

America's Racial Limits: U.S. Cinema and the Occupation of Japan

*Hiroshi KITAMURA**

On May 5, 1951, Douglas MacArthur appeared at a U.S. Senate hearing to discuss the military situations in East Asia. Following detailed exchanges on the tense international conflicts in China and Korea, the aging general was asked to comment on the Allied Occupation of Japan. Proud and confident, General MacArthur, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in Japan (SCAP), stated that “many good results have flowed from its occupation.” His reasoning was simple. In the process of “administer[ing] a decent and just form of government” in the former Axis state, the Japanese not only “became acquainted with the American way of life” but also “began to realize that the liberty of an individual, the dignity of man . . . were real methods” with which they could better “their own basic concepts and methods of life.” Although a great many Japanese “had never even seen a white face,” the Occupation inspired a “great social revolution” akin to the Magna Carta and the French Revolution—“the great revolutions of our own types”—with “no drop of blood.” In the end, “a very isolated and backward nation” had come to “practice . . . the freedoms which you and I learned at our mothers’ breasts when we were born.”¹

MacArthur’s remarks reveal the permeation of racial thinking in the U.S.-led Allied Occupation. The six-and-a-half years of occupation after World War II has often been seen as an era in which SCAP launched a

*Associate Professor, College of William and Mary

barrage of political, legal, economic, and social reforms in the name of demilitarization and “democratization,” but this process also came with racial bias and conflict. Over the past decade and a half, scholars have explored the racial dimension of the Occupation by looking at white America’s Orientalist (re)imagination of the Japanese Other, specifically noting the changing perceptions of the Japanese from war-mongering beasts to childlike inferiors who required American tutelage for “uplift” and “reorientation.”² Others have explored how the Japanese refashioned their racialized worldviews after the war by accepting their subservient status to the West while claiming superiority over Asian neighbors and ethnic minorities. The persistence of cultural divides led to tense cross-social reactions involving miscegenation, pan-pan prostitution, and fraternization.³

In this essay I offer new insight by showing the construction and dissemination of American racial discourse through Hollywood’s business operation. During the early postwar era, the Occupation utilized cinema as a tool for the “re-education” and “reorientation” of the war-shattered Japanese population. Hollywood aided SCAP by claiming to be a “fountain of culture” (*bunka no izumi*) that offered lessons on “true democracy” while entertaining the public.⁴ Yet the discourses it offered assumed an imagined social hierarchy ordained by race. The stream of U.S. narratives and publicity texts by and large celebrated America’s humanity as a “white” achievement, while erasing ethnic difference among Europeans, marginalizing Africans and African Americans, and both suppressing and sensationalizing the presence of Native Americans. Hollywood constructed a kind of melting-pot whiteness as the norm superior to the values and lifestyles of nonwhites. In so doing, U.S. studios played an active role in establishing a hegemonic order in Japan—one that boosted (white) American power over the (nonwhite) Japanese.⁵

My goal here is not simply to illuminate the racialized discourses in the screen texts but to situate the films in the larger institutional structures and politics that surrounded them. In what follows, I begin by discussing the establishment of the Hollywood apparatus in defeated Japan, namely the Central Motion Picture Exchange (CMPE), the distribution outpost of the U.S. major film studios. I then examine how occupation censors, finding undesirable tropes and ideas on the screens, confronted Hollywood’s racial representations. Discussions on occupation policy are followed by a look at the transpacific dissemination of Hollywood’s racialized worldview. In addition to official SCAP documents and U.S.

trade papers, I rely on Hollywood's Japanese-language publicity materials to elucidate the cultural formations of U.S. cinema. In the end, in this essay I seek to demonstrate U.S. cinema as a hegemonic instrument that reinforced America's dominant influence on Japan in the aftermath of World War II. Hollywood, I contend, played a key role in shaping this uneven transpacific relationship.

A CHOSEN INSTRUMENT

The end of World War II ushered in a new era in U.S.–Japanese relations. Following the string of island-hopping battles and air bombings that scorched much of the Asia-Pacific region, the Japanese government acquiesced to the Allied Powers on August 15, 1945. Defeat in war led to the arrival of the U.S.-led forces of occupation, which pursued a far-reaching, Herculean program to transform Japan's political, social, and cultural landscape. Led by General MacArthur, the occupationaires began with a rigorous effort to dismantle Japan's military and take charge of its territorial possessions. In an ambitious attempt to “democratize” the landscape, SCAP also enacted sweeping political and legal reforms. While promoting equality and opportunity through suffrage and political activism, MacArthur also sought to empower rank-and-file workers by encouraging unionization and collective bargaining. An ambitious attempt to break up the powerful *zaibatsu* conglomerates proceeded simultaneously. Even though the looming “reverse course” soon compromised SCAP's reform programs, these early initiatives left a lasting mark on the “new” Japanese state—well beyond MacArthur's tenure in East Asia.⁶

In this climate of change, the occupiers also aimed to influence Japanese public opinion. To achieve this, SCAP moved to control the sphere of cultural expression. This was pursued in part through the Civil Information and Education Section (CIE), a civilian bureau that generated reform in the areas of education, religion, and public information. MacArthur also relied on the Civil Censorship Detachment (CCD), a military office designed to preserve national security, collect intelligence, and generate counterespionage programs to further SCAP's objectives across the Pacific. Together, these offices censored and monitored the media enterprises—including newspapers, magazines, books, radio, and the movies. As a result, Japanese filmmakers, among other cultural producers, were forced to interact with SCAP personnel who

“instructed” and “advised” them on appropriate on-screen content. While much less draconian than censors in Nazi Germany or Stalinist Russia, the Occupation scrutinized synopses, screenplays, and film prints and often conspicuously influenced the final product, to the chagrin of the local studios.⁷

The attempts to influence Japanese cinema coincided with Hollywood’s transpacific penetration. During World War II, U.S. film studios turned away from their commitment to producing “pure” entertainment and actively assisted the Allied cause. Hollywood studios routinely submitted scripts and prints to the Office of War Information, which offered “instructions” and “suggestions” to enhance the U.S. government’s information campaign.⁸ In return, the U.S. government aided Hollywood’s operation. During the second half of the war, the State Department worked with key studio representatives to plan the industry’s postwar international trade. A string of meetings and discussions between government and industry resulted in the creation of the Motion Picture Export Association (MPEA). Dubbed “the little State Department,” this legal cartel of Hollywood studios was used to spearhead the U.S. film trade in state-controlled or protected markets. Japan, one of the four countries (the others being Germany, Austria, and Korea) occupied by the Allies, became a prominent site of the MPEA’s action.⁹

SCAP formed an intimate working relationship with Hollywood. Convinced that message-driven American films could offer both entertainment and inspiration, the occupiers privileged the MPEA over other foreign film distributors that sought to break into the Japanese market. Thanks to this backing, U.S. cinema achieved a dominating presence within the field of “foreign cinema” (*yōga*). In addition, SCAP assisted the formation of the Central Motion Picture Exchange (CMPE), the MPEA’s distribution outpost in Japan (and Korea). Founded in Tokyo as an institutional arm of the CIE, the CMPE soon earned a U.S. Treasury license to operate as a full-fledged business enterprise under MacArthur’s presence. Run by former 20th Century-Fox manager Charles Mayer, the operation expanded as the CMPE founded regional branches in Nagoya, Osaka, Fukuoka, and Sapporo. Mayer also parceled the required labor into bureaucratically managed departments that sought efficiency and effectiveness. The newly created departments—publicity, production (for subtitling), accounting, and general affairs—were typically managed by Americans and other foreigners dispatched by Hollywood, while day-to-day tasks was conducted by the company’s Japanese employees,

who soon exceeded four hundred. This type of managerial structure, typical of Hollywood in other eras as well, did not sit well with some Japanese observers, who criticized it as a "colonial" practice.¹⁰

CENSORING RACE

SCAP's institutional support was a blessing for Hollywood, but this did not mean that the occupiers were entirely pleased with the U.S. film industry's filmic lineup. While believing that many U.S. films could aid Japan's democratic reconstruction, the occupiers were also troubled by the presence of films that might harm their overall mission. American officials, therefore, censored and monitored Hollywood's renderings before they were released to theaters. The censorship of U.S. cinema differed from that of Japanese cinema, partly in that the censors inspected the finished products instead of interfering in the production phase. In addition, the censorship of Hollywood also came with the intervention of the U.S. State Department and the Civil Affairs Division (CAD) of the U.S. Army in New York. In particular, the CAD employed a stringent control measure, at times taking issue with films that SCAP censors found to be acceptable. This infuriated Charles Mayer, who once complained to his superiors in New York that the U.S. Army was "dumber than we could ever imagine."¹¹

The censors' area of concern was broad and deep. They began by taking issue with Hollywood's renderings of war and nationalism. Fearing that films with a military backdrop could revive Japan's perceived warlike tendencies, occupation censors barred the entry of such products. This, for example, resulted in the suppression of Alfred Hitckcock's *Lifeboat* (1944), a grim survival tale that takes place on a crowded escape raft, for depicting a Nazi captain's gradual (albeit failed) control of the fate of the survivors.¹² *Counter-Attack* (1945), a Zoltan Korda film starring Paul Muni that depicted a Russian counteroffensive against the Nazis, bothered a CCD censor, who complained of the film's "glorification of war, individual heroism, self-sacrifice, and blind obedience."¹³ SCAP found problems even in *The Major and the Minor* (1942), a Billy Wilder film about a young woman who disguises herself as an eleven-year-old to take a train ride at half-price fare. En route to her final destination, she meets a U.S. Army major who is deceived by her and a group of young cadets who, instead of showing discipline, vie for the attention of the "eleven-year-old." The film bothered CIE because it appeared to

ridicule Army officers while also creating an impression that military education was compulsory for American boys.¹⁴

Films that depicted political and social disturbance faced the ire of occupation censors, as they were presumed to undermine Japan's social harmony. For this reason, the CCD decided to suppress *In Old Chicago* (1938). The story highlighted the off-and-on relationship of two immigrant brothers—one an honest politician and the other a racketeer—and displayed bribery, graft, manipulation, rowdy beer parties, and illegal voting practices in post-Civil War Chicago. Although the final scene, set during the Great Fire of 1871, converts the dishonest brother into a moral and considerate being, the CCD censor could not dismiss the overall lack of political justice.¹⁵ *The Fountainhead* (1949) signaled trouble because of its protagonist. This adaptation of the Ayn Rand novel introduced a stubborn architect (Gary Cooper) who resists the temptation to compromise his aesthetic originality. When a fellow architect begs him to design a housing project under his name, the main character agrees at first. But he soon blows up the construction site, particularly because of the modifications made later by the client and his cohorts. While acknowledging the film's "thesis that creative spirit in men should be free," the CIE was unhappy to find that the "action on which the architect hero's expression of freedom hinges is criminal action." The agency denounced the film for its "questionable morality."¹⁶

Scenes of torture and cruelty did not fare well in the eyes of occupation censors. One example was *Arabian Nights* (1942), which displayed two scenes that the Army questioned: one in which a half-conscious man is hanged in a public square under the sharp gaze of hungry vultures, and the other in which a captive is tortured on a wooden wheel and then stabbed to death.¹⁷ Another troublesome film was *The Sea Wolf* (1941), an adaptation of Jack London's bleak novel about an Ahab-esque captain on a scavenger ship. The CIE did not favor the film because the *Ghost* (the name of the vessel)—peopled with criminals, convicts, alcoholics, and rugged sailors—was heading toward the Japanese coast "for the purpose of piracy on the high seas."¹⁸ Swashbucklers faced criticism in part because of physical violence, but mostly because they appeared to embody "feudalistic" traits. Occupation censors—oddly, I must add—identified semblances of the vengeful samurai in the rope-swinging pirates and saber-rattling duelists in the popular Hollywood genre. Censors specifically called for the removal of "excessive swordplay" from *The*

Black Swan (1942), *The Fighting O'Flynn* (1949), and *The Son of Monte Cristo* (1941), among others.¹⁹

Race was another trope that the U.S. occupiers handled cautiously. This began with stereotypes of the Japanese. During World War II, U.S. studios produced a body of war films that caricatured the Japanese as sly, malignant, merciless, and faceless enemies.²⁰ While some of those films, such as *Across the Pacific* (1942) and *Thirty Seconds over Tokyo* (1945), were immediately approved for release in U.S.-occupied Germany, virtually none of them entered Japan in the wake of the war.²¹ The reason had a lot to do with Hollywood's own decision to avoid showing films about the Pacific War and the U.S. government's pressure against their enlistment. Nonetheless, SCAP still detected problematic depictions of the former Axis enemy—in films about the home front and productions that did not deal with the war. One example was *A Medal for Benny* (1945), a story in which residents of a small town decide to honor a young man who died in combat after killing a slew of Japanese soldiers. After viewing the film, the CIE requested the elimination of "all references to the killing of the Japs." Later, the CCD verified that the offensive language was removed, but it spotted one oversight: an image of a man holding a sign that read: "Wipe the Japs off the Map." This shot was trimmed out of the final product.²² In *No Leave, No Love* (1946), the CIE requested modification of a line that characterized the "Japs" as "savages on the island."²³ *The Lady is Willing* (1942) posed no problems except for the following utterance: "I am going to commit hari-kari [*sic*] in order to keep us all out of jail." The CIE argued that this line was "not necessary in the film." The CMPE agreed to remove it from the celluloid prints.²⁴

The Hollywood western genre included few stereotypes of the Japanese, but it presented a cargo of problems to SCAP. Censors were routinely bothered by the depiction of violence as a solution to the crisis at hand. On viewing the John Wayne film *Tall in the Saddle* (1944), a CCD censor therefore took issue with its presentation of "lawlessness, killing, gambling, and frontier justice," all of which could expose "objectionable practices or elements of American life."²⁵ Another problem with the genre was the glorification of the antihero. *Bad Bascomb* (1946), for instance, dramatized the exploits of a notorious outlaw who develops a close bond with a young Mormon girl as he helps her community. The CIE was relieved to see that for the protagonist, who is eventually caught by the U.S. Cavalry, it "appears that . . . [he] will face the law." But the

rest of the film was nothing but troubling because the outlaw's "entire appearance in the picture is one of sentimentality, which could easily create [sic] sympathy."²⁶ Westerns, furthermore, often came with depictions of revenge, vengeance, and retaliation, which, as with the swash-buckler and the Japanese period film (*jidaigeki*), seemed to represent "feudalistic" traits encoded with loyalty and sacrifice. For this reason, reading the synopsis was enough for a CIE censor to take issue with Stuart Heisler's *Dallas* (1950). "The story synopsis," noted Donald Nugent, "gives the impression that the theme [of the film] is personal revenge, with three men killed without punishment of any kind for the killer." For this reason, "it would be difficult to give clearance for this picture," the CIE officer noted.²⁷

The Hollywood western created problems also because of its tendency to disparage nonwhites. While admitting that the genre "var[ie]d in content" and had a "legitimate spot as entertainment," Nugent "hesitate[d]" to support westerns, especially because "Indians and Mexicans are mistreated by dominant whites."²⁸ Although the CIE censor did not single out any films, Hollywood of this era had a broad lineup that flaunted violence with Native Americans, such as *Stagecoach* (1939), *She Wore a Yellow Ribbon* (1949), and *Ambush* (1950). The problem with the depiction of Mexicans was more complex, as a curious controversy emerged over *The Gay Amigo* (1949). This film from the Cisco Kid series revolved around the U.S. Cavalry's attempts to capture a band of robbers in the Arizona Territory. An officer spots the Cisco Kid and Pancho during a chase and suspects that these two Mexican American men were leading the raids. Yet, on the contrary, the sombrero-clad duo, while being followed by law enforcers, turned out to be heroes as they expose the actual conspirators: two white men. This was not a welcome ending for the CIE, which complained about "the build-up of the Cisco Kid as compared to the breakdown of the Army sergeant," as well as the fact that "the actual culprits are Americans, not Mexicans."²⁹

Films that depicted colonial and imperial adventures also faced opposition because of racial issues. This discourse repeatedly emerged with the Tarzan features. In *Tarzan and the Amazons* (1945) the chest-thumping hero helps an injured "Amazon woman" and gains the trust of her people. A British expedition team, however, intrudes in search of hidden treasures and nearly destroys her secret civilization.³⁰ The CIE expressed reluctance to clear this film because it highlighted a "clash between the white man and the people of a different culture."³¹ SCAP

voiced dismay at *Tarzan and the Green Goddess* (1938) as well. In this feature, set in the Guatemalan jungle, two white expedition teams compete in a search for the Green Goddess, a Mayan idol that contains a secret formula for an explosive that could “destroy the world.” The problem with this film was partly the presence of a massive explosive that seemed to resemble the atomic bomb. This, a CIE censor grouched, was an “unusual coinciden[ce].”³² The other trouble was the existence of greedy white explorers who exploit the local population. A CIE censor thus charged that the film portrayed “imperialism at its worst.”³³

Films that dramatized tension in white colonial governance were also problematic. The CIE was reluctant to clear John Ford's *The Hurricane* (1937), which in Germany received classification as a “reorientation” picture.³⁴ The film featured a romance between two Polynesians who survive a colossal hurricane that wipes out the idyllic island of Manacura. The problem the censor saw was not the presence of French colonists in the South Pacific but, rather, the violence and animosity that spark between the islanders and the European interlopers. In the film, the dark-skinned protagonist, Terangi, suffers from arduous manual labor, extended jail sentences, and physical punishments imposed on him for striking a white “man of influence.” The French governor's obsession with punitive law and Terangi's accidental killing of a prison guard escalate the conflict. As a result, *The Hurricane* appeared unsuitable in Japan because it stressed the “clash . . . between the White Man and people of a different culture.”³⁵

The Letter (1940), a screen adaptation of an acclaimed play by W. Somerset Maugham, brought about a tense reaction for the same reason. Set in British Malaya, the film dramatized the trial of a white rubber planter's wife who is accused of killing a male friend. The jury declares her “not guilty,” but this happens only after she secretly buys back a key letter that could have proved her malice. Toward the end, she confesses that she was actually in love with the murdered man and that she killed him after discovering that he had married a “native woman” with “cobra's eyes.” In the final scene, the angry widow quietly stabs the protagonist to death under the moonlight. The CIE was willing to clear the film for release, but the Army found it “entirely unsuitable.” The central problem did not lie in the white “yellow-face” performance by Gale Sondergaard, but the “inter-racial theme” that resulted in hatred, jealousy, and death.³⁶

Yet not all colonial stories suffered from SCAP's hostility. *Anna and*

the King of Siam (1946), for instance, was a favored example. Based on the life story of Anna Leonowens, the film deals with a widowed British woman's efforts to tutor the Siamese royal family. A highlight of the film is Anna's interaction with the crusty king, who aspires to learn about Western science and "modernization" without losing his pride and dignity as leader of the people. Understanding the king's status and ambition, Anna inspires him by teaching the principles of Western democracy, fashion, etiquette, and the English language. Despite the caricatured white-face presentation of the Siamese king by Rex Harrison, the CCD praised the film for showing the "introduction of progressive Western thought into a Far Eastern nation."³⁷

While evaluating films with colonial backdrops, the occupationaires encountered *Go for Broke!* (1951), a narrative that highlighted U.S. servicemen of Japanese descent. The MGM production depicted the 442 Regimental Combat Team, which was made up of young Nisei soldiers who fought the Axis foes in southern Italy. The narrative couples these Japanese Americans with a white U.S. lieutenant who reluctantly serves as the platoon leader (early on, a colonel instructs him not to refer to his men as "Japs") but soon comes to respect them for their bravery in battle. The film provides an uneven representation of race, as it largely relies on a single protagonist in presenting (American) whiteness while utilizing a band of Japanese Americans to construct the Japanese American Other. In the film's formulation, the Nisei can only be protagonized as a collective (not as a single person). The cultural conversion of the prejudiced white lieutenant also exposes the film's "racial limits." As T. Fujitani notes, the admiration and tolerance expressed by the white protagonist conformed to a "discourse . . . that countenanced cultural difference as long as it did not upset the top of the racial hierarchy."³⁸ Yet, in part for starring five Nisei veterans of the actual 442nd Battalion, the final product pleased occupation censors. Without hesitation, the CIE cleared this film as a "reorientation" picture to reward its treatment of the Nisei in the U.S. military.³⁹

INVENTING WHITENESS

Hollywood was sensitive to the politics of the Occupation. Understanding that SCAP's support was essential to its business in Japan, MPEA studios, although not always pleased with the criticism, complied with most requests for change. Hollywood's conciliatory attitude was

also evident in the CMPE's SCAP-friendly attitude. In arranging the filmic programs, the distributor paired feature films with CIE films and educational newsreels that showcased world news and pro-American messages. The CMPE also promoted its features as both educational and entertaining texts. In a full-page magazine ad, the CMPE boasted of its "adaptation of best sellers [and] acclaimed theatrical dramas" as well as "music, sports, dance, science, [and] American history." In other words, Hollywood offered "the best guidebook with which to learn about American culture."⁴⁰ U.S. studios were confident about the results of these "pedagogical" endeavors. In 1951 Charles Mayer confidently reported: "Our pictures have had a vitalizing effect on the thought of the [Japanese] people, and a very far-reaching direct and indirect influence on the national life of Japan in the direction of democracy."⁴¹

Yet the cultural kaleidoscope that Hollywood offered was not an egalitarian worldview but a hegemonic construction that celebrated white achievements over those of others. In the words of Daniel Bernardi, the "U.S. cinema has consistently constructed whiteness, the representational and narrative form of Eurocentrism, as the norm by which all 'Others' fail by comparison."⁴² The process of privileging whiteness has involved the diffusion of European ethnicities and nationalities and their integration in the broader rubric of a white America. It has also been shaped by the exoticization, marginalization, and erasure of nonwhites, such as Africans, African Americans, and Native Americans. This exercise of power did not only take place in the spheres of film production and on-screen representation. In the process of distribution and promotion, the CMPE actively employed a similar procedure to influence the minds of Japanese consumers. Hollywood's racial formations are particularly visible in the CMPE's Japanese-language newsletters and press sheets, which circulated widely to augment publicity campaigns.

The hegemonic process could be seen, first, with the celebration of white America. U.S. films often developed flattering portraits of representative Americans, praising them as honest, caring, and benevolent individuals. This was the case for *Young Mr. Lincoln* (1939). This biopic dramatized the log-cabin president's early career. A caring lawyer who strives to defend an innocent family from a murder charge, Lincoln, performed by Henry Fonda, is presented as an honest and pure-hearted man. The CMPE's press sheet underscored this attribute by boosting the hero as "warm," "sincere," and saturated with "humanism."⁴³ The same could be said of *Pride of the Yankees* (1943). This Sam Wood biopic

dramatized baseball legend Lou Gehrig's emergence from humble beginnings to become Yankee first baseman; the film ends with Gehrig's famous speech at Yankee Stadium, which he gave after learning that he had to retire because of a mysterious illness (ALS, now commonly known as Lou Gehrig's disease). What particularly stood out in the narrative, according to the CMPE, was the "sincere" and "warm" characterization of the baseball star, who would teach viewers the "joy to live as human beings." *Pride of the Yankees* celebrated a white American icon whose path in life seemed to resonate with people around the world.⁴⁴

Sergeant York (1941) turned to American heroics in World War I. It depicted the life story of Alvin York, a poor Tennessee farmer who wins a Congressional Medal of Honor for single-handedly capturing 132 German soldiers in the European trenches. In dealing with a biopic that used World War I as a pretext to address interventionist politics on the eve of the Pearl Harbor attack, the CMPE stressed that the film, which starred Gary Cooper, was "not merely a war film that worshipped a hero."⁴⁵ According to the distributor, the narrative—just as *Young Mr. Lincoln* and *Pride of the Yankees* did with their biographical subjects—"sincere[ly]" depicted "York the human being" and highlighted the "beauty of emotion and love" that surrounded the "humble" and "pure-hearted" protagonist. Additionally, the distributor made special note of the scene in which York objects to military service due to his religious convictions. Stressing that such a "film with an antiwar theme" would not have been made in "militaristic Japan," the CMPE touted this white man's story as an emblem of "America's humanism," even though it involved the theme of war.⁴⁶

While celebrating the achievements of famous white Americans, the CMPE also released films that touted community life. Rosy depictions of American life often focused on white families and neighborhoods with little ethnic and racial diversity. One example was *State Fair* (1945), a Rogers and Hammerstein musical that followed the Frake family's trip to the Iowa State Fair, where the daughter meets the love of her life, the son rekindles romantic feelings with a childhood sweetheart, the father wins a competition with his prize boar, and the mother reigns triumphant in a "pickle and mincemeat" contest. This joyous story in which non-whites were virtually absent depicted "the center of provincial farm culture and provincial popular entertainment since the early days of American development," according to the press sheet.⁴⁷ The CMPE

regarded this 1945 Technicolor picture as an ideal vehicle for boosting Hollywood's image. Shortly before the film's release, Charles Mayer penned a letter to General MacArthur to urge the Supreme Commander to "make a statement for the press that *State Fair* gives a true and wholesome picture of American home life." In so doing, Mayer intimated that the white small-town farmer in Iowa represented the norms of American everyday life.⁴⁸

The presentation of American beneficence and humanitarianism as a contribution by whites required another procedure: the dilution and removal of European ethnic difference. Hollywood films such as *Boys Town* (1938) underwent this cultural process. The film was based on the real-life story of Father Edward Flanagan, a Catholic priest who beats the odds to construct a boys' self-run orphanage. The narrative focused on Flanagan's tireless efforts to build and run this facility in the face of financial and social difficulties. There is little mention of the protagonist's Irish origins; thus, in this narrative, the Irish, to borrow the words of Noel Ignatiev, "became white."⁴⁹ While erasing Flanagan's "Irishness," the film crafted the drama as an American ("national") story. In the press sheet, the CMPE's Tamura Yukihiko noted that *Boys Town* "teaches us" the "proactive nature of Americans." According to Tamura, the protagonist seemed to exemplify the following attitude: "State without hesitation that you don't like something if there is something you don't like. Then work hard yourself to improve on it. This is the true freedom and democracy."⁵⁰ Another example was *The Story of Alexander Graham Bell* (1939). Set in Boston during the mid-1870s, this biopic largely downplayed the inventor's Scottish background and chose to underscore his trials and tribulations as an American in developing the telephone. The press sheet treated Bell as an "inventor of the telephone whom America is proud of." Hollywood reinforced America's "ownership" of this ethnically liminal innovator.⁵¹

The diffusion of ethnic difference also occurred in community-oriented narratives such as *Our Town* (1940). Set in Grover's Corner, New Hampshire—a "very ordinary town" as noted by one of its characters—the film adaptation of a Thornton Wilder play presented an everyday drama of small-town America involving romance, marriage, death, and life. Although someone mentions a Polish town located in the vicinity, the narrative actually makes little use of this place. Not surprisingly, the CMPE had little to say about ethnic diversity. Instead, it pointed out the presence of the narrator who, facing the camera, directly engages the

movie audience. Additionally, it lauded the film's teaching of "the significance of life" based on a story about a "typical American small city [town]." ⁵² Ethnic difference was more apparent in *I Remember Mama*, in which a woman novelist reminisces about her upbringing in a Norwegian American immigrant family in San Francisco. Although the main characters display their ethnicity via their heavy accents, the CMPE's press sheet chose to promote the film mainly as a story about a "poor but bright family in San Francisco." The highlight of the narrative is the mother (played by Irene Dunne). The distributor simply underscored the "warm affection of family centered around a beautiful mother." ⁵³

The CMPE's construction and presentation of whiteness involved more than the "whitening" of European immigrants. It also entailed the suppression and masking of ethnic and "national" characteristics from whites in international contexts. *Song of Love* (1947), a biopic about Clara and Robert Schumann, dramatized the pianist wife's devotion to her composer-husband. Although set in nineteenth-century Bavaria, the film "Americanized" the protagonists. This could be seen in the characters' dialogue in English (with, and sometimes almost without, "European" accent) and their use of the U.S. unit of measure ("feet") and currency ("the dollar") in the dialogue. In advertising the film, the CMPE pointed out another element of "Americanization": Schumann's "brightness" (*akarusa*) and "humanity" (*ningensei*) that rendered the film "most fun" and "wonderful." Such "American-ness" that director Clarence Brown presented, noted the distributor, rendered the film worthy of viewing. ⁵⁴ *Sister Kenny* (1946) dealt with an Australian nurse who fought to heal children infected with polio despite her ridicule by the medical profession. Much of the publicity discourse de-emphasized Kenny's country of origin and urged viewers to simply appreciate the "fun and beauty in life" that was embedded in this movie. As could be seen in the Japanese title of this film, *Sekai no haha* (Mother of the World), the CMPE downplayed Kenny's Australian identity and largely treated her as a ubiquitous white woman. ⁵⁵

ERASING BLACKNESS

Hollywood's melting-pot whiteness diffused the differences among European ethnic subgroups, but it was still inclusive of them. By contrast, Africans and African Americans were largely excluded. In Oc-

cupied Japan, this resulted in the general absence of blacks from the screen. During the early postwar era, Hollywood actually began to produce a growing body of provocative pictures that directly engaged with race and racism. Pictures like *Crossfire* (1947) and *Gentleman's Agreement* (1948) exposed the widespread existence of anti-Semitism in the United States and earned noteworthy attention at the Academy Awards. Others cast a spotlight on the plight of African Americans. *Home of the Brave* (1949), for example, told a story of racism against blacks in the U.S. military, while *Lost Boundaries* (1949) and *Pinky* (1949) depicted the struggles of light-featured African Americans who could “pass” as whites. According to Donald Bogle, these social-problem films helped shape an era that “broke the most ground of all for blacks in American films.”⁵⁶

Curiously, the Japanese public encountered none of these films during the Occupation. Instead, the filmic lineup, for the most part, functioned to marginalize blacks from the white mainstream. This could be seen, first, in narratives of colonial and imperial adventures, such as *King Solomon's Mines* (1950). Based on Henry Rider Haggard's popular novel, this MGM film depicted British adventurer Allan Quartermain's quest to find a secret treasure buried in a mysterious “dark country” in the heart of Africa. While integrating a romance plot involving Quartermain and an Englishwoman who hires him to look for her missing husband in this uncharted territory, the narrative portrays most Africans as expendable, faceless, and incomprehensible beings. The film's emphasis on white colonial exploits apparently did not sit well with occupation censors, who refused to regard the film as a “reorientation” film. This led the CMPE to stress the film's “excellent photography”—partly shot on location in Africa—as well as its “superior” entertainment quality that seemed to inject “happiness into the lives of millions throughout the world.” This might be read as a tacit admission of the film's racial mis-treatments.⁵⁷

The *Tarzan* film series also came with similarly racialized traits. Despite the resistance of censors, some fourteen Tarzan films were screened in Occupied Japan. For features that involved the presence of Africans, the CMPE referred to them as “earth people” (*dojin*), but generally it chose not to underscore their presence in the marketing campaign.⁵⁸ Instead, as was done with *King Solomon's Mines*, the distributor touted the films' other highlights. For example, the ad campaign for *Tarzan and the Huntress* (1947) stressed the presence of “a great number of animals

who will display their interesting ecology.” The list included “lions, zebras, hyenas, panthers, elephants, monkeys, water bulls, deer, bears, rhinos, American panthers, hippos, raccoons, etc.” To exhibitors, the CMPE particularly urged tie-in campaigns with local zoos.⁵⁹ For other Tarzan films, the CMPE emphasized discourses of gender and sexuality over race. In *Tarzan and the Leopard Woman* (1946), for instance, Tarzan is captured by a cult in Africa headed by a mysterious “leopard woman.” The CMPE mounted a publicity campaign around this exoticized character, performed by Venezuelan actress Acquanetta. In the press sheet her character was presented as a “sensual naked woman,” but little was mentioned of her race. The CMPE privileged her sexual attributes over her identity as a nonwhite Other.⁶⁰

The fate of African Americans was not that different. In the process of film selection, few “black” or “ethnic” films—let alone social-problem films—actually entered Japan. A notable exception was *Stormy Weather* (1943), a story about black musical entertainment. A celebration of the “magnificent contribution of the colored race to the entertainment . . . world during the past twenty-five years” (as noted by a magazine that appears in the film), it wove the musical performances of Bill Robinson, Lena Horne, Cab Calloway, and Fats Waller (among others) into a narrative about a pair of ambitious African American men who yearn to reap success in show business. This was a path-breaking film that enlisted an all-black cast and featured a constellation of their stage performances. Even though the film ironically functioned to reinforce racial divisions by “blackening” the field of American popular music, the CMPE naturally touted the “song and dance and piano and tap-dancing and revues” presented by “Negroes” (*niguro*). The distributor ultimately promised an “extravagant musical parade that would thoroughly satisfy [you with] jazz.”⁶¹

This effort to present jazz as black performance may not be surprising from our contemporary viewpoint, but it stood out as unique in Occupied Japan, as Hollywood often identified the musical genre as a white creation. One could see this tendency, for instance, in *Rhapsody in Blue* (1945), a biopic about George Gershwin. Dealing with the New York-born composer’s rise to international fame as a jazz composer, the narrative underscored Gershwin’s training in classical music, while mentioning little of the inspiration he gained from African American music. The CMPE amplified the transatlantic connection by titling the film in Japanese *Amerika kōkyōgaku* (American Symphony) and foregrounding

the white cast of characters—Robert Alda, Joan Leslie, and Paul Whiteman—in publicity. At the same time, the narrative also limited the discourse on Gershwin's Jewishness and did little to demonstrate the United States as a multiethnic state. Thus, when the CMPE boasted that *Rhapsody in Blue* is a film with the "true essence of jazz," the musical genre was presented as a white formulation.⁶² Gershwin himself was portrayed as a sincere and hard-working "white American."

The "whitening" of jazz can also be seen in *The Jolson Story* (1947). This biopic about Al Jolson featured the famous minstrel singer's rise to fame from burlesque performer to Broadway celebrity to movie star. In contrast to *Rhapsody in Blue*, the Jolson biopic devoted considerable attention to the protagonist's Jewish origins by making note of his actual name (Asa Yoelson) and allotting conspicuous roles for his tradition-abiding parents. But Jolson's success, according to the narrative, owed to his adoption of an "Americanized" name and life away from his parents' Washington, D.C. home—first in New York and then in Los Angeles. Another reason for his success is his "discovery" of jazz in New Orleans. During his stint as a minstrel performer, Jolson witnesses a lively jam session for the first time and gains inspiration. Impressed with the performance of unnamed African Americans, Jolson seeks to infuse his shows with their creative acts despite having a reluctant producer. He finally does so by quitting his job in the minstrel-show circuit. Yet beyond the brief encounter in the Big Easy, African Americans show up very little in the film, which the CMPE championed as a chronicle of "America's national treasure-singer," "the greatest singer in America," and an "epic music [film] . . . for jazz fans!"⁶³ In the end, an assimilated white man once again became the face of the hybrid musical genre.

DEALING WITH THE INDIAN

While marginalizing blacks from the screens, Hollywood devoted considerable effort to spreading westerns in the Japanese market. Between 1946 and 1951, the CMPE released 80 westerns out of a total of 619 feature films—the proportion of films of this genre during this era reached some 13 percent.⁶⁴ For Hollywood, it made good business sense to shower consumers with shoot-'em-up action, as the western had been popular in Japan since the prewar era. Indeed, the most popular film released by the CMPE during its first six months was *Tall in the Saddle*, a John Wayne western that was exhibited in spite of SCAP's

opposition.⁶⁵ Yet, from the distributor's standpoint, there were two problems with the genre. First, SCAP was highly ambivalent about the presentation of violence, revenge, and racism against nonwhites. Second, these action-heavy narratives had unquestionable success among the "mass" (*taishū*) audiences, but they seemed to lack the patronage of the "intelligentsia" or "learned class" (*chishikisō* or *chishiki kaisō*).⁶⁶ These two difficulties raised questions as to how to present Native Americans—often used in films to represent an obstacle to the "advancement" of white civilization—in the marketing campaigns.

The CMPE handled Native Americans in two ways. First, it downplayed their existence. This occurred with notable "A" films that were armed with strong name value, such as *Stagecoach*. This John Ford-directed western was first released in Japan in 1939 and became a major hit there as it had been in the United States. Confident in the product, the CMPE chose to emphasize one selling point: the film's title. As one publicity blurb read, "There is no *Stagecoach* before *Stagecoach*, and no *Stagecoach* after *Stagecoach*!"⁶⁷ In banking on the drawing power of the narrative's label, the CMPE decided not to exploit the Apaches' dangerous assault on the zooming coach nor to stress the diversity of American society as represented by the six frightened passengers riding in the transportation vehicle.⁶⁸ The presence of Native Americans was also downplayed in the promotion campaign of *Yellow Sky* (1948), a 20th Century-Fox western that concerns a group of gold-seeking outlaws. The press sheet urged exhibitors to stress the "great name value" of the stars—Gregory Peck, Ann Baxter, and Richard Widmark—as well as the film's "high artistic value" that separated it from "B westerns." The Apache raid—once again, a highlight of the film—did not become the main selling point.⁶⁹

At the same time, the suppression of conflict between whites and Indians also occurred with certain "B" films that appeared as marketable beyond the "masses." This could be seen, for example, in the publicity for *Union Pacific* (1939), which dramatized the construction of the first transcontinental railroad. In this Paramount western, the Union Pacific's attempts to lay the tracks across the Great Plains are hindered by two forces: the henchmen of a rival railroad company who repeatedly obstruct the operation and attacks by Sioux. In the press sheet, the CMPE did not refrain from hyping the Indian attack. One promotional blurb touted how the white heroes of the story "fight through the obstacles caused by the wild Indians." Yet the distributor more actively celebrated

the film as a “history of railroad construction.” Noting the “extravagant and modern facilities” with which contemporary trains were equipped, the distributor promised that the film would reveal the “blood and sweat” that went to this ambitious engineering project. Learning this history, stated the press sheet, was “necessary for . . . the youth.” In underscoring this content, the CMPE instructed exhibitors and publicists “not to emphasize the racial struggle [*minzoku tōsō*] between Indians and whites too strongly in print.” The official reason was clear: “Today we are in [an era of] peace after war.”⁷⁰

Comanche Territory (1950) also involved sensitive marketing. Loosely based on the life story of James Bowie, the film dramatized the white protagonists’ attempts to peacefully negotiate a new treaty with the Comanche in order to obtain rights for silver mining. Trouble arises, however, when a seamy (white) mine seeker tries to wipe out the Native Americans by coaxing them to give up their weapons. The film ends as Bowie and the villain’s sister save the Indians by returning their munitions during the climactic standoff. The existence of Indian conflict prompted the distributor to exploit the Native American angle. It thus titled the film in Japanese *Komanchi zoku no ikari* (Rage of the Comanche) and recommended that publicists stress the portrayed “struggle between whites and Indians.” But, while doing so, the CMPE also claimed that the forthcoming piece “depicted . . . the cooperation of the two parties,” specifically the Texas folk hero and the elderly Comanche chief Quisima. Despite the presence of white malice and Indian rage, the press sheet claimed that the film “sung in triumph for humanism [*nin-gensei*] and justice.”⁷¹

Second, Hollywood played up the violence of Native Americans. This tactic was used for films that appeared to lack marketability to the “intelligentsia.” Examples of this type of western grew abundant as the volume of westerns increased during the second half of the Occupation. The press sheet of *Bad Bascomb*, for instance, made note of the “hand-to-hand fight with the raiding Indians.”⁷² *Ambush*, which in Japan was entitled *Apacchi zoku no saigo* (The end of the Apache tribe), earned wide publicity as a “heroic” (*yūsō*) story about the “fierce clash” (*gekitō*) and “annihilation” (*senmetsu*) of the Native American villains.⁷³ The CMPE highlighted the presence of Native Americans in *Canyon Passage* (1946) by retitling it *Indian keikoku* (Indian valley); ad texts did not fail to stress the whites’ “fierce struggles with Indians!”⁷⁴ The press sheet of *Fury at Furnace Creek* (1948), a rugged western with Victor Mature, altered

viewers to the “vicious assault of the Apaches,” who were the “most bold and vicious among the belligerent Indians.”⁷⁵ *Omaha Trail* (1942), a decidedly “mass-oriented” MGM western about the business of ox-train transport companies in the West, promised not only a “bloody and raw competition of stagecoach companies” but also a “spectacle of Indian attack.”⁷⁶

Native Americans were not an essential ingredient of the Hollywood western, but U.S. filmmakers often turned to them to create tension and enhance the drama of the narrative. As noble or bloodthirsty “savages,” they served as a “clearly definable Other” against an “immigrant nation where the Euro-American is anything but homogeneous,” according to Jacquelyn Kilpatrick.⁷⁷ The tactics used in presenting the “Hollywood Indian” in Occupied Japan were not monolithic but dual. On one end, conflict with Indians was downplayed (or suppressed) even if it fared significantly on the screens. This was evident in the marketing of “A” films that boasted considerable drawing power and of some “B” films that were expected to perform well beyond attracting “mass” audiences. The cultural politics of the Occupation also affected the decision to de-emphasize racial conflict. On the other end, the distributor sensationalized violence and tension involving Native Americans. This publicity tactic applied to the other, primarily “mass-oriented” (*taishū muke*), “B” films that were devoid of appeal for “intellectual” moviegoers. Ultimately, both promotional paths marginalized the Native American. Their role and significance were secondary to that of the white protagonists of Hollywood narratives.

CONCLUSION

The Occupation of Japan was a transformative event. U.S. efforts for reform—political, economic, and cultural—were powerful and far-reaching. Described by one political scientist as “one of the world’s most radical experiments,” General MacArthur’s operation contributed to Japan’s dynamic shift from being a war-mongering Axis empire to a largely demilitarized, democratic-oriented state.⁷⁸ This helped shape a “solid pro-American consciousness” in Japan during much of the post-war era.⁷⁹ Yet the Occupation was also an endeavor with limits. This was created in part by SCAP’s suppression of union activities, prioritization of corporate reconstruction, and assault against left-wing movements in the name of a “reverse course.” The shortcomings of the Occupation also

surfaced in the arena of race. While arguing for equality, democracy, and tolerance, SCAP celebrated white contributions to society while treating nonwhites as secondary actors within an imagined racial hierarchy. MacArthur's famous (and infamous) statement at the Senate hearings did not appear in a void. Rather, it exemplified the cultural assumptions and beliefs that U.S. occupationaires brought to Japan from the other side of the Pacific.

Hollywood offers us a window to understanding U.S. racialized thinking during the Occupation. A "chosen instrument" of the U.S.-led operation, it dispersed a wide array of genres, stars, and ideas across Japanese cities. Yet, while promising the presentation of "culture" and "democracy," U.S. studios by and large disseminated a worldview that revolved around the construction of a melting-pot whiteness. This process occurred together with the diffusing of European ethnic difference, the marginalization of Africans and African Americans, as well as the suppression and sensationalizing of Native Americans. Overall, Hollywood's construction of whiteness over the nonwhite Other demonstrates the limits of the American Occupation. It shows how Japan's defeat in a "war without mercy" did not put an end to racism or racial thinking but, rather, inaugurated a new era of American racial (re-)imagination—one that remained uneven and unequal despite claims otherwise.⁸⁰

NOTES

¹ Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the U.S. Senate, 82nd Cong. (1951), 310–11 (statement of Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers).

² John W. Dower, *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon, 1986), esp. 293–317; Naoko Shibusawa, *America's Geisha Ally: Reimagining the Japanese Enemy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006). Although not specifically about Japan, also see Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945–1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

³ Michael Cullen Green, *Black Yanks in the Pacific: Race in the Making of American Military Empire after World War II* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), 1–108; Yukiko Koshiro, *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Michiko Takeuchi, "'Pan-Pan Girls' Performing and Resisting Neocolonialism(s) in the Pacific Theater: U.S. Military Prostitution in Occupied Japan, 1945–1952," in *Over There: Living with the U.S. Military Empire from World War II to the Present*, ed. Maria Höhn, and Seungsook Moon (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 78–108.

⁴ *Sentoraru nyūsu* 2, n.d., 3. I have discussed this topic at length in Hiroshi Kitamura, *Screening Enlightenment: Hollywood and the Cultural Reconstruction of Defeated*

Japan (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010). In this essay I offer an analysis of the racial dimensions that shaped Hollywood's Occupation-era campaign, a subject I explore only sparsely in the aforementioned book.

⁵ On Hollywood's handling of race, see Harry M. Benshoff and Sean Griffin, *America on Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender and Sexuality at the Movies*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 49–164; Daniel Bernardi, ed., *The Birth of Whiteness: Race and the Emergence of U.S. Cinema* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1996); Thomas Cripps, *Slow Fade to Black: The Negro in American Film, 1900–1942* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977); Yunte Huang, *Charlie Chan: The Untold Story of the Honorable Detective and His Rendezvous with American History* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010); and Diane Negra, *Off-White Hollywood: American Culture and Ethnic Female Stardom* (New York: Routledge, 2001). For general discussions of race in the United States, see, for example, George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1971); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formations in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 1994); and David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class*, new ed. (London: Verso, 2007).

⁶ For general works on the Occupation, see John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton and the New Press, 1999); Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); and Eiji Takemae, *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and Its Legacy* (New York: Continuum, 2002).

⁷ Kyoko Hirano, *Mr. Smith Goes to Tokyo: Japanese Cinema under the American Occupation, 1945–1952* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992).

⁸ Clayton R. Koppes and Gregory D. Black, *Hollywood Goes to War: How Politics, Profits, and Propaganda Shaped World War II Movies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

⁹ Kitamura, *Screening Enlightenment*, 22–29.

¹⁰ *Asahi shinbun*, March 28, 1958, 9.

¹¹ DA (CSCAD EXEC) to SCAP (FOR FOX), February 24, 1949, box 5072, folder 2, Records of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, Record Group 331, National Archives II, College Park, Maryland (hereafter cited as SCAP Records, NA). Charles Mayer to Irving Maas, May 12, 1949, Motion Picture Association for America General Correspondences, roll 14, Special Collections, Margaret Herrick Library, Los Angeles (hereafter cited as MPAA General Correspondences, MHL).

¹² CIE Teleconference, TT 6895, August 29, 1946, box 743, Records of the Civil Affairs Division, Record Group 165, National Archives II, College Park (hereafter cited as CAD Records, NA).

¹³ CCD Memorandum, March 3, 1947, box 8578, folder 33, SCAP Records, NA.

¹⁴ CIE Teleconference, TT 6895, August 29, 1946, CAD Records, NA.

¹⁵ CCD, "Manual for censors of Motion Picture Department," August 15, 1946, box 8603, folder 7, SCAP Records, NA.

¹⁶ Donald Nugent to Mayer, February 10, 1951, box 5088, folder 16, SCAP Records, NA.

¹⁷ CAD Checklist, "Feature films under consideration for overseas use," n.d., box 5072, folder 2, SCAP Records, NA.

¹⁸ Harry Slott to Yukihiro Tamura, August 19, 1948, box 5035, folder 9, SCAP Records, NA.

¹⁹ Slott to Mayer and William Schwartz, September 24, 1949, box 5305, folder 3, SCAP Records, NA; CAD Checklist, box 5072, folder 2, SCAP Records, NA; Slott to Mayer, April 17, 1950, box 5308, folder 13, SCAP Records, NA; William C. Rogers to Francis Harmon, October 6, 1948, roll 13, MPAA General Correspondences, MHL.

²⁰ Thomas Doherty, *Projections of War: Hollywood, American Culture, and World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 133–39.

²¹ Heide Fehrenbach, *Cinema in Democratizing Germany: Reconstructing National Identity after Hitler* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 261–64.

²² Memorandum by Walter Mihata, April 29, 1947, box 8579, folder 38, SCAP Records, NA.

²³ Slott to Takada, January 29, 1948, box 5304, folder 12, SCAP Records, NA.

²⁴ Slott to Tamura and Takada, December 13, 1949, box 5305, folder 9, SCAP Records, NA.

²⁵ CCD Memorandum, March 3, 1947, box 8578, folder 33, SCAP Records, NA.

²⁶ Report by Slott, July 2, 1948, box 5305, folder 8, SCAP Records, NA.

²⁷ Nugent to Mayer, August 28, 1951, box 5088, folder 15, SCAP Records, NA.

²⁸ Nugent to Mayer, November 4, 1950, box 5081, CIE(B)-08389, Records of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, National Diet Library, Tokyo (hereafter cited as SCAP Records, NDL).

²⁹ OIC, MPU to Chief, Info Div, April 17, 1951, box 5231, folder 3, SCAP Records, NA.

³⁰ Note how European imperialism is depicted as a gendered project, with white male conquerors itching to take over feminized lands beyond the boundaries of civilization. See Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

³¹ K. C. Grew to Tom Blakemore, November 25, 1950, box 5081, CIE(B)-08388, SCAP Records, NDL.

³² CIE Memorandum to Kenneth R. Dyke, October 31, 1945, CIE, “Consolidated Report of Civil Information and Education Section Activities, 11 Oct 1945–1 Dec 1945,” unpublished document collection, SCAP Records, NDL.

³³ Notes on Conference of Wadsworth, Putnam, Blake, Dibella, Kunzman, Costello, Conde, March 11, 1946, box 8520, folder 8, SCAP Records, NA.

³⁴ A. L. Caplan to Nugent, November 16, 1950, box 5081, CIE(B)-08388, SCAP Records, NDL.

³⁵ Grew to Caplan, November 22, 1950, box 5081, CIE(B)-08388, SCAP Records, NDL.

³⁶ CIE Teleconference, April 16, 1948, TT9367, CAD Records, NA; Rogers to Harmon, October 6, 1948, roll 13, MPAA General Correspondences, MHL.

³⁷ CCD, “CCD Monthly Report,” February 1–29, 1948, box 8565, folder 5, SCAP Records, NA.

³⁸ T. Fujitani, “*Go for Broke*, the Movie: Japanese American Soldiers in U.S. National, Military, and Racial Discourses,” in *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*, ed. T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001), 251.

³⁹ Nugent to Mayer, July 21, 1951, box 5088, CIE(B)-00837, SCAP Records, NDL.

⁴⁰ *Eiga no tomo*, October 1947, back cover.

⁴¹ Mayer to G. P. Waller, May 23, 1951, box 7494, folder 22, SCAP Records, NA.

⁴² Daniel Bernardi, “Introduction: Race and the Emergence of U.S. Cinema,” in Bernardi, *Birth of Whiteness*, 5.

⁴³ CMPE, press sheet of *Young Mr. Lincoln*, n.d.

- ⁴⁴ *MPEA News* 29, March 1, 1949, 2.
- ⁴⁵ Doherty, *Projections of War*, 100–103; CMPE, press sheet of *Sergeant York*, n.d.
- ⁴⁶ CMPE, press sheet of *Sergeant York*, n.d.
- ⁴⁷ CMPE, press sheet of *State Fair*, n.d.
- ⁴⁸ Mayer to MacArthur, August 24, 1948, “MPEA” folder, OMS Correspondence, SCAP Papers, RG-5, Records of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, MacArthur Memorial Library, Norfolk, Virginia.
- ⁴⁹ Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White*, 4.
- ⁵⁰ CMPE, press sheet of *Boys Town*, n.d.
- ⁵¹ CMPE, press sheet of *The Story of Alexander Bell*, n.d.
- ⁵² *MPEA News* 7, n.d., 3.
- ⁵³ CMPE, press sheet of *I Remember Mama*, n.d.
- ⁵⁴ *MPEA News* 28, February 1, 1949, 2.
- ⁵⁵ CMPE, press sheet of *Sister Kenny*, n.d.
- ⁵⁶ Donald Bogle, *Toms, Coons, Mulattoes, Mammies, and Bucks: An Interpretive History of Blacks in American Films*, new exp. ed. (New York: Continuum, 1993), 118.
- ⁵⁷ Extract from letter by Maas, August 8, 1951, box 5233, folder 2, SCAP Records, NA.
- ⁵⁸ CMPE, press sheet of *Tarzan and the Leopard Woman*, n.d.
- ⁵⁹ CMPE, press sheet of *Tarzan and the Huntress*, n.d. Also see CMPE, press sheet of *Tarzan and the Desert Mystery*, n.d.
- ⁶⁰ CMPE, press sheet of *Tarzan and the Leopard Woman*, n.d.
- ⁶¹ CMPE, press sheet of *Stormy Weather*, n.d. For more on the mixed “success” of this path-breaking film, see Arthur Knight, *Disintegrating the Musical: Black Performance and American Musical Film* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002), 110–19.
- ⁶² *Sentoraru nyūsu* 4, n.d., 2.
- ⁶³ CMPE, press sheet of *The Jolson Story*, n.d.
- ⁶⁴ Kitamura, *Screening Enlightenment*, 68.
- ⁶⁵ *CMPE News* 1, n.d., 1.
- ⁶⁶ CMPE, press sheet of *Yellow Sky*, n.d.; CMPE, press sheet of *Pursued*, n.d.
- ⁶⁷ CMPE, press sheet of *Stagecoach*, n.d.
- ⁶⁸ Lary May, *The Big Tomorrow: Hollywood and the Politics of the American Way* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 89.
- ⁶⁹ CMPE, press sheet of *Yellow Sky*, n.d.
- ⁷⁰ CMPE, press sheet of *Union Pacific*, n.d.
- ⁷¹ CMPE, press sheet of *Comanche Territory*, n.d.
- ⁷² CMPE, press sheet of *Bad Bascomb*, n.d.
- ⁷³ CMPE, press sheet of *Ambush*, n.d.
- ⁷⁴ CMPE, press sheet of *Canyon Passage*, n.d.
- ⁷⁵ CMPE, press sheet of *Fury at Furnace Creek*, n.d.
- ⁷⁶ CMPE, press sheet of *Omaha Trail*, n.d.
- ⁷⁷ Jacquelyn Kilpatrick, *Celluloid Indians: Native Americans and Film* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), xvi.
- ⁷⁸ Susan J. Pharr, “The Politics of Women’s Rights,” in *Democratizing Japan: The Allied Occupation*, ed. Robert Ward and Yoshikazu Sakamoto (Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 1987), 222. Pharr uses this phrase to discuss SCAP’s efforts to instill new rights and opportunities for women.
- ⁷⁹ Yoshimi Shun’ya, *Shinbei to hanbei: Sengo Nihon no seijiteki muishiki* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2007), 13.
- ⁸⁰ Dower, *War without Mercy*.

â€œAmericaâ€™s Racial Limits: U.S. Cinema and the Occupation of Japan,â€ Japanese Journal of. 1. October 2013.Â Selected Professional Presentations â€œThe Hong Kong Trilogy and the Triangular Politics of Japan, Hong Kong, and the United States,â€ â€œTransnational Currents of US-China Relationsâ€ conference, Hong Kong University, November 16, 2013. â€œâ€™Gassakuâ€™ to â€™koraborâ€™shonâ€™ no poritikusu: Sengo no Hariuddo, Nihon, Honkon eiga ni tsuiteâ€™ [The Politics of Co-production and Collaboration: A Study on Hollywood, Japanese, and Hong Kong Cinema after World War II], invited speaker at the Japan-in-Asia Cultural Research Center, Nagoya University, July 22, 2013 [in Japanese]. Was the Occupation limited to Japanâ€™s main islands? The islands of Hokkaido, Honshu, Shikoku, and Kyushu were under the control of the Supreme Commander Allied Powers, but the U.S. had sole authority over Okinawa (which it would retain until returning it to Japan in 1972). Former Japanese colonial possessions were divided up among other Allied nations.Â But the censorship exercised by the Occupation, the release and return to power of those arrested for war crimes and the crackdown on socialists and communists created problems that lingered long after the Occupation ended. The decision by MacArthur not to try Emperor Hirohito as a war criminal provoked anger among other allied nations. (37) Other surveys tell us that more than half of the film goers were either students or company employees (the number of unemployed film goers declined as years passed and the economy grew), although data from rural areas is somewhat lacking. (37-38). As most film goers belonged to a relatively narrow profile group, this gives Sorensen an excellent opportunity to draw a more in-depth picture of Moe-san; his or her educational background, overall wartime experiences, as well as relationship with the media can all, argues Sorensen, be reconstructed based on the film goersâ€™ average age. But the American government, which had led the Allied war effort and whose representative, General Douglas MacArthur, was named the Supreme Commander of the Occupation forces, felt that only a democratic Japan would be truly peace-loving. It was assumed that democratic countries like the United States and Great Britain were more peaceful than nondemocratic countries such as Hitler's Germany and prewar Japan under the emperor. But what makes a country "democratic"? Is a country democratic simply because of certain political institutions, like free elections and free speech? After the defeat of Japan in World War II, the United States led the Allies in the occupation and rehabilitation of the Japanese state. Between 1945 and 1952, the U.S. occupying forces, led by General Douglas A. MacArthur, enacted widespread military, political, economic, and social reforms. Allied Occupation in Japan after WWII. The groundwork for the Allied occupation of a defeated Japan was laid during the war. In a series of wartime conferences, the leaders of the Allied powers of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the Republic of China, and the United States discussed how to disarm Japan, d