

# Contextualizing “We, Okinawans”: Perspectives on the Okinawa Status Issue of 1951 from Okinawa, Tokyo and Honolulu

Satoko UECHI

## Abstract

This paper focuses on the status issue of the Okinawa islands before the San Francisco Peace Treaty, from the triangular perspective of three Okinawan communities: Okinawan people in Okinawa, those in mainland Japan, and Okinawan immigrants in Hawai'i. The main aim of this paper is to describe how the three Okinawan groups reacted to the status of their homeland, through an analysis of opinion articles which appeared in newspapers in 1951.

Two findings are presented: the difference in terms of discussion regarding the territorial issue, and the gap in positioning among the three connected communities. Okinawan people, having immigrated overseas in prewar time, resumed networking immediately after the Second World War in order to support their homeland, which had been devastated by the fighting. With those in Hawai'i as a hub, connecting each Okinawan community, the Okinawans overseas seem to have shared a sense of unity, based on their being Okinawan. The reactions printed in newspapers varied. While lively debate over the pros and cons of returning to Japan was printed in Okinawan local newspapers, the opinions printed in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* in mainland Japan was solely supportive of Okinawa's return to Japan. In Hawai'i, despite the close connection with Japan and Okinawa, local Japanese newspapers only received a mere two pro-reversion opinions.

The three communities' mutual relations were also problematic. Okinawan people in Tokyo sometimes took a paternalistic attitude towards their fellows in Okinawa, whereas those in Hawai'i occasionally showed irritation to the people in Okinawa to whom they sent relief. Both those in Tokyo and Hawai'i also shared the position of being “outsiders” in terms of the Okinawan status issue. For those in Okinawa, the opinions of outsiders tended not to reflect the reality of Okinawa, that of an island that had been put under the direct control of the U.S. military.

## Introduction

Okinawa<sup>i</sup>, the island prefecture located between mainland Japan and Taiwan, has, since the beginning of twenty century, a long history of emigration. The network between the islands from which people emigrated and the oversea descendants of those émigrés is still visible, as is highlighted by the existence of the Worldwide Uchinanchu Festival that has been held in the Okinawa Island for almost every five year since 1990. According to the festival website, which is available in four languages (Japanese, English, Spanish, and Portuguese), the 4<sup>th</sup> Festival in 2006 attracted 4,937 participants from 21 countries, and the local newspaper has reported that the 5<sup>th</sup> gathering scheduled from October 12 to 15, 2011 expects 5,000 visitors and participants<sup>ii</sup>. Among other Japanese prefectures with a history of emigration, Okinawa prefecture is the only example of a local government which has organized and given continuous support to such an overseas networking event.

Another important factor in the history of Okinawa is its unique experience of U.S. occupation after the Second World War. Being the locus of the last land battle, these East China Sea islands were put under the direct control of the U.S. military, which had lasted for twenty-seven years until 1972. Widespread "Reversion to Japan" movements, which started to grow in the 1960s, organized by local people in Okinawa, continued till power transferred from the U.S. to Japan. The memory and experience of this political change feature the islands' post war history.

The years of diplomatic negotiation up to 1972 are not, however, the first moment Okinawa's status arose as a political issue: as the Peace Treaty between Japan and the Allied Powers loomed in 1951, the status of these islands came up as one of the territorial issues. Okinawa, which had been put under *de facto* U.S. military control since the end of the war, was among other territories such as the Kuril, Iwo, and Bonin islands that seemed likely to be cut off from Japan at the forthcoming San Francisco meeting. What this paper focuses on is the Okinawa status issue in 1951, as seen by Okinawan people both inside and outside of Okinawa. How did the Okinawan people, facing their home islands' ambiguous future, react to the Okinawa disposition issue in 1951? In order to seek the answer to this question, my research focus on the arguments and opinions found in contemporary Okinawa-related public media.

The aim of this paper is to introduce two findings that have been gained in ongoing research on Okinawa-related publications. One is the difference in the number of arguments that appeared in the public media regarding the territorial agenda of 1951. The major sources used here are two local newspapers: *Okinawa Times* and *Uruma Shimpo* in Okinawa Island; *Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, a newspaper issued in Fukuoka; *Jiyu Okinawa*, the organizational newspaper of the League of Okinawan People (沖縄人聯盟: Okinawajin renmei), issued in Tokyo; *Kosei Okinawa*, the organizational newspaper issued by the Okinawa Relief and Rehabilitation Foundation in Honolulu; and *Hawaii Times*, one of two major Japanese newspapers of that time in Honolulu. Regarding the discussion on the Okinawa status issue in 1951, preceding studies have explored the arguments by Okinawan people in Okinawa [Oguma 1998; Toriyama 2001, 2004; Sakurazawa 2007], and made analysis taking Okinawan people in Tokyo into account [Uechi 2008]. Yamashita [2003] has revealed the situation of the Okinawan community of that time in Hawai'i from the perspective of the Okinawa disposition agenda.

Based on the findings of these preceding studies, what this paper tries to do is to approach the Okinawan status issue from the transborder perspective, i.e. from Okinawa, Japan, and Hawai'i, in order to grasp the dynamics of the Okinawa disposition issue. Although a detailed text analysis of Okinawa-related arguments and opinions is not yet complete, the number of articles and their general tendencies suggest the differences in attitude among Okinawan people in the three geographical spheres.

The other finding, observed during the analysis of the texts found in the above publications, is the subtle but uneven relationship among the three Okinawan communities, i.e. those in Okinawa Island, in Tokyo, and in Honolulu. As is to be described in the second section of this paper, Okinawan people seem to have shared the sense of being Okinawan at the time when Okinawa's future was at stake. Their concerns about their devastated home islands took a variety of shapes, such as frequent exchange of letter and publication among each other, and vigorous campaign of sending relief materials to individuals' home islands and distant communities. This sense of unity, which one might interpret as one of the backbones that has led to the contemporary Uchinanchu Festival, seems to have coexisted with the sense of difference. Regarding the positionality among Okinawan communities, Tobe

points out the cultural hegemony of Okinawan intellectuals in Tokyo over their counterparts in Okinawa in the pre-war era, and the complex power relations over authenticity and approval that existed between the two groups in the post war period [2000: 50-51]. Okano stresses the Okinawa-Hawai'i linkage on the Okinawa status issue [2008: 1], though his main analysis dealt with the Hawai'i-side Okinawan community during the post-Peace Treaty period. What this paper focuses on is the triangular connection, i.e. Okinawa-Tokyo, Okinawa-Hawai'i, and Tokyo-Hawai'i relationships of the Okinawan communities when the Okinawa's status was at stake in 1951.

The structure of this paper is as follows: firstly the brief history of pre-war Okinawa immigration, or the spread of people inside and outside Japanese territory, is discussed with emphasis on the close relationship between the original islands and the remote communities. The second part describes how these Okinawa communities have resumed mutual communication in the immediate post-war period. Attention will be given to the effort to reconstruct the networks of communication through material and personnel circulation, and the seemingly shared mentality of “being Okinawan people”. The active role taken by those in Hawai'i is also illustrated here. Then the two findings, the uneven number of arguments regarding Okinawa's disposition and the uneven positioning among the three Okinawa communities, are presented. In conclusion, drawing on the social and political conditions and contexts of each sphere, a tentative explanation as to what caused such differences among the three communities, which seems to have made continuous efforts to connect with each other up to the present day, is presented.

## 1 . **Background: Okinawan Communities in the Pre-War Era**

Okinawa prefecture, which was annexed to imperial Japan 12 years after the Meiji Restoration, quickly became one of the largest senders of émigrés. Starting with the 26 Okinawan laborers landed in Honolulu in 1900, the subsequent destination list grew long: Mexico and the Philippines in 1904, the French territory New Caledonia in 1905, and Peru and Brazil in 1906 and 1908 respectively [Isa 2008: 190-191]. South American countries became popular destinations after the immigration restriction to America, which was made by the Gentlemen's agreement between Japan and the U.S. in 1907. The imperial Japanese domain of the South Sea islands (*Nan'yo shotō*), Taiwan,

and Manchuria turned to be alternative since 1924 when the Immigration Act, legislated for the purpose of excluding aliens ineligible for citizenship from entry into the country, became effective in the U.S. [Isa 2008: 190-191, Kimura 1981: 56-57]. Despite the restriction, however, Okinawan people continued to move as did Japanese immigrants, into the U.S. and Hawai'i through "*yobiyose*" (summoning families) system until 1924 [Kimura 1981: 56-57]. Among these destinations, Hawai'i attracted the most immigrants. According to Sakihara, the total number of people immigrating from Okinawa increased to 26,500 by 1927, of which 10,119 immigrated to Hawai'i, 5,464 to Brazil, and 1,369 to Peru [Sakihara 1981: 15]. In 1938 the number of Okinawan immigrants in Hawai'i was 20,118, with 16,426 in the Philippines, 14,829 in Brazil, and 11,311 in Peru. The same source also suggests that the total number of Okinawan in overseas (mostly outside the imperial Japanese domain) was 72,745 in 1938 [Asano 2004: 319-320]<sup>iii</sup>, which indicates that the immigrant population of Okinawans in Hawai'i was nearly 30% of all Okinawan people living abroad at that time.

This huge population flow to Hawai'i was not a one-way movement. Being far from their home islands, Okinawan immigrants tended to have kept close ties with their home islands, through sending back family members and monetary remittance.

Sending back the offspring to the parents' homeland was quite a common practice among Okinawan society in Hawai'i. Although this trend was not particular to Okinawan immigrant but rather a prevalent custom among Japanese settlers, Okinawan parents were "more likely to send their children to Okinawa" due to economic reasons – in order to reduce the expenses of bringing-up the childrens – and also due to the common Okinawan practice of extended families rearing family member's children [Maehara Yamazato 2007: 84-85]. From the early 1930s the motivation had changed to one of education. Many Nisei (second generation of immigrant) were sent to Okinawa for schooling and some went to mainland Japan for higher education. According to Maehara Yamazato, there were approximately 3,000 Okinawan Nisei who had returned from Okinawa to Hawai'i during 1920s and 1930s [Maehara Yamazato 2007: 85].

In terms of financial support, the remittance from oversea communities was vital for the poor prefecture. A previous study reveals that in 1933, the

amount of money transferred from Okinawan immigrants overseas counted to about 2,080,000 yen, 38% of the annual revenue of the prefecture of that year (5,500,000 yen), and the amount increased to approximately 5,000,000 when the money brought in by temporary returnees is included [Asano 2006: 81]<sup>iv</sup>. Here Hawai'i showed her presence. Although the data is taken from a different period, the total remittance of 592,752 yen from Hawai'i in 1910 accounts for 82.2% of all money sent from oversea immigrant communities, which is followed by 27,418 yen from Mexico (3.8%) and 25,306 yen from Brazil (3.5%) [Ishihara 1981: 99]. This ratio stays high from 1912 (682,946 yen: 79.2%) to 1915 (699,342 yen: 79.2%) [Ishihara 1981: 99]. Taking into account the fact that the biggest overseas population of Okinawans was in Hawai'i, it is highly possible that Okinawan community in Hawai'i remained the most generous contributor of finance in the late 1930s. In the both ways, i.e. via personnel circulation and remittance, the Okinawan immigrants and their birthplace had been connected both mentally and materially over the pre-war period, with Hawai'i as a major presence in these connections.

Many Okinawan people also moved out to the mainland Japan. Data shows the number of Okinawan inhabitants in Japan in 1935 was around 32,335 whereas the total population of the prefecture was 562,580 [Asano 2006: 84]. This large population flow is understandable considering the geographical condition of the prefecture: people went from a collective of islands and islets, unsuitable for industrial development, to the mainland for better job opportunities. Tsurumi ward in Kanagawa prefecture in Kanto area, and Taisho district in Osaka in Kansai area, both of which were the centers of large industrial areas, have been famous for large number of Okinawan inhabitants in Japan since the pre-war period. People in Okinawa also left their islands for higher education as their counterparts in Hawai'i did. Since Okinawa did not have any higher educational institutions in the pre-war era, students who sought further education in university and college had no choice but to move out to the mainland Japan. Also Tokyo, the metropolis of the imperial Japan, had attracted Okinawans who succeeded in such careers as government officials, university professor, and journalists. Some of them later took active roles in stressing the importance of reversion to Japan in the discussion in 1951, as is dealt with in the following section.

Besides the pre-war Okinawan communities, Japan accepted fairly

large number of evacuees from Okinawa until the end of the Second World War. From late 1944 to early 1945, the authorities hurriedly executed the evacuation program as the front line of the Pacific War approached to Okinawa. Approximately 60,000 of people, mainly school children, the elderly and women were shipped to the mainland, out of which 40,000 were spread over Kyusyu area [Okinawa Times 1971: 30]. In order to facilitate their temporary settlement, administrative offices were established in Kagoshima, Miyazaki, Ohita, and Kumamoto prefectures with headquarters in Fukuoka prefecture [Okinawa Times 1971: 30; Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum 2000: 54]. The office in Fukuoka also served as a tentative prefectural government when the communication and transportation with the home islands became less reliable as the Americans invaded, and the land battle situation got worse. This was the situation at the time the Second World War ended.

## **2. Reconstructing the Network Among the Okinawans**

The two-and-a-half-month land battle destroyed most of the social infrastructures in Okinawa Island, resulting in a halt of transportation and communication between Okinawa and mainland Japan. Okinawan people in Japan were deeply concerned and worried about their home islands and their family members left there. The end of the war did not mean they got any detailed information about the present situation of Okinawa; the territory was controlled by the U.S. military government, and what they could have learned from official media and heard via the grapevine was the fact that their islands suffered severe damage and huge human losses<sup>v</sup>. Facing such a difficult situation, Okinawan people in Japan, themselves as the subject to the Allied Force occupation, began to form their own organizations in late 1945.

The Okinawa office in Fukuoka was restructured to be remote prefectural government to give official protection and support, with financial aid from the Japanese government, to the evacuated from Okinawa and the Okinawan repatriates from the former imperial territories [Okinawa Times 1971: 30]. It also begun, in 1946, issuing the newspaper *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* in order to circulate necessary information among the settlements in Kyusyu area. Besides this semi-governmental institution, the Okinawan people in Kyusyu

area, Kansai area, and Kanto area (Tokyo) started to establish their mutual aid organizations in their respective areas from late 1945.

Spontaneously emerging at first, these organizations soon established liaison with each other and in early 1946, the integrated body League of Okinawan People was founded in Tokyo. While the Okinawa office limited their scope of activities to the administrative aspect, the League of Okinawan People aimed "to contribute to the rebuilding of Okinawa by democratic means as well as to reconstruct mutual communication and to engage in relief activities for Okinawan people" [Arasaki 1982: 15]. While planning various activities to support Okinawan fellows in Japan and in Okinawa, and issuing their organizational newspaper *Jiyu Okinawa*, the core members of this organization quickly handed out a petition to GHQ. In the plea they called for support for the early return of the evacuated and the repatriated to Okinawa; authorization to dispatch their members to Okinawa to collect local information; and the resuming communication and transportation of people, money, and relief materials among Okinawa and the South Sea islands (*Nan'yo shotō*) of Micronesia, and Hawai'i [Arasaki 1982: 14].

It was a matter of course for those in Tokyo to have turned to the oversea Okinawan communities including Hawai'i, their important financial supporters, when facing the necessity of rescuing their fellow islanders and their common homeland. Zenchu Nakahara, the chair of the League of Okinawan People, expressing his delight in resuming communication with Brazil, Peru and Hawai'i, stated that "the economic potential of oversea prefecture fellows (在外縣人: *zaigai kenjin*) is huge, and they are full of affection for their homeland" therefore "in this sense appealing to the oversea immigrants has become an important task"<sup>vi</sup>. When they found themselves left with little information and few resources for aiding Okinawa, it was natural for them to seek to communicate with other Okinawan communities to share information and exchange ideas. In this regard, too, the Okinawan community in Hawai'i was not only the biggest, but also the closest overseas community to the Okinawans in Japan, as was illustrated already. Several clues suggest how closely connected the communities in Tokyo and Hawai'i as well as those in Okinawa and Hawai'i have been since the pre-war era<sup>vii</sup>.

In Hawai'i, the devastating situation of the Battle of Okinawa and its aftermath was constantly reported through the local Japanese newspapers<sup>viii</sup>.



Mr. Higa, an Okinawan Nisei soldier in Okinawa sent a report to *Hawaii Times* to describe the islands' situation to the concerned Okinawan community in Hawai'i<sup>ix</sup>. He toured around Hawai'i in September 1945, after coming back from Okinawa, to convey the necessity of launching an Okinawa relief campaign [Kawawa 2000: 244]. Being driven by the timely flow of information from Okinawa, relief activities arose voluntarily, as happened, for example, in the late 1945, when people started to collect and box used clothes for Okinawa [Wakukawa 2000: 41-43].

Meantime, news of the miserable situation of the evacuated and repatriated Okinawan people in Japan reached Hawai'i in early 1946 through two Okinawans: Mr. Nakamura and Mr. Kochi, immigrants who lived in the west coast of the U.S. They were member of a group of official inspectors sent to Japan by the U.S. government. On the course of their visit, according to an article in *Jiyu Okinawa*, they encountered the fund rising campaign by the League of Okinawan People, visited their office and talked about possible liaison among Okinawan communities inside and outside Japan<sup>x</sup>. After leaving Japan, they posted a report to a Japanese newspaper in New York about the pitiful conditions of their evacuated and repatriated fellows stranded in Japan<sup>xi</sup>. This approach from the U.S. mainland presumably also drove the Okinawa relief activities in Hawai'i [Wakukawa 2000: 42-43].

Nakamura and Kochi stressed, in a talk with the members of the League of Okinawan People, their intention to cooperate with the Okinawan in Japan<sup>xii</sup>. An article in *Jiyu Okinawa* on June 1946 reports that the two men promised to appeal to their "compatriots" (同胞: doho) in North America, South America and Hawai'i, and to collect and send relief material to Japan from all Okinawans throughout the world when they returned to the U.S.<sup>xiii</sup>. The same article suggests Kochi had already gone to Hawai'i after his visit to Japan in order to establish cooperative connection with the local Okinawan community.

Okinawan people resumed communication. Their active exchange of information is clearly appeared in the contents of the Okinawa-related publications issued in Japan and Hawai'i. For example, in 1948, *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* in Fukuoka reports on an Okinawan sumo wrestler and his fund-raising activity based on reports in *Hawaii Times*<sup>xiv</sup>, has its editorial based on a source from the two Okinawa local newspapers *Uruma Shimpo* and *Okinawa Times*<sup>xv</sup>,

and has two articles based on *Kosei Okinawa* in Honolulu<sup>xvi</sup>. Several articles of the monthly *Kosei Okinawa* in 1948 are based on sources from *Okinawa Shin Mimpō*<sup>xvii</sup>, *Uruma Shimpo*<sup>xviii</sup>, and a report from the Okinawa Relief Committee in Brazil (伯国沖縄救援委員会会報: Hakukoku Okinawa Kyusai Inkaikai Kaihou)<sup>xix</sup>. An article in *Jiyu Okinawa* on January 20, 1948 features the mimeographed pamphlet, *Situation of Post War Okinawa* (終戦後の沖縄事情: Syusengo no Okinawa jijo), issued in São Paulo, that offers selected articles from *Jiyu Okinawa*, *Hawaii Times* and other resources<sup>xx</sup>. The Okinawa Relief & Rehabilitation Foundation in Hawai‘i, the organization behind *Kosei Okinawa*, even had some correspondents in Okinawa<sup>xxi</sup>.

The Okinawans were fully conscious in their networking. An article in *Jiyu Okinawa* on November 15, 1946 emphasized the need to establish an international organization for Okinawans “that connects South America, North America, Hawai‘i, Japan mainland and Okinawa”<sup>xxii</sup>. *Kosei Okinawa* in Honolulu stated their purpose in the following manner: “to be an assistant institution that helps to integrate the homeland relief activities conducted by the worldwide Okinawan fellows in mainland Japan, North America, Central America, and South America and establishing communication among them”<sup>xxiii</sup>.

What is noticeable in this trend is the use of expressions of collective identity as Okinawan people. The articles and contributions in the Okinawa-related publications frequently employ expression such as “compatriots” (同胞: doho), “fellow of Okinawa prefecture” (縣人同胞: kenjin doho) and “overseas compatriots” (海外同胞: kaigai doho)<sup>xxiv</sup>. Also they often refer to themselves as Okinawan people (沖縄人: Okinawa jin), and people of Okinawa prefecture (沖縄縣人: Okinawa ken jin) interchangeably<sup>xxv</sup>. The term Okinawa/Ryukyu “minzoku” (race or ethnic group) was also frequently used<sup>xxvi</sup>. As is indicated in the range of terms used for self reference, from the Japanese administrative term “prefecture” to “ethnic group”, the self definition of Okinawan people at that time seems to not necessarily be that of being separate from Japan. Still, the variety of self-description, along with the active networking, implies a possibility that they have shared a sense of unity, based on their being Okinawan people.

As mentioned above, the Okinawan community in Hawai‘i was in a better position to gain information from Okinawa, partly due to its being the

largest overseas community, and partly due to its being the strategic center of the U.S. military in the Pacific, which had responsibility for governing Okinawa at that time. An article “Relief News” ‘(救援ニュース: kyuen news) in *Kosei Okinawa* in the December 1947 issue contains a list of newly arrival publications that were sent from North America, South America and Japan to the Okinawa Relief & Rehabilitation Foundation in Honolulu. In the list were the pamphlet *Relief News* vol. 5 and 6 from the west coast of America, *Situation of Post War Okinawa* (終戦後の沖縄事情: syusen go no Okinawa jijo) vol. 6 and “Reports” (会報) vol. 1 to 4 from Brazil, and *Uruma Shimpo* from Okinawa. It is also suggested that the Foundation circulated the Okinawa local newspaper *Uruma Shimpo* to the South and North America continents. A Similar but longer list of recently arrived publications is found in *Kosei Okinawa* in May 1948 issue<sup>xxvii</sup>.

In terms of the relief activities, the Okinawan people in Hawai'i were also outstanding among those in overseas Okinawan groups. Firstly, they were quick in move. Encouraged by the first hand report of the Nisei soldier from Okinawa, they shipped the first batch of relief clothes as early as late 1945. Secondly, their relief materials were unique. In contrast to the other Okinawan communities in North and South America who tended to send money and general commodities, they prepared and shipped, as individual volunteer groups, 550 pigs (in December 1947), 10,000 dollars worth of medicine (in January 1948), and 800 goats (in October 1948) [Kawawa 2007: 244-246; Wakukawa 2000: 43]. The Okinawa Relief & Rehabilitation Foundation in Honolulu, with Seiyei Wakukawa as manager, launched a campaign to invite Okinawan students to universities and colleges in the U.S. (finally realized in 1948) and also tried to support the foundation of the first university in Okinawa. Besides these collective campaigns, members of the community individually sent daily necessity such as sugar, oil, clothes, stationery and books to their family and friends in Japan and in Okinawa<sup>xxviii</sup>.

### 3. The Triangular Standpoint, Part One: Toward the Okinawan Status Issue

The Okinawa disposition issue arose in 1951, in the conditions described above. This section will demonstrate the difference in the framework and

the number of opinion articles regarding Okinawan status in newspapers in

| Resources                           | Uruma Shimpo<br>Okinawa Times                               | Okinawa Shin Mimpo         | Hawaii Times  |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Framework<br>of Arguments           | Pro-Reversion to Japan<br>vs.<br>Anti-Reversion to<br>Japan | Pro-Reversion to Japan     | Few arguments |
| Number of<br>Article / Contributors | Pro-R. 11/9<br>Anti-R. 12/9<br>+ 2 special features         | Pro-R. 6/3<br>+ 1editorial | Pro-R. 2/2    |

Okinawa, Japan, and Hawai'i.

The following is a visualized comparison of the arguments in 1951<sup>xxxix</sup>:

In Okinawa, some individuals and political parties had occasionally suggested their standpoints regarding the future status of their islands since the end of war<sup>xxx</sup>. But it was in the first half of 1951 that the overt arguments began appearing in the local newspapers. The framework of the arguments was the dichotomy of pro-reversion and anti-reversion to Japan, though in the latter group some clearly refer to their pro-independence attitude and others vaguely suggest their preference for the U.N. trusteeship [Uechi 2008: 8-13]. *Uruma Shimpo* contains 5 pro-reversion opinion pieces and 8 of anti-reversion opinion pieces with 4 and 6 contributors in each, respectively<sup>xxxi</sup>. *Okinawa Times* has 6 pro-reversion opinion pieces and 4 of anti-reversion opinion pieces with 5 and 3 contributors in each, respectively<sup>xxxii</sup>. The above table shows the combined numbers of both. Most of the contributors presented their opinion in a series of articles so the discussion was more detailed and long. Moreover, *Uruma Shinpo* featured two special articles that presented a wide range of opinions from pro-reversion to Japan to preferences for independence collected from readers<sup>xxxiii</sup>.

On the Japan side, in contrast, it seems that no such a lively discussion was developed in the public sphere<sup>xxxiv</sup>. In *Jiyu Okinawa*, issued from 1946 to 1948, several texts are found that imply a preference for being separate from Japan<sup>xxxv</sup>. This kind of opinion, however, did not have many followers. What is noticeable in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, the only major Okinawan newspaper existing by 1951 in mainland Japan, is the increasing number of voices

calling for reversion to Japan. Before 1949, no clear opinion was found in this newspaper except that of the pro-reversionist Ryoko Nakayoshi in 1946, who had just moved from Okinawa to mainland Japan<sup>xxxvi</sup>. In 1949, however, several texts start implicitly indicating a pro-reversion mentality to Japan<sup>xxxvii</sup>, which became explicit in 1950<sup>xxxviii</sup>.

In 1951, the year of the Peace Treaty, the number of opinion article was 6, of which 1 was an editorial and 3 were by the same person<sup>xxxix</sup>. In this year the stance of pro-reversion to Japan can also be sensed in the way the newspaper cover two other items of news<sup>xl</sup>. A counter argument could not be found. What is to be noted here is the fact that two of the contributors to *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* in 1951 also sent their opinion pieces to *Uruma Shinpo* and *Okinawa Times* in the same year<sup>xli</sup>. Indeed, 3 out of the 4 pro-reversion participants in *Uruma Shinpo* and 3 out of 5 in *Okinawa Times* were those in Tokyo<sup>xlii</sup>.

In terms of the situation of Hawai'i, the corresponding data on article counts is yet to be grasped. However, with the preceding work by Yamashita [2003], a thorough survey on the major newspapers in Hawai'i, including *Hawaii Times* and *Hawaii Herald*, together with some facts gained from my own ongoing project, it would be possible to give enough information to be offered for comparison.

Up to 1951, several texts sporadically appear in *Hawaii Times* and *Hawaii Herald* that concern the future of Okinawa. The earliest one is of Houn Tamayose, a Buddhist monk who had lived in Hawai'i since before the war. He wrote "On the relation of Okinawa with China" in the *Hawaii Times*, which was printed from January 10 to 16, 1946, and in which he insisted that "Ryukyuan people is genuinely Japanese"<sup>xliii</sup> with the intention of minimizing the historical connection of the Ryukyu Kingdom, the predecessor of Okinawa prefecture, with Chinese dynasties. Chiro Yosemite evaluates the present situation of U.S. control over Okinawa in his contribution to *Hawaii Herald* on January 1, 1948, suggesting that the best way for Okinawa to achieve cultural rehabilitation is to belong to a nation from which it can derive constant economical support [Yamashita 2003: 104]<sup>xliiv</sup>. Besides these two texts, "Okinawa, Where Are you Going?" (沖縄よ何処へ行く?, Okinawa yo doko he iku?) is found in *Hawaii Herald* on January 1, 1947. This is the first article in newspapers in Hawai'i that indicates a clear pro-reversion standpoint, according to Yamashita. This piece on January 1, 1947 was, however, wire

report featuring the speech of Ryoko Nakayoshi, a vigorous pro-reversionist in Tokyo [Yamashita 2003: 104].

Chiro Yosemite seems to have moved his position toward a more Japan-oriented one until 1951. One of the two statements found in the *Hawaii Times* in 1951, “Contribution: On Okinawa Attribution Issue” (寄書: 沖縄の－帰属問題に就て, Yosegaki: Okinawa no kizokumondai ni tsuite) from March 22 to 24, was written by him. In this text, he characterizes the reversion of Okinawa to Japan as the absolute solution that will lead to world peace. Two days later, Houn Tamayose wrote his opinion in the same newspaper with the same title as Yosemite’s article, in which he explicitly express his hope for Okinawa’s return to Japan<sup>xlv</sup>. Tamayose’s writing was not originally composed for the readers in Hawai’i, however. As he reveals in the beginning, this statement was reprinted from the monthly magazine *Okinawa* issued in Tokyo at that time. Apart from these two samples, published successively in March, Japanese newspapers in Hawai’i in 1951 seem not to have received any other contributions regarding the Okinawa issue<sup>xlvi</sup>.

In summary, the local newspapers in Okinawa were the locus for discussion over the pros and cons of reversion to Japan, while *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* conveyed only opinions on the pro-reversion side. *Hawaii Times* also ran pro-reversion opinions. The number of opinion pieces, two, was less than that of Tokyo, however, and one of these was a reprint of another journal article published in Tokyo. As Yamashita points out, there would have been constrain for the Okinawans in Hawai’i, being in sub-group of the Japanese society, to clarify their standpoints regarding Okinawa’s disposition in Japanese newspapers [Yamashita 2003: 104-105]. Recalling the active networking and relief material sending, and the sense of unity described in the previous sections, this unevenness is still interesting.

#### 4. The Triangular Standpoint, Part Two: Among the Okinawans

In analyzing the Okinawa-related publications, another point of difference was found regarding the three Okinawan communities. The tone of Okinawans in Tokyo was sometimes anxious or had a paternalistic mentality toward their countrymen in Okinawa. For example, Ryoko Nakayoshi, in

*Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, wrote the following: “Why do people in Okinawa, even now, remain in silence as if they are mute and do not move like stones. They are cowards and hesitate to say anything while they have much to say inside them”<sup>xlvii</sup>. Seiryō Kamiyama, a government bureaucrat and influential person in the Okinawan community in Tokyo, stated in *Uruma Shimpo*: “It is really irresponsible (“taylorinai”) of the local Okinawans, as the scheduled Peace Conference approaches, to have yet to clarify their attitude toward the status issue”<sup>xlviii</sup>. A Similar tone could be perceived in the letter from Chuzen Nakahara, the head of the League of Okinawan People of that time, to the Okinawa Relief & Rehabilitation Foundation. He remarks “the local people seem to have lost hope for their future, being overwhelmed by the suffering in their present situation. So I think it is necessary for them to be encouraged, directed and commented on from outside”<sup>xlix</sup>.

Neither did the attitude of the Okinawan community in Hawai‘i, the energetic supplier of relief materials and the hub of oversea Okinawa communities, show an unconditional sense of unity with their fellows in Okinawa. While publishing few opinions on the territorial issue, their comments and reactions suggest a standpoint of their own. For example, a report published in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* in June 5, 1947 states that some Okinawan people in Hawai‘i got angry at the letter of thanks from the governor of Okinawa, Shikiya, in which he referred to some badly packed parcels received from Hawai‘i and the trouble they caused<sup>l</sup>. Taking into account the frequency of requests for relief materials and for financial support the Okinawan community in Hawai‘i received from Okinawa (and from Japan as well)<sup>li</sup>, the following remark, made by a visitor from Hawai‘i to Okinawa, is understandable: “We do not have money falling from the sky; we are also constantly working and exerting a lot of effort”<sup>lii</sup>. Other documents suggest that the basic image of contemporary Okinawa in the Okinawan community in Hawai‘i were that of miserable, powerless, unfortunate islands to which “we Okinawans in Hawai‘i should give help”<sup>liii</sup>. An advisory tone can also be perceived in the attitude of Okinawans in Hawai‘i. According to an article in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, the three Okinawans who brought pigs to Okinawa from Hawai‘i, gave harsh comments to the local people such as “You should abandon bad habits if they will be obstacles for building a new Okinawa, especially the lack of punctuality” or “It is sad to see conflict among fellows, to

which I hope the local leaders thinking it over”<sup>liv</sup>.

The Okinawans in Tokyo and Hawai’i also seem to have had a common sense of “being an outsider”. Meitatsu Takamine, a government official and vocal proponent of reversion in Tokyo states “... On the other hand, this status issue is primarily up to the local Okinawan people. If the majority is against return to Japan, I will withdraw my pro-reversion argument, and hold back my tears” in his widely circulated text “Okinawa, Where Are You Going”<sup>lv</sup>. This way of thinking, that is, considering the local Okinawans as the primary deciders on the territorial issue, seems to have been shared among other Okinawans in Tokyo. Ryoko Nakayoshi also says “Because it is decided based on what the local Okinawan people wish, the key to the inalterable future of Okinawa is in the hand of the local residents”<sup>lvi</sup>. These phrases resonate with the remark by Seiyei Wakukawa in Honolulu, who stated in an interview with Yoshio Higa, a delegation of the Okinawa Civilian Administration, “Even if we say anything, do anything to Okinawa, enough support for homeland will be difficult if they – our fellow countrymen in Okinawa – do not show a clear attitude toward the status issue. We, the Okinawans overseas love our home islands as the locals do. But we are standing on the outside, after all. I would like the people at home to stand up”<sup>lvii</sup>.

How did the local people in Okinawa react to these attitudes from those outside? Replying to Wakukawa’s statement that suggests the “outsideness” of their position, Higa said “Surely it is right. I guess the people in the island also appreciate your attitude. Trouble would be caused if someone from outside, without knowing the reality of the island, makes a racket about it. It is the islanders who would be in trouble. They would appreciate if you said it in that way”<sup>lviii</sup>. What can be guessed from this conversation is the mentality of the local people: they feel the voices from outside are problematic if they do not consider the reality of the island.

Similar tone, or sometimes even stronger tones, could be found in the reaction of the Okinawans to their fellows in Tokyo. Tatsuo Taira, the governor of the Okinawa Gunto government in 1951, was a supporter of reversion to Japan. Even he, however, once stated that the people in Tokyo cry out to push the locals to declare their opinion, which is because they do not directly know the actual conditions here<sup>lix</sup>. Other angry opinions came from an anti-reversion assembly member Ginzo Shinzato, who defined the Okinawan people who



engaged in pro-reversion signature collecting campaigns in Tokyo as “actually Japanese”, and continued “It would be a better course of action for them to come to our Okinawa first, to experience our bitter reality, and then challenge to the Japanese government and the GHQ, if they really love the homeland and if they could guess our hardship” [Okinawaken Sokoku Fukki Toshō shi Henshu Iinkai 1982: 1358]<sup>k</sup>.

The observations in this section are based on limited resources. However, bearing in mind the largely shared sense of “being Okinawan” or “Okinawan fellows” among the Okinawan communities, as described above, this difference in the standpoint of the three communities reveals a subtle but interesting implication, helpful to understand the relationship between Okinawans in Okinawa, in the metropolis of Tokyo, and in the overseas community.

## 6. Where Did These Differences Come From?: Implications

What are the possible factors that can account for the discrepancy between the three Okinawan communities? In this section, I will introduce some information that might be helpful in answering this question.

In terms of the difference in the number of arguments, the difference in political and administrative status probably did matter in both Tokyo and Hawai'i. Cutting Okinawa off from Japan meant that Okinawan people in Japan would be categorized as “foreigners” in the Japanese domain. For those who established their life on the mainland, it would be inconvenient to be put under the insecure condition as being “foreigners”. As early as 1947, a Japanese government official report to the Diet contained some comments from Okinawan people who were worried about their situation when their home islands would be cut off from Japan, resulting in their either being treated as “foreigners” or being sent back to Okinawa despite their long settled life in mainland Japan [Noutomi 2004: 55]. Here I would like to recall that most of the vocal Okinawans in Tokyo were those who had been living in the metropolis since the pre-war era, and who were established and had successful careers.

In Hawai'i, the Okinawan also had their own context. The early post-war period was the time when the members of the Japanese immigrant society in the U.S., including in Hawai'i, started seeking naturalization rights

of the first generation (Issei) and restoration of civil rights for the second generation (Nisei). These movements were also conducted hand in hand with the campaign for Hawai'i's statehood [Yamashita 2003: 105-106]. In terms of administrative and social status, these campaigns were more critical for Okinawans in Hawai'i, who had lived and would keep living in the Pacific islands, than the status of their remote home islands. The as yet unfixed policy of Washington toward Okinawa, and the need to demonstrate they were "good American citizens" who deserved to gain these rights, would be the possible factors explaining the silence of those Okinawans in Hawai'i about Okinawa's status issue, regardless whether they personally wished it to be a part of Japan or not [Yamashita 2003: 106].

In terms of the gap among the three Okinawan communities, it can partly be accounted for by differences in social status. To understand the anxiety and paternalistic tone of those in Tokyo, I would point out the fact that, again, most of the vocal people were those who achieved social success during the pre-war period: they were famous and influential figures among Okinawans. As mentioned already, the two figures, Seiryō Kamiyama and Meitatsu Takamine, were government officials, which was an exceptionally high-status career path for Okinawans under the pre-war Japanese control. Ryoko Nakayoshi also had a career as a journalist in Tokyo before becoming mayor of Shuri, a historical city in Okinawa in 1942. Zenchū Nakahara had a long career as a teacher and educator in Tokyo. This social context would have formed their anxiety and paternalistic attitudes toward their fellow islanders<sup>bxi</sup>. With their established careers and the geographical advantage of being in Tokyo, they had access to the Japanese government and GHQ for the Okinawa's status issue, and behaved as informants and as representative<sup>bxi</sup>.

Okinawan people in Hawai'i experienced economic advancement due to increasing cash flow during war time. This advancement was realized by the war time economic boom and the stop of remittance to Okinawa due to the breaking up of the Pacific War. Okinawans in Hawai'i were materially rich compared to the countrymen on the ruined islands. They were the contributors of finance and the Okinawan people in Okinawa were the receivers. Moreover, the Okinawans in Hawai'i were on the side of the "winner" in the war and belonged to the modernized country of America. It can be assumed that this social structure put them in the position of "having much more and

knowing much better” than those in Okinawa. It would be true that people in Hawai’i felt a lot of unity and love toward their home, and it was from these feelings that most of the relief campaign stemmed. This kind of uneven social difference, however, could not help but affect the relations between Okinawa and Hawai’i.

As for the community in the Okinawa islands, the local Okinawans implied, from time to time, that the outsiders do not know the reality of Okinawa. But what was the reality of Okinawa? I would like to point out here the presence of the U.S. military authority that held absolute power to feed the locals and control the land. In Tokyo and in Hawai’i, the U.S. military institution and personnel were not a part of daily life; Okinawan people in both places would go to an office to meet the military personnel when consulting on their activities. In Okinawa, the U.S. military institution and personnel were ever-present; local people worked at the U.S. bases, local businesses received customers from the military institutions, and the U.S. authorities decided what was acceptable and what was not, and could change what they thought. Vice-Governor Koki Matayoshi, while showing his understanding of the pro-reversion movement in Tokyo, hesitated to clarify his own preference toward the status issue, and said that it was too delicate an issue, facing the Americans with whom they shared “both bitterness and happiness” in reconstructing Okinawa<sup>lxiii</sup>. His expression can be interpreted in several ways. But what it clearly shows is the closeness of the U.S. personnel to the Okinawan community in Okinawa. Okinawans in Tokyo kept telling the locals that it was safe to state their opinions because America is a democratic country<sup>lxiv</sup>. In Hawai’i the opinions found in newspapers also employed similar expressions<sup>lxv</sup>. For the local people in Okinawa, however, these encouraging, or sometimes even irritated voices from outside sometimes sounded problematic, as the speakers, in the eyes of the locals, did not have the knowledge of what life there was like.

This paper focused on Okinawan communities in three spheres from the viewpoint of the Okinawa disposition issue, which was, at the same time, part of the diplomatic agenda between Japan and the Allied Powers. Two additional salient points should be noted. Firstly, the emerging cold war structure, a factor that has not been included in the scope of this paper, certainly had an effect on the Okinawan communities’ ways of thinking and behaving, as well as on

the mindset of the policy makers, both in the Japanese government and in the Allied Powers. Contemporary Okinawans facing the Okinawa disposition issue in 1951 must have recognized that the U.S was a rising power in the bipolar world of international politics, and also must have had the expectation that the U.S. military bases would stay on Okinawa Island no matter how the status of Okinawa would be termed in the looming San Francisco Peace Treaty. Secondly, it is an important fact that Okinawan people were never officially asked to clarify their opinion, by such method as a referendum, about the territory issue. This was presumably due to their ambiguous status as being a part of Japan and also being a people liberated from Japan. The case of Okinawa, therefore, can not fully be analyzed in the context of “self determination” or simply be regarded as an emancipated former colonial territory.

Where then does the importance of this study lie ? I argue that it is in the very ambiguity of Okinawa. When located in the contemporary climate of international politics, with the U.S. hegemony in the emerging cold war structure in East Asia and the Pacific region, the diversity among the Okinawan diasporic communities described in this paper potentially sheds light on the intricate relationship between the hegemonic power and the people who seek a better life under difficult condition. The maneuvers Okinawan people performed in different political, economical, and social contexts when their homeland’s status was at stake, and the subtle differences in the rhetoric they employed while affirming their solidarity in being Okinawan give ideas suggestive to broader issues such as identity, citizenship, and occupation.

### Primary Resources

*Uruma Shimpo* (reprint), Fuji Shuppan.

*Okinawa Times*, Okinawa Prefectural Library.

*Jiyu Okinawa* (reprint), Fuji Shuppan.

*Okinawa Shin Mimpo* (reprint), Fuji Shuppan.

*Kosei Okinawa*, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai’i at Manoa.

*Hawaii Times*, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai’i at Manoa.

“Wakukawa Seiyei Paper” (Wakukawa Seiyei bunsho), Okinawa Prefectural Archives.

“Documents on Shakai To” (Shakaito ni kansuru bunsho), Okinawa Prefectural Archives, R00000478B.

“Nakayoshi Ryoko Paper” (Nakayoshi Ryoko kankei bunsho), Naha City Museum of History.

## Bibliography

- Arasaki, Moriteru (1982) “Okinawa jin Renmei”, Okinawa Times co. ed., *Shin Okinawa Bugaku*, November issue.
- Asano, Toyomi (2004) “Primary Resources on the Issue of Emigration and Nationality of the Okinawans under the U.S. Administration”, the Aichi University Institute of International Affairs, *Kijo*, vol. 123.
- Asano, Toyomi (2006) “Repatriation to the Ryukyus under the U.S. administration: A Folded-down Empire and the Multilayered Separation”, *Shakai Kagaku Kenkyu*, Chukyo University Institute of Social Science, 26(1).
- Isa, Yuki (2008) “‘Japaneseness’ in Okinawan Immigrants: Reconsidering Immigration from Perspective of Modernization and Conscription”, Ken’ichiro Kondo ed., *Okinawa: Toi wo Tateru 2*, Shakai Hyoron Sha.
- Ishihara, Tomonori (1981) “A study of the historical geography of early Okinawan immigrants to the Hawaiian islands”, Ethnic Studies Oral History Project, Ethnic Studies Program, *Uchinanchu*, University of Hawai’i.
- Kawawa, Shintaro (2007) “Transformation of Okinawan Social Organizations in Hawai’i”, *Imin Kenkyu Nenpo*, vol. 13.
- Kimura, Yukiko (1981) “Social-Historical Background of the Okinawans in Hawai’i”, Ethnic Studies Oral History Project, Ethnic Studies Program, *Uchinanchu*, University of Hawai’i.
- Maehara Yamazato, Kinuko (2007) “To Okinawa and Back Again: Life stories of Okinawan Kibei Nisei in Hawai’i”, Joyce N. Chinen ed., *Uchinaanchu Diaspora: Memories, Continuities and Constructions*, Department of Sociology, University of Hawai’i at Mānoa.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (1950) *Outline of the reversion to Japan campaigns in Okinawa islands* (Okinawa shoto nihon fukki undo gaiyou).
- Nakasone, Genwa (1955) *Okinawa kara Ryukyu he* (From Okinawa to Ryukyu), Hyoronsha.
- Nakayoshi, Ryoko (1964) *Okinawa Sokoku Fukki Undo Shi* (History of Okinawan movement for reversion to Homeland), Okinawa Times co.
- Noutomi, Kaori (2004) “The Reexamination of *Ryoko Nakayoshi*: The Role of *Fukki-Otoko* in the Modern History of Okinawa”, *Historica*, Tokyo Women’s Christian University, No. 57.
- Okano, Katsunori (2008) “The ‘Okinawan Problem’ in Hawai’i after the WWII: U.S. occupation policy of Okinawa and Okinawan immigrants”, *Immigration Studies*, Center for Migration Studies, University of the Ryukyus, No. 4.
- Okinawaken Sokoku Fukki Toshō shi Henshu Iinkai (1982) *Okinawaken Sokoku Fukki Toso Shi Shiryo ben* (History of the struggle for reversion to homeland in Okinawa prefecture), Okinawa Jiji Shuppan.
- Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum (2000) *Okinawa Ken Heiwa Kinen Shiryo Sogo Annai* (Complete guidebook of Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum).

- Okinawa Times (1971) *Okinawa no Shogen* (Testimony of Okinawa).
- Oguma, Eiji (1998) *The Boundaries of the Japanese*, Shin'yosha.
- Sakihara, Mitsugu (1981) “Okinawa, the homeland”, Ethnic Studies Oral History Project, Ethnic Studies Program, *Uchinanchu*, University of Hawai'i.
- Sakurazawa, Makoto (2007) “Revising the Pro-reversion / Pro-independence Discussion in early Post-war Period in Okinawa: Ideological Aspects of the Attribution Arguments around the San Francisco Peace Treaty”, *Nihon Shiso Shigaku*, vol. 39.
- Tobe, Hideaki (2000) “Beginning of the Political Activities in Post-War Okinawa: the Scope and Significance of ‘Report on contemporary Okinawa’ in Higa Shuncho Paper”, *Minshūshi Kenkyū*, vol. 60.
- Toriyama, Atsushi (2001) “The Course of Reconstruction and the Election of the Gunto Governer in Okinawa”, *Hitotsubashi Ronsō* Iwanami Shoten, 125 (2).
- Toriyama, Atsushi (2004) “Pragmatism in bankrupt: A Current being Transformed to ‘Uprising in the whole island’”, *Okinawa Bunka Kenkyu*, Hosei University Institute for Okinawan Studies, vol. 30.
- Uechi, Satoko (2008) “Contested Blueprints: Support towards a ‘Return to Japan’ in Okinawa 1951, and Matters Undebated”, *Ryukyu Okinawa Kenkyu*, vol. 2.
- Wakukawa, Seiyei (2000) *Building Bridges of Understanding Between America and Japan*, Nirai Sha.
- Yamashita, Yasuko (2003) “Okinawan immigrants in Hawaii and their identity in early postwar times when Okinawa was under U.S. Control: 1945-1952”, *The Study of International Relations*, Tsuda College, No. 29.

- 
- <sup>i</sup> The term “Okinawa” in this paper indicates one or more of the following: 1) Okinawa prefecture, 2) the Okinawa Islands and 3) Okinawa main island.
- <sup>ii</sup> See the official website “The 5<sup>th</sup> Worldwide Uchinanchu Festival” (<http://www.wuf5th.com/index.php/ja/introduction>, last checked in September 23, 2011) and the online article of *Okinawa Times* ([http://www.okinawatimes.co.jp/article/2011-09-12\\_23317/](http://www.okinawatimes.co.jp/article/2011-09-12_23317/), last checked in September 23, 2011). “Uchinanchu” means “Okinawan people” in Okinawan language.
- <sup>iii</sup> These figures are originally from a handout “On the Okinawa Immigrant Issue” (沖縄の移民問題について: Okinawa no imin mondai ni tsuite) prepared by Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan for the liaison meeting on Okinawa immigration (沖縄移住連絡会議: Okinawa iju renraku kaigi) held from July 9 to 10, 1958.
- <sup>iv</sup> An editorial “Impressed by the Achievement of the Fellows in Hawai'i” (布哇同胞の壮挙に感ず: Hawai doho no soukyo ni kanzu) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on April 5, 1948 mentions a similar amount of remittance.
- <sup>v</sup> One of the predecessors of “The League of Okinawan People”, which was formed in Tokyo in as early as November 1945, set five aims, three of which were to establish communication with the Okinawan islands and arranging relief materials, to conduct a survey on the number of survivors in the islands, and to conduct survey on the reality

- of the Battle of Okinawa [Arasaki 1982: 15].
- vi “To be World Wide” (世界的なひろがりへ: sekai teki na hirogari he) in *Jiyu Okinawa* on January 20, 1948.
- vii The Nakaima affair in 1930 is a good example of such a close relationship. Social turmoil was caused when two factions of Okinawan politicians, one right wing and the other left wing, asked an influential Okinawan journalist in Honolulu to raise funds for their election campaigns in Tokyo, which resulted in the splitting of the Okinawan community in Hawai'i along the two lines, with members engaging in abusive arguments and behaviors [Wakukawa 2000: 102-105]. This closeness between Tokyo and Hawai'i had not been particular to the Okinawa community but could be generalized, to some extent, to Japanese society in Hawai'i. A New Year editorial of *Hawaii Times* in 1952 suggests how the Japanese tried to affect and utilize their fellow Japanese in Hawai'i.
- viii Several articles picked up from *Hawaii Times* indicate the constant coverage of the Battle of Okinawa and the local situation. For example, “12,000 Japanese Soldiers / Fated to Death in Okinawa” (一萬二千の日本軍／沖繩島で死滅の運命: ichioku nisenman no nihon gun / Okinawa jima de shimetsu no unmei) on June 12, 1945: “Shuri after the Fire Tells of the Fierce Battle” (砲弾の跡激戦語るの首里: hodan no ato gekisen kataru shuri) on June 21, 1945: “Okinawans Moving in to the New House in North” (北方の新居へ移る沖繩人: hoppouno shinkyō he utsuru Okinawa jin) on July 19, 1945.
- ix “From Devastated Okinawa / Ruined Shuri and Naha” (戦禍の沖繩より／何も残らぬ首里と那覇: senka no Okinawa yori / nanimo nokoranu shuri to naha) on August 4, 1945.
- x “Good News from North America / Active Campaign of Our Fellows in America for Refugee Relief” (北米より感激の朗報／難民救済に在米同胞活躍す: hokubei yori kangeki no roho / nanmin kyusai ni zaibei doho katsuyaku su) in *Jiyu Okinawa* on June 15, 1946.
- xi Wakukawa document contains an untitled typescript which is possibly the copy of the report [Wakukawa Seiyei Paper: 50209].
- xii “Message from Okinawa Association in North America” (北米沖繩協会のメッセージ: hokubei Okinawa kyokai no messeji) in *Jiyu Okinawa* on January 25, 1946.
- xiii “Good News from North America / Active campaign of our fellows in America for refugee relief” (北米より感激の朗報／難民救済に在米同胞活躍す: hokubei yori kangeki no roho / nanmin kyusai ni zaibei doho katsuyaku su) in *Jiyu Okinawa* on June 15, 1946.
- xiv “Okishikina did Good Job in the Fund-raising” (救済基金募集に“沖識名”善戦: kyusai kikin boshu ni “Oki shiki na” zensen) in June 5.
- xv “The Significance of Okinawan Representative Participation” (沖繩代表出席の意義: Okinawa daihyo shusseki no igi) in July 25. This article features Yoshio Higa, a missionary in Okinawa who was scheduled to attend “Sekai Kirisutokyo Taikai” ,

literarily “Worldwide Christianity Convention” which possibly indicates The World Council of Churches (WCC).

- xvi “Friend that Knows Okinawa Best / Academic Presentation at University in the U.S. / Importance of the Art, Crafts, Music and Dance Recognized” (沖繩を知る最良の友／米大学で研究を発表／美術, 工芸, 音楽, 舞踊再認さる: Okinawa wo shiru sairyō no tomo / bei daigaku de kenkyū wo happyō / bijutu, kougei, ongaku, buyō sainin saru) and a contributed article “Open Up the Destiny of Okinawa / The Expectations Placed on the Young Generation” (沖繩の運命開拓／新人の出現に期待: Okinawa no unmei kaitaku / shinjin no shutugen ni kitai) by Gongoro Nakamura, the chief of League for Reconstruction and Relief of Okinawa in North America in December 5.
- xvii For example, “On Okinawa Shin Mimpo / Passionate Editorial / Proud of Fellows in Hawai’i” (沖繩新民報紙上／切々たる社説／布哇同胞の誇り: Okinawa shin mimpo shi jo / setsuetsutaru shasetsu / hawai doho no hokori) in February 1948 issue.
- xviii For example, “Good News to Students / Study Abroad / Permission Gained” (学徒に朗報／海外留学／渡航許可さる: gakuto ni roho / kaigai ryugaku / toko kyōka saru) in the first page of May 1948 issue.
- xix “Baile for Relief of the War-damaged Okinawan / Nisei in Brazil / Initiative of the Youth” (沖繩戦災民救援バイレ／ブラジル国在住二世／男女青年の活躍: Okinawa sensaimin kyuen baire / burajirukoku zaiju Nisei / danjo seinen no katsuyaku) in the first page of May 1948 issue.
- xx “10,000 Dollars Worth of Relief Materials / Active Okinawan Fellows in Japanese Newspaper Business” (救援物資一萬弗／邦字新聞に同胞活躍: kyuen busshi ichiman doru / houji shinbun ni doho katsuyaku).
- xxi See the private letter dated in May 17 or 18, 1948, from Iwao Okuda to Seiyei Wakukawa, the chief of The Okinawa Relief & Rehabilitation Foundation [Wakukawa Seiyei Paper: 50213].
- xxii “Facing Okinawa’s Territorial Problem / Restart of the League of the Okinawans” (帰属問題を転機に／沖繩人聯盟再発足: kizoku mondai wo tenki ni / Okinawa jin renmei sai hossoku) in *Jiyū Okinawa* of November 15, 1946.
- xxiii “Foundation Address” (創刊の辞: sokan no ji) in *Kosei Okinawa* in November 1947 issue.
- xxiv For example, “Okinawa Relief Activities by Fellows in Mexico / Our Camp Extending” (在墨同胞間にも沖繩救援運動／伸び行く吾れ等の陣営: zaiboku doho kan nimo Okinawa kyuen undo / nobiyuku warera no jin’ei) in *Kosei Okinawa* in February 1948 issue; “Cheer Up to Okinawa from Across the Pacific Ocean / Corporate Body Formed for Relieving Fellows” (太平洋の彼方から沖繩へ激励の声！／同胞救援の為に法人団組織: taiheiyo no kanata kara Okinawa he gekirei no koe / doho kyuen no tame ni hojindan soshiki) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* of January 25, 1947; “Impressed by the Value of Being Okinawan” (沖繩の有難さを滞米中



- に痛感: Okinawa no arigatasa wo zaibei chu ni tsukan) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* of September 25, 1950 for the expression of “fellow of Okinawa prefecture” (縣人同胞: kenjin doho); “Message of the League of Okinawan People to Overseas Fellows” (聯盟海外同胞にメッセージを送る: renmei kaigai doho ni messeji wo okuru) in *Jiyu Okinawa* of January 15, 1946.
- xxx “Message from Okinawan Association in North America” (北米沖縄協会のメッセージ: hokubei Okinawa kyokai karano messeji) in *Jiyu Okinawa* of January 25, 1946, uses both of the terms, for example.
- xxvi One example that suggests the sense of being Okinawa *minzoku* is found in “Celebrating the First Issue” (創刊号を祝す: sokango wo shuku su), a letter from Shinsei Kochi in Los Angeles in *Kosei Okinawa* of November 1947 issue.
- xxvii “Newly Arrival Publication” (近着刊行物: kinchaku kanko butsu) listed 12 items of news and documents arrived from Fukuoka, Okinawa, Tokyo, Brazil, the west coast of America, and military authority in Okinawa.
- xxviii A private letter to Wakukawa from his relatives in Tokyo suggests they had frequently received daily commodities from Hawai’i [Wakukawa Seiyei paper 50700, letter from “Haruyo in Shibuya” in 1947]. Other letters also show gratitude at the parcels from Hawai’i [Wakukawa Seiyei paper 49950, letter from “Sumiyoshi Taira” (平良住吉) in 1950; Wakukawa Seiyei paper 50213, letter from “Shinyashiki” in 1948].
- xxix *Jiyu Okinawa* in Tokyo and *Kosei Okinawa* in Honolulu are excluded from this table due to the halt in issuing in 1948. “R.” in the table above stands for abbreviation of “Reversion to Japan”.
- xxx For example, Ryoko Nakayoshi handed out “petition for reversion to Japan” to the occupation body as early as August 1945 [Nakayoshi 1964: 14; MOFA1950: 3], and Genwa Nakasone had clarified his preference for an independent Okinawa since late 1945 [Nakasone 1955: 183]. The expression “belonging to the U.S.” is found in the program of Okinawa Social Party in 1947 [Okinawa Prefectural Archives, R00000478B: 3].
- xxxi In *Uruma Shimpo* pro-reversion pieces are: by Seiryō Kamiyama from February 10 to 13, Meitatsu Takamine on February 23, Ryoko Nakayoshi from May 12 to 13, Saichi Kaneji from May 22 to 29, and again, Meitatsu Takamine from July 10 to 13; anti-reversion pieces are: by Shui Ikemiyagushiku from February 6 to 8, Morio Shiroma from February 21 to 22, Seizen Shiroma from March 3 to 5, again Shui Ikemiyagushiku from March 17 to 19, Koichi Higa from April 17 to 21, again Morio Shiroma from June 25 to 30, Keiki Oba in July 12, and Koki Nakamine from August 13 to 15.
- xxxii In *Okinawa Times* pro-reversion pieces are: by Saichi Kaneji from April 1 to 5, Ryoko Nakayoshi in April 9, Kazuhiko Kinjo on April 23, Michio Iesaka from April 27 to 29, again Ryoko Nakayoshi in May 19, and Meitatsu Takamine from July 10 to 15; anti-reversion pieces are: Genwa Nakasone from March 23 to 24, Chotoku Ogimi from April 5 to 8, again Genwa Nakasone from April 14 to 19, and Shun’ichi Omura from

April 20 to 22.

- xxxiii “Voice from the Street regarding the Status Issue” (キゾク問題に街の声: kizoku mondai ni machi no koe) in April 23 includes of 18 people, and “On the Status Issue: from Readers” (読者よりキゾク問題: dokusha yori kizoku mondai) in May 30 and 31 includes 6 people.
- xxxiv “Destiny of Okinawa” (沖縄の運命: Okinawa no unmei) by Seibin Shimabukuro in *Uruma Shimpo* in January 1, 1951 indicates that, however, there were discussions about the Okinawa status issue among Okinawans in Tokyo in private gatherings and meetings.
- xxxv For example, “On Characteristic of the League of □□ People” (□□人聯盟の性格に就て: □□ jin renmei no seikaku ni suite) by Chitaro Nagaoka on May 5, 1946, and “Political Trend in Okinawa / Under the Military Control” (沖縄の政治的動向 / 米国軍政下に於ける: Okinawa no seiji teki doko / beikoku gunseika ni okeru) also by Chitaro Nagaoka on November 15, 1946. The title of the former article is unreadable due to the bad printing condition.
- xxxvi For example, “Okinawa, Where Are You Going / On Trusteeship / Outline of Speech in Shuri” (沖縄よ何処へゆく / 信託統治につき / 首里市での講演概要: Okinawa yo doko he yuku /shintaku tochi ni tsuki / shuri shi deno kouen gaiyo) on August 5, and “Open up the Future of Okinawa with Key of Solidarity” (同心同調の鍵で沖縄の運命を開け: doushin doucho no kagi de Okinawa no unmei wo hirake) in October 25.
- xxxvii For example, an contribution by Seiryō Kamiyama, the chief of the League of Okinawan People in Tokyo, on January 5, and the editorial “Learn about Okinawa, Both Statesmen and Nation” (議員も国民も沖縄を勉強せよ: giin mo kokumin mo Okinawa wo benkyo seyo) on November 5.
- xxxviii “On New Year” (新年に際して: shinnen ni saishite) by Seiryō Kamiyama on January 5, and the editorial “Okinawa’s Reversion to Japan and the Ideal of Governors’ Meeting” (沖縄の復帰と知事会議の理念: Okinawa no fukki to chiji kagi no rinen) in June 15.
- xxxix The editorial is “Draft of Peace Treaty and Hope of Okinawan People” (講和草案と沖縄人の希望: kouwa soan to Okinawa jin no kibou) on April 5. The three articles by Ryoko Nakayoshi are: “Okinawa will Return to Japan: If Local People Wish / Return to Japan / Refrain from Being Mute like Stones” (沖縄の復帰: 地元住民が希望せば / 日本に返へる / 石の如く黙するをさけよ: Okinawa no fukki, jimoto jyunin ga kibou seba / nihon ni kaeru / ishi no gotoku mokusuru wo sakeyo) on April 5, “Give Cheer to Homeland Okinawa / Signature Collecting Campaign for Reversion to Japan Developing” (郷土沖縄に声援を送れ / 日本復帰の署名運動展開す: kyodo Okinawa ni seien wo okure / nihon fukki no shomei undo tenkai su) on June 5, and “Strong Will of Islanders as Key for Reversion” (日本復帰は島民の決意が鍵: nihon fukki ha toumin no ketsui ga kagi) on August 5. The other two articles are “Realize Reversion to Japan by Appeal to Grassroots Diplomacy” (国民外交に訴

- え日本復帰を解決せん: kokumin gaiko ni uttate nihon fukki wo kaiketsu sen) by Shoken Okusato on April 25, and “Okinawa, Where Are You Going” (沖縄よ何処へゆく: Okinawa yo doko he yuku) by Meitatsu Takamine on July 15.
- xi “Ryukyū Independence Opinion / Down in the Last Moment” (琉球独立論／うちちやりを喰う: ryukuu dokuritsu ron / ucchari wo kurau) and “Okinawa Pavilion Appeared in Religion Expo. in Kyoto” (京都の宗教博に沖縄館も登場: Kyoto no shukyo haku ni Okinawa kan mo tojo) on June 15.
- xii Ryoko Nakayoshi and Meitatsu Takamine wrote two each: Nakayoshi posted “Again, My Wish to Okinawa” (再び沖縄によせる願望: futatabi Okinawa ni yoseru ganbo) in *Uruma Shimpo* on May 12, “Request the Reversion to Japan” (日本復帰を要望せよ: nihon fukki wo kibou seyo) and “Gleam of Hope for Reversion to Japan” (日本復帰の曙光見ゆ: nihon fukki no shoko miyu) in *Okinawa Times* on April 9, and May 19. Takamine’s texts are “On Leaving Homeland” (故郷を去るに当って: kokyo wo saru ni atatte) and “Okinawa, Where Are You Going” (沖縄よ何処へゆく: Okinawa yo doko he yuku) in *Uruma Shimpo* on February 23 and from July 10 to 13. The latter also appears in *Okinawa Times* from July 10 to 15 intermittently.
- xiii In *Uruma Shimpo*: Seiryō Kamiyama on February 10, Meitatsu Takamine on February 23 and July 10, and Ryoko Nakayoshi on May 12. In *Okinawa Times*: Ryoko Nakayoshi on April 9, Kinjo Kazuhiko on April 23, Takamine Meitatsu on July 10.
- xiiii “On the Relation of Okinawa with China” (沖縄と支那との政治的關係 (-): Okinawa to Shina tonō seijiteki kankei), January 10, 1946. This piece was originally written, however, in December 7, 1944, according to Tamayose himself in the article.
- xlv “Okinawa Attribution Issue” (沖縄帰属問題: Okinawa kizoku mondai) in *Hawaii Herald*, January 1, 1948.
- xlv “Contribution: On Okinawa Attribution Issue” (寄書: 沖縄の帰属問題に就て: yosegaki, Okinawa no kizoku mondai ni tsuite) in *Hawaii Times*, March 26.
- xlvi On the same day as *Hawaii Times* published the first volume of Yosemori’s contributions in March, *Hawaii Herald* also started publishing “Personal Opinion on Okinawa Attribution Issue” vol. 1 to 3 by Chiro Yosemori, according to Yamashita [2003: 104]. Although I have not yet checked the particular issue of the *Hawaii Herald*, it is highly possible, judging from the summary by Yamashita, that the basic argument of these two texts is almost the same.
- xlvii “Okinawa will Return to Japan: If Local People Wish / Return to Japan / Refrain from Being Mute like Stones” (沖縄の復帰: 地元住民が希望せば／日本に返へる／石の如く黙するをさけよ: Okinawa no nihon fukki, jimoto jumin ga kibou seba / nihon ni kaeru / ishi no gotoku mokusuru wo sakeyo) by Ryoko Nakayoshi in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, April 5, 1951.
- xlviii “Suggestion for Reversion to Japan” (日本復帰提唱: nihon fukki teisho) in *Uruma Shimpo*, February 13, 1951.
- xlx “The way for Reconstructing Okinawa / Through Human Education and Modernization of Industry / Letter from Nakahara, Chief of the League of Okinawan

People” (沖縄再建の途／人間教育の徹底と産業の近代科学化／仲原沖繩人連盟長書翰: Okinawa saiken no to / ningen kyoiku no tettei to sangyo no kindai kagaku ka / Nakahara Okinawa jin renmei cho shokan) in *Kosei Okinawa*, December 1947 issue.

i “Okinawan Fellows in Hawai’i / Wish Reconstruction of Okinawa with Countrymen’s Own Effort” (ハワイの沖縄同胞／郷土人の自力再建を熱望: hawaii no Okinawa doho / kyodo jin no jiriki saiken wo netsubo) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, June 15, 1947.

ii Examples of the request are found in [Wakukawa Seiyei paper 50213, donation request from “Okinawa ken gakuto engokai” in 1949; letter from “Tamagusuku Magotaro” in 1949].

iii Taken from the photo column “Remark from Hawai’i” (ハワイの言葉: hawaii no kotoba) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on September 25, 1950. This remark is given by a Hawai’i Issei (first generation immigrant) visiting his homeland when he was interviewed by a local reporter.

iiii See “Okinawa as It is Viewed” (沖縄みたま: Okinawa mita mama) by Houn Tamayose in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on November 5, 1949. The mentality of viewing Okinawa as something to be rescued is also found the manuscript of radio program by the Okinawa Relief & Rehabilitation Foundation [Wakukawa Seiyei paper 65001].

liv “Present Day Okinawa Expend Less Effort than It Did 30 Years Ago” (現在の沖縄は30年前より不勉強だ: genzai no Okinawa ha sanju nen mae yori fubenkyo da) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on November 25, 1948. They gave these remarks at the official welcome party for them.

lv This is taken from *Uruma Shinpo*, July 10, 1951. The same text is found in *Okinawa Times* from July 10 to 12, 1951, and *Okinawa Shin Mimpo*, July 15, 1951. This is a different piece from the wired report in *Hawaii Herald* on January 1, 1947, although the title is the same.

lvi “Strong Will of Islanders as Key for Reversion” (日本復帰は島民の決意が鍵: nihon fukki ha tomin no ketsui ga kagi) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on August 5, 1951.

lvii “Talk about Okinawa: Story from Yoshio Higa” (沖縄を語る／比嘉善雄氏寄港談: Okinawa wo kataru / Higa Yoshio shi kikou dan) in *Kosei Okinawa* on October 1948 issue.

lviii Op. cit.

lix Article in the New Year interview with Taira in *Okinawa Times*, January 1, 1951.

lx Remark in the assembly meeting on March 19, 1951.

lxi A point also suggested by [Tobe 2000].

lxii “We Wish to Share the Destiny with Homeland Japan / Mr. Ie and Nakayoshi at Upper House Foreign Affairs Committee” (我等は祖国日本と苦楽を共にしたい／参院外務委員会で伊江仲吉氏陳情: warera ha sokokou nihon to kuraku wo tomoni shitai / san’in gaimu iinkai de Ie Nakayoshi shi chinjo) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on March 15, 1951, and “Q and A between Mr. Dan and Mr. Ie regarding Okinawa Attribution Issue” (帰属問題をめぐる団・伊江氏の問答: kizoku

mondai wo meguru dan·Ie shi no mondo) in *Okinawa Shin Mimpo* on March 25, 1951. The pro-reversion to Japan group in Tokyo sometimes used the name “Representatives of Okinawans resident in Tokyo” when they presented petitions to GHQ and other foreign powers. See “Petition to Mr. John Foster Dulles, Adviser to the United States State Department, concerning the Return of Okinawa to Japan” [Document on Ryoko Nakayoshi: 003] for example. A local Okinawan criticized the standpoint of those in Tokyo. See Morio Shiroma “On Okinawa Attribution Issue: Questioning the Actuality in Reversion to Japan” (帰属問題に就いて – 日本帰属の内容を問う – : kizoku mondai ni tsuite, nihon kizoku no naiyo wo tou) in *Uruma Simpo*, February 21, 1951.

<sup>lxiii</sup> “On Okinawa Attribute Issue” (帰属問題をめぐって : kizoku mondai wo megutte) in *Uruma Shimpō*, June 25, 1951.

<sup>lxiv</sup> For example, see “Suggestion for Reversion to Japan” (日本復帰提唱 : nihon hukki teisho) by Seiryō Kamiyama in *Uruma Shimpō*, February 11.

<sup>lxv</sup> For example, see “Contribution: On Okinawa Attribution Issue” (寄書 : 沖縄の – 帰属問題に就て : yosegaki, Okinawa no kizokumondai ni tsuite) by Chiro Yosemite in *Hawaii Times*, March 24.

