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Abstract

“THE JAPANESE EXPERIENCE IN VIRGINIA, 1900S-1950S: JIM CROW TO INTERNMENT”

By Emma Tamayo Ito
Bachelor of Arts, Virginia Commonwealth University, 2013

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia, 2017.

Major Director: Dr. John Kneebone
Department Chair and Associate Professor, Department of History, Virginia Commonwealth University

This thesis addresses how Japanese and Japanese Americans may have lived and been perceived in Virginia from 1900s through the 1950s. This work focuses on their positions in society with comparisons to the nation, particularly during the “Jim Crow” era of “colored” and “white,” and after the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941. It highlights various means of understanding their positions in Virginia society, with emphasis on Japanese visitors, marriages of Japanese in Virginia, and the inclusion of Japanese in higher education at Roanoke College, Randolph-Macon College, William and Mary, University of Virginia, University of Richmond, Hampden-Sydney College, and Union Theological Seminary. It also takes into account the
Japanese experience in Virginia during Japanese internment, while focusing on the Homestead, Virginia, as well as the experiences of Japanese students and soldiers, which ultimately showed Virginia was distinct in its mild treatment towards the Japanese as compared to the West Coast.
Introduction

Virginia, a southeastern state in America with both big cities and small towns, stretches from the Chesapeake Bay to the Appalachian Mountains and boasts of beautiful beaches, mountain paths, and wooded forests. Today, it is famous for Skyline Drive, Luray Caverns, and more, but is also prominently recognized as having deep roots in American history. Virginia’s very soil is seeped with history that is truly distinct from its neighboring states. It was one of the first to ratify the Declaration of Independence and is known both as the “Mother of States” and “Mother of Presidents.” It is host to Jamestown, the site of the first lasting British settlement in the New World, and had both strong Union and Confederate presence during the Civil War. Its history of race relations has been the topic of pages upon pages of publications and even spotlighted in the media, particularly with close attention to the famous court case, *Loving v. Virginia*. Because of its uncommon past, it would be a lie to say that Virginia didn’t attract a number of historians -- both academic and amateur alike. Historian Peter Wallenstein has written that “Virginia has followed its own path through the centuries,” a theme accurate across many contexts.¹ Wallenstein added that “at one point or another, Virginians have differed over a wide range of issues, taking those differences seriously and expressing them with great feeling.”² Wallenstein’s interpretation pinpoints a rare quality of Virginia history, which can be seen especially within small niches of unstudied materials on the state.

One such area concerns the Japanese in Virginia. Often overlooked because of the small population, there are no previous works dedicated to Japanese in Virginia -- nothing to tell us the

---

² Wallenstein, *Cradle of America*, xv.
lives these people lived and their experiences within the borders of Virginia. Very few publications even address how Asians as a whole were even viewed in the South during the Jim Crow period, let alone how the Japanese may have been perceived in the South after Pearl Harbor. The first chapter of this work offers a comprehensive look at the historiographies to date, in order to show gaps within the narrative. This provides a comparative analysis in two theoretical means -- one of which focuses on the national, regional, and local historiographies. These historiographies are expanded, beginning with the publications on Japanese internment by date of publication (with the other theoretical means through focus on the West Coast and national response), Asians in Jim Crow South, Asians in Virginia, and World War II in Virginia. Each of these historiographies are vital components to a large and complicated historical picture and in order to interpret the localized Japanese presence in Virginia, the national and regional contexts are crucial.

The second chapter of this thesis addresses how the Japanese were perceived in Virginia prior to World War II. During the period of Jim Crow Virginia, when African Americans and whites were separated into strict caste lines of “white” or “colored,” where did this modest number of Japanese fit and how did Jim Crow affect their lives, if at all? Did the period of Jim Crow restrict their rights, such as the ability to marry outside of their race? Virginia’s 1924 Racial Integrity Act adds a fascinating dimension to answering where Asians belonged in society, as they were “individuals and communities who did not fit into a cultural and legal system predicated on the binary distinction between black and white.” The 1924 Statute specifically limited the rights of anyone who was not categorized as “white” in Virginia and included “prohibition against whites marrying anyone save another white; and the definition of a

3 See Appendix. Exact numbers of Asians in Virginia are provided in Chapter Two.
white person as one ‘who has no trace whatsoever of any blood other than Caucasian.’” Where then, did Asians fall under this Statute? This chapter addresses these overarching themes and more, with specific examples of Japanese who visited and lived in Virginia during Jim Crow’s grasp on the state.

The third chapter highlights the perceptions of Virginians towards Japanese in the state after the attack on Pearl Harbor, when many in the country resented and loathed the presence of Japanese and Japanese Americans to a point which led to the interment of the Japanese. On the West Coast, anyone seen as a leader of the ethnic community -- Japanese Association officials, Buddhist priests, Japanese language teachers, and newspaper editors -- were quickly arrested in the weeks following the attack on Pearl Harbor. Ultimately, 120,000 Japanese Americans, two-thirds of whom were citizens, were interned in camps, many of which who were removed from the West Coast. How was this monumental event handled in Virginia and did Virginia mirror the country as a whole, as historians seem to imply? Although the Japanese presence in Virginia seemed inconsequential to other historians due to the relatively small size, there were in fact a handful of Japanese in Virginia after Pearl Harbor. How did their positions in Virginia society prior to Pearl Harbor translate into their treatment in Virginia after?

Virginia is host to remarkable histories but its complex context adds an intriguing dimension regarding perceptions and attitudes of Virginians towards Japanese residents and visitors, which will be addressed within the next three chapters. The intent of this work is to make a significant addition to the historiography of Japanese American history as well as Virginia history and will explore where Japanese fit into Virginian society.

---
7 Ibid., 5.
Chapter 1: Four Historiographies, One Picture

To fully understand the localized Japanese presence in Virginia, a comparative analysis is necessary -- in this chapter, this is understood through the chronology of the national context of Japanese internment by date of publication, a regional look at Asians in Jim Crow South, and a local historiography of Asians in Virginia and World War II in Virginia. These historiographies can also allow a glimpse of attitudes nationally both pre-and post-Pearl Harbor.

The vast historiography of Japanese internment offers an important comparative narrative to this thesis. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, which required that all Japanese and Japanese Americans, regardless of age, loyalty, or citizenship, move into designated camps surrounded by barbed wire and military police. There are numerous publications dedicated towards the topic and as minority history continually gains more traction, it is perhaps unsurprising that historians choose to focus on such an unparalleled episode in American history. However, these studies often spotlight on Japanese internment from a national or West Coast perspective, with little mention of Japanese on the East Coast.

Publications as early as 1942 began to assess the significance of Japanese internment. Although two early publications were written by sociologists rather than historians, their articles merit attention, as they attempted to interpret the atmosphere of internment at the time. The 1950s lacked historical publications on internment and only a few notable works were released until the late 1960s, when historians began to focus on previously ignored topics. Initially, histories of Japanese internment began as a broad study, yet as the years have progressed, more publications have paid specific attention to distinct topics or themes. Particularly in the past ten years, many historians criticized Japanese internment, underscoring the faults of individuals or
the government. Many of these publications often assume that West Coast attitudes and policies reflected national attitudes and vice versa, with very few works focused on a southern context.

One of the earliest published works was that of sociologist Galen Fisher, who received his M.A. from Columbia in 1919. Fisher, now remembered as a leading white organizer of opposition towards Japanese internment and founder of the Northern California Committee for Fair Play for Citizens and Aliens of Japanese Ancestry, wrote a short article for the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1942, titled “Japanese Evacuation from the Pacific Coast” and stressed that the actions of the government were unprecedented in national history. Fisher emphasized internment was “so momentous is it that it merits careful and continuing examination both as a war measure and its implications for post-war policies.” He argued that the assembly centers were simple and crude, with some lacking basic facilities like plumbing. He excused the Army for the initial accommodations, stating that perhaps if the Army had realized women and children would be detained there for prolonged periods, “it would have doubtless provided more adequate facilities.” Moreover, he stressed that Army and civil officials “were as courteous as could be” and strived to keep families, churches, and other groups and organizations together.

Fisher’s vocabulary is worth noting -- throughout his publication, he referred to internment as the “evacuation” of the Japanese, a term consistently used by other historians until the twenty-first century. This term alluded to the seemingly transient nature of internment, for

---

9 Ibid.
11 The Japanese and Japanese Americans were first sent to assembly centers while the internment camps were being built. There were fifteen of these makeshift camps set up by the army, which provided temporary housing to about 92,000 people of Japanese ancestry.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
“with the coming of victory and peace, not the least crucial problem facing the American
Government and people will be how to treat the evacuees.” Fisher suggested alternative
possibilities for the “evacuees” -- “one would be to treat these Japanese like ‘second-class
citizens,’ to ‘let them stay in the United States but away from the coast, and strip the Japanese-
Americans of the franchise,’ or to ‘ship them all back to Japan.’" Fisher posed that the other
alternative “would be to recognize, even during the war, that two-thirds of them are fellow
citizens, that they are victims of circumstance beyond their control,” with the hope that the
people would “narrow the gap opened by the war between them and the rest of the American
people so that, after the war, they would again enjoy freedom of travel, residence, and
occupation, and be able to resume their place in normal life, more fully Americanized than they
were before.” His hopes aside, he highlighted the possibility of segregation after the
redistribution of the Japanese in American society. He highlighted that the Army emphasized the
possibility of mob violence due to a tense public atmosphere of those opposed to the presence of
the Japanese in society. Fisher’s publication was one of few which posited the idea that those
of Japanese ancestry might experience a form of segregation, yet he did not compare this idea to
Southern segregation. It is clear however that Fisher believed this would significantly affect the
lives of Japanese and Japanese Americans throughout the country.

Fisher argued that “the limitation of evacuation to persons of Japanese ancestry,
including citizens, gave the movement the appearance of race discrimination, as well as the
violation of constitutional rights,” and Gwynne Nettler’s publication the following year also
hinted at an atmosphere of opposition to those of Japanese descent within American society. He wrote that this fear was evidenced by the actions of the FBI -- “all persons suspected of subversive activities or regarded as potential dangers and restrictions were placed on the movements of all enemy aliens on the coast.” He emphasized that the government had banned financial transactions with the Japanese almost immediately and various Japanese businesses were quickly boycotted. Nettler’s opinion was that fear towards the Japanese in America was largely exacerbated by specific groups, officials, and the media -- he underlined that veterans in the American Legion and officials from Los Angeles pushed for the evacuation of the Japanese from coastal areas in February 1942. He argued that fear towards the Japanese and Japanese Americans fully permeated society, choosing to highlight one rumor reported in the news in which a woman called the police because she believed a nearby dog had been barking in Japanese code. Nettler posited that the environment in America led to Executive Order 9066, with the assumption that the West Coast reactions to the Japanese were reflected nationwide. He emphasized that Lieutenant-General John DeWitt, commanding officer of the Western Defense zone, pushed the order, and that it was a “legalization of racism.” Overall, Nettler wrote that the government’s actions gave definition to the fear and racism in America towards the Japanese.

Fisher’s and Nettler’s sociological analyses are crucial to the overall study of Japanese internment, particularly because of the date of their publications. Their work offers a contemporary understanding of the role fear may have played towards the execution of Order 9066, at least on the West Coast. However, both assume that the reactions and racism felt by the

19 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid., 31.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., 34.
Japanese on the West Coast were reflected in the nation as a whole. Nonetheless, they both question the legality of the actions taken by the government, but ignore the involvement of President Franklin Roosevelt in the decision towards internment, other than the brief mention of his sign-off on Order 9066. President Franklin Roosevelt’s role was continually overlooked until Ronald Takaki’s 1981 book *Strangers from a Different Shore* and Greg Robinson’s 2001 book, *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans*.

Historical publications on Japanese internment were few until the late 1960s and early 1970s. A shift in academic focus brought a greater emphasis on cultural, ethnic, and social history. The subsequent works provide a solid foundation towards the historiography, since little had been previously written on Japanese internment. Over twenty-five years after the end of internment, Audrie Girdner and Anne Loftin authored *The Great Betrayal: The Evacuation of the Japanese-Americans During World War II*. They continued to reference the internment of the Japanese as an evacuation, but took a much more forceful stance than previous historians had. For example, they argued that “the actions of the nation betraying its traditions and its constitutional guarantees appears...as a black page in our history.”

Girdner and Loftis attempted to frame the experience of Japanese internment as a “cataclysmic uprooting” and where previous scholars had suggested a possible infringement of basic rights, Girdner and Loftis were much more emphatic that internment was constitutionally wrong.

The 1970s garnered more attention to the injustices experienced by those of Japanese descent. In 1971, race and discrimination were mentioned regularly in the discourse of Japanese internment, particularly by William Peterson and Dillon Myer. Peterson, in *Japanese Americans: Oppression and Success*, argued that many publications failed to provide a full context of

---

26 Ibid.
American history due to their lack of focus on ethnicity and race. Much like Girdner’s and Loftis’ *The Great Betrayal*, Peterson emphasized the role discrimination held towards Order 9066. After Peterson’s work, historians questioned the factors that pushed towards internment, with particular focus on who (they felt) was responsible.

Peterson’s work was one of the first that placed the blame for internment on General John L. DeWitt. He argued that as the commanding general of the Western Defense Command, DeWitt had been empowered to carry out Executive Order 9066 the day after it was signed. DeWitt’s first act directed all Japanese, both aliens and citizens, to leave the coastal area. He argued this was further proof that discrimination was a key component towards interment, as this was only aimed towards the Japanese and not to German nor Italian aliens. Peterson also blamed internment on a slew of others, including liberals, President Roosevelt, Attorney-General Francis Biddle, the Supreme Court in California, Progressive governor Culbert Olson, Attorney-General Earl Warren, and reform mayor of Los Angeles, Fletcher Bowron. Peterson claimed that “it was men of this political stamp who engineered the evacuation,” and that they were at each stage, “encouraged to go forward not only by the anti-Japanese clamor but - more significantly- by the absence of meaningful resistance to incarceration of thousands of Americans whose only crime was their race.”

Additionally, Peterson’s book briefly addressed the difficulties of life in the camps constructed while the evacuees lived in temporary assembly centers. The War Relocation Authority (WRA) was the U.S. civilian agency responsible for the relocation and detention of the Japanese and was created by President Roosevelt in March 1942 with Executive Order 9102. The WRA oversaw the relocation centers, also known as internment camps, that were built in isolated

---

sites in several states: Manzanar and Tule Lake in eastern California, Poston (or Colorado River Project, or Parker) and Gila River in Arizona, Minidoka in Idaho, Heart Mountain in Wyoming, Granada in Colorado, Topaz in Utah, and Rohwer and Jerome in Arkansas.\textsuperscript{28} The location of the camps truly makes one wonder if those in the Southern camps were treated any differently than in the other camps, yet Peterson’s book addresses the camps as a whole, rather than each individual camp, and argued that “in their function and mode of operation, these were essentially prison camps, but overlaid with a thick patina of official euphemism.”\textsuperscript{29} Overall, Peterson believed internment was an incomparable act of “imprisoning a whole subnation, no individual of which was charged with any crime or guilty of any, climaxed the long history of discrimination.”\textsuperscript{30} His book, \textit{Japanese Americans: Oppression and Success}, emphasized whom he thought responsible for Order 9066. He affirmed arguments made by previous historians -- that fear had infused itself into American society (at least on the West Coast) and played a large role towards internment.

In 1971, likely in response to the works about internment, the former director of the War Relocation Authority, Dillon S. Myer, published \textit{Uprooted Americans: The Japanese Americans and the War Relocation Authority during World War II}. His book offered a defense of the War Relocation Authority. Myer, like many of the works prior to his, addressed the panicked decision of internment that was fostered by the repetition of rumors, racist attacks, and the fear of attacks by the Japanese. He believed that false rumors gained credence which “led to fears and served as fodder for the racist press and organizations.”\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid., 82.
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 93.
*Uprooted Americans* is apologetic in tone towards the choices made by the War Relocation Authority. His publication deflected the complaints towards the assembly centers and internment camps by highlighting three basic problems that he felt had been difficult and time-consuming; how to care for a group of people with a sizable age range; how to reestablish the people into a “normal community;” and “a problem not anticipated,” when the mass evacuation of Japanese Americans from the West Coast had been decided upon in the earlier part of 1942.\(^{32}\) Myer defended the constitutionality of internment, arguing that the WRA lawyers and federal government “took the position that the responsible military commander could have reasonably decided, in the spring of 1942, that such a mass evacuation could be considered a military necessity.”\(^ {33}\) He further emphasized that a majority of the Supreme Court agreed and held that the evacuation was constitutional at the time it was ordered.\(^ {34}\)

Opposite of Myer’s work was Roger Daniels’ book (also published in 1971), *Concentration Camps: North America, Japanese in the United States and Canada During World War II*. His work is crucial to the study of internment and offered original interpretations, unique from the established discourse. Daniels was the first to recognize and admit that his focus on the West Coast experience was due to the clustering of the Japanese-American population within three Pacific Coast states.\(^ {35}\) He also criticized previous historians’ works, claiming that many books paid little to no attention to Japanese internment.\(^ {36}\) Daniels argued that the evacuation was not a “wartime mistake,” but a “legal atrocity which was committed...which taught Americans to regard the United States as a white man’s country in which nonwhites ‘had no rights which the

---

\(^{32}\) Ibid., 32.

\(^{33}\) Ibid., 259.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.


\(^{36}\) Ibid., xv.
white man was bound to respect.”\textsuperscript{37} Concentration Camps also highlights Daniels’ broader interpretation of how racism played into internment -- “The evacuation, then, not only betrayed all Americans, but grew directly out of the American experience. Although it affected only a tiny segment of our population, it reflected one of the central themes of American history- the theme of white supremacy, of American racism.”\textsuperscript{38}

Additionally, Daniels addressed interracial marriage between the Japanese and other ethnic groups, a topic previous historians had ignored. He argued that interracial marriage or sex was not a significant factor in Californian history, stating that Japanese rarely married or cohabited outside of their own ethnic group.\textsuperscript{39} Yet when interracial marriage was broached, Daniels posited that “no longer the pauper immigrant, but an increasingly successful entrepreneur…. the Japanese possessing the white woman- could be interpreted as the sexualization of a different kind of usurpation, the yellow man’s taking of what the white man conceived to be his rightful place in society.”\textsuperscript{40} Could this same logic be applied to the country as a whole, or only to the West Coast, as Daniels implies? His interpretation suggests that interracial marriage is a measure of racism, a theme explored in the next chapter.

Daniels is also one of the first historians to addresses two specific battalions -- the 100th Battalion, composed largely of Hawaiian Nisei (second generation Japanese Americans), and the 422nd Regimental Combat Team (RCT), composed largely of voluntary inductees and draftees from the internment camps and from the resettled Nisei.\textsuperscript{41} Daniels pays close attention to race within this context and observed that members of both units were instructed by the War

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid., xvi.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 15.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{41} The 100th Battalion trained in Camp Shelby, Mississippi, where the 442nd was also activated early in 1943. Daniels, Concentration Camps, 151-152.
\end{itemize}
Department to use “White” rather than “Colored” facilities when off post -- yet, “from the very beginning, the Army, since its prestige was at stake, gave special treatment to the Japanese American units.”\(^{42}\) However, Daniels argues this was meaningless, as the national policies were not this way and the internment camps continued. Daniels' work was a forerunner into a new way of interpreting Japanese internment, and he posed questions never asked before in the historiography.

After Daniels’ work came another key addition to Asian American history -- *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*. Published in 1989, notable revisionist historian Ronald T. Takaki provided a general overview on Asians in America, but also contributed essential observations on Japanese internment as well as redress for it. Takaki’s framework of internment differed from previous historians. Rather than solely calling attention to the difficulties of life in the camps, Takaki instead chose to highlight General Delos Emmons, the military governor of Hawaii. He spotlighted Emmons’ refusal for the mass evacuation of the Japanese in Oahu and claimed that “Emmons’ success in resisting pressures from Washington depended not only on his administrative savvy and his ability to wage a waiting war of bureaucracy, but also on widespread local opposition to mass interment."\(^{43}\) In addition to Emmons’ role, the press in Hawaii “behaved responsibly and politicians and public officials also urged restraint and reason,” which Takaki believed further contributed to a better atmosphere. Takaki’s highlight of Hawaii shows an obvious difference in attitude from that of the West Coast. Takaki also briefly criticized the choices of Franklin D. Roosevelt, which had not been brought up by previous publications. He claimed that President Roosevelt had been considering the internment of Japanese Americans for as long as five years prior to the attack of Pearl

\(^{42}\) Ibid., 152.
Harbor, which had been made clear in a memorandum to the Chief of Naval Operations.\textsuperscript{44} Most compelling of Takaki’s work however, was his attention to events after the closing of the camps. While other historians highlighted that living in the camps was challenging, Takaki wrote on the lasting, long-term effects of internment -- former internees were met at train stations with hostile signs such as, “No Japs Allowed, No Japs Welcome.”\textsuperscript{45} He argued that “an uncertain, fearful future seemed to await all of the returnees,” and that many of them returned to damaged homes and ruined fields.\textsuperscript{46}

Additionally, Takaki regarded redress -- in August 1988, less than a year before the book’s publication, Congress passed the Civil Liberties Act, an apology and a promise of $20,000 to the survivors of internment or their heirs.\textsuperscript{47} He highlighted what he felt was President Ronald Reagan’s regret, with Reagan’s statement that the United States had committed “a grave wrong” during World War II to the Japanese Americans who had remained “utterly loyal” to this country.”\textsuperscript{48}

Following the historical marker of redress, the contribution of historians in the 1990s continued to focus on redress and how the law affected Japanese and Japanese Americans. Leslie Hatamiya and Charles McClain similarly addressed the laws that made redress possible. They both agreed that “the Japanese Americans had suffered great property losses as a result of their removal from their homes and argued that they were due generous financial redress.”\textsuperscript{49} This began with a campaign in the 1970s for reparations, backed by the support of various Japanese American civil rights groups.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., 390.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 405.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 485.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.
Leslie Hatamiya, author of *Righting a Wrong: Japanese Americans and the Passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988* expanded on the context of redress, when the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) reported that the incarceration of the Japanese and Japanese Americans was an infringement of rights. The commission recommended that the U.S. government offer an apology to the surviving internees, and only on August 10, 1988 did the recommendations become law in the Civil Liberties Act. Hatamiya’s work is essential because Takaki’s information on redress leaves out the CWRIC. Hatamiya further argued that the passage and signing of the Civil Liberties Act was historic on numerous levels -- it not only reconfirmed the constitutional civil rights of all citizens but it was also “a promise by the U.S. government that it would never again incarcerate a group of its own citizens en masse, without due process of law, solely on the basis of ethnicity.”

Editor Charles McClain’s comprehensive book *Asian Americans and the Law*, contains eighteen essays on both historical and contemporary perspectives on Asian American law, with specific attention to internment and redress. McClain set out to prove that Asians had been “deeply implicated” in the national, legal history of the United States since the 1860s. McClain addressed similar themes as Hatamiya’s works and the essays focus on injustices in the national courts that shaped American law both before and after the Civil Liberties Act. Some of these national policies will be expanded upon in later chapters, with specific focus on how and if they affected Japanese in Virginia.

Page Smith’s *Democracy on Trial*, published in 1995, reverted to a general history of internment, rather than focusing on only redress. Smith addressed “DeWitt’s decision” to order

---

51 Ibid.
52 Ibid.
the evacuation of all of those with Japanese ancestry.\(^{54}\) *Democracy on Trial* is one of the few works that does not specifically focus on the West Coast and he attempted to broaden the context of internment, arguing it was “necessary to review the relationship between Japan and the United States, a relationship that began, for all practical purposes, with Commodore Matthew Perry’s famous voyage to Japan in 1853 which opened up that exclusive, essentially feudal society to the modern industrial world.”\(^{55}\) However, Smith emphasized that the theme of the Japanese people in America is “the story of their remarkable integration into the mainstream of American life to the great benefit of the nation.” He argued that the tide of positive popular feeling had washed away “the last vestiges of racial prejudice.”\(^{56}\) His study focuses on a larger, national picture, but one is again left wondering how the Japanese and Japanese Americans were treated in the South, particularly once the internees were released from the Southern camps.

The twenty-first century saw historic works continuing a dialogue of Japanese internment. During the 2000’s, the largest number of publications were written on specific aspects of Japanese internment, like the journeys of a person or peoples. Additionally, more voices were added to the historiography of internment as survivors or their children and grandchildren seemed more willing to talk about their experiences. A shift in vocabulary during this time is noticeable and many of the historians who wrote in the decade use the word incarceration synonymously with internment.

In 2001, Greg Robinson’s *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans* addressed a little-explored topic -- Franklin Roosevelt’s decision for internment. Only Takaki’s work had criticized Franklin Roosevelt but Robinson argued that it

---


\(^{55}\) Ibid.

\(^{56}\) Ibid., 442.
“seems especially perplexing that such an action could have taken place during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, a President justly celebrated for his attachment to human rights and his dedication to creating government programs to serve the needs of ordinary Americans.”

Robinson underlines that, humanitarianism aside, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 into action. Robinson’s work argued that Roosevelt’s view of Japanese Americans as “immutably foreign and dangerous” played a crucial role in his approval of internment. He additionally felt that Roosevelt’s early life and attitudes towards those of Japanese ancestry in the United States were shaped by dominant social and intellectual patterns of the period.

A particularly infamous book written by Michelle Malkin was released in 2004, titled *In Defense of Internment*. Malkin’s work differed drastically from previous discourse, in part because she was not a historian, but a Fox News contributor. However, her work adds an interesting perspective towards Japanese internment historiography, albeit with poorly supported evidence. Malkin attempted to defend the evacuation and relocation of “ethnic Japanese” from the West Coast, by stating that internment was a choice that was made for the protection and safety of the American people. With chapters such as “A Time to Discriminate” and “The Threat of the Rising Sun,” Malkin’s book offered the defense that “survival of the nation comes first. Civil liberties are not sacrosanct.” She argued that the phrase ‘Japanese internment,’ “belongs in scare quotes because it is historically and legally inaccurate,” because, she claimed that only

---


58 Ibid., 7.


potential dangerous enemies were apprehended, and not American citizens.\(^{61}\) She further argued that “ethnic Japanese living outside of prescribed military zones were not affected by the order.”\(^{62}\) This comment, along with many others, lacked cited evidence and was in direct disagreement with much of the accepted discourse.

On the heels of *In Defense of Internment* was Diana Meyers Bahr’s *The Unquiet Nisei*, published in 2007 and drastically different than Malkin’s publication. She focused instead on one individual -- Sue Kunitomi Embrey, who had been placed at a camp in Manzanar. She described the difficult experience through Embrey’s eyes and added an element of empathy to the story of Embrey, along with the goal and hope that others would realize that Embrey’s story was only one among many.

Eric Muller’s *American Inquisition: The Hunt for Japanese American Disloyalty in World War II* was also published in 2007. He framed *American Inquisition* with the discriminatory mechanisms the federal government created to judge the loyalty of the American citizens of Japanese ancestry in World War II. One such mechanism included a questionnaire given to those who lived in the camps -- Muller claimed that previous scholars had never studied the details of the questionnaires which “judged the loyalty of the incarcerated Americans who had filled them out.”\(^{63}\) Muller added that when the government released the loyalty review program in early 1943, a questionnaire was attached which required all Japanese Americans seventeen years of age and older to fill out.\(^{64}\) Muller expanded on the demoralizing nature of the

\(^{61}\) Ibid., xv.
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questionnaire, which had been filled with polar questions, such as if they would swear unqualified allegiance to the United States and forswear any form of allegiance to Japan.65

Muller wrote that the wartime bureaucracy was four distinct agencies, where “Japanese American disloyalty became a chimera for each of these agencies, a wall on which each organization projected a constantly shifting show of its own motivations, needs, and experiences.”66 He also claimed that nothing in the actual allegiances of the observed people themselves produced the characterizations that the questionnaires looked for. Overall, Muller’s book highlighted the embarrassment and difficulties that the Japanese and Japanese Americans had to go through, particularly when filling out answers on a questionnaire behind barbed gates. The book focused on the government’s loyalty bureaucracy, and Muller ultimately argued that “the federal government’s enterprise of evaluating the loyalty of Japanese Americans in World War II began with racist presumptions and ended with distortions and misrepresentations under oath.”67

Crucial to this thesis is John Howard’s 2008 publication, Concentration Camps On the Home Front: Japanese Americans in the House of Jim Crow, which aimed to “provide us with a new angle of vision on the Japanese American incarceration and twentieth-century racial formation.”68 He stressed that as historians write more on “injustices,” they need to continue to look at the past with fresh perspectives, in order to “rely on the insights of feminist scholarship, critical race studies, and socioeconomic analysis in a Marxist tradition -- all of which this study attempts.”69 Howard illuminated “unflattering” precedents for incarceration and attempted to
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expand the framework of internment beyond that of many previous historians.\textsuperscript{70} He specifically analyzed the ways in which international conflict and imperial expansion shaped and reflected structures of inequality of the home front, specifically with “racial hierarchies of sexual normalcy and deviancy, and gender categorization -- all through the experiences of incarcerated Japanese Americans.”\textsuperscript{71} He posited that incarceration actually aided Japanese American women in moving up the economic ladder -- “as never before, in a camp labor market without racial stratification, they held responsible positions as teachers, clerks, writers and manufacturers” and were paid equally as men.\textsuperscript{72} He also emphasized that since the 442\textsuperscript{nd} trained in Mississippi, Japanese American women were “regularly bused across the [Mississippi] state line, for wholesome, racially partitioned dating and matrimony, signaling a new era of state-sanctioned courtship and institutionalized heterosexuality.”\textsuperscript{73} Howard’s publication is intriguing, but he lacks substantial evidence for his claims. He mostly relies on secondary sources, with some interviews and papers, as well as camp papers, but fewer national newspapers than expected. Flaws aside, Howard deviated from the many other historians who addressed internment, with his attempt to frame internment in the South.

Much like Howard’s work, in 2012 Matthew Briones published \textit{Jim and Jap Crow: A Cultural History of 1940s Interracial America}, which attempts to understand how life may have been for those of Japanese descent in Jim Crow South. Briones specifically focuses on the experiences of Charles Kikuchi, a second-generation Japanese American. \textsuperscript{74} By following years of entries from Kikuchi’s diary, Briones specifically emphasizes interracial interactions Kikuchi
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encountered while enlisted in the U.S. Army in the South. Most relevant to this thesis are Kikuchi’s interactions on leave from Camp Lee, Virginia, which will be explored more in depth in Chapter Three.

Briones expands a question I too will answer -- “is yellow black or white?” He argues that Kikuchi was not the only Nisei to observe the “strain of southern folkways” and underlines the interactions of Thomas Higa, who was surprised at the segregation between whites and blacks. Briones emphasizes that Kikuchi, Higa, and others fell into a “neither-nor” category, which “signified a no-man’s-land in the South for these Nisei soldiers, ‘dis-Oriented’ literally and figuratively.”

Cherstin Lyon’s *Prisons and Patriots: Japanese American Wartime Citizenship, Civil Disobedience, and Historical Memory* was one of the first notable books of the 2010s decade and expanded on a topic not previously written on -- the choices Japanese and Japanese Americans may have faced during their internment. She claimed that even though the Japanese and Japanese Americans had many rights taken away during World War II, they “were not immune from state demands that they obey the law, peacefully cooperate with their own removal and incarceration, and two years into the war, accept the draft as a restoration of their ‘rights’ to service in the military.” Japanese Americans could be “rewarded” for military service with the restoration of their rights in the future or they could choose prison. Lyon’s book attempted to weave the stories of basic, constitutional rights, into the nuances of wartime citizenship.

*Prisons and Patriots* primarily focused on the decisions made by a group that called themselves the Tucsonians -- a group of men in the same federal prison near Tucson, Arizona,
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serving as punishment for civil disobedience for refusing the draft. With the case study of the Tucsonians, Lyon’s book explored citizenship and asked questions like, “at what point is a citizen obligated to obey or disobey the law.” Lyon’s book expanded on the duality and evolution of definitions of criminality and patriotism.

In 2015, Erika Lee’s The Making of Asian American History and Gary Okihiro’s American History Unbound were published. Both of these books are comparable to Takaki’s in that they are a broad overview of Asians in America, yet there is a large focus on internment in their books. However, they frame national policies as reflective of the nation as a whole, which isn’t necessarily reflective of Virginia.

Okihiro’s American History Unbound offers a substantial history of Asians and Pacific Islanders in the United States. He argued that “unlike other U.S. peoples of color, Asians and Pacific Islanders continued to be seen as ‘aliens ineligible to citizenship’ until the twentieth century.” He additionally addressed Japanese internment, harshly writing that the Japanese were “wards of their government, which arbitrarily stripped them of their rights and possessions; and told nothing about their destinations or futures.” American History Unbound: Asians and Pacific Islanders referred to internment camps as “concentration camps” and Okihiro wrote that “the government’s actions sought to deprive Japanese not only of their civil liberties, property, and livelihoods but also of their dignity and humanity.” Okihiro also emphasized the journey of Yasutaro Soga, a Honolulu newspaper publisher. He noted that Soga claimed “a young white military policeman treated the internees, many of whom were elderly and distinguished, with
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obvious contempt and brusquely ordered them around with his pointed bayonet.” Experiences like these are important for comparisons between different localities, particularly with regard to treatment in Virginia after the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

Like Okihiro’s work, Erika Lee’s *The Making of Asian America*, provides an overview of Asian American history that spotlights Japanese internment. Lee highlighted that in the years prior to the United States entry into the war, Japanese Americans came under increased government surveillance. She implied that the overall atmosphere in the United States before the war was kindling for Japanese internment due to the discriminatory attitudes of many Americans. Additionally, Lee drew attention to the 1940 Alien Registration Act, which required “all resident aliens over fourteen years of age to register annually with the federal government and provide their fingerprints.” Lee’s context of internment and important federal acts represents a reflection of attitudes within United States’ laws towards those of Japanese descent, and more broadly, all foreigners.

*The Making of Asian American History* created a larger context for Japanese internment as well, beyond the American continent. Lee broadened the definition of internment with comparison to British Columbia and Latin American countries. She claimed that Japanese Canadians were ordered to leave for reasons of national security and over 2,100 Japanese Peruvians and other Japanese Latin Americans were arrested by their governments, detained and taken to the United States to be incarcerated in camps as “enemy aliens.”

Lee argued General DeWitt was convinced that the Japanese in the United States were a major national security threat. She believed he proposed “mass removal and the incarceration of
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peoples of Japanese ancestry” as early as mid-December 1941. She even attacked his personal character, and stated that “unsurprisingly, DeWitt saw danger everywhere and was prone to believe every sensationalist rumor that crossed his desk.” Lee believed DeWitt’s subsequent actions and more made most Japanese Americans feel powerless, particularly when asked on the questionnaire which Howard had previously addressed in Concentration Camps On the Home Front: Japanese Americans in the House of Jim Crow, if they would renounce their Japanese nationality, “even though they were barred by the law from becoming U.S. citizens.”

The narrative has certainly changed from 1942 to 2015. Each year, publications on internment typically became more critical of the government and the choices that led to internment. Fisher’s publication in 1942 claimed that the Army did the best it could, while addressing the ingenuity and courtesy of the soldiers. By 2015, Okihiro wrote harshly that the Japanese were “wards of their government, which arbitrarily stripped them of their rights and possessions; and told nothing about their destinations of futures,” with nothing to say on courteous soldiers. Even the terminology changed over time; the earlier works address movements of the Japanese as “evacuation” to temporary “relocation centers.” More recent works, particularly those from the last few years, instead referenced the “incarceration” of the Japanese in “concentration camps.”

The histories on Japanese internment capture a few important themes. Many of the works highlighted prejudice and discrimination that the Japanese faced, as well as the initial causes of internment. They underlined those who pushed for internment, highlighting figures like Franklin Roosevelt and General DeWitt, with many studies paying strict attention to the role of the media. The implications of Executive Order 9066 were far-reaching and internment continues to be a
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relevant topic of American history, perhaps now more than ever. Moreover, the historiography of Japanese internment is integral to the understanding of our nation’s past. Numerous historians have focused on internment and of particular note are William Peterson, Greg Robinson and Ronald Takaki. Their contributions to history aid in the understanding of anti-Japanese sentiments after the attack on Pearl Harbor, at least on the West Coast, as well as legal orders, such as Roosevelt’s executive order 9066. Many of these writers, including Michelle Malkin and Erika Lee, passionately shared their perspectives on how they viewed internment. A number of these historians address the redress of Japanese internment camps and President Reagan’s Civil Liberties Act, which paid internment survivors as an apology.

However, while these publications include an enormous amount of information on internment, there are several problems with their works. Almost all of the authors typify the attitude in the United States as one comprehensive response. They typically begin by clarifying their focus on the West Coast or particular camps, yet fail to provide examples of other areas in the country. Only Howard, Daniels, and Briones create a loose framework that attempts to answer how internment was viewed in the South. Additionally, many authors addressed the discrimination Asians received in the United States, but how did this specifically affect life in somewhere like Virginia? To fully understand the historiography of internment in the South, the historiography of early Asians and Japanese in the South and Virginia are crucial. As many historians have underscored, on the West Coast, the already existing anti-Japanese sentiments helped create an atmosphere willing to embrace Order 9066. Were there pre-existing anti-Japanese attitudes in the South, or more specifically in Virginia? This will be answered in the following chapter (Chapter Two).
There are a few publications on the general treatment of Asians in the Jim Crow South, but most of the works highlight the treatment of Chinese in the South, rather than the Japanese. As mentioned previously, Matthew Briones’ 2012 publication, *Jim and Jap Crow*, as well as John Howard’s 2008 publication, *Concentration Camps on the Home Front: Japanese Americans in the House of Jim Crow*, are valuable secondary resources into the interplay of the Jim Crow South and those of Japanese descent.

A vital point of comparison is literature on the Southern treatment of the Chinese during Jim Crow. A short Virginia reference to the Chinese is made in Helen Rountree and Randolph Turner’s *Before and After Jamestown*, in which they explain that in 1900, the Chickahominy Indians had to ride a different railroad car to shop in Richmond and lodged protests against riding in the “colored” sections on public transportation, which they won, “and so did the protesting Chinese community in Richmond.”<sup>90</sup> This small mention suggests that there was an Asian community established as early as the 1900s in Virginia, which clearly defied the strict definitions of “colored” or “white” or, at least, claimed white status.

James W. Loewen’s *The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White* offers insight on how the Chinese were treated in Jim Crow Mississippi, elucidating on the Supreme Court ruling *Gong Lum v. Rice*, which formally established the “colored” status of the Chinese in Mississippi in 1927. However, Loewen emphasized that by the time he arrived to do fieldwork in 1967, “the Chinese were apparently card-carrying white people -- or at least they were according to the ‘W’ on their driver’s licenses.”<sup>91</sup> Loewen’s work attempts to highlight how this change in Mississippi transpired, and it is crucial for the comparison of how the Japanese were treated within Virginia, particularly after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Additionally, Lucy Cohen’s *Chinese in the Post-
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Civil War South as well as Shades of the Sunbelt: Essays on Ethnicity, Race, and the Urban South, edited by Randall Miller and George Pozzetta, frame how Asians, specifically the Chinese, were treated in the Jim Crow South.

One of the most important publications is Leslie Bow’s 2010 Partly Colored: Asian Americans and Racial Anomaly in the Segregated South. In this excellently written book, Bow underlined “what racial identity segregation demanded of those who seemed to stand outside -- or rather, between -- its structural logics,” with the use of government documents, sociology, anthropology, history, autobiography, visual culture, and fiction.92 Bow highlights Asians within the Jim Crow South, with specific attention towards those of Chinese descent. She wrote that the shift in status of the Chinese in Mississippi represents, “racial interstitiality, the space between normative structures of power.”93 She notes that “in exploring the repressed stories of southern segregation, I consider what theorizing racial interstitiality might contribute to Asian American Studies, American Studies, New Southern Studies, and comparative race studies, and what the exaggerated context of southern race relations tells us about the cultural anxieties that frame the space of the in-between.”94 Partly Colored is a well-researched book which attempts to answer questions that had rarely been posed in previous historiographies.

Many of these studies also consider the theme of whiteness. Partly Colored addresses some aspects of the idea of whiteness, but Matthew Frye Jacobson’s 2000 publication, Barbarian Virtues and Grace Elizabeth Hale’s 1998 work, Making Whiteness, provides further context to the definition of whiteness, among other works. Bow also argues that The Mississippi Chinese: Between Black and White is an “unacknowledged precursor to Critical White Studies; in positing
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Asians under segregation as ersatz white people, it recognized whiteness as a detachable, transferable social status.”\textsuperscript{95}

Whiteness studies create a crucial context to how Asians and Japanese Americans were treated in the South, particularly in Virginia. Historian J. Douglas Smith, in his 2002 book, \textit{Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia}, briefly addressed the topic of Asians within Jim Crow Virginia -- his work suggests Asians did indeed face problems within the confines of Virginia laws. Smith argued that Virginia’s 1924 Racial Integrity statute “had the effect of outlawing for the first time marriages between whites and Asians. Before 1924, state law defined only black persons, and therefore all Asians were considered white.”\textsuperscript{96} Smith’s work highlighted the oppressed position that Asians had within Virginian society after the Statute. Furthermore, he speculated that the 1926 Massenburg Bill affected Asians within Virginia, as it required the separation of white and colored persons within public places. He noted that under the Massenburg Bill, “members of the Richmond Ministerial Union, the foreign mission board of the Southern Baptist convention, and the Methodist and Baptist ministers’ conferences of Richmond argued that, under the proposed legislation, white colleges in the state would have to provide separate seating for Chinese and Japanese students who attended white colleges as part of denominational missionary efforts,” again providing a Virginian context to how segregation may have affected Asians.\textsuperscript{97} This thesis will explore if this was truly the case in the next chapter.
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Smith’s work, underlining that the 1924 statute “did not specify any races other than ‘white,’ ‘negro,’ and ‘Indian.’” He argued that “Legislators’ central concern, after all, related to European and African ancestry, but the exclusive language also brought Asians into the binary world of Virginia’s racial laws, and it placed Asians on the nonwhite side of the racial boundary. Thus a ‘white’ person and someone of Asian birth or ancestry could no longer marry each other under Virginia law.” This theme of interracial marriage between white Virginians and the Japanese will additionally be examined in the next chapter.

With Wallenstein’s legal semantics in mind, Raymond Boone’s (founder, editor, and publisher of the Richmond Free Press) parents-- Japanese father, Tsujiro Miyanski, and mother, Leathia M. Boone, of mixed African and Native American descent-- were reportedly banned from marrying (yet remained together), which creates an even more ambiguous picture of where those of Japanese descent sat within the racial divides of Virginia. Their relationship brings to light questions which have not yet been addressed within the historiography. Unfortunately, Smith’s and Wallenstein’s works did not clarify further, but their research brings up questions on how Asians were truly perceived in Jim Crow Virginia.

Smith’s and Wallenstein’s publications are only two examples of works that cover general Virginia history. Aside from Managing White Supremacy: Race, Politics, and Citizenship in Jim Crow Virginia and Wallenstein’s “Race, Marriage, and the Law of Freedom: Alabama and Virginia 1860s-1960 -Freedom: Personal Liberty and Private Law,” there are also a number of other works integral to the context of Virginia as a whole. This includes Wallenstein's comprehensive history of Virginia, Cradle of America: A History of Virginia, Ronald
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This context is particularly applicable to interracial interactions during World War II, both in the South and Virginia. A well-written article by historian Jason Morgan Ward, ‘‘No Jap Crow’: Japanese Americans Encounter the World War II South,” emphasizes two Japanese internment camps in the Arkansas Delta. However, even Ward noted that “studies of the Japanese American experience during World War II have included scant information on the two internment camps in the Arkansas Delta.”

Ward argued the “Japanese American experience in the South during World War II revealed the increasingly permeable borders of Dixie,” and that “first in Arkansas and then in Mississippi, whites granted Japanese Americans some privileges of whiteness to isolate them from African Americans,” while at the same time, “whites discriminated against the Japanese Americans in explicitly racial terms.” Ward’s study is crucial as a comparison towards Virginia.

Several authors address World War II in Virginia, but few mention the presence of Japanese or Japanese Americans within the state. Walter S. Griggs Jr., author of *World War II: Richmond, Virginia*, focuses on the reactions of Richmond citizens towards the attack on Pearl Harbor, but Japanese and Japanese Americans in Virginia are virtually nonexistent in this work. While his work captures the atmosphere within Richmond well, it seemed, from his account, that no Japanese and Japanese Americans lived within the city limits. Francis Earle Lutz’s work also falls into this category, in the 1951 publication *Richmond in World War II*.
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Although Lutz’s publication is incredibly comprehensive, he argued that Virginia “had only a few Japanese,” which merited no attention to their presence or towards the specific census statistics, which will be further examined in Chapter Three.\textsuperscript{104}

Within the pages of amateur historian Joe Freitus’ work, \textit{Virginia in the War Years, 1938-1945}, Japanese and Japanese Americans do appear. He writes that Japanese diplomats and their families were sent to the Homestead, Virginia -- while his statistics of Japanese sent were incorrect, his initial findings are accurate (which will additionally be addressed and expanded on within Chapter Three).\textsuperscript{105} Freitus briefly highlights the role of Japanese American and Japanese women in industry -- he argued that “local” Japanese-American women, “who were traditionally bound to the home, were denied entrance to industry,” but it is unclear if he is addressing women local to Hampton Roads (as that was the area previously mentioned) or to the West Coast. \textsuperscript{106} Freitus also highlights a number of prisoner-of-war camps within Virginia which he argued held Japanese and Japanese Americans -- he alludes that Camp Allen, Camp Ashby, Camp Lee, Camp Patrick Henry, Camp Peary, Camp Pickett, Fort Curtis, and Fort Eustis all saw Japanese and Japanese Americans at least pass through.\textsuperscript{107} Although Freitus lacks sufficient evidence and mostly cites secondary sources, this information, while comparable to stale breadcrumbs, are breadcrumbs nonetheless.

The historiographies of Virginia studies, Southern studies, Whiteness studies, Asian American studies, and Japanese internment are all crucial to this thesis. This chapter presents a full picture of the attitudes and opinions regarding those of Japanese descent in terms of what is already written nationally, regionally, and locally. The historiographies, while comprehensive,
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ultimately show visible gaps. While Japanese internment has received much attention throughout numerous publications, it is apparent that many of the works focus on the West Coast or a broader, national spectrum based on the laws created. Regional studies on the South often focus on the “white - black” dichotomy, but lack sufficient attention to how Asians were perceived. There are a few books that attempt to focus on the South as a whole, but Virginia specifically receives no attention except from the few jotted lines, written seemingly as an afterthought, without full focus or context. It is clear from the historiography that this localized thesis is both original and needed -- an attempt to fill some of the spaces left blank within the pages of history.
Chapter 2: Pre-World War II National Laws and Attitudes towards the Japanese versus Virginian Law and Attitudes

Many historians, as mentioned in the previous chapter, argue that anti-Japanese sentiments existed prior to Executive Order 9066 -- were these sentiments visible in Virginia? Law scholar Rachel Moran argued that, overall, “for Asians, federal immigration law made their status as nonwhite wholly unambiguous.”\(^{108}\) In Virginia however, evidence suggests that, while the Japanese status was ambiguous, they were closer to a “near white” status prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor. In order to fully understand where Japanese and Japanese Americans stood in Virginia society, it is first prudent to develop a basic understanding of the federal laws and policies that affected Asians prior to World War II, and to determine if these national attitudes were reflected within Virginia.

Philip Yang’s work, *Asian Immigration to the United States*, discusses the number of Asians that came to America, as well as the national laws that affected them. Much of Asian immigration prior to 1965 was restricted by national laws or policies.\(^{109}\) However, more than one million Asians arrived in the United States and Hawaii between 1820 and 1965, including Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Filipinos, and Asian Indians.\(^{110}\)

The Chinese were the first to come to the United States in large numbers and soon after they began to immigrate, a movement with anti-Chinese riots began on the West Coast. The


\(^{109}\) See more on specific theories in Chapter Two (page 18) of Philip Q. Yang’s *Asian Immigration to the United States*.

“Chinese issue” drew attention during the 1876 presidential election, and in 1882, Congress passed the Chinese Exclusion Act, which suspended the immigration of Chinese laborers for ten years and prohibited Chinese immigrants living in the United States from naturalization.\textsuperscript{111} The Chinese exclusion laws were not repealed until the Magnuson Act in 1943, “in order to counter Japanese propaganda that the United States was anti-Asian.”\textsuperscript{112} Although the Chinese are not the focal point of this thesis, it is crucial to recognize national laws which focused on Asian immigrants. Additionally, these acts set a precedent -- history shows that the nation was willing, able, and had put forth specific legislation to exclude Asians, in this case the Chinese.

The Japanese began immigrating to the United States shortly after the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, and they initially came to fill the gaps that Chinese labor had left.\textsuperscript{113} In 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt signed Executive Order 589, which prohibited the continued immigration of Japanese who held passports from Hawaii, Mexico, or Canada. This was meant to prevent them from entering the United States mainland and reducing the “Japanese exodus” from Hawaii to the mainland United States.\textsuperscript{114} Yang explains that more Japanese women migrated to America because the Japanese government promoted female migration “in order to deal with problems of prostitution, alcoholism, and gambling,” although in Virginia, as is evidenced later in the chapter, there seemed to be more men than women.\textsuperscript{115}

Much like the Chinese American experience, the influx of Japanese immigrants led to an anti-Japanese movement, particularly on the West Coast. Yang argues this was due to fear white workers held that the Japanese would steal their jobs -- for example, unions refused to accept
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Japanese workers.\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, cities like San Francisco urged Congress to extend the Chinese Exclusion Act to the Japanese and pushed for Chinese, Japanese, and Korean children to be placed in separate schools.\textsuperscript{117} Ultimately President Theodore Roosevelt allowed desegregated schools for Asians, but promised to “ensure the cessation of Japanese immigration,” resulting in the “Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907-1908.”\textsuperscript{118}

The Gentlemen’s Agreement comprised of six diplomatic notes exchanged between the United States and Japanese governments. Both governments agreed that the Japanese government would not give passports to Japanese laborers immigrating to the United States. However, Japanese laborers already in the United States would be permitted to bring their wives, children, and parents.\textsuperscript{119} Yang argued that the Gentleman’s Agreement was intended to exclude the Japanese from the United States, but instead it brought a number of Japanese to the United States mainland, including “picture brides,” or Japanese women whose marriages had been arranged through exchanges of photographs.\textsuperscript{120} In Virginia however, through statistics done by historian Brent Tarter on population by race in Virginia, one can see that the number of “Asian” peoples dropped from 252 in 1900 to 169 in 1910 -- the Gentlemen’s Agreement likely had an impact on Japanese immigration in Virginia.\textsuperscript{121}
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Yang also highlighted discrimination that Japanese faced from state legislatures and United States courts. In 1913, the Alien Land Act, passed by the California legislature, prohibited the Japanese (as well as other Asians) from owning land and barred them from leasing lands for more than three years in a row. Additionally, the Alien Land Act of 1920 in California banned “aliens ineligible for citizenship from holding land in guardianship for their children who were citizens,” which Japanese farmers had been doing in attempt to circumvent the law. A November 1922 Supreme Court ruling, Ozawa v. United States, prohibited Japanese from becoming naturalized citizens because they were “not Caucasian.” The Supreme Court’s decision was made against Takao Ozawa, a Japanese man who contended that race was a matter of color and culture, and “claimed his skin was whiter than that of ‘the average Italian, Spaniard or Portuguese,’ and that he was thoroughly assimilated and a fervently patriotic American.” This argument attempted to sway the Court for him to be considered white and eligible for citizenship, however the court rejected his arguments and relied on “the scientific opinion that denied skin color as a criterion of racial classification and held that white as synonymous with Caucasian.”

In 1924, the Immigration Act, often referred to as the National Origins Act, was established, which introduced a permanent national origins quota system, and set an annual immigration quota from each foreign country. While the quota set for European countries was quite large, Asian countries were only allowed 100 people per year to immigrate to the United
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States.\textsuperscript{128} Furthermore, the Act contained an anti-Japanese provision, which excluded Japanese from the United States, citing the Supreme Court ruling that the Japanese were aliens ineligible to citizenship.\textsuperscript{129} According to Yang, this Act “effectively ended Japanese immigration until 1952, as evidenced in the diminishing numbers of Japanese immigrants admitted during that period.”\textsuperscript{130}

However, national perspectives and laws did not necessarily mirror sentiments within the Southern states. Although small in number, from 1900 through 1940, the United States censuses show that there were Asians traveling and dwelling in Virginia, of both Chinese and Japanese descent, and their positions in society can be interpreted in various ways. According to Virginia historian Brent Tarter’s population statistics, 252 Asians lived in Virginia in 1900. In 1910, the number was 168; 1920, 437; 1930, 466; 1940, 543 and by 1950, 1,403.\textsuperscript{131} With a closer look at the Census, newspapers, and other sources, one can glean a sense of these Japanese immigrants’ unique position in Virginia society. It is important to keep in mind, however, that such small numbers likely shaped the way the Japanese were seen in Virginia -- a state with a long history of paternalistic tendencies, where ultimately, “interracial cooperation was always governed according to terms dictated by whites.”\textsuperscript{132}

From the 1900s and throughout the 1940s, the Census reported at least 100 people in residence in various locations throughout Virginia.\textsuperscript{133} Most of these immigrants were males 20-30 years old, but there were a handful of women as well, who for the most part came in the late
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1930s and 1940s. Their occupations covered various roles in Virginia society -- some were listed as servants such as butlers, cooks, and stewards, but many simply as “lodgers” or “roomers.” However, “lodgers” and “roomers” did not define all of these immigrants -- for example, in 1917 twenty year old female, Toshi Yoshii, came as a nurse to Richmond, Virginia.\(^{134}\) In 1919, the *Richmond Times Dispatch* featured an article on another girl from Japan who wished to be a nurse at Memorial Hospital in Richmond, where “the question of the present applicant’s entering Memorial as a nurse will depend entirely on her being able to meet the educational requirements necessary for admission,” with no mention that it was dependent on her racial status.\(^{135}\) There were also those who seemed to be elite Japanese immigrants, including students, educators, and esteemed visitors. However, many of them had one common factor -- their Christianity.

Japanese students provide a valuable insight into their status in society. Peter Wallenstein argued that although *Plessy v. Ferguson* ruled “separate but equal” accommodations, in Virginia it was realistically aimed towards categorically excluding African Americans from “white” public institutions -- Wallenstein highlighted that Asians, however, had access to these traditionally “white” schools.\(^{136}\) The inclusion of Asians in higher education is crucial towards understanding their positions in society. On a national context, some Asians were prohibited from even entering the country, while within the local context, there were those in Virginia who attended traditionally “white” colleges. Wallenstein highlighted that Virginia schools were better understood as being “non black,” adding that “Chinese cadets had enrolled at

---


\(^{135}\) Memorial Hospital is historically known as a traditionally “white” hospital. “Girl from Japan Wants to Be Nurse: Applies for Admission to Memorial Hospital Training School,” *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, October 8, 1919.

Virginia Military Institute (VMI) in Lexington as early as 1904.” Wallenstein also added that in the 1920s, Chinese student Cato Lee lived on campus and was a part of the track and tennis team at Virginia Polytechnic Institute (VPI) in Blacksburg, and Arthur (often referred to as Art) Matsu, whose father was Japanese, starred on the varsity football team at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg.

Wallenstein’s findings are fascinating -- there are few historians that address Asians in higher education before the 1960s, particularly in Virginia. For example, notable sociologist Jerome Karabel’s *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*, argues that Princeton only began to recruit Asian Americans in the early 1970s. However, Arthur Matsu had actually been recruited by both Princeton and William & Mary for his athletic abilities in football in 1917. Additionally, with the use of various local newspapers, there were traces of Japanese students in the University of Chicago, Vanderbilt University, Elon University, Johns-Hopkins University, and Columbia University before 1920.

The *Presbyterian of the South*, a regular publication out of Georgia, reported in 1914 that...

---

142 Glimpses of Japanese students in higher education outside of Virginia came from several different sources. References to University of Chicago students can be found in the *Presbyterian of the South* (Atlanta, GA), April 19, 1916. Vanderbilt University students are mentioned in the *Staunton Spectator and Vindicator* (Staunton, VA), July 28, 1911. Elon University students are referenced in *The Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), December 7, 1913. Johns-Hopkins University students are mentioned in the *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), February 14, 1904. Columbia University students are referenced in the *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), May 7, 1903.
“thousands of Japanese students have studied in American schools and enjoyed all privileges here and splendid treatment.” In Virginia, Japanese students attended Roanoke College, Randolph-Macon College, University of Virginia, University of Richmond, Hampden-Sydney College, and Union Theological Seminary, all before the 1930s.

Roanoke College was featured in a *Times Dispatch* article about its first Japanese student, Hidel Fukuoka, whom the author claimed began there in 1888. It seems Fukuoka did well at Roanoke and stated he was happy there, but in the middle of his second year, he announced his intention of leaving to instead study law at Washington and Lee University, where “no persuasion by the professors of the college or the lawyers of Salem, all of whom advised him that it would be better to begin the study of law at the opening of the next session, could shake his determination to enter upon the law course in February, 1890.” The article notes that after his time at Washington and Lee, he studied at Yale, where he received his Master’s degree in law in June 1892, and the University of Brussels where he received a Ph.D. in political economy, administration, and diplomacy.

A number of articles as early as 1903 mention Japanese student Sangi Ogawa at Randolph-Macon College. Ogawa was written very highly of -- he lectured at the Monterey Methodist Church one Sunday evening in front of “probably 300 persons,” where “that our people thought well of him and his undertaking was evidenced by the credible voluntary contribution raised to assist him in his further education.” The *Times Dispatch* dedicated a small piece on him as well -- “Ashland is for Japan.” It seems he had a strong impact on

---
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Ashland, Virginia, as a “clever student,” as was evidenced with “the strong pro-Japanese feeling even in the small community.”

In 1904, Ogawa was stricken with typhoid fever and stayed in the Hampton Hospital until he passed away -- funeral services were conducted in Ashland. However, it was clear Ogawa had made an impact on his peers -- according to a Highland Recorder article, the student body of Randolph-Macon attended his funeral. The article adds that “Sangi by his many admirable traits of character, and by his wonderful christian influence, won the hearts not only of his professors and fellow-students, but of the people of Ashland at large.” Furthermore, “as a token of the esteem in which he is held, the student[s] of the college will place a tablet to his memory in the auditorium of the college.” Even after death, he continued to merit attention -- his ashes were sent back to his family in Japan, but were reportedly stolen in 1905. A faculty member at Randolph-Macon read this news to fellow faculty, where “profound regret was expressed as this unfortunate occurrence, as one of the most interesting and promising young men who has ever attended this college.” His presence was so impactful at the university that one man made the suggestion that a fund should be raised among the friends of Ogawa to endow a scholarship to give others the opportunity Ogawa was given. Ogawa is an important example of the Japanese student experience in Virginia -- desegregation for blacks in higher education in Virginia did not come to fruition until the 1950s and 1960s, long after Ogawa’s enrollment.

149 *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), February 18, 1904.
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154 *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), April 23, 1905.
155 *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), April 23, 1905.
is clear Ogawa was perceived as not only an equal to whites, but also admired by his peers and community.

Arthur Matsu was another student whose presence made an impact at his university. Although he was born in Scotland, his father was Japanese and Arthur grew up in Cleveland, Ohio. Matsu was known as an exceptional young athlete and was recruited to play football by both Princeton University and The College of William and Mary.\(^{157}\) He chose to attend William and Mary, where he was the first Asian American student in the school’s history, and was actively involved in campus life. By his senior year in 1928, Matsu was a member of the Seven Society, two honors fraternities, Cotillion Club, and the Varsity Club.\(^{158}\) He participated in football, basketball, baseball and track. He was quarterback for the William and Mary Tribe football team from 1923 to 1926 and in December 1925, was selected by his team to be the captain of the 1926 team, one of the first Japanese students to “be so honored.”\(^{159}\) He received attention in newspapers as far as St. Petersburg, Florida, where *The Evening Independent* wrote “the William and Mary men are counting largely on the masterful ability of Matsu,” and was known as a “triple-threat man and fans declare he is perhaps the craftiest player in the South Atlantic division.”\(^{160}\) Arthur Matsu is clear example of how the Japanese (and likely Asians as a


whole) were seen very differently from African Americans in Virginia -- he was praised for being an excellent athlete and was encouraged to attend William and Mary.

However, it is important to note historian Greg Robinson’s take on Matsu -- while Robinson highlighted that “Matsu’s athletic talent and good looks assured him campus celebrity,” he argued that “nevertheless, fears that his popularity would spark interracial fraternization may have prompted Virginia’s legislature to pass the Racial Purity Act in 1924, extending the state’s miscegenation law and explicitly forbidding intermarriage between Asians and whites.”\textsuperscript{161} Although Robinson is an acclaimed historian, evidence in Virginia seems to say otherwise, as does Wallenstein’s claims that Virginia’s segregation laws were more “anti-black.” It is also hard to argue that one man prompted the 1924 statute, when Virginia history points to many more factors. Additionally, Asian-white marriages will be expanded upon later in this chapter, and the evidence suggests that miscegenation laws was not strictly enforced towards Asians.

Other Asian students left their mark on universities in Virginia, although most did not receive as much media attention as Hidel Fukuoka, Sangi Ogawa, or Arthur Matsu. They were often featured in small blurbs. For example, in October 1890, another Japanese student attended Roanoke College for two years -- “A young man, who illustrated in a striking manner the sturdy self-reliance and independent spirit of the Japanese was Yataro Ichinari,” who was “eager for western learning.”\textsuperscript{162} Mentioned in \textit{The Times}, University of Virginia’s 1902 roster included Kiyohiko Konomi, a student in the department of Engineering Mathematics, Applied Mathematics, and Chemistry.\textsuperscript{163} Japanese students also studied at the United States Naval

\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Times Dispatch} (Richmond, VA), November 27, 1904.  
\textsuperscript{163} University of Virginia, \textit{University of Virginia Catalogue}, (Charlottesville: VA: University of Virginia, 1903), 38.
Academy in Annapolis, where *Times Dispatch* reported in 1905 that the base was very proud of their first Japanese graduate from the Academy.\(^{164}\) In 1906, Randolph-Macon student “Mr. Yanagiwari” was another who “made such a favorable impression” on Virginians who listened to him speak on missionary work in Japan.\(^{165}\) Similarly, in 1911, a visiting Japanese man, Reverend Murata, “delivered a lecture, which was highly interesting,” and was “heard by another large congregation,” in Greenville.\(^{166}\) In 1921, the *Richmond Times Dispatch* mentioned “Mr. Watanabe a Japanese student now attending the Union Theological Seminary” and a “Mr. Cheng Young Hul, a Chinese student at the University of Richmond.”\(^{167}\)

At William and Mary, Hatsuye Yamasaki, a Japanese American woman, entered in 1933 and graduated in 1937.\(^{168}\) Yamasaki, from Washington D.C., was a part of the Judicial Council, Women’s Sophomore Tribunal, President of Brown Hall, Spanish Club Secretary, *Indian Handbook* staff, and an intramural sports representative. Hatsuye’s father, Rinkichi Yamasaki was born in Japan and had previously lived (according to the 1920 Census) in Newport, Rhode Island, where he was a steward in the U.S. Navy.\(^{169}\) Both Rinkichi and his wife, Yuki, were listed as naturalized citizens, in 1902 and 1915 (respectively).\(^{170}\) It is curious how Hatsuye ended up in Williamsburg in attendance at William and Mary, considering that she had frequently moved -- perhaps she had heard of Arthur Matsu’s successful college experience there.

Additionally, in 1940, twenty-four-year-old college student Hasegawa Shintaro came to study in
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Virginia, residing that year in the “Hampden Magisterial District, Prince Edward” -- he likely studied at Hampden-Sydney College.\(^{171}\) The overall experience for these Japanese students seemed very positive -- their presence in higher education in Virginia showed that they were more than accepted by their white peers and they were particularly welcomed if they were Christian. Many were involved in extracurricular activities on their campuses and seemed to excel in their studies.

Aside from students, Japanese educators and visitors were also welcome to Virginia campuses. In 1912, Japanese scholar Dr. Inazo Nitobe was invited to the University of Richmond (then called Richmond College) to speak on “Japanese Conditions.”\(^{172}\) Described as “a scholar learned in many tongues,” he was president of the First Imperial College of Japan and “first exchange professor from that country to lecture in America” where he “delivered an address in exquisite English.”\(^{173}\) Inazo was of particular importance -- he was ranked among the elite in prewar Japan and was known for his book *Bushido, the Soul of Japan*.\(^{174}\) He would often travel abroad and “was frequently invited to address diverse audiences on intercultural topics.”\(^{175}\) His visit to Richmond College “held the close interest and attention of the large audience that assembled to hear the distinguished scholar’s lecture.”\(^{176}\) In 1920, *The Richmond Collegian* reported that Miss Michi Kawai spoke at a “Y.W.” meeting at Westhampton (the College for women at the University of Richmond), where she praised the work of the Y.W.C.A. and “her

---


\(^{172}\) “Japanese Scholar on Japanese Conditions,” *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), March 16, 1912.

\(^{173}\) “Japanese Scholar on Japanese Conditions,” *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), March 16, 1912.

\(^{174}\) George Oshiro, “Internationalist in Prewar Japan: Nitobe Inazo, 1862-1933” (PhD diss., The University of British Columbia, 1985), ii.

\(^{175}\) Oshiro, “Internationalist in Prewar Japan,” ii.

\(^{176}\) “Japanese Scholar on Japanese Conditions,” *Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), March 16, 1912.
sweet voice, quaint speech and charming manner, enhanced her message, which was received with delight and deep interest.”177 Also at the University of Richmond was “distinguished visitor” R. Sugimoto, in 1928.178 Sugimoto, the Secretary of Government of Formosa Japan, visited to study the universities of the United States “for the purposes of establishing educational institutions of a like nature in the two provinces in Japan.” In 1934, “celebrated Japanese Christian,” Dr. Toyohiko Kagawa came to the University of Richmond, where “more than one thousand students and friends of the University made up the capacity crowd to hear the famous social worker deliver one of the concluding lectures of a series begun yesterday at Virginia Union University.”179 Additionally, in 1926, a group of sixty foreign educators from “all parts of the world” were invited to visit Hampton Institute.180

Even though there were only a handful of Japanese and Japanese American students and educators who either attended or visited schools in Virginia, their presence allows us to speculate that, at least in these universities, many were held as an almost equivalent status to whites. As Smith had written in Managing White Supremacy, “members of the Richmond Ministerial Union, the foreign mission board of the Southern Baptist convention, and the Methodist and Baptist ministers’ conferences of Richmond argued that, under the proposed legislation [the 1926 Massenburg Bill], white colleges in the state would have to provide separate seating for Chinese and Japanese students who attended white colleges as part of denominational missionary efforts,” showing opposition to the idea of separating Japanese students from white students.181 Numerous Japanese students were invited to attend historically “white” schools and seemingly

177 “Japanese “Y.W.” Worker at Westhampton,” The Richmond Collegian (Richmond, VA), October 29, 1920.
178 “Distinguished Visitor Here Last Thursday,” The Richmond Collegian (Richmond, VA), January 20, 1928.
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181 Smith, Managing White Supremacy, 119.
flourished, while educators like Dr. Inazo Nitobe were welcomed with large, interested crowds. It is important to highlight however, that many of these students were welcomed as Christian visitors, which perhaps made them a little less foreign to native Virginians. Ultimately though, race likely trumped religion -- there were Christian African American residents in Virginia who were seen as a lesser status than these Japanese visitors and immigrants.

Other visitors included those interested in Virginia tobacco. In August 1900, Dr. “H.” Ikado came from Tokyo as a representative of the Japanese government to study the manufacturing of tobacco, cotton, and cotton goods. He stayed at the Jefferson, a luxury hotel in Richmond, during some of his visit in Virginia and made plans to continue traveling to Danville and Lynchburg, Virginia, and to North Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana. In March 1901, The Washington Post reported that “S. Hotta and B. Ueyda, officials of the financial department of the Japanese government, in company with Dr. H. Ikado, are here to make a study of American methods of handling tobacco.” In addition, Japanese businessman Tokukichiro Abe warranted much attention from the press. Abe came from the upper echelons of Japanese society and in March 1906, was asked by the Japanese government to research the tobacco industries in western countries and purchase tobacco to import and export. Abe settled on East Broad Street in Church Hill, Richmond, Virginia while doing business, where he was held in high esteem by the leaders of the tobacco industry.

---
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During Abe’s travels, he was hospitalized at Virginia Hospital for typhoid fever and passed away three days later in January 1907.187 Because he died of a contagious disease, his body could not be returned home to Japan, but was instead buried in Hollywood Cemetery, in Richmond, Virginia -- members of the Tobacco Trade in Richmond met after his death and said that they “deeply regret the sudden departure from this life of Dr. T. Abe, who has been called away from our midst in the flower of his manhood...Although in a foreign land he had quickly made many friends amongst us who are shocked at the sudden loss which has befallen us.”188 His funeral service was led by the Reverend J.Y. Downman of All Saints Church, with music provided by members of St. Paul's Episcopal Church choir, as well as pallbearers that included leaders prominent in Richmond’s tobacco industry.189 It is clear from this treatment that Abe was a well-respected member of society, despite the fact that he was from a different place.

Like Tokukichiro Abe, there were other visitors from Japan to Virginia from the upper crust of Japanese society. Japanese golf teams and the Japanese Ambassador and his family often visited the high-end, luxury resort known as the Homestead in Hot Springs, Virginia. In Charlene Boyer Lewis’ publication, Ladies and Gentlemen on Display, she provides a cultural and social history on how Virginia Springs, at least throughout 1790-1860, were more than a place a relaxation --visitors traveled to the spas for numerous reasons, such as the attraction of business deals and connections, reinforcement of one’s status, to better their health, or even to alleviate boredom.190 The idea that Japanese came and stayed at the Homestead is of significance -- blacks were only at the Homestead in the early nineteenth century as slaves and servants, and certainly

not as guests. This contrasts greatly with the Japanese that visited there prior to World War II and is telling of the perceived higher status of these guests by Virginians. “Mme. Hirosi Saito,” wife of the Japanese ambassador in 1938, was even included in The Washington Post’s “Notes of Society,” stating when she would be visiting the Hot Springs with her children.191 Their children, Masako and Sakiko Saito, were included among those who enjoyed a summer water carnival in the Homestead pool, where they likely swam and played with other white children, again a commentary on their perceived higher status over blacks.192 Additionally, Japanese men played golf at the Homestead alongside whites, where they were invited to the Cascades Open Golf Tournament, with “twelve or more of the leading professionals of the United States.”193 Specifically, “a six-man Japanese golf team and five Virginia professionals...came out all even this afternoon after a day of hard play.”194

Marriages offered another compelling commentary on the status of Japanese in Virginia. According to law scholar Rachel F. Moran, in her publication Interracial Intimacy, “anti-miscegenation laws have played an integral role in defining racial identity and enforcing racial hierarchy.”195 She highlights that specifically for Asians, “anti-miscegenation laws confirmed their status as unassimilable foreigners.”196 However the Census shows that a number of Japanese male residents married both white and black women in Virginia, creating a complex picture of their racial identity or status. Virginia has a long history of anti-miscegenation laws aimed against interracial marriage, but they seemed primarily to prevent the marriages of blacks

196 Ibid., 18.
and whites. For example, Virginia’s 1691 law banished a white spouse from the colony within three months of an interracial wedding.197 By 1910, the law had established that “a person with at least a drop but less than one-sixteenth black blood was defined as white and prohibited from marrying a black person.”198 This too seems to point to the idea that the Japanese were held in a higher status than blacks, as they did in fact marry white women. This also reflects the difference of Virginia from national laws and the West Coast, which highly frowned upon interracial marriages between Asians and whites -- on the West Coast, anti-Japanese propaganda warned that the Japanese were casting furtive glances at young women with the desire to marry them.199 In California, Moran argues there was a low intermarriage rate of Japanese to whites and “to preserve a sense of white superiority, the lack of Japanese-white relationships had to be attributed either to Japanese chauvinism or to thwarted sexuality.”200 Furthermore, the California legislature criminalized Chinese-white intermarriage in 1901, which was held unconstitutional, but still reflected its initial response to interracial marriage.201

Japanese in Virginia, however, married both whites and blacks, before and after the 1924 Racial Integrity Statute. Additionally, it seems that much like Asians were in higher education, the anti-miscegenation laws were anti-black and anti-Native American in Virginia, rather than necessarily anti-Asian. Dr. Walter Ashby Plecker, a staunch defender of “racial purity,” and Virginia’s State Registrar of Vital Statistics, largely influenced and pushed for the 1924 Racial Integrity Statute. However, Plecker’s distaste for interracial marriage concerning the Native Americans in Virginia was much more obvious than his attitudes towards Asians. Plecker was “convinced that there were no Virginia Indians without some trace of African ancestry,” and
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“waged a systematic campaign to discredit all persons designating themselves as Indians.”

Plecker additionally published a pamphlet on eugenics, “alerting the public to the racial machinations of ambitious nonwhites.” However, Plecker’s views against the racial mixing of Native Americans and blacks in Virginia society seemed to be more clearly defined than his perspectives towards Asians. Perhaps because of the low number Asians as a whole in Virginia, there was less fear towards racial mixture. There were a number of men of Japanese descent who married white women, unlike Virginians who were deemed “negro” or “colored,” suggesting that Japanese in Virginia maintained a higher status over American Indians and blacks, and perhaps were perceived as having no “drops” of African American blood. Although many of their race identifications are listed in the Census as “Japanese” and not ‘White,” they married white women with seemingly few problems.

Japanese immigrants also married black women -- in the 1930 Census, both George Yo Miguth and Charlie Nakano (from Norfolk, Virginia and Portsmouth, Virginia respectively) married women listed as “negro.” Like Arthur Todda, George’s son, George Yo Miguth, seemed to take the mother’s status -- in this case as “negro.” This Census information points to how the children may have taken their mother’s race status and also may perhaps highlight that the Japanese, no matter their “honorary white” status, were not in fact white.

203 Ibid.
The marriage information from the Census suggests that it was possible these people might have been uncertain regarding their children’s race -- or perhaps it was easier to list their children as white prior to the 1930s in order to give them a higher position in society. These marriages reveal that some white women perceived their status as equivalent to Japanese men, allowing them to marry. The Japanese men in Virginia seemed to be at a somewhat fluid status -- willing and able to marry both white and black women.

The experiences of these people seem at odds with the national and West Coast laws and policies. While national laws reflected racism and discrimination towards the Japanese, it is hard to find this reflected in pre-World War II Virginia, particularly in comparison towards how blacks or Native Americans in Virginia were treated during this time. A number of historians address pre-existing racist attitudes before World War II towards the Japanese, but it seems clear that Virginia differed from this -- it is hard to see a population unwelcomed. Furthermore, many of those historians argued that it was the discriminatory attitudes held by many that led to internment in the first place -- perhaps this may have been apparent on the West Coast and from national leaders, but this doesn’t seem to be present in Virginia society. However, it is important to keep in mind scholar Claire Jean Kim’s observation -- although in reference to the Chinese in Mississippi, her interpretation may seem accurate when applied to the Japanese in Virginia -- that “both the relative sizes of the White, Black, and Chinese American populations in the two regions and the presence of a more rigid and established racial caste system (Jim Crow) in the South may explain why White Southerners felt they had less to lose than White Californians in permitting a slight shift in the racial positioning of the intermediate group.”

---

Chapter 3: The Japanese Experience in Virginia After Pearl Harbor

On the morning of December 7, 1941, the Imperial Japanese Navy launched a surprise military attack against the United States naval base at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii Territory. In February 1942, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, which required that all Japanese and Japanese Americans, regardless of age, loyalty, or citizenship, move into designated camps. How were Japanese and Japanese Americans treated in Virginia, a location where, prior to Pearl Harbor, they had been treated seemingly quite well? The ramifications of this order affected the lives of Japanese nationals and those of Japanese descent in America and with the use of the 1940 Census, newspapers, and more, one can attempt to interpret their status in Virginian society and how they were perceived by other Virginians. It is clear that Japanese living in Virginia experienced a difference in attitudes depending on their citizenship, which is not necessarily reflected in the West Coast discourse.

For example, the Japanese diplomats in Washington, D.C., consisting of those who had previously been “confined to the embassy here since the war began,” were sent to the Homestead in Hot Springs, Virginia. 206 A number of news articles explain that the members of the Japanese embassy, including Japanese ambassador Kichisaburo Nomura, Japanese “Peace Envoy” Saburo Kurusu, and others, were sent to Homestead “under heavy police guard.”207 They were brought by a “special train,” where “several baggage cars were required for the visitors’ luggage.”208 Their luggage even included “at least 25 sets of golf clubs,” implying that the diplomats had

208 “Two ‘Specials’ Bring Japs To Hot Springs,” The Highland Recorder (Monterey, VA), January 9, 1942.
likely taken all of their belongings from the embassy or perhaps knew they would be golfing.\textsuperscript{209}

The people at the Homestead were reportedly given no advance notice of their arrival, and a “sizable crowd” gathered to watch the Japanese arrive, where they entered into the hotel “without incident.”\textsuperscript{210} The Homestead was subsequently closed to the public -- the FBI had “practically taken over the hotel for the duration of the enemy nationals’ stay,” and “all entrances to the grounds have been closed with barricades and commanded by sentry boxes.”\textsuperscript{211} Furthermore, “employees and the few others, whose duties require access to the hotel and adjacent grounds, must be identified by pass cards bearing photographs and fingerprints.”\textsuperscript{212}

In February 1942, \textit{Life} even featured a four-page spread on the Japanese and their time at the Homestead, titled “The Homestead: A Great Hotel Entertains Jap Diplomats As Patriotic Duty.” The author added that “here, in cloistered luxury, a little group of Japanese has been spending the winter at the expense of the U.S. Government (their estimated bill: more than $2,000 a day).”\textsuperscript{213} \textit{Life} is sure to highlight that, although the Homestead’s staff “treated the Japanese with scrupulous hospitality,” the Homestead President Fay Ingalls “made it plain he regarded the episode as a necessary patriotic duty.”\textsuperscript{214} They added that “to his regular patrons Ingalls sent a hopeful message: ‘By the time spring returns to our valley, all traces of alien visitation will be gone.’”\textsuperscript{215} Their negative perspective towards the Japanese aside, the image of a “Homestead bootblack” could suggest that even after Pearl Harbor, race did not surpass ethnicity.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{210} “Two ‘Specials’ Bring Japs To Hot Springs,” \textit{The Highland Recorder} (Monterey, VA), January 9, 1942.
\item \textsuperscript{211} “Two ‘Specials’ Bring Japs To Hot Springs,” \textit{The Highland Recorder} (Monterey, VA), January 9, 1942.
\item \textsuperscript{212} “Two ‘Specials’ Bring Japs To Hot Springs,” \textit{The Highland Recorder} (Monterey, VA), January 9, 1942.
\item \textsuperscript{213} “The Homestead: A Great Hotel Entertains Jap Diplomats As Patriotic Duty,” \textit{Life} (New York City, NY), February 16, 1942.
\item \textsuperscript{214} “The Homestead: A Great Hotel Entertains Jap Diplomats As Patriotic Duty,” \textit{Life} (New York City, NY), February 16, 1942.
\item \textsuperscript{215} “The Homestead: A Great Hotel Entertains Jap Diplomats As Patriotic Duty,” \textit{Life} (New York City, NY), February 16, 1942.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
-- the black servant still was made to wait on and clean up after the Japanese visitors. Overall, *Life* emphasized the beauty of Homestead, rather than the Japanese visit there. However, the article made it clear that these visitors were only welcomed to the extent of a necessary duty.

The Japanese stay at Homestead did not last long. The *Highland Recorder* wrote that “Even the weatherman perked up last week when it was definitely learned that the Japs, who have been quartered at Hot Springs since December were to be moved.”\(^{216}\) The author added that “Old Sol was positively beaming” on Saturday, April 4, “when the 285 little yellow sons of (sho) guns were herded onto the train which was to take them to their home at White Sulphur Springs.”\(^{217}\) *The Washington Post* reported on April 5, 1942, that “from Hot Springs, VA., comes word that natives there are breathing audible sighs of relief for the first time in many weeks.”\(^{218}\)

It is clear that the attack on Pearl Harbor and the war had changed perspectives towards the Japanese. This juxtaposition of the Japanese clearly unwanted at the Homestead stands out when in 1938, the Japanese ambassadors were happily welcomed as guests. Although treated well enough, it seems that in Hot Springs, Virginia, the Japanese were certainly not welcome after World War II, a drastic change from prior to the war. It is clear however, that these Japanese diplomats were seen not as Japanese American residents, but as Japanese nationals and visitors unwelcome to the United States.

Aside from the Japanese nationals, the 1940 Census reported at least 30 residents of Virginia who had been born in Japan. Most of them were males between 30-60 years old, and many resided in Newport News and Norfolk. There were also those from Northern Virginia, Goochland, Richmond and Portsmouth. Much like the earlier Censuses, their written race seemed to cause confusion. While some of them were written down as “Japanese”, “JP”, or even

---

“Jap,” there were still a few cases where they were written as “W,” for white. Hitomi Yamasaki’s entry illustrates the confusion the Census takers may have had when faced with Japanese residents -- his race was clearly marked “W” before being scratched out with “JP” instead.

The Census also shows that there may have been a handful of residents who stayed in Virginia from before 1940. For example, Arthur Todda, as mentioned in Chapter Two, and his wife Mary, were listed as residents of Tanner Creek Norfolk, Virginia in 1910. The 1930 Census reports an Arthur Tade in Norfolk, twenty years older than Arthur from 1910 and married to his white wife, Mary -- he is likely the same person. He appears again in the 1940 Census as Arthur Tada, age 57, still residing in Norfolk. By 1940, his occupation was listed as a waiter at a restaurant, showing he was employed and working to support his children, Alma and Arthur -- his son reportedly was an artist with his own studio, while his daughter was a bookkeeper.219 Referred to as Wataru Tada in a 1941 Virginian-Pilot article, Arthur Todda was reported to operate a restaurant on Church Street in Norfolk and had lived in Norfolk since 1908.220 This information tells us that Arthur had built a relatively stable life for himself and his family, and that they had lived seemingly comfortably in Norfolk for quite some time.221 However, this chapter outlines how after the attack on Pearl Harbor, Arthur’s life was drastically changed.
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This seems to also be the case with Tenny Maheta, who can be found in the 1920, 1930, and 1940 Censuses under slightly different names, likely because the Census taker spelled them wrong or misheard him -- each Census entry lists his white wife Annie, as well as his residence in Norfolk, and his age seems to appropriately change with the Census. A resident of Deep Creek, Norfolk, in 1920, he was married to Annie, with their twelve-year old son Joseph.²²² Like Hitomi Yamasaki’s entry, the 1920 Census has a scribbled out “W” under his race, leaving an illegible mark. In 1930, he seems to be listed as Thomas Wakita, a restaurant cook in Norfolk, now listed as “Jp” for race. By 1940, he is listed as a restaurant proprietor, implying that this man had also built himself a life in Norfolk, remaining there throughout the years with his family.

What happened to these residents after Pearl Harbor was attacked? On Monday, December 8, 1941, immediately after Pearl Harbor, the Virginian-Pilot reported that 14 Japanese residents of Norfolk were taken into custody. The “lightninglike speed” in which these Japanese residents were taken was due to police Captain Ted Miller’s “personal direction several months ago,” where “Japanese in Norfolk and other localities in this section were interviewed, fingerprinted, and full information was filled out about them with their photographs and signatures.”²²³

Perhaps Miller’s decision to document the Japanese residents aligned with the Alien Registration Program, enacted in July 1940, in response to the threat of war. The Alien Registration Program, also known as the Smith Act, required every alien resident living in the United States to register at a local post office, and aliens entering the United States had to

²²² See Tenny Maheta’s Census information in Appendix. In the 1920 Census, his son Joseph is listed as “W.”
²²³ “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” Virginian Pilot (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
register as they applied for admission.\textsuperscript{224} These requirements applied to all aliens over the age of fourteen, “regardless of nationality and regardless of immigration status.” \textsuperscript{225} As part of this process, aliens were fingerprinted and asked to fill out a two-page form, which were forwarded to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS).\textsuperscript{226} This article adds that around 93,000 Japanese registered under the Alien Registration Law “last year,” and while “some left for home during recent months, the bulk of those who signed up with the Justice Department and were fingerprinted are still here [in America].”\textsuperscript{227} They reported that about 41,000 of those who had stayed were in Hawaii, some in Alaska, and “the remainder in Continental United States.”\textsuperscript{228} Additionally, the \textit{Virginian-Pilot} stated that “the groundwork for quick action was laid last spring and summer at the request of the War and Navy departments, when the Alien Registration Division prepared detailed data on every Axis national in the United States.”\textsuperscript{229} The article, however, implies that Captain Miller personally had a hand in the Norfolk Japanese resident registrations because even until “a late hour” on the night of the arrests, he had “received no information from Government officials as to what should be done with them.”\textsuperscript{230} Additionally, one photograph caption states that Captain Miller had compiled a list of Japanese nationals “here several weeks ago, which expedited the arrest of the men yesterday.”\textsuperscript{231} Miller’s actions are reminiscent of historian Ronald Takaki’s description of General Emmons’ contrasting

\textsuperscript{225} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{226} Ibid., 165.
\textsuperscript{227} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{228} “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” \textit{Virginian Pilot} (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
\textsuperscript{229} Szucs, \textit{They Became Americans}, 165.
\textsuperscript{230} “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” \textit{Virginian Pilot} (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
\textsuperscript{231} “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” \textit{Virginian Pilot} (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
reaction in Hawaii and how the local reaction to taking Japanese into custody could make a large impact on the community.\textsuperscript{232}

It is important to note, however, the article’s headline -- “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police.” It seems Miller did not take into custody Japanese women, only men. This could also be due to the possibility that some of the Japanese women who lived in Virginia may have been servicemen’s wives. Several temporary laws in the late 1940s allowed servicemen to marry their Japanese girlfriends and bring them home, however they had to complete the paperwork in a timely manner and the system was supposedly difficult to accomplish.\textsuperscript{233}

However, this may have also been merely because the Japanese women were not considered as large of a threat as Japanese men. This gender skew was seen with Wataru Tada’s (referred to as Arthur Todda, Arthur Tade, and Arthur Tada in the Census) situation. His daughter Alma, who would have been half-Japanese, was not taken and obtained an attorney for her father immediately after he was taken into custody.\textsuperscript{234} Perhaps those in the community had come to think of Alma as not a Japanese national, but as truly American, particularly when she had lived her entire life in Norfolk.

After taken into custody, Wataru Tada was asked what he thought of the day, particularly towards the bombing of Pearl Harbor, to which he replied, “it’s all a mess.”\textsuperscript{235} The \textit{Virginian-Pilot} said that Tada “seemed concerned over his situation, and solemn when he considered the possibility that he might to spend the duration of the war in an internment camp.”\textsuperscript{236} “With the exception of two of the Japanese,” all arrested in Norfolk at that time had been residents there for

\textsuperscript{232} General Emmons refused the mass evacuation of the Japanese in Oahu, Hawaii.
\textsuperscript{234} “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” \textit{Virginian Pilot} (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
\textsuperscript{235} “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” \textit{Virginian Pilot} (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
\textsuperscript{236} “Norfolk’s Male Japanese Held By City Police,” \textit{Virginian Pilot} (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
at least 15 years, and “several of them have lived here 35 years or more.”\textsuperscript{237} The article identified a number of the men -- Wataru Tada, as mentioned previously, Sugama Ikeda, 38 years old, Sumiji Hara, 44, Karanosuke Ishii, 51, and Seyamatso Mizutant (known as Perry by his friends), 46 years old. Additionally, “all of them [all 14 Japanese men gathered] knew each other and have long been acquainted -- even the two who recently came to Norfolk had become acquainted with the older Japanese residents.”\textsuperscript{238} This suggests a small community the Japanese had managed to create in Norfolk.

After their arrests, “burly naval shore patrolmen blocked doorways to the rooms in which the Japanese were held,” and officials “worked until 9 o’clock fingerprinting and photographing the 14 men, and they later were transported to the city jail.”\textsuperscript{239} The \textit{Virginian-Pilot} truly seems to capture the solemn air of this event -- the Japanese men “sat quiet in a detention room at Police Headquarters, and most of them stared at the ceiling or smoked cigarettes. Only one or two engaged in conversation.”\textsuperscript{240} At least three of these Japanese male residents were sent away to the Rohwer Relocation Center in Arkansa, according to the “United States Japanese Americans Relocated During World War II” database, including Hidemitsu Toyota, pictured in the \textit{Virginian-Pilot}. All three, Hidemisto Toyota (listed as Hidemits in the 1940 Census), Tsuruji Miyasaki, and Shisuke Wada, were single men and residents of Norfolk and Suffolk. Toyota had reportedly given military service in the United States Naval Coast Guard, which is why perhaps he was photographed being questioned.\textsuperscript{241} The \textit{Virginian-Pilot} had additionally captioned a photograph of him, stating that “Shown in the center of this photograph is Hidemisto Toyota, aged 53, cook in a restaurant at 1103 Church street, whose activities here have interested Norfolk
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\textsuperscript{241} See Appendix.
\end{flushleft}
police for several months. Quiet, reflective, Toyota has been in this country for 33 years and has lived in Norfolk for the past 16. When asked about his reactions to the bombing of Pearl Island, he said: ‘I thought there would be some more of those negotiations.’ He speaks English well and Japanese fluently.”

It is clear that the attack Pearl Harbor changed how many Virginians felt towards the Japanese. These attitudes were negatively focused on distinct Japanese nationals, like the diplomats at the Homestead. Even with the residents in Norfolk, it doesn’t seem like the family members of the Japanese men were taken into custody, just the men who had emigrated from Japan themselves. Additionally, the Norfolk area may have had more elevated fears than other areas in Virginia, due to its military installations.

The Virginian-Pilot also reported that in the “Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News area,” there were about “40 subjects of the Mikado so far as known,” which “already has been taken in custody.” Federal Bureau of Investigation arrest warrants from 1941 note Kosuke Nakano from Portsmouth, Virginia, as well as Yoshimi Shiba, from Norfolk were seized within the next few days, on December 8 and December 9. However, the article specified that “there are other natives of Japan in this area, who have become American citizens.” These Japanese Americans “will not be affected by the confiscation order nor will they be taken into custody.” Furthermore, “their rights as American citizens, it is stated, will be protected by the Government unless they prove unworthy of that protection.” In Norfolk, the officials seemed to obey the law, and rounded up those that could be legally due to the Smith Act.

---
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These points seem crucial when compared to the West Coast and even what those in the federal government were saying, where both Japanese aliens and Japanese citizens were seen as one and the same -- “even second- and third- generation Japanese Americans who were citizens and ‘Americanized,’ could not be trusted, according to DeWitt [General John L. DeWitt, Commander of Western Defense Command], because ‘the racial strains are undiluted.”247 This can be additionally be perceived through DeWitt’s words in 1942, “A Jap’s a Jap. It makes no difference whether the Jap is a citizen or not,” and Colonel Karl Bendetsen, administrator of the Wartime Civil Control Administration, who said, “I am determined that if they have one drop of Japanese blood in them, they must go to camp.”248 With the exception of Governor Ralph Carr of Colorado, the governors of the Western states of Washington, Oregon, and California, urged that all Japanese and Japanese Americans be placed in camps, away from the public.249

The areas around Norfolk were similar in their swift reactions towards Japanese residents. In Portsmouth, detectives of the police department, led by Captain L.C. Warren, the acting chief of the police and a Naval Intelligence officer, “swooped down on two restaurants in the city yesterday afternoon [December 7, 1941] about 4 o’clock and seized eight Japanese nationals,” employees of the restaurant.250 These Japanese nationals were lodged in the Portsmouth jail “pending further disposition.”251 They were taken from “Charlie’s Cafe,” operated by Charlie Nakana, who had not been in Portsmouth at the time but in Buckroe Beach, “where he was picked up.”252 This is likely the same Charlie in the 1940 Census, listed as

250 “Eight Japanese Are In Custody In Portsmouth,” Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk, VA), December 8, 1941.
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Charlie Najuraki, a forty year old, married, cafe proprietor. On the same block as Charlie’s Cafe, “the officers picked up one Japanese,” from The Oriental Cafe, operated by Mori Ostubo (who had been taken into custody). Ostubo can also be found in the 1940 Census, a fifty-year-old cook at the restaurant, also married. In Suffolk, Chief of Police Lawrence B. Butler also gathered the Japanese residents. This included Tsuiugua Myasiki, “who operated the Horse Shoe Cafe” and Shigeo Nakasato, an employee of the cafe. It is clear that Norfolk and the surrounding areas were particularly fast in their responses to Pearl Harbor, perhaps due to the actions local officials had taken prior to the attack. However, these actions seemed geared towards Japanese male first generation residents, rather their wives or towards Japanese American citizens like their children.

These actions were apparent in Washington D.C. as well. The Virginian-Pilot reported the arrest of D.C. resident Kiyosha K. Kawakami, “well-known Japanese newspaper writer and a resident of Washington for nearly 40 years,” who was “one of the first Japanese subjects taken by the FBI in a round-up of Japanese Nationals in the capital.” However, just as a separate article in the Virginian-Pilot had reported that Japanese Americans would not be affected by the confiscation regulation, nor would they be taken into custody. Kawakami’s wife and daughter, American citizens, “were not disturbed.” Moreover, “Clarke Kawakami, an American-born son and an American citizen, also was questioned briefly today, but was not taken into custody.”

Meanwhile, it is difficult to gauge the atmosphere in other areas in Virginia at this time -- historian Francis Lutz highlights a frenzied air in Richmond, where the city had an “enemy hunt”

---
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after the attack on Pearl Harbor, “when police were told by an excited taxi driver that he had taken a couple of Japanese fares to a Fulton address” -- and “with sirens shrieking, the police cars descended on the address.” 258 However, “to police disappointment,” the passengers were Seminole Indians. 259 Lutz’s account seems to show very different attitudes in a city that had previously welcomed the Japanese. Arrest warrants from the FBI do note that one Japanese “alien,” Shigeaka Morizawa, who was taken into custody from Richmond. 260 Unfortunately, there is no trace of what may have happened to Morizawa. These accounts contrast with an article by the New Journal and Guide from Norfolk in May 1945, when Richmond hosted an interracial “I Am An American” Day, sponsored by the United Service Organization at E. Leigh Street, where “representatives from such American minority groups as the Chinese, Japanese, Jews, Catholics, and Negro Americans were present.” This was likely because it was not an immediate reaction to Pearl Harbor, as in Lutz’s account, however it suggests that calm returned later to Richmond, Virginia, whereas hysteria against the Japanese continued on the West Coast. 261 Ultimately, the attack on Pearl Harbor made it clear that the already ambiguous and marginal position of the Japanese in Virginia could turn badly very easily, and Japanese nationals in Virginia felt the brunt of this.

Even as there were those who were sent away, by 1944 it seems at least four Japanese-Americans from the West Coast were relocated in Richmond, Virginia, likely in order to move them far from the West Coast. 262 One article stated that the War Relocation Authority’s

258 Lutz, Richmond in World War II, 121.
259 Ibid.
262 Unfortunately, this article does not say why these Japanese were relocated to Virginia. It is likely however they were to move them as far away from the West Coast as possible. “33 Jap-Americans Relocated in Va.,” The Washington Post (Washington, D.C.), November 22, 1944.
breakdown, “as of November 15, showed four Japanese-Americans in Vienna, 12 in Arlington, 3 in Falls Church, 4 in McLean (Fairfax County), and one each in Warrenton, East Falls Church, Hamburg, Newport News, Lynchburg, and Alexandria.”\textsuperscript{263} From this, it seems that there were a handful of Virginian Japanese residents that were not sent away by that time or that had been relocated there, however it is important to note the term “Japanese-American” -- this suggests that these were not Japanese nationals. This language is used additionally to describe others that were in Virginia. The \textit{Richmond Times-Dispatch} reported in January 1942, that in Roanoke, “German, Italian and Japanese nationals in the Western District of Virginia now have been brought under a Federal order requiring them to surrender radio transmitters, short-wave radio receiving sets and cameras,” implying there were possibly still Japanese Americans living in the area that were not immediately sent away.\textsuperscript{264} The article also added that “travel proclamations are being construed as not forbidding travel within the alien’s resident community, commuting from his home to his place of business, or travel between his home and his place of religious worship, school, college, or institution of learning at which he is in regular attendance, or any Federal, State, or local government agency with which he is required to transact business.”\textsuperscript{265}

Japanese students’ experiences create an even more complex picture. A number of them continued their educations in Virginia throughout the war, rather than being sent to internment camps. However, the students who stayed were all tied in some way to Christianity, perhaps lending them an identity more closely associated to an American citizen, rather than as a Japanese national. In 1940, Japanese woman Tamiko Okamura studied at the Presbyterian School of Christian Education (formerly the Assemblies Training School or ATS) in Richmond, Virginia. Additionally, Japanese American student Kei Kaneda studied there in 1944. She lived

\textsuperscript{263} “33 Jap-Americans Relocated in Va.,” \textit{The Washington Post} (Washington, D.C.), November 22, 1944.
\textsuperscript{264} “Tavenner Cities Order,” \textit{Richmond Times-Dispatch} (Richmond, VA), January 4, 1942.
\textsuperscript{265} “Tavenner Cities Order,” \textit{Richmond Times-Dispatch} (Richmond, VA), January 4, 1942.
in the home of Henry Mack and his daughter, Margaret Patterson Mack, recollected her memories of Kei:

. . . Henry (Mack) brought Kei Kaneda to Richmond. F.D.R. had put all Japanese-Americans in camps. Henry felt this was utterly unfair; therefore he had to do something. The only thing he thought of was to get one out of camp and bring her to the Training School. It took many months, much twisting of arms, much conversation with our government representatives. But finally she came and became a part of our family until she died just last year (in 1998). Henry would take her when he went out to make speeches so that people in the churches could see that she wasn't a dangerous character. She graduated and went on to the University of North Carolina, getting a degree in social work. She then moved to Massachusetts where she spent the rest of her life. She was very active in trying to get our government to reimburse the Japanese Americans in some way, for all that had been taken from them. Finally Washington did, in a token way.. 266

Kei’s presence in Richmond adds an interesting aspect -- she lived and went to school in Richmond, and it seems she was never hurt on the tours Henry took with her. In an interview with Margaret, when asked how Kei was treated in restaurants, she stated that they “never went out to eat,” adding that “the only time we went out to eat was when my Uncle Charlie...would come to Richmond, which was a couple of times in my memory.” 267 It is unclear if this was due to money or the fear of discrimination in public. However, as seen with Richmond’s “I Am An American” Day, it may be that hysteria towards the Japanese began to lessen and that ultimately calm returned to Virginia, unlike on the West Coast.

There were traces of other Japanese students who continued their studies after Pearl Harbor as well. In 1943, Father K.W. Nakajo worked as a graduate student of Hebrew at the Episcopal Seminary in Alexandria -- he was also the assistant priest at the Emmanuel Episcopal Church in Washington, D.C. In February 1944, the Richmond Times-Dispatch reported that Miss Mary Miyasaki, a Japanese student at Lynchburg College, was set to discuss the “Japanese

266 It is not made clear how Henry was able to do this, however one can imagine he was likely a well-connected Richmond citizen. Margaret Patterson Mack, My Heart’s Recollections (Harrisonburg, Virginia: Self-Published, 2000), 74.
267 Mack, Margaret Patterson, Interviewed by Emma Ito, June 7, 2016.
Relocation Project” in an opening session of a three-day conference.\(^{268}\) The conference, an annual meeting of the Methodist Student Conference for the State of Virginia, was said to be attended by 150 to 200 students in Farmville.\(^{269}\)

Perhaps most engaging are the experiences of Japanese American soldiers who came through Virginia -- they seemed to be treated quite well. Much like the students, others may have tied their American uniforms to these soldiers as being American first and not as Japanese nationals. Toshikazu “Tosh” Okamoto recalled his time in the 442\(^{nd}\) Regimental Combat Team (RCT), where he went through basic infantry training at Camp Lee. There was no mention of if he had been treated badly, actually adding that his training on the Chesapeake Bay “was a fun time for us.”\(^{270}\) Another veteran of the 442\(^{nd}\) RCT, Thomas T. Kobayashi, was asked in an interview what he did in his spare time off-duty in Virginia, stating he was stationed in Warrenton, Virginia, for two years. He mentioned that “We had friends there, girlfriends,” and that “Because of a lot of Nisei girls that moved to Washington, D.C. for their work, so there were a lot of friends there. In fact, Niseis were already in that area too. We’d go to USOs and movies.”\(^{271}\) His mention of women provides a glimpse into a subject with very little information -- many Japanese women seemingly disappeared when they came to America. Many “either tried, or were pressured to give up their Japanese identities to become more fully American.”\(^{272}\)

Hideo Hoshide, another 442\(^{nd}\) RCT veteran, recalled his first arrival in Washington, D.C., where he knew the bus was segregated, but was unsure where to sit. He decided that “in between, I thought it would be a safe place,” and had no problem on that particular bus ride. However, he

\(^{268}\) “Bishop Peele To Address Conference,” \textit{Richmond Times-Dispatch} (Richmond, VA), February 20, 1944.

\(^{269}\) “Church Youth Plan Sessions In Farmville,” \textit{Richmond Times-Dispatch} (Richmond, VA), February 24, 1944.

\(^{270}\) Toshikazu “Tosh” Okamoto II Segment 9, Interviewed by Tom Ikeda, June 11, 2009, Densoh Digital Archives, Desho Visual History Collection (N-Z), Denso ID Number: denshovh-otoshikazu-02-0009.


had to change buses in Alexandria and was faced again with the issue of where to sit -- “It was kind of a big question that I didn’t know where to go, but there was a lady sitting in the front side, and she heard me talking to the driver.”\(^{273}\) He went on to say that the white woman who had overheard him invited him to sit next to her. He added that after he met workers in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), he mentioned this incident, when they told him “You know, when you’re over here, there’s only two classifications. You’re either a white or black. There’s nothing in between,” to which he responded that he was “yellow race.” Their response to him was “You’re a white.” Hoshide’s interaction highlights that, just as the Census takers may not have been sure which race to categorize the Japanese as, Hoshide himself was unsure -- “I didn’t know how I should act, whether I’m a black or a white.” However, it seems in Virginia, it was clear that Hoshide and others like him were categorized as white, at least in these situations, perhaps because of his status as a soldier.

Matthew Briones’ *Jim and Jap Crow* highlighted a similar situation where Charles Kikuchi experienced segregation in Washington, D.C., while on leave from Camp Lee. His company went out to eat and he wrote that, as he was eating, “an elderly colored man came in,” but was stopped by the waiter and told that he “could not be served, as it was restricted for whites only.”\(^{274}\) Kikuchi added that he “felt pity and hot anger.”\(^{275}\) However, Kikuchi “was for walking out in protest, but the boys wanted their steaks so I didn’t say anything else.” Kikuchi, like Hoshide, was clearly considered as white in this situation, and again in another instance at Camp Lee. This time, he had been a part of a group of white soldiers who invited a handful of Black soldiers to eat with them. Briones added that “after breaking bread with one another, albeit

\(^{273}\) Hideo Hoshide Interview II Segment 4, Interviewed by Tom Ikeda, February 1 & 2, 2006, Densho Digital Archives, Densho Visual History Collection (A-M), Densho ID Number: denshovh-hhideo-02-0004.
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awkwardly, the white and black soldiers went their separate ways, and Kikuchi -- by his own admission, somewhat shamefully -- accompanied the whites to Richmond.  

The soldiers’ experiences in Virginia was mirrored at Camp Shelby in Mississippi as well. Senator Daniel K. Inouye recollected his time training for the 442nd RCT and recalled segregated camps -- one of his friends attempted to go into a black area latrine, but was kicked out, adding that “here we were classified as ‘white.” Matthew Briones’ *Jim and Jap Crow* similarly added the account of Thomas Higa, where he remembered:

> I was surprised at the invisible wall that existed between blacks and whites. I learned about it traveling in the South. On buses, the front seats were reserved for whites and the rear seats were for blacks. Since I was neither white nor black, I could sit anywhere. When there was a seat in the white section, I sat there. No one complained…

Perhaps these soldiers’ experiences become clear however when thinking of segregation already in place by the time these soldiers would have joined. When the first draft call had been issued in October 1940, the War Department ordered the Selective Service System to fill racial quotas, which asked for a certain number of recruits for white and “colored” units. This required local draft boards to distinguish blacks from whites and classify each registrant by race - - “with the exception of Japanese Americans, who were excluded from the draft (immediately) after Pearl Harbor, members of no other ethnic group (other than blacks) were subject to military segregation. Thus, if a registrant could convince his draft board that he was not a Negro, he was considered to be white.” By the time Japanese Americans began to fight in either the 100th Battalion or 442nd RCT they were in their own segregated group (as the Japanese only regiments). Once around the other battalions they would have been classified as either one or the

---
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other -- it seems, much like other ambiguous groups in Virginia, such as American Indians, that they were classified as white.\textsuperscript{281}

It is apparent that Pearl Harbor certainly changed attitudes and perceptions in Virginia towards the Japanese. However, these attitudes became significantly more negative towards those perceived as Japanese nationals rather than those who were classified as Japanese Americans, which still marked a change in Virginia from prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor. Japanese Christian students may have been vouched for by others within their church and because of their religion, may have been aligned as an American more so than a Japanese national, whereas Japanese American soldiers were likely closely associated with their uniforms as American. Ultimately, Virginia is different in that the racism and panic was not nearly as distinguishable as it had been in the West Coast. Virginia’s response to the attack on Pearl Harbor turns a light back on the extremism of the West Coast’s reactions.

\textsuperscript{281} Ibid.
Conclusion

The experience and status of the Japanese in Virginia was particularly ambiguous. Japanese in Virginia truly did fall in between strict color castes of “black” and “white.” Before the attack on Pearl Harbor, Japanese in Virginia fell closer to the “white” category on the racial spectrum, likely because a majority of the Japanese visitors and residents were upper class, wealthy, educated, Christian, and chose to be aligned with “white” status. However, as is often seen in Virginia history, race ultimately was the most prevalent quality, and Japanese were simply not black nor white, but indeed an “other.” They seemed able to marry both whites and blacks and attended traditionally “white” colleges and universities, where many like Arthur Matsu and Sangi Ogawa excelled. The attitudes and perceptions of Virginians before Pearl Harbor seemed less negative than national and West Coast laws and perceptions -- in California, “yellow peril,” or xenophobia directed towards Asians, was solidified through the courts in the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, which was not repealed until 1943, the Gentlemen’s Agreement of 1907-1908, the 1913 and 1920 Alien Land Acts, court case *Ozawa v. United States*, and more. In Virginia, possibly because of the small number and already established racial caste system, Japanese were seemingly tolerated. Although there is little study of the Japanese in Jim Crow South, it is likely that these attitudes were reflected in other southern states as well.282

The attack on Pearl Harbor did change how Japanese were seen, as war often does, but many continued to float in an ambiguous status. Japanese nationals were perceived negatively, as

282 For example, Japanese students were accepted in higher education outside of Virginia at Vanderbilt University, Tennessee, and Elon University in North Carolina. Additionally, much like Arthur Matsu, in 1923, Taro Kishi was the first Japanese student at Texas A&M who played football. (Vanderbilt) *Staunton Spectator and Vindicator* (Staunton, VA), July 28, 1911. (Elon University) *The Times Dispatch* (Richmond, VA), December 7, 1913. (Texas A&M) “Japanese Player Relied on Heart.” Joe Michael Feist. [http://hirasaki.net/Family_Stories/Taro_Kishi/A_M.htm](http://hirasaki.net/Family_Stories/Taro_Kishi/A_M.htm) (accessed April 8, 2017).
seen with the Japanese diplomats at the Homestead and the first-generation Japanese men taken into custody in Norfolk. Their experience showed how truly precarious the status of Japanese was however, and at least three, unmarried resident males in Norfolk were sent to the Rohwer internment camp. At the same time, Japanese Americans, such as soldiers and students, as well as Japanese missionaries, continued to travel and live in Virginia, in a time when most Japanese and Japanese Americans living on the West Coast had been forced to leave their homes and placed in assembly centers and eventually internment camps. There was a respect for citizenship in Virginia, which was clearly not present on the West Coast. Virginia’s actions after the attack on Pearl Harbor ultimately shows that the West Coast’s response to the attack on Pearl Harbor was extreme, and is deserving of the condemnation numerous historians highlight. Although Virginia’s response was not as sympathetic as General Emmons’ was in Hawaii, Virginia’s reactions to Pearl Harbor and their attitudes towards Japanese in the state was mild compared to the West Coast. By contrast, Virginia shows how racist and outrageous the violation of internment truly was on the West Coast.

The Japanese experience in Virginia from the 1900s to the 1950s is complex. Japanese straddled a strange, ambiguous status, from Jim Crow throughout internment, which is distinct from the West Coast. Perhaps a 442nd RCT veteran put it best in reference to where to sit on a Jim Crow bus, that “in between, I thought it would be a safe place.”
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Appendix

Selected Census Information on persons whose birthplace was Japan and claimed residence in Virginia
(The Appendix does not include every person born in Japan and living in Virginia)

Table 1: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Twelfth Decennial Census of the United States, 1900*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Written Race</th>
<th>Residence (City)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masateo Sheiski</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ward Room Servant</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisabuso Eshie</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Ward Room Cook</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hekachi Ukamina</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ward Room Cook</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hozo Kagotami</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Wa[illeg]</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsusui Sadajiro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yohio Toye</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki Hassoms</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sailor, US Navy</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Osawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Servant, Butler</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Pulaski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryosuke Hiroaka</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Charlottesville District, Albemarle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Thirteenth Decennial Census of the United States, 1910.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Written Race</th>
<th>Residence (City)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Todda</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>[illeg]</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Ja&quot;</td>
<td>Tanner Creek, Norfolk</td>
<td>Arthur and Mary had son Arthur Todda Jr. (1 yr old). He is listed as &quot;W,&quot; born in PA. Likely is Arthur Tade from the 1930 Census and 1940 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsusui Sadajiro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Patient and Cook at the United States Naval Hospital</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yohio Toye</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Servant, Cook</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Chesapeake, Elizabeth City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsuneshiro Urimoto</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>US Navy Yard Sailor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isunego Kitaura</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hired Man, laborer on a farm</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Wythe, Elizabeth City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigora Tomisawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Salesman of a store</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>He is listed as the Head of home. Married to a &quot;W,&quot; New Jersey born wife. Both their sons' races are listed as &quot;Jap,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Kadota</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cook for a &quot;private family&quot;</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Yoshida</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Butler for a &quot;private family&quot;</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Fauquier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahi Yokoyama</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sailor in the US Navy</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menne Kakogwa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Boarder, a &quot;Picture Artist&quot;</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot; crossed out with &quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Written Race</td>
<td>Residence (City)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenny Maheta</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Stamper</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot; scribbled out, illegible</td>
<td>Deep Creek, Norfolk</td>
<td>Married to his white wife Annie and his 12 year old son Joseph is listed as &quot;W.&quot; Likely the same person as Toma Waketa in the 1940 census and Tomas Wakita in the 1930 Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiahie Ogawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Head of home, Butler</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W,&quot; &quot;JP&quot; written over it</td>
<td>Craigsville, Augusta</td>
<td>Married to his white wife, Grace. Their two daughters, Bertha and Altie are listed as &quot;W&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toshi Yoshii</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Worked with a number of other nurses under two house doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toki Tona</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>&quot;Keeper&quot; of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Jefferson Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichicawa Tsuneckick</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lodger of Toki Tona, cook of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Jefferson Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwanu Toyotaro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lodger of Toki Tona, cook of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Jefferson Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miyata Hohichiro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lodger of Toki Tona, waiter of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Jefferson Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivo Nemdra</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lodger of Toki Tona, cook of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Jefferson Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukir Nobby</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>None (married)</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td>Married to What Nobby (head of house), a Japanese (written as &quot;Jp&quot; in the Census) male of 45 years old, who was a restaurant proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kurokawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Head of home, Restaurant Manager</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokuji Tanabe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Lodger of George Kurokawa, Waiter of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijataki Miya</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lodger of George Kurokawa, waiter of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoichi Ayesng</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lodger of George Kurokawa, cook of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Inouye</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lodger of George Kurokawa, cook of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Tanaka</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fukugi Maronaka</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&quot;Helper&quot; under Tom Tanaka, cook at a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk, Adams Ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadagiro Ahaigi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Head of home, Boarding House Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Married to his 42 year old, Japanese (&quot;Jp&quot;) wife, Kana, who is listed underneath his name in the Census.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Fifteenth Decennial Census of the United States, 1930*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Written Race</th>
<th>Residence (City)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Tade</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Cleaning Shop Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td><em>W</em> stricken through and written as &quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Married to white wife, Mary, from VA. Their children, Arthur Tade Jr and Alma race was also &quot;W&quot; and crossed out and rewritten as &quot;Jp.&quot; This family can also be found in the Census 1940.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Nakano</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Head of home, Cafe Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>His wife, Eula Nakano was a young &quot;neg&quot; Virginian woman, who was a waitress at a cafe (likely his).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskla Sagawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lodger under Charlie Nakano, cook at cafe</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuku Shima</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Lodger under Charlie Nakano, cook at cafe</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laro Ushio</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Head of home, Merchant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>He has a &quot;negro&quot; servant, Josephine Whittaker, 30 year old Virginian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Yo Miguth</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Head of home, Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Married to Virginia &quot;neg&quot; Mary E Miguth, Son is George Yo Miguth listed as &quot;neg&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Nickname</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wakita</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Head of home, Restaurant Cook</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jp&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Married to Annie, a white Virginian. Likely the same person as Toma Waketa in the 1940 census and Tenny Maheta from the 1920 Census</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Sixteenth Decennial Census of the United States, 1940.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Written Race</th>
<th>Residence (City)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fukushima, [illegible]</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Head, Proprietor and Cook of a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyata, [illeg.]</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Lodger under Fukushima, cook at a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[illeg.], Suemont</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lodger under Fukushima, cook at a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Tanaka</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Head, Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kido Yama</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Lodger under Tanaka, cook at a restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitomi Yamasaki</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot; crossed out, replaced with &quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Yamaguchie</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Chauffeur</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Falls Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sujiyiye</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Head, owner and cook of restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen Yageshithe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Lodger under Sujiyiye, owner and cook of restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Nishi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Lodger under Sujiyiye, owner and cook of restaurant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matruno Sigeru</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Head, cook &quot;Independent Princess Cafe&quot;</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiichi Hino</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Head, Steward for the US Army Club and Officers Mess</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Mount Vernon, Fairfax, Married to Clara B Hino, whose birthplace is Switzerland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tano Nshio</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Head, Cafe Proprietor</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of his lodgers was Virginian female Josephine Whitaker, listed as "neg" and waitress of cafe, likely the same one her fellow lodger and head worked at

Perhaps his "W" status came from the head of the family he chauffeured for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Status of Relationship</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacco Higashi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Lodger to Tano Nshio, Cook at a Cafe</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Married to Leura Nagayama, his white wife from Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hideyo Nagayama</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Proprietor of a Beauty School</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Jefferson Ward, Richmond</td>
<td>Married to Natlie Otsubo, his white wife from North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Otsubo</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Head, a cook at a restaurant</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Jefferson Ward, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukikiaro Bogihara</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Chesapeake Magisterial District, Elizabeth City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Tada</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Head, waiter at a restaurant</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Married to Mary Tada, his white wife. His son Arthur Tada is listed as &quot;JP&quot; as is his daughter Alma. His son was a &quot;com. artist&quot; with his own studio while his daughter was a bookkeeper for an auto dealer. He is also listed in the United States Census, 1930. Alma was 25 in the 1940 census, Arthur (son) was 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomi Uyehara</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>&quot;Retired&quot; but striken through, not head of household</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Licking Hole Magisterial District, Goochland</td>
<td>Place of birth is &quot;Cal,&quot; Father's (Tomi Uyehara) is Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirstia Uyehara</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>says &quot;son of servant,&quot; servant</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Licking Hole Magisterial District, Goochland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto Kodama</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Head, Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toma Waketa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Head, Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Najuraki</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Head, Cafe Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Jefferson Ward, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deangoi Hayashi</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Head, Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Kono</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Head, a cook at a restaurant</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Jap&quot;</td>
<td>Jefferson Ward, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadie Thomas</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&quot;Salad Maker [?], Retail Lunch Counter&quot;</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot;</td>
<td>Wytheville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasegawa Shintaro</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>College Student</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;Ja&quot;</td>
<td>Hampden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukichi Misso</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Servant, Chauffeur of a Private home</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>&quot;JP&quot;</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Married to Annie Waketa, his white Virginian wife. He is likely Thomas Wakita from 1930 census and Tenny Maheta from the 1920 Census.

Married to his white, Pennsylvanian wife. They have a 10 year old son (race listed as "JP"), Harry, born in PA.

Married to his North Carolinian "neg" wife, Lucille, a beauty parlor attendant. They have a 4 year old daughter, Helen, listed as "Jap" who was born in VA.

Married to Robert Thomas, the head of the home, white Virginian, a Mathematics Public School teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanie Kawakami</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Restaurant Proprietor</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>&quot;Ja&quot;</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>Married to Japanese wife, Toki Kawakami with their 19 year old daughter born in NY, Hatsuko Kawakami and 15 year old son Taro Kawakami, also born in NY. Both children are listed as &quot;Ja&quot; as is his wife. Wife and Daughter are waitresses at a restaurant, and his son is a cashier at a restaurant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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