

American Film Star Unsettling Japanese Culture: A Cross-Cultural Analysis of Clara Bow's Image in 1920s Japan¹

Hideaki FUJIKI

In this essay, I examine the star formation of Clara Bow in relation to the rise of consumer culture and modern girls in Japan during the latter half of the 1920s. While her original images were produced in the United States, she was identified as a representative of modern girls and associated with the new audiences who were recognized as modern girls and/or the petit bourgeois class. In being so, this American star functioned to disclose contradictions between her fans' consuming activity and their national identity, but concurrently induced reactionary discourses. Her screen persona balanced its flapper-sensationalism and other properties, such as her seemingly spontaneous characterization, socially marginalized positions, and active physical movements. This ambiguity about the star's attributes allowed Japanese media to take advantage of this star as a controversial yet lucrative subject. It follows that the vernacular formation of this star persona involved cultural and even political conflicts among her fans' self-defining identities, critics' valuations and evaluations, and governmental directions. While her fans' activity increased the diversity and mobility of people's identities and values in the nation, critics mostly was bent on prescribing them into either/or categories of binary oppositions, such as American versus Japanese and modern versus pre-modern. Thus, the American stars unsettled Japanese culture, but turned out to enhance the reactionary trend in which to confine Japanese people into a monolithic identity.

In 1928, the volume *The Cartoon of Contemporary Social Aspects* (Gendai sesô manga) initiated its inaugural section entitled the “catalogue of *moga*”—which is the abbreviation of “*modan gâru*” or “modern girl”—with an illustration of Clara Bow and her fans (See Figure 1). The upper half of the illustration shows the screen occupied by a close-up of Bow, whose face appears erotic, with “amorous” eyes and half-opened, thick lips. Below this the audience is depicted; their raised hands and smiles suggest their excitement, while their Western clothes and short hairstyle—the hairstyle then fashionably called “*danpatsu*”—mark their modern quality. The caption on the right side “anchors” the meaning of this caricature with the following words: “Once the up-and-coming American cinema star Clara Bow's picture was exhibited, modern girls all over Tokyo thronged to the theater, immediately resulting in a full house. ... As long as modern girls do not cease to exist in Japan, Clara Bow will continue to have delightful success.”²

While this cartoon might represent with some exaggeration, it served as a medium through which the images of Clara Bow and modern girls were socially constructed. At the same time, it represents the interdependent relationship between the American star and the Japanese audience, as the illustration implicates the former's influence over the latter, and the caption suggests the latter's support for the former. Moreover, placed on the first page of the



Figure 1. Clara Bow and her fans. From Shirota Shūichi, *Gendai manga taikan: Gendai sesō manga* (Tokyo: Chūō bijutsu-sha, 1928): 3.

volume, this representation vividly indicates a set of the cinema star and the female audience as one of the most socially conspicuous, “modern” phenomena in Japan at that time.

This essay will examine the star formation of Clara Bow in relation to the rise of consumer culture and modern girls in this nation. The female actress was identified as a representative of modern girl and associated with the new audiences who were recognized as modern girls and/or the petit bourgeois class.³ Bow, whose original images were produced in the United States, tended to present contradictions between her fans’ consuming activity and their national identity.

Numerous scholars have discussed consumer culture and “the modern girl”—particularly so-called “*moga*” who are often distinguished from intellectual “new women”⁴—, but most of them have hardly investigated their relationship with cinema stars.⁵ While expressing different views, recent studies seem to concur on the following three points. First, “the modern girls,” embodied the rising consumerism, which can be defined, as Barbara Sato does, as “buying for the sake of buying.”⁶ They were, she argues, “a quintessential icon of consumerism, added a new dimension to the city streets.”⁷ Second, “modern girls,” especially young women who were somehow derogatorily or exotically called “*moga*,” were not simply real beings, but products constructed by and through media and other discourses. Particularly in terms of gender politics, they were shaped as a representation of the new female sexuality that was a fantasy for men.⁸ Finally, “the modern girl” was such a prominent phenomenon that it might have destabilized the dominant, patriarchal system and even the

status quo. While the “*moga*” was just one stage in an average woman’s life cycle and thus did not undermine the patriarchal regime,⁹ this female “phantasm of modernity” evoked anxiety about social disorder and a sense of crisis, which could lead to the collapse of the culture’s reproducing process.¹⁰

My argument accords with these views to a large degree, but I would like to illuminate three relatively unexplored aspects of the formation of modern girls with respect to film stars. First, the emergence of modern girls marked contradictions between national unity and consuming activity under expanding capitalism. As I will illustrate, modern girls were not merely figures about which men fantasized, but they involved female self-defining activities such that they could disrupt the national identity or any identity that other people attempted to observationally define.¹¹ Second, even though modern girls or *moga* were products of the media, they were not homogeneous or singular. As well as Bow, Natsukawa Shizue, for instance, was primarily associated with modernity, but they were endowed with different meanings *vis-à-vis* dominant, national values. Correlated with this, the last aspect of the new female figure in my thesis is that the modern girls were not simply antithetical to nationalism, but, if only in part, incorporated into it.¹² Bow, I argue, unsettled the existing society and culture in terms of Japanese identity, aestheticism, educational knowledge, and morality, and, at the same time, induced a reactionary response.

Clara Bow did not originate Japanese modern girls, but she was an agent and component of what was represented as modern girls in a variety of discourses in Japan. While the critic Kitazawa Shûichi’s April 1923 essay fueled the boom of modern girls, Bow’s first Japanese-released film, *Down to the Sea in Ships*, was shown only in April 1924 (US release in March 1923).¹³ In addition, she was not a main character until *Poisoned Paradise* (August 1924; US release in February 1924) and was not steadily cast as a leading star until *The Best Bad Man* (October 1926; US release in November 1925).¹⁴ However, the January 1927 advertisement of *Mantrap* (April 1927; US release in July 1926) privileged her image and name for the first time among her Japanese-released ads (see Figure 2),¹⁵ and the February 11, 1927 issue of *Kinema junpô* adopted her as its cover girl. At the same time, Bow was recognized as an influential agent, as well as a symbolic and unique component of the creation of modern girls. Many critics referred to her as a root of modern girls, and Bow was noted both typically and specifically as something modern.¹⁶ Indeed, while Mary Pickford and Janet Gaynor were not associated with “modern,” it was agreed that Bow, as well as Colleen Moore and Louise Brooks, was endowed with this quality. And yet, as some critics compared Bow with Moore or Brooks, her persona was constructed as something not only representative, but also unique in the latitude of what the “modern” meant in the historical context.¹⁷

In what follows, I will contend that the circulation and formation of Clara Bow’s persona disclosed a potential diversity of the Japanese, but at the same time induced a kind of monolithic and impractical view, which exemplified discourses on modern girls in general. The film scholar Sara Ross, in analyzing Bow’s films, argued that her characters, especially in films made from 1927 through 1929, comprised two contradictory qualities: “sexually aggressive but relatively sympathetic” and “naughty but virtuous.”¹⁸ I would like to extend this view and argue that her screen persona balanced its flapper-sensationalism and

other properties, such as her seemingly spontaneous characterization, socially marginalized positions, active physical movements, “adorable” bodily features, and privileged role as a protagonist. This ambiguity about the star’s attributes sustained her marketability not only in the United States, but also in Japan, under Hollywood’s industrial strategy aimed at global markets. Yet, Bow’s image circulation and its concomitant popularity in Japan were not merely the result of American industrial efforts. Nor was the impact of her image limited to its influence on Japanese youth culture. On the contrary, Bow’s social prominence was established insofar as the Japanese media took advantage of this star as a controversial yet lucrative subject in relation to the boom of modern girls. My final argument then will shed light on how this vernacular formation of the foreign star persona involved cultural and even political conflicts among her fans’ self-defining identities, critics’ valuations and evaluations, and governmental directions. While her fans’ activity increased the diversity and mobility of people’s identities and values in the nation, critics did not encourage them to be the self-determining individuals who could at once be critical of, and symbiotic in, their consumer culture and nation. Instead, they mostly took a morally privileged position and attempted to prescribe them into either/or categories of binary oppositions, such as American versus Japanese, modern versus pre-modern, and capitalist versus communist.

Ambivalent Screen Persona

Among Bow’s 58 films released in the United States from 1922 through 1933, 48 were shown in Japan from 1924 through 1934. All of her films after *The Runaway* (June 1927; US release in April 1926) were distributed, but, before this, some typical flapper works, including *Black Oxen* (US premier in December 1923), *Parisian Age* (US release in August 1925), *Plastic Age* (US release in December 1925) and *Dancing Mothers* (US release in March 1926), were not exhibited.¹⁹ The order of the releases was also not necessarily the same as in the United States: *Black Lightning* (US release in December 1924) was shown only in August 1929; and Ernst Lubitsch’s *Kiss Me Again* (US release in August 1925) was not officially screened until April 1931 due to censorship.²⁰ Nevertheless, Bow’s films were by and large steadily imported. The censorship, which was steered by the Police Agency (*keiho-kyoku*) under Home Ministry, prohibited the exhibition of *Kiss Me Again* and ordered that parts of more than sixteen of her films be cut, mainly because of “obscenity.”²¹ However, overt prohibition was limited to Lubitsch’s film, and, more importantly, the industry could take advantage of the sensation caused by the censor’s cuts, since they had a sort of publicity effect.

As the word, “flapper,” as well as the “modern girl,” gained a wide currency, along with the circulation of Bow’s images in Japan as in America, her screen persona owed one of its key characteristics to what this term implied. Sara Ross provided a detailed illustration of its signification and prevalence in the United States.²² Since around 1915, when one of the first references to the “flapper” appeared in H. L. Mecken’s essay in *Smart Set* (SS), a number of articles and stories about “flappers and/or flapperlike characters” appeared in this and other magazines, including *Vanity Fair* (VF) and *Ladies’ Home Journal* (LHJ). Although

these magazines had distinct characteristics and targets (as *VF* was more “sophisticated” than *SS*, and as *LHJ* was more oriented toward moral concerns), the “flapper” had a prototypical characteristic in that it brought on consumption by offering both sensational attractions and moral relief. On the one hand, in the literary media the flapper played a role in attracting young female readers as consumers by her unconventional behaviors, especially those related to sexuality. On the other, as in *Vanity Fair*, it provided readers with knowledge about the management of sexuality, and, as in *Ladies’ Home Journal*, it also allowed the targeted readers, mothers, to take a morally superior position and to recognize “a girl’s inherent goodness and natural desire for family life.”²³ Beginning with flapper-vehicles in the late 1910s and Selznick Pictures’ *The Flapper*, the first feature film with a flapper protagonist in 1920, the film industry made its own use of this character’s dual meanings: unconventional behavior and potential for moralizing. It did so while encouraging the consumption of their products and tie-ins, like cosmetics and clothing, in combination with other media.

Clara Bow’s screen persona was built upon such ambivalence regarding the flapper, though not as an anonymous or general type, but as a distinctive and peculiar character. While its attributes changed from earlier to later works, the flapper epitomized sensational features of the newly forming youth culture in America during the 1920s. As seen in *Wine* (February 1925; US release in August 1924), the character’s behaviors, such as smoking, drinking, and dancing, as well as her appearance, including relatively skin-exposed, thin clothing and a short hairstyle, were apparent signs of the flapper. In her relationships with other characters, such acts and looks were usually tied to her attitudes, like flirting, selfishness (as in *The Runaway*), and seductive manipulation (as in *It* and *Get Your Man*). Her physical movements, especially her sensuous posing (like rounding her lips, smoothing her hair upward with her hands, twisting her body, and making physical contact with men, as in *Mantrap*), served to enhance the sexual implications of Bow’s flapper, which was absent in, say, Colleen Moore’s characters. Narrational devices, such as the close-up of body parts and the off-screen intimation of the exposed body (as in *Wings*), further helped construct her sexual sensation. Moreover, her characters were associated with typical “modern” environments, including dance halls (in *Wine*, *Rough House Rosie*, *The Fleet’s In*, *Three Weekends*, and *Hoop-La*), beauty salons (in *Mantrap* and *Red Hair*), and department stores (in *It* and *The Saturday Night Kid*), as well as with “modern” social positions such as an actress (in *The Runaway* and *Her Wedding Night*), a dancer (in *Rough House Rosie*, *The Fleet’s In*, and *Three Weekends*), a nail beautician (in *Mantrap* and *Red Hair*), and a clerk (in *It* and *The Saturday Night Kid*).²⁴

These morally and sexually sensational or “modern” attractions, however, were balanced with sympathetic aspects of Bow’s characters in several ways. In many films, her characters assume socially disadvantageous positions in terms of class, gender, age, and job. They are mostly working-class women, as indicated above. This economical and political powerlessness could make them psychologically accessible and identifiable for unprivileged audiences. Likewise, her sexuality is not merely the tool of play, but the tactic by which the weak obtains a man (in *Mantrap*), social elevation (in *It* and *Get Your Man*), or even morally “true love” (*Rough House Rosie* and *Red Hair*). In *Rough House Rosie*, for instance, after Bow’s

character, the factory girl Rosie, participates in an upper-class society yet finds it corrupt, she realizes her “true love” with her boyfriend and helps him win a boxing game by casting amorous eyes at the competitor to make him lose concentration. Her films’ narratives also contributed to the characterization of her as manipulative, yet inoffensive, spontaneous, and fundamentally virtuous. In *Hula*, Bow’s heroine, the island girl Hula, deliberately explodes someplace near the dam (as far as it can be interpreted from her dialogue) that her lover, Anthony, is constructing, so that his wife, who is married to him only for money, takes it for destruction and leaves him. As this film suggests and Sara Ross aptly noted, a plot often sets a rival character *vis-à-vis* the protagonist, thereby making it favorable for the latter to win the spectator’s sympathy.²⁵ And yet, while her films likely attracted lower-class and female audiences, they do not threaten the middle- and upper-classes and men; their plots mostly endorse society’s status quo in terms of class and gender. As in *Hula*, the “happy” ending comes with the conclusion that the lower-class heroine subordinates herself to an upper-class man. This may have helped the films draw middle- and upper class male audiences, as well as working-class ones.

Not only the narratives, but also other filmic devices functioned to counterbalance Bow’s sensational qualities. While her “active” and “seductive” conduct may have evoked anxiety for the spectator who expected women to be passive, her physical movements appeared comical and adorable, and hence playful and harmless.²⁶ Her frequent, amorous posing is inextricably combined with other types of lively acts. An excellent example is the scene in *Mantrap*, in which the detective Ralph makes his first visit to the rural house of Bow’s character, Alverna, who has recently begun to live with her new husband, Joe. In this less than three-minute scene, she exhibits a variety of dazzling physical movements, including fixing her hair with a side glance to Ralph off screen, holding his hands while shaking her body and their hands, putting a chocolate into his mouth and kissing his lips, stepping on Joe’s knees, throwing a pillow toward him in anger, hanging on Ralph’s neck by her hands while making her feet move upward, and sitting on the table and eating a chocolate. Inserted into this series of vigorous actions, closer shots showcase her varying facial expressions, encompassing smiles, anger, and coquetry, so as to enhance her energetic, frisky performance. In another scene, in which Alverna tries to allure Ralph after burglars have left the house, this seemingly seductive action appears not vicious, but adorable. This is partly because of the close-ups of her ample facial movements that effectively present her as adorable: grading from protruding her lips and knitting her brows, through turning her eyes away to the left and then looking sideways at him in the right zone, and moving her hand onto her hair and baring her shoulder, to loosening her eyes and mouth while slightly swaying her head. It is also partly because of the shot/reverse shot of these actions with Ralph, who gradually began to smile.

In addition to such “seductive” actions, most of Bow’s nudes were implicitly, rather than explicitly, shown, so that they more or less eased the sense of obscenity. In *Wings*, for example, when Bow’s character, Mary, changes her clothing at the hotel in Paris, her supposedly bared body cannot be seen, but close-ups of her face and of the two men’s eyelines imply it out of the framing. Such a stylistic treatment is well suited to what Ruth

Vasey points out about the general strategy of American film production: It at once eschews the censorship of obscenity and attracts audiences, by creating eroticism in concealing, rather than eliminating, naked bodies. This device enables some audiences and censors to extrapolate the nude, but not affirm it.²⁷

It was an exemplary work that offset the flapper's sensationalism and modernity with other properties. Although her character, Betty, does not smoke or drink heavily, her seductive manipulation is apparent, for instance, in the scene in which Betty hears Waltham promising to meet his fiancée on the phone and then deliberately tries to set an appointment with him at that time. The spectator can realize her wily handling due to the filmic narration—especially, editing, framing, and *mise-en-scene*—that tells the informational gap between Betty, who knows Waltham's date, and Waltham, who does not notice Betty's listening to the content on the phone. Betty is introduced literally as an "it girl," with Elinor Glyn's word, and visually as a "modern girl," who works as a clerk at a department store.

Meanwhile, the film's plot characterizes Betty as sympathetic mainly by setting her up as a working-class woman who defends her single-mother friend from having her baby taken away. Betty also embodies a lower-class value by guiding Waltham from ostentation in aristocratic society to physical pleasure at the fairground. Moreover, her sexuality can be considered to be a means by which she survives and gains socio-economic status, as well as love and marriage with a man. At the same time, while Betty acts aggressively to obtain the rich man, she eventually subjugates herself to him, thereby endorsing the existing power relations in gender and class. As the culture analyst, Lori Landay, along with the film scholar, Marsha Orgeron, argues, "*It* participated in the construction of a public femininity that depended on women's active satisfaction of their desires, an ideal that encouraged women to participate in the public sphere as consumers as well as commodities."²⁸ Orgeron especially stresses that the female's active looking at a man and goods is no less important than the male gaze at the female figure.²⁹ While this is true, I also would like to stress the equal significance of the narrative representation in which the manipulative heroine was in fact an "ideal" commodity in the male-centered marriage market. Her coherently lively movements and humorous actions—particularly in the scene in which she cuts her casual clothes with scissors and turns it into a formal dress—made it possible for the audience to experience her as lovable and frank rather than as threatening and naughty. In effect, Bow's flapper character in this film, as well as in many others, is ambivalent, both bringing about new sensibility and reckoning on prevailing sentiments.

Bow's Public Currency and Popularity in Japan

In her films distributed and exhibited in Japan, Bow's flapper character peaked between *Mantrap* (April 1927) and *The Wild Party* (June 1929; US release in April 1929), but underwent a remarkable transformation afterwards. As in *The Fleet's In* (January 1929; US release in September 1928) and *The Wild Party*,³⁰ Bow's character is united with a male protagonist, not just by her seductive approach, but by her self-sacrifice. In *The Fleet's In*, for instance, her character Peachy testifies her sin, which is actually innocent, in order to help

her boyfriend Eddie who has scuffled and been arrested by police. As a result, she gains “true love” with him, even though he has been a philanderer. In addition to this change, as critics pointed out that her hair had grown and she had become stout,³¹ her character retrieved from a typical flapper in such films as *Dangerous Curves* (November 1929; US release in June 1929) and *Kick In* (September 1931; US release in May 1931).³² More fatally, the conversion from silent to talkie likely exerted an unfavorable influence on her performance, which centered on dynamic physical movements, rather than on nuanced expressions and dialogue. For two years after she appeared in *Kick In*, she left film production. She then came back with *Call Her Savage* (June 1933; US release in November 1932),³³ but completely retired after her next work, *Hoop-La* (May 1935; US release in November 1933).

Although Bow’s films faded out after a relatively short time in this way, there is no doubt that this unique flapper star with ambiguous attributes gained a broad currency and outstanding popularity in Japan, as in the United States. One plausible factor that made this possible was the practices of the American industry, which had produced such a marketable star and promoted her in their distribution and promotion. As Ruth Vasey illustrated in detail, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors Association (MPPDA)—which was founded as the representative and arbitrator of Hollywood major companies in 1922—aimed not only to secure profits in the domestic market, but also to expand its market at a global level. In order to do this, it gathered information about censorship in foreign countries and guided companies to make films that would not be banned.³⁴ Although American companies did not always accept the MPPDA’s advice but, rather, negotiated with its self-censorship,³⁵ such organizational efforts doubtlessly helped sell their products overseas, including in Japan.

Combined with the American film industry’s marketing strategy, the Japanese media boosted the circulation of Bow’s images. Her vehicles were not only materials directly related to films, such as photographic cards, movie magazines, and theater displays, not to mention the films per se. But they also included general and woman’s magazines, cartoons, books on modernity, beauty salons, and dictionaries. Among them, dictionaries were both a constitutive part and an indicator of this multiplication of her name and images. While the Japanese-language linguist, Niimura Izuru, remarked that he did not know the meaning of “it” until 1930,³⁶ numerous dictionaries of modern words published between 1930 and 1933 carried the entries of “flapper” and “it,” often referring to Bow as the source of its origin.³⁷ Certainly, popularity polls of actresses and films in film magazines—which were inclined toward “artistic” performances and performers—did not necessarily place Bow or her films in the higher ranks,³⁸ but apparently she achieved exceptional fame in the Japanese public sphere during the late 1920s and early 1930s. Indeed, in addition to magazines, photo-cards, and dictionaries, well-known film-script writers, including Ôkubo Tadamoto, Murakami Tokusaburô, Noda Kôgo, and Shimazu Yasujirô cooperated to create the scenario entitled, “The Crisis of Clara It,”³⁹ while the celebrated poet, Muroo Saisei and the up-and-coming film critic, Iijima Tadashi, each published a poem about Bow.⁴⁰

One thing that enabled the American star to gain such enormous popularity is that, corresponding to her screen persona represented in films, extra-filmic advertising and publicity generated ambivalence with sensationalism and other kinds of elements. An



Figure 2. Clara Bow foregrounded in the ad of *Mantrap*. From *Kinema junpô* (January 1, 1927).

advertisement for *Mantrap* is an illustrative example (See Figure 2). Above the drawing of Bow's face and shoulder, in which the combination of the upturned eyes, half-opened lips, bared shoulder, and twisted neck among other elements creates an amorous atmosphere, the caption introduces her as follows:

“Does such a girl exist in the world? If she does...” The heroine of this movie would make any audiences, young or old, get this sort of sense. She is really an honest, tender girl. Besides, she was born with such an odd nature that, once seeing a man, she cannot help casting amorous eyes at him. With this girl, a naïve rural man and a famous lawyer fall in love, and then a risky accident happens. [This movie] is such a human work containing rich modern taste and comedy-action.⁴¹

Here, signifying various kinds of meanings, both of her personality—honest, tender, and odd—and of the film's genre—modern taste, comedy, action, and human—are highly ambiguous.

At a more macro level, two dissimilar kinds of articles made her public persona flexible enough to accommodate audiences who had different preferences: one incited curiosity about her sexuality and the other disclosed her “true” personality as innocent behind the flapper character on screen. One newspaper article reported that when Hayakawa Sessu, the well-known hairstylist, Mei Ushiyama, and her husband visited Bow, she became so crazy about Hayakawa that she guided him to her dressing room and even undressed in

front of him.⁴² Her autobiography, “My Life Story,” on the other hand, carried in the film magazine, *Eiga sekai*, from May 1928 to January 1929, dramatized her struggles and “genuine” personality, while differentiating them from the “stereotype” in which she was frivolous and abnormal.⁴³ Consequently, one female reader of this magazine expressed her sympathy with Bow and blamed some audience for regarding the actress as vulgar,⁴⁴ though another reader showed contempt for such maudlin sympathizers.⁴⁵ The equivocal signification of Bow’s persona also operated in relation to the audience’s sexual differences. As male fans were, critically or favorably, obsessed with her body, and as female fans, if not completely, imitated or at least longed for her fashions and attitudes, she engendered both male sexual interest and female identification.

And yet, Bow’s popularity was sustained not only by favor, but also by disfavor. If Bow had been disregarded rather than disliked, her images and name would not have gained such a broad currency. To the contrary, whether she was admired or condemned, creating controversy enabled her to be socially distinguished. As I will discuss in more detail, fans and critics eagerly articulated their negative or positive feelings and views on her, so that all of them contributed to her public preeminence. In line with this, the aforementioned frequent cuts by censorship, despite or because of this concealing treatment, were likely to titillate the audience’s sensual curiosity. Though periodicals did not always give the censorship’s case-by-case order extensive coverage, media at once created and exploited Bow’s controversial properties as a lucrative topic so that they could increase their sales. This tie-in between media and the star went hand in hand with tie-ins between the star and what she wore or physically displayed, such as clothing, cosmetics, and hairstyle.⁴⁶ In sum, the consumption of media and the consumption of the star (and her associated commodities) sustained, and were sustained by, each other, thereby activating the circulatory mechanism through which Bow’s name and images extensively diffused.

Creating Controversy on the “Japanese Identity”

In this formation of Bow’s circulation and popularity, particularly important for the Japanese historical situation was how fans committed themselves to the controversy centering on the American star. Indeed, this controversy was created not just because of the actress’s self-sufficient characteristics, but because of Japanese fans’ involvement with her. In my view, Bow’s image-circulation induced her fans’ self-identifying activities, whether they consisted of actual imitation or fantasy, which initiated the problems concerning the mobility and diversity of the Japanese identity with regard to knowledge, nationality, race, gender, class, aesthetics, and morality. It is highly possible that the fans themselves were unaware that such political meanings were associated with their practices. It also should be noted that their tastes depended not only on their one-on-one relationship with the star, but also on the influence of critics and others’ articulated ideas. With these qualifications, we nevertheless can read the identity problems in the controversy on the American star, whether the fans actually existed or were discursively constructed.

One emblematic statement of the identity problem was critics’ repeated amazement

regarding how cinema stars, especially Clara Bow, were famous. On a national level, Nii Itaru pointed out that people knew Bow and Louise Brooks, even though they did not know such classic writers as Ozaki Kôyô and Tokutomi Roka.⁴⁷ On a global level, Hirabayashi Hatsunosuke noted that Bow and Chaplin were the most popular, while politicians like the German President were not known.⁴⁸ As I noted in Chapter 1, Gonda Yasunosuke and other critics already had made such a comparison between the fame of stars like Onoe Matsunosuke and Chaplin and that of other cultural figures by the early 1920s. However, what was particularly noticed with the prevalence of Bow and other “modern” stars was the Americanization or globalization of the culture that simultaneously attenuated the national peculiarity. Hirabayashi thus argued that “Hollywood’s domination over the world” caused “the obliteration of locality,” with the proviso in another article that it was unnecessary to be flustered about it because “Americanization is not new but has proceeded for a long run since 1854” and because it is a natural consequence for a capitalist society to be influenced by such a powerful country as America.⁴⁹

The flow of information and images concerning the American star was linked not only to nationality, but also to class, gender, and aesthetics. In a roundtable discussion by female critics in the April 1929 issue of the magazine, *Eiga jidai*, one participant remarked that many upper-class young ladies aspired to be actresses and were happy when they were said to resemble cinema stars. Although this comment did not specify Bow, it was made in the context in which Bow was a subject of discussion, suggesting that their aspiration for the identity-transformation, which was instigated by existing stars to become an actress, went beyond class difference.⁵⁰ In the historical situation in which the feminization of men and the masculinization of women were pointed out with the emergence of modern girls and modern boys,⁵¹ Bow was detected as having prompted changes in women’s attitudes, behaviors, and social conduct. One male critic asserted that Bow and Brooks led women to imitate their appearances and to take the same attitudes as men’s, in that they had come to enjoy jazz and sports with modern boys, feminized men.⁵² More critically, the Marxist feminist, Matsuzaki Ryûkô, discerned that “for these two years, Clara Bow has existed as a shadow not only on screen, but also on the streets, homes, and offices where young women were,” and that she taught independent women a new type of femininity.⁵³ Open flirtatiousness like hers, Matsuzaki continued, was not shameful, but a necessity and women’s natural right. For this female Marxist, however, Bow was insufficient to liberate women because she was ultimately a commodity under capitalism, as well as a slave for bourgeois men. “What Bow’s presence suggests,” she argues, “reflects the consciousness of bourgeois men as rulers so much that it cannot serve as the real woman for her own sake. Is her freedom nothing but the one through which a woman becomes a perfect commodity?”⁵⁴ Still, Matsuzaki’s statement marked the actual or potential modification of Japanese women that Bow had brought about.

In effect, Japanese women’s interaction with the American star embodied the mobility and diversity of their identities, at least in discursive recognition. Aesthetics was another indicator of the fluidity. Kaeriyama Norimasa and others interpreted Bow’s popularity as evidence that the standard of beauty had transformed.⁵⁵ A film critic articulated a similar view when he explained how he had yelled at people who looked coldly at him wearing

a *hanten*, or Japanese traditional short coat, in Ginza, but then realized that the style had changed and was ashamed of himself.⁵⁶ In such critics' commentaries, social change paralleled the individual practice that Japanese women, especially "modern girls," learned, including bodily expressions, attitudes, makeup, and other daily life activities, from American stars such as Bow.⁵⁷

In addition to mobility, fans' and critics' comments on Bow uncovered the Japanese people's diversity of tastes and values. Some magazine readers admired Bow for her "beauty of health," freshness, brightness, and cuteness.⁵⁸ Some readers demonstrated their hatred for her "indecent" and "exhibitionism."⁵⁹ One female reader insisted, "it is the indecency that is her attractiveness and individual characteristic."⁶⁰ These assertions indicate how their opinions and valuations differed, as much as how some fans shared similar preferences. Vitality, they were made in the formation of their multifaceted, yet illusory relationships with the star in that they included not only commentaries on the actress and sympathies with her, but also seeming dialogue with her. In one reader's column, a reader called out to Bow, "You don't have to mind such a vulgar criticism."⁶¹ While such symbiotic relations were constructed between Japanese fans and the American star, disputes also occurred between Japanese people: "You wouldn't understand Bow's goodness!"⁶² They proceeded side by side with critics' debates on her, as most outstandingly seen between the two eminent writers, Iijima Tadashi and Uchida Kisao. Although Iijima's evaluations varied among his articles, he basically praised her for her "pleasant play," "freshness," "comfort," health, "dynamism," "rhythm," "legitimate 'it'," and "intelligent pleasure." "This is the first time," he added, "when the film depicts such a 'woman.'"⁶³ Uchida, on the other hand, repudiated her with words like "lowbrow," "vulgar," "selfish," "carnal," and "unspiritual."⁶⁴ This clear opposition between Iijima and Uchida was succinctly reflected in the fact that the former inserted Bow's photograph in his book, *The ABCs of the Cinema*, whereas the latter put Brooks's photograph in his *Introduction to Film Study*.⁶⁵ It goes without saying that these valuations of and commitments to Bow by fans and critics were inextricably linked with issues of aesthetics and morality.

Fixing the Identity

In this way, the controversy surrounding Clara Bow disclosed mobility and differences among Japanese people. How this newly emerging, "chaotic" phenomenon unsettled the status quo also can be extrapolated from the Minister of Education's instructions, which stressed the need to reinforce censorship and prompted film company owners to "ban the screening of foreign films" because they were "the source for the prevalence of 'moga' and 'mobo.'"⁶⁶ And yet, while the fans were "progressive," they were vulnerable to manipulation by industries and/or administrations, since they mostly uncritically subordinated themselves to the business strategy by which the film industry and media among others aimed at the expansion and habituation of consumption.

What roles, then, did critics take in this situation? On the one hand, as I have illustrated, they detected (or might have created) the transformation and diversification of

Japanese identities that occurred with the circulation of the American stars' images. At the same time, their controversy per se attested to the different values and tastes among them. On the other hand, from their privileged position, they were largely inclined to reduce Bow to a monolithic meaning by objectifying, rather than identifying themselves or interacting with, the actress and her fans. Their aesthetic and moral criticism tended to be made on the basis of binary categories, such as modern versus pre-modern, American versus Japanese, and capitalism versus communism, while they lacked the view with which to encourage the rising diversities and mobility of fans' identities.

Film critics were apt to define modernity by describing or constructing Clara Bow's persona. One often-taken tactic was to compare her with other American stars. The critic Okura Shoji, for instance, made a most commonly accepted assumption, classifying Louise Brooks, Colleen Moore, and Clara Bow as "modern" actresses, while identifying Lillian Gish and Mary Pickford as "old-type" actresses.⁶⁷ Despite her equal popularity during the same period, Janet Gaynor too was disqualified from the "modern" persona because, unlike Bow, she was seen to be an "innocent-type," not a sexually attractive or "flapper-type."⁶⁸ Still, as I already have noted regarding the opposition between Iijima and Uchida, not all critics identified Bow as the embodiment of modernity. For Iijima, Bow was modern, but Brooks was not, since Brooks lacked not only acting skills, but also Bow's brightness and cheerfulness; instead, she exemplified "abnormal 'it,'" "dullness," "stickiness," "masculinized woman," "just body and looks without acting," "grotesque," and "decadence."⁶⁹ For Uchida, however, it is Brooks that symbolized modernity, or "the construction of the future." He thus asserted, "her appearance and expressions all differed from something like yesterday."⁷⁰ More moderately, other critics dealt with the two American female stars as exemplifying a difference in modernity. One critic explained that Brooks was an uncompleted, modern girl, but not a "*moga*," while Bow was conservative (especially because she subordinated herself to a rich man in the end of her films), but perfectly modern, and worth calling "*moga*."⁷¹ In any case, these struggles for categorization indicate that "modernity" or "modern" was not a clear concept, but an ambiguous one. Concurrently, they show that critics, however oppositely, all strove to fix its meaning.

Unlike film critics, cultural critics did not always specify Clara Bow, but equated her with other American film stars and tried to understand them together on sets of binary categories like ones between surface and depth, consumption and production, and oldness and newness. For Gonda Yasunosuke, "*moga*" and "*mobo*," who imitated American stars, were oriented toward leisure and consumption, and hence perverted. They were also in contrast with work and production, which should be regarded as wholesome.⁷² For Uchida Roan, unlike European arts, which were "profound" and "dignified," Bow and Brooks were the "cheap" and "thin" "object lessons" by which Japanese modern girls learned about hairstyles, clothing, attitudes, and expressions. Uchida, then, posited that Japan had to make America a paragon because the Japanese civilization was not as evolved.⁷³ While Nii Itaru differentiated Bow from Brooks, he presupposed a similar hierarchy between Japan and America. For him, whereas Bow displayed rich, splendid acting yet little modernity, Brooks epitomized modernity due to her embodiment of "linear conciseness" and scientific

intelligence. Japanese women, he asserted, could not realize modernity until they reached her level by overcoming “sentimentalism and lowbrow tastes.”⁷⁴ More critically, as noted above, using terminology like “internationalization,” “Americanization,” and “colonization,” Hirabayashi Hatsunosuke, as well as Andô Kosei, set up Japan as an “old,” “local” culture in contraposition to America and its cinema stars as the dominating, “new” culture of the world.⁷⁵ Although these writers espoused neither extreme nationalism nor globalism, they were prone to highlight Japan’s reception of the American stars as having either a progressive or regressive direction, rather than an incentive for diversifying the culture.

Feminist critics used dichotomies to illuminate Bow’s significance for their gender politics. Itsuki Shoko defined “it,” which was coined by Elinor Glyn, as signifying the charm of Bow’s “personality,” and marked off it from her sex appeal and physical attraction. She then attacked men who “nevertheless made this word the pronoun of sexual attraction.”⁷⁶ The Marxist feminist, Matsuzaki Ryûkô, demonstrated a much more nuanced argument, while premising the binary view between capitalism (or Americanism) and communism. On one hand, Matsuzaki countered many male critics who, as illustrated, tended to reduce Bow’s persona to a single meaning. This reduction was also the case of male Marxist critics, even though they certainly shared the same tenet with her. Sumi Rei, for instance, contended that Bow was not modern, but an uncultured and superficially disguised proletariat who lacked social consciousness and was produced under American capitalism.⁷⁷ Likewise, the famous leftist film critic, Iwasaki Akira, though giving Bow a favorable review in *Mantrap*,⁷⁸ fundamentally repudiated the star system as a whole.⁷⁹ On the other hand, Matsuzaki also elucidated the ambivalence of Bow’s persona, which I partly noted above. For her, Bow, as well as other American flapper stars, manifested a new female type with her active and free actions, so that modern girls could learn from her not only the methods of makeup and the latest technique of romantic love, but also eroticism and nonsense, which were armaments challenging old-fashioned morality.⁸⁰ Despite such an evaluation, however, Matsuzaki claimed that Bow was not a rebel, but rather a commodity satisfying bourgeois men,⁸¹ and that, even if the flapper was radical, this was a deception produced by a capitalist industry.⁸² Thus, this feminist critic detected the potential female mobility and power that were generated from the Japanese female fans’ interaction with the American star, but ultimately she did not turn toward cultivating the significance of their self-defining activities. Instead, she just pointed to the limits of capitalism as a whole.

Matsuzaki, as well as other Marxist critics, criticized American stars such as Bow for capitalism, while taking advantage of sensational commercialism to have their articles carried in periodicals and to earn money. More fatally, they rendered the actress sensational by creating controversies about her, which gave way to the rise of reactionary forces against the new Japanese culture surrounding American film stars. In this sense, Bow’s role in the Japanese historical context involved a complexity that was not simply reducible to the radicalism that such film scholars as Lori Landy and Cynthia Felando attributed to Bow’s performance. Both highlighted the actress’s “kinetic” performance style and embodiment of a new sense of femininity while challenging Molly Haskell’s and Sumiko Higashi’s earlier studies, which regarded the star as conservative.⁸³ However, Bow’s relation to Japan’s status

quo went beyond such a binary opposition between conservativeness and progresiveness. More vitally, the Japanese fan culture of Bow was much more complex and paradoxical than the popular culture that John Fiske theorized. He assumed that the consumers' specific uses of commodities—in our case, star images—created their own meanings and pleasure, thereby destabilizing the power structure dominated by the industry, the national administration, and the patriarchal system, among others, which tended to treat people as homogeneous.⁸⁴ Certainly, as I have illustrated, this view applied, to a considerable degree, to the Japanese consumer culture that emerged with modern girls and American stars like Clara Bow. However, we should not make Bow and her fans heroic. In fact, the fans were vulnerable to the manipulation of images, as well as reactionary forces, not the least because their self-defining activities appeared to lack critical consciousness about the star.

In effect, the circulation of Clara Bow's images affected Japanese society by opening up the fluidity and diversity of people's identities, while inducing the criticism and administrative cautions that tried to reduce them to a rather monolithic meaning. While film stars are likely to be seen as a cultural trivia, the American star became a significant force to transform the socio-cultural sphere in Japan during the latter half of the twenties.

Notes

- 1 This essay is the one in which I have developed my ideas from my Japanese article, "Nihon no kindaisei to Amerika no eiga sutâ: Kurara Bau no imêji ryûtsû o megutte," *Eizôgaku* 65 (November 2000): 5–24. For a more extensive discussion, see my "Multiplying Personas: The Formation of Film Stars in Modern Japan," (Ph.D. diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2005).
- 2 Shirota Shûichi, *Gendai manga taikan: Gendai sesô manga* (Tokyo: Chûô bijutsu-sha, 1928): 3.
- 3 More specifically, this is what Gonda Yasunosuke's referred to as "propertied leisured class, or at least petit bourgeois." See his *Minshû goraku ron* (Tokyo: Genshōdō shoten, 1931), reprinted in Gonda Yasunosuke chosaku-shû, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Bunwa-sha, 1974), 240–247. This class also can be identified with a "new middle class," which became salient in the early twenty century, especially in the wake of World War I. The formation of the new middle class involved various social factors including the influx of population from countries to cities, the popularization of media, the transformation of educational system, and the rise of consumer culture. See Kadowaki Atsushi, "Shin chûkansô no ryô teki henka," in *Seikatsu suijun no ryô teki bunseki*, edited by Nihon risâchi sôgô kenkyûsho (Tokyo: Sôgô kenkyû kaihatu kikô, 1988), 213–249; Maeda Ai, *Kindai dokusha no seiritu* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2001), 211–229; Yamamoto Taketoshi, *Kindai nihon no shinbun dokushasô* (Tokyo: Hôsei daigaku shuppan-kyoku, 1981), especially 273–288; Takeuchi Yô, *Gakureki kizoku no eikô to zassetsu* (Tokyo: Chûô kôron-sha, 1999), 175–190; and Louise Young, "Marketing the Modern: Department Stores, Consumer Culture, and the New Middle Class," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 55 (Spring 1999): especially 61.
- 4 See Miriam Silverberg, "The Modern Girl as Militant," in *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600–1945*, edited by Gail Lee Bersten (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 239–266.
- 5 For studies of modern girls, see, for instance, Minami Hiroshi, "Masu bunka to seikatsu ishiki," in *Taishô bunka, 1905–1927*, edited by Minami Hiroshi et al. (Tokyo: Keisô shobô, 1965), 350–369; Barbara Hamil Satô, "Josei: Modanizumu to kenri ishiki," in *Shôwa bunka, 1925–1945*, edited by Minami Hiroshi et al. (Tokyo: Keisô shobô, 1987), 198–231; Suzuki Sadami, *Modan toshi no hyôgen* (Kyoto: Hakuchi-sha, 1992); Saitô Minako, *Modan gârû ron: Onna'noko niwa shusse no michi ga futatsu aru* (Tokyo: Magazinhausu, 2000); Takahashi Yasuo, *Danpatsu suru onnatachi* (Tokyo: Kyôiku shuppan, 1999); Phyllis Brinbaum, *Modern Girls, Shining Stars, the Skies of Tokyo* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Kendall H. Brown, "Flowers of Taishô: Images of Women in Japanese Society and Art, 1915–1935," in *Taishô Chic: Japanese Modernity, Nostalgia, and Deco* (Honolulu: Honolulu Academy of Arts, 2001), 17–28; Miriam Silverberg, "The Cafe Waitress Serving Modern Japan," in *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan*, edited by Stephen Vlastos (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 208–225; and Barbara Sato, *The New Japanese Woman: Modernity, Media, and Women in Interwar Japan* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). For discussions on modern girls' relationship with cinema, see Darrell William Davis, *Picturing Japaneseness: Monumental Style, National Identity, Japanese Film*

- (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996), 47–62; and Mitsuyo Wada-Marciano, “The Production of Modernity in Japanese Cinema: Shochiku Kamata Style in the 1920s and 1930s” (Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 2000), Chapter 6.
- 6 Sato, *The New Japanese Woman*, 16, Chapter 2.
 - 7 Ibid., 45.
 - 8 For instance, Ibid., Chapter 2; Silverberg, “The Cafe Waitress Serving Modern Japan,” 208–225; and Harry Harootunian, *Overcome by Modernity: History, Culture, and Community in Interwar Japan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 11–13, 21–22. Other scholars have pointed out that modern girls were observed and described exclusively from a male-centered view. See, for instance, Ikeda Shinobu and Kim Hyaesin, *Shokuminchi ‘Chôsen’ to teikoku ‘Nippon’ no josei hyôshô*,” in *Kindai nihon no bunkashi*, vol. 6, *Kakudai suru modaniti, 1920–1930 nendai 2* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2002), 284–298.
 - 9 See Yoshimi Shun’ya, “Teito Tokyo to modaniti no bunka seijigaku: 1920, 1930 nendai eno shiza,” in *Kindai nihon no bunkashi*, vol. 6, *Kakudaisuru modaniti: 1920–1930 nendai 2* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2002), 24–36.
 - 10 This view also seems to be shared by Sato, Silverberg, and Harootunian, all of whom also are aware that modern girls or *moga* were a product of the capitalism system and served to reinforce it. See endnote 5.
 - 11 In this sense, I depart from Sato and others, who have posited that “the modern girl was more an object than as a self-defining subject.” Sato, *The New Japanese Woman*, 48. Also see Ikeda and Kim, *Shokuminchi ‘Chôsen’ to teikoku ‘Nippon’ no josei hyôshô*.”
 - 12 While the exclusion of modern girls or *moga* has been analyzed, an analysis of ways in which they were incorporated into nationalism seems almost absent in many previous studies.
 - 13 For the release of her films, see Hata Akio, ed., *20 seiki Amerika eiga jiten* (Tokyo: Katarogu hausu, 2002).
 - 14 In *Eve’s Lover* (September 1926; US release in July 1925), Clara Bow was not a main character.
 - 15 *Kinema junpô* (January 1, 1927).
 - 16 See, for instance, Mori, “Amerika eiga amerika onna,” 185; Minami Akio, “Furappa bunmei,” *Kinema junpô* (May 1, 1928): 57; Kishiyama Osamu, “Shinkô eiga, “Eiga no kôsei,” *Shinkô eiga* (October 1929): 83; Nii, “Eiga to josei no kindai gata,” 196; Andô, *Ginza saiken*, 51; and Uchida, “Modân o kataru,” 21.
 - 17 See, for instance, Nii, “Eiga to josei no kindai gata,” 196; Iijima Tadashi, “Kurara Bou to Ruizu Burukkusu: Firumu no yohaku ni,” *Eiga jidai* (June 1927): 19–21; Ôkura Shôji, “Eiga joyû no futatsu no kata,” *Gekkan eiga* (June 1927): 1; Inukai Ken, “Eiga dan’yû joyû oyobi kantoku,” *Eiga jidai* (July 1927): 7; and Nito Bôshû, “Jûroku no hoshi: Ruizu Burukkusu,” *Eiga sekai* (April 1928): 32–33.
 - 18 Sara Ross, “Banking the Flames of Youth: The Hollywood Flapper, 1920–1930” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2000), 265, 267.
 - 19 For their releases in United States, see David Stenn, *Clara Bow: Runnin’ Wild* (New York: Cooper Square Press, 2000), 287–313.
 - 20 For the prohibition of *Kiss Me Again*, see “Tôsei onna daigaku,” *Yomiuri shinbun* (December 27, 1930): 7. According to this article, only five-meters were cut, and now that the society had changed for five years and eroticism had been accepted, its exhibition was realized.
 - 21 See Naimushô keiho-kyoku, *Katsudô shashin firumu ken’etsu jihô*, reprinted in *Eiga ken’etsu jihô*, edited by Makino Mamoru (Tokyo: Fuji shuppan, 1985–1986). For the censorship, see Makino Mamoru, “Fukkokuban eiga ken’etsu jihô: Kaisetsu,” Ibid., vol.1, 1; and his *Nihon eiga ken’etsu-shi* (Tokyo: Pandora, 2003); and Gregory J. Kasza, *The State and the Mass Media in Japan, 1918–1945* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988, 54–71. The censorship system was established by Ordinance No. 10 of Home Ministry on April 5, 1925, and the Police Agency issued a periodical about their direction of each film from 1927 through 1943.
 - 22 Sara Ross, “The Hollywood Flapper and the Culture of Media Consumption,” in *Hollywood Goes Shopping*, edited by David Desser and Garth S. Jowett (Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 2000), 61–68.
 - 23 Ibid., 67.
 - 24 “Modan gâru to yamaotoko (*The Runaway*),” *Kinema Junpô* (June 1, 1927): 17; “Koibito gôdatsu (*Get Your Man Wine*),” *Kinema Junpô* (March 1, 1928): 22; “Sake! Sake! (*Wine*),” *Kinema junpô* (January 1, 1925): 27; “Ranbô Rôsi (*Rough House Rosie*),” *Kinema junpô* (October 11, 1927): 19; “Kantai nyûkô (*The Fleet’s In*),” *Kinema junpô* (December 11, 1928):39; “Sanshûkan (*Three Weekends*),” *Kinema junpô* (February 1929): 18; “Fûpura (*Hoop-La*),” *Kinema junpô* (April 1, 1934): 111; “Akai kami (*Red Hair*),” *Kinema junpô* (June 1, 1928): 20; and “Koi no depâto (*The Saturday Night Kid*),” *Kinema junpô* (February 1930): 40. Most of these films are unavailable or difficult to see while *It*, *Mantrap* and *Hula* are not.
 - 25 Ross, “Banking the Flames of Youth,” 269.
 - 26 Lori Landay might highlight this as the “kinetic and comic aspects of the flapper film.” See her “The Flapper Film: Comedy, Dance, and Jazz Age,” in *A Feminist Reader in Early Cinema*, edited by Jennifer M. Bean and Diane Negra (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 223.
 - 27 Ruth Vasey, *The World According to Hollywood, 1918–1939* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997), 113.
 - 28 Lori Landay, *Madcaps, Screwballs, Con Women: The Female Trickster in American Culture* (Philadelphia:

- University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 76; and Marsha Orgeron, "Making It in Hollywood: Clara Bow, Fandom, and Consumer Culture," *Cinema Journal* 42/4 (Summer 2003): 88.
- 29 Ibid., 83–84.
- 30 "Sokonuke sawagi (*Wild Party*)," *Kinema jumpô* (July 1, 1929): 56.
- 31 See, for instance, the review of "Denkô musume (*Black Lighting*)," *Kinema jumpô* (September 11, 1929): 68; and the review of "Koi no depâto (*The Saturday Night Kid*)," *Kinema jumpô* (February 11, 1930): 40.
- 32 "Kyokusen nayamashi (Dangerous Curves)," *Kinema jumpô* (September 21, 1929): 39–40; and "Kikku in (Kick In)," *Kinema jumpô* (September 1, 1931): 41–42.
- 33 "Misu dainamaito (*Call Her Savage*)," *Kinema jumpô* (July 11, 1938): 40.
- 34 Vasey, *The World According to Hollywood*.
- 35 In addition to *ibid.*, see Lea Jacobs, *The Wages of Sin: Censorship and the Fallen Woman, 1928–1942* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); and Richard Maltby, "The Production Code and the Hays Office," in *Grand Design: Hollywood as a Modern Business Enterprise, 1930–1929*, edited by Tino Balio (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 37–72.
- 36 Niimura Izuru, "Itto oyobi sonota no hanashi," *Bungei shunjû* (October 1930): 40–41.
- 37 See the collection of reprinted dictionaries, *Kindai yôgo no jiten shûsei*, vols. 11–23, 34 (Tokyo: Ôzara-sha, 1994–1996). Also see "Modan hyakugo jiten," *Bungei shunjû* (January 1930): 376.
- 38 In the popularity poll of actresses in *Eiga sekai*, for instance, she took tenth place, while Mary Astor first and Colleen Moore second. In the best films of the year in *Kinema jumpô*, the highest rankings among her films were taken by *Mantrap* in sixteenth place and by *It* in thirty-fourth in 1928, while *Seventh Heaven* took first place in that year. See *Eiga sekai* (February 1928): 86; *Kinema jumpô* (March 11, 1928): 40.
- 39 Ôkubo Tadamoto, "Kurara Itto no kiki," *Eiga sekai* (December 1927): 56–59; Murakami Tokusaburô, "Onikubo Kyûso," *Eiga sekai* (January 1928): 52–55; Kôfuku no kuni no iriguchi de," *Eiga sekai* (February 1928): 106–109; Minami Hankurô, "Geigun o otte," *Eiga sekai* (March 1928): 61–65; and Shimazu Yasujirô, "Dotô kôshinkyoku," *Eiga jidai* (May 1928): 61–65. Likewise, Iwasaki Akira created the story that contained the character named Clara Louise. See his "Eiga geijutsu-shi," in Iwasaki Akira, *Eiga geijutsu-shi* (Tokyo: Geibun shoin, 1930), 3–74.
- 40 Muroo Saisei, "Kurara Bou ron," *Chûô kôron* (May 1928): 109–110; and Iijima Tadashi, "Sokode kanojo ga," *Eiga jidai* (July 1929): 68.
- 41 *Kinema jumpô* (January 1, 1927).
- 42 *Yomiuri shinbun* (October 14, 1929): 3.
- 43 Clara Bow, "Mai raifu sutôri," translated by Kikuchi Yutaka, *Eiga sekai* (May 1928): 66–69; (June 1928): 64–67; (July 1928): 64–65; (August 1928): 66–67; (October 1928): 68–71; (November 1928): 74–76; (December 1928): 87–89; and (January 1929): 61–63. For the differentiation, see *Eiga sekai* (May 1928): 66.
- 44 "CLUB," *Eiga sekai* (December 1928): 104.
- 45 "CLUB," *Eiga sekai* (January 1929): 88.
- 46 For example, Bow was incorporated as a model in a photograph with the article about cosmetics by Mei Ushiyama, a then-famous stylist who ran her beauty salon named "Hariuddo keshôshitsu (Hollywood cosmetic salon). See *Yomiuri shinbun* (July 1, 1931): 9.
- 47 Nii, "Eiga to josei no kindai-gata," 196.
- 48 Hirabayashi Hatsunosuke, "Supôtsu to Marx to cinema," 150.
- 49 Ibid. and his "Beikoku no kikan toshite no eiga," 411–415. Similar observations about the globalization of the culture with Bow and other American stars can be seen in Nii, "Eiga to josei no kindai-gata," 196; Uchida, "Modân o kataru," 20; Andô, *Ginza saiken*, 51; Minami, "Furappa bunmei," 57; Muroo Saisei, "Eiga jihyô," *Chûô kôron* (March 1928): 151; and Kishiyama Osamu, "Eiga no kosei," 83.
- 50 "Joryu eiga zadan kai," *Eiga jidai* (April 1929): 37–38.
- 51 For the most evident example, see Ôya Sôichi, *Modan sô to modan sô*, 137.
- 52 Minami Akio, "Furappa bunmei," 57.
- 53 Matsuzaki Ryûko, "Kurara Bau to sono kage," *Shinkô eiga* (November 1929): 62.
- 54 Ibid., 63.
- 55 Kaeriyama Norimasa, *Eiga no seiteki miwaku* (Tokyo: Bunkiyû-sha, 1928), 110–111; "Joryû eiga zadankai," 37–38. Yet, in another article, Kaeriyama explained that her popularity was not due to a modern beauty, but to her "it." See his "Aa!! Seiteki miwaku," *Eiga jidai* (February 1929): 32–35.
- 56 "Eiga to warera ga modan raifu," 39. This statement was made by Higashi Kenji, who was known by his pseudonym, Gu Kyôshi.
- 57 For instance, see Mori, "Amerika eiga Amerika onna," 185; Nii, *Eiga to josei no kindai-gata*, 193; and "Modan hyôjô jutsu," *Modan tehadoki*, separate booklet of *Fujin kôron*, (April 1931): 6; and Shirota, ed. *Gendai sesô manga*, 36.
- 58 For instance, see Kubota Hitomi, "Kurara Bau san," *Eiga sekai* (January 1929): 71.
- 59 For instance, see Satsuma Shôjin, "Eiga gaku' o kensetsu seyo," *Eiga sekai* (December 1928): 97.

- 60 Yukiko, "Kurara Bou, soshite Ruizu Burukkusu," *Eiga sekai* (October 1928): 72–73.
- 61 Kubota, "Kurara Bau san," 71.
- 62 "CLUB," *Eiga sekai* (January 1929): 89.
- 63 Iijima, "Kurara Bou to Ruizu Burukkusu," 19–20.
- 64 Uchida Kisao, "Burukkusu," *Eiga sekai* (November 1928): 38; and his and Furukawa Roppa's "Kurara Bou ron," *Eiga jidai* (March 1929): 70–74.
- 65 Iijima Tadashi, *Shinema no ABC* (Tokyo: Kôseikaku shoten, 1929); and Uchida Kisao, *Eigagaku nyûmon* (Tokyo: Zen'ei shobô, 1928).
- 66 *Yomiuri shinbun* (August 17, 1928): 2.
- 67 Ôkura, "Eiga joyu no futatsu no kata," 1.
- 68 "Tôzai sutâ hyaku den," *Fujin kôron* (April 1928): 200; and "Gaikoku eiga yunyû haikyûkai," *Kinema junpô* (September 1, 1929): 361. Another critic also disqualified Constantine Talmage as being a modern actress because she lacked the amorousness that an actress like Bow had. See *Kinema junpô* (June 1, 1927): 22.
- 69 Iijima, "Kurara Bou to Ruizu Burukkusu," 21.
- 70 Uchida, "Burukkusu," 38.
- 71 Nito, "Ruizu Burukkusu," 32–33. Also see Inukai Ken, "Eiga danyû joyû oyobi kantoku," *Eiga jidai* (July 1927): 7.
- 72 Gonda, *Minshû goraku ron*, 240–247.
- 73 Uchida, "Modân o kataru," 16–24.
- 74 Nii, "Eiga to josei no kindagata," 196–199.
- 75 Hirabayashi, "Supôtsu to Marx to cinema," 150–152; his "Beikokuka no kikan toshitenô eiga," 411–415; and Andô, *Ginza saiken*, 51.
- 76 Itsuki Shôko, "Onna ga mita shinema no yôfu to furappâ," *Eiga jidai* (April 1930): 89–91.
- 77 Sumi Rei, "Zuisô nidai," *Kinema junpô* (March 1, 1928): 58.
- 78 *Kinema junpô* (May 5, 1927): 34.
- 79 For instance, see Iwasaki Akira, *Eiga to shihonshugi* (Tokyo: Ôrai-sha, 1931): 85–88.
- 80 Matsuzaki, "Kurara Bau to sono kage," 62; and her "Eiga ni arawareta josei," *Shinkô eiga* (April 1930): 65–68, quote from 66 in the latter.
- 81 Matsuzaki, "Kurara Bau to sono kage," 63.
- 82 Matsuzaki, "Eiga ni arawareta josei," 67. As evidence that the flapper was unrealistic, she exemplified that five short-haired women were fired in Japanese film companies.
- 83 Lori Landay, "The Flapper Film," 221–248; Cynthia Felando, "Clara Bow is It," in *Film Stars: Hollywood and Beyond*, edited by Andy Willis (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2004), 8–24; Molly Haskell, *From Reverence to Rape: The Treatment of Women in the Movies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 79–80; and Sumiko Higashi, *Virgins, Vamps and Flappers: The American Silent Movie Heroine* (Quebec: Eden Press Women's Publications, 1978), 105.
- 84 Fiske, "Commodities and Culture," 23–47. For an alternative view, Heather Addison illuminated the relationship among the historically prevailed notion of physicality, Bow's physical proportion and its change, and her popularity. See his *Hollywood and the Rise of Physical Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 115–125.