

10:8

de Cristoforo, Violet Kaye

Victim of a Tule Lake Anthropologist

Mar. 1988

83/115

C

# A VICTIM OF A TULE LAKE ANTHROPOLOGIST

By Violet Kazue de Cristoforo  
(Formerly Kazue Matsuda)

( A Paper for presentation at the Fifth National Conference of the  
Association for Asian American Studies, March 24-27, 1988,  
Washington State University, Pullman, Washington)

Air Mail Par avion

## A VICTIM OF A TULE LAKE ANTHROPOLOGIST

This paper deals with Rosalie Hankey, an anthropologist with the Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study (JERS), while she was at Tule Lake.<sup>1</sup> It touches on some of the lies and distortions by Rosalie Hankey (later known as Wax) about me in her two books, The Spoilage and Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Also, some of her unethical behavior is revealed.

Immediately prior to the Second World War my family, consisting of my husband, Shigeru Matsuda (a legal resident alien), me and our two children, lived in Fresno, California. My younger brother, Tokio Yamane, an American - born citizen, as I was, lived with us and attended Edison Technical High School there. My father-in-law and mother-in-law (also legal resident aliens) were raising grapes in an outlying part of Fresno and another brother, Richard Yamane, was serving in the United States Army. My own father and mother were living in Hiroshima, Japan.

On February 19, 1942, ten weeks after the Pearl Harbor attack, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 paving the way for the evacuation and internment of Japanese Americans, citizens and legal resident aliens alike, who had been living on the West Coast, and within two weeks we were forced to dispose of our home and furniture, our thriving book store, and all our possessions including our new car.

On the appointed day we were hastily taken to the Fresno "Assembly" Center, a temporary detention area on the grounds of the Fresno County Fair, with only those possessions we could carry in our hands. At this time my boy was seven years old, my daughter five and I was pregnant with my third child. Yet, we had to carry everything we would need in the foreseeable future, including clothing for ourselves and for the baby I was expecting.

Immediately prior to our evacuation I had undergone abdominal surgery for the removal of a

tumor and my weakened condition, plus the change in diet and extreme heat, caused me to be admitted to the camp hospital several times with pre-natal complications until I eventually gave birth to a sickly baby weighing only five pounds.

For several months we were forced to live in what had been the stable area of the Fresno County Fairground, housed in hastily-constructed wooden barracks covered with tar paper, devoid of any furniture except a metal army cot for each person. There was no other furniture. Later on we were given ticks, which we had to fill with straw (to which I was allergic), for use as mattresses. The extreme summer heat of central California was unbearable. The army food we were given was totally lacking in the fresh fruits and vegetables to which we were accustomed, uniformly unappetizing, and at times tainted because of the lack of refrigerators and the inexperience of the cooks. But the most offensive aspect of our detention was the suffocating and nauseating stench of urine emanating from the stable area and constantly in our nostrils. It was under these appalling conditions that my baby was born.

Eventually we were moved to the Jerome Relocation Center, a more permanent but equally dismal camp, located in the swamps of Arkansas, and infested with chiggers, mosquitoes and snakes. My husband and my brother had been sent ahead of us from Fresno to work on the still unfinished barracks and my father-in-law and my mother-in-law had been moved with a different group. On the train trip from Fresno my baby, who was less than a month old, contracted double pneumonia, so when we reached our destination she had to be hospitalized for several months in the primitive camp hospital (which, on our arrival, still lacked windows, medical supplies and hospital equipment). And, still not fully recovered from my recent surgery, I had to struggle to care for my three young children and my in-laws, who spoke no English.

In the spring of 1943, while we were still being detained in Jerome, we were required to fill the infamous loyalty questionnaire. This form had originally been designed in conjunction with a recruitment drive for a segregated "Japanese Combat Team" made up of volunteers from Hawaii and the ten internment camps, but had been administered to all internees, including the young (from age 17 on), the old, and those unfit for military service, as the ultimate proof of their loyalty.

The long questionnaire contained two crucial questions: No.27 asked the internees if they were willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States. And No. 28 asked whether they would swear unqualified allegiance to the United States, and foreswear allegiance to the Japanese emperor and to any other foreign government.

As legal resident aliens who had been prevented from becoming naturalized U. S. citizens, my husband and my father-in-law did not think they were qualified to serve in the U. S. armed forces and, in any case, my father-in-law was too old to do so, consequently neither one answered Question 27. As for Question 28, they both realized that by renouncing the only citizenship they had they would become stateless persons and neither one answered Question 28. My mother-in-law did not answer those questions either.

Although an American-born citizen, with three young children I would not have been eligible to serve in the armed forces. Moreover, women of my generation had been taught that their first duty was to their husbands. To fulfill my responsibility to my husband, to keep my family together, and also because my husband was our sole means of support I, too, went along with the decision of the male members of my family and, with a heavy heart, did not answer either question, knowing that by acting in conformity with them I would eventually be sent to Japan with my relatives.

As a result of our refusal to answer the loyalty questionnaire, in September 1943, my family and I were sent to the Tule Lake Segregation Center in Northern California. En route there the train had to make an emergency stop in Hoisington, Kansas, because my mother-in-law had become gravely ill and, accompanied by my husband, she was taken to the local hospital, where she remained for the next two months.<sup>2</sup>

On November 4, 1943, my brother Tokio, who was an assistant cook in one of the mess halls, was arrested by War Relocation Authority (WRA) personnel and severely beaten because they suspected he knew about the thefts of food (by WRA personnel), and its subsequent sale on the black market. Needing someone to blame for that evening's "incident" at the food warehouse, they accused my brother of being the instigator of the unrest among the internees. Recently declassified records reveal that my brother was completely absolved from participating in the November 4 incident, or any other disturbance.<sup>3</sup> Following his intermittent beating, which lasted all night, he was confined in the "Bull Pen" of the stockade.<sup>4</sup> He remained there for ten months without the due process of law guaranteed by both the United States and California Constitutions.

Two weeks after Tokio's confinement, my mother-in-law, who, in the absence of my own mother had become very close to me and to my brother, finally arrived at Tule Lake. She was

taken directly to the camp hospital, still seriously ill, (She was affected with cancer though it was still undiagnosed.) The news of my brother's beating and unwarranted imprisonment caused her additional grief.

In spite of my own debility, and the ill-health of my children and mother-in-law, it was necessary for me to act as interpreter for my husband and in-laws. In the following months I also continued my efforts to secure my brother's release from the stockade. I repeatedly contacted the WRA camp authorities and the army officials in charge of the stockade, the American Red Cross, the Department of Interior, and even the Spanish Consul in San Francisco because the Spanish Legation had become the protecting power for Japanese nationals in America. However, my efforts were in vain and my brother continued to languish in the stockade.

More than six months following Tokio's imprisonment, Rosalie Hankey (Wax), one of several researchers of the Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study sponsored by the University of California, Berkeley, was permanently assigned to Tule Lake, in May 1944, after three short visits totaling not more than eighteen days. She represented herself to the internees, including me, as an anthropologist from the University of California, sympathetic to what she called "our" cause, and one who could be trusted because she was only interested in doing her research.

At this time I was distraught by my personal and family problems and I desperately needed a person I could trust and confide in, and who would advise me or speak to the camp authorities on my behalf. I accepted Hankey's overtures and told her of the difficulties encountered just to survive with a little dignity. Hankey ingratiated herself with me so that I would continue the discourse and over time I was completely open with her on the strength of her promises that whatever information she obtained would be used exclusively for her dissertation, to be based on the lives of the internees at Tule Lake. Instead, she exploited my trust and damaged me irreparably by reporting details I had revealed to her in confidence to the authorities.<sup>5</sup> Later she published the information she obtained under false pretexts from me, and other internees, in The Spoilage<sup>6</sup> and in Doing Fieldwork.<sup>7</sup>

Hankey herself acknowledges the mercenary motives for her actions with this comment, "...Most of the people (internees) with whom I tried to scrape up an acquaintance were troubled in mind and wanted to be left alone. But, if I acted like a decent human being and left them

alone, how was I to earn my salary as a researcher?"<sup>8</sup>

It is important to point out that, although Rosalie A. Hankey is listed among the contributors to The Spoilage (the first volume of the JERS series), she now declines responsibility for writing or editing any part of that book, including the biographical notes. However, Marvin Opler, WRA Community Analyst at Tule Lake, identifies Hankey as the chief source of information on Tule Lake,<sup>9</sup> and neither Dorothy Swaine Thomas, the author, nor Richard S. Nishimoto, the co-author, were at Tule Lake while the Matsuda family was there, and neither ever met, or corresponded, with my husband or me. Yet, The Spoilage repeatedly refers to "H. Tsuchikawa"<sup>10</sup> (my husband Shigeru), and to me, "Tsuchikawa, Mrs. H." It follows, therefore, that only Hankey, who also uses the pseudonym "Tsuchikawa" for my husband and me in Doing Fieldwork, and who was at Tule Lake from May 1944 to May 1945, could have had access to information about the Matsuda family.

Like the other members of the Fresno Japanese community, my husband and I had been law-abiding and respected citizens with spotless records, as a search of my documents from the National Archives (including the FBI, Army and Navy Intelligence Services) recently indicated. However, within a few months of Hankey's arrival at Tule Lake (in May 1944) my reputation was blemished because of her innuendoes and other defamatory remarks. These took the form of references and aspersions directed against "Mrs. Tsuchikawa" such as: "She assumed a position of leadership in the underground movement"; "The prominent Resegregationist"; "The more extreme among them (Resegregationists) such as Mrs. Tsuchikawa"; "Mrs. Tsuchikawa and others were threatened with complicity in the Noma murder"; and so on. These references will be discussed in greater detail in due time.

For the moment it might be appropriate to return to my efforts to secure the release of my brother from the stockade, about which Hankey comments,

The meeting was held at the home of Mrs. Tsuchikawa, sister of Sadao Endo (Hankey's pseudonym for my brother Tokio) who had been arrested on November 4 and confined in the stockade. She assumed a position of leadership in the underground movement and also agitated constantly and openly for the release of her brother. In the course of time she came to be regarded by the administration as the instigator of most of the trouble that later developed.<sup>11</sup>

In this quotation there are several fabrications and innuendoes which must be exposed: (1) "The meeting was held at the home of Mrs. Tsuchikawa..." Hankey makes it sound as if it was part of a conspiracy, however, the meeting consisted of family and friends who desired to see my brother released from the stockade. They met occasionally at my home at the invitation of my husband, Shigeru Matsuda, to see what could be done to resolve that issue. We were family and friends - not agitators!

(2) "She assumed a position of leadership in the underground movement..." This is a deliberate falsehood since Hankey was aware that in the 1940's the Japanese culture was completely male dominated. Hankey's statement contradicts the mores of Japanese society which placed a woman in a submissive relation to men and expected women not to engage in affairs which were the domain of males. Furthermore, had I, a young woman, tried to assume such a position of leadership, my husband would have been disgraced by my actions and I would have been embarrassed by trying to do a job which was the province of older, more experienced and respected male members of the Japanese community. In addition, in 1944, I was too busy trying to resolve personal and family problems to have the time or interest in camp politics.

(3) "...She came to be regarded by the administration as the instigator of most of the trouble that later developed." As it turned out this was quite true, but only thanks to the fact that Hankey had branded me a "troublemaker", "resegregationist leader", "pressure group leader", etc., and a dossier was compiled about me. This is substantiated by the records I secured from the National Archives under the Freedom of Information Act, about which more information will be provided later.

One question immediately comes to mind: After three previous short visits totaling less than eighteen days, and one month before being permanently assigned to Tule Lake (in May 1944), how could Hankey have presumed to know all these details, including the allegation that Mrs. Tsuchikawa was a member of the underground pressure group, when there were more than sixteen thousand internees at Tule Lake and, in the brief period Hankey was there she would not have had the time to interview many of them?

On November 1, 1943, on the occasion of the visit of Dillon Myer, the WRA National Director, to Tule Lake, he was confronted by several thousand internees who presented him with a list of demands for redress of grievances. The meeting ended peacefully and, at the suggestion of my brother Tokio, the internees bowed in a gesture of gratitude and respect to the National Director

before dispersing.

Yet, the display of public feeling, "had thrown those of uneasy conscience (camp authorities) into a paroxysm of unreasoning terror."<sup>12</sup> On the night of November 4, a group of evacuees assembled near the motor pool to prevent the authorities from transporting the internees' food to the strikebreakers at a nearby camp. (The strikebreakers were detainees who had been brought in from other relocation centers to break the Tule Lake farm strike.) My brother, who was attending a meeting of the Organization for the Betterment of Camp Condition, was asked by Rev. Kai and George Kuratomi to go to the food warehouse area to try to restore calm, and it was there that he was attacked, without provocation, by WRA Caucasian personnel and taken to the WRA office, where he was severely beaten and thrown in the "Bull Pen" of the stockade the following day.<sup>13</sup>

As a result of this incident, my brother and a dozen or so young men were arrested and imprisoned in tents, under heavy guard, on a site selected by the army near the hospital. This was the beginning of what became known as the stockade, which operated from early November 1943 to late August 1944. By the middle of December (a full five months before Hankey's assignment at Tule Lake) there were well over two hundred internees confined in the stockade, including alleged leaders and agitators, farm strikers and members of the Negotiating Committee.

The stockade was an important phase of every political issue between the camp authorities and the detainees; and between the stockade prisoners, their relatives, and various internee groups claiming to represent the detainees; or to negotiate with the authorities for the release of the prisoners. However, by the end of December their efforts had failed and the stockade prisoners went on a six-day hunger strike.

However, much of this unrest, and the activities of the "underground pressure movement" for the release of the stockade detainees, took place long before Hankey's arrival at Tule Lake and all her comments about what she calls the "incarceration" had to be based on hearsay, rumor and gossip, and perhaps a few questionable records of opinionated and prejudiced administration officials. By the time Hankey was permanently assigned to Tule Lake, in May 1944, all but about twenty-five of the stockade prisoners had been released, but Tokio was still being detained and would be in the stockade until August 28, 1944.

"She agitated constantly and openly for the release of her brother..." possibly because the

stockade prisoners included those confined for political issues, Hankey gratuitously assumed that my brother was involved in camp politics and in the clandestine activities of the various groups. If she had properly familiarized herself with the circumstances she would have learned that my younger brother Tokio, then aged twenty-one, had been the foremost track and field athlete of his high school and had won the West Coast Relays Championship prior to the internment. And, as an athlete he was more interested in sports and athletics than in the partisan political activities of some of the Tule Lake internees. She also would have known that he had been asked by others to go to the warehouse area and diffuse any potential confrontation. Finally, an anthropologist should have understood that, in the absence of our parents, I, as the older sister, had the responsibility of looking after my younger brother and attempting to secure his release from the stockade. But, disregarding the blatant travesty of justice, all Hankey could say was that I "agitated constantly and openly for my brother's release."

In any case, neither "Mrs. Tsuchikawa", "Hideki Tsuchikawa" nor "Sadao Endo" ever belonged to the "underground group", which was led by Rev. Kai and Kuratomi, and it would have been utterly impossible for Mrs. Tsuchikawa (me) to assume a "leadership position" in a group of which she was not even a member.

In connection with the third hunger strike of the stockade prisoners, which took place in July, 1944, Hankey states that the Extremists abandoned their delaying tactics to secure the release of the detainee when they realized they could profit from the internees' sympathy for the stockade prisoners to raise funds for the expenses of their (Resegregationist) organization. She charges: "There is some evidence to support this contention, for a drive initiated at this time by Mrs. Tsuchikawa, Yamashita, and others is said to have yielded a fund of \$2,000 to \$3,000, only \$500 of which was allocated to the Saiban-iin (legal committee) for the attorney's fee."<sup>14</sup>

This is absolutely untrue because I not only was not a Resegregationist, but I was not involved in any phase of the fund-raising effort. To make matters worse, Hankey also falsely accuses me, along with Yamashita and others, of defrauding the internees of \$1,500 to \$2,500. Yet, all she can say to substantiate her imputation is, "there is some evidence to support this accusation" (but she doesn't say what that evidence might be.)

Hankey admits that when she went into the field she was technically and intellectually unprepared, and knew very little about the Japanese Americans, interviewing or statistical methods, although she knew something of "primitive" societies.<sup>15</sup> If she had been more

knowledgeable and experienced in dealing with the internees, she would have realized that those who had refused, or failed to answer, the loyalty questionnaire had been branded by the authorities as politically disloyal to the United States and potentially dangerous to the war effort, not because of what they had said or done, but because the official interpretation of "disloyalty" was based more on emotion than upon behavioral attitudes. Hankey accepted as fact the stigma of disloyalty wrongly placed on some of the internees and let it overcome the intellectual honesty demanded of a true researcher.

Ignoring this crucial issue and not comprehending some of the factors which had fueled the resistance movement at Tule Lake, which included the indifferent relations between the administration and the internees, the inability of the project officials to explain the issues to the detainees, the mistakes made by the administration in defining the penalties for non-cooperation, and the use of duress in applying these penalties, Hankey obscures the reasons for the discontent of the internees.

From time to time some of the diverse internee groups merged to bring pressure on the administration, and eventually this clandestine assemblage gained considerable strength. Throughout the early months of 1944 the activities of this underground group were directed toward maintaining the "status quo" (passive non-cooperation with the army and camp authorities, continuance of the partial strike, refusal to betray the hidden leaders, and refusal to elect a new representative group), and the release of all stockade prisoners. A few months later Hankey came to Tule Lake and obtained some surface knowledge concerning the issues troubling the internees. Needing a focus to explain the situation at Tule Lake, Hankey remembered "Mrs. Tsuchikawa", who had confided in her about problems at the center, and branded her as being the center of the resistance. Hankey's superficial treatment of the problems might be convincing were it not for the following considerations:

1. Hankey came to Tule Lake from the Gila Relocation Center where her performance as a fieldworker had been questioned by Dorothy Swaine Thomas, her superior, who regularly kept asking Hankey why she was not sending her the kind of voluminous data about the attitudes and events that she desired.<sup>16</sup> The situation worsened to the point that Hankey states, "every letter I received from Dr. Thomas made it clear that I was not doing what she expected me to do...and after about two months I began to see myself as a total failure."<sup>17</sup> Finally, Thomas sent Richard S. Nishimoto, co-author of The Spoilage, to Gila to report on whether Hankey should be fired or not. This visit strengthened Hankey's slowly developing realization that she could not do the

kind of participant observation desired by Thomas.<sup>18</sup>

It would seem logical to assume that when Hankey came to Tule Lake, still smarting under Thomas' rebukes, she decided to submit the type of reports which would enhance her prestige and her worth in the eyes of her superior, and she began to spin a tale replete with exaggerations, half-truths, and misinterpretations. As Hankey reports, "...I had constructed an ideal model of 'true Japanese' behavior - for the Japanese and for myself - and I proceeded (in my own mind) to criticize and despise anyone who deviated from this model."<sup>19</sup>

Further on Hankey gives an example of how this was accomplished,

When I found out that Kira (Kinzo Wakayama, whom she had met only once and interviewed for approximately fifteen minutes), one of the most vigorous exponents of the renunciation of citizenship (for other people) had not applied for denationalization, I again talked to the Department of Justice investigators and suggested they question him about his loyalties in the presence of some of the young Hokoku officers. Kira applied for denationalization.<sup>20</sup>

However, this is another falsehood because Kinzo Wakayama told me when we last met in October 1987, he was forced by Justice Department Agents - who had a gun pointed at his head - to renounce his American Citizenship.

It should also be noted that Dr. Thomas made it perfectly clear to Hankey that on no account was she to give any information or "data" to the WRA,<sup>21</sup> an admonition which Hankey did not follow at Tule Lake because much of the information she secured from me, and the other internees, found its way to the WRA camp administration, and other government agencies.<sup>22</sup>

2. A second particular that must be considered is that the Tule Lake population must have included several thousand women. However, Hankey quotes, or mentions by name, only half a dozen or so of them and attributes a few trivial comments to un-named females to whom she refers only as: "an older Nisei woman", "a Nisei girl", again, "a Nisei girl", "a Kibei girl", and

so on. However, the ubiquitous Mrs. Tsuchikawa (the pseudonym Hankey gave me) is quoted, or blamed, no less than nine times in The Spoilage and not less than twelve times in Doing Fieldwork and, additionally, several times Hankey deviously uses only the last name, "Tsuchikawa", so that the reader is left in doubt as to whether she refers to my husband or to me.

In another descriptive reference to Kira, Hankey relates the following:

Subsequently he (Kira) was sent to Japan with other expatriates and were all once again confined in a "center", this time by the Japanese government. Many months later, a friend sent me a clipping from a California newspaper. The clipping told how a certain expatriate, Stanley Masanobu Kira, confined in a detention area in Japan, had appealed to the American Army to remove him because certain of the young men confined with him had threatened to kill him.<sup>23</sup>

Sounds plausible enough but, in truth, this is fatally at variance with the facts. First, Kira was Hankey's pseudonym for Wakayama, not the name by which other internees knew him. That being the case, how can the newspaper article refer to Kira unless there was someone else (not Kinzo Wakayama) whose name was actually Stanley Masanobu Kira?

Second, on my visit to Japan last October (1987) I managed to meet and talk with several expatriates, including Kinzo Wakayama. He and other expatriates related some of their internment experiences to me and were emphatic in stating that none of the expatriates from America were ever "detained" by the Japanese government, or the U. S. Army, and there were no such "centers" maintained either by the Japanese or the occupation forces, neither of which had any reason whatever to detain the expatriates or repatriates.

Obviously this is another bit of dis-information Hankey includes in her book to enhance her prestige and credibility, or to add color and the appearance of authoritativeness to her story of Tule Lake, or perhaps because she never expected that any former internee might someday challenge her statements.

Takeo Noma (Hankey's pseudonym for Yaozo Hitomi, the manager of the Tule Lake Cooperative store) was murdered on the night of July 2, 1944, just a little over a month after

Hankey came to Tule Lake. An interesting revelation is made by Hankey about this period (mid-June 1944 to mid-September). Under the heading "I Became a Fanatic" she states,

... Once again I went a little crazy. I came to believe that observing and recording what went on at Tule Lake was my transcendental task, and I went about this task with an unflagging energy and relish that today seems rather frightening... I do not think that this manic or "battle-mad" state hampered my fieldwork... (but) I developed an unpleasant sense of self-righteousness.<sup>24</sup>

Referring specifically to the Noma murder she continues, "When I heard that Noma had been murdered, I experienced a self-righteous satisfaction. As I told myself, the Japanese accommodators had been asking for it for a long time and now they had gotten it."<sup>25</sup>

At this time (July 1944) I was still desperately trying to have my brother released from the stockade, I was doing my best to care for my mother-in-law, whose physical condition was worsening day by day, I was afflicted with a serious sinus condition which required an operation shortly thereafter, and was taking care of my three sickly children who were usually in and out of the hospital. This is verified by clinical data from the Tule Lake Hospital which state that my weight was down to about eighty-two pounds, I was nervous and my appetite was poor, I often could not sleep at night, and felt dizzy while doing housework.<sup>26</sup>

Under these unfavorable conditions I knew absolutely nothing of the Noma murder until the news of the killing was brought to me by Hankey herself, who was quite hysterical at the time, but I attributed her agitation to camp gossip of Hankey's role as a spy for the WRA, rumors which were rampant at the time.

In discussing the Noma murder Hankey gives two entirely dissimilar accounts (by chance or by design?) in Doing Fieldwork<sup>27</sup> and in The Spoilage,<sup>28</sup> where she accepts the version published in the Tule Lake Cooperator (a publication of the Coop) and, curiously enough, both of Hankey's versions differ substantially from the report of an unidentified witness to the murder.<sup>29</sup>

Nevertheless, in her preoccupation with casting suspicion for the Noma murder on the various

factions in Tule Lake, and on the internees she disliked, Hankey asserts, "Early in September, relations between the factions were further strained when leaders of both (Kubo, Mrs. Tsuchikawa and others from Resegregationists; Abe, Kuratomi, and Tada for the other faction) were threatened with indictment for complicity in the Noma murder."<sup>30</sup>

In another reference to the murder Hankey states,

...During the first week in September... an investigator from the office of the District Attorney in Modoc County came to the project and undertook intensive questioning of Abe, Kuratomi, and Tada as well as such Resegregationist leaders as Mrs. Tsuchikawa, Kira and Kubo. Several of them were taken to the County seat for further questioning. The belief that they would be indicted by the Grand Jury for complicity in the murder became widespread..."<sup>31</sup>

In both quotations Hankey speaks in generalities and makes veiled accusations about Mrs. Tsuchikawa's involvement in the Noma murder. That is to say, she plants the seed of suspicion in the reader's mind then, as an afterthought, she casually mentions, "... No indictment was made and the matter was dropped."<sup>32</sup>

The truth of the matter is that I was never questioned by an investigator of the Modoc County District Attorney's office, or by anyone else about the murder, either at Tule Lake or at the County seat. Nor, for that matter, was I ever threatened with indictment.

In the middle of May 1945, Dr. Thomas ordered Hankey to leave the Tule Lake "immediately" because of several accusations made by a Washington official of the WRA against Hankey. One of the charges made by this official was that Hankey had communicated with the Department of Justice.

In spite of Dr. Thomas' admonition not to give any information to government agencies, Hankey's cavalier attitude greatly damaged me when her untruths became known to the Department of Justice and, at a Justice Department Hearing I requested in the spring of 1957, I was grilled for hours on end about the Noma murder and the spurious indictment - subjects about which I knew absolutely nothing.

There is much more that could be said in order to confute the false accusations Hankey made about me in The Spoilage and in Doing Fieldwork, and by her distortions of facts and realities as they applied to the Tule Lake internees. However, in the interest of brevity, I will conclude this essay with a brief sketch of my post-war years in Japan.

In March 1946, the Tule Lake Segregation Center closed and my three children and I were expatriated to Japan. My husband (who had previously been transferred to the Santa Fe Justice Department Camp For Enemy Aliens) had been repatriated earlier and had married a Japanese woman. As a result, I was left with the sole custody of my three American-born children.

In Japan we lived a life of unimaginable hardship because most of the transactions were on a barter basis and many necessities could be purchased only on the black market at inflated prices. (I should point out that when we went back to Japan we had little more than the clothes on our backs.) And, in spite of the fact that I had no job skills or business experience, with the help of the Chief of Chaplains of the Australian military forces, I was able to eventually work at three different low-paid jobs, concurrently, but, unlike other American citizens in Japan I was being paid not in dollars, but in devalued yen.

Unable to properly raise my children in the war-devastated and depressed economy of Japan, and hoping my older children might have a better opportunity in their native land, in 1948, I made the heart-breaking decision to send my boy, aged twelve, who did not remember a word of English, back to America, alone and friendless, because the American consular authorities refused to let me accompany him. A few years later, in 1951, I again had to make the same sorrowful decision and send my daughter, aged fourteen, back to the United States, also alone and friendless and unable to speak English.

Why had the American authorities refused me permission to accompany my children? As the Consular officials in Kobe, Japan, explained to me, my name had been placed on a "black list" (of undesirables) because of the dossier Rosalie Hankey had helped to assemble concerning my alleged "trouble-making" and "pressure group" activities during my internment at Tule Lake. Also as a result of those allegations they could not give me permission to accompany the children back to the United States - in spite of the fact that I was an American-born citizen, and I had been told by Mr. Charles M. Rothstein of the Justice Department (at the Tule Lake "Mitigation" Hearings) that I could return to America with my children whenever I so desired.

My children were unable to understand that my motive in sending them back to America was to

try to give them a better life in the land of their birth. They were also unable to comprehend the convolutions of the political and legal processes involved in American-Japanese relations and believed instead that I was trying to get rid of them. As a result they have repudiated me and, to this day, they refuse to see me or to have anything to do with me. Thus, my devastating experiences with Rosalie Hankey Wax have not only damaged me because of her distortions and unfounded accusations, but they have also left a deep and humiliating scar on my psyche, and that of my children.

We cannot remake history but, having helped to bring about the disintegration of three generations of my family, I feel Rosalie Hankey Wax is morally and legally obligated to recognize her unprincipled conduct and publicly apologize to me, my three children, the Matsuda family, and the other former Tule Lake internees.

## NOTES

1. For a detailed analysis of JERS, including information on Hankey, see Peter T. Suzuki, "The University of California Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study: A Prolegomenon." (1986)
2. For an account of my mother-in-law's terminal illness see, "A Victim of the Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study (JERS): Affidavit of Violet Kazue de Cristoforo, 30 June 1987, Salinas, CA., PP. 52-55.
3. FBI Report, File No. 100-15311, made by M. E. Gurnea, San Francisco, California, 12/14/43.
4. Bernstein, Joan Z. et al., 1982, Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, PP. 210, 247.
5. de Cristoforo, Op. Cit., P.41.
6. Thomas, Dorothy Swaine & Richard S. Nishimoto, with Contributions by Rosalie A. Hankey, 1946. The Spoilage. Berkeley: University of California Press.
7. Wax, Rosalie H. 1971, Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
8. Ibid., P. 71
9. Opler, Marvin K., Book Review of The Spoilage, *American Anthropologist* 50, (1948): 307-310
10. Proof that this pseudonym was used for us is found in the Bancroft Library folder entitled, "True Names of Persons Hidden by Pseudonyms in The Spoilage," Call No. 67/14 wl.23.

11. Thomas, Op. Cit., P. 223, Also, Doing Fieldwork, PP. 112-113.
12. Weglyn, Michi, 1976, Years of Infamy. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks, P. 162.
13. Bernstein, Op. Cit., Testimony of Tokio Yamane, P. 210.
14. Thomas, Op. Cit., P. 298.
15. Wax, Op. Cit., P. 63.
16. Ibid., P. 69.
17. Ibid., P. 71.
18. Ibid., P. 75.
19. Ibid., P. 140.
20. Ibid., P. 168. Hankey's emotional involvement in the affairs of the Tule Lake internees was first discussed by Peter T. Suzuki in "Anthropologists in the Wartime Camps for Japanese Americans: A Documentary Study", *Dialectical Anthropology* (1981), 6:23-60. Also, for a detailed analysis of Hankey's activities, especially with respect to "Kira", see Peter T. Suzuki, "The University of California Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study: A Prolegomenon". (1986) 10: 204-205. Elsevier Science Publishers B. V.
21. Wax, Op. Cit., P. 65.
22. de Cristoforo, Op. Cit., PP. 41-42.
23. Wax, Op. Cit., P. 169.
24. Ibid., P. 139. See also Suzuki, *Dialectical Anthropology* 6 (1981): 31.
25. Ibid., P. 140. See also Suzuki, *Dialectical Anthropology* 6 (1981): 31.

26. Out Patient Progress Record/Ward Surgeon's Progress And Treatment Record, dated 7/7/44, signed by Dr. G. K. Hashiba, General Services Administration, National Archives And Records, Washington, D.C. 20409.

27. Wax, Op. Cit., P. 137.

28. Thomas, Op. Cit., P. 271.

29. Tamura, Hidekazu, 1984. The Nippon - U. S. War Within The Internment Compounds (In Japanese), Tokyo, Aeronautics News Agency, P. 259.

30. Thomas, Op. Cit., P. 329.

31. Ibid., P. 301.

32. Idem.

p. 1. In her opening statement Mrs. de Cristoforo erroneously attributes the authorship of THE SPOILAGE to me. THE SPOILAGE was written by Dorothy Swaine Thomas and Richard S. Nishimoto.

p. 5 I reported nothing ~~Mrs. de Cristoforo~~ told me to ~~take~~ the authorities .  
She ~~see~~ does not explain <sup>she</sup> that Mr. Robertson, the Assistant Project Director in charge of the Operations Division, ~~who was doing his best to help to establish peace and harmony in the center, had suggested that I "might find it interesting to talk to some of the members of the 'underground group'."~~ I might call ~~on~~ Mrs. Tsuchikawa (de Christoforo) at whose home the secret meetings were being held. I called on Mrs. Tsuchikawa who told me that her brother had been put in the stockade for ~~no reason at all~~ no reason at all and that she was tired of ~~being~~ being grilled by the Internal Security. . We discussed democracy, freedom of speech, and other 'safe' topics. " (DOING ~~FIELDWORK~~ ~~FIELDWORK~~ FIELDWORK, pp. 112-3).

p. 5 note 8. This statement comes ~~from my~~ not from Tule Lake, but from my desperate and difficult early period of work in the Gila Relocation Center.

(Check if ought to comment on note 10 p. 5.)

p. 5 note 11. On page 223 of THE SPOILAGE, Thomas attributes this statement to Mr. Robertson. ~~(note 1)~~ (note 1) I do not know who made the ridiculous assertion that Mrs. Tsuchikawa assumed a position of leadership in the underground movement. As I have already explained, Mr. Robertson ~~told me~~ told me that Mrs. Tsuchikawa was a member of the underground pressure group.

p. 8 note 14 - This is entirely Dr. Thomas' statement. I knew nothing about it.

10 11 12 - ~~Many~~ Most of her critical statements come from my honest description of how the difficulties of doing fieldwork in this agonizing situation were affecting me. I felt that inexperienced ~~fieldwork~~ students should be aware that this can, ~~and does~~ happen to them, ~~and~~

P. 5. I ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ The statement about being regarded as and as a leader  
instigator of trouble quoted from Dr. Thomas ~~and I did not tell her this~~  
O did not tell her this / she must have used some other source -  
Dr. Thomas.

Here is a quotation from Doing Fieldwork p. 113 -

Again on p. 8 - again Thomas used some other source -  
does not name informants or cite my notes -  
interested readers should read p. 298 or The Splilage.

p. 9 - not true -

p. 10 - note 19 - p. 140 this should be quoted.

also quote - pp 168-

at end I make a mistake.

I doubt that Mr. Wakayama had gun pointed at his head.

p 11 - explain quote - I ~~put~~ put in Kira rather than Wakayama  
~~again~~ again - ~~Quote~~ Quote not nec. - but I was angry at Kira  
and ~~I~~, I fear, ~~took~~

After murder of Hitomi

I went through a period of mental unbalance, which as I explain  
in great detail - - pp. 137-142. felt it my duty to describe it  
~~not only as fact but in order to~~  
assist ~~other~~ future fieldworkers - who ~~may~~ may be assisted by  
knowing that this can happen to a fieldworker.

p. 12- Thomas version entirely hers -- / I report what she does not  
mention.

p, 13 - This long quote comes from Thomas and was not sent to me by her.