

INTRODUCTION

TRAFFIC IN ASIAN WOMEN

This book offers several ways of making critical sense of the transnational circulation of “Asian women” as distinguished figures of female injury and women’s empowerment in the 1990s. One of the most well-known and sustained campaigns was organized around documenting and adjudicating the Japanese military “comfort system,” which forcibly conscripted two hundred thousand women for systematic rape by soldiers and officers of the Imperial Army across a broad swath of East and Southeast Asia before and during World War II. The issue first captured international news headlines on December 6, 1991, when Kim Hak-sun and two other Korean women survivors joined a thirty-five-person lawsuit filed in Tokyo against the Japanese government for violations perpetrated during the colonial occupation of Korea (1910–45). In addition to requesting 20 million yen in compensation for each plaintiff,

the lawsuit demanded a thorough investigation and proper memorialization of this history of Japanese colonial violence and exploitation.

Although it was widely heralded as a shocking revelation of Japanese wartime atrocities, the memories of these military “comfort stations” had never been forgotten or fully suppressed. How the issue was able to garner so much international publicity in the early 1990s must be understood within the context of several overlapping economic, political, and discursive shifts that crisscross national and regional demarcations. After nearly three decades of U.S.-backed military dictatorship in South Korea, massive popular protests in the 1980s led to the restoration of civil rights and direct presidential elections in 1987. The country’s rapid economic growth was showcased in its hosting of the 1988 Summer Olympics in Seoul. With its earlier economic ascendance and expanding reserves, Japan became an influential source of bilateral aid and direct investment in South Korea, Taiwan, and throughout East and Southeast Asia. Although the U.S. played a key role in supporting the economic growth of Japan and South Korea as part of its Cold War strategy of containment, the end of the Cold War in 1989 combined with greater intra-Asian diplomatic rapprochement and regional economic integration to engender new spatiotemporal imaginaries such as “the rise of Asia” and “the Asian century.” Japan also began to play an increasingly prominent role in global governance through increased financial contributions to the United Nations and the World Bank and also through a sustained campaign to gain a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. The death of Japanese Emperor Hirohito in 1989 rekindled bitter memories of Japan’s brutal colonial rule in South Korea and its expansionist drive throughout Asia and the Pacific. That same year, Japan sent observers to UN peacekeeping forces, provoking renewed concerns and protests over its remilitarization and refocusing attention on the past atrocities of the Japanese Imperial Army. In 1992, the passage of the International Cooperation Law authorized Japan to send military personnel to UN peacekeeping operations.

The multisited recall, revelation, and problematization of the history of Japanese military “comfort system” unfurled within these shifting configurations of sovereignty, cooperation, and ambition. In February 1988, three members of Korean Church Women United (KCWU), Yun Chung-ok, Kim Hye-won, and Kim Sin-sil, conducted a research trip to investigate former “comfort stations” in Okinawa and Fukuoka. In April 1988, Yun gave a presentation about their findings on the Japanese military “comfort system” at an international conference on “Women and Tourism” on Korea’s Cheju Island, a popular destination for “sex tours” by Japanese men taking easy advantage of the strength of the Japanese yen against the Korean won. These tours had become the target

of public protests by Korean women's groups in the early 1970s, which later expanded into an allied regional network that connected activists in South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, and the Philippines working on the conjoined problems of sex tourism and U.S. military prostitution in Asia. Following the "Women and Tourism" conference, the KCWU organized the *Chongshindae* Research Association in July 1988. *Chongshindae*, commonly translated as "voluntary labor corps," was the Korean term used to designate the Japanese colonial state's conscription of Korean girls and women to work often far from home and homeland in support of its imperialist expansion, which included the military "comfort stations."

On January 7, 1989, a broad coalition of women's groups, including the KCWU, the YWCA of Korea, and the Federation of Korean Women's Associations, composed an open letter protesting the South Korean government's plan to send a representative to the funeral of the Japanese Emperor Hirohito. They pointed to the coercive and violent expropriation of Korean women as laborers and "comfort women" for Japanese soldiers and demanded an apology. In May 1990 the occasion of a state visit to Japan by President Roh Tae-woo set off impassioned protests in South Korea and new debates in Japan but also internationally over whether Japan should apologize for its forced annexation and colonial exploitation of Koreans.¹ South Korean women's groups seized this opening to issue a joint statement about the *Chongshindae*. Following Roh's visit, Motooka Shoji, a Social Democrat member of the Japanese Diet, requested clarification from Shimizu Tadao, then Director-General of the Employment Security Office, about whether military "comfort women" (*jugun ianfu*) were included in the forced labor mobilizations of Koreans during the colonial period. Shimizu's facile denial of official involvement and forced recruitment roused more anger. On October 17, 1990, a coalition of thirty-seven South Korean women's groups drafted an open letter of protest to the Japanese Diet and later formed the Korean Council for Women Drafted for Sexual Slavery by Japan (hereafter referred to as the Korean Council) on November 16, 1990. Through mass media appeals, the Korean Council set about to locate survivors. On August 14, 1991, the Korean Council held a press conference in which Kim Hak-sun became the first survivor to testify publicly about her experiences in the Japanese military "comfort stations," which moved other survivors to come forward. In November 1991 two allied *zainichi* (Korean residents in Japan) organizations were formed, the Uli Yosong Network on Comfort Women (Yosong Net) in Tokyo and the Group Considering the Korean Military Comfort Women Issue in Osaka.² In February 1992 the Korean Council first raised the issue at the United Nations.

This recharged attention to Japanese military “comfort stations” coincided with an unprecedented proliferation of new communication technologies, media platforms, and institutional forums through which atrocities and grievances could be publicized and debated. The United Nations became more hospitable to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working on a broader range of issues and representing new, previously ignored, or marginalized constituencies. As Jutta Joachim matter-of-factly characterized this interregnum, the “thaw” of the Cold War “freed up agenda space.” There was a closely staggered convergence of multiple discursive and organizational shifts: “In the absence of the East-West conflict, issues that UN policymakers had once considered important began to appear meaningless. Looking for new issues to fill the vacuum, UN policymakers decided to hold a series of specialized conferences in the early 1990s, starting with the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, followed by the World Human Rights Conference in Vienna in 1993 and the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo in 1994.”³ An incitement to documentation and a consequent will to declaration, which motor the work of global governance, accrued new urgency and created new openings. There was a groundswell of new social movements and knowledge formations that assiduously catalogued multiple violations of human rights, including several concerted efforts to publicize, codify, and redress specific abuses of women. The organized mass rapes of women in the former Yugoslavia in the spring and summer of 1992 spurred the UN Security Council to establish a Commission of Experts to call for an investigation. In December 1992 the Security Council declared that “massive, organized and systematic detention and rape of women, in particular Muslim women, in Bosnia and Herzegovina” constituted an international crime. The Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), first adopted in May 1993, would consequently include rape as one of the “crimes against humanity” in Article 4 alongside enslavement, deportation, imprisonment, and torture. Even as it was upheld for its singular and unfathomable brutality, the Japanese military “comfort system” strikingly instantiated multiple modes of gendered violence, degradation, and exploitation. As Indai Lourdes Sajor, a prominent activist, enumerated this expansive relevance, “Based on the testimonies given by the Asian comfort women, it is evident that more than one crime has been committed against every woman. Evidence points to crimes of rape, murder, abduction, forced labour, kidnapping, sexual slavery, torture, racial discrimination, forced sterilization, massacre and genocide.”⁴

Although it was widely held up as exemplifying these varied offenses, the belated—and still very contested—recognition of the Japanese military “com-

fort system” incriminates a longer, more jagged history of international maneuvers to categorize, document, and regulate female vulnerability and their often dubious, ex-centric delineation of Asian women. The Japanese military “comfort system” presented a compelling instance of the traffic in women, which had long been a persistent fixation and flash point for domestic and international regimes of surveillance and control over female migration, labor, and sexuality. The title of this book, *Traffic in Asian Women*, partially echoes this notorious career of the traffic in women but also notates the distinguished place of Asian women in anti-trafficking discourses and policies, which reach back into the nineteenth-century crusades against “white slavery” and Asian female migration. Later, in the interwar period, the League of Nations undertook a “worldwide” study that was published in two parts: *Report of the Special Body of Experts on Traffic in Women and Children* (1927) and *Enquiry into Traffic in Women and Children in the East* (1932). The 1932 enquiry report drew a clear line between what were separately designated as “Traffic in Occidental Women in Asia” and “Traffic in Asian Women.” In the aftermath of World War II, the newly established United Nations resumed the League of Nations’ anti-trafficking work and inherited these demarcations. The UN General Assembly passed a “Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others” in 1949 and sponsored the publication of a “Study on Traffic in Persons and Prostitution” in 1959. This 1959 report reinforced a demarcation between “Asia and the Far East” and “North America and certain European countries.”⁵

The “traffic in women” reemerged as a problem for concerted international investigation and action with the designation of the UN Decade for Women (1975–85). Its many associated international conferences and preparatory activities fueled a new drive to document both old and new forms of gendered abuse. The First World Conference of the International Women’s Year, convened in Mexico City in 1975, yielded Resolution 7, on the “Prevention of the exploitation of women and girls,” which began by characterizing prostitution as “one of the most grievous offences against the dignity of women” and then noted concern with “the injustice and suffering imposed especially on women who are forced into prostitution.” This resolution concluded by urging governments “to take energetic action to put an end to forced prostitution and the traffic in women, both of which are forms of exploitation” and invoked the recently passed UN General Assembly Resolution 3218 (XXIX), on “Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment in relation to detention and imprisonment,” to request the Secretary-General to explore “the possibility of undertaking a worldwide survey of houses of prostitution

where torture is practiced.” The traffic in women was thus narrowed and subordinated to forced prostitution, which was, in turn, amplified as a form of torture in its resurgence as a feminist issue in the 1970s.

In 1979 Kathleen Barry published her influential book *Female Sexual Slavery*, where she offered this bracing definition: “Female sexual slavery is present in all situations in which women or girls cannot change the immediate conditions of their existence; where regardless of how they got into those conditions they cannot get out; and where they are subject to sexual violence and exploitation.” Arguing that “virtually the only distinction that can be made between traffic in women and prostitution is that the former involves crossing international borders,” Barry concluded that “the practices used to force women into prostitution are the same whether they are trafficked across international boundaries or from one part of a city to another.” In addition to more accurately describing their coercive conditions, “female sexual slavery” was more all-encompassing because it “refers to international traffic in women *and* forced street prostitution taken together.”⁶ Both geographical distinctions of scale and political-juridical demarcations of sovereignty were rendered insignificant.

Barry would go on in the 1980s to lead a concerted international campaign to install the more visceral and emotively powerful category of “sexual slavery” in the lexicon of feminist organizing, scholarship, and global governance. At the 1980 Mid-Decade World Conference on Women in Copenhagen, Barry helped U.S. Congresswoman Barbara Mikulski draft Resolution 43—“Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others and Traffic in Persons”—which was included in the World Plan of Action. The emphasis on force in the 1975 Mexico resolution was amplified by declaring now that “women and children (boys and girls) are still all too often victims of physical abuse and sexual exploitation constituting virtual slavery.”⁷ In addition to helping draft Resolution 43, Barry also led workshops on “female sexual slavery” at the parallel NGO Forum in Copenhagen.

In 1982, at the request of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) appointed Jean Fernand-Laurent as a Special Rapporteur charged with producing a new UN report on the traffic in women, which he completed and submitted in March 1983. The report declared that in taking a “human rights approach” to the issue, “we, like the Commission on Human Rights, consider prostitution to be a form of slavery.”⁸ Then, in April 1983, Kathleen Barry, Charlotte Bunch, and Shirley Castley co-organized the ten-day Global Feminist Workshop to Organize Against Traffic in Women in Rotterdam. In the introduction to the published proceed-

ings, *International Feminism: Networking against Female Sexual Slavery*, Bunch and Castley pressed for the adoption of “female sexual slavery” as a more accurate term: “Traditionally, forced prostitution has been somewhat euphemistically referred to as ‘traffic in women,’ thus often masking the actual condition of involuntary servitude and violence against women that this practice entails.”⁹ Note the emergence of this new category of “violence against women” as one aspect of the older category of traffic in women. In her opening paper at the Rotterdam workshop, Barry recalled that she had been “motivated to understand the relationship of force, coercion and violence in prostitution to the violence in all women’s lives around the world, in wife battery, rape, incest, bride burning, excision and pornography.” She continued: “In these meetings we realized that as we defined female sexual slavery, it applied to women who are the victims of sex tourism, who are the victims of gangs that traffic in women from South America to Europe, women who are sexually tortured and enslaved as political prisoners in totalitarian dictatorships and women enslaved in their own homes.” Thus, sexual abuse, physical violence, and spousal rape could now be placed under the rubric of female sexual slavery. Barry went on to explain a key difference between the prevailing United Nations definition of traffic in women and a feminist definition of female sexual slavery: “We include in our concerns *any* situation a woman is in, in which she cannot get away, and in that situation is physically abused and sexually exploited.”¹⁰ The ambiguous situation of “women enslaved in their own homes” could also be extended to any form of compulsory and uncompensated domestic labor, thus suggesting a very broad compass of female slavery, but this was circumscribed by emphasis upon its sexual forms, which was further reduced to and conflated with prostitution. By May 1983, the ECOSOC passed Resolution 1983/30, which declared that “the enslavement of women and children subjected to prostitution is incompatible with the dignity and fundamental rights of the human person.” The nondistinction between trafficking and prostitution and between prostitution and slavery became merged and codified as a distinctive human rights position considerate of women.

A parallel and sometimes overlapping effort to identify violence against women (VAW) as a distinctive phenomenon necessitating focused attention and documentation also created new activist linkages, institutional openings, and knowledge formations. Although international organizing around the issue can be traced back to the formation of the Women’s International Information and Communication Service (ISIS) in 1974, “violence against women” was not included in the agenda for the first UN Decade for Women (1975–85), which had the focus of “Equality, Development, and Peace.”¹¹ Neither the

phrase “violence against women” nor the word “violence,” for that matter, appears in the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). It was not until the 3rd World Conference on Women in Nairobi in 1985 that the problem was explicitly addressed and included in the resulting *Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women*: “Violence against women exists in various forms in everyday life in all societies. Women are beaten, mutilated, burned, sexually abused and raped. Such violence is a major obstacle to the achievement of peace and the other objectives of the Decade and should be given special attention.”¹² Perhaps the easy opposition of violence versus peace created a special discursive opening in 1985, but this suturing of obstacle and goal was muddled by their incommensurable scales. Violence against women was still largely confined to the domestic sphere and not fathomable as a matter of interstate relations and negotiations.

In the aftermath of the Cold War, violence against women was able to command greater attention and gained much traction with the intertwined growth of human rights and feminist activism. The Center for Women’s Global Leadership (CWGL), which was established in 1989 at Rutgers University under the leadership of Charlotte Bunch, organized a three-year program on the theme of “women, violence, and human rights,” which included the convening of a two-week-long Women’s Leadership Institute and the publication of pamphlets and reports. In 1990 Bunch published in the *Human Rights Quarterly* an influential essay titled “Women’s Rights as Human Rights.” Versions of this essay were also reprinted and circulated as part of the CWGL’s publications. The essay outlines several examples of how “sexism kills” and how “being female is life-threatening”: “Sex discrimination kills women daily. When combined with race, class, and other forms of oppression, it constitutes a deadly denial of women’s right to life and liberty on a large scale throughout the world. The most pervasive violation of females is violence against women in all its manifestations, from wife battery, incest, and rape, to dowry deaths, genital mutilation, and female sexual slavery.”¹³ Female sexual slavery was now configured as one specific manifestation of a much broader and “most pervasive” rubric of violence against women.

The CWGL launched several linked initiatives to raise international awareness around violence against women (VAW). According to the 1992–93 report of the CWGL, “The Center has focused on violence against women as the issue that clearly and urgently highlights the importance of expanding human rights to include women.”¹⁴ In June 1991 the first Women’s Leadership Institute brought together twenty-three women from twenty countries to share infor-

mation and strategize collectively. In anticipation of the June 1993 UN World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna, the CWGL organized the still-active campaign titled “16 Days of Activism against Gender Violence,” which begins November 25, designated as the International Day against Violence against Women, and ends December 10, on Human Rights Day.¹⁵ The 16 Days Campaign included a worldwide petition drive coordinated with the International Women’s Tribune Centre (IWTC), which called on the Preparatory Committee of the Vienna Conference to recognize violence against women as “a violation of human rights requiring immediate action.” The center also coordinated the Global Campaign for Women’s Human Rights, a network of ninety NGOs that held local and regional hearings and rallied together to make violence against women a “special theme” of the 1993 conference. Finally, it organized the Global Tribunal on Violations of Women’s Human Rights, which was to be convened parallel to the intergovernmental UN conference in Vienna.

These coordinated efforts proved effective. According to paragraph 18 of the Vienna Declaration and Program of Action, “Gender-based violence and all forms of sexual harassment and exploitation, including those resulting from cultural prejudice and international trafficking are incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person, and must be eliminated.” By December 1993, the UN General Assembly adopted without a vote the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (DEVAW), which called for the appointment of a Special Rapporteur on violence against women. Radhika Coomaraswamy, a Sri Lankan lawyer educated in the U.S. who had served on the Steering Committee of the Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development (APWLD), was appointed to the position and would serve until 2013. Violence against women soon came to be decried and was codified in several other sectors of the United Nations and global governance. The Programme of Action emerging from the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo declared that “the elimination of all kinds of violence against women and ensuring women’s ability to control their own fertility are cornerstones of population and development-related programmes.” Also in 1994, the World Bank sponsored the publication of a study titled *Violence against Women: The Hidden Health Burden*. These moves to recognize and codify the problem were hailed as the successful fruition of international feminist organizing. As Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink pointed out in *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, “By the mid-1990s, it had become the most important international women’s issue, and the most dynamic new international human rights concern.”¹⁶ As violence against women was defined and deployed as an all-encompassing category but more stirring

than discrimination against women, the transnational movement against VAW generated and proliferated a growing catalogue of variously particular modes of injury, proper ways of knowing and systematically recording their occurrence, and their corresponding remedy, punishment, and prevention.

These multiple power/knowledge streams on traffic in women, female sexual slavery, and violence against women merged with and amplified one another in the 1990s. The distinctively and viscerally imperiled groupings of “trafficking victims” and “sex slaves” were thus crucial to the early arguments for “women’s rights as human rights.” But the newly activated categories of abuse also delineated smaller demographics for documentation, analysis, and redress, and thereby effected the neutralization of “women” (unmodified). The inclusion of Asian women as “Asian women” but also under its many subcategories was also necessary to qualify for the global and international banners of these efforts.

A new discourse joining trafficking and “Asian women” gained much traction through the overlapping proliferation of activist forums, social services, philanthropic projects, and global governance maneuvers specifically attentive to the traffic in Asian women. In addition to academic studies, a sizable number of surveys, reports, and recommendations were produced by several different divisions of the United Nations, including the UN Development Program, UNICEF, and the International Organization of Migration. Many NGOs and INGOs convened conferences, published their proceedings, and commissioned their own reports focusing on different countries and specific border regions.¹⁷ For example, Women’s Rights Project and Asia Watch, two divisions of Human Rights Watch, conducted and published several investigations into the trafficking of Asian women throughout the 1990s, including the widely cited *A Modern Form of Slavery: Trafficking of Burmese Women and Girls into Brothels in Thailand* in 1993.¹⁸ Throughout the 1990s, several commercial and academic publications focused specifically on the traffic in Asian women.¹⁹ Although it bears a generic title, *The Traffic in Women: Human Realities of the International Sex Trade* (1997) is focused specifically on the trafficking of women into and out of Thailand. Additionally, some version of “traffic” or “trafficking” has been used in titles and subtitles by authors writing about “Asian women” more generally.²⁰ These earlier efforts fed into the production and dissemination of ever more articles, monographs, and edited collections into the twenty-first century, such as Louise Brown’s *Sex Slaves: The Trafficking of Women in Asia* (2000).

A specific cohort of Asian women played an active role in this process of making “Asian women” visible, sometimes alongside activists and researchers from other regions in broad international settings but also through the organization of several regionally focused events and nongovernmental entities. Although

there had been regionally focused intra-Asian feminist meetings and collaborations since the 1970s, there was a new wave of workshops, conferences, and tribunals focused on “Asian women” and often spearheaded by Asian women. The recharged attention to the history of Japanese military “comfort stations” proved to be a dynamic rallying point for intra-Asian feminist affinity and networking. In December 1991, four months after Kim Hak-sun first spoke out in a press conference, the Asian Women’s Human Rights Council (AWHRC) sponsored the Regional Meeting and Conference on Traffic in Women in Seoul. Many attendees first learned of the Japanese military “comfort stations” at this gathering, which spurred on new investigative and political projects. On February 20, 1992, the Taipei Women’s Rescue Foundation began to collect reports from Taiwanese victims, and shortly thereafter, on March 12, the government organized the Taiwan Comfort Women Project Task Force. In July 1992 the AWHRC, GABRIELA (General Assembly Binding Women for Reforms, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action), and the BAYAN Women’s Desk established the Task Force on Filipino “Comfort Women” (TFFCW), made up of thirteen groups, which worked to locate Filipina survivors. Then on August 10–11, 1992, the first Asian Conference for Solidarity for Women Drafted for Sexual Services by Japan was convened in Seoul and included over one hundred participants from South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Thailand.

At the United Nations, the issue of the Japanese “comfort system” was first raised by the Korean Council at the Commission on Human Rights in a February 1992 memorandum that requested an investigation. In short order the issue was addressed and debated in May at the Working Group on Contemporary Forms of Slavery and then at the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities in August 1992.²¹ In her oral presentation to the Sub-Commission in August 1992, Shin Heisoo, speaking on behalf of the Korean Council, categorized the “comfort system” as sexual slavery. The issue would be debated at the Working Group on Contemporary Forms of Slavery throughout the 1990s.

The United Nations World Conference on Human Rights, which was convened in Vienna in June 1993, was an especially important turning point. At the parallel NGO forum, Korean civil rights lawyer Park Won Soon delivered a paper titled “‘Comfort Women,’ Justice and International Law.” The Global Tribunal on Violations of Women’s Human Rights, which was also convened parallel to the Vienna Conference, prominently featured the issue. A panel on “War Crimes Against Women” was moderated by Nelia Sancho of the Asian Women’s Human Rights Council and featured presentations by Chung Chin Sung of the Korean Council and Kim Bok-dong, who was identified as

“a survivor of sexual slavery in Japan.”²² These concerted efforts led to the inclusion of the issue in Article 38 of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which explicitly states that “violations of the human rights of women in situations of armed conflict are violations of the fundamental principles of international human rights and humanitarian law. All violations of this kind, including in particular murder, systematic rape, sexual slavery, and forced pregnancy, require a particularly effective response.” According to Donna J. Sullivan, “The draft version of this provision included the term ‘current’ before the reference to violations; its elimination from the final text brought the abuses by Japanese forces against Asian women during World War II, particularly Korean and Filipina ‘comfort women’ who were forced into prostitution in military brothels, clearly within the scope of the text.”²³

This inclusion would later prove to be crucial to the decision by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to appoint Linda Chavez as a Special Rapporteur to undertake “an in-depth study of systematic rape, sexual slavery and similar practices during wartime, including internal armed conflict.” The Japanese military “comfort system” was prominently featured in a “preparatory document” that Chavez submitted in September 1993. After noting that “forced prostitution during wartime has also been practiced on a large scale, notably during the Second World War” and that “rape has been widely and systematically used in the former Yugoslavia, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a method of ethnic cleansing,” the report continues: “While the immediate harm and anguish to victims caused by rape is readily apparent, we are only now coming to understand better the long-term emotional and/or physical consequences for victims. Recent publicity concerning the continued deleterious effects suffered by Chinese, Dutch, Filipino, Indonesian and Korean women forced into sexual slavery during the Second World War confirms that systematic rape can have a devastating impact on its victims, which lasts years beyond the immediate horror of the act itself.”²⁴ By imbuing historical depth and geographical breadth to contemporary atrocities in Bosnia and Rwanda, the “comfort women” redress movement thus fortified the campaign to codify rape, forced prostitution, and sexual slavery as war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The “comfort women” issue also featured prominently in the earliest UN-sponsored investigations of violence against women in the 1990s. The *Preliminary Report on Violence against Women*, which was published in November 1994 by Radhika Coomaraswamy, the newly appointed Special Rapporteur on violence against women, included a detailed account critical of the Japanese military “comfort system” as an instance of “violence against women in situations of

armed conflict,” which was delineated as a newly recognized subcategory of “violence perpetrated or condoned by the state.”²⁵ At the invitation of both the governments of Japan and South Korea, Coomaraswamy later undertook an investigative mission to the two countries in July 1995 and then drafted a report with an addendum that also included information about North Korea.²⁶ Noting the Japanese government’s objection to the use of the term *military sexual slavery* as inaccurate, Coomaraswamy firmly articulated “the opinion that the practice of ‘comfort women’ should be considered a clear case of sexual slavery and a slavery-like practice.”²⁷

The setting of the 1995 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing would prove especially opportune for large numbers of Asian women to attend and participate in the parallel NGO forum. Activists working on the “comfort women” issue organized the Asian Tribunal on Japanese Military Sexual Slavery. In her presentation, Shin Heisoo framed the issue as “an example of an extreme form of violence against women in wartime.”²⁸ Their successful effort to seek recognition was reflected in the final Platform of Action, which identified “rape in the conduct of armed conflict” as a “war crime” (section E, paragraph 147 [e]) and called on the United Nations to “undertake a full investigation of all acts of violence against women committed during war, including rape, in particular systematic rape, forced prostitution and other forms of indecent assault and sexual slavery, prosecute all criminals responsible for war crimes against women and provide full redress to women victims” (section E, paragraph 147 [f]). In 1998 the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court explicitly recognized “sexual slavery” as a war crime and a crime against humanity. It is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain who or what came first and authorized the other.

I have laboriously recited this only partial but crowded genealogy to emphasize from the outset of this book that the category of “Asian women” and specifically the “comfort women” case importantly shaped the negotiated categorization and recalibration of injuries and violations in need of proper certification and adjudication by the United Nations and newer entities such as the International Commission of Jurists and the International Criminal Court in the 1990s.²⁹ The resurgent and avowedly feminist anti-trafficking movement could hold the Japanese “comfort system” up as a clear and documentable instance of direct state involvement in the traffic in women. With the growing legibility of violence against women, activists and scholars would strategically cast the “comfort system” as a definite and especially egregious instantiation of VAW.³⁰ The “comfort system” case also offered a clear demonstration of how such crimes against women had gone unpunished,

were suppressed, and were made illegible in the intervening decades. For example, although the examples of “violence against women in situations of armed conflict” in Coomaraswamy’s *Preliminary Report* included several contemporary instances in Rwanda, Haiti, and the Kashmir as well as the mass rapes in Bangladesh in 1971, she drew special attention to the “comfort women” case following a discussion of the problem of “impunity” or “official failure to condemn and punish rape.” She continued to point out that although an apology had been made by Japan in July 1992, the matter of compensation and related recognition of the “comfort system” as a crime under international humanitarian law were still unresolved: “It is a crucial question that would set a legal precedent at the international level for the prosecution of perpetrators of systematic rape and sexual slavery in times of armed conflict. A symbolic gesture of compensation would introduce a remedy of ‘compensation’ for victims of violence perpetrated during times of armed conflict.”³¹ The tenacious demands for apology, admission, and reparations by the survivors of the Japanese military “comfort system” challenged the emerging “women’s rights as human rights” platform and the global governance entities charged with their protection and promotion to grapple with the proper calculation and distribution of monetary compensation alongside other rights violations.

By the end of the 1990s, both the past atrocity and the contemporary redress movement came to be heralded for their extraordinary transnational visibility. The authors of *The Traffic in Women* (1997) characterized the “comfort system” as “one of the most notorious episodes in the 20th century,” and Louise Brown distinguished it as “the most well-publicized antecedent of modern-day sexual slavery in the region.”³² This extraordinary visibility was hailed by some as confirmation of a democratizing transnational public sphere that was especially attuned to women’s rights as human rights. As Katharine H. S. Moon noted in 1999, “South Korean survivors of Japanese military sexual slavery (‘comfort system’ or *chongshindae*) and activists on their behalf have been noted as some of the most persuasive and omnipresent advocates of women’s human rights at international meetings and conferences.”³³ Reflecting on the success of the redress movement, Chih-Chieh Chou emphasized in 2003 that “the comfort women issue is promoting a new claim for human rights, in particular, women’s rights in Asia. East Asian women have been extremely effective in networking—creating NGOs with transnational links which have been able to raise this issue, mobilize people and victim survivors for political action, gain support of the United Nations and international media, and put pressure on the target Japanese government.”³⁴

This super-visibility has incurred cautious skepticism and increasingly frank criticism. In that 1999 essay, Moon pointedly questioned the reasons for this international prominence in contrast to the effacement of the older movement against the abuses of U.S. military-related prostitution in South Korea.³⁵ Noting how “the wartime and postwar experiences of these mostly poor and uneducated old ladies has sparked enormous scholarly and popular interest in Asia, Europe, Oceania, and North America,” Laura Hein went so far as to frame “that suddenly augmented imaginative power” in the 1990s not as enlightened justice but a “savage irony.” Asking readers to consider “Why them? Why now?” Hein pointed out that this history had been “public knowledge in Japan for decades” and declared even more unsentimentally that “many—Japanese and non-Japanese alike—who knew about the military comfort women at the end of the war thought of them as the unfortunate losers in a normal social and legal relationship rather than as victims of human rights violations or war crimes.”³⁶

I propose to recast this double-edged exemplarity—of both atrocious violation and impressive publicity—as a broader problematic about the collision and co-constitution of global governance, capital flows, transnational politics, feminist knowledges, and new communication technologies in the 1990s, which were importantly shaped by earlier deployments of U.S. economic, military, political, and epistemological power in Asia in the twentieth century. The claim of “breaking the silence” justified—and continues to underwrite—the production of a plethora of impassioned political, scholarly, and artistic endeavors about the “comfort system.” But we must keep in mind the partiality of any narration of these events and be especially skeptical about any account that claims a linear, positive unfolding—a displacement of silence with voice, a filling of absence and ignorance with knowledge, a welcoming by those in power after convincing entreaties for recognition by the victimized—through a series of rational exchanges between distinct yet univocal parties. Both the supposed silence around Japanese military sexual slavery and the much-heralded breaking of that silence in the 1990s were forged by older racist and imperialist power/knowledge regimes that disqualified, segregated, and demoted “Asian women” from both humanity and women. These persistent taxonomic habits and their attendant methods of knowing and nonknowing these distinguished collectivities predisposed the compositional methods of these late twentieth-century projects to document female vulnerability, including a persistent delineation of an Asian difference and unknowability. Then too, the tapered attention to physical and especially sexual violence against women displaced

the concern with female labor exploitation, which had been the focus of much important feminist scholarship on the global assembly line and the new international division of labor in the 1980s. The acclaimed induction and circulation of Asian women as newly empowered and mobile subjects of women's rights and human rights propped up the vision of a world made borderless for both capital accumulation and pursuing justice.³⁷

Given that all of these problems afflicting Asian women continue to exist and fuel ever-more projects of representation and redress, this book asks: How and why did "Asian women" become intelligible through particular modes of documenting their violation and violability? Put differently, how and why did "Asian women" function as an especially demonstrative and portable embodiment of both the taxonomic singularities and the compounded intensity of female oppression? But also, how did the privileging of spectacularly and especially sexually violated Asian female bodies foreclose other terms and conditions for making "Asian women" intelligible? Each chapter traces how "Asian women" might be reframed not as a bounded and knowable population but as a critical prompt for mapping varying configurations of power, knowledge, and justice. In the wishful trajectory of gradual accretion and orderly conversion from silence to voice to recognition to justice, there's an illusory isomorphism that would say that at the end of so much effort and contestation, "Asian women" end up right where and what they have always been or where they should be like other already protected and empowered subjects. I have rehearsed a chronicle of just such a positive and progressive becoming-into-being earlier in this introduction, which would effectively contain the disparate figurings of Asian women. In contrast, the rest of this book will attempt to trace out multiple generic, speculative tangents and to pinpoint their significant but occluded overlaps, adjacencies, and divergences. In each chapter I examine how "Asian women" were made visible but also incoherent and inconsequential through specific methods of documentation, categorization, calculation, and compilation across multiple nodes of national archiving, global governance, nongovernmental advocacy, media coverage, and academic scholarship. Simply put, my aim is to have "Asian women" mean less intensely and matter more broadly, a knotty proposition that I will elaborate upon in chapter 1, "Asian Women as Method?"

The next three chapters will trace how "Asian women" have figured in the composition and permutation of three categories of female vulnerability and harm: traffic in women, sexual slavery, and violence against women. The early twentieth-century efforts to construct a regime of international governance entailed the production of new modes and networks of data gathering, begin-

ning with the League of Nations between the two world wars and continuing to the postwar period of decolonization and the expansion of the United Nations in the 1960s, and to the ongoing efforts focalized through the developing United Nations bodies and protocols in the 1980s and especially the 1990s. The final three chapters will explore three different modes of justice and redress—monetary compensation, disclosure of truth, and proper memorialization—that partially constitute the list of six demands first articulated by the Korean Council in October 1990:

- 1 the Japanese government acknowledge the fact that (the military) forced Korean women to accompany troops as comfort women;
- 2 the Japanese government issue an official apology for these practices;
- 3 the Japanese government disclose all acts of brutality (committed by the government or military);
- 4 a memorial to the people victimized be erected;
- 5 survivors or their families be compensated; and
- 6 in order to prevent the recurrence of these wrongs, the facts be taught as a part of history education.³⁸

As many different subjects and stakeholders became involved in investigating and adjudicating the Japanese military “comfort system,” they have generated new questions and odd permutations which demand that we rethink those specific forms of remedy but also the categorical enclosures of female injury and vulnerability. Each chapter considers specific responses and attempts to resituate them in terms of both their heterogeneous effects and implications and to speculate upon alternative, not-taken paths of inquiry and analysis.

I have deliberately excised the definite article in the odd title of this book, *Traffic in Asian Women*, so that we might bear in mind that there is no single phenomenon or discourse that could contain the multiple figurations, textualizations, calculations, archives, itineraries, and detours that are examined in the chapters that follow.³⁹ Cast as a stirring appeal, *Traffic in Asian Women* calls us out to recognize and account for the violated and dispossessed, which we cannot refuse and turn away from. But, framed as a command, it can mean a forceful summons, a compulsion to render “Asian women” as recognizable and worthy subjects in ways that are preset, limited, and obfuscating. What compels and what is so compelling about these multiple claims for truth and justice? How does each petition stake out its own urgency and singularity, especially its unique significance and potential consequences for the Asian women that are conjured up? Why and how is it that in the aftermath of so much

effort and often celebrated success in securing international visibility for battered, exploited, and aggrieved Asian women, so much of the social, political, economic, and psychic conditions of violence, inequality, and injustice has not been transformed? Why do so many Asian women continue to suffer in the same coeval space of so much publicity, knowledge production, and activism? Then too, how do certain spectacular but habituated modes of their visibility obscure other bodies in pain and other modes of subjectivization and politicization? These are indeed impossible questions that I can only approach from acute, peculiar angles. Perhaps Asian women might be impressed not to know and represent what we can readily name but to open up and out to alternate modalities of thinking together about the hows and whys of what we do not know but cannot not want.