

## Editor's Introduction

### *Yuji Ichioka and New Paradigms in Japanese American History*

EIICHIRO AZUMA

Yuji Ichioka was a pioneer historian. During a span of over thirty years, from the establishment of Asian American Studies in U.S. universities in the late 1960s through the beginning of the twenty-first century, Ichioka was unarguably the most influential figure in the field of Japanese American history. Having been involved in the antiwar and civil rights movements in the 1960s, his life as a professional historian began as something inseparable from his ties to “community” and deep concerns for social justice. Not only did he revolutionize the practice of research and writing, which gave birth to Japanese American scholarship, but Ichioka also challenged long-standing interpretations, prompting “paradigm shifts” in the field. This volume, which explores the Japanese American experience of the hitherto neglected “interwar years,” is no exception. The significance of *Before Internment* is best appreciated if it is read in light of Ichioka’s overall scholarly trajectory from 1971 to his sudden passing in September 2002.

Through his many publications, including those collected in this volume, Yuji Ichioka called into question the master narrative that had been constructed over the years by white academicians, *Issei* intellectuals, and *Nisei* writers. Infused by the modernizationist assumptions of linear progress and the dominant “immigrant paradigm” of U.S. history, much of the existing literature on Japanese Americans structures historical narration around the question of assimilation (or the lack thereof), based on the polarizing notion of “America vs. Japan.” However differently they explain such processes, orthodox histories have much in common in the privileging of exemplary

Issei and Nisei individuals (usually male entrepreneurs and intellectuals), in the emphasis on their “contributions” to U.S. society and economy, and in downplaying the force of racial restrictions in shaping the lives of Japanese Americans. One of the most extensively cited historical works, Yamato Ichihashi's *Japanese in the United States*, is representative of that master narrative, and Ichioka's critique of that book in Chapter 10 exemplifies the best of the “revisionist” thrust in his scholarship.<sup>1</sup> Ichioka unravels the basic assumptions and biases that underlie Ichihashi's work, but he does so with an understanding of the social conditions in which the Issei intellectual had to operate, as he also tries to historicize the production process of Ichihashi's study by bringing to the foreground the political agenda that influenced it.

Published in 1988, Ichioka's first book, *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885–1924*, was to change the established academic discourse on early Japanese immigrant history once and for all. Based on a collection of pathbreaking essays crafted between 1971 and 1985, *The Issei* centers the focus of historical research and interpretation on race, labor, and, to a lesser degree, gender. First and foremost Ichioka declares that Japanese immigrant history is “a history of a racial minority struggling to survive in a hostile land,” which was “far from being a success story.”<sup>2</sup> Rejecting the familiar scheme of acculturation and economic achievement, Ichioka illuminates the political disenfranchisement of the Issei, or the plight of “aliens ineligible to citizenship”—the legal status that kept them outside the American body politic and social life until the early 1950s. In his painstaking construction of various aspects of Issei history this theme occupied a central place after 1977, when he first took up *Ozawa vs. U.S.*, the case of Ozawa Takao, a longtime Japanese resident in Hawaii who in 1922 had taken his ultimately unsuccessful case for naturalization to the U.S. Supreme Court. Ichioka's study of the Ozawa case was so crucial that it has become a staple for Asian Americanists, immigration historians, and Critical Race theorists, among others, in discussing racial formations and processes in early-twentieth-century America.<sup>3</sup>

*The Issei* also emphasizes the importance of labor issues in the study of Japanese immigrant history. Since Ichioka characterizes Issei experience as “labor history,” much of his narrative revolves around the explication of the activities of immigrant workers, labor contractors, and leftist dissidents.<sup>4</sup> For the first time in the history of Japanese Americans, Ichioka shifted attention from what white racism did to these “political pariahs” and “cheap labor” to

how they fought and negotiated racism and exploitation. Some scholars in the 1970s called for a “history from the bottom up,” but none were able to unearth the “buried past” of the Issei as substantively as Ichioka did, since the task of reading and interpreting Japanese-language materials was too onerous. His ability to take advantage of the rich collections of immigrant sources also allowed him to mitigate the male-centered nature of the existing scholarship. *The Issei* incorporates two articles on Issei women—prostitutes and immigrant wives—that he produced during the early years of his career.<sup>5</sup> Ichioka’s insistence on bringing all these marginalized figures to the center of our historical consciousness signifies his radical politics, which not only sought to overcome the myth of Asian Americans as a model minority but also to connect Japanese immigrant experience to the struggles of many other people inside and outside the United States.

For all intents and purposes, *Before Internment* is a continuation of *The Issei*. Like its predecessor, *Before Internment* is a compilation of articles—published and unpublished—that Ichioka authored after 1985, though his untimely death prevented him from weaving these articles into more of a narrative, as he had done with the earlier volume. In 1986 he published one of the most important works that appears to have set the basic tone and direction of his scholarship after *The Issei*. In “A Study in Dualism,” which is the fifth chapter of this volume, Ichioka led yet again a discursive shift in Japanese American history. Looking into the dilemmas on identity and politics of an early Nisei leader and newspaper publisher, James Y. Sakamoto, he introduced new paradigms—generation and dualism—into research on a Japanese American past from 1924 to 1941. As he expounds in his unfinished introduction to this volume, “historians have treated this period as an interlude between the Japanese exclusion movement . . . and the outbreak of the Second World War” or “as an incidental backdrop to mass internment” (3). No serious scholarly attention had been paid to the interwar years, which Ichioka saw as key to properly understanding what took place during the 1940s, especially the mass internment of Japanese Americans. As readers will be quick to perceive, the problems of generation (distinctions between the Issei and Nisei) and dualism (dual identities, affiliations, and loyalties) inform the discussions in this volume. Generation and dualism form the organizing grammar for Ichioka’s narration of the collective experience of Japanese Americans during the 1930s.

New paradigms also called forth a reconsideration of the periodization of

Japanese American history. Ichioka chose to punctuate the second phase of Japanese American history with the transition of the 1930s not simply because the decade was when the Nisei came of age or because it was situated between the two distinct events that scholars have studied extensively. His periodization is suggestive of a more profound reconceptualization of Japanese American history. The first phase (and hence the first book) concluded with the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 by the United States Congress, which Ichioka describes as the culmination of anti-Japanese racism and the end of mass migration, including common laborers and Issei women. In light of his interpretation of the early immigrant experience, then, the year 1924 marked a logical break in history. Here Ichioka's genius was also to find at the same historical moment the emergence of generational differences among Japanese Americans and growing ambiguities in their consciousness and practice. Therefore, in the context of post-1924 community formation, *Before Internment* concentrates on the contentious relations between the Issei and Nisei, the dilemmas for the Issei of educating their American-born children and for the Nisei of growing up as a racial minority, and the challenge of balancing ties and allegiances to America and Japan within a context of exacerbating bilateral relations.

In this volume Ichioka operates on the premise that the boundaries of the Issei and Nisei were forged as a matter not of simple age differences or cultural divides but of historical exigencies in the aftermath of racial exclusion. In the very last paragraph of *The Issei* he had already set up that scheme, discussing the ramifications of the 1924 law in this way:

Japanese immigrants came to attach extra significance to the American-born generation. They transferred their hopes and aspirations onto the Nisei generation. The Issei could not escape the liability of being aliens ineligible to citizenship; the Nisei were American citizens who, in theory, had all the rights and privileges that came with their American citizenship. Since the Issei no longer perceived any real future for themselves, the Nisei's future, however precarious it appeared in 1924, suddenly loomed all-important to them. The future of the Japanese in the United States now depended on how their children would grow up and fare in their own native land.<sup>6</sup>

Generations, according to Ichioka, were fundamentally political constructs. The production of differences between the Issei and Nisei rested with their

citizenship status, which was in and of itself a product of racial formation under white American hegemony.<sup>7</sup> As it was racism that arbitrarily distinguished “aliens” and “citizens” in the Japanese American population, *Before Internment* duly employs race as the key variable in the analysis of how the two generations of Japanese Americans thought, acted, and lived in the complex political spaces between the two nation-states prior to the Pacific War.

With the lens of generation, Ichioka was the first historian to examine the lives of both Japanese immigrants and their American-born children in an encompassing and integrated manner. As he notes in his brief introduction, several studies that treat the 1930s as their subject matter tend to look only at the doings of the Issei or of the Nisei but not both. The articles included in *Before Internment* indicate that Ichioka divided his attention almost evenly between the two groups; put together in one volume they provide a fuller and more nuanced picture of Japanese American intergenerational experience during the decade than is available elsewhere.

Ichioka also includes in this narrative yet another political construct, the *Kibei*, even though the coverage is not substantial. Born on United States soil but educated mainly in Japan, these second-generation youth formed a distinctive subgroup with a unique experience of their own. They added to the intricate entanglements of the generations in post-1924 Japanese America that Ichioka unveils in this book. The categories of the Issei, Nisei, and Kibei were so essential in the numerous studies of the wartime internment that our understanding has been structured in accordance with their alleged differences, rifts, and struggles that became manifest inside the camps. But contrary to conventional wisdom, as Ichioka shows in his introduction, division and contention already existed during the 1930s. The matter of generational differences serves as a good example of what he means by “significant continuities and discontinuities between [what transpired in] the 1930s and the 1940s,” for without “taking into account the former,” as he insists, “the latter cannot . . . be properly understood” (3). In this sense *Before Internment* is indispensable for substantive reevaluations of internment history.

Since Ichioka’s interpretations necessitate historicizing the production of generational differences in the context of interwar American race relations, one may wonder why this volume offers only a limited discussion of the Kibei, who increased in number during the 1930s as a result of the Issei resolution to pass on to the second generation their tradition and language despite the prevailing racist denial of a Japanese heritage in the United

States. As Chapter 2 (“*Dai Nisei Mondai*”) reveals, Ichioka was quite mindful of the topic, intending to write more about that subgroup after the publication of this volume—an idea he shared with this writer on numerous occasions. Yet Ichioka never realized his plan to organize a conference on the Kibei, where invited scholars would present academic papers while ordinary Kibei men and women discussed their personal experiences. Based on that conference, he envisioned editing a special issue of *Amerasia Journal* dedicated to the Kibei.

This is the strategy that he had employed to promote the studies of the interwar era and its relevance to the internment when very few had yet recognized the importance of, or cared to take on, such research. A 1985 “Coming of Age in the Thirties” conference he organized provided a forum for the unveiling of “A Study in Dualism” (Chapter 5), which was subsequently published in a special *Amerasia* edition on “Japanese Americans in the 1930s and 1940s.” In much the same way, “The Meaning of Loyalty” (Chapter 7) came out of his 1995 symposium and a 1997 *Amerasia* issue entitled *Beyond National Boundaries: The Complexity of Japanese-American History*, which includes memoirs of some Kibei and Nisei residents in Japan. Following another academic conference in 1988, Ichioka also edited *Views from Within*, an anthology of essays that critically examines the meaning of social science research conducted in the camps and beyond, which subsequently helped compound slanted views on the three groups of Japanese Americans according to such sociological categories as “Americanized versus unassimilated.” Ichioka interrogated the relationship between power and knowledge production because their entanglement made the studies of internment inescapably prejudiced and oppressive under the façade of scholarly objectivism. Common biases against the Kibei (unacculturated, pro-Japan, and disloyal), which the public now tends to wrongly accept as historical truth, were perpetuated, if not produced, by academic explanations provided by liberal social scientists in the camps. Ichioka was among the first historians who systematically scrutinized the manner in which Japanese Americans had been studied, which generally subjected the people to the objectifying gaze of white scholars, and to the theories and frameworks they constructed in the name of detached scientific research.<sup>8</sup>

Ichioka was always the trailblazer, and the articles in this volume mirror a critical historical method that is unparalleled in existing scholarship: to let the Issei and Nisei speak for themselves in their terms with all their faults and

problems, including internal exploitation and racism against other minorities. Had illness and death not cut short his endeavor, he would have continued to rattle historical “common sense” and complicate our understanding with new discoveries and eye-opening arguments. But what is in *Before Internment* already shows younger generations of scholars what else needs to be undertaken, including an in-depth study of the Kibei experience. In particular, Chapter 2 provides a useful overview of the Nisei’s generational dilemmas and challenges that the Issei conceived as “Dai Nisei Mondai” before the Pacific War. Published in Japanese in 1991, it contains overlaps with other chapters, as the treatise was not part of the original manuscript Ichioka had been preparing. Having revised the essay several times between 1984 and 1987, Ichioka appears to have relied on it as guidelines for research and writing in producing most of the chapters of this volume. The editors have elected to add “*Dai Nisei Mondai*” to this volume without modification in respect for the integrity of its narrative and arguments, since we believe that the chapter provides an invaluable window into the complexities of interwar Japanese America, which would certainly “stimulate future research” as Ichioka wished (4).<sup>9</sup>

The second paradigm around which *Before Internment* is organized, dualism, too, has profound implications for the future direction of Japanese American Studies and history writing. Ichioka first introduced this notion into his 1986 article, in which he explored the seemingly conflicting agendas of “full-blooded” Americanism (the Nisei as loyal citizens) and internationalism (the Nisei as a bridge of understanding between the United States and Japan), in the ideas of a key Nisei leader, James Y. Sakamoto. Placing this dualism in the context of ongoing white racism in the 1930s, Ichioka probes the strategic use of identities for survival among Japanese Americans. The idea of dualism debunks the established definitions of nation and culture (categories of “American” and “Japanese” as polar or incompatible opposites), as well as bounded notions of political identities and affiliations.<sup>10</sup> Building on this problematic, Ichioka goes on to tackle the thorny and highly sensitive issue of loyalty. Examining different responses of Issei and Nisei individuals, the chapters in Part II of this volume elucidate that “the question of loyalty was never black and white,” especially when white society “overwhelmingly rejected the Nisei [and the Issei] on racial grounds” (171). As he argues convincingly, the experiences of marginalized people defy the “simplistic wartime categories of loyalty versus disloyalty” (156).

The problem of dualism accounts for what Ichioka calls “discontinuities between the 1930s and the 1940s.” As Chapter 3 (“*Kengakudan*”) and Chapter 4 (“*Kokugo Gakkō*”) demonstrate, the internationalist ideal of the Nisei as a bridge of understanding constituted an important part of the intellectual current in the Japanese American community of the 1930s. Both Issei leaders and older Nisei embraced the idea, even though they differed in the practice. Their dualism, in the form of the bridge concept, nonetheless became “untenable” by 1940. Nisei leaders, like Sakamoto, “began to espouse Americanism exclusively and refashioned [their] original Americanism into a flag-waving form of 200 percent patriotism” (110) that naturally came into conflict with the Issei’s continuous identification with Japan. Nisei expressions of cultural and political identity became so one-dimensional that it hardly entailed any trace of previous dualism. Internment history, as we know, is only an extension of this shift, which had already taken place around 1940.

Laying its focus on the questions of political identity and loyalty, *Before Internment* takes readers to highly controversial and sensitive terrain. Ichioka confronts the greatest “taboo” of Japanese American Studies: discussion of possibilities of espionage and subversion among some Japanese Americans before the attack on Pearl Harbor. While Chapter 7 traces the trajectory of Buddy Uno from a naive Nisei journalist to a propagandist on the Japanese side, Chapter 9 looks into the activities of Issei members of the Japanese Naval Association of Southern California in the 1941 Tachibana espionage case. Whether or not one agrees with his contention that the arrest of the implicated Issei in the Tachibana incident was justified, it is certainly courageous of Ichioka to problematize the biases embedded in Japanese American historiography that have categorically excluded the so-called disloyal.

In Ichioka’s view the ongoing treatment of the disloyal as *persona non grata* in history represents an enduring legacy of white racism and the mass internment, which has disallowed recognition of complexities or ambiguities in our understanding of Issei and Nisei lives. Ichioka was fully cognizant of the political implications of history writing, as well as the danger that his revisionist endeavor might entail, in light of the dogged attempt in segments of white America to rationalize wartime internment even at the present. It is precisely for this reason that his article on Issei pro-Japan nationalism (Chapter 8) remained shelved until after the successful conclusion of the redress and reparations movement in 1988, even though it had been ready for publication for several years. In the post-redress era, when historical research



and writing are no longer inseparable from community movements for justice, Ichioka stressed that it was high time for historians to grapple with controversial problems of political identity and so-called loyalty that they had hitherto dodged or neglected consciously or unconsciously. Buddy Uno, Furusawa Takashi and Sachiko (Chapter 9), and Honda Rikita (Chapter 11) are examples of such historical amnesia or denial.

While tackling the Tachibana espionage case was his way of being true to history's ambiguities and shades of meaning, Ichioka would nevertheless have little tolerance for a political exploitation of Japanese American history, just as he lambasted Page Smith's attempt to absolve America from the blame for the mass internment.<sup>11</sup> Now in post-9/11 America, conservatives have once again advocated the detention of "anti-American" elements (Muslims this time around) for "national security" without due process by citing historical precedents of alleged Issei and Nisei "treachery," including the activities of the Furusawas.<sup>12</sup> Had he observed such a distorted use of Japanese American history for "reactionary" politics, Ichioka would have been the first to fight it and insist that the individual allegations not be construed as representing the behavior and thinking of the entire group, let alone constituting any sort of justification for the indiscriminate suspension of their civil rights.

Finally, transnationalism is another important theme that infuses *Before Internment*. Because he appreciates the transnational nature of Japanese American lives, practices, and ideas, Ichioka was critical of single-nation frameworks that characterize U.S. scholarship on ethnic minorities and immigrants. In a fundamental sense his entire career could be described as a commitment to debunking nationalist narratives. As early as 1971, when it was still unpopular and even stigmatized among scholars of both the United States and Japan, he brought a transnational perspective to Japanese American history, calling for empirical research that would transcend national boundaries. In his very first published essay Ichioka declared, "Japanese-American history must be studied alongside the history of modern Japan." He made it clear, however, that this "does not mean the two are synonymous" because "Japanese-American history after all is an integral part of American history, the essential larger context from which its basic meaning derives."<sup>13</sup> More than thirty years ago, in simple language, if not articulated as theory and devoid of trendy academic jargon and convoluted expression, the pioneer historian already ventured into questions of the global versus the

local, as well as of the tensions and entanglements between Asian American (ethnic) Studies and Asian (area) Studies that have drawn critical considerations in both fields in recent years.

Ichioka also spearheaded internationalizing Japanese American history by attempting to extend the scope of research and analysis from the confines of United States society to the entire Americas, an ongoing development that has led to several publications.<sup>14</sup> While personally traveling to Brazil, Peru, and Mexico for networking and research, he invited Latin American scholars, like Mary Fukumoto of Peru, for lectures during the 1990s, and he also encouraged U.S. scholars to take up comparative studies of Japanese experiences in the Western Hemisphere. Prepared for a public lecture in 1999, "The Future of Japanese-American Studies" (Chapter 12) succinctly explains Ichioka's rationale for transnational perspectives on *Nikkei* (people of Japanese ancestry) in the Americas, and as one can see, his primary interest remains the same as three decades ago. Ichioka continued to focus on "the essential . . . context from which [the] basic meaning" of a collective experience "derives," that is, a society in which Issei and Nisei lived their everyday lives as Nikkei under the constraints of a hegemonic power. To Ichioka, being Nikkei takes many shapes and forms, but their differences are bound to the specific manners in which political economies operate in various countries. In a comparative setting, then, juxtaposing Nikkei histories in different societies ultimately serves a pivotal goal of deepening an understanding of Japanese Americans' racial position in the United States, and of the impact of American racism on their identity formation that set them apart decidedly from others, especially those in Brazil.

Although Ichioka was unable to produce a comparative historical study in his lifetime, *Before Internment*, in its own light, offers an excellent example of a transnational history based on substantive archival research. All the discussions here deal with aspects of Issei and Nisei lives that overarched the Pacific Ocean, in consciousness or actual practice. Critical of ahistorical abstractions, Ichioka was insistent on appreciating the complex agency of the people in the context of their times with the help of the vernacular documents that they left behind. His transnational approach naturally entailed the collection and organization of Japanese-language source materials from inside and outside the United States. When teaching this writer how to do Japanese American history, Ichioka stressed that it should not only involve telling a story from one perspective or another but also help preserve the

remains of the people's activities and thinking—the primary sources that would allow other historians to tell different and perhaps more informed stories in the future.<sup>15</sup> Archival research was central, he asserted, because that is where historians would be able to establish meaningful connections to the people they study. Theories would be meaningless unless they are predicated on the analysis of the people's voices—however fragmented. Thus, an important aspect of Ichioka's professional life was devoted to the development and expansion of the Japanese American Research Project (JARP) Collection at UCLA, the best archives of Japanese immigrant materials in the nation, soon to be renamed the Yuji Ichioka-JARP Collection.

His sophisticated approach and methodology notwithstanding, Ichioka would have hated to be associated with any theoretical school or position. His essays are full of fascinating conceptualization and interpretation, but he was impatient of fuzzy theorization without consideration of concrete social realities and historical contexts. Ever committed to social justice and the interest of his community, Ichioka knew too well where he stood first and what he was concerned about most. “Although bilingual and bicultural,” he notes in his last published article (Chapter 13), “I identify myself as an American committed to politically changing our country for the better” (296). This political impulse characterizes his style of writing, which values clarity so as to be able to also reach ordinary readers outside academia. Thus, Ichioka declared that he still believed in “the old-time practice of doing narrative history, of telling a story in ordinary language based on substantive research in primary sources” (296). As readers will see, *Before Internment* indeed does all that, but it is hardly “old-fashioned.” With new paradigms and a transnational approach to uncover interwar Japanese American history, this book no doubt opens up new horizons for research and learning. *Before Internment* is another milestone built by Yuji Ichioka, the pioneer historian in Japanese American Studies.

#### Notes

1. Other prewar English-language works that helped define academic discourses on Japanese immigrant experience include Sidney L. Gulick, *The American Japanese Problem* (New York: Charles Scriber's Sons, 1914); Harry A. Millis, *The Japanese Problem in the United States* (New York: Macmillan, 1915); Karl K. Kawakami, *The Real Japanese Question* (New York: Macmillan, 1921); E. Manchester Boddy, *Japanese in America* (Los Angeles: E. Manchester Boddy, 1921); Eliot

G. Mears, *Residential Orientals on the American Pacific Coast* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1928); and Jean Pajus, *The Real Japanese California* (Berkeley, CA: J. J. Gillick, 1937), among others. Most of these works were produced in the context of anti-Japanese agitation, with the specific goal of either refuting or supporting racial exclusion. Before the war Issei intellectuals were also active in the construction of specific historical narratives in search of national inclusion. Their vernacular publications are too numerous to list, but for a detailed analysis of Japanese immigrant history making see Eiichiro Azuma, "The Politics of Transnational History Making: Japanese Immigrants on the Western 'Frontier,' 1927–1941," *Journal of American History* 89, no. 4 (March 2003): 1401–30. After the war Nisei writers joined the process of history making. The most prolific writer is Bill Hosokawa, whose works have contributed to the emergence of orthodoxy on the Nisei. See Hosokawa, *Nisei: The Quiet Americans: The Story of a People* (New York: Morrow, 1969); Robert A. Wilson and Bill Hosokawa, *East to America: A History of the Japanese in the United States* (New York: Morrow, 1980); and Bill Hosokawa, *JACL: In Quest of Justice* (New York: Morrow, 1982). Other postwar metanarratives of Japanese American history are Bradford Smith, *Americans from Japan* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1948); William Petersen, *Japanese Americans: Oppression and Success* (New York: Random House, 1971); and H. Brett Melendy, *The Oriental Americans* (New York: Hippocrene Books, 1972).

2. Yuji Ichioka, *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885–1924* (New York: Free Press, 1988), 1.

3. Yuji Ichioka, "The Early Japanese Immigrant Quest for Citizenship: The Background of the 1922 Ozawa Case," *Amerasia Journal* 4, no. 2 (1977): 1–22. This article went on to occupy a key place in Ichioka's first book.

4. See Ichioka, *The Issei*, 2. With an interest in labor issues, he also edited an autobiography of a Kibei communist-union organizer, Karl G. Yoneda, *Ganbatte: Sixty-Year Struggle of a Kibei Worker* (Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1983).

5. Yuji Ichioka, "Ameyuki-san: Japanese Prostitutes in Nineteenth Century America," *Amerasia Journal* 4, no. 1 (1977): 1–21; and Yuji Ichioka, "America Nadeshiko: Japanese Immigrant Women in the United States, 1900–1924," *Pacific Historical Review* 48 (1980): 339–57.

6. Ichioka, *The Issei*, 253–54.

7. Students of "assimilation" usually understand generational divides as a natural manifestation of cultural clashes between "America" and the "Old World."

8. See, e.g., Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, *The Politics of Fieldwork: Research in an American Concentration Camp* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1999); and Henry Yu, *Thinking Orientals: Migration, Contact, and Exoticism in Modern America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

9. For the Japanese version see Ichioka Yūji, “Dai-Nisei Mondai, 1902–1941,” trans. Sakata Yasuo, in *Hokubei Nihonjin Kirisutokyō Undōshi* [History of Japanese Christian Activities in North America], ed. Dōshisha Daigaku Jinbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo, 731–84 (Tokyo: PMC Shuppan, 1991).

10. Clearly this idea has influenced how Lon Kurashige (Nisei “biculturalism”) and Azuma (Issei “eclecticism”) analyze their subjects in their respective works. See Kurashige, “Problem of Biculturalism”; and Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

11. See Ichioka’s review of Page Smith, *Democracy on Trial: Japanese American Evacuation and Relocation in World War II* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), in *Pacific Historical Review* 65 (August 1996): 498–99.

12. For example, see Michelle Malkin, *In Defense of Internment: The Case for “Racial Profiling” in World War II and the War on Terror* (New York: Regnery, 2004).

13. Yuji Ichioka, “A Buried Past: Early Issei Socialists and the Japanese Community,” *Amerasia Journal* 1, no. 2 (July 1971): 15.

14. On his early formulation see Yuji Ichioka, “Nikkei in the Western Hemisphere,” *Amerasia Journal* 15, no. 2 (1989): 175–77. For an example of comparative Nikkei studies, albeit not historical, see Lane Ryo Hirabayashi, Akemi Kikumura-Yano, and James A. Hirabayashi, eds., *New Worlds/New Lives: Globalization and People of Japanese Descent in the Americas and from Latin America in Japan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002).

15. Ichioka was fond of characterizing Issei history as a “buried past,” for scholars have neglected to use the immigrant-language material—the best source of historical information in his opinion. To help unearth it, Ichioka believed in historians’ responsibility for the preservation of primary source documents. On his philosophy of combining history writing and archival development see Yuji Ichioka et al., *A Buried Past: An Annotated Bibliography of the Japanese American Research Project Collection* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 3–15; and Yuji Ichioka and Eiichiro Azuma, *A Buried Past: A Sequel to the Annotated Bibliography of the Japanese American Research Project Collection* (Los Angeles: UCLA Asian American Studies Center, 1999), v.