

Konpira-*san* as Enemy Asset: The Contestation and Confrontation over the Interpretation of a Shinto Sea Deity and the Kotohira Jinsha v. McGrath Case in 1949

*Manako OGAWA**

INTRODUCTION

Japan is an archipelago blessed with one of the most productive seas in the world, and its people have engaged in fishing for centuries. Because of the migratory nature of fish, Japanese fisherfolk have constantly explored the sea around and outside Japan. On their adventurous yet highly dangerous journeys, they often brought guardian deities of the sea with them. In the Korean Peninsula, where the Japanese built towns to conduct commercial fishing beginning in the fifteenth century, they erected a small Shinto shrine. In 1678, Yoshizane Sō, feudal lord of Tsushima domain in Japan, established Kotohira Shrine at the foot of Mount Yongdu (Jp. Ryūtō) when the domain's institution, Japan House (Wakan), was moved to that spot.¹

As the people of Tsushima looked to Kotohira Shrine (also called Konpira Shrine), popularly known as “Konpira-*san*” for protection of the fishing and maritime trades between Japan and Korea, it was probably the most popular *kami*, or deity, of the sea in western Japan.² The history

*Professor, Ritsumeikan University

of Kotohira Shrine goes back to ancient times. Located at the top of a mountain in the middle of the Sanuki Plain, the shrine had served as a noticeable landmark for vessels sailing off the coast of the Seto Inland Sea. As a beacon that saved many lives, it gradually developed a reputation as a guardian of navigation. Its *ofuda*, or talismanic strip, available at a small fee, traveled with fishing and merchant vessels, and some of these strips became enshrined at Kotohira shrines established by fisherfolks and merchants where they settled. After the medieval era, Konpira-*san* developed into Konpira Daigongen, an amalgamation of Shinto, Buddhism, and Shugendō (a set of beliefs and practices associated with mountains). Following the policy of separating Buddhism from Shinto carried out by the Meiji government, Konpira Daigongen reorganized itself as Kotohiragū, a Shinto shrine, in 1871, enshrining the kami Ōmono-nushi-no-mikoto and Emperor Sutoku (reigned 1124–1140).³ With the dawn of the modern era, Japanese fisherfolk spread throughout the Pacific. Worship of Konpira-*san* accompanied them on journeys and crisscrossed the Pacific to Sakhalin, Korea, former Manchuria (Northeast China), Taiwan, the South Sea Islands (Nan'yō Guntō, former Japanese mandates in the Micronesian region), and even outside of the Japanese empire.⁴ Hawaii Kotohira Shrine in Honolulu was a product of the mobility of the Japanese fisherfolk since the beginning of government-contract immigration (*kan'yaku imin*) between Meiji Japan and the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1885.⁵

Shinto shrines in Hawai'i expanded with the growth of Japanese settler communities. In particular, Hawaii Kotohira Shrine in Honolulu grew to be the largest shrine in the Hawaiian archipelago by the 1930s. Japan's Pearl Harbor attack in 1941 and the subsequent war brought its rituals to a halt. After the war, the US Department of Justice confiscated the property of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine under the Trading with the Enemy Act and attempted to put it up for auction in 1948. Shrine members filed a lawsuit, Kotohira Jinsha [shrine] v. McGrath, and after winning the lawsuit, the shrine property was returned to them in 1951, and it is still there.

The history of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine from its birth to its wartime suppression and postwar court struggles for survival not only shows the significance of Konpira-*san* as a sea deity but also reveals US policy toward Shinto, an essential component of Japanese religious culture. Nevertheless, Shinto, the sea deities in Hawai'i in particular, has received little academic attention with some notable exceptions. Takakazu Maeda compiled a history of Shinto shrines in Hawai'i, including Hawaii Kotohira Shrine, by using local Japanese newspapers and a limited number of primary sources

owned by Shinto shrines.⁶ The sixth chapter of Noriko Shimada's book on the wartime experiences of ethnic Japanese in Hawai'i was on Shinto.⁷ Referring to Maeda's work, Shimada heavily relied on local English and Japanese newspapers, and she concluded that anti-Shinto campaigns spearheaded by local English newspapers influenced the drastic measures of the federal government against Shinto shrines.

Both Maeda and Shimada agree that Shinto shrines in Hawai'i were intrinsically related to the emperor, which made Shinto an ethnic religion acceptable only to ethnic Japanese; the members of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine denied the practice of emperor worship at the trial for strategic reasons.⁸ Such an ahistorical generalization about Shinto ironically meshes with the interpretation of the US Department of Justice that it was a cult of Mikadoism, a spiritual backbone for Japan's ultranationalistic propaganda and responsible for its imperial aggression. In sharp contrast to such oversimplistic interpretations, Helen Hardacre has succinctly stated that Shinto was never "just one thing." Rather, it has been "highly diverse and stratified in every historical era."⁹ Fabio Rambelli has indicated that Shinto contains hybridized aspects of Buddhism, Daoism, Confucianism, and even Western religious cultures.¹⁰ In this article I attempt to add to this variegated interpretation of Shinto.

Japan's empire building beginning in the late nineteenth century coincided with the export of Shinto outside of the Japanese archipelago. Besides functioning as a source of emotional support for Japanese settlers, overseas shrines played a significant role as the vanguard of Japan's colonial control and imperial subject making.¹¹ While Hardacre distinguished some 1,640 overseas shrines with diverse forms from settler's shrines to government-constructed ones, Michio Nakajima classified them into four categories: (1) shrines founded in "overseas colonies" such as in Taiwan, Korea, and the South Sea Islands; (2) shrines erected in "occupied areas" such as in the Republic of China and Southeast Asia; (3) shrines built in Manchuria; and (4) shrines erected in Hawai'i or in North or South America where Japan did not have any administrative power.¹² Nobutaka Inoue categorized settlers' shrines in Hawai'i into those dedicated to folk religious deities and those housing ancestral or tutelary deities of home villages; Kotohira Shrine belonged to the former group.¹³

In line with the interpretation of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine as a settlers' shrine with folk religious aspects, the unique characteristics of Kotohira Shrine as a highly mobile sea deity cannot be underestimated. As Rambelli pointed out, an important feature of sea religion was "its fluid,

decentralized nature, as related to shape-shifting deities, moving from one place to another, and to shifting networks of people connected by changing sea routes and trade interests.”¹⁴ Examining whether Hawaii Kotohira Shrine shared such features, given that it was a sea deity, is one of the most important purposes of this article. In addition, I examine how the US comprehended the complex dimensions of Shinto and shaped (mis-)perceptions of Kotohira Shrine, which escalated to the drastic action of its confiscation after the end of the war in 1948.

In order to detail the contestation and confrontation over the interpretation of the sea deity between the worshippers of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine and the US government, I used archival records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the US Department of Justice, and the General Headquarters Supreme Commander for Allied Powers (GHQ/SCAP) of the US National Archives and Record Administration, College Park, as well as the records of the US District Court for the District of Hawai‘i at the Hawaiian and Pacific Collections, University of Hawai‘i Hamilton Library.

THE EARLY DAYS of HAWAII KOTOHIRA SHRINE

The history of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine began with the growing numbers of Japanese fisherfolk. Inspired by the expanding Japanese population after the beginning of government-contract immigration in 1885, Japanese fisherfolk, those from Wakayama, Yamaguchi, and Hiroshima Prefectures in particular, headed to Hawaiian waters to feed Japanese settlers, who chose fish as a primary protein source.¹⁵ The expansion of the Japanese fishing fleets accompanied the formation of Japanese fishing communities and the establishment of Shinto shrines to protect them from dangers at sea.

The oldest recorded Shinto sea deities in Hawai‘i were at Kotohira Shrine, established in Wailuku, a coastal town on the island of Maui, in 1901.¹⁶ In Honolulu, the Fishermen’s Association, an organization of Japanese fishing boat owners in Kaka‘ako set up a Shinto household altar (*kamidana*) at its office and added a deified *ofuda* talismanic strip from Kotohiragū. In 1921, the altar developed into Kaka‘ako Kotohira Shrine. Another Kotohira shrine (hereafter, Hawaii Kotohira Shrine) was founded at the corner of Walter Lane and North King Street around 1920 by Itsuki Hirota, a Shinto priest from Hiroshima Prefecture, and his friends. In 1928, Misao Isobe, head priest (*gūji*) of Shirasaki Hachimangū in Iwakuni City, Yamaguchi Prefecture, came to Hawai‘i to assume the head priestship of

Hawaii Kotohira Shrine.¹⁷ Later, his brother, Naohisa Isobe, joined him and served as the head priest of Kaka'ako Kotohira Shrine.

In the 1930s, Hawaii Kotohira Shrine accepted a spirit of the deity of the main shrine (*gobunrei*) from Shirasaki Hachimangū in Iwakuni City brought by “Mr. and Mrs. Takichi Kunikiyo” of Hawai'i, who had visited the shrine. The divided spirit of Otaki Shrine in Otake Town, Hiroshima Prefecture, also moved across the Pacific with “Mr. Ryuichi Ipponsugi,” who temporarily returned to Otake Town, his birthplace, from Hawai'i. The divided spirits of Shirasaki Hachimangū and Otaki Shrine were installed and enshrined at Hawaii Kotohira Shrine.¹⁸

In 1931, Hawaii Kotohira Shrine purchased a 578,320-square-foot parcel of land at Kama Lane in Honolulu from the Bishop Trust by using individual donations, and the shrine moved to the new location the following year. By 1941, it had grown into the largest Shinto shrine in Hawai'i, with a *torii* gate, a *temizusha* absolution water basin, a pair of *koma-inu* lions and *tōrō* lanterns, a community center, a martial arts center, a *kyudo* archery range, an outdoor theater, a kendo training facility, and a sumo ring.¹⁹ Its annual festival in 1941 attracted approximately 12,000 families.²⁰

The island of O'ahu had other sea deities. Ebisu, a *kami* of prosperity



Hawaii Kotohira Shrine annual festival, pre-Pearl Harbor
Photograph courtesy of Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha–Hawaii Dazaifu Tenmangu

and traffic safety, was enshrined in Hale'iwa, 'Aiea, and Kaka'ako to ensure a rich haul and safe navigation.²¹ Suitengū and Watatsumi Shrine in Honolulu were also revered as enshrining guardians of the sea.²² In Maui, at Ma'alaea, Ebisu Kotohira Shrine was built in 1914 by Japanese fisherfolk, boat builders, and villagers, according to a story passed down by word of mouth among local residents.²³ In Kaua'i, Kapa'a had Itsukushima Shrine, although detailed records of its origin remain unavailable.

These Shinto deities of the sea reflected the prosperity of the Japanese fishing industry in Hawai'i. Unlike at sugarcane plantations, where Japanese workers were in a position of economic dependency, the Japanese at sea held a firm grip on the fishing industry, which had expanded into the third-largest sector of the islands' economy behind the sugarcane and pineapple businesses.²⁴ The territorial government of Hawai'i and local business leaders protected the Japanese at sea in order to stimulate fishing and increase the local food self-sufficiency rate, which had dropped to approximately 30 percent in the 1930s.²⁵

THE FBI INVESTIGATION and RISING SUSPICIONS of SHINTO

During the 1930s, the number of Japanese settlers and their descendants in Hawai'i grew to 139,621, approximately 38 percent of the total island population of 368,336.²⁶ In addition to the numerical predominance of the Japanese population, the demand for labor for plantation fields, the benevolent paternalism of plantation management, and the Japanese contribution to the fishing industry nullified the Japanese exclusion drive from the land and sea of Hawai'i.

Deteriorating US-Japan relations beginning in the late 1930s, however, produced suspicions of the Japanese population in Hawai'i and on the West Coast of the United States. The federal government in Washington, DC, and the FBI, in particular, paid special attention to Shinto shrines as the spiritual backbone of Japanese militarism. In 1939, "confidential informant N" provided information about the history of Shinto to the FBI.²⁷ N was a self-proclaimed "logical white man to act as a go-between for the Japanese and Americans." Most of his informants were not experts on Japanese culture, including Seishiro Okazaki, Japanese marshal art master popularly known as "Professor Henry S. Okazaki"; a former University of Hawai'i student who studied with an exchange professor from Kyoto; a participant in a sukiyaki dinner held by an undersecretary of the Japanese consulate; and an informant who eavesdropped on conversations of elderly Japanese who frequently met

at Shinto shrines to “discuss matters that were certainly un-American” and “plots against the future welfare of the United States.”²⁸ By heavily relying on these biased informants, N concluded that the fundamental principle of Shinto was “to conquer the entire world in order to impose Japanese culture in accordance with the divine [the emperor’s] will.”²⁹

After the outbreak of war in December 1941, the FBI intensified its scrutiny of Shinto shrines on US soil.³⁰ Agent Edmund D. Mason in Los Angeles gave a much more detailed description of Shinto than N had. His report made in May 1942 frequently referred to works written by the leading Japanologists of the day, such as William George Aston, British diplomat and scholar of Japanese and Korean languages; George Foot Moore, Harvard professor of religion; D. C. Holtom, an ethnologist teaching at various universities in Japan; and Genchi Kato, professor of religion at Kokugakuin University in Tokyo.

These professional names added an authentic tinge to Mason’s report, although his description of Shinto remained overly simplistic. According to Mason, in 1882, the Japanese government divided Shinto organizations into two categories, state Shinto and sect Shinto, but the “Kami of Sect Shinto and those of State Shinto are for the most part one and the same.”³¹ State Shinto was not a religion but “merely a National patriotic fever” teaching that “Japan is God’s nation and the origin of other countries,” while sect Shinto could “pay homage to the Emperor” and be “loyal in times of crisis to any Government but [the government of] Japan.”³²

While Mason did not refer to Shinto shrines in the United States, John Sterling Adams, another FBI agent dispatched to Hawai‘i, prepared more detailed and exhaustive studies on Shinto and Shinto shrines in Hawai‘i. In his report in September 1942, Adams asserted that Shintoism was “not a true religion but a Japanese nationalist and propaganda cult” that existed to assist “Japanese military and economic domination.”³³ Much of his information derived from a series of articles published in 1943 in the *Honolulu Star Bulletin*. The author of these articles, Shunzo Sakamaki, assistant professor of history at the University of Hawai‘i, asserted that state Shinto was nationalistic in its nature and that its expansion overseas accompanied the exportation of Japanese political and racial ideologies.³⁴

Adams’s report began with a brief history of Shinto by referring to *Kojiki* (712) and *Nihon-shoki* (720), the mythological cosmogony beginning with the separation of heaven from earth along a vertical axis, and continuing to its evolution into a “tool of statecraft” of modern Japan.³⁵ While emphasizing the self-sacrificing loyalty of adherents of the divine imperial

line and the preeminence of Japan as the core principle of Shintoism, he argued that state Shinto shrines were “state institutions,” financed and supervised by the government, and “ever [*sic*] Japanese is born a Shinto.”³⁶ He roughly divided thirty-nine Shinto shrines in Hawai‘i into state Shinto and sectarian Shinto; the former group included Kotohira shrines while the latter included the shrines of Izumo Taisha and Tenrikyo.³⁷

Adams’s report included personal information about Misao Isobe, the forty-eight-year-old head priest of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine, who was sent from the “headquarters of this shrine located in the Kagawa Prefecture.” As Adams mentioned, Isobe was interned with his brother Naofumi immediately after the outbreak of the war.³⁸ Prior to the Pacific War, Army Intelligence (G-2), the FBI, and the Honolulu Police Department had already prepared lists of individuals considered “potentially dangerous” to the United States. Buddhist and Shinto priests, Japanese language school officials, members of various organizations and societies, Japanese businessmen, and *kibei* (US born but educated in Japan), were listed. Soon after Japan’s Pearl Harbor attack, those on the list, including Misao Isobe, were apprehended at the Honolulu Immigration Station together with approximately three hundred ethnic Japanese.³⁹ Thereafter, Isobe was transferred to Sand Island Detention Camp in Honolulu, Camp McCoy in Wisconsin, Camp Forrest in Tennessee, and finally Camp Livingston in Louisiana. In November 1943, he was sent back to Japan by an exchange ship.⁴⁰

Two-and-half months after submitting the first report, Adams sent an additional report from Honolulu to Washington, DC. By relying on information from Shunzo Sakamaki again, he reiterated the assumption that the core principle of Shinto was “Mikadoism,” or emperor worship.⁴¹ Although he mentioned that the deity of Kotohira shrines sought to protect “sailors and fishermen” from “the dangers of the sea,” he restated that Shinto in general had “military and aggressive aspects” and was “deeply rooted in the soul of national spirit and patriotism.”⁴²

SECT SHINTO and STATE SHINTO

These FBI reports lumped together all Shinto shrines in Hawai‘i as cult institutions promoting Mikadoism and Japan’s militarism, and they treated all the Japanese as Shintoists while obscuring followers of other faiths, such as Christianity or Buddhism. Their rough definitions of state Shinto and sect(arian) Shinto also need further examination. When the Meiji

government mandated separation of Shinto from Buddhism, it designated thirteen religious groups as Shinto sects (*kyōha Shinto*). The Shinto sects had developed teachings that had not necessarily included Shinto-influenced religious tradition.⁴³ Some founders of these sects, in particular, Tenrikyo and Konkokyo, had resisted the transformation of their creeds into a form of Shinto even though their resistance brought severe suppression.⁴⁴

At the same time, the Meiji government invented state (*kokka*) Shinto by reorganizing various types of Shinto shrines (*jinja*), placing them under its administration. Along with the imperial family's supposed genealogical ties to Amaterasu, the sun goddess, the government placed Ise Shrine at the apex of a shrine hierarchy and divided other shrines into three types: official shrines (*kansha*), prefectural shrines (*fukensha*), district shrines (*gōsha*), village shrines (*sonsha*), and unranked shrines (*mukakusha*). The official shrines were divided into imperial (*kanpeisha*), national (*kokuheisha*), and special shrines (*bekkaku-kanpeisha*); the imperial and national shrines were further subdivided into three grades: major, middle, and minor.⁴⁵ Complying with a series of government policies on religion, Kotohiragū was classified as a national (*kokuhe*), minor shrine (*shōsha*) in 1871. It was elevated to the rank of middle grade shrine (*chūsha*) in 1885.⁴⁶

Because the government ostensibly rejected the idea of state religion and yet treated state Shinto as national religious service (*kokka no saishi*), the definition of state Shinto has remained controversial among Shinto scholars.⁴⁷ In his influential book, *Kokka Shinto*, Shigeyoshi Murakami treated state Shinto as a state-sponsored creed to inculcate an attitude of unquestioning obedience to the state and mobilize Japanese nationals for empire building.⁴⁸ Hardacre used "state management" as a synonym for state Shinto and explored how it had expanded "intellectual, political, and social influence, its permeation of the educational system, and the imbrication of shrine management with local government and business."⁴⁹

The formation of state Shinto accompanied the promotion of the emperor's divinity as a descendent of Amaterasu by integrating rituals of the imperial family, and its process accompanied the construction of the modern emperor system (*kokutai*).⁵⁰ With the expansion of the Japanese empire and the rise of militarism after the 1930s, state Shinto gained formidable influence over various aspects of Japanese life. But the relationship between Shinto and the Japanese was never simplistic, as Susumu Shimazono has argued, because many Japanese embraced a "dual structure of religious landscapes," with state Shinto and a variety of other faiths. State Shinto represented by ceremonies conducted at schools and

other public spaces could not eliminate other religions and creeds embraced by people in the private sector, such as in traditional communities, in homes, or individuals.⁵¹

Such layered complexities of religious landscapes in Japan were not incorporated in the FBI reports, and the distinction between Shinto shrines in Japan and those in Hawai‘i remained obscure. Nevertheless, the information amassed by the FBI agents reached high officials in the US Department of Justice and was uncritically accepted and integrated into federal policy toward Shinto shrines in Hawai‘i.⁵² The Internal Security Section of the Department of Justice listed “Shinto temples” as subversive organizations in accordance with Executive Order 9300 issued in February 1943.⁵³ In early 1943, the Internal Security Section attempted to prosecute “Shinto priests and priestess for subversive activities, especially in the Territory of Hawaii,” but they could not “establish a clear violation of our national laws.”⁵⁴ With the suspicion that Shinto “teachings were calculated to create a loyalty of the Japanese people to their emperor” and that “these teachings produced a seditious result,” the US Department of the Treasury dissolved Hawai‘i Izumo Taisha in Honolulu and Hawai‘i Daijingu in Hilo, while many other shrines voluntarily disbanded themselves.⁵⁵

THE CONFISCATION OF HAWAII KOTOHIRA SHRINE as an ENEMY ASSET

During the war, the Japanese and their descendants were prohibited from fishing operations in Hawaiian waters, and their fishing boats were confiscated by the US Navy. Without the operation of the fishing fleets, the Japanese fishing industry in Hawai‘i was on the verge of extinction.⁵⁶ Kotohira Shrine at Kaka‘ako disappeared with the decline of its adjoining fishing community, while Hawaii Kotohira Shrine stopped its religious services and kept functioning as a gathering space for its members and neighbors to engage in volunteer activities. Without its head priest, the shrine officers decided to temporarily close it on April 6, 1946.⁵⁷

After the end of hostilities in August 1945, Japan, except for Okinawa, Amami, and Ogasawara, was placed under the occupation of the GHQ/SCAP. In December 1945, the GHQ issued the “Abolition of Governmental Sponsorship, Support, Perpetuation, Control and Dissemination of State Shinto (Kokka Shinto, Jinja Shinto)” directive, or simply the Shinto Directive. The directive required abolition of governmental sponsorship of shrines; forbade all perpetuation of militaristic ideology in Shinto doctrines, practices, rites, and ceremonies; and stopped dissemination of

Shinto doctrines in schools. No shrine was to be closed, however, if it was divorced from its affiliation with the government and divested of militaristic and ultranationalistic elements. The Japanese government swiftly complied with the directive sufficiently to satisfy the GHQ/SCAP.⁵⁸ In his New Year's rescript of 1946, Emperor Hirohito denied his divinity, which had been the central tenet of state Shinto.⁵⁹

The Shinto Directive convinced the US Department of Justice that "State Shintoism was abolished by General MacArthur."⁶⁰ In 1947, the US attorney general Tom C. Clark designated "Shinto Temples" as totalitarian organizations under US Executive Order 9835, generally known as the Loyalty Order, to conduct loyalty checks on federal employees to root out members of totalitarian, fascist, Communist, or subversive organizations.⁶¹ Complying with the interpretation of Shinto shrines as totalitarian organizations, the *Honolulu Advertiser* started an anti-Shinto campaign. It published articles in which US war veterans and Christian ministers accused Shinto shrines of being dangerous institutions under the control of Japan.⁶² On June 1, 1948, federal officers raided Hawaii Kotohira Shrine under the authority of the Trading with the Enemy Act (although the war was over) and seized the shrine, asserting that the shrine was an agent "for the spread of Japanese nationalism, and that for this reason the property should be subject to permanent confiscation."⁶³ In March 1949, the shrine was put up for sale. On March 31, shrine members filed a suit against Attorney General Clark, the Territory of Hawai'i, and the Federal Office of Alien Property for misusing section 9 of the Trading with the Enemy Act against a civilian organization.⁶⁴ On August 24, President Harry Truman appointed Sen. J. Howard McGrath as the US attorney general. Hereafter, this case became known as *Kotohira Jinsha v. McGrath*.⁶⁵ The first trial in the US District Court in Hawai'i was scheduled for June 15, 1949, but it was extended a couple of times.⁶⁶ The rapid postwar revival of the fishing industry and the prosperity of Japanese fishing communities enabled the shrine members to finance the costly court struggles that lasted for years.⁶⁷

THE JOINT INVESTIGATION IN JAPAN

Faced with a lawsuit, the US Department of Justice turned to the GHQ/SCAP for help. With the permission of the court, the department dispatched Leon R. Gross, attorney and manager of the Hawai'i Office of the Office of Alien Property for the US Department of Justice, to Tokyo to undertake a joint investigation with GHQ officers.⁶⁸ At the preliminary conference,

Gross and the GHQ officers shared information that Hawaii Kotohira Shrine had enshrined a guardian deity of fishermen, but the shrine was “actually controlled by agencies in Japan or acting directly or indirectly for the benefit of Japanese interests.”⁶⁹ They recognized that Kotohiragū in Kagawa Prefecture had a period of *ryobu*, or dual aspects of Shinto and Buddhism, and that Shinto gained ascendancy over Buddhism after the Meiji Restoration in 1868. Despite such fundamental changes, they did not see substantial change in the cult of the shrine, because it accepted imperial envoys giving money, gifts, and making repairs, as well as accepting small grants from the government as a national shrine of medium grade.⁷⁰ Although Kotohira shrine in Hawai‘i was a private institution outside of Japan’s jurisdiction, they assumed that Kotohiragū “aided and abetted” its branch shrine in Hawai‘i to “further the nationalistic aspects of Shinto” and “the interests of Japan in the Territory of Hawaii.”⁷¹

The joint investigation of Leon R. Gross and the GHQ officers, however, betrayed their expectations to confirm such assumptions. When Gross, Frank T. Motofuji of the GHQ Civil Information and Education Section, and six staff members of GHQ Kobe and the Shikoku Region visited Kotohiragū in Kagawa Prefecture, they met Mitsushige Kotooka, the head priest. Kotooka denied institutional connections between his shrine and Hawai‘i. He stated that Kotohiragū had only five branch shrines: in Kobe, Shimane, Osaka, Aichi, and Tokyo; other shrines in Japan and abroad were “established without the sanction of the head shrine.”⁷² Kotohiragū sent proxy prayers, charms, and amulets to Honolulu on request “in a manner no different from any other similar request.”⁷³ Kotooka impressed on the investigation team that he had “no prior knowledge of the litigation in Honolulu and that the existence of Kotohira shrines in Honolulu was a matter of very little importance.”⁷⁴ In addition, his words did not indicate that Hawaii Kotohira Shrine was “a direct instrumentality used to further the interests of Japan in the Territory of Hawaii.”⁷⁵

Tamotsu Kaneseiki, veteran *negi* (priest) of Kotohiragū, gave more detailed and objective information regarding the shrine’s history, relationship with the government, and overseas shrines. First, he summarized the evolution of Konpira as the patron deity that protected seafarers since ancient times, emphasizing that the number of its yearly worshippers was second only to that of Ise Shrine. After the outbreak of the Pacific War, Kotohiragū conducted an emergency ceremony to notify the *kami* of the declaration of war at the instruction of the Kagawa Prefecture School Affairs Department chief. Thereafter, the priests added a “prayer for

the exaltation of Imperial power and eternal success in Japan's arms" at the end of the *norito*, or the address to the *kami*, during major ceremonies. He also detailed the amount of governmental grants in the forms of monetary offerings to *kami* (*kyōshinkin*) and expenses for *kami* offerings and symbols (*shinsen-heihakuryo*) from 1941 to 1945.⁷⁶ He added that "the militarists used the shrine as an instrument to give reality to their idea of 'all the nations of the world under one rule (*hakko ichiu*),'"⁷⁷ although it did not mean that "we were subjected to the influence of the military clique."⁷⁷

Kaneseki explained that Kotohiragū served as "spiritual food for the inhabitants" of distant places, including Hawai'i. Although Kotohiragū did not dispatch its priests to Hawai'i, Japanese residents there looked to it as the object of their faith and asked for small talismans to pray for their own health and safety even after the war. He concluded his interview by highlighting the distance of Kotohiragū from the Japanese government and emperor; the government repeatedly rejected its promotion to a national major shrine due to a "lack of relationship with the Imperial Household and its lack of relationship from the national aspect."⁷⁸

Yaichi Kurokawa, who retired as *negi* of Kotohiragū after forty years of service, stated that Hawaii Kotohira Shrine was established without the involvement of Kotohiragū. Kurokawa became acquainted with Misao Isobe when Isobe visited Kotohiragū, and he asked Kurokawa to write a recommendation letter to attend Kōten Kōkyūjo, a training institution for Shinto priests. Thereafter, Kurokawa had not heard from Isobe during his tenure as head priest of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine.⁷⁹

Kotooka and Kaneseki asserted that Kotohiragū had a certain distance from the Japanese government and the imperial household, as indicated by its middle shrine status, despite its fame and popularity. F. T. Motofuji of the GHQ recorded that Kotooka "ruefully admitted that it had been wishful thinking on his part that a shrine dedicated to the patron deity of fishermen and seafarers could have been so honored."⁸⁰ Moreover, Kotooka, Kaneseki, and Kurokawa unanimously denied an institutional relationship between Kagawa and Hawai'i and insisted on the spontaneity and autonomy of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine. Kaneseki guessed that there were probably a total of "ten thousands" of Kotohira shrines within and outside of Japan, including in Hawai'i but that they were "established upon their own option" after receiving a talisman from Kotohiragū.⁸¹ The investigation team collected the leaflets and archival records regarding the branch shrines of Kotohiragū, and these documents confirmed their testimony.

In Iwakuni City, Yamaguchi Prefecture, Leon R. Gross and the GHQ

officers conducted a more exhaustive interrogation of Misao Isobe by telephone and in person; at that time, he resided in Toyoura County, his birthplace in Yamaguchi Prefecture. They asked Isobe about his personal history and the membership, festivals, and rituals observed at Hawaii Kotohira Shrine, and about his relationship with the Japanese consulate in Honolulu, the Japanese military force, and Kotohiragū in Kagawa Prefecture. They carefully examined whether he engaged in the propagation of emperor worship and the militarism of Japan during his tenure in Honolulu.

Isobe reconfirmed the absence of institutional ties between Kagawa and Hawai'i and the autonomy of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine. He received no guidance or instruction from Kagawa, except private correspondence with a priest at Kotohiragū. As for emperor worship and militarism, Isobe asserted that "the militarists utilized the shrines as an instrument to inculcate the idea of loyalty to Emperor, love of nation and the total unity of church and state to the Japanese subjects," but he propagated teachings for "the prosperity, betterment, welfare and happiness of the congregation and worshippers in general," not emperor worship. Moreover, he denied instructions from Japan or the Japanese consulate in Honolulu relative to his teachings and ceremonies and asserted that his travel expenses to Hawai'i and salary came from the shrine members and worshippers, not from the Japanese government.⁸² The shrine premises served as welcome reception grounds for the Japanese naval-training squadron, and the shrine members collected donations of comfort bags (*imon bukuro*) and comfort money (*imonkin*) for Japan prior to the war. Isobe denied any further contributions to the Japanese military.⁸³ He concluded the interrogation with the remark that "the former Emperor *Sutoku* is deified at the Kotohira Shrine in Kagawa Prefecture but is not enshrined at the Kotohira Shrine in Hawaii."⁸⁴

The joint investigation team additionally visited Toshio Imaji, head priest of Shirasaki Hachimangū in Iwakuni City, and Yoshihiko Tokoro, head priest of Otaki Shrine in Otake Town.⁸⁵ In addition, they met with Masaatsu Nogami, ritual section chief at Ise Shrine, and Japanese government officials of the Religious Affairs Section of the Ministry of Education. The team visited Genchi Kato, a prominent Shinto scholar, whom FBI agents often referred to in their reports.⁸⁶ All of them agreed that the Japanese government did not administer Shinto shrines outside its jurisdiction.⁸⁷ As for the dissemination of ultranationalistic propaganda, presumably conducted by Kotohiragū, Genchi Kato stated that Hachiman, a tutelary deity of warriors, could be nationalistic but "the Kotohira deity

was the patron god of fishermen and of seafarers,” tacitly denying its ultranationalistic elements.⁸⁸

THE TRIAL

After coming back from the field trip empty handed, Leon R. Gross wrote to Howard K. Hoddick, US assistant attorney general, to “use Shunzo Sakamaki as [an] expert witness” because the “connection between Japanese and Hawaii shrines was ideological because of [the] inherent nature of Shinto practiced at Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha.”⁸⁹ Without evidence of governmental control and the ostensible promotion of emperor worship at the shrine, an “ideological” connection between Japan and Hawai‘i seemed the last resort to justify themselves at the trial.

In court, the defense represented by Hoddick, Gross, and Ray J. O’Brien, US attorney for the Territory of Hawai‘i, submitted exhibits including Shunzo Sakamaki’s newspaper articles in 1943, a memorandum prepared for “certain Intelligence Agencies” of the US government, and a typewritten copy of the Shinto Directive by the GHQ/SCAP; the records and documents of investigations that Gross obtained in Japan were excluded from the list.⁹⁰ Shunzo Sakamaki took the witness stand for the defense and repeated his own view of Shinto shrines in Hawai‘i and state Shinto in Japan.⁹¹ In the meantime, Kotohira Jinsha (Shrine), the plaintiff, represented by attorneys of Robertson, Castle & Anthony, submitted exhibits including a certified copy of its charter in which the purposes of Hawai‘i Kotohira Shrine were defined as “purely those of religion, charity and education.”⁹² The plaintiff also contended that it was “primarily [a] tutelary shrine of fishermen” and that it never advocated “Emperor worship” or “called for its members to commit acts of sabotage or espionage or otherwise against the United States.”⁹³ They testified that there were no official connection between Japanese and Hawaiian shrines and that the Shinto Directive did not affect Hawaiian shrines.⁹⁴

On May 18, 1950, Judge J. Frank McLaughlin of the US District Court in Hawai‘i handed down a decision in favor of the plaintiff. The essential part of his judgment was not regarding emperor worship, even though the plaintiff’s witnesses “respected the Japanese Emperor as a descendant of a god rather than as a god in living human form.”⁹⁵ Instead, he stressed the importance of the Constitution’s First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of religion. No matter “how primitive, absurd or strange such beliefs might seem to others,” it did not allow for the US government to take away the

shrine's property, he stated.⁹⁶

As for "the control, financial, doctrinal, or otherwise of any state Shinto shrine in Japan or of the Japanese government," the evidence submitted by the defense was not convincing enough to discredit the plaintiff.⁹⁷ The Shinto Directive of the GHQ on December 15, 1945, functioned as counterevidence for the defendants. Even if the shrine was controlled by Japan, the directive in December 1945 technically ended "the control of this shrine by Japan." "As of June 1, 1948, the date of the Vesting Order, there was no enemy taint."⁹⁸ In the opinion attached to the court decision, McLaughlin denied that "this little insignificant shrine in Hawaii, with not more than 500 members, should be deemed to be an economic, military, or even ideological threat to the United States," and he went as far as to state that "all the Shinto shrines in the United States (not many) put together would not threaten the United States."⁹⁹ Therefore, the alleged danger of the shrine had "no other basis than emotion and fear."¹⁰⁰

Because the US Department of Justice did not appeal to a higher court, Hawaii Kotohira Shrine won the case. In March 1951, it regained all the confiscated properties.¹⁰¹ In 1952, Misao Isobe came back to Honolulu and resumed the shrine priesthood. Inspired by the victory of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine, Hawai'i Izumo Taisha and Hawai'i Daijingū followed its path and regained their own properties.

CONCLUSION

In this article I have presented a description and explanation of how the worship of Konpira, a highly mobile and autonomous sea deity in Japan, crossed the Pacific and came to Hawai'i and how the US government interpreted and dealt with the beliefs and practices associated with its worship from the 1930s to 1951. Without noticing the distinguishing traits of Hawaii Kotohira Shrine, the US Department of Justice interpreted it exclusively in the context of state Shinto, which they defined as an immobile and monolithic ideological apparatus manufactured by the Japanese government to justify its imperial aggression. After the war, the US Department of Justice attempted to confiscate Hawaii Kotohira Shrine as an enemy asset, asserting that the believers had propagated "Mikadoism" and conducted subversive activities under the direction of the Japanese government and Kotohiragū in Japan. Behind the confiscation of what Judge McLaughlin called "this little insignificant shrine in Hawaii" were exaggerated "emotion and fear," fueled by the biased conclusions of FBI

agents and a stretched interpretation of the Shinto Directive by the GHQ/SCAP.¹⁰² The joint investigations conducted by the US Department of Justice and the GHQ confirmed the ideological distance of the Kotohira deity from the emperor and the decentralized nature of its worship; all the key witnesses in Japan and Hawai'i unanimously stated that Kotohira shrines were established at the will of fisherfolk and seafarers seeking their own "prosperity, betterment, welfare and happiness," as Misao Isobe asserted.¹⁰³ Hawaii Kotohira Shrine was far beyond the control of its "head shrine" in Japan or of Japanese government authorities. Without rational evidence other than Shunzo Sakamaki's biased statements against Shinto in general, the Department of Justice lost the case.

After the trial, *Konpira-san* in Hawai'i added variegated stories to its history. In 1952, the divided spirit of Dazaifu Tenmangū arrived from Fukuoka Prefecture at the request of the local prefectural society, Fukuoka Kenjinkai, and the shrine renamed itself Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha—Hawaii Dazaifu Tenmangu. A little while later, the shrine absorbed Palama Inari Shrine, Watatsumi Shrine, and Suitengū in Honolulu. Although it lost two-thirds of its lands due to the construction of Lunalilo Freeway (H-1), it has survived the postwar upheaval of society, such as the dissolution of Japanese fishing communities and the drastic demographic changes in Honolulu.¹⁰⁴ Nowadays, it attracts more than ten thousand visitors on New Year's Day alone, and many of them are not ethnic Japanese. Irene Isa Takizawa, wife of the head shrine priest Masahiko Takizawa, considers that Kotohira Shrine, by enclosing a deity of the sea, is universally appealing to a wide variety of people beyond Japanese ethnic enclaves and for this reason *Konpira-san* has survived well into the twenty-first century.¹⁰⁵

NOTES

This article was supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) number 21K00930.

In this article I use "Hawai'i" to describe the populated islands of the Hawaiian Archipelago. The Hawaiian Kingdom, established in 1810, was overthrown by a pro-US faction in 1893 and replaced by a republic in the same year. In 1898, the US annexed the Republic of Hawai'i and made it a territory. In this article I use "Japanese" to describe Japanese settlers/immigrants in Hawai'i and their descendants. Because this research includes

both Japanese nationals and Japanese Americans, their names are written with the personal name first, followed by the surname, in order to avoid confusion.

¹ Michio Nakajima, “Shinto Deities That Crossed the Sea: Japan’s ‘Overseas Shrines,’ 1868 to 1945,” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 37, no. 1 (2010): 31; Manako Ogawa, *Sea of Opportunity: The Japanese Pioneers of the Fishing Industry in Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2015), 18.

² Kotohira is sometimes called Konpira. The difference between the two derives from different kanji expressions for the same shrine. In addition to Kotohira or Konpira, there are a number of other sea deities in Japan, such as Watatsumi, Sumiyoshi, Munakata, Benzaiten, and Ebisu. Hachiman, Izumo, Kashima, Kumano, and Ise are also deeply related to the sea. Fabio Rambelli, “General Introduction: The Sea in the History of Japanese Religions,” in *The Sea and the Sacred in Japan: Aspects of Maritime Religion*, ed. Fabio Rambelli (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), xiv, xviii.

³ In‘nan Toshihide, “Sumiyoshi shinkō kara Konpira shinkō-e [From the worship of Sumiyoshi to Kotohira],” in *Setouchi no kaijin bunka* [The culture of sea people in Seto Inland Sea], ed. Taryō Ōbayashi (Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1991), 195–98. Ōmono-nushi-nomikoto was believed to have promoted agriculture, seafaring, fisheries, medicine, and various other productive industries. Emperor Sutoku was exiled to Sanuki (Kagawa) after the Hogen Insurrection (1156). He deeply worshiped Konpira. Kotohiragū, “Yuisho,” accessed, August 5, 2021, http://www.konpira.or.jp/articles/20200814_history/article.htm.

⁴ Hokkaido Jinchachō, ed., *Karafuto no Jinja* [Shinto shrines in Sakhalin] (Tokyo: Jinjashinpōsha, 2012), 405; Peter M. Nakahara, “Report,” undated, National Archives and Record Administration, College Park (NARA), record group (RG) 331, box (B) 5774.

⁵ The English name of the subject shrine was “Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha,” not “Jinja,” for phonetic reasons. I primarily address it as Hawaii Kotohira Shrine, but Jinsha or Jinja are sometimes used, following the description of primary sources. Both *jinsha* and *jinja* mean “shrine.”

⁶ Maeda Takakazu, *Hawai no jinjashi* [History of Shinto shrines in Hawai‘i] (Tokyo: Ōzorasha, 1999).

⁷ Shimada Noriko, *Sensō to imin no shakaishi: Hawai Nikkei Americajin no Taiheiyōsensō* [The social history of the war and immigrants: The Pacific War of Japanese Americans in Hawai‘i] (Tokyo: Gendaishiryō shuppan, 2004).

⁸ Ibid., 189–91; Maeda, *Hawai no jinjashi*, 216.

⁹ Helen Hardacre, *Shinto: A History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 2.

¹⁰ Fabio Bambelli, “Bloomsbury Shinto Studies,” accessed March 9, 2021, <https://www.bloomsbury.com/uk/series/bloomsbury-shinto-studies/>.

¹¹ Nakajima, “Shinto Deities That Crossed the Sea,” 40.

¹² Ibid., 431; Nakajima, “Shinto Deities That Crossed the Sea,” 22–23.

¹³ Nobutaka Inoue, *Umi wo watatta Nihon shūkyō: Imin shakai no uchi to soto* [Japanese religion across the seas: Within and outside of immigrant society] (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 1985), 54–55.

¹⁴ Rambelli, “General Introduction,” xiii–xiv.

¹⁵ For the development of Japanese fishing, see Ogawa, *Sea of Opportunity*, 33–59.

¹⁶ *Maui Shinbun*, February 25, 1941, 2.

¹⁷ F. T. Motofuji, “Interview with Mr. Isobe,” April 8, 1950.

¹⁸ Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha–Hawaii Dazaifu Tenmangu, “History of the Shrine,” accessed, August 5, 2021, <http://www.e-shrine.org/history.html>. F. T. Motofuji, “Interview with

Mr. Isobe,” April 8, 1950; Frances T. Motofuji, “Report of Field Trip to Yamaguchi and Hiroshima Prefectures,” April 19, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid. Three distinct supporters’ groups formed around the shrine. The Kotohira Jinja Believers’ Association comprised about five hundred regular members who paid monthly dues and about two thousand occasional members who paid dues once a year. Otaki Shrine had its supporters’ association with approximately forty members, and Shirasaki Hachimangū had approximately two hundred supporters. They paid twenty-five cents a month. F. T. Motofuji, “Interview with Mr. Isobe,” April 8, 1950.

²¹ Ogawa, *Sea of Opportunity*, 84.

²² J. Sterling Adams, FBI, “Shinto Sects in the Territory of Hawaii,” September 15, 1942, NARA, RG60, entry (E)146-10, B5, 20.

²³ “Mā‘alaea Fishing Shrine: An Evolving Tradition,” accessed August 7, 2021, <https://www.thehawaiiherald.com/2015/10/20/maalaea-fishing-shrine-an-evolving-tradition/>.

²⁴ Ogawa, *Sea of Opportunity*, 6.

²⁵ Casey Hayes, “Food Administration in Hawaii during Wartime,” (master’s thesis, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, 1942), 11, 15.

²⁶ Ryūkichi Kihara, *Hawai Nihonjin-shi* [The history of Japanese in Hawai‘i] (Tokyo: Benseisha, 1935), 41.

²⁷ FBI, “Shinto Religion in Hawaii,” March 16, 1940, NARA, RG 60, E146-10, B5.

²⁸ Ibid., 7.

²⁹ Ibid., 5.

³⁰ From J. Edgar Hoover to Wendell Berge, “Shinto Sects in the Territory of Hawaii Internal Security,” November 10, 1942, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5.

³¹ Federal Bureau of Investigation, “The Shinto Cult,” made by Edmund D. Mason, May 30, 1942, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5, 12.

³² Ibid., 1, 2.

³³ J. Sterling Adams, FBI, “Shinto Sects in the Territory of Hawaii,” September 15, 1942, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5, 1.

³⁴ Shimada, *Sensō to imin no shakaishi*, 171.

³⁵ Adams, “Shinto Sects in the Territory of Hawaii,” September 15, 1942, 10.

³⁶ Ibid., 11.

³⁷ Ibid., 14–25.

³⁸ Adams, “Shinto Sects in the Territory of Hawaii,” September 15, 1942, 17, 27.

³⁹ Dennis M. Ogawa and Everts C. Fox Jr., “Japanese Internment and Relocation: The Hawaii Experience,” in *Japanese Americans: From Relocation to Redress*, rev. ed., ed. Roger Daniels (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1986), 135–37.

⁴⁰ P. M. Nakahara, “Translation: Statement by Misao Isobe,” April 5, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

⁴¹ John Sterling Adams, FBI, “Shinto Sects in the Territory of Hawaii,” November 29, 1942, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5, 3.

⁴² Ibid., 22.

⁴³ Shigeyoshi Murakami, *Kokka Shinto* [State Shinto] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970), 120–25.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 110–11; Hardacre, *Shinto*, 422.

⁴⁵ Hardacre, *Shinto*, 374; Murakami, *Kokka Shinto*, 95–96.

⁴⁶ In‘nan, “Sumiyoshi shinkō kara Konpira shinkō-e,” 195, 228. Shirasaki Hachimangū and Otaki Shrine were classified as a district shrine and a village shrine, respectively. Frances T. Motofuji, “Report of Field Trip to Yamaguchi and Hiroshima Prefectures,” April 19, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

⁴⁷ Tadanobu Kawamura, *Kingendai Shinto no houseiteki kenkyū* [The legal study of Shinto in the premodern and modern era] (Tokyo: Kōbundō, 2017), 319.

⁴⁸ Murakami, *Kokka Shintō*.

⁴⁹ Hardacre, *Shinto*, 357, 404.

⁵⁰ Murakami, *Kokka Shinto*, 118–19.

⁵¹ Susumu Shimazono, *Kokka Shinto to Nihonjin* [State Shinto and the Japanese], (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2010), vi, 51.

⁵² From J. Edgar Hoover to Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General, November 10, 1942, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5; Harold I. Baynton and James M. McInerney, “Kotohira Jinsha,” April 11, 1950, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5.

⁵³ Executive Order 9300 was revoked by Executive Order 9835 in 1947.

⁵⁴ Harold I. Baynton and James M. McInerney, “Kotohira Jinsha,” April 11, 1950, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5; US District Court, Hawai‘i (Ter.), “Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgement Kotohira Jinsha, A Hawaiian Eleemosynary corporation, Plaintiff vs. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States.” Hawai‘i-Pacific Collection (HPC), Hamilton Library, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*; Shimada, *Sensō to imin no shakaishi*, 171, 176.

⁵⁶ Ogawa, *Sea of Opportunity*, 100–106, 114.

⁵⁷ Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha–Hawaii Dazaifu Tenmangu, “History.”

⁵⁸ Hardacre, *Shinto*, 444–46.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 449.

⁶⁰ “Shinto Temples,” August 31, 1955, NARA, RG60, E146-10, B5.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, “Executive Order 9835,” accessed, July 30, 2021, <https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/executive-orders/9835/executive-order-9835>.

⁶² Shimada, *Sensō to imin no shakaishi*, 174–77.

⁶³ F. T. M., “Memo for the Record,” undated, NARA, RG331, B5774.

⁶⁴ Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha–Hawaii Dazaifu Tenmangu, “History.”

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Maeda, *Hawai no jinjashi*, 216.

⁶⁷ Ogawa, *Sea of Opportunity*, 116–24.

⁶⁸ J. Frank McLaughlin, “Opinion,” US District Court, Hawaii, HPC, 2.

⁶⁹ F. T. Motofuji, “Shrine Property in Hawaii,” March 6, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Frances T. Motofuji, “Report of Field Trip to Kagawa Prefecture,” March 31, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Peter M. Nakahara, “Report,” undated, NARA, RG331, B5774. The amount of *kyōshinkin* increased from \$550 in 1941 to \$700 in 1945, and *shinsen-heihakuryō* from \$195 in 1941 to \$325 in 1945.

⁷⁷ Nakahara, “Report.”

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ P. M. Nakahara, “Statement by Yaichi Kurokawa,” April 13, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

⁸⁰ Motofuji, “Report of Field Trip to Kagawa Prefecture.”

⁸¹ Nakahara, “Report.”

⁸² Isobe said that his net income was approximately \$4,000. P. M. Nakahara, “Statement by Misao Isobe,” April 5, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.

- ⁸³ Ibid.; F. T. Motofuji, “Interview with Mr. Isobe,” April 8, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁸⁴ Nakahara, “Statement by Misao Isobe.” As of August 2021, Emperor Sutoku was worshiped at the shrine.
- ⁸⁵ Francis T. Motofuji, “Report of Field Trip to Yamaguchi and Hiroshima Prefectures,” April 19, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁸⁶ F. T. Motofuji, “Some Aspects of Shinto,” April 21, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁸⁷ F. T. Motofuji, “Interview with Religious Affairs Section Officials,” April 4, 1950; F. T. Motofuji, “Interview with Mr. Nogami,” April 6, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁸⁸ Motofuji, “Some Aspects of Shinto.”
- ⁸⁹ From Leon R. Gross to Howard K. Hoddick, April 13, 1950; from Leon R. Gross to Howard K. Hoddick, April 17, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁹⁰ US District Court, Hawai‘i (Ter.), “Motion of Defendant for Summary Judgement.”
- ⁹¹ Shimada, *Sensō to imin no shakaishi*, 184.
- ⁹² “In the Matter of the Charter of an Incorporation of the Kotohira Jinsha, to the Honorable E. S. Smith, Acting Treasurer of the Territory of Hawaii,” HPC.
- ⁹³ F. T. M., “Memo for the Record”; “Plaintiffs,” undated, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁹⁴ Outgoing message from Leon R. Gross to Howard K. Hoddick, April 17, 1950, NARA, RG331, B5774.
- ⁹⁵ “Opinion, Kotohira Jinsha, Plaintiff, v. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, Defendant,” 5, HPC.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid., 12–14; “Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Kotohira Jinsha, Plaintiff, v. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, Defendant,” 3, HPC.
- ⁹⁷ “Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law,” 6.
- ⁹⁸ Ibid., 6.
- ⁹⁹ “Opinion,” 10.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 12.
- ¹⁰¹ Maeda, *Hawai no jinjashi*, 217.
- ¹⁰² “Opinion,” 10, 12.
- ¹⁰³ Nakahara, “Statement by Misao Isobe.”
- ¹⁰⁴ Hawaii Kotohira Jinsha–Hawaii Dazaifu Tenmangu, “History.”
- ¹⁰⁵ Manako Ogawa, *Umi o meguru daiarōgu Hawai to Nihon suisangō kara no apurōchi* [Dialogue over the sea between Hawai‘i and Japan: An approach from the fishing industry] (Tokyo: Hanawa shobō, 2019), 196–97.