

85
Thursday May 11, 1944 Community Council Conference Room 1:40 P.M.

Chairman Mr. Kusozo Hatchimonji

- Hatch. Request is made by Mr. Ingraham that we call the witnesses one by one, so that the witnesses could give testimony without feeling any interference or, as you know, pressure from the others present.
- Saito This is an open hearing. For anyone who presents the facts with truth, there is to be no fear in presenting the truth and facts, it is human nature that one rather speaks out the truth according to the human of the contents, in doing anything against his conscience, therefore, if you are presenting the truth, there should be no opposition in having an open hearing.
- Kimoto Since this is an open hearing, it is very funny to have such hearing behind the closed door, you know, exclusive of other witnesses. If Mr. Robertson had said it to that effect, it is well to go and see him first, before we proceed.
- Hatch In order to speed up the hearing, I suggest you compromise and comply with the suggestion of Mr. Robertson.
- Saito I would like to add a little more to that. We, the committee, are the representative of the Community Council, of the public at large; consequently, we want to have an open hearing. However, if that is the case we won't make any further objection.
- Nagumo I want to ask the witnesses how they feel about it, if they are, are afraid we should have an open hearing.
- Ing. Witnesses I expect to call this afternoon have been advised that this would be a private hearing, and I am not going to violate it by calling on them unless this is a private hearing.
- Hatch Mr. Ingraham, in order to facilitate this hearing, the committee has decided to compromise with your request and proceed on the line
- 84

yes laid down, provided however, in case there is any doubt that a witness said is true or not, the committee should be given the right to call upon or inform the other witnesses and given a chance to cross examine the witnesses. Do you want to present Mr. Saijo's witness first?

Ing. That's all right. I want to keep just one witness. I would like to have a room where they can wait and I can call them in one at a time.

Hatch. O. K. Mr. Terui.

Now just try to be as fair as possible, you see. If there is anything, it is for the committee to decide.

Saite Mr. Ingraham and Mr. Hartman, please be aware that these small conversations don't vitally concern, don't have to be suspicious. That's all right.

Hatch. Before we proceed, Mr. Ingraham, I want to know if you or Mr. Hartman reported to Mr. Robertson that I, as Chairman, interfered with the questioning at the last session of the hearing. I deny ever having interfered with the questioning or answers made by the witnesses. If so, it came from the fact that you are not familiar with the Japanese language. Sometimes when the witnesses made too long statements, I tried to make them cut it into 2 or 3 small pieces, because I knew a long statement that takes maybe 3 minutes is very difficult for the interpreter to make an accurate translation. I am an interpreter in the criminal court and it is a regular custom for judge or interpreter, himself, to try to cut it whenever the meaning or the paragraph is complete. So in today's hearing I may do it in fairness to the witnesses themselves so that he could present his testimony and have testimony accurately translated into Japanese or into English language. I wish you would understand that before we begin this hearing.

Ing. I have no objections to have translation made for the witnesses, only

85

point I have is that as a presiding Officer, I feel, you should be patient with the witnesses and try to find out what the witnesses have to say. Your job as Presiding Officer is to question the witnesses or in any way do that sort of thing. To give witnesses a fair chance to see what they have to say.

Hatch. I guess this is my privilege to make the meaning clear. As you said in the last session "we are not working under Mr. Saijo but we are working under WRAF You are encouraging them Mr. Ingraham. I don't want to find fault with your English but it doesn't come quite close to explaining.

Separated into Two Groups

Mr. Hoshizaki's witnesses into Block Managers Office
Mr. Saijo's witnesses into Community Council Office.

Hatch. If Mr. Saijo's witnesses don't mind.

Hart. That isn't the point, that's the request of Mr. Robertson.

Hatch. Then Let's resume the hearing. At the beginning I want to say this, that I am Chairman today again not because I wanted to be but because our regular Chairman, Mr. Choppy Umemoto, is relocating. He is going today or tomorrow, I called on him to ask him to come today. He said, "As I am leaving tomorrow I am too busy." The rest of the committee has selected the job for me to be the Chairman today. That's why I am here

Kimoto Before you call the witnesses I want to ask something about the termination. Mr. Ingraham, you stated that as you signed the termination paper for Mr. Hoshizaki, you are responsible and Mr. Saijo has no responsibilities for the case.

Ing. Mr. Saijo merely brought to us the information on which we based the termination.

Kimoto This is not the only case of the termination. So many other workers

were terminated. Every termination paper you signed? Will you take responsibility for every case? You signed the termination paper because Mr. Saijo recommended them?

Hart. If I say, Mr. Saijo under our administration has authority to recommend to us for termination, either to Mr. Ingraham or Myself.

Ing. I might say this, this Mr. Saijo may advise me or Mr. Hartman or both on the situation. We accept his recommendation. The point I would like to make is that Mr. Saijo did not ask us to terminate Mr. Hoshizaki. He was causing difficulty on his crew there and Mr. Saijo asked what should be done about it. Mr. Todd, Mr. Hartman, and myself met and out of that meeting we decided that Mr. Hoshizaki be terminated.

Kimoto I asked this question because at the previous meeting so many witnesses stated that their termination were very unfair. I forgot the right name but you can see on the paper. She told us that one day she got sick, so she couldn't go down to the Poultry Farm and she was terminated the following day on the ground of disharmony. I believe this was Mrs. Hirose. After a few days later she got the doctor's certificate and went to the office. Then she found out that she was already terminated right after that day. In that case who takes the responsibility?

Ing. I don't say that the responsibility lies in Mr. Hartman or me, whoever signed that termination. We don't sign unless we see fit. We sign by information given us. Usually the thing that happens is that the Timekeeper comes and decides now this lady hasn't reported to work for several days or she is ill or gives some other reason and they have the termination papers ready for my signatures. It is based on the information we receive. We can't handle each case individually.

Nagumo You decided by recommendation.

Kimoto In other words by recommendation is relative to specific standing but in this particular case the recommendation was not for termination but it was just Mr. Saije coming for advice as to what should be done under the circumstances?

Ing. When the recommendation is mistaken it is my responsibility. I don't mean to say that the foreman has no responsibility, for he has. I don't even remember about the other cases. I would have to look up into the records.

Hatch. Make the answers quickly and shortly.

Kimoto At the previous hearings, you know, we have heard about so many unfair terminations. He told us that he had 8 members in his family, I don't remember the name, and he is the only worker but still you terminated him.

Ing. I would like to know the name.

Nagumo He has made so many unfair termination in his work.

Kimoto You signed termination according to somebody's recommendation?

Ing. That's right.

Saite You think even now, this very minute, you consider Mr. Hoshizaki as uncooperative?

Ing. Yes

Saite Now Mr. Hartman is the division head and you are his assistant according to this letter from Mr. Hartman to Mr. Hoshizaki. The thing that has happened seems to be due to the different characteristics and temperaments of the two men and not due to non-cooperation. Then how could that be. I want to know why it is that the division head and his associate have different views on this matter. You two disagree in the judgement there and how did you terminate that kind of man? I want to know the grounds upon which you based your final decision.

Ing. I think I can explain that. At that time that letter was written we didn't have the detailed information that we have today. I will have to amend that. When this case began to come into the open. I had some serious amendments. I had hoped Mr. Hoshizaki would accept this letter explaining that two man couldn't get along. I talked to a number of workers and gathered their attitude and I knew in the mind or at least in my mind that Mr. Hoshizaki was not cooperative. I mean cooperation in this sense. He was disturbing and tended to divide the workers among themselves. He was non-cooperative in respect to the little jobs that he may have been assigned to.

Hatch. Mr. Saito, do you want to put this paper as an evidence in connection with this question?

Saito I want to put this, as an evidence.

Hatch. Dated April 6, 1944, to Mr. K. Hoshizaki and the letter is signed by Glen Hartman, Chief of Agriculture.

(Copy of letter attached)

Saito We too regret much the fact that we heard from people there that whereas, Mr. Saijo didn't pay such earnest and sincere desire for the workers or the welfare of the project, for instance, as in this case-- chickens with their feathers being out on account of sickness or so and their back parts becoming black and in case like this it is Mr. Saijo's idea that these chicks are no use and therefore to throw them out. However, Mr. Hoshizaki had intentions of saving them and even cared to the last minutes to save them to bring into full grown chickens. He took that attitude and did his best for the welfare of the project there. And now if the worker, inferior worker, under the foreman has such idea it may not please the foreman because he is a subornate. However, from the stand point of project, if you terminate such eager persons on the grounds of non-cooperation, you will regret less made on the handling or

89

managing of the project there.

Ing. I don't question the fact that Mr. Hoshizaki has many admirable qualities. I do feel that when Mr. Hoshizaki set out to stir up a large number of witnesses against the foreman regardless who the foreman was, he was committing the worst kind of non-cooperation and subordination. If there was anything Mr. Saijo was doing that wasn't right he should have brought it to some of us rather than to stir up and say he is no good and that Mr. Saijo be removed.

Hatch. Gentlemen, less expression opinion. It takes too much time, Mr. Ingraham. Could you prove your opinions and statements by presenting witnesses?

Ing. That's the way I would like it.

Hatch. Unless you have more questions to ask Mr. Ingraham just now, you can ask him later. Let's start taking in witnesses.

MRS. ASANO SAIJO ~~17-17-E~~ Wife of Mr. S. Saijo, one of the principals in the case.

Hatch. Anybody would like to ask her questions?

Ing. Mrs. Saijo; can you tell us of any attempts that Mr. Hoshizaki made to stir up an anti-foreman meeting held at the chicken farm last summer?

Saijo Yes, there was.

Ing. Can you tell us some of the things Mr. Hoshizaki said that would tend to turn the workers against him?

Saijo When Mr. Sakaguchi and workers had meeting I went there too. That time Mr. Hoshizaki said to me, "Mr. Saijo had been acting as if he were a dictator, but I am not working under Mr. Saijo, I am working under the WRA and getting 16 dollars a month and if you be persistent and insist more efficiency, I am very much embarrassed." Then there was a lady sitting next to him. Mr. Okasaki agreed with him that