, and this material detail gives Nobuko ‘a real feeling of a new way of life’ (*atarashii seikatsu no jikkan*) (p. 191). She and Motoko take part in this ‘average life’ by eating pickled red cabbage and roast duck at the local cafeteria (*shokudō* glossed as *stolovaya*) (pp. 191-92). The neighbourhood cinema is a small affair on the third floor of the

food coop and the stolid yet 'quietly content' (*odayaka na manzoku o arawashite iru*) local clientele wear traditional felt outdoor boots (*valenki*); a contrast to the fancy Tverskaya cinemas the women had previously frequented in the city centre. In this environment, Nobuko feels her 'centre of gravity sink' (*jūshin o shizume*) and the 'sole of her mind's foot' (*kokoro no ashi no ura*) begins to touch something, presumably the 'bottom' of Moscow life (p. 192).

Her particular, visceral experience of Moscow life affects Nobuko as a writer. In drafting an article for publication – a direct reference to Yuriko's 'A Record of Moscow Impressions' – she notes a new tension, like a 'scuffle [*kakutō*] in her heart' (p. 233). In trying to express Moscow's 'colours, movements, sounds and feelings' as she has experienced them, Nobuko finds her style becoming fragmented, impressionistic and fast-paced. She likens it to Eisenstein's films and Meyerhold's plays, and ascribes this change to the stimulation of living in Moscow (p. 233-34). The experience of Moscow is not merely something that Nobuko 'observes outside herself' (*Nobuko no soto ni miete iru genshō*), but something that she 'absorbs into herself', enabling her 'to dig deeply into herself' (*jibun no naka e samazama na mono o ukeire, jibun to iu mono o sore ni yotte hakkutsu shite mo ita*) (p. 234). The intensity and physicality of her Moscow life is changing Nobuko to the extent that she can no longer write as her old self; however, this experience and this new self is as yet beyond her expressive abilities (p. 234).

Nobuko's emerging awareness of Soviet Russia as distinct from the Russia she imagined and loved from nineteenth-century literature is expressed, in this first stage, in terms of 'old' and 'new'. Nobuko and Motoko spend the summer of 1928 in Leningrad, which lost its status as capital city to Moscow after the 1917 revolution. The contrast between Leningrad/St Petersburg as 'old' Russia and Moscow as the new, Soviet Russia is manifest for Nobuko by the surroundings and atmosphere she perceives in Leningrad. The Leningrad branch of VOKS, housed in an old mansion, has a hushed atmosphere that Nobuko describes as a 'cut-glass' (*tegirei na kiriko garasu*) plate of hors d'oeuvres compared to the 'boiling soup pot' (*nietate iru sūpu nabe*) of the Moscow VOKS (p. 277). In Moscow, people are sublimated within the 'huge organism called Soviet society' (*Sobieto shakai to iu ōki na yūkitai*), a mechanism she likens to a bicycle wheel turning so quickly that its

individual spokes are invisible (p. 278). In Leningrad, the tempo is slower and rules are more relaxed: they are able to visit the Women's Section of the Leningrad Soviet, housed in the Smolny Institute,²³ four days in a row with only the one letter of introduction and without any intervention by VOKS (pp. 278-80). Despite Nobuko's intoxication with the vitality of Moscow, she is able to appreciate the more relaxed atmosphere of the Smolny in Leningrad that allows her speak directly with the peasant women – styled 'delegates' – who have come in for political training (pp. 284-86).

The theme of the stale old and the vigorous new is reinforced when Nobuko and Motoko stay in the Pension Somorov on the outskirts of Leningrad, within the former Tsarist estate renamed Detskoye Selo (Children's Village, the present-day town of Pushkin). The 'social mood' of the pension is described by Nobuko as 'NEP' (p. 299), a disparaging reference to the New Economic Policy era (1921–28), the restoration of limited capitalism following the austerities of War Communism, which brought about a class of profiteers known as 'NEPmen'. The mostly elderly residents of the Pension Somorov avoid discussion of their pasts or of politics (p. 300), albeit with occasional slips into self-pity or reminiscence. By contrast, the youthful Sunday day-trippers and the vendors who sell them ice-cream and sunflower seeds are a 'lively wave of Soviet life' (*Sobieto seikatsu no pichi pichi shita nami*) breaking upon the grounds of Detskoye Selo (p. 308).

While in Pension Somorov, Nobuko receives news, via telegram, of the suicide of her younger brother Tamotsu back in Tokyo. Distraught, she finds comfort in the Sunday sound of singing and laughing and the distant view of Komsomol and Pioneer youths playing (p. 321), a scene of 'simplicity' (*tanjun*) and 'health' (*kenkōsa*) (p. 323). 'Simplicity' and 'health' reappear frequently as terms defining the new Soviet society, in opposition to the enervated, decadent aspect of 'old' societies, represented by the cities of 'Old Europe' and the literally past-it residents of the Pension Somorov. The only representative of youthful energy in the Pension Somorov, the maid Dasha, comments matter-of-factly that there used to be lots of student suicides in Russia too (p. 325). That unhealthy time is now over,

²³ A former school for daughters of the nobility, the Smolny Institute served as the Bolshevik headquarters in 1917.

and as Nobuko watches the ‘ordinariness’ (*heibonsa*) of young men and women walking about the park, ‘a new everydayness [*nichijōsei*] unfurls that is equal to her grief’ (p. 325). The sight of untroubled youths going about daily life assuages her sorrow and also demonstrates the living possibility of a healthy society in which youths such as her brother are not driven to self-destruction.

Throughout the novel, Nobuko’s presumption of living what she considers an authentic ‘Soviet life’ and her identification with Soviet Russia is at odds with her actual class positionality, which is not always acknowledged by Yuriko the narrator, as noted by Hirabayashi (1979a: 116) and Honda (1994). Nobuko’s assumption of a class-neutral, Soviet-identified positionality is demonstrated by the search, after the summer trip away, for what Nobuko considers appropriate lodgings. Back in Moscow, the Sokolsky household in the Ostozhenka complex is deemed too pretentious: the family dines at a white-clothed table and Nobuko does not feel at home with such a ‘high-ranking official’ (*jōkyū kanshi*). She prefers their previous lodging, the ‘lower-class’ (*gekyū*) household of Engineer Rybakov, its atmosphere epitomised by the rank body odour of their peasant maid (DH, Vol. 2, pp. 45-46).²⁴ In the event, the Sokolskys turn them out in short order to make room for a fellow official, possibly hiding from the purges. Nobuko feels this to be at odds with what, in light of one year’s experience, she regards as good, ‘Soviet-like’ (*Sobietorashii*) conduct, and attributes their behaviour to bureaucratism, a social evil targeted by the Soviet regime as antithetical to itself (pp. 47-53). When the women threaten to report the Sokolskys to VOKS, they are quickly found alternative lodgings within the Ostozhenka complex, with the Rukyanovs. Nobuko is relieved by their ‘modesty’ (*shisso*) and instantly trusts the wife’s ‘unsophisticated (*junboku*) face’ (p. 59). She prides herself on the fact that two women live modestly themselves, like ‘many honest Muscovites’ (*ōku no jitchoku na Mosukuvahito no dōyō ni*), in that they do not eat at the Savoy Hotel and hardly ever buy sweets, which are expensive in Moscow (p. 79). Nobuko’s desire to immerse herself in an ‘authentic’ Moscow life means associating only with ‘simple’ people and avoiding those she perceives as

²⁴ Domestic service continued and actually increased under the Bolsheviks in the 1920s. This reflected the influx of peasant women into the city, the failure of Bolshevik policy to liberate women from household duties, and the rise of a new Soviet elite. See Spagnolo (2006).

'former' people, intellectuals or the current Soviet elite, who display all the domestic affectations of the middle classes familiar to Nobuko from her own life. Thus, by having Nobuko identify with 'simple' folk and view the new elite critically as 'un-Soviet', Yuriko repositions her protagonist socially, presenting a younger, fictional self who in class terms is free-floating and able to choose her affiliation, untainted by the privilege of her upbringing and circumstances.

At this stage of the narrative, Nobuko's impressions of the Soviet Union are overwhelming sensory and physical, phrased in terms of 'energy', 'simplicity', 'health', and a machine-like tempo, embedded in detailed descriptions of mostly urban landscapes. Nobuko is compelled to go 'deeper' into the way of life embodied in these landscapes; her engagement with Russia, through the urban environments of Moscow and Leningrad, is described as primarily emotional and instinctive, not intellectual. A constant, underlying theme of the novel is the superiority of understanding gained through emotionally engaged, lived experience over knowledge that is merely intellectual. The emphasis on Nobuko's almost childlike capacity to throw herself physically and emotionally into her experience of Russia serves to demonstrate the authenticity of what she discovers, enabling her to resist the anti-Soviet arguments she encounters later in the narrative.

Critics have compared Yuriko's initial experience of Moscow to a religious conversion that transcended any rational critique (Kondo 2002: 176-77), but in *Dōhyō* Yuriko presents this as a positive. In her portrayal of Nobuko, Yuriko creates a naïve version of her younger self whose capacity for joyful immersion in direct, sensory experience, unmediated by prior prejudice, allows her an understanding of the reality of Soviet Russia that pre-empts any intellectual criticism and in retrospect helps explain the dogged faith that sustained Yuriko during the political oppression and privations of the 1930s and war years.

Nobuko and Motoko: experience vs knowledge

The gulf between lived experience and intellectually acquired knowledge is embodied by Nobuko's increasing distance from her companion Motoko, even though Motoko shares her love of Russia and is sympathetic to the Soviet project. Initially, this distance is signalled by the differences in how Motoko and Nobuko are

shown to experience Moscow, which is presented in terms of closed/open and intellectual/sensory. Motoko, who has come to improve her Russian, spends her days inside with her books, while Nobuko, who has no reason to be in Moscow other than as her companion, is dispatched to do the shopping and run errands, despite her very basic language skills. In fact, her lack of Russian makes her sensory experience all the more intense, unmediated by language. Walking along a boulevard, Nobuko sees children in thick coats playing on sleds; a Chinese woman with bound feet selling coloured balls; a Tartar vendor whose dark face contrasts sharply against the white snow and the yellow millet he is eating: 'The colour and movement entered Nobuko's heart like a painting or music' (*shikisai no sonna ugoki mo, e ka ongaku no yō ni Nobuko no kokoro ni haita*) (DH, Vol. 1, p. 51). She then cuts through the food market in Okhotny Ryad, which is described in exotic travelogue terms of sights and smells – old women selling eggs from baskets, black unidentifiable meat, lumps of butter, dead chickens. In the shop where Nobuko goes to buy cabbage and fish roe for their dinner, the floor is covered in wet sawdust and the air reeks of pickles and smoked fish (pp. 52-53). Back in the room at Hotel Passage, Motoko is eager to hear about Nobuko's experiences 'outside', but unwilling to sacrifice work time to go out herself, even if she is already fed up with her dusty labours. An explicit contrast is made in the narrator's mind between the 'faint stiffness' (*kazuka na katasa*) of the newspapers that Motoko uses as study material and Nobuko's eyes that 'sparkle freshly with all the vibrant impressions' (*samazama no inshō de mizumizushiku kagayaite ita me*) she has taken in (p. 54). While Nobuko is depicted as engaging with Moscow on an instinctive, joyful and energising way, Motoko's intellectual labours weary her as well as distancing her from the 'real' Russia that exists at street-level, underlining that the 'truth' of Soviet Russia can only be discovered by wholehearted lived experience.

Command of Russian – instinctive vs book-learned – is another marker of their respective relationships with the lived reality of Moscow. Nobuko depends on Motoko to translate for her, but Motoko has limited patience in summarising newspaper articles for her benefit and tells Nobuko she will pick up the language soon enough (pp. 55-56). In fact, Nobuko is so good at picking up spoken language by ear that she supersedes Motoko's hard-earned grammatical mastery. After an

episode in which Nobuko shows up Motoko's poor pronunciation during a private lesson, Motoko asks her to vacate their shared room for all her lessons henceforward (pp. 57-59). When they are invited by VOKS to a workers' club, Motoko is overcome by stage fright and asks Nobuko to speak instead. With her natural confidence, Nobuko says a few very simple sentences and is rapturously applauded, which 'binds her feelings more concretely to Moscow' (*Nobuko o Mosukuva no shinjō ni yori gutaiteki ni musubitsuketa*) (pp. 62-64). Again, Nobuko's receptivity to experience is shown to allow her a more organic, unforced connection to her surroundings than uptight Motoko, who remains at a distance. This distance is emphasised by Motoko's insistence on working with the Russian classics rather than the emerging Soviet literature, in face of Nobuko urging her to plunge into the new (pp. 64-65). Nobuko's Russia is what she lives and experiences on daily basis, while Motoko keeps it at a distance, not only by immuring herself in her room but by focusing on the past, a one-way interaction that does not challenge her sense of self in the way that Nobuko's self is laid wide open by her active engagement with the present. This opening-up is expressed in terms of a release from her 'stifling existence' (*ikigirushii sonzai*) in Japan, the claustrophobia of her marriage and then her life with Motoko. In Moscow, she is liberated by her child-like receptivity to the experience of Moscow. The city's strange intermingling of old and new 'stimulates all Nobuko's knowledge and sensibility' (*Nobuko no zenchishiki to kankaku o mezamashiku katsudō sase*) and gives her fresh zeal for life, which puts a distance between herself and Motoko (pp. 60-61).

Nobuko partly ascribes this difference to Motoko's immutable positionality as Japanese, compared to her own more worldly self, whose own national/ethnic positionality is presented as relatively relaxed. On one occasion, the two women are walking together in the market. Motoko is enraged by taunts of 'Chinawoman!' and the two have to flee the crowd after Motoko slaps her tormentor (pp. 102-104). Nobuko cannot understand why Motoko, who has not previously demonstrated prejudice against the Chinese back in Japan, should be insulted to be mistaken for one in Russia. Offended by this question, Motoko retorts that Nobuko is a 'cosmopolitan' (*kosumoporitan*) and that as a Japanese, Motoko can only manage the feelings of a Japanese person (p. 110). Nobuko reflects that she lives with

'hardly any consciousness of herself as a Japanese' (*aratamete jibun o nihonjin da to ishiki suru made mo nai hodo*); unlike other Japanese, she does not have the habit of appreciating foreign things by likening them to Japanese equivalents (p. 110). The implication that a strong sense of 'Japaneseness' can act as a barrier to experiences of the foreign is enacted physically and spatially when Nobuko is hospitalised over the winter of 1928–29. Left to her own devices, Motoko goes skating in the diplomatic enclosure, with other Japanese, inside a paling fence that keeps ordinary Muscovites out (DH, Vol. 2, p. 100). Nobuko feels that such exclusivity is out of character for Moscow and she cannot understand Motoko's choice to remove herself from Soviet life in this way and associate with diplomats (pp. 101-102). In hospital, Nobuko feels herself to be immersed in Soviet life ever more deeply (although she has paid extra for a private room) (p. 101). Motoko's desire for Russians not to see her fall over and her anger at being called a 'Chinawoman' are linked in Nobuko's mind. Although they have spent the same amount of time in Russia, Motoko has remained inner-directed and unchanged, unlike Nobuko, whose experience of Moscow has been outward and open, and thus transformative (p. 102). This difference is made explicit from the beginning of *Dōhyō*, prefiguring Nobuko's gradual sense of estrangement from her companion.

The new Soviet feminine

Central to Nobuko's ideological shift in positionality is her discovery that women in the Soviet Union can enjoy a fulfilling public life as citizens and workers, equal to men, without sacrificing their 'femininity' and the possibility of satisfying heterosexual relationships. This growing realisation, demonstrated by three key encounters during Nobuko's first year in Moscow, highlights another aspect of her gradual distancing from Motoko: her privileging of heterosexuality.

In *Dōhyō*, Yuriko retrospectively re-scripted her relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko, representing it, from Nobuko's perspective, as a very close, affectionate friendship between two professional women who had chosen to live together and share their lives. Motoko is not labelled a lesbian, but her masculine demeanour is unequivocally shown by her chain-smoking, her habit of wearing suits and her use of abrupt male language in contrast to Nobuko's demurely feminine speech style.

To what extent the original relationship between Yuasa Yoshiko and Yuriko was sexual is beside the point. Yoshiko later told her biographer Sawabe (1990: 205) that her relationship with Yuriko, although affectionate, was not particularly physical. In my view, the emotional intensity and exclusivity of their relationship and the fact that Yuriko and Yoshiko lived together and shared a life, made them a couple, regardless of the finer technical details of their shared physicality. In her analysis of letters between Yuriko and Yoshiko, Ōgata (2006) uncovers a relationship that was retrospectively ‘erased and warped’ in *Futatsu no niwa* and *Dōhyō*. Yuriko’s unacknowledged positionality as bisexual, or at the least, as not entirely a lifetime heterosexual, slips through in the occasional ambiguity of the Motoko narrative, when what is presented as ‘friendship’ slips into something else, as when Nobuko returns from Paris to Moscow and assuages Motoko’s jealousy by gestures that are more lover-like than friendly (DH, Vol. 3, p. 340). For Nobuko, the positive model of modernity represented by Soviet society embodies all that is ‘healthy’ and ‘natural’, which precludes same-sex relationships and unnaturally masculinised women. Yuriko’s repeated use of the word ‘nature/natural’ (*shizen*) to affirm a male-centred society and heterosexual relationships, and the difference between the sexes, is the subject of a study by Ōkawa (2001). In *Dōhyō*, the USSR is presented as heterosexual utopia in which women can be liberated while retaining their ‘naturalness’, as embodied by two female ‘roadsigns’, the nurse Natasha and the Party worker Anna Simova.

Nobuko is greatly impressed by her encounter with the warm, spontaneous, no-nonsense Anna Simova at the Smolny Institute in Leningrad (DH, Vol. 1, pp. 282-88). When Nobuko and Motoko take leave of her, she tells them that her husband has gone to the regions to organise agricultural collectivisation. They have an infant daughter, and in a week’s time they will all have a holiday together. In this simple, joyful description of her life is ‘a lively rhythm like a song and a keen delight in life’ (*uta no yō na katsudō no rizumu to tsuyoi seikatsu no kanki*) (p. 288) that awakens Nobuko’s envy. This heteronormative simplicity and joy embodies for Nobuko an ideal of womanhood. In the Soviet Union, relations between the sexes were being ‘rationally and emotionally liberated’ (*riseiteki ni mo kanjōteki ni mo kaihō sarete ite*), and Nobuko, who had given up on heterosexual fulfilment in Japanese society,

sees Anna Simova as embodying the possibility of a ‘fully bloomed’ (*sakisorotte*) existence (p. 291). The implication here that in the Soviet Union, a woman’s desire for heterosexual relations does not require her to sacrifice her autonomy and selfhood. When Nobuko admits to envy of the ‘fully bloomed’ and therefore fully ‘human’ (*ningenrashii*) Anna Simova, Motoko, not surprisingly, takes offence and suggests that she find herself a man (p. 291-92). Nobuko’s lips ‘go pale in disgust’ (*itowashisa de Nobuko no kuchibiru ga aosameta*) (p. 292) at this crudely physical interpretation. She is forced to reflect on the ‘hidden and abnormal thing’ (*kakusarete iru futsū de nai mono*) in their life together as two women (p. 293). Nobuko feels the ‘abnormality’ is more on Motoko’s side; for Nobuko, the difference between men and women is ‘as clearly made by nature’ (*shizen ga sore o kubun shite iru tōri hakkiri shite ite*) and Motoko is no ‘compensation’ (*daishō*) for a man – for all that Nobuko occasionally wants to brush her cheek against Motoko’s or touch her lips (p. 294). While she has enjoyed emotional and intellectual fulfilment with Motoko, Nobuko rejects the sexual implications of her choice, and ultimately, Motoko herself. By her emphasis on the healthy ‘naturalness’ of heterosexuality and the ‘abnormality’ of Motoko, Nobuko firmly repositions herself as heterosexual, despite her actual day-to-day existence as one half of a same-sex couple.

Another female ‘roadsign’ appears in the form of the nurse Natasha, who cares for Nobuko during her long hospitalisation. Seven months pregnant, Natasha embodies the benefits of the Soviet regime for women: she cannot be fired during her pregnancy and is entitled to paid leave and hospital care. She is also studying medicine in the evening ‘Labour Faculty’ (DH, Vol. 2, p. 106-110).²⁵ Although Nobuko has been on VOKS sightseeing tours of maternal health facilities, this reality only comes alive for her by meeting Natasha (p. 108), who makes her reflect on her own situation. When Nobuko married her first husband Tsukuda, she had not realised that under Japanese law, a woman lost her legal identity upon marriage and depended on a husband’s consent for divorce (p. 111). She admires the

²⁵ Natasha appears under the name ‘Tanya’ in ‘Kodomo, kodomo, kodomo no Mosukuwa’ (Children’s Moscow, MYZ Vol. 9, 89-114), originally published in *Kaizō* (October 1930), which contains a lengthy description of the maternal benefits and protections offered by the Soviet Union.

conditions created by Soviet society, in which a young woman like Natasha can live, study, work – even while pregnant – and marry without fear or hypocrisy (p. 112). Nobuko compares Natasha's situation to that of 'Miss Jones', who nursed her during her stay in New York. Miss Jones was not allowed to wear her engagement ring while on duty; her life as a woman had to be kept separate from her public working life (pp. 113-15), unlike Natasha, whose life as a woman is fully integrated with her working life. She is described brimming with the 'pure, solemn beauty of a young, robust animal in litter' (*wakai kyōsō na dōbutsu haranderu yō na sōchō na junketsu na utsukushisa*) (p. 112), going cheerfully about her work, embodying the benefits of Soviet society for women, whose development as full human beings, in both public and private spheres, is not limited by gender as it is in Japan.

A third significant encounter foregrounds both femininity and nationality. Nobuko is introduced to Dr Lin by the diplomat 'Klaude' (Kuraude). After the ruddy faces and angular bodies on the streets of Moscow, Nobuko is gladdened by the sight of Dr Lin's Chinese skin and smooth black hair (DH, Vol. 1, pp. 90-96), an acknowledgement that she is aware of her obvious physical difference as a Japanese, however much she has tried to blend in. Nobuko has noticed two kinds of Chinese women in Moscow: the older women with bound feet who run basement laundries and sell trinkets in the streets, and the young girls come to study at Sun Yat-sen University, their serious faces speaking of the suffering inflicted upon revolutionaries back home. Their hair, significantly, is bobbed, a marker of the modern woman across the political divide (pp. 91-92). Chinese people far outnumber Japanese in Moscow, and the very few Japanese women are, for the most part, diplomatic wives, who dress in distinctively fine clothes. This is the only marker of their Japaneseness; even Motoko and Nobuko cannot distinguish between Chinese and Japanese on the streets of Moscow. On several occasions, they pass men who seem to be Japanese, but the recognition is not mutual. As in the case of the market woman whose taunts inflamed Motoko, the two are taken for Chinese, even by their own countrymen (p. 106). Unlike Motoko, Nobuko does not take offence at this imposed, generic East Asian identity. She feels a rapport with Dr Lin, whose manner is described as 'calm' (*ochitsuita*), 'quiet' (*shizuka de*), 'soft' (*yawarakai*), 'sagacious' (*sōmeirashii*), and 'warm' (*atatakasa*), feminine

qualities that set her apart from the officious female bureaucrat at the Smolny Institute and the brusque director of VOKS, Olga Kameneva²⁶ (pp. 15-22), who is described as having a powerful, angular, masculine jaw and prominent eyes (p. 19). Throughout the novel, the distinction is made between 'soft', 'natural' women and hard, masculinised ones; the former are presented as desirably feminine models of Soviet or politically aware womanhood, and thus as inspirational for Nobuko, while the latter are associated with the negative, non-authentic aspects of Soviet life, such as the bourgeois writer Vera Kember, who writes about nature rather than social problems and is perceived by Nobuko as cynically adapting to the new regime (pp. 155-56).

In this early stage of the novel, Yuriko as narrator emphasises Nobuko's political innocence by having her confide in Dr Lin that she has no political awareness, but 'feels' (*kanjite iru*) what she calls 'the contradictions of society' (*shakai no mujun*). Dr Lin asks if she thinks Moscow will change her. Nobuko acknowledges the transformative power of the city – 'Moscow is cooking. Nobody can live here without cooking' (*Mosukuwa wa niете imasu – dare datte, koko dewa nirarezu ni wa ikiraremasen*) – but says that she wants to 'cook' in her own way, taking the time she needs. Dr Lin assures her that she will find her own path (pp. 94-95). The encounter ends with Dr Lin's reflection on the difficult lives of both Chinese and Japanese people. Nobuko is aware of her selfish, narrow existence, compared to the ardent young Chinese women students who will suffer and fight for their people's freedom (pp. 95-96), an awareness that prefigures her choice, at the end of the novel, to return to Japan to suffer and fight for the communist cause.

These three female 'roadsigns' in the first stage of Nobuko's journey – Anna Simova, Natasha and Dr Lin – demonstrate that political awareness and liberation do not preclude 'natural', heteronormative femininity, opening the way for Nobuko to reject the same-sex relationship she has chosen, under the constraints of Japanese society, with Motoko. In these encounters, Nobuko's own positionality as a woman is foregrounded as she implicitly compares her own situation and

²⁶ Olga Kameneva (1883–1941) was the sister of Leon Trotsky, who had been expelled from the Party in November 1927 and sent into internal exile, along with her husband, Lev Kamenev. Kamenev recanted in 1928 and was allowed to return to the Party, but was purged in 1935 (Service 1997). At the time Kameneva met Yuriko/Nobuko, her own position was precarious, to say the least.

considers the possibilities of the Soviet/communist feminine, including a new kind of heterosexual relationship.

Art, self and progress

Nobuko's political development is entwined with her sense of self as an artist, which is challenged by her experience of the new Soviet life embodied by Moscow. A visit to a photographic exhibition on the writer Maxim Gorky (1868-1936) forces Nobuko to consider not only her own purpose as a writer but her middle-class privilege (pp. 206-233). A much-photographed child, Nobuko is shocked by the absence of any pictures of Gorky as an infant or youth, and becomes ashamed of her snobbery towards the 'country bumpkin' (*inakappoi*) (DH, Vol. 1, p. 211) behaviour of people with cameras, currently in vogue among Soviet youth – ordinary people whose lives had never been considered worthy of any record. She reflects that as an individual born of poverty who had endured great hardship, Gorky's story is representative of the Russian people and they acknowledge him as their own writer (p. 214). Nobuko asks herself, for whose sake is she a writer? (p. 215). Her interest in the Soviet Union is not matched by any corresponding need by the Russian people for her as a writer (p. 216). In fact, she is not necessary to anyone, not as a mother, wife or a middle-class woman writer. She had come to Russia with a profound desire to live authentically, 'as herself' (*jibun no matomo ni*) (p. 216), but for what purpose and for whom? This lengthy episode highlights how Nobuko's emotional identification with Russia/the Soviet Union challenges her previously unconsidered positionality as a middle-class writer, forcing her to think about what kind of writer and person she wants to be.

The role of artist in society comes to the fore again, toward the end of their first year in Moscow, when the Japanese expatriate community is thrown into a state of patriotic pride and excitement by the visit of a kabuki troupe (DH, Vol. 2, pp. 9-41). A long section is devoted to Nobuko and Motoko's association with two figures attached to the troupe, the film director Nakadate Kōichirō and the young

actor Nagahara Kichinosuke.²⁷ On the surface, this seems something of a detour from the main communist conversion narrative; however, through her protagonist's long conversations with these characters, Yuriko as narrator is exploring the role of art and the artist in politics. Nagahara is impatient with the tradition-bound world of kabuki and eager to visit Berlin to see developments there. Nakadate's interest is in Soviet film; accompanied by the two women, he makes a special trip to the Sovkino studios to watch director Sergei Eisenstein at work.²⁸ Nobuko is inspired by Nagahara and Nakadate's attitude to life, 'staking themselves in the future' and 'advancing towards tomorrow' (*ashita wa ashita ni kui o uchikonde zenshin shite yukō*) (p. 20). Nagahara's desire to move beyond kabuki despite the huge social and technical obstacles affirms for Nobuko that she too is looking for something new, even while she carries the legacy of the old within her (p. 29).

The Sasa family: repository of class privilege

The immense challenge to Nobuko's class positionality presented by Soviet Russia is, for the most part, refracted onto her family. Nobuko's lived experience of socialism and her sincere identification with Soviet Russia enable her to distance herself from bourgeois values, even while her travels abroad are enabled by bourgeois wealth and connections. The distance between the newly aware Nobuko and her politically oblivious family back in Tokyo at this stage is one of values, expressed as the contrast between the healthy vigour of Moscow life, as experienced by Nobuko, and the inert, wasteful life of the Sasa household (DH, Vol. 1, p. 122). When her brother Tamotsu writes to her about the greenhouse given him as a high school matriculation present, she visualises the scene at the First Moscow University and the slogan, 'All working people, study!', and writes back to Tamotsu to berate him for his unthinking privilege in accepting a present that would fund a more gifted

²⁷ In 1928, a kabuki troupe led by Uchikawa Sadanji II (1880-1940) toured Moscow and Leningrad. Accompanying this troupe was the actor Kawarasaki Chōjurō IV [Kawarasaki Toranosuke] (1902-1981), who became a communist sympathizer as a result of his travels and the actor turned film director Kinugasa Teinosuke (1896-1982), who came to Europe via Moscow in 1928 with his film 'Jūjirō', known in English as 'Shadows of the Yoshiwara'. This was the first Japanese film shown in Europe. I assume the character of Nakadate Kōichirō is modelled on Kinugasa, and that of Nagahara Kichinosuke on Kawarasaki.

²⁸ Sergei Eisenstein (1898-1948) was famous for his development of the montage technique.

and worthy poor student for a whole year (p. 121). Living in Moscow, Nobuko is being transformed, 'greedily' (*donyoku ni*) absorbing each impression of a 'seething way of life that knew no stagnation' (*futtōshi teitai suru koto shiranai seikatsu*) (p. 127), by contrast to her family and friends back in Japan, who are stuck in the same way of life.

Nobuko is closest to her father Taizō, an Anglophile who prides himself on his English-style 'common sense', which he refers to in English, rather than using the Japanese *jōshiki* (p. 258). However, his concern for his daughter's political proclivities alienates her. A detailed description of Moscow May Day celebrations in 1928 is cut through by Nobuko's musings on a newspaper sent to her by Taizō, carrying articles about the 15 March arrests of communists in Japan. He has highlighted the headline of the relevant article in red ink. Although Yuriko the narrator insists that Nobuko knows nothing of politics and has no particular feelings about these nationwide arrests, her time in Moscow has habituated her to the existence of communist parties to represent the workers, and these red-ink marks arouse in her a sense of resistance (p. 246-47). The motif of the red-ink marks emphasising the new distance between father and daughter recurs throughout the novel, as does the theme of Nobuko's instinctive, experiential acceptance of communism.

After Tamotsu's suicide in August 1928, Nobuko's sense of physical and emotional estrangement from her family, who embody her class positionality, is presented graphically as an image of Nobuko with the back half of her body – symbolising the past – ripped away, leaving her front half – facing the future – all the more securely attached to Russia (pp. 338-339). The second volume begins with an affirmation of the changes wrought in Nobuko, in particular, her intensified connection to the Soviet Union. Tamotsu's death is represented as freeing Nobuko from her family and what they represent – a complacent, stifling bourgeois existence, as opposed to a vitally lived one. She feels herself a 'small hard wedge' (*chiisai katai kusabi*) driven into a wall: 'her existence had been nailed into the Soviet Union and had stuck there' (*jibun to iu sonzai o Sobieto shakai e uchitsukurare, soko ni tsukisasatta*) (DH, Vol. 2, p. 7). Following her whole-hearted immersion in Soviet Russia, Nobuko's rejection of bourgeois values, as represented

by her family and by what she calls 'old Europe', is foregrounded in the second stage of her journey.

The rejection of 'Old' Europe: April–November 1929

Towards the end of her hospital stay, in April 1929, Nobuko receives news that her family are heading out to Europe to see her. Dreading that they will attempt to take her home, Nobuko plans with Motoko to meet them in France. For the next seven months, Nobuko passes through several key European cities, all of which she experiences and 'reads' as meaningful stages in her ideological journey. Various 'roadsigns' – experiences and encounters – in each city consolidate her emotional identification with the Soviet project and her rejection of her class of origin and Motoko. At the same time, her sense of self as a writer both encourages and complicates her emerging political worldview.

Warsaw

From the very beginning of her European journey, Yuriko depicts Nobuko as someone who conducts herself as a fellow-traveller whose emotional loyalty is with Soviet Russia. During their transit in Warsaw, the two women seek out the local May Day march, despite the warnings of the hotel manager (DH, Vol. 2, pp. 182-89). Caught up in a clash between right-wing thugs in black armbands and a small contingent of marchers in a square, they seek refuge in a café. The interior of the café is calm, while bodies are pressed against the glass outside. Nobuko notes sadly that there is no singing, few flags, and no women among the marchers. Watching the brief clash, Nobuko's hand 'involuntarily forms a fist inside her glove' (p. 186), a common visual trope in Soviet cinema (e.g., as in *Battleship Potemkin*, described by Taylor 2000: 32) and left-wing iconography in general, signifying solidarity and resistance, although the fist – like this small crowd of marchers – was generally male (see Coutts 2012).

When Nobuko and Motoko take a sightseeing tour in a cab, she is disgusted by the contrast between the scenes of luxury in the New Town, the smart private cars and palatial residences with lawns and fountains, and the claustrophobic poverty of the Old Town, the Jewish ghetto, which is described in detail: ragged

laundry hanging out in the street, half-naked women in the windows, the strangely docile filthy children (pp. 191-92). Profound inequality is inscribed on the city landscape, which Nobuko observes with her newly aware Soviet eyes: the rich of Warsaw take their wealth so much for granted they feel no need to hide it (pp. 193-94), even though it exists alongside utter deprivation. Nobuko, an outsider, situates herself on the side of the poor and oppressed, seeing 'Old Europe' through her fresh experience of the Soviet Union. Her only reference to Japan is to compare the massacre of Jews to that of Koreans in riots after the 1923 earthquake (p. 192). For Nobuko, the new Soviet Union is the standard by which she judges 'Old Europe' and its cities, as the representative of capitalism; by identifying with the USSR, she rejects Europe rather than Japan, indicating the extent to which Nobuko is able to detach herself from her national and class origins and position herself as a free-floating observer whose loyalties are chosen rather than intrinsic.

Vienna

Nobuko and Motoko spend several weeks in Vienna, a city that foregrounds Nobuko's ambivalent class and national positionalities. The city's prosperous atmosphere (DH, Vol. 2, p. 197), embodied by the ornate interiors of its famous cafes, makes Nobuko reflect upon the profoundly conservative instincts of the inhabitants, whom she perceives to want a settled and stable middle-class existence, having lost their nobility in the Great War (p. 202). However, at the same time as observing critically with her new Soviet eyes, Nobuko actively engages with the consumer and touristic pleasures of Vienna (p. 195). The two women visit art galleries, stay in a pension where a maid in black livery and a lace cap serves white bread and coffee for breakfast, buy new clothes, and view the historical flight of the Graf Zeppelin from the windows of the Japanese legation (pp. 205-206). Nobuko mingles in the bustling streets, and her transformed appearance, caught in the shop-windows, is that of a feminine and fashionable Viennese-style outfit in lace (p. 206). The city itself reflects back to Nobuko the material changes it has wrought in her: her swift re-adaptation to an urban consumer lifestyle she had enjoyed in Tokyo and forfeited in Moscow.

In Vienna, Nobuko is confronted by memories of her former piano teacher, Kawabe Misako,²⁹ a long section in which Nobuko ponders the question of a woman's ambitions as an artist and the role of the artist in society (pp. 212-224). Having established her reputation in Japan, Misako came to Vienna determined to 'conquer the world with her Beethoven' (*jibun no Bētōvuen sekai o seifuku shite kuru*) (pp. 221). Told by her European professor that her technique was completely wrong and that she needed to learn from scratch, she fell into despair and killed herself by jumping out the window of her lodgings. Nobuko recalls her horror at Misako's vaunting ambitions and 'genius-ism' (*tensaishugi*) (p. 223) before her teacher's departure for Europe. Around the same time, Nobuko was resisting her mother Takeyo's desire for her daughter to achieve literary fame with her first novel, which had just been published (pp. 223-24). In rejecting the hypocritical Japanese burden of modesty, which fell particularly heavily on women, Misako at least was honest in her drive for individual glory, which reflected the society in which she lived. However, Nobuko rejects for herself (after many pages of reflection) the lifestyle of a 'woman of letters' (*jobunshi*), even though she has as yet no alternative path in mind (p. 224). She is depicted as continuing to struggle in the isolation this entails, all the while aware of how the lives of writers and musicians have changed in Soviet Russia. The reader understands that Nobuko is searching for a wider, less individualistic sense of purpose as a writer, and that what she has seen in the Soviet Union may offer a way forward.

Parallel to Nobuko's comfortable material experience of Vienna is her awareness of May Day riots in Berlin and clash between armed police and workers, which she reads about in English-language newspapers. She does not understand why May Day marches have been banned in Germany, a republic with a Social Democrat government (pp. 202-204). The city government of Vienna at this time was also Social Democrat, and 'Red Vienna' had a reputation for its socialist reforms. A young man from the Japanese legation, Kurokawa Takakazu, takes them sightseeing in the famous Karl Marx Hof housing complex for workers in the outskirts (pp. 226). When they challenge him on the absence of residents, he

²⁹ Modelled on the pianist Kuno Hisa (1886-1925).

responds that everyone is at work. There is none of the 'seething vigour of life in motion' (*ugoite iru seikatsu no kakki ga tagitte ita*) (p. 229) that Nobuko has witnessed in the Novodevichy new town and associates with Moscow. Motoko suggests that the complex is merely for show (p. 229). An argument ensues between the women and Kurokawa about the relative merits of Soviet Russia and Social Democrat Vienna, a schematic exchange in which Nobuko's emotional loyalties and experiential knowledge triumph over Kurokawa's intellectual scepticism. His use of 'intellectual' German words – *Bildung* (culture), *geistige* (spiritual/ intellectual) – that the women do not understand reveals him to be pretentious, indicating that his ideas are based on high-flown discourse rather than grounded in reality (pp. 230-240). As a final appeal, Kurokawa says he could not bear that under 'Bolshevik theory', 'a Sasa Nobuko' would give up her writing and become a cleaning-woman (p. 240). Nobuko ripostes that intellectuals have a role within socialism (p. 241). The ongoing insistence in the narrative on Nobuko's political and economic ignorance and the 'authentic' experiential and emotional foundations of her knowledge of the USSR sit uneasily with the chunks of socialist rhetoric she delivers as the novel progresses, demonstrating a slippage between Nobuko the protagonist, who is supposedly still a political innocent, and Yuriko the communist narrator.

All the Japanese Nobuko meets in Europe are middle or upper class, so her rejection of her class of origin is necessarily entangled in her positionality as Japanese. In Vienna, the legation is the pivot of the small expatriate community whose pan-European outlook and attitude of 'repulsion' (*hanpatsu*) towards the USSR reflects that of the Austrian Socialist Democratic administration (p. 284). The consul's wife, conscious of being in the so-called world capital of music, makes music the focus of her socialising. When Nobuko asks why no European musicians tour the USSR (p. 211), their polite conversation is abruptly terminated and Nobuko is acutely aware of the gulf between herself and such Japanese expatriates. Although she does not (as yet) have a 'fixed political viewpoint' (*seijiteki na tachiba o kimete iru no de wa nai*), her lived knowledge of the Soviet Union puts her in opposition to them (p. 237). Nobuko's loyalty to the Soviet Union is not presented as ideological and therefore intellectually willed and subject to persuasion; it is a

natural and therefore 'authentic' outgrowth of her material and observed experience, which throughout the novel trumps intellectual knowledge. Nobuko's emotional, experiential grasp of the 'truth' is continually confirmed by her experience of non-Russian European cities.

The next stage in the journey is Berlin, where encounters with various compatriots and particular experiences of the city highlight Nobuko's complex positionality as a young, middle-class Japanese woman with passionate pro-Soviet views.

Berlin

By contrast to Vienna, with its small expatriate community, Berlin in its period of stagflation has drawn in large numbers of Japanese, with their own particular interests and motivations (DH, Vol. 2, p. 284). In Berlin, the social life of Nobuko and Motoko moves on two axes (p. 279), representing the youthful left and old right: their acquaintance from Moscow, the film director Nakadate Kōichirō, and another Japanese called Kawase Isao,³⁰ who is studying theatre, both of whom have proletarian affiliations (p. 248); and Dr Tsuyama Shinjirō, a scientist researching poison gas, a distant relative forced on Nobuko by her mother Takeyo (p. 253). Nobuko prefers the company of the young men, people 'trying to live widely in the world' (*sekai o hiroku ikiyō toshite iru*) (p. 247). For left-wing Japanese men at least, cosmopolitan Berlin and its large, fragmented expatriate population offers the freedom to explore other ways of life. There is no mention in *Dōhyō* of any Japanese women exploring such freedom, artistic or political, in Berlin.

It is Kawase who shows Nobuko a key site in her self-definitional journey: the aftermath of the May Day clashes in the working-class area of Neukölln (pp. 248-250). As a memorial to the workers shot by police, the shapes of their fallen bodies have been outlined in white paint in the square in front of the Karl Leibknecht building, the headquarters of the German Communist Party (KPD). The dead workers are literally inscribed on the surface of the city. Kawase explains that

³⁰ Kawase Isao is described as associating with Nakadate in Berlin; however, there are no entries for Berlin in the 1929 diary, nor any mention in the 1930 diary of such a person passing briefly through Moscow on his way back to Japan, as Kawase does later in *Dōhyō*. I have been unable to ascertain the original model.

the German working classes do not understand the true nature of the Social Democrats, who will inevitably betray them, confirming Nobuko's instinctive reaction to the model worker Karl Max Hof residence built by the Social Democrat administration in Vienna.

Nobuko is excited to be able to enter the KPD HQ and visit the bookshop. In Moscow, although the Communist Party acronym is ubiquitous in her daily life through the radio and in print, both as a Japanese and a non-Party member, Nobuko has no entrée to the Party HQ within the Kremlin walls (p. 251). As a fellow traveller in Berlin, however, she can enact her political sympathies by physically entering the inner spaces of communism. In the KPD shop, she buys art books: George Grosz (1893-1959), Käthe Kollwitz (1867-1945) and Franz Masereel (1879-1982), all artists with communist sympathies who produced scenes of modern urban life. Yuriko refers to these artists in her later *Sobieto kikō* articles as a kind of descriptive shorthand, indicating the extent to which art both reflected and informed her view of the modern, capitalist cityscape. In Berlin, the city as a space that is both inscribed upon and represented artistically is replete with political meaning that Nobuko is now able to read and understand, even while she experiences the city materially as a middle-class tourist.

Kawase suggests that she write for *Senki*,³¹ a journal Nobuko has not seen before although she was aware of proletarian literature while still in Japan. She has doubts about the literary style, including that of Kobayashi Takiji's '15 March 1928', and about the ponderous theoretical debate; all the same, she feels an 'attachment' (pp. 296-98). Here, Nobuko's ideological sympathies are shown as being in conflict with her literary sense. As a writer, she is not at this point prepared to compromise her notion of literary quality to her growing political inclination.

On the other social 'axis', Dr Tsuyama invites Nobuko to talk on conditions in the USSR at a meeting of Japanese medical scientists in Berlin. No wives are present, and her 'schoolgirl figure' (*gakuseippoi sugata*) is out of place in the clubby masculine atmosphere that smells of tobacco and dry wool (p. 255). Nobuko enters

³¹ *Senki* (Battle Flag, 1927-1931) was the official journal of NAPF from May 1928 to December 1931. The All-Japan Federation of Proletarian Arts (Zen-Nihon Musansha Geijutsu Renmei) was known by its Esperanto acronym NAPF (Shea 1964: 128, 200).

the room very aware that as a young woman she will not be taken seriously by these elderly Japanese men. She is in effect back in Japan, where women have no speaking authority, unlike what she has witnessed in the Soviet Union. When Tsuyama, introducing her, says she will discuss medical issues in the USSR, she protests that she has no specialist knowledge. Instead she talks about her actual experience – the medical facilities in factories, maternal and child care clinics, her own treatment in the university hospital. In a style that is ‘conversational’ (*zadanteki*) and ‘childishly rambling’ (*osanaï yō na iumawashi*), Nobuko talks about the ‘reality’ (*genjitsu*) of Soviet life, which she has ‘seen with her own eyes’ (*jibun no me de mite kite iru*) (p. 257). Under the epistemological norms established by Yuriko as narrator of *Dōhyō*, what is seen and sincerely experienced is necessarily true. Nobuko counters the doctors’ specialist language with ‘straightforward language’ (*atarimae no kotoba*) (p. 263) and concludes by telling them they should all go to see for themselves the reality of Soviet Russia, since Moscow is only a night’s train ride away. Nobuko is clearly the winner in this encounter, although without undermining her femininity: she is described in terms of her ‘small figure’ (*kogara*) and ‘the soft contour of her neck and shoulders’ (*yuruyaka na kubi kara kata e no rinkaku*) picked out by the overhead light (p. 258). In a rare overlap of milieus, Kawase and Nakadate have been listening up the back. When Nakadate congratulates Nobuko, she blushes and puts a demure hand to her cheek in a ‘child-like way’ (*kodomorashiku*) (p. 266). Whenever Nobuko’s lived experience of the Soviet Union is shown to triumph over male intellectual scepticism, the heteronormative order is maintained by an emphasis on her soft, physically unthreatening feminine demeanour.

Nobuko’s sexual positionality is challenged by the final significant ‘roadsign’ in Berlin, when their male companions take Nobuko and Motoko to a lesbian café (pp. 304-308). Honda Shūgo could not see the relevance of this episode to the novel as a whole (1994: 271); in my reading, this is a key scene in which Nobuko’s rejection of Motoko is justified by her association with bourgeois perversion, even though Motoko is, like Nobuko, a fellow-traveller and socialist sympathiser. As usual, Nobuko is wearing a dress and Motoko is wearing a suit, which Nobuko has

always ascribed to their different body shapes.³² In the lesbian café, women in suits are dancing with women in dresses. They all look ‘thin’ (*yasete*) and ‘sickly’ (*kaoiro ga warukatta*), and there is something ‘weirdly dirty and abnormal’ (*bukimi ni shita byōteki na yogore no kanji*) about the pomaded hair of the women in suits (p. 305). The recognition Nobuko perceives in the looks directed by these women at herself and Motoko disgusts her, and she is horrified that the two men have assumed a connection between the two women and the atmosphere of this ‘pervert’ (*sakutōteki [=tōsaku] na*)³³ café (p. 307). She leaves the café with a sense of ‘lost innocence’ (*mujaki o ushinatte*), having ‘glimpsed the pit of degeneracy of relations between women’ (*onna to onna to no kankei no taihai no soko o nozokimita*), and newly reminded of the ‘healthiness’ (*sukoyaka*) of Moscow life (p. 307). She does not dare discuss this with Motoko, for fear of provoking another argument like the one they had after meeting Anna Simova in Leningrad. Nobuko’s physical sense of shock at the café scene is similar to her shock at seeing the white circles on Karl Liebknecht square (p. 307): the violent repression of the workers and sexual decadence are two disturbing, negative aspects of the same city.

While Nobuko’s physical experiences of Berlin and Moscow are similarly described in terms of mechanistic tempo, in the case of Berlin, this is negative and ultimately repulsive. In Berlin, Nobuko feels herself to be within a ‘huge, complex, perpetually moving system’ (*koku mo tomarazu ugoiteiru daikibo de fukuzatsu na kikō*), a sensation that is physically enacted by her nerve-wracking encounter with the paternoster lift in the Deutsche Bank building (p. 284-85). However, unlike the energising tempo of Moscow, which Nobuko has experienced positively as a ‘boiling pot’ and a ‘machine’, Berlin’s rapid, mechanical pace confuses her and arouses her resistance (p. 286). By the end of her stay, she finds Germany ‘creepy’ (*kimi ga warui*). Even the paintings in the national gallery repel her (p. 308), despite her enthusiasm for art. Nobuko reflects that Japan resembles rule-bound, hierarchical Berlin more than it does Soviet society. In Berlin, there is no sign of a new way of life being built (i.e., socialism); the communists and social democrats are opposed

³² The photograph on the page following the abstract shows Yuriko’s feminine appearance and Yuasa Yoshiko’s mannish attire.

³³ The characters for ‘pervert’ (*tōsaku*) are reversed in the text. I cannot find any incidence of ‘sakutō’ in dictionaries or online.

to each other, while the militarists prepare for another war behind the scenes. The seriousness of new German art, according to Kawase and Nakadate, has ended up in a 'rotting drain' (*kusatta dobu*), swallowed up by American-style nude revues (p. 310). Her time in Weimar Berlin affirms Nobuko's identification with the anonymous 'workers' and the Soviet way, which represents all that is 'healthy' and 'natural', as opposed to capitalist decadence and the treachery of social democracy.

Paris

Compared to the other cities encountered by Nobuko in her journey, cities in which politics are visible in the surface – as in the forms of dead workers on the streets of Berlin – Paris is a city of pleasure and frivolity in which politics are invisible or easily ignored by affluent foreign tourists. For Japanese in the interwar period, Paris represented the arts, culture – and decadence, in the form of public sexuality, such as cabaret revues, that were still new and shocking in Japan (Slaymaker 2007: 110). In contrast to London, a political and economic centre, Paris was imbued with less onerous meanings for the Japanese traveller. For Nobuko, the experience of Paris represents her growing distance from her family, who are aligned with the city's middle-class pleasures, and her new awareness of political affairs beyond the selfish confines of personal life, a contrast that is starkly drawn by Yuriko the narrator as she redraws the boundaries of the traditional I-novel to situate her protagonist within historical events.

Nobuko's first stay in Paris is marked by the tension in her troubled family, who have arrived en masse: her mother Takeyo, father Taizō, 13-year-old sister Tsuyako, brother Kazuichirō and new sister-in-law Sae. (DH, Vol. 3, p. 8). Like Paris itself, the Sasa family is made to represent a litany of bourgeois sins – decadence, frivolity, waste, selfishness – from which Nobuko is shown to be distanced by the transformative experience of living in Soviet Russia. The unhealthy emotional control wielded by the sickly Takeyo is embodied by the brocaded package containing the ashes of the dead Tamotsu, which has accompanied the family to Europe. On first seeing Tsuyako, Nobuko notes with shock that she is badly dressed (p. 13), a 'pitiable' (*kawaisō*) figure who reflects the state of the Sasa household (p. 72-73). Sae is being used as a maid by Takeyo, while Kazuichirō sulks and does

nothing to help his wife (pp. 13-17). What Nobuko perceives as the ‘middle-class contemptibility’ (*chūryūteki na iyashisa*) of the Sasa way of travelling is epitomised by the hasty marriage of Sae and Kazuichirō, so that Sae’s dowry could be used to fund the trip (p. 38). Hearing this revelation from her brother and his wife, Nobuko doubts her father’s judgement, his so-called ‘English common sense’ (p. 38). It is up to Nobuko to rescue her family from the misery created by Takeyo’s domineering selfishness; tiresome emotional labour created by the Japanese family system, which Nobuko has been avoiding by sheer geographic distance. Mother and daughter are presented as two opposite poles of family power: Nobuko’s positive, active, quasi-Soviet personality is contrasted against the negative, inward-looking ‘Old World’ invalidism of Takeyo, like two ends of a battery.

Parallel to the inwardness and frivolity of the Sasa family’s life in Paris are world events that serve to highlight Nobuko’s shifting ideological positionality and her privileging of the political over the personal: in particular, Chiang Kai-shek’s policy of hostility towards the USSR (pp. 56-57). Reading about the ‘reality’ (*shinjitsu*) of events in the French Communist Party paper, *L’humanité*, Nobuko understands that Chiang is seeking the assistance of imperialist countries to suppress the Chinese masses, and that Japan’s role is subsidiary, that of ‘guard dog of the East’ (*tōyō no banken*), sending troops to Siberia support the imperialist effort (pp. 56-57). Long reportorial paragraphs of political developments between Republican China and the USSR, gleaned from *L’humanité*, are wedged between descriptions of the family drama in Paris, highlighting Nobuko’s frustration at the disjuncture between her life and her beliefs (p. 86). For Nobuko, large-scale events in the outside world are far more important than the overheated private space of the family. For her father Taizō, however, events in the China-USSR borderlands are no more than articles in foreign newspapers. Unlike Nobuko, he has no emotional investment in them. He is at ease with the lifestyle of a leisured tourist, ‘as if in this place called Paris there were no serious human thoughts, as if there was no hard, serious class struggle for people trying to develop themselves freely’ (*Pari to iu tokoro ni kibishii ningen no shisō ga nai yō ni, jiyū ni seichō shiyō to suru hitobito no kurushiku majime na kaikyū no tatakai ga nai yō ni*) (p. 59). Nobuko feels the distance between them grow even greater. Even when the French police round up

communists in Paris on 23 July, Taizō is indifferent, and Nobuko senses that he is relieved that such events are taking place in Paris rather than at home in Japan (p. 60).

Nobuko experiences her new political awareness and positionality as 'national borders living within her' (*jibun no naka ni ikite iru kokkyō*) (p. 58). Having passed through Harbin, the plains of North China and the forests of Siberia on her way to Moscow, Nobuko bears the visual and experiential imprint of these borderlands, visceral memories that make her feel homesick for Russia in Paris (p. 58). This homesickness is exacerbated by the contrast between the 14 July festivities celebrating the French Revolution, which seem no more than a drunken street party to Nobuko and Motoko, and the joyful, proud May Day celebrations they have witnessed in Moscow (pp. 50-53). They have no left-wing contacts in Paris to take them to the workers' festivities held by the CGTU (General Combined Trade Unions) in the working-class area of Paris (p. 53) – a role that will later be filled for Nobuko by Hachiya Ryōsaku.³⁴ Nobuko's shifting political positionality leaves her isolated in Paris. Her complete physical separation from French working-class life is emphasised when she catches an early train into the city centre (pp. 275-290). This is Nobuko's first experience of riding the Metro at 7am and she is astonished to find it crowded with flat-capped workers, reading *L'humanité*. She is more used to the 10am crowd of paunchy, bowler-hatted men (p. 275). The small Nobuko is physically crushed within the silent crowd of working-class men, their newspapers skimming the top of her head. By travelling at certain times of the day, living the city as a middle-class tourist, Nobuko has up to this point unintentionally avoided the proletariat with whom she emotionally identifies; her only point of commonality is that she too reads *L'humanité*, choosing the official communist perspective on the news over the mainstream, capitalist press. Her isolation at this stage from her political soulmates is emphasised by the image of the tiny Japanese woman amid the crowd of indifferent working-class men.

In Paris, Nobuko is made keenly aware of her positionality as Japanese, through the attitude of many Chinese there towards Japanese, as one of the

³⁴ Modelled on the economist Taira Teizō (1894-1978).

imperialist countries that treats China like a colony. In Chinese restaurants, she is treated in a business-like fashion, without the courtesy afforded other customers (p. 32). When she walks with her family in the park, Chinese youths are openly contemptuous as they pass. Feeling herself to be a different kind of Japanese from her elegant sister-in-law Sae and brother Kazuichirō, who live entirely for themselves, Nobuko is hurt by this treatment and ‘horribly aware of her own class’ (*kurushimu jibun no kaikyū o ishiki o jikaku shi*) (pp. 32-33), a positionality that in this instance she is unable to avoid, however much she usually distances herself from it. Her sympathies are naturally with the oppressed Chinese masses. She has seen with her own eyes the ‘admirable’ (*kenage na*) Chinese girls who have come Moscow to study at Sun Yat-sen University (p. 33), but her sympathy is of no account to the sneering Chinese youths in Paris, to whom she is merely another well-off Japanese, a citizen of an oppressive imperialist power. Nobuko is pained by this disjunction between her instinctive loyalty and external positionality.

Up to now, Motoko has served as Nobuko’s mentor, introducing her to Russian language and elementary Marxism. As Nobuko gradually pulls away from Motoko, she needs a new political mentor. Towards the end of their stay in Paris, the two women meet the economics scholar Hachiya Ryōsaku, an acquaintance from Tokyo (pp. 95-96). Nobuko is attracted to Hachiya as a potential teacher. He is not a social democrat mouthpiece like Kurokawa in Vienna nor an enthusiastic militarist like Tsuyama in Berlin; neither is he a weak youth like her brother Tamotsu, straining his ‘immature, sickly spirit’ (*osanaku hiyowa na seishin*) in search of ‘absolute truth’ (*zettai no tadishisa*) (p. 100). Nobuko is hungry to understand, ‘properly, from the heart’ (*shin no shin kara*), because she believes this kind of emotionally validated knowledge is ‘strong’ (*tsuyoi*) (p. 100), and Hachiya, who does not arouse her ‘resistance’ (*hanpatsu*), seems to offer such knowledge (p. 100). However, their relationship is put off until her return to Paris, when Motoko is out of the way.

The next stage of the Sasa family journey, to London, brings about the physical separation of Nobuko and Motoko. Motoko is fed up with existing on the fringes of the Sasa family drama and impatient to resume her studies. After a mere three days in London, she returns to Moscow on her own (pp. 88-89).

London

Nobuko is impatient to get to London, where, with her working knowledge of English, she will be better able to understand what is going on the world. Her desire for knowledge grows stronger and she leaves for London determined to 'get a grip on things' (*shikkari tsukamitai*) (DH, Vol. 3, p. 88). She is aware that she and her father Taizō have different 'maps' of London. Taizō's is nostalgic, based on his time in England as student during Nobuko's childhood. Nobuko's map contains the scene of Eleanor Marx and her children evicted on the pavement near the British Museum, saved from destitution by the locals. She has in her mind's eye the map of London used by Lenin during his years of exile, which she saw in the Revolutionary Museum in Leningrad. It is 'natural' for Nobuko (*Nobuko toshite no shizen de atta*) to think of Covent Garden not merely as a market, but as the location of the headquarters of the Communist Party of Great Britain (pp. 87-88). Her experience of Moscow enables her to see London differently, in the context of the revolutionary struggle.

Nobuko's relatively short³⁵ but ideologically crucial stay in London (pp. 108-126) is more or less identical to the account in Yuriko's 1930 article, 'London 1929', to be discussed in the next chapter. The style, unlike that of the article, is matter-of-fact, as if in writing the chapter Yuriko was working through a list of negative impressions that had been already formed and consolidated in the writing of 'London 1929', 20 years previously, and left to stand unchanged. Several key encounters are portrayed in flashback, in the course of a conversation with Hachiya soon after her return to Paris (pp. 131-133), perhaps reflecting the exigencies of a serialised novel written 'on the hoof', in which previous chapters could not be amended. Overall, Nobuko is very disappointed by London. In particular, she is disgusted by actions of the British Labour Party under MacDonald, its crushing of the 1927 miners' strike and lack of support for the millions of unemployed, which proves to Nobuko that social democracy and the unions have sold out the working classes – a point already demonstrated to her in Vienna and Berlin. The Japanese she met in London, similar to her father Taizō, had absorbed into themselves the

³⁵ Yuriko herself was in London from 4 August to 18 September 1929, a period of six weeks.

English line of 'fair play' and 'common sense', and make a point of beating Nobuko down in argument (p. 134). Kimura Ichio, a former businessman resident in London, offends Nobuko by confusing the dictatorship of the proletariat with the dictatorship of Mussolini (pp. 134-36). The scholar Toshine Ryōsuke queries the criticism of Bukharin's 'rightest tendency' in *Pravda* and refers to the dictatorial nature of the CPSU. Nobuko, whose knowledge of communist theory is based on Bukharin's primer, *The ABC of Communism*, had been shocked by the revelations of Bukharin's alleged treachery appearing in *Pravda* in late 1929, but did not question them. Instead, she understands this as a warning that for all her good intentions, she too could fall into error unless armed with 'theoretical correctness' (*rironteki na tashikasa*) (pp. 138). The nature of Nobuko's relationship with Toshine is glossed over. His scepticism towards the Soviet Union ultimately repels her, and her final riposte to him is based on her lived experience as a woman in 'backward' Japan, where women are the 'oppressed masses' (*onna wa yokuatsu sarete iru taishū na no yo*) and her 18 months in the USSR, where happiness is possible (p. 140). Again, intellectual doubts are trumped by passionately felt experience, this time with an emphatic female perspective.

Paris

When Nobuko returns to Paris from London and the Sasas finally leave for Japan, she is on her own for the first time in five years, a significant freedom after the physically claustrophobic intensity of her relationship with Motoko and the recent, emotionally fraught proximity of her family (DH, Vol. 3, p. 123). The main theme of her second stint in Paris is her relationship with the economist Hachiya (pp. 128-129). Through her affair with Hachiya, Nobuko attempts a theoretical understanding of Marxism, and explores for the first time the possibility of a heterosexual relationship based on ideological compatibility.

Instinctively, Nobuko is drawn to people who can lead her further along her chosen path, providing intellectual confirmation of her emotional knowledge, and rejects people who present any doubts or alternatives. Motoko has fulfilled the role of guide and teacher for several years now, but Nobuko feels that all her knowledge does not inform how Motoko actually lives her life (p. 142-43). In Paris, Hachiya

quickly replaces the now absent Motoko in the role of teacher as well as companion (p. 133-134), agreeing to give Nobuko lessons on Marx's *Capital*, which he essentially translates aloud for her while she takes notes in school exercise books specified by him. Despite according him the status of intellectual superior and enacting the role of schoolgirl, Nobuko keeps cutting him down to size by requesting that he use simpler phrases (pp. 224-227). Through her time in the Soviet Union, she has become accustomed to newspapers written in plain language for semi-literate workers: nothing need be beyond reach of someone with an ardent desire to learn, like Nobuko. This 'simplicity' distinguishes her from intellectuals like Hachiya and Kurokawa in Vienna, who are driven by ideas rather than emotion and lived experience, and also aligns her with the down-to-earth workers.

A scene in which Nobuko reads the news of the Wall Street crash on 29 October, like the previous reportage of the USSR-China stand-off, places her personal journey firmly within historical events. The crash is a dramatic, resounding validation of her 22 months of lived experience in Moscow. Comintern's criticism of Bukharin and his theory of the stability of capitalism has been proved correct – a retrospective riposte to the cynical Toshine in London. In a filmic sequence she sees the unemployed on the steps of St Paul's, the white body-shapes on the streets of Berlin, the grim rainy May Day in Warsaw: scenes that confirm for Nobuko that her judgement is not mistaken (pp. 223-224). The meanings embodied by her particular experience of each city have been proven by events, a moment that is portrayed in terms of almost religious ecstasy and certitude (pp. 229-232).

Historical events are inscribed upon the surface of cities, to be read and interpreted by Nobuko. After the crash is reported in the papers, she and Hachiya travel into Paris to see if the crash has wrought any changes. Nobuko tells Hachiya that since she cannot read French she can only 'see' the effects with her eyes and feet (p. 248), by walking the city, as she did when she first arrived Moscow. She observes that the luxury shoe-shop Pinet is empty. The clientele of rich Americans has vanished: a stillness hangs over the main boulevards and the usually busy cafes are empty (p. 247).

Hachiya disappoints Nobuko on two levels: by not being a true (unquestioning) believer in communism, and by reverting to the conventional script of a lonely married man wanting an affair, which he dresses up in terms of romance. Although Nobuko enjoys his attentions and occasionally responds to his advances, she always holds back, aware that she does not love him (p. 293-294). Her disillusionment with him has already set in by time of the Wall Street crash. Despite his scholarly knowledge, and his two years in Paris, he has not made the journey to Moscow to acquire experiential knowledge (p. 251). The distance between them is demonstrated when they attend a CGTU anti-fascist meeting. Completely at ease with being one foreign woman surrounded by hundreds of men, Nobuko is able to understand the speakers through their gestures and expressions, rendering Hachiya's translation unnecessary (p. 306). When the *Internationale* is played, she sings along in Russian in parallel with the workers' French while Hachiya stands in silence because he does not know the words. Beside him, Nobuko is aware of the unbridgeable distance between their respective ways of life (p. 307). Afterwards, Hachiya recognises that she 'carries a flame that is not just theory' (*riron dake ja nai hi o motte irun da na*) and that he is merely an intellectual who was out of place at the meeting (p. 307). In Nobuko's final rejection of Hachiya, when she gets into bed with him as a spontaneous expression of sympathy at his feigned illness, then jumps out smartly when he complains she is still fully clothed, she tells him she cannot be with him because they are 'not comrades' (pp. 315-317). She utters the word without thinking, and Hachiya demands to know if Motoko is a 'comrade'. At this moment, Nobuko realises that Motoko, after all, is a 'comrade' (although not in the way that Hachiya could well be thinking at this point). This awareness finally releases her from Hachiya: he cannot offer her a relationship based on shared ideology.

Parallel to the Hachiya storyline is that of the community of Japanese artists in Paris. In this section, Yuriko the narrator is examining, again, the role of the individual artist in society and what it means to live as an artist. Many Japanese artists went to Paris from the 1900s up to the late 1930s to study Western techniques of painting, most famously Fujita [Leonard] Tsugaru (1886-1968) (Rimer 1988; Birnbaum 2007). In *Dōhyō*, Yuriko provides a snapshot of this community,

who first appear when Nobuko receives notice of the sudden death of the young artist Isosaki Kyōsuke,³⁶ an acquaintance of Motoko's, who had been living in insalubrious conditions in a working-class area of Paris (pp. 144-154). Attending the vigil, Nobuko is deeply impressed by the dignity and strength of Isosaki's widow, Sumiko, a contrast to her mother's self-indulgent emotionality. Around this time, she hears of the arrest of the JCP leader Sano Manabu. When she had found out about the 15 March arrest of communists the previous year, through the newspaper sent to her by Taizō, she had felt an acute sense of individual 'constraint' (*kyūkutsusa*), in response to her father's red-ink annotations; now she reacts to Sano's arrest as an incident of the Japanese Communist Party and understands, thanks to her time in Europe, the true meaning of the oppression of communism (p. 161). Deeply affected by the pathos of Isosaki's individual effort as an artist and the lonely suffering of Sumiko after his death, Nobuko is also aware of the contrast with the mass suffering faced by the members of the JCP following their leader's arrest.

When Nobuko's parents leave Paris and she decides to prolong her stay, Hachiya helps her find more economical lodgings in Clamart, a suburb of Paris, where he is already based. He introduces Nobuko to the Japanese artists who live in the area, and toward the end of her stay, Nobuko is invited, along with Hachiya, to a meal at the house of the Kamedas (pp. 323-330). A comparison is made between Isosaki, who wore out his 'pitiful life' (*itaitashii seimei*) for art (p. 324) and the more worldly wife of Kameda. (Unlike Isosaki Sumiko, her name is not given, perhaps because she is not an artist in her own right.) Portrayed as cheerfully ambitious for her artist-husband, she supports him as a Western-style seamstress and milliner and creates a comfortable, healthy home environment, which Sumiko had been unable to provide for Isosaki, whose premature death Nobuko partially blames on the damp, bruise-coloured walls of their lodgings. Kameda's wife confesses her concern to Nobuko that her husband's paintings are disadvantageously dull-coloured, compared to someone like Matisse, and implies that some money would be a fine thing. Nobuko reflects that the artists of Clamart have chosen to live apart from the opportunities of Paris, in the same way that the bourgeois French

³⁶ Modelled on Itakura Kanae (1901-1928).

residents of Clamart – including her landlady – are indifferent to the recent Wall Street crash. It is on this occasion that Nobuko decides to return to Moscow. Implicit in this is her rejection, as an artist, of isolation from the wider world, as well as her rejection, as a woman who identifies with the Soviet Union, of Hachiya Ryōsaku.

Moscow, December 1929–December 1930

In the final stage of Nobuko's journey, the ideological meaning of her accumulated urban observations and experiences is made explicit. However, while the 'truth' of emotionally engaged experience is still foregrounded over intellectual abstractions, her last year in Moscow is described in contemporary, often bureaucratic Soviet terms rather than as the idealised 'Russia' of nineteenth-century literature. The parallel narrative threads of her political identification with the Soviet Union and her search for meaning as a writer come together in her encounters with the exiled communist leader Yamagami Gen.³⁷

Nobuko's identification with Soviet Russia and the value of the socialist project has been confirmed by her time in Europe. Being away from Moscow has made her love life in the USSR all the more and she wants to 'hurl herself, body and soul' (*kokoro to karada o nagekakeru*), back into her 'beloved Moscow' (*ai suru Mosukuva*) (DH, Vol. 3, pp. 164-165). Returning to Moscow by train, she crosses the Russo-Polish border with a portentous sense of homecoming: 'The stage set changed over ... The self that was returning home had chosen to change the scenery' (*Butai ga mawaru ... Sono butai o jibun o sentaku shite kaette kite iru jibun*) (p. 335). The image here is of Nobuko literally stage-managing her own life and deciding where she belongs. However, the cityscape of Moscow, the filter through which Nobuko has viewed and experienced the cities of Europe, has itself entered an accelerated period of transformation under the impetus of the first Five Year Plan (1928-1933). Construction has begun on the huge Palace of the Soviets; the

³⁷ Based on Katayama Sen (1859-1933), a founding leader of the Japanese Communist Party in 1922, who left Japan in 1914 after being imprisoned for his involvement in the 1911–1912 Tokyo streetcar strike and spent the last years of his life in Soviet Russia working for the Comintern. See Scalapino (1967: 6), also https://www.marxists.org/archive/katayama/1918/labor_movement/ch07.htm (accessed 17 Nov 2014).

kiosks along Okhotny Ryad have been cleared away and the street peddlers, old peasant men and women who used to sell eggs and butter, have disappeared from the gate by Red Square. The *Moscow Evening News* has taken over the once-gloomy and deserted building on the corner by the Hotel Passage and the Central Post Office has been completed, a magnificent building with marble floors and polished brass, still smelling of varnish. Nobuko marvels to see such a place in Moscow (pp. 341-342). Banners carrying the slogans of the Five Year Plan are visible everywhere: 'FIVE DAY WEEK', 'FIVE YEARS IN FOUR'. By comparison to London and its visible, milling jobless, in Moscow, unemployment and begging have gone down. The proof of this reported improvement is clearly visible to Nobuko; there are no more people prowling around the *stolovayas* or loitering on the boulevards (p. 344). In December, when the snow falls, the new purity of the cityscape is paralleled by posters announcing 'purifications' (R. *chistka* /J. *shukusei*), the institutional and workplace purges implemented to combat 'bureaucratism' and the invidious influence of the now discredited Bukharin (pp. 353-55).

Keenly aware of being left behind, Nobuko sets about catching up (p. 347), as if her own progress towards socialism must keep pace with that of Moscow. In one episode, she is described as seated at her desk in front of a pile of pamphlets on the Five Year Plan, reading a book called *The Five Year Plan for Children*. The 'entire surface' (*zenmen*) of what she experienced in her first two years in Moscow has become three-dimensional, expressed in statistics and new acronyms that she and ordinary Soviet citizens must master (p. 346).

Nobuko's return to Moscow prefigures her rejection of Motoko, despite their shared sympathy for socialism. Having suspected (quite correctly) that something was going on between Hachiya and Nobuko, in a letter to Nobuko in Paris, Motoko had accused Nobuko of abandoning her (pp. 304-305). Although Nobuko admits to herself that she has not been entirely truthful with Motoko, she nevertheless feels herself to be the injured party and is determined pursue experience wherever it takes her (p. 311-312). When she returns to the new, spacious room that Motoko has secured for them in the Rukyanov flat, with ample work space for them both, Nobuko refuses to answer questions as to what exactly she was up to in Paris when she prolonged her stay. She assures Motoko that she

has not changed, and the two embrace (p. 340). At the same time, Nobuko is aware that she has returned not to Motoko, but to Moscow (p. 340). Her journey towards the possibility of heterosexual fulfilment offered by socialism excludes Motoko, although since Yuriko the narrator has depicted their relationship as no more than close friendship, this particular trajectory remains ambiguous. Thus, her estrangement from Motoko is presented principally in terms of Nobuko's full emotional engagement with Soviet Russia and Motoko's intellectual distance.

City and country

Nobuko's identification of socialist modernity with the city is paralleled by her complete rejection of the rural, which is represented as backward and counterrevolutionary. A detailed episode describes Nobuko's reaction to Stalin's essay, published in *Red Star* in January 1930, on the necessity of eliminating kulaks as a class. Nobuko has no doubts about the official line reported in the papers: that rich peasants have been sabotaging the agricultural production plan and obstructing collectivisation is 'clear to anyone' (*dare no me ni mo hakkiri shita*) (DH, Vol. 3, p. 361). For Nobuko, Stalin's essay is like 'the smell of freshly fallen snow hitting people's faces, bracingly, with the harsh winter cold' (*atarashiku tsumotta bakari no yuki no nioi ga, kibishii kanki to sugasugashisa to de hitobito no kao o utsu kanji*) (p. 364). She evinces no pity for the peasant street vendors whose wares she has bought over the last two years, who will now, in official Soviet-speak, be divested of their means of production (p. 364). She finds the decisiveness of Stalin's declaration stimulating and uplifting, a sign that 'the steering wheel was held firmly' (*handoru ga shikkari nigirareta*) in the right direction – the security and construction of Soviet society (p. 364).

Even in the presence of an actual as opposed to rhetorical or reported peasant, Nobuko's zeal is unrelenting. During Nobuko's time in Paris, Motoko befriends a linguist, Olga Poltava, who helps her with her studies (pp. 364-368). Nobuko and Motoko go to visit her in the outskirts of Moscow, where she lives in a room in an old-fashioned wooden house, sparsely furnished with table, a bed, a kerosene stove and a tin-plate kettle, hardly the picture of a rich peasant. Olga reminisces about her home village, near Minsk, boasting of its cleanliness, the

forests and the local food. However, she does not invite them to visit it. Olga is a 'serious office worker' (*majime na tsumehito*) and Nobuko regards such 'moderation' (*setsudo*) towards foreigners as natural in the context of 'the Soviet order of things' (*Sobieto no chitsujo*) – possibly a reference to the reports of sabotage by foreigners and the need for people in 'serious' jobs to be cautious.

It is Olga who brings up the subject of Stalin's essay, perhaps testing the reactions of her foreign acquaintances. Nobuko says frankly that she has no pity for the kulaks, who are reported to have killed livestock rather than surrender it, as well as the cadres sent out to implement collectivisation. Hearing this, Olga does not express an opinion herself on Stalin's essay. On the way home, Motoko comments that Olga 'does not have the appearance of a poor peasant' (*ano yōsu ja, hinnō ja nai*), implying that they have been keeping company with one of the maligned kulak class. The contrast between Olga's apparent kulak status and her extremely modest living conditions, as described by the narrator, does not lead to any reflection by Nobuko on what she has read in the papers and believed. This episode ends with the narrator's observation that the depth and sharpness of Stalin's essay had 'penetrated the mood of the entire citizenry, to the most obscure part' (*zenshimin no seikatsu kanjō no inbi na bubun e made shintō shite itta*) (p. 368), a recognition of the reach of Stalin's decisive policy, but not one accompanied by any sympathy.

In the chasm between urban and rural Soviet Russia, Nobuko's loyalties are firmly urban. Her knowledge of the country is based on what she reads in the papers. The actual VOKS-organised tour that Yuriko and Yoshiko made to the model *sovkhos* (state-run farm) Gigant near Rostov in their final summer does not appear in *Dōhyō*; its existence is only referred to in the form of photographs (p. 382). While Nobuko's knowledge of the urban is founded in her own experience and observation, second-hand reports suffice for knowledge of the rural. By contesting the modern order imposed by the urban authorities, the countryside thereby defines itself as 'backward' and opposed to the Soviet model of modernity. The first-hand reports of anyone with the wrong kind of rural origins are automatically suspect, without any benefit of the doubt in face of official accounts. The

experience of, and momentum towards modernity is shown to be fundamentally urban.

Art and politics

A long section on the funeral of the poet V.V. Mayakovsky (1893–1930) foregrounds Nobuko's ongoing reflections on the role of the artist within socialism. Originally a supporter of the Revolution and a member of the Left Art Front in the 1920s, Mayakovsky's later disillusionment with Soviet bureaucracy and philistinism was expressed through two biting satirical plays, *Bedbug* (Klop, 1929) and *Bath House* (Banya, 1930) (Struve 1972: 17-22, 178-180). Nobuko is irritated by *Bath House*, which seems to her a disrespectful 'spectacle' (*mirumono* glossed as *supekutākuru*); to Nobuko, socialism is visible in Moscow streets, 'a living reality' (*ikite iru genjitsu*) (DH, Vol. 3, p. 371). She much prefers A.N. Afinogenov's (1904-41) *The Eccentric* (Chudak, 1928), in which an honest, cheerful oddball criticises bureaucracy and finds his own way of meeting Party targets (p. 431-32) (see Struve 1972: 305-306). Nobuko and Motoko take their place in the long queue of mourners who file past Mayakovsky's coffin at the Writers' Union. She is struck by the glint of metal segs on the soles of his shoes: in life, Mayakovsky had always been in a hurry to keep up with the pace of the revolution and to stand at the forefront of history, wearing down his shoes, and yet, in the end, he had been unable to reconcile his poetry – his symbolism and romanticism – to the needs of the revolution (pp. 395-96). Shortly after the funeral, the two women attend the premiere of *Bedbug*. Nobuko finds it empty and does not understand why Mayakovsky chose the bed bug as a symbol of socialism. She wonders if Mayakovsky had become aware of his limitations as a writer within socialism (pp. 398-402). His suicide itself could be construed as a criticism of Soviet society, the ultimate escape from the impossible position in which he found himself. Even though she is incapable of taking a critical view of the Soviet Union and therefore of appreciating Mayakovsky's satires, Nobuko understands the difficulty faced by Russian writers themselves in recreating themselves and their writing within Soviet society (p. 469). Since her return from Europe, Nobuko herself has found it harder to write novels: she can no longer construct novels from her observations – 'scenes

of life' (*seikatsu fūkei*). In face of the great socialist project, literary matters seem trivial. She understands that the 'shipwrecked boat of love' in Mayakovsky's final poem, read as a suicide note, was nothing to do with romantic love (p. 469).

The necessity for an artist to submit to the needs of the revolution is shown in passing by the experience of the young Japanese artist Kanbara Junji,³⁸ briefly billeted on the two women by VOKS when he arrives from Berlin to study proletarian art (pp. 433-444). Assigned the task of producing a May Day mural by the Proletarian Art League, his first effort is criticised for being merely technical. After several attempts, Kanbara is able to set aside his artistic ego and accept that technique is not enough, that he needs to paint from the perspective of the masses, and that to criticise proletarian art for being crude and amateurish is shallow. This echoes Nobuko's earlier reactions to the short stories in the proletarian journal *Senki*, and suggests that she too is moving towards acceptance of a politically determined style in the arts.

The outsider

Despite Nobuko's by-now complete identification with the Soviet Union, she is still fundamentally an outsider: a non-Russian, a non-proletarian and a non-communist. Two of these three positionalities are beyond her control. Her outsider status is confirmed by the two final episodes that precede her decision to return to Japan.

Firstly, the two women are given ten days' notice to vacate their comfortable and spacious lodgings in the Rukyanov household (DH, Vol. 3, pp. 375-379). Housing laws are being tightened up and foreigners are no longer allowed to live in private flats. At first Nobuko is hurt. She does not feel herself to be a foreigner in Moscow, certainly not the kind who lives in fancy apartments or the luxurious Bolshaya Moskovskaya hotel. She considers herself to live a genuine Moscow life and has experienced her recent return from Europe as a homecoming. The lack of racial prejudice has enabled the two women to forget that they are foreigners, and Nobuko does not want to live like one. However, Nobuko recalls the recent discovery of sabotage in the Donbas coal-mining area and the role of foreign

³⁸ According to the diary, a young proletarian artist called Terajima Teishi (1905-1983) lived briefly with Yuriko and Yoshiko at the Hotel Passage before finding his own lodgings.

experts in this, as reported in the Soviet media. She decides not to take this new anti-foreign legislation personally. Such measures are evidently necessary to protect socialism against the depredations of imperialism. She concludes that it is their duty as foreigners in the USSR to abide by these new laws and find somewhere else to live (p. 382). Nobuko takes it upon herself to secure rooms back at the Hotel Passage. The hotel is fully booked, but she returns daily and waits in the reception for a vacancy. Through this perseverance, Nobuko feels that she is proving herself worthy of staying in Moscow. As if mirroring Soviet society, Nobuko herself 'continues to change and progress towards socialism' (*Nobuko wa shakaishugi ni mukatte kawari tsu tsu aru*) (p. 383). She experiences her threatened material displacement from authentic Soviet life as a test and she has passed, unlike the sulky and cynical Motoko, who refuses to make any preparations for their eviction.

Their return to the Hotel Passage, rather than distancing them from Soviet life, in fact puts them back into the centre of it. The silent evenings of semi-suburban Ostozhenka are replaced by 'evenings full of Moscow energy' (*Mosukuwa no kakki ni michita yoru*) (p. 386). The fast-paced development of socialism under the Five Year Plan is embodied by changes in the hotel itself. Their room is illuminated by the new *Moscow Evening News* sign on the roof next door, and the formerly decrepit roof of the covered bazaar below has been glassed over. The black hole into which Nobuko had watched snow disappearing in December 1927 is now alive with music and light (p. 386). The elderly hotel waiter, who had provided room service to the delegates barking orders at him in the old-fashioned language used by masters to servants, is no longer in evidence. The Moscow Hotel Management Committee has deemed that guests in hotels for travellers go directly to the kitchen for hot water and eat in the dining room. Nobuko welcomes the changes (p. 402). Her modest but heartfelt participation in the Five Year Plan is symbolised by the blue enamelled kettle that she carries down twice a day for their tea, and by the occasional lack of butter and other basic foodstuffs. The street vendors are gone; the two women prefer to avoid the shop on Tverskaya for foreign diplomats; and they do not have access, like Motoko's friend Olga, to workplace grocery shops. Their only source of food is the hotel dining room, but it is assigned

a strict daily quota, monitored by the Moscow People's Food Committee, and unless they dine there, they can only buy what is left over, if anything. On butterless days, the women resort to eating bread with cucumber pickles or fish roe. Both the women are running short of money. Amid the titanic efforts and sacrifices made by the Russian people to achieve the goals of the Five Year Plan, Nobuko feels that these modest privations make her part of the greater Soviet project (pp. 404-406).

The final episode that reveals to Nobuko the limits of her identification with Russia and her usefulness to the Soviet system is her meeting with Yamagami Gen. Without telling Motoko, she contacts Yamagami, who is staying at the Hotel Lux, the Comintern residence for foreign communists, and he invites her to visit. She is immediately struck by his authenticity and simplicity; he is likened to 'strong, clean old stone in a sunny spot' (*hinata no furui ishi ga shikkari shite ite seiketsu de aru*) and their meeting that of an old dog meeting a puppy (p. 415). When she explains how seeing Europe has made her understand capitalism and the value of the USSR, Yamagami responds that he had the same experience in London and Edinburgh in 1894 (p. 416). Nobuko leaves with a deep impression of his 'unique vitality' (*dokutoku na seiki*) and 'walnut toughness' (*kurumi no yō na gacchirisa*), compared to the soft, plum-like Hachiya. However, as a young woman she senses that he is a 'Meiji man' in his attitudes to women (p. 423). When he showed her his complete collection of the *Heimin shinbun* (People's Newspaper), Nobuko notices that there are no women in its pages.

At their second encounter, Yamagami asks Nobuko to write for the communist journal *Senki*, echoing Kawase's earlier overture in Berlin. He says he has already read some of her work, 'A Record of Moscow Impressions', written in her first few months in Russia. Nobuko's socialist consciousness has developed to such an extent that she now considers that piece to be 'too caught up in her interest in Russian-ness' (*Roshia no minzokusei to iu kyōmi ni hikkakari suigite ita*) and without an awareness of class (p. 453-54). Her initial infatuation with 'Russia' and the apparent embodiment of her literary impressions by the street-scenes of Moscow has progressed to a contemporary, political understanding. Yamagami then springs the big question: has she thought of staying on? (p. 455). Nobuko's first response is to ask what sort of work she could do in Moscow. She has never

thought of being ‘a woman involved in political activities’ (*seijiteki na katsudō o suru onna*) (p. 456). Yuriko’s contempt for the Seitō movement was noted later by Yuasa Yoshiko (cited in Sawabe 1990: 204) and her negative view of the pursuit of women’s rights outside socialism was evident in letters to her husband Kenji (Kondo 2002: 234). Despite her confirmed pro-Soviet positionality, the suggestion to Nobuko that she become politically active *as a woman* challenges her existing sense of self, which has not to date encompassed such activity.

The prospect of staying on in her beloved Russia also challenges Nobuko’s self-definition as a literary writer. She is not convinced by Yamagami’s assertion that she could continue to write novels about Japan while in Russia, the way he uses news reports as the basis of his writings. When he tempts her with the massive print runs of literary works in Russia compared to Japan, Nobuko realises he knows nothing about literary writing (p. 457-59). Throughout *Dōhyō*, the ‘truth’ of lived experience, embodied by Nobuko, is represented as superior to intellectual knowledge. As a writer, Nobuko depends on lived experience to produce authentic work and she is not prepared to sacrifice this. The reader knows that Yamagami’s suggestion of using second-hand reports as source material is impossible for her. All the same, Nobuko immediately ‘90%’ decides to stay (p. 459), thrilled by the confirmation that she can be of use to her beloved Soviet Union (p. 463).

The decision forces Nobuko to reconcile two key aspects of her identity: her established writer-self and her newly emerged communist-self, born out of her former love of Russia and her current lived experience. She has been searching for a wider, socially embedded purpose as a writer and liberation as a woman. Socialism as represented by the Soviet Union seems to offer both, but at what potential cost to her as a writer? The prospect of trying to write novels about Japan while living in Russia gives her presentiments of ‘unendurable emptiness’ (*taegatai kūkyo*) (p. 467). She cannot imagine how she can be of use to the Soviet people *as a writer*. Reporting on life in the Soviet Union for the benefit of people back in Japan is mere journalism (p. 469). She struggles with a translation task assigned her by Yamagami while she makes her decision, aware that such onerous, anonymous tasks would also be part of her ‘work’ if she stayed in Russia (p. 469). Since Nobuko has not suffered to create Soviet society as it exists in 1930, she feels that continuing to live

in Moscow, writing Japanese novels based on reports with print-runs of 100,000, would be 'empty' (*kūkyo*) and 'deceitful' (*giman*) (p. 474). As a *Japanese* writer, Nobuko concludes that it is her place to write about the suffering and struggles of the Japanese people (p. 468), and she resolves to return to Japan – not the Japan she left, but a Japan unknown to her middle-class family, the Japan of one million unemployed (p. 475). Notably, this is the first mention in *Dōhyō* of the Japanese proletariat, albeit in the abstract.

When faced with the possibility of distancing herself even further from Japan, Nobuko realises that for all her love of the Soviet Union, she is a Japanese writer and that her future lies there. The novel ends with Nobuko bracing herself for the disappointment of Yamagami Gen and the possibility of future suffering – the prison sentences and marital separation that Yuriko, writing in 1950, knew lay ahead of her younger fictional self – prefigured in *Dōhyō* by the young Chinese girl-students in Moscow Nobuko had previously admired. However, this difficult choice is presented as life-affirming: 'There was a song of life towards which Nobuko's heart inclined and yearned to sing' (*Kokoro o mukete utaō to yoku suru seikatsu no uta ga aru*) (p. 477), an echo of her feelings on encountering Anna Simova, the young mother and Party worker in Leningrad. This choice not only affirms Nobuko's loyalty to the communist cause, but her refusal to sacrifice herself as a writer by going into linguistic exile, away from her primary subject matter. Her positionality as Japanese, which has been occluded by her deluded sense of living like a local in Moscow, is what, in the end, enables her to live as both a communist and a writer, sacrificing her 'Russian' self. Ironically, the demands and costs of political activism were such that Yuriko would not find her voice as a literary writer again until after the war. She never returned to Russia.

Conclusion

In *Dōhyō*, Yuriko the narrator retrospectively recreates her personal and political development as the younger Nobuko through her experience of foreign cities that are assigned clear and particular meanings. During her first encounter with Moscow, her romantic literary love of 'Russia' is transformed, through experience detailed in richly sensory terms, to love of the actual Soviet Union. Her emotional engagement

with Soviet Russia enables her to see Europe through new eyes even as she experiences it as an affluent tourist. The stark comparison she is able to make between the cities of capitalist 'Old Europe' is accompanied by a growing intellectual and political awareness, prompted by figures such as Kawase Isao in Berlin and Kurokawa Takakazu in Vienna who enable her to distinguish social democracy from communism and choose the true path.

Throughout her journey, Nobuko's intertwined positionalities as a woman, a middle-class Japanese and a writer are foregrounded in various episodes as they come up against her newfound and paradoxical political identification. Her experience of Paris and London highlight her rejection of what she perceives as bourgeois frivolity – as symbolised by her sickly, selfish mother – and her beloved father, whose English 'common sense' is shown as no more than complacent acceptance of the capitalist status quo. As I have shown, Yuriko as narrator was able to distance herself from her class positionality and take a critical view of her family and other middle and upper-class people, while still enjoying the benefits, overt or implied, of a middle-class traveller.

In *Dōhyō*, the possibility of equal and fulfilled heterosexual relationships in the Soviet Union, as perceived by Nobuko in her encounters with the nurse Natasha and the Party worker Anna Simova, is counterbalanced by an insistence on 'natural' femininity underscores the importance, to Yuriko as narrator, of the heterosexual dyad of man-woman. Yuriko sought a society in which women could be political, public agents, but she did not question 'femininity' itself, nor its fundamental, subordinate relationship to the masculine authority, embodied by the Communist Party. Her interpretation of these encounters further unsettles what is presented, on Nobuko's side, as a close but troubled friendship with Yoshimi Motoko. Nobuko's rejection of the 'decadence' of Motoko's unspecified but implied lesbian desires takes place, fittingly, in Berlin, a city that epitomises the final stages of bourgeois sickness before fascism takes over.

Nobuko is made to consider the role of artist in society in episodes that at first sight seem like detours from the main communist conversion narrative: the visit of the kabuki troupe, the Japanese artist colony in Paris, Nobuko's protracted reminiscences of her former piano teacher, her photographic contemplation of

Gorky, and the funeral of Mayakovsky. This theme comes into play at the end, when Nobuko has to choose whether to stay in her beloved Russia or return to Japan. As a writer, she has been searching for a wider meaning, beyond individual ambition, but she will not sacrifice her literary self entirely by losing her vital connection to Japan. Throughout the novel, lived experience is always presented as a superior means of knowing compared to emotionally unengaged intellectualism; thus, as a Japanese writer, it is impossible for Nobuko to stay in Russia. In the end, Nobuko chooses to return to Japan, as a communist and a writer.

In the next chapter, I will examine two articles from the *Sobieto kikō* that showcase Yuriko's transformative encounters with Moscow and London. Unlike *Dōhyō*, they were written very close to the events which they describe. The two years between these articles captures clearly the shift in how Yuriko's perception and therefore experience of the cityscape had changed.

6. The *Sobieto kikō*: The Modern(ist) Self in the City

The 'Soviet travel writings' (*Sobieto kikō*) take up an entire volume (Vol. 9, 1980) of the 1979–1986 edition of *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū* (MYZ), on which my research is based. This volume contains the 42 articles and essays Yuriko wrote and published on the subject of her experience in the Soviet Union. The articles and essays fall into two groups: the first group, much smaller, comprising only eight articles, written during Yuriko's time away from Japan; and the second, larger group, written after her return to Japan in November 1930, up until early 1933. As the comprehensive chronology in Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai (1976) attests, Yuriko wrote prolifically unless prevented by arrest and publication bans.

The first group of articles appeared in the mainstream press: the *Yomiuri* newspaper and the progressive journal *Kaizō*, which partly funded her trip (*Diary*, 13 April 1927, p. 173). The second group appeared in wide-ranging publications, from the mainstream *Yomiuri*, *Kaizō*, *The Lady's Graphic* and *Sarariman*, to the journals put out by communist-affiliated arts organisations such as *Senki*, *NAPPU*,³⁹ and *Hataraku fujin* (Working Woman),⁴⁰ which Yuriko herself edited, along with Sata Ineko. Yuriko also published several articles⁴¹ in *Nyonin geijutsu*, the feminist arts journal that became an important forum for socialist women after its 'left turn' in early 1930 (Frederick 2006; Karlsson 2013). Among its wide-ranging subjects, *Nyonin geijutsu* published reportage about life in the Soviet Union, a subject on which Yuriko was well qualified to write in the period immediately following her return to Japan.

The style of these two groups of writings differs markedly. Honda comments that the articles written while Yuriko was in Russia reflected the influence of the

³⁹ *NAPPU* was published by NAPF from September 1930 to November 1931, after which NAPF became KOPF, the Japan Proletarian Culture Federation. Shea describes both *Senki* and *NAPPU* as the 'official organs' of NAPF (1964: 128).

⁴⁰ In 1931, *Senki* published a short-lived women's journal called *Fujin senki* (Women's Battle Flag). After NAPF dissolved into KOPF in October that year, the journal reappeared under the name *Hataraku fujin*, and ran sporadically from January 1932 to April 1933 (Coutts 2012: 334, n. 11). Most of the articles were in fact written by men. Yuriko's involvement in this journal led to her arrest in 1935 (Coutts 2006: 174, n. 16).

⁴¹ 'Across the New Siberia' (Jan-Feb 1931), 'Happy Soviet Children' (March 1931), 'Warsaw May Day' (May 1931), 'The Issue of Proletarian Women Writers and Cultural Activities' (Oct-Dec 1931), and 'Letter to a Cousin – the Story of the Children's House' (Jan 1932).

Shirakaba-ha:⁴² ‘sensuous’ (*kankakuteki*), with ‘layers of impressions’ (*inshō no jūsōsei*). By the standards of the proletarian literary movement (PLM), which advocated ‘proletarian realism’,⁴³ such writing was considered merely ‘fellow-traveller literature’ (Honda 1976: 37). When Yuriko returned to Japan and joined the Japan Proletarian Writers’ League (known as the Sakka Dōmei) of NAPF, her ‘work’ was to ‘introduce Soviet culture’ (*Sobieto bunka shōkai no shigoto*). Accordingly, her style was ‘NAPPified’ (*NAPPUka shita buntai*), ‘exorcised of scholarship and sensitivity’ (*gakushoku to kanjusei o harande*) (Honda 1976: 37-38). She wrote that ‘Crossing the New Siberia’ (1931) was the last piece in her former, ‘affected’ (*kidori*) style (cited in Honda 1976: 38). In the opinion of Hirabayashi Taiko, after Yuriko joined the Communist Party and the NAPF executive, she abandoned her ‘outstanding, free’ writing style (*sugureta jiyū bunshō*) (1976a: 112) – a style that had been criticised as ‘bourgeois’ by left-wing critics (Phillips 1987: 59). Yuriko’s writing after her return to Japan and her plunge into PLM activism was for the most part journalism with a clear propagandistic intent. The style is simple and didactic, aimed at a working-class readership. Unlike the first group, in these essays, Yuriko’s persona and actual experience is hardly present. She quotes statistics and ‘facts’ in short declarative sentences and makes hortatory calls for universal sisterhood. Although these essays demonstrate Yuriko’s new positionality as a woman communist, I do not regard them as personal or self-writing and therefore have not included them in my study.

In the next stage of my analysis, I will examine two essays from the former group of essays: ‘Mosukuwa inshōki’ (Record of Moscow Impressions, 1928) and ‘London 1929’ (1930). I treat them as self-writing because Yuriko writes as herself: she is the narrator, a public figure whose background and recent travels are well-known, drawing directly on her actual experiences and observations. I have chosen

⁴² The Shirakaba-ha (White Birch group) was an aristocratic literary clique, formed in the 1910s, who admired the humanistic thought of Tolstoy and rejected the influence of naturalism. Members included the I-novelist Shiga Naoya (1883-1971) and Mushakōji Saneatsu (1885-1976).

⁴³ The chief literary theorist of the PLM from about 1928, Kurahara Korehito, advocated a realism that was ‘objective’ by virtue of taking the view of the proletarian vanguard. This proletarian ‘objectivity’ abjured all details that served no purpose in the liberation of the proletariat and is thus opposed to the Barthesian ‘reality effect’ in which layers of detail create the impression of ‘reality’ (Karlsson 2008: 239- 240; see also Barthes 1986: 141-154).

these two essays firstly, because they demonstrate how Yuriko's dynamic positionality was explicitly contextualised within her experience in these two cities, which she 'reads' through a prism of pre-ascribed meaning; and secondly, because they show very clearly the shifts in Yuriko's subjectivity from her romantic, sensory first encounter with Moscow from December 1927 to May 1928, to the more politically aware Yuriko who went to London in summer 1929 and was further radicalised by the experience – a progression that was schematically laid out in *Dōhyō*, as discussed in the previous chapter.

Modernism and the influence of film on literature

Although Yuriko is situated in the canon as a proletarian writer rather than as a modernist, I believe that the influence of modernism is evident in these two articles under discussion, and that the symbiotic relationship between modernity and the city as experienced by Yuriko is clear in her stylistic choices at this intermediate stage, when her emotional loyalty to Soviet Russia had not yet consolidated into an official political affiliation accompanied by the acceptance of proletarian and social realist literary imperatives. Before proceeding with my analysis, I will discuss aspects of Japanese modernism, or the 'modan', that are relevant to Yuriko.

The development of Japanese literary and artistic modernism in the 1920s in response to the interrelated experiences of modernity and Westernisation, and its relationship to Western modernist movements, has been studied by authors such as Weisenfeld (1996, 2002), Lippit (2002), Gardner (2006), Tyler (2008) and Suzuki Sadami (2008, 2012). Gardner describes a Japanese modernism that was deeply aware of developments in Europe and America and situated itself in response to these, but was also independent of them, not merely an imitation of what was happening elsewhere but a particularly Japanese response to a particularly Japanese modernity (2006: 34, 46-47, 52). Similarly, Tyler critiques English-language studies that present Japanese modernism as a pale 'derivative' of European modernism (2008: 6-10). Japanese *modanizumu*, in Tyler's view, diverges most sharply from Western modernism in the crossover between artistic modernism and the vernacular modernism expressed through popular culture. In its European manifestation, artistic modernism was often sombre and elite, with an emphasis on

alienation. By contrast, Japanese *modanizumu* also encompassed the playful and experimental, and was absorbed into the mainstream of mass-market fiction and film in a way not seen in the West (Tyler 2008: 4, 26; see Hansen 2000 and Richie 2005: 85, on film).

Modanizumu, like Marxism, was part of the cultural and intellectual environment of Taishō and early Shōwa Japan. Although Marxism was often represented in opposition to artistic modernism in the 1920s in Japan, it was actually part of *modanizumu* writ large, in that it offered an alternative form of modernity as well as an artistic and intellectual mode of dealing with ‘the modern’. There was significant cross-over between the two literary movements, which Tyler describes as ‘uneasy left-of-centre bedfellows’ (2008: 5; also Iwamoto 1974: 158). Both were opposed to the culture created by capitalism (Lippit 1980: 104-105). At the high point of the PLM, around 1927-1928, many bourgeois modernists such as Kataoka Teppei (1894-1944) (Tyler 2008: 52) ‘converted’ to left-wing literature. Kataoka’s friend Yokomitsu Ri’ichi, one of the figureheads of modernism, engaged briefly with Marxism as he developed his own aesthetic approach (Lippit 1980: 104-119; Keene 1998: 650). Socialism and *modanizumu* intersected in the most modern of art forms, cinema, which gave rise to both leftist ‘tendency films’ (*keiko eiga*) and films influenced by German expressionism that presented the modern city as a place of menace and exploitation, such as Mizoguchi Kenji’s *Blood and Spirit* (1923) and the films of Uchida Tomu (Richie 2005: 84-91).

This was the literary and artistic environment in Japan during Yuriko’s twenties and early thirties. *Modanist* as well as proletarian and socialist works appeared in mainstream publications that Yuriko both read and contributed to, such as *Chūō kōron* and *Kaizō*. When she returned to Tokyo, she first took up residence in the Kikufuji Hotel near Tokyo University, well-known as the haunt of modernist artists and writers (Tyler 2008: 52). Within weeks of her return, she was invited to participate in a *zadankai* (round table) on the subject of Soviet cinema held by the modernist poetry journal *Shishin* (The Muse, 1925-1931, also known as *A*), an indication of her knowledge and interest in cinema and her connections with modernist figures (*Diary*, 12 December 1930, p. 583).

I will argue that although Yuriko's writing does not evince any of the formal markers of modernism, such as 'fragmentation of grammar and narrative' or experimentation with genre forms (Lippit 2002: 7), the influence of modernism, in particular, techniques derived from the new popular medium of the cinema, can be clearly seen in the two articles I discuss. Yuriko was a regular cinema-goer in Tokyo and Moscow, and her diaries contain detailed critiques about what she saw, including comments on the techniques and acting. She had been particularly impressed by a special showing of *Battleship Potemkin* (dir. Eisenstein, 1925) and *Mother* (dir. Pudovkin, 1926) at the Sovkino studios in Leningrad (*Diary*, 17 July 1928, p. 294). The density of her visual descriptions suggests that her writing had been influenced by the exciting new medium of film.

In her diary, she records several meetings with the actor/director Kinugasa Teinosuke in Moscow, Berlin and back in Tokyo. His experimental *Kurutta ippeiji* (1926, *A Page of Madness*) was a landmark work of Japanese cinema (Tyler 2008: 58-59). While Kinugasa was influenced by German expressionism, *Kurutta ippeiji* was original in the relentless tempo of its cuts, unprecedented in German or Japanese film. Eisenstein's tempo was similar, although Kinugasa did not see *Strike* (1924) or *Potemkin* until his visit to Russia later in the decade – where he met Yuriko (Richie 2005: 88).

In the articles to be discussed, Yuriko uses the modernist cinematic technique of 'montaging', the juxtaposition of contrasting scenes to convey a particular impression, such as her switching, in 'London 1929', between the West and East End. The popularity of montage as a technique within Japanese modernism in the 1920s was not limited to cinematography but crossed over into literature and art (Gardner 2003: 73, n. 10). It was used by writer Yokomitsu Ri'ichi, most notably in his city-novel *Shanghai* (1928-1929, 1932) (Tyler 2008: 176), which fellow modernist Kawabata regarded as the 'grand summation' of New Sensationist (Shinkankaku-ha) methods (Keene 1998: 656). The New Sensationist school to which Yokomitsu belonged rejected realism for a style that used 'startling images, mingled sense impressions and an abruptness of transition' (Yokomitsu 1962: 223), all of which occur in the two articles I will discuss. In her

diary for 6 May 1928 (*MYZ* Vol. 24, p. 271), Yuriko praises an unnamed piece⁴⁴ by Yokomitsu which she has read in the April issue of *Kaizō*, which she and Yuasa Yoshiko had sent to them in Moscow.

In describing the influence of cinema on *modanizumu*, Tyler (2008: 57-61) points out the importance of *kōkei* (spectacle) in *modanist* prose. Such spectacles take the form, in Yuriko's work, of densely descriptive passages about the cityscapes of Moscow and London. Artificial light as a trope of modern life can be seen in Yuriko's emphasis on illumination in the recurring 'spectacle' of snowy night streets of Moscow illuminated by arc lights, like the movie scenes made possible by the invention of Klieg lights (Tyler 2008: 60). Conversely, dimness was associated with the pre-modern, as seen in Tanizaki's *In Praise of Shadows* (1933–34), celebrating the gloom of a Japanese squat toilet.

In *Dōhyō* (Vol. 1, p. 233-34), Nobuko reflects on how the transformative tempo of Moscow has changed her literary style, likening its new pace and quick cuts to the cinematic and theatrical work of Eisenstein and Meyerhold. From the very first, the effect of Moscow on Nobuko is apparent through its effect on her as a writer, rather than in any immediate change in her consciously held politics. As I will demonstrate, although Yuriko did not experiment formally in her creative writing in any way recognised as 'modernist', she absorbed certain modernist cinematic techniques and used them to clear effect in her writing on the modern cityscapes of Moscow and London during her time abroad, when these impressions were most fresh and immediate.

'Record of Moscow Impressions' (*Mosukuwa inshōki*)

'Record of Moscow Impressions' was published in *Kaizō* in October 1928. A discursive, personal essay with no clear structure or subheadings, it takes up 27 pages in volume nine of the *zenshū*. In this article, Yuriko presents herself first and foremost as a writer, whose love of and connection to 'Russia' (more so than 'Sobieto') is emphasised by layers of detailed sensory description. The occasional discursive digressions, such as on the 'depth' of Russia and its people, are more

⁴⁴ Not *Shanghai*, which only appeared from November that year (Keene 1998: 711 n. 61).

philosophical than political, unlike her later, overtly propagandistic writings. References to Russian history and literary figures, the insertion of Russian words in katakana, and the occasional Soviet statistic or fact demonstrate that Yuriko's impressions are embedded in knowledge, a mutually reinforcing alternation between the impressionistic and the factual. Short, apparently reported dialogues break up the text and add a journalistic verisimilitude. Yuriko did not merely observe her surroundings, she interacted with the local people, inserting herself into the scenery. The essay reads as a direct account of her experience in Moscow, although the narrative has been manipulated to create this very effect. The essay combines the meandering style of a *kansōbun* (impressionistic essay) with a filmic eye that creates a sense of immediacy, as if a camera is following Yuriko's progress around Moscow. I will provide an overview of the article and then focus on particular aspects that demonstrate the points I have mentioned above.

The essay opens in a distinctly modernist way in that it resembles the opening scene of a film. The reader is given a description of Tverskaya Street, the main shopping street of Moscow: the central news-board (newspapers were displayed on public notice boards), a window display showing the viscera of a cat and a human being; the entry of six sleigh-loads of cement being delivered to a building site, guarded by a man with a gun. He sees two women walking on the opposite side of the footpath and asks them if they are Chinese (*Kitayanki?*). He does not understand what they are saying. One of the women laughs loudly. He watches them head toward a building, the Hotel Passage ('Record of Moscow Impressions', p. 17).⁴⁵ The effect of the detailed descriptions is almost to situate the reader inside the text, in Moscow alongside Yuriko, as a Japanese who abroad is externally indistinguishable from Chinese and whose native speech is rendered incomprehensible – except, of course, to the reader, who is entered into a conspiracy of Japaneseness with the narrator.

The reader of *Kaizō* would know that the two women were Yuriko and her companion Yuasa Yoshiko. They might even guess that it was Yoshiko who let out the 'big, unladylike laugh' (*takawarai o shita*). Throughout the text she is referred

⁴⁵ All references to 'Record of Moscow Impressions' are taken from Vol. 9 of the *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū* (1980: 17-44).

to as ‘Y’, as she is in the diary. Yuriko was a public figure and her departure for Moscow had been reported in the papers.⁴⁶ Although the two women are not named, the identities of both would have been clear to a Japanese reader at the time of publication.

The article follows the seasons from winter to late spring, framed by the women’s arrival at the Hotel Passage amid the snow and the final view from the balcony of their lodgings in the apartment of Engineer Rybakov in May 1928. After this opening scene, the article circles around its main theme – a discussion of Russia’s ‘depth’ (*fukasa*) and how Yuriko has been drawn into it – jumping, sometimes abruptly, between close-ups of vividly drawn street scenes, short dialogues, and discursive passages.

A key, oft-mentioned passage in ‘Record of Moscow Impressions’ (Honda 1976: 35; Kato 1981: 2-3; Iwabuchi 1996: 169; Kondo 2002: 176-77) describes Yuriko’s ‘first three minutes’ in Moscow. Getting out of the train carriage hung with icicles and seeing the Moscow streets in the dim lights, the reflection of horse-drawn sleighs on the taxi window, Yuriko writes, ‘My direction was decided’ (*watashi no hōkō o kimeta*). She wanted ‘to get rid of’ (*sutete shimaitaku natta*) her English as quickly as possible and speak the language of the people all around her, ‘to approach the essence of the life of her beloved [Russia]’ (*watashi wa wagaai suru no mono no seikatsu no hontai made sekkin shiyō*) (p. 23). In this passage, Yuriko dates her love of Russia from her first reading of Tolstoy’s novella *The Cossacks* (1863) and Gorky’s story ‘Six Men and A Girl’ (1899). This short passage implies that the experience of arriving in the real, earthly Russia overlapped so powerfully with Yuriko’s imagined Russia, based on her reading of its literature, that she was overwhelmed. Kato suggests that this ‘first three minutes’ predisposed her to see the good aspects of the Soviet Union (1981: 2-3). Similarly, Kondo likens these critical moments to a religious feeling, so powerful that Yuriko ‘could only see the light of her ideal’ (*risō no hikari shika miru koto ga dekinaku naru*) (2002: 175).

The overwhelming impression that Moscow made on Yuriko is conveyed by descriptions that verge on novelistic, drawing on Yuriko’s prior literary imaginings.

⁴⁶ E.g., ‘Nijūshichinichi shuppatsu Roshia ni omomuku Chūjō Yuriko joshi’ [Miss Yuriko Chūjō Departs for Russia on 27 November], *Yomiuri shinbun*, 25 November 1927, p. 4.

In one scene (pp. 23-24), she and Yuasa leave a cafeteria near a theatre at eight o'clock on a February night. Tverskaya is enveloped in thickening, smoky fog. Yuriko informs the reader that fog heralds a change in the weather. The next day, the sweat on the bodies of sleigh horses has frozen. 'Father Frost' (R. Ded Moroz) has descended upon Moscow, writes Yuriko, demonstrating her knowledge of Russian folk traditions. The sun goes down at three-thirty in the afternoon, 'red like a fireball shot from a blast furnace' (*yōkōro no hidama fukiageta yō ni akai*), hanging over the frozen roofs. After five, Moscow is illuminated by the moon. Yuriko describes a scene in which the celestial glitter of gold church domes contrasts against the sparks flying from knife-grinder's round whetstone in a dark corner, giving off the smell of hot metal. The impression created is richly atmospheric, almost otherworldly, a brooding and mysterious cityscape that belongs more to the imagination than to reality. The fierce contrast of frost and the fireball sun, the glitter of church domes in the moonlight and the furnace-like spectacle of the whetstone, creates an image of Russia that combines both its semi-legendary past and its immediate, material present, beguiling the spectator, who sees this through Yuriko's eyes.

And then, in a brisk cinematic jump cut, in the next paragraph, Yuriko switches to a humdrum description of the people who populate the twilight streets: a female beggar running after a woman in a squirrel coat; an old woman selling apples by the road; two Komsomol members in their characteristic black leather coats, who ask the 'two Japanese women' if they are from Shanghai, mistaking them for Chinese. The sublime and the banal are shown to coexist in Russia, as described by Yuriko, and she inserts herself into her scene like a film director making a cameo appearance.

Another street scene (pp. 25-26) is presented like a short play, serving to illustrate Yuriko's fondly imagined conception of the 'Russian' character. On a warm day, six degrees, it is difficult to walk on the melting snow and steam rises from the bodies of labouring horses. Street sellers are lined up, selling newspapers, tobacco, boot-laces, cheese, penny toys and mandarins. In the late 1920s, police were beginning to crack down on peasant streets traders, who had been permitted during the New Economic Policy era. When Yuriko arrives at Nikitsky Gate, she

witnesses a policeman apprehending an apple seller. The two walk away, apparently chatting in a friendly fashion. A sleigh blocks their path, and the apple-seller, seeing his chance, makes off down a side-street with his forbidden wares. The effect is so comical that Yuriko laughs out loud, as do other passers-by. The policeman makes no attempt to pursue the vendor and does not seem particularly troubled. Hands in pockets, he wanders off. Yuriko describes the opportunism and apparently cheerful fatalism of the scene as 'typically Russian. And peasant-like' (*Roshiateki da. Soshite nōminteki da*). Her understanding of an inherently Russian, peasant character is straight from Russian literature, in particular, Gorky, whose accounts of his brutal childhood and hardscrabble youth epitomised for Yuriko the struggles of the ordinary 'Russian people', as depicted in the detailed description of Nobuko's lengthy musings on a photographic exhibition on Gorky's life (*Dōhyō*, Vol. 1, pp. 206-223). Her 'understanding' of the Russian character allows her to enjoy the scene alongside the locals and to enlighten her readers with this snatch of actually observed Russian street-life that confirms her pre-existing conceptions.

In addition to these street scenes, the 'reality effect' (Barthes 1986) created by all this layering of detail is supplemented by reported dialogue. In one scene (pp. 18-19), Yuriko places herself, 'the Japanese woman', in the Hotel Passage, describing the rough carpet on the stairs, the palm tree in the lobby by the shoe-storage area, right down to the door-handle of the office, which is made of the same blue-green glass as an inkstand in the Mitsukoshi stationery department. This minor detail, which adds a familiar touch to this foreign scene, is then undercut by a large portrait of Lenin. The scene shifts to night, and Yuriko relates, in third person, her conversation with the hotel maid, who sits by the stair railings doing drawn-work. Yuriko presents herself as the initiator of this conversation despite her low level of Russian, discarding the rules of grammar for the sake of an authentic, unmediated exchange with this citizen of Moscow. In the course of their limited conversation, it turns out that the maid, who is described as very thin, has second-stage TB. The sanatoria are full and she will not be admitted until she is stage three. This scene is presented without any commentary or analysis – for example, of Soviet health care facilities – simply as a 'slice of life' that illustrates for the reader

the stoicism of the hotel maid, and Yuriko's interaction with a humble Soviet working woman.

Another conversation, between an old woman and a young woman in the Church of Christ the Saviour during Easter celebrations, provides a similar fly-on-the-wall view of Russian life, in particular, the generation gap already evident between the children of the revolution and the pre-revolutionary generation (pp. 37-38). The young woman has climbed up on a plinth, to better see the ceremony at the altar, pulling herself up using a religious banner. The old woman tells her to get down, because it is sacrilegious to stand on the plinth; a man standing in the crowd gives her a push. The young woman curses them both. Yuriko uses this scene, in which she is the invisible spectator, along with her readers, to muse upon what she perceives as the lingering religiosity of the Russian people: the girl was compelled to see the altar properly, although she had no conception of the sacrilegious.

Embedded in the filmic descriptions and cinematic changing of 'scenes' is the core of the article: Yuriko's musings on the nature of the Russian people and the terrible, compelling 'depth' of Russia (pp. 26-34). This section begins with the blunt statement that 'Ropshin had to kill himself', a reference to the socialist revolutionary Boris Savinkov (1879-1925), who left Russia in 1920 after being involved in counter-revolutionary activities, then returned in 1924 and was arrested. He died in prison in 1925. In Yuriko's romantic view, Ropshin was compelled to return to Russia, despite the danger in doing so, because he could not live without it. The American journalist John Reed (1887-1920), author of *Ten Days that Shook the World* (1919), was similarly beguiled, in Yuriko's view, and thus ended his life in Russia, dying of dysentery while reporting on the famine. Yuriko situates herself alongside these historical figures, trying to analyse the 'allure' (*miryoku*) that has drawn her in too (p. 26).

She describes first what it is *not*: the mysterious attraction of Russia is not embodied by magnificent scenery, such as the Swiss Alps, which does not exist in Russia. Yuriko experiences it in the relentless contrasts embodied in the cityscape of Moscow: the holy pictures rammed into niches in the outer walls of old churches and the old woman in a dirty scarf below the wall selling sunflower seeds for three

kopecks a cup, set against the brisk movement of the black shoes worn by Komsomol women in their fur coats as they cut past the old woman – ‘these mutually illuminating cross-sections of life hit you in a single glance’ (*tagai ni taishō suru jinsei* [glossed in furigana as R. *zhizn’*] *danmen ga hitome no uchi ni tobikonde kuru*) (p. 27). It is implied that Yuriko, like her hypothetical traveller in this section – who is qualified for this experience by being ‘fully alive’ (*iki iki shita*) – has been mesmerised by these ‘fragments of human life that dance their way into consciousness as scenery’ (*fūkei toshite kankaku no uchi ni odorikonde kuru sorera jinsei no danpen*) (p. 27). This emphasis on the necessity of being open to sensory impressions prefigures the insistence in *Dōhyō* on felt experience as the authentic route to knowledge.

The next scene makes clear that only certain people have these special sensibilities – like Yuriko – and are thus susceptible to Russia’s peculiar attraction. The reader/viewer is whisked from the church wall and the beggar woman to the dining room of the grand Hotel Savoy, which caters to foreign travellers (p. 27). Here, on one occasion, Yuriko is seated before a plate of smoked salmon and salmon roe, surrounded by other Japanese, men who have been engaged in official business in Russia for years. They are comparing the country before and after the revolution. Russia is a ‘swamp’ (*doronuma*), concludes one man resentfully, complaining that it is impossible to make money from Russia or to extract oneself. Yuriko reflects that this is true, but unlike the businessman, she ‘feels and understands’ (*kanjishitte iru*) (a significant co-location) Russia’s ‘depth’, its ‘hugeness’ (*ōkisa*) and ‘heaviness’ (*omosa*), which merely make the man indignant. The ‘depth’ and ‘vastness’ are ‘the germ’ (*hai*) of the ‘magic that draws us in’ (*watashitachi o kono yō ni suiyoemisuru tokoro*), that drew Ropshin home to his death and beguiled John Reed.

What follows (p. 28) is a disquisition on what Yuriko understands and admires as the Russian ‘depth’. For Yuriko, the depth of the Russian people is a ‘bottomless’ (*sokonashi*) depth, exemplified by the behaviour of the apple seller at Nikitsky Gate, the policeman and the passers-by who laughed. None of them, writes Yuriko, judged the incident critically, from the perspective of morality or civic order. Russians experience life directly through their emotions, unmediated by rationality

(like the Germans), obligation (*giri*) (like the Japanese) or English ‘common sense’ (p. 29) – here an obvious reference on her Anglophile father, as represented by Taizō in *Dōhyō*. Life is able to ‘soak into them deeply, deeply, until it touches their souls directly’ (*Fukaku, fukaku, karera no tamashii* [glossed in Russian as *dusha*] *ni chokusetsu fureru made, jinsei wa karera no naka ni shimikonde iku koto o yurasareru*) (p. 29). She draws here on the literary examples of Gorky’s (appropriately named) play ‘The Lower Depths’ and Dostoevsky, whose ‘diseased but sensitive soul’ (*byōteki na shikashi binkan na tamashi* [*dusha*]) enabled him to ‘sink to the very bottom of the bottomless Russian way of life’ (*Roshia no soko naki seikatsu no soko no soko e to shizunde itta*) (p. 29). These literary sources inform Yuriko’s understanding of the Russian ‘soul’ and its bottomless depth, which she then sees all around her in the streets of Soviet Moscow. Her use of Russian words in katakana alongside the kanji (*zhizn’, dusha*) demonstrates her knowledge of ‘Russia’, further validating Yuriko’s lived experience of the ‘real’ Russia.

In the next paragraph, Yuriko presents herself as the object or willing victim of this all-consuming Russian depth. Even though she does not know ‘Old Russia’ and inhabits the modern city of Moscow, amid ‘the increasing tempo and dynamism of the people’s history’ (*minshūshichū mottomo katsudō teki, tempo hayaki*), she still feels ‘overwhelmed by the frightening depth’ (*jibun ni semaru osoroshii Roshia no fukasa*) of Russia. Her continued use of ‘Russia’ is significant: the Soviet Union is a new historical entity, but it is ‘Russia’ that signifies the timeless and mysterious qualities of depth and emotionality Yuriko regards as quintessentially Russian. This entity called Russia demands a lot of the traveller; unlike Japan, which snubbed the Russian writer Boris Pilnyak,⁴⁷ Russia draws the traveller in: ‘the strangely deep, wide, complicated life draws us in and we cannot see the bottom of it’ (*iyō na fukai hiroi fukuzatsu na jinsei ga watashitachi ga soko shirezu suikomu*) (p. 30).

This ‘depth and bottomless feeling’ is not only embodied by the people, but by the landscape. Yuriko switches from the abstract to a new scene: the Kremlin

⁴⁷ Pilnyak visited Japan in 1926, and wrote a book about the experience called ‘The Roots of the Japanese Sun’ (Struve 1972: 226-27). In her diary, Yuriko criticizes this book for the shallowness of its observations (*Diary, MYZ Vol. 24, 16 December 1927, p. 222*).

walls at night, the sentry standing by Lenin's mausoleum, and closes in on the stone dais in Red Square, the Lobnoye Mesto, which Yuriko believes to have been an execution block. She describes it, in melodramatic language, as a symbol of the Russian people's oppression, surrounded on all sides by the church crosses that 'speak of fear' (*kyōfu o katatte iru*). 'The people, thronging like the sea (*umi no yō ni*). The axe, already sharpened, on the block. Blood staining (*shimiru*) the snow. Oh God! Our Father the Tsar! Loving Tsarina!' (p. 31). (In fact, the stone dais was primarily used by tsars from the time of Ivan the Terrible to announce imperial edicts.) Eventually, the Russian people could no longer endure their oppression and threw off their burden, shocking the world (p. 32). The history of the Russian people and their 'bottomless depth' is manifest for Yuriko in the buildings and street scenes of Moscow, the monumental and the trivial. The capacity of the passionate Russian people to make great progress is grounded in their great and terrible history, but 'will they go to God or to the Devil?' (*Kami e mukatte ka, akuma e mukatte ka'* (p. 32) – a question that indicates Yuriko, for all her self-described bedazzlement with 'Russia', had not yet entirely made up her mind about the Soviet Union. This scene is recreated in similar detail in *Dōhyō*, right down to Nobuko's imagining of the cries of the oppressed Russian people, but without this particular question.

That last question underscores an aspect of 'Record of Moscow Impressions' that does not appear in any of Yuriko's subsequent writing, a view of Soviet Russia that is not completely positive. She describes the overcrowding of Moscow, quoting statistics: four families sharing a flat with one kitchen; schools working double shifts (p. 20). She and Yoshiko have to share a hotel room, enduring lack of space and privacy. In these conditions, Yuriko cannot write and Yoshiko cannot practise her Russian pronunciation. The Hotel Passage, when they first arrived, is full of Profintern (Red International of Labour Unions) delegates. She notes the preferential treatment given them – the dining room tables are laid with real cloths instead of white paper, the folded napkins and heavy tableware (presumably silverware) (p. 21) – and their high-handed behaviour as the hotel waiter is overburdened by their imperious demands for room service. Yuriko is not satisfied by the surface-level 'facility sight-seeing' (*shisetsu kankō*) provided by

VOKS, along with an English-speaking guide; they see the wonderful crèche, reading room and workers' club at the Red October sweet factory, but what does this mean, beyond the fact that such facilities exist at all in the USSR? Such sightseeing 'pokes up like a stepping-stone from the surface of life in the USSR' (*tobi ishi no yō ni CCCP zentai seikatsu no fukai suimen kashira o dashite iru*) (p. 23). For Yuriko, determined to explore the 'depths' of Russia, this surface-level tourism is frustrating. However, she does not reflect on the propaganda role of VOKS: to instil foreign visitors with a positive image of Soviet Russia. Finally, she describes the beggars (p. 24) and street vendors, permitted under Lenin's 1921 New Economic Policy but subject to increasing suppression under the Five-Year Plan inaugurated in 1928. The discrepancy between what Yuriko records in 'Record of Moscow Impressions' and her later writings on the Soviet Union, including *Dōhyō*, is discussed at length by Iwabuchi (1996: 168-175), who concludes that while Yuriko clearly saw the negatives as well as the positives, she was able to rationalise this gap – socialism was still under construction – and therefore chose to represent only the Soviet ideal in her subsequent, politically committed writing. For Iwabuchi, Yuriko's decision to suspend her critical faculties was to her detriment as a writer. Other critics, such as Tsuda (2001), claim that it was not possible for Yuriko know the full reality of Stalinism either during her stay in Russia or when she was writing *Dōhyō*.

In my view, the answer is contained within 'Record of Moscow Impressions'. Yuriko's love of 'Russia' as she has imagined it from translated novels flowers into full infatuation with what she sees of modern Soviet Russia within minutes of her arrival – the famous first three minutes – and determines her positive perspective thereon in. These 'negatives' do not detract from the overall positive tone of the piece; rather, they add to the realistic effect; for example, the attempted arrest of the apple seller is presented as a warm, folksy anecdote that demonstrates Russian fatalism rather than as an incident of oppression.

In the final scene, a description of the view from the balcony of their room at Engineer Rybakov's flat, Yuriko writes,

The Japanese women have only lived here in Moscow for six months ... but Russia has made a strong impression on them [*tsuyoku kanjitte iru*]. The USSR is trying to achieve good things [*yoi mono*] that exist nowhere else on earth in the twentieth century. At the same time, it is also suffers from being incomplete and has problems that exist nowhere else [*dokodemonai kyodai na mikansei to konnan o motte iru*] (p. 44).

Yuriko accepts that as an unprecedented development in human history, the Soviet Union is still a work in progress and that the going will not be easy. The negatives she presents are thus growth pangs, not the final outcome.

In this essay, Yuriko's experience of Moscow is presented as primarily sensory, informed by her historical and literary love of Russia, a vivid imaginary that is superimposed on the reality of Soviet Moscow within minutes of her arrival. The detailed description of the cityscape and narrated episodes, such as the runaway street vendor, recreate the city in a highly visual, cinematic way that reflects the influence of modernist techniques on Yuriko's already descriptive, consciously literary prose. In 'Record of Moscow Impressions', traditional Russia is portrayed as still palpable beneath the modern Soviet Union, as the narrator relates her book-knowledge (Gorky, Dostoevsky) to what she actually observes and experiences. The distinction between traditional Russia and the modern Soviet Union is not yet fully clear in the narrator's mind; Moscow the city is presented as embodying both. In this piece, Yuriko's positionality is that of a literary writer who is overwhelmed by her first six months in Moscow and sympathetic to 'Russia' in all its aspects, but not yet intellectually committed to communism.

In Nobuko's encounter with the former communist leader Yamagami Gen in the final section of *Dōhyō*, she is critical of 'Record of Moscow Impressions' for its lack of class consciousness and its infatuation with 'Russian-ness' (DH, Vol. 3, p. 453-54). This indicates clearly the extent of Nobuko/Yuriko's political development over the intervening two years, as recognised by Yuriko herself, and captured in the next essay, 'London 1929', written around the same time as this meeting (unrecorded in her diary) with Katayama Sen.

'London 1929'

Yuriko's side-trip to Europe in April-December 1929 gave her the opportunity to compare her positive impressions of the USSR with the visible inequalities of European capitalism, in particular, the situation of Britain, the imperial world power at this time. An observer did not need to be a committed left-wing ideologue to read the Wall Street crash of October 1929 as evidence that capitalism was tottering or at least deeply dysfunctional.

'London 1929'⁴⁸ was also published in *Kaizō*, in June 1930, almost exactly two years after 'Record of Moscow Impressions'. It is assumed to have been written in March that year (*MYZ*, Vol. 9, *Kaisetsu*, p. 593). Like 'Record of Moscow Impressions', the style is highly descriptive, generating almost photographic images of London streets and parks. Tonally, however, this piece has an ideological awareness that is absent from 'Record of Moscow Impressions', demonstrating a shift in Yuriko's positionality and self-presentation towards unquestioning advocacy of the Soviet Union. The unsubtle 'scene changes' and the heavy-handed commentary of 'London 1929' leave the reader in no doubt as to where Yuriko's sympathies lie. She is writing as an overt critic of capitalism, particularly in its British manifestation, a socialist sympathiser who tries, unsuccessfully, to have the doorman of her smart Kensington hotel deliver her the workers' paper, *The Herald*, and takes walking and bus tours of the East End to observe the poverty first-hand. Nevertheless, in 'London 1929', Yuriko the communist has not yet been subsumed by Yuriko the literary writer, who still employs the densely descriptive style of her 'bourgeois' period, drawing on a sophisticated range of cultural and historical references.

At the time of writing 'London 1929', Yuriko, who had a keen interest in cinema, had been exposed to modernist Soviet cinema and become acquainted with the Japanese director Kinugasa Teinosuke, and her cinematic narrative strategies are even more marked in this essay than in 'Record of Moscow Impressions'. Ideological harangues and tables of statistics, while present, are still subordinate to the visual argument presented through intricately described street

⁴⁸ All references to 'London 1929' are from Vol. 9 of *MYZ*, pp. 46-89.

scenes – ‘spectacles’ (*kokei*), as described by Tyler – that are presented, for the most part, to ‘speak for themselves’. I will describe the literary devices Yuriko uses to ‘film’ London as a critical outsider, using vivid detail to create a visual critique rather than an abstract argument.

As in the previous essay, ‘London 1929’ is framed like a film, beginning with the unnamed ‘Japanese woman’ arriving by plane and travelling into London by bus, and concluding with a panoramic shot of the moon rising over London and the Dover Strait as if seen from the air. The use of a nameless ‘Japanese woman’, yet again, as the visually presented protagonist figure in this filmic text, narrated by Yuriko, works in a similar fashion to her use of Nobuko as an alter-ego in *Dōhyō*: while retaining her narrative prerogatives, Yuriko distances herself half a degree from her own story, creating a space between actual events and her reportage or fictional version of them, as if inviting the reader to step into the subject position of the nameless ‘Japanese woman’ (perhaps a challenge for her male readers) and see through her eyes. In this way, an intrinsically personal narrative is detached from its original subject and universalised.

The essay maps the city’s inequalities, switching from East to West and back again, and zeroing in on the Bank of England as the central point at which these two cities meet and are divided. All this is observed by the ‘Japanese woman’, who in a modernist fashion moves like a camera eye through the city, travelling on its buses and strolling in its parks. Yuriko uses the filmic technique of ‘montaging’, switching abruptly between scenes in a way that emphasises the stark contrasts between the squalor of the East End and the complacent comfort of the West End. The noise, dust and crowds of Whitechapel Road are described in detail: a young shop assistant, dirt visible on her face beneath her powder and lipstick; the unemployed men in their flat caps and collarless shirts standing about in the streets; the throng in the ‘sixpence’ shop; and a young woman whom Yuriko imagines, taking novelistic licence, to have foregone cups of tea in order to buy a cheap bead necklace for Sunday best (‘London 1929’, pp. 50, 52-53).

Victoria Park and Kensington Gardens are described in alternation. In Kensington Gardens, children play with their toy yachts in the large pond, the white sails contrasting against the colourful clothes of their mothers (p. 65). In Victoria

Park, 'hollow-cheeked, sallow children' (*hoppeta no koketa kaairo warui kodomo*) who have no toy yachts wade in the pond, exposing their dirty clothes and limbs and splash their friends with pieces of wood (p. 65). A baby is pulled along in a wheeled wooden box contraption by older children, their emaciated faces like 'upside-down Russian balalaikas' (*Roshia no bararaika o gyaku ni tateta yō ni*), their bodies ingrained with the 'strangely sticky blue-black' (*iyō ni nettori nebari tsuiteiru aoguroi*) dirt of the East End (p. 65-66). The lawn in Victoria Park is thin and worn; there are no chairs for rent or pet dogs with tinkling collars (p. 66). On a Sunday in Victoria Park, there are lots of children with starved, triangular faces; the older ones look after the younger ones. In the West End parks, however, there are hardly any women with more than five children (p. 83). Yuriko describes a scene in an open-air Kensington Park teashop: a baby in a perambulator and its nurse; the striped sunshades; an elderly gentleman who lifts a teacup to his mouth, the other hand, white-gloved, resting on a smart cane; a waiter in white apron and a tailcoat who smilingly rolls a ball back to a mother and a child at one of the other tables (p. 55).

To emphasise the obliviousness of the affluent towards the poor, Yuriko describes an incident (p. 56) in which a drunken man, whom she presumes to be unemployed, wearing a flat cap and a collarless shirt – the sartorial markers of the working classes – climbs over the low iron railing that surrounds this tea room. He falls flat on the ground and the sparrows eat the crumbs around his head. Everyone in the teashop ignores him, even though it is impossible that they cannot see this drunk, dishevelled man in their midst. Eventually the drunk clambers to his feet and, trying to find his way out, staggers among the tables, amid the waiters carrying their loaded trays. People glance in his direction, then look away. There is a 'strange, non-man's land/ uninhabited region' (*fushigi na mujinkyō*) between this man and the other people in the café. The reader assumes Yuriko, or her alter-ego, the 'Japanese woman', is sitting in this café too, an observer who gains admittance to such polite venues as a Kensington Garden teashop through her middle-class attire and money. She is the only the person who 'sees' this man, assigning him significance as a representative of the social divide; nevertheless, she too maintains her distance and does not display any active sympathy.

The pivot between East and West London, the London of the poor and the rich, is the Bank of England and the Stock Exchange, which Yuriko describes as the great hub of both London and British capitalism, ‘two gigantic magnetic rocks’ (*futatsu no kyodai na jishakuiwa*) around which a ‘human tide’ (*hitonami*) ‘swirls like a vortex of rubbish’ (*gomi magiage tsu tsu nagareru*) (p. 69). This human tide is mirrored at Oxford Circus and other Underground stations, where the lifts and escalators pour out ‘dense formations of black [-suited] people like grains, a giant rotatory spawning’ (*kuroi ningen no tsubutsubu no misshū sasete kaiten suru kyodai na sanran*) (p. 72). This description of city crowds brings to mind scenes from contemporary films, such as Fritz Lang’s *Metropolis* (1929),⁴⁹ in which the modern city is portrayed as a huge machine in which humans are reduced to worker-robots, mere cogs in the mechanism. Similarly, in Yokomitsu’s short story, *Kikai* (Machine, 1930), four metalworkers are depicted as devoid of agency, subject instead to the calculations of fate, envisaged as an invisible machine.

In the central polemic of this essay, Yuriko the narrator addresses these unthinking, robot-like humans directly:

Workers of London, ladies and gentlemen! ... Are you aware at all of the map of London that is developing over your heads as you are carried along on the London Underground? Long black lines from the East End, colony of the megalopolis [*daitokai no shokuminchi*] of London, to the Bank of England and from there to the wide, lively streets around Buckingham Palace. ... Do you live somewhere in all this? Do you know that the city of London exists on the surface of the earth only because of the labour of workers? The Underground sucks them into the city like a vacuum tube [*shinkūkan no yō ni suikonde*] and continuously blows them out of the city like dregs [*kasu toshite shi no soto e sutetsutsu aru*] ... The ladies and

⁴⁹ *Metropolis* was released in Japan in April 1929, while Yuriko was out of the country and she does not mention having seen it in Moscow, but such representations of the modern city was a feature of films in the 1920s-1930s. In German cinematic expressionism, which was very influential in Japan, the city was often presented as a menacing environment, shot at night or in the rain (Richie 2005: 88).

gentlemen are tranquil, as if they own London [*Rondon o shoyū shite iru ka no godoku heian na no da*] ...

One day, the prematurely aged young generation [*oitaru wakai jidai*] with their reverse-triangle faces will form ranks and come forth [*taigo o nashite kuridashite*] from the East End. They must know how London has been built on their backs. (p. 72)

The inequality of London is presented geographically, as an opposition between East and West, the city itself as a machine that ‘sucks’ workers in and out. Additionally, the relationship between the East End and the City of London is contextualised as a colonial one: the periphery exploited to enrich the centre.

The final, ‘camera-eye’ view of London is provided by a Thomas Cook bus tour of the East End (pp. 87-89). Yuriko describes the narrow, dark streets, still gas-lit, treeless, stairwells with no doors, cheap lodging houses with their signs (‘BED SIXPENCE’), the spectacle of a well-dressed man leading a woman into a car through a crowd of beggar children as his chauffeur distributes cigarettes among them. The black and white scene, within the white-tiled, brightly lit but dirty Thames Tunnel,⁵⁰ of a young worker (identified by his flat cap) walking with his girl, has the ‘intense beauty’ of a woodcut (*kyōretsu hangateki utsukushisa*) by Frans Masereel. In *Dōhyō*, Nobuko is depicted as buying a book of his prints from a bookshop in the German Communist Party HQ in Berlin, images that evidently informed Yuriko’s own visual experience of the modern cityscape. Additionally, her reference to a left-wing artist to supplement her own description serves to show her up-to-date knowledge as a middle-class art aficionado and her artistic sensibility to the readers of *Kaizō*. Inadvertently, this reference distances her from her objects of sympathy, the ‘workers’ identified by their flat caps. This echoes Nobuko’s experience, in the scene in *Dōhyō*, of taking an early-morning Metro once during her stay in Paris and being surrounded by workers, a novelty that highlights for the reader Nobuko’s separation from the actual proletariat in these teeming modern cities, and how her experience and interpretation of the city-space was fundamentally middle-class.

⁵⁰ The Thames Tunnel was opened in 1843, the world’s first tunnel under a river.

The other geographical binary presented in this article is that between the Soviet Union and Britain. The Soviet Union is the point of comparison throughout. It is barely mentioned, an almost phantom presence, but Yuriko's readers would have been well aware of this. Soviet Russia is the positive corollary of the relentlessly negative view Yuriko presents of 'London', which metonymically represents British capitalism and empire. Japan is only mentioned as a subsidiary point of comparison. Yuriko identifies with the Soviet Union, in opposition to 'London' as Britain, representing the global imperialist-capitalist system of which Japan is a part. Although Yuriko spent longer in Paris than in London in 1929,⁵¹ France escapes the burden of representing global capitalism and its evils. This may reflect the different meanings of France and Britain for the Japanese: France was perceived as a centre of culture (Rimer 1988; Slaymaker 2007), while Britain represented an economic and political model for Meiji statesmen.

In her critique of 'England', Yuriko draws on various stereotypes, presenting them in a negative light. On her way from the airport, the 'Japanese woman' observes the 'peculiarly subdued' (*dokutoku no shizumarikata*) façade of middle-class housing: compact, two-storey houses, with brick or gravel paths, low hedges, flowerbeds and lace-curtained windows (p. 49). A person cannot enter an 'English home' (*eikoku no katei*, glossed as *ingurishu hōmu*), says Yuriko the narrator, without a letter of introduction. (In fact, going by her diary, she did not actually enter any English homes, or associate with any English people other than her father's former landlady.) For the respectable 'Mr' and 'Mrs' of England, their home, like the Japanese home, is a 'microcosm of the state' (*kokka saibō toshite no katei*). This is the first instance in which Yuriko explicitly aligns Japan with Britain, creating a parallel in which the conventional household reflects and supports the political and economic superstructure. She goes on: in the 'English' way of doing things, everyone knows the distinction between what one says to other people and what one keeps to oneself, and one is always skilfully ensuring that this distinction is not compromised (p. 49). This clichéd description of 'English society' as emotionally repressed and therefore emotionally inauthentic seems based on

⁵¹ Yuriko spent approximately six weeks in London in August-September 1928, with her family, and two months in Paris on either side of this trip.

novel-reading rather than on any experience of reality. My interpretation here is that Yuriko is invoking Japanese *perceptions* of 'England', to a significant extent probably formed by the range of English literature (in translation or in the original) available in Japan in this period. For example, in *Dōhyō* (Vol. 3, p. 112), as Nobuko passes through West London, she names it as the setting for John Galsworthy's (1867-1933) novels. The most famous of these, *The Forsyte Saga*, was a critical depiction by an Edwardian writer of the rigid social and moral codes of the Victorian-era English upper-class. Yuriko's experience of London, like her experience of Moscow, is in many ways mediated through literature, which enables her to assume inside knowledge of a society which she otherwise only observes from the outside.

She extends her critique of Britain, the representative capitalist nation, to the elite Japanese who continue to admire the British way – men like her architect father Seichirō, who studied at Cambridge and had fond memories of England. She observes that the Japanese in Britain adapt to middle-class British ways, being generally middle or upper-class themselves, since London is an expensive place. Representative of this type is 'Mr M', a former Japanese businessman resident in London. 'Mr M' reads copiously on economics; has friends in the British union movement; attends meetings of the League of Nations in Geneva; and advises visiting Japanese on all things British, including government officials who lack the time or language skills to understand Britain themselves. Mr M is an admirer of English 'fair play' (*kōhei na shōbu*, glossed as *fueā pure*) and 'commercial spirit' (*shōkon*), and holds forth on the meaning of 'gentleman' to his many Japanese visitors. Yuriko describes a scene in which Mr M declares that British trade unions will cooperate with demands to cut wages, a 'rationalisation' (*gōrika*) that the Third International⁵² has declared irrational, disregarding the special British 'commercial spirit' (p. 73). Mr M believes cooperation to be the 'English way' (*Igirisu ryū*). The 'Japanese woman' thinks privately that there is a distinction between what is rational and what is convenient for certain people. Elsewhere, Yuriko further

⁵² In its Sixth Congress in summer 1928, the Third International (Comintern) (1919-1943) declared capitalism to be entering its final days and decreed that communist parties should take a militant line against moderate leftists ('social fascists') (Service 2007: 167).

satirises this concept of 'fair play', describing the British as a race who enjoy playing with balls, and suggesting that they are thus inclined to treat the whole globe as a ball to be kicked or knocked around (p. 73). 'M' appears in *Dōhyō* as the businessman Kimura Ichio, whose endorsement of the 'English merchant spirit' echoes the faith of Nobuko's father Taizō in 'English common sense', which Nobuko now understands as representing the capitalist status quo.

Yuriko concludes this scene with an aside to the reader: the 'commercial spirit' that devised the rationalisation of British coalmining has brought about a 16% reduction in worker numbers in two years and a drop in wages, set against a higher rate of injury and death (p. 79). The intrusion of economic facts and statistics into the otherwise descriptive, cinematic narrative demonstrates that Yuriko is shifting from a purely sensory, emotional engagement with her surroundings to an attitude that is underpinned by 'hard' abstract data, a shift that is also evident in the last year of her diary, 1930, and the latter part of *Dōhyō*, which includes long paragraphs that read like newspaper reportage on world affairs, inserted into a novel.

English philanthropy, capitalism's answer to socialism and the domain of the humanitarian middle-class, is treated dismissively by Yuriko. When 'the Japanese woman' first visits Toynbee Hall, the pioneering 'settlement' in which Oxbridge students lived as social-work volunteers in the East End, she is impatient to find that it is shut on Saturdays. Having seen what life is like in Moscow, the 'Japanese woman' is 'not as patient as Londoners' (*Rondon jin no yō ni nintai tsuyoku nai*) (p. 52). In a separate 'scene', she returns on a weekday, with her letter of introduction, and is given a tour of the facilities – in fact, the same kind of tour she has experienced in Soviet Russia, although Yuriko does not make this comparison. When she is shocked by the separate cafeterias – a dark, low-ceiling upper room with a dirty table and folding chairs, where 'they' (the people who come to Toynbee Hall) can drink tea for tuppence, and an airy, wainscoted room with Gothic windows and white tablecloths, where the volunteers take their tea (p. 61-62), her guide responds cheerfully that it is better than nothing. Yuriko is shown photographs that portray only Toynbee Hall's social workers, in which the graduates of its Adult Education courses are invisible. Her guide points out a single

Japanese woman, described by Yuriko as a representative 'living model' (*namagata*) of a graduate of Japan Women's University (p. 61). Despite her own privileged upbringing and education, Yuriko does not identify with this do-gooding young Japanese woman who, like herself, had been able to study at university and travel abroad, who is instead lumped in with the Oxbridge volunteers, on the side of capitalism. Yuriko herself is positioned on the side of the 'workers' and the underprivileged, despite the markedly middle-class style of her stay in London.

The People's Palace on Mile End Rd, Whitechapel⁵³ is described in similar terms, a public facility that is the pride of London and the envy of Japanese officials, but nonetheless deserted. Here Yuriko makes one of the few overt comparisons to Moscow, where 'even a shabby workers' club will be overflowing' (*kechi na rōdōsha kurabu ni sae michiafureru*) (p. 63). In this building, there is no reading room, no clubs to spread knowledge. Yuriko lambasts charity as a farce: the contributions of the British to public charitable works are traditionally equivalent to the seven shillings and sixpence of tax payable for keeping a dog (p. 74). Despite the supposed generosity of the British, charities of all kinds are desperate for donations and Yuriko is bitterly critical of the rich women who pursue fund-raising to advance their own social careers: 'The holding of a splendid exhibition [*hanabanashii kaisai*] of silver utensils owned by their families for generations by a gaggle of upper-class ladies [*jōryū kifujin ren*] to raise money for a maternity hospital for poor mothers must surely excite grotesque irony [*gurotesuku na hiniku ni kōfun o saserarete wa ikenai*]' (p. 75). Contrasted against the self-interested charity of the rich, the union-funded Central Labour College (1909-1929) was forced to close that year because the unions could no longer bear the costs of £3000-4000 a year. The reader is presented with a final, cinematic, meaning-laden image of the sun shining on the college's brass name-plate and the FOR SALE sign on the balcony (p. 79).

This article is very similar to the London section of *Dōhyō*, which in its details reads as if Yuriko were writing directly from the memories captured in 'London 1929'. The main difference is the mention of Nobuko's family in the later *Dōhyō*

⁵³ Now the Mile End campus of Queen Mary University of London, the People's Palace was founded in 1887 as a philanthropic institution providing cultural and educational resources to the residents of the East End. See <http://www.qmul.ac.uk/about/history/index.html>

version. In the novel, Yuriko presents her family critically, as the embodiment of the middle-class. Their presence in 'London 1929', apart from being extraneous to a contained, single-protagonist narrative in which she presented herself as a free-floating and critical observer of the British class divide, would have jarringly foregrounded her class origins.

First, in *Dōhyō* the former landlady of Nobuko's father Taizō, Mrs Layman, has come down in the world since the Great War and does not feel herself able to offer appropriate lodgings to his son and daughter-in-law. Nobuko feels no sympathy for the declining fortunes of a middle-class family and reflects that the Sasa family would face a similar fate in due course – a statement representative of the dogmatic, mature Yuriko, who coldly accepted, as a communist, the inevitable end of the middle classes and depicted her ideological rejection of her family very clearly in *Dōhyō* (DH, Vol. 3, p. 110).

Secondly, Nobuko takes her younger sister Tsuyako with her on the Thomas Cook night tour of the East End (DH, Vol. 3, pp. 117-118). There is no mention of Yuriko's sister Sueko in the article. In *Dōhyō*, Nobuko considers it necessary that Tsuyako, currently living in a state of innocence, needs to understand the 'truth' (*shinjitsu*) (p. 118). Here Nobuko is shown acting as a 'roadsign' for her sister, attempting to change her perspective, in a way that she was not able to change Tamotsu's by letter, by confronting her with an alternative experience of the cityscape. For Nobuko, the actual experience of various cities, rather than theory or debate, has been profoundly transformative, and it seems that she hopes Tsuyako will be similarly affected.

Finally, it transpires that Nobuko is only permitted three weeks' stay in the UK, whereas her family have no such limits. Taizō questions Nobuko about this, provoking the 'red ink mark' feeling in Nobuko, a reference to the marked-up article he sent her in Moscow about the mass arrest of Japanese communists. Nobuko assures him that this is only because she came directly from Moscow, not from Tokyo, and that he need not worry, she is not a communist (DH, Vol. 3, pp. 119-121). In face of Nobuko's identification with the Soviet Union, this disavowal seems dishonest to the reader, but she is not formally a Party member and, as she has experienced herself already, the distinction between fellow-traveller/outsider and

committed Communist/insider is strictly observed by the Party. As a narrator, Yuriko is emphasising that Nobuko has not yet made the step from fellow traveller to fully committed, card-carrying communist – a step that Nobuko knows has serious consequences back in Japan. As the author of ‘London 1929’, fully aware of the suppression of communism in Japan, Yuriko had no reason to advertise her own father’s suspicions of her, even if she denied them at the time.

Yuriko’s positionality in this piece is contradictory. The anonymous ‘Japanese woman’ of the article has no family or social context, apparently in London on her own, her experience of the city unmediated by any companions. While the narrator is an unmistakably middle-class presence in London, arriving by airplane, staying in a Kensington hotel, taking tea at the Trocadero⁵⁴ and attending a mannequin show at Swan’s Department Store [sic],⁵⁵ she positions herself in opposition to the middle-class world she inhabits, criticising its hypocrisy and its obliviousness to the squalor created by its political and economic underpinnings. Materially, she is within the system, and yet ideologically she is an outsider, a problematic positionality that Yuriko herself does not question in this piece. She also situates herself apart from the Japanese in London, even while she associates with them. She does not record any encounters with actual English working people, who remain the voiceless objects of her outraged concern and observation. In this article, Yuriko the writer is still dominant; although her ideological loyalties are evident, they are expressed through her existing literary style, in which her positionality as a well-travelled, well-educated middle-class woman is overt.

Conclusion

In these two non-fiction, personal essays, written two years apart, Yuriko’s positionality undergoes a marked shift. While her visual and sensory experience of both cities remains foregrounded in these texts, she moves from a deep emotional and sensory engagement with Moscow to an ideologically informed critique of London – albeit as a middle-class observer. The ideological meanings of Moscow

⁵⁴ High-class restaurant located at the corner of Shaftesbury Ave and Windmill St, renowned for its ‘concert teas’.

⁵⁵ Swan & Edgar Ltd was an upmarket department store located at the corner of Piccadilly and Regent Street, on the site occupied until recently by Tower Records/Virgin Megastore.

and London, which represent opposed modernities – socialism-under-construction vs imperial capitalism – are inscribed on the cityscapes, to be observed by Yuriko’s textual avatar, the ‘Japanese woman’, who moves through the text like a character on a cinema screen, and decoded for the reader by Yuriko the omnipresent narrator. However, although Yuriko’s loyalties were very much with Soviet Russia, these articles were written before she became active in the Japanese communist movement and adapted her style and output in accordance with its demands. In these articles, she represents herself as a lover of Russia and therefore of the Soviet Union, its contemporary manifestation, and a critic of capitalism, as embodied by London, but she is not yet a communist, nor a communist writer. She deploys the densely detailed personal style she has already developed as a successful young writer. The polemic and statistics that were a hallmark of her communist journalism in the early 1930s appear in ‘London 1929’, but they are still subordinate to the richly visual description whose rapid cuts and ‘spectacles’ reflect the influence of cinema, more usually found in writing acknowledged as ‘modernist’. Yuriko was no literary modernist, but she was alive to the expressive possibilities of film, and it is fitting that she chose to frame her experience of the modern city in such a modern way. In the late 1940s, Yuriko returned to the conventional I-novel style of her most successful work, *Nobuko*, but the visual imprint of modernism can be seen in the dense descriptions of *Dōhyō* that reflect the more immediate impressions captured in both these articles.

As with the fictional account given in *Dōhyō*, the two articles discussed above are deliberately shaped to present a particular self to an external audience: that of a cosmopolitan, well-read young woman who records the impact of her travels on her subjectivity, in particular, her developing political awareness. The focus of the articles is much narrower, temporally and geographically, the first covering Yuriko’s initial five months in Moscow, the second her relatively brief stay in London. The observing, judging self in these two articles is the obvious precursor of Nobuko in *Dōhyō*. The novel format allowed Yuriko to flesh out in length and detail the experience and impressions that were necessarily compressed and preliminary in the articles. (Admittedly, *Dōhyō* was long by Japanese standards and

there were doubts that *Tenbō* would continue to publish it to the end; Kondo 2002: 286.)

The close convergence between Yuriko's accounts of London and Moscow and her retrospective reconstruction of her experiences in *Dōhyō* lead me to speculate that in writing the two essays immediately following the time they describe, she effectively constructed her future memories of the two cities, ascribing them particular and vivid meanings in her personal narrative that she had no cause to reconsider in the intervening 20 years. If Yuriko had changed her mind about communism, her reconstructed memories of London and Moscow in *Dōhyō* would possibly have taken a different form – as would the novel itself.

7. The Diaries: The Fragmented, Private Self

In this chapter I turn to the diaries, the final layer of my analysis. Yuriko was a life-long diarist and made regular, if often brief, entries throughout her three years abroad. Her diary does not read as a polished, coherent narrative written for publication. Her diaries are ‘dated traces’ (Lejeune 2009), chronologically linked notes. She jotted down small incidents, conversations, the cost of food, arguments with Yuasa Yoshiko, the books she read, the progress of her work, going out for meals, and meeting people. Many days are blank. The longest entries in my period of study occur after her brother Hideo’s suicide in summer 1928 and during her hospital stay in January–April 1929. The mood and focus of the entries varies abruptly. Many seem trivial or incomplete, rushed notes on the day’s events, obscure comments, encounters with people who never reappear. The fragmentary, often terse nature of the diary makes it frustrating to read. Unlike *Dōhyō*, it is not crafted narrative and the reader, aided by the copious annotations in the appendices and the comprehensive chronology (*nenpū*) (*MYZ* Vol. 30), has to pull together a meaningful ‘story’ from what are essentially Yuriko’s private notes.

The lack of deliberate, overarching narrative makes the diaries revealing in different ways from *Dōhyō* or the articles. The Nobuko of *Dōhyō* and the Chūjō Yuriko⁵⁶ of the published articles is the author’s textual creation of herself for public view, a unified, coherent persona: the campaigning communist writer, full of righteous sympathy for the ‘workers’ and ‘the people’, unwavering and consistent in her beliefs. By contrast, in the diaries Yuriko is writing as herself in her late 20s; she is not retrospectively creating an alter-ego to assign a particular meaning to her experiences. The narrator and the protagonist of the diaries are the same person. As a record of Yuriko’s spontaneous, private impressions, unshaped by the self-presentational demands of publication, the diaries are ‘honest’ in a way that her published works are not. By this, I do not mean to claim that Yuriko was ‘lying’ in her published works or that her diaries are transparent. Diaries are not immune

⁵⁶ Although she married Kenji in 1932, Yuriko only formally took his name in December 1934, when she entered herself in his family register. The articles regarded as her Soviet works (*Sobietō kikō*) were published between 1928 and 1933, when she was still known as Chūjō Yuriko.

from self-delusion. The difference is that the form of this delusion is not consciously shaped for an outsider readership, unless the diaries are written or later edited specifically for publication. Yuriko wrote in her diaries what was uppermost in her mind at the time, constantly making choices about what was, literally, noteworthy, and overlooking, or forgetting, other incidents, impressions and encounters that to another diarist may have seemed more significant. These choices do not always reflect what appears in *Dōhyō*.

In attempting to read a life through an 'incremental text' (Dryburgh 2013: 110), I will draw on Culley's notion of 'fragments' and Lejeune's approach of noting the patterns to identify and draw out repetitive threads that relate to Yuriko's dynamic and intersecting positionalities in the context of several foreign cities, as already identified in my analysis of *Dōhyō* and the two essays. How did Yuriko record the effect of her travels on her subjectivity as a middle-class Japanese woman writer when she was not constructing a coherent narrative for an audience? How does this compare to the retrospective, semi-fictional narrative she created in *Dōhyō* and the polished accounts of 'Record of Moscow Impressions' and 'London 1929', written at the same time as the diaries but for publication, and what does this comparison reveal? I consider how these themes reflect contradictions, stability or development in particular aspects of her self-conception and subjectivity.

Material encounter with Soviet Russia

In this section I shall examine Yuriko's material experience of Soviet Russia as depicted in the diaries. Much of Yuriko's Moscow diary is a record of her practical experiences and challenges in making a life there as a foreign resident. A decade after the October Revolution, daily life in Russia, even in the capital city, was dogged by all kinds of shortages. Yuriko's diary is a catalogue of these mundane exigencies. While her daily life followed a familiar pattern, Moscow in the late 1920s presented novel challenges to a Japanese woman who was used to living in comfort. How she recorded this experience tells us much about her self-conception and to what extent it was destabilised by life in Soviet Moscow *at the time*, not as

she remembered and reconstructed her experience in *Dōhyō*, from the perspective of a long-time loyal communist who omitted the negatives.

Why is there nowhere for me to sleep?

The most immediate practical challenge for the two women when they arrive in Moscow on 15 December 1927, and one that they never satisfactorily resolve, is that of accommodation. Unable to find a room in the grand Bolshaya Moskovskaya hotel, Yuriko and Yoshiko are taken by their acquaintance, the leftist Esperantist and writer Akita Ujaku, to the modest Hotel Passage. The Hotel Passage becomes a recurring theme throughout the Moscow diary, a fixed and usually reliable point to which Yuriko and Yoshiko continually return as they are evicted from rented rooms or return from travelling. The experience of Moscow life is one of on-going domestic instability; while attempting to live a settled existence in Moscow, as necessary for Yuriko's writing and Yoshiko's intensive program of Russian language study, they are constantly subject to the fundamental condition of travel: displacement.

Yuriko's representation of this experience varies. During their long absence in the summer of 1928, their excess belongings – a perpetual travellers' hassle – have been left for safekeeping here and there, wrapped in newspaper. Yoshiko says, in Russian, 'We're completely down and out!' (rendered in katakana and translated as *Watashitachi mattaku binbō ni natte shimatta*) (6 November 1928, p. 319).⁵⁷ The fact that Yuriko includes this joking comment in her diary underlines that 'down and outness', signified by carrying one's possessions around wrapped in newspapers – rather than in a suitcase or a more traditional *furoshiki* – is an unusual, even extreme, condition; also, that she does not expect it to be a permanent one. This 'down-and-outness' is a temporary outcome of her life in the Soviet Union and thus she can refer to it lightly, perhaps alluding to the *runpen* (lumpen [proletariat]) genre that was popular in the late 1920s and early 1930s, supposedly reflecting the experience of people on the margins of the economy and society (Ericson 1997:63-69).

⁵⁷ All diary references are from *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū* (Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 1979-1986), Vol. 24.

The comedic novelty of homelessness eventually wears on Yuriko. When she is due to leave hospital after her long illness in April 1929, the doctor will not allow her to be discharged into a hotel room (2 April 1929, p. 383). Yuriko is in despair: there are ‘many places in the world’ (*yo no naka ni wa ōku no basho ga aru*), so ‘how is it possible that I cannot find a place to sleep?’ (*da kara dōshite jibun no neru basho wa nai no ka*) (3 April 1929, p. 386). Moving from cramped room to cramped room, at the mercy of landlords, with no security of tenure and the constant prospect of homelessness, this is how poor people live, not genteel ladies. This outburst in Yuriko’s diary, along with the repetition of the details, often complaining, of her accommodation woes, reveal Yuriko’s fundamental expectation, as an affluent middle-class person, that there will always be a place for her. Despite her intellectual awareness, as the precocious author of ‘A Flock of Poor People’, that poverty and thus homelessness exist, she never considers the possibility that she herself will ever be without ‘somewhere to sleep’. However, nowhere in the diary does she blame the Soviet system for her predicament. As I will discuss, during her time in the Soviet Union, she did not identify as privileged, but rather perceived herself to be sharing the privations of socialism-under-construction along with her beloved Russians.

Cold meat and tea

In Moscow as private travellers, not by invitation as important cultural or political figures, the two women had to fend largely for themselves. Unlike the average Russian citizen, however, they had friends in the embassy who could provide them with foreign goods (rice, soy sauce, *katsuoboshi*) and treat them to Japanese dinners or meals at the Savoy (e.g., 9 March 1930, p. 497) – an advantage not mentioned in *Dōhyō*. Nevertheless, the two women lived in a more limited fashion than Yuriko had been used to in Tokyo. Here I will analyse what Yuriko’s representations of this in her diary can tell us about how this material experience challenged her positionality – or not.

Before their trip, Yuriko’s relaxed attitude to spending and Yoshiko’s zealous thrift had been a cause of tension between them. However, apart from noting their arguments on the topic (e.g. 25 August 1927, p. 209), in the year before leaving for

Tokyo, Yuriko's diary does not contain detailed information on shopping for daily necessities – presumably undertaken by their maid – as opposed to the leisurely process of going to Mitsukoshi and Maruzen to purchase presents, books, stationery and clothes. From the very start of her journey, by contrast, Yuriko comments regularly on the price and availability of food and the process of obtaining it. In early 1928 she records her success at bargaining down the price of oranges and apples at a street kiosk, an unexpected achievement for someone like herself, who only ever pays the price she is told (8 January 1928, p. 240). Her frustration with the lack of fixed prices and the need to negotiate is evident in her record of their dealings with the VOKS Japan representative Novomirsky (literally, Mr 'New World'), over possible lodgings, who is presented as a somewhat shifty character (13-14 January 1928, pp. 241-42).

Meals are mentioned regularly, not so much as pleasures but as achievements. As lodgers, not having the facilities to cook for themselves, the two women regularly eat lunch at a vegetarian cafeteria (the '*begeterian*') and take light meals in their room in the evening, cold meat and tea, rather than venturing out for dinner, especially during the Russian winter. Yuriko writes that she is 'fed up and annoyed' (*akite heikō nari*) by this repetitive fare (3 April 1928, p. 266), but accommodation with full board is hard to find (23 December 1928, p. 339). By 1930, she complains in the diary about 'years' of eating in cafeterias (8 May 1930, p. 515). She notes the simple meals prepared in their room: macaroni and butter (20 September 1930, p. 563); rice, *nori* and *katsuboshi* (22 September 1930, p. 563). On 24 September there is nothing to be had in the cafeteria, again, so they cook rice (p. 564). The repeated mention of their simple, limited meals and Yuriko's frustration indicates that this is not what she considers the normal state of affairs – for her.

In her diary Yuriko mentions frequent shortages, a negative of Soviet life that does not appear in *Dōhyō*. Caught up in the Christmas shopping crowds in the department store Mostorg, she writes, 'A Russian crowd doesn't appear because there is a lot of money [*kane*] and many goods [*busshi*]. The opposite: it appears because there is a shortage of them [*ketsubō shite iru*]' (10 December 1928, p. 335). In April 1928, she writes, without commentary, that ration books are required to

purchase bread, and that a person can only buy one *funt* (=400g) of bread a day (4-5 April 1928, pp. 387-88). Back in Moscow in 1930, after months of relative ease in Europe, Yuriko's diary features frequent cursory notes on prices and availability of basic items. Food stocks have become 'strained' (*shokuryō ga nakanaka hippaku shite kita*) (9 February 1930, p. 490). On 10 March, the coop has lemons, but there are empty wooden crates (p. 497). They eat canned fish in the evening, which is always tomato-flavoured (11 March 1930, p. 497). The two women acquire a taste for a smoked fish called *ōbura*, which, she notes, used to be the food of very poor people (18 March 1930, p. 499).

When they are evicted by their landlord and move back to the Hotel Passage in April 1930, Yuriko writes in some detail about new, higher prices at the hotel dining room (*shokudō*): 50-55 kopecks for soup, 15k for tea, stickleback up to 75k from 35k. Main dishes up to 80-90k from 60K, 90K for an entrecote. Butter has gone up in 5k increments (15 May 1930, p. 518). The next day, Yuriko continues what she calls a 'cost of living survey' (*bukka chōsa*). In a Moscow *stolovaya* (cafeteria), soup is 25k, other dishes 50-90k (16 May 1930, p. 518). She sees hundreds of people queuing at a kiosk for 'Deli' brand tobacco (2 June 1930, p. 528). From 12 June, 'Lux Delu' brand tobacco is available from hotel reception desks and from the VOKS lobby (p. 533), obviously for the convenience of visiting foreigners, although Yuriko does not offer any comment. Eggs go up to 23k from 22k, and the coop has no alcohol to sell (21 June 1930, p. 536). When the women return to Moscow after travelling south for the summer, in the space of three months, supplies in Moscow are 'even tighter' (*sara ni fuben ni natta*) (4 August 1930, p. 551). People in Moscow are spending about half their money in order to eat, and books (an important regular purchase for both women) are also more expensive (12 August 1930, p. 554). Brief notes on the cost of food items and frustration with their limited diet (macaroni, rice, onions, garlic) occur regularly right up until their departure in late 1930.

This repetitive, detailed commentary indicates that price rises and shortages matter to Yuriko. She is recording the material reality of her life in Moscow, an environment in which, unlike Tokyo, her basic needs are met by what is available, not what she chooses. This is the first time in her life that she has endured such

material limitations, although she is by no means starving: after losing weight in hospital, she records that it has gone back up to 57kg (6 April 1929, p. 389). What this commentary emphasises is that Yuriko is not sheltered from the reality of Soviet conditions, unlike, for example, foreign dignitaries such as Baron Gotō Shinpei, who are accommodated at the luxurious Hotel Savoy. She presents herself as living like an ordinary Soviet citizen, not only observing but experiencing Russian life at street-level, an experience she ‘authenticates’ in the diary by recording, with journalistic brevity and exactitude, the nitty-gritty daily details.

Yuriko does not, however, reflect in the diary about the political background to these increasing shortages, a result of the dismantling by Stalin of the New Economic Policy (NEP) implemented by Lenin in 1921 to appease the fractious peasantry. Under the NEP, private commercial exchanges were re-legalised (Service 1997: 123-125); hence, the peasant street markets and kiosks used by Yuriko and Yoshiko in tandem with the state cooperative stores. In 1928 a new system of collective farms was forcibly introduced, along with the repression of the ‘rich peasant’ class (kulaks) (Service 1997). The move to centralised state planning with the First Five Year Plan (1929-32) and the drive to rapid industrialisation marked the start of ‘an era of chronic shortages’ (Fitzpatrick 1999: 2-4). In her diary, Yuriko notes that when farmers appear on Okhotny Ryad, selling things, the government ‘appears to be accepting of such small-scale capitalism’ (*seifu ga yurusu yō ni natta no da*) (15 March 1930, p. 498). On the same day, Yoshiko reads in the newspaper about various unspecified ‘episodes’ [katakana, *episōdo*] taking place in *kolkhozes* (collective farms). On 23 March she writes that the peasant market has become crowded beyond words; there are no lemons or anything in the cooperative, but on the streets, the peasants have lemons to sell. Where do they get them from? Yuriko concludes, echoing the official government line, that ‘indeed, peasants have a stranglehold over supplies’ (*yappari hyakushōme, nakanaka dōshite kyūjo o nigitte iru*) (p. 500). However, she continues to shop at Okhotny Ryad peasant market until it is shut down by the police on 13 April 1930. Yuriko merely notes that she is surprised by this change (p. 504). In June the market is merged into No. 1 Market (2 June 1930, p. 528). Yuriko does not record any further information about nature of this merger or its new management.

By noting these details in the diary, Yuriko is already creating herself as an authority on the actual Soviet situation (*genjitsu*), a role she will step into publicly and vigorously on her return to Japan. Her authoritative view of Soviet life is based on street-level observation, reportage and lived experience, as reflected in the diary; however, she does not go beyond this to speculation or analysis. Since Yuriko's lived experience of the Soviet Union subsequently endowed her with significant authority and credibility as a writer and political activist, this is an appropriate point at which to invoke Joan Scott: 'Experience is at once always already an interpretation and is in need of interpretation' (1991: 797). What Yuriko records as the evidence of her own eyes and body, having the authority of lived experience, is in fact only her interpretation. By reporting shortages factually, as the norm, in Moscow and recording official explanations without question, she naturalises instead of questioning the situation, leaving no space for what she does not know and does not see.

A revealing counterpoint to Yuriko's description of material circumstances in Russia is provided by a diary entry made during her time in Paris in late 1929. After her parents leave, she is so concerned by her finances that she writes out a detailed schedule of expenses in her diary (3 November 1929 p. 470). The 4,000 francs⁵⁸ given to her by her father, only 11 days previously, is more or less used up. She had wanted to make a kimono and buy a watch, but it seems she will have to undertake 'austerity measures' from now on (*kore kara, kinshuku, kinshuku*). In her expenses, Yuriko includes not only the cost of lodgings and travel back to Germany, but French lessons and newspaper subscriptions, which come to 2,521.80F. She allows herself 2,000F at least of the remainder for theatre, art books and music. Being 'hard up' (*pī pī*) already is frustrating: 'I will have to work' (*dōshitemo shigoto seneba naranu*) (p. 471). The necessity of working not for self-fulfilment but because she needs the cash, is represented in the diary as an annoying inconvenience.

⁵⁸ For reference, in another entry, Yuriko records receiving 500 yen from her publishers, Kaizōsha, which converts into 6,100 francs 12 centimes (15 October 1929, p. 455); thus, just before the Wall Street crash on 24 October, the yen was worth about 12 francs.

The self that Yuriko presents in the diary regards attendance at plays and the purchase of books as normal entitlements, the same leisurely, cultured way of life she took for granted in Tokyo. In Moscow, although she keeps track of rising prices, there is no indication that Yuriko lacks the cash to buy what she regards as necessary. Whether passing through Paris as an affluent Japanese tourist or living and working in Moscow, Yuriko is situated comfortably *vis-à-vis* her surroundings. Her material expectations are so ingrained that she does not question them in either context, as clearly revealed when she anticipates, in Paris, an irritating financial shortfall.

The material shortages and deficiencies encountered by Yuriko in Moscow are assigned different meanings to her minor budgetary woes in Europe. Rather than questioning conditions in Russia, as did other foreign visitors (David-Fox 2012: 105), Yuriko rises to the challenge, and through it, creates a new, authoritative self, the loyal Soviet Russia expert and advocate, whose attachment to the 'Russian people' and by association their vast socio-political experiment, is consolidated by shared material experience. This is in spite of the fact that Yuriko's actual material expectations for herself had very little in common with the workers she idealised.

Yuriko's Moscow

A primary function of a traveller's diary is to make sense of a new place and to situate oneself within it. A newcomer to a city can render it liveable by 'reducing' it to a minimum set of necessary destinations and filtering out the vast, bewildering hinterland. In her diary, Yuriko 'maps' Moscow, thus transforming an unknown, foreign city into a familiar place in which she can establish routines of daily life. These routines in themselves reveal much about her positionality and self-conception.

Yuriko regularly notes where she goes, what she does and whom she meets there. As mentioned above, a central location to which she and Yoshiko keep returning, is the Hotel Passage off the main shopping thoroughfare Tverskaya, opposite the Central Post and Telegraphic Office. Otherwise, they live, off and on, in various apartments in the residential block 1 Ostozhenka, opposite the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour, which was later destroyed by Stalin. An advantage of this

location, noted by Yuriko, is that it is close enough to the city centre when plays run late (8 November 1928, p. 320). The women are regular theatre-goers and Moscow Art Theatre (MXAT) and Bolshoi Theatre, just off Tverskaya, are frequently mentioned. Another pivotal location in central Moscow is the VOKS headquarters, where the two women often go to arrange tours of model Soviet facilities and travel out of Moscow. Also mentioned in the diary are shopping visits to Kuznetsky Most, for books, which they both buy in quantity; the Japanese embassy, to collect mail and for social events; the old street markets in Okhotny Ryad, near the theatres; and the famous Eliseevsky emporium on Tverskaya, a luxury grocer's in pre-revolutionary days that still went by its old name rather than its new Soviet moniker, Gastronom No. 1.

All these locations map out an area, west-central Moscow, which is loosely analogous to the West End of London. It is a zone of national monuments, museums, galleries, theatres and government offices, the natural destination of tourists and official visitors. The amenities Yuriko enjoys in this area – frequent visits to cinema and theatre, for example – replicate her lifestyle in central Tokyo, where she lived most of her life, in and around what is today Bunkyo ward. In her diary Yuriko represents her Soviet life in the same way she wrote about her Tokyo life immediately prior to her departure in her diary of 1927: as the life of an independent, affluent, urban young woman who keeps company with people of similar background and prioritises cultural pursuits. She works, but her style of work is autonomous and leisured, in keeping with her lifestyle. She is not an employee. She is not confined to an office or house by law or custom. As a woman, she has the physical and social liberty to go where she pleases. She never mentions feeling spatially constrained or endangered because of her gender.

Overall, compared to the sensory detail and infatuation recorded in the first part of *Dōhyō*, and 'Record of Moscow Impressions', the diary is a primarily practical record of Yuriko's material life in Moscow, revealing her expectations of a certain level and pattern of life. The negative aspects of Soviet life that she mentions and excuses as the necessary growing pains of socialism under construction in 'Record of Moscow Impression' appear unvarnished in the diaries, sometimes as inconveniences – such as the difficulty in securing accommodation –

but not accompanied by any commentary critical of the Soviet system, or indeed, any critical reflection on her own material expectations as a fellow traveller.

Material expectations are rooted in class. In the next section I will analyse how Yuriko situates herself in the diary within the rhetoric and reality of class in Soviet Russia, a newly minted society in which class pedigree was as critical as bloodlines to an aristocracy.

Class

Yuriko's class positionality as revealed in the diary shows a disjuncture between her actual circumstances and her sympathies and identification. In her 1927 diary, she does not record meeting any named proletarian writers in Tokyo, although her reading has a leftist theme, showing that she was well abreast of the current literary-political fashion. When she arrived in Moscow in late 1927, she had no formal affiliation with any leftist or proletarian literary movement. According to Honda, although she was aware of socialism and the revolutionary movement, they were not central to her life before she left for Moscow (1976: 30-31). In strict Marxist terms, she was a member of the bourgeoisie – Kondo (2002: 175) describes her as 'upper middle class (*jōsō no chūsan kaikyū*) – and yet she felt an emotional identification with the common 'Russian people' as she had imagined them, although by the late 1920s, they had in fact officially become 'Soviet people', new model men and women under construction (Attwood and Kelly 1998). This identification seems partly based on qualities of 'simplicity' – integrity, honesty, straightforwardness, lack of pretence – that Yuriko associates with the idealised 'workers' (*rōdōsha*), in contrast to intellectuals and bureaucrats, such as the writer Boris Pilnyak and the VOKS official Novomirsky, who are presented as lacking in integrity, bourgeois who have ingratiated themselves with the new regime.

From the very first, Yuriko shows herself to be positively disposed towards the 'workers'. In January 1928, invited to the Saturday literary salon held by scholar and publisher Evdokia Nikitina,⁵⁹ she meets the poet Mikhail Gerasimov (1888–

⁵⁹ There is very little information in English on Evdokia Nikitina. She is described as the chairperson of the publishing cooperative Nikitinskie subbotniki in Milne (1995: 65). An essay translated from Russian appears at <http://www.russianavantgard.com/phpBB3/viewtopic.php?f=19&t=64>.

1939) and the writer Alexander Yakovlev (1886–1953), whom she presents very positively, ‘large men like stone-cutters who nevertheless are warm and good-hearted’ (*atatakao tokoro ga atte, makoto ni kokoromochi yoi hitotachi*), the opposite of ‘so-called’ (*iwayuru*) proletarian writers in Japan, who ‘swagger with weak shoulders’ (*hinjaku na kata bakari iya ni sobiyakashite*) (3 January 1928, pp. 236-237). Here Yuriko reveals an unfavourable image of Japanese proletarian (male) writers, presented as intellectual poseurs lacking the sturdy bodies of genuine workers, compared to the real article, which she meets in the Soviet Union.

On another occasion, Novomirsky gets them admitted to a workers’ club, the Rykov, where she ‘enjoys herself immensely’ (*taihen yukai*) talking in Russian to the workers. She remarks that they are ‘simple’ (*tanjun*), possessing ‘free, good hearts’ (*jiyū na, ii kokoro*) (18 March 1928, pp. 260-261). In Vienna the following year, revelling in the comforts of her hotel room – a wooden bed, not a metal one, and freely running hot water – she wishes she could share this luxury with ‘my beloved Russian people’ (*jibun no ai suru Roshiajin*) who ‘live in such dirt and inconvenience’ (*ika ni kitanaku, fuben de kurashite iru*) (2 May 1929, p. 421).

Conversely, Yuriko quickly takes against Russians who appear bourgeois, even those who work within the Soviet regime. In her first month, she meets the writer Boris Pilnyak, the model for the boorish Boris Polnyak in *Dōhyō*. Having read his Japanese travel diary beforehand, she comments that his ‘observations are shallow’ (*kansatsu no asasa*) and that his income is ‘over 2000’, making him a nouveau riche (*narikin*) (16 December 1927, pp. 221-222).⁶⁰ The immediate juxtaposition of her impressions and this monetary fact, both presented negatively, suggests that in her mind they are interconnected. At a Japanese cultural evening organised not long after (21 December 1927, p. 224), several Japanese, including Yuriko, give talks, and Pilnyak reads at length from his Japanese travel book. Yuriko is annoyed, feeling that Pilnyak has somehow used the Japanese participants to promote his own interests. She meets many writers at this event, but does not enjoy their noisy celebrations afterwards in the basement bar, where young writers

⁶⁰ Yuriko notes in the margins that a minister’s monthly salary is about 250 roubles, and that a normal person in a good post gets 200 roubles, providing a point of comparison for Pilnyak’s alleged income (16 December 1927, p. 221-228).

(presumably men) drink champagne and ‘party’ (*sawaide ita*) with ‘loose women’ (*shina yoku nai onna*) while someone plays the piano badly. She records in her diary that she is in agreement with ‘Russian writers’ (the older ones?) who have become ‘sceptical’ (*kaigi*) about young people living such a life. When Yoshiko remarks, ‘Didn’t you come so that you could get in with such people?’ (i.e., literary circles) (*sonna nakama ni hairu tame ni kita no de wa nai*), Yuriko is angered, but does not specify why she is so offended by the sight of young writers carousing. In Tokyo, she had enjoyed late nights in the company of friends herself, as recorded in her 1927 diary. One possibility is that she had already accepted and internalised the high moral seriousness of the Soviet cause and did not expect to witness such mundanely frivolous partying in Moscow. This did not fit her ideals of ‘simplicity’ and the ‘Russian people’ (by definition *not* the middle or upper classes), or indeed the high-mindedness of Russian writers, as represented by the towering, Old Testament prophet-like figures of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. The scene was, quite simply, *out of context*. This was not how Yuriko expected writers in Soviet Russia to behave. Her disgust at this frivolity is made explicit in her 1931 essay, ‘Sobieto bundan no genjō’ (The Present Situation of Soviet Literary Circles) (*MYZ* Vol. 9, pp. 308–348).

A sense of disapproval underlines Yuriko’s description of the bourgeois tastes and lifestyles of certain Soviet writers. On Christmas Day 1927, the two women are invited to Pilnyak’s house in the suburbs. Yuriko comments that the luxury of the interior show Pilnyak’s ‘comfortable standard of living and influence’ (*seikatsuryoku to wanryoku*) (25 December 1927, p. 227). One month later, still very early in her Soviet sojourn, Yuriko writes that she thinks she is having a ‘varied view of life in Moscow’ (*iroiro Mosukuwa no seikatsu o mite omou*), and she would infinitely prefer to see the lives of working people rather than the old houses of ‘superficial’ (*namajikka*) intellectuals (30 January 1928, p. 247), clearly a direct reference to her recent visit to Pilnyak’s house. When they visit the science-fiction writer AN Tolstoy (1883–1945) in Leningrad that summer, Yuriko describes in some detail his style of living, which resembles that of a ‘landowner of old’ (*moto no jinushi*). He is ‘surrounded by old things’ (*furui mono ni torimakarete*), indicating his cultured tastes and bourgeois capacity to collect or own such objects, including

Pushkin's death-mask, seventeenth-century German paintings, a portrait of Peter the Great and Chinese porcelain. Yuriko does not consider such 'monotonous' (*tanchō na*) surroundings conducive to writing good books (10 July 1928, pp. 291-92).

Yuriko has even less sympathy for the middle and upper classes dispossessed by the revolution, 'former people' in Soviet terminology, even though in class terms, these are 'her people': educated, cultured and accustomed to a comfortable urban lifestyle. In Tokyo she had befriended the Russian expatriate artist Varvara Bubnova,⁶¹ who provided her with presents for friends and relatives back in Russia (29 November 1927, p. 213). Shortly after she arrives in Moscow, Yuriko sets out to see one of them, a woman who lives in one room of an old Moscow house with a dark stairwell. The room is furnished with 'old junk' (*goda goda furukusai mono bakari*) (18 December 1927, pp. 222-223), presumably remnants from a more comfortable pre-revolutionary mode of life. Bubnova's friend is 'terrified' (*hidoku biku biku*) about the repercussions of befriending foreigners, which could bring an official visit the next day. Yuriko does not speculate in the diary about why this should be so, merely commenting that it 'felt odd' (*hen na kimochi ga shita*).

The same attitudes are evident when, during her summer in Leningrad in 1928, Yuriko visits Bubnova's sister, who is eking out a living as a piano teacher for 45 roubles a month (29 June 1928, p. 284). The sister complains that she works over eight hours a day. Yuriko responds in her diary, 'People in Russia today can live without pianos but not boots' (*hito wa ima no Roshia de, nagakutsu nashi de kurasenu ga, piano nashi demo ikirareru*). In the margins, perhaps an afterthought, she adds, 'I can sympathise with the harsh living conditions [*seikatsu no kurasa*] but I can't agree with her reactionary ideas [*handōron ni wa sansei sezu*]'.

The implication is that in the sister's place, Yuriko would not complain about hardships brought about by the revolution, which she already accepts as a positive and necessary thing. This dismissal of piano lessons and music as a luxurious extra is at

⁶¹ The print artist Varvara Dmitrievna Bubnova (1886–1983) lived in Japan from 1922 to 1958, and is credited as having an important role in the development of Japanese modern art. See Omuka (1995).

odds with Yuriko's regular attendance at concerts, theatre, and the cinema, which, according to her book-keeping in France, is part of normal life – for Yuriko. In the diary, Yuriko does not reflect on the discrepancy between her material expectations for herself, and the sacrifices that building socialism requires from others.

During their time in Leningrad, Yuriko and Yoshiko stay in a pension on the outskirts of the city, where she encounters another 'former person', a woman who 'used to be rich' (*moto okanemochi*). She tells Yuriko at length about how 'horribly' she lives now (*hidoku kurashi o shite iru*), her eyes welling up with tears. Yuriko has no sympathy at all: 'the olden days!' (*mukashi banashi!*) (30 June-1 July 1928, pp. 285-286). In France, Yuriko comes across a magazine, *Russia in Pictures*, produced by exiled White Russians. Initially, she feels nostalgia for Russia, but the old-style spelling and the general tone of 'lingering nostalgia' (*nanka no menmen omoide mitai*) hold no interest for her and she discards it: the magazine does not represent her new, vital Russia (31 October 1929, p. 464). She is instinctively on the side of the faceless, idealised 'people', who represent a glorious Soviet future, at the expense of individuals who, short-sightedly, think only of their present discomfort, trapped in musty memories of better days.

There is no indication in the diary that Yuriko recognises these 'former people' as in any way reflecting her own class privilege and status back in Japan. And yet, the people she associates with in the Soviet Union and describes most acutely are for the most part intellectuals, cultural figures and Party officials; the occasional 'workers' appear as cyphers, representatives of the people rather than individuals, such as the ones she meets in the arranged visit to the Rykov workers' club (18 March 1928, pp. 260-261). Similarly, the Japanese she associates with in Moscow – and in her European travels – are academic, literary or diplomatic types, the same people who form her usual milieu in Tokyo. Among these people, she is received on the same terms as she would back home: as a well-known young writer from a well-connected professional family. On the evidence of the diary, Yuriko's class positionality is not destabilised or challenged. In class terms, she situates herself firmly on the side of the 'workers', whose 'simplicity', a quality she values highly, is set against the self-serving middle and upper classes, from whom she instinctively disassociates herself by virtue of her own 'simplicity'.

This sense of dissociation from her own class positionality also comes across very clearly in *Dōhyō*, in which Nobuko's emotional identification with Soviet Russia and the reified 'workers' or 'people' sets her apart from her family, former middle or upper-class Russians, and the affluent Japanese she encounters in various European cities. In 'London 1929', the anonymous Japanese woman's perambulations around the city, her Kensington hotel and her ability to patronise restaurants and tea-rooms indicates a certain level of affluence and leisure, even as she judges London from a point of view informed by Soviet socialism. Thus, Yuriko's rejection of her own class positionality – even as she continues to enjoy its privileges – is clearly evident from the very first, from her diaries, an element of her subjectivity that continues right through to *Dōhyō*.

Family

Yuriko's references to her family in the Soviet diaries are marked by two major themes. Her irritation with their 'dead' bourgeois existence is evident before she leaves Japan: 'People exist [*ikite iru*]. But they are not living [*seikatsu wa shite inai*]' (16 June 1927, p. 187). Their lives are blanketed by a 'frighteningly powerful, inert ignorance' (*osoroshii chikara o motta daryokuteki muchi*). She worries about the effect of this atmosphere on her siblings: it will be sad if they become people who are 'carried along by life' (*seikatsu ni osarete isshō ni okuru*). It is unlikely that they will be driven 'to live richer lives, with some sort of aim' (*seikatsu ga motto yūtake naru nani mono ka ni mukatte unten sarenai no de arō*). In a rare instance of self-questioning, Yuriko writes, in the same entry, that she feels the same of herself: 'I don't have the ability to produce anything better [*yoritakai mono o jibun de tsukuridasu chikara wa nai*]. Indeed, I'm narrow [*semai*]. Self-righteous [*dokuzenteki*]. This is bad' (p. 187). This comment reveals Yuriko's belief that a life should have some sort of aim or meaning, and that she is not entirely confident that hers measures up to her own high standard. In the diary she presents the aimless, self-indulgent, 'dead' existence of her family as something against which she reacts and defines herself, while recognising, with some humility, that her own life as yet lacks such a purpose. This prefigures the theme of *Dōhyō*: Nobuko's

search for this higher purpose and her gradual discovery of it, as a writer, in communism.

This criticism is particularly directed at her mother Yoshie, in terms that echoes her criticism of the embassy wives in Moscow, and serves to distance Yuriko from such an existence. When the Chūjō family arrive in France in July 1929, Yuriko spends the next few months with them in London and Paris. She confides in the diary her frustration at her sickly mother's emotional neediness and dependence, her 'stupidity and ignorance' (*gumai*) and 'strange passivity/ negativity' (*hen na shōkyokutekisa*) (5 October 1920, p. 448). She does not reflect on her own emotional dependence on Yoshiko. In this and other diary entries, her mother represents a particularly feminine weakness that Yuriko despises. It is tempting to speculate that Yuriko's judgemental and dismissive attitude towards women as individuals (as opposed to women as anonymous oppressed masses) was founded at least partly in her original contempt for her mother, an intelligent and gifted woman of the Meiji era (Kobayashi 1991: 55; also Mikals-Adachi 1997: 117) who soured into a passive-aggressive semi-invalidism and saw her own thwarted artistic ambitions fulfilled by her talented daughter.⁶² The mother-daughter relationship was a complex one, and the two women had in common a strong fighting temperament, as noted by Hirabayashi Taiko (1979a: 98-99). However, in the diary, apart from a few moments of sympathy, Yuriko presents her mother as a negative female exemplar, to be reacted against. This parallels the presentation of Nobuko's mother Takeyo in *Dōhyō*. One of the strongest, least ideological episodes is that in which the family arrive in France and Nobuko is shown as undoing the damage wrought by Takeyo's emotional despotism. In the years between Paris and the writing of *Dōhyō*, Yuriko's harsh view of her mother did not soften in the least. In *Dōhyō* her depiction of Takeyo's bourgeois triviality and selfishness merges into Nobuko's overall rejection of her class of origin, in particular, its women.

The second family-centred theme is the suicide of her youngest brother Hideo, aged 20, on 1 August 1928, which had a huge impact on her, and is regarded by many Japanese critics (e.g., Honda 1976: 35, Sawabe 1990: 233-34; Hasegawa

⁶² As a woman, Yoshie was not eligible for admission to the Ueno National School of Art (Kobayashi 1991: 55).

2006: 167) as one of the factors precipitating her conversion to communism. The news reached Yuriko on 3 August, during her stay at Detskoye Selo on the outskirts of Leningrad. There are no diary entries for the following two weeks. They resume on 20 August, following the usual brief note form. Yuriko does not mention Hideo's death until she arrives back in Moscow and finds a letter from her father describing the circumstances in detail (13 October 1928, p. 307). This is juxtaposed with descriptions of autumn leaves and the purchase of tickets for a Tolstoy play at the Experimentalny Theatre. Not until 19 October does Yuriko vent her feelings about her brother's death in the diary, an entry of three pages (pp. 310-312). She blames herself for not trying hard enough to help him. In deploring that the frail Hideo could not cope with the gap between his ideals and reality and chose death, Yuriko affirms her determination and strength to live. She does not mention Akutagawa in this entry, but she had been deeply affected by his suicide in 1927, and the archetype of the despairing, individualistic bourgeois artist who gives up on life, as immortalised the following year in Miyamoto Kenji's prize-winning essay *Haiboku no bungaku* (The Literature of Defeat, 1929) (Arima 1969: 152-72) was no doubt on Yuriko's mind. Another long entry on Hideo is dated 4 December 1929 (pp. 331-32). Yuriko reflects upon the 'sense of failure' (*sogo*) Hideo's death must have caused her parents as well as herself. How does a person live a life that is full of failure? Without discovering truth within such a life, she writes, it is not possible to live (p. 331). For Yuriko, the death of her brother confirmed her belief in strength and her need for a certainty and purpose beyond the individual, as represented in the diary, although she does not make any clear connections here to communism or even political activity. This contrasts to the depiction of Tamotsu's death in *Dōhyō*, which is presented as a key incident that radically disconnects Nobuko from her family – represented graphically as half her body torn away – and 'nails' her into the Soviet Union. This implies that while Hideo's death was a shocking and destabilising event for Yuriko, one that invoked her ongoing search for meaning, it was only in retrospect that she knitted it into her narrative of communist conversion.

In sum, in Yuriko's representation of her family in the diary, she associates them with a 'dead bourgeois' existence, specifically her mother, who represents a triviality, selfishness and emotionalism that she regards as 'feminine'. Yuriko

defines herself against these intertwined class and gender qualities embodied by her mother, qualities she despises even more for having experienced the vigour and seriousness of life in the Soviet Union. In microcosm, her family, with her mother at its core, represents what she rejects, a rejection that is intensified by the existence of an alternative, the 'Sobieto no seikatsu'.

The vigorous new life of the Soviet Union is also contrasted against the pointless suicide of her brother. Stifled by the protective, deadening embrace of a bourgeois family within a bourgeois society, Hideo dies, literally. Writing about Hideo's death in her diary, Yuriko repeatedly affirms her will to live, a determination that aligns her with the serious, masculine vibrancy of the Soviet Union, the 'boiling pot' of Moscow, against the sterility and 'deadness', coded feminine by Yuriko, of bourgeois life in Japan and Europe. What this shows is that, at the time of writing, the emotional associations and loyalties that prefigured her conversion to Soviet-style communism were already firmly in place.

For Yuriko, her family and class identity was closely intertwined with her positionality as Japanese, which I will discuss in the next section.

A Japanese abroad

How did Yuriko as a Japanese woman situate herself in the new Soviet Union, the second foreign country she had lived in after the United States? How did this experience challenge or confirm her cultural, ethnic and national positionality as Japanese? I will start this section with a revealing diary entry (13 April 1929, p. 404), in which Yuriko describes, in unusual detail, the room she shared with Yuasa Yoshiko after her discharge from hospital. This entry provides an almost photographic image of the small domestic, personal, space, a little Japanese interior, that the two Japanese women have created within a literally unaccommodating foreign city: one window, a large desk pushed up right against it; books, books, books; pot plants, a calendar; a clock; a doll (*ningyō*); a small Japanese heater, on which handtowels (*tenugui*) are always hung to dry; a small stool, covered in a white napkin, which serve as their dining table; magazines, magazines; a box of chocolates sent from home. The canvas camp bed used by Yoshiko is up against the wall when not in use. One low easy chair. A book case and

a dressing table stool are crammed together ‘so as not to waste any space’ (*arayaru kūkan o muda ni sezu*). On the right-side wall Yoshiko has hung a map of Europe, Hiroshige postcards and a small Russian-style wall hanging that hides a stain on the wall. Other named items are a bottle of Esentoki-brand mineral water, a box of rice, *katsubushi* [sic], a bottle of *shōyu* and an American-made Gillette razor, used to sharpen pencils.

This snapshot conveys not only the claustrophobic conditions in which the two women live at this time, but also how they, like many foreigners abroad, insulated themselves from an overload of ‘Otherness’ by recreating a familiar ‘home’ environment. The fact of Russia is not entirely absent from the room, but the wall-hanging is counterbalanced by the Hiroshige postcards. Russia is Yoshiko’s object of study, after all; however, represented by a wall-hanging, its unmanageable size and overwhelming unknowability is safely reduced and domesticated. The piles of books and magazines show that this is a working room: they are women of letters, engaged in serious literary and linguistic work. It is also a Japanese home, as indicated by the drying hand-towels, a typical sight on Japanese balconies even today; the Japanese doll; and the Japanese foodstuffs. For travellers, food is the primary emotional and physical connection with home, in particular for Japanese in Europe, where food culture is so different. The importance of food and a vivid embodied awareness of ‘Japaneseness’ is similarly evident in Endo Shūsaku’s novel *Ryūgaku* (Foreign Studies, 1968). Literature professor Tanaka is sent to Paris to study in the 1950s. Shortly after arriving, he meets another Japanese, Sakisaka, who is staying in the same hotel, and they share their supplies of Japanese tea, pickles and rice crackers, their immediate commonality as Japanese in France acknowledged by food-sharing. On entering Sakisaka’s room, Tanaka reflects that a Japanese room always has a Japanese smell, wherever it is in the world, an essentialised Japanese odour only partly created by the smell of Japanese food (Endo 1968: 78). Tanaka observes that Sakisaka has a *kokeshi* doll in his room; the ‘ningyō’ in Yuriko and Yoshiko’s room is likely one of these.

This physical cocoon of Japaneseness is replicated socially. Throughout her time in Russia, and Europe, Yuriko associates primarily with Japanese, a networks of expatriates and visitors centred on the embassy. Although Yuriko and Yoshiko are

private visitors, they become attached to the embassy, a little Tokyo-in-Moscow, in a way that is hard to imagine for the twenty-first century traveller who has only minimal, last-resort recourse to her embassy. From the very first, Yuriko and Yoshiko are not alone and anonymous in Moscow, but are welcomed into a pre-existing community of Japanese in Moscow, beginning with Akita Ujaku and Narumi Kanzō, who meet them at station. Shortly after their arrival, the two women go to pay their respects to Baron Gōto Shinpei, their visa sponsor, who is staying at the Savoy (23 December 1927, p. 226). They are joined in the Hotel Passage by the *Asahi* Berlin correspondent, Kuroda Reiji, whom they also meet at the Savoy, and pass New Year's Eve partying with a group of Japanese (31 December 1927, p. 229). They regularly attend events at the embassy: New Year's celebrations (1 January 1928, p. 235); lunch at the embassy with the ambassador (28 May 1928, p. 276); an embassy party that goes on until five the next morning (16 November 1928, p. 323). During her time in hospital, Yuriko is visited by embassy wives (24 March 1929, p. 353). A distant relative, a military cadet attached to the embassy, borrows a car from the first secretary to fetch her from hospital (9 April 1929, p. 398). When she and Yoshiko pass through Vienna, they meet the Legate and his wife, and are invited to view a Zeppelin flight from the balcony (2 May 1929, p. 421). In Paris, she is invited to dine with Ambassador Adachi, which she regards as something of a wearisome 'duty' (*giri*) (25 October 1929, p. 460). Back in Moscow, she is invited to the embassy to meet the Japanese athletes who are passing through Moscow en route to the Prague International Women's Tournament (6 August 1930, p. 552). She also socialises with embassy staff on a personal informal level: the embassy translator Hirōka invites them to his house for Japanese food on several occasions (14 October 1928, p. 307; 29 October 1928, p. 316) and Yuriko enjoys playing mah jongg with a couple called the Koyanagis (2 December 1928, p. 330; 14 December 1928, p. 336). They pass Christmas Day 1928 at Hirōka's house, where they all get drunk and criticise the first secretary Sakō (25 December 1928, p. 340). When the film director Kinugasa Teinosuke visits Russia, they are invited to meet him at a rooftop cabaret in Leningrad (26 August 1928, p. 301), and summoned to meet him again, at the embassy in Moscow (5 August 1930, p. 551). Other Japanese contacts of note are the Russian scholars Yonekawa Masao (1891-1965) and Nobori Shomu

(1878-1958), and the Osaka *Mainichi* correspondent Nagahara Shigeki. In Paris she associates with the artist Itakura Kanae (1901-1929), who dies suddenly during this time, and his wife, Sumiko, the daughter of the Russia scholar Nobori Shomu, and is introduced to Kitazawa Rakuten (1876-1955), regarded as the founder of Japanese manga.

In short, in Russia and in Europe, Yuriko is never isolated from her compatriots, who form a shifting but supportive expatriate society in miniature, into which Yuriko unquestioningly takes her place. She describes in her diary social rounds and interactions that could just as well be taking place in Tokyo. The picture created by the diary is that of middle-class young woman who exists emotionally, socially and materially within a Japanese space created by herself, her partner Yuasa Yoshiko, and the community of Japanese expatriates, within the larger, foreign spaces of Soviet Moscow and European capital cities. In *Dōhyō*, this community plays a far lesser role in the narrative while the two women are in Moscow, almost as if they are surviving on their own. Yuriko prided herself on living a genuine Soviet life. This is emphasised throughout *Dōhyō*, such as when Nobuko is critical of Motoko for going ice-skating in the diplomatic enclosure with other Japanese; however, the social rounds detailed in the diaries suggest that in retrospect, Yuriko imagined herself more deeply embedded in local life than in fact she was.

From within the emotional comfort and convenience of Tokyo-in-Europe, to what extent was Yuriko's positionality as Japanese foregrounded and challenged? The first indication in the diaries that Yuriko's equilibrium as a Japanese has been shaken by the shock of arriving in Russia is a comment about Akutagawa shortly after her arrival, in December 1927. She had been deeply affected by news of his suicide in summer that year. Trying to settle in her hotel room one evening in Moscow, she tries to read something by Akutagawa. However, out of Japan, Akutagawa's works seem 'fragmented' (*moseikku no kanji*) and 'no longer speak to her' (*kokoro ni pittari shite konakatta*). Even reading word by word is difficult. Displaced in Moscow, Akutagawa's works seem 'inadequate' (*tappuri fusenu*) and to 'lack subtlety' (*jimi no kanji ni toboshi*) (20 December 1927, pp. 223-224). Out of context, Akutagawa is diminished for Yuriko, a not unusual experience for someone

newly arrived in a foreign country and overwhelmed by novel impressions that render the familiar colourless by comparison. Yuriko makes no further comments about losing her taste for Japanese literature, but this diary entry indicates the destabilising impact of arrival in Soviet Moscow. The incident does not resurface in *Dōhyō*: Yuriko's retrospective narrative emphasises her successful immersion in Soviet life.

Yuriko does not comment at all in the diaries about how she was received by Russians as a Japanese. She only notes in passing an exchange between Yoshiko and a Russian student of Japanese about racist abuse. Yoshiko reports being called a 'Chinawoman' (*hōja*) in the streets. The student says this is not 'abuse' (*waruguchi*). Yoshiko disagrees (7 December 1928, p. 252). Yuriko does not report any such abuse directed at herself, implying either it did not occur or that she did not regard such racialised name-calling as personally significant. The account in *Dōhyō* of Motoko slapping a street trader for calling her a 'Chinawoman' and Nobuko's indifferent reaction (DH, Vol. 1, pp. 102-104) suggests the latter.

There are in fact very few points in the diary in which Yuriko reflects on 'Japan' and 'Japaneseness', on either a personal or a more general level. One is occasioned by the April special issue of the monthly *Bungei shunjū* (1923–),⁶³ one of several journals and newspapers she and Yuasa have sent to them via the embassy. This issue features a *Bungei shunjū* 'parliament' (*gikai*), presumably a round-table discussion (*zadankai*), that provokes a comment by Yuriko that the male writers have no experience of women as 'comrades' (here she uses the Russian word *tovarich*) and 'use' (*tsukau*) women 'only as sex partners' (*koi dake no taishu*). This reflection on the attitudes of Japanese men is expanded to one on Japan's general backwardness: 'Japan is one part of the Mongol tribe, and not yet among the first ranks of the world (in terms of social conditions); this grieves me' (*Mongoruzoku no ichibu de, mada sekai no naka de shin no ichiryū denai (shakai seikatsu ni oite) tokoro to hiai o kanjita*) (10 April 1929, p. 400). In this entry, she explicitly links the

⁶³ *Bungei shunjū* was founded in 1923 as a literary journal by the writer Kikuchi Kan, shifting to a general-interest publication in 1926. Associated writers in the early stages include Yokomitsu Ri'ichi, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, Kume Masao and Kawabata Yasunari (*Kokushi daijiten* and *Nihon dai hyakka zensho*, accessed via Japan Knowledge+). By 1941 the journal had bowed to government pressure on publications to support the war effort (Rubin 1984: 262).

subordinate, 'Asian' (Mongol) status of women to Japan's status in the world, a common Meiji-era trope. While there is no overt comparison to the status of women in Russia, that she is doing so is made clear by her use of the word 'tovarich'.

The sense of East Asian solidarity and sympathy with the exiled Chinese that appears in *Dōhyō* is absent from the diaries. The model for the encounter between Dr Lin and Nobuko in *Dōhyō* appears briefly: Yuriko records meeting a Chinese woman she names Chin Shuku-kei, the wife of a Russian, Vozneshensky, without mentioning the context or reason.⁶⁴ She merely comments that the woman is 'unusually pleasant' (*mezurashiku yukai*): because she is 'educated', she lacks the 'narrow antipathy' (*semai hankan*) towards Japan characteristic of Chinese women (*Shina no jotokuyū*) (6 January 1928, p. 239). No details of their conversation are recorded and certainly no impression of pan-Asian sisterhood prefiguring Nobuko's eventual decision to join the struggle in Japan, as suggested by the meeting with Dr Lin in *Dōhyō*. The views expressed in the diary of 1928 are those of a middle-class woman who perceives Chinese hostility in terms of individual ignorance towards herself as a Japanese, not in the wider political context. The hostility Nobuko encounters from Chinese in Paris in *Dōhyō* is not recorded in the diaries, perhaps because Yuriko took such 'antipathy' for granted and was not yet at the point of understanding it politically.

The final foregrounding of Nobuko's Japanese identity, in her encounter with Yamagami Gen, when she realises she cannot live as a Japanese writer in Soviet Russia and makes the painful decision to leave, is entirely absent from the diaries. I have not found any explanation of this omission in the critical literature. My supposition is that since Yuriko was well aware of the repression of communism in Japan, she chose to omit or later to edit such damning material from her personal diaries, the same way she kept her membership of the Japanese Communist Party secret until after the war. After all, when she first boarded the ferry at Shimonoseki in December 1927, she had been subject to a police check, and

⁶⁴ Vozneshensky in the diary and the diplomat Kuraude in *Dōhyō* are both mentioned as living with Bukharin's father, which is how I have made the connection between Dr Lin and Chin Shuku-kei. Yuriko does not record any other encounters with Chinese women in her diary.

journalists had tried to trick her into saying if she would meet Katayama Sen (2 December 1927, p. 214) – the only mention of his name in the diaries for my period of study.

Russia/Soviet Union

As previously discussed, Yuriko's love of Russian literature endowed her with a romantic, positive and semi-mythologised notion of 'Russia' that informed her experience of the contemporary Soviet Union from the very first. En route to Moscow she notes that one of the waiters in the dining car of the Trans-Siberian railway had a face like Smerdyakov, a character in Dostoevsky's *Brothers Karamazov* (14 December 1927, p. 220). Such occasional references to Russian literature reveal that this pre-existing Russian imaginary was in the back of Yuriko's mind, informing her view of the actually existing Soviet Union before her eyes.

Her emotional attachment to the Russia of literature became a passionate, physical love for Russia itself. Confined to a hospital bed in early 1929, she expresses a possessive, sensory longing for Moscow, already anticipating that she would not be present to see it the following winter. She wants to 'inhale my Moscow' (*waga Mosukuwa o suikomitai*), through her eyes, hair and skin, a desire that 'resembles lust' (*seiyoku ni nita mono*) (24 February 1929, pp. 345-56). Leaving Russia on her European trip in spring 1929, Yuriko views the still-snowy Russian scenery from the train window and anticipates how happy she will be to return (24 April 1929, p. 409). When her residence permit is removed from her passport in October 1930, she feels 'terribly, painfully sad' (*Kanashikatta. Hijō ni. Itai yō da*) (12 October 1930, p. 568). Passing over the plains of Siberia on her way back to Japan, she thinks of Moscow, a sensation like 'touching a boiling pot' (*Mosukuwa o kangaeru to, nietatsu nabe ni sawaru yō na kanjita*) (29 October 1930, p. 576). Yuriko perceives Moscow as the dynamic heart of the Soviet Union, the red-hot forge of socialism-under-construction, and she is sad to move away from the centre of action.

Her physical attachment to and conception of 'Russia' is highlighted during her European sojourn. In Vienna, which Yuriko experiences as staid and conservative, she misses the 'wildness' of Russia (12 May 1929, p. 424). She

describes Vienna as prosperous, but lacking in life and enthusiasm, stifled by bureaucracy; by comparison to Moscow, it has money but lacks a 'youthful, warm heart' (*wakawakashiku atsui kokoro ga nai*) (14 May 1929, p. 428). There is no doubt on which side Yuriko aligns herself: the youthful ardour and invigorating freshness embodied by Russia. For Yuriko, strong, honest emotions are markers of integrity and authenticity, the 'simplicity' that she admires in Russian workers and finds lacking in society ladies. As reflected in her diary, 'Russia' represents for Yuriko this bracing, future-oriented simplicity, against which 'old' Europe, despite its comforts, is judged and found wanting.

What I have described above is Yuriko's idealised view of and reaction to 'Russia' (*Roshia*), to which she felt a strong emotional connection. I will now discuss her observations of the Soviet Union and communism in particular, which she describes in less poetical, more measured, ways, as the diary progresses. She uses the diary to keep track of the numerous official outings organised through VOKS. Yuriko and Yoshiko receive special tickets to view the May Day parade (1 May 1928, pp. 269-71). In Leningrad, they attend two Children's Theatre performances, on the themes of superstition and anti-monarchism (13 June 1928, p. 280; 16 June 1928, p. 282) and special screenings of *Mother* (dir. Pudovkin) and *Battleship Potemkin* (dir. Eisenstein) at Sovkino studios (17 July 1928, p. 294). They visit Lenin's simple room in the Smolny Institute, the Bolshevik headquarters during the early days of the Revolution (6 September 1928, p. 304). Back in Moscow in 1930 after her extended European sojourn, Yuriko resumes a regular round of VOKS-sponsored educational visits: a workers' club on International Women's Day (8 March 1930, p. 495); a 'reformatory' that Yuriko distinguishes from a prison, because its aim is 'enlightenment' (*kyōka*) rather than 'punishment' (*chōbatsu*) (21 April 1930, p. 507-08); a children's library (24 April 1930, p. 509); the Krasnaya Rosa silk factory (23 May 1930, p. 520-21); two visits to a primary school (28-29 May 1930, p. 524-25); a regional literary circle (2 June 1930, p. 528); and a Pioneer camp (9 July 1930, p. 543). Even as they are making preparations to leave in mid-1930, the two women are still signing up for official sightseeing: a maternity hospital (12 October 1930, p. 568) and a maternal welfare research institute (13 October 1930, p. 569). The type of excursions organised for them by VOKS, to approved venues, with a focus on

child and maternal welfare, education and social rehabilitation, were entirely typical for foreign visitors (David-Fox 2012).

Yuriko's description of these excursions in the diary, similar to her records of shortages, is briskly journalistic, becoming more detailed in 1930, her final year, as if she is more conscious of measuring her impressions against ideals she has absorbed and accepted. While the tone is generally positive, occasional comments reveal her awareness of the less than ideal reality. She observes that the children's library also serves as a playground for children from Moscow's overcrowded housing (24 April 1930, p. 509), a reality Yuriko has experienced herself. While the Krasnaya Rosa has a model workers' club and a nursery, she notes that the activities of the club are flagging because energies have been redirected to the Five Year Plan (23 May 1930, p. 520-21). In her description of the primary school she is very impressed that the children's aspirations are all connected to labour, even the girls, who nominate 'teacher', 'nurse', 'prison warder', and 'factory worker' as their future careers (28-29 May 1930, p. 524-25). In these diary entries, Yuriko's tone is authoritative and she is confident in her judgements, which nevertheless, occur within her over-arching acceptance of the Soviet project. The self-assured communist who describes these same visits at length in published articles after her return in Japan is already apparent in these preliminary diary notes.

As with the food and accommodation shortages, already discussed, other less than ideal aspects of Soviet life are mentioned, as they are in 'Record of Moscow Impressions' – as noted by Iwabuchi (1996: 170) – but not criticised. In spring 1929 she comments, almost glibly, that 'both beggars and spring coats have appeared in number' (*haru gaitō to tomo ni kojiki ga ōku awareta*)(15 April 1929, p. 407). In October she notes homeless people gathered around an asphalt pot in the street, presumably for warmth, and comments that this year, their clothing is 'especially bad' (*toku ni hidoi*) (21 October 1930, pp. 573-74). She downplays a 'silly incident' (*bakarashii hanashi*) in which the two women are robbed of their money and watches by children dressed as Pioneers (12 May 1928, p. 272). In fact, the huge numbers of homeless children, up to seven million, was a pressing social problem throughout the 1920s. Left to their own resources after the Civil War, many of these *bezprizorniki* (homeless waifs) formed gangs and turned to crime,

from pickpocketing to violent robberies, followed in the early 1930s by a new generation of orphans who appeared in the wake of collectivisation. The spectacle of homeless children, witnessed by foreign visitors, was a severe embarrassment to the Soviet state (Fitzpatrick 1999: 150-152; David-Fox 2012: 159). VOKS chair Olga Kameneva described it as 'our most vulnerable issue' (David-Fox 2012: 54). And yet, Yuriko does not reflect on the wider implications of her experience with the 'Pioneers', merely presenting it as an isolated instance of being duped. She does not even mention the issue of homeless children. By contrast, during her stay in London in August 1929, she makes frequent note of poor children in London's East End, on one occasion so moved by the 'unforgettable triangle' (*ano sankaku no kodomo no kao, wasurarezu*) face of a hungry child that she sketches it in her diary (24 August 1929, p. 435-436), and uses the image again in 'London 1929'. It is not possible that she simply did not see the *bezprizorniki* of Soviet Moscow; what is clear from her omission of them in the diary is that she did not regard them as noteworthy, perhaps because she did not perceive them as representing deeper social malaise or systemic injustice, as in 'old Europe'. In that sense, she was able, literally, to *overlook* them.

Yuriko occasionally records what she reads in the newspapers (or what Yoshiko translates for her), in an uncritical, unreflective way. On 8 April 1929, she notes that a 'class war' (*kaikyūsen*) has broken out between kulaks and poor peasants, in a bullet point next to another bullet point on the new price of chicken (p. 397). In the same entry she notes, also in a bullet point, that a party 'purge' (*R. chistka*, 'purification') is taking place. When the All-Soviet Sixteenth Party Congress is held in July 1930, Yuriko praises Stalin's 'clear understanding' in his *dokrad* (statement) about the crisis of capitalist countries and the construction of socialism and even quotes his down-to-earth put-down of the rightist tendency, in which he likens it to someone who wears a wadded overcoat even in the heat for fear of being cold (4 July 1930, pp. 540-41). This prefigures Nobuko's ecstatic reaction – described at length in *Dōhyō* – to Stalin's essay on the necessity of eradicating the rich peasant class.

On the train to Rostov, she makes a flippant note about their sleeping fellow passengers, 'Timid Bolsheviks, exhausted by the purges, sleep' (*Shōshin na*

borushebiki wa chistka [shukusei] de tsukarete, nemuru) (17 July 1930, p. 546). The great purges of the mid and late 1930s were yet to come; at this point, at the time of the First Five Year Plan, Stalin and his secret police chief Yagoda were still hunting down former Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, as well as ridding the party itself of people with less than impeccable opinions or class origins. Mass expulsions began in May 1929 (Service 1997: 185). Yuriko's remark *en passant* indicates that she accepted the purges as a normal process within the context of Soviet Russia.

Returning to Japan on the Trans-Siberian Railway, she reports an incident in which stones are thrown at the train, breaking a window. The conductor blames the incident on hooligans. Yuriko comments that such incidents did not occur in 1928 or 1929, and that this is different from 'simple kid's mischief' (*tanjun na kodomo no itazura*), but she does not pursue this observation any further to infer dissatisfaction with the regime in remote areas (30 October 1930, p. 577). Her curiosity seems satisfied by the conductor's explanation, the next day, that since the broken glass is deemed a criminal act, he will not be held liable (31 October 1930, p. 578). Overall, by the 1930 diary, Yuriko's uncritical acceptance of the Party line and the achievements of the Soviet Union reflects that of Nobuko in *Dōhyō*. Yuriko returned from Europe not just a fellow traveller but a fervent supporter of the Soviet Union, and the final year of the diary are the point at which the voice of Yuriko the established communist, writing *Dōhyō* 20 years later, is closest to that of her younger self.

Her few criticisms are reserved for VOKS staff. When a VOKS representative fails to turn up at the station to see off the departing kabuki actor Kawarazaki Chōjurō, Yuriko comments bitterly on this 'unfair treatment' (*sabetsu taigu*) and rails about 'toadying bumpkin' (*jidai no inakappē*) who always say 'yes' to important people (2 November 1928, p. 318). In the early Soviet era, peasants were regarded as representative of the backwardness of old Russia, mired in superstition and ignorance, needing to be re-educated and reformed into new Soviet citizen, by force if necessary, as with collectivisation. Yuriko's juxtaposition of 'toadying' – the opposite of the 'simplicity' and integrity she so admires – with 'bumpkin' demonstrates that in her mind such miserable behaviour is not a Soviet

characteristic, but a legacy of the bad old days, a quality intrinsic to peasants, as opposed to the proletariat. The VOKS representative who is supposed to get them a letter of introduction to Gigant, the Rostov state farm, part of their southern itinerary, tries to wriggle out of the responsibility. Yuriko comments that in general VOKS is 'an unpleasant place' (*fukai na tokoro nari*) (15 July 1930, p. 545). Similar to her mention of VOKS in 'Record of Moscow Impressions', she does not comment upon or critique its function in managing the experience of foreign visitors (David-Fox 2012), suggesting that she was either oblivious to this or took it for granted.

As mentioned in the section on class, during her time in Moscow, the Russians with whom Yuriko associated were in the main VOKS staff and writers who were working within the Soviet system. She was taken to see VOKS chair Olga Kameneva soon after her arrival, an encounter only briefly mentioned in the diary (17 Dec 1927, p. 222), but in more detail in *Dōhyō*, where Kameneva is portrayed as cold and rude. At the time of her meeting, Yuriko may well have been unaware of Kameneva's precarious political situation, but by the time of writing *Dōhyō*, Kameneva was dead, shot in 1941 on Stalin's orders. Hirabayashi conjectures that in writing *Dōhyō*, Yuriko, as a loyal communist, felt free to be critical of someone who had been officially condemned as a counter-revolutionary (1976a: 108, 113).

In the diaries, Yuriko recorded regular attendance at the literary salon held by Evdokia Nikitina (24 December 1927, p. 226). During her time in Russia, she met Grigory Gauzner (1907-1934),⁶⁵ a poet and assistant director at the Meyerhold Theatre; the writers Vera Inber (1890-1972), Isaak Babel (1894-1940), Boris Pilnyak, AN Tolstoy; and the Esperantist and poet Vasili Eroshenko (1890-1952).⁶⁶ While in Leningrad, she and Yoshiko arrange a meeting with Maxim Gorky, who happens to be staying at the same hotel. The description of this meeting is very brief: Yuriko gives him a copy of *Nobuko* and discovers that Gorky collects netsuke (5 September 1928, p. 304). They are introduced to the film director Sergei Eisenstein through the actor Kawarazaki Chōjurō, and Yuriko praises him in her diary as 'pleasant'

⁶⁵ Gauzner spent six months in Japan in 1927. See <http://www.jrtf.jp/nowadays/2526.html> (accessed 9 June 2014). It is not recorded in Yuriko's diary if she met him during this time.

⁶⁶ Eroshenko spent time in Japan and became popular there. Because of the connection between Esperantism, the anti-war movement and cosmopolitan anarchist ideas, he was watched closely by the secret police and eventually deported (see Konishi 2013).

(*kokoromochi yoi*), ‘warm’ (*atatakade*), ‘built like a work horse’ (*ōki shigoto no dekiru kokkaku*) and, her ultimate accolade, a man of ‘simple feelings’ (*kanjō wa wariiai tanjun da*) (23 October 1928, p. 312-313). Although Yuriko and Yoshiko were not famous or influential foreigners, paraded around like Romain Rolland⁶⁷ or Sidney and Beatrice Webb (David-Fox 2012), in the diary she presents them as mixing with an array of key cultural figures.

Outside of these circles, Yuriko and Yoshiko are befriended by several students of Japanese, who are referred to by their assumed Japanese names. They also employ several Russian teachers, one of them the wife of the VOKS Japanese representative, Novomirsky. Apart from arranged trips to workers’ clubs, Yuriko’s contact with ‘ordinary’ Russians is fairly limited, in the same way that she has no social dealings with lower-class people in Japan. In hospital, she briefly mentions the nurse Tonya, the model for Natasha in *Dōhyō*, and hears about the harsh life of Masha the nurse’s aide, who has had ten children, eight dead, and a husband who is a ‘good worker’ when not drunk. Masha is not yet 40 and her hair is half white (27 March 1928, p. 361). Yuriko’s closest experience of the life of average Russians is that of being a tenant. In the diary, Yuriko’s landlords, actual and potential, are for the most part presented negatively as mercenary, petit bourgeois and unreliable.

Japanese scholars have debated what Yuriko *could* have seen and *must* have known (e.g., Iwabuchi 1996; Tsuda 2001; Kondo 2002), but what interests me is what, as indicated in her diaries, struck her as noteworthy enough to record as part of *her* experience of Soviet Russia, experience that she marshalled on her return to Japan to speak as an authority on a range of Soviet topics: literature, politics, the status and conditions of women and children, workers’ clubs and life in general. Given her emotional attachment to literary Russia, she was predisposed to see and experience Soviet Russia in a positive, accepting way from the start. This dynamic, in the absence of countervailing scepticism, in turn created a particular view and a particular experience that by 1930 is represented in the diary by Yuriko’s uncritical,

⁶⁷ ‘Perhaps the most distinguished European intellectual friend to consistently defend Stalinism in public – and remain silent during the Purges’ (David-Fox 2012: 208). Yuriko noted her reading of Rolland’s works in her diary.

authoritative description of a Russia in which shortages and party purges are merely stages in the building of the socialist ideal. None of the negatives she records challenge her developing positionality as a devoted supporter of the Soviet Union. In her retrospective fictional account, they are simply erased.

Europe

Yuriko's time in Europe was a key stage in her conversion, when her experience of the Soviet Union provided her with a point of contrast. Nobuko's travels in Europe and her significant encounters and experiences take up the middle third of *Dōhyō* and the overriding theme of 'London 1929' is a critique of capitalism and a comparison to Moscow. How then is this period depicted in her diaries?

Amid the usual short entries recording meals, prices and hotel names, Yuriko begins her account of Europe by describing in some detail, over two pages, her experience of attempting to view the May Day parade in Warsaw, in which the marchers are routed by right-wing thugs, and her subsequent sightseeing trip that encompasses the old ghetto and the wealthy part of town, where people drive about in private cars (1 May 1929, pp. 416-418). In the same entry she includes details of average wages and the cost of living, which suggests she is consciously researching and comparing. In Vienna she records her visit to the Japanese legation, described in detail in *Dōhyō*, as an episode that underlines Nobuko's sense of estrangement from her compatriots. One entry contains brief political notes about clashes between communists and social democrats, pan-Europeanism and the vaguely negative attitude towards Russia, and a celebratory list of the consumer pleasures: clothes, hats, books, cafes (2 May 1929, p. 422). The visit to the Karl Marx Hof workers' residence – a key episode in *Dōhyō* – is covered in a short paragraph. Yuriko notes that the 'guide' (*annaiyaku*) and even the local children were selling postcards, which she sees as emblematic of the 'character' (*kishitsu*) of Vienna, which I take to mean its relentlessly commercial, tourist-oriented economy (p. 423). There is no mention of a named Japanese escort or a heated discussion about communism and social democracy, as in *Dōhyō*, suggesting that this episode may have been recrafted by Yuriko in retrospect, to emphasise Nobuko's instinctive defence of the Soviet Union in face of ideological competition.

In Vienna, Yuriko's feelings about Japan's backwardness are reversed: 'When I was in Russia, I was disappointed [*shitsubō shita*] in Japan. Coming to Europe, I see Japan afresh [*Nihon o minaosu*].' She experiences 'Old Europe' (in English) as stultifying, with an atmosphere that 'clogs her skin' and 'blocks the working of her cells' (*hifu no ue ni nantoka nenchaku shite, kappatsu na saibōsōshiki no undō o sogai saresō*). By comparison, she misses the invigorating 'wildness' of her beloved Russia, described in terms of physical friction: 'I'm homesick [*natsukashii*] for Russia. The longing for Russia, which is rough [*arappoi*] and scours the skin [*goshigoshi hifu o kosuru*].' From these intimately sensory descriptions of how she experiences Russia and Old Europe, Yuriko shifts to the abstract: the 'new generation of world civilisation' (*atarashii jidai no sekai bunmei*) will arise not in the Alps area; the civilizational 'driving force' (*gendōryoku*) lies latent east of the Urals, including, perhaps, Japan (12 May 1929, p. 424). Seeing Europe affirms for Yuriko the words of Maxim Gorky, that Japan has the 'initiating power', or 'starter motor' (*hatsugenryoku*) of a new East Asian civilisation (pp. 424-25). However, she feels that Japanese back home have 'too narrow a perspective' (*shiya no semasa*) to grasp this, and doubts that the Japanese in Europe have any sense of Japan's 'valuable position as a race' (*kachi aru minzokuteki chii*), which must be 'discovered and created' (*midasu beki, sōzō subeki*). Instead, in acquiring a world view, they 'over-adapt' (*jiko o adapt shisugiru*), 'stupidly' (*oroka na koto*) taking on European attitudes that have no bearing on Japan, such as anti-Semitism, and are unable to see things from a Japanese perspective (p. 425). In writing this, Yuriko is implicitly distancing herself from the blinkered, inadequate Japanese in Europe incapable of forming an independent world view. She is in the unusual position of being able to 'triangulate' between Japan, Russia and 'Old Europe', freed from the Meiji-era binary of Japan and the West by the addition of a radical third point of the comparison, Soviet Russia, against which both Old Europe and Japan are found wanting. As discussed, in the Meiji era, Europe, specifically, Britain, Germany and France, was considered representative of advanced civilisation, from which 'backward' Japan had to learn not only modern technologies but a modern way of life. Thus, for Yuriko, whose first ten years were the last decade of the Meiji era, to describe Europe as 'old', is a bold re-ordering of the civilizational hierarchy.

In Yuriko's view, both Japan and Europe are relegated to the status of 'old', meaning 'backward'. 'New civilisation' is represented by Soviet Russia, the model that offers hope for the realisation of Japan's potential, if the limitations of Japanese understanding can be overcome. The future is no longer represented by the West but the East, and Yuriko positions herself in the diary as a Japanese in unique possession of this insight.

There are no entries between 15 May and 16 June 1929. Yuriko's stay in Berlin, which is described in detail in *Dōhyō*, is completely absent from the diaries. A fundamental paradox of diary-keeping is that the more interesting and active a life, the less time there is to record it. Going by the account in *Dōhyō*, I speculate that Yuriko was simply too busy in Berlin to make entries.

The diary resumes in Paris, beginning with short descriptive passages in keeping with Paris's reputation for Japanese as an aesthetic rather than political city. The account of Yuriko's trip to Marseilles to meet her parents is very similar to that in *Dōhyō*, including one of the few kind depictions of Yoshie/Takeyo, whose haggard, ill appearance briefly provokes Yuriko's/Nobuko's sympathy (p. 434).

Yuriko's reactions to London, recorded at length in 'London 1929', are prefigured by a long meandering diary entry made during her hospital stay (1 April 1929, pp. 376-382), in which she comments at length on the classified sections of the 30 January edition of *The Times*. She compares the average age of death in Moscow and in London, noting that Russians die between 30 and 50, exhausting themselves for the revolution. *The Times* includes death notices for people who reach the age of 80 or 90. She refers to Great Britain as 'the world's biggest colonial kingdom' (*sekai saidai no shokuminchi ōkoku*) (pp. 376-77) and comments that in Britain, all big public projects depend on charity. Most of her comments are transcriptions of jobs with conditions and wages, noting such oddities as the requirement for 'lady typists' to be able to drive (in Japan, she adds, actresses pretend to drive cars). This entry indicates that Yuriko is already taking a critical view of London, informed by comparison to the USSR. The actual description of Yuriko's relatively short stay in London (24 August to 15 September 1929, pp. 434-44) essentially prefigures the narrative of 'London 1929' and *Dōhyō*, in note form. I conclude from this that the meaning Yuriko assigned to this experience and the

particular incidents and impressions she selected as important remained constant across time and genre. Yuriko's visit to London, although short, had a considerable effect on Yuriko, as noted by Yuasa Yoshiko (see Iwabuchi 1996: 165), and her depiction of it was consistent, the dense cinematic description of the essay and novel fleshing out the fragments in the diary in a coherent and convincing narrative.

Yuriko's account of her second stay in Paris (18 September-22 November, pp. 444-478) anticipates the narrative of *Dōhyō*: a mix of family drama, a bourgeois rounds of restaurants, galleries and shops, complaints about her French teacher, her interactions with the community of Japanese artists, and her involvement with the economist Taira Teizō (1894-1978), the model for Hachiya Ryōsaku. The parallel political reportage and commentary of *Dōhyō* is absent, clearly a retrospective insertion by the mature Yuriko. Although the experience of London had made a deep impression on her, her preoccupations while in Paris – from the evidence of the diary at least – were still her personal relationships and practical day-to-day concerns, including her dwindling funds.

Overall, the account of the diaries provides an insight into what Yuriko noticed and thought worthy of recording during her European travels. Her critical eye, informed by the Soviet example, takes note of costs and workers' conditions, while at the same time she enjoys the existence of an affluent middle-class tourist, staying in hotels, dining in restaurants, shopping, and visiting art galleries. The paradox of Yuriko as both middle-class traveller and fellow-traveller is fully captured in the diary in a way that is sometimes elided in her public writings. Her judgement of capitalist Europe in the diary carries over clearly in 'London 1929' and in *Dōhyō*, stripped for the most part of the account-keeping and archival details of a diary. The core subjective truth of her experience of Europe was not substantially revised in the retelling, merely formed into a coherent, consistent narrative.

Gender

Yuriko came to Russia as an unconventional Japanese woman who had gone against social norms to marry for love, and had then divorced and set up house with another woman rather than returning to the family home. In the Taishō and early Shōwa era, very few young women had the freedom enjoyed by Yuriko, thanks to

the unusual dual blessing of parents who were both liberal and affluent, as noted by Hirabayashi (1979a: 94). Having achieved her uncommon freedoms relatively easily, through fortunate individual circumstances rather than through political struggle, it is perhaps not surprising that Yuriko had no interest in organised feminism and gave her loyalty instead to the male-dominated communist movement, taking the communist, male-eye view that 'women's issues' would be resolved as a matter of course after the revolution. On her return from the Soviet Union, she became an active promoter of communism, writing articles about her experiences and observations, focusing on the state of women and children in the new Russia. In male-dominated organisations, women are often assigned to speak for women and children as a 'subcategory', while men speak for 'everyone', a category in which the interests of women and children are generally ignored and those of men, representing the norm, are foregrounded. Despite not identifying politically as a woman herself, Yuriko took on this role with authority.

As explored in Chapter 5, in *Dōhyō*, Nobuko encounters three female 'roadsigns' – the Chinese Dr Lin, Natasha the nurse and Anna Simova the Party worker – who exemplify politically liberated yet feminine women. In the diaries, these women appear in passing, without any particular emphasis. Dr Lin is merely mentioned as Chin Shuku-kei, the pleasant and educated wife of a Russian. The visit to the Smolny Institute is recorded on 1 September 1928, but there is no mention of Anna Simova, who appears in the article 'Red Flag Over Smolny' (1930). The pregnant nurse Tonya (Natasha) is also only mentioned in passing when she is replaced – by another *nyanya* less generous with the bathwater (1 April 1929, p. 375; 2 April, p. 383), which Yuriko finds irritating. She appears in more detail in 'Children's Moscow' (1930), as an exemplar of the benefits of the Soviet system to women as mothers. These three women, who were presented as key characters in *Dōhyō* and in two essays written on Yuriko's return, during the first phase of her communist literary activism, are minor or absent entities in the diaries. What can we understand from this?

My view is that Yuriko only retrospectively assigned symbolic importance to these women in *Dōhyō* and pro-Soviet essays. My study of her diary indicates that she did not regard women individually as particularly important or interesting. I

posit that Yuriko's positionality as a woman demonstrates a similar paradox to her class positionality: she regarded 'women' in the abstract as a category of concern, like the idealised 'workers', to be 'saved' through communism, while in person, she did not feel an automatic, instinctive connection with or sympathy for other women. In the diary, for the most part, she comments critically on women, almost from a male-eye position of superiority, defining herself in opposition to their feminine frivolity or lack of ability. A friend of a friend, a young woman who has come from their village to Tokyo in search of work, is written off as having 'no intellectual spark whatsoever' (*interekuto no hikari, gō [sukoshi] mo nai*) (20 February 1927, p. 160). When Yuriko's Russian acquaintance, the artist Varvara Bubnova, expresses the desire to paint her portrait, Yuriko comments that she is relaxed about the prospect because Bubnova is 'not particularly talented' (*taishita tarento no nai*); conversely, a 'truly talented artist' (*rippa na hito*) would make her shy (17 June 1927, p. 188). She is critical of her own sister, Sueko, who is about eleven when Yuriko writes in her diary that she worries that Sueko seems like 'a girl without mental capacity' (*seishinteki na tokoro nai yō na musume*), compared to Yuriko herself, who matured early and was playing the piano and singing Lieder at six years old (25 February 1927, p. 162). In these passages, Yuriko reveals here a clear conception of a hierarchy of ability, based on her own judgement, and her own, elevated position within it *vis-à-vis* other women.

In Moscow, Yuriko is repeatedly critical of the embassy wives. After an embassy party, she writes that they are like 'dead people' (*shinin no yō nari*), who live a life of luxury they could not afford in Japan and 'put on airs' (*jōhin ni kifujin rashiku aru*) (16 November 1927, p. 323). During her protracted hospitalisation (January-April 1929) she is visited regularly by the wives. In the diary she repays their kindness (or dutiful solicitude) by reproducing an example of their conversation in dialogue form, a polite, trivial exchange about coffee, titled, like a short play, 'Wives' Conversation' (*saiguntachi no kaiwa*) (24 March 1929, p. 352-53). By describing these women as empty-headed and snobbish, Yuriko is implicitly defining what type of woman she is *not* as well as affirming a misogynistic stereotype of 'femininity', situating herself on the side of the masculine, the serious and the 'simple'.

A pen-portrait in the diary of her meeting with Countess Mitsuko Coudenhove-Kalergi (1874–1941), widow of an Austro-Hungarian diplomat, during her time in Vienna, reveals Yuriko’s attitude to the positionality of a Japanese woman who lived permanently in Europe. She comments approvingly, ‘Usually when a Japanese woman marries a foreigner, she abandons her conviction in being Japanese [*Nihonjin da to iu kakushin o sutete*] and *adapts* [in English], but this wife is conquering the *nonsense* [in English] of the social world with her *Edokko* flashiness [*hadesa*] and her indomitable spirit, and has continued to insist on her Japaneseness [*Nihonjin da zo to oshitsuzuketa*]' (13 May 1929, p. 427). She quotes Mitsuko’s boasts that she never uses curling irons or face powder and that she is happy with her yellow skin and black hair. As one of the first Japanese to emigrate to Europe in the post-*sakoku* (closed country) period, no doubt Mitsuko had been an object of intense curiosity. From Yuriko’s description, she dealt with this by developing a proud, active identity as a ‘Japanese’ woman rather than ‘adapting’, which Yuriko regards negatively. And yet, Yuriko has a final dig, undermining in her diary Mitsuko’s posturing: her ‘gesture’ [sic, in English] are the ‘exaggerated ones of a Western lady’ (*sukkari ōgyō na seiyōfujin da*). In spite of herself, Mitsuko has ‘adapted’ and compromised an element of her Japaneseness. Yuriko’s private criticism confirms her own, superior, capacity to distinguish essential qualities of ‘Western’ and ‘Japanese’ over that of the verbose old lady, who nevertheless, for all her sisterly, ‘we are Japanese’ talk, has the manner of a society lady and only talks about herself. This encounter is mentioned only briefly in *Dōhyō*. Nobuko privately dismisses the old lady’s support of her son’s pan-European activism, from which the Soviet Union has been excluded (DH, Vol. 2, pp. 235-237). ‘Akiko’ Coudenhove is counted among the conservatively minded Japanese in Vienna with whom Nobuko feels she has nothing in common; her particularities as a Japanese woman abroad that so struck Yuriko in 1928 do not rate a mention in *Dōhyō*. The Japanese women Yuriko meets while abroad, as recorded in her diary, are merely wives, a role she had rejected by divorcing her first husband and living with Yuasa Yoshiko.

When Yuriko and Yoshiko return to Tokyo at the end of 1930 and seek settled lodgings, they inspect a house belonging to an acquaintance of Yoshiko’s, described by Yuriko as an old widow who makes miniature landscape gardens

(bonseki), and teaches ikebana and Noh chants. She records herself smiling ‘good-naturedly’ (*kōi aru*) to see ‘such an example of a little feudal woman’ (*maru de hōkenteki na Nihonjo no mihon*) (17 December 1930, p. 584), by doing so situating herself so far down the opposite end of the spectrum to feudal widows, so confident in the irrelevance of what this woman represents, that she can afford a condescending smile.

Yuriko’s attitude to actual working-class women, in the form of servants, was very much of her class and time, and showed no development over the four years of diaries. Before her departure for Moscow, she and Yuasa kept a maid, and in the diary Yuriko complains about her taking time off to deal with a personal matter and taking too long to come back (10 March 1927, pp. 166-67). Back in Japan and churning out hortatory articles on the Soviet Union from a seaside retreat in Fujisawa, Yuriko records in her diary without the slightest irony that she has had the maid send off one article, ‘Red Flag Over Smolny’ (27 December 1930, p. 588). She has a maid come in to help her and decides to have meals brought in so she can concentrate on her work (29 December 1930, p. 588). Her final entry for 1930 is a short meditation on her lack of interest in home-owning or home-making. She ‘could not bear to spend a whole day looking after a house’ (*junbiteki na kōdō dake de ichinichi sugosu to yarikirenai*). Just thinking about such an ‘individualistic lifestyle’ (*kojinteki seikatsu*) makes her ‘angry’ (*hara ga tatsu!*) (31 December 1930, p. 589). She does not reflect that her freedom from such bourgeois individualism as housekeeping is in fact underpinned by her class privilege, which enables her to buy the labour of working-class women.

Writing 20 years later in *Dōhyō*, Yuriko’s attitude to maids demonstrates no change. Lodging with the Rybakovs, Nobuko ‘helps’ the peasant maid Nyura by accompanying her to the communal drying room. After a spate of thefts, Nyura is nervous of going alone at night to hang out the laundry. Nobuko stands and watches Nyura hang out the washing and lectures her on her right to join a union, about which Rybakov’s wife has neglected to inform her (DH, Vol. 1, pp. 224-230). What is represented in *Dōhyō* as a moment of understanding between women, as they face each other across rows of laundry, comes across, to a modern reader, as a scene of breath-taking condescension. As Kondo (2002) acerbically points out,

Nobuko does not even offer to help hang out the clothes while she is there, because such a thought was beyond Yuriko's mental range, as an *ojōsan* who always had maids to do such lowly feminised work. When Nyura approaches Nobuko again, concerned that she will be held responsible for the thefts after being sniffed by a police dog, Nobuko brushes her off, telling her again to join the union and that she has no need to worry if she has been honest, thus displaying no understanding of how powerless and distrustful a lower-class person might feel in the face of authority.

Given that her male counterparts in the Japanese Communist Party considered the services of a female 'housekeeper' indispensable (Mackie 1997: 222 n. 14; Loftus 2004: 248-49), Yuriko's unreflective use of the labour of working-class women is hardly shocking or unusual. At least, unlike the female communists exploited by their male 'comrades', her maids were presumably paid. However, as a female writer and activist who presented the condition of women in the Soviet Union as her special area of concern, her unthinking blindness to the gendered implications of domestic work and lack of understanding and sympathy for the actual working-class women in her daily sphere, is striking. Kondo (2002: 184) comments on Yuriko's relationship with maids, as individuals surely a 'treasure trove' of stories and information for an activist who purportedly sought the liberation of women, and yet in Yuriko's writings, fiction and non-fiction, maids are presented merely as 'tools' rather than as women or human beings on a level with Yuriko herself.

My reading of this is that Yuriko positioned herself, relying on her class prerogatives, on a level with male intellectuals and Party members, who of course did not do their own housework or cooking. She regarded women, *in the abstract*, as a focus of ideological concern, but had no actual sense of solidarity with other women, certainly not women of the lower classes. In the same way that Yuriko positioned herself alongside male writers rather than as a *joryū sakka*, politically too she was 'one of the men', and this entitled her to have working-class women do her housework while she wrote articles extolling the liberation of women in the Soviet Union.

This complete lack of real political identification with actual women comes across in her comments on women's organisations and publications. Reading the minutes of a joint review meeting held by the journal *Ūman Karento* (Woman Current),⁶⁸ Yuriko notes in her diary that she is surprised by its 'superficiality' (*amari uwasuberi*) and is glad not to have attended what would have been an 'unsatisfying' event (*manzoku shinai*) (3 June 1927, p. 183). In Moscow, she is pleased to receive a copy of *Fujin kōron*, but disappointed by the 'vagueness and carelessness' (*sanman*) of the articles. On the next line, she notes the receipt of 1,000 yen from *Kaizō*, the mainstream journal that is partly funding her stay abroad (19 March 1928, p. 265). This coincidental juxtaposition neatly demonstrates Yuriko's self-positioning in the world of publishing and her attitudes towards it: although she is an occasional contributor to *Ūman Karento* (e.g., 14 January 1927, 148-49), she belongs to the broader world of male intellectual publishing and has only a passing interest in women's journals, which she judges for not measuring up to masculine standards of seriousness.

In May 1928, reflecting on two unnamed female friends with whom she no longer feels compelled to correspond, Yuriko describes them as 'passionless' (*moeyuru tamashii nai*), 'uninteresting/colourless' (*umami ga nai*), 'cold' (*hiyayaka*), 'like Bluestockings of the Sōseki era' (*Sōseki jidai no buryū sotikingu no taipu nari*), 'killing themselves with knowledge' (*chishiki de jibun o katatsukete iru*). Here Yuriko the university drop-out who rejected higher education – unattainable for most Japanese women at that time – situates herself in opposition to the musty Bluestocking, 'New Woman' types who pursue book-knowledge at the expense of passionately felt experience.⁶⁹ Although she was proud of her own book-knowledge, constantly referring to her reading across various literatures in the

⁶⁸ The journal *Ūman Karento* (Woman Current) was launched in 1923 by the writer and critic Miyake Yasuko (1890-1932). See <http://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E4%B8%89%E5%AE%85%E3%82%84%E3%81%99%E5%AD%90>; also Iwabuchi and Sachie (2005).

⁶⁹ In fact, this notion of the dried-up, bookish 'Bluestocking' draws on Anglo-American tropes rather than the Japanese 'New Woman' (*atarashii onna*) of the 1910s, as exemplified by the women of the Seitō group, who were notorious for their love-lives and for escapades such as visiting the Yoshiwara and drinking 'five-coloured liqueur'. See Lowy (2007), Mackie (2013). Yuriko had been well aware of the Seitō group during her adolescence; however, her interests inclined more to the male-run Shirabaka (White Birch) literary group (Kobayashi 1991: 55).

diary, Yuriko attached great importance to sensibility and emotions as the ultimate signifiers of integrity, a theme that comes across strongly in *Dōhyō*, as I have already discussed in Chapter 5. Her passionate nature, marked by a precocious love-marriage, distinguish her from what she imagines as the cold, colourless ‘New Woman’ feminist. At the end of her life, Yuasa Yoshiko told an interviewer that Yuriko had been contemptuous of the notion of a women’s liberation movement and ‘very critical of the Seitō movement’ (*Seitō no undo ni taihen hihiyōteki de atta*) (Sawabe 1990:204). Yuriko acknowledges this herself in a diary entry in 1929, in which she remarks that five years previously, she had ‘despised’ (*iyashimu*) the idea of women entering politics alongside men, but as an ‘adult’ (*shakajjin*) she needed to ‘correct’ (*teisei*) this way of thinking, a revealingly Marxist turn of phrase (10 April 1929, p. 400). In the same entry, she comments that the *Nyonin geijutsu* women, Hasegawa Shigure, Ōi Sachi and the others, all have ‘ability and the quality of defiance’ (*issun surudoī sai to hankō to no soshitsu*), but they are ‘far from being able to make a difference where it matters’ (*honshitsu o katsukasu tokoro kara tōi*). She concludes that the ‘quiet authority’ (*sōzōshikunai kenryoku*) and ‘actual ability’ (*jitsuryoku*) of the Japanese ‘New Woman’ (*atarashii onna*, in quotes) do not have the power to move against imminent danger in the world, in this case the situation in China.⁷⁰ Although she does not say so explicitly, having witnessed the participation of Soviet women in the public sphere as Party members and functionaries may have softened Yuriko’s view on women in politics. All the same, in her diary, she does not view women as political actors *in their own right*; they have no power on their own as women to change anything and therefore any movement made up only of women is doomed to failure. This is the same diary entry – a long one, made while she was still hospitalised – in which Yuriko, commenting on a special edition of *Bungei shunjū*, writes that for women, men appear as the ‘standard’ (*hyōjun*), the ones with the prerogatives of power and agency: ‘Men give, men do’ (*otoko no hō mo ataeru toka yaru toka*) (10 April 1929, p. 400). Yuriko had always aligned herself to the male standard, recognising the male prerogative of bestowing publication and status. In her enduring belief that

⁷⁰ Two months after this entry, in June, young Japanese officers in Manchuria assassinated the Chinese warlord Zhang Zuo-lin in a failed attempt to bring about a Japanese occupation.

women were subsidiary and powerless relative to men, political action without men had no meaning for her.

Shortly after arriving back in Japan in late 1930, Yuriko is invited to the *Asahi shinbun's* 'Women's Room', the so-called 'Thursday meeting'. She writes, 'It was awful' (*suzumashii*). All the women, including the suffragists and future politicians Ichikawa [Fusae] (1893-1981) and 'Kaneko' (presumably Yamataka Shigeri, 1899-1977) are described in the diary as intellectual lightweights, 'woolly headed' (*hidoku chiri no kaburi*). 'Ishimoto' [presumably family-planning advocate and future Dietwoman Katō Shidzue, 1897-2002] 'smiled like a Baroness' (which, in fact, she was). Yuriko's impatience and disgust at being put in an all-women group is conveyed in an almost childish vehemence: 'Aaaa, I won't go again!' (*Aaaa nido to yukazu*) (15 December 1930, p. 583). As a communist propagandist, she would speak *for* and *about* women, but she refused to place herself among them politically. Yuriko's insistence on 'natural' femininity over (in her view) a bloodless, intellectual and masculinised form of womanhood required the validating, empowering presence of men.

Although she wrote at length about the condition of women in the Soviet Union in subsequently published articles, Yuriko made little mention of them in her diary. A uniquely revealing comment in her diary about the situation of women, and men and women, in the USSR appears in 1928:

Since coming to the USSR, I've been impressed by many things, but I have not seen a family [*katei*] that I've thought, yes, this is a good family, where man and woman are truly bound by something human and live their life's aims [*seikatsu no mokuhyō*] within it. They are entangled in the same old expediency [*hōben*], getting ahead [*risshin*] and meanness [*kechisa*]. (19 November 1928, p. 324)

This paragraph reveals Yuriko's own ideal of a relationship and her disappointment at not yet finding it in Soviet Russia, a place that she has otherwise accepted as her promised land. At the time of writing this passage, she had already met the Party worker who appears as Anna Simova in *Dōhyō*, but not nurse Natasha/Tonya, both

of whom are presented as embodying the new Soviet model of liberated yet feminine womanhood, even though she had only heard about their marriages second-hand. A similar observation appears in *Dōhyō*, but earlier in the fictional narrative than in the diary, around the time of writing ‘Record of Moscow Impressions) (i.e., before May 1928), and in a qualified form. Nobuko reflects that while she has seen the social provisions that offer the possibility of happiness, she has not yet seen one ‘rich fresh union’ (*shinzen de yutaka na ketsugō*) that inspires her envy (DH, Vol. 1, p. 241-42). However, she appreciates the ‘social contract’ (*shakai keiyaku*) under which each woman is cared for as a worker, a wife, a mother and an old woman, a contract that does not exist in Japanese society, and this awareness fills her with confidence for the future of women. In this passage, the older Yuriko as narrator distinguishes between her ideal relationship, which she did not encounter during her time the Soviet Union, and the conditions that allowed for a secure and fulfilled female life – including the *possibility* of equal relationships with men. Yuriko’s ideal relationship – one of man and woman, not woman and woman – in which both share the same life aim, politically defined, appeared later in the short story ‘Koiwai no ikka’ (The Koiwai Family). Some scholars (e.g., Mizuta Lippit 1978: 5; Mikals-Adachi 1997: 120) regard Yuriko’s later marriage to fellow communist Miyamoto Kenji as the fulfilment of this ideal.

Thus, in the diaries, Yuriko presents herself as naturally aligned with men, on account of her superior intellectual and literary seriousness relative to other women. As such, her wholehearted adoption of the communist world-view, in which ‘women’s issues’ were subordinate to the revolution, did not cause any shift in her positionality as a woman.

The obvious riposte to my description of Yuriko as a woman who had no intrinsic loyalty to women in general and often took a critical view of individual women, is that she nevertheless had a close, loving and mutually supportive relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko, from their meeting in 1924 to 1932, when Yuriko left Yoshiko for Kenji. My reply to this is that Yuasa, as a masculine woman and self-confessed lesbian (Sawabe 2007) who was dedicated to serious intellectual and literary pursuits, who was herself a professional woman of letters, earning her living as an editor when they met, resisted any kind of negative judgement for feminine

frivolity or stupidity and provided a model of how an independent, literary woman could live. In her relationship with Yoshiko, Yuriko found the intellectual and creative support and leadership that her first husband, the lacklustre, conventional Araki, had failed to provide. What Yoshiko could not provide, however, was sexual satisfaction, which Yuriko hinted at, in coyly botanical terms, in her diary for 1927: 'the pistil calls out to the stamen' (15 August 1927, p. 203). For Yuriko, the norm was ultimately always male, whether in literature, politics or love. In this next section, I shall look more closely at Yuriko's relationship with Yoshiko.

Yuasa Yoshiko

A major theme in the diaries, as well as *Dōhyō*, is Yuriko/Nobuko's relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko/Motoko and her gradual distancing from her companion of several years. In *Dōhyō*, their relationship is presented as that of no more than close friendship, at least from Nobuko's point of view. The depiction is more ambiguous in the diaries. There, the intensity and regularity of their arguments are suggestive of a couple rather than 'just friends'. Yuriko refers to Yoshiko by the endearment 'Moya' (R. 'mine'), and to herself as 'Beko', the endearment used by Yoshiko. In *Dōhyō*, 'Beko' becomes 'Buko-chan', but there is no mention of or equivalent to 'Moya', which suggests Yuriko was playing down the romantic intensity of their relationship in her fictional life-narrative. There are no diary entries for Berlin, therefore, unfortunately, no contemporary record of the visit to the lesbian café that so disgusted Nobuko in *Dōhyō*.

On the evidence of the diaries for 1927, their relationship was already rocky before their departure for Russia, and their cramped living conditions in Moscow worsened the situation. Yuriko's frustration with the relationship comes across through her frequent complaints about her lack of privacy. This was not a problem unique to travellers. Historian Sheila Fitzpatrick (1999: 41-42, 46-49) describes the huge increase in the Soviet urban population – 15 million – between 1926 and 1933. Moscow's population increased from 2m to 3.6m, leading to chronic shortage of housing. In 1930, average living space per head in Moscow was 5.5 square metres. This was the era of the *kommunalka*, the communal apartments set up in residential buildings seized by the state after the revolution, in which one

family lived in one room and shared all other facilities, immensely stressful conditions in which privacy was impossible.

In Tokyo, in the year before their departure, the two women had shared a house with a maid in Komazawa, Setagaya-ku. As the daughter of an affluent family who had encouraged her talents, Yuriko had expectations of private space necessary for writing. She and Yoshiko supported each other's work, which was accorded equal space in their relationship; a contrast to heterosexual couples of this period, in which the woman was usually expected to sacrifice her work to provide domestic service to the man, even the leftists, as described by Sata Ineko (Loftus 2004: 215-219). Materially and emotionally, as a woman writer, Yuriko took a certain amount of personal space for granted, reflected in her repeated complaints in the diary about her lack of it in Moscow.

From the very beginning of their Russian stay, starting at the Hotel Passage, Yuriko has to share a room with Yoshiko, which serves both as their bedroom and their work space. By early January 1928, she is already feeling the strain of such intense cohabitation. One night, when Yoshiko has gone to bed early, Yuriko, enjoying sole use of the desk, reflects on their extremely cramped life, always together in one room and thinks longingly of having 'her desk in her own room' (*hitori no heya ni jibun no tsukue*), where she can settle down and write (13 January 1928, p. 242). This theme recurs repeatedly: thinking ahead to their planned summer trip to Leningrad, Yuriko reflects, again, how wonderful it would be if she had 'her own room in which to read and write' (*hitori de hitotsu no heya o motte, mono o kaku, yomu, donna ni ureshisō de arō*) (6 May 1928, p. 271).

After Yuriko's discharge from hospital in April 1929, the two women have to share a room again. In Yuriko's absence, Yoshiko has changed the Ostozhenka room around and hung maps and pictures on the wall, in effect, made it *her* room. She has also had the freedom to organise her time without considering the habits or physical presence of another person. She is used to working late into the night and having her dinner at 11pm, which keeps Yuriko awake (9 April 1929, p. 388). Not long after Yuriko's return from hospital, she reports Yoshiko as saying, 'Life has become unbearable since you came home' (*Kimi ga kaette kitara, seikatsu ga shinde shimatta*) (14 April 1929, p. 405). If Yoshiko wants open the door, she has to

ask Yuriko to stand up, because her legs are in the way as she sits in the easy chair, only inches away from the bed. When Yoshiko is in a good mood, Yuriko is told '*Fusutawai, rabōchii!*' (R. Workers, arise!); when she is in a bad mood, the command is curt: '*Tate!*' (Get up!) (14 April 1929, pp. 405-406). It seems to Yuriko that Yoshiko would prefer to live alone, and she herself thinks that it would 'be good to live separately' (*betsu betsu ni kurashite mo yoi*) when they return to Japan (p. 406). Yuriko writes, 'It limits our freedom if we can't live separately' (*futari de kurasenai to kurasenu, kore wa tagai ni fujiyū da*) (p. 406). She concludes this diary entry with the comment, 'I'll certainly live by myself when I return to Japan' (*Hontō ni Nihon e kaettara hitori de kurasō*) (p. 406).

Thus, the enforced proximity of their living conditions brings about a new desire for distance in their relationship, a distance that is realised geographically in August 1929, when Yuriko stays on in London and Paris and Yoshiko returns alone to Moscow to continue her studies. When Yuriko's family leave Paris for Japan in late October 1929, Yuriko stays for a further month. She records what seems to have been a brief affair with Taira Teizō, although this is couched in extremely vague terms, perhaps reflecting an unwillingness by Yuriko to acknowledge, even to herself, her betrayal of Yoshiko and her desire to damage or end the relationship. She bemoans 'T's' 'sentimental words' (*senchi na koto o iu*) (6 November 1929, p. 472) but enjoys his admiration and attention (9, 10 November 1929, p. 474). However, she holds back from falling in love with him, because for her, he lacks 'talent' (*sainō*) (23 November 1929, p. 478). She feels grateful to 'Moya' who, as a person worthy of love, has protected her from 'unhealthy' (*fukenkō na*) love – presumably, in this context, that of someone whose talent does not match Yuriko's own. The relationship of Nobuko and Hachiya Ryōsaku as depicted in *Dōhyō* is similarly vague, although Nobuko's reason for ending it is explicitly ideological – Hachiya's lack of true commitment to communism.

However, Yuriko's desire to escape the emotional claustrophobia of her relationship with Yoshiko was subject to a countervailing need for companionship and an uneasiness, both physical and emotional, when entirely alone. The pattern of frustration and dependency was already well-established before their departure: it was her unwillingness to be separated from Yoshiko, despite their arguments,

that motivated Yuriko to accompany her to Russia in the first place. In Moscow she depends upon Yoshiko, the Russian speaker, as her intermediary and escort, as well as for emotional support. She makes special mention in her diary when she goes alone to a new place (22 February 1928, p. 257). The experience is disconcerting and physically uncomfortable. On the way there, the tram windows are frozen over and she does not know where she is. As a foreigner, she suffers the double disorientation of not *knowing* the place she is in and not knowing where, literally, she is. On the return journey, the tram is crowded; she is ‘anxious and exhausted’ (*ki o momunde kutabireta*). The act of moving around Moscow independently is physically and mentally challenging. This contrasts to Nobuko’s confident experience of Moscow in *Dōhyō*, in which her encounter with the new – such as the crowded market by Nikitsky Gate – is described in terms of uplifting stimulation.

By November that year, however, Yuriko is confident enough to go to Leningrad alone for three days, after having spent the summer there with Yoshiko. Although she is travelling solo, however, her time in Leningrad is insulated by the companionship of Japanese acquaintances there (10-12 November 1928, pp. 320-322). Back in Moscow in December, Yuriko notes in her diary that she has seen a play by herself for the first time since coming to Russia, Ostrovsky’s ‘The Forest’ at the Meyerhold. It was ‘strange’ (*hen*) and her feelings were ‘a little affected’ (*kanjō ga issun eikyō sareru*). She chides herself: ‘I should be self-sufficient’ (*Hitori de tappuri shite inakereba naranu*) (6 December 1928, p. 332). By this point, Yuriko is already thinking ahead to life back in Japan. The plan at this stage is that Yuriko will return to Japan mid-year while Yoshiko continues her studies in Russia until the end of the year. Yuriko writes, revealingly, in her diary that she likes the idea of living alone for half a year (25-26 December 1928, p. 340).

The arguments with Yoshiko, the constant complaints about lack of space, the anticipation of separate lives back in Japan and Yuriko’s gradual experiments with such separation, read together, demonstrate that in the diary Yuriko is exploring and justifying the possibility of a self without Yoshiko, even while she is still dependent on her. In her diary, Yuriko creates a picture of Yoshiko as bad-tempered and foul-mouthed and herself as the victim, as if she is already, if not consciously or deliberately, ‘collecting evidence’ and ‘building a case’ for an

eventual split. In the context of the diary, the cramped conditions of life in Moscow acquire a meaning quite separate from the material reality of the Soviet Union, representing the state of Yuriko's relationship with Yoshiko and her growing desire for 'space' within it.

At the time of writing *Dōhyō*, Yuriko's relationship with Yoshiko was already 20 years in the past. Critics such as Iwabuchi (1996: 298-326) claim that Yuriko 'whitewashed' and downgraded the relationship in her novel, and presented an overly negative image of Yuasa, overlooking the positives, such as her devoted care of Yuriko during her long illness, when she put aside her studies and brought home-cooked meals to the hospital every day. In my view, Yuriko had already created the 'negative' Yoshiko in her diaries, a perspective that enabled Yuriko to literally walk out of the house and abandon Yoshiko for Miyamoto Kenji in 1932.

Yuriko's complete rewriting of one particular incident suggests that she was aware her treatment of Yoshiko was not always blameless. In the diary, she records a violent argument after the writer Boris Polnyak 'flirts' (*fusake*) with her at a literary event, and she brushes off Yoshiko's anger with a casual, 'Oh, it's nothing' (R. nichevo) (11 January 1928, p. 241). In the privacy of their hotel room, Yoshiko shouts and hits her so hard she falls to the ground. In the *Dōhyō* version, the two women go to Boris 'Polnyak's' house for dinner. Nobuko delicately refuses alcohol and goes to the cloakroom to retrieve a handkerchief. The drunken Polnyak pursues her, scoops her up in his arms, and takes her into another room. Another guest, a Russian man, intervenes before matters proceed any further (DH, Vol. 1, pp. 130-148). Shocked and humiliated, Nobuko reflects on the affection and respect she received at a worker's club meeting. Thus, in *Dōhyō*, an incident that in life showed Yuriko as extravert and unashamed is recast, emphasising Nobuko's innocence and Yuriko's retrospective distaste for fellow-traveller writers such as Polnyak, whose lack of proletarian integrity is augmented by his representation as a would-be rapist (see Iwabuchi 1996: 288-89).

The insistent theme of experience vs learning in *Dōhyō*, with Nobuko representing the superiority of authentic, lived experience over Motoko's claustrophobic and limited book-study, is absent from the diaries. As I will discuss in the following section, Yuriko kept regular notes on theatre, cinema, and her

reading, presenting a different, far more intellectual image than that of Nobuko, who comes across as something of a naïf who responds entirely by instinct – which invariably leads her to the truth of socialism.

Writer & communist

The clearest subjective development represented by Yuriko in her diary is her positionality as a politically committed communist writer.

Her literary identity was firmly established well before her departure to Moscow. In the 1927 diary she makes note of days when she writes, which she refers to as ‘work’ (*shigoto*), emphasising the professional nature of this activity, and when she submits a completed essay or story to a journal. On 8 April she sends ‘Waga gogatsu’ (Our May) to *Kaizō* (p. 171); on 23 April she sends a story, ‘Akarui kaihin’ (Bright Beach) to the *Asahi*; on 8 July she finishes ‘Shiroi kaya’ (White Mosquito Net) and submits it to *Chūō kōron* (p. 192). Her established relationship with these three leading publications (Kasza 1988: 44) is mentioned matter-of-factly in the diary: Yuriko took her status as a published writer for granted. In April she is visited by a Kaizōsha representative who proposes that the company will pay ¥5000 towards her travel expenses to Russia, quantifiable proof of her status as a writer (13 April 1927, p. 173). When she and Yoshiko board the ship from Shimonoseki for the Korean peninsula in December, she is met and interviewed by journalists (2 December 1927, p. 214). As a young female writer who lived unconventionally, Yuriko was a public figure whose activities were tracked in the press. She expresses no bemusement at this attention in the diary, apparently habituated to a certain level of fame and recognition.

Although Yuriko does not decide to accompany Yoshiko to Russia until mid-1927, her reading, as recorded in her diary, has a definite left-wing flavour. Passages in socialist writer Henri Barbusse’s *Christ* makes a deep impression on her (9 July 1927, p. 193). She records reading *Socialism and Evolution* by Takabatake Motoyuki (1886-1928) (16 July 1927, p. 193) and Vsevolod Ivanov’s (1895-1963) Russian civil war story, ‘Armoured Train’ (1922) (6 August 1927, p. 200). Having read *La Nuit* by French poet and communist Marcel Martinet (1887-1944), she comments that ‘writers who have a philosophy of life’ (*jinseikan o motsu sakka*),

like Martinet, Barbusse, and the pacifist poet Charles Vildrac (1882-1971), are interesting as the 'first page of the history of civilisation' (*bunmeishi no ichipēji*) after the [first world] war (13 August 1927, p. 202), an indication that Yuriko is drawn to writers who engage with their historical moment and whose response is not merely aesthetic but consciously intellectual. The combination of Yoshiko's imminent departure for Soviet Russia and the topicality of left-wing writers and ideas in 1920s intellectual life in Japan, along with Yuriko's pre-existing interest in 'Russia', evidently informed her reading at this time. This is not to say she did not read other kinds of works, but the ones she chooses to record in her diary demonstrate a self that is intellectually serious and engaged with the weighty issues of the world.

In 1928, her first year in Moscow, Yuriko's sense of self as a writer, while remaining fundamentally strong, is challenged. She publishes only three articles: 'Shinani shoten no benchi' (The Bench in the Shinani Bookshop; *Bungei shunjū*, June), 'Mosukuwa inshōki' (Record of Moscow Impressions; *Kaizō*, August) and 'Roshia no tabi yori' (From a Russian Journey, *Yomiuri shinbun*, October). In May, she notes in her diary that she is having trouble getting back into her current piece of work, 'Record of Moscow Impressions', after leaving it for a week (7 May 1928, p. 272). On 12 May Yuriko finally finishes the piece, but feels 'dissatisfied and strangely homesick for Japan' (*Hen ni kyōshū o kanzu. Nihon ga koishii*) and wants to be in Japan, writing novels (12 May 1928, p. 274), a sentiment repeated one month later (23 July 1928, p. 296). The longing to write novels is expressed in visceral terms, like a hunger (*hara made*) and occurs alongside the longing to be in Japan. Her ability to function as a writer is grounded in her identity as Japanese. Not just out of context but in a foreign country whose 'personality' – both the weight of its history and literary tradition and its on-going immense social and political transformation – is overwhelming, Yuriko seems to lose her bearings as a writer, in the same way that Akutagawa's works, away from Japan, seem to lose their meaning for her when she first arrives in Moscow (20 December 1927, p. 223). Nobuko's inability to write creatively about Japan while in Russia is what informs her difficult decision, at the end of *Dōhyō*, to leave Russia.

In her first year in Moscow, 1928, Yuriko's reading and cultural activities continue in a left-wing vein. She writes that Yoshiko has been reading to her (presumably translating) from a book by the poet and writer Vera Inber and from Evdokia Nikitina's biographies of the writers Alexander Yakovlev (1886-1953) and poet Mikhail Gerasimov (4 January 1928, p. 237). Yuriko buys the play-script for Meyerhold's play 'Roar, China!', commenting that while she does not regard it as art, it succeeds as propaganda, here making a clear distinction between the two. She goes on to say that she found it 'very unpleasant' (*kurushii iya na kokoromochi ni natta*), commenting on the use of national stereotypes, and compares Meyerhold's anti-naturalistic style to kabuki (5 January 1928, p. 238). Yuriko's use of the term 'propaganda' (in katakana) and her use of Japanese drama as a point of comparison contrasts to her later, ideologically informed, judgements in the 1930s diary.

Yuriko takes notes while Yoshiko reads the essays of the writer and former Red Army commissar Larissa Reisner (1895-1926). She appreciates Reisner's intelligence and respects her as a 'foundation worker' (in katakana) of the Revolution who suffered for the cause. However, she states that Reisner's writings, although valuable for their 'sure judgement' (*kaku na handanryoku*), are not stylistically beautiful (30 January 1928, p. 246), again making a distinction between form and content. The women buy a copy of Bukharin's *Historical Materialism*, which presumably Yoshiko is going to tackle in the original and discuss with Yuriko, as with Reisner's book (2 February 1928, pp. 248-49). By noting this in her diary Yuriko is representing a serious intellectual self who is grappling not only with the language but with the ideological underpinnings of her new surroundings, an enterprise she shares with Yoshiko.

She reads John Reed's first-hand account of the revolution, *Ten Days that Shook the World* (1919), and ponders that Kerensky's provisional government failed not only for ideological reasons, but for psychological ones: not only was he a bourgeois intellectual, his government was irresolute and 'soft'. By comparison, the Bolsheviks succeeded through ideology and 'hardness' (*katasa*) (20 March 1928, p. 261). This passage shows how Yuriko feminises the bourgeoisie as 'soft' and

‘irresolute’ and valorises the masculine ‘firmness’ of the Bolsheviks, a firmness that rests on ideology.

In 1929, when Yuriko spends four months in hospital and the rest of the year travelling, she publishes nothing. Her longest, most reflective diary entries appear during her hospital stay, occasionally sparked by something she has read in *Kaizō* or *Chūō kōron*. These entries provide an insight into her developing sense of self as a writer, intellectual and future activist. The death confessions of the executed terrorist Furuta Daijirō⁷¹ prompt her to speculate that anyone reading these must feel that he was ‘tender-hearted’ (in katakana): ‘A person trying to understand the socialist movement would surely recognise the psychological reasons [*shinriteki gen’in*] – this sentimental tendency [*junjōteki keikō*] – why this young men started on the road to terrorism’. Referring to the ‘tender love of nature’ (*shizen ni taisuru komayaka na ai*) and ‘abundant gentleness’ (*afureru yasashisa*) in Rosa Luxemburg’s letters, Yuriko writes, ‘It’s clear that people involved in the socialist movement have sensitive natures [*binkan na seishitsu*] with regard to life ... they love life [*jinesei o aishi*]’ (22 March 1929, pp. 348-349). She compares Furuta’s final, fierce awareness and love of life in his cell, awaiting death, with her own experience of hospital, declaring that if she died in a week’s time, she would die loving the door frame and the leather-covered stool (p. 350). Thus, the heightened sensibility that Yuriko admires in others – and herself – as a marker of integrity is linked in her mind to a susceptibility to socialism. She is able to romanticise revolutionaries as people of exquisite sensitivity who have been driven to extreme actions by their love of life and are sustained by this in their suffering. By comparing her own hospital stay to her imagined scenes of Furuta and Luxemburg in their prison cells, Yuriko is drawing explicit links between herself and these doomed revolutionaries. Her personal mythology of the stoic revolutionary is already visible in this 1930 diary entry, and comes across clearly in the final paragraph of *Dōhyō*, when Nobuko decides to return to Japan as a communist, even though she may be destroyed in the struggle (DH, Vol. 3, p. 477).

⁷¹ Furuta Daijirō (1900-1925), a member of the anarchist group Girochinsha (Guillotine Society, formed 1922), was hanged in 1925 for planning to assassinate the Crown Prince in retaliation for the deaths of fellow activists (Raddeker 1997: 131)

News of the suicide of the younger brother of a friend in Tokyo prompts a long entry in which Yuriko revisits the shock of her own brother's suicide, reaffirming her determination to live and to write:

I want to write something that does not exist in Japanese literature to date. This is the meaning of my existence [*jibun no sonzai igi da*]. I won't die until I have achieved this. It is not in my nature to give up living until I have completed this task. To live is to walk this road [*ikiru no wa soko e iku michi da*]. ... Therefore I won't die. I will walk and live even on the edge of death [*shinu to sure sure no tokoro o demo aruite ikiru*]. (29 March 1929, pp. 372)

Yuriko's determination to live is rooted in her literary vocation; correspondingly, her literary vocation is affirmed and strengthened by her will to live. Again, the example of Akutagawa is the unvoiced comparison. The life-and-death intensity of her vocation echoes her imagining of Furuta and Luxemburg. Yuriko is burning with intent but at this point, the union of literary and political purpose is not made explicit in the diary.

In 1930, Yuriko's writing/work life and what I have called her intellectual life appear to merge, with literary and ideological commentary combined. In her remaining ten months in Russia, after the lull of 1929 and her travels in Europe, she writes four articles: two for *Kaizō*, one for the *Asahi* and one for *Jiji shinpō*. She is also 'blessed' (*sasagaru*) with the 'work' of translating Marxist theorist Georgi Plekhanov (1856-1918) into Japanese – a request by exiled former Communist Party leader Katayama Sen, although Yuriko does not mention his name in the diary (10 February 1930, p. 491, see note p. 893).

Ideological commentary, particularly about socialist literature, film and theatre, and the relationship between socialism and the arts, features strongly in the 1930 diary. Yuriko's notes on the various plays, films and literary circles attended during this last year in Russia demonstrate that she took a deep interest in the debates, while maintaining her belief in the necessity of authentic feeling and in artistic value separate from ideological value. She questions the predominance of

ideology in certain works, which compromises them artistically, but never the need for an ideological superstructure.

In April Yuriko sees an 'awful' (*hidoi*) art exhibition by the group 'Chekh' (Bohemians), and remarks on the difficulty of incorporating socialism into art. A recent exhibition by self-taught artists at a Moscow workers' club is far more interesting to her (23 April 1930, p. 508). The next month, there appears the statement: 'The principles of Marxism are the basis of a world view [*sekaikan no konpon*] = Art cannot be born from Marxist art theory [*Marukushizumu no geijutsuron sono mono kara wa geijutsu wa umarenu*]', followed by the comment, 'I understand some things completely but not others' (*wakarikitta koto, shikashi wakarikiranu koto*) (6 May 1930, p. 514), suggesting that Yuriko is struggling to grasp the relationship between ideology and art in a Marxist context. A day later, she goes to the Vakhtangov Theatre to see 'Avant-garde' by Valentin Kataev (1897-1986), which she enjoys, but qualifies by adding that she 'agrees' (katakana, R. *soglasno*) with the criticism that the focus on the individual rather than the collective is a 'flaw' (*ketten*) in Soviet terms (7 May 1930, pp. 514-15). Here she attempts a specifically ideological judgement about a creative work, separate from her actual enjoyment of it.

Her criticisms extend to the running and content of the various literary groups she attends. She writes of the Sokolsky literary circle that everyone was confident and there was lots of debate, but the work itself, poems on the theme of the Five-Year Plan were 'nothing special' (*taishita koto nai*) (22 May 1930, p. 520). She writes critically about a talk given to a literary circle by the writer Anna Karavaeva (1893-1979), who in Yuriko's view does nothing to cultivate the artistic understanding of the attending workers and who is dismissive of their questions afterwards. Yuriko concludes, 'She's a cow' (*iya na yatsu da*) (26 May 1930, p. 522-23). Yuriko's sympathies, as ever, are with the workers, not Party intellectuals or indeed, another female writer. The procedure of another literary circle is described approvingly: the editor of the journal *Oktabyr*⁷² wrote down all the questions and they were answered by everyone: 'This is what should be done' (*Kō subeki da*).

⁷² The organ of the Moscow Proletarian Writers' Association (MAPP).

However, the negative aspect of the circle was the lack of leadership; no ‘organised research’ (*chitsujo tatta kenkyū mo shite inai*) was carried out, Yuriko writes. Yuriko herself was very interested in the technical questions raised by writer Yuri Libedinsky’s controversial ‘Birth of a Hero’ (1930): did it represent a step forward for proletarian literature or was it merely an individual development? (2 June 1930, p. 528).⁷³ Yuriko is well aware of Soviet literary controversies and takes a keen interest, as recorded in her diary. She is also judgemental about the sort of people who are engaged in writing. At a 3 June literary circle, she records meeting a woman who was ‘not employed or working’ anywhere (*tsutomete mo hataraite mo inaide*) and does ‘only’ literary work (3 June 1930, p. 529). Another woman is a primary school teacher: ‘Lots of newly hatched chicks [*hiyokko*]. No workers.’ Despite being ‘unemployed’ herself, Yuriko positions herself within what she accepts as the Soviet viewpoint, that ‘work’, narrowly defined as manual labour, is the source of authenticity.

Her interest in the development of Soviet arts comes through in her detailed description of Afinogenov’s play ‘Chudak’, a good-natured satire of bureaucracy and the intelligentsia (4 June 1930, p. 529), notable for the ways in which it ‘breaks away from the form [*katashi o yabutteru ten de*] of Soviet playwrighting up to now’. In *Dōhyō*, ‘Chudak’ is favourably compared to Mayakovsky’s ‘Bath House’, which Nobuko does not understand. Yuriko criticises an Uzbek play about cotton production in Turkmenistan for having an ‘ideologically poor structure’ (*ideorogiteki ni kōsei ga yoku nai*): the communist stands alone and does not join with the poor peasant (22 June 1930, p. 537). Conversely, she criticises a play at the Korsh Theatre for being ‘too Red’ and ‘without any feeling’ (*chottomo kokoromochi no nai aka, aka, aka made kudaranai*) (13 October 1930, p. 569). She deems a play at the Moscow Area Workplace Union Soviet Theatre to have more substance than Kataev’s ‘Avant-garde’, which she had criticised for being intellectual and conceptual (19 October 1930, p. 572). These diary notes indicate that Yuriko is

⁷³ Y.N. Libedinsky (1898-1959), one of the foremost proletarian writers in the 1920s, was renowned for his short story ‘The Week’ (1922). ‘Birth of a Hero’ was criticized as ‘Freudian’ for depicting the hero’s inner life. It was ultimately disowned by the author himself (Struve 1972: 232).

consciously developing her ideological judgement and her ideas about the integration of art and politics.

Her growing confidence is evident in her comments on the literary situation in Japan. A back copy of *Kaizō* carrying the debates around the time of the split in the proletarian literary movement, when the Worker-Peasant (Rōnō) faction broke away, inspires a lengthy diary entry (4 May 1930, p. 513). Yuriko criticises the position of both sides, and concludes that they are both merely indulging in ‘intellectual debates’ (*interiteki ronsō da*). She finishes this entry with the pronouncement that it is the responsibility of the ‘transition-period artist’ (*katokiteki na geijutsuka*) to ensure that good proletarian art comes from within the proletariat. The authority of this statement is founded in Yuriko’s experience in the homeland of communism; it is as if she is addressing the fissiparous Japanese proletarian literary movement from a superior vantage point. Nowhere in the diary does she record her ‘conversion’ to communism, but this statement clearly indicates that she has gone beyond identifying with ‘Russia’ and sympathising with communism to speaking from a communist point of view.

She records going to see a preview of Suzuki Jūkichi’s ‘What Made Her Do It?’, about girl driven to arson by her circumstances,⁷⁴ with Fukuro Ippei (1897-1971), a researcher of Soviet film and culture, at the Red Army Central Building. She writes that the film is not particularly good: not only is the technique poor, but the development of feelings to the point of resistance stops at individual revenge (7 June 1930, p. 531). A story in an issue of *Nyonin geijutsu* by a writer Yuriko only identifies as ‘NT’ (possibly communist writer Nakamoto Takako, 1903-1991) is taken to task for trying to grasp the proletariat and construct the background ‘conceptually’ (*kannen de*): if she does not stop doing this, then she will be incapable of writing ‘stories from the heart’ (*shin kara no shōsetsu*) – something that evidently remains important to Yuriko as a writer, despite her attempts to take on an ideological view of art (27 May 1930, p. 524). Reading stories by two proletarian writers, Miyajima Sukeo (1886-1951) and Eguchi Kiyoshi (1887-1975), Yuriko notes her judgement in the diary: although Miyajima has a ‘superior

⁷⁴ Based on the 1927 play ‘Nani ga kanojo o sō saseta ka’ by the proletarian writer Fujimori Seikichi (1892-1977).

penetration' (*chinsen ryoku*), his works lacks a 'frame' (*kokkaku*), which I assume refers to ideological consistency. By comparison Eguchi's 'outrage' (*kanjō no gekkōsei*) had motivated him to join the proletarian movement (3 July 1930, p. 540). Here, Yuriko's own literary and political standards are implicitly laid out: a writer must have not only a framework (i.e., ideology) but must also be emotionally engaged and passionate, a view that demonstrates an awareness of leftist debates at this time about how to produce effective revolutionary literature, such as those published by Nakamoto in *Nyonin geijutsu* (see Coutts 2013). Going in the face of the conventional wisdom that ideological stringency strangled proletarian literature, Karlsson argues that even though the PLM's chief theorist in the late 1920s, Kurahara Korehito, advocated realism informed by dialectical materialism, he did not intend this at the expense of 'artistically adept' literature (Karlsson 2008: 260-61).

Reading *Kaizō*, Yuriko notes her interest in the 'transition of the Japanese literary world' (*Nihon no bundan no henshen*) (9 May 1930, p. 515). She begins to make a point of 'studying Japan' (*Nihon benkyō o shita*) in her reading of journals such as *Kaizō* and *Chūō kōron* (11 May 1930, p. 516). Japan and its literary world have become sufficiently distant from her daily experience that she is able to 'study' them objectively, with the benefit of her new, broader, external perspective. It is also possible that she felt dislocated from her milieu as a writer and, with the prospect of return looming, wanted to 'catch up' and prepare herself. What sort of writer would she be back in Japan, after all her experiences in Russia and Europe, and where would she fit into the literary and intellectual world, which had not remained static in her absence?

As I have already mentioned, the climactic scene of *Dōhyō* – Nobuko's encounter with Yamagami Gen, when she is presented with the possibility staying in her beloved Russia and chooses, as a Japanese writer, to return to Japan – is entirely absent from the diary. Yuriko and Yoshiko arrive back in Tokyo on 8 November 1930. There is no announcement of this in the diary: the first hint that they are back in Japan at all is a mention of the purchase of three brooms for 10 *sen*. Yuriko wastes no time fulfilling her mission of educating Japan about the Soviet Union. Her first, short, diary entries, in late November, are simple notes about work: 21 pages

on 'Excursion to the Don National Tobacco Factory' (26 November), 10 pages on 'Three Weeks in Japan' for the *Yomiuri* (29 November) and 15 pages 'On Looking at a Proletarian Art Exhibition' for the *Tokyo nichichi shinbun* (1 December), a heavy schedule that demonstrates her enthusiasm and energy for her self-appointed task. In early December she starts writing 'Crossing the New Siberia', an account of her return journey for *Nyonin geijutsu*, then 'The Five-Year Plan and Soviet Art' for *NAPP* (20 December), 'Moscow Horse Cabs' for the *Yomiuri* (23 December) and starts on 'Red Flag over Smolny' for the *Osaka mainichi shinbun* (27 December). Her opinions are in demand: on 12 December, she is interviewed by Haneda of the *Asahi* and attends a roundtable on Soviet cinema; on 15 December she is invited to the *Asahi's* 'Women's Room' discussion. Interspersed are short entries about haircuts, finding accommodation, fittings for coats and the weather. There are no long, contemplative entries. Yuriko is focused on work and organises the practicalities of life around this. The tone is business-like and confident. She has arrived back from Soviet Russia with a purpose and the experiential authority to carry it out. Chūjō Yuriko went to Moscow as an established writer with a love of an imagined, literary 'Russia' and a humanitarian inclination towards the left; she returned as a communist for whom writing, life, love and politics would henceforward be combined.

Yuriko used her diary to track her work, her reading and her impressions of theatre and cinema, which in retrospect provides a relatively clear picture of the progression of her intellectual and artistic/creative subjectivity over the three years, even if her decision to 'turn Red' is never explicitly stated. The difference between the love-struck Yuriko of 'Record of Moscow Impressions' and the ideologically informed author of 'London 1929' is evident in the diary, and was noted by Yuriko herself in *Dōhyō*, when she has Nobuko comment on the defects of the former to Yamagami Gen. However, compared to the sensitive Nobuko, who apparently absorbs her knowledge of socialism almost entirely through experience and the evidence of her senses, the Yuriko of the diaries is aggressively intellectual, always reading and considering ideas, and never afraid to be critical, a working writer who tracks her output. In *Dōhyō*, Yuriko creates a softer, more feminine,

modest and intuitive self. Despite being presented as a writer, Nobuko does not appear to do much of it in the novel.

Conclusion

What then do Yuriko's Soviet diaries tell us about the impact of travel on positionality? In my close reading of four years of diaries, I have identified recurring themes and threads relating to Yuriko's various positionalities and traced the development, or lack thereof, through her time in the Soviet Union.

Yuriko's diary demonstrates how her experience of the four years abroad was to a significant extent mediated by pre-existing positionalities: her identification with the masculine and the intellectual; a rejection of the feminine and the bourgeois, represented by her family, primarily her mother; a desire for existential fulfilment that went beyond individual artistic expression, which she had already achieved as a successful writer; and a longing for a relationship in which she would not feel cramped. The Chūjō Yuriko of the diary shows an active female subjectivity that observed and judged, seeking a new way of female being within a world that Yuriko, quite pragmatically, understood to be run on masculine standards. Rather than questioning these standards as a woman, she had always sought a place within male hierarchies as an exceptional woman, and she found one within communism, as she had in literature. However, Yuriko's transition to communist writer is never made explicit, as it is in *Dōhyō*. Grand literary ambition and the desire to sublimate herself to a larger purpose both appear in Yuriko's diary, but not on the same page. In sum, her time in the Soviet Union and Europe, as recorded in her diaries, did not profoundly challenge most of her existing positionalities. What it did was give her new direction as a writer while re-forming her as a politically active woman – albeit within a male context. This new and interdependent positionality was buttressed by experiential authority that Yuriko was still emphasising in *Dōhyō*, 20 years later.

How does my 'reconstruction' of Yuriko's dynamic subjectivity through the evidence of the diary fragments compare to her self-depiction in *Dōhyō* and the two articles? Writing for an audience requires an individual to present a coherent persona within a coherent narrative. A diary – unless it is specifically written to be

read – allows a writer to dispense with such connective sinews, which are already present in the writer’s mind. In the two articles, Yuriko presents herself as a traveller, showing her readers London and Moscow as she experiences and observes them, in effect, allowing the audience to occupy her subject-position within the text, manipulating their point of view as deliberately as a film-maker. The articles are highly visual, albeit heavily ‘annotated’ snap-shots of Yuriko’s subjectivity at two specific points in time – May 1928 and early 1930 – embedded in two different cities. *Dōhyō* represents her subjectivity in 1947-1950, as a mature woman whose 20-year dedication to the communist cause as a writer has been vindicated by the defeat of Japan’s militarist regime and the imposition of democracy by the American occupiers. In her retrospective recreation of her picaresque communist conversion, Yuriko the narrator creates a seamless narrative, filling the gaps of the diary account and modifying it to fit her self-conception at the time of writing. She reconstructs her relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko to reflect her later, ‘reconverted’ heterosexual view of it, and creates a dramatic decision-point that emphasises Nobuko’s selflessness, omitting Yuriko’s desire for a ‘cause’. The only obvious and knowable fabrication is the reinvention of the Pilnyak incident. While the diaries do not directly contradict or undermine the accounts of her published work, they provide an insight into the subtle but noteworthy differences between the younger and the older Yuriko and her self-conception that is for the most part obscured in *Dōhyō*. In *Dōhyō*, the raw material of the diary is re-formed into a coherent self that accorded with Yuriko’s self-understanding and presentation in the postwar period, creating a clear narrative trajectory towards political awareness and loyalty to the communist cause, downplaying or eliding problematic class and sexual positionalities.

The diary fragments that Yuriko abandoned tell us that what a diarist chooses to record on the day may not become part of her retrospective personal narrative, written at a different time, to meet different needs, by a future self. A private diary written by a bourgeois young woman in her late 20s, travelling in interwar Europe and Soviet Russia, necessarily reflects different discursive and historical circumstances than an autobiographical novel published by a middle-aged woman and loyal communist of 20 years’ standing in post-war Japan. The evidence

of *Dōhyō* tells us that this retrospective personal narrative may include events, people, thoughts, and encounters – remembered or adapted – that went unrecorded at the time, for reasons that can never be known.

8. Conclusion

As a woman and writer who reworked and represented her experiences and life story across genres, boldly situating her own narrative within the larger historical context of capitalism vs communism, Miyamoto Yuriko offers rich material to the scholar of life-writing and the cultural/social historian of women in Japan in the first half of the twentieth century, when the top-down Meiji modernisation project was succeeded by a vibrant urban modernity that was no longer dictated by the state. In this thesis I have focused on a very specific, significant period of Yuriko's life, when she 'converted' to communism, a move that decided her life's trajectory from her early 30s up until her death 20 years later. The relevant material – the diaries, *Dōhyō* and the *Sobietō kikō* – has not been studied, individually or collectively, in English-language scholarship to date, or treated in such depth in Japanese scholarship.

In analyzing the relationship between experience and life narrative, I have found Starr's (2013) inclusive approach – viewing life narratives as components of a larger, overarching self-narrative – particularly fruitful in the case of Yuriko, a prolific writer who represented her transformative period in the USSR and Europe in several genres, providing plentiful material for comparison. I have shown how the experiences represented in fragmentary form in the diary were reworked by Yuriko into personal travel essays reflecting in her state of mind *at that time*, and subsequently, how the mature Yuriko created a retrospective, seamless narrative of her younger self's communist conversion in *Dōhyō*. This is a narrative very much based on the self-conception of the older Yuriko, staking out her place in history as a politically active woman writer who had negotiated this identity within the male-dominated communist movement. The same life experience informs all three genres of Yuriko's life writing; the differences between them demonstrate how she re-interpreted and re-presented this experience in the context of genre, time and circumstance, resulting in a self-conceptualisation that was dynamic and contingent. This finding suggests that a strategy of comparative or parallel reading of self-writings, applied more widely, could serve to illuminate the complex

interactions between the mutable self and its material and discursive contexts, as refracted through different genres of self-writing.

In my analysis, I have demonstrated, through the use of positionality, *how* her experience worked on Yuriko, analysing various intersecting aspects of her identity – gender, class, nationality, family, profession, sexuality, political beliefs – in relation to her experiences, locating the points at which it was foregrounded and at times challenged. This approach allows for a more detailed understanding of how subjectivity shifts, while acknowledging that in many aspects it resists change.

Positionality is necessarily invoked by context, and in my study I have highlighted the influence of three interlocking discursive and material contexts: modernity, the city and the status of women. As I have demonstrated, the experience of travel to and residence in several key cities in a period of contested modernities was foundational to Yuriko's transformation as a woman who was seeking personal development beyond what she could achieve in Japan, for all her significant class and family advantages relative to other women. In *Dōhyō*, her final account of this period, she wrote her conversion to communism into the narrative of development that began with *Nobuko*, explicitly grounding her shift in subjectivity in her lived experience of these cities and fusing the political to the personal.

What then does this comparison of these three forms of self-writing tell us about Yuriko's experiences in the Soviet Union and Europe, and the meanings she ascribed to them, as extrapolated from her various life-narratives? The articles and *Dōhyō* contain observations and details that do not appear in the diary. What went into the diaries and was later discarded, and what appeared in her subsequent published works, fiction and non-fiction, the slippage between the immediate 'self-reportage' and the later, constructed literary or journalistic texts, demonstrates the fluidity of the self as remembered and textually constructed.

The diaries reveal a more complex and fragmented positionality than *Dōhyō* and the essays, which, as other-directed forms of writing, necessarily present a unified or at least coherent subjectivity, a public persona. However, several consistent threads emerge.

Firstly, as highlighted throughout this thesis, Yuriko very rarely represents herself specifically as middle-class, maintaining a critical distance between her class of origin and her politically awakening self. She was able to detach herself from her class positionality, and by association, her family of origin, identifying very early with Russia and the Soviet project. In the first year of the diaries Yuriko complained about having nowhere to live; back in Moscow in 1930, she had learned to blame peasants, bureaucratism and 'un-Soviet' behaviour for any shortfalls. Unlike the tragic Arishima Takeo, Yuriko's positionality as middle-class in no way obstructed her identification with Soviet Russia, socialism and the (abstract) proletariat. She was highly critical of her bourgeois family and other upper or middle-class people she met in her travels, but never herself, even while she enjoyed the same privileges. To observers, Yuriko may embody a 'crisis of representation' as a bourgeois woman speaking for socialism and the proletariat, but for Yuriko herself, her fierce emotional identification with her chosen cause apparently served, in her own view, to quarantine her from any association with her class of origin.

Secondly, there is the paradox of Yuriko who sought liberation as a woman through male-dominated communism. Her perception of the status and freedoms of Soviet women reinforced her pre-existing aspirations for female fulfilment, in the form of equal heterosexual relationships and the ability to lead a public working life. However, Yuriko did not identify with women as a writer or an intellectual, preferring to align herself with men. Her attitude to individual women in the diary are generally critical and condescending, and she is dismissive of independent female political activism. In *Dōhyō*, the Japanese men Nobuko encounters are described in terms of their political attitudes, that is, their attitude towards the Soviet Union, suggesting that Yuriko perceived the political arena as defined, mapped and ultimately embodied by men. By contrast, women are presented as either warm and feminine, or cold, masculine and unlikeable, demonstrating Yuriko's insistence on a form of female liberation that did not upset 'natural' femininity. This shows the continuing influence on Yuriko of conventional discourses of womanhood: although she envied the political freedoms of Soviet women, she still regarded 'femininity' as a necessary female trait and did not question it. This is underscored by the discrepancy between the aggressively

intellectual Yuriko of the diaries and the insistence in *Dōhyō* on the almost child-like Nobuko's intuition and experiential knowledge. Even as a senior figure in the resurgent Japanese communist movement of the immediate post-war years, Yuriko was compelled to emphasize the unthreatening femininity of her youthful alter ego at the expense of the questing intelligence revealed in the diary.

Yuriko's emphasis on femininity and her discovery of a new model of heterosexuality within socialism carries through to her presentation of her ambiguous relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko. In the diaries, Yuriko is frustrated but dependent; however, she is beginning to look outside and beyond it. In *Dōhyō*, the mature Yuriko, having found her ideal heterosexual soulmate in Miyamoto Kenji, retrospectively reconstructs the relationship as an intense friendship, with Yoshimi Motoko, the model for Yuasa Yoshiko, bearing the full weight of any 'perversion'.

These two central paradoxes of Yuriko's self-representation – her mostly unacknowledged class positionality and her rejection of feminism even as she seeks liberation as a woman – are consistent throughout the texts studied.

Less centrally, Yuriko's positionality as Japanese was not challenged by the experience of travel, although her political conversion did make her consider Japan's place within global capitalism, and its role in East Asia.

Finally, the clearest shift in subjectivity is Yuriko's identity as a writer. In the diaries, she reveals herself to have large literary ambitions; in the account of *Dōhyō*, these are explicitly united with her political conversion and her rejection of artistic individualism.

Overall, the aspects of Yuriko's positionality that underwent the most change during her travels were those of woman and writer. She had discovered, through personal experience, the severe limitations placed on women in Japan, even one with the advantages of class, money and supportive family. In the Soviet Union, such traditional restrictions on womanhood seemed to have been blown away, opening up new possibilities of personal fulfilment, within relationships and in society more broadly. Yuriko had given up on heterosexual relationships in Japan and settled into a same-sex relationship that was intellectually and emotionally if not physically satisfying. What she perceived of the status of women in the emerging socialist society of Soviet Russia offered her not only the legal and

political status that she lacked in Japan as a woman, but a society in which she could feasibly have a relationship of equals with a man. Yuriko's restlessness and dissatisfaction in her relationship with Yuasa Yoshiko comes through in different ways in the diaries and in *Dōhyō*, but points in the same direction: an imagined heterosexual socialist future. As a writer, Yuriko had achieved fame young, and was questioning her purpose and direction. The apparently successful transformation of her beloved Russia into the Soviet Union seemed to offer a cause that corresponded with her need for a more socially and political embedded existence as a writer, beyond the selfish individual desire for fame – which, in the case of Nobuko's former piano teacher, had led to madness and death. The progression to communism *as a writer*, an undercurrent in the diaries, is made explicit in *Dōhyō*.

Following her return from the Soviet Union, Yuriko dedicated herself to the communist cause in Japan right up to her death in 1951. The experience of those three years set her course for the rest of her life, and going by the evidence of *Dōhyō* as well as known biographical facts, she did not question either communism or the life-narrative she had constructed around her conversion. If she had, the discrepancies between the selves presented across three genres of self-writing may have been far more pronounced.

In sum, my comparative study of Miyamoto Yuriko's diaries, essays and autobiographical novel *Dōhyō* shows how various elements of experience are knitted together in a coherent and meaningful self-narratives according to the interaction of the subject's positionalities and the relevant discourses and contexts at the time of writing. How Miyamoto Yuriko portrayed her transformative travels across time and genre sheds light on the relationship between lived experience and its representation in self-writing, and demonstrates how one Japanese woman navigated and shaped her particular life narrative in the first half of the twentieth century, an era in which the form of modernity, and its implications for women, was still being contested.

References

Primary works

- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1979–1986), *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha. 25 vols.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (2000–2004), *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*. Shin Nihon Shuppansha. 33 vols.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1980a), London 1929, 46–89, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1980b), Mosukuwa inshōki, 17–44, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1994), *Dōhyō*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha. 3 vols.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1980a), Kodomo, kodomo, kodomo no Mosukuwa, 89–144, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1980b), Sobieto bundan no genjō, 308–348, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1980c), Sumōrinui ni hirugaeru akahata, 152–191, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, Vol. 9. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.

Translations (some with commentary/essays)

- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1963), Banshu Plain [excerpt], 78–80, in: Gluck, J. and Sakaguchi, Y. (Trans.), *Ukiyo: Stories of the Floating World of Postwar Japan*. New York: Vanguard Press.
- Miyamoto, Yuriko (1987), Nobuko [excerpt], 41–64, in: Tanaka, Y. (Ed & Trans.), *To*

Live and To Write. Selections by Japanese Women Writers 1913-1938.
Seattle, WA: Seal Press.

Miyamoto, Yuriko (1991), The Family of Koiwai, 3–19, in: Noriko Mizuta Lippit and Kyoko Iriye Selden (Eds.), Lippit, Noriko Mizuta (Trans.), *Japanese Women Writers: Twentieth Century Short Fiction*. New York ; London: M.E. Sharpe.

Miyamoto, Yuriko (2005), A Sunless Morning, 480–485, in: Rimer, J. T. and Gessel, V. C. (Eds.), McDonald, Keiko (Trans.), *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Japanese Literature. Vol 1: From Restoration to Occupation, 1868-1945*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Miyamoto, Yuriko (2013a), The Earth Still Moves, 78–80, in: Wilson, Michiko Niikuni (Ed & Trans.), *Modern Japanese Women Writers as Artists as Cultural Critics: Miyamoto, Ōba, Saegusa*. Portland, ME: Merwin Asia.

Miyamoto, Yuriko (2013b), What Is Womanliness, 75–78, in: Wilson, Michiko Niikuni (Ed & Trans.), *Modern Japanese Women Writers as Artists as Cultural Critics: Miyamoto, Ōba, Saegusa*. Portland, ME: Merwin Asia.

Miyamoto, Yuriko (2013c), Women's History: Following in the Footsteps of Literature, 47–75, in: Wilson, Michiko Niikuni (Ed & Trans.), *Modern Japanese Women Writers as Artists as Cultural Critics: Miyamoto, Ōba, Saegusa*. Portland, ME: Merwin Asia.

Miyamoto, Yuriko and De Bary, Brett (1984), After the War: Translations from Miyamoto Yuriko [excerpts from *Banshū heiya* and *Fuchisō*] (B. De Bary, Trans.). *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 16(2): 40–47.

Miyamoto, Yuriko and De Bary, Brett (1984_85), Wind and Leaves: Miyamoto Yuriko's The Weathervane Plant [excerpt] (B. De Bary, Trans.). *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese*, 19(1): 7–28, 29–33.

Miyamoto, Yuriko and Lippit, Noriko Mizuta (1978), The Family of Koiwai (Lippit, Noriko Mizuta, Trans.). *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 10(2): 2–7, 10–

17.

Miyamoto, Yuriko and Nee [De Bary], Brett (1975), Nobuko [excerpt] (N. [De B. Brett, Trans.]). *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 7(4): 44–51.

Miyamoto, Yuriko and Sipos, George (2002), Miyamoto Yuriko and the Soviet Propaganda. [Excerpt from 'The Current Situation of Soviet Literary Circles'] (Sipos, George, Trans.). *Virginia Review of Asian Studies*, IV(Fall): 73–91.

Works cited – English

Alcoff, Linda (1988), Cultural Feminism versus Post-Structuralism. The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory. *Signs*, 13(3): 405–436.

Alcoff, Linda (2006), *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*. New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ames, Catherine (2008), Yamata Kiku and the Representation of a Gendered Japanese Cultural Identity. *Japan Forum*, 20(3): 405–428.

Arima, Tatsuo (1969), *The Failure of Freedom: A Portrait of Modern Japanese Intellectuals*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press & Oxford University Press.

Arkin, Marian and Shollar, Barbara (1989), *Longman Anthology of World Literature by Women, 1875-1975*. New York ; London: Longman.

Atkinson, Dorothy, Dallin, Alexander, and Lapidus, Gail Warshofsky (eds) (1978), *Women in Russia*. Hassocks: Harvester Press.

Attwood, Lynne and Kelly, Catriona (1998), Programmes for Identity: The 'New Man' and the 'New Woman', 256–290, in: Kelly, C. and Shepherd, D. (Eds.), *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Barshay, Andrew E. (1988), *State and Intellectual in Imperial Japan: The Public Man in Crisis*. Berkeley ; London: University of California Press.
- Barthes, Roland (1986), The Reality Effect, 141–154, in: Howard, R. (Trans.), *The Rustle of Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Beasley, W. G. (1995), *The Rise of Modern Japan*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Birnbaum, Phyllis (2007), *Glory in a Line: A Life of Foujita, the Artist Caught Between East and West*. London: Faber.
- Blodgett, Harriet (1989), A Woman Writer's Diary: Virginia Woolf Revisited. *History, Theory, Criticism*, 12(1): 57–71.
- Bowen-Struyk, Heather (2004), Revolutionizing the Japanese Family: Miyamoto Yuriko's 'The Family of Koiwai'. *positions: east asia cultures critiques*, 12(2): 479–507.
- Bowen-Struyk, Heather (2011), Streets of Promise, Streets of Sorrow: Kobayashi Takiji and the Proletarian Movement. *Japanese Studies*, 31(3): 305–318.
- Bridge, Gary and Watson, Sophie (2011), Reflections on Affect, 278–287, in: Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (Eds.), *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brown, Janice (1993), Reconstructing the Female Subject: Japanese Women Writers and the Shishosetsu. *British Columbia Asian Review*, 7: 16–35.
- Buck-Morss, Susan (2000), *Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West*. Cambridge, MA; London: MIT Press.
- Bunkers, Suzanne L. (1987), 'Faithful Friend': Nineteenth-Century Midwestern American Women's Unpublished Diaries. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10(1): 7–17.
- Claremont, Yasuko (2009), Modernising Japanese Women Through Literary Journals. *Hecate: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Women's Liberation*,

35(1/2): 42–56.

Clements, Barbara Evans (2012), *A History of Women in Russia: From Earliest Times to the Present*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Clements, Barbara Evans, Engel, Barbara Alpern, and Worobec, Christine (eds) (1991), *Russia's Women: Accommodation, Resistance, Transformation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cooper, Joanne E. (1987), Shaping Meaning: Women's Diaries, Journals, and Letters—The Old and the New. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10(1): 95–99.

Copeland, Rebecca L. (2000), *Lost Leaves: Women Writers of Meiji Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Copeland, Rebecca L. (2006), *Woman Critiqued: Translated Essays on Japanese Women's Writing*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Copeland, Rebecca L. and Ortabasi, Melek (2006), *The Modern Murasaki: Writing by Women of Meiji Japan*. New York ; Chichester: Columbia University Press.

Coutts, Angela (2001), The Gendering of Japanese Literature: The Influence of English-Language Translation on Concepts of Canon in the West. *Japan Forum*, 14(1): 103–125.

Coutts, Angela (2006), Gender and Literary Production in Modern Japan: The Role of Female-Run Journals in Promoting Writing by Women During the Interwar Years. *Signs*, 32(1): 167–196.

Coutts, Angela (2012), Imagining Radical Women in Interwar Japan: Leftist and Feminist Perspectives. *Signs*, 37(2): 325–355.

Coutts, Angela (2013), How Do We Write a Revolution? Debating the Masses and the Vanguard in the Literary Reviews of Nyonin Geijutsu. *Japan Forum*, 25(3): 362–378.

- Crang, Mike (2005), Travel/Tourism, 34–40, in: Atkinson, D. (Ed.), *Cultural Geography: A Critical Dictionary of Key Concepts*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Cullen, Jennifer (2010), A Comparative Study of Tenko. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 36(1): 65–96.
- Culley, Margo (1985), Introduction to A Day at a Time: Diary Literature of American Women, from 1764 to 1985, 217–221, in: Smith, S. and Watson, J. (Eds.), *Women, Autobiography, Theory. A Reader*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- David-Fox, Michael (2012), *Showcasing the Great Experiment: Cultural Diplomacy and Western Visitors to Soviet Union, 1921-1941*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- De Bary, William Theodore, Gluck, Carol and Tiedemann, Arthur E. (2005), *Sources of Japanese Tradition. Vol. 2, 1600 to 2000*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Donald Keene (1993), *Seeds in the Heart: Japanese Literature from Earliest Times to the Late Sixteenth Century*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Dryburgh, Marjorie (2013), The Fugitive Self: Writing Zheng Xiaoxu, 1882-1938, 110–132, in: Dryburgh, Marjorie and Dauncey, Sarah (Eds.), *Writing Lives in China, 1600-2010. Histories of the Elusive Self*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Edmondson, Linda Harriet (ed.) (2001) *Gender in Russian History and Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ericson, Joan E. and Hayashi, Fumiko (1997), *Be a Woman: Hayashi Fumiko and Modern Japanese Women's Literature*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Fairbanks, Carol (2002), *Japanese Women Fiction Writers: Their Culture and Society, 1890s to 1990s: English Language Source*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

- Felski, Rita (1995), *The Gender of Modernity*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.
- Ferguson, Joseph P. (2008), *Japanese-Russian Relations, 1907-2007*. London: Routledge.
- Fessler, Susanna (2004), *Musashino in Tuscany: Japanese Overseas Travel Literature, 1860-1912*. Ann Arbor: Center for Japanese Studies, University of Michigan.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila (1999), *Everyday Stalinism. Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times: Soviet Russia in the 1930s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila (2008), Australian Visitors to the Soviet Union: The View from the Soviet Side, 1–39, in: Fitzpatrick, S. and Rasmussen, C. (Eds.), *Political Tourists. Travellers from Australia to the Soviet Union in the 1920s-1940s*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Fogel, Joshua A. (2006), *Traditions of East Asian Travel*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Fowler, Edward (1988), *The Rhetoric of Confession: Shishōsetsu in Early Twentieth-Century Japanese Fiction*. Berkeley ; London: University of California Press.
- Fowler, Edward (1992), Rendering Words, Traversing Cultures: On the Art and Politics of Translating Modern Japanese Fiction. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 18(1): 1–44.
- Frederick, Sarah (2006), *Turning Pages: Reading and Writing Women's Magazines in Interwar Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Gardner, William O. (2003), Mongrel Modernism: Hayashi Fumiko's 'Hōrōki' and Mass Culture. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 29(1): 69–101.
- Gardner, William O. (2006), *Advertising Tower: Japanese Modernism and Modernity in the 1920s*. Cambridge, MA ; London: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Gossmann, Hilaria (1995), *The Quest for Emancipation: The Autobiographical*

- Novels of Miyamoto Yuriko and Sata Ineko. *Japan Quarterly*, 42: 332–342.
- Hansen, Miriam Bratu (2000), *Fallen Women, Rising Stars*, New Horizons: Shanghai
Silent Film As Vernacular Modernism. *Film Quarterly*, 54(1): 10–22.
- Hijiya-Kirschner, Irmela (1996), *Rituals of Self-Revelation: Shishōsetsu as Literary
Genre and Socio-Cultural Phenomenon*. Cambridge, MA: Council on East
Asian Studies, Harvard University.
- Hogan, Rebecca (1991), Engendered Autobiographies: The Diary as a Feminine
Form. *Prose Studies*, 14(2): 95–107.
- Hosking, Geoffrey (2001), *Russia and the Russians. From Earliest Times to 2001*.
London: Penguin.
- Hutchinson, Rachael and Williams, Mark (2007), *Representing the Other in Modern
Japanese Literature: A Critical Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Ilić, Melanie (2013), *Life Stories of Soviet Women: The Interwar Generation*. New
York: Taylor & Francis.
- Iwamoto, Yoshio (1974), Aspects of the Proletarian Literary Movement in Japan,
156–182, in: Silberman, B.S. and Harootunian, H.D. (Eds.), *Japan in Crisis:
Essays on Taishō Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnson, Jeri (2000), Literary Geography: Joyce, Woolf and the City. *City*, 4(2): 199–
214.
- Karlsson, Mats (2008), Kurahara Korehito's Road to Proletarian Realism. *Japan
Review*, 20: 231–273.
- Karlsson, Mats (2013), Thirst for Knowledge: Women's Proletarian Literature in
Nyonin Geijutsu. *Japan Forum*, 25(3): 1–16.
- Kasza, Gregory J. (1988), *The State and Mass Media in Japan, 1918-1945*. Berkeley ;
London: University of California Press.

- Keene, Donald (1956), *Modern Japanese Literature: An Anthology*. New York: Grove Press.
- Keene, Donald (1978), The Barren Years. Japanese War Literature. *Monumenta Nipponica*, 33(1): 67–112.
- Keene, Donald (1989), The Diary of Ichiyō Higuchi. *Japan Quarterly*, 36: 167–178.
- Keene, Donald (1998), *Dawn to the West: Japanese Literature of the Modern Era. Fiction*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Kelsky, Karen (2001), *Women on the Verge: Japanese Women, Western Dreams*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kim, Hong N. (1976), Deradicalization of the Japanese Communist Party under Kenji Miyamoto. *World Politics*, 28(2): 273–299.
- Kobayashi, Fukuko (1991), Women Writers and Feminist Consciousness in Early Twentieth-Century Japan. *Feminist Issues*, 11: 43–64.
- Kobayashi, Hideo (1995), *Literature of the Lost Home: Kobayashi Hideo. Literary Criticism, 1924-1939*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kokusai Bunka Kaikan (1979), *Modern Japanese Literature in Translation: A Bibliography*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai (1939), *Introduction to Contemporary Japanese Literature*. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai.
- Kokusai Bunka Shinkōkai (1970), *Synopses of Contemporary Japanese Literature II. 1936-1955*. Tokyo: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai.
- Konishi, Sho (2013), *Anarchist Modernity: Cooperatism and Japanese-Russian Intellectual Relations in Modern Japan*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Koschmann, J. Victor (1993), Intellectuals and Politics, 395–423, in: Gordon, A. (Ed.),

- Postwar Japan as History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Koshiro, Yukiko (1999), *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the US Occupation of Japan*. New York ; Chichester: Columbia University Press.
- Lapidus, Gail Warshofsky (1978), *Women in Soviet Society: Equality, Development and Social Change*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lejeune, Philippe (2009), *On Diary* (J. D. Popkin and J. Rak, Eds.) (K. Durnin, Trans.). Honolulu: Published for the Biographical Research Center by the University of Hawai'i Press.
- Lewell, John (1993), *Modern Japanese Novelists: A Biographical Dictionary*. New York ; London: Kodansha International.
- Lippit, Noriko Mizuta (1978), Literature, Ideology And Womens Happiness
Autobiographical Novels of Miyamoto Yuriko. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 10(2): 2–9.
- Lippit, Noriko Mizuta (1980), *Reality and Fiction in Modern Japanese Literature*. London: Macmillan.
- Lippit, Noriko Mizuta and Selden, Kyoko Iriye (1991), *Japanese Women Writers: Twentieth Century Short Fiction*. New York ; London: M.E. Sharpe.
- Lippit, Seiji M. (2002), *Topographies of Japanese Modernism*. New York ; Chichester: Columbia University Press.
- Loftus, Ronald P. (2004), *Telling Lives: Women's Self-Writing in Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Lowy, Dina (2007), *The Japanese New Woman: Images of Gender and Modernity*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lyons, Phyllis L. (1989), Miyamoto Yuriko, 367, in: Arkin, M. and Shollar, B. (Eds.), *Longman Anthology of World Literature by Women, 1875-1975*. New York ; London: Longman.

- Mackie, Vera (1997), *Creating Socialist Women in Japan: Gender, Labour and Activism, 1900-1937*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackie, Vera (2000), Modern Selves and Modern Spaces. An Overview, 185–199, in: Tipton, E. K. and Clark, J. (Eds.), *Being Modern in Japan. Culture and Society from the 1910s to the 1930s*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Mackie, Vera (2003), *Feminism in Modern Japan: Citizenship, Embodiment and Sexuality*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackie, Vera (2005), Embodied Subjects: Feminism in Imperial Japan, 95-118, in: Tomida, H. and Daniels, G. (Eds.), *Japanese Women: Emerging from Subservience, 1868-1945*. Women in Japanese History. Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- Mackie, Vera (2011), Embodied Memories, Emotional Geographies: Nakamoto Takako's Diary of the Anpo Struggle. *Japanese Studies*, 31(3): 319–331.
- Mackie, Vera (2013), Review Article: New Women, Modern Girls and the Shifting Semiotics of Gender in Early Twentieth-Century Japan. *Intersections: Gender and Sexuality in Asia and the Pacific*, (32): 1–13.
- Maeda, Ai (2004), *Text and the City: Essays on Japanese Modernity*. Durham, NC; London: Duke University Press.
- Mamola, Claire Zebroski (1989), *Japanese Women Writers in English Translation: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York ; London: Garland.
- Mikals-Adachi, Eileen (1997), Miyamoto Yuriko, 116–121, in: Gessel, V.C. (Ed.), *Japanese Fiction Writers, 1868-1945*. Dictionary of Literary Biography. Detroit: Gale Research.
- Milne, Leslie (1995) Nationalism, Anti-Semitism and Bulgakov, 63-76, in: Milne, L. (Ed.), *Bulgakov: The Novelist-playwright*. Luxembourg: Harwood.
- Minear, Richard (1980), Review Symposium: Orientalism and the Study of Japan.

The Journal of Asian Studies, 39(3): 507–517.

Miner, Earl (1969), *Japanese Poetic Diaries*. Berkeley ; Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Miyoshi, Masao (1991), *Off Center: Power and Cultural Relations between Japan and the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Morita, James R. (1994), Miyamoto Yuriko, 221–228, in: Mulhern, C. (Ed.), *Japanese Women Writers: A Biocritical Sourcebook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Morris, Ivan (1962), *Modern Japanese Stories: An Anthology*. Tokyo & Rutland, VT: Tuttle.

Mostow, Joshua S. (2003), *The Columbia Companion to Modern East Asian Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mulhern, Chieko Irie (1994), *Japanese Women Writers: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*. Westport, CT; London: Greenwood Press.

Nash, Jennifer C. (2008), Re-Thinking Intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, 89(1): 1–15.

Nishikawa, Yuko (1999), Diaries as Gendered Texts, 241–255, in: Tonomura, H. and Walthall, A. (Eds.), Walthall, A. (Trans.), *Women and Class in Japanese Society*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Nolte, Sharon H. and Hastings, Sally Ann (1991), The Meiji State's Policy Toward Women: 1890-1910, 151–174, in: Berstein, G. L. (Ed.), *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Oakes, Tim and Price, Patricia Lynn (2008), *The Cultural Geography Reader*. London: Routledge.

Orbaugh, Sharalyn (2007), *Japanese Fiction of the Allied Occupation: Vision, Embodiment, Identity*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill.

Omuka, Toshiharu (1995) Varvara Bubnova as a Vanguard Artist in Japan, 101-113,

in: Rimer, Thomas J. (Ed.), *A Hidden Fire. Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press and Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Phillips, Susan (1987), *Beyond Borders: Class Struggle and Feminist Humanism in Banshū Heiya*. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 19(1): 56–65.

Raddeker, Helene Bowen (1997), *Treacherous Women of Imperial Japan: Patriarchal Fictions, Patricidal Fantasies*. London: Routledge.

Raddeker, Helene Bowen (2007), *Sceptical History: Feminist and Postmodern Approaches in Practice*. London: Routledge.

Rak, Julie (2009), *Dialogue with the Future: Philippe Lejeune's Method and Theory of Diary*, 16–26, in: *On Diary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Richie, Donald (2005), *A Hundred Years of Japanese Film: A Concise History, with a Selective Guide to DVDs and Videos*. New York: Kodansha USA.

Rimer, J. Thomas (1988), *Pilgrimages: Aspects of Japanese Literature and Culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Rimer, J. Thomas and Gessel, Van C. (2005), *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Japanese Literature. Vol. 1. From Restoration to Occupation*. New York ; Chichester: Columbia University Press.

Rubin, Jay (1983), *Injurious to Public Morals: Writers and the Meiji State*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Said, Edward W. (1991), *Orientalism. Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin.

Sato, Barbara (2003), *The New Japanese Woman: Modernity, Media, and Women in Interwar Japan*. Durham, NC; London: Duke University Press.

Sawabe, Hitomi (2007), *A Visit with Yuasa Yoshiko, A Dandy Scholar of Russian Literature*, 31–40, in: McLelland, M., Suganama, K., and Welker, J. (Eds.),

Queer Voices from Japan: First-person Narratives from Japan's Sexual Minorities. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Scalapino, Robert A. (1967), *The Japanese Communist Movement, 1920-1966*. Berkeley ; Los Angeles: University of California Press ; London.

Schierbeck, Sachiko Shibata (1994), *Japanese Women Novelists in the 20th Century: 104 Biographies 1900-1993*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.

Scott, Joan (1991), The Evidence of Experience. *Critical Inquiry*, 17(4): 773–797.

Service, Robert (1997), *A History of Twentieth-Century Russia*. London: Penguin.

Service, Robert (2007), *Comrades. Communism: A World History*. London: Pan.

Sewell, Jessica Ellen (2011), Gendering Urban Space, 596–605, in: Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (Eds.), *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shea, George Tyson (1964), *Leftwing Literature in Japan: A Brief History of the Proletarian Literary Movement*. Tokyo: Hosei University Press.

Siegel, Kristi (2004), Introduction. *Intersections: Women's Travel and Theory*, 1–11, in: Siegel, K. (Ed.), *Gender, Genre and Identity in Women's Travel Writing*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Sievers, Sharon L. (1983), *Flowers in Salt: The Beginnings of Feminist Consciousness in Modern Japan*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Silverberg, Miriam (1991), The Modern Girl as Militant, 239–266, in: Bernstein, G. (Ed.), *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Silverberg, Miriam (1998), The Cafe Waitress Serving Modern Japan, 208–225, in: Vlastos, S. (Ed.), *Mirrors of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Silverberg, Miriam (2006), *Erotic Grotesque Nonsense: The Mass Culture of Japanese Modern Times*. Berkeley, CA; London: University of California Press.
- Slaymaker, Douglas (2007), Yokomitsu Riichi's Others: Paris and Shanghai, 109–124, in: Hutchinson, R. and Williams, M. (Eds.), *Representing the Other in Modern Japanese Literature*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Smith, Sidonie and Watson, Julia (1998), *Women, Autobiography, Theory: A Reader*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Smith, Sidonie and Watson, Julia (2010), *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sokolsky, Anne (2003), Miyamoto Yuriko and Socialist Writers, 164–169, in: Mostow, J.S. (Ed.), *The Columbia Companion to Modern East Asian literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spagnolo, Rebecca (2006), When Private Home Meets Public Workplace. Service, Space and the Urban Domestic in 1920s Russia, 230–255, in: Kiaer, C. and Naiman, E. (Eds.), *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia: Taking the Revolution Inside*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Spakowski, Nicola (2013), Destabilising the Truths of Revolution: Strategies of Subversion in the Autobiographical Writing of Political Women in China, 133–158, in: Dauncey, S. and Dryburgh, M. (Eds.), *Writing Lives in China, 1600-2010. Histories of the Elusive Self*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spender, Dale (1987), Journal on a Journal. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10(1): 1–5.
- Starr, Chloë (2013), Zhang Xianliang: Recensions of the Self, 159–181, in: Dauncey, S. and Dryburgh, M. (Eds.), *Writing Lives in China, 1600-2010. Histories of the Elusive Self*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Starrs, Roy (2012), *Japanese Modernism Reconsidered*, 3–35, in: Starrs, R. (Ed.), *Rethinking Japanese Modernism*. Leiden: Global Oriental,.
- Struve, Gleb (1972), *Russian Literature Under Lenin and Stalin, 1917-1953*. London: Routledge and KPaul.
- Suzuki, Michiko (2010), *Becoming Modern Women: Love and Female Identity in Prewar Japanese Literature and Culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Suzuki, Sadami and Abi-Samara, Raquel (2008), How Would You Define Japanese Modernism? Interview with Suzuki Sadami. English Version. (W. Tyler, Trans.). available at <http://www.nichibun.ac.jp/~sadami/2008/int-final.pdf>
- Suzuki, Tomi (1996), *Narrating the Self: Fictions of Japanese Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Suzuki, Sadami (2012), *Rewriting the Literary History of Japanese Modernism*, 37–61, in: Starrs, R. (Ed.), *Rethinking Japanese Modernism*. Leiden: Global Oriental.
- Tanaka, Yukiko (1987), *To Live and To Write: Selections by Japanese Women Writers, 1913-1938*. Seattle, WA: Seal Press.
- Taylor, Richard (2000), *The Battleship Potemkin: The Film Companion*. I.B.Tauris.
- Tipton, Elise K. (2008), *Modern Japan: A Social and Political History*. London: Routledge.
- Tipton, Elise K. and Clark, John (2000), *Being Modern in Japan: Culture and Society from the 1910s to the 1930s*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Tomida, Hiroko and Daniels, Gordon (2005), *Japanese Women: Emerging from Subservience, 1868-1945*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- Tyler, William Jefferson (2008), *Modanizumu: Modernist Fiction from Japan, 1913-1938*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Wada-Marciano, Mitsuyo (2008), *Nippon Modern: Japanese Cinema of the 1920s and 1930s*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press ; London.
- Walker, Janet A. (1994), Reading Genre Across Cultures: The Example of Autobiography, 203–235, in: Lawall, S. (Ed.), *Reading World Literature: Theory, History, Practice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Walters, Anna (1987), Self Image and Style: A Discussion Based on Estelle Jelinek's the Tradition of Women's Autobiography from Antiquity to the Present. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10(1): 85–93.
- Weisenfeld, Gennifer (1996), Mavo's Conscious Constructivism: Art, Individualism, and Daily Life in Interwar Japan. *Art Journal*, 55(3): 64–73.
- Weisenfeld, Gennifer S. (2002), *Mavo: Japanese Artists and the Avant-Garde, 1905-1931*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wilson, Michiko Niikuni (1997), Misreading and Unreading the Male Text, Finding the Female Text: Miyamoto Yuriko's Autobiographical Fiction. *US-Japan Women's Journal English Supplement*: 26–55.
- Yokomitsu, Riichi (1962), Machine, 223–244, in: Morris, I. (Ed.), Seidensticker, E. (Trans.), *Modern Japanese Stories. An Anthology*. Boston: Charles E. Tuttle.
- Young, Louise (1998), *Japan's Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism*. Berkeley & London: University of California Press.

Works cited – Japanese

- Endō, Shūsaku (1968), *Ryūgaku*. Tōkyō: Shinchōsha.
- Hasegawa, Kei (2006), Dōhyō to onna no futari tabi–kyō toikakeru mono. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō*. [Tokushū] Miyamoto Yuriko no atarashisa (April): 165–172.

- Hirabayashi, Taiko (1979a), Miyamoto Yuriko, 91–146, in: *Hirabayashi Taiko zenshū*, Vol. 10. Tokyo: Ushio Shuppansha.
- Hirabayashi, Taiko (1979b), Miyamoto Yuriko ron, 220–224, in: *Hirabayashi Taiko zenshū*, Vol. 10. Tokyo: Ushio Shuppansha.
- Honda, Shūgo (1976), Miyamoto Yuriko. Sono shōgai to sakuhin, 15–45, in: Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai (Ed.), *Miyamoto Yuriko. Sakuhin to shōgai*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Honda, Shūgo (1994) [1951], Dōhyō ron, 265–282, in: *Honda Shūgo zenshū*, Vol. 3. Tokyo: Seishidō.
- Iwabuchi, Hiroko (1996), *Miyamoto Yuriko: kazoku, seiji, soshite feminizumu*. Tokyo: Kanrin shobō.
- Iwabuchi, Hiroko and Kitada, Sachie (2005), *Hajimete manabu Nihon josei bungakushi. Kingendai*. Kyoto: Minerva Shobō.
- Katō, Shūichi (1981), Miyamoto Yuriko no Soren keiken, 1–4, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū*, Vol. 18, geppō 24. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppan Kaisha.
- Kon, Wajirō (2011), *Kon Wajirō saishū kōgi*. Tokyo: Seigensha.
- Kondo, Hiroko (2002), *Shigeharu Yuriko oboegaki: akogare to nigasa*. Tokyo: Shakaihyōronsha.
- Kurahara, Korehito (1953), *Kobayashi Takiji to Miyamoto Yuriko*. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō.
- Kurahara, Korehito (1976)[1966], Sakka. Kakumeika toshite no Miyamoto Yuriko, 46–56, in: Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai (Ed.), *Miyamoto Yuriko. Sakuhin to shōgai*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Miyamoto, Kenji (1976)[1952], Dōhyō no sekai, 313–333, in: Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai (Ed.), *Miyamoto Yuriko. Sakuhin to shōgai*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.

- Nihon no meisaku iinkai (2010), *Shiranai to hazukashii Nihon no meisaku. Arasuji 200 Hon.* Tokyo: Takarajimasha.
- Nishisawa, Shun'ichi (1994), Kaisetsu, 479–493, in: *Dōhyō, Vol. 3.* Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Ōgata, Akiko (2006), Miyamoto Yuriko no tegami. Yuriko to Yuasa Yoshiko. *Kokubungaku kaishaku to kanshō. [Tokushū] Miyamoto Yuriko no atarashisa* (April): 188–198.
- Ōkawa, Harumi (2001), Dōhyō. Haijo Suru 'shizen', 276–292, in: Iwabuchi, H., Kitada, S., and Numazawa, K. (Eds.), *Miyamoto Yuriko no jikū.* Tokyo: Kanrin shobō.
- Ōmori, Sueko (1980), Kaidai, 931–940, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū, Vol. 24.* Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Sawabe, Hitomi (1990), *Yuriko, dasuvidāniya: Yuasa Yoshiko no seishun.* Tokyo: Bungei Shunjū.
- Sawabe, Hitomi (2001), Miyamoto Yuriko to Yuasa Yoshiko, 309–320, in: Iwabuchi, H., Kitada, S., and Numazawa, K. (Eds.), *Miyamoto Yuriko no jikū.* Tokyo: Kanrin shobō.
- Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai (ed.) (1976), *Miyamoto Yuriko. Sakuhin to shōgai.* Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.
- Tsuda, Takahashi (2001), Rekishi no hendō to Miyamoto Yuriko. *Minshu bungaku* (424): 125–133.
- Unno, Hiroshi (1983) *Modan toshi Tokyo.* Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.

Other works consulted – English

- Anderson, K. and Smith, S. (2001), Editorial: Emotional Geographies. *Transactions of*

the Institute of British Geographers, 26(1): 7–10.

Andrew Gordon (1993), *Postwar Japan as History*. Berkeley, CA; Oxford: University of California Press.

Bacchilega, Cristina and Moore, Cornelia Niekus (1996), *Constructions and Confrontations: Changing Representations of Women and Feminisms, East and West: Selected Essays*. Honolulu: College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, University of Hawai'i and the East-West Center.

Baxter, James C. (2009), *Interpretations of Japanese Culture: View from Russia and Japan/Nihon bunka no kaishaku: Roshia to Nihon kara no shiten*. Kyōto-shi: Kokusai Nihon Bunka Kenkyū Sentā.

Beckmann, George M. and Genji, Okubo (1969), *The Japanese Communist Party, 1922-1945*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Berger, John (1972), *Ways of Seeing*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Bergstrom, Brian (2006), Revolutionary Flesh: Nakamoto Takako's Early Fiction and the Representation of the Body in Japanese Modernist and Proletarian Literature. *positions*, 14(2): 311–343.

Bernstein, Gail Lee (1991), *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945*. Berkeley ; Oxford: University of California Press.

Berton, Peter and Langer, Paul F. (1981), *The Russian Impact on Japan: Literature and Social Thought* (P. Berton, P.F. Langer, and G.O. Totten, Eds.). Los Angeles: CA: University of Southern California Press.

Berton, Peter, Langer, Paul F. and Swearingen, Rodger (1956), *Japanese Training and Research in the Russian Field*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.

Bird, Isabella L. (2006), *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan*. Berkeley, CA: Stone Bridge Press.

Birnbaum, Phyllis (1982), *Rabbits, Crabs, Etc.: Stories by Japanese Women*.

Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Bondi, Liz (1990), *Feminism, Postmodernism, and Geography: Space for Women?* *Antipode*, 22(2): 156–167.

Bondi, Liz and Davidson, Joyce (2005), *Situating Gender*, 15–31, in: Nelson, L. and Seager, J. (Eds.), *A Companion to Feminist Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bowen-Struyk, Heather (2001), *Rethinking Japanese Proletarian Literature* [unpublished PhD, University of Michigan].

Bowen-Struyk, Heather (2006), *Guest Editor's Introduction: Proletarian Arts in East Asia*. *positions*, 14(2): 251–278.

Bowen-Struyk, Heather (2009), *Why a Boom in Proletarian Literature in Japan? The Kobayashii Takiji Memorial and The Factory Ship*. *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, 26-1-09.

Buckley, Sandra (1996), *Broken Silence: Voices of Japanese Feminism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bukh, Alexander (2010), *Japan's National Identity and Foreign Policy: Russia as Japan's 'Other'*. London: Routledge.

Caute, David (1988), *The Fellow-Travelers: Intellectual Friends of Communism*. New Haven, CT & London: Yale University Press.

Clifford, James (1997), *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.

Coutts, Angela (2004), *Self-Constructed Exoticism: Gender and Nation in Hōrōki by Hayashi Fumiko*. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 45(2): 113 – 131.

Davidson, Joyce, Bondi, Liz and Smith, Mick (Eds.) (2005), *Emotional Geographies*. Aldershot & Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Davidson, Joyce and Milligan, Christine (2004), *Embodying Emotion, Sensing Space:*

Introducing Emotional Geographies. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 5(4): 523–532.

Dower, John W. (1999), *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. London: Allen Lane.

Dryburgh, Marjorie and Dauncey, Sarah (Eds) (2013), *Writing Lives in China, 1600–2010: Histories of the Elusive Self*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Duncan, James S., Johnson, Nuala Christina and Schein, Richard H. (2008), *A Companion to Cultural Geography*. Malden, MA & Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila and Rasmussen, Carolyn (2008), *Political Tourists: Travellers from Australia to the Soviet Union in the 1920s–1940s*. Carlton, VIC: Melbourne University Publishing.

Fogel, Joshua A. (1989), Japanese Literary Travelers in Prewar Japan. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 49: 575–602.

Fogel, Joshua A. (2006), *Traditions of East Asian Travel*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Friedman, Susan Stanford (1995) Beyond White and Other: Relationality and Narratives of Race in Feminist Discourse. *Signs*, 21(1): 1–49.

Friedman, Susan Stanford (1996), 'Beyond' Gynocriticism and Gynesis: The Geographics of Identity and the Future of Feminist Criticism. *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 15: 13–40.

Friedman, Susan Stanford (1998), *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gayn, Mark (1948), *Japan Diary*. New York: William Sloane Associates.

Gide, Andre (1937), *Return from the USSR*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Goldman, Emma (1923), *My Two Years in Russia. An American Anarchist's*

Disillusionment, and the Betrayal of the Russian Revolution by Lenin's Soviet Union. St Peterburg, FL: Red and Black Publishers.

Goreglyad, Vladislav N. (1995), Russian-Japanese Relations: Some Reflections on Political and Cultural Tendencies, 190–200, in: Rimer, J.T. (Ed.), *A Hidden Fire. Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*. Stanford, CA & Washington DC: Stanford University Press & Woodrow Wilson Press Centre.

Gregory, Derek (1994), *Geographical Imaginations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Guichard-Anguis, Sylvie and Moon, Okpyo (2009), *Japanese Tourism and Travel Culture*. London ; New York: Routledge.

Hardacre, Helen (1989), *Shintō and the State, 1868-1988*. Princeton, NJ; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Heldt, Barbara (1995), 'Japanese' in Russian Literature: Transforming Identities, 171–183, in: Rimer, J.T. (Ed.), *A Hidden Fire. Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*. Stanford, CA & Washington DC: Stanford University Press & Woodrow Wilson Center.

Hiratsuka, Raichō (2006), *In the Beginning, Woman Was the Sun: The Autobiography of a Japanese Feminist*. (Trans. Teruko Craig). New York: Columbia University Press.

Hollander, Paul (1981), *Political Pilgrims: Travels of Western Intellectuals to the Soviet Union, China and Cuba 1928-1978*. New York ; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopper, Helen M. (1996), *A New Woman of Japan: A Political Biography of Katō Shidzue*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Horiguchi, Noriko J. (2012), *Women Adrift: The Literature of Japan's Imperial Body*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Iwabuchi, Koichi (1994), *Complicit Exoticism: Japan and Its Other*. *Continuum: The*

Australian Journal of Media & Culture, 8(2): 49–82.

Kano, Ayako (2005), Towards a Critique of Transhistorical Femininity, 520–554, in: Molony, B. and Uno, K. (Eds.), *Gendering Japanese History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

Karlsson, Mats (2011), United Front from Below: The Proletarian Cultural Movement's Last Stand, 1931-34. *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, 37(1): 29–59.

Keene, Donald (1998), *Modern Japanese Diaries: The Japanese at Home and Abroad as Revealed Through Their Diaries*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kelly, Catriona and David, Shepherd (Eds.) (1998), *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution, 1881-1940*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kelsky, Karen (2008), Gender, Modernity, and Eroticised Internationalism in Japan, 86–109, in: Willis, D.B. and Murphy-Shigematsu, S. (Eds.), *Transcultural Japan: at the Borderlands of Race, Gender, and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Laffin, Christina (2013), *Rewriting Medieval Japanese Women: Politics, Personality, and Literary Production in the Life of Nun Abutsu*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Large, Stephen S. (1977), The Romance of Revolution in Japanese Anarchism and Communism during the Taishō Period. *Modern Asian Studies*, 11(3): 441–467.

Lawall, Sarah (1994), *Reading World Literature: Theory, History, Practice*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Levy, Indra A. (2006), *Sirens of the Western Shore: The Westernesque Femme Fatale, Translation, and Vernacular Style in Modern Japanese Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Mack, Edward Thomas (2010), *Manufacturing Modern Japanese Literature:*

Publishing, Prizes, and the Ascription of Literary Value. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mackie, Vera (1997), Narratives of Struggle: Writing and the Making of Socialist Women In Japan, 127–145, in: Tipton, E.K. (Ed.), *Society and State in interwar Japan*. London: Routledge.

Mackie, Vera (2011), Tales of the City. *Japanese Studies*, 31(3): 299–304.

McLelland, Mark J., Suganuma, Katsu and Welker, James (2007), *Queer Voices from Japan: First Person Narratives from Japan's Sexual Minorities*. Lanham, MD; Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.

Mikhailova, Yulia and Steele, M. William (2008), *Japan and Russia: Three Centuries of Mutual Images*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.

Mills, Sara (1991), *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Monicat, Benedicte (1994), Autobiography and Women's Travel Writings in Nineteenth-Century France: Journeys Through Self-Representation. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 1(1): 61–70.

Monnet, Livia (1989), 'In the Beginning, Woman Was the Sun': Autobiographies of Modern Japan Women Writers 1&2. *Japan Forum*, 1(2): 55–81, 197–233.

Morin, Karen (1995), A 'Female Columbus' in 1887 America: Marking New Social Territory. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 2(2): 191–208.

Morton, Leith (2008), *The Alien Within: Representations of the Exotic in Twentieth-Century Japanese Literature*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Moss, Pamela J. (2002), *Feminist Geography in Practice: Research and Methods*. Oxford; Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Mulvey, Laura (1975), Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema. *Screen*, 16(3): 6–18.

- Murakami, Haruki (2006), Introduction. Akutagawa Ryūnosuke: Downfall of the Chosen, ix–xxxvii, in: Rubin, J. (Ed.), *Ryūnosuke Akutagawa. Rashomon and Seventeen Other Stories*. London: Penguin.
- Nelson, Lise and Seager, Joni (2005), *A Companion to Feminist Geography*. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Nenzi, Laura (2006), Women's Travel Narratives in Early Modern Japan: Genre Imperatives, Gender Consciousness and Status Questioning, 44–69, in: Fogel, J.A. (Ed.), *Traditions of East Asian Travel*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Orbaugh, Sharalyn (2003), Naturalism and the Emergence of the Shishosetsu (Personal Novel), 137–140, in: Mostow, J.S. (Ed.), *The Columbia Companion to Modern East Asian Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Perry, Samuel (2014), *Recasting Red Culture in Proletarian Japan: Childhood, Korea, and the Historical Avant-Garde*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Pflugfelder, Gregory M. (2005), 'S Is for Sister: Schoolgirl Intimacy and 'Same-Sex Love' in Early Twentieth-Century Japan, 133–190, in: Molony, B. and Uno, K. (Eds.), *Gendering Modern Japanese History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Pinnington, Adrian (2007), 'Race', Gender and Orientalism in Tanizaki Jun'ichiro's 'the Mermaid's Lament', 75–95, in: Hutchinson, R. and Williams, M. (Eds.), *Representing the Other in Modern Japanese Literature*. London: Routledge.
- Pollock, Griselda (1988), *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and Histories of Art*. London: Routledge.
- Powell, Brian (1975), Japan's First Modern Theater. The Tsukiji Shogekijo and Its Company, 1924–26. *Monumenta Nipponica*, 30(1): 69–85.
- Powell, Irena (1983), *Writers and Society in Modern Japan*. Tokyo ; New York: Kodansha International.

- Pratt, Mary Louise (1992), *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Preston, Valerie and Ustundag, Ebru (2005), Feminist Geographies of the 'City': Multiple Voices, Multiple Meanings, 211-227, in: Nelson, L. and Seager, J. (Eds.), *A Companion to Feminist Geography*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Raddeker, Helene Bowen (1995), The Past Through Telescopic Sights. Reading the Prison-Life-Story of Kaneko Fumiko. *Japan Forum*, 7(2): 155–169.
- Raddeker, Helene Bowen (1997), 'Death As Life': Political Metaphor in the Testimonial Prison Literature of Kanno Suga. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 29(4): 3–12.
- Rimer, J. Thomas (1995), *A Hidden Fire: Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*. Stanford, CA & Washington DC: Stanford University Press & Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Robertson, George (1994), *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement*. London: Routledge.
- Rossiter, Benjamin and Gibson, Katherine (2011), Walking and Performing 'the City': A Melbourne Chronicle, 488–498, in: Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (Eds.), *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sakaki, Atsuko (1996), Autobiographizing Fiction? Fictionalizing Autobiography?: A Contemporary Japanese Woman's Experimentation with Meta-Autobiography, 194–206, in: Bacchilega, C.B. and Moore, C.N. (Eds.), *Constructions and Confrontations: Changing Representations of Women and Feminisms, East and West: Selected Essays*. Honolulu: College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, University of Hawai'i and the East-West Center.
- Sand, Jordan (1998), At Home in the Meiji Period. Inventing Japanese Domesticity, 191–207, in: Vlastos, S. (Ed.), *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Sand, Jordan (2003), *House and Home in Modern Japan: Architecture, Domestic Space and Bourgeois Culture, 1880-1930*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Schalow, Paul Gordon and Walker, Janet A. (1996), *The Woman's Hand: Gender and Theory in Japanese Women's Writing*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime (2009), Introduction: Travelling Modernisms. *Hecate*, 35: 5–9.
- Scott, Joan W. (2006), Gender. A Useful Category of Historical Analysis, 133–148, in: Morgan, S. (Ed.), *The Feminist History Reader*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Shoichi, Saeki and Craig, Teruko (1985), The Autobiography in Japan. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 11(2): 357–368.
- Silverberg, Miriam (1990), *Changing Song: The Marxist Manifestos of Nakano Shigeharu*. Princeton, NJ; Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, Mick (2009), *Emotion, Place, and Culture*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Smith, Sidonie (2001), *Moving Lives: Twentieth-Century Women's Travel Writing*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Soeshima, Yumi (2006), The Politics of Gender, Class and Sexuality in Miyamoto Yuriko's Fiction [unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison].
- Stanley, Liz (1993), The Knowing Because Experiencing Subject. Narratives, Lives and Autobiography. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 16(3): 205–215.
- Starrs, Roy (2012), *Rethinking Japanese Modernism*. Leiden: Global Oriental,.
- Sterry, Lorraine (2009), *Victorian Women Travellers in Meiji Japan: Discovering a 'New' Land*. Folkestone: Global Oriental.
- Suzuki, Michiko (2006), Writing Same-Sex Love: Sexology and Literary Representation in Yoshiya Nobuko's Early Fiction. *The Journal of Asian*

Studies, 65(3): 575–599.

Swearingen, Rodger and Langer, Paul F. (1952), *Red Flag in Japan: International Communism in Action, 1919-1951*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tanaka, Yukiko (2000), *Women Writers of Meiji and Taishō Japan: Their Lives, Works and Critical Reception, 1868-1926*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Tipton, Elise K. (1997), *Society and the State in Interwar Japan*. London: Routledge.

Twine, Nanette (1978), The Genbunitchi Movement. Its Origin, Development, and Conclusion. *Monumenta Nipponica*, 33(3): 333–356.

Uno, Kathleen (1993), The Death of ‘Good Wife, Wise Mother’?, 293–322, in: Gordon, A. (Ed.), *Postwar Japan as History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ury, Marian and Borgen, Robert (1996), Oe No Masafusa and the Practice and Heian Autobiography. *Monumenta Nipponica*, 51(2): 143–151.

Vernon, Victoria V. (1988), *Daughters of the Moon: Wish, Will, and Social Constraint in Fiction by Modern Japanese Women*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California.

Walker, Janet A. (1995), The Russian Role in the Creation of the First Japanese Novel, Futabatei Shimei’s *Ukigumo*, 22–37, in: Rimer, J. T. (Ed.), *A Hidden Fire. Russian and Japanese Cultural Encounters, 1868-1926*. Stanford, CA & Washington DC: Stanford University Press & Woodrow Wilson Press Centre.

Wędziagolski, Karol (1988), *Boris Savinkov: Portrait of a Terrorist*. Kingston Press.

Wilson, Elizabeth (1992), The Invisible Flaneur. *New Left Review*, (191): 90–110.

Wolff, J. The Invisible Flaneuse. Women and the Literature of Modernity. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 2(3): 37–46.

Woollacott, Angela (2000), The Colonial Flaneuse: Australian Women Negotiating Turn-of-the-Century London. *Signs*, 25(3): 761–787.

Yamagiwa, Joseph K. (1953), Fiction in Post-War Japan. *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, 13: 3–22.

Young, Louise (1999), Marketing the Modern: Department Stores, Consumer Culture, and the New Middle Class in Interwar Japan. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, (55): 52–70.

Other works consulted – Japanese

Inazawa, Junko (2006), Dōhyō no ashiato o tazunete. *Minshu bungaku. Tokushū: Miyamoto Yuriko botsugo gojūgonen tokushū* (485): 101–111.

Iwabuchi, Hiroko, Kitada, Sachie and Numazawa, Kazuko (2001), *Miyamoto Yuriko no jikū*. Tokyo: Kanrinshobō.

Kurosawa, Ariko (Ed.) (2008), *Miyamoto Yuriko to Yuasa Yoshiko: ōfuku shokan*. Tokyo: Kanrinshobō.

Kusabe, Kazuko (1981), Dōhyō Ron, 267–272, in: Nihon Bungaku Kenkyū Shiryō Kankōkai (Ed.), *Nakano Shigeharu. Miyamoto Yuriko*. Tokyo: Yūseidō Shuppan.

Miyamoto, Kenji (1980), *Miyamoto Yuriko no sekai*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.

Mori, Mayumi (2009), *Onna sannin no shiberia tetsudō*. Tokyo: Shūeisha.

Nakamura, Tomoko (1973), *Miyamoto Yuriko*. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

Ono, Michiko (1996), Dōhyō ga toraeta shakaishugi. *Minshu bungaku. Tokushū: Miyamoto Yuriko botsugo 45 shūnen* (362): 172–179.

Satō, Shizuo (2001), *Miyamoto Yuriko to dōjidai no bungaku*. Tokyo: Hon no

izumisha.

Suzawa, Chika (2004), *Dōhyō kara mieru mono*, 125–153, in: Takiji Yuriko Kenkyūkai (Ed.), *Ima ni ikiru Miyamoto Yuriko*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppangaisha.

Tsuda, Takashi (1996), *Miyamoto Yuriko to Konno Dairiki : Sono jidai to bungaku*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.

Yamaguchi, Teruomi (2012), *Miyamoto Yuriko nikki*, 164–176, in: Yamaguchi, T. (Ed.), *Nikki ni yomu kindai Nihon. 3.Taishō*. *Nikki ni yomu kindai Nihon*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan.

Yonekawa, Masao (2003), [Kaisō] *Mosukuwa no Yuriko-San*, 6–8, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū, Vol. 30, geppō 30*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.

Yuasa, Yoshiko (2003), *Mosukuwa de sodatta Yuriko. Kanojo no gaman tsuyosa*, 6–8, in: *Miyamoto Yuriko zenshū, Vol. 27, geppō 27*. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha.

Appendix
Biographical overview/ 年賦

1899	Chūjō Yuri born in 1899 in Tokyo, to the Cambridge-educated architect Chūjō Sei'ichirō and his wife Yoshie, the daughter of a prominent Meiji scholar Nishimura Shigeki, one of the founders of the Meirokusha (Meiji Six).
1916	Publication of her debut story, 'Mazushiki hitobito no mure' (A Flock of Poor Folk) in the journal <i>Chūō kōron</i> , sponsored by critic Tsubouchi Shōyō, a family friend. She drops out of Nihon Joshi Daigaku to concentrate on writing.
1918	Yuriko accompanies her father on a trip to New York and enrolls as an audit student at Columbia University. She marries the scholar Araki Shigeru, a 'love marriage' that does not have the blessing of her parents.
1924	Yuriko is introduced to the Russian translator Yuasa Yoshiko (1896–1990), at that time working as an editor on the journal <i>Aikoku fujin</i> (Patriotic Woman). They quickly become very close, and Yuriko leaves her husband and goes to live with Yoshiko. Encouraged by Yoshiko, she writes her first autobiographical novel, <i>Nobuko</i> , first published serially in 1926 and seen by some critics as a proto-feminist novel.
1927	Yuasa Yoshiko decides to go to Russia to improve her language skills and Yuriko accompanies her. Their visas are sponsored by the elder statesman Baron Gotō Shinpei, a key figure in Japan-Russia relations, and a friend of Yuriko's family.
15 December 1927	The two women arrive in Moscow, where they are met by Akita Ujaku (1883–1962), the writer and Esperantist, who had been invited to the Soviet Union for the tenth anniversary celebrations of the Revolution, his companion the Russian scholar Narumi Kanzō (1899–1974), and Yonekawa Masao (1891–1965), also a scholar of Russian literature.

June-September 1928	They spend the summer in Leningrad. In August, Yuriko receives news from Tokyo that her youngest brother, Hideo, has committed suicide.
September-October 1928	To distract Yuriko from her grief, Yoshiko organises a sightseeing trip down the Volga, to the Caucasus and Donbas region. They return to Moscow in October.
January-April 1929	Yuriko is hospitalised with a gall-bladder inflammation. Her family send notification that they are coming to Europe. Yuriko and Yoshiko plan to meet them in France.
April-November 1929	Travelling through Warsaw, Vienna and Berlin to Paris, Yuriko and Yoshiko take up separate accommodation in Paris in advance of the arrival of the Chūjō family. In August, Yuriko accompanies her family to London. Yoshiko returns alone to Moscow to continue her studies. Yuriko returns to Paris with her family and decides to prolong her visit another month when they leave in October. After a brief involvement with economics scholar Taira Teizō, Yuriko returns to Moscow in November 1929.
1930	In summer, the two women make their final trip, to Rostov, Sebastopol and Yalta. In Moscow, Yuriko meets exiled former communist leader Katayama Sen, who suggests she stays on in Russia and work for the Comintern. She decides to return to Japan. She and Yoshiko arrive in Tokyo in November. In December she joins the Nihon Puroretaria Sakka Dōmei, the literary division of NAPF (The All-Japan Federation of Proletarian Arts/Zen-Nihon Musansha Geijutsu Renmei).
1931	In October 1931, NAPF reorganises as KOPF and Yuriko joins both the central and the women's committees as well as taking on editorship of <i>Hataraku fujin</i> (Working Woman). She also joins the Japanese Communist Party, but keeps her membership secret.
1932	Yuriko leaves Yoshiko and marries the Marxist literary critic Miyamoto Kenji in February. She is arrested in April and held for 80 days. Kenji

	goes underground. Publication of '1932 no haru' (Spring of 1932) in <i>Kaizō</i> .
1933	Kenji is arrested and imprisoned until Japan's defeat in August 1945. Fellow proletarian writer Kobayashi Takiji dies in police custody in February. Yuriko writes 'Kokkoku' (Moment by Moment) but <i>Chūō kōron</i> cannot publish it under censorship conditions.
1934	Yuriko is arrested in January and released in June just in time to reach the bedside of her dying mother Yoshie. Publication of 'Koiwai no ikka' (The Family of Koiwai) and 'Fuyu o kosu tsubomi' (The Buds that Survive the Winter), both in <i>Bungei</i> . In December she is allowed to see Kenji for the first time since his arrest.
1935	Publication of 'Chibusa' (Breasts) in <i>Chūō Kōron</i> . Yuriko is arrested in May for her involvement in <i>Hataraku fujin</i> and sent to Ichigaya prison.
1936	Death of her father Sei'ichirō. Yuriko is briefly released from prison. At her trial in June, she is given a two-year sentence suspended for four years.
1937	Yuriko is included on a blacklist of writers issued to editors by the Home Ministry in December. She is forbidden to publish from January 1938 to spring 1939.
1938-40	Yuriko resorts to translation to make a living and works on <i>Fujin to bungaku</i> (Women and Literature).
1941	From February Yuriko is again forbidden to write for publication. After the outbreak of the Pacific War with the US, she is arrested and held in Sugamo prison.
1942	Suffering severe heatstroke in July, she is not expected to survive, and is released. By this point, she has spent two years in total in prison. Her health is permanently damaged and she is banned from publication. Between 1932 and 1945 there are fewer than four years in which she can publish.
1944	Trial of Miyamoto Kenji. He is sentenced to life imprisonment. His

	appeal is rejected the following year.
1945	Following Japan's defeat, Kenji is released in October and the couple are reunited. In the aftermath of the war, Yuriko is admired for her unfaltering stand against the government. She is active in the reformed and legal JCP as well as the New Japan Literary Society (Shin Nihon Bungakkai), founded by former members of the PLM, and the Women's Democratic Club (Fujin Minshū Kurabu).
1946	Yuriko publishes <i>Banshū heiya</i> and <i>Fuchisō</i> .
1947	Yuriko publishes <i>Futatsu no niwa</i> and begins work on <i>Dōhyō</i> , which is published serially in <i>Tenbō</i> . Ill-health forces her to curtail her public activities.
1948	She becomes involved in the peace movement following the Occupation's 'reverse course' and the increase in ideological tensions between the US and the USSR.
1950	Outbreak of Korean war. Yuriko completes <i>Dōhyō</i> .
1951	Yuriko dies on 21 January at the age of 51 from cerebrospinal meningitis.

Acknowledgements

Many thanks are due to my principal supervisor Angela Coutts for her hard work and patience reading numberless drafts and guiding me through the project, which often seemed overwhelming; also to my second supervisor Professor Hugo Dobson, who provided practical advice, support and coffee along the way.

In Sheffield, Kanda Fumi helped with my first reading of the diaries and essays. Chris Harding and Catherine Ames kept me going with good company and cocktails in Tokyo and encouragement back in the UK. I am grateful to Professor Gaye Rowley of Waseda University for her ongoing encouragement, advice and reassurance. Jamie and Jenny Coates, Mark Pendleton, Alejandra Armendariz and Emiliano Cancellieri, Helen Mort and Anna Crewe supplied advice, moral support, pizza and large glasses of wine in the writing-up phase. Long-distance support from Stella Hughes, Michael Nest, Sharon Southwell, Peter Davies, Kathryn Pinnick and Annie Kelly helped me through the tough patches.

A Japan Foundation Fellowship in 2011–12 allowed me to undertake a year's research at Waseda University, kindly sponsored by Professor Kanai Keiko.

Finally, I would like to thank Professor Vera Mackie, who has been a source of advice, encouragement and support since I first studied Japanese history with her at the University of Melbourne in the mid-1990s.