



UNIVERSITY
OF WOLLONGONG
AUSTRALIA

University of Wollongong
Research Online

Faculty of Arts - Papers (Archive)

Faculty of Law, Humanities and the Arts

2007

A Very Gendered Occupation: Australian Women as “Conquerors” and “Liberators”

Christine M. De Matos

University of Wollongong, cdm@uow.edu.au

Publication Details

de Matos, C, A Very Gendered Occupation: Australian Women as ‘Conquerors’ and ‘Liberators’, *US-Japan Women's Journal*, 33, 2007, 87-107. Original journal information available [here](#)

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library:
research-pubs@uow.edu.au

A Very Gendered Occupation: Australian Women as ‘Conquerors’ and ‘Liberators’¹

[T]he power relations of gender have intertwined with those of class, race, and sexuality and...these technologies of power have been at the heart of the histories of imperialism, colonialism and nationalism shaping our modern world. (Ruth Roach Pierson & Nupur Chaudhuri, *Nation, Empire, Colony*)

The Allied Occupation of Japan (1945-1952) is usually rendered as a masculinist American exercise. Women, when portrayed, are usually Japanese and appear as victims of either Japanese patriarchy or American soldiers, or as the benefactors of Occupation reforms related to constitutional equality and suffrage. Individual American women based in the Occupation headquarters in Tokyo and involved in reforms, such as Beate Sirota Gordon, sometimes occasion mention. What is less known is how (white) women acted as occupiers and their participation in the ‘technologies’ of occupation power. The Pierson and Chaudhuri quote above refers to the need for gendered analyses of imperialism, colonialism and nationalism, but military occupation, which contains elements of all three, also needs to be gendered. Examining the technologies of occupation power, particularly the intersections of race and gender, can shed light on the practice and dissemination of power.

As Pierson and Chaudhuri again state, ‘the strategies of colonial and imperial administrators for securing “white prestige” and maintaining “white” control rested not only on the policy of rigid boundaries between colonizer and contamination from the colonized but also on the imposition of western bourgeois ideals of cleanliness and gender difference on native peoples.’² This, too, can be applied to the Occupation. This paper will examine the role of Australian women in the Australian area of administration, the Hiroshima prefecture, thus giving a gendered and non-U.S. perspective of the Occupation. In particular, the paper will focus on the complicity of Australian women through their participation in the hierarchies of power based on race and gender as ‘vindicated’ by victory in war, and in the dissemination by demonstration of western ideals of the bourgeois home. The construction of the Australian woman as the superior to the inferior Japanese ‘Other’ will be considered, despite the existence of a discursive framework that included human rights and female emancipation – discourses used to justify invasion and occupation both then and now.

Empire, Gender and Race: Constructs for Gendering the Allied Occupation of Japan

In his influential work on the Allied Occupation of Japan, *Embracing Defeat*, John W. Dower calls the Occupation the ‘last immodest exercise in the colonial conceit known as “the white man’s burden”.’³ Masculine parallels between military occupation and imperialism/colonialism are suggested by the quote: what is less apparent is the role of occupier women in exercising ‘the white woman’s burden’.⁴ In recent times literature has emerged on the intersection of race, gender and class in the imperial/colonial context, yet this is less apparent in literature on military occupation, despite some of the similarities between them. However, the body of literature that exists on imperialism/colonialism and gendered experience can be utilized to inform a gendered and racial analysis of military occupations.

The similarities between military occupation and imperialism/colonialism abound, especially in gendered constructions of power. As in the colonial context, white women went to occupied Japan as virtuous symbols of ‘civilization’,⁵ as the liberated western woman to the submissive and oppressed Japanese ‘Other’, and as agents of occupation. The relationship of western women to masculine power in the Occupation is almost indistinguishable from the colonial space. I have used a quote from McClintock, writing on women and colonialism, to demonstrate the synchronicity between the two contexts:

Colonial [Occupier] women ... barred from the corridors of formal power ... experienced the privileges and social contradictions of imperialism [occupation] very differently from colonial [occupier] men.... The vast, fissured architecture of imperialism [occupation] was gendered throughout by the fact that it was white men who made and enforced laws and policies in their own interests. Nonetheless, the rationed privileges of race all too often put white women in positions of decided – if not borrowed – power, not only over colonized [occupied] women, but also over colonized [occupied] men. As such, white women were not the hapless onlookers of empire but were ambiguously complicit both as colonizers [occupiers] and colonized [occupied], privileged and restricted, acted upon and acting.⁶

Although there were non-white occupiers (eg African-Americans, Japanese-Americans, British-Indians, New Zealand Maoris and Australian Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders), occupation power was primarily defined and controlled by white men – civilian and military – and white women's roles were defined in relation to that power.⁷ Yet, as in McClintock's quote on colonizer women, that relationship between white male and white female did provide access to a 'borrowed' or ancillary power: white women who were colonizers or occupiers "often gained opportunities lacking at home and played a central role in shaping the social relations of imperialism" [occupation] because of the contradictory experiences of being "members of the inferior sex within the superior race" in a colonial [occupation] setting.⁸ Literature on gender, race and imperialism/colonialism not only provides a theoretical framework for gendering the Occupation, but the discourse of imperialism/colonialism informed the behavior and understanding of the gendered role of the occupier. As will be shown, Australian women used the language of colonialism/imperialism to create and reinforce their privileged status as a victor and occupier over the defeated and occupied. Studies on imperialism/colonialism can help elucidate the 'multiple intersections of structures of power' and the gendered processes of 'ruling' during military occupation.⁹

Postcolonial critiques of western feminism can also aid in illuminating the experience of feminist activity during the Occupation. Mohanty cites Amos and Parmer to depict "the cultural stereotypes present in Euro-American feminist thought. The image is of the passive Asian woman, subject to oppressive practices within the Asian family with an emphasis on wanting to 'help' Asian women liberate themselves from their role...." These images illustrate the extent to which paternalism is an essential element of feminist thinking that incorporates the above [stereotype], a paternalism that can lead to the definition of priorities for women of color by Euro-American feminists.¹⁰ The universalistic feminist discourses constructed the non-white woman as unprogressive, traditional, ignorant, backward and unaware of their rights,¹¹ in contrast to western/white women as liberated, secular and independent.¹² The 'politically immature' non-western woman needed to be 'versed and schooled in the ethos of Western feminism'.¹³ In the meantime, the diversity, especially in terms of race and class, of the non-western woman was submerged in an illusion of homogeneity and thus denied 'their historical and political agency'.¹⁴ These discourses of the female 'Other' can be faithfully applied to the case of Japanese women during the Occupation in terms of their treatment and the paradigm that framed their 'emancipation' by the Allied Occupation authorities. This is despite, of course, that Japan had undergone a self-directed westernization process since the Meiji Restoration. This history was ignored in occupation rhetoric in order to justify the Occupation and the extensive reform program it engendered.

Women as Liberators

It is generally assumed across Occupation literature that gender reform was one of the key aims of the Allied Occupation of Japan. Yet, the early Occupation documents do not bear this out. The 'United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (IPSP)',¹⁵ (August 29, 1945) conveys in general terms the aims of the Occupation, including disarmament and demilitarization and the 'Encouragement of Desire for Individual Liberties and Democratic Processes'. Under the latter, it is stated that any laws that discriminate on the basis of 'race, nationality, creed or political opinion shall be abrogated'. A startling omission from this list, and indeed the rest of the document, is gender discrimination. The

later 'Basic Post-Surrender Policy for Japan (BPSP),'¹⁶ the Far Eastern Commission's revision of the IPSP (June 19, 1947, but sent to the Supreme Commander for the Occupation Forces (SCAP), General Douglas MacArthur, on June 26, 1947), similarly omits any reference to the role of women in postwar Japan or of discriminatory practices based on gender. One must conclude that gender reform was not a priority of the architects of the Occupation, but was rather an afterthought in the wider reform program, or perhaps subsumed beneath the more amorphous labels of democratization and human rights.¹⁷ It is perhaps a little ironic that a reform given little, if any, expression in the early aims of the Occupation came to be the exploited 'poster girl'¹⁸ depicting Occupation success.

Despite the above, the 'woman issue' did emerge quickly in the Occupation, with MacArthur urging the Japanese cabinet to vote for female enfranchisement as early as October 1945.¹⁹ Images of Japanese women at the voting booth have become the ubiquitous visual testimony of Occupation success and benevolence. Individual American women in GHQ/SCAP (Occupation headquarters in Tokyo) played pivotal roles in regards to women's issues, such as Beate Sirota Gordon, who was determined to have gender equity included in the U.S.-written postwar constitution. Her legacy includes the anti-discrimination clause of Article 14 (which appears to be an amended version of the IPSP), which includes a reference to discrimination based on 'sex', and Article 24, related to gender equity in marriage. Carmen Johnson is another individual woman who worked on Shikoku to 'educate' Japanese women about democratic rights. Both women have written memoirs about their experiences in occupied Japan.²⁰ It must be noted, however, that there was little acknowledgment or understanding by occupation authorities of the role of the Japanese feminist movement prior to 1945.

The Australian government had no specific policy towards women in Japan, as their focus was directed toward the emancipation of the generic Japanese worker.²¹ The only Australian feminist to visit Japan during the Occupation was Jessie Street, an internationalist and peace activist, who channeled her energies into working to gain political rights, economic independence and increased status for women world-wide via the United Nations.²² Street believed that gender equity could be gained through international treaties,²³ and it was in this capacity that she visited Japan in December 1948 (and later in 1954 to talk to *hibakusha*, survivors of the atomic bomb). There is little written record of Street's visit, but a photograph demonstrates that she had a meeting with at least six Japanese women and one other woman, most likely American, in Tokyo.²⁴ It is conceivable that Street was in Japan to check on the progress of female emancipation and to report this to the UN Status of Women Commission.

Critiques of the gender reforms initiated in occupied Japan have recently begun to emerge. In 1999, Koikari wrote a critique of the ongoing laudation of the role of occupiers such as Gordon and Johnson in both U.S. and Japanese scholarship, entitled 'Rethinking Gender and Power in the US Occupation of Japan'.²⁵ Koikari demonstrates that reforms cannot be divorced from the context of the 'enormous power inequities' that existed between the United States and Japan.²⁶ Therefore, 'emancipation' was conducted without the widespread participation or acknowledgement of a diverse range of Japanese women, many of whom had been involved with feminist movements in Japan prior to the Occupation. Additionally, as the reforms were enthusiastically conducted by American female occupiers, they exude white, Euro-Ameri-centric, patronizing, universalistic, middle-class feminism. Alternative feminisms, for example radical working class, are excluded from this dominant 'triumphant' narrative. These arguments are developed further by Koikari in 'Exporting Democracy? American women, "Feminist Reforms," and the Politics of Imperialism in the US Occupation of Japan'.²⁷ On the colonial tradition, Koikari argues that 'US and European women's reform efforts in Asia, including "feminist" interventions, were inextricably intertwined with Western imperial and colonial endeavour in the region. Western women's efforts to emancipate and civilize "other women" often originated from their perception that defined non-Western women as helpless victims without agency who were mired in premodern and uncivilized tradition, in contrast to Western women's self-image as feminist agents endowed with progressive and modern gender ideology and practice.'²⁸ Further, in the context of the Occupation, 'Japanese women were constructed as victims of the "feudalistic" tradition and male

domination in contrast to more liberated American women who enjoyed greater gender equality.... The predominant image of Japanese women was either that of geisha/prostitute or wife/mother who had been silently suffering under the centuries-old patriarchal social and cultural system.²⁹ Thus, colonial and imperial paradigms framed the Occupation reform process in Japan, ‘especially racialized and gendered discourses of Western superiority and non-Western inferiority’.³⁰

Likewise, Yoneyama has called the Occupation of Japan a ‘colonized space’ and invokes the western image of Japanese women as ‘submissive yet licentious’. Japanese women, Yoneyama argues, were constructed as objects of liberation and as recipients of American liberal feminist tutelage³¹ – taking a passive rather than active role in their own emancipation. The conferring of constitutional rights and the franchise ‘obscures the occupation as a space of unfreedom, a place of non-rights, and thus masks the paradox of its simultaneous violence and benevolence.’³² This issue is also addressed more generally by DeFranciso, who refers to the ‘ethnocentrism of outsiders attempting to speak for and presuming to empower others, through their own outside frame of reference.... By giving power to others, empowerment still connotes a controlling agent’.³³

Further, Yoneyama articulates the ‘discursive power of the dominant memory of the US-Japan war and its aftermaths’ and its ability to influence the ‘production of “just war” narratives’ to legitimize the actions of the United States and its allies in the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq. The ‘woman question’ is an integral component of this ‘just war’ narrative – the conservative American journalist George F. Will, in defending the actions of the Bush administration, wrote that the ‘liberators of Afghan women wore US battledress’.³⁴ Thus, a greater analysis of female emancipation under conditions of occupation, the attempted imposition of western feminist ideals in ‘colonized’ spaces, of the technologies of power as related to gender, class and race, and of the actual practice and direct participation of women as occupiers will not only give a more nuanced understanding of the Occupation and the practice and dissemination of power, but dismantle the narratives of emancipation that are revised, recycled, and reconstructed to legitimize further instances of war, invasion and military occupation.

Background: Australia and the Gendered Occupation

Although the United States dominated the control of the Allied Occupation of Japan, Australia also participated as an ally. Australia’s occupying forces arrived in early 1946 as a contingent of the British Commonwealth Occupation Force (BCOF) to assume the administration of Hiroshima prefecture from the United States. The Australian base was in Hiro, while the BCOF headquarters was located in Kure (both in Hiroshima prefecture). BCOF was comprised of Australian, New Zealand, British and British-Indian troops, but was always commanded by an Australian. At the height of its presence in 1946, Australia provided almost twelve thousand troops to BCOF, and forty-five thousand Australians served in Japan over the entire period – the most provided by any of the participating Commonwealth nations. Australia also contributed diplomatically to the Occupation: an Australian represented the British Commonwealth on the advisory body based in Tokyo, the Allied Council for Japan (ACJ); an Australian presided over the International Military Tribunal of the Far East; and a separate Australian delegation participated in the policy-making body for the Occupation, the Far Eastern Commission (FEC), based in Washington DC.

There are four aspects of Australian involvement in the Occupation that are integral to this paper in terms of the relations of occupation power. First, the Australian experience provides an alternative paradigm of occupation to that of the United States. Second, Australia was a subordinate power to the United States and, while they commanded BCOF, they were still viewed by both the United States and the Japanese as being submerged within the British forces and not a force in their own right, both thus affecting their status as an occupier. Third, Australia was a former colony of the British, Japan a former colonizer, which creates an interesting dynamic for relations of occupation power. Australia

also had a limited experience as a ‘colonizer’ in Papua and New Guinea. Finally and most importantly, in addition to male soldiers, Australian women came to Japan as wives, mothers, teachers, nurses/medical corps, and volunteers, the latter including the Women’s Voluntary Service, the Red Cross, and the YWCA..

Australian nurses and medical corps personnel began to arrive in Japan in April 1946, civilian women in August 1946. Particularly interesting is the phenomenon of the BCOF families in Japan. In November 1946, the Australian government approved that the wives and children of soldiers serving in Japan could join them if the soldier continued to serve at least one year in Japan after his family’s arrival.³⁵ Preparing for the arrival of the families in 1947 was a major task, with five hundred and sixty-one new buildings purposefully built and one hundred and thirty-four Japanese homes claimed and renovated.³⁶ The largest development was just outside Hiro, where a whole village was built especially for the BCOF families. It was named Nijimura, or Rainbow Village, for the colorful pastel buildings. The village was built with Japanese labor under BCOF supervision and included a church, a school, a library, a shop, a cinema, the fire brigade, a medical post, a sporting field and a playground.³⁷ A little piece of Australian suburbia was transplanted in Japan, creating a community distinct from the rest of the Japanese locals – a tangible and policed architectural barrier between occupier and occupied to reinforce the hierarchies of power and to ‘protect’ the occupiers, particularly the women and children, from the occupied.

Women as Conquerors: Practicing Grassroots Occupation Power

The remainder of this paper will direct away from the centers of occupation power (Tokyo, Washington) and toward the grassroots peripheries in Hiroshima prefecture to examine the role of Australian women as occupiers. While the Hiroshima prefecture was certainly not peripheral to the Australians, in the wider context of the Occupation it was removed from the centers of SCAP and US decision-making. ‘Grassroots’ is used for a similar reason: here we have occupiers and occupied interacting in public and private domains while undertaking their day-to-day activities, and it is in these spaces that the daily practice of occupation power can be revealed.

Australian women embarking upon their first sojourn to Japan were given a handbook called *BCOF Bound*. In the forward to this handbook, they were told they were

bringing once more to members of the Force the ties of home and family on which our Western civilization has been built.

You are coming to live in a country whose people, together with their ways of living and their ways of thinking, are vastly different from our own.³⁸

These bearers of ‘civilization’ were further simultaneously warned and reassured:

Japan is still a primitive country populated by a primitive people, and the Japanese scene is only partially coated with a thin veneer of Occidental civilization....

Initially, everything will be strange to you, but you will find that as long as you conform to the various Occupation Force instructions and live the life of the community of which you are now a member, life should be pleasant.³⁹

The ‘community’ of course referred to the BCOF community, not the Japanese one, and ‘instructions’ would include the rules of non-fraternization with Japanese locals other than for work purposes, and the relative architectural segregation of the BCOF families from local Japanese communities. While one female reporter for the *Australian Women’s Weekly* anticipated that ‘Life in Japan would be hard on soldiers’ wives,⁴⁰ the contrary proved to be the case and most wives indeed found life in Japan

quite pleasant – primarily through the allocation of domestic help to occupation households, who were referred to as the infantilized ‘housegirl’ or ‘houseboy.’

Housewives and ‘Housegirls’

In her book narrating the ‘real life’ story of an Australian soldier, Gordon Parker, and the Japanese ‘housegirl’ he married, Nobuko Sakuramoto (‘Cherry’) in occupied Japan, Carter describes an early meeting between the two:

The girl worked in a neat and careful Japanese way, sweeping and dusting, arranging medicines and drugs on the shelves, washing towels.

The second day she came, the Australian soldier Don Parker found her on her knees in the barracks dormitory cleaning his boots. She had already made his bed and folded his clothes.

He whistled. “What will they say when I tell them this back home?”

The girl smiled and bowed politely, not understanding him.

The Australian marveled at the anxious attention they were getting from the housegirls. “What do you reckon, the men don’t do any work in Japan. They make their wives do it. They just sit back and take it easy.”

Don laughed. “It’s going to be hard when we get home and have to clean our own boots ... maybe I’ll take one of them back with me!”⁴¹

The passage reveals attitudes held towards ‘Oriental’ women (as girl) that sit uncomfortably against narratives of emancipation – there an expression of envy expressed than critique of the exploitation of Japanese women. These narratives were not limited to Australian men, but also extended to Australian women. While the relationship of the Australian male occupier to the Japanese female occupied was primarily related to the sexual (prostitute, lover, wife), for the Australian female occupier it related to social status.

The Japanese government supplied male and female, though primarily the latter, domestic workers to BCOF forces and their families, free of charge (domestic worker wages were paid for by the Japanese government, but domestic workers were allocated to occupation families by BCOF authorities). Their duties included housekeeping, cooking, gardening, childcare and the like. Actual numbers assigned are unknown, but as a rough guide an Australian officer without children was entitled to three, four to officers with children, two to other ranks without children, three to other ranks with children, and men in barracks or women in dormitories shared one or two. Donnelly states, ‘it was considered undesirable for [Australian] wives to perform menial and domestic tasks, particularly as it was thought that they would be unable to cope with such duties in the hot, humid months’.⁴² The treatment of domestic workers was subject to the postwar labor reforms, and they thus were entitled to a forty hour week, paid leave of two days a month, three days menstrual leave a month (which included the two days), and six weeks pre-and-post natal leave. Domestic workers received between ¥150-250 a month. There is no obvious data to determine if these rights were upheld. Domestic workers were also required to undergo regular medical examinations⁴³ to check for contagious and sexually transmitted diseases (the Japanese woman as unclean/diseased and immoral). If a domestic worker was found to have venereal disease, she would lose her employment.⁴⁴

The use of domestic workers was one tangible, daily practice where the Australian woman as occupier could visibly construct an asymmetrical relationship with the female (or male) occupied – a space where she could exert power over other women (and men) and enjoy a privileged, high-status lifestyle that she could never have accessed in Australia.⁴⁵ Essentially, Australian women class-jumped – a case

of opportunistic, transient upward mobility where the formerly colonized (Australians) could play the role of the colonizer. The relationship constructed between Japanese and Australian women is reminiscent of what Anderson has described as Victorian English 'values': 'The employment of domestic workers meant women could negotiate the contradiction between domesticity, requiring physical labour and dirtiness, and the cleanliness and spirituality of feminine virtue. "Ladies" need servants.'⁴⁶ White, middle-class women were constructed as the 'pure, pious, moral and virtuous centre of the household' in the dichotomous mistress/domestic worker relationship, which 'helped to maintain difference: workers proved their inferiority by their physicality and dirt, while female employers proved their superiority by their femininity, daintiness, and managerial skills.'⁴⁷

The transient space of the Occupation allowed Australian housewives to pretend the life of a 'Victorian lady' and to reinforce perceptions of the superiority of the (mostly white) victorious powers over defeated Japan in the private domestic realm. The dichotomies of victor/vanquished and superior/inferior were reinforced through language. For example, domestic workers are often referred to by individuals as 'my servants' – possession is taken of the (paid) domestic worker, and the term is imbued with notions of class. 'Ownership' was claimed via Australian status as the occupier. Sometimes the more derogatory 'Jap servants' was used, which has racial, colonial and class connotations. Clear distinctions of difference between white Australian women as occupiers and Japanese occupied were defined in a similar way to that of white women in the southern United States in relation to black women.⁴⁸ As Anderson describes when referring to southern slavery, the 'master gains honour through the slaves dishonour,' and in Japan that dishonor came with defeat and was reinforced through the types of tasks and duties the Japanese performed for the occupiers. Having 'servants' raised the status of these white occupying women, not entirely dissimilar to the role slaves of the south played for white southern women.⁴⁹ This status was also reinforced by the more ubiquitous terms used to describe domestic workers: 'housegirls' or 'houseboys'. These diminutive terms, also evident in European colonial and US slavery discourse, a woman described as a girl and a man as a boy, constructed and named the unequal relationship between the occupier and occupied within the domestic or private sphere of the Occupation. The illusion of 'ownership' could be shattered when BCOF authorities would remove a domestic worker from employment without the consent of the Australian woman, for instance if a worker was found to carry a sexually transmitted disease. White occupier males still held occupation authority over both Australian and Japanese women.

Single Australian women, working as teachers, nurses and volunteers, also had access to shared domestic help. One teacher reminisced that she rarely had to do any housework herself. The only time involved ironing: 'It was a frock that needed stretching, and I couldn't explain it, so I ironed it. The only frock I ironed the whole time I was there.... You left your clothes on the floor, they'd be picked up and done.'⁵⁰ The 'housewives' had more day-to-day contact with the domestic workers in their homes, and often acted in the role of tutor to them, teaching western ways of housekeeping. This is exemplified by the publication and use of the 'handbook,' *The American Way of Housekeeping*, also used in the Australian area of occupation.⁵¹ Published with instructions in English and Japanese, *The American Way of Housekeeping* was primarily a guide for Japanese domestic workers working in occupation homes. As the Forward states, 'This book is designed to meet the everyday needs of the women who are maintaining Western households here in the East.' The expected role of the domestic worker is obvious in the language used in the instructions, for example: 'Your *mistress* will also want you to wash windows, take care of upholstery and rugs etc...Talk with your mistress about when each periodic cleaning activity should be done, and find out how she prefers to have it done.[emphasis added]'⁵² It is certain that many Japanese domestic workers would not have the English language skills to communicate with their 'mistress' that the instructions demand, nor of course the 'mistress' Japanese language skills. *The American Way of Housekeeping*, written by a group of American occupation wives, demonstrates the role of occupation women in the wider discourse and practice of democratization through westernization, in this case through the domestic sphere.

One BCOF child remembers her mother teaching their domestic workers about housekeeping and cooking: 'I remember how they watched with surprise when my mother made her deliciously light sponge cake. How did that sloppy mixture become that beautiful cake? There were several comical results from misunderstood directions from my mother. I recall some confusion about the starching of my father's uniform which eventuated in his undies also being starched.'⁵³ There were many examples of situations resulting from cultural misunderstandings, not least because of language issues. Rose O'Brien recalls a dinner party where her military police husband wanted to entertain some high ranking army officers. The domestic workers were present to serve the food:

One of the housegirls used to say all sorts of things that [she] heard the soldiers saying....and I remember once we had a dinner party at our house...so the housegirls would be in the kitchen getting the dinner and take it and give it around to the soldiers there and...one of the housegirls brought the dinner to [one of the higher ranking guests], put it down and she says: 'Here's your bloody dinner!' ...She heard 'bloody' used, you know, so she thought that was good....They got quite proficient in using all the Australian language.⁵⁴

Using the occupier's language, in this case Australian English, was a way to reclaim some power for the occupied. We will never really know whether the Japanese woman made a humorous error, or whether she engaged in a subtle form of resistance. She had broken an important rule found in *The American Way of Housekeeping*: 'It is the desire of your mistress to give her family and her guests perfectly prepared, properly dished and nicely served food, on a beautifully laid table served by spotlessly clean, quiet, efficient servants.[emphasis added]'⁵⁵

Domestic workers were often the only source of contact with Japanese for many Australian women as they were forbidden (by the rules established by the male military ostensibly for their own protection) to fraternise with the occupied. Fond relationships did often develop between BCOF children and their Japanese caretakers, and also between the Australian and Japanese women. One woman said she 'Really liked the Japanese, especially the old mama-sans, they were really nice and they were lovely to the children. Our housegirls were really good...we had young housegirls and...they really enjoyed the children.'⁵⁶ Gifts were often exchanged (especially food) and sometimes (depending on language abilities) contact was maintained after the family returned to Australia. This is a common phenomenon relationships that develop between domestic workers and their employers across time and geography, but as Anderson is quick to remind us, it is still clearly an asymmetrical relationship and an expression of 'maternalism': 'Maternalism is based on the supraordinate-subordinate relationship with the female employer caring for the worker as she would a child or a pet, thereby expressing, in a feminized way, her lack of respect for the domestic worker as an adult worker'.⁵⁷ This asymmetrical, maternalistic working relationship was intensified by the unequal Australian occupier-Asian occupied relationship and the orientalist stereotypes that accompanied it.

One of the perhaps paradoxical positive effects of close contact with Japanese women was that at the same time stereotypical images were reinforced to construct a nationalistic image of the Australian woman, other stereotypes were challenged or subverted – especially the barbarian wartime propaganda image of the Japanese. When they returned to Australia, these women were able to talk positively of Japan and the Japanese, much to the shock of many other Australians. Rose O'Brien conducted talks about Japan to the conservative Country Women's Association (CWA) when she returned to Australia:

they used to be amazed that I spoke kindly of the Japanese because their idea was of the war and all the very vindictive things that had happened during the war, that's what I felt, I felt that I could speak as I knew them....I felt we were giving them first hand information which I was able to project to them instead of the suppositions that they had before we went away.

I used to tell them [CWA] how I was living in Japan and they used to wonder how I could speak decently about the Japanese. They thought it was stupid, they thought that there was no way you could speak nicely

about the Japanese at all and yet living with them made you feel like that...because you saw them in a different light.⁵⁸

Thus the positive legacy of the Occupation is that Australian women (and men) acted as a vanguard of changed attitudes towards the Japanese in postwar Australia – through their experiences in Hiroshima they were able to deconstruct many of the stereotypical cultural constructs of the Japanese that had been engendered through fear and war.

Yet it remains that differences and borders had to be maintained in order to distinguish the occupier from the occupied. The ‘housegirl’ as a symbol of hierarchy and difference appears in Occupation fiction. A novel of the Occupation, *A Handful of Pennies*, by Australian writer Hal Porter, who worked as a teacher in one of the dependents’ schools in Kure, contains the following passage: ‘Housegirls had become as much conversation possessions as children, dogs, husbands or wives, but a tone of ridicule revealed that housegirls were only half-price, had been bought on the cheap’.⁵⁹ Domestic workers were constructed as conversational possessions, but without the value that other family members were imbued with – even the family pet held more value. Female domestic workers were also constructed in relation to the Australian soldiers, once again with an element of disdain. In a novel written by an Australian BCOF soldier, T.A.G. Hungerford, *Sowers of the Wind*, one scene describes a group of Australian women, one of whom has a conversation with an Australian soldier, Flannery, known to have previously contracted venereal disease:

The other girls had walked on to the jeep when Siddy Grey stopped to talk to Flannery. As she approached them they regarded her with sour disapproval.

“I don’t know why you talk to him, Siddy,” one of them remarked petulantly. “You know he’s had...he’s been...*twice!* And for that, he must have been out with one of those horrible house-girls, or worse. He’s awful.”⁶⁰

In the eyes of the women in this scene, the soldier had been tainted by his association with the ‘unclean immoral’ Japanese woman, and Siddy had violated an implied code of maintaining distance between themselves and Japanese women (mediated through Flannery), which was required to reinforce the ostensible ‘moral superiority’ of the Australian woman.

The asymmetrical relationship between Japanese female domestic workers and Australian female occupiers is problematic when considered alongside the Occupation discourses of democratization and female emancipation, and is evident of the inherent contradictions in the imposition of democracy by military means. One contemporary observer, Australian reporter/writer Frank Clune, who wrote a demeaning and racist account of the Japanese in *Ashes of Hiroshima*, did observe with some sarcasm that the Occupation was a ‘great experience for the [Australian] wives, to have two or three Japanese domestic servants to do all the housework. I don’t see how this helped to teach the Japanese “the democratic way of life”. It looks more like teaching the Australian women the feudalistic way’.⁶¹

Many Australian women I have interviewed about their experiences in Japan have expressed their regret at having to leave the occupation lifestyle behind to return to Australia – a lifestyle one described as the British-style, upper class, colonial lifestyle.⁶² One Australian woman was quoted as saying ‘We wives all wondered what we were heading for in Japan, but none of us imagined things would be so nice’.⁶³ The *Melbourne Sun* claimed that ‘Many Australian wives in Japan would be reluctant to leave their comfortable home and abundant home help for a servantless Australia’.⁶⁴ Despite the fondness that may have developed between Australian and Japanese women, their places in the Occupation hierarchy were never questioned. As one Australian woman informed, ‘they [Japanese domestic workers] were a thing apart from us, if you know what I mean...they were just treated as the servants...A lot of us were possibly nice to them as we weren’t used to people as servants all the time.’⁶⁵ No-one appears to have questioned the paradox of the western victors’ critique

of Japanese society and males for oppressing Japanese women and the simultaneous exploitation of Japanese women for the purposes of the occupier. When I ask questions about women's issues in Japan, or how they saw themselves as contributing to the democratization of Japan, I am usually met with incredulous or quizzical looks: 'we were the "top dog" over there'; 'we were the head of the occupation forces'; 'there was a superiority feeling of "we are the occupiers"'; 'we were the ones they had to kowtow down to'.⁶⁶

Australian Media Representations: The Australian Women's Weekly

Most Australian daily newspapers and some magazines regularly ran articles on the progress of the Occupation in Japan. Of great relevance to this paper is the Australian women's magazine, the *Australian Women's Weekly*. Most articles over the course of the Occupation depicted the lifestyles of the occupiers, especially women and families. There is, however, an interesting distinction between articles on Japan immediately after surrender and later ones that construct the Japanese woman in relation to the Australian woman. In the former, Japanese women are viewed as a source of democratic change (Japanese woman as active); in the latter, the Japanese woman is primarily seen as 'traditional,' submissive, and in need of tuition in 'western' ways (Japanese woman as passive).

A female correspondent, in an October 1945 article (that is, just over a month after the formal surrender ceremony), conveys a number of images, or types, of Japanese women, often contradictory: one image is of the 'arrogant woman' who is warlike and resentful and spoke of carrying out the emperor's will to kill Americans with their husband's swords – the woman of wartime propaganda. The writer laments of the disappearance of the 'traditional woman': instead of kimono, they were wearing 'shapeless pantaloons' (*monpe*). It reflects a yearning for an orientalist exotic 'Other' female stereotype. Then there was the wage conscious factory worker woman, who earned money equivalent to someone in a shop 'on the fashionable Ginza', although still 'treated in the old tyrannical way' – the Japanese woman as simultaneously feudal and modern. But in essence, the article conveys a feeling of hope:

Most people who have lived in Japan before the war [who we assume are western/white] think that the greatest single effect of the occupation will be the emancipation of Japanese women.

This feminist element that is appearing can have a big influence on the Japanese character for these women are gentle and not warlike.

If the Japanese woman can only use this opportunity to assert herself she can be the salvation of her country.⁶⁷

Paternalistic and orientalist the article may be, but at least some level of agency is assigned to these Japanese 'feminists'.

Another early article, by a male correspondent, details a luncheon held with Japanese business women in November 1945. While the decision to give women the right to vote is seen as 'the first step in the emancipation of Japanese women', the tone is a little more pessimistic about long-term possibilities of 'success'. At the luncheon, the reporter talked with women about 'the Emperor, women's suffrage, the long oppression of women in Japan...health problems of the threatened famine, and how they would regard relatives who had been prisoners of war' – all fairly notable issues. Moreover, he asked them 'why no Japanese women wore hats,' and 'how they felt about not having cosmetics'.⁶⁸ The male reporter, while attempting to discuss important political issues of relevance to these business women, betrays his gendered and racial assumptions.

The focus on Japanese women, their 'emancipation' and their agency in that process mostly disappeared from *AWW* occupation stories after the Australian troops arrived in early 1946. Nurses and Australian Army Medical Corp women, when interviewed by *AWW* in the process of leaving Australia for Japan, did not mention democratization or the emancipation of women but were instead

rather 'hopeful of getting Japanese labor to do their washing'.⁶⁹ They were not disappointed, but some took on the role of 'tutor' to the occupied 'Other'. Another article, following up in April 1946, said: 'Jap girls [sic] wash out the quarters using plenty of water and much energy, but Sister Kath O'Bryan gave some in our dormitory a lesson on the correct technique'.⁷⁰

Once the wives and families arrived, the 'girls' became 'servants' and their role defined more concretely in relation to Australian women in the private domain, rather than in their role in the Japanese public and political sphere. One article, entitled 'Shopping in Japan presents few difficulties,' declared: 'No crowds. No queues. No waiting. Instead a carefully planned system to make their [Australian women's] lot happy and comfortable' – Australian women came with 'their shopping lists and housegirls'.⁷¹ Another complained that

Japanese servants have been so accustomed to paying deference to boys that it's just as well [Australian] fathers are around to counteract their indulgence.

Sensible parents are keeping the training of their children in their own hands'.⁷²

There was a downside to the presence of domestic workers in one's home if there were children involved – they could corrupt that 'home and family on which our Western civilization has been built.' Overall, the women's magazine participated in the dissemination of a discourse that constructed Australian women as the superior modern woman against the inferior, defeated, traditional Japanese woman as part of a wider nationalist discourse that sought to elevate Australia's international standing among the major world players (U.S., U.S.S.R., Britain). The gendered and racial role of Australian women as occupiers served to enhance this nationalist image of Australia rather than a reformist agenda in Japan.

Religion as a Vehicle for Emancipative Discourse and Practice

The Allied Occupation of Japan was viewed by many occupiers to be a vehicle through which to export Christian values to Japan. As Dower asserts, [f]or the victors, occupying defeated Germany had none of the *exoticism* of what took place in Japan: the total control over a pagan, 'Oriental' society by white men who were (unequivocally in General MacArthur's view) engaged in a Christian mission.⁷³ While there were occasions where the wives of missionaries accompanied their husbands to Japan (see the Coaldrakes below), women engaged in Christian activities in Japan were most likely to be connected to the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA). As with colonialism, Christianity followed the western occupiers into Japan.

Australian women traveled to Japan with the YWCA primarily to provide recreational services to soldiers that did not involve prostitutes or alcohol, and to run dormitories for the single women working for BCOF. The first eight arrived in April 1947, and there were forty-four at the peak of their presence.⁷⁴ They staffed the YWCA hostels and managed the Japanese staff, while others were assigned to Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) hostels as hostesses.⁷⁵ These roles are primarily national ones aimed to aid the Australian forces. Yet as Christensen has demonstrated, the World YWCA had developed a more international perspective regarding its aims and work in the years prior to the Asia-Pacific war. The YWCA constitution included an article that called for 'peace and better understanding between classes, nations and races' and stated that 'obedience to the law of Christ will force the extension of God's kingdom in which the principles of justice, love, and the equal value of every human life shall apply to national and international as well as personal relations'.⁷⁶ This agenda was taken to Japan.

The YWCA demonstrated a political dimension in Japan in regards to issues that affected women. There was a connection made between 'theory' (as outlined in previous paragraph) and practice in a

form of 'social Christianity'. Christensen argues that in this way 'the YWCA can be seen as a pragmatic interpreter and practitioner of several of the ideas of feminism and of socialism at the time'.⁷⁷ In occupied Japan, the World YWCA held a conference in 1947 to bring Japan's YWCA members back into the fold. Present were one hundred Japanese women, members of Japan's junior YWCA, and representatives from Australia, England, New Zealand, Canada, the United States, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden.⁷⁸ Although the delegates had just come from a major international meeting in Hangzhou, China, it is interesting to note the absence of any other Asian, or indeed non-white, delegates on the list. Representing Australia were the Australian national general-secretary, Leila W. Bridgman, and Amy Carver, with the full support of BCOF Commander-in-Chief, General Robertson, thus implying semi-official sanction of YWCA activities in Japan from BCOF authorities.⁷⁹

The *AWW* covered the conference and the story published denotes the political slant of the meeting. Women's issues were at the forefront: Japanese YWCA women were expected to 'play a vital part in the future of the women of the country,' and one of the Japanese delegates spoke of the war and occupation changing 'the attitudes of women, not only towards work, but towards many other aspects of their life', including marriage and divorce. The inclusion and implicit approval of the latter is most interesting when considering Christian values regarding marriage, but perhaps it was palatable as the occupation reforms would primarily affect non-Christian values and ceremonies (Shinto), thus were contextualized within the non-legitimate culture of the 'Other'. Uemara Tamaki, president of the Japan YWCA and vice-president of the World YWCA, stated the most pressing problem was the 're-education and teaching of women to give them a wider outlook on world affairs. Women must become world citizens.'⁸⁰ Did this mean the westernization of Japanese women? The article is at times contradictory in its representation of the Japanese delegates, referring to them as 'highly respected women' – doctors, lawyers, journalists – and yet describing them as in 'drab kimonos' and carrying their possessions in 'shabby bundles'.⁸¹ Perhaps it implied that there was a lot of 're-education' yet to be done.

Back in Kure, the Australian BCOF YWCA representatives helped the local chapter of the Japanese YWCA to reestablish. As Donnelly argues, 'cooperation with the Japanese YWCA enabled [Australian women] to meet Japanese in a capacity other than servants'.⁸² However Donnelly's assumption that the BCOF YWCA women helped to demonstrate 'the freedom from male domination that could result from the changes that the Occupation authorities were attempting to make to their status' should be questioned.⁸³ This statement reflects the view BCOF YWCA women held of their own role, and once again relegates Japanese women and their past agency and activism to an invisible background. Relationships between the women, though on a more even level than those with the domestic workers, were still imbued with paternalism within asymmetrical relations of power and framed within western paradigms. And after all, the BCOF YWCA in Japan was there primarily to serve the entertainment interests of the Australian male soldiers – hardly a great feminist objective.

A different example of western religion in Japan lies with the missionaries who arrived with or independent of the occupation forces. In 1947, Anglican priest, pacifist and social activist, Reverend Frank Coaldrake, went to Japan as an Australian civilian missionary (independent of BCOF) and as part of the Anglican Church of Japan (Nippon Seikōkai).⁸⁴ In 1949 he married Maida Williams, and she subsequently joined him in 1950.⁸⁵ Maida Coaldrake's experience as an Australian woman in Japan is unique as she was outside the 'BCOF community', based at Odawara and Itō on the Izu peninsular near Tokyo in the American area of administration. Her opportunities to interact with Japanese women on her own terms were far greater than for most Australian women in Japan.

Maida made many observations on Japan and Japanese women in the letters and newsletters she and her husband sent back to Australia. Of her first impressions, she says: 'Japan is a land of contradictions! Beneath all this seemingly modern Western culture, fast trains, splendidly distributed

electricity and luxury hotels, their women are still in a position of near-slavery in their houses and in the fields or farming areas.’⁸⁶ The Coaldrakes lived at first in a six hundred year old Japanese farmhouse, which presented all sorts of challenges for Maida, but, as with other occupier women, she had domestic help (one only) from ‘Ogata-san’. While this was still clearly an asymmetrical relationship, Maida was far more reflective of the situation many Japanese women were placed in than other occupier women. In a later oral history interview, Maida recollected that at the beginning of her time in Japan: ‘Ogata-san was quite frightened to work in the house with me. At first I didn’t have Japanese language at that stage [sic]. And her husband had been killed in the fighting in the Pacific War. She had been taken into the household of Murota-san [owner of the house the Coaldrakes lived in] and then she found herself looking after people who had been on the side of the soldiers who had killed her husband.’⁸⁷

Despite this display of compassion and understanding, Maida was on a mission to Christianize and ‘civilize’. She described an early interaction with three Japanese women who were wearing westernized clothing:

You might see such young women anywhere in any country town at home [in Australia]. But did they behave like it? Oh no! Unashamedly intrigued by this foreign woman, they lifted her skirt to see how the seams were sewn, they smelled her scarf, they studied her hair and head from several angles, and said what they thought in conversation with each other and with her. Fortunately I couldn’t understand much, but behaved as I thought a film star would in those circumstances, remembering how much the Japanese *girl* [emphasis added] had absorbed of Western culture from the film, and how keen she was of absorbing a great deal more. They wore our type [of] clothes but they haven’t quite got the slant on how to wear them, and go clattering off down the street on their noisy awkward geta, hatless, gloveless, stockingless, wondering why they lack the finish and the carriage! No one could have any carriage, it seems to me, when four wooden stilts tied to your feet by your big toe push your stomach alternately in and out.⁸⁸

The assumption that Japan had to westernize, and so far had been doing a superficial job or were perhaps even incapable, is apparent in this description of Japanese women. The idea of the West as tutor in this process is also assumed, in this case through the medium of the Hollywood film. Maida also participated in this process – obviously through church activities, but also in terms of attempting to transform domestic life. A local Japanese woman who ran a dressmaking school for Japanese females to learn western-style techniques wanted to expand to include ‘something of the household and life of the western woman whom they only know through pattern books and the film ... she [wanted] them taught how to behave in a Western world of which they [had] already adopted many customs.’ Both Maida and Frank participated, and Maida related having to stand on the teacher’s desk ‘in stockinged feet’ while Frank demonstrated ‘some point’. Maida thought the program had ‘great possibilities for the future’.⁸⁹

Maida Coaldrake had greater opportunities to interact more intimately with Japanese women than her occupation counterparts, and developed a fondness for and understanding of the Japanese people and their country. Yet her experiences were still constructed within the framework of western superiority, in terms of religion, morality and cultural practice, and the Coaldrakes’ missionary work acted as a vehicle for disseminating western practices and ideas.

Conclusion

The Allied Occupation of Japan occurred at a time when optimism concerning the protection of human rights was high, particularly due to the end of the Asia-Pacific War and the establishment of the United Nations. Some of this optimism entered the Occupation in the form of imposed reforms, including the emancipation of women. Yet the exigencies of military occupation demanded that limitations be placed on the practice of emancipative discourses, as the primary objectives of occupation were to maintain order and the status of the occupiers. Defining the relations of power was crucial to achieving these objectives. Those relations of power could be formally defined by the upper echelons

of the Occupation hierarchy in Tokyo or Washington, or they could be informally practiced in daily routines and communicated through language in any area of the Occupation. Australian women participated in this practice of occupation power.

Those Australian women who did interact with Japanese women at a more intimate or political level – the YWCA, international feminists – still did so in a paternalistic and racist way and without due acknowledgement of the previous and contemporary work of Japanese feminists. Yoneyama claims that veteran Japanese feminist Ichikawa Fusae ‘apparently suggested that Japanese women would have sooner or later gained suffrage without the occupation, primarily as a result of their active participation in the war effort’.⁹⁰ Human rights and female emancipative discourse and practice in Japan are revealed to be western-centric with pretensions to universality.

Australian women occupiers, rather than participating in the transmission of emancipative discourse, were willing participants in the extension of occupation power to the domestic realm. The intricate webs of occupation power were thus able to traverse the public and private spheres of occupation spaces, even away from the centres of occupation power. The parallels between women and occupation and women and imperialism/colonialism are obvious, and the latter can be used to elucidate the former. The elevated social position of Australian women in the occupation hierarchy constructed an image of self as the superior race and nation against the defeated and inferior ‘Othered’ Japanese, rather than an image of the Japanese woman as an equal. Japanese women were either in need of saving or there to be exploited. There was a clear disparity between discourses of emancipation and the practice of occupying, and contradictions within the concept of forced emancipation and reform via military occupation. Whether the same types of relations existed between occupier women and Japanese women in other areas of the Occupation – U.S., New Zealand, British/British-Indian – remains to be analyzed. The practice of power and subsequent elevated social status of Australian women also nurtured the nationalistic government discourse that sought for Australia a larger role on the world stage. Additionally, occupation power distracted Australian women from their subordinate gendered position in their own society. While Australian women did return home with a more positive image of Japanese women, this image was one related to ‘niceness,’ not equality. As one informant declared: ‘We were the conquerors. And we lived as conquerors.’⁹¹

¹ The research upon which this article is based has been made possible with funding from the Japan Foundation, the University of Wollongong Research Committee Small Grant Scheme and University of Wollongong Faculty of Arts Research Committee, Research Support. Many thanks to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions to improve this paper.

² Ruth Roach Pierson & Nupur Chaudhuri, *Nation, Empire, Colony: Historicizing Gender and Race* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 5.

³ John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1999), 23.

⁴ From title of a chapter in Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* (London: Verso, 1992), 1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 11; Dolores E. Janiewski, “Gendered Colonialism: The Woman Question in Settler Society” in Pierson & Chaudhuri, *Nation, Empire, Colony*, 62.

⁶ Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 6.

⁷ One difference between the US and Australia in the Occupation of Japan should be noted: there were a few American women who *did* gain access to the corridors of formal power in GHQ, such as Beate Sirota Gordon. However, this was not the case for Australian women.

⁸ Margaret Strobel cited in Janiewski, “Gendered Colonialism,” 57.

- ⁹ Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* (Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2004), 56.
- ¹⁰ Amos & Parmer cited in Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders*, n. 257.
- ¹¹ Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders*, 40.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, 42.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 24.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 39.
- ¹⁵ In Robin Kay (ed), *Documents on New Zealand External Relations Vol II: The Surrender and Occupation of Japan* (Wellington: Government Printer, 1982), 171-179.
- ¹⁶ In Edwin M. Martin, *The Allied Occupation of Japan* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1948), 105-116.
- ¹⁷ Part I(c) in the IPSP (Part I.2(c) in BPSP) reads: 'The Japanese people shall be encouraged to develop a desire for individual liberties and respect for fundamental human rights, particularly the freedoms of religion, assembly, speech, and the press. They shall also be encouraged to form democratic and representative organizations.'
- ¹⁸ Mire Koikari, "Exporting Democracy?: American Women, Feminist Reforms, and Politics of Imperialism in the U.S. Occupation of Japan, 1945-1952," *Frontiers*, 23:1 (2002), 29.
- ¹⁹ Lisa Yoneyama, "Liberation under Seige: U.S. Military Occupation and Japanese Women's Enfranchisement," *American Quarterly*, 57: 3 (2005), 897.
- ²⁰ Carmen Johnson, *Wave Rings in the Water: My Years with the Women of Postwar Japan* (Alexandria: Charles River Press, 1996); Beate Sirota Gordon, *The Only Woman in the Room: A Memoir* (New York: Kodansha International, 1997).
- ²¹ Christine de Matos, *Imposing Peace and Prosperity: Australia, Social Justice and Labour Reform in Occupied Japan* (Melbourne: Australian Scholarly Publishing, in press).
- ²² Heather Radi (ed), *Jessie Street: Documents and Essays* (Marrickville: Women's Redress Press Inc, 1990), 11.
- ²³ Penny Russell, "Jessie Street and International Feminism" in *Ibid.*, 181.
- ²⁴ Lenore Coltheart, *Jessie Street: A Revised Autobiography* (Sydney: The Federation Press, 2004), 224.
- ²⁵ Mire Koikari, "Rethinking Gender and Power in the US Occupation of Japan, 1945-1952," *Gender & History*, 11:2 (1999), 313-335.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 314.
- ²⁷ Mire Koikari, "Exporting Democracy?," 23-45.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 32.
- ³¹ Yoneyama, "Liberation under Seige," 895-898.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 892.
- ³³ Victoria DeFranciso, "Gender, Power and Practice: Or, Putting Your Money (and Your Research) Where Your Mouth Is in Ruth Wodak (ed), *Gender and Discourse* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 43.
- ³⁴ Yoneyama, "Liberation under Seige," 886.
- ³⁵ Roma Donnelly, "A Civilising Influence? Women in the British Commonwealth Occupation Force in Japan 1946-1952," (MA thesis, Swinburne University, 1994), 107.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 112. Other early statistics on housing suggest the following: 80 houses erected at Etajima; 157 at Hiro; 55 at Okayama; 41 at Iwakuni; and 5 at Tokushima (total of 348). [Australian War Memorial (AWM) 114: 130/1/23 Pt II, "Introduction – Dependents Housing," c. 1947, 10-11.
- ³⁷ Donnelly, "A Civilising Influence?" 109, 112.
- ³⁸ AWM114 130/2/58, "BCOF Bound," 1947.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ Dorothy Drain, "Life in Japan would be Hard on Soldiers' Wives," *Australian Women's Weekly (AWW)*, June 22, 1946, 9.
- ⁴¹ I.R. Carter, *Alien Blossom: A Japanese-Australian Love Story* (Melbourne: Lansdowne Press, 1965), 8-9.
- ⁴² Donnelly, "A Civilising Influence?" 111.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁴ Interview with Ruth Warner-Bishop, Toorak VIC, July 11, 2006. A domestic worker in the household of Mrs Warner-Bishop lost her job this way (as decided by BCOF authorities, not Mrs Warner-Bishop).
- ⁴⁵ Some Australian women were able to live the 'colonial lifestyle' complete with domestic workers in the Australian protectorates of Papua and New Guinea, but this was on a very small scale. For further information see Chilla Bulbeck, *Australian Women in Papua New Guinea: Colonial Passages 1920-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- ⁴⁶ Bridget Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work? The Global Politics of Domestic Labour* (London: Zed Books, 2000), 18.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 132.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 143.
- ⁵⁰ Interview with Patricia Olney, Waitara NSW, August 22, 2006.
- ⁵¹ American Women's Guild, Cavalry Officers' Wives, Christian Women's Association, GHQ Officers' Wives and Navy Officers' Wives, *The American Way of Housekeeping* (Tokyo: Far Eastern Library Agency and Publishing House Inc,

- 1948). A copy of this was found in the Australian War Memorial, inscribed with the name of one of the BCOF families who lived in Nijimura.
- ⁵² *Ibid*, forward & 2.
- ⁵³ Elaine Ladyga, *Memories of BCOF in Japan, 1947-1952* (self-published, 2004).
- ⁵⁴ Interview with Rosina O'Brien, Macgregor QLD, September 13, 2006.
- ⁵⁵ American Women's Guild, *et al.*, *The American Way of Housekeeping*, 144.
- ⁵⁶ Interview with Rosina O'Brien, 2006.
- ⁵⁷ Bridget Anderson, *Doing the Dirty Work?*, 144.
- ⁵⁸ Interview with Rosina O'Brien, 2006.
- ⁵⁹ Hal Porter, *A Handful of Pennies* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1958), 98.
- ⁶⁰ T.A.G. Hungerford, *Sowers of the Wind: A Novel of the Occupation of Japan* (Sydney: Pacific Books, 1961), 192.
- ⁶¹ Frank Clune, *Ashes of Hiroshima*, (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1950), 152.
- ⁶² Interview with Gretel Woodward, Carlton NSW, June 19, 2006.
- ⁶³ Author unknown, "Dandenong Woman Likes Life in Japan," unknown newspaper provided to author by Barbara Hogg.
- ⁶⁴ Author unknown, "Family Home from Japan will miss help," *Melbourne Sun*, 1950, provided to author by Barbara Hogg.
- ⁶⁵ Interview with Rosina O'Brien, 2006.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*; Interview with Patricia Olney, 2006.
- ⁶⁷ Lorraine Streeter, "Tokio's Children Wander Like Cats," *AWW*, October 20, 1945, 20.
- ⁶⁸ 'They told us they did not mind having no hats, but hope cosmetics could be made again soon.' Massey Stanley, "They've Never Seen a Women's Paper in Japan," *AWW*, November 3, 1945, 28.
- ⁶⁹ Joan Powe, "Australian Nurses and AAMWS Leave for Japan," *AWW*, March 23, 1946, 17.
- ⁷⁰ Dorothy Drain, "New Hospital Moves in on Eta Jima Island," *AWW*, April 20, 1946, 19.
- ⁷¹ Alice Jackson, "Shopping in Japan Presents Few Difficulties," *AWW*, January 3, 1948.
- ⁷² Author and title unknown, *AWW*, December 6, 1947.
- ⁷³ Dower, *Embracing Defeat*, 23.
- ⁷⁴ Donnelly, "A Civilising Influence?" 83.
- ⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 84.
- ⁷⁶ Hilda Romer Christensen, "Religion as a Source of Activism. The YWCA in Global Perspectives" in Hilda Romer Christensen, Beatrice Halsaa and Aino Saarinen (eds), *Crossing Borders: Re-mapping Women's Movements at the Turn of the 21st Century* (Odense, Denmark: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2004), 104.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 113.
- ⁷⁸ Alice Jackson, "Y.W.C.A. in Japan Holds Vital Conference," *AWW*, December 13, 1947, 19.
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁸¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁸² Donnelly, "A Civilising Influence?" 92.
- ⁸³ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁴ William H. Coaldrake, *Japan from War to Peace: The Coaldrake Records 1939-1956* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 3, 7-8.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 9-10.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 298.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 300.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 302.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 327.
- ⁹⁰ Yoneyama, "Liberation under Seige," 897.
- ⁹¹ Interview with Patricia Olney, 2006.