

P 8.05

67/14

c

P 8.05

ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Begun August 15, 1944

Introduction

This analysis of community council elections is a part of a study of leadership among evacuees. The analysis serves to establish facts and "trends" already known or suspected, and to raise questions which might otherwise be overlooked. The unpopularity of block managers on the project, for instance, can definitely be established by the analysis, as can the trend toward dominance of political positions by aliens rather than citizens. The relative unpopularity of ex-Tuleans as leaders and the increasing number of parolees as nominees for the community council have been revealed by the analysis. It is also possible to raise the question as to the validity of considering personal motivation as a factor in gaining leadership positions.

In studying evacuee leadership, it is possible to compare the leadership in different social situations. Here we are interested primarily in the leaders representing the whole Japanese community. In conjunction with the changes the Japanese community has undergone since the outbreak of the war between Japan and America, it has already been observed that leadership, too, has undergone change. Prior to evacuation, Japanese communities were organized around such organizations as the Nihonjinkai and the Japanese Chamber of Commerce. These organizations were almost wholly run by Isseis until December 7, 1941, at which time there was a tendency to place a greater

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 2

number of responsible positions in the hands of citizens.

Also, the FBI at this time interned several hundred alien men up and down the Pacific Coast, and included among them were most Isseis who had held prominent positions in the Japanese community. Consequently, in considering different leadership situations, the period following the attack on Pearl Harbor can be separated from the period preceding it.

Since most of the former leaders were sent to internement camp, the leadership situation in the internement camps and in the assembly centers can be considered to have been different. In the assembly center, key positions among evacuees were given largely to Niseis. In the Puyallup Assembly Center, for instance, the evacuee directors and assistants were usually members of the Japanese American Citizens League. When evacuees were sent to relocation centers, however, the leadership again swung gradually back into the hands of Isseis. This process was facilitated by relocation, which drew off the older Niseis from the centers, and by the return of former community leaders from internement camps to the project as parolees. Furthermore, since those who relocated were largely Niseis the leadership situation of the relocated Japanese must center around Niseis. From this standpoint the following classification of leadership situations among evacuees can be made:

1. Pre-Pearl Harbor
2. Pre-Evacuation. From Pearl Harbor to evacuation.
3. Internement Camp

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 3

4. Assembly Center
5. Relocation Center
6. Relocated areas.

This present analysis, of course, is a part of the study of leadership within the relocation center.

In making a study of leaders, it is convenient to define leadership. A person who is occupying a leadership position in a community is not always the one who leads the activities of the members. Many persons who have been officials in the Nihonjinkai have been of object of criticism. The Community Analyst's evacuee assistant, for instance, made the comment that many of the "so-called" leaders in Seattle were never respected by the Japanese. He did not think that those elected to the present Community Council were greatly respected, either. Men serving as the head of the block were often merely tolerated in that position because they were willing to do the work required and there were no others to take their place. On the other hand, in some situations men who do not occupy the recognized leadership position does the actual guiding of community affairs. In order not to confuse the issue, it seems advisable to differentiate between the formal and informal leaders. The former are those who occupy recognized leadership positions, whereas the latter are those who do not occupy such positions, but who nevertheless are instrumental in guiding the activities of the community. The study of nominees for the Community Council, of course, is the study of formal leaders.

The basis for the present study is material gathered on two elections for community council. The first election was held on

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 4

February 7, 1944, and the second one on August 7 of the same year. For both of these elections, special delegates, two from a block, attended a nomination convention. At this convention each delegate was given a chance to nominate whomever he pleased, and the rank of the nominees was determined by secret voting. The first 21 were selected as the official candidates, while the rest were held as runner-ups. In both elections there were 38 nominees in all. Because of the large number of declinations, however, practically all of those nominated have been able to appear on the ballot if they did not decline their nomination. At the second nomination convention a ruling was passed by those present that anyone nominated and present at the convention would have to decline his nomination from the floor. The acceptance of such declinations was to be left to a vote by those present. The only declination allowed at this convention was that of Kenji Ito, who pleaded sickness in the family and overwork in his present job. The seven councilmen were elected on a project-wide basis, each resident over 18 years of age being entitled to vote for not more than seven candidates. For the first election a majority vote was required for gaining office, but for the second election in order to avoid a run-off election, the by-laws were changed to make plurality vote sufficient.

As a basis for the analysis the following data are available:

1. Name and rank order of nominees.
2. Result of project-wide election by block.
3. Basic data on nominees, including age, citizenship, marital status, center of origin, size of family,

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 5

previous political positions held.

4. Prediction of declination by the Community Analyst's assistant, and predictions of the result of the election.

Comparison of Basic Data on Nominees

In Tables I and II are given the basic data for nominees of Election I and II, respectively. The rank indicated by the first column of numbers is that established as a result of the vote of the nomination convention. The age is of March 31, 1944. Under marital status M stands for married, S for single, and W for widowed. Under citizenship, A stands for alien and C for citizen. Under origin AC stands for assembly center, and indicates that a person came to Minidoka from an assembly center, generally from either Puyallup or Portland Assembly Centers. P indicate parolees from internment camp. T stands for transfers from other relocation centers, and TS for transfers from Tule Lake as a result of segregation. The size of the family indicates the number of persons now living with the individual and does not take into account members of the family who have relocated. Under previous political positions held, the positions of Co-op delegate and occupational positions were not considered. BD stands for block delegates, who were elected from each block to approve the charter for self-government. BM stands for block managers. BC stands for block commissioners, the block representatives after the formation of the community council. CC stands for community council members. BD-BM or BC-BM indicates that an

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 6

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Rank		Election I							Election II
		Age	marital Status	citizenship	origin	size of family	block	Political Position	
1.	Kenji Ito	35	M	C	TS	3	44	✓	Dec.
2.	Yoshito Fujii	42	M	A	AC	5	36	BD	1
3.	Dick Kanaya	39	M	A	AC	4	19	BD	Dec.
4.	Floyd Tokuda	39	M	A	AC	2	40	BD	Dec.
5.	Yoshio Urakawa	39	M	A	AC	6	10	BD	Dec.
6.	C. T. Takahashi	39	M	C	AC	2	42	BD	Dec.
7.	Shigeru Osawa	52	M	C	AC	8	24	BD	6
8.	Dr. Paul Shigaya	52	M	A	AC	2	4	BD	2
9.	K. Kuraoka	54	S	A	AC	1	29	BD	10
10.	Jack Chikata	40	M	A	AC	4	4	BD	5
11.	A. Arai	42	M	C	AC	3	24		Dec.
12.	Iwao Matsushita	52	M	A	P	22	2	✓	Dec.
13.	Harry Hatate	42	S	A	AC	1	1	BD RM	Dec.
14.	Shosuke Sasaki	32	S	A	AC	2	36		Dec.
15.	Kintaro Takeda	39	M	A	TS	7	5	✓	8
16.	Roy Sakamoto	33	M	C	AC	7	16		12
17.	Tamaichi Yamada	62	M	A	AC	2	30	BD	Dec.
18.	Roy I. Akiyama	55	M	A	AC	3	39	BD	4
19.	K. Nakayama	36	M	C	AC	4	32	BD	14
20.	Motosuke Hayasaka	59	M	A	P	5	40	✓	Dec.
21.	Tom Ogawa	36	M	A	P	4	10	✓	Dec.
22.	Y. Doi	47	M	A	AC	2	44	BD RM	9

nomination
for
Election II

Intends to Rel.

Seas.

Seas.

Ind.

15

27

17

6

10

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 7

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF COUNCIL ELECTIONS (CONT'D)

Rank	Election I										Nomination for Election II
	Age	Marital Status	Citizenship	Origin	Size of Family	Block	Political Position	Election Results			
23.	K. Tambara	61	M	A	AC	1	34	BD	Dec.	13	
24.	S. Ikoma	53	M	A	AC	4	3	BD	15	18	
25.	Harry Katsuyama	35	M	A	TS	3	10	/	Dec.	Seas.	
26.	Tom Takeuchi	36	M	C	AC	4	34	BD	7	14	
<hr/>											
27.	Ken Yamada	43	M	A	AC	4	13	BD	11	Seas.	
28.	Toshikazu Hirokane	58	S	A	AC	1	28	BD	Dec.	Sick	
29.	Shuji Sugawara	62	W	A	AC	3	21	BD	Dec.	Seas.	
30.	Masshige Ota	57	M	A	AC	3	17	BD	EM 13	24	
31.	Genji Mihara	54	M	A	P	3	41	/	3	4	
32.	Ritsuji Akiyama	42	M	A	AC	6	37	BD	Dec.	31	
33.	Okiyama, Eikichi	56	M	A	P	2	7	/	Dec.		
34.	Harry Iwata	40	M	A	AC	4	24	BD	Dec.		
35.	Frank Ozawa	56	M	A	AC	8	13	EM	Dec.	Ind.	
36.	Shigesaburo Fukuhara	53	M	A	AC	3	22	EM	Dec.		
37.	Sam Taniguchi	24	M	C	AC	3	21	BD	Dec.		
38.	Ernest Hirayama	28	S	C	AC	4	37		16		

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 8

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Election II										
	Age	Marital Status	Citizenship	Origin	Size of family	Block	Political Position	Election Results	Presence of nomination com.	Kanaya's Prediction
1. Yoshito Fujii	42	M	A	AC	5	36	CC	1	/	P
2. Yoshio Urakawa	39	M	A	AC	6	7	BC	Dec.	/	O
3. Jack Chikata	40	M	A	AC	4	4	CC	2		P
4. Genji Mihara	54	M	A	P	3	41	CC	3		PP
5. Shigeru Osawa	52	M	C	AC	8	24	CC	4	/	P
6. Tom Ogawa	36	M	A	P	4	10	CC	Dec.	/	O
7. Keisaburo Koyama	46	M	A	P	5	29	/	Dec.		?
8. Kunizo Mayeno	58	M	A	P	5	22	/	6	/	P
9. Dick Kanaya	39	M	A	AC	4	19	BC	Dec.	-	-
10. Yosajiro Doi	47	M	A	AC	2	44	BC	7		P
11. Heitaro Hikida	49	M	A	AC	7	19		5	/	
12. Harry Hatate	42	S	A	AC	1	1	BC	Dec.		O
13. Karl Tadashi Tambara	61	M	A	AC	1	34	BC	8		O
14. Tom Takeuchi	36	M	C	AC	4	34	BD	Dec.	/	P
15. Tamaichi Yamada	62	M	A	AC	2	30	BC	Dec.	/	O
16. Chusabura Ito	62	M	A	P	2	38	/	Dec.		-
17. Motosuke Hayasaka	59	M	A	P	5	40	/	Dec.		-
18. Sadahiko Ikoma	53	M	A	AC	4	3	BC	11	/	PP
19. Teruo Tsuboi	54	M	A	P	3	30	/	Dec.		?
20. Yoritada Matsui	66	M	A	AC	2	32	BM	Dec.		O
21. Iwao Matsushita	52	M	A	P	2	2		Dec.		-
22. Senichi Tomihiro	60	M	A	P	2	37	/	10	/	?

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 9

COMPARISON OF COUNCIL ELECTIONS (CONT'D)

Election II

	age	marital status	citizenship	origin	size of family	Black	political position	election results	presence at nomination conv.	Ken's vote
23. Kamenoshin Hara	68	M	A	AC	2	22	BC	12	/	-
24. Masashige Ota	57	M	A	AC	3	17	BC	Dec.		P
25. Shuji Ikeda	53	M	A	AC	8	28	BM	16	/	P
26. Jikichi Yoshida	58	M	A	AC	2	36	BD	18	/	PP
27. Roy I. Akiyama	55	M	A	AC	3	39	CC	Dec.		P
28. Takuji Yamashita	69	M	A	T	2	8	/	Dec.		?
29. Junjiro Yukawa	69	M	A	AC	2	14	BD	9		-
30. Chosaku Hashiguchi	68	M	A	AC	3	21	BC	14	/	P
31. Ritsuji Akiyama	52	M	A	AC	6	37	BD	Dec.		-
32. Ginosuke Hara	58	M	A	AC	3	35	BM	13	/	-
33. James S. Nomura	57	M	A	AC	4	10	BC-BM	15	/	P
34. Kuhnichi Kimura	57	M	A	AC	4	16	BC	17	/	P
35. Raisuke Tamura	54	W	A	TS	2	26	/	19	/	?
36. Hachiro Kumata	56	M	A	AC	4	13	-	20	/	?
37. Masamori Hashimoto	46	M	A	TS	5	13	-	21	/	P
38. Kiyotaka Omura	58	M	A	AC	4	28	-		/	?

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 10

Table III

DATA ON NOMINEES

COMPARISON FOR TWO COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Election I (February 7, 1944)

	Age	Marital Status	Citizen-ship	Origin	Size of family	Political Position	Declinations
Upper	43.6	11 M	9 A	11 AC	3.3	9 BD	8
Third		2 S	4 C	1 P 1 TS		1 BD-BM 3 Others	
Middle	44.8	12 M	10 C	9 AC	3.7	6 BD	6
Third		1 S	3 C	2 P 2 TS		1 BD-BM 6 Others	
Lower	43.6	9 M	10 A	10 AC	3.7	6 BD	8
Third		2 S 1 W	2 C	2 P		1 BD-BM 2 BM 3 Others	

All	44.0	32 M	29 A	30 AC	3.5	21 BD	22
		5 S	9 C	5 P		3 BD-BM	
Nomi- nees		1 W		3 TS		2 BM 12 Others	

Election II, August 7, 1944

Upper	46.5	12 M	12 A	9 AC	4.2	5 CC	5
Third		1 S	1 C	4 P		5 BC 3 Others	
Middle	57.7	13 M	12 A	8 AC	3.1	4 BC	8
Third			1 C	5 P		2 BD 2 BM 5 Others	

Lower	61.7	12 M	12 A	9 AC	3.7	1 CC	3
Third				2 TS 1 T		2 BC 1 BC-BM 2 BD 1 BM 5 Others	

All	55.0	37 M	36 A	26 AC	3.7	6 CC	16
		1 S	2 C	9 P		11 BC	
Nomi- nees				2 TS 1 T		4 BD 1 BC-BM 3 BM 13 Others	

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 11

individual has held two positions at the same time. Under election results, Dec. stands for declined. The number indicates the order in which candidates polled votes in the project-wide election. For the first election the result of the run-off election has not been considered. In Table I under Nomination for Election II Dec. stands for dedined. The number indicates rank of a nominee at the second nomination convention. Intends to Rel. means intends to relocate; Ind. means out on indefinite leave; Seas. means out on seasonal leave. In Table II Presence at Nomination Convention is indicated by /. Kanaya's prediction as to whether a nominee would decline his nomination was indicated by P (plus) will run; PP (double plus) sure to run; Q may or may not run; ? unknown; - will not run.

In Table III is given the summary of the data for Table I and II. The nominees were divided into the upper third (13), middle third (13) and lower third (12) for the purpose of comparison.

Age It should be noted that the average of the nominees in Election I is 44 and fairly young. Part of the youthfulness is explained by the presence of 9 citizens and 5 single individuals among the nominees. There is no marked difference between the three groups in Election I. In Election II, however, the average age for all nominees is 55 years, an increase of 11 over the average for Election I. Part of this increase is accounted for by the decrease in the number of citizens from 9 to 3, and of single persons from 5 to 1. When the three groups in Election II are compared, one finds a surprising difference of 11

years between the upper third and middle third, and 4 years between the middle third and the lower third. Clearly, the increase in the average age among the nominees for Election II is accounted for largely by an influx of older men in the middle and lower groups. In both elections the most popular men are the younger Isseis. The greater ability of the younger Isseis to use the English language probably aided them in the maintenance of their leadership status. Even block commissioners are handicapped when they do not understand English well, since most of the official memoranda are issued in English. One hypothesis to explain the differences in age is that the ideal type of leader on the project is a person who is bilingual and adaptable to both Isseis and Caucasians, usually an older Nisei or younger Issei. Since there is a dearth of such leaders, the balance has to be filled with either younger Niseis or older Isseis. The increasing preference for Isseis rather than Niseis has been established, ^{but} ^{necessarily} ~~by~~ not explained.

Marital Status There is no noticeable difference in marital status among the three groups. But in comparing the nominees in Elections I and II one finds a definite decrease in the number of single men in the second election. In Election I there are 5 single men, whereas in Election II there is only one. This reduction in the number of single individuals is not caused by the reduced number of Niseis among the nominees, since only one of the Nisei nominees was single. In the first election there was a great deal of anti-administration sentiment expressed and there was a noticeable discussion of candidates who were likely not to

give in easily to administrative demands. At least three of the single men--Kuraoka, Hatate, and Sasaki--can be included as having had this reputation. Of these only Hatate was nominated in the second election, in which there was a noticeable lack of anti-administration sentiment. Community leadership, it can be said, to a greater and greater extent is being placed in the hands of married individuals.

Citizenship When Election I and II is compared, it is evident that citizens have become increasingly unpopular as leaders. In Election I there were 9 citizens, whereas in Election II there were only 3. In Election I, 4 of the citizens were in the Upper Third, whereas in Election II there was only one citizen in upper bracket. Several of the citizen nominees in Election I were either out on indefinite or seasonal leave when Election II took place. Several were still in the center, but were not nominated. The two citizens in Election II are Osawa, 52 years old, and Tom Takeuchi, 36 years of age.

Origin In comparing the centers of previous residence, one finds an increasing number of parolees being nominated for councilmen. In Election I there were 5 parolees, and in the second election 9. In the first election, their distribution among the three groups was 1-2-2. In Election II, the distribution was 4 in the Upper Third, 5 in the Middle Third, and none in the Lower Third. In contrast the number of Tule Lake transferees has remained about the same in both elections, but their position was lower in the second election. Leaving Kenji Ito out of consideration, in Election I there were two

Tule Lake transferees in the middle third, whereas in Election II the two Tule Lake transferees occupied the lowest bracket. Kenji Ito, who came from Tule Lake, but who might have been one of the most popular candidates, declined his nomination from the convention floor.

Size of Family The average size of the family for Elections I and II is 3.5 and 3.7, respectively. The only significant difference is in the comparatively larger average (42) for the Upper Third in the second election. This contrasts with the 3.3 of the Upper Third of the first election, and with the 3.1 and 3.7 of the Middle and Lower Thirds in Election II. The difference seems to be accounted for largely by the difference in the number of single men in these brackets.

Previous Political Position Held In Election I the participants were mostly block delegates. Out of the 38 nominees 21 were block delegates, and 3 had been both block delegate and block manager. This is not strange for the block delegates were the ones who worked on the approval of the charter. Many of the block delegates were also delegates to the nomination convention, and there was a definite tendency to vote each other into office. The unpopularity of the block managers is clearly brought out statistically. Only 5 persons who had been block managers (out of a possible total of over 40) were nominated for councilmen. Of these nominated, three were block delegates also, and they were distributed one to each bracket. Both of the two remaining block managers who had not been block delegates were in the lowest bracket, thus showing their unpopularity.

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 15

In Election II 6 of the possible 8 councilmen (including the Community Clerk) were renominated. One relocated, and one was out on seasonal work. Eleven block commissioners were nominated, and were distributed 5-4-2 in the three groups, showing their relative popularity. There were 4 former block delegates who were neither councilmen nor block commissioners, and two of them were in the Middle Third and two in the Lower Third. This seemed to indicate that the most popular block delegates had already been selected as councilmen or block commissioners. There was one person who was a block commissioner and a block manager and 3 other block managers. Two of them were in the middle bracket, and 3 in the lower bracket. Compared to Election I, the block managers have been able to gain in popularity, but still their popularity is low. The number of nominees who have not held a political position before is about the same for both elections--12 and 13--and three nominees are fairly evenly distributed among the three groups.

Number of Declinations In both elections the number of declinations have been large. In the first election 22 out of 38 candidates refused to run for councilman, and in the second election 16 of the 38 declined their nomination. More in the second election would undoubtedly have withdrawn from the race if it had not been for the convention ruling that those present must decline from the floor. There seems to be some significance in the number of declinations in the Upper Third. In Election I the declinations totalled 8. In Election II 7 were not present at the convention and could have declined easily, but only

three of these did so. Two others declined in spite of the convention ruling, making a total of 5. In other words, persons nominated into the Upper Third in the second election were less prone to decline their nomination than in the first election.

Although interest in the first election among residents ran fairly high, some of those who refused to run declared that the attempt of the Council to oppose the administration would be a "waste of time", or that the Council would merely be a "rubber-stamp" of the administration. In the second election, those who had declined their nomination in the first election were not renominated. Some of those who were renominated, withdrew from the race once more. Here the effect of the personal factor of declining or not declining the nomination become clearly evident. Declination is not merely a matter of form, since some persons did not decline their nomination and others refused to run both times. Formal leadership, in other word, is affected by the individual's willingness to run or not.

Kanaya's prediction In connection with declinations Kanaya's predictions in Table II throws light on the subject. Before the election Kanaya predicted which nominees would run and which ones would withdraw. To tabulate his predictions and actual declinations, we have:

		<u>Declinations</u>
Sure to run	3	0
Will run.....	13	3
Either run or not run, depending on circumstances.....	8	6
Will not run.....	7	4
Unknown.....	7	3

Kanaya predicted fairly accurately those who ran for office.

His prediction of those who would refuse to run for office was not as poor as it would seem, since of those who could have withdrawn without breaking the convention rule only one did not do so. Kanaya had as a basis for his predictions the results of the last election and the behavior of these individuals in the past. The very fact that such predictions can be made with fair accuracy shows a consistency in the attitude of an individual toward accepting the position of councilman. That this prediction is somewhat based on an individual's personality is indicated by some of the remarks made by Kanaya when he made by Kanaya when he made the prediction. On placing a double-plus before Yoshida, who had not previously run for councilmen, Kanaya stated: "This fellow will stay in even if it kills him."

For some a plus was placed with confidence with the remark:

"He's the type that likes to show off."

For some he placed a minus, saying:

"He's the quiet, gentleman type."

He himself withdrew from the race on the grounds that he was not a good politician and a liar. Clearly, the willingness to accept an office is a factor to be considered in the study of leadership.

Why there is such a widespread lack of willingness to run for office is difficult to establish. It is certainly not because it is the trait of the Japanese people since the struggle for status among Japanese is strong enough to be noticeable when they are compared with any group of people. One possible explanation is that the position of councilman is an unpopular one.

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 18

Councilmen are open to the charge of either being a tool of the administration or an agitator. Parolees, it is said, especially are wary of accepting leadership positions, since it was largely because of having done so before Pearl Harbor that they were interned. Their wives, for instance, advise them not to accept a political position on the project. Of the five parolees nominated for the first election, 4 declined, and of the 9 in the second election 6 withdrew from the race. Another reason sometimes presented to explain the lack of interest in running for office is the lack of incentive. The statement is made that there is no use in people's running for office because it does not give them any tangible advantages. However, even in the pre-evacuation communities, being an official of the Nihonjinkai or the Japanese Chamber of Commerce did not usually mean advantages outside of increased prestige. This problem is one which requires further investigation.

Nomination for Election II In Table I it is possible to follow the position in the second election of those nominated in the first election. Of the 38 nominated in Election I, 18 were not nominated. At least four had relocated, and at least five more were out on seasonal leave. While those out on seasonal leave were eligible for nomination, none were nominated. The outstanding individual, Kintaro Takeda, ex-Tulean and councilman, who was out on seasonal leave, was dropped in the second election. When the delegates from his own block failed to renominate him, it was speculated that he was not too popular in his own block. Harry Katsuyama, another ex-Tulean, was also out on

seasonal and was not nominated. The same thing happened to Ken Yamada, the liberal block commissioner from Block 13. In place of Yamada, Block 13 produced two inferior candidates. Of those still on the project and not nominated in the second election some comments can be made. First of all, it is not surprising that the least popular nominees were not nominated a second time. The most outstanding person who was still available and not nominated was K. Kuraoka. He was argumentative, single, and rated fairly high in the first election. The same was true of young Shosuke Sasaki, who was known to be quick-tempered. K. Nakayama, from Portland, was little known by people from the state of Washington, and his not being renominated is not surprising.

Of those who were nominated the second time, some fared better than the first time, others worse, and still others maintained a relatively equal position in both elections. Dick Kanaya and Iwao Matsushita rated 3rd and 12th place, respectively, in the first nomination, but fell down to 9th and 21st in the second. Both of them declined their nomination. Kanaya still was the block commissioner from his block, but Matsushita avoided all public positions. The person who lost popularity without apparent reason was Roy I. Akiyama, Portlander, and councilman. He was in 18th position at the time of the first nomination, and came in fourth in the election. In the second nomination he had dropped to 27th place, and subsequently withdrew from the race. Akiyama had two reputations--one of being somewhat of an administration stooge, and another of being an argumentative fellow. He had had quarrels with Stafford, and was

desirous of attacking him at the time of the warehouse conflict. He was also known to be a "show-off". There was also a story circulated about him that he had left his wife in Tacoma to follow another woman. His appearance in public as chairman of the Public Relations Committee did not seem to be a reason for diminishing his popularity.

Considering those who had improved their position, we find that all of them have held some sort of position on the project which kept their names before the public. This included:

- Yoshio Urakawa (Executive Secretary of the Coop)
- Jack Chikata (Councilman)
- Tom Ogawa (Executive Secretary of the Council)
- Y. Doi (Block Commissioner and later Councilman)
- K. Tambara (Block Commissioner)
- S. Ikoma (Recreational leader and Block Commissioner)

The only exception is Tom Takeuchi, who was a block delegate.

Urakawa probably would have been more popular in the first nomination if he had not been accused of being an inu during the boilermen conflict. S. Ikoma has raised his position slightly in spite of his reputation for being lacking in leadership qualities.

By comparing Table I and II it is possible to pick out those in Table II who do not appear in Table I. These individuals, so to speak, are fresh competitors in the race for the position of councilman. There are 21 new competitors in all. Ten of these are in the Lower Third, and can be considered individuals who are not very important. Of the remaining 11 six of them are parolees who returned from internment camp fairly recently. Hikida, who was elected as councilman, is the Postmaster and Chairman of the Co-op Board of Directors. His knowledge of English is not

too broad, and he stayed in the background until now, according to Kanaya. Kanaya, who lives in the same block, was active as the block representative from the block, primarily, he believes, because of his greater ability to employ the English language. Matsui and Ikeda are block managers. Kamenoshin Hara is a block commissioner and the chairman of the hospital koenkai. Yoshida was a former block delegate.

From the review of the rise and fall of the nominees in two elections, the following tentative conclusions can be stated. First of all, those who have kept their names in exposed to the public through some position have tended to improve their position or to be admitted in the list of nominees. Conversely, those who have withheld their names from the public have tended to lower their position. In Election I there was a tendency to nominate individuals who were argumentative or considered to be willing to oppose the administration. This included ex-Tuleans and parolees, and excluded block managers. In the second election the tendency was for these individuals to be eliminated or to drop to a lower position. Parolees, however, continued to rise in popularity, probably because of other favorable factors.

Comparison of Nomination Convention and Project-wide Vote

In Table IV are listed the nominees who did not withdraw from Election I. They are listed in the order of rank established at the nomination convention. Opposite each name is the number of votes polled and the rank established by the popular vote.

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 22

In the final column is the result of the comparison of the two ranks, one established by the nomination convention and the other by the resident vote. The symbols stand for:

- // More popular (in the election)
- / Slightly more popular
- 0 About the same
- Slightly less popular
- Less popular

It is obvious that the two ranks do not always coincide. Why a person should be more or less popular in a project-wide election than at a nomination convention is difficult to explain. One factor that can be mentioned is that a nomination convention is a face-to-face situation, in which the candidate has an opportunity to display himself or have someone else do this for him. K. Kuraoka, for instance, did a great deal of talking at the first nomination convention, and made himself outstanding by this act. Fujitomi, an ambitious individual, gained attention by talking a great deal and seconding the nomination of a number of individuals in the second election, but he was never nominated in spite of his bid for attention. According to Ogawa, the Executive Secretary of the Council, almost anyone might have been nominated at the convention by well-chosen remarks by one individual at the convention. Also, delegates sometimes nominate persons who are not well-known, but who are friends or associates, such as fellow delegates.

On the other hand, the election on a project-wide basis often takes place without the benefit of face-to-face contact

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 23

Leadership Study

Table IV

Comparison of Choice of Nomination Convention and Residents

Election I

<u>Nomination Convention</u>				<u>Resident Vote</u>
1.	(49)	Yoshito Fujii	(2219) I	0
2.	(32)	Shigeru Osawa	(1331) VI	--
3.	(29)	Dr. Paul Shigaya	(1961) II	0
4.	(25)	K. Kuraoka	(816) X	--
5.	(24)	Jack Chikata	(1375) V	0
6.	(20)	Kintaro Takeda	(950) VIII	-
7.	(20)	Roy Sakamoto	(780) XII	--
8.	(19)	Roy I. Akiyama	(1472) IV	/
9.	(19)	K. Nakayama	(724) XIV	--
10.	(16)	Y. Doi	(868) IX	0
11.	(16)	S. Ikoma	(640) XV	0
12.	(15)	K. Takeuchi	(1034) VII	/
13.	(14)	Ken Yamada	(789) XI	0
14.	(13)	M. Ota	(742) XIII	0
15.	(13)	G. Mihara	(1498) III	//
16.	(3)	Ernest Hirayama	(509) XVI	0

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 24

Leadership Study

Table V.

Comparison of Choice of Nomination Convention and Residents

Election II

<u>Nomination Convention</u>		<u>Resident Vote</u>	
1. Yoshito Fujii	2024	I	0
2. Jack Chikata	1581	II	0
3. Genji Mihara	1505	III	0
4. Shigeru Osawa	1198	IV	0
5. Kunizo Mayeno	884	VI -	0
6. Yosajiro Doi	854	VII	0
7. <u>Heitaro Hikida</u>	1034	V /	/
<hr/>			
8. Karl Tambara	836	VIII	0
9. <u>Sadahiko Ikoma</u>	523	XI	-
10. Senichi Tomihiro	592	X	0
11. Kamenoshin Hara	517	XII	0
12. <u>Shuji Ikeda</u>	404	XVI -	-
13. <u>Jiukichi Yoshida</u>	324	XVIII -	-
14. <u>Junjiro Yukawa</u>	613	IX /	/
15. Chosaku Hashiguchi	475	XIV	0
16. <u>Ginosuke Hara</u>	495	XIII -	/
17. James Nomura	430	XV -	0
18. Kuhachi Kimura	371	XVII	0
19. Raisuke Tamura	235	XIX	0
20. Hachiro Kumata	222	XX	0
21. Masanori Hashimoto	199	XXI	0

or intimate knowledge of the candidates. A person's popularity or unpopularity is likely to depend on hearsay. G. Mihara, former President of the Nihonjinkai in Seattle and a parolee, was rated 15th at the nomination convention, and came out 3rd in the election. Word had gotten around that Mihara was a "good" man. Roy Sakamoto, on the other hand, was talked of as being an inu, especially in connection with the draft issue, and he dropped from 7th to 12th place. A person who is well-known or who has a title like "Dr." is likely to poll more votes in the election than his leadership ability would seem to merit. Dr. Shigaya, physician, and Jack Chikata, pharmacist, probably can be placed in this category. The analysis of election results by blocks will amplify on these points.

Prediction of Results of Election II For the second election, Ogawa and the writer predicted who would be elected. They chose:

Y. Fujii (1st place)

Genji Mihara (certain to be elected)

Jack Chikata (certain to be elected)

Shigeru Osawa (certain to be elected)

Kunizo Mayeno (will undoubtedly be elected)

Heitaro Hikida (will probably be elected)

Yosajiro Doi (will probably be elected)

Karl Tambara (will compete with Doi for the last place)

The actual order was:

1. Fujii
2. Chikata
3. Mihara

4. Osawa
5. Hikida
6. Mayeno
7. Doi

Tambara trailed 18 votes behind Doi. The next person, Yukawa, was more than 200 votes behind Tambara. Chikata had proved to be more popular than the writer had expected. Hikida did better than both the writer and Ogawa had expected. Undoubtedly, his positions of Postmaster and Chairman of the Co-op Board of Directors aided his popularity. Mayeno was considered a good choice because he was a former Nihonjinkai official and considered to be as good a leader as Mihara. To a certain extent the popularity of candidates is predictable.

Analysis of Election Results

For the purpose of analyzing the election results a set of three tables has been made for each election. The first tables (Tables VI and VII) give the election returns for each candidate by blocks. In the second tables (Tables VIII and IX) the rank positions of the candidates in different blocks have been tabulated. In the third tables (Tables X and XI) the ranks of the candidates within each block are tabulated. All of the tables are based on the first one, but give a different slant on the election results. The third set of tables is the most convenient for use in this analysis.

Election Returns by Blocks In Tables VI and VII are given the election returns by blocks. The number of ballots cast for each candidate is available. The total number of

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 27

Table VI

ELECTION RETURNS BY BLOCKS
Community Council Election
February 7, 1944

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	12	13	14	15
ROY AKIYAMA	8	30	52	35	66	40	25	33	10	23	17	43	38
CHIKATA	7	18	89	<u>46</u>	36	43	34	62	23	36	36	38	51
DOI	1	26	26	25	45	9	15	25	4	27	23	26	19
FUJII	9	36	96	56	99	64	38	69	21	40	59	71	51
HIRAYAMA	1	6	9	10	16	3	4	8	2	4	2	12	8
IKOMA	7	29	<u>102</u>	27	57	13	22	34	6	11	11	33	23
KURAOKA	4	4	18	10	32	37	8	16	8	11	12	19	8
MIHARA	10	23	76	39	56	64	27	44	10	36	32	45	39
NAKAYAMA	1	1	15	9	17	5	6	12	3	10	6	11	9
OSAWA	3	23	65	23	65	51	27	51	5	24	34	31	30
OTA	4	6	39	7	56	5	11	36	14	21	54	46	54
SAKAMOTO	1	23	52	22	25	12	20	40	16	18	39	33	39
SHIGAYA	7	27	54	<u>50</u>	60	47	37	60	22	43	52	50	65
TAKEDA	7	17	60	29	<u>121</u>	9	26	18	10	31	14	29	26
TAKEUCHI	2	12	20	19	8	7	7	11	3	6	8	13	18
YAMADA	5	3	44	23	13	8	14	28	10	12	<u>82</u>	88	39

TOTAL NO.
OF BALLOTS 13 48 138 67 128 71 54 91 33 53 86 99 90

16	17	19	21	22	24	26	28	29	30	31	32	34
37	17	37	23	41	26	108	11	78	47	66	29	20
128	31	68	42	30	52	30	18	33	24	22	10	13
33	13	28	13	20	13	17	8	17	27	12	9	13
150	41	84	37	60	59	106	26	59	47	58	28	40
9	12	8	4	4	6	5	3	46	25	32	24	12
22	18	28	10	12	10	8	3	13	5	15	2	3
58	7	31	12	18	13	79	2	<u>108</u>	23	30	6	8
72	38	40	24	27	40	22	22	51	29	38	13	29
32	6	18	3	5	6	7	5	43	66	70	<u>43</u>	20
84	38	61	34	34	88	109	16	20	11	7	6	17
70	<u>71</u>	51	20	3	5	6	4	10	1	4	0	2
<u>49</u>	44	38	16	17	19	22	9	19	9	9	4	5
136	66	79	41	36	66	113	23	73	36	71	21	25
84	17	26	10	39	9	97	4	33	34	4	1	19
23	10	13	6	3	16	16	9	73	53	79	40	<u>41</u>
101	14	32	7	5	6	91	1	23	16	18	10	3

160 78 101 56 71 94 130 36 119 81 94 44 53

35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	44	Total
48	31	71	42	<u>112</u>	51	67	32	58	1472
21	55	23	23	24	58	66	57	18	1375
20	21	8	13	41	57	50	59	<u>105</u>	868
47	<u>95</u>	89	48	92	80	93	80	81	2219
31	11	<u>92</u>	10	61	25	27	7	10	549
3	8	14	10	25	24	22	5	5	640
23	22	17	22	22	34	26	7	61	816
30	50	48	37	58	60	<u>119</u>	68	80	1496
55	19	49	12	65	32	25	17	21	734
14	53	40	35	28	54	40	62	42	1331
7	16	6	13	12	11	11	8	53	742
14	20	14	14	18	35	32	13	16	780
48	84	50	24	35	78	92	63	38	1961
19	10	9	19	14	36	39	13	17	950
67	56	73	28	98	39	31	52	70	1034
11	14	16	6	46	20	27	7	6	789

83 104 107 55 133 124 136 86 112 3028

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 28

Table VII

ELECTION RETURNS BY BLOCKS
Community Council Election
August 7, 1944

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	12	13	14	15
CHIKATA	24	21	68	55	43	25	43	60	38	75	33	68	45
DOI	17	18	24	30	14	7	19	15	10	46	34	38	24
FUJII	30	39	63	55	53	64	42	60	41	88	42	80	83
HARA, G.	8	3	3	10	5	3	6	1	2	7	8	10	7
HARA, K.	13	3	16	13	11	19	7	9	14	13	9	12	7
HASHIGUCHI	7	13	19	8	12	11	26	9	7	11	3	18	21
HASHIMOTO	6	10	5	5	2	3	7	4	1	10	40	16	16
HIKIDA	15	20	42	26	40	27	33	26	16	60	25	36	54
IKEDA	7	12	13	8	14	4	11	9	6	12	8	16	13
IKOMA	19	23	68	19	32	18	25	23	14	115	1414	17	24
KIMURA	1	2	3	6	4	5	1	7	11	16	17	41	49
KUMATA	1	2	7	7	8	8	2	6	6	5	51	10	33
MAYENO	14	19	29	27	17	21	28	19	13	57	10	32	32
MIHARA	14	21	56	32	28	71	32	37	24	722	34	58	59
NOMURA	11	6	22	9	8	9	3	18	45	16	3	24	27
OSAWA	17	13	35	27	37	55	29	43	19	53	21	43	36
TAMBARA	6	5	15	32	9	6	6	13	8	20	7	18	9
TAMURA	6	4	6	6	7	7	3	8	5	10	2	15	16
TOMIHIRO	6	2	12	13	2	2	3	48	3	8	1	12	1
YOSHIDA	5	8	7	8	7	2	7	3	3	3	3	9	17
YUKAWA	12	20	22	8	12	10	4	17	18	33	25	70	45

NO. OF BAL-
LOTS CAST

36 44 91 61 60 75 50 78 60 93 57 102 111

16	17	19	21	22	24	26	28	29	30	31	32	34	
93	33	52	51	49	58	46	46	10	30	60	36	21	
22	15	20	23	20	22	3	19	5	28	33	25	15	
93	40	59	52	63	56	53	54	21	56	67	55	55	
6	1	4	6	7	1	1	8	13	30	56	27	41	
61	9	21	32	51	54	0	12	5	7	13	3	7	
12	12	7	58	5	8	1	18	3	22	12	13	6	
2	2	1	6	0	4	0	6	2	2	6	1	2	
73	32	59	33	26	39	5	31	11	19	17	37	11	
7	11	13	19	10	30	2	45	6	13	10	7	3	
5	10	26	10	3	15	47	2	3	9	8	4	1	
95	12	14	10	7	6	0	2	2	2	4	1	3	
6	5	3	7	2	2	0	6	1	1	3	0	3	
13	23	39	56	58	77	53	19	1	6	9	7	8	
86	25	30	26	28	37	48	29	11	34	34	43	35	
8	8	19	9	9	17	40	6	2	7	18	11	3	
75	34	39	35	41	93	52	40	7	24	13	16	14	
7	5	9	6	26	10	1	22	25	62	81	56	65	
5	6	5	9	2	22	4	7	8	6	4	3	1	
9	1	4	8	6	11	3	13	20	30	53	46	47	
5	4	4	10	3	10	0	13	3	4	17	6	12	
6	8	33	9	5	25	0	18	4	8	7	9	20	
99	447	636	872	723	63	105	54	60	33	73	86	63	66

35 36

35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	44	Total
17	43	53	51	35	66	47	46	40	1581
13	20	16	25	38	48	43	48	57	854
55	71	75	67	54	71	63	61	43	2024
51	13	64	22	41	8	11	8	3	495
8	9	3	20	13	21	4	6	12	517
7	10	18	23	18	17	19	8	13	475
1	0	3	3	6	3	9	13	2	199
4	30	16	42	16	40	34	19	20	1034
6	10	3	21	8	19	12	9	7	404
3	4	6	4	6	18	16	6	6	523
3	6	1	9	8	4	11	4	4	371
2	6	2	4	3	5	3	9	3	222
26	32	11	22	8	28	19	22	29	884
59	43	63	52	54	61	82	45	42	1505
4	11	2	18	4	8	8	11	6	430
19	36	19	47	20	35	35	44	32	1198
71	19	59	36	55	17	17	16	17	836
3	11	6	16	3	5	5	4	5	235
65	4	64	16	46	11	7	7	8	592
7	42	19	19	9	22	7	21	5	324
7	17	16	28	9	30	21	26	11	613
83	81	77	81	74	98	89	102	61	2553

ballots cast for each candidate is available. The total number of ballots cast in different blocks vary considerably in both elections. In the first election the total number of ballots cast range from 13 to 138, and in the second from 33 to 111. There is also some variation in the same block in the two elections. In general the number of ballots cast within a block in the second election is smaller than in the first. This decrease is accounted for by a general decrease in the total number of ballots cast--3028 in the first election against 2553 in the second. Much of this reduction can be attributed to the seasonal decrease in the population. In some blocks, however, there were more ballots cast in the second election than in the first. It is known that the method of conducting elections differ from block to block in spite of uniform election rules. This in turn seems to be largely dependent on the men in charge of the election. In some blocks elections are hastily conducted before and after meals in the mess hall. In others, ballots are passed out to each voter beforehand to encourage voting. Sometimes when the person in charge of the voting in his block is also a candidate a large number of ballots are cast. This happened in Ikoma and Akiyama's blocks in the first election, and it was said of both of them that they campaigned actively for themselves. In the second election, Ikoma was still a candidate and block cast a relatively large number of votes, whereas Akiyama's block (and he was not a candidate) cast a relatively small number of votes. Also, those blocks in which a candidate resided generally cast a

larger number of ballots than blocks which had no candidate in the election.

In all blocks many of the residents complained that they did not know for whom to vote. The manner in which the voting was conducted was apt to influence their choice. Where the voting was done hastily before or after meals, a person would not have time to consider his choice of candidates carefully, and sometimes he would mark only a few of the more prominent candidates. Sometimes he would ask for advice of those in charge of the election or anyone nearby. Sometimes the person in charge of the election would attempt to influence the voting of the residents in his block. One extreme example of this sort of maneuvering is evident in the voting of the residents in Block 26 in the second election. Seven candidates received practically all of the votes in the block, and the other 14 did not receive more than five. Two of the seven choice men (Ikoma and Nomura) were unpopular in the election and in nearby blocks. Tamura, who lived in this block, polled only 4 votes, Doi only 3, and Tambara only 1. It was said that the block council had determined the choice of the block, and that the ballots were burned up and not turned into the Community Clerk as required by regulations. It was also said that the block council of this block was in the habit of carrying on this sort of maneuvering in other elections such as for the Co-op.

Of the candidates only Fujii and Shigaya received a majority of the votes in the first election, and only Fujii,

Chikata, and Mihara in the second. Takeuchi and Takeda had only about a third of the votes in the first election (Takeda was elected to the Council in the run-off election), and Mayeno and Doi, both of whom were elected in the second election, barely had a third of the votes. In other words, about one third of the total residents could elect a candidate to the Council. In terms of blocks this meant about 12 blocks. Since there are only 8 Portland blocks, the difficulty Portlanders experienced in electing a candidate from their midst is understandable. The same is true of ex-Tuleans, who constitute only about a fifth of the project population. This helps to explain the former Seattle residents' dominating the political field since the majority of the people are from Seattle.

Tabulation of Ranks of Candidates For the comparison of the popularity of candidates in different blocks it is convenient to translate their raw score into rank position in the block. This has been done in Tables X and XI. In Tables VIII and IX these rank positions have been tabulated to show the range of a candidate's ranks. In the first election the ranks extend from 1st to 16th places, and in the second from 1st to 21st places. By locating the middle rank for a candidate his mean rank has been roughly determined. The range of the candidate's ranks then has been broken up into five categories. The blue lines on both sides of the mean rank include roughly one half of the ranks. This can be considered to include the "average" rank of the individual. Beyond the blue

Table VIII

TABULATION OF RANKS OF CANDIDATES
Community Council
Election

February 7, 1944

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Mean Rank
AKIYAMA	1	4	5	4	2	6	4	5	2	1	1						6
CHIKATA	2	1	7	4	3	3	3	2	6	2	1	1					6
DOI	1				3	2		4	7	4	4	6	2	1	1		10
FUJII	13	11	6	2	3												2
HIRAYAMA	1				2	1	2		1		2	1	5	7	3	10	14
IKOMA	1		1		1	1	1	5		8	2	3		4	4	4	11
KURAOKA	1				1		2	4	4	4	4	3	6	3	3		11
MIHARA	3	1	6	3	5	6	9	1	1								5
NAKAYAMA	2	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	2	1	2	4	9	4	4	13
OSAWA	1	1	1	7	6	1	4	3	2	2	2	3	1	1			7
OTA	1	1	1	1	2		4	1	2		3	4		1	4	9	12
SAKAMOTO				2	1	2	4	3	4	7	1	4	5	2			10
SHIGAYA	3	12	6	5	4	2	1		2								3
TAKEDA	1		1		4	4	2	1	4	4	5	2	2	1	4		10
TAKEUCHI	3	2	4	1	1		2	2		1	1	3	3	7	4	1	12
YAMADA	2			1		2	2	2	2	3	6	3	2	4	3	2	11

RANKS OF CANDIDATES
Council Election

February 7, 1944

Table IX

TABULATION OF RANKS OF CANDIDATES
RANGE IN RANK POSITION

August 7, 1944

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Mean Rank
CHIKATA	4	7	10	3	3	5	2	1														3
DOI	1	1		4	1	1	6	8	4	3	4	1	1									8
FUJII	18	13	2	2																		1
HARA, G.		1		3	3		1			1	1	3	1	2	3	2	1	3	4	4	2	15
HARA, K.			1		1		3	1	2	4	3	4	4	3		1	4	2	1	1		12
HASHIGUCHI	1						1	3	7	4	2	1	4	5	5	2						11
HASHIMOTO			1								1	1		1	2	2	3	4	7	2	10	19
HIKIDA	1		3	3	7	6	5	3	2	2	2				1							6
IKEDA			1				2	5	3	4			5	7	1	2	3					13
IKOMA	1	1	1		2		1	5			4	4	2	2	1	2	1	3	2	3		12
KIMURA	1			1		1		1		2	1	2	2		1	2	5	3	5	5	2	17
KUMATA	1						2				1		1	1	1	4	1	8	3	9	4	18
MAYENO	1	3		1	1	7	4	5	3	2		2	2		2	1				1		8
MIHARA	2	4	8	10	3	4	3	1														4
NOMURA	1						1	1	2	3	5	4	2	4	3	3		3	3			13
OSAWA	1	1	2	6	10	4	3	2	5		1											5
TAMBARA	7		1		1	1	2	2	1	2		2	5	3	3	3		1	1			12
TAMURA							1	1	1		1		1	1	3	11	2	4	5	4		16
TOMIHIRO		2	4	1	2				2	1	2			2	2	2	4	4	1	4	2	15
YOSHIDA				1			1	1	2	1		5	1	2	3	4	2	6	2	2	2	16
YUKAWA		1			2	3	5	2	1	6	2	3	3		2	3	1	1				10

TABULATION OF RANKS OF CANDIDATES
RANGE IN RANK POSITION

August 7, 1944

line and up to the red line are approximately one-eighth of the ranks. This can be considered to be the range in which the individual is better (if on one side of the mean) or worse (if on the other side) than average. Beyond the red line on both extremes are again about one eighth of the ranks, which can be considered the ranks which are much better or much worse than the average.

In comparing the ranges of the various candidates in both elections one is impressed with the variation in popularity of a candidate from block to block. In the first election, Fujii, Shigaya, and Mihara, the three highest vote-getters, have the smallest range. Even then both Shigaya and Mihara's range is 1-9. In comparing the results of Election I and II the range in the second election tends to be smaller. Chikata, Doi, Fujii, Mihara, and Osawa all have narrowed their range in the second election. Ikoma, who appears in both elections, has about the same range in both. The narrowing of range in the second election can be interpreted as a more definite establishment of a person's status in the elections. Chikata, for instance, narrowed his range from 1-12 to 1-8, and Osawa from 1-14 to 1-11. The wide range of the candidates from Portland will be explained in the following section.

Rank of Candidates within Blocks

In Table X and XI a number of information have been brought together to facilitate analysis. First we have the rank of the candidates within each block. To this has been added the following notations:

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 37

// Much better than average

/ Better than average

- Worse than average

-- Much worse than average

Where no notations are made, the average rank for that particular candidate is implied. These notations are based on Tables VIII and IX. The rank of a candidate in his own block has been distinguished by a square around the figure. The blocks dominated by people from Portland and the rest of Oregon have been distinguished by underlining with red pencil, and the candidates from Portland have been indicated in the same manner.

One of the first conclusions that can be made by an examination of Tables X and XI is that a candidate ranks very high in his own block. Every candidate ranged first in his own block in the first election with the exception of Chikata (3rd), Shigaya (2nd) and Sakamoto (10th). Chikata and Shigaya lived in the same block, and it is possible that in their own block there were reasons for their not being as popular as they were in other blocks. Sakamoto did fairly well between blocks 8 and 28, but rated only 10th in his own block. This can be attributed primarily to his reputation of being an administrative stooge, especially at the time of the draft issue. It was said that he incurred the wrath of Isseis in his block by discouraging protest against the draft at a Nisei meeting in his block. In the second election, the following failed to rank first in his own block:

Table X

RANK OF CANDIDATES WITHIN BLOCKS
COMMUNITY COUNCIL
ELECTION

RANK OF CANDIDATES WITHIN BLOCKS
COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION

RANK OF CANDIDATES WITHIN BLOCKS
COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION

February 7, 1944

February 7, 1944

February 7, 1944

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	21	22	24	26	28	29	30	31	32	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	44	Project Rank
AKIYAMA	3 ⁺	2 ⁺⁺	8 ¹ ₂	5	3 ⁺	6	7	9 ⁻	7 ¹ ₂	8	10	6	8	11	9 ¹ ₂	8	6	2 ⁺⁺	6	3 ⁺	6	2 ⁺⁺	4	4	3 ⁺	5 ¹ ₂	3 ¹ ₂	7	4 ⁺⁺	2 ⁺⁺	1 ¹	7	4	8	6	4
CHIKATA	5 ¹ ₂	9	3	3 ⁺	10	5	3 ⁺	2	1	3 ¹ ₂	6	7	3 ¹ ₂	3	7	3	1 ⁺⁺	6	4	8	4	9 ¹ ₂	10	9	8 ¹ ₂	9 ¹ ₂	9	4	9	7	12	4	5	6	11	5
DOI	13 ¹ ₂	5 ⁺⁺	12	8 ⁺	9	10 ¹ ₂	10	11	13	6 ⁺	9	12	12	12	12	11 ¹ ₂	9	8 ⁺	9 ¹ ₂	11	9	14	8 ⁺	12	10	9 ¹ ₂	10	9	15	11 ¹ ₂	8 ⁺	5 ⁺⁺	6 ⁺⁺	5 ⁺⁺	1 ¹	9
FUJII	2	1	2	1	2	1 ¹ ₂	1	1	3	2	22	2	3 ¹ ₂	1	3	1	3	1	3	4	1	5	2	5	4	2	5	1 ¹	2	1	3	1	2	1	2	1
HIRAYAMA	13 ¹ ₂	12 ¹ ₂	16	13 ¹ ₂	14	16	16	16	16	16	16	15	15 ¹ ₂	16	13	16	15	14	14	16	13 ¹ ₂	7 ⁺	9 ⁺	7 ⁺	5 ⁺⁺	11 ⁺	6 ⁺⁺	14	1 ⁺⁺	14 ¹ ₂	5 ⁺⁺	13	11 ¹ ₂	14	14	16
IKOMA	5 ⁺⁺	3 ⁺⁺	1 ¹	7 ⁺⁺	6 ⁺⁺	8 ⁺	8 ⁺	8 ⁺	11	12 ¹ ₂	13	8 ¹ ₂	11	15	8	11 ¹ ₂	11 ¹ ₂	11	11	13	13 ¹ ₂	15	15	11	14	14 ¹ ₂	16	16	12 ¹ ₂	14 ¹ ₂	11	14	15	16	16	15
KURAOKA	9 ¹ ₂	14	14	13 ¹ ₂	11	7 ⁺⁺	13	13	10	12 ¹ ₂	12	13	15 ¹ ₂	9	15	10	10	9	9 ¹ ₂	7 ⁺⁺	15	1 ¹	11	8	11 ¹ ₂	12	8	8	10	8 ⁺	13	11	13	14	5 ⁺⁺	10
MIHARA	1 ⁺⁺	7	4	4	7 ¹ ₂	1 ¹ ₂	4 ¹ ₂	5	7 ¹ ₂	3 ¹ ₂	8	5	6	7	5 ¹ ₂	6	5	7	5	9 ¹ ₂	3 ⁺	6	7	6	7	3 ⁺	7	6	7	3 ⁺	6 ⁺	3 ⁺⁺	1 ¹	2 ⁺⁺	3 ⁺	3
NAKAYAMA	13 ¹ ₂	16	15	15	13	14 ¹ ₂	15	14	14 ¹ ₂	14	15	16	14	13	16	14	16	12 ¹ ₂	14	14	10	8 ⁺	1 ⁺⁺	3 ⁺⁺	1 ¹	5 ¹ ₂	2 ⁺⁺	11	6 ⁺	13	4 ⁺	12	14	9	10	14
OSAWA	11	7	5	9 ¹ ₂	4	3 ⁺⁺	4 ¹ ₂	4	12	7	7	10	9	5 ¹ ₂	5 ¹ ₂	4 ⁺	4	5	1 ¹	2	5	12	13	14	11 ¹ ₂	8	12 ¹ ₂	5	8	4 ⁺	10	6	7	4 ⁺	8	6
OTA	9 ¹ ₂	12 ¹ ₂	11	16	7 ¹ ₂	14 ¹ ₂	12	7	5	9	3 ⁺⁺	4 ⁺⁺	2 ⁺⁺	8 ⁺	1 ¹	5 ⁺	7	15 ¹ ₂	16	15	11 ¹ ₂	16	16	15 ¹ ₂	16	16	15	12	16	11 ¹ ₂	16	16	16	12	7 ⁺	13
SAKAMOTO	13	7 ⁺	8 ¹ ₂	11	12	9	9	6 ⁺	4 ⁺⁺	10	5 ⁺⁺	8 ¹ ₂	6 ⁺	10	4 ⁺⁺	7 ⁺	8	10	7	9 ¹ ₂	7 ¹ ₂	13	14	13	13	13	12 ¹ ₂	10	12 ¹ ₂	10	14	10	9	10 ¹ ₂	12	12
SHIGAYA	5 ¹ ₂	4	7	2 ¹	5	4	2	3	2	1 ⁺	4	3	1 ⁺	2	2	2	2	4	2	1 ⁺	2	3 ¹ ₂	5	2	6	4	3 ¹ ₂	2	5	6	9	2	3	3	9	2
TAKEDA	5 ¹ ₂	10	6	6 ⁺	1 ¹	10 ¹ ₂	6 ⁺	12	7 ¹ ₂	5	11	11	10	5 ¹ ₂	9 ¹ ₂	13	11 ¹ ₂	3 ⁺⁺	12	5	11 ¹ ₂	9 ¹ ₂	6 ⁺	15 ¹ ₂	15	7	11	15	14	9	15	9	8	10 ¹ ₂	13	8
TAKEUCHI	12	11	13	12	16	13	14	15	14 ¹ ₂	15	14	14	13	14	14	15	14	15 ¹ ₂	8	12	7 ¹ ₂	3 ¹ ₂	3	1	2 ¹	1 ¹	1 ⁺⁺	3	3	5	2 ⁺⁺	8	10	7	4 ⁺	7
YAMADA	8 ⁺	15	10	9 ¹ ₂	15	12	11	10	7 ¹ ₂	11	1 ⁺⁺	1 ⁺⁺	6 ⁺	4	11	9	13	12 ¹ ₂	14	6	16	11	12	10	8 ¹ ₂	14 ¹ ₂	14	13	11	16	7 ⁺	15	11 ¹ ₂	14	15	11

- Portlander
- Portland Blocks
- Own Block
- Ranked much better than median rank
- Ranked better than median rank
- Ranked worse than median rank
- Ranked much worse than median rank

Analysis of Community Council Elections - 41

Table XI

RANK OF CANDIDATES WITHIN BLOCKS
COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION

August 7, 1944

Rank Position

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	21	22	24	26	28	29	30	31	32	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	44	Project Rank
CHIKATA	2	3½	1½	1½	2	5	1	1½	3	2	6	3	5½	2½	3	3	4	4	3	6	2	7	5	3	6	6	8	2½	6	3	7	2	3	3	4	2
DOI	4½	7	8	5	8½	13½	9	11	12	7	4½	7	11½	8	7	10	9	9	10½	10½	8½	11½	7	7	8	8	9	8	11	8	6	4	4	2	1	7
FUJII	1	1	3	1½	1	2	2	1½	2	1	2	1	1	2½	1	1½	3	1	4	1½	1	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	1	2½	1	2	1	2	1	
HARA, G.	12	17½	20½	12	18	18½	15	21	20	19	14½	19½	19½	16	20½	18	20	12½	21	14	15	4	5	4	7	4	5	11	2½	10½	5	16½	13½	15½	19½	13
HARA, K.	9	17½	12	10½	12	7	12	14	8½	13	13	17½	19½	7	12	9	7	3	5	18½	14	11½	14½	11½	17½	13	10	16	17	13	11	10	20	18½	10	12
HASHIGUCHI	13½	9½	11	16½	10½	9	7	14	14	15	18	11	13	10	8½	15	1	15½	17	14	10½	15	9	13	10	14	12	14½	9	9	9	13½	8½	15½	9	14
HASHIMOTO	16½	12	19	21	20½	18½	12	19	21	16½	3	14½	15½	21	19	21	20	21	19	18½	18	17½	19½	18	19½	19	21	21	17	21	17	21	15	11	21	21
HIKIDA	6	5½	5	8	3	4	3	6	7	4	7½	8	3	6	4	1½	6	7½	6	8	5	5½	10	9½	5	11	15½	7	11	5	10	5	6	9	7	5
IKEDA	13½	11	14	16½	8½	17	10	14	15½	14	14½	14½	17	13½	10	12	10	10	8	12	3	10	11	14	13½	16½	14	14½	17	12	15	11	12	13½	13	16
IKOMA	3	2	1½	9	5	8	8	7	8½	12	11	13	11½	19	11	8	12	17½	13	5	20½	15	12	16	16	20½	18	19½	14½	19½	18	12	11	18½	14½	11
KIMURA	20½	20	20½	19½	19	16	21	17	11	10½	10	6	4	1	8½	13	12	12½	18	18½	20½	17½	19½	19½	19½	16½	18	17½	21	18	15	20	13½	20½	18	17
KUMATA	20½	20	16½	18	14½	12	20	18	15½	20	1	19½	8	16	16½	20	18	19½	20	18½	18	20½	21	21	21	16½	20	17½	19½	19½	20½	18½	21	13½	19½	20
MAYENO	7½	8	7	6½	7	6	6	8	10	5	12	9	9	9	6	4½	2	2	2	1½	8½	20½	16½	15	13½	12	6	6	13	10½	15	8	8½	7	6	6
MIHARA	7½	3½	4	3½	6	1	4	5	4	3	5½	4	2	4	5	7	8	6	7	4	6	5½	3	6	4	5	3	2½	4	2	2½	3	1	4	3	3
NOMURA	11	14	9½	13	14½	11	18	9	1	10½	18	10	10	12	13½	11	15	11	12	7	18	19	14½	8	11	16½	15½	12½	19½	15	19	16½	16	12	14½	15
OSAWA	4½	9½	6	6½	4	3	5	4	5	6	9	5	7	5	2	4½	5	5	1	3	4	9	8	11½	9	9	7	5	7½	4	8	6	5	5	5	4
TAMBARA	16½	15	13	3½	13	15	14	12	13	9	16	12	18	13½	16½	14	20	7½	15½	14	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	5	6	1	13½	10	10	8	8
TAMURA	16½	16	18	19½	16½	13½	18	16	17	16½	20	16	15½	19	15	16	15	19½	10½	9	16	8	16½	19½	17½	20½	18	12½	14½	16½	20½	18½	19	20½	16½	19
TOMIHIRO	16½	20	15	10½	20½	20½	18	3	18½	18	21	17½	21	11	20½	18	17	14	14	10½	12½	3	5	5	3	3	2	19½	2½	16½	4	15	17½	17	12	10
YOSHIDA	19	13	16½	16½	16½	20½	12	20	18½	21	18	21	14	19	18	18	12	17½	15½	18½	12½	15	18	9½	15	10	12	4	7½	14	12½	9	17½	8	16½	18
YUKAWA	10	5½	9½	16½	10½	10	16	10	6	8	7½	2	5½	16	13½	6	15	15½	9	18½	10½	13	13	17	12	7	12	10	11	7	12½	7	7	6	11	9

Community Council Elections - 42

RANK OF CANDIDATES WITHIN BLOCKS
COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION

August 7, 1944

Rank Position

Community Council Elections - 43

RANK OF CANDIDATES WITHIN BLOCKS
COMMUNITY COUNCIL ELECTION

August 7, 1944

Rank Position

Hashimoto, Block 13 (3rd)

Yukawa, Block 14 (2nd)

K. Hara, Block 22 (3rd)

Mayeno, Block 22 (2nd)

Tamura, Block 26 (9th)

Ikeda, Block 28 (3rd)

G. Hara, Block 35 (5th)

Yoshida, Block 36 (4th)

Tomihiro, Block 37 (2nd)

All of the second places are accounted for by Fujii's acquisition of the first place in that block. K. Hara's third place is accounted for by the presence of Mayeno in the same block. Hashimoto's third place is accounted for by another candidate from the block taking first place, and Fujii taking second place. This leaves four candidates whose unpopularity in their own block must be explained. The circumstances underlying Tamura's unpopularity is not known, but it has already been shown that the election in this block was controlled to prevent residents' voting for him. Both G. Hara and Ikeda were block managers, and it is possible that this fact alone was sufficient to make them unpopular. Kanaya's comment on Yoshida's reluctance to withdraw from the election leads one to believe that his unpopularity has a basis in his personality. When it is considered that most candidates have rated first or second in their block--including those who are little known throughout the project or who are considered to be poor leaders--a person who does not rate high in his own block at an election can be considered to be highly unpopular.

The popularity of the Portlanders shows a definite sectional bias. In general, Portlanders are unpopular in all other blocks except their own--Blocks 29 to 35, 37, and 39. In these blocks they generally rank very high. This accounts for the wide range in rank for persons who are from Portland.

The same kind of phenomenon occurs for the person who is popular locally. They may be fairly popular in one section of the project, and practically unknown in another. This is especially true of persons from Seattle who are not too well-known. Ikoma, for instance, who directs recreation in Area A, is fairly popular in this area, but is practically unknown in Area B. Roy Sakamoto's best ranks are obtained in blocks surrounding his own, and his poorest performance is in the Portland blocks. Yamada does well in blocks surrounding his own--13, 14, 15, 16. Mayeno, the former Nihonjinkai official from Seattle, does well in Blocks 19-26 (he lives in Block 22), but very poorly in the Portland blocks.

It has been pointed out that a person with a title like "Dr." is likely to be at an advantage at an election. Results of the first election seem to bear this out. Both Dr. Shigaya and Chikata live in Block 4, close to the hospital. From Blocks 1 to 5 their popularity is generally below their project average. Chikata's ranks beginning with Block 1 runs: 5, 9, 3, 3, 10. From Block 6 his popularity tends to increase: 5, 3, 2, 1, 3, 6, 7, 3, 3. Dr. Shigaya's ranks beginning at Block 1 are: 5, 4, 7, 2, 5. From Block 6 they run: 4, 2, 3, 2, 1, 4, 3, 1, 2. One explanation for this phenomenon of increased popularity in blocks farther away from one's own block

is that face-to-face contact or accurate knowledge of the individual diminishes. The reputation of being a doctor or a pharmacist is allowed to hold full sway without interference by actual contact or knowledge of the individual in question. By the second election, however, Chikata had established his reputation to the extent that his popularity was high in most blocks regardless of distance from his own block.

Another interesting comparison is between Mihara and Mayeno, both former Nihonjinkai officials, and parolees released from internment camp. Mihara was released before Mayeno and ran in the first election, whereas Mayeno was a new arrival on the project when the second election took place. Mihara's mean rank was 5th place in the first election and 4th in the second, and Mayeno's was 8th in the second election. In most blocks, Mihara was several ranks ahead of Mayeno. However, in blocks surrounding Mayeno's own block Mayeno ranked high and Mihara did more poorly than his rival, and more poorly than his average in other blocks. The contrast is striking.

	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>26</u>
Mayeno	+	++	++	++	++
Mihara	--	--	-	--	

It is difficult to explain why when Mayeno does his best performance Mihara should be at his worst, unless there is a rivalry between the two men. This, however, has not been established by other means.