ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273837887

Caught in Between Okinawa and Hawai'i

Article *in* Amerasia Journal · January 2015

CITATIONS
0

READS
214

1 author:

Eliko Kosaka
Tokyo Keizai University

3 PUBLICATIONS **0** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

All content following this page was uploaded by Eliko Kosaka on 22 March 2015.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

Amerasia Journal 41:1 (2015):

Caught in Between Okinawa and Hawai'i:

"Kibei" Diaspora in Masao Yamashiro's *The Kibei Nisei*

Eliko Kosaka

Introduction

The term "Kibei" typically refers to U.S.-born individuals of Japanese ancestry who have had experience living for a specific period of time in Japan before returning to the U.S., particularly prior to World War II. In Japanese, the term is often written as 帰米, which literally translates to "return to the U.S." However, one would be remiss to overlook the term's inherent ambiguity.[1] That is, in some instances, "return" does not adequately provide an accurate description for these individuals who neither fit the profile of the first-generation Issei nor the Nisei, who never left the U.S. It is also noteworthy to mention that before the term Kibei emerged, prior to the 1924 immigration law the term *yobiyose seinen* or "youth summoned from abroad" was used to refer to both Nisei and Japanese-born youth who entered the U.S. After the 1924 immigration law prohibited Japanese immigrants from entering the country, however, "Kibei" became the predominant term used to indicate individuals who remained in the U.S.[2]

Despite such efforts to limit numbers of the distinct group of individuals coming in from all parts of Japan, as a study conducted by Masaharu Ano indicates, the Kibei themselves were far from homogeneous, and individuals designated as Kibei were much more diverse than the term tends to portend. There is no established definition attached to the term aside from the one generated by the Intelligence authorities, which rendered Kibei as "individu-

---

Eliko Kosaka is currently a lecturer at Hosei University. Her research area is Japanese American "Kibei" narratives which is the focus of her PhD.

als who received three or more years of education in Japan, particularly after the age of thirteen." [3] However, such a definition hardly attends to the inherent contradictions that provoke further inquiry of the term.[4] For example, the mobility of such individuals were not always unidirectional, meaning that not all so-called Kibei returned to the U.S. permanently or even at all. In some instances, usage of labels such as Japan and the U.S. as places of residence may also be contestable, as in the case of Hawai'i or Okinawa, which have retained strong associations to an indigenous history complicated by immigration and colonization. [5]

An autobiographical anthology of works written in Japanese by Hawaiian-born Masao Yamashiro, *The Kibei Nisei* (1995) reveals a complex and disharmonious rendering of a Kibei who traverses between Hawai'i and Okinawa while problematizing the signifiers "Japanese American" and "Japanese." Posing as a viable counter-narrative to those narratives written predominantly in English about a specifically Japanese/American identity, I argue how the rendering of a Kibei in Yamashiro's autobiographical text generates a significantly more ambiguous and hybrid representation of an individual with fraught ties to both Japan and the U.S. By providing a testimonial narrative that depicts Yamashiro's lived experience, his text provides an alternative to generalized iterations of the Kibei, who are predominantly associated with the two nation-states of the U.S. and Japan. Therefore, as a medium to articulate the agency of the author, Yamashiro's autobiography can accomplish this role of unveiling.[6] As a testimony of his lived experience, the text manages to illustrate an individual of "Japanese" ancestry living in Hawai'i, his identity rife with contradictions and a diversity that complicates and prompts reexamination of the signifiers Kibei and Japanese American.

What is significant about Yamashiro's autobiographical writings is that he chose Japanese as the primary language of his text. Historically speaking, Japanese language acquisition for the Kibei can be traced back to prior to the Immigration Act of 1924. This also adds to the quandary over the terms Japanese American and Kibei, as children of Issei fathers were granted Japanese citizenship along with the U.S. citizenship they were granted at birth. This subsequently made the position of the children of the Issei all that more complex.[7] This privilege allowed many Nisei to be educated in Japan as Japanese and in some instances to be conscripted into the Japanese Imperial Army when the Pacific War broke out. Those who returned to the U.S. and renewed their U.S.

citizenship status were undoubtedly affected by their experience in Japan, most prominently evident in their often high fluency in Japanese. Conversely, many were faced with the difficulty of (re)adjusting to American society as the English language skills of Japanese-educated Nisei's language skills had languished or failed to develop. The Japanese publication of Yamashiro's work is evidence of how his Japanese fluency set him apart in contrast to Nisei writers who wrote primarily in English, complicating how Japanese American and Kibei are typically defined.

Yamashiro's autobiographical essays and prose were originally printed in *Rafu Shimpo*, an English/Japanese language newspaper printed in Los Angeles, under the title *Kobutakaini*, which roughly translates to "Shopping for a Piglet," as well as *Nankabungei Special Edition*, a special edition of the *Nankabungei* newspaper printed in Los Angeles. The pieces were printed in these two newspapers intermittently over a ten-year period, from 1981 to 1993. The pieces as they appear in the anthology also have been modified to some extent so they are not exactly as they appear in the newspaper. The individual pieces are grouped into seven sections, individually entitled *Kokuseki* ("Citizenship"), *Nozawa jooji no omoide* ("Memories of Jōji Nozawa"), *Amerika ni ikiru to wa* ("What it means to live in America"), *Tachinoki songaibaisho* ("Redress Reparations"), *Shutaisei no mondai* ("On Subjectivity") *Nihon fukei* ("Scenes of Japan"), *Fubo no haka* ("My parents' grave"). In sum, it is an eclectic collection of self-reflective narratives, all consistently rendering the author as the narrator of each work. Particularly, the last piece of the anthology, "My Parents' Grave," is a provocative example of how the Kibei can be imagined as an individual who is perplexing, not only because he is arguably neither Japanese nor Japanese American, but also because he is a product of parents from Okinawa who immigrated to Hawai'i, suggesting a further complicated genealogy. Appearing only in Yamashiro's *The Kibei Nisei*, this narrative depicts the author's deeply conflicted ties to two geographical locations, Okinawa and Hawai'i, both regions that were once autonomous kingdoms. When considering how the author is intricately tied to these two locations we must also recognize what we occlude when we appropriate the term Japanese.

Returnee/Visitor

Historian Arif Dirlik suggests that the contested region of "the Pacific is as much a realm of fragmentation as of unity that might

lend a guise of comprehensiveness to an otherwise diffuse subject."[8] Here, he alludes to the dissolution, dissonance, diaspora as well as the hybridities, intersections, and coalitions that have emerged from the countless encounters and transgressions throughout the Pacific. What is generated by these intersections can often be occluded by generalized terms such as "the Pacific" which can also carry with it various capitalistic connotations. Yamashiro epitomizes such fragmentation and integration, since he is both marred and mobilized by his encounters on the islands of Okinawa and Hawai'i and his family background.

Yamashiro was born in 1916 in Kauai, Hawai'i, only 18 years after Hawai'i was annexed by the U.S. His family left an Okinawa which had only been annexed by Japan in 1879. His father died when he was two and his mother passed away seven years later, so he was raised by his sister, who was already married with two children. In 1924, she divorced her husband, and with her two younger brother and sister in tow, along with her own two children, she moved back to Okinawa. Yamashiro returned to Hawai'i in 1932, and, in 1936, he traveled to Los Angeles, where he graduated from Los Angeles Polytechnic High School. After a year of enrolling in college, where he studied literature, war between the U.S. and Japan broke out, with Executive Order 9066 was instated on February 19, 1942. Yamashiro was one of the over 18,000 Japanese Americans who were interned in Tule Lake internment camp located in northern California, which had been transformed into a "'segregation center' for 'disloyals'" from the period of June 1942 to March 1946.[9]

The family legacy that Yamashiro carries bears the history of Hawai'i's Okinawan immigrants, but it is also further complicated by his mobility between Okinawa and Hawai'i after the Pacific War. Through this mobility, Yamashiro becomes enmeshed in Okinawa's multi-layered history of invasion, subjugation, and colonization. The earliest part of this history traces back to the rise of the Ryukyu Kingdom, a thriving civilization, before it was overtaken and occupied by the Satsuma clan in 1609. After the Ryukyu Kingdom fell to the Satsuma and its diplomatic ties with China were severed, its economy gradually declined. This trend accelerated after it was annexed by Japan in 1879. Subsequently, the people of Okinawa gradually turned their attention elsewhere seeking a viable alternative living option, particularly in Hawai'i.[10] However, those who chose migrant life in Hawai'i quickly learned it was far from ideal, as they were subject to gru-

eling conditions and subjugation under U.S. sovereignty. On the other hand, after Japan was defeated by the U.S. in the Pacific War in 1945, the people of Okinawa also eventually had to face U.S. military occupation. This U.S. presence, shared by the histories of these two islands, is what destabilizes Yamashiro relationship to both Hawai'i and Okinawa.

"My Parent's Grave" portrays the protagonist Yamashiro in the first person, and depicts his youth growing up in Hawai'i and his "return" to Okinawa with his three siblings after both of his parents' untimely deaths. He eventually moves back to Hawai'i when he is of high school age. When he decides to visit Okinawa again, it is after several decades have passed and he is much older. One of the objectives of this visit is to return his mother's remains to her homeland and to her Okinawan family's grave in Aza. The second is to settle an unresolved issue over land that was under his possession after he inherited the property from his father. However, in an attempt to liquidate his property, his encounter with his relatives, which is far from amicable from the beginning, eventually devolves into a situation that is quite emotional and culminates into a physically violent exchange between Yamashiro and a cousin, who felt sorry for his uncle for being denied the benefits of using the land during Yamashiro's family's absence.[11] Their view of him simultaneously oscillates between suspicious disdain for an outsider and expectations that he will fulfill his obligations as a member of the family. Likewise, the narrator, who is portrayed as the author, is prompted to contemplate his indeterminate position as returnee/visitor to Okinawa and the socio-political bearing and ramifications of his mobility between both places indicating his own precarious and uncertain ties to Okinawa.

Marking the passage of half a century since the end of the war, the year 1995 generated many forms of war reflection. The publication of Yamashiro's book is one example. Moreover, Yamashiro's unique background of being Japanese American but also having lived with his relatives in Okinawa complicates how the Pacific War fits within his narrative of having lived in two places that were affected by the war differently. In the case of Okinawa, however, on June 9,1995, the Japanese Diet hammered out an agreement on the final wording of their Resolution on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the end of World War II, in which it expressed no acknowledgment of Japan's "war of aggression" and contained no apologies to other countries. Lisa Yoneyama refers to a poll that was conducted by NHK asking Okinawans about

the Battle of Okinawa, with the majority of responses revealing they felt it was a "reckless battle which sacrificed countless Okinawan lives."[12] This interview indicates the pervasive negative sentiments the Okinawans had and continue to have toward mainland Japanese policies and policy makers.

Conversely, this resolution also brought into relief the reticent position the Japanese government took in relation to its involvement in the bloodshed that occurred at the expense of the Okinawans during the war. Although the dual sovereignty of Japan and the U.S. officially ended with the return of Okinawa to Japan in 1972, the U.S. military presence has undoubtedly persisted. Therefore, when considering this unresolved past of aggression and resistance, Yamashiro's relatives' exaggerated emotional response to his presence as an "outsider" suggests an alternative context of betrayal. That is, Yamashiro is prepared to forsake his Okinawan family ties to sell land he inherited and return to the U.S., a nation with whom Okinawa has such a dissonant past. He fulfills his filial role as a member of the family, represented by his returning his mother's remains to Okinawa, yet he is also relegated to being an unwelcome stranger who possesses a U.S. passport and resides in the country whose dominating presence continues to flare up tensions between Okinawa and mainland Japan.

In contrast, Yamashiro's initial return to Okinawa as a boy in 1924, as he depicts it in the text was at least, even if resignedly, met with acceptance by his relatives, since he was the offspring of Okinawan parents and only a boy who did not pose any sort of threat to them. However, how Yamashiro recounts this first encounter is not a case of recognizing someone familiar, but someone who is a stranger. The following passage depicts Yamashiro and his siblings having just arrived at his relatives' house in Aza, Okinawa.

> When our group arrived at our home in Aza, peering from above the rock wall that surrounded the house on both sides was my uncle who was situated in front, among a multitude of other eyes staring curiously at us. It was like those natives I saw in Hollywood movies when I was in Hawai'i. They gazed upon those explorers with eyes greeting outsiders.[13]

While he describes meeting his Okinawan relatives as a return to his *furusato* (home country), this is contradicted by the analogy he uses of him and his siblings being akin to explorers depicted in Hollywood movies who visit an indigenous people for the

first time. Using such a subjugating gaze, he transforms himself into someone akin to a civilized colonizer encountering a primitive, uncivilized people, exoticizing and dehumanizing them by reducing each to a pair of curious eyes. At the same time, his gaze is also obstructed by the Japanese American/Kibei signifier he bears, which hindered him after the outbreak of war between the U.S. and Japan when he was forced into internment after Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor. By being in Okinawa, he is both burdened by and empowered by U.S. hegemony, causing a rift between him and his relatives.

The relatives' resistance to Yamashiro's reappearance as an adult takes on more overtly hostile forms: antagonizing silence, intentional postponement of meetings, verbal harassment, finally concluding in physical violence. One striking example of resistance comes when the relatives try to expedite Yamashiro's departure, as they attempt to remove the remains of Yamashiro's mother and father from the family grave. These actions clearly expressed their intent to quite literally expel any evidence of a familial link that connected them to Yamashiro, to purge any evidence that they were ever related. However, their plan was ultimately aborted, since they later discovered that removal of a set of remains from the grave required carrying out additionally complicated rituals.

> When I proceeded with my plans to sell the land, the *honke* (head family) promptly responded. They told me to "please take back your parents' remains"...And yet, despite asking me to do this, I could imagine why they would suddenly change their minds. If there were no special reasons to remove remains from a tomb, it was believed that they had to replace the remains with another's. They probably realized that that would most likely be the remains of their currently bed-ridden beloved grandson. That is the most likely reason why they were so quick to have a messenger relay to him that removing his parents' remains would not be necessary.[14]

In the end, their failure to prevent Yamashiro from asserting his filial duty is what reveals a powerlessness ironically caused by the constraints determined by their very own burial traditions.

Yet even though they do not succeed in severing the filial tie that binds them to Yamashiro, his relatives still make a concerted effort to revoke any ties of affiliation to him. Edward Said's examination of filiation and affiliation within cultural history delineates how the bond between non-filial ties has increasingly served to replace familial bonds in correlation with the devel-

opment of institutional communities that emerged in society. [15] For a diasporic individual such as Yamashiro, such horizontal affiliations within the Japanese American community were a contributing factor that fitted him with the Japanese American/ Kibei signifier, but one can argue that perhaps it is this affiliation which prompted his Okinawan relatives to resist to include him into their community. Hence, he is put in an awkward position of being "family" but perpetually an "outsider" in the eyes of his Okinawan relatives.

To get a better grasp of what exacerbates their staunch opposition to Yamashiro's return, it is important to examine how it stems from his intent to reclaim his father's Okinawan property that had been left for decades in the care of his relatives, which they had openly used in his absence. The passage below depicts Yamashiro reflecting on a conversation he has with his wife's relatives in Saitama city near Tokyo on the topic of land stealing after his visit to Okinawa.

> Regarding the issue of land, my notion differs from that of people from the mainland. The right to an abode was something that was established after the war when homes were scarce. But now with the surplus of housing, it is not difficult to procure a home.[16] And yet, sadly it is still common for archaic laws to be applied in order to usurp land. This has caused a loss of principles among the Japanese people, and has perpetuated this wrong behavior. Reiterating this to people is my basic principle regarding the land issue. [17]

He is evidently critical of the ease with which property rights seem to have been undermined and continue to be disregarded, particularly in Okinawa, from where he had just returned. His tone echoes his own sour experience in Okinawa with his relatives in his attempts to reclaim his inheritance. However, what makes this situation an even more complicated one is Yamashiro's own problematic positionality as the child of Okinawan migrants who in fact dispossessed the indigenous Hawaiians of their land to establish their own communities. That is, Yamashiro is paradoxically entrenched in the legacy of Hawaiian colonial history just as he is burdened by the weight of his own internment experience.

Although he does not elaborate in his narrative about his childhood in Kauai, Hawai'i, where he was born and raised, Yamashiro, as the progeny of Okinawan immigrants in Hawai'i, is

inextricably tied to this colonial past.[18] Since Hawai'i's annexation in 1898, Okinawan migrants gradually began to settle and grow in numbers on the islands. The settler experience itself, however, was far from ideal: They suffered hardships and endured long grueling hours of labor on the plantations, and subjected to brutality and humiliation by plantation overseers. Having overcome such maltreatment and successfully established communities and planted their roots in Hawai'i, these settlers forged their rights to be in America and to call themselves Americans. On the flip side, though, this discourse occluded the fact that the success of Asian settlers also came at the expense of the indigenous Hawaiians' livelihoods. In her co-edited work, *Asian Settler Colonialism*, Candace Fujikane writes about how Asians who have settled in Hawai'i are also "settlers in another's homeland."[19] That is, the Asian settler is both complicit in colonial expansion, while perpetuating a diasporic bearing that continually unsettles their own positionality in Hawai'i.[20]

Therefore, we can conclude that just as Yamashiro's position in Okinawa is ambiguous, so is his position in Hawai'i. And yet, despite distinguishing Yamashiro's first trip to Okinawa as a *kikoku* (return) and his second as a *hōnichi* (visit), we can surmise that, for Yamashiro, his relatives' home in Okinawa was an unfamiliar foreign space right from the beginning. Therefore, this context obscures the very distinction Yamashiro attempts to make between return and visit. This ambiguity in meaning of these two terms begs the question of what the significance of returning is for Yamashiro?

> Even though Japanese immigrant history is over one hundred years old, the new immigrants that continue to enter into the U.S., write about their "homeland" / "the land they call home" just as earlier immigrants did. I have written this work with the intention of shedding such notions of homeland (native country), and with a primary focus on the subjectivity of the locality where I live.[21]

Here he suggests that notions of "homeland" are no longer relevant to a subject of immigrant history; rather, home is one's locality, the place where one lives. In so doing, he disassociates himself from reference to national affiliations, even though he is undeniably shaped and troubled by such allegiances.

Throughout his narrative, the very repetition of this term *genchi* (local/locality) becomes perceptible. Yamashiro elaborates on

his notion of locality reflecting on the process of the immigrant becoming a local.

> To "leave" one's home country means to experience a different life. Initially, like a destiny that cannot be avoided, you will drag it along with your whole being, but eventually when you realize that you are actually living this other life and treading its unsmooth path, not only does your home country become your past, but also from your hometown's point of view, you will have become a person from the past. Eventually you will be weaned off your homesickness and melancholy for the past. As a variant of your former self that has been blown away to another land, you will have drunk the local water and air and germinated under the temperate climate, spread your leaves under a foreign sky, set your roots into the ground, and lived to your fullest as a local in the land. Then, your home country will become nothing more than a mere illusion like the great beyond.[22]

This grassroots conceptualization of the immigrant's transformation into a local, conveyed through the imagery of the seed traveling from afar taking root and germinating under a "foreign sky," is a romantic and idyllic portrayal of the local that celebrates migration, cultural hybridity, transnationalism, and multi-ethnicity. Conversely, one can argue that it also obfuscates the power dynamics between the Asian settlers and the indigenous Hawaiians, as well as the subjugated position of the Asian immigrant and their descendants in a Hawai'i under U.S. sovereignty.

The term local can also be understood in an alternative context: Insightfully, Fujikane indicates "the term 'local' is often used to mask the political power that Asian settlers have historically exercised, often against Hawaiians."[23] That is, the history of encroachment and usurpation of land that belonged to the Hawaiians is shrouded in the notion of a homogenized local identity that implicitly asserts the Asian settlers' right to be in Hawai'i. Furthermore, Fujikane suggests that "the violence of American colonialism is ideologically transformed into 'democracy,' masking the realities of a settler colony that continues to deny Native peoples their rights to their lands and resources."[24] In other words, the term local is arguably another expression of colonial hegemony that Yamashiro incites.

At the end of his second trip to Okinawa, Yamashiro eventually does succeed in reclaiming and selling his land. The protracted struggle on between Yamashiro and his relative over the property concludes in a complete shattering of what relationship

he had with his Okinawan family. Yamashiro portrays a symbolic final meeting with his nephew, who was entrusted to represent his relatives in acknowledging Yamashiro's ownership of the land.

> "Sorry for making you wait so long. Please sell that land to someone else," he said with effort. It seemed that he was unable to procure the necessary funds. As he was about to leave he said "publish a good book," and shook my hand.
>
> As I shook back, I truly felt torn by mixed feelings that I had done something irrevocably wrong, and that I felt sorry. But watching as he dejectedly walked away, my clouded mind forged an unfalsifiable human thought,"I was glad that I didn't lose." [25]

After a final failed attempt to buy the land from Yamashiro, land that they had been using during the decades that Yamashiro had been absent, his relatives finally admitted defeat. This defeat is an example of the various forms of conflict that can emerge as a ripple effect from migration.

Resonating with different histories of invasion and usurpation, both Hawai'i and Okinawa are locations burdened by colonial hegemonies that are complicated further by the migrating Asian subject. Yamashiro's narrative illustrates, however, that even the Asian subject, in this case, a Kibei, must also negotiate with these colonial hegemonies in order to articulate his own point of reference that is destabilized by his very mobility. Therefore, Masao Yamashiro's "My Parents' Grave" provides us with an insightful counter-reference to the U.S./Japan binational subject that is often associated with the term Kibei, while reminding us of the limitations of such labels to adequately reflect the dissonance and diversities that characterize such individuals.

Notes

1. One can question whether the normalization of such terms as Japanese American is viable when considering individuals who cannot accurately be included within such a categorizations. We must question how we may determine who falls under such a signifier and what it means to be identified as such. Similarly, by serving to racially categorize by means of juxtaposing ethnicity and nationality into a single term, the term shares similar issues raised about Asian American, which is a term that continues to be the subject of heavy inquiry as it is perpetually made ambiguous by what David Palumbo-Liu calls the "persistent reconfigurations and transgression of the Asian/American 'split'" or a "sliding over between two seemingly separate terms" (1). In other words, we must first recognize the

term's inherent "indecidability" or its duality of being both inclusive and exclusive, sustained by contextualizing the subject as both American but still perpetually "other." Palumbo-Liu indicates that by acknowledging how the interdependence of both Asia and America has shaped U.S. society, we can help to dismantle the notion that normalizes the "universality" of the American and continues to relegate the Asian as other. See David Palumbo-Liu, *Asian/American: Historical Crossings of a Racial Frontier* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999): 1.

2. The 1924 Immigration Act, or Johnson Reed Act, was established on May 26, 1924, and was intended to restrict immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe, East Asia, the Middle East, and people from India in order to sustain a more homogeneous society.

3. Masaharu Ano, "Loyal Linguists: Nisei of World War II Learned Japanese in Minnesota," *Minnesota History* 45:7 (Fall 1977): 274.

4. Aside from the more official definition generated by U.S. intelligence authorities, the term Kibei was also used prevalently during the 1920s to 1940s in a more critical context, particularly as tensions between the U.S. and Japan had grown steadily worse. Individuals who had returned from Japan were regarded suspiciously and deemed as potential threats. Ironically, such negative sentiments towards these Kibei were also shared by many second-generation Japanese Americans who had not been sent to Japan, but remained in the U.S. In particular, those who were active in the Japan American Citizens' League (JACL) viewed these transgressors as severe impediments to the Niseis' integration into U.S. society because of the Kibeis' prominent sense of loyalty to Japan and affinity to Japanese sentiments and sensibilities, which were unwelcome at the time.

5. Traversing from one archipelago to another, Okinawans have been migrating to Hawai'i since 1900, when the first group of 26 arrived in Honolulu as contract laborers on the British steamer, SS City of China. Seeking reprieve from depleting resources, many Okinawans left Okinawa for Hawai'i only to be met with the hardships of forced labor on sugar plantations, where they endured harsh treatment and abuse. According to Scott Y. Matsumoto, "In 1899 Toyama formed a group of 30 men, aged 21 to 35, as the first contract labor immigrants to Hawaii from Okinawa. These men sailed from Naha aboard the SS *Satsuma-maru* on December 5, 1899. They docked in Osaka and went to Yokohama by train, arriving there on December 15. There three men were rejected because of poor health. The remaining group then sailed from Yokohama on December 30 on a British steamer, SS City of China, and arrived in Honolulu on January 8, 1900. One man was detained by the Honolulu Quarantine Station and later sent home. Twenty-six men entered Hawaii as the first Okinawan immigrants" (125-126). However, whether they remained in Okinawa or moved to Hawai'i these people were subject to bear the burden of a history of U.S./ Japanese colonization, exploitation, changing sovereignty, and effacement of their indigenous culture and language. See Scott Y. Matsumoto, "Okinawa Migrants to Hawai'i," *Manoa* 16 (1982): 125-132.

6. Linda Anderson, *Autobiography: The New Critical Idiom* (New York: Routledge, 2001): 123.

7. Yuji Ichioka, *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants 1885-1924* (New York: The Free Press, 1988): 197.
8. Arif Dirlik, ed., *What's in a Rim?: Critical Perspectives on the Pacific Region Idea* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998): 3.
9. During his time there, he became one of the editors of the internment newspaper *Tessaku* (Metal Fence), referring to the barbed wire fence that imprisoned the internees. He has also published another work *Tooii taigan: Aru kibei no kaiso* (*A Distant Shore: Reflections of a Kibei*) (Tokyo: Grobi Publishing, 1984).
10. Social activists Jabana Noboru and Toyama Kyuzo had established the Liberal Civil Rights Movement to garner interest in Hawai'i as an alternative living option for Okinawans. With the permission of the Okinawan governor and the Kumamoto Immigration Agency, this option became a reality in 1900 when the first group of Okinawans headed for Hawaii were shipped off on the SS City of China.
11. Yamashiro, 242.
12. T. Fujitani, Geoffrey M. White, and Lisa Yoneyama, eds. *Perilous Memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001): 87-88.
13. Masao Yamashiro, 山城正雄『帰米二世—解体していく「日本人」』[*The Kibei Nisei: Dissecting the "Japanese"*]（Tokyo: Gogatsu Shobo, 1995): 202-203.
14. *Ibid*., 239.
15. Edward W. Said, *The Word, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983): 22.
16. It is important to note, however, that there are some inaccuracies in his statement, particularly in reference to right to an abode. The Imperial Japanese Constitution, Article 22 states that "[t]he Japanese citizens have the freedom to occupy an abode or move residences within the stipulation of the law." This was established during the Meiji Restoration, hence clearly before the end of the Pacific War contrary to what he indicates.
17. Yamashiro, 272.
18. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969): 30. According to Fanon, "for there is no native who does not dream at least once a day of setting himself up in the settler's place."
19. Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008): 21.
20. Another proponent to the indigenous Hawaiian population's cause is Hawaiian studies authority and Hawaiian nationalist leader, Haunani-Kay Trask who argues that "Asian success proves to be but the latest elaboration of foreign hegemony"(Trask, "Settlers of Color and 'Immigrant' Hegemony" In Fujikane and Okamura, eds., 47). That is, as Asian immigrants continued to flow into Hawai'i, embarking on new ventures and capitalizing on business opportunities, sacred land continued to be desecrated, its resources depleted and its people disadvantaged. Therefore, even as the Asian settler regarded with animosity the abusive power wielded against

them in the name of U.S. imperialism, it was the Native Hawaiians who regarded with resentment the threatening presence of the Asian settler. Behind the veil of ignorance, the Asian settler entered the colonial space that was Hawai'i, and was projected on a trajectory to desperately succeed. As a result, what befell the Native Hawaiians was deprivation, diminishing populations, and subordinated group status. Acknowledgment of the cost the Hawaiians had to pay for their presence was conveniently neglected.

21. Yamashiro, 277.

22. *Ibid.*, 264.

23. Fujikane and Okamura, eds., 27.

24. *Ibid.*, 3.

25. Yamashiro, 255.

View publication stats