

Meghan Osato

Dr. Roetzel

Humanities Core Seminar

2 June 2016

Proving Loyalties: The Japanese American Struggle for Agency During World War II

On December 7<sup>th</sup>, 1941, Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, a strategic U.S. Naval base in Hawaii, initiating U.S. involvement in World War II (Hansen 54). The attack on U.S. soil was unnerving to many Americans, and the overwhelming public fear of another Japanese attack resulted in the issuance of the controversial Executive Order 9066. The order led to the evacuation and resettlement of all people of Japanese descent from the west coast, stripping many natural born citizens of their freedom and rights, and alienating first generation Japanese immigrants. Greg Robinson, a history professor at Université du Québec À Montréal, argues the justification for the mass internment of Japanese Americans was the fact that government leaders and the public believed there was no way to tell the difference between a loyal Japanese person and a spy (207). During the internment period, the need for manpower to support the war led to the decision to draft loyal Japanese Americans: men into the military and women into nursing positions and other acceptable jobs (Muller 35). The extent of each person's loyalty was determined through a loyalty questionnaire, developed by the U.S. government's War Relocation Association, which emphasized a preconceived notion of the qualities that exemplified a loyal Japanese American. Although the interned Japanese Americans were extremely limited in their actions, not all remained unresponsive to the events occurring. Those that protested the loyalty questionnaire and draft created their own agency and left a greater impact than those who

followed traditional perceptions of Japanese American loyalty.

When discussing Japanese American internment, many scholars agree that Japanese Americans were placed in an unfair position that stripped them of their rights and freedom. In her essay on Japanese American experience during World War II, Rosalyn Tonai, an Executive Director of the National Japanese American Historical Society, states, “Even though Japanese Americans were held against their will, the government called the event an ‘evacuation’ or ‘relocation’” (32). The government unconstitutionally imprisoned Japanese Americans without proper reasoning or proof, and then used euphemisms such as “evacuation” or “relocation” to disguise its actions. These words connote a feeling of having the best interest of Japanese Americans in mind, and protecting them from harm. However, in reality, “the event in question is more properly called an imprisonment, internment, incarceration, detention, confinement or lockup” (Tonai 32). In other words, by labeling the Japanese American experience in the camps as a form of imprisonment, Tonai not only emphasizes the unlawful crimes against Japanese American rights when they were arrested without proper cause, but also the great restrictions and lack of freedom the people experienced as characterized by “imprisonment.”

An influential planner in the evacuation of Japanese Americans and wholehearted proponent of their imprisonment, General DeWitt, claimed, “It is just impossible to determine the loyalty of a Jap by investigation” (Muller 33). With these sorts of opinions spreading through the public and governmental spheres, Japanese Americans were placed in a difficult position where attempts to prove their loyalty through their actions were seen as insincere. DeWitt’s view of Japanese American loyalty led them to a dead end; since there was no way to judge loyalty, there was no way to prove they were loyal and gain back their rights. He refers to them as

“Japs,” a term that was used in the media to describe both Japanese Americans at home and Japanese enemies overseas. This term does not distinguish between American citizen/friend and enemy, blurring the line between the two, and further emphasizing his claim that it is impossible to distinguish the loyalty of Japanese Americans. Even the Supreme Court, which is supposed to interpret the constitutionality of laws and protect the rights of the citizens ruled in favor of the unlawful executive order. In *Fred Korematsu v. U.S.* (1944), Korematsu, who resisted relocation, was arrested and convicted for disobeying the executive order (“Famous Dissents: Korematsu v. U.S (1944)”). He believed the mass internment of Japanese Americans to be unconstitutional, and took his case to court. The Supreme Court ruled against Korematsu, “finding mass race-based evacuation to be a constitutional use of presidential wartime authority” (Robinson 224). The Supreme Court continued the use of euphemisms referring to the imprisonment as an “evacuation,” again suggesting the government was protecting Japanese Americans in some way. No matter which way the Japanese Americans turned, the government placed blockades, so their actions seemed futile.

Although faced with roadblocks to freedom, not all Japanese Americans were discouraged from acting. Frank Emi, an internee at the Heart Mountain Relocation Camp, was particularly active in protesting the loyalty questionnaire issued to all internees above 17 years of age. The loyalty questionnaire was a 28-question document (Fig. 1-4) created to quantify the loyalty of Japanese Americans by scoring the answers based on a system of plus and minus points (Muller 46-48, 75-76). It consisted of non-controversial, bookkeeping questions such as birthdate, gender and citizenship status, but also more intrusive questions inquiring about the internee’s religion, hobbies, organization membership, and magazine and/or newspaper

subscriptions (Fig. 1-4). In a public address in 1988, Emi states, “We were treated more like enemy aliens than American citizens” (315). These questions served as a form of “investigation” of Japanese American loyalty, as General DeWitt puts it. In reality, however, the term “investigation” acts as a euphemism for interrogation, since the questions Japanese Americans were required to answer probed them for personal information that would disprove their loyalty or incriminate them.

The scoring systems for some of the more intrusive questions of the loyalty questionnaire, in particular questions 7 through 26, provide insight into what defined a loyal Japanese American during World War II. Two scoring systems based on weighted point systems were created: one by the Provost Marshal General’s Office (PGMO), an office that deals with investigations in the army, and another by the War Relocation Authority (WRA), a government agency that managed Japanese American internment (Muller 62, 73). They were designed to minimize the amount of questionnaires that required thorough review due to the high volume of answer sheets the government received (Muller 46). Notably, the points were weighted heavily against anything relating to or resembling Japanese culture. For example, in the PGMO scoring guidelines, being a Shintoist resulted in an automatic rejection, while being a Christian scored 2-plus points, or being a part of a “Japanese named organization” led the application to be referred to another reviewer, while being a member of Boy Scouts of America scored 2-plus points (Muller 47). Japanese American loyalty was defined not by their allegiance to the U. S., but by assimilation into American society. The higher the score on the questionnaire, the more loyal that person appeared. Japanese American associations with “American” religions or organizations were weighted positively, while associations with “Japanese” ones were weighted

negatively. As a result, the scoring guide favored those that fit the image of a stereotypical American. To score as a loyal American, the questionnaire required Japanese Americans to reject their heritage altogether, and practice the culture of the society that interned them. Those that answered the questions with the intention of proving their loyalty to the U.S. only encouraged the racism and prejudice toward the ethnically Japanese and their culture.

However, the last two questions, 27 and 28, caused the greatest amount of uneasiness and protest, reading:

27. Are you willing to serve in the armed forces on combat duty, wherever ordered?

28. Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces and foreswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor or any other foreign government, power, or organization? (Fig. 4)

Eric Muller, a professor at University of North Carolina, School of Law, argues the internees knew answering yes to question 27 guaranteed them to be drafted, because it meant they were willing to serve their country; while answering no would make them seem disloyal and suspicious consistent with the views of other scholars in this field (Muller 35-36). Similarly, answering yes to question 28 forced first generation Japanese Americans, Issei, to become people without a country, as it required the relinquishment of citizenship to any foreign state during a time when there were laws against naturalization for Japanese immigrants. For second generation Japanese Americans, Nisei, question 28 implied they had a former allegiance to the Japanese emperor, when most of them had only known the U.S. as their home (Robinson 186). Questions 27 and 28 each required Japanese Americans to choose between what, for most, were

two impossible choices. Despite the upsetting nature of the questions, only 11% of all internees answered with “No”, or another unsatisfactory answer, to questions 27 and/or 28 (Fugita 58). According to Brian Hayashi, a Professor of Human and Environmental Studies at Kyoto University, the majority of people answered “Yes,” most likely because they believed it was the answer officials wanted (Hayashi, Brian 144). Although DeWitt may have been incorrect in stating it was impossible to determine Japanese American loyalty, the ambiguous questions on the loyalty questionnaire support his statement. Since many Japanese Americans could not answer the questions truthfully because of their vagueness, they could not truly prove their loyalty, despite the score they received on their questionnaire, because neither possible answer reflected their present state. The poor wording of the questions limited the agency of the Japanese Americans by restricting them to the answers “yes” or “no” for inquiries that required greater explanation and more thorough review by scorers.

Although Japanese Americans’ actions were limited in countless ways, such as internment and the loyalty questionnaire, they still had agency to stand up for and protect their rights; though the results of their courage was not always ideal. In a public address at the Fifth National Conference for the Association of Asian American Studies on March 24, 1988, Frank Emi began his story with, “Today I hope to dispel the myth that we were all ‘Quiet Americans’” (Emi 314). Immediately, Emi reveals that Japanese Americans were more active in resistance and had more agency than is often thought. His term “Quiet Americans” implies a passive, uninvolved group, a title that he seems to disapprove of. However, his term also implies a sense of belonging to the U.S., referring to his fellow Japanese Americans and himself as Americans, members of the country. This emphasizes the betrayal he and other Japanese Americans felt

when the U.S. turned against its own and imprisoned them. Several organizations, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and the WRA, were all constantly working together in favor of Japanese American “relocation” and the use of the draft to prove Japanese American loyalty. Ironically, the JACL and ACLU, whose names suggest they would be in protest of the internment and unfair draft of imprisoned Japanese Americans, were in support of it. The WRA’s use of “relocation,” rather than interment in its name, is also ironic because relocation is an understatement of what Japanese Americans experienced. Emi displays his resentment of these agencies when he refers to them as the “JACL-ACLU-WRA axis” paralleling the threat to Japanese American freedom and rights to the World War II Axis powers’ threat to the free world (317). The Axis Powers had an immense and tragic impact on the agency of people throughout the world and caused the death of many. The juxtaposition between the seemingly harmless names of the organizations/agencies and the term “axis” only emphasizes Emi’s feelings of indignation. Emi deliberately chooses to refer to these agencies as the Axis Powers because he felt extremely marginalized by their actions and the regulations they enforced. His decision to use this term highlights the parallels between the home front and global front with respect to the disenfranchisement of people that occurs during war. This feeling of indignation toward his situation, the U.S. government, and other powers involved, ultimately encouraged Emi to act.

The constraints on Emi and his fellow Japanese Americans did not discourage his protest, as it did for some, but rather roused him to act. Emi’s decision to respond to questions 27 and 28 on the loyalty questionnaire with “under the present conditions I am unable to answer these questions” set a precedent and encouraged others to react in similar ways (Emi 315). Questions

27 and 28 implied a “yes” or “no” answer based on the wording of the question and the answer line being only about one to one and a half inches long (Fig. 4). Despite this implication, Emi still defied the question in two ways: by not answering it and by giving an unsolicited explanation as to why he couldn’t answer it. Emi, like all other Japanese Americans issued the questionnaire, was faced with two choices, “yes” and “no,” that did not thoroughly represent his answer. He was required to choose between two flawed responses that would each lead to consequences, such as being drafted or being viewed as disloyal. By formulating his own response to the question, outside of the intended answers, Emi created his own agency within his limited sphere of action. Emi’s belief in equitable treatment for Japanese Americans led him, and seven other internees, to found the Fair Play Committee, dedicated to draft resistance and protesting the loyalty questionnaire within the Heart Mountain Relocation Camp (Emi 316). The name of their new group emphasizes its goals, fair treatment and equal rights for Japanese Americans. A major aim of the group was to discourage people from answering affirmatively to questions 27 and 28 on the loyalty questionnaire.

While the political actions of Emi and the Fair Play Committee did not go without consequence, the draft resisters’ response to government action taken against them emphasizes their exercise of agency within their limited sphere. Emi and his fellow resisters were put on trial because they “counsel[ed] others to resist military service” (Emi 318). Ironically, the use of the word counseled implies speech, a freedom that should have been protected under the First Amendment. To their surprise, a man who had befriended them in the camp, Jack Nishimoto, had been working with the FBI to gather information to be used against them. Rather than argue with Nishimoto’s testimony, the leaders of the Fair Play Committee planned an “offensive

strategy,” and decided to plead guilty to the charges (Emi 319). Emi’s use of sports diction highlights the game-like nature of the Japanese American struggle for fair treatment as well as draft resister agency. By acting “offensively,” the resisters created their own agency by planning an attack. The trial and testimony by Nishimoto placed them in a lose-lose situation, because the evidence gathered by the court as well as the court’s political leaning clearly pointed to their guilt. In pleading guilty, rather than waiting for the court to find them guilty, Emi and his friends were able to “declare their belief that the draft law was not only morally wrong, but unconstitutional as well,” and thus make an argument for the unjust nature of the laws (Emi 319). Emi’s actions not only challenged the ethics of the draft, but they challenged the law itself by declaring it unconstitutional. Eighteen months after the war, the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeal’s Justice Bratton stated “one with innocent motives, who honestly believe[s] a law is unconstitutional and therefore not obligatory, may well counsel that the law should not be obeyed,” overturning the sentences of Emi and the seven leaders. The Fair Play Committee leaders not only acted for what they believed in, but their persistence in getting their case to a court of appeals led a legal precedent to be established in favor of Japanese Americans. Emi and the leaders’ actions challenged the idea of “Quiet Americans,” the term Emi began his testimony with. Their actions were quiet; they did not act unreasonably or forcefully. Instead, their actions were always a calm, respectable response to unfair treatment. While they were “quiet” in the literal sense because they did not cause chaos or turmoil in their protests, their actions protesting the draft and loyalty questionnaire were moving and impressive. The results of their actions were anything but “quiet.” Their exercise of agency left a lasting impact on the court system, as their case was one of the two cases where the courts ruled in favor the Nisei.

On a larger scale, the Issei were able to alter the loyalty questionnaire through their protests and actions. Answering affirmatively to question 28 would have made the Issei people without a country, since the U.S. did not allow for the naturalization of Japanese immigrants at the time (Tonai 31). Faced with two possible answers, “yes” or “no,” to an impossible question, the Issei chose the unconventional route and instead rallied for the question to be changed. As a result of their anger toward the question, the WRA changed the wording to ask if they would “swear to abide by the laws of the United States and take no action which would in any way interfere with the war effort of the United States” (Muller 35). Muller stated that the impact of their actions was limited as many the Issei were distrusting of the new wording because of the ambiguity of its predecessor (36). However, their actions still resulted in a considerable change that allowed the Issei to more easily answer question 28, without devastating consequences. The Issei demands were met far more easily met than those of the Nisei because the Issei demands required the revision of one question on the questionnaire. Cherstin Lyon, a professor of U.S. history, immigration, and citizenship, notes the Nisei were most concerned with the unfair draft of interned Japanese American “citizens” (83). However, Lyon’s use of the word citizens is somewhat inaccurate since most of their rights had been taken away as a result of the executive order. Japanese American demands challenged the definition of U.S. citizenship itself and citizens’ rights. While the Nisei’s impact was more limited due to the nature of their demands, their actions are still significant, and urged people to come to a realization about the unethical treatment Japanese Americans.

Not all interned Japanese Americans protested the draft. Some sat back passively, while others took the initiative to prove their loyalty, often through military service. In 1943, the 442<sup>nd</sup>

Regimental Combat Team was initially made up of both Nisei volunteers from the camps and volunteers from Hawaii, but the draft was eventually instituted to replenish numbers (Bloom 204). The internment of Japanese Americans, as well as the loyalty questionnaire, left the imprisoned upset that their allegiance was being questioned, and in consequence, several set out to demonstrate their loyalty by fighting for their country. In doing so, they gave in to a traditional perception of Japanese American loyalty. Answering question 27 in the affirmative may have been empowering for those who marked yes when the draft of Japanese Americans was reinstated (what year). Registering for the draft, a privilege of male American citizens, would have returned some rights to Japanese Americans who had already been stripped of most of their rights. Yet their actions were ironic because they validated the implied notion that Japanese Americans must prove their loyalty to gain back their right as citizens, suggesting no moral problems from their loss of rights in the first place.

Throughout most literature on the subject, the Japanese American battalion is discussed with regards to their heroism and sacrifice. In his book, Muller describes the all-Nisei, segregated 100<sup>th</sup> Battalion/442<sup>nd</sup> Regimental Combat Team as having an “outstanding combat record” (203). This regiment is commonly referred to as “Purple Heart Battalion” and is “the most decorated unit in [the] U.S. military for its size and length of service” (Tonai 37) with 900 Purple Hearts (Muller 209). Even the name of their unit implies their dedication to fighting as the Purple Heart is given to those injured in combat. This nickname only adds to their courage because it highlights the sacrifices of the battalion. Despite the 442<sup>nd</sup>'s bravery, they still lost a great number of men, with their numbers reduced by more than half, from 1,432 men to 521 men, over the course of their service (Muller 209). Those Nisei who volunteered for the military

before the distribution of the loyalty questionnaire, supposedly enhanced their agency when they were freed from the camps and gained back their rights as citizens (such as the right to be drafted). But ironically, were stripped of their agency upon entering the war. The military structure allows for little flexibility in decision-making and individual action, as the commanding officers usually formulate plans, which the unit must perform as a team. Also, the high death rate and injury rate of those who served in the 442<sup>nd</sup> suggests that it was a feat to return home from fighting in this unit unscathed. The near inevitability of injury or death left the men of the battalion trapped in a limited sphere of options.

Both the draft resisters and the Purple Heart Battalion remain significant people in American history. However, the success of their attempts to promote equality for Japanese Americans was varied. The 442<sup>nd</sup>, often discussed with regards to their heroism, promotes the memorialization and remembrance of the deaths and sacrifices made by Japanese Americans fighting during the war. Robert Hayashi, a professor of American Studies at Amherst College, discusses the film *Go For Broke*, which provides a representation of the courage and sacrifice Japanese American regiments in Europe. He claims the movie is “one of the very few mass media treatments of the [Japanese American] experience, but the story is partial at best” (Hayashi, Robert 62). Hayashi’s argument suggests the limitation of portraying Japanese Americans’ heroism. The story is “partial” in some ways because one film cannot possibly encompass the true extent of the situation Japanese Americans experienced in World War II. The story is also “partial” because only a few portrayals of these events are widely publicized. *Go For Broke*, a major film in this category, has an overarching message of valor and sacrifice, rather than recognition of the Japanese American struggle or the problematic government actions

that plagued the time. As a result, we view their sacrifices with a sentimental attitude and see their gallantry as the overarching message of their service. Hayashi states, “[A] limited definition of the Japanese American community persists—accepting victim or fearless fighter” (61). Japanese American soldiers are represented as “fearless fighter[s]” in the literal sense. Because the soldiers fall into one of the two categories Hayashi defines, their efforts and figurative “fight” to prove their loyalty and respond to the great prejudice they faced are more easily ignored. The 442<sup>nd</sup> is much more visible and accessible to the general public as compared to the actions of Frank Emi and the draft resisters. Although it was more well known, the 442<sup>nd</sup> did not initiate change, but rather acted within the limitations set by their situation and the U.S. government. The draft and voluntary service were the two options within their sphere of action. In contrast, the draft resisters do not fall into either of Hayashi’s categories, allowing them to stand out. They created their own agency by formulating new answers to questions 27 and 28 outside of the intended “yes” / “no” answers. Their actions actively promoted change to the unfair system, and as a result, had greater political impacts with regards to civil rights, than that of the 442<sup>nd</sup> Regimental Combat Team, such as changing question 28 or winning the court case for the Nisei. Emi and his fellow protesters made an effort to expand their scope of action increasing their agency relative to their compliant counterparts.

Ultimately, Frank Emi and other protesters of the draft created their own agency by finding ways to act outside the limitations they were set up against. As a result, the consequences of their actions were more significant in the movement towards “fair play.” The internment of Japanese Americans and the loyalty questionnaire were restrictive to their agency. However, Frank Emi and other draft resisters overcame some of those restrictions through their protests.

Members of the 442<sup>nd</sup> also took action in response to Japanese American interment, by either volunteering for service or agreeing to be drafted, acting within the restrictions placed on them. The heroism of the 442<sup>nd</sup> memorializes them and leads them to be viewed in a positive light, undermining the sacrifices they made to prove their loyalty. In contrast, the draft resisters, while less well known, left lasting impacts on the loyalty questionnaire and the courts system that contributed to the American people's realization of their wrongs. Memorialization is often successful in promoting remembrance, however the creation of new precedents inspires people to advocate change.

## Works Cited

- Bloom, Leonard. "Transitional Adjustments of Japanese-American Families to Relocation." *American Sociological Review*, Vol 12, No. 2 (1947): 201-209. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 May 2016.
- Emi, Frank Seishi. "Draft Resisters at Heart Mountain." *Only What We Could Carry: The Japanese American Internment Experience*. Ed. Lawson Fusao Inada. Salt Lake City: Heyday Books, 2000. 313-323. Print.
- "Famous Dissents: Korematsu v. U.S (1944)." *The Supreme Court*. Educational Broadcasting Corporation, 2007. Web. 30 May 2016.
- Fugita, Stephen S. and Marilyn Fernandez. *Altered Lives, Enduring Community*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2004. Print.
- Hansen, Arthur A. "The 1944 Nisei Draft at Heart Mountain, Wyoming: Its Relationship to the Historical Representation of the World War II Japanese American Evacuation." *OAH Magazine of History*, Vol. 10 No. 4 (1996): 48-60. *JSTOR*. Web. 5 May 2016.
- Hayashi, Brian Masaru. *Democratizing the Enemy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. Print.
- Hayashi, Robert T. "Transfigured Patterns: Contesting Memories at the Manzanar National Historic Site." *The Public Historian*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (2003): 51-71. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 May 2016.
- Lyon, Cherstin. *Prisons and Patriots: Japanese American Wartime Citizenship, Civil Disobedience, and Historical Memory*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011. Print.

Muller, Eric L. *American Inquisition*. The University of North Carolina Press, 2007. Print.

Robinson, Greg. *A Tragedy of Democracy: Japanese Confinement in North America*. Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2009. Print.

Tonai, Rosalyn. "A Short History of the Japanese American Experience." *U.S. – Japan Women's Journal. English Supplement*, No. 2 (1992): 38-39. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 May 2016.

Thomas, Rick. "Statement of United States Citizen of Japanese Ancestry." 1943. Photograph. *Japanese Internment: In Time and Place*. Web. 8 May 2016.

Wollenberg, Charles. "'Dear Earl' The Fair Play Committee, Earl Warren and Japanese Internment." *California History*, Vol. 89, No. 4 (2012): 24-55, 57-60. *JSTOR*. Web. 9 May 2016.

Appendix

Figure 1: Loyalty Questionnaire (Page 1)

FORM APPROVED  
BUDGET BUREAU No. 33-R045-43



(LOCAL BOARD DATE STAMP WITH CODE)

### STATEMENT OF UNITED STATES CITIZEN OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Surname) (English given name) (Japanese given name)  
 (a) Alias \_\_\_\_\_
2. Local selective service board \_\_\_\_\_  
(Number)  
(City) (County) (State)
3. Date of birth \_\_\_\_\_ Place of birth \_\_\_\_\_
4. Present address \_\_\_\_\_  
(Street) (City) (State)
5. Last two addresses at which you lived 3 months or more (exclude residence at relocation center and at assembly center):  
 \_\_\_\_\_ From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_
6. Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Height \_\_\_\_\_ Weight \_\_\_\_\_
7. Are you a registered voter? \_\_\_\_\_ Year first registered \_\_\_\_\_  
 Where? \_\_\_\_\_ Party \_\_\_\_\_
8. Marital status \_\_\_\_\_ Citizenship of wife \_\_\_\_\_ Race of wife \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Father's Name) (Town or Ken) (Birthplace) (State or Country) (Occupation)
10. \_\_\_\_\_  
(Mother's Name) (Town or Ken) (Birthplace) (State or Country) (Occupation)

**In items 11 and 12, you need not list relatives other than your parents, your children, your brothers and sisters.  
 For each person give name; relationship to you (such as father); citizenship; complete address; occupation.**

11. Relatives in the United States (if in military service, indicate whether a selectee or volunteer):
  - (a) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name) (Relationship to you) (Citizenship)  
(Complete address) (Occupation) (Volunteer or selectee)
  - (b) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name) (Relationship to you) (Citizenship)  
(Complete address) (Occupation) (Volunteer or selectee)
  - (c) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name) (Relationship to you) (Citizenship)  
(Complete address) (Occupation) (Volunteer or selectee)

DSS Form 304A  
(1-23-43)

*(If additional space is necessary, attach sheets)*

16-32565-1

Figure 2: Loyalty Questionnaire (Page 2)

12. Relatives in Japan (see instruction above item 11):

..... (Name)	..... (Relationship to you)	..... (Citizenship)
..... (Complete address)	..... (Occupation)	
..... (Name)	..... (Relationship to you)	..... (Citizenship)
..... (Complete address)	..... (Occupation)	

13. Education:

Name	Place	Years of attendance
..... (Kindergarten)	.....	From ..... to .....
..... (Grade school)	.....	From ..... to .....
..... (Japanese language school)	.....	From ..... to .....
..... (High school)	.....	From ..... to .....
..... (Junior college, college, or university)	.....	From ..... to .....
..... (Type of military training, such as R. O. T. C. or Gunji Kyoren) (Where and when)		
..... (Other schooling)	..... (Years of attendance)	

14. Foreign travel (give dates, where, how, for whom, with whom, and reasons therefor):

.....

.....

.....

15. Employment (give employers' names and kind of business, addresses, and dates from 1935 to date):

.....

.....

.....

.....

16. Religion ..... Membership in religious groups .....

.....

17. Membership in organizations (clubs, societies, associations, etc.). Give name, kind of organization, and dates of membership.

.....

.....

16-32565-1

Figure 3: Loyalty Questionnaire (Page 3)

18. Knowledge of foreign languages (put check mark (✓) in proper squares):

(a) Japanese	Good	Fair	Poor	(b) Other (Specify)	Good	Fair	Poor
Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Reading	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Writing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Speaking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Sports and hobbies .....

.....

.....

20. List five references, other than relatives or former employers, giving address, occupation, and number of years known:

(Name)	(Complete address)	(Occupation)	(Years known)
.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....

21. Have you ever been convicted by a court of a criminal offense (other than a minor traffic violation)? .....

Offense	When	What court	Sentence
.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	.....	.....	.....

22. Give details on any foreign investments.

(a) Accounts in foreign banks. Amount, \$.....  
 Bank ..... Date account opened .....

(b) Investments in foreign companies. Amount, \$.....  
 Company ..... Date acquired .....

(c) Do you have a safe-deposit box in a foreign country?  
 What country? ..... Date acquired .....

Contents .....

