

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)

HON. D. C. MURPHY
CALIF. STATE FED. OF LABOR

JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND SEC'Y NATIVE SONS
OF THE GOLDEN WEST

California Joint Immigration Committee

85 SECOND STREET

PHONE GARFIELD 2697

San Francisco, Cal.

DOROTHY KALTENBACH
(SECRETARY)

11/1
CHARLES M. GOETHE
(TREASURER)

H. J. McCLATCHY
(EXEC. SECY.)

HON. U. S. WEBB
ROBERT H. FOUKE
V. S. McCLATCHY
(1897-1938)

March 29, 1941

Hon. Halford D. Wilson,
Alderman
City of Vancouver
Vancouver, B. C.

My dear Sir:

This will acknowledge your letter of March 14th, asking for information with regard to the Japanese situation in California, and sending a Brief which has been presented to your Government in Ottawa.

As per your request, I enclose herewith such printed material as may be of interest to you, some of which is now no longer applicable, but which will show you conditions under which California struggled before the exclusion measure was enacted in 1924. Conditions outlined in the article on Hawaiian statehood are to some extent repeated also in California.

First and foremost, you are most fortunate in not having made the blunder of granting the franchise to Orientals or their descendants. In this country the original Oriental immigrants are ineligible to citizenship (the naturalization law limiting that privilege to "free white persons") but everyone born in the United States, regardless of race or color, is a citizen thereof, with all of the rights and privileges of that state.

The American born Japanese are taking advantage of that fact and are most insistent in their demand for complete equality. Not only that, but they are joining with the Negroes in an effort to force their views on an unwilling American public. As you perhaps know, Americans do not, in their social structure, grant equality to the colored races, but in this state, at least, there is no law segregating them. Seeregated they are, each into their own districts, but only by force of public opinion.

California and several other states have alien land laws, aimed primarily at the acquisitive Japanese, which provide that aliens ineligible to citizenship (the technical term for Orientals) may not own land nor lease agricultural land. These laws, however, are fast becoming dead letters, as the older Orientals are no longer desirous of buying land and the American born have no difficulty in doing so. Residence property in metropolitan areas are frequently restricted in their deeds of sale to members of the white race, but even that is more a matter of public opinion than of law.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

14/

A short history of the exclusion movement may be useful to you.

As early as 1892 there was friction in California over the entrance of Japanese coolies. Warned by her experience with Chinese, the state wanted no more Orientals (large employers of cheap labor did want them). The state legislature tried repeatedly to get Congress to pass an exclusion law, but Congress was unsympathetic. In 1900 Japan entered into what is known as the First Gentlemen's Agreement to keep her laborers out of continental U.S., but did not keep it. California was being over-run. In 1906 at the time of the San Francisco earthquake and fire the question broke and there was much trouble. President Theodore Roosevelt "appeased" Japan as much as he could, making himself very unpopular in California. He finally negotiated a second Gentlemen's Agreement, but it fared no better than the first, and California continued to receive thousands of Japanese. The American Congress was just an unsympathetic to her pleas as is the Canadian Parliament.

However, agitation against the Japanese continued and grew until in 1924 when the general immigration restriction act was passed. Three members of this Committee went to Washington and fought successfully for the exclusion measure. It is contained in Sec. 13c of that Act, providing that no alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admissible as immigrant.

The Japanese have fought that measure continuously, claiming discrimination and demanding to be placed on a quota basis with the eligible races. But largely through the efforts of this Committee those demands have been refused. The principle of complete exclusion of the colored races of Asia still dominates our policy.

We are doubtful of the loyalty of the American born Japanese. Japan does everything in her power to hold them to her, and 60% of their number have dual citizenship. Through the influence of parents, church and language schools they are reared to be Japanese more than Americans. We are just in the process of having a law passed regularizing language schools, since an examination of the textbooks used shows them to teach Emperor Worship and patriotism to Japan. (This law will be introduced into the California Legislature.)

Japan has never kept a Gentlemen's Agreement, no matter with whom made, and Japanese nationals have been distrusted and disliked wherever they go. Australia was wise in refusing them an Agreement in 1900, and her Japanese population today numbers less than 2,000 and is decreasing.

I am glad to have had the pleasure of discussing these matters with you through correspondence and will be pleased to answer any further questions you may care to ask. Please feel free to call upon this Committee at any time.

Very truly yours,

Dorothy Kaltenbach
Dorothy Kaltenbach, Secretary

P. S.

I have found the brief most interesting and will write later concerning it. D.H.

11/2
WHITE CANADA RESEARCH COMMITTEE

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~VANCOUVER B.C.~~
J. H. BOSE, J.P.
T. REID, M.P.
R. A. PAYNE
HUGH THORNLEY
CAMERON MOORE
D. F. MACKAY
CHAS. E. HOPE,
HON. SECRETARY

193

R.R.#1 Milner, B.C.

April 24, 1941.

Alderman Wilson
City Hall
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Sir:

I enclose a release of the Joint Immigration Committee in California, and also a recent letter from their secretary, outlining the situation in the Hawaiian Islands and California. I think you will be interested in reading these.

The California Joint Immigration Committee is a similar organization to the White Canada Research Committee, but started their operations many years before we did, and as they have had command of considerable funds, have been able to do a good deal more than we have done.

I have followed with a great deal of interest your activities in the City Council in connection with this Japanese question, and not only my thanks, but I am sure that the thanks of a very large number of people in Vancouver, go out to you for your efforts in this connection.

As secretary of the White Canada Research Committee, I have a large amount of information with reference to this question, and if there is any particular point you would like information on, I should be glad to supply it.

Yours faithfully,

Charles Hope

CEH/EK
Encl.

Japsee

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk
Dept. Adj. American Legion
Chairman

Hon. D.C. Murphy
Calif. State Fed. of
Labour

John T. Regan
Grand Sec'y Native Sons
of the Golden West

COPY

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE

85 Second Street
San Francisco, Cal.

Dorothy Kaltenbach
(secretary)

11/2A Charles M. Goethe
(treasurer)

H.J. McClatchy
(exec. Sec'y.)

Hon. U.S. Webb

Robert H. Fouke

V.S. McClatchy
(1857-1938)

March 31, 1941.

Mr. Charles E. Hope
R.R.#1,
Milner, B.C.

Dear Mr. Hope:

Thank you for your most interesting letter of March 5th, outlining the Japanese situation in British Columbia. I sent you the two dozen copies of our Hawaiian release, which I hope has reached you in good order.

We are at present attempting to have a bill introduced in the California Legislature to close any and all language schools teaching allegiance to a foreign state. We have copies of the textbooks now used in the Japanese language schools, and Emperor Worship and Japanese patriotism run all through the series. The Japanese newspapers here say that "conferences" are being held in Vancouver to work to the end that school books shall conform to a standard. Apparently, from what you write, this is not true.

The history of "Gentlemen's Agreements" with Japan seems the same the world over--they are never kept, and are probably not intended to be kept. You have been wiser than the United States, however, in not granting the franchise to American born Japanese. These have a bloc of 25,000 votes in California, and not content with using that bloc as bait to the politicians, the Japanese leaders are attempting to stir up the Negroes and join the Negro bloc of 100,000 votes in an attempt to force equality.

A new fishing bill has been introduced in the California Legislature which appears to have a good chance of passing. It provides for registration and finger printing of anyone holding a commercial fishing license and make it unlawful for a fishing boat to operate near Navy ships and bases. This has been the trouble in the past--the Japanese have had too much opportunity for espionage.

The best of luck to you in your endeavors. Command me if I can be of further service.

Very truly yours,

(sgd.) Dorothy Kaltenbach,
secretary.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/3

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Edw. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N.S.G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2697

Chas. M. Goheen
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U.S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exce. Secy.)

July 19, 1930.

QUOTA FOR JAPAN AS A REMEDY FOR MISUNDERSTANDING
AND PROMOTER OF TRADE.

To the Chairman and Members
California Joint Immigration Committee
San Francisco, California.

At the meeting of this Committee, June 26th, Mr. Wallace M. Alexander, of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, read a statement taking issue with the points of the brief concerning quota for Japan prepared by your Secretary and presented in your name, under instructions, to the Resolutions Committee of the Los Angeles convention of the National Foreign Trade Council, May 21, 1930. Mr. Alexander was a member of that Resolutions Committee.

There is such a wide divergence between Mr. Alexander and the Committee as to certain pertinent facts and conclusions to be drawn therefrom that it is desirable, in the interest of mutual understanding, that the differences be adjusted if possible. It is particularly desirable because many others probably share the views of Mr. Alexander. Some study has been made of Mr. Alexander's data, and this memorandum of results was prepared for information of the Committee.

ELIGIBILITY, NOT QUOTA, THE REAL ISSUE

In the first place, the real issue is not "quota", with entrance of a limited number of Japanese immigrants. That is but a half way station. Japan has frequently declared thru her representatives at international meetings, at Paris and elsewhere, that she will insist on "racial equality", - the same privileges for her nationals, including naturalization, as are conceded Europeans. It has been declared with equal positiveness that quota will not satisfy her. We may assume fairly then that to grant quota would be simply an exhibition of weakness on our part which will strengthen the demand which she has frankly said must be conceded ultimately if we wish to satisfy her. The present immigration act with its bar against ineligible aliens would be unobjectionable to Japan if our naturalization law were amended to include Japanese in the privileged class. To grant immigration quota now to Japan would except the Japanese from a disability imposed by our naturalization law, and handicap us in opposing Japan's final demand for the right to citizenship. That is the issue which the country must face; and it were best to face it now.

The Japanese point of view on this issue finds expression, a little guarded it is true but none the less clear, in the issue, June 15, 1930, of Gaiko Jiho, the Revue Diplomatique of Tokyo, a semi-official publication supported by government subsidy, in an article by Dr. U. Oyama, former Consul General of Japan at San Francisco. The article discusses the present situation in its various phases and gives prominence therein to the activities of this committee and Mr. Alexander in connection therewith. The quotations below are taken from a translation of the article:

"But we must not forget that along with the immigration question there are many other matters of Japanese exclusion unsettled. One of them is the matter of ineligibility of Orientals for citizenship. Another is the Japanese exclusion land laws of California and other western states of America."

"The decision of the United States Supreme Court that Japanese being neither negro nor white, are ineligible, is final as an interpretation of the existing law. Nevertheless it has become an important question requiring further study whether the provisions of the existing law which does not give the right of naturalization to Japanese are appropriate or not.

"Particularly in the case of the Japanese the question is not simply one of eligibility or ineligibility. In America the Japanese exclusion immigration law, Japanese exclusion land laws and all other laws excluding Japanese, are based on the ineligibility of Japanese for citizenship. The refusal of naturalization to Japanese is a grave matter in international intercourse and international life."

Chairman Albert Johnson of the House Immigration Committee, who announced May 24th his intention to secure "quota for Japan" has since explained that his meaning was misunderstood. He does not favor making the yellow races eligible for American citizenship or for entrance as immigrants. He proposes simply an increase in the nominal quota for Japan from 100 to 180, the number to which she would be entitled under national origins if her nationals were eligible. He would do this without change in the "eligible" provision. But the present nominal quota for Japan is not for entrance of Japanese--but for entrance of nationals of other countries eligible to our citizenship and residing in Japan. Increasing that number to 180 will not admit any Japanese and will not therefore satisfy Japan. Her nationals can be admitted only by making exception in their favor either to the immigration policy or to the naturalization law, which Mr. Johnson declares he does not favor. Japan's hopes apparently were prematurely raised by the original announcement.

There is no question as to the cultural assimilability of the Japanese, and none as to their physical, mental and moral qualifications. But the racial differences are so great, as demonstrated by the second generation Japanese in Hawaii and California, individually fine young men and women, that they are not absorbable and must remain apart an unassimilated group in our population, therefore an obstacle to homogeneity of citizenry. Mr. Alexander uses the word "assimilation" in a different sense from that given it by the Committee, whose investigation of the facts in connection therewith has been so thorough that no further reference need be made thereto. That may be said also for other minor points made by him.

PROMOTING TRADE BY IMMIGRATION REGULATION?

Mr. Alexander insists that our immigration law has so deeply offended the Japanese that it has resulted in a great loss of trade to this country and that future results in that direction will be more serious still; therefore that the law should be so amended as to meet Japan's wishes. He stresses that point and attention is given it here accordingly.

Similar demands were made by other nations in 1924 and similar representations were offered by the State Department when the policy of immigration restriction was in the balance. The question is not whether such nations declare themselves aggrieved, but whether they have just cause for grievance; and further whether it is our national interest or their desire which should regulate our immigration policy.

Dismissing for the moment that question, consideration is given to the loss of trade, if any, which has been caused by Japanese ill will or boycott, induced by our immigration law.

Mr. Alexander rests his case as to this phase of the matter on loss of part of the lumber trade of the Pacific Northwest with Japan, and on loss to certain California articles of export under Japan's "luxury tax", operative July 1, 1924, which he declares was passed as a retaliatory measure against this country.

He calls attention to the fact that the State of Washington lost 26% of its Japanese trade (in lumber) in one year, 1929, and refers to it as "a pretty stiff price to pay for exercising national prejudice." He offers J. J. Donovan as authority for the statement that Washington's loss of trade in this matter is due to Japan's resentment. But as a matter of fact Donovan did

not make that statement. He said the loss was due "some to curtailment in all purchases by Japan, some to the new Japanese tariff favoring Russia, and some to resentment".

On the other hand, it is stated by a representative of the large lumber interests of the Northwest that the result is in no way due to resentment; that the Japanese buy when and where they can buy to best advantage; that the loss in the lumber trade of the Northwest with Japan is due to a variety of causes, including general world business depression, Japan's present industrial slump, decrease in use of lumber for building purposes because of use of other material, and competition in the lumber trade from Russia and from Canada.

Again, if Japan cut down her orders for lumber in resentment against the immigration act of 1924 why wait 5 years to do it, and meanwhile flood the Pacific Northwest with her orders. The absurdity of the claim is apparent when placed side by side with that other claim that Japan's luxury tax, passed in 1924, was a retaliatory measure against this country. Why punish us by refusing to buy some things and flood us with orders for others?

JAPAN'S LUXURY TAX

Mr. Alexander relies on an unnamed "gentleman in California" for information as to the loss suffered by California thru the "luxury tax" of Japan, which he says was passed by the Japanese Parliament because it was "filled with indignation at the exclusion act". The authority quoted calls attention to the decrease in raisin shipments and in "Del Monte Products, Oakland Shredded Wheat and Napa Shoes", and adds, "Mr. McClatchy has caused his friends a loss of at least \$500,000 a year". The "gentleman in California" overestimates Mr. McClatchy's importance, and he is sadly misinformed as to facts.

Japan's luxury tax was not in any way a retaliatory measure aimed at this country. In fact it hit other nations, with which Japan has no immigration or other problem, more severely than it hit us. An explanation of the situation which forced the luxury tax will be found in the Japan Year Book, 1924-25, at p. 611, and also, with much interesting detail, in an article "Luxury or Life" in the "Far East Review" of Shanghai, September, 1924. The tax covered originally 123 articles, afterwards reduced to 106 (see partial list in Japan Year Book, 1930, p. 435) on which a duty of 100% ad valorem was levied. It covered such a wide range as clothing, leathers, jewelry, perfumes, toothpouders, confectionery, house furnishings, phonographs, films, etc., etc. It was imposed as a measure of national economy and to control a tendency toward luxurious habits on the part of the Japanese. It was forced in a way by Japan's rapidly increasing adverse trade balance, her great silk exports decreasing while her imports for rebuilding and rehabilitating her people increased. It was intended to force the Japanese to buy at home, of home products and home manufacture, and thus do their part in adjusting the trade balance.

The article in the Far East Review referred to says that the statement that the tax was intended as a boycott on American goods is "disposed of without difficulty in view of the protest from British Boards of Trade", and adds: "It would appear that no nation is especially hit by this luxury tariff, but that all suffer equally, the Japanese themselves being hardest hit, since those who have come to depend on imported goods of the 'luxury' classification must find some homemade substitute or go without".

The figures for exportation of raisins to Japan referred to by the "gentleman in California", when examined by calendar years and analyzed, furnish no indication of feeling against this country. It is true that in 1925 the tonnage decreased to one-half that of 1924, but, as the tax was 100%, the amount spent by Japanese consumers for California raisins in 1925 was practically the same as in 1924. The figures show too that for each of the three years, 1926, 1927 and 1928 (no figures available for 1929) Japan consumed 20% more California raisins than she did in 1925. No evidence of ill will or boycott there! Even now with the 100% luxury tax Japan consumes 40% more California raisins than she did in 1921 when there was no tax. The year 1924 showed a drop as compared with 1923 in Japan's raisin importations of 20% in

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/3

tonnage and 33% in value, undoubtedly due to the effectiveness of her economy campaign. The luxury tax went into effect in the middle of 1924.

It is understood that the U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has not found in the imposition of the luxury tax any indication of retaliation on the part of Japan. Attention is called to the fact that there are a number of articles in the list not produced in this country; and the Crosse and Blackwell products of England were as much affected as the Del Monte products of California.

Mr. K. Nishida, English editor of the San Francisco Japanese American News (Nichi Bei), says the luxury tax was not due to retaliation, but to economic conditions resulting from the earthquake and a desire of the Japanese government to stress economy.

The authorities on both sides of the Pacific who know agree that there has been no indication of trade retaliation on the part of Japan for hurt claimed in connection with operation of our immigration law, and the facts and figures disprove any such charge.

Equally without foundation is the claim that Japan's future trade with us is dependent upon our conceding her the privilege of dictating our immigration policy or the belief that she would have increased respect for us if we did so. It is evident that an effort is being made to stampede certain business interests into the belief that trade is to be fostered or lost according as we concede the privilege of regulating our immigration to other nations or reserve it strictly for ourselves to be exercised primarily for the national welfare. Lack of information and spread of misinformation tends to give prominence to such an impression and to conceal the grave results to national standards and national welfare that must result from such a policy.

We owe it to ourselves and to our neighbors on the Pacific to do our share in maintaining friendly relations and preserving peace, and to do those things which, without sacrifice of our interest or self respect, will show due regard for their rights and for international comity. It has been the Committee's viewpoint that we must cease to buy good will at sacrifice to well defined interests of the nation if the nation is to live.

V. S. McClatchy, Secretary

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/4
Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

OPENING GATES TO ASIATIC IMMIGRATION
A MOVEMENT INAUGURATED IN CALIFORNIA

There is an organized effort to secure an expression of public sentiment in California favorable to grant of immigration quota to Japan, and the repeal thereby of the present law excluding aliens ineligible to citizenship. The State Legislature would then be asked to urge Congress to act in the matter.

Two years ago Wallace M. Alexander, of Alexander and Baldwin, one of the "big five" which controls the plantation and commercial activities of Hawaii, organized "The Committee of Fourteen", selected from several of the Pacific Coast port Chambers of Commerce, for the purpose of securing quota for Japan, and succeeded in obtaining approval thereof by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce Immigration Committee, and finally by its Directors. An approach was made to the California Legislature of 1931 to secure a resolution urging Congress to grant quota, but no encouragement was received and the attempt was abandoned. Theretofore, in 1923, the Legislature had, with only one dissenting vote, demanded the exclusion of all aliens ineligible to citizenship, and in 1929, by similar vote, had protested against grant of quota to Japan or any other modification of the general exclusion law of 1924. The State and National bodies of Legion, A. F. of L., and Grange, together with the California organization of Native Sons of the Golden West, had actively assisted in securing passage of the law, and in defending it from attack since passage.

After failure to induce the 1931 Legislature to give consideration to the proposed repeal of the exclusion measure, there was organized the California Council on Oriental Relations, composed of 25 prominent people of the state located at advantageous points, for the express purpose of securing quota for Japan. Samuel Hume was employed to present the matter to service clubs and other organizations thruout the state and its members secured opportunities for him to address bodies in the respective districts. He has done work effectively, and with opportunity to only a minor degree for answer before the same bodies by those opposing opening the gates to Asiatics. The question may be brought before the California Legislature which convened January 3, 1933.

The Commonwealth Club of California, thru its Immigration Section, took up the question of quota for Japan early in 1932, giving to consideration thereof all of the Section's semi-monthly meetings, and listening to those in position to furnish information or offer argument on either side. At a Club meeting held at conclusion of the investigation, November 17, 1932, a comprehensive report on the subject was submitted by the Section's Chairman, Paul Stinchfield, followed by a debate between Mr. Hume, speaking for the California Council on Oriental Relations, and V. S. McClatchy, Executive Secretary of the California Joint Immigration Committee, which represents the national bodies of the American Legion, American Federation of Labor, and the Native Sons of the Golden West. The full text of report and debate appears in "The Commonwealth" of December 20, 1932, published at 345 Sutter St., San Francisco, California.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2697

145 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.
Hon. U.S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.
V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

THE EXCLUSION QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA

It was due to the determined attitude of the American Federation of Labor, acting in conjunction with the American Legion and other organizations, that Congress passed in 1924 the measure excluding all aliens ineligible to citizenship, thus closing the gates to the Japanese, then the only Asiatics still coming in. Since then, the A. F. of L. has been equally active in opposing efforts to repeal or modify that law. Frank Morrison, Secretary of the A. F. of L., wrote on November 1, 1931, "The American Federation of Labor has not changed its attitude towards this law. It helped to have it enacted and will oppose any attempt made for its repeal."

Some two years ago there was organized in California the California Council on Oriental Relations for the purpose of securing immigration quota for Japan which would automatically repeal the exclusion law; and a continued campaign of propaganda before service clubs and other organizations for the purpose has been carried on since. Efforts were made by its representatives without success to have the State Legislature, which had unanimously demanded exclusion, and afterwards opposed quota, change its point of view.

The Commonwealth Club of California, composed largely of business and professional men, has for many years thru its various Sections, made painstaking and impartial study of important public questions and given the benefit of its findings to the public. It recently concluded a year's study of the Japanese quota problem and published in the "Commonwealth" of December 20, 1932, a comprehensive report of its work, together with a debate on the subject between the representative of the California Council on Oriental Relations and the Executive Secretary of the California Joint Immigration Committee, which represents the State Federation of Labor, State Department of the American Legion and the Native Sons of the Golden West. The membership of the Club, on January 14th, having had that report before it for two weeks, voted on various phases of the quota question, as follows, in each instance the vote showing a heavy majority against the demands of the quota advocates:-

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor granting an immigration quota to Japan?.....	364	715
2. Do you favor granting an immigration quota to Japan exclusive of other Asiatic countries?.....	91	359
3. Do you favor granting an immigration quota to all Asiatic countries?.....	279	733
4. Do you favor repeal of the Naturalization law which now disqualifies certain races from United States citizenship?.....	194	875

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2637

11/6 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.
Hon. U.S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.
V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

A FAR EASTERN LEAGUE OF NATIONS

Released

Gaiko Jiho is a periodical published in the Japanese vernacular at Tokyo under subsidy from the Japanese Government, the articles in which are understood to be semi-official and either inspired or approved by the Government.

In the issue of April 15, 1933, the leading article, by Prof. Hikomatsu Kamikawa, proposes a carefully outlined plan for the establishment of a Far Eastern League of Nations, to do for the Far East what the League of Nations has assumed in the past to do for the entire world. The article explains that since Japan has withdrawn from the League of Nations there is now no authority of that character to preserve peace and protect the interests of peoples in eastern Asia.

The members in full standing, under the proposed plan, are to be "independent, self-governing states and peoples, whose headquarters are in the Far East". There are but four which answer this description--as announced by the author Japan, Manchukuo, the Chinese Republic and Siam. Siberia is excluded, since the Russian headquarters are in Europe, but it is suggested that the Soviet Union, because of its interest in Far Eastern affairs, should be a party to the League under some exceptional understanding.

It is also suggested that the Philippines may, with propriety, with consent of the United States, become a member, since under the bill passed by Congress and only awaiting approval of the Filipino people, the Islands will have their independence in ten years.

Tokyo is suggested as the proper location for headquarters of the League, with a permanent office there. The affairs of the organization should be governed by a council of representatives from the separate state members, and meetings of the council might be held at the capitals of the various member states in order.

The League would handle all matters of concern to the section and countries indicated, acting along the general lines and policy followed by the League of Nations. The author suggests that the present League of Nations, having lost its character and authority as a world League, might confine itself to handling the problems of Europe. He suggests, however, that there might be danger of its becoming a Euro-American association of whites, and degenerating into a machine for protecting world hegemony of the white race.

The Far Eastern League of Nations would not refuse concert of action in mutual interest with states like England, America, France, etc., altho, regardless of such interests as they may possess in the Far East, they are not eligible for membership in the League. Under an arrangement of this character international peace could be safeguarded, and trade relations promoted, the author suggests.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/7 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

THE JAPANESE QUOTA QUESTION
No. 1. Congress and Exclusion - Judgment or Resentment?

The California Joint Immigration Committee has addressed to the Directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and to the California Council on Oriental Relations the first of a series of open letters on the Japanese quota question, which reads as follows:

"There is an honest difference of opinion between yourselves and the California Joint Immigration Committee, with resulting opposition in effort, on the question, 'Shall the present law excluding all aliens ineligible to citizenship be repealed and immigration quota granted to Japan?'.

"Discussion is useless, however, unless agreement can be had as to the facts upon which our respective opinions are based. We ask your earnest consideration, therefore, for this, the first of a series of open letters, in which basic matters of fact, at issue between us, are referred for settlement to the available records. We will be glad to treat in similar manner such other phases as you suggest.

"The subject of this letter is the attitude of Congress towards the exclusion measure in 1924 prior to appearance of Ambassador Hanihara's letter with its implied threat of 'grave consequences'.

"You assert, based on the 'confident belief' of Senator David Reed (see his letter, November 1, 1932, to the United States Chamber of Commerce, at p. 332 of the Commonwealth Club Report, 'Quota or Exclusion for Japanese Immigrants?') 'that Japanese exclusion would not have been put into the 1924 immigration act if it had not been for the Hanihara letter'; and that it was passed not as the deliberate judgment of Congress but in resentment at such letter.

"The California Joint Immigration Committee declares--not that the phrase, grave consequences, did not affect the decision of the Senate in 1924, as stated--but that the use of the phrase merely turned a very large Senate majority for exclusion into a practically unanimous vote; while in the House it had no effect on the vote.

"The Hanihara letter was first published in the Congressional Record, April 11th. The objectionable phrase therein was first called to the attention of Congress by Senator Lodge on April 14th. On April 12th, the House passed the restriction bill containing the exclusion measure, 323 to 72, before its attention had been called to 'grave consequences'--Albert Johnson, then Chairman of the House Immigration Committee, so states.

"Senator Reed gives, as foundation for his belief that the Senate opposed exclusion, a standing division which, he says, was a test vote and 'understood on all hands to indicate the sentiment for and against Japanese exclusion'. He describes it as 'an effort, as I recall it, to reject a committee amendment which would have permitted the coming of Japanese students'. He assumes therefore that if there were an exclusion majority in the Senate it would have defeated such an amendment.

"Senator Reed is clearly at fault either in his recollection of, or in the significance attached to, that incident. All immigration restriction and exclusion measures in force in 1924 permitted entrance and temporary stay for students, tourists and visitors. The program of the exclusionists in 1924 provided for such exception. Therefore Senator Reed's standing division was not a test vote on the main issue. A number of exclusionists probably voted in favor of the committee amendment.

"As conclusive evidence that Senator Reed is mistaken in his belief there is the positive statement made at the time by ex-Senator James D. Phelan--whom all Californians will believe--that a personal poll of the Senate made by Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi, and himself, some days before appearance of the Hanihara letter, showed a large majority committed to exclusion.

"Clearly then, a large majority of Congress favored exclusion before the Hanihara letter appeared."

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/8 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

WHY WE LOST JAPAN'S RESPECT

Roy W. Howard, head of the Scripps-Howard organization which publishes 24 newspapers in the United States, returned recently from a trip to the Far East, where in addition to conferring with many prominent leaders, he had the honor--unprecedented for a newspaper man--of a personal audience with the Emperor of Japan. In a published article he declares that the Japanese no longer respect the American people, holding that, partly because of woman suffrage, we have lost national virility, and now advocate pacifism and disarmament, not from motives of altruism, but to avoid taxation and because we lack the spirit and the equipment for national defense. He urges therefore that we build our Navy up to full treaty strength to regain Japan's respect.

Evidently Mr. Howard would not recommend compliance with Japan's naive request, recently made, that the American Navy be withdrawn from the Pacific Ocean for the reason that its presence there is displeasing to the Japanese people. He does suggest, however, that, as a step towards securing Japan's good will, we repeal the law excluding aliens ineligible to American citizenship and grant immigration quota to her people.

Adequate increase of our Navy, already inaugurated by President Roosevelt with Congressional approval, may aid us in regaining Japan's respect; but the effect would certainly be nullified if, at Japan's demand, we reverse our long established policy and open the immigration gates to the Asiatic races. Japan makes no such demand on the other English speaking nations, which, for reasons similar to ours, exclude Asiatics. That she makes the demand on us furnishes some proof of the correctness of Mr. Howard's diagnosis of Japanese psychology.

And if we do grant quota to Japan it must be done with knowledge that she will accept it only as a step towards her announced goal of "racial equality"--the same rights for her people in immigration, citizenship, land ownership and other matters, as conceded to Europeans. She fought for recognition of that principle at Versailles in 1919, and has repeatedly proclaimed it since.

The facts and arguments which induced Congress to reject quota for Asiatics and approve general exclusion of all ineligible races are fully covered in the hearings of the Immigration Committees of Congress in 1924 and preceding years; and, recently, in "Quota or Exclusion for Japanese Immigrants?", a comprehensive detailed 50 page report of a year's investigation of the subject by the Commonwealth Club of California, in which accredited representatives of the California Council on Oriental Relations and of the California Joint Immigration Committee took prominent part. One thousand members of the Club, in January, 1933, after reading the report, voted two to one in opposition to quota.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Rogan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
88 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/9 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

THE JAPANESE EXCLUSION QUESTION
No. 2. What decided Congress in 1924

The California Joint Immigration Committee's second open letter, addressed jointly to the Directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and to the California Council on Oriental Relations, under date of August 10, 1933, reads as follows:

This is the second of a series of open letters planned for friendly discussion of certain basic facts connected with the subject of Japanese immigration, as to which there is difference of opinion between us. It seeks to resolve the doubt of the California Council on Oriental Relations, which insists (see letter of its Executive Secretary, Samuel J. Hume, August 1st) that our initial open letter, July 26th, is not conclusive, and that the law was passed "not as the deliberate judgment of Congress, but in resentment at such letter" (meaning the Hanihara "grave consequences" letter). The sole support for that statement is the "confident belief" of Senator David Reed to the effect indicated by the language quoted.

That Senator Reed was mistaken as to the attitude of the House is tacitly conceded by Mr. Hume when he ignores the record quoted, showing that the House passed the exclusion bill by a 4 to 1 majority, 323 to 72, two days before the attention of Congress was called by Senator Lodge, on April 14th, to the implied threat in that letter.

The Senate did not vote on the main issue before April 14th. It would have been extraordinary if, with access to the same facts and arguments, pro and con, the Senate, immediately before the 14th, had held by a majority small or large against exclusion, while the House voted 4 to 1 in favor thereof. As a matter of fact, a poll of the Senate taken a number of days before April 11th by Senator Pat Harrison of Mississippi and ex-Senator James D. Phelan of California disclosed a large majority in favor of exclusion.

The only support cited by Senator Reed for his "confident belief" is a standing division on the question of admitting Japanese students, which, he claims, was a "test vote", indicating the sentiment of the Senate for and against Japanese exclusion. It was not a test vote on that question because (1) all immigration and exclusion laws then in force provided exception for students and visitors; (2) the 1924 exclusion program provided for similar exception; and (3) pronounced exclusionists were in all probability among those who voted in the standing division to except students.

Senator Reed was probably misled by a sentiment in favor of Japanese quota which had developed in both Houses prior to March, 1934, through personal efforts of the agents of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Evidence thereof appeared in the announcement of the Senate Immigration Committee that it had decided to recommend quota for Japan, and that hearings therefore would not be held. California forced a hearing, however, commencing on March 11th, and after the first two days' presentation of facts by members of the California Joint Immigration Committee, Senator Colt, Chairman of the Senate Committee, made frank admission in open session that quota should not be granted, and that some other plan to meet the conditions must be found. That plan was found in the general exclusion of aliens ineligible to citizenship; and the Senate Committee's investigation and report solidified sentiment in both Houses in favor of that plan. Incidentally, Senator Reed's "confident belief" of say, early March, faded into an "erroneous impression" before the end of that month.

Mr. Hume adds that the administration opposed exclusion; that the Senate was predominantly Republican; that strong supporters of the administration (he names 12) "changed their votes following receipt of the Hanihara letter"; and that "this certainly is conclusive evidence that the majority of the Senate were opposed to the exclusion clause". That is a very illogical conclusion. Even if 12 Republican Senators, originally opposed to exclusion, changed their vote because of the Hanihara letter it does not follow that the other 37 or 39 Republican Senators who voted for exclusion had been opposed thereto up to the appearance of that letter.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/10 Chas. M. Goetha
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released September 11, 1933

"THE DIGEST" GUESSES CALIFORNIA WRONG.

The California Joint Immigration Committee concedes that the Literary Digest forecasts with accuracy the result of national elections by use of a well devised plan for preliminary poll, but protests the Digest's forecast of public opinion in California on the subject of opening the gates to Asiatic immigration without such a poll, and based on the statements of a local Chamber of Commerce and a newspaper man fresh from a personal interview with the Emperor of Japan.

In a letter the Joint Committee calls attention of the Digest to its article of September 2nd, concerning grant of quota to Japan and the statement therein that "Traditional champion of exclusion, California has already reversed its attitude."; and says:--

"The recorded facts prove the exact contrary. The Digest quotes the Directors of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce in support of the statement. Those Directors, however, do not indicate reliably public sentiment in state or city, or even in the Chamber's own membership. A few years ago that membership, by a referendum vote of 3 to 1 instructed the Directors to cease opposing entrance into California of a competing trans-continental railroad!

"The Commonwealth Club of California, with a membership open to all under nominal dues, carefully investigates, through 50 organized sections, subjects of current interest and offers a better indication of public opinion. Its year's study of the Japanese quota subject, in which leading proponents of quota participated, culminated in a 50 page report of December 20, 1932, after study of which the membership voted as follows on issues involved:

- 2 to 1 against quota for Japan.
- 12 to 1 against quota for Japan exclusive of other Asiatic nations.
- 4 to 1 against change in the law of naturalization so as to qualify Asiatic races therefor.

"The California Legislature in 1923 demanded passage of the exclusion law, only one vote opposing; in 1929, by the same vote, it opposed quota for Japan; and in 1931 and 1933 advocates of quota abandoned as hopeless the idea of introducing a resolution to indicate a change of sentiment in Legislature or state.

"The California bodies of the American Legion (484 Posts), Federation of Labor (750 Unions), Grange (183 Granges), Native Sons of the Golden West (160 Parlors), in respective state conventions unanimously opposed this movement to open the gates to Asiatics. The national bodies of the first three named have taken similar action, as has the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, with its 95 affiliates.

"Those organizations declare that national policy in immigration matters should be dictated by national welfare and not by benefit to, or ideals of, particular sections, groups or interests."

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/11

An Unpublished Letter

The letter below to the San Francisco News was not published. The reason is obvious.

November 13, 1933.

For publication in
Public Pulse.

Editor News. Samuel J. Hume, speaking for the California Council on Oriental Relations, criticizes me for the statement that the terms of the Gentlemen's Agreement were not fulfilled by Japan and offers polite assurances of President Coolidge and Secretary of State Hughes to support his views. The following facts of record furnish complete answer.

Japan was to secure under the Agreement, according to the published statements of President Theodore Roosevelt, two results; (1) to prevent increase of Japanese population in continental United States; (2) exclude Japanese laborers as immigrants. The results for the period 1908 - 1923, under Japan's control of this immigration, were as follows:-- (1) Japanese population in continental United States almost trebled. Japanese immigration for that period totaled; immigrants (arrivals) 125,773; emigrants (departures) 41,781; net increase 83,992. (Report Secretary of Labor, 1923, p. 133.) Mr. Hume and others make the mistake of mixing non-immigrant arrivals and departures with those of the immigrant class, and thereby occasionally prove to their own satisfaction that more Japanese have left the country than ever came in (See House Document #600, 68th Congress, Second Session, p. 9). (2) That net increase of 83,992 in Japanese population, as certified by the Department, under the Gentlemen's Agreement, was composed in greater part of adult male laborers, who came to labor and most of whom earned their living while here by labor. That is known to every Californian.

The official manifests show that 56,980 Japanese "laborers" entered the United States after July 1, 1908. Iohihashi quotes the figures in his "Japanese in the United States". Mr. Hume insists, however, that these 56,980 Japanese laborers had acquired residence in the United States, and when counted, were returning from a temporary visit to Japan, as permitted by the Agreement. Mr. Hume in that contention places himself in a curious dilemma, and may choose the particular horn thereof on which he prefers to be impaled. These 56,980 Japanese laborers were composed either (1) entirely of alien Japanese who had acquired residence in continental United States prior to July 1, 1908, or (2) partly of alien Japanese who entered first after the date named. The first supposition is eliminated by the fact that there were not in continental United States in 1908 that number of alien Japanese laborers, and that even of those here at that time a fraction only made the trip back to Japan and return. So that the 56,980 laborers must have been composed in large part of those who entered after July 1, 1908. And every Japanese laborer who so entered under Japan's passport furnishes proof of a direct violation of the Gentlemen's Agreement.

Mr. Hume asserts that I insinuate that Japan is responsible for present smuggling of Japanese immigrants. On the contrary, it is Congressman Dickstein and Mr. Hume who make that insinuation when one says and the other suggests that "fewer Orientals would enter the United States under quota than do now under the 1924 law". I contend that quota to Asiatics will not in itself decrease illegal entry. I have not said, and do not believe, that Japan is encouraging illegal entry as an object lesson to us.

California Joint Immigration Committee
V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/12 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION - QUOTA OR EXCLUSION

- - -

The California Joint Immigration Committee answers the two leading
Proponents of Quota

- - -

The following statement answers seriatim the 15 points of a recent argument in favor of opening the immigration gates under quota to Asiatics, sponsored jointly by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and the California Council on Oriental Relations. This answer is made on behalf of the California Joint Immigration Committee, representing the California Department American Legion, State Federation of Labor and the Native Sons of the Golden West.

The references, "A", "B", "C", etc., indicate authorities and documents, listed on the last page hereof, which furnish corroboration and further explanation of averments herein.

Each point made in behalf of quota by its sponsors is quoted below, either verbatim or briefed, followed by the answer thereto, with references.

- - -

No. 1. EXCLUSION OR RESTRICTION?

Argument---"The rigid restriction of Asiatics is of vital importance to the best interests of California."

Answer---Not "rigid restriction", but "absolute exclusion" of Asiatics in the future is vital to California. The Gentlemen's Agreement, announced as a plan for rigid restriction of Japanese immigration, was to be carried out by Japanese good faith instead of enforced by United States law. As negotiated, it was to cover only immigration to continental United States, but Japan voluntarily agreed it should apply also to Hawaii. Today over one-third of Hawaii's total population is Japanese; over two-thirds is Asiatic. Hawaii, a United States Territory, is lost to the white race. Note later in this statement how the Gentlemen's Agreement has failed to accomplish its agreed purpose in continental United States. The only "rigid restriction" of Asiatic immigration which would be effective under all possible future conditions is absolute exclusion for permanent settlers. (See "A", pp. 3 to 51; "J").

No. 2. EXCLUDE POLITELY!

Argument---"Exclusion legislation should conform with recognized principles of international courtesy, making for mutual understanding, etc."

Answer---Efforts had been made continuously for nearly 20 years to secure Japanese exclusion under friendly arrangement with Japan. The Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, which made Japan responsible for accomplishment of the purpose, was violated in that, while under it Japanese population in continental United States was not to increase, and Japanese laborers were to be absolutely barred (see "A", p. 12 to 18; "D" p. 411 to p. 414; "H", p. 104), such population trebled between 1907 and 1920. The report of the Secretary of Labor for 1923, p. 133, states that net gain in Japanese immigration over emigration in continental United States, excluding non-immigration elements, for the period 1908 - 1923, was 83,992. The greater portion thereof consisted of adult Japanese aliens nearly all of whom were laborers, being even listed on the manifests as such, and they continuously earned their living in California and elsewhere by labor. The records of the Immigration Bureau show that during the period named, 56,980 Japanese, classed officially as laboring men, entered. Only a small portion thereof entered under the provision which permitted laborers who had acquired residence in the United States prior to July, 1908, to visit Japan and return. (See "C", p. 316, footnote #14).

11/12

After 1917, Japan was the only Asiatic country (except the Philippines) which continued to send us unassimilable immigrants, exclusion from all other countries of Asia, whose nationals are ineligible, being enforced by special laws. President Theodore Roosevelt had an express understanding with Japan that if she failed to secure the results called for by the Gentlemen's Agreement the United States would enact a special Japanese exclusion law, similar to that which excludes Chinese. (See "A", p. 13, 14; "D"; and "H".) Instead of enforcing that understanding, Congress sought in 1924 to find a plan that would not thus hurt Japan's pride. Japan and her friends insisted on either a new agreement, a treaty, or a quota allowance. Each of such plans called either for surrender of national sovereignty, or sacrifice of Congressional control of immigration, or abandonment of the principle of exclusion of ineligible Asiatic immigration, or a combination of two or all three thereof. (See "A", p. 28; "C", p. 314-316.) The plan adopted, general exclusion of all ineligible, was the only one suggested that met the requirements of the case.

No. 3. IS THE ACT DISCRIMINATORY?

Argument---"The 1924 immigration act is discriminatory and casts a needless stigma on Asiatic peoples."

Answer---It is not discriminatory against Japan, certainly, because it bars as immigrants all aliens ineligible to citizenship, in which category is included half the population of the world, the Japanese constituting only 7% of such half. It is admitted that Japanese are mentally, morally and physically the equal of Caucasians, but racial differences and racial pride, and social conditions and ineligibility to citizenship make them hopelessly unassimilable. Even the second generation as demonstrated in California and even Hawaii, notwithstanding individual merit, form a separate, unassimilated racial group. Exclusion of ineligible casts no reflection on the mental, moral and physical fitness of those excluded. They are excluded because their unassimilability makes them a danger to the political health of the nation, as immigrants deficient physically would offer danger to the physical health of its citizens. In neither case can the exclusion be considered discriminatory. (See "B", p. 1 to 4; "H", p. 42 to 46; "J": "C", p. 311, 312.)

No. 4. NATURALIZATION AND LAND LAWS.

Argument---"Quota, if extended to Asiatics, affects neither our naturalization laws nor our alien land laws."

Answer---Quota for Asiatics would defeat the intent of the naturalization law because it would encourage making citizens, thru birth on the soil, of units not racially fitted for such citizenship. It would affect the intent of the alien land law by granting land ownership to those who, notwithstanding citizenship by birth, are not assimilable into American citizenry. (See No. 3 Answer.) The present law is a logical and necessary corollary of the 150 year old naturalization law.

No. 5. ONLY 185 JAPANESE!

Argument---"Under quota only 185 Japanese and 195 Chinese would be admitted annually."

Answer---The actual number of Japanese or Chinese who could be admitted annually under grant of quota under the present law and conditions is not the vital point involved. If that number were only 5 it would still be necessary to repeal the 1924 exclusion law and abandon thereby its basic principle. However, the Japanese would be but a fraction of the number of ineligible Asiatics whom we would have to admit, since we could not well grant to the Japanese a privilege denied to other Asiatics, equally friendly. And even that large number of unassimilable entrants would be swelled greatly by minor changes in the law. For instance, if Asiatics enjoyed the quota, the plan of allotment in force from 1924 to 1928, the retention of which was advocated by President Hoover, would admit 2,000 Chinese per year. Under special non-quota allowance many Japanese could be admitted. If Japanese were granted the right of immigration, Japan would perhaps demand in time the right to send in as many immigrants as any other first class power. Such a demand would be strictly in line with others she is now making. (See "C", p. 319-320; and "E").

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

4/12

1

No. 6. WHY NOT ALSO FOR ASIA?

Argument---"Quota has for 9 years effectively and satisfactorily restricted European immigration. Quota is the right way to do the right thing."

Answer---Even if it be assumed that quota has satisfactorily restricted immigration of those who are eligible to American citizenship, and therefore assimilable (it was reinforced during the past three years by the order of President Hoover instructing American Consuls to refuse quota visas) that offers no logical argument, and certainly no proof, that the conceded danger of admitting unassimilable immigration would disappear if such immigration came in under quota.

No. 7. QUOTA AND LABORERS

Argument---"No laborers of any kind would be admitted under quota, since U. S. Consuls in Japan and China would refuse Consular visa to anyone * * likely in any way to compete with American labor."

Answer---That is a mistake. Quota, if granted to Asiatics, would admit Asiatics under precisely the same terms as Europeans; and European laborers are not barred by the law. In this argument the quota proponents doubtless have in mind the executive order of President Hoover, authorizing U. S. Consuls to refuse the Consular visa and thus cut down quota from any country to say 10% of the allowance. That order, while undoubtedly beneficial in result, was really an invasion by the Executive of the Congressional prerogative to control immigration. President Hoover himself recognized that fact in time, and a year before his retirement called attention of Congress thereto, suggesting that his order be replaced by Congressional legislation to accomplish the same purpose. In any event, such an order could not be used in discrimination against Asiatics.

No. 8. QUOTA CANNOT DECREASE ENTRANTS.

Argument---"Under quota it is believed fewer Orientals would enter the United States than do now under the 1924 law."

Answer---That is an unfounded and illogical contention. With the same laws and conditions in force as now, the number of Orientals who would secure admission, if quota were granted, would be increased over the present number by exactly the number admitted under quota. With the exception of ministers and professors and their families, no such Asiatics come in legally now, save for temporary residence as merchants, students or visitors. Those who come in illegally enter because Congress and the Administration fail to provide adequate means for enforcing the law. Such illegal entrants will not be diminished in number by grant of quota.

No. 9. ASIATIC QUOTA FOR WHITES?

Argument---"These negligible quotas, 185 and 105, would in great part be filled by members of the white race * * * no laborers would be admitted."

Answer---Both statements are inaccurate. Japan would use her entire quota, naturally, for her own nationals, and so would China. Any attempt by our Consular agents to force either nation to use her quota for resident aliens of the white race would cause international trouble. As for laborers, see answer to No. 7.

No. 10. QUOTA IN THE BARRED ZONE

Argument---"Quota extended to countries in the barred zone area would mean a minimum courtesy quota of 100 only to a few obscure countries, * * * open to members of the white race and to natives of the business and professional classes only."

Answer---That is a mistake. There is a present "courtesy quota" of 100 for the countries referred to, which can be used, not for their own nationals, but only for aliens resident in such countries and eligible to American citizenship, who do not find it convenient or practical to enter under quota of their native land. Formal quota, if granted to Asiatics under the proposed plan, would guarantee them the same rights in immigration as are conceded to the nationals of any European

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/12

4

country. Nothing less would satisfy Japan, even for the time being. (See answers to No. 7 and No. 9, above.)

No. 11. STATISTICS vs FACTS.

Argument---"In the last 9 years 20,000 more Japanese have departed from the United States than have arrived. (Report of the United States Commissioner of Immigration.)"

Answer---The Report of the Secretary of Labor for 1923, p. 133, declares that between 1908 and 1923 Japanese total immigration into continental United States was 125,773, and emigration 41,781, a net gain of 83,992, during the period when the Gentlemen's Agreement guaranteed practical exclusion of Japanese immigration. (See "B", p. 9.) Regardless of feats of legerdemain that may be done with statistics of legal arrivals and departures (usually by adding "non-immigration" figures), the Japanese population of continental United States, and particularly California, has not decreased in the past 9 years, while such population in Hawaii has materially increased. Illegal entry may have had something to do therewith. The Number of Japanese now in this country has no necessary connection with the question, "Shall we formally open the immigration gates to ineligible Asiatics, now excluded under the law?"

No. 12. PERCENTAGES vs PRINCIPLES.

Argument---"The Japanese in California represent 1.7% of the total population. They are constantly decreasing in proportion to the total population of the state."

Answer---The Japanese in California decrease in proportion because the white population of the state increases very rapidly. The Japanese do not decrease in number. They congregate in certain counties, where they gradually secure more or less dominance. In Hawaii the ascendancy secured by the Asiatic population has discouraged any material increase of Caucasian population there. Hawaii may serve at least as a warning.

No. 13. BASIC ISSUES INVOLVED?

Argument---"This is only a question of good manners. No basic issue is at stake. Grant of quota sacrifices no material interest and would remove the only source of friction to mar peaceful relations."

Answer---There is a basic issue at stake. Shall we abandon the basic principle of exclusion of aliens who are ineligible to American citizenship, and in consequence unassimilable, and whose children, citizens by birth, have proved also unassimilable, a separate, undigested racial group? We certainly sacrifice a material interest if by repeal of the exclusion act we abandon the only plan suggested which will prevent an inflow of the unassimilable Asiatic races under all possible future conditions.

And even in abandoning that safeguard we would not insure good will because the concession would only invite early demand for Japan's ultimate announced goal, "racial equality", the same rights in all matters for her nationals as are conceded to Europeans. (See "E", p. 23 & following; "C", p. 315, 316.) It would in no case change Japan's already inaugurated plans for excluding the United States and other nations from trade with Asia and for invading such nations and supplanting their domestic trade with her own goods produced with modern machinery and a labor cost one third to one quarter that even of England. (See "G").

No. 14. AMERICANS SHOULD DECIDE.

Argument---"This is a question for Americans to decide without dictation from any other power."

Answer---True. But Japan seeks to dictate to us in this matter, and the urge in her behalf from various American groups, religious, commercial and other, for 18 years past has been made at the suggestion of Japan and under covert threats of ill will and loss of trade if we fail to make the concession. (See "J".)

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

1/12

5

Yes, it is a question for Americans to decide; but for such Americans as hold that national welfare should guide their decision, rather than the demands of foreign powers or the interests of groups, sections or cults in our own country.

No. 16. YIELD: AND SET A GOOD EXAMPLE!

Argument---"We can well afford to set an example in this matter by maintaining justice and courtesy for all."

Answer--That is the plea which has been made for many years whenever the United States was called upon by foreign nations, or by selfish American interests to sacrifice itself at the demand or for the benefit of others. We scrapped our Navy; we paid the war expenses of Europe, and now we are asked to pay for the outlay she has made since the war in monstrous new war preparations; we have accepted for permanent settlement and citizenship during the past 30 years many undesirable elements of European immigration; we opened the gates wide to the entrance of two million unassimilable Mexican peons at the demand of employers of cheap labor, and as a "friendly gesture to a neighbor".

We have by such suicidal policy contributed to unemployment in the United States times greater than exists in any country we have thus mistakenly befriended. We have apparently earned in addition their contemptuous regard as a weakling. We have made thereby immeasurably greater the task which President Franklin D. Roosevelt faces at home and abroad. And now we are asked to open our gates to Asiatic immigration to avoid the displeasure of Japan.

Japan very wisely excludes Chinese immigration under Imperial Ordinance No. 352, though in 1924 China made her seventh protest thereat, calling attention to Japan's inconsistency in enforcing such exclusion while demanding entrance for Japanese immigration into the United States.* Let us act in immigration and in all other matters with the same scrupulous care for the national welfare as do other nations.

*(See "B", p. 35.)

California Joint Immigration Committee,

V. S. McClatchy, Executive Secretary.

San Francisco, California,
November 13, 1933.
#348

REFERENCES

- "A" - "Japanese Immigration Legislation". Hearing before Senate Immigration Committee on S. 2576 - 68th Congress, First Session, March, 1924.
- "B" - "Japanese Exclusion - A Study of the Policy and the Law." J. B. Trevor, House Document #600, 68th Congress, Second Session.
- "C" - "Quota or Exclusion for Japanese Immigrants?" Report of a year's study by the Commonwealth Club of California, December 20, 1932.
- "D" - Autobiography of Theodore Roosevelt, P. 411 to 414.
- "E" - "What! Only 165 Japanese to Insure Peace on the Pacific?" - V. S. McClatchy San Francisco Examiner, August 19, 1933. C.J.I.C. Document #327.
- "F" - "Genesis of Japan's Movement for Quota." V. S. McClatchy, San Francisco Examiner, August 26, 1933. C.J.I.C. Document #329.
- "G" - "Trade Follows the Flag - Home". Upton Close, Saturday Evening Post, October 21, 1933.
- "J" - "Quota for Japan", C.J.I.C. Document #270.
- "K" - "The Japanese Problem in California" C.J.I.C. Document #246.
- "H" - "Japanese Immigration and Colonization". V. S. McClatchy. Brief presented to the Department of State, 1921.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/12 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.
Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.
V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released December 4, 1933

THE A. F. of L. on JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Wm. Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, characterizes as without foundation a recently published statement that the organization had changed its position and would not solidly oppose the movement for admission of Asiatic immigration under quota and incidental repeal of the law excluding aliens ineligible to citizenship.

The record shows that Frank Morrison, Secretary of the A. F. of L., stated for publication on November 1, 1931, "The American Federation of Labor has not changed its attitude toward this law. It helped to have it enacted and will oppose any attempt made for its repeal."

On August 30, 1933, President Green, in answer to a California correspondent who called attention to the movement for granting quota to Japan, wrote as follows: "The American Federation of Labor will vigorously oppose any attempt to break down the law which provides that immigrants ineligible to citizenship cannot enter the United States."

The A. F. of L. in national convention in October, 1933, reaffirmed unanimously its stand on Japanese immigration and instructed its executive committee to resist any attempt to liberalize quotas.

On November 1, 1933, Frank Morrison, Secretary of the A. F. of L., in a letter to the California Joint Immigration Committee said, "The fact that the A. F. of L. adopted a resolution at its recent convention directing the Executive Council to secure legislation stopping Filipino immigration is certainly evidence that Labor would not request Congress to permit the immigration of Japanese."

12-2-33
#367

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

1/4

QUOTA FOR 185 JAPANESE
WOULD ADMIT THOUSANDS "NON-QUOTA"

The California Joint Immigration Committee in the following letter of February 19, 1934, to the Oregon Council on Oriental Relations, explained how immigration quota, if granted to 185 Japanese annually, would insure admission to thousands of Japanese "non-quota" under the existing law:--

"In our letter of February 1st we took the liberty of calling attention to certain facts which in our judgment might modify any conclusion already reached by the Oregon Council on Oriental Relations as to the proposed grant of immigration quota to Japanese and other Asiatics. We invite your attention to the points outlined in this letter as furnishing in addition an insurmountable obstacle to the plan proposed.

"The advocates of quota strongly stress the claim that grant thereof to Japan would admit only 185 Japanese per year. In addition to answer thereto already made in C.J.I.C. Docs. #327 and #348, there is an even more conclusive answer in the fact that grant of quota to Japan now would open the gates immediately under operation of the present law to thousands of "non-quota" Japanese immigrants coming as alien Japanese wives for American citizens. In the face of such a situation President Roosevelt and his advisers would not recommend, and Congress certainly would not enact the legislation urged. Further agitation of the subject would only produce additional friction with Japan.

"Repeal of Subdivision (c) of Sec. 13 (the present exclusion provision) and grant of quota to Japan would permit Japan to exercise the same rights as accorded other nations under Subdivision (a) of Sec. 4, which grants admission, "non-quota", to the alien wife of an American citizen.

"Japan evaded the two-fold purpose of the Gentlemen's Agreement by sending thru our gates many thousand adult male laborers who were later supplied with picture brides, most of them also laborers. Our Immigration Bureau found itself powerless to bar these entrants in the face of frequent decisions that the courts could not take cognizance of such violations, the Gentlemen's Agreement being neither law nor treaty.

"The proportion of Japanese males to females in continental United States was in 1900 twenty five to one, in 1910 (after two years operation of the Gentlemen's Agreement) seven to one, and in 1920 three to one. In consequence, Japanese population in continental United States trebled between 1907 and 1920 and Japanese births in California alone increased from 455 in 1908 (when operation of the Agreement commenced) to 5,275 in 1921. The 1924 Act excluded all aliens ineligible to citizenship, including picture brides, and the Japanese births in California steadily declined, in 1933 being less than 1,700.

"To grant quota to Japan now would admit Japanese women, non-quota, without limit, and revive conditions as they existed under the Gentlemen's Agreement, rapidly increasing our Japanese population and rearing a third generation imbibing the Japanese standards of alien mothers.

"There are in continental United States, Hawaii and Japan, it is estimated, 160,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry. Of the adult males a large portion are unmarried and most of them unlikely, because of choice or necessity, to take as wife a girl trained to American standards. The Japanese Emigration Bureau, under its established policy, would aid in supplying brides from Japan to these Japanese American citizens, thus establishing new families in this country.

"We submit that while apparently the quota plan has recommended itself to your Council for certain reasons, the cost, immediate and prospective, may not have been fully understood. Certainly the points made in this communication have not had your consideration, for, so far as known, there has been no mention made of them by anyone up to this date."

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)
PAUL SCHARRENBURG
SEC. TREAS. STATE FED. OF LABOR
JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND DEPT. NATIVE SORE
OF THE GOLDEN WEST

California Joint Immigration Committee

85 SECOND STREET
PO BOX 6447
San Francisco, Cal.

CHARLES M. GOETHE
PRES. IMMIGRATION STUDY COM-M
(TREASURER)

HON. U. S. WEBB
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

V. S. McCLATCHY
(EXECUTIVE SECRETARY)

NOTE
AND FILE FOR REFERENCE

RESTRICTION OF ASIATIC IMMIGRATION
Under Past and Present Exclusion Laws and Proposed Quota

When Congress took up consideration of the immigration question in 1924, immigration from Asia was restricted as follows:--(1) by the Chinese Exclusion Act which, with modifications, had excluded the Chinese since 1882; (2) by the Act of 1917 excluding indigenous or colored races of the "Barred Zone", including India, Malaysia, the Dutch East Indies, Siam and certain sections of the Asiatic continent; (3) by the Gentlemen's Agreement to exclude Japanese, which became operative July 1, 1908. The first two had accomplished their declared purpose. The third failed, its two-fold purpose of excluding laborers and preventing increase of Japanese population in continental United States (as outlined by President Theodore Roosevelt) being defeated thru violations which the immigration officers could not prevent. The courts in many habeas corpus proceedings declared that the Agreement, being neither law nor treaty, could not be enforced or violations punished thru court action.

Even college professors and men in public life, regardless of position, ability or reputation, may err when, without intimate knowledge of the law and the facts, they offer advice or venture opinion in connection with the complicated subject of Asiatic immigration and Japanese quota.

Careful reading of C.J.I.C. Document #393, attached hereto, "Restriction of Asiatic Immigration Under Past and Present Exclusion Laws and Proposed Quota", briefed in 509 words, will correct some of the mistaken impressions most frequently entertained.

Extra copies of the document may be had by addressing the California Joint Immigration Committee, 85 Second Street, San Francisco, and references supporting any questioned point will be furnished on request.

#393
4-23-34

were admitted for temporary residence and not classed as immigrants under Sec. 3, including government officials with servants and employees, tourists and visitors, seamen awaiting trans-shipment, merchants carrying on trade under existing treaties.

WHAT GRANT OF QUOTA WOULD DO

It has been asserted that grant of formal quota to Japan would reduce the average Japanese annual immigration from 632 to exactly 185. That is a mistake. Japan would be entitled thereby to 185 "quota" immigrants, but also to such "non-quota" immigrants, whether 632, or more or less, as could enter under Sec. 4, (b), (d), (e). In addition, the attendant cancellation of Sec. 13 (c) would open the gates to many other non-quota immigrants under Sec. 4 (a) and (c), including alien Japanese wives (threatening another picture bride flood) and all Japanese born in free states of the Western Hemisphere, whether coming from Japan or any other country. Japanese natives of all quota countries could also qualify for admission under the respective quota limitations of such countries. The present annual Japanese immigration would be swelled probably to a few thousand. Illegal entry will continue regardless of quota, if the administration is tolerant and Congress fails to provide adequate appropriation and machinery for apprehension and deportation.

In repealing Sec. 13 (c), as would be necessary even if quota were granted to Japan alone, complications would ensue as to immigration from other parts of Asia. For instance, admission would be granted to any member of the colored races in the Barred Zone now barred by Sec. 13 (c) excepting Chinese resident in the Zone who would still be subject to the Chinese exclusion law.

If quota were granted to other Asiatic races as well as to the Japanese, it is probable that both the Chinese exclusion act and the Barred Zone provisions of the 1917 Act would be repealed, in which event we would be subject to a flood of immigrants from all the colored races of Asia similar to the flood of Japanese which we would face, as explained above.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)

PAUL SCHARRENBURG
SEC. TREAS. STATE FED. OF LABOR
JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND SOC. NATIVE SONS
OF THE GOLDEN WEST

California Joint Immigration Committee

81 SECOND STREET
FROM CHASEFIELD 1097
San Francisco, Cal.

CHARLES M. GOETHE
PRES. IMMIGRATION STUDY COM-
(TREASURER)

HON. U. S. WEBB
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

V. S. McCLATCHY
(EXECUTIVE SECRETARY)

NOTE
AND FILE FOR REFERENCE

RESTRICTION OF ASIATIC IMMIGRATION
Under Past and Present Exclusion Laws and Proposed Quota

When Congress took up consideration of the immigration question in 1924, immigration from Asia was restricted as follows:--(1) by the Chinese Exclusion Act which, with modifications, had excluded the Chinese since 1882; (2) by the Act of 1917 excluding indigenous or colored races of the "Barred Zone", including India, Malaysia, the Dutch East Indies, Siam and certain sections of the Asiatic continent; (3) by the Gentlemen's Agreement to exclude Japanese, which became operative July 1, 1908. The first two had accomplished their declared purpose. The third failed, its two-fold purpose of excluding laborers and preventing increase of Japanese population in continental United States (as outlined by President Theodore Roosevelt) being defeated thru violations which the immigration officers could not prevent. The courts in many habeas corpus proceedings declared that the Agreement, being neither law nor treaty, could not be enforced or violations punished thru court action.

WHAT EXCLUSION OF INELIGIBLES ACCOMPLISHED

To remedy that situation the exclusion of all aliens ineligible to citizenship was demanded under a uniform law by various organizations and interests. Sec. 13 (c) of the 1924 Act was framed to carry out that plan. It automatically abrogated the Gentlemen's Agreement and nullified treaties and laws so far as in conflict. Congress, however, failed to repeal the two exclusion laws covering China and the Barred Zone respectively, declaring instead (Sec. 25) that the provisions of the Act are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws already in force; and that no alien may be admitted as an immigrant if he be barred either by the Act of 1924, or by immigration laws then in force. In consequence, since 1924, immigration from Japan has been regulated solely by the 1924 Act, while that from certain other portions of Asia has been regulated partly by that act and partly by the laws already in force.

PRESENT IMMIGRATION FROM JAPAN

The 1924 Act recognizes two classes of immigrants, "quota" and "non-quota". Japan at present is not entitled to any "quota" immigrants for its natives of Japanese race. It has a courtesy quota of 100 for natives of races eligible to our citizenship. Japan's "non-quota" immigrants are restricted under Sec. 13 (c) to:--(1) a former immigrant returning from a temporary visit abroad; (2) a minister of any denomination or college professor with wife and minor unmarried children; (3) a student coming for temporary stay. As the law is rigidly enforced, the average of 632 Japanese immigrants admitted annually since 1924, according to the Immigration Bureau reports, must have been confined to the three classes named. A number of other Japanese were admitted for temporary residence and not classed as immigrants under Sec. 3, including government officials with servants and employees, tourists and visitors, seamen awaiting trans-shipment, merchants carrying on trade under existing treaties.

WHAT GRANT OF QUOTA WOULD DO

It has been asserted that grant of formal quota to Japan would reduce the average Japanese annual immigration from 632 to exactly 185. That is a mistake. Japan would be entitled thereby to 185 "quota" immigrants, but also to such "non-quota" immigrants, whether 632, or more or less, as could enter under Sec. 4, (b), (d), (e). In addition, the attendant cancellation of Sec. 13 (c) would open the gates to many other non-quota immigrants under Sec. 4 (a) and (c), including alien Japanese wives (threatening another picture bride flood) and all Japanese born in free states of the Western Hemisphere, whether coming from Japan or any other country. Japanese natives of all quota countries could also qualify for admission under the respective quota limitations of such countries. The present annual Japanese immigration would be swelled probably to a few thousand. Illegal entry will continue regardless of quota, if the administration is tolerant and Congress fails to provide adequate appropriation and machinery for apprehension and deportation.

In repealing Sec. 13 (c), as would be necessary even if quota were granted to Japan alone, complications would ensue as to immigration from other parts of Asia. For instance, admission would be granted to any member of the colored races in the Barred Zone now barred by Sec. 13 (c) excepting Chinese resident in the Zone who would still be subject to the Chinese exclusion law.

If quota were granted to other Asiatic races as well as to the Japanese, it is probable that both the Chinese exclusion act and the Barred Zone provisions of the 1917 Act would be repealed, in which event we would be subject to a flood of immigrants from all the colored races of Asia similar to the flood of Japanese which we would face, as explained above.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)

PAUL SCHARRENBURG
SEC. TREAS. STATE FED. OF LABORS
JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND SEC. NATIVE SONS
OF THE GOLDEN WEST

California Joint Immigration Committee
87 SECOND STREET
PHONE GARFIELD 2697
San Francisco, Cal.

11/16
CHARLES M. GOETHE
PRES. IMMIGRATION STUDY COM-M
(TREASURER)

HON. U. S. WEBB
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

V. S. McCLATCHY
(EXECUTIVE SECRETARY)

Released April 3, 1934.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION - PRESENT AND POSSIBLE

Prof. E. K. Strong, Jr., of Stanford University, in a recently published article, calls attention to the fact that an average of 632 Japanese immigrants have entered annually during the eight years, 1926 to 1932, and declares that "quota will restrict this number to 185 a year".

The California Joint Immigration Committee, however, explains that the 632 immigrants referred to entered "non-quota", either as former immigrants, returning from a temporary visit abroad, or ministers and college professors with families, students coming for temporary stay, all under special exception as called for by Sec. 13 (c) of the Act of 1924; and that similar exceptions are allowed to all countries, whether entitled to quota or not.

It appears that Japan, if entitled to quota since 1924, could have sent in as immigrants not only the "quota" allotment of 185, but also the 632 "non-quota"; and in addition other "non-quota" immigrants under Sec. 4 (a) and (c), including an unlimited number of alien Japanese wives for American citizens of Japanese ancestry, and any Japanese born in a free state of the Western Hemisphere. Japanese immigration could then have run into thousands coming annually for permanent settlement instead of the 632 referred to, some of whom were immigrants previously accepted and returning from a visit abroad, and others coming for a limited stay.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/7

June 1, 1934.

COPY

Mr. Samuel J. Hume, Editor,
"Quota"
Berkeley, California

Dear Sir:

Your attention is called to certain misleading statements made in the April-May number of "Quota", published by the California Council on Oriental Relations.

The California Joint Immigration Committee, in offering for public information a carefully verified 500 word brief on the subject, said that "Even college professors and men in public life, regardless of position, ability or reputation, may err, when, without intimate knowledge of the law and the facts, they offer advice or venture opinion in connection with the complicated subject of Asiatic immigration and Japanese quota".

"Quota" derides that suggestion as a reflection on responsible advocates of quota, and then naively furnishes corroboration of its merit by commendatory reference to an earlier statement of Professor E. K. Strong, Jr., of Stanford University, that an average of 632 Japanese immigrants entered this country annually between 1925 and 1932 and that "quota will restrict this number to 185 a year".

The public now knows that the group of 632 was composed entirely of former residents returning from a temporary visit abroad, of ministers and college professors with their families, and of students coming for temporary stay--all classed as "non-quota" entrants; and that they would have entered, in addition to 185 quota immigrants, had Japan been entitled to quota. (See C.J.I.C. Doc. #391, Apr. 3, and letter of Commr. Gen. of Immigration, D. W. McCormack, Mar. 15). You yourself made a similar mistake in confusing "immigrant" and "non-immigrant" entrants in your letter to the S. F. News in November, 1933. (See C.J.I.C. Doc. #356, my unpublished answer of Nov. 13)

Professor Strong, like others equally sincere and equally able, erred because he made a statement and "ventured an opinion without intimate knowledge of the law and the facts". When he learned of the error he ceased to repeat it. "Quota" and other advocates of open gates for Asia have done Professor Strong no kindness and themselves no credit by giving his original statement continued publicity notwithstanding their knowledge of the error.

"Quota" in the same issue lays itself open to further criticism in re-publishing a statement made in March to the effect that "Secretary of State Hull ... finds that if the Japanese Exclusion Act were cancelled it would not affect the United States. Not a single additional Japanese would land in California". Secretary Hull formally disclaimed making such a statement in a Department letter, April 10th, as covered in C.J.I.C. Doc. #394, issued April 23rd, which received newspaper publication and general distribution.

Certainly few--we believe none--of the members of the California Council on Oriental Relations whose names are published in "Quota" will countenance that sort of publicity. While it may mislead some of the public temporarily it will discredit the organization at once with those who know the facts and ultimately with all who learn of them.

"Quota" carries an excellent maxim at its mast head. "Prejudice in the background of the human mind prevents the intake of truth". It must have been temporarily lost sight of in issuing the April-May issue.

Truly yours,

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy. James K. Fisk, Chairman

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)

PAUL SCHARRENBERG
SEC. TREAS. STATE FED. OF LABOR

JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND SONS NATIVE SONS
OF THE GOLDEN WEST
Released

California Joint Immigration Committee

85 SECOND STREET
PO BOX 645010 2497
San Francisco, Cal.

11/18 CHARLES M. GOETHE
PRES. IMMIGRATION STUDY COM-
(TREASURER)

HON. U. S. WEBB
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

V. S. MCCLATCHY
(EXECUTIVE SECRETARY)

OFFICIAL STORY OF THE PICTURE BRIDES

The recent inside story from Washington referring to Japan's diplomatic sacrifice of its "picture brides" as a maneuver to end agitation for exclusion of Japanese laborers, gathered from the 1919 correspondence of the State Department, does not disclose the most interesting phases of the picture bride story. That, at least, is the statement made by V. S. McClatchy, Executive Secretary of the California Joint Immigration Committee, who supplies the missing phases from records in possession of the Joint Committee as follows:

THE GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT The Gentlemen's Agreement, a mass of secret correspondence conducted under President Theodore Roosevelt's direction during the fiscal year 1907, became operative at Japan's request in July, 1908. Roosevelt stated its two-fold agreed purpose as (1) the exclusion of Japanese laborers from continental United States, and (2) prevention of increase of Japanese population in continental United States. The United States agreed to admit for residence without question any Japanese bearing Japan's visa, and Japan agreed to so guard the issue of visas as to insure accomplishment of the Agreement's two-fold object. If the plan proved unsuccessful the United States was to enact a Japanese exclusion law similar to that excluding Chinese. *(a)

THE 1911 TREATY The plan worked well during the remainder of Roosevelt's term of office (less than a year) but not thereafter. In 1911, under President Taft, a new Treaty of Commerce was made with Japan, which Roosevelt declared would destroy the safeguards against Japanese immigration provided in his Gentlemen's Agreement. In consequence, the Senate declined to approve the Treaty until the Japanese Ambassador had signed a footnote thereto in which he declared, with full authority, that his government would faithfully observe the intent of the Gentlemen's Agreement as to non-admission of laborers, as it had in the preceding three years. *(b)

JAPAN'S OPERATION Notwithstanding that guarantee, Japan sent over during the following nine years many thousands of laborers, as shown by the Immigration Bureau reports. They were detained at the ports of entry, but ordered released from Washington, or by the Courts under habeas corpus for lack of jurisdiction, the Gentlemen's Agreement being neither law nor treaty. So far as known, the Washington Administration did nothing to force Japan to comply with her obligations under the Agreement, nor to denounce the Agreement because of non-compliance. *(c)

PICTURE BRIDES The picture bride plan was adopted to furnish wives for those laborers who had entered in violation of the Gentlemen's Agreement, with the result that by 1920 the Japanese population in continental United States had nearly trebled, while the annual Japanese births in California increased from 455 in 1908 to over 5,000. Because of unfavorable public comment, and at the suggestion of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which had since 1915 sought to secure immigration and naturalization privileges for the Japanese, Japan, in August, 1920, ceased to ship picture brides. They were immediately replaced, however, with "kankodan" (excursion) brides, who entered during the next few years in even greater number than had the picture brides. Under the kankodan plan, a Japanese resident of the United States could go to Japan, and, if seeking a bride, remain for three months without performing military duty and return with his bride, at a total expense approximating that which would have been incurred in securing a picture bride. *(d)

RESULT OF THE 1924 LAW The act of 1924 excluded all aliens ineligible to American citizenship, and barred therefore Japanese laborers and brides. In consequence, Japanese population in continental United States (aside from illegal entries) has remained nearly at a standstill since, while annual births in California have dropped from a peak of 5,275, to less than 1,700.

The barring of brides, however, has imposed no hardship on the Nisei (American citizens of Japanese ancestry), since among them the sexes are equally divided. If, however, a Nisei young man prefers a bride thoroughly Japanese in thought, training and standards, he is at liberty to select one from the thousands of Japanese maidens, born American citizens, but educated since early childhood in Japan, and still residing there. That is the present adaptation of the "kankodan" bride plan.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/9

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
Garfield 2637
San Francisco, California.

Chas. M. Gecche
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

"500,000 ARMED JAPANESE!"

The California Joint Immigration Committee, speaking for its supporting organizations, the state bodies of American Legion, Federation of Labor and Native Sons of the Golden West, characterizes as a fantastic dream a statement made a few days ago before a Congressional Committee to the effect that "there are 500,000 armed Japanese in the United States, chiefly on the [Pacific] Coast and in Hawaii", and declares that the uncontradicted publication thereof is likely to disturb the friendly relations and mutual appreciation now existing between Japanese and Caucasians in California which has developed since settlement of the immigration question in 1924. As an indication of that sentiment, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are taking steps to secure from Congress such action as will permit without modification of the exclusion provision of the 1924 law, the naturalization of Japanese veterans who served with the Colors during the recent war.

In disproof of the statement as to "500,000 armed Japanese", the Joint Committee calls attention to the fact that the entire Japanese population in the United States, men, women and children, is only about 300,000, almost equally divided between Hawaii and continental United States; that in Hawaii fully two-thirds of the Japanese are American citizens by birth, and that over 50,000 thereof are still attending public school; that two-thirds of the entire Japanese population of continental United States reside in California, where close contact has impressed Californians with their law abiding character and the fine standards, mental, moral and physical, of the second generation.

That there are in California, among the few alien leaders of the Japanese, sufficient able bodied men to maintain armed units for ulterior purposes is most improbable; and that such units could be maintained in secrecy is still more unlikely. It is fairly certain that the Japanese-American citizens league, in which most of the grown Japanese of American birth seek to perfect themselves in American citizenship, would discourage and expose, if it could not prevent, a movement which would inevitably wreck the future careers of its members.

It is true that some of the Japanese in this state are violating the alien land law, but it is also true that they are doing it under arrangement with Caucasian land owners who profit thereby and are equally guilty under the law. It is probably true, as charged, that the Japanese fishing fleet of high powered boats operating in the southern part of California, is responsible for the surreptitious entry of Japanese into the state and otherwise constitutes a danger against which the states of Oregon and Washington have taken safeguards. But these matters can be corrected by law and by law enforcement, and they do not reflect upon the great body of the Japanese population in California.

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

James K. Fisk, Chairman

#417
March 2, 1935.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

California Joint Immigration Committee,
85 Second St.,
San Francisco, Cal.

Released

* Copy of item in Japan Times, Tokyo, Japan.
December 4, 1934.

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN U.S. TO BE GIVEN
BOOKS WITH CORRECT INFORMATION ON JAPAN.

The Society of International Cultural Relations at its meeting Monday afternoon decided on a plan to be followed for the compilation of school textbooks to be used at high schools in the United States for diffusing correct information on Japan.

According to the plan, the collecting and provisional compilation of Material on Japan will be undertaken by a committee in this country, while final compilation will be done by a joint committee including both American and Japanese members. It was also decided at the meeting to present the draft by the Japanese committee to Mr. Lasker, chairman on the cultural relations of the I. P. R.* for his suggestions before sending it to the joint Japanese-American committee for final compilation.

Material of instruction on Japan will cover almost every phase of modern Japan, embracing topics on the government, economic and social conditions, art, etc., which will be presented in a way that will appeal to the average high school student in America.

* The "Japan Times and Mail" published at Tokyo under direction of the Foreign Office.

** I. P. R. - The Institute of Pacific Relations, whose members in recent biennial sessions - notably at Banff, Canada, in 1933, were urged by the Japanese delegation thereto to proselyte for immigration quota for Japan.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)

PAUL SCHARRENBURG
SEC. TREAS. STATE FED. OF LABOR

JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND SECT. NATIVE SONS
OF THE GOLDEN WEST

California Joint Immigration Committee

81 SECOND STREET
PHONE GARFIELD 2697
San Francisco, Cal.

11/22

CHARLES M. GOETHE
PRES. IMMIGRATION STUDY COM. (TREASURER)

HON. U. S. WEBB
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

V. S. McCLATCHY
(EXECUTIVE SECRETARY)

Released

JAPAN PROPOSES TO INSTRUCT OUR PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS

The Japan Times and Mail, English language voice of the Foreign Office of Japan, in its issue of December 4th last, published an interesting item headed, "High School Students in U.S. To Be Given Books With Correct Information on Japan". The article states that the Society of International Cultural Relations has adopted a plan for compilation of text books for the purpose indicated, to be prepared in Japan by a special committee with suggestions from a representative of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The books will cover, it is stated, "almost every phase of modern Japan . . . in a way that will appeal to the average high school student in America".

The Society of International Cultural Relations is an organization supported by such powerful commercial interests as Mitsui, Mitsubishi, etc. It acts under direction of the Government Bureau of Cultural Relations, which has been allowed an appropriation of 2,500,000 Yen in the 1935 budget. "Cultivating cultural relations", is Japanese for "inviting foreign approval of Japan's point of view". The Japanese delegates to the Institute of Pacific Relations, at its recent bi-ennial sessions--and particularly at that held at Banff, Canada, in 1933, as shown by news reports--sought to secure the cooperation of American delegates thereto to obtain from the United States an immigration quota for Japan.

USE OF THE BOOKS PROTESTED IN HAWAII

Further information as to the text book plan is found in a letter of protest addressed by the Sino-Korean Peoples League of Honolulu to the Territorial School Commissioners of Hawaii, December 11, 1934. Therein it is declared that the plan was approved at a meeting of departmental heads of the Japanese government, including the Foreign Office, at Tokyo, November 21, 1934. At that meeting, Mr. Okada, head of the Bureau of Cultural Relations and former Consul General of Hawaii, is quoted as saying, concerning the proposed free distribution of Japanese text books, that "all the necessary arrangements have been made with the Public Instruction and also with the various religious and social leaders of Hawaii".

Setuechi Aoki, General Secretary of the Society of International Cultural Relations, is quoted as stating that "for several years the school heads of Hawaii and America, with the aid of many more influential educators and missionaries, made a thorough survey of American text books for the Japanese society. The survey revealed that if proper propaganda is systematically carried out in the schools the American children will become strong friends of Japan".

The plan includes also distribution among all the Japanese language schools in Hawaii and America of "educational material concerning the vital national defense policy of Japan".

The letter of the Sino-Korean Peoples League protests against such proposed use of the public schools "in spreading Japanese propaganda in Hawaii" and declares that "the result will be disastrous to Americanization of the American citizens of Japanese ancestry". *

* Details in C.J.I.C. Releases #407-8-9.

#410 2-13-35

Suggestion: Imagine the reaction in Japan if the United States were to publicly announce its intention to introduce into the public school system of Japan text books prepared under its direction furnishing "correct information" concerning the United States and its policy and views.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/27

JAPAN'S PLANS FOR SCHOOL PROPAGANDA

The document attached is copy of a protest made to the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education in December 1934, in connection with the proposed introduction into the public schools of a text book on Japan then being prepared under cooperation of the Board of Education, the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Society of Cultural Relations of Japan. The protest was suppressed and a similar one made to the Hawaiian Legislature in the following March was pigeonholed. The meeting of Japan's departmental heads referred to was mentioned by the Japan Times December 4, 1934, with certain details as to how material for the text books contemplated was to be gathered and how the books would be written by a Japanese-American Committee (C.J.I.C. #409). The procedure outlined was that followed in preparation of the text book on Japan used in the public schools of Honolulu in 1935.

#4114-A

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/23

Exh. B

Mr. George M. Collins,
Chairman, School Commissioners,
2862 Kahawai St.,
Honolulu, T. H.

Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.
December 11, 1934.

(COPY)

Dear Mr. Collins:

We have been informed that the Departmental Conference of the Japanese Government on the 21st of November last, have approved number of important projects concerning the promotion of Japanization of the Japanese and the American public schools in Hawaii.

The following department heads were present:

1. Foreign Office
2. Education Department
3. Commerce Department
4. Cultural Bureau
5. Overseas Education Institution
6. Promotion of International Cultural Relations Society
7. Prince Fushimi, Chief of the Japanese Naval Supreme War Council; the Founder of Hawaii's Prince Fishimi Scholarship Assn., incorporated in 1924.

I wish to call your attention to two projects which directly concerns with Hawaii's public school and the Japanese Language Schools.

First: The Overseas Education Institution to publish education material concerning the vital national defense policy of Japan and to distribute the same to all Japanese schools in Hawaii and America.

Second: Supply (free of charge) all the public schools of Hawaii with reference books for teachers, reading material, portfolios containing Japanese pictorial and other graphic materials for schoolroom use and etc.

In connection with the free distribution of Japanese textbooks and etc., Mr. Okada, the head of the Cultural Bureau and former Consul General of Hawaii, stated "that all the necessary arrangements have been made with the Public Instruction, also with the various Religious and Social leaders in Hawaii".

Mr. Setsuechi Aoki, General Secretary of the Promotion of International Cultural Relations Society, said, "For several years the school heads of Hawaii and America with the aid of many more influential educators and missionaries made a thorough survey of American textbooks for the Japanese Society. The survey revealed that if proper propaganda is systematically carried out in the schools the American children will become strong friends of Japan".

Undoubtedly you are aware of the significance of such projects in Hawaii. We are very deeply touched and concerned with the action of the Public Instruction taking a hand aiding in spreading Japanese propaganda in Hawaii. We believe the result will be disastrous to Americanization of the American citizens of Japanese ancestry.

God knows they have enough contact with the things of Japan and the Yamato and Bushido Spirit in their homes and in the language schools. Why let the Japanese government promote Japanism even in the Public Schools?

We are writing this letter with the spirit of cooperation and Aloha and with the hope that you will call the attention of your fellow Commissioners.

Yours to serve

#414
C.J.I.C.

W. K. Lyhan
Confidential Representative of
The Sino-Korean People's League

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/24

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
Garfield 2697
San Francisco, California.

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

*JAPANESE PROPAGANDA IN AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PLAN INAUGURATED IN HAWAII

Japan, after thorough survey in which she claims to have had the aid of "the school heads of Hawaii and America * * * and many more influential educators and missionaries", and with later assistance in operation from the Institute of Pacific Relations and Commissioners of Public Instruction of Hawaii, has embarked upon an elaborate program for propagandizing in Hawaii, and later on the mainland, by the introduction of text books prepared under Japanese direction for use in the public high schools of the United States. These text books are to cover "almost every phase of modern Japan", the survey having revealed, as reported, "that if proper propaganda is systematically carried out in the schools American children will become strong friends of Japan". The plan also provides for distribution in the Japanese language schools of Hawaii and the mainland of "educational material concerning the vital national defense policy of Japan". In Hawaii the Japanese language schools are attended by over 50,000 young Japanese, nearly all of them American citizens.

The material for these text books is being gathered in Japan by Setsuechi Aoki, General Secretary of the Society of Cultural Relations, under direction of former Consul General of Hawaii Okada, now head of the Government Bureau of Cultural Relations, assisted by Bruno Lasker, of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The first book of the contemplated series is now ready for publication in Honolulu, where the manuscript was prepared by Dr. Nisamichi Royama and Miss Helen Gay Pratt. Dr. Royama is Professor of Economics at the Imperial University of Tokyo, who came to Hawaii for the purpose, remaining three months. Miss Pratt is referred to in an official report as being "of the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Department of Public Instruction".

Details of the plan are covered in an announcement published December 4th. in the Japan Times and Mail of Tokyo, English language voice of the Foreign Office of Japan, and in four documents not yet given to the public, but full copies of which have reached San Francisco--(1) A written protest, sent to the Commissioners of Public Instruction of Hawaii by the Sino-Korean Peoples League of Honolulu, against permitting the use in the public schools of such propaganda and declaring its belief that "the result will be disastrous to Americanization of American citizens of Japanese descent". The protest gives full details of a meeting of Department heads of Japan held in Tokyo, November 21st last, at which the plans were agreed upon. (2) A report, February 20th, from Oren E. Long, Superintendent of Public Instruction of Hawaii, to the Commissioners of Public Instruction of the Territory, outlining the progress made in preparation of the book on Japan and other similar books intended for use in the public schools. (3) Letter, March 5, 1935, from the Secretary of the Sino-Korean Peoples League to Superintendent Long, referring to the latter's report of February 20th. (4) Petition presented to the Hawaiian Territorial Senate, March 27, 1935, (referred to the Committee on Education) asking for investigation of "Japanization activities" in Hawaii, including propaganda in public schools.

*Details appear in C.J.I.C. Documents 407-8-9-10, to be had on request.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/25

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Rogan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
Garfield 2697

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF JAPANESE VETERANS

It seems probable that the bill H. R. 7170, introduced by Hon. Clarence F. Lea, Dean of the California Congressional Delegation, to permit naturalization of the Japanese veterans who accepted service under the colors during the World War, though entitled to exemption as aliens, will be passed by Congress. It has already been recommended by the House Immigration Committee without dissenting vote.

At the close of the Great War a Congressional act granted the privilege of immediate naturalization to aliens who had served with the colors. Several hundred Japanese were made citizens under that law by the U. S. Federal Court in Hawaii. Subsequently that action was set aside by the U. S. Supreme Court, which declared that the law intended only to shorten the probationary period for aliens eligible to naturalization and not to confer the right of naturalization on those ineligible thereto. Last summer, while the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars had under consideration the matter of recommending Congressional action to recognize the service of those veterans, the California Joint Immigration Committee obtained from Consul General Shuh Tomii of San Francisco information as to conditions under which Japan would permit the abandonment of their Japanese citizenship. With that information before them the State Attorney General of California and the District Naturalization Officer offered suggestions as to how Congress might confer the desired privilege without repealing or endangering the exclusion provision of the 1924 act, and inviting opening of the gates to Asiatic immigration thereby. Congressman Lea was asked to take charge of the matter and the bill prepared under his direction was given approval of those who had investigated the subject on behalf of California.

These facts were made plain to those who were inclined to oppose the measure because of a belief that Japan would see in such a concession an entering wedge encouraging later demand for immigration quota. The assurance was also given that the desire of the California Joint Immigration Committee to have gracious acknowledgement made of a service to the nation in no way changed its unalterable opposition to any modification of the exclusion provision of the 1924 act. As a result of that explanation no one appeared in opposition to the bill at the hearing before the House Immigration Committee, April 23rd. Representatives Lea and Scott from California spoke in favor, as did also the National Americanism Officers of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, while a telegram from the California Joint Immigration Committee announced its approval of the bill as "effective and properly safeguarded". The measure was recommended out without adverse vote and Representative Kramer of California, a member thereof, was delegated to make formal report to the House.

#421

5-9-35

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/26

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U.S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

JAPAN AND CALIFORNIA SHAKE HANDS

California and Japan have joined in felicitations over the favorable prospect for passage by Congress of H.R. 7170, introduced by Congressman Lea of California for naturalization of Japanese veterans who served with the American colors during the War, the bill having been already unanimously reported out favorably by the House Immigration Committee.

The California Joint Immigration Committee, which, following action by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, was instrumental in formulation of the plan and preparation of the bill, has expressed in a letter to Hon. Shuh Tomii, Consul General of Japan at San Francisco, its appreciation of the assistance received from him in indicating procedure under which acceptance of the plan by Japan could be assumed. That letter said in part: "This action of Congress, when consummated, will serve as fitting recognition of the act of those Japanese residents of the United States who accepted call to the colors, tho they could have claimed exemption as aliens. It should strengthen the cordial relations developing in California between Japanese and citizens of Caucasian ancestry. To the end that no further misunderstanding may mar those relations, this committee will gladly counsel with your office whenever conditions suggest mutual or independent action. We realize that the future peace of the Pacific rests largely in the hands of Japan and the United States of America; and that harmonious relations in California may go far toward preventing friction between the two nations."

The letter also suggests that California's desire to accord proper recognition to those Japanese veterans in no way affects or conflicts with her unwavering support of the nation's established policy against admission as immigrants of aliens ineligible to American citizenship.

Consul General Tomii, in a cordial reply to that letter, says that he "highly appreciates the support given by the California Joint Immigration Committee and others to the cause, which has been most appropriately expressed in the House Committee's Report as 'simply a measure of justice to resident persons who rendered service in our own armed forces during war time, who notwithstanding racial differences entered our forces and fought for this country'".

The Consul General further says: "I fully concur with your view that the future peace of the Pacific rests largely in the hands of Japan and the United States of America, and that harmonious relations of the Japanese and Americans in California will go far toward preventing friction between the two nations. I shall spare no effort for the promotion of friendship and good understanding between our two peoples, and will always be happy to cooperate with you in this noble task."

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

JAMES K. FISK
DEPT. ADJ. AMERICAN LEGION
(CHAIRMAN)
PAUL SCHARRENBURG
SEC. TREAS. STATE FED. OF LABOR
JOHN T. REGAN
GRAND SECY. NATIVE BOND
OF THE GOLDEN WEST

California Joint Immigration Committee
85 SECOND STREET
Phone GAAsfield 2697
San Francisco, Cal.

11/27
CHARLES M. GOETHE
PRES. IMMIGRATION STUDY COM. (TREASURER)

HON. U. S. WEBB
STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

V. S. McCLATCHY
(EXECUTIVE SECRETARY)

Released

THAT TEXT BOOK ON JAPAN

It will be rewritten, but under the same auspices

The New York Times, July 14th, contains an interview with Helen Gay Pratt, of the General Office of the Institute of Pacific Relations at Honolulu, but now in New York, in which she answers certain charges concerning the text book on Japan of which she is co-author. The book has been used experimentally in Honolulu high schools and is being studied at Columbia University for general use in mainland high schools.

The charges are that the book is a piece of Japanese propaganda, prepared under auspices of the "Society for Cultural Relations of Japan", with aid of the Institute of Pacific Relations and approval of the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education, and that it conceals or grossly misrepresents important facts. Those charges were made to the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education December 11, 1934, to the Hawaiian Legislature March 27, 1935, and to the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction June 21, 1935. The co-authors of the book are Professor M. Royama, of the Imperial University of Tokyo, and Professor G. M. Sinclair of Honolulu, formerly an instructor in Japan.

Miss Pratt stated in her interview that she is "not an expert on Japan, but is primarily interested in how books shall be written to be of effective school use", and that her collaborators "assisted her only with the research". Concerning the charge of gross misrepresentation of facts in connection with the immigration question she said that she "would be glad to correct any errors of fact though she still felt that the Japanese Exclusion Act was a disgrace to the United States". She said that in the book on Japan she had not fully explained matters in Manchuria because a previous book on China had done so; and that the books on both Japan and China will be entirely rewritten so as to "avoid troubling high school students with questions which international statesmen could not solve".

Apparently, however, the book on Japan is to be rewritten under the same auspices and with the same or similar assistance in research.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/22

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

THE JAPANESE LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

Released

Criticized as a Menace to American Citizenship

Separate Japanese language schools are maintained by the Japanese in Hawaii and California, and the young Japanese are compelled to attend regularly the sessions which are held before or after public school hours. The reason given is that better contact can be maintained thereby between the children and their alien parents who do not readily learn English. The schools are used, however, by the Japanese Government to develop and maintain in the young Japanese, who claim and enjoy American citizenship, a dominating loyalty to Japan's God-descended Emperor. The text books prescribed are those used in the schools in Japan, the teachers are Japanese, usually Buddhists and always Shintoists, and the exercises are such as are usual in Japan for the training of good Japanese citizens.

In 1919 the Hawaiian Legislature was compelled, on demand of the Japanese electorate, to kill a bill which provided that teachers in such schools must have a working knowledge of the English language and of American history and civics. In 1920 a Survey Commission of the Federal Department of Education at Washington after lengthy investigation stigmatized the Hawaiian Japanese language schools as "un-American if not anti-American" and recommended that they be abolished. Accordingly, in the following year the Legislature passed a more strenuous measure, the operation of which was bitterly fought by the Japanese; and the U. S. Supreme Court in 1927 declared that certain features of the law were unconstitutional. Since then these Hawaiian schools have been controlled entirely by Japanese influences.

Meanwhile, California, after study of translations of the text books used in the Japanese separate schools in the state, passed in the early 20's a law giving the State Department of Education control thereof and providing that all teachers therein must be American citizens. A new set of text books in consonance with American standards was prepared, and after approval by Mombusho--the Department of Education of Japan--was printed and put in use. The law was later rendered inoperative by the decision in the Hawaiian case, but it is understood that the text books prescribed under that law are still in use in California.

There is general demand on the part of the Japanese in both California and Hawaii for new text books more in consonance with world events and ideas of today. Such books if introduced will doubtless be prepared under direction of Japan, and will conform to her ideas and policy, with the object of making the pupils advocates thereof. Charges were made before the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education, December 11, 1934, and before the Territorial Legislature, March 27, 1935,--and not since denied--that Japan plans to distribute among the Japanese language school pupils in Hawaii "educational material concerning the vital national defense policy of Japan" (C.J.I.C. Doc. #414).

The difficulty of developing loyal American citizens, dependable in a crisis, out of young Japanese trained under such auspices causes grave concern to those familiar with conditions. In Hawaii today Japanese comprise more than 50% of the total school registration, and about 90% of them attend the separate Japanese schools. In California these schools have about 15,000 pupils, principally in the Los Angeles, San Francisco and Sacramento districts.

In California the Nisei--the second generation Japanese born on American soil--are awakening to the doubtful position as American citizens they must occupy in public opinion if these conditions continue. They find too that the pupils, because of the time demanded by the separate schools, find themselves handicapped in their public school studies; that the knowledge of the Japanese language obtained under the system does not prove adequate in later years; while the additional expense involved is considerable. The belief is entertained by many that if the Japanese language were taught in the public high schools, as are other foreign languages, the young Japanese would obtain a better practical knowledge thereof, and the separate schools might be abandoned. That solution of a serious problem is now receiving consideration in California and to a minor degree in Hawaii.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/29

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
GARfield 2697

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

MEXICAN INDIANS DENIED NATURALIZATION

A Bar to Further Immigration

The U. S. Federal Court at Buffalo, N.Y., John Knight, Judge, has declared Mexican Indians ineligible to American naturalization and therefore inadmissible as immigrants. It held, in a decision rendered December 11, 1935, that they are not included in any of the three categories fixed by the naturalization law, to-wit:--"Aliens being free white persons, and aliens of African nativity, and persons of African descent". The court also held that the Rodriguez decision rendered in Texas in 1897, that Mexicans are white and eligible to citizenship "was not consistent with later decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court".

The decision of the Buffalo Federal Court is an important one because of its effect on our existing relations with Mexico, 40% or more of whose population is Indian. The Immigration Restriction Act of 1924 permitted the entrance as immigrants without quota of all citizens of countries of the Western Hemisphere not otherwise ineligible. Under that provision for several years between 100,000 and 200,000 Mexican immigrants entered the United States annually, legally and illegally. Indians were admitted by the immigration authorities without question because of the order of Secretary of Labor J. J. Davis declaring all Mexicans, regardless of race, eligible to American naturalization.

That order was protested by the California Joint Immigration Committee to Secretary Davis and to his successor Secretary Doak, as in conflict with the rule laid down by the U. S. Supreme Court in the cases of Ozawa (Japanese), 1922, and Thind (high class Hindu), 1923, to the effect that members of the yellow and brown races are not "white persons" within the meaning of the law. That rule, it was claimed, indicated clearly a similar classification for members of the Indian or red race. The protest was supported by a clear cut opinion from State Attorney General U. S. Webb of California. A request for a test case in the matter was denied by both Secretaries.

The Joint Committee protest and Attorney General Webb's opinion were made part of the record in the Buffalo case. The census of 1930 showed over 360,000 Mexican population in California, most of which had been admitted since 1924 and under the Davis order.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Son G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
Garfield 2697

11/70

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

WOULD ADMIT 100,000 INELIGIBLE ASIATICS
A Feature of Hawaiian Statehood

Statehood for Hawaii, now under consideration by Congress, is urged by certain elements in the Territory because Hawaii's influence in Congress would be greatly increased if it had two Senators and a Representative with votes, instead of a single Delegate without vote. Governor Judd, in 1931, in vetoing a legislative resolution therefor, declared that Hawaii would be unwise to accept statehood until experience had shown how the Asiatic majority would use the franchise. (Ref. a)

Among organizations which oppose statehood for clearly defined reasons are the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Federation of Labor, State Grange of California and Native Sons of the Golden West. In 1923 the American Legion in National Convention strongly opposed statehood. (Ref. b)

There are in Hawaii today over 100,000 ineligible, now barred from migration to the mainland (Filipinos and alien first generation Japanese and Chinese) who would be free to settle in any one of the mainland states if and when Hawaii were granted statehood.

It is asserted that Hawaii, as the nation's western outpost, remote from the mainland, should be safeguarded against possibility of disaffection. Its population is 68% Asiatic and 32% Japanese. Japanese now hold the balance of political power. They will in a comparatively short time control absolutely. While American born Japanese who have renounced Japanese citizenship may desire to be loyal Americans, not many could oppose the interests of Japan if there be trouble with that nation.

Under Japan's new nationality law all Japanese born in Hawaii after December 1, 1924, lose Japanese citizenship automatically at birth; but 45% of that number have been reinstated as Japanese citizens by registration at the Japanese Consulate. Of those born prior to the date named only a small minority have availed themselves of the right to divest themselves of Japanese nationality. The remainder, of their own volition, are subject to Japan's orders in peace and in war. (Ref. d)

Over 90% of the young Japanese who are American citizens are compelled to attend the Japanese language schools where they are taught loyalty to the Mikado by Japanese teachers, two-thirds of whom are alien Japanese Shintoists, while the remainder are Japanese of American birth who were instructed by those Shintoists. (Ref. e) It has been publicly charged and not yet denied that Departments of the Japanese Government have announced a plan to distribute in Hawaii's Japanese language schools propaganda concerning "Japan's national defense policy" (Ref. f) and have succeeded in introducing into Hawaiian public schools, with the aid of the Institute of Pacific Relations and endorsement of the Territorial Education Commissioners, a text book on Japan concealing or misstating the facts which American citizens should know. -- See charges filed with the Commissioners of Education of Hawaii, December 11, 1934, (Suppressed); request to Hawaiian Legislature, March 27, 1935, for investigation (pigeonholed); and statement, with exhibits, filed with the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, June 21, 1935 (open to inspection). (Ref. g)

REFERENCES: (a) C.J.I.C. #270; (b) hearing, Sen. Com. Immig., March, 1924, p. 139; (c) C.J.I.C. #423; (d) Honolulu Advertiser, October 13, 1935; (e) C.J.I.C. #425; (f) C.J.I.C. #414; (g) Sacramento Bee, June 21, 1935, C.J.I.C. #426.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons C.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.

11/31

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

JAPAN INVADES THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
What Hawaiian Students are Taught

In June, 1935, Vierling Kersey, Supt. of Public Instruction of California, made public facts concerning a text book on Japan, then in use in the public schools of Honolulu and which was under consideration by the Lincoln Teachers College, Columbia University for use in high schools of continental United States (a). It was charged before the Legislature of Hawaii that the book was an instrument of Japanese propaganda compiled and published under joint auspices of the Society of Cultural Relations of Japan, the Institute of Pacific Relations, and the Department of Education of the Territory, in the belief that "if proper propaganda is systematically carried out in the schools the American children will become strong friends of Japan" (b). . . . Despite authoritative statements in July that the book would be entirely rewritten and mistakes if any, corrected, new protests made in Hawaii in December declare that use of the book has increased (c).

Supt. Kersey has received from the California Joint Immigration Committee an analysis of certain portions of the book substantiating the charges made (d). It is pointed out therein that Chapter V, purporting to give in brief a reliable sketch of the policies, activities and international relations of Japan during the present century is evasive or misleading as to most of the important occurrences. . . . The conquest of Manchuria, creation of the puppet state of Manchukuo, siege of Shanghai and occupation of various districts of Northern China are supposed to be sufficiently covered for the information of inquiring American students by the following paragraph:--"During the World War and afterwards Japan played a part in China utterly different than anything previously known. Japan entered actively into the internal affairs of that great and disorganized country, imposing the 21 demands in 1915, and beginning an economic penetration of the country by lending money and establishing factories." . . . Korea, which was annexed in violation of treaty obligations, receives only two brief mentions, one in connection with the request for two new Army Divisions "to maintain order in Korea", and another in regard to "the cost of maintaining order in a hostile dependency such as Korea". . . . The Nine Power Treaty is dismissed with the statement that "this treaty dealt with maintaining the territorial integrity of China and Open Door trade relations with China". . . . The Chapter closes with the statement that "this brief survey . . . may serve to indicate the growing complexity of the problems of contemporary Japan and their international significance".

In Chapter V, and also at pp. 129 and 150, are statements concerning Japanese immigration to the United States and the "Gentlemen's Agreement", which the Joint Committee declares "are so much at variance with the records of the facts, accessible to anyone, as to discredit the entire book". The text book states that the Gentlemen's Agreement provided for entrance of 200 Japanese annually; that the Agreement was scrupulously kept by Japan; and that the law of 1924, excluding all aliens ineligible to citizenship, "was one of the most unjustifiable and unfortunate pieces of legislation imaginable". In refutation of those statements it is pointed out on the published authority of Pres. Theodore Roosevelt, under whose direction the Gentlemen's Agreement was made, that (1) the Agreement did not permit the entrance of any number of Japanese immigrants per year (2) that it was made for the agreed purpose of excluding Japanese immigration; (3) that to save Japan's "face", instead of passing an exclusion act, as in the case of Chinese immigration, the object was to be secured by Japan so limiting her passports as to exclude all Japanese laborers and to prevent increase of Japanese population in continental United States; (4) that if the plan failed to accomplish those purposes it was to be replaced by an exclusion act (e).

Official records show that the terms of the Agreement were not complied with. Thousands of male laborers were sent over with passports; they were detained at ports of entry, but released under habeas corpus by Federal Courts, which disclaimed jurisdiction; the Agreement being neither law nor treaty; the male laborers were followed by thousands of picture and kankedan brides, nearly all of whom came to labor in the fields and incidentally to increase the population by births. California's protests were unheeded until 1924, when under a nationwide demand, Congress was forced to substitute for the Agreement a general law excluding all aliens ineligible to citizenship--the only one of five plans proposed which would accomplish, without discrimination, the agreed purpose of the Agreement (f).

References: (a) Sacramento Bee, 8-21-35. (b) Japan Times & Mail of Tokyo, 12-4-34; Protest to Commrs. of Education, 12-11-34; C.J.I.C. #414, #432. (d) Letter C.J.I.C. 1-15-36. (e) T. Roosevelt's Autobiog., 411-414; his telegram to Calif. Legis., 2-9-09; Hearing Mar. 1924, Senate Immigration Com.; House Doc. #260, Feb. 1925; House Immigration Rept. 3-24-24. (f) Interview with H. H. H. N.Y. Times 7-14-35; Supt. Gen. Inv. to C.J.I.C. 7-12-35. (438 - 1-20-36)

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/22

James K. Fisk, (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.V.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
GARFIELD 2697

Chas. M. Goettle
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

HAWAIIAN TROUBLES COME TO MAINLAND

Propaganda in Public Schools

In the office of Vierling Kersey, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, at Sacramento, is a copy of a text book on Japan now in use in the public schools of Honolulu and urged by its authors for use in the public schools of California and other mainland states. Accompanying the book is a statement with exhibits from the California Joint Immigration Committee in support of the charge originally made before the Hawaiian Legislature, that the book misrepresents, in the interest of Japan, certain historical facts and available official records in matters of material concern to the United States. The book was prepared and issued under joint sponsorship of the Society of Cultural Relations of Japan, the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education.

Superintendent Kersey called attention of local school authorities in California to the matter. As a result he has been asked to investigate special school courses in two California cities which, it is charged, may be used to similarly deceive the American students.

The Hawaiian book makes various statements as to the "Gentlemen's Agreement", its purpose and operation, including the claim that it authorized the entrance of 200 Japanese immigrants annually, which are criticized as at variance with the records. The Joint Committee's document offers also the following analysis of Chapter V of the book:

In Chapter V, which purports to present a brief sketch of the policies, activities and international relations of Japan during the present century, the conquest of Manchuria, creation of the puppet state of Manchukuo, siege of Shanghai and occupation of various districts of Northern China are supposed to be sufficiently covered for the information of inquiring American students by the following paragraph:--"During the World War and afterwards Japan played a part in China utterly different than anything previously known. Japan entered actively into the internal affairs of that great and disorganized country, imposing the 21 demands in 1915, and beginning an economic penetration of the country by lending money and establishing factories." Korea, which was annexed in violation of treaty obligations, receives only two brief mentions, one in connection with the request for two new Army Divisions "to maintain order in Korea", and another in regard to "the cost of maintaining order in a hostile dependency such as Korea". Japan's action under the Nine Power Treaty is dismissed with the statement that "this treaty dealt with maintaining the territorial integrity of China and Open Door trade relations with China". The Chapter closes with the statement that "this brief survey . . . may serve to indicate the growing complexity of the problems of contemporary Japan and their international significance."

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
Garfield 2697

11/11 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

(Copy)

March 14, 1936.

Commander Walter F. Lafrenz, U.S.N., Chairman,
Sub-section on Asia House, International Relations Section,
Commonwealth Club of California,
San Francisco, California.

Dear Sir:

It is noted that at the meeting of the Sub-section, February 19, Edward C. Carter, Secretary General, Institute of Pacific Relations, and Frederick P. Field, Secretary, American Council of the same organization, explained the plans of the Institute for introducing into 152 high schools of California and into the public schools of other states certain courses on Pacific Relations and Japanese Culture.

Because of the importance of the subject, there are offered herewith for information of the Sub-section, in the shape of documents and references, certain necessary details, which, it is inferred, the speakers did not cover. The plan is undertaken jointly under mutual understanding between the I.P.R. and the Society of International Cultural Relations of Japan, and assumes cooperation of educational authorities in the United States. In the Japan Times and Mail, January 1, 1936, Count Kabayama, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Society named, explains Japan's desires in the matter, and stresses the importance of receiving favorable consideration therefor in our institutions of learning which he regards as the real centers of American culture.

The general plan of collaboration is indicated in an item in the December 4, 1934, issue of the Japan Times and Mail of Tokyo ("English language voice of the Foreign Office of Japan"), reproduced in C.J.I.C. Dec. #409 attached. It is covered more fully in report of a meeting of departmental heads of the Japanese Government held on November 21, 1934, as stated in a protest to the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education, December 11, 1934, (C.J.I.C. Dec. #414 attached).

A practical demonstration of what is intended to be taught American students under the plan is found in the text book on Japan which was in use, notwithstanding repeated protests, in certain public schools of Hawaii throughout the year 1935, and which was personally urged by its co-author for general use in public schools of the mainland. A general idea thereof may be had by reading the attached copy of a letter to the Editor of the Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 11, 1935, and C.J.I.C. Docs. #436 and #443. Copy of #436 was mailed recently to more than 200 members of the American Council, I.P.R..

Copy of the book itself, together with statements and exhibits explaining fully the charges made were deposited with Vierling Kersey, Superintendent of Public Instruction of California at Sacramento, on June 21, 1935, and January 15 and 31, 1936, and duplicates thereof are in the office of the Bay region Group, I.P.R. at San Francisco.

Respectfully,

California Joint Immigration Committee,

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

VSM,FP
cc Members Sub-Section
cc Governors C.C.C.
#446

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
GARfield 2697

11/34

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

(Copy)

March 14, 1936.

Commander Walter F. Lafrenz, U.S.N., Chairman,
Sub-section on Asia House, International Relations Section,
Commonwealth Club of California,
San Francisco, California.

Dear Sir:

It is noted that at the meeting of the Sub-section, February 19, Edward C. Carter, Secretary General, Institute of Pacific Relations, and Frederick P. Field, Secretary, American Council of the same organization, explained the plans of the Institute for introducing into 152 high schools of California and into the public schools of other states certain courses on Pacific Relations and Japanese Culture.

Because of the importance of the subject, there are offered herewith for information of the Sub-section, in the shape of documents and references, certain necessary details, which, it is inferred, the speakers did not cover. The plan is undertaken jointly under mutual understanding between the I.P.R. and the Society of International Cultural Relations of Japan, and assumes cooperation of educational authorities in the United States. In the Japan Times and Mail, January 1, 1936, Count Kabayama, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Society named, explains Japan's desires in the matter, and stresses the importance of receiving favorable consideration therefor in our institutions of learning which he regards as the real centers of American culture.

The general plan of collaboration is indicated in an item in the December 4, 1934, issue of the Japan Times and Mail of Tokyo ("English language voice of the Foreign Office of Japan"), reproduced in C.J.I.C. Dec. #409 attached. It is covered more fully in report of a meeting of departmental heads of the Japanese Government held on November 21, 1934, as stated in a protest to the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education, December 11, 1934. (C.J.I.C. Dec. #414 attached).

A practical demonstration of what is intended to be taught American students under the plan is found in the text book on Japan which was in use, notwithstanding repeated protests, in certain public schools of Hawaii throughout the year 1935, and which was personally urged by its co-author for general use in public schools of the mainland. A general idea thereof may be had by reading the attached copy of a letter to the Editor of the Honolulu Star Bulletin, March 11, 1936, and C.J.I.C. Docs. #438 and #443. Copy of #438 was mailed recently to more than 200 members of the American Council, I.P.R..

Copy of the book itself, together with statements and exhibits explaining fully the charges made were deposited with Vierling Kersay, Superintendent of Public Instruction of California at Sacramento, on June 21, 1935, and January 15 and 31, 1936, and duplicates thereof are in the office of the Bay region Group, I.P.R. at San Francisco.

Respectfully,

California Joint Immigration Committee.

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

VSM,FP
cc Members Sub-Section
cc Governors C.C.C.
#446

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Edward Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2897

11/35 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII
Some of the Pros and Cons

* * * * *

April 22, 1936.

Mr. Lorrin P. Thurston, Gen. Mgr.,
Honolulu Advertiser,
Honolulu, T. H.

Dear Mr. Thurston:

Referring to your letter of April 8th, concerning the problem of statehood for Hawaii. Incidentally it dealt with the statement of the California Joint Immigration Committee to a Section of the Commonwealth Club, March 14, 1936, charging that a text book on Japan in use during 1935 in the public schools of Hawaii, and urged for similar use in continental public schools, is a vehicle of Japanese propaganda, misrepresenting historical facts and available records. That statement of facts, which has met neither denial nor explanation, is offered as an indication of what Japanese influences have accomplished in moulding public opinion and official action in Hawaii. It outlines one phase of the statehood problem.

You suggest that the Joint Committee is unduly excited as to that problem and that its members could better inform themselves as to the facts by a visit to Hawaii. On every subject there is place for honest difference of opinion. In this matter there should be no question as to the material facts, the records of which are available to all, and on which intelligent decision must be based. It is possible that the members of this committee, because they have not close contact with Hawaiian influences, but with full knowledge of the facts, can arrive at a decision more likely to be correct than that which seems popular in Hawaii. Bear in mind that you are one of the few Hawaiian citizens of prominence who has had the courage to publicly concede the existence of some of the pertinent facts and to oppose therefore grant of statehood at this time.

California and Hawaii have long held widely different views on the subject of Asiatic immigration. Thruout the present century Hawaii has continually invited the entrance of a flood of cheap Asiatic labor for permanent settlement in order to produce wealth for plantation owners and commerce for the Islands. In doing so she made it impossible for the Territory to be populated by an assimilable element from the mainland and created conditions which, it is claimed, must work ultimate injury to the Territory and incidentally threaten grave dangers to the Union.

California, forewarned by events in Hawaii, has fought for over 50 years against introduction of Asiatic labor into the mainland. Ample justification for that action was furnished in 1920 by exposure of Japan's elaborate plans for maintaining in California a state within a state, every Japanese, whether alien or American born, being regimented in local associations under control of the Japanese Association of America and direction of Japan's Consulate General at San Francisco to take orders from Japan. (See Brief V. S. McClatchy, prepared for Department of State, 1921, Secs. 196 to 218; also "Japan's Secret Policy", a digest of interviews with

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

1/15

Prof. Yoshi Kuno of the University of California, in the Oakland, Cal., Tribune, October, 1920, reprinted in Senate Document #55, 1921.)

Hawaii, as a result of her policy, faces early control of her political and economic destinies by an overwhelming Japanese plurality, which, it is claimed by some, will act as a thoroughly loyal American citizenry under any and all circumstances. That belief is open to grave doubt. Leading Japanese have declared frankly that our citizens of Japanese ancestry may be confidently relied upon in case of trouble with any nation other than Japan, but that it will be difficult, naturally, for them to oppose Japan.

A. G. M. Robertson, a long time resident of the Territory, who helped frame the Constitution for the Republic in 1894, and was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for a number of years commencing in 1911, appeared at the Sub-Committee hearing at Honolulu in 1935 as an advocate for statehood. He declared, however (see p. 78 of transcript), that "nothing short of a war between the United States and Japan would actually demonstrate the fibre of the Japanese-American population or settle the question of their loyalty to the Stars and Stripes. No one would want such a calamity as war in order to find the answer."

You point out in your letter that the tenor of your published articles on the subject has been "against statehood for the present, based largely on the belief that fifteen or twenty years time will automatically solve any problems incidental to 'loyalties' which are now perhaps questionable". Evidently you do not approve the course advocated by Robertson and others in placing the independent powers of statehood in the hands of a Japanese plurality now and permitting the future to decide whether that policy be wise or an invitation to disaster.

The Hawaiian born Japanese have indicated clearly the difficulty they find in choosing between Japanese and American citizenship by wholesale retention of the Japanese citizenship which, under the new nationality law, they are free to renounce. Governor Joseph Poindexter in a letter to this committee, February 13, 1936, says: "The total number of American citizens of Japanese ancestry [in Hawaii] who have relinquished Japanese citizenship was, as of June 30, 1934, 34,270; approximately 33% of those eligible for expatriation." In other words, two-thirds of the Hawaiian born Japanese at the date named retained, largely on their own election, their Japanese citizenship which made them subject to the orders of Japan in peace and in war.

In the face of these facts, and disregarding your earnest warning, certain influences in Hawaii still press the demand for immediate grant of independent powers of statehood to the Territory. The California Joint Immigration Committee, speaking for California, sees in such plan a grave menace to state and nation, and dispassionately calls attention to the facts, none of which so far have been questioned. Perhaps you and we are not so far apart on the main issue.

With personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

1476

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

E. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
Garfield 2697

Chas. M. Coombs
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

A Hearing Which Did Not Disclose The Facts

May 23, 1936.

Mr. Wm. Dunkerly, Secy.,
Chamber of Commerce,
Pasadena, California.

Dear Mr. Dunkerly:

Mr. Arthur Dudley, Secretary of the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, on return from a few weeks absence in Washington, has sent me your letter of May 1st, with an enclosed report of your Committee on National Affairs, Wm. B. Munro, Acting Chairman, in connection with the Hawaiian statehood question. He requested, as I am familiar with the Honolulu Sub-Committee hearing thereon and he is not, that I comply with your desire for further details in connection with the case.

It is noted that your National Affairs Committee recommends that the Pasadena Chamber of Commerce take no position for or against such statehood, until the question comes up in a form sufficiently definite for intelligent discussion; that the procedure established consumes years before statehood can be finally granted; that the stenographic transcript of the hearing at Honolulu shows the question to be a complicated and many sided one with plenty of room for honest difference of opinion; that the presumably main ground for opposition to such statehood--admission of Asiatics now resident in Hawaii to the mainland--could be guarded against by provisions in the statehood act. etc..

The conclusion reached by your Committee is a natural and reasonable one if the premises on which it is apparently based are admitted. At your request the following suggestions in regard thereto are offered.

The mimeographed copy of the transcript of the hearing at Honolulu is not a complete copy thereof, nor does it offer a fair statement of both sides of the case. It is not even a fair report of the statements and exhibits presented. As to the original complete transcript, the Honolulu Times says editorially in its issue of March 7, 1936:

The Committee [the Sub-Committee which held the Honolulu hearing] gave as its opinion that "it would be conservative to state that a comfortable majority of the citizens of the Territory of Hawaii favor statehood for the islands.

Perhaps. But if the Committee, as is to be assumed, bases that opinion on the evidence and arguments presented during the hearings held in the islands, then it is in point to recall that

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

1436

those hearings were carefully stage-managed by a local pro-statehood committee which gave the inside track to those favoring statehood and made it difficult--indeed, all but impossible---for the opponents to present their case.

The mimeographed transcript shows on its face that it was edited by Prof. D. L. Crawford, President of the University of Hawaii, who is Chairman of the Bi-Partisan Committee of Hawaii, promoting the cause for statehood. He presents therein a ten page summary of the case for statehood, written by himself. A similar summary for the case against statehood, "with many newspaper clippings and photostatic excerpts", by John F. G. Stokes, is referred to at page 731, but is omitted, as is also the evidence of certain other opponents named. Those are to be found, as stated, only in the one copy of the original transcript which is deposited presumably in Washington, and available only to those who can go to Washington. Stokes, who was apparently the main deponent against statehood, was allowed only seven minutes (see pp. 325 to 333), and he made in that time some grave charges which call for investigation.

The statistics which appear in the transcript were furnished by the Bi-Partisan Committee for Statehood. They show notable omissions of pertinent facts. For instance, there is no presentation of statistics concerning the serious problem of dual citizenship--two-thirds of all the Japanese born in Hawaii and enjoying American citizenship have failed to expatriate and are still bound to Japan (see the letter of Governor Joseph Poindexter to the California Joint Immigration Committee, February 15, 1936); the Japanese language schools and the inability of the Territorial Government to control them is briefly referred to, but no mention is made of the fact that the alien Shinto Buddhist instructors therein are teaching loyalty to the Mikado to 90% of the young Japanese in the Territory, who are American citizens. All of these matters are important in connection with the grant of independent statehood, and some of them were commented on and the facts presented by the Honolulu Advertiser during the hearing.

It is undoubtedly a fact--it was so charged in the course of the hearing and in certain of the Honolulu newspapers--that powerful influences were exercised to prevent presentation by those well qualified to speak, as to the facts which would justify opposition to statehood. The situation was made so unpleasant for those who oppose statehood that most of them did not appear before the Committee and the few who did were offered little opportunity for presentation of facts. For that reason even the lone transcript of hearing at Washington is not dependable as basis for final judgment.

Concerning the suggestion that Congress in granting statehood may bar undesirable aliens from the mainland; California's recent experience has demonstrated that one state of the Union may not exclude from admission the residents tolerated by any other state; and that therefore California could not exclude alien Asiatics now residents of Hawaii if it became a state.

While it is true, as the Committee suggests, that a few years will elapse before final action is taken by Congress and the people in this matter, the ruling influences in Hawaii seek in the meanwhile, by propaganda and concealment of the facts, to convert public opinion. It is easier to educate a man by presentation of the facts before he has reached a decision than to convert him after he has formed an adverse opinion. The mimeographed copy of the transcript of the Honolulu hearing, for reasons indicated, is a very effective instrument for propaganda in favor of statehood. Another is the University of Hawaii debating team, sent out by President Crawford for debate of the subject with teams of the various universities and colleges of the mainland. Their presentation of the facts against opponents who are not well advised is calculated to assure audiences, and

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/76

the public thru newspaper publicity, that the best interests of the nation would be served by the grant of statehood at this time to Hawaii. If that is not true, the time to convince the public thereof is now, not after it has been converted to the opposite opinion. Chambers of Commerce thruout the country will undoubtedly look to their Committees on National Affairs, or similar committees, for investigation and advice.

In the few minutes allowed him before the Sub-Committee, Mr. Stokes quoted historical occurrences to show the intent of Japan as to securing control of Hawaii, first by annexation, then by warship threat and finally thru a flood of forced emigration. Japan's history shows that she does not change her plans. She bides her time to carry them out, and other nations should, if wise, act accordingly. She maintained in California for many years prior to 1924 a state within a state wherein every American born Japanese was compelled under regimentation to do Japan's will (see Brief prepared for consideration of the Department of State, 1921, Secs. 196 to 218). The text book used in 1935 in some of the public schools of Honolulu, and urged for adoption in public schools thruout the mainland of the United States, is shown now to be a piece of Japanese propaganda. It was promoted and prepared thru joint cooperation of the Society of Cultural Relations of Japan, the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Educational Department of the Territory. (See the book and statement in connection therewith made to the Superintendent of Public Instruction of California, June 21, 1935, and to Asia House Sub-Section of the Commonwealth Club of California, March 14, 1936.)

Louis R. Sullivan, who made biological researches in Hawaii thru 1920 and 1921, on behalf of the American Museum of Natural History and the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, in an article in "Asia" Magazine, March, 1922, stated that "it has been predicted that in the natural course of events the Japanese will control the electorate by 1940". The Japanese in 1934 had already passed every other racial group in the number of registered voters, a fact which the statistics offered by the Bi-Partisan Committee on Statehood conceal by apparently combining the figures for three groups, "Hawaiian", "Caucasian-Hawaiian" and "Asiatic Hawaiian".

In view of these and other facts of similar import it is believed by many who have given considerable time and thought to investigation of the subject that the grant of statehood to Hawaii should be indefinitely postponed until such time as it can be affirmatively proved that there is no chance of danger to state or national interest, now or in the future, involved therein.

If further information is desired by the Chamber or its Committee on points made in this communication and only briefly outlined it will be a pleasure to furnish them on request.

Truly yours,

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

VSM:DK

#452

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/17

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

E. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California.
GARFIELD 2697

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

DANGERS CREATED BY JAPANESE DUAL CITIZENSHIP

A serious problem exists, particularly in Hawaii and California, because most of the Japanese born under the American flag and exercising the right of American citizenship still elect to retain Japanese citizenship with its obligations, altho they are now free to expatriate. It is charged that many of these dual citizens would use their American citizenship under direction or influence to further the purposes of Japan.

As late as the early 1920's, Japan maintained in California a state within a state in which every Japanese, whether alien or native born American citizen, was under orders of Japan, in peace and in war. He was forced to belong to a local association subject to the Japanese Association of America and all under control of the Consul General of Japan at San Francisco. (Senate Doc. #55, 1921, p. 63; also Japanese Immigration and Colonization - V. S. McClatchy, 1921, Secs. 196 to 218.)

Publication of the facts and the passage in 1924 of that provision of the immigration restriction act excluding as immigrants all aliens ineligible to American citizenship induced Japan to put into operation on December 1, 1924, a new nationality law. Under that law Japanese born in the United States after the date named automatically lost Japanese citizenship unless within 14 days they were registered at the Japanese Consulate. The law further provided that those so registered, as well as those born here before December, 1924, could renounce Japanese citizenship by declaration at the Japanese Consulate after reaching their 20th year.

Under that system it was assumed that dual citizenship would disappear if the Japanese themselves really desired to renounce all obligations to Japan as the price for American citizenship. The records prove, however, that various factors, including the insistence of the first generation, the pull of heredity, the Japanese law of family, the teachings of alien Buddhist instructors in the Japanese language schools, and the encouraged study of "Japanese culture", tend to nullify the purpose of the law. In Hawaii, for instance, "the total number of American citizens of Japanese ancestry who had relinquished Japanese citizenship was, as of June 30, 1934, 34,270, approximately 33% of those eligible for expatriation". Of that number 28,459 are Japanese born since December 1, 1924, who lost Japanese citizenship automatically at birth under the terms of the law; 5,811 is the total number of those who lost Japanese citizenship by formal declaration at the Consulate after reaching the age of 20 years. (Letter of Gov. Joseph Poindexter to California Joint Immigration Committee, February 15, 1936.) In other words, two-thirds of the Hawaiian-born Japanese still retain their Japanese citizenship with all obligations thereof. That situation is attracting special attention because the Territory is now asking for statehood, and the Japanese who constitute 38% of the total population have already passed every other racial group in the number of registered voters.

In California it must be assumed that conditions as to dual citizenship are somewhat similar, although the figures are not available because the Consulate General at San Francisco no longer keeps statistics of such matters, as was formerly done. (Letter Shuh Tomii, Consul General of Japan at San Francisco, December 19, 1935.)

The following facts in connection with the California situation are of interest. The Japanese American Citizens League, a powerful organization with approximately 50 Chapters in the Pacific States, has for its main proclaimed purpose the training of American born Japanese so that they may properly discharge their obligations as American citizens. The League admits to membership without question, however, all Japanese born under our flag, many if not most of whom, it would seem, still retain Japanese citizenship. It even admits the "Kibei Shimin", Japanese born here and sent in early childhood to Japan and there brought up to manhood and womanhood as Japanese citizens. They are, to all intents and purposes when they return here, alien Japanese immigrants who have the privileges of American citizenship. Japanese authorities place the total number of Kibei Shimin at between 40,000 and 50,000, and say they are returning now at the rate of 1,000 per year. The Japanese Association of America is planning to bring back at once to California all the Kibei Shimin still in Japan who will come.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/78

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Edward D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N.S.G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, Calif.
GARfield 2697

C. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

CALIFORNIA JAPANESE URGE DROPPING OF RACIAL BARS

A number of articles have appeared recently in the Japanese vernacular press of California, urging adoption by Congress of various amendments to the present laws so as to make Japanese eligible for immigration and naturalization. In instances these articles were written by Nisei (Japanese who claim American citizenship by birth) and by members of the Japanese American Citizens League, which was organized as indicated by its by-laws, for the purpose of fitting its members for faithful performance of their duties as American citizens.

Among the specific measures thus urged by California Japanese are the following (a) naturalization for alien Japanese now residing here (b) entrance as immigrants for relatives of Japanese residing here, whether alien or Nisei (c) entrance of alien Japanese women for wives of resident Japanese (d) repeal of the state alien land laws (e) repeal of the 1924 exclusion measure and grant of immigration quota to Japan (f) such change in our naturalization law as will remove all disabilities from the colored races of Asia and automatically put in operation the measures above suggested.

The line of argument offered in support of the elaborate program outlined is in effect as follows: since the Japanese war veterans have been granted naturalization, that privilege should not be withheld from other Japanese who have lived here many years and would make equally good citizens; if such resident Japanese are granted citizenship they should not be refused the privilege of bringing over their alien relatives from Japan to share their good fortune, and a similar privilege should certainly be granted to the Nisei now enjoying American citizenship; and as the adoption of these two plans will in effect nullify the objectionable features of the act of 1924 and of the century and a half old naturalization law, these measures may as well be repealed now and save time and trouble.

Interesting facts in connection with the subject are presented in a statement of the California Joint Immigration Committee (Doc. #451) explaining the practical effect of the present system of dual citizenship in Hawaii and in California (in Hawaii two-thirds of the American-born Japanese still retain their Japanese citizenship, with the obligations thereof); and in a letter of the Joint Committee to the Japanese American News of San Francisco, June 12, 1936, answering a defense of such dual citizenship.

#453
6-25-36

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

4/29

JAPAN'S PROPAGANDA MACHINE

HOW IT WORKS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF HAWAII AND CALIFORNIA

The attached correspondence between the Secretary of the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, and the Executive Secretary of the California Joint Immigration Committee constitutes Exhibit (c) of C.J.I.C. Doc. #456, "Japanese Propaganda in the Public Schools". It concedes--on the part of the promoters and authors of a certain text book on Japan, used in public schools of Hawaii during the year 1935--the justice of the charge that such book contains misrepresentation of facts which make it in effect an instrument of propaganda in Japan's behalf. It refers also to similar efforts to introduce into the public schools of California text books of similar tendency.

#458-a

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/29

JAPAN'S PROPAGANDA MACHINE

HOW IT WORKS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF HAWAII AND CALIFORNIA

The attached correspondence between the Secretary of the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, and the Executive Secretary of the California Joint Immigration Committee constitutes Exhibit (c) of C.J.I.C. Doc. #456, "Japanese Propaganda in the Public Schools". It concedes--on the part of the promoters and authors of a certain text book on Japan, used in public schools of Hawaii during the year 1935--the justice of the charge that such book contains misrepresentation of facts which make it in effect an instrument of propaganda in Japan's behalf. It refers also to similar efforts to introduce into the public schools of California text books of similar tendency.

#458-a

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/79

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
65 Second Street
San Francisco, California
GARFIELD 2697

Chas. M. Goetho
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

(Copy)

Mr. Frederick V. Field, Secy.,
American Council,
Institute of Pacific Relations,
129 E. 52nd St.,
New York City.

Ediphoned Tahoe City, July 29,
Transcribed at San Francisco.
August 1, 1936.

Dear Mr. Field:

Your letter of June 30th contains the first intimation received that the executives of the American Council, I.P.R., regard with anything but stern disapproval our criticism of the text book on Japan sponsored by that organization and used in certain public schools of Hawaii in 1935. Your frank acknowledgement of the justice of that criticism merited prompt personal acknowledgement, if not answer, but since June 15th, while enjoying a prescribed rest here, I have not attended to office work.

Your letter concedes that the book does indeed, as charged, misrepresent or conceal the facts as to provisions and operation of the Gentleman's Agreement and as to Japan's policy and activities during the present century; also that we were right in questioning the procedure under which material for the book was gathered under auspices of the Society for International Cultural Relations of Japan; and you advise that use of the book has been discontinued, and a new unit written with aid of American authors.

You are kind enough to say that we did a service in pointing out those and similar errors and that you are grateful therefor. You feel, however that this committee has taken unnecessary steps in giving the subject wide publicity before assuring itself as to whether the I.P.R. executives "are earnestly seeking accuracy". You feel too that we "on several occasions have engaged in a crusade against one or other of your projects and by implication against the entire organization." In justice to this committee and with a frankness inspired by your own permit me to call your attention to the facts, and to suggest that careful consideration will perhaps induce you to withdraw that criticism.

The California Joint Immigration Committee is maintained by its supporting organizations--California bodies of the American Legion, Federation of Labor, Native Sons--for the purpose of defending and promoting effective operation of the law excluding from permanent settlement aliens ineligible to American citizenship. That law is the only effective barrier against peaceful penetration by the unassimilable races of Asia; and the California Joint Committee is performing without compensation to its members a valuable service to state and nation. Like any other agency performing a similar service it must at times take steps or offer criticism which run counter to the views or interests of some individuals or groups.

Japan in recent years has sought, with aid of American friends, many of them acting innocently, to undermine that law and secure entrance for her immigrants by a system of propaganda designed to mislead public opinion. That program culminated in a bold plan to introduce into our public school system, under the guise of study of Pacific Relations and Japanese culture courses and text books which would convert American students to the Japanese point of view. The plan was frankly outlined in the Japan Times in December, 1934, and in the utterances of Japanese officials, as publicly charged and not denied. The text book introduced under auspices of the I.P.R. in Hawaii offers a striking illustration of the plan and the methods followed.

The book and the plan were subjects of protest before the Commissioners of Education of the Territory in December, 1934, and of petition to the Legislature in

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/79

March, 1935. The protest was suppressed and the petition was pigeonholed, the covered in reports of the news agencies. Use of the book in Honolulu continued and the co-author, a representative of the I.P.R., was sent to Columbia University at New York to secure endorsement for its use in the public schools of continental United States. On June 21, 1935, the Joint Committee filed with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of California a statement of the case, and copies thereof were sent to the San Francisco headquarters of the I.P.R. and to the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Hawaii.

In July the representative of the I.P.R., still at Columbia University, defended the book in a published interview, the press in Hawaii abused the Joint Committee for calling attention to the facts, while the executives of the I.P.R. said nothing and, so far as this committee was advised at the time, did nothing. Finally a statement of the case was mailed to each of some 200 members of the American Council I.P.R., and thru them presumably, the executives were induced to act.

You will recall informing a Sub-Section of the Commonwealth Club of California in February, 1936, that the I.P.R. had arranged to introduce into 152 public schools of California courses on Pacific Relations and Japanese Culture. You did not, of course, know that Japan was improving that opportunity by securing recognition in Los Angeles of a guide book for teachers in such courses prepared by an official agent of Japan and recommending K.K. Kawakami, Japan's longtime propagandist in this country, as reliable authority on history and policies of Japan; and that the Society for International Cultural Relations was providing for some leading schools of Southern California books of reference and Japanese instructors to properly inform the students.

As you know, the I.P.R., at its biennial sessions has been steadily urged by its Japanese delegates, many of whom competently represent the Society for Cultural Relations, to give consideration to such matters as "racial equality", "Universal right of migration", and "international control of immigration". At the 1935 session at Banff a resolution was offered, calling for appointment of a special committee to report on "international control of immigration". Those matters do not appear in the published proceedings, but the effects thereof can be seen in the attitude of many members of the American Council who have no opportunity to hear the other side from sources well informed thereon.

The facts above presented and the connection between them are not generally known, but with the fairness of mind so evident in your letter, you will concede that anyone knowing them and concerned in protecting our public school system against foreign propaganda designed to attack national policy and national law, would reach certain conclusions and act upon them. He would feel that an author who would, either deliberately or misled by others, so falsify or misrepresent available records as was done in the Hawaiian text book, should not be permitted to take part in any way in preparation of text or reference books for use in public schools.

He would feel that an organization which, regardless of the high character of individual members thereof, was responsible for preparation and introduction of the text book referred to under the auspices and in the manner indicated by the facts, could not, with propriety, be entrusted with the duty of providing courses on Pacific Relations for use in 152 public schools of California.

He would feel that an organization which sought even by extreme publicity to prevent consummation of the plan so clearly indicated was performing a public service and should be supported therein.

It is fair to assume that you did not know, or did not realize, what certain factors within the I.P.R. organization were doing; and your letter justifies the confidence with which this frank statement of the situation, as it must appear to others, is presented for consideration.

Permit me to express personally confidence in your sincerity and admiration for your courage and spirit.

Very sincerely,

#458

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.
California Joint Immigration Committee

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

1/29

(COPY)

AMERICAN COUNCIL
INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS
NEW YORK CITY

129 E 52nd St.

Officers

Carl L. Alsberg, Chairman
Wallace M. Alexander, Vice Chmn.
Miss Ada L. Comstock, Vice Chmn.
Frederick V. Field, Secy.
Chas. J. Rhodes, Treas.
Miss Hilda Austern, Asst. Treas.

Dear Mr. McClatchy:

June 30, 1936

I have before me a considerable amount of correspondence which has come to the office and to Mr. Carter's office from you during the last few months.

I should first of all like to assure you most earnestly that we are always grateful for the correction of error in tentative or final drafts of our literature. You have done us a service in pointing out certain mistakes in the first draft of the high school text book on Japan and we are grateful to you for doing it. Unquestionably the references to the Gentlemen's Agreement in the mimeographed Hawaiian study serial were erroneous, and there were also other doubtful interpretations. In looking back over my file I am sorry to find that suitable acknowledgement was not made promptly to you for pointing out these mistakes. I think that perhaps this was due to the public nature of your statements, and to your seeming distrust of the good faith of the Institute of Pacific Relations in its educational activities. Meanwhile, as you doubtless have been informed, because of our own dissatisfaction with the material prepared for the Hawaiian school system, the text on Japan as well as the one on China have been abandoned and new units written with the aid of American authorities.

You are quite right in questioning the procedure under which further material for the enlightenment of American youth was being collected last year under the auspices of the Society for International Cultural Relations in Japan. The idea proved unworkable and the Society has given up the project. In its justification it should be added, however, that the sponsorship which the Japanese Society came to assume in this project was not originally of its own desire, but resulted from the recognition by American members of the I.P.R., of which I was one, of the Society's exceptional facilities for helping to meet a lack which was felt by many American school men, namely of descriptive teaching material about contemporary Japan which was both authentic and in form suitable for juvenile reading. The American Council will now endeavor to meet this need without Japanese cooperation from literary resources available in this country.

Let me again emphasize the point that we always welcome suggestions as to how our work may be improved. It is specifically for this reason that we often issue our publications in a tentative draft to allow plenty of time for criticism before the final manuscript is prepared. Insofar as you have taken the trouble to perform exactly this task for us on a number of occasions, we are grateful. We are sorry, however, that you find it necessary to go far beyond the procedure of pointing out to us our mistakes and that on several occasions you have engaged in a crusade against one or another of our projects and by implication against the entire organization. It seems to us quite unnecessary, in view of our eagerness to receive suggestions, to carry the question to as wide a public as you can command before first assuring yourself as to whether or not we are honestly seeking accuracy.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.
California Joint Immigration Committee
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California

s/d Frederick V. Field

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Paul Scharrenberg
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
GARfield 2697

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

(C O P Y)

August 15, 1936.

A CRITICISM OF "PACIFIC RELATIONS" - Hoffman

Hon. Vierling Kersey,
Superintendent of Public Instruction,
Sacramento, California.

Dear Sir:

In connection with the attempt to introduce Japanese propaganda into the public schools, first called to your attention in June, 1935, permit us to submit herewith a statement with exhibits concerning "Pacific Relations", by Walter Gayley Hoffman, a text book for use in the public schools, and already in use, it is stated, in some of the California schools. The author, as appears from the title page, is now connected with the public schools of Los Angeles and was formerly Director of Curriculum in the Chico High School. It is understood that he outlined the course on Pacific Relations now used in the Chico School.

Apparently that book, so far as concerns its treatment of the subject of Japanese immigration, is intended, as was the Hawaiian text book on Japan, to deceive the student as to the facts, and as to the proper conclusions to be drawn therefrom; and to make of him an innocent ally in securing abandonment of our national policy for exclusion of all unassimilable Asiatic immigration. The book fits in, whether intentionally or not, with the general plan to which your attention has been called already.

That plan was exposed in protest to the Hawaiian Commissioners of Education in December, 1934; to the Hawaiian Legislature in March, 1935; and to your office by a statement and exhibits from this committee on June 21, 1935. It was charged therein--and has never been denied--that at a Departmental Conference of the Japanese Government on the 21st of November, 1934, Mr. Setsuechi Aoki, General Secretary of the International Cultural Relations Society, said, "For several years the school heads of Hawaii and America, with the aid of many more influential educators and missionaries, made a thorough survey of American text books for the Japanese society. The survey revealed that if proper propaganda is systematically carried out in the schools the American children will become strong friends of Japan". Mr. Okada, head of the Bureau of Cultural Relations, and former Consul General of Hawaii, was quoted as stating, "That all the necessary arrangements have been made with the department of public instruction, also with the various religious and social leaders of Hawaii." The Japan Times ("English Language Voice of Japan's Foreign Office") in its issue of December 4, 1934, declared that "The Society of International Cultural Relations at its meeting Monday afternoon decided on a plan to be followed for the compilation of school text books to be used at high schools in the United States for diffusing correct information on Japan". It stated also that the collecting and provisional compilation of material for the purpose would be done by a committee in Japan, and then referred to the representative of the Institute of Pacific Relations before submission to a joint Japanese-American committee for final use. (C.J.I.C. Docs. #414 - #409)

It was charged that in furtherance of that plan the Institute of Pacific Relations, with the aid of the Society for Cultural Relations of Japan and the Department of Education of Hawaii, prepared a text book on Japan which was used in the Honolulu public schools, notwithstanding protest, during 1935; that, thru gross misrepresentation therein of facts concerning the Gentlemen's Agreement and its operation, and Japan's policy and activities during the present century, the authors sought

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/40

to persuade the students that the United States should abandon its exclusion policy and open the gates to Japanese immigration.

In that and in later statements and exhibits offered for your consideration it was shown that efforts were made to have the book endorsed for general use in public schools of continental United States; that the executives of the Institute of Pacific Relations announced in February, 1936, that that organization had arranged to have courses in Pacific Relations and Japanese Culture introduced into 152 public high schools of California; that there had already been introduced into the public schools of Los Angeles, for guidance of teachers in such proposed courses, a book written by a diplomatic attache of Japan and manifestly intended to induce favorable consideration of Japan's point of view; that the Society for Cultural Relations of Japan had arranged to present to certain schools in Southern California books of reference "to correctly advise students" as to Japan's policies and acts; that on June 30, 1936, a year and a half after the first protest in regard thereto had been made, the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, thru its Secretary, made acknowledgement that the criticism of its text book on Hawaii was correct, and announced that the book had been withdrawn from use and would be rewritten.

No one will question the advisability of having in the high schools courses which will correctly inform the pupils as to our neighbors on the Pacific with which relations are becoming always closer, and particularly as to their history and activities during the present century, their aspirations and established policies. But certainly every precaution should be taken that, under the guise of information, there is not contained, in text or reference book, propaganda in the interest of a foreign nation designed to further its purpose by creating false impressions in the minds of the students.

"Pacific Relations", by Walter G. Hoffman, may or may not have been inspired by the influences and policy which produced the text book on Japan as used in Hawaii; but so far as concerns the chapter devoted to Japanese immigration at page 361, it serves a similar purpose, i.e., to deceive the student as to facts and thereby make of him a "strong friend of Japan". The purpose of the author, as declared in the preface, is to so present facts with pictures of existing conditions and past events that the student may appraise current events accurately. But, in the chapter referred to, there is careful presentation of Japan's point of view, and as careful omission of the facts which furnish complete answer thereto. The student who relies upon this text book for accurate information as to the Japanese immigration question cannot be blamed for believing that the United States is wrong in the position it has taken.

In verification of the charge made herein there are enclosed (1) copy of the Chapter on "Emigration"; (2) reference to some of the important facts omitted by the author but necessary to a knowledge of the subject; C.J.I.C. #455, "Why Immigration Quota Should Not Be Granted To Japan", covering briefly the reasons which actuated Congress in passing the 1924 law, and in declining since, notwithstanding repeated requests, to take up reconsideration thereof.

In conclusion the California Joint Immigration Committee, representing the State bodies of the American Legion, the State Federation of Labor and the Native Sons of the Golden West, respectfully urges that use or recognition in the public schools should be refused to any text book which misrepresents known facts concerning matters of grave import to the United States; and that authors of such books, or agencies which are responsible for the production or introduction thereof should not have place or authority in connection with public school curricula.

Respectfully,

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

James K. Fisk, Chairman

Encs.

#460

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

E. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N. S. G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
GARfield 2697

11/41 Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Released

Sacramento, Calif.
August 20, 1936.

JAPANESE PROPAGANDA IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In a statement with exhibits filed with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Vierling Kerscy, by the California Joint Immigration Committee it is charged that a recent text book on "Pacific Relations", by Walter G. Hoffman, so misrepresents or conceals facts in connection with the subject of Japanese immigration that the student will be led to believe that the United States should yield to Japan's demand for admission of such immigration. Accompanying the statement is a brief of those facts bearing on the subject, which have been omitted by the author and which, it is claimed, answer conclusively the pleas put forth on behalf of Japan.

The statement declares that the chapter on "Emigration" in the Hoffman book, thus becomes, whether with deliberate intention of the author or not, an instrument in Japan's frankly announced plan for introduction of propaganda into our public schools.

That plan was exposed in protest against the use in Hawaiian public schools, and the proposed use in California and other states, of a certain text book on Japan, because of concealment or misrepresentation of well known facts as made therein. Those protests were made to the Hawaiian Department of Education in December, 1934; to the Hawaiian Legislature in March, 1935, and to the Superintendent of Public Instruction of California on June 21, 1935.

It appeared therefrom that at a Departmental Conference of the Japanese Government heads at Tokyo, on November 21, 1934, it was reported by the Secretary of the International Cultural Relations Society, that a survey, made in Hawaii and the United States with aid of Educators and Missionaries, "revealed that, if proper propaganda is systematically carried out in the schools, the American children will become strong friends of Japan". At the same meeting the head of the Cultural Relations Bureau stated that "All the necessary arrangements have been made with the Public Instruction [Department] and also with the various religious and social leaders in Hawaii". (a) The Japan Times ("English Language Voice of Japan's Foreign Office") in its issue of December 4, 1934, declared that "The Society of International Cultural Relations at its meeting Monday afternoon decided on a plan to be followed for the compilation of school text books to be used at high schools in the United States for diffusing correct information on Japan". It stated also that the collecting and provisional compilation of material for the purpose would be done by a committee in Japan, and then referred to the representative of the Institute of Pacific Relations before submission to a joint Japanese-American committee for final use. (b)

Under that plan the text book on Japan referred to was prepared in Honolulu by representatives of the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Hawaiian Department of Education, with assistance of Prof. Misemichi Royama, of the Imperial University of Tokyo, and was used during 1935 in the Hawaiian public schools. It was not until June 1936, that, as a result of the protest referred to and the publicity occasioned thereby, the Institute of Pacific Relations, thru the Secretary of the American Council, acknowledged that criticism of the text book was justified and that it had been withdrawn from use. (c)

In February, 1936, executives of the Institute of Pacific Relations made announcement in San Francisco that the organization had arranged for introduction into 152 public high schools of California of courses on Pacific Relations and Japanese Culture. The Joint Committee's statement, while recognizing the desirability of courses which will reliably inform high school students as to the history, activities, policies and aspirations of our neighbors on the other side of the Pacific, calls attention to the fact that the plan fostered by the Institute of Pacific Relations has already been used to secure introduction of text and reference books which not only misled the student, but are intended to further purposes inimical to the United States.

It urges therefore that the Hoffman book and similar books of reference which give entirely one-sided pictures of policies and activities of Japan, and of the relations between the two countries, be excluded from public school use; and that agencies responsible for preparation or introduction of such books be barred from any connection with public school curricula. (d) (e)

Ref. (a) C.J.I.C. Doc. #409; C.J.I.C. Doc. #414; Letter F. V. Field, Secy. American Council I.P.R. to C.J.I.C., June 30, 1936, and reply thereto, July 29, 1936.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

142

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

E. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N.S.G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2697

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

DUAL CITIZENSHIP ON THE PACIFIC COAST

The following statement of the California Joint Immigration Committee, maintained by California bodies of the American Legion, Federation of Labor and Native Sons of the Golden West, appeared in the Japanese American News of San Francisco, June 14th, 1936. It was made in reply to various articles in the Japanese American News and other Japanese Vernacular newspapers criticizing the Joint Committee for calling attention to the dual citizenship of Japanese Americans in California and Hawaii, and to the complications and misunderstandings liable to result therefrom.

* * * * *

(C O P Y)

The Editor, Japanese American News.

June 12, 1936.

Dear Sir:

In the Japanese American News of June 10th appeared several articles criticizing the California Joint Immigration Committee and its management because of recent statement of facts made by it in regard to the serious problem of dual citizenship. There is evident misunderstanding on the part of the News and its editors as to the action and intent of the Joint Committee in a matter which vitally concerns California citizens of Japanese and Caucasian ancestry between whom friendly and cordial relations now exist.

The Joint Committee does not question the right of the Japanese American Citizens League to admit to membership any Japanese, American citizen by birth, whether he has lived his life in this state or was brought up in Japan as a Japanese citizen. It did suggest the impropriety, in an organization for promotion of American citizenship among its members, of admitting those who showed preference for Japanese citizenship by declining or failing to avail themselves of the opportunity of renouncing obligations to Japan. It will not be disputed that under certain conditions no man can be at the same time loyal to both Japan and the United States.

If it be true, as stated, that the records will show that a large portion of the membership of the Citizens League is voluntarily bound as strongly to Japan as to the United States, there is certain to arise in the minds of California citizenry generally a doubt as to the sincerity of the Nisei as a group. That difficulty was recognized, officially and publicly, by a district convention of the League two years ago when it, by resolution, urged members of the organization who still retained Japanese citizenship to rid themselves thereof under the simple procedure provided. How many, if any, have since done so is not known. The statistics for California have not been published and they are not available at the Japanese Consulate. But the Governor of Hawaii reports that two-thirds of the Japanese born in that Territory still retain Japanese citizenship.

It is said, and apparently not denied, that no one is refused admission to the Citizens League because he prefers to retain his Japanese citizenship with all its obligations. It is argued, however, that the most effective way of converting those dual citizens is to admit them to the comradeship of the League and instruct them in American citizenship. On the other hand, it is common knowledge that unity in any

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/42

organization may be destroyed by admitting to its active membership a number whose views are in direct opposition to the organization's proclaimed policy.

That the seriousness of the situation is realized by some at least in the League is evidenced by the action of the League district convention two years ago, as referred to above. The California Joint Committee has refrained until now from calling attention to the matter, and its frank statement of the facts, now criticized in the News columns, is in the nature of constructive criticism. Its respect and admiration for the California Nisei have been sufficiently attested by continued cooperative efforts between the two for mutual benefit in the interests of the state and of the two friendly nations. There is no reason that its intent in this matter should be misunderstood or mistrusted.

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

James K. Fisk, Chairman

#465
9-1-36

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/43

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

E. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N.S.G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2697

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

DUAL CITIZENSHIP ON THE PACIFIC COAST

The following statement of the California Joint Immigration Committee, maintained by California bodies of the American Legion, Federation of Labor and Native Sons of the Golden West, appeared in the Japanese American News of San Francisco, June 14th, 1936. It was made in reply to various articles in the Japanese American News and other Japanese Vernacular newspapers criticizing the Joint Committee for calling attention to the dual citizenship of Japanese Americans in California and Hawaii, and to the complications and misunderstandings liable to result therefrom.

* * * * *

(C O P Y)

The Editor, Japanese American News.

June 12, 1936.

Dear Sir:

In the Japanese American News of June 10th appeared several articles criticizing the California Joint Immigration Committee and its management because of recent statement of facts made by it in regard to the serious problem of dual citizenship. There is evident misunderstanding on the part of the News and its editors as to the action and intent of the Joint Committee in a matter which vitally concerns California citizens of Japanese and Caucasian ancestry between whom friendly and cordial relations now exist.

The Joint Committee does not question the right of the Japanese American Citizens League to admit to membership any Japanese, American citizen by birth, whether he has lived his life in this state or was brought up in Japan as a Japanese citizen. It did suggest the impropriety, in an organization for promotion of American citizenship among its members, of admitting those who showed preference for Japanese citizenship by declining or failing to avail themselves of the opportunity of renouncing obligations to Japan. It will not be disputed that under certain conditions no man can be at the same time loyal to both Japan and the United States.

If it be true, as stated, that the records will show that a large portion of the membership of the Citizens League is voluntarily bound as strongly to Japan as to the United States, there is certain to arise in the minds of California citizenry generally a doubt as to the sincerity of the Nisei as a group. That difficulty was recognized, officially and publicly, by a district convention of the League two years ago when it, by resolution, urged members of the organization who still retained Japanese citizenship to rid themselves thereof under the simple procedure provided. How many, if any, have since done so is not known. The statistics for California have not been published and they are not available at the Japanese Consulate. But the Governor of Hawaii reports that two-thirds of the Japanese born in that Territory still retain Japanese citizenship.

It is said, and apparently not denied, that no one is refused admission to the Citizens League because he prefers to retain his Japanese citizenship with all its obligations. It is argued, however, that the most effective way of converting those dual citizens is to admit them to the comradeship of the League and instruct them in American citizenship. On the other hand, it is common knowledge that unity in any

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/43

organization may be destroyed by admitting to its active membership a number whose views are in direct opposition to the organization's proclaimed policy.

That the seriousness of the situation is realized by some at least in the League is evidenced by the action of the League district convention two years ago, as referred to above. The California Joint Committee has refrained until now from calling attention to the matter, and its frank statement of the facts, now criticized in the News columns, is in the nature of constructive criticism. Its respect and admiration for the California Nisei have been sufficiently attested by continued cooperative efforts between the two for mutual benefit in the interests of the state and of the two friendly nations. There is no reason that its intent in this matter should be misunderstood or mistrusted.

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

James K. Fisk, Chairman

#463
9-1-36

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/44

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Edward D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons Golden West

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
65 Second Street
San Francisco, Calif.
GARfield 2697

C. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.
Hon. U.S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

WHY DENY IMMIGRATION QUOTA TO JAPAN?

In order to avoid recurrence of the serious conditions existing in California prior to the enactment of Section 13 (c) of the 1924 immigration restriction act excluding aliens ineligible to citizenship as permanent immigrants to the United States it is imperative that the young men and women of this state, unfamiliar with conditions then existing, fully inform themselves as to the actual facts upon which passage of that law was based.

Many individuals and organizations interested in evangelization, trade, world peace, etc., are attempting to obtain Japan's good will by seconding her efforts to effect repeal of the exclusion provision. Propaganda designed to develop a friendly attitude toward Japan, misleading in character when not distorting the truth, has been disseminated thru the public press, in a text book used in the schools of Hawaii and otherwise, by those agencies. An attempt is now being made to introduce courses in Pacific Relations and Japanese Culture into public schools of California under a plan formulated in Japan (C.J.I.C. Doc. #414), and the California Joint Immigration Committee has sent two formal protests to the California Superintendent of Public Education concerning text books containing misleading Japanese propaganda.

In order to obtain a knowledge of the facts and conditions that resulted in enactment of the exclusion measure, as well as of developments since its adoption in 1924, it is suggested that reference be had to numerous available records, including the hearings of the two Immigration Committees of Congress, 1919 to 1924; "California and the Oriental", report of the State Board of Control of California, 1920; "Japanese Exclusion - A Study of the Policy and the Law", J. B. Trevor, House Doc. #600, 1925; documents and records of the California Joint Immigration Committee; and "Quota or Exclusion for Japanese Immigrants?"--the report of a year's investigation made in 1932 by the Commonwealth Club of California at San Francisco, and covering fully both sides of the question.

Exclusion of Asiatics is in conformity with the principles enunciated by the founders of this nation who sought to establish a homogeneous citizenry. Under the naturalization law of 1790 only "free white persons" were eligible to become naturalized; and later one exception was made, namely grant of citizenship to persons of African nativity and descent. Chinese were excluded in 1882; Hindus and other specified Asiatics were excluded under the Barred Zone Act of 1917. These measures were successful in excluding those proscribed by it. The Gentlemen's Agreement of 1908 was made for the express purpose of checking increase of Japanese population in continental United States. Following the failure of the Agreement and adoption of the 1911 Treaty of Navigation and Commerce with Japan, it was found necessary to enact the much controverted Asiatic exclusion provision of the immigration act of 1924. Five plans were under consideration at that time, but the law adopted was the only one which safeguarded the interests of this country while giving least cause for offense. That the Gentlemen's Agreement failed in its purpose is indicated by the fact that Japanese population in continental United States increased from approximately 50,000 in 1906 to 150,000 in 1920; and of that number approximately two-thirds resided in California.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/44

Conditions of race, language, culture, devotion to the Mikado as head of Japanese religion, dual loyalty, lower standards of living, acquisition of a large portion of desirable farming lands in California's agricultural counties, Japanese language schools, and similar conditions led to many racial controversies; enactment of the California alien land act of 1913 provoked diplomatic controversies between the United States and Japan.

Today of over 100,000 Japanese born in Hawaii, two-thirds retain dual citizenship. Of 15,317 registered Japanese voters, all but 5,768 voluntarily remain subject to Japan's orders in peace and in war. Similar conditions no doubt exist in California, but statistics are not available. Efforts are being made by the Japanese community here to bring back to this country American-born Japanese sent to Japan in early childhood for education there, known as the Kibei Shimin, estimated to approximate 50,000 in number. Members of this group are aliens in every particular except in the right to American citizenship. Those who are promoting this movement desire that these Kibei Shimin help in retaining control of the fruit and vegetable growing and marketing established by the Japanese in this state, particularly in the southern portion thereof.

Contrary to statements made by advocates of quota that fewer Japanese would come in under quota than come at present, the fact is that more would enter. Today practically all Asiatics with the exception of "laborers" may enter this country and remain for stated periods, including visitors, students, members of professions, ministers, members of the diplomatic corps with their servants and families, all being non-quota immigrants. If quota were granted, each Asiatic country would have a minimum annual quota of 100, the total of which would be a considerable number. (Each Asiatic country now has a minimum quota of 100 for members of eligible races who are resident there.) Every American-born Asiatic could import a wife born in Asia, who would rear her family to Oriental numbers and standards. And the non-quota immigrants would continue to come in, as at present.

Significant indeed is the fact that while advocates of a quota for Asiatics are insisting that this country let down the only effective permanent barrier against an influx of Asiatic immigration, Japan, under Imperial Ordinance 352 excludes not only her own Korean subjects, but also Chinese laborers, and for one of the major reasons that this country has seen fit to exclude unassimilable aliens ineligible to citizenship, namely inability to compete with those having lower standards of living and willing to work long hours and under adverse conditions.

Brazil, with a population composed approximately of 80% colored persons, has found it necessary to limit immigration of Japanese by adoption of a 2% quota law. Even this has not proven satisfactory, many more Japanese coming in than called for under quota, and other restrictive measures are being sought. New Zealand, Australia and Canada have taken measures to protect themselves against Oriental peaceful penetration and have been so firm about enforcing those measures that Japan no longer protests "hurt feelings".

It is well to consider our neighbor, but it is of prime importance that consideration be given to the welfare of our own state and nation. Japan repeatedly demands racial equality and the right of migration of her subjects to sparsely settled nations, but the welfare of the people of the United States will not be enhanced by development in this country of alien, unassimilable groups, whose language, culture and aspirations are so at variance with our own.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk, (Ch.)
American Legion

E. D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N.S.G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Garfield 2697

11/43-
Chas. H. Goethe
Imm. Study Com.

Hon. U. S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
Exec. Secy.

FACTS WHICH AUTHOR WALTER HOFFMAN OVERLOOKED

In the accompanying extract from "Pacific Relations", a school text book by Walter G. Hoffman, a statement of facts in connection with the problem of Japanese immigration is made for guidance of the American student. Certain sentences and paragraphs therein are marked with reference letters (a) to (h). Paragraphs below similarly marked indicate very briefly the important facts which Mr. Hoffman overlooked. More information in concise form may be obtained from California Joint Immigration Committee Doc. #455, "Why Immigration Quota Should Not Be Granted To Japan".

(a) The two basic provisions of the Gentlemen's Agreement, as imposed by President Theodore Roosevelt and stated by him, called for such control of passports by Japan that (1) Japanese laborers should not come to continental United States; (2) Japanese population in continental United States should not increase. If Japan failed to secure those results the alternative set by President Roosevelt was an exclusion act for Japanese.

(b) "The fear of Japanese immigration continued until 1924." Because, of Japan's deliberate violation of the terms of the Agreement, many thousands of laborers entered and the Japanese population of continental United States multiplied.

(c) The provision excluding all aliens to American citizenship was inserted in the 1924 immigration act as the only one of five plans proposed which would effectually remedy the situation without discrimination against Japan or surrender of our national sovereignty or Congressional control of immigration.

(d) Provisions had been made for exclusion not only of the Chinese but also of all other ineligible Asiatics, including the Japanese, the latter thru the Gentlemen's Agreement. The plan for exclusion of Japanese was the only one that failed. As that was due to Japan's violation of its terms there was no affront to her. Instead of resorting to the alternative fixed by President Roosevelt in such case, Congress provided the only effective remedy which would at the same time save Japan's face.

(e) Japan's quota, it is true, would be only 185 under the terms of the present act, but admission would have to be conceded also to all of the other ineligible races of Asia; and slight modification of the present plan, some already urged, would multiply admissions; the exclusion law and its basic principle, the only barrier against peaceful invasion of Asiatics, would be automatically destroyed, and could not be replaced.

(f) "Many" may "feel that Japan's status in world affairs entitles her to this consideration"; but Uncle Sam believes that his status in world affairs entitles him to the same protection against immigrant invasion as Japan erects, under Imperial Ordinance #352, against all Asia, including Korea, and such as Japan defers to without protest, when imposed against herself by English speaking nations other than the United States.

(g) The situation is indeed "unpleasant". Japan's actions and demands have made it so. It should indeed "be rectified", but by withdrawal on Japan's part of a demand which is not only not justified by the facts but is entirely at variance with what she herself exacts under similar circumstances and what she accepts without protest from nations other than the United States.

(h) The citizens of the United States are also "absolutely sincere" in declaring that they see no reason why they should open this country to settlement by a nation which proudly boasts that it is destined to govern all nations, and is systematically and openly operating to bring about an early accomplishment of that destiny. #462

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/45
COPY OF CHAPTER FROM "PACIFIC RELATIONS" BY WALTER G. HOFFMAN

#461

JAPAN IS MEETING HER PROBLEMS
EMIGRATION

Due to overpopulation resulting from industrialization, expansion and improved sanitation, the Japanese have wished to find "a place for their people". They have also felt that their prestige has suffered from racial discrimination and hence have pressed for racial equality. So far the results have been negative.

IMMIGRATION TO
THE UNITED STATES

In the United States it is felt that the fecund Japanese race, if allowed to enter freely, would not only undermine American standards but might eventually become dominant. With the exclusion of Chinese coolies in 1882 Japanese began immigrating to America in increasing numbers until, in 1907, the arrivals numbered 10,000, nearly all of whom stayed in California, creating a race problem.

The Japanese who immigrated to the United States soon started the practice of sending for picture brides from Japan and began raising large families. Race antagonism developed, particularly on the west coast. In San Francisco it was ruled that Japanese attend separate schools. California was greatly perturbed. However, President Roosevelt placated the Californians and obtained from Japan a Gentleman's promise that no further passports would be issued to the peasant or coolie class. (a) However, the fear of Oriental immigration continued until 1924, (b) when Congress enacted a law excluding all persons ineligible to American citizenship. (c) As the Chinese had already been excluded, Japan felt that this was a direct affront to her. (d) The law created bitter feeling, our Ambassador to Japan resigned in protest, and a number of Japanese committed seppuku, or what is more vulgarly known as hara-kiri.

Under the present general immigration law, enacted in 1929, immigration is on the quota basis, this quota bearing the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of each nationality in the United States in 1920 bears to the total population of the United States in 1920. Were this law applied to Japan her annual quota would amount to only about 185. (e) Many feel that Japan's status in world affairs entitles her to this consideration. (f) But California believes that almost all of those would settle within her boundaries rather than go farther east, thereby bringing about further complications. More than half of the Japanese population in the United States now lives in California.

As matters stand at present the situation is unpleasant and should be rectified. (g)

Owing to their long period of isolation and their comparatively brief history, the Japanese have not migrated in large numbers as have the Chinese. The entire number of Japanese in lands other than China is scarcely more than 450,000; of this number there are 140,000 in the United States and another 140,000 in the Hawaiian Islands.

The Japanese are absolutely sincere in stating that they fail to see why their people should not be permitted to occupy the undeveloped or sparsely populated regions of the world. (h)

Note:--Above is the statement of facts and conditions in connection with the Japanese immigration problem, made by Mr. Hoffman in his text book for American high school students, so that, as indicated in his preface, they may, with proper knowledge of matters bearing on international relations in the Pacific, develop ability to appraise current events.

The reference letters (a) to (h) correspond to explanations in the accompanying statement, "Facts Which Walter Hoffman Overlooked", without knowledge of which the student would be poorly qualified to make a statement or reach a conclusion which would bear inspection. Further information on the subject, in briefed form, may be had from California Joint Immigration Com. Doc. #455.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/46

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Edward D. Vandeleur
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
N.S.G.W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, Calif.

Chas. M. Goethe
Imm. Study Comm.

Hon. U.S. Webb
State Atty. Gen.

V. S. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

October 12, 1936

JAPANESE PROPAGANDA IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

To Members of the American Council,
Institute of Pacific Relations.

On September 18, 1936, a statement was sent by the C.J.I.C. to approximately 200 members of the American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations (it was sent to no one else) referring to the experience of California in the matter of public school books containing Japanese propaganda. That statement has been construed by the Council's Secretary, Mr. F. V. Field, as charging the I.P.R. with endorsement, or publication of a school text book, "Pacific Relations", by W. G. Hoffman, now under investigation by the state school authorities as an alleged vehicle for Japanese propaganda. In explanation of the situation thus created and to correct any possible misunderstanding on the part of others, this letter goes to each member of the Council who received the statement of September 18th.

The C.J.I.C. has made no such charge as is inferred by Mr. Field and did not intend that any statement made by it should be so construed. The misunderstanding was apparently created by the inclusion in the statement of three sets of facts without careful delimitation of connection between two of those sets. In justice to itself and to the Institute of Pacific Relations and particularly in appreciative recognition of the straightforward course followed by Secretary Field, this explanation is made.

Following are the facts to which the attention of the Council members was intended to be directed: (1) A certain text book on Japan, produced under joint instrumentality of the I.P.R., the Japan Society for International Cultural Relations and the Hawaiian Department of Education, was used in the public schools of that Territory in 1935, and urged for similar use in public schools of continental United States. Charges filed with the California state school authorities June 18, 1936 held that certain portions of that book misstated facts in furtherance of Japan's purposes. The American Council I.P.R., thru its Secretary, acknowledged on June 30, 1936 that certain portions of the book are open to the criticism indicated and announced withdrawal of the volume. * * * (2) The Institute of Pacific Relations, thru its Secretary and the Secretary of the American Council thereof, announced in San Francisco in February, 1936, that the Institute had arranged for introduction into 152 public schools of California of courses on "Pacific Relations" and "Japanese Culture". * * * A letter of Secretary Field, September 24, 1936, states that the I.P.R., to supply necessary accurate information to high school students concerning conditions on the Pacific "has been engaged in the preparation of text book material in Hawaii, and in California itself". * * * (3) The attention of the California Joint Immigration Committee has been directed to three books prepared for use in California public schools in the courses referred to; one already in use, another published and listed, and a third still in press. All of these books prove on inspection to contain objectionable matter similar to that which led to withdrawal of the Hawaiian text book; and the C.J.I.C. has protested their use in formal statement to the state school authorities.

Please note, however, that the C.J.I.C. has not, and does not, charge that the I.P.R. is responsible for the preparation or listing of any of the three books referred to; and that, in a report to the committee, the Executive Secretary thereof specifically stated that there is no evidence in possession of the Committee that the I.P.R. is chargeable with the production or use of any of these three books.

But it becomes important to know to what extent, if at all, the I.P.R. has been led, in preparation of text book material in California, to endorse therein--thru oversight or untrustworthy agents, as in the case of the Hawaiian text book--mis-statements or concealment of facts, to further the plans of any nation.

In view of the final action taken by the I.P.R. in connection with the Hawaiian text book it is fair to assume that it will cooperate with the C.J.I.C. in preventing the use in California schools, in courses sponsored by the I.P.R., of text books open to the same criticism as that which induced condemnation of the Hawaiian book. This statement of the present conditions, it is hoped, will assist in establishing an understanding which may promote such cooperation.

Respectfully,

California Joint Immigration Committee

V. S. McClatchy, Exec. Secy.

James K. Fisk, Chairman

4466

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk, Ch.
American Legion

Hon. D. C. Murphy
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, Calif.

Dorothy Kaltenbach, Secretary

Chas. M. Goette
Imm. Study Com.

V. S. McClatchy
(1857 - 1939)

Hon. U. S. Webb
H. J. McClatchy
Robert H. Fouke

DUAL CITIZENSHIP OF AMERICAN BORN JAPANESE

Previous to 1924 Japan claimed as her citizen any Japanese born anywhere in the world. But in that year the Japanese Government, heeding criticism against dual nationality in certain countries granting citizenship by birth, amended her nationality law so that "a child born of Japanese parents in the United States, Canada and certain South American countries . . . is not claimed as a subject of the Japanese Government unless it declares, within fourteen days after birth, through its legal representative, its intention of retaining Japanese nationality. Moreover, even if such a declaration of intention to retain Japanese nationality has been filed, the person may abandon it at any time by making simple notification. Furthermore, the law is retroactive, providing that even those who were born prior to the adoption of the law and who consequently possess dual citizenship, may at any time cancel their Japanese citizenship by a mere notification." *

That the majority of American citizens of Japanese descent are not canceling their Japanese citizenship is proved by the fact that in Hawaii in 1934 out of an estimated total of 103,948 American born Japanese, only 34,270 (about 33%) had expatriated from Japan. The Japanese American News of San Francisco, on May 15, 1939, stated that about 60% of the American born Japanese (in California) had not expatriated and thus had dual citizenship. The 1930 census gives California 48,973 American born Japanese. In other words, in spite of the fact that they may divest themselves of Japanese citizenship "by simple notification", over 66% of the American born Japanese in Hawaii, and 60% of those in California, even when registered as American voters, are, thru choice, citizens of Japan and subject to her orders in peace and in war, as well as citizens of the United States.

The Japanese American Citizens League has recently inaugurated a campaign in California to have its members expatriate from Japan. No details thereof have been published so it is not known how successful that campaign has been.

There are in Japan today over 50,000 American born Japanese who are being educated there. These are being urged to return to America where they can use their American citizenship for the best interests of the Japanese. They are, of course, practically Japanese immigrants, having been reared in a Japanese atmosphere. They are eligible also to membership in the Japanese American Citizens League.

There is at present no law in the United States which forbids anyone born here from possessing citizenship in another country, as well as the American citizenship conferred at birth. This is, of course, a dangerous weakness in our laws, which should be corrected at once in view of the various nationalistic trends of the day.

#527A 5-17-39

* Ichihashi -- "The Japanese in the United States" p. 323

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/48

James K. Fisk (Ch.)
American Legion

Hon. D. C. Murphy
Cal. State Fed. of L.

John T. Regan
N. S. G. W.

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE

85 Second Street
San Francisco, California

Dorothy Kaltenbach, Secy.

C. M. Goshko
Dist. Secy. C

V. S. McClatchy
(1857-1886)

Hon. U. S. Webb
H. J. McClatchy
Robert H. Cooke

American Born Japanese Retain Dual Citizenship
And Threaten Our Protective Laws

The American born Japanese of California, of whom there are about 25,000 of voting age, are urging in their press that their bloc of votes be used in conjunction with those of other racial minorities--Chinese, Negroes, etc.--to "eliminate the numerous laws which have been based on color lines."

This means that these minorities will be used in an attempt to repeal or nullify exclusion, naturalization, alien land and other protective laws, most of which have been enacted, after a long struggle, to guard against further infiltration of the unassimilable races of Asia. Enactment of such laws as the alien fishing bill, which is a national defense measure, will also be fought.

The Japanese call attention to the fact that "A solid bloc of 25,000 votes is a factor which may decide the outcome in a close election", and think that fact should influence politicians into favorable consideration of their demands.

They fail to state, however, that 60% of those American born Japanese who boast of their voting strength and threaten our protective laws, are also citizens of Japan. They were registered at birth with the Japanese Consulate and have failed to expatriate although free to do so under Japanese law.

California Joint Immigration Committee

1-15-40
#532

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/49

James K. Fisk (Chmn.)
American Legion

D. C. Murphy
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California
Dorothy Kaltenbach, Secretary

C. M. Coombs
Imm. Study Com.

H. J. McGlatchy
(Exec. Secy)

Hon. U. S. Webb
Robert H. Fouke

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD
and
DUAL CITIZENSHIP

At the general election on November 5th, the citizens of the Territory of Hawaii indicated by a two to one vote that they desire statehood. This does not mean that Congress will grant statehood--it only means that the citizens themselves, a majority of whom are of Oriental extraction, believe that Hawaii should be a state, with the right to elect those who govern it.

A most interesting phase of that election was the approval by the electorate of the Republican candidate for the Territorial Senate, Sanji Abe. During the entire campaign and up to November 2nd, Abe was a citizen of both the United States and Japan. He was only expatriated three days before election, when his papers were rushed from Tokyo!

When the Territory of Hawaii will elect to its highest legislative body a man who had the temerity to seek and accept the nomination for office while still owing allegiance to Japan, the question may well be asked, "Is Hawaii ready for the responsibilities of Statehood?"

Hawaii is this country's most important fortification. Over one-third of its voters are of Japanese ancestry, and of these about 60% have dual citizenship--are citizens of Japan as well as of the United States, and are subject to military duty in Japan. The safety and welfare of the one hundred and thirty million Americans in the whole nation must not be jeopardized by turning over the government of its most important military outpost to a majority of Asiatic descent whose allegiance is largely divided.

#542

November 14, 1940

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Chmn.)
American Legion

D. C. Murphy
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California

Dorothy Kaltenbach, Secretary

11/50
C. M. Gontho
(Treas.)

H. J. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Hon. U. S. Webb
Robert H. Fouke

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD
Reasons Why It Should Not be Granted Now

At the general election on November 5, 1940, the voters of the Territory of Hawaii indicated by a two to one majority that they desire statehood. To the many Americans who are appreciative of the need for national unity and safety, this matter is of great interest, for Hawaii is the western outpost of our national defense. It is now for Congress to decide whether or not statehood shall be granted.

Hawaii is preponderantly Oriental and very largely Japanese. The total population of the Territory, as of 1939, is 414,391. Of this total 284,449 are Orientals (including Asiatic Hawaiians), and 155,042 are Japanese. The Caucasian population, aside from the relatively small number of permanent residents, is to a large extent made up of Army and Navy personnel.

In the category of American citizens, those of Oriental ancestry also predominate. Of a total citizenry of 334,657, those of Asiatic extraction number 186,983, of which 119,361 are Japanese, 24,573 Chinese, 21,838 Asiatic-Hawaiians, 16,949 Filipinos and 4,462 Koreans. The Japanese, not all of whom use their voting privilege at present, constitute about 35% of the total eligible electorate of the Territory. This group is increasing and even now can control any election or plebiscite.

According to the last obtainable figures, more than 60% of these American born Japanese possess dual citizenship. That is, because they were registered at birth with the Japanese Consulate and have since failed to expatriate (although free to do so under Japanese law for 15 years), they are citizens of both the United States and Japan. They are subject to military duty in Japan. Expatriation campaigns inaugurated from time to time have brought little result, altho recently, because of agitation against Fifth Column activities, they may have been more successful. Altho they claim repeatedly to have reduced the number of dual citizenship considerably, the Japanese appear unable or unwilling to furnish definite official figures. American agencies investigating such matters say that the number has decreased very little.

It is quite evident that Japan, although she enacted an expatriation law in 1924 in response to criticism of the dual citizenship of American born Japanese, does not desire these Americans to cast off their Japanese nationality. The process of expatriation is apparently made as difficult as possible.

The Japanese themselves claim that the traditional family system of Japan is responsible for their reluctance to expatriate. If a Nisei (second generation American born Japanese) renounces his Japanese citizenship to retain only American citizenship, he will be dismembered legally from his family. Thus any inheritance (in Japan) is lost. The question may well be asked how many Japanese, mostly peasant laborers who came to the United States to better their economic condition, can have much property in Japan. American law takes care of any inheritance due a Nisei in this country.

The oft-heard argument that the Japanese have not known that expatriation was expected of them, is idle. Japan would never have enacted the expatriation law of 1924 had it not been for continued criticism of dual citizenship.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/6

A most interesting phase of the November election was the approval by the voters of the Republican candidate for the Territorial Senate, Sanji Abe. During the entire campaign, and up to November 2nd, Abe was a citizen of both the United States and Japan. He was only expatriated three days before election, when his papers were rushed from Tokyo.

The custom of registering American born children at the Japanese Consulate still continues. Many of these children are sent to Japan in early childhood to be educated to maturity as Japanese citizens, there being about 50,000 there at present. When they return to this country they are practically alien Japanese, frequently not even being able to speak English.

That Japan binds the Miso to herself as much as possible is shown by a statement made by Foreign Minister Koki Hirota, quoted in the Honolulu Star Bulletin of March 7, 1938, that "Second generation Japanese in the United States . . . must receive American Education. But they remain Japanese and should be educated as Japanese in order to retain their Japanese virtues. For this purpose the semi-official Migration Association keeps close connection with them." The Japanese Consul and visiting Japanese dignitaries play a large part in the affairs of the American born Japanese. Study trips to Japan are financed by the Japanese Government and such trips are offered as prizes in essay writing contests, with Japan as the subject.

Another method of holding the Miso, and probably the most effective one, is through the Japanese language schools. There are in Hawaii more than 175 of these schools where some 42,000 young Americans are taught daily after public school hours the language, culture and ambitions of Japan. These schools are maintained by the Japanese community at a cost of from \$500,000 to \$800,000 per year (exclusive of textbooks which are printed in Japan), and are alien directed and controlled. A majority of the teachers are alien. The textbooks used are the same as used in the schools of Japan and in every Japanese language school in the world. In these books the national heroes and acts of Japan are glorified. The children are required to bow before the Emperor's picture and sing patriotic Japanese songs, and they refer to the Emperor with utmost respect as the "Son of Heaven", "Our Prince", etc. They are taught that "There is no other country in the world that can compare with ours. It is our duty to carry on the great spirit of loyalty to the Emperor and Empress and try to achieve their aims. We must also try to understand the government of our nation and the problems that confront it." **

Several years ago the Honolulu Advertiser published a lengthy article on the subject of the language schools and said in conclusion, "The community feels that Japanization at present plays a dominant part in the purpose of the language school." Brazil, fearing the menace of the Japanese language schools, has abolished them; British Columbia has passed a law providing for inspection of foreign language schools. The Japanese Government itself is aware of the menace of such schools, a recent Tokyo dispatch stating that under a new law Japan will strictly supervise foreign language schools so that the "evils" attending their operation will be eliminated. The purpose of such supervision will be to inculcate in pupils the "patriotic" view of Japanese policy.

The Buddhist and Shinto Churches are also instruments for holding the Miso to Japan. Young Americans are there taught that the Japanese Emperor is a god, and they worship him as such.

* It is interesting to note that there are but 186 public schools in the Territory.

** Translation from textbook used in Japanese language school.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/30

In 1933 when an heir to the Japanese throne was born, the universal celebration of that event in Hawaii would have done credit to a Japanese colony. The whole spirit of the Islands has become so Japanized that only outsiders, apparently, realized the significance of that celebration and protested. The Japanese press in Hawaii called that protest "blasphemous".

This Japanization of spirit was further shown in 1935, when there was in use in the public high schools of Honolulu a textbook on Japan, compiled under the joint auspices of the Cultural Relations Society of Japan (Prof. H. Royama coming from Tokyo to assist in its preparation), the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Territorial Board of Education. The book contained misstatement of fact and propaganda to induce favorable opinion, on the part of teachers and students, of Japan's present course in Asia and of her persistent attempt to force repeal of the exclusion measure of the Immigration Act of 1924. Only under persistent and much resented criticism from the mainland was the book withdrawn and rewritten. In its corrected form it still leaves much to be desired as a textbook, minimizing or omitting all that Americans consider reprehensible in Japan's activities in Eastern Asia.

There is little intermarriage of Japanese with members of other races, even in Hawaii's much publicized melting pot. Japanese maintain their racial purity for "the glory of the Yamato race" at the behest of intensely nationalistic alien elders, and live a typically Japanese family life (with modern comforts). They are an entirely separate community, having their own banks, schools, churches, theatres, radio programs (some of which come direct from Japan), clubs, societies, temples and newspapers. These newspapers have a very large circulation. They are alien controlled, are exponents of the Japanese viewpoint and are frequently quite inimical to America and its spirit. The capacity of the Japanese to live cheaply makes competition against them impossible for Americans.

When Hawaii rushed into the arms of the United States, and was annexed in 1898 without stipulation, it was for protection against threatened annexation by Japan. The Japanese Government protested to Washington at that time, and the protest has never been withdrawn. Thwarted in her desire to take the Islands, Japan has flooded them with her nationals, who, with their descendants, control general retail business and the various trades. Hawaii is today practically an Oriental land.

In 1920 a strike of Japanese sugar plantation workers was aided by practically every Japanese, citizen or alien, in the Territory, for the alleged purpose of sabotaging the industry and gaining control thereof. Hawaii will always face the possibility that Japan can inspire a similar nationalistic uprising in a crisis where in her interests are concerned, particularly if the high officials of the Islands are elected by a Japanese plurality. In this connection there is also danger from the large Japanese fishing fleet, the powerful boats of which are capable of remaining at sea for weeks at a time. These boats could communicate and cooperate with war vessels in time of trouble.

About 90,000 alien Orientals would be able to migrate to the mainland from which they are now barred, were statehood granted. They would, of course, congregate on the west Coast. California, having had long years of experience with alien Orientals, and having successfully led the fight to bring about their exclusion, does not desire any such influx. It is idle to argue that this could be prevented, for California has long and unsuccessfully tried to prevent the influx of migrants from the dustbowl areas. The movement of residents of one state of the Union to another apparently cannot be prevented.

That Hawaii contributes heavily in taxes to the Treasury of the United States is not denied, nor is it denied that it is an enlightened and extremely pros-

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/50

perous community. The ruling Caucasian oligarchy wants statehood because it would profit thereby. The Asiatic majority may desire it for reasons of its own. But the welfare and safety of one hundred and thirty million Americans of the whole country should not be jeopardized by turning over the government of its most important military defense to an Asiatic majority, particularly at so critical a time.

In 1931, Governor Lawrence M. Judd, who is now actively propagandizing for statehood for Hawaii, vetoed a resolution of the Territorial Legislature requesting Congress to grant statehood. His reason given for that veto was, that time had not yet shown how the Asiatic majority would exercise its control of the franchise.

California Joint Immigration Committee

January, 1941
#543

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

James K. Fisk (Chmn.)
American Legion

D. C. Murphy
State Fed. of Labor

John T. Regan
Native Sons

CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE
85 Second Street
San Francisco, California

Dorothy Kaltenbach, Secretary

11/51

C. M. Goethe
(Treas.)

H. J. McClatchy
(Exec. Secy.)

Hon. U. S. Webb
Robert H. Fouke

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD
Reasons Why It Should Not be Granted Now

At the general election on November 5, 1940, the voters of the Territory of Hawaii indicated by a two to one majority that they desire statehood. To the many Americans who are appreciative of the need for national unity and safety, this matter is of great interest, for Hawaii is the western outpost of our national defense. It is now for Congress to decide whether or not statehood shall be granted.

Hawaii is preponderantly Oriental and very largely Japanese. The total population of the Territory, as of 1939, is 414,991. Of this total 284,449 are Orientals (including Asiatic Hawaiians), and 155,042 are Japanese. The Caucasian population, aside from the relatively small number of permanent residents, is to a large extent made up of Army and Navy personnel.

In the category of American citizens, those of Oriental ancestry also predominate. Of a total citizenry of 334,657, those of Asiatic extraction number 186,983, of which 119,361 are Japanese, 24,573 Chinese, 21,638 Asiatic-Hawaiians, 16,949 Filipinos and 4,462 Koreans. The Japanese, not all of whom use their voting privilege at present, constitute about 35% of the total eligible electorate of the Territory. This group is increasing and even now can control any election or plebiscite.

According to the last obtainable figures, more than 60% of these American born Japanese possess dual citizenship. That is, because they were registered at birth with the Japanese Consulate and have since failed to expatriate (although free to do so under Japanese law for 15 years), they are citizens of both the United States and Japan. They are subject to military duty in Japan. Expatriation campaigns inaugurated from time to time have brought little result, altho recently, because of agitation against Fifth Column activities, they may have been more successful. Altho they claim repeatedly to have reduced the number of dual citizenship considerably, the Japanese appear unable or unwilling to furnish definite official figures. American agencies investigating such matters say that the number has decreased very little.

It is quite evident that Japan, although she enacted an expatriation law in 1924 in response to criticism of the dual citizenship of American born Japanese, does not desire these Americans to cast off their Japanese nationality. The process of expatriation is apparently made as difficult as possible.

The Japanese themselves claim that the traditional family system of Japan is responsible for their reluctance to expatriate. If a Nisei (second generation American born Japanese) renounces his Japanese citizenship to retain only American citizenship, he will be dismembered legally from his family. Thus any inheritance (in Japan) is lost. The question may well be asked how many Japanese, mostly peasant laborers who came to the United States to better their economic condition, can have much property in Japan. American law takes care of any inheritance due a Nisei in this country.

The oft-heard argument that the Japanese have not known that expatriation was expected of them, is idle. Japan would never have enacted the expatriation law of 1924 had it not been for continued criticism of dual citizenship.

11/51

A most interesting phase of the November election was the approval by the voters of the Republican candidate for the Territorial Senate, Sanji Abe. During the entire campaign, and up to November 2nd, Abe was a citizen of both the United States and Japan. He was only expatriated three days before election, when his papers were rushed from Tokyo.

The custom of registering American born children at the Japanese Consulate still continues. Many of these children are sent to Japan in early childhood to be educated to maturity as Japanese citizens, there being about 50,000 there at present. When they return to this country they are practically alien Japanese, frequently not even being able to speak English.

That Japan binds the Nisei to herself as much as possible is shown by a statement made by Foreign Minister Koki Hirota, quoted in the Honolulu Star Bulletin of March 7, 1938, that "Second generation Japanese in the United States . . . must receive American Education. But they remain Japanese and should be educated as Japanese in order to retain their Japanese virtues. For this purpose the semi-official Migration Association keeps close connection with them." The Japanese Consul and visiting Japanese dignitaries play a large part in the affairs of the American born Japanese. Study trips to Japan are financed by the Japanese Government and such trips are offered as prizes in essay writing contests, with Japan as the subject.

Another method of holding the Nisei, and probably the most effective one, is through the Japanese language schools. There are in Hawaii more than 175 of these schools where some 42,000 young Americans are taught daily after public school hours the language, culture and ambitions of Japan. These schools are maintained by the Japanese community at a cost of from \$500,000 to \$800,000 per year (exclusive of textbooks which are printed in Japan), and are alien directed and controlled. A majority of the teachers are alien. The textbooks used are the same as used in the schools of Japan and in every Japanese language school in the world. In these books the national heroes and acts of Japan are glorified. The children are required to bow before the Emperor's picture and sing patriotic Japanese songs, and they refer to the Emperor with utmost respect as the "Son of Heaven", "Our Prince", etc. They are taught that "There is no other country in the world that can compare with ours. It is our duty to carry on the great spirit of loyalty to the Emperor and Empress and try to achieve their aims. We must also try to understand the government of our nation and the problems that confront it." **

Several years ago the Honolulu Advertiser published a lengthy article on the subject of the language schools and said in conclusion, "The community feels that Japanization at present plays a dominant part in the purpose of the language school." Brazil, fearing the menace of the Japanese language schools, has abolished them; British Columbia has passed a law providing for inspection of foreign language schools. The Japanese Government itself is aware of the menace of such schools, a recent Tokyo dispatch stating that under a new law Japan will strictly supervise foreign language schools so that the "evils" attending their operation will be eliminated. The purpose of such supervision will be to inculcate in pupils the "patriotic" view of Japanese policy.

The Buddhist and Shinto Churches are also instruments for holding the Nisei to Japan. Young Americans are there taught that the Japanese Emperor is a god, and they worship him as such.

*-It is interesting to note that there are but 186 public schools in the Territory.

**Translation from textbook used in Japanese language school.

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/57

In 1933 when an heir to the Japanese throne was born, the universal celebration of that event in Hawaii would have done credit to a Japanese colony. The whole spirit of the Islands has become so Japanized that only outsiders, apparently, realized the significance of that celebration and protested. The Japanese press in Hawaii called that protest "blasphemous".

This Japanization of spirit was further shown in 1935, when there was in use in the public high schools of Honolulu a textbook on Japan, compiled under the joint auspices of the Cultural Relations Society of Japan (Prof. N. Royama coming from Tokyo to assist in its preparation), the Institute of Pacific Relations and the Territorial Board of Education. The book contained misstatement of fact and propaganda to induce favorable opinion on the part of teachers and students, of Japan's present course in Asia and of her persistent attempt to force repeal of the exclusion measure of the Immigration Act of 1924. Only under persistent and much resented criticism from the mainland was the book withdrawn and rewritten. In its corrected form it still leaves much to be desired as a textbook, minimizing or omitting all that Americans consider reprehensible in Japan's activities in Eastern Asia.

There is little intermarriage of Japanese with members of other races, even in Hawaii's much publicized melting pot. Japanese maintain their racial purity for "the glory of the Yamato race" at the behest of intensely nationalistic alien elders, and live a typically Japanese family life (with modern comforts). They are an entirely separate community, having their own banks, schools, churches, theatres, radio programs (some of which come direct from Japan), clubs, societies, temples and newspapers. These newspapers have a very large circulation. They are alien controlled, are exponents of the Japanese viewpoint and are frequently quite inimical to America and its spirit. The capacity of the Japanese to live cheaply makes competition against them impossible for Americans.

When Hawaii rushed into the arms of the United States, and was annexed in 1898 without stipulation, it was for protection against threatened annexation by Japan. The Japanese Government protested to Washington at that time, and the protest has never been withdrawn. Thwarted in her desire to take the Islands, Japan has flooded them with her nationals, who, with their descendants, control general retail business and the various trades. Hawaii is today practically an Oriental land.

In 1920 a strike of Japanese sugar plantation workers was aided by practically every Japanese, citizen or alien, in the Territory, for the alleged purpose of sabotaging the industry and gaining control thereof. Hawaii will always face the possibility that Japan can inspire a similar nationalistic uprising in a crisis where in her interests are concerned, particularly if the high officials of the Islands are elected by a Japanese plurality. In this connection there is also danger from the large Japanese fishing fleet, the powerful boats of which are capable of remaining at sea for weeks at a time. These boats could communicate and cooperate with war vessels in time of trouble.

About 90,000 alien Orientals would be able to migrate to the mainland from which they are now barred, were statehood granted. They would, of course, congregate on the west Coast. California, having had long years of experience with alien Orientals, and having successfully led the fight to bring about their exclusion, does not desire any such influx. It is idle to argue that this could be prevented, for California has long and unsuccessfully tried to prevent the influx of migrants from the dustbowl areas. The movement of residents of one state of the Union to another apparently cannot be prevented.

That Hawaii contributes heavily in taxes to the Treasury of the United States is not denied, nor is it denied that it is an enlightened and extremely pro-

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/51

perous community. The ruling Caucasian oligarchy wants statehood because it would profit thereby. The Asiatic majority may desire it for reasons of its own. But the welfare and safety of one hundred and thirty million Americans of the whole country should not be jeopardized by turning over the government of its most important military defense to an Asiatic majority, particularly at so critical a time.

In 1931, Governor Lawrence M. Judd, who is now actively propagandizing for statehood for Hawaii, vetoed a resolution of the Territorial Legislature requesting Congress to grant statehood. His reason given for that veto was, that time had not yet shown how the Asiatic majority would exercise its control of the franchise.

California Joint Immigration Committee

January, 1941
#543

VOLUME 2/11: H.D. WILSON, RE: CALIFORNIA JOINT IMMIGRATION
COMMITTEE.

11/52

13 Commissioner Bowes made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Cooper, that no license of any kind be granted by the City of Portland to any Japanese National and that the Bureau of Licenses be so instructed.

Yeas 5.

Commissioner Bowes made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Cooper that the License Inspector and the Bureau of Licenses be instructed not to accept or receive any license application of any kind, or receive any deposit of money on application for license from a Japanese National.

Yeas 5.

Commissioner Bowes made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Cooper that the License Inspector and Bureau of Licenses be instructed to take all necessary steps to recall and revoke all licenses of any kind which have been issued by the City of Portland to Japanese Nationals for the year 1942; and that January 29, 1942, at 1:30 P. M. be fixed as the time for hearing on the revocations of those licenses heretofore issued which have not been surrendered prior to that time to the Bureau of Licenses for cancellation.

Yeas 5.

Commissioner Bowes made a motion which was seconded by Commissioner Cooper that the License Inspector and Bureau of Licenses be instructed not to accept any application for any license or any deposit of money upon application for license from any enemy alien of the United States and that the License Inspector and Bureau of Licenses be instructed to take the necessary steps to recall or revoke all licenses of any kind issued to any enemy alien for the year 1942; and that January 29, 1942, at 1:30 P. M. be fixed as the time for hearing on revocation of those licenses held by enemy aliens which have not been surrendered to the Bureau of Licenses prior to that date.

Yeas 5.

Cal.#13

1/2/42