lack of specific instances of racism in their lives, except for Naoko’s school principal, a “Mrs. Duncan”, suggest it was far from “constant.”

Flaws notwithstanding, In Love and War is a useful book and a welcome addition to the study of Japanese Americans. Hopefully, Walters will continue with more studies on the subject.

Brian Masaru Hayashi
Professor, Human & Environmental Studies
Kyoto University
Kyoto, Japan


This transnational history of the Hawaiian fishing industry in the modern age fills a useful niche in several fields, but does not live up to the promise of the introduction to dramatically revise our understanding of any of them. Manako Ogawa has done solid work in archives, secondary literature, and especially oral history interviews, in Japanese and English, and has constructed an efficient and readable history. The book starts with a “pre-history” of Japanese fishing cultures, then moves through the arrival, rise, and ascendency of Japanese immigrants in Hawaiian fishing. World War II interrupts this progress, of course, and the post-war industry is transformed into a multi-ethnic enterprise, with an influx of workers from U.S.-occupied Okinawa taking the place of mainland Japanese or Hawai‘i Japanese apprentices.

For the most part, this is a new version of the familiar narrative of Japanese migrants who took up agriculture in early twentieth century California: adapting Japanese methods to dominate a previously underdeveloped industry; facing discrimination and competition on the basis of national origin; circumventing legal restrictions by transferring title to Nisei even though Nisei frequently preferred other work; massive loss of property and position due to racial displacement in World War II; and a postwar recovery marked by legal victories over prejudice and general economic success. Ogawa doesn’t make that comparison, unfortunately. She focuses on contrasts with the agriculturalists and professionals who moved from Japan to Hawai‘i, whom she characterizes as “static farmers” (p. 5) with a culture of collectivist patriarchy (p. 7). This is odd, as multi-directional and seasonal labor migration was well-established tradition in Japan and a prominent feature of the Hawai‘i Japanese
experience. Plantation work was a stepping stone to physical and educational mobility and immigrants who did remain in agriculture had a similarly hard time convincing their offspring to stay “down on the farm.”

Ogawa situates this research as part of the rising tide of ocean-based histories, and argues that Japanese are fundamentally “maritime people” (p. 2) with the effect that the experience of fishing folk should be considered the central, not peripheral, experience of migration. “[T]he agricentric literature on the Japanese has often overlooked or obscured” seafaring people, she argues. (p. 2, though it’s “agrocentric” on p. 129) This is definitely a contribution to newer maritime studies of Japan, which includes recent works on classical trade, Tokugawa-era travel, and medieval piracy. Looking at Japan’s oceans as an historical field falls into the same category as women’s history fifty years ago; it seems absurd now that there was a time when we didn’t ask this question, but all questions start somewhere. Ogawa doesn’t return to this argument at the end and the lack of a strong, thoughtful conclusion is a serious structural flaw in a monograph with an aggressive historical thesis.

Ogawa admits sometimes that the numbers in fishing are small (p. 65), but suggests that maritime mobility proffers new ways of looking at oceans and travel. She argues effectively that the economic impact of the fishing industry under Japanese immigrant leadership is underappreciated, and that fishing communities were politically and economically independent of other Hawai‘i Japanese. Ogawa also highlights how women were independent economic actors within fishing communities, with substantial oral history interviews. Oral history from working women is a particularly welcome addition to the literature, though Ogawa gives only a passing nod to similar scholarship on Japanese immigrant women in agricultural and mercantile settings. All of these arguments would be more convincing if her depiction of non-fisher folk was more realistic, or the argument more subtly developed. For example, non-fishing Japanese were the most important consumers of fish and the political vanguard of Japanese power in the islands, which shouldn’t be overlooked in evaluating the independence of the fishing industry.

Oral history interviews often go in interesting directions. Ogawa’s sources shared a wealth of information on migration to and from Yamaguchi Prefecture’s distinctive Okikamuro island community, Okinawan Occupation-era social history and migration to Hawai‘i, and a frank and disturbing picture of “the ordeal of Nisei stranded in Japan” which “has been absent from the collective memories of Hawai‘i. The story has been silenced and marginalized by the dominant, masculinist narratives of the warring powers” (p. 106). While their anomalous and liminal situation is fascinating, the lack of attention may be more a result of the fact that there were only about two thousand Nisei in Japan at the time, and sources have been sparse.
Sea of Opportunity could also be considered a new addition to the histori-
cal literatures on industry, business, technology, and food, though the work
of connecting the narrative here to those fields remains to be done. For
example, there are several moments where the industry is revitalized by trans-
planted technology enabled by the political destruction of previous capital
investments or by new immigration flows, or both. Demand fluctuations and
transport technology are largely unexamined, except for the flailing attempts
of U.S. authorities to balance fear and food supplies in World War II.

Ogawa has marshaled some excellent sources to reveal a new angle on
Japanese migration and Hawai‘i history, and the Hawai‘i presentation is well-
done. Sea of Opportunity broadens the discussion and makes some intrigu-
ing gestures towards new connections and themes, but takes too narrow
an approach. Attacking “agr-centric/agro-centric” (pp. 2, 129) history by
ignoring “landlubbers” (p. ix) is not an effective scholarly intervention. Revi-
sionism requires more aggressive, direct argumentation, and more careful
engagement with the intersecting literature.

Jonathan Dresner
Associate Professor of East Asian History
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas
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