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Foreword

The history of the Gordon W. Prange Collection is a tale that is at once global, national, and local. While much of the story that follows focuses on events and personalities tied closely to the University of Maryland, it also speaks to larger historical forces and themes. These include military occupation, civil censorship, the significance of cultural heritage materials, and the evolution of the archival and historical professions.

As a student enrolled in the History and Library Science dual-Master’s degree program at the University of Maryland, I straddle several disciplines: I am both an MA student in the department of History and an MLS student specializing in the archives track at the College of Information Studies. Thus, my professional and academic background allows me several perspectives through which to view the issue of the collection: that of the historian, the librarian, and the archivist. In addition to appealing to my academic and professional interests, the story of this collection appeals to my personal interest in Japanese culture. I moved to Maryland to attend graduate school in the summer of 2004, fresh from a two-year stint of teaching English to high school students on Sado Island, in rural northwestern Japan. When I mentioned my recent Japan experience to professors in College Park, they usually asked, “Oh, do you know about the Prange Collection?” I did not at first, but as a result of their prodding, I began to. The more I learned about the University’s rare cache of Japanese materials, the more questions I had. Even relatively straightforward queries, such as how the collection first came to Maryland,
yielded contradictory stories and admissions of uncertainty about its origins. My understanding was short on facts and long on lore.

In the spring of 2006, under the guidance of Professor Marlene Mayo, my search for the “true story” of the Gordon W. Prange Collection began in earnest. I looked in the university archives and collected oral history interviews from key individuals who had firsthand knowledge of the Prange Collection’s history. I also spent a good deal of time sifting through the extensive set of Gordon Prange’s own papers, donated to the University of Maryland in December of 2001, in an attempt to deconstruct the myths of origin that surrounded the collection.¹

I relied on a variety of published sources for this paper, including speeches, pamphlets, newspapers, video of the 1979 ceremony naming the collection after Prange, a 2001 Maryland Public Television documentary, information from the UM Libraries’ Web site, historical accounts of the Allied Occupation of Japan, and books on the history of the University of Maryland. Unpublished and primary source research, however, provides the backbone of my account. University and library records gave me a strong timeline, while correspondence and oral history interviews provided the human side of the story. I interviewed former and current University of Maryland faculty and staff, researchers, and members of Gordon Prange’s family.

The interviews allowed me to go beyond or even question what was captured in the documents, and the interviewees sometimes challenged ideas I held about the Prange Collection. Incorporating the input of so many disparate witnesses to the history of the Collection made the project challenging, but also even more intriguing and rewarding.

At present, no one published or unpublished source tells the full story of the Gordon W. Prange Collection, from its origins in the Allied Occupation of Japan to the prominent place it occupies in the UM Libraries today. With this master's thesis, I hope to change that.
Note on Asian Names

All personal names, be they Japanese, Chinese, or American, appear in this work following the standard American custom of given name followed by family name.

While Japanese and Chinese names are customarily written with the family name first, I have chosen to follow the American convention throughout this paper both to be consistent for an English-speaking audience, and because many of the Japanese and Chinese who are important to this story also utilized American-style names in their professional lives while working in the United States.
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Chapter 1: Hidden Treasures Brought to Light

In 2006, Dr. Takeshi Tanikawa made a surprising discovery. A scholar at Waseda University in Tokyo, he was busy conducting research on a famed artist of Japanese *manga* and *anime* (comic pictures and cartoons), Osamu Tezuka. Creator of the animated character Astro Boy, Tezuka has often been called the “Father of Anime,” or the “Walt Disney of Japan.” Tanikawa was searching for lost drawings, or “missing manga,” that were rumored to have been drawn by the master in the late 1940s during Japan’s occupation by the Allies. His colleague, Professor Taketoshi Yamamoto, told him that he should try his hand at “treasure-hunting” in an archive of Occupation-era Japanese materials at the University of Maryland, aided by a research database that Yamamoto himself had recently developed. Yamamoto knew that the collection was extensively and largely unexplored; within it, he felt that Tanikawa might have a chance to find a work of “missing manga.”

Neither of them anticipated that Tanikawa would eventually find not one but nine “missing manga” by Osamu Tezuka. After crosschecking the artist’s different name spellings in the database, and consulting other sources, Tanikawa contacted the Gordon W. Prange Collection at the University of Maryland Libraries to request color photocopies of the drawings. He compared them to Tezuka’s other early works and
consulted with numerous experts before finally concluding that the *manga* were indeed in the hand of Osamu Tezuka. Among the discoveries was a drawing that may provide a clue to the origin of Astro Boy’s Japanese name, Mighty Atom. This break-through is equivalent, for scholars and fans of *anime*, to an American finally learning why Disney named his mouse Mickey. Tanikawa revealed his “scoop” by phoning the Japanese newspaper the *Asahi Shinbun* in May 2006; the *International Herald Tribune* also soon picked up the story.

Tanikawa’s tale is only one recent (and upbeat) example of a significant historical discovery made using the Gordon W. Prange Collection. Additional scholarly research in the collection documents a far darker side of the Allied Occupation, including the systematic censorship imposed on the Japanese press by MacArthur’s staff, found in the records of the Civil Censorship Detachment. While conducting research in the Prange Collection in the late 1980’s, well-known Japanese historian Yoshiaki Yoshimi found some of the first evidence suggesting the Japanese government’s involvement in the sexual enslavement of Korean and Chinese women for the benefit of the Japanese military (referred to in media accounts as the “comfort women” issue). He went on to

________________________

---


In addition to providing evidence on the controversial topic of military sexual slavery, the Collection includes examples of censored reference to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Marlene Mayo counts among her scholarship several important discoveries from Prange Collection holdings on this topic. They include the suppression by Occupation censors of a short story by Japan’s most important writer of that era, Jun’ichiro Tanizaki, in one of the country’s leading journals; the heavily censored reference to the practice of coerced, militarized prostitution.

---

censored volume of atomic bomb and anti-war poetry from 1946, *Black Eggs*, by Sadako Kurihara; and the book of non-fiction *The Bells of Nagasaki* by a Catholic medical doctor who lost his wife to the atomic bombs’ aftermath.

Beyond the sensational works that Occupation censors chose to suppress, the Prange Collection holds a rich quantity of works that serve simply to chronicle everyday Japanese life in the early postwar period. Eizaburo Okuzumi, a librarian and former UM staff member who worked with the Collection for nearly a decade, explained that “the Prange Collection is a result of censorship activities, but at the same time, the function of the Censorship Detachment [was] to gather real information about the Japanese people. So the materials themselves are historical documents: not only the censorship records, but also the common people’s records.”

Nearly every significant scholar on the Allied Occupation of Japan has had to consult the Collection at some point. From Rinjiro Sodei to John Dower, the roster of

---


American and international visitors to the Collection reads as a veritable “who’s who” list of important names in Japanese historical scholarship. In terms of the quality and depth of the information it provides on the Japan of 1945-1949, the collection is unparalleled even by the holdings of Japan’s National Diet Library (NDL). UM Dean of Libraries Charles Lowry explained in an interview that a study has shown that the NDL, Japan’s largest collecting repository, has only “between forty to fifty percent at most of what we have in the Prange Collection” for the same years. The world’s knowledge of literary, artistic, social, economic, political, and popular movements in Occupied Japan would therefore be shadowy without the sources that the Prange Collection provides.

Scholars of the Allied Occupation and UM faculty and students aside, the average American is likely ignorant that the Gordon W. Prange Collection exists. According to Lowry, the collection is “heavily utilized for scholarly purposes, but I don’t think there is any kind of national-level awareness that we have a collection here on this cultural and historical moment.” By contrast, he explained, “in Japan, it’s very famous, and the ‘Pu-

---

6 Eizaburo Okuizumi, interview with the author, March 6, 2007.


8 Charles Lowry, interview with the author, February 8, 2006.
ran-gi’ Collection, as they call it, is something of great concern and interest.” Thanks in part to widely publicized discoveries like the evidence of military sexual slavery or Tanikawa’s “missing manga,” articles on the Prange Collection materials have appeared steadily in the mainstream Japanese press since the 1960s. The Collection has especially caught the attention of Japanese politicians and journalists, some of whom have heralded it as a fine example of how Japan’s history has been preserved. Others have denounced it, saying that the United States has no right to possess a treasure of Japanese cultural heritage and demanding that it be repatriated to Japanese soil. “There are not a few Japanese who think we should not have it,” Lowry said. Japan’s National Diet Library has taken a pragmatic approach, accepting the UM Libraries’ stewardship of the Collection and choosing to collaborate in scanning and microfilming projects to enhance preservation efforts and improve user access.

The contents of the collection represent a portion of Japanese history, one that continues to be of great interest to Japan’s wartime and postwar generations. Yet the relationship each generation of Japanese has to the materials is distinct. For younger Japanese scholars, the collection contains a wealth of historical data that they can use for

______________________

9 Ibid.
research. However, for older generations who remember the Pacific War, it is not a symbol of the musty past but a reminder of living memories that inhabit the present. For Japanese who remember the Occupation, the Prange Collection tells stories from their own lives.

In order to understand how and why this collection first got to Maryland, we need to look at another life: that of Gordon W. Prange.
Chapter 2: 1945-1960, Gordon W. Prange and “the Battle of the Books”

In October of 1946, a 36 year-old professor of German history took a job he was not quite sure he wanted, 7,000 miles away from his home. At a time when he had expected to be returning from his naval tour of duty to his work and family in Maryland, the job, with GHQ/SCAP, also known as the Allied Occupation of Japan, put this man in Tokyo instead.

Intense personal and professional ramifications ensued from his decision to work in Japan, as well as an unforeseen set of historical consequences revolving around a set of rare books and documents. In 1949, while working in Tokyo, the professor, Gordon W. Prange, gained possession of a collection of unique print and documentary materials (books, maps, archival records, photographs) that would have an impact on scholarship, politics, and the relationship between the Japan and the United States for decades to come.

Prange’s life up to that point had done little to prepare him for a sustained Japanese detour. He was born on July 16, 1910, in the town of Pomeroy, deep in the cornfields of northwest Iowa. Gordon Prange’s parents had little formal education, neither one continuing school past the third grade. His father, a massive, serious man, worked as the town’s blacksmith. The family grew up in home without electricity or indoor plumbing. But like many Americans of their generation living in the Midwest, the Pranges did not view this as a deprivation, but simply part of the reality of rural life.
They labored, attended church, never took vacations; they rarely (if ever) ventured outside Calhoun County.

Prange attended Lutheran parochial schools in Pomeroy, largely filled with students whose families, like his own, were originally of German extraction. Sports provided Gordon Prange and his older brother Russell with their main source of recreation. In high school, Gordon was a standout runner and shot putter who led his team to statewide victories. His impressive speed and strength caught the attention of coaches from the University of Iowa, who gave him a track and field scholarship. In 1929, Prange moved to Iowa City, took up residence in the dorms, and began his college career.

Prange soon realized that he had an aptitude for scholastic work beyond his talent in athletics; this altered his view of himself and of the possibilities for his future. Although he lettered twice in baseball for the Hawkeyes, and even considered a professional baseball career after receiving an offer from the Chicago Cubs, his professors recognized him as an academic talent. The head of Iowa’s history department, Winfred Trexler Root, encouraged Prange to choose a career steadier than baseball—like
being a historian and teaching in a university. Over the next eight years, Prange obtained three History degrees from Iowa: a BA, an MA, and a PhD.  

Prange’s own German heritage and early German-language training sparked in him a desire to focus his studies on German language and history. In 1935, as a graduate student, Prange took his first trip abroad to study at the University of Berlin. He there caught a glimpse of a country amidst the rise of fascism and Hitler’s Third Reich. He also had the chance to travel to surrounding countries like Austria and Czechoslovakia. By the time he returned to Iowa in 1936, Prange proudly felt that he could speak German

---

10 For the biographical information about Gordon Prange in this section I relied on oral history interviews with two of his children Polly and Winfred Prange, newspaper articles, and letters and documents found in the Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections Department, University of Maryland Libraries.

11 University of Iowa. The Hawkeye, Vol. 43 (1943), 243. Special Collections Department, University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City, Iowa.
with an accent authentic enough to fool a native. This experience not only broadened his
horizons beyond the Iowa plains, but also ignited in Prange an even greater passion for
European history, reinforcing his commitment to becoming a professional historian.

In 1937, Prange completed his PhD and in June married Anne Root, the daughter
of the head of Iowa’s history department. A few years younger than her husband, Anne
was also a bright and able scholar: she had herself completed an MA in History. Their
honeymoon was more work than relaxation, as Prange spent the summer of 1937
studying Russian at the University of California Berkeley. The University of Maryland
soon hired him as an assistant professor in their History department, and the newlyweds
moved to University Park, Maryland that fall.

Maryland’s gentle green landscape and mild climate appealed to the Pranges, but
they were unsure at first about the University. The campus was smaller and less well
equipped than Iowa’s had been, for one thing. In addition, according to their daughter
Polly, they found Maryland a little “backward.” While the Midwestern states put great
stock in their public universities, on the east coast the private colleges enjoyed far greater
status and funding. In addition, the region struck the Pranges as more Catholic, southern,
and segregated than they were used to. The University of Iowa had a long reputation as a
progressive school; it been admitting men and women on equal basis since 1855, and was
the first U.S. college to grant a law degree to an African American. Maryland, by contrast, had only allowed women since 1919, and the school would not enroll an African-American student until 1951. Still, as the couple grew accustomed to the region, they found many things about their new life to enjoy.

Prange’s duties at the University of Maryland centered on teaching basic knowledge of European civilization to undergraduate students. He liked being at a state school, though at that time Maryland still had a relatively humble academic reputation. Under President Harry C. “Curley” Byrd, however, there was a sense that the university’s ambitions were beginning to rise. Like Prange, Byrd had an assertive personality and a love of athletics; the two soon developed a warm working relationship. After a few years at Maryland, the Pranges began to feel at home. In a letter to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Prange declared, “I am happy here at Maryland. If in the future I can continue to give to the school only a portion of what the school has given to me, I shall be able to live with my inner self.”


14 Gordon Prange to L.B. Broughton, Nov. 4, 1940, Box 4, "Jobs and the administration" folder, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
But the Prange’s peaceful life in Maryland was not to last long. On December 7, 1941, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, and the United States officially entered WWII. Prange immediately decided to enlist in the Navy and took a wartime leave of absence from his University career. Due to his education, he began training as an officer. He attended the Columbia School of Military Government’s naval officer training courses. Thanks to his language skills in German, Prange hoped that he would end up in Europe. But the Navy had a different plan, and Prange received training in occupation of occupied territories and in “native” language, custom, and culture.¹⁵

In October of 1944, Anne and Gordon Prange had their first child, called Winfred after Anne’s father. The following year, in 1945, Prange received word of his imminent deployment to the Pacific front: he would be heading first to Japan and then to the island of Formosa (now Taiwan). The news disappointed Prange. Never passive in accepting his circumstances or shy in the face of authority, Prange later claimed that he pleaded with his supervising officer for a European assignment. His protests went unheeded, and in November of 1945, three months after the Americans dropped the atomic bombs on

¹⁵ While I do not have access to details of the curriculum Prange studied while at Columbia, the Naval School of Military Government and Administration had a focus in training officers for service in East Asia and the Southwest Pacific. Therefore, it seems that Prange probably studied Japanese language and culture, and would have known that he was headed to the Pacific theater. See Schuyler C. Wallace, “The Naval School of Military Government and Administration,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol. 231, *Higher Education and the War* (January 1944): 29-33, and Columbia University, “World War II: Wartime Efforts,” Columbia University Web site, http://www.columbia.edu/~th2149/WarEffortCUWWII.htm.
Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Prange shipped off for the port of Yokohama. Waylaid by a storm once he arrived in the Japanese archipelago, his ship never made it as far as Formosa. Prange’s assignment was accordingly changed, and he served the rest of his tour of duty in Japan doing intelligence work as an officer in the Statistics and Reports Section of General Headquarters, Supreme Commander of Allied Powers, otherwise known as GHQ/SCAP.  

2.1 Civilian Life in Occupied Japan

After ten months in Japan, Prange completed his service to the Navy. In August of 1946, as he was preparing his return, a colleague mentioned an interesting civilian job opening. He thought the position would be perfect for Prange: Chief Historian of the Historical Branch, G-2 Intelligence Section of GHQ/SCAP. The duties of the job included researching and writing the official history of General Douglas MacArthur’s exploits in the Southwest Pacific. If he accepted it, the job would even allow Prange to bring his wife and young son to live in Tokyo. The offer did not interest him though,

16 Hisayo Murakami, as reported to her by Anne Prange, 1993, Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries.
and, despite his colleagues’ attempts at persuasion, he turned it down on three separate occasions.\(^\text{17}\)

Prange boarded a ship at Yokosuka bound for San Diego, with a stop at the naval base in Sasebo, Kyushu to pick up a load of returning U.S. Marines. While anchored in Sasebo, a typhoon blew through, delaying the ship’s departure by three days. By chance, on the second night of the Sasebo stopover, Prange encountered an old classmate from the Navy School of Military Government at Columbia University, Guy J. Swope. Swope was serving as a commander in the US Naval Reserve, Government Section, in Tokyo, and came aboard to greet the temporarily stranded sailors. Prange mentioned the job offer to his colleague Swope, who immediately set about convincing Prange of the value of the opportunity. He argued that the chance to write the history of MacArthur’s campaigns in the Pacific would not only enhance Prange’s career as a historian, but it would also provide a remarkable chance to continue witnessing the “ground zero” of history. As if this were not enough, the position promised an excellent salary and benefits, more than double what Prange would have made teaching at the University of Maryland. Prange listened carefully; he respected Swope’s opinion. Prange’s senior by eighteen years, Swope was a man of broad experience in government: before the war, he

\(^{17}\) Most of the factual account of this section and the following paragraphs comes from Gordon W. Prange’s speech, “Address by Dr. Gordon W. Prange at the Dedication Ceremony of the Gordon W. Prange Collection,” The Gordon W. Prange Collection Dedication Ceremony, Sunday, May 6, 1979, VHS (College Park, MD: University of Maryland Libraries, 1979).
had spent two years representing Pennsylvania to the seventy-fifth US Congress, and, in 1941, briefly served as Governor of Puerto Rico. According to Prange, Swope “was so urgent and so genuinely interested that his words penetrated my consciousness as those of my other friends and colleagues had not.” After a restless night of pondering Swope’s arguments, Prange decided that he should accept the job offer after all, and wrote to the G-2 to let them know that he had reconsidered.

When Prange arrived in San Diego he called his wife Anne and the University of Maryland’s President Byrd. Anne grew immediately excited by the prospect of moving to Japan. According to her daughter Polly, she believed that the move to Tokyo would be “a great adventure.” From President Byrd, Prange requested an additional leave of absence from his professorship at Maryland, despite the fact that he had not yet even visited the campus. Byrd acquiesced, but only on the condition that Prange sign a contract that guaranteed he would return to Maryland eventually, and not go to another


institutions. Universities around the country were flooded with returning soldiers ready to take advantage of the G.I. Bill, and Maryland needed all the teaching help it could get.

A few short months later, in October of 1946, Prange returned to Tokyo, with Anne and the two-year old Winfred in tow. Prange began his duties at the Historical Branch in the Nippon Yusen Kaisha (NYK) building. A Mitsubishi company, NYK had served the transport needs of Japan’s imperial government during the Pacific war; consequently, most of their fleet was destroyed by 1945. Some of the company’s remaining assets, like the office building, were quickly repurposed for GHQ/SCAP use. The Historical Branch took up one entire floor of the NYK building, one of the largest in Tokyo.

Prange may never have fulfilled his desire to serve the Allies in Germany, but he did manage to cultivate a close relationship with one German-born commanding officer in Tokyo—his boss, Major General Charles A. Willoughby. Willoughby commanded the G-2 Civil Intelligence Section, which included both the 100-employee Historical


23 Willoughby was born and raised in Heidelberg, Germany, but moved to the U.S. in 1910 at the age of 18. He later became a naturalized American citizen. See the “Guide to the Papers of Major General Charles A. Willoughby, USA, 1947-1973,” (Woodbridge, CT: Scholarly Resources Inc., an imprint of Thompson-Gale, 2006).
Section where Prange worked and a larger unit known as the Civil Censorship Detachment, as well as several other divisions devoted to intelligence functions. Prange’s relationship with General Willoughby later proved to be a pivotal factor in his acquisition of materials for the University of Maryland’s library.

Prange worked hard to find common ground with Willoughby, a large, gruff man with a formidable reputation who enjoyed direct access to the highest levels of MacArthur’s civil and military administration. The two got along well, at first, speaking in German to keep their conversations secret from the others who worked for GHQ. Besides language, they had other traits in common, including a shared awareness of the historical significance of their moment. Each had a shrewd eye trained on his own career and legacy. Both had intense, even intimidating, personalities and were regarded as leaders by some, although just as many others found fault with their outsized

24 Four main divisions made up the G-2 Civil Intelligence Section: the Civil Censorship Detachment (CCD), the 41st Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC), the Public Safety Division, and the Operations Branch, which coordinated information gathered in the field by the CCD and the CIC. In addition, there was an Executive Group, which took care of plans, policy, administration, and Prange’s History and Reports Branch. Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, and Douglas MacArthur. “MacArthur in Japan: The Occupation: Military Phase,” Reports of General MacArthur. Volume 1 Supplement. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966): 234.


26 Donald Goldstein (Gordon Prange's editor and former student), interview with the author, March 23, 2007.
presence and often-aggressive ways of expressing themselves. Both men were physically intimidating as well, over six feet tall and strapping.

As Prange conducted his research on MacArthur’s campaigns in the Southwest Pacific under the auspices of the G-2 Historical Section, he had his first opportunity to meet and interview a number of important figures from the Japanese navy and military. From these interviews, he gained some understanding of the officers’ perspectives during the Pacific War, and to admire the boldness with which they had enacted their military strategies, however fatal their results. It was probably during this time that Prange realized he alone in the English-speaking world had access to an exclusive story: the bombing of Pearl Harbor from the Japanese point of view. He guarded copies of his
interview transcripts and notes carefully among his personal papers, understanding that they were an invaluable resource for future publications.  

In June of 1949, the G-2 promoted Prange from Chief Historian to Chief of the entire Historical Branch, in which position he answered directly to Willoughby. This put the two into even more frequent contact. Prange later claimed that it was during this period that he learned to know his superior “inside out.” This firsthand knowledge permitted Prange to describe Willoughby, years later, as “conceited, opinionated,” and a man who “worshipped MacArthur with an almost sacrilegious fervor.” Nevertheless, Prange added, “he was also a gentleman, well-educated, and spoke several languages fluently, although when he was excited his English carried a German accent as heavy as a

27 The close connections Prange forged with former senior Japanese military figures while he worked for GHQ/SCAP enabled him to continue conducting interviews even after he returned to the United States. Prange never deposited the interviews in a library, archives, or Army records center, but kept the transcripts of the interviews in his study at his Maryland home. More than 20 years after his death, these transcripts were recently split up between two different archival repositories. In 2002, Prange's heirs donated the portion of his personal papers that remained in their possession to the Special Collections Department at the University of Maryland Libraries. This collection includes a good deal of material on World War II and all of Prange's personal correspondence. The rest of Prange's research materials can be found in the Goldstein Collection at the University of Pittsburgh. In the fall of 2006, Donald Goldstein, Prange's former student, posthumous editor, and a longtime Professor the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh, gave the archival research materials that he had in his possession from Prange’s filing cabinets to the University of Pittsburgh. Although a finding aid or guide is not yet available, the Goldstein Collection purportedly contains transcripts of over 200 interviews with Japanese and American participants in the attack on Pearl Harbor, in addition other materials. The value of the Goldstein Collection has reportedly been appraised at $890,000. Peter Hart, "Pitt's campaign tops $1 billion," University Times Newsletter, University of Pittsburgh, November 9, 2006, http://mac10.unc.pitt.edu/u/FMPro?db=ustory&-lay=a&-format=d.html&storyid=7270&-Find, and "Faculty News," The GSPIAN, March 7, 2007, http://www.gspia.pitt.edu/The_GSPIAN/Winter2007/Faculty_News.htm.
knockwurst, and his neck swelled like a bullfrog in the running season. He could be a terror, but I worked for him like a machine and we got along famously.”

Like many of their American military colleagues during that era, Prange and Willoughby also shared concerns over how to combat the global rise in support for communism. This attention sometimes led to a focus on rooting out suspected traitors from within. While Willoughby’s anti-communist rhetoric and McCarthyesque activities in Japan have been well documented, Prange was no reactionary himself. According to his son, Gordon Prange “was not a political animal,” but could be counted as a New Deal Democrat, if anything. Still, in a 1951 letter to University of Maryland President Byrd, Prange wrote, “I am beginning to think that there are many more Communists in the top brackets of our government than the American people actually realize.” This statement may indicate the strength of Willoughby’s influence on Prange’s thinking during that time, or possibly, it was a calculated move in an attempt to ingratiate himself to President Byrd, a known conservative and anti-communist.

---


29 “Address at the Dedication Ceremony of the Gordon W. Prange Collection,” Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.


2.2 Censorship in Occupied Japan

At the same time that Prange’s Historical Section labored to write the official history of MacArthur’s campaigns in the Southwest Pacific, the Civil Censorship Detachment (CCD), also part of the G-2, was hard at work trying to control public expression among Japanese media and publishers. Initial planning for Civil Censorship began as early as 1944, was refined in the summer of 1945 (even before Japan officially surrendered), and called for censorship control under military invasion conditions. Such censorship would have been a means of discovering enemy espionage, catching war criminals, and suppressing organizations, individuals, and groups that might have presented a danger either to the occupying forces or to the general project of reconstructing Japan. SCAP soon adjusted their censorship plans according to the conditions that Allied soldiers encountered in the first days of the Occupation. Civil

________________________

Censorship then transformed into “a medium of information on the Japanese military, economic, social, and political activities through control of Japanese communications.”

The Press, Pictorial and Broadcast Division (PPB) oversaw the censorship of Japanese print and broadcast media, including books, magazines, radio transmissions, films, theatrical performance, and a variety of other formats. In addition to acting as a “medium of information,” the PPB also aimed to try to eliminate the stranglehold that the Japanese government had once had over the main press and broadcasting outlets. To this end, SCAP devised a series of directives and codes outlining what sort of communication would and would not be tolerated from Japanese journalists, authors, and broadcasters. It passed these codes and directives on to the Japanese government in the form of memos, and began implementing civil censorship in phases beginning in September of 1945.

On September 21, 1945, SCAP issued its Code for the Japanese Press. This particular code included several notable provisions that expressly forbade criticism of the Allied Force of


34 It is important not to confuse the censorship work that the CCD and PPB undertook with the information control performed by the Civil Information and Education Section (CI&E), a distinct division of GHQ/SCAP. CI&E had a dual mission of education reform and “information guidance,” attempting to “[shape] news and entertainment programs […] to insure the insinuation of approved ideas and themes into Japanese minds. Not unexpectedly, they evolved a philosophy of selling democracy.” In sum, while CCD censors discussed what should be removed from the Japanese media, CI&E was trying to determine what should be added into it. Mayo, “Civil Censorship,” *Americans as Proconsuls*, 303.

Occupation, or even reference to their whereabouts—effectively erasing the troops from the print media map. The introduction to the September 21 code also declared that its goal was not to restrict but rather “to educate the press of the Japanese in the responsibilities and meaning of free press.”

Initially, the PPB practiced pre-publication censorship for all print media types. Publishers and news agencies had to submit two copies of the galley proofs of each manuscript or article to the PPB for review before publication. SCAP employed a number of Japanese nationals to review the material; they flagged material that they felt might be in violation of the Press Code or another directive, referring it to a senior translator. The translators, a number of them Japanese-Americans, then translated the “questionable” sections into English and passed them on to the supervising censors. Either the supervising censors then chose to accept the manuscript as submitted, or they did not accept it and deleted words, phrases, or paragraphs. In rare cases, censors suppressed a manuscript entirely.

---


37 SCAP, Reports of General MacArthur, Volume 1 Supplement, 237.
In the summer of 1947, as the number of manuscripts submitted for pre-publication censorship increased, SCAP first began to modify its censorship controls, perhaps in response to U.S. National Security Council directive #13/2. On October 15 of that year, all book publishing was transferred from pre-publication to post-publication censorship, with the exception of fourteen publishers who were deemed to specialize in ultra-right wing or ultra-left wing publications. In addition, any book, from any publisher, which dealt with the Allied Powers or the Occupation would have to be submitted for pre-publication censorship. Two months later, on December 15, 1947, nearly all Japanese magazines switched to post-publication censorship, again, with an exception. Pre-publication censorship continued on twenty-eight titles, including ultra-left and ultra-right publications, and “those which, because of circulation, subject matter, censorship record, or influence, required closer surveillance.”\(^{38}\) In July of 1948, SCAP moved all pre-censored newspapers and news services to the post-publication censorship system; by the end of August 1948, all book publishers and books on all subjects were post-publication censored, but not magazines.\(^ {39}\)

By the end of 1948, the PPB no longer performed pre-publication censorship at all, employing post-publication censorship only, regardless of publisher or format. Post-

---

\(^{38}\) Ibid., 239.

\(^{39}\) Ibid., 240-241.
publication censorship activity consisted of more intelligence reporting and analysis than deletion or suppression of texts or communications. The PPB and the other divisions of the CCD filled out “comment sheets” with the information they obtained through the censorship process, and forwarded them along to other SCAP sections or agencies.  

Jun Etō has argued that the practice of Civil Censorship dampened Japanese creativity. Several scholars have contested Etō’s view by examining the PPB’s practices in the context of the often more severe censorship writers experienced under the Japanese government, going back as early as the Meiji period. In his discussion of a postwar surge in depictions of sensuality and “decadence” in Japanese literature, Jay Rubin argues that the predominant influence of the Occupation on postwar writers “came not from the imposition of this alien censorship system,” but rather, it stemmed from “the liberation of writers from the native prewar censorship.”  

Marlene Mayo also demonstrates the creativity of postwar literature, while at the same time acknowledging documented examples of censorship, including the repeated suppression of Mitsuru Yoshida’s epic prose poem Requiem for Battleship Yamato that Etō Jun used to make his argument.

40 Ibid.


John Dower and other scholars have attempted to single out General Charles A. Willoughby as the one to blame for a general escalation in scrutiny and censorship that took place in 1946 and early 1947. They claim that he was markedly bent on singling out certain left-wing publications for suppression, arguing that he fostered a culture of extreme cautiousness among the censors which may have led to materials being more severely censored than was strictly called for by the Press Code. As Cold War tensions increased, Willoughby was not the only member of the US military who saw a greater need for counter-intelligence with the intensified focus on containing communism. Civil censorship focusing on the left certainly was one means of gathering that intelligence. The Prange Collection shows extensive censorship of the right as well, however. The significance of Willoughby’s legacy with regard to censorship remains without consensus.

The PPB did not set out with the express aim of squelching free speech amongst the Japanese, although that was a consequence of their actions, in practice. Rather, it was meant to serve as the key source of intelligence on the hearts and minds of the Japanese people. After several years of the press and publishing pre-publication and post-publication censorship process, the raw “intelligence” data—the newsletters, maps,

---

magazines, pamphlets, textbooks, photographs, posters, newsprint—began to pile up. Because of the comprehensive scope of the PPB’s activities, it managed to amass in its offices one copy of virtually every single item ever submitted for publication in occupied Japan. By 1949, the PPB’s archives probably constituted one of greatest libraries in the country.44

Through his work in the Historical Branch and his ever-closer relationship with Willoughby, Prange grew more aware of the work of the PPB, although he himself was never personally involved in the censorship process. Prange remained occupied with his daily work in the Historical Division, but he also used his time in Japan to begin research and writing on several new subjects that he found fascinating: the bombing of Pearl Harbor, and the spy ring led by Richard Sorge, a topic that Willoughby had become especially obsessed with.

In late 1949, Prange heard the news that GHQ/SCAP had plans to dissolve the censorship operation, under orders from Washington. This design was not common knowledge amongst Japanese, since GHQ did not allow the censorship apparatus to be discussed in the press: the list of taboo subjects that the censors unfailingly cut from all

Japanese publications included any reference or allusion to the process of censorship having taken place. Only Occupation insiders noted that offices of the Civil Censorship Detachment ceased to exist.  

2.3 The “Battle of the Books”

When he heard that the censorship offices were being dismantled, Prange became concerned with the fate of the incredible quantity of books, papers, magazines, and other records that the CCD had amassed over the previous years. GHQ staff must have already had begun packing portions of the CCD materials for shipment to US Federal Records Centers, including documents related to the censorship of radio, mail, film, theater, and telecommunications. These materials would stay in storage facilities or the Records Centers for 30 years before moving to the U.S. National Archives. Not all of the CCD material was bound for the Records Centers, however, and Prange became eager to receive a slice of the unclaimed pie.

Prange had started sending his own research collections to Maryland in the winter of 1949. These items and series focused more on the Pacific War than the Allied Occupation. Prange probably hoped that having these materials at Maryland’s library  

would support his own growing research interests in the war and in Pearl Harbor. His ambitions grew, however, when he discovered that some of the records and materials collected by the PPB were also potentially available for an enterprising collector. As a historian accustomed to doing archival research, he instantly recognized that the PPB materials that had undergone the censorship review process comprised historical data in its rawest form. Although the PPB materials could not have contributed to his own research, given that the bulk were in Japanese, he decided to acquire the remains of the PPB offices as a gift for the University of Maryland’s Library. Securing the PPB records, however, was not that easy; others had noticed the value of the collections as well. Never shy in applying military analogy to civilian undertakings, Prange deemed this his project of obtaining PPB and G-2 materials for Maryland “the Battle of the Books.”

In late 1949, Prange penned a series of letters to University of Maryland President Byrd, in which he painted this “battle” as both intense and secretive. He confided that the library of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University “would give their eye teeth” for the collection, while also claiming that someone from Harvard had expressed interest. He suspected that other universities and research institutions likely had bids in for the material as well. Willoughby had the authority to make the ultimate decisions, however, and Prange knew that. He begged Byrd for “ammunition” to use in the struggle, in the form of both cash and promises.
On November 22, 1949, Prange wrote:

“...the situation is most promising and can, if I watch my step and if the General [Willoughby] backs me, far exceed anything you and I ever expected along this line. There are still a lot of problems to be faced and I shall have a real struggle on my hands but I am now, with the General’s kind assistance and cooperation, preparing the ground for acquiring what may eventually prove to be one of the finest collections of materials pertaining to the Pacific War and the Occupation of Japan anywhere in the United States or Japan itself for that matter. [...] I cannot go into the problem in detail at this time, but if I win the Battle of the Books, I shall write you an extensive report immediately.”

Six days later, Prange wrote to Byrd again. He explained that the question of whether or not he would be declared the winner of the “battle” depended on three factors: his personal relationship with Willoughby, his ability to convince the other libraries that Maryland was the right place for the materials, and his “circumvention” of Army rules. He did not elaborate on which Army rules he was referring to, but this and other letters leave the impression that the question had to do with whether it would be the Army or the University who paid for the cost of shipping and labor.

Prange’s ideas for this new project consumed his imagination. He presented scenarios to Byrd in which Willoughby might agree to give “everything” to Maryland (implying the General’s personal papers as well) if Byrd would agree to a certain set of conditions:

__________________________

46 Gordon Prange to Harry Byrd, November 22, 1949, Series 1, Subseries 6, Box 70, Records of the Office of the Director of Libraries, Special Collections, UM Libraries.
“First, that you would be prepared to maintain all of these materials on Japan and the War in the Pacific separately and intact. Secondly, that we would call these materials within the library the ‘Willoughby Collection of Japanese Materials.’ Thirdly, that when the new library opens, there will be a reading room called the ‘Willoughby Reading Room.’”

Prange added that “there is one important point concerning these materials which should be brought out: their disposition and utilization.” He explained that Willoughby wanted the PPB materials under the supervision of someone “like myself, who knows the materials and appreciates their value.” He flattered Byrd, claiming that “future generations of Maryland students and faculty members will use these materials long after you and I have had our day. They will thus remain a permanent monument to higher learning at Maryland as such another tribute to your progressive, efficient, and brilliant administration of the University.”

As is the case with many of Prange’s letters to Byrd, it is difficult to determine the degree of sincerity behind his ebullient flattery. In his desire to persuade people to do what he wanted, Prange had a tendency to focus his version of events on the dramatic. This flair for inventive storytelling was a trait that came to define his career, for good and for ill. The same vivid personality and colorful language that delighted his students—

47 Gordon Prange to Harry Byrd, November 28, 1949, Series 1, Subseries 6, Box 70, Records of the Office of the Director of Libraries, Special Collections, UM Libraries.

48 Ibid.
and, later, his readership—struck some of his more high-minded academic colleagues as bombast. Byrd, however, was not among the critics. Inspired by Prange’s compelling story of the “Battle of the Books,” he would eventually send an advance of $3000 for shipping fees on behalf of the University, perhaps so that Prange would not feel forced to “circumvent” any Army rules after all.

One thing Prange may not have been exaggerating was the fierceness of the competition for the PPB materials, which he called a “battle.” The powerful Hoover Institution had the means to put up a real fight. His rival proved no match for his wily tactics, though: at one point, Prange secretly managed to obtain a copy of the minutes of the June 29, 1946, meeting of the Tokyo Hoover Library Advisory Committee; he versed himself in their goals and strategy, and then forwarded the minutes on to President Byrd. At times, Prange’s dramatic rendering of events in his letter to Byrd—such as his insistence that the copy of the meeting minutes be returned to him, lest they fall into the wrong hands—plays like a parody of early Cold War espionage, an echo of his fascination with the spy Richard Sorge.

After weeks of this kind of plotting and scheming, at the end of November, Prange received favorable word from Willoughby and decided to act with or without Byrd’s final stamp of approval. He explained, “I did not think events would crystallize
quite as fast as they have...but things are moving swiftly and I am compelled to move with them or be left behind.” Prange instructed Byrd not to show anyone these letters except Library Director Howard Rovelstad, who “must be brought into the picture.” He explained that the materials were “not only outstanding but unique.” Prange also mentioned finding a complete set of the *Asahi Shinbun* (a major daily newspaper) from 1936 to 1944 for sale for slightly under $100. “Dirt cheap, I bought it on the spot,” he bragged.  

Prange explained in his letter to Byrd that Willoughby had formally decided to send “the Civil Censorship Detachment materials” to Maryland, including:

“1. the CCD collection of 70,871 books
2. the CCD collection of Japanese magazines and bulletins, which number 82,287
3. the CCD collection of newspapers, which number 689,690”

He reiterated, “This collection is one of the most valuable groups of materials any library could hope to acquire on the Occupation of Japan.” He noted, “It includes the


49 Ibid.

50 This was probably a late moment to bring the Director of Libraries “into the picture.” The notion that the library had the staffing, the space, or the will to take on such a massive project in the first place represents a large presumption on both Byrd and Prange’s part. See the section on the University Library later in this chapter for further details.

51 Gordon Prange to Harry Byrd, November 29, 1949, Series 1, Subseries 6, Box 70, Records of the Office of the Director of Libraries, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
most complete selection of Japanese Communist newspapers anywhere in the world for the years 1946-49.” With the Cold War intensifying and the Korean War about to begin, Prange knew that, for Byrd, communism in Asia would be a topic of vital concern.

Once Prange had secured permission, he felt he only had one problem left: physical transport. He claimed that there were no suitable shipping crates available, so he moved the materials “army style.” He requisitioned a great deal of pine lumber and hired carpenters to construct over 500 wooden crates. Then it came time to fill them. Even with official Army sanction and hired labor, the process of sorting, boxing, and shipping all of the materials Prange had gathered took nearly two continuous years, from the fall of 1949 to the summer of 1951.

In June of 1950 the Korean War broke out, and Anne and two the children, like the dependants of all military families in Japan, were sent back to America. They went back to Iowa and stayed with the Root side of the family, waiting for Gordon Prange’s

52 Ibid.

53 The true, original number of crates sent to Maryland from Japan fluctuates greatly depending on the source. Gordon Prange reported “over 500” in a 1964 report he prepared for University administration. In his 1979 address at the Prange Collection dedication ceremony he said the crates numbered 540. By contrast, several annual reports from the UM Libraries/East Asia Collection from the 1970s refer to only 450 original crates. In a 2003 speech at the International Library of Children’s Literature in Tokyo, the present Dean of Libraries Charles Lowry stated that the boxes originally numbered 500, a number probably supplied to him by Prange Collection staff.
Prange stayed on in Tokyo alone, and he and his assistants continued to fill crates and ship them to College Park. It was an immense effort, but Prange believed that the struggle was worth it, and remained committed to seeing the project through. His mind must have been on the welcome reception awaiting him back at the University; for just like the crates of Japanese materials, Prange himself was soon to be Maryland bound.

How did Prange come up with the idea to obtain these materials and send them to Maryland? Did he conceive of the idea on his own, or was it the fact that other libraries and research institutions had expressed interested that piqued his interest and roused his competitive spirit? Alternately, might a colleague have suggested to him that the materials would be valuable?

One person who would have certainly recognized the value of the CCD materials was the librarian and archivist of the G-2 Historical Section, Dr. Louis William Doll. Like Prange, Doll had completed a PhD in history in 1937, studying English medieval constitutional history at the University of Michigan. After completing his coursework, he worked full time at the University of Michigan Library in the Graduate Reading Room for History and Political Science. He enjoyed library work so much that he went back to school to complete a bachelor’s degree in Library Science in 1942. After serving in the

Army from 1942 to 1945, during which time he did advanced study in Japanese at the Army Intelligence Service Language School in Fort Snelling, Minnesota, Doll volunteered to extend his military service so that he could join the Allied Occupation forces in Japan. He arrived in Tokyo in February 1946, and became the librarian and archivist of the G-2 Historical Branch, nine months before Gordon Prange began working there.\footnote{Biographical information on Louis Doll comes from the Delta College Foundation, where a scholarship endowment has been set up in his name. See Delta College Foundation, “Louis W. Doll/Patricia Drury Scholarship Endowment,” Delta College, http://www.delta.edu/foundation/endowments/dolldrury.html.}

Several of Prange’s letters to the University of Maryland include references to or specific advice from Doll regarding how the UM Libraries should treat the incoming Japanese language materials. For example, he recommended that the Library use the Hepburn system of Romanization of Japanese characters when performing the cataloging. This involvement suggests not only that Doll himself had interest in the collection, but also that he may have played an advisory role in shaping Prange’s plans. Had Doll once hoped to acquire the materials for the University of Michigan’s Library? Michigan certainly did receive some books and records from other sections of the Allied Occupation. Alternatively, was Doll in league with Prange, supporting his efforts to obtain the materials for Maryland? In 1950, after the transfer of the materials to
Maryland had already been secured, Prange even suggested to the University administration that Doll might find time to “stop by” College Park, on his way back from Japan, in order to check in on the processing of the collection. Doll left Japan in July of 1950, but he returned to Ann Arbor, with no stopovers in Maryland to check on the Library’s progress.  

Regardless of how he originally came up with the notion, Prange must have had several levels of motivation, both personal and professional, for wanting to acquire the Civil Censorship Detachment’s PPB materials for Maryland. While he may have had some interest in the office’s English language correspondence, with the thought that it might aid his Pearl Harbor research, Prange also thought of how the collection might benefit his home institution. He wished to see Maryland’s status and prestige increase, and the acquisition of a rare special collection could be an opportunity for that. He also must have been motivated by his own pride and pleasure in being able to give such a gift to the University of Maryland. The process of wrangling for the collection excited him, and his ultimate success in obtaining certainly enhanced his own professional stature.

56 Gordon Prange to Harry Byrd, January 10, 1950, Series 1, Subseries 6, Box 70, Records of the Director of Libraries, Special Collections, UM Libraries.
In addition, Prange probably felt the need to assuage his employer in light of the fact that he had been absent from his teaching duties for much longer than originally planned. Nearly a decade had passed since he took his leave from Maryland after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Teaching loads for professors at the University of Maryland became burdensome during the postwar years as the number of enrolled students grew exponentially. Prange’s colleagues in the Department of History certainly must have grown weary of covering the classes that Prange was hired to teach. The grand gesture of a magnificent and valuable gift seemed like the perfect way to soothe ruffled feathers.57

Prange also saw obtaining the Civil Censorship Detachment’s PPB records as a stepping-stone towards a larger goal: the establishment of a Military Institute at the University of Maryland. He had always been a supporter of the military, and such an Institute might have been a successful addition to a campus located so near Washington, D.C., and Annapolis. He attempted to draw Willoughby into this vision, with some initial success. Prange even suggested to President Byrd that he might manage to obtain both General Willoughby’s and General MacArthur’s personal papers for the library at Maryland. Whether or not Prange believed this himself is difficult to say—he may simply have been trying to kindle Byrd’s support. What is certain is how much Prange

57 For an account of the postwar boom at the University of Maryland see George H. Callcott, A History of the University of Maryland (Maryland Historical Society. Baltimore, MD: 1966): 338.
valued the sense of importance and authority that he derived from his close relationship with Willoughby. Through Willoughby, he even had the chance to meet with MacArthur himself in 1950 to discuss his work in the Historical Section and to share his ideas for a Military Institute at Maryland. This momentous meeting with MacArthur provided Prange with a vivid story to dash off to Byrd and a classroom anecdote for years to come.

2.4 Crates’ True Contents

The records of the censorship practices of the PPB comprise the bulk of what was actually shipped in crates from Tokyo to College Park, now called the Gordon W. Prange Collection at the University of Maryland Libraries. These records include the actual books, magazines, newspapers, and newsletters in Japanese that passed beneath the censors’ eyes, as well as the supporting documentation showing how the censorship process took place, attesting to any deletions or suppression.

The collection is not only PPB materials, however. Like many historians, Prange was a voracious collector of materials he believed to be of enduring informational, evidential, and intrinsic value. He accumulated books and documents everywhere he
went, and seemed never to throw anything away.\textsuperscript{58} Since he possessed the means and the motivation to ship an unlimited quantity of paper materials back to Maryland, he supplemented the contents of the crates with additional documents, publications, and rare books that he managed to acquire during his five years with the Historical Branch, many of which he thought might someday support his own research. These range from the stack of wartime \textit{Asahi Shinbun} newspapers he bought for $100, to the complete proceedings of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East--400 volumes, which Prange explained as previously being his “personal property.”\textsuperscript{59}

In letters that accompanied some of the first crates to Maryland, Prange gave an inventory for each shipment. These first shipments consisted mainly of items from the G-2 library and not the censored PPB materials. Few of these letters still exist in the archives, however, which means either that the letters got lost or that he simply became tired of writing them. Thus, many of the crates must have arrived in Maryland with no explanation of their contents.

\textsuperscript{58} Prange appears to have kept a copy of every document, clipping, or postcard that ever crossed his desk, plus carbon-copied versions of every outgoing letter, memo, and note. This extensive set of materials is a rich source of both biographical and historical information which still remains largely unexplored. It is housed by the University of Maryland Libraries in a separate location, in the Hornbake Library. See the Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.

\textsuperscript{59} Gordon Prange to Howard Rovelstad, August 25, 1949, Series I, Subseries 6, Box 70, Records of the Office of the Director of Libraries, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
In the inventory letters that do exist, Prange mentioned the following non-PPB materials as examples of items he added:

- “Miscellaneous materials on National Socialism (”some of it more valuable than others”)
- CINCPAC/CINCPOA Bulletins (”Intelligence studies covering combat areas in the Far East, by commander of U.S. Pacific Fleet”)
- Civil Affairs in Occupied and Liberated Territory (“a publication of the Analysis branch, War department, Public Information Division. A weekly digest of public opinion relating to American participation in World affairs and compiled for official use only”)
- Allied Geographical Section Publications
- U.S. Strategic bombing surveys
- Allied translator and interpreter section reports, 1942-1946
- Gazetteers of Pacific areas”

One additional set of materials that stands out from the rest of the collection is a set of books on ships and naval strategy from the Kaigunkan (the Institute of the Japanese Navy). These materials appear to have been confiscated from the Japanese following the partial dissolution of the Imperial Navy in 1947. Prange probably obtained them from

---
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the G-2 library; they likely appealed to him due to his growing research focus on Pearl Harbor.\textsuperscript{61}

This hodge-podge of materials made its way across the Pacific Ocean incrementally, ship by ship, until it was unloaded at West Coast ports like Seattle and San Francisco. The crates then traveled to Maryland on land, usually by train. Donald Goldstein, who was Prange’s student in the early 50s, remembers boxes arriving at Baltimore Harbor in 1951. Prange paid him and some other students, out of pocket, to go up to Baltimore and load the crates onto two big trucks.\textsuperscript{62}

However, even after their long voyage, for these materials, the true odyssey had only just begun.

\textbf{2.5 University of Maryland’s Library}

The University of Maryland Library of 1950 was unprepared to deal with acquiring such a huge quantity of any kind of materials, let alone such an immense store

\textsuperscript{61} The Kaigunkan may have been a Japanese naval officers club in Harajuku, Tokyo, whose building was possibly taken over by GHQ, according to Curator of the Prange Collection Eiko Sakaguchi. She guesses that the books came into Prange’s possession from the G-2 library. She also explained that Dr. Thomas Kang remembers opening the boxes and finding this particular set of books. Eiko Sakaguchi, email to the author, April 30, 2007.

\textsuperscript{62} Donald Goldstein, interview with the author, March 23, 2007.
in a language no one on staff could read. Library Director Howard Rovelstad had plenty of problems before Prange’s 500-odd crates hit American shores. Squeezed into the modest Shoemaker Hall alongside a small gymnasium, the size of the library was grossly inadequate for even the small collection of books they already had, to say nothing of the burgeoning student population. Students and professors clamored for the standard texts and publications they needed to do their coursework and research and for enough room in the library to sit and read these texts. The arrival of an immense vernacular collection in Japanese at a University with no East Asian language or East Asian Studies program seemed indeed to be a mismatch. However, Rovelstad’s wishes were no match for the aggressive duo of Byrd and Prange. The library had no choice but to accept the material.

Lacking space, Rovelstad stored the unopened crates in some outbuildings east of Route 1, across from the main College Park campus. When Prange returned from Japan, he was shocked to see the collection he worked so hard to acquire and ship in such a shoddy locale, and he demanded that the University move the collection out of these remote storage spaces. Portions of the collection moved to the basement of Shoemaker Hall—not much of an improvement.

Maryland’s library had long lagged behind the rest of the university’s development. When Maryland Agricultural College (MAC) opened in 1859 it had no library, only a simple reading room stocked with periodicals. In 1894, facilities expanded to include a two-story building which served as both a gymnasium and a library—barbells on the first floor, books on the second. MAC hired its first full-time librarian in
1915, one year before the State of Maryland took over the College. The College Park campus merged with the University of Maryland at Baltimore in 1920 to make the University of Maryland system. The 1920s and 30s saw incredible growth in the new Universities, and back then the development of the libraries seemed promising. Librarians worked to standardize resources and procedures. Existing materials in College Park and Baltimore were re-catalogued using the Library of Congress classification scheme. The creation of a permanent faculty Library Committee in 1923 seemed to signal a long-term commitment to the institution. In 1925, the Library became a regional depository library for government documents and maps, an official function it carries out to the present. \(^63\)

The College Park library moved to the second floor of Shoemaker Hall in 1931. By 1942, the collections at College Park had grown take up the entire Shoemaker building as well as an annex. In 1943, the University Librarian, Carl Hintz, was granted a new, more prestigious title, Director of Libraries. Hintz managed a staff of 16 in those days, with eight employees in College Park and eight in Baltimore. \(^64\)


\(^64\) Ibid.
Hintz’s successor, Howard Rovelstad, oversaw the most dramatic years as Director of Libraries. An Illinois native, three years younger than Gordon Prange, Rovelstad had attended the University of Illinois, where he received a BA and an MA in English. In 1940, he earned a 5th year degree in library science from Columbia University, and the University of Maryland hired him as a librarian. With the exception of his three-year stint in the Army during World War II, Rovelstad spent his entire career at UM, working first as an order librarian and then a reference librarian before becoming Director of the University Library in 1946. Rovelstad knew that the overflowing Shoemaker Hall did not befit the major research university status that Maryland aspired to be; he fought tirelessly for a new library building from the very beginning of his tenure until McKeldin Library opened in 1958.

2.6 Impact of the Library Situation on the Japanese Collection

Two important facts about the University of Maryland library in the 1950s affected the initial preservation of and access to Prange’s collection of Japanese materials. First, for all his conspiring with Gordon Prange to obtain the PPB materials, President Byrd’s administration did not actively support the growth of the library facilities in general. Even as he encouraged Prange to win the “battle of the books” on the one hand, he stood firmly in the way of Rovelstad’s “battle of the building” on the other.
Rovelstad knew the campus needed a new, dedicated library building. He entreated Byrd with reports and frequent memos about the overcrowding problem, explaining, “the problem of providing space which has been confronting the library for several years is rapidly becoming acute.” Compared with Prange’s bold sloganeering, it is easy to see why Rovelstad did not have Byrd’s ear. Prange used language that stirred Byrd into action; by comparison, Rovelstad’s polite and generally complacent character meant that his pleas (which must have seemed desperate enough to him) amounted to no more than a constant, gentle pester for Byrd. Byrd rebuffed Rovelstad, saying that any proposed library expansion projects should “only be considered as preliminary studies.”

Byrd’s administration maintained this attitude throughout the 1940s. Growing the University Library was far less vital to the President (and former coach) than the quest to have a number one football team. The issue of the neglect of Maryland’s library building would come back to haunt Byrd after he resigned from the Presidency of the University in 1953 to pursue his political career. While campaigning against incumbent Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin for the governorship of Maryland in 1954, Byrd used the fact that he had been unable to get money for a new university library from the state of Maryland as ammunition against his political rival. McKeldin shot back, stating that Byrd “never gave the Library priority during my administration.” He went on to announce that he had

---

already promised support of a $2 million library proposal to Byrd’s successor, Wilson Elkins. The outcome of the subsequent gubernatorial election is apparent in the fact that the main College Park campus library today is named after Theodore McKeldin, not Byrd.

One structure at the University of Maryland is named for Byrd, though: the football stadium, which he built in 1950 at a cost of $1,000,000. It is clear that when it came to Byrd’s spending priorities, the balls trumped the books. Among the student body, some jeered at the way sports seemed to be the only priority for the campus that year. In 1950, the *Diamondback* published a disapproving editorial (picked up later by the *Washington Post*) that announced, “When a university neglects its cultural responsibilities for less educational activities, there’s something out of joint.” Still, many students and fans cheered approvingly as the football team won its first game in the new stadium. In 1951, the football team went on to become the co-champions of the Southern Conference.


The second factor to consider in how the library situation affected Prange’s Japanese collection is the fact that Rovelstad and the library were not actively supporting the growth of archival collections at that time. In Rovelstad’s view, new books and periodicals in English were in high demand by library patrons—rare Asian documents and publications were not. In fact, Rovelstad was actively looking to get rid of archival materials that the library already had. In March of 1949, he wrote to a local man who, many years earlier, had donated of a collection of horticultural pamphlets to the library. He said, “As we are badly in need of more space in our basement for caring for library material I would like to ask you to consider what you wish to have done with this material.” Rovelstad suggested that the man might want the horticultural collection back, so that he might give it to the College of Agriculture or to a different library.69 Rovelstad undertook this desperate act of de-accessioning the horticultural collection, as Prange’s crates were en route, because there was simply no space in the basement left.

In 1958, the new McKeldin Library opened its doors to students and to the rest of the University community. Gordon Prange’s unopened crates migrated from the basement of the old library to the basement of the new.

69 Howard Rovelstad to Mark Woods, March 11, 1949, Series 1, Subseries 6, Box 44, Records of the Director of Libraries, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
Library Director Howard Rovelstad surveying the crates, in a storage warehouse on or near the Maryland campus in 1953.
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Records of the Office of the President, Special Collections, UM Libraries.

© University of Maryland, 1953
Chapter 3: 1960-1970, Cracking Open the Crates

“The route of objects has sometimes been no less colorful and dramatic than that of the persons who initiated their journey.”

–Jeanette Greenfield, The Return of Cultural Treasures

The climate of the America of the 1960s had both positive and negative effects on research universities in general. The baby boom, economic expansion, and federal assistance dollars ensured a continuation of the growth and development that they had enjoyed in the 1950s. The war in Vietnam, civil rights protests, and struggles over student power brought a degree social and cultural instability, and even the once-sleepy College Park campus was not immune.\(^{70}\) Change was in the air, around the country and on the campus.

One observable change in the academic realm nationwide was a general push for enhanced programs in East Asian Studies. With the realities of the Cold War and the war in Vietnam, more Americans had become aware of how tied their own situation was to that of the “Far East.” Given the number of American soldiers who had spent time in Japan, Southeast Asia, and Korea, for many the East no longer felt “far” at all. American policy planners had seen Japan as a bulwark against encroaching communism since the
late 1940s, and thus considered it a vital Cold War ally. Japanese bases provided the practical means for an American military presence in Asia. Therefore, increased economic, cultural, and political ties between the two nations reflected a more sympathetic regard for America’s former enemy, and helped to spark a growing focus on East Asia by American scholars.

By the early 1960s, this inclination had reached the University of Maryland. Numerous students and professors, like Gordon Prange, had military experience in East Asia. Although he was still a professor of European history, Prange had already begun teaching a popular course on the topic of Pearl Harbor. The global interests of incoming UM faculty reflected and confirmed the crucial nature of these ties to East Asia. Japan specialist Theodore McNelly joined the Department of Politics and Government in 1960. McNelly’s colleague, Chun-Tu Hsueh, an expert in modern Chinese politics,

---


71 American planners of the 40s and 50s like George Kennan and Dean Acheson reasoned that a secure and financially powerful Japan would help support Southeast Asia against Chinese communism. American policies toward Japan in the 1960s were a continued outgrowth of this reasoning. Michael Schaller, "Securing the Great Crescent: Occupied Japan and the Origins of Containment in Southeast Asia," The Journal of American History 69 (September 1982): 393.

72 Biographical information about McNelly comes from his memoirs. Theodore McNelly, Witness to the Twentieth Century: The Life Story of a Japan Specialist (Xlibris Corporation, Tinicum, PA: 2005)
also had great interest in seeing Maryland’s commitment to Asian studies grow. Both Hsueh and McNelly were products of East Asian Studies at Columbia University.⁷³

Among academic departments, it was the Department of History, however, which proved to be the driving force behind attempts to grow East Asian Studies in the 1960s. Even though the History Department had only two positions for professors in East Asia, as it was just beginning to expand beyond its traditional focus on American history, the men and women who held those positions proved to be energetic and instrumental to the cause.⁷⁴ David Farquhar, a young scholar who specialized on Mongolia and Inner Asia, joined the Department of History as an assistant professor; although he was only with UM for a few years, he was a crucial hire in attempting to “globalize” the department, and also became one of the first people at Maryland to look inside Prange’s crates.⁷⁵ Kenneth Folsom, a scholar of Chinese History, joined the History Department after Farquhar left in 1964; he would later support the struggle to create an East Asian Studies

⁷³Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006. Mayo was also a product of East Asian Studies at Columbia.

⁷⁴For an account of the development of the UM Department of History up to 1968, see Martha Ross, “CLIO at College Park: the teaching of history at the University of Maryland, 1859-1968,” (Master’s thesis, University of Maryland College Park, 1978). My colleague Keith Swaney’s recent work compliments Ross’ account, as he highlights professionalization of the historical discipline at Maryland in the 60s and 70s. Keith Swaney, “We Now Stand at the Crossroads: The Transformation of the Department of History at the University of Maryland, 1936-1976” (Unpublished research paper, University of Maryland College Park, 2006).
program on the College Park campus. In 1966, the Department decided to recruit another historian of Japan and East Asia, in order to complement the courses taught by Folsom and to help put the Japanese language Occupation materials Prang brought on the map.

Although the University saw some growth in the study of East Asian history and cultures in the 60s, course offerings for students continued to be limited. There were no Asian language classes offered except for a few Chinese courses as part of the University’s “Oriental and Hebrew Language Program.” In fact, in the mid-60s Chinese was a popular choice with the football team because students saw it as an easy way to satisfy foreign language requirements—one instructor, a retired mechanical engineer from Taiwan, only required that his students read Chinese poetry in translation.

The 1960s represented a momentous decade for the Library as well as for the College Park faculty. With the opening of the long-delayed McKeldin building in 1958 and the support of a president, Wilson Elkins, who was more academically focused than his predecessor had been, the University of Maryland library finally had the space and

---


76 Kenneth Folsom, telephone conversation with the author, March 14, 2007, and Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.
means to come into its own.\textsuperscript{78} Budgets increased, staff numbers went up, and the librarians could finally begin to stock the new brick building with the vital academic resources for which faculty and students had long petitioned.\textsuperscript{79}

University support and space for the Library in combination with the increasing interest in East Asia finally resulted in a campaign for the University to take advantage of Gordon Prange’s untapped resource. What was in those boxes, the administration wanted to know. Was it valuable or worthless? Should the library even keep it? Some of the University deans suggested that whatever it was, they should give it away, since no one used it and was taking up too much space. The University administration was “seriously considering trying to find a way of getting rid of [the materials], possibly giving them to another university,” Theodore McNelly explained in an interview. “Several people were

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{mayo} Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.
\bibitem{elkins} Technically, Elkins’ direct predecessor was Thomas B. Symons, who served as acting President for a brief time in 1954 after Byrd stepped down to run for Governor of Maryland. In terms of leadership and policy, it makes more sense to compare the legacies of the two presidents who served the longer terms, with Byrd heading the institution from 1935 – 1954, and Elkins leading from 1954 – 1978. University of Maryland, “Past Presidents of the University of Maryland,” http://www.president.umd.edu/pastpres/index.html.
\bibitem{callcott} According to Callcott, this initial growth in the Library was impressive when compared to the previous conditions, but faculty and students continued to find the facilities inadequate. He writes “the University made major efforts to acquire standard works for undergraduate use, and the increase in the library budget was impressive. Attempting to keep pace with the enormously increasing flow of current materials for graduate student use while simultaneously striving to supply past deficiencies remained major problems. A faculty study in 1965 urged that the library facilities be approximately doubled and that the total book holdings be more than tripled within the next decade." George H. Callcott, \textit{A History of the University of Maryland} (Baltimore, MD: Maryland Historical Society, 1966): 382-383.
\end{thebibliography}
appointed to a committee to make recommendations, including myself and Farquhar. The committee strongly urged that the materials be kept at Maryland. I was thinking—from a selfish point of view—if they were here, then I could use them,” McNelly said. McNelly did not recall Gordon Prange being very involved in the meetings or the unpacking process, and explained that he “never got to know him well.” On the other hand, in a 1964 report that came out of the committee’s inquiry, Prange claimed that he personally had “participated in part in this undertaking” along with Farquhar. It is difficult to say, then, precisely what role Prange played.

Farquhar agreed to spearhead the investigation of the crates. Around 1961, Farquhar, together with a Korean graduate student, first descended into the dark basement of McKeldin Library and pried open a few of the dusty wooden crates. They began to unpack materials, stacking them on tables and the floor. They pulled out magazines, newspapers, and pamphlets, many already yellow and brittle with age. By contrast, the


81 Gordon Prange, “The Japanese Collection in the University Library of the University of Maryland,” page two of 13, January 21, 1964, Box 9, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.

82 Some records of the East Asia Collection indicate that Farquhar’s investigation began as early as 1960, and Prange’s January 1964 report to Vice President for Academic Affairs R. Lee Hornbake indicates that the unpacking process began “about 3 years ago,” which could mean 1960 or 1961. Theodore McNelly, however, recalled that the committee to investigate the crates’ contents formed either in 1961 or 1962. After much consideration, I have chosen to use the 1961 date here, but with the caution and disclaimer that more conclusive research is still required. Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries. Theodore McNelly, interview with the author, December 10, 2006.
Many books—literature, nonfiction, children’s books, textbooks, comic books, books that spanned numerous categories and genres—seemed to be almost new, though most bore the seal of the Civil Censorship Detachment. Documents, photographs, and maps began to pile up: posters, fliers, wall hangings, gazetteers, women’s magazines, and communist newspapers from the far-flung countryside—even news dispatches from the Kyodo and Jiji news services. There were published print materials of every conceivable sort, seemingly from every corner of Japan.

Soon, the sheer quantity of books and paper began to overwhelm Farquhar and his student workers; it became necessary to sort the piles into some kind of order. Eventually, they managed to group the contents roughly by type of material, and placed them on shelves in the basement, adjacent to the crates. Over following months, until 1962, Farquhar continued this process, aided by his graduate students. In the end, he and his assistants opened and unpacked around 300 of the more than 500 crates.

My investigation did not reveal the identities of Farquhar’s graduate student assistants. I was only able to learn that his first assistant was of either Korean nationality or descent. Further research in the University of Maryland’s student records would be needed in order to attempt to identify and locate this person for an interview.

My understanding of much of the events of 1960-1965 comes from the access I had to some of the files of the East Asia Collection, currently still in use at McKeldin Library. I owe a debt of gratitude to the present Curator of the Prange Collection, Eiko Sakaguchi, for facilitating that access and guiding me to the relevant reports, while at the same time protecting and respecting the privacy of past and current Libraries’ personnel.
What motivated Farquhar to take prime responsibility for this immense task, and then to undergo grueling physical labor in dank conditions for so long with no clear reward for his effort? Was he simply fulfilling the job that the University committee asked him to do? As his scholarly expertise focused on pre-modern China and the Altaic peoples, especially the Mongols, there could not have been much hope of finding documents that he himself could utilize in his own research among the Japanese publications and files. In an interview, George Callcott recalled Farquhar as a gifted scholar but a quiet and unassuming man who was not likely to claim credit or to call attention to himself.\textsuperscript{85} It seems then that the voluntary aspect of Farquhar’s quest was undertaken for the duty and the pleasure of making some new primary source evidence on East Asia available to the scholarly world. Though he was more versed in the Chinese language, Farquhar did read Japanese (in addition to several other Asian languages), so he must have understood how significant and rare these materials were even as he unearthed them. He did not publish any work based on what he found, however.\textsuperscript{86} In 1964, he left Maryland to become a professor of pre-modern Chinese history at the University of California Los Angeles, severing his connection with the Japanese

\textsuperscript{85} George Callcott, interview with the author, March 27, 2007.

\textsuperscript{86} Investigation of Farquhar’s publishing record in four of the scholarly citation indexes and databases show he published only on the subjects of China and Mongolia, mostly on the pre-modern era. Searches performed in JSTOR, Academic Search Premier, Project Muse, and Google Scholar, under author keywords David Farquhar, April 17, 2007.
The Department of History continued its commitment to scholarship on China, however, and immediately recruited Kenneth Folsom to take his place.

Once the crates were broken down and the materials exposed to dust and dampness of the open air, it became clear that the Library could no longer ignore the collection that Gordon Prange had brought them. The Library decided to hire a full-time staff member to work specifically on the Japanese collection, a librarian with a reading knowledge of Japanese, who could begin to make some sense of what kind of cataloging would need to be done in order to make the holdings accessible.

In 1963, the Library hired that first staff member, Hideo Kaneko. A native of Japan and a professional librarian by training, Kaneko worked as a cataloger for the Yale University Libraries for two years before coming to Maryland. He had also previously worked with East Asian materials at the University of Michigan. Kaneko began the enormous task of caring for Maryland’s collection with the help of only one part-time assistant. The first order of business they faced was simply assessing the extent and nature of the materials themselves—figuring out what it was the Library actually had.

---


Soon after arriving at Maryland, Kaneko was tasked with writing a report for the UM administration on that very subject. He had Farquhar’s committee report to use as a starting point, but in need of further assistance, he turned to the one person who knew even more about the contents of those boxes than did the men who unpacked them: the man who had packed them, Gordon Prange.

Prange and Kaneko collaborated on the report on the state of the materials in order to submit it to Dr. R. Lee Hornbake, the Vice-President for Academic affairs. Kaneko prepared a detailed inventory based on both his own observations and the earlier report by Farquhar. Prange then edited and expanded Kaneko’s work into a lively 13-page narrative, including his own explanation of how he acquired and transported the materials. Prange submitted this final report to Hornbake’s office in January of 1964, evidently filled with hope that the University was finally taking action to make his gift available to researchers. Hornbake was not available in person that day, so Prange handed the report to a secretary. Then, he waited for a reply. And waited.

No word ever came back to Prange from Hornbake’s office. In fact, Hornbake never acknowledged that he received the report, let alone thanked Prange for it. Prange, who was eternally conscientious in his own correspondence and did not bother to keep his personal and professional relationships distinct, never forgave this slight from the
University administration. He would complain about it to others for years to come. From Prange’s point of view, Hornbake and the University dropped the ball. Not only did Prange see no visible change in the way the University treated the collection, it seemed to him as though he had worked so many hours on the report for nothing.

Although he remained friendly with Kaneko and other library staff, Prange’s disenchantment with the Library and indeed with the University only deepened after his perceived rebuff by Hornbake. This bad feeling would end up depriving the institution of further valuable collections. For example, when Prange inherited a collection of significant Bismarckian historical materials of the 1930s from his friend and fellow scholar of German history, Chester Clark, he found a different university to provide them with a safe and appropriate home. This is just one documented example; there is no telling what other opportunities or acquisitions the University Library must have missed by no longer having an active collector of historical materials on their side.

What Prange did not realize is that his January 1964 report would continue being modified and circulated among Library staff and would form the basis for much of what
was known about the collection for years to come. In October of 1964, Kaneko produced an updated version to submit to Dr. Leslie R. Bundgaard, Assistant to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. This “corrected” and expanded version both incorporated more recent findings and changed some of Prange’s statistics about the quantities of the holdings. Kaneko contextualized the Library’s holdings in comparison to Japanese holdings in other US libraries, relying on a study that a librarian from the International House of Japan, Naomi Fukuda, had published in Tokyo the previous year. He pointed out that even when just considering the bound volumes alone, UM’s possessions were “quite impressive.” Kaneko emphasized that it was both the completeness and the rarity of the unbound materials—the documents, pamphlets, newspapers, and galley proofs—that made the collection unique. He called them “priceless source[s] for research in all phases of the Japanese life in the first five years of the Occupation period.”

In his October 1964 report, Kaneko made four main recommendations to the UM administration. The first two dealt with how Prange’s material should be treated, while the second two set out to establish an ongoing acquisitions and collection development

---

89 While there was apparently some pressure from the Department of History to keep the German collection at Maryland, ultimately the combination of Prange's distaste with the Library situation coupled with a financial incentive induced him to sell the materials to the recently opened University of California, Irvine (UCI) in 1967. In a letter to Henry Meyer of UCI, Prange fancied the worth of the German books and papers at $50,000. But, he appears to have settled for the far smaller sum of $5000. One can imagine that, had his feelings about the University administration been better, Prange might have given this collection to the Library as a donation. See Box 16, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
plan, in order to form a comprehensive and useful East Asia Collection. First, he cited the urgent need for preserving and processing the newspapers and unbound materials, stating that staff needed more room to remove the materials from their boxes. He added that the University should look into microfilming as the newspapers were “rapidly deteriorating.” Second, he recommended cataloging and assessing the book collection. Third, on the topic of future acquisitions, he emphasized the need for specific reference and supporting materials on the subject of the Allied Occupation of Japan, to enable further study of this period. Finally, he recommended that the library should rely on this “solid nucleus” of a research collection and acquire scholarly monographs and periodicals for a general research collection on East Asia, “in view of the future expansion of the University’s program in the East Asian fields.”

As a road map for the East Asian Collection to follow, Kaneko’s contribution was a groundbreaking document. For a librarian (typically bibliophilic by training and inclination) to immediately to recognize the value of the unbound primary source materials and to emphasize preservation over access as the number one priority, his assessment was historically prescient and frankly archival in an age when such concepts

90 Hideo Kaneko, ”The East Asian Collection in the University Library of the University of Maryland," October 21, 1964, Records of the East Asia Collection, University of Maryland Libraries.
were only beginning to be recognized by the professional communities in which he moved. 91

In 1965, the UM Department of History hired a new chair, David A. Shannon, from the University of Wisconsin. Shannon knew of Farquhar’s early efforts on behalf of the East Asian Collection, and was aware of the strides that Kaneko was attempting to make in the Library, with Prange and Farquhar’s help. Shannon felt that the new East Asian historian hired to replace Farquhar should also be someone with the background and drive to help “exploit” the Japanese collection. In 1966, he hired Marlene Mayo, also an alumnus of the History Department and East Asian Studies program at Columbia, to fill that role. Mayo served as the History Department’s first full-time faculty member in Japanese history. She recalled in an interview how Shannon explained the situation to her: that the University had “this collection brought by Prange, the library doesn’t seem to know quite what to do with it and Gordon Prange is very busy teaching his courses. We need someone to develop Japan […] and] we don’t have Japanese taught here.” Mayo explained that Shannon ‘used the word ‘exploit,’ not ‘put the collection on the map,’ which was an expression that came up later. He said ‘we want the collection to be

91 In my conclusion, I consider the development of the archival and library disciplines as a way of contextualizing the decisions that the librarians after Kaneko made about what to do with the materials.
exploited and the best way to do that is to bring in a Japan historian.”

Over the next 40 years, Mayo’s fate became intertwined with that of the contents of Prange’s crates, eventually broadening her own area of scholarly focus from Meiji Japan to the study of the Occupation, censorship, and gender. In 1966, however, she was simply glad to be teaching in Japanese history, her area of interest and expertise, at a public institution. Her first graduate student was Hideo Kaneko.

3.1 The Japanese Library Trainee Program

Quite apart from the efforts of the Library, the Academic Affairs administration, and the Departments of History and Government and Politics, the founding of a new graduate program in College Park importantly influenced the fate of the East Asia Collection. The School of Library and Information Science (SLIS) was born out of a need for more trained librarians in Maryland and in the Washington, D.C., area. Viewed by Library Director Howard Rovelstad as a prime means for cultivating future staff members and student assistants, SLIS and the UM Libraries had a close relationship from the

92 Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.

SLIS’s inaugural year began with an innovative international exchange, called the Japanese Library Trainee Program, created with help from the Library’s Hideo Kaneko. Among the first 81 students, SLIS recruited a young man, Yasuaki Tanaka, who had recently graduated with the equivalent of a bachelor’s degree from Keio University Library School in Tokyo. Keio University, considered along with Waseda as one of Japan’s most prestigious private universities, boasted the first formal college-level school for librarianship in Japan, founded with help from the American Library Association in 1951. The first participant in UM’s Japanese Library Trainee Program, Tanaka worked part time on Kaneko’s staff at McKeldin while also pursuing a Masters in Library Science at SLIS. The Trainee Program provided a unique opportunity for young Japanese librarians to gain new skills and experiences, while bringing native speakers of Japanese to work in the East Asian Collection at the library and introducing an increasingly international perspective to the entire campus community.

________________________


By the end of 1965, Kaneko’s staff had expanded to include three additional staff members. In January of 1965, Eiko Mitoma joined the staff as a Library Assistant, followed by another professional librarian, Thomas Kang, in February of 1965, and then the young Library Trainee Tanaka in September. It seemed that despite Prange’s personal displeasure with Hornbake and the University administration, the future of the newly founded East Asian Collection was secure.

Keeping staff around, however, proved more difficult than anticipated—especially where Trainees were concerned. Tanaka left his post in December 1965 and returned to Japan, less than four months after he arrived. Misao Amano replaced Tanaka as Library Trainee in August 1966. Meanwhile, in March of 1966, a local Japanese homemaker named Connie Galmeijer came to replace Library Assistant Mitoma. Staffing would hover around four or five members for years to come; with a few notable exceptions, high staff turnover would be a notable feature of life in the East Asia Collection. Galmeijer, however, would remain a constant figure for many years.

One reason for the frequent staff departures may well have been the conditions in the basement. Reports and photos from the time characterize the place as dark, filthy, and prone to flooding, with messy piles of materials and boxes teetering precariously on high shelving. In addition, McKeldin Library had no air conditioning, so the dampness of the basement must have been frequently uncomfortable—both for the delicate paper and for the people. Even after the Library added air-conditioning units to the building in
1966, the basement continued without climate control: a shameful decision, given the value of the materials—and staff members—that spent day and night there.

Another factor that certainly affected the working climate for young Japanese at the University of Maryland in the 60s was race and sex discrimination. Marlene Mayo has frequently mentioned the culture of ingrained sexism at the University in the late 1960s; records from the Papers of the Office of the Director of the Libraries, dated September 1967, bolster some of her claims. In one letter, Robert Pierson, Assistant Director of Libraries, wrote to Professor Takashi Hashimoto of the Japan Library School
at Keio University, regarding recruiting for a new Library Trainee. The letter stated that UM would be:

“particularly interested in appointing a man to this position, rather than a woman: as the activity of the East Asia Section develops, there is an increasing need for someone able to work with heavy volumes and sort large collections...It is also possible that a recent male graduate would be more likely to remain after the first year and continue his study toward a possible master’s degree in library science.”

Pierson, perhaps the first person ever to suggest that women aren’t fit for librarianship, offers flimsy excuses for an across-the-board policy of overt sexual discrimination. What is noteworthy here is that the Assistant Director of Libraries not only saw nothing wrong with such discriminatory hiring practices, but he also saw no problem with sharing this bias with his Japanese colleague, Takashi Hashimoto.

Just as the trainees must have been aware of their otherness, the collection itself was an “other” within the rest of the Library’s collections. Wartime perceptions of the Japanese continued to be included in the way Americans sometimes talked about the collection. One example of this can be seen in the first grant application to process the Prange materials, submitted to the Ford Foundation on September 30, 1966. Theodore McNelly wrote the first drafts of the proposal, based on Kaneko’s input and the 1964

96 Robert Pierson to Takashi Hashimoto, September 29, 1967, Series 1, Subseries 6, Box 70, Records of the Office of the Director of Libraries, University of Maryland Libraries.
report by Farquhar, Kaneko, and Prange. The proposal explained the value of the collection as providing “evidence of Japanese ultra-nationalism.” This was an explicit reference to the censored materials, which were indeed, in some cases, ultra-nationalist. It does not characterize the significance of the bulk of the Collection, however, which captures the mainstream of Japanese thought from 1945 to 1948, not just the political fringe. To call it a collection that is about “ultra-nationalism” was to continue to reduce Japanese society to the way one might have seen it through the lens of the immediate aftermath of the Second World War.97

In the proposal, McNelly and Kaneko asked for $255,000 for a five-year program “for the development of its extensive and significant Japanese collection.” They explained that the University was able to provide a small amount of money, but that it was not nearly enough to pay for all of the staff, space, microfilming, and book purchasing that was needed. “Outside support is urgently needed [...] to bring this collection under bibliographic control, to strengthen it, and to provide suitable quarters for it,” McNelly wrote.98 The Ford Foundation rejected the grant.

In June 1968, after five years of service, Hideo Kaneko left Maryland to take head the East Asian section of Yale University Library. Maryland’s East Asia Collection

97 Records of the East Asia Collection, University of Maryland Libraries.
subsequently experienced a nearly complete turnover in staff; only Library Assistant Connie Galmeijer stayed on. Thomas H. Kang left that November to go work in what was then called the Orientalia Division of the Library of Congress, though he continued his relationship with the University for many decades (even coming back after he retired, as a volunteer). In August 1968, Shigeru Morizono joined the staff as the new SLIS Library Trainee.

3.2 The Committee for East Asian Studies

In December of 1968, five months after Kaneko’s departure, Naomi Fukuda came from her position as the Librarian of the International House of Japan to head the East Asia Collection. She was curious and wanted “to see the unusual collection of Japanese materials published during the American Occupation, 1945-50.”\(^9\) Marlene Mayo recalled first meeting Fukuda in Japan while she was there as a graduate student, in 1958-59, and seeing her again when she returned to Japan to do research as a Fulbright Scholar in 1967-68. The well-connected Japanese librarian helped her access a number of rare special collections in Tokyo. Mayo remembered being favorably impressed in 1969

\(^{98}\) Ibid.
when she heard that UM had managed to lure such an expert Japanese librarian to the campus. “She was this wonderful icon at the International House of Japan Library… she created that library,” Mayo said. “She was a little woman—under 5 feet I think—and she was a terror! I mean, she was so good!”

Fukuda seems to have left a powerful impression on many who knew her. She had professional presence and seemingly boundless energy and authority. “Naomi [Fukuda] was as entrepreneurial and as visionary a person as you could imagine,” her successor Jack Siggins recalled. She was also a strong influence on generations of Japanese librarians and scholars. One of her colleagues, Eizaburo Okuizumi, referred to her as “kami-sama” because, for the young librarians she mentored, “she was like a god.”

When this respected and professional librarian arrived in the winter of 1968 and saw the crates of rare books and historic Japanese publications in the grimy basement, she did not hesitate to drop her composure and react with an unrestrained horror. Fukuda decided to let her Rovelstad know how she felt about these conditions. She caught

99 Like many Japanese workers of her generation, Fukuda may have been expected to retire from her job in Japan at age fifty-five. However, it is not clear from my research whether she had reached her retirement age limit in her home country before she came to America. In the letter quoted here she refers to being “on leave” from the International House Library. Naomi Fukuda to Eugene Power, December 1968, Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries.

100 Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.


several large cockroaches in the basement, near the East Asia Collection. She wrapped them up in a box, tied it with a bow, and delivered this surprising gift to Rovelstad, the same Library Director that had been in charge when Prange’s crates arrived 19 years earlier. Once again, Rovelstad was in for a surprise.\textsuperscript{103}

In an interview, Marlene Mayo explained the story of Fukuda’s gift to Rovelstad, saying, “Ms. Fukuda was a \textit{thorough} professional, and she \textit{hated} the dirt and dampness and bleakness of the basement.” Not only that, but she saw the history and heritage of her country being allowed to molder and become infested with vermin. Because she was a small person and a foreigner, she most likely had a hard time making her voice heard. When the Library administration would not take notice of her words, Fukuda chose to send her message with a symbol. “I think it made an impression,” Mayo said. “I don’t think he forgot!”\textsuperscript{104}

In March of 1969, Yayoi Kobayashi Cooke joined the East Asia Collection as a part-time assistant. Although no one realized it at the time, Cooke had actually served as on the staff of the PPB during the Allied Occupation, reviewing magazines. Her journey had taken a fascinating full-circle, but she would tell no one until years later. That same

\textsuperscript{103} Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006, and Jack Siggins, interview with the author, February 10, 2006.

\textsuperscript{104} Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006. Jack Siggins also mentioned the cockroach story, interview with the author, Feb. 10, 2006.
month, Kuang-Yao “K.Y.” Fan joined to work on Chinese materials as an Associate Librarian.

In June of 1969, Fukuda wrote the first annual report that the Library had seen on the progress being made in the East Asia Collection. This included reorganizing the magazines from a strict alphabetically order to a subject grouping. She noted that among magazines “the coverage is just as extensive as that of local papers.” Fukuda used the term “general collection” to refer to the books, and “other collections” to refer to local papers and magazines. As Kaneko did, she emphasized that the “other collections” were “just as important and require careful handling.”

Though she would stay only one year at Maryland, Naomi Fukuda participated in an impressive number of professional meetings and conferences, including meetings of the Library School Association and of the Association for Asian Studies Library Committee. She visited the Asian Libraries at Harvard, the Japan Society of New York, the University of Illinois, Yale, and the MacArthur Memorial Library, among others. Her wide professional connections ensured that, for the first time, numerous visitors came to see the collection firsthand, including dozens of researchers and librarians from Japan.

Even on campus, Fukuda did not limit her influence to the Library. Her most important long-term contribution to the University was an idea that she and Marlene Mayo hatched together: the founding of a committee for East Asian Studies. They saw the committee as a means of advancing common goals. Mayo wished to fulfill the task Shannon had charged her with when he hired her: to “exploit” the possibilities of Prange’s Japanese collection for the benefit of the History Department and the campus, and to bring greater attention to campus scholarship on East Asia. In addition, Mayo and Fukuda knew that improved teaching of Asian languages on campus would both bolster Mayo’s teaching of Japanese and East Asian history and create a new user group for the East Asian library materials. While the idea of a new committee inspired them, they also took a realistic approach. They understood the limits of their influence, both as relative newcomers to the campus and as women. “[Fukuda] and I talked several times, and we decided that we would have to work through a man,” Mayo explained with a laugh, “even though the women’s movement was a bit underway” on the College Park campus.\footnote{Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.}

Mayo and Fukuda knew that the Department of Government and Politics had the most senior Asian scholars on campus. They decided to tap McNelly, a scholar of the 1947 Japanese constitution, as the ad hoc committee’s founding chair. The committee started meeting in October 1969, mostly at lunchtime. Mayo recalled that eight or nine
members participated at first. Although he technically served as chair, McNelly told me in an interview that Mayo and Fukuda really articulated the mission and organized the group. In addition, while he was flattered to be chosen as chair, he said he also felt somewhat puzzled and frequently overwhelmed by what he termed the combination of “emphatic personalities” on the committee.  

In her June 1969 report, Fukuda recommended increased microfilming of the local newspapers as well as the sorting and cataloging of magazines and books. She recommended that uncataloged books be grouped by subject, unless they had a place in the existent general collection. It seems there was some effort to keep censored materials separate, but the procedure for this remained inconsistent. The definition of “censored” was then and continues to be contentious. If a book passed under the eyes censorship staff, who emblazoned it with a CCD seal but did not delete or suppress any of the contents, was that book actually censored? In one sense, yes, because the mechanism of censorship was pervasive enough to extend outside the walls of the PPB. Publishers and writers knew that official censorship was occurring; therefore, authorial or editorial self-censorship was inevitable. In a sense then, the stamp was merely the symbolic culmination of a much bigger and more insidious process. According to the East Asia Collection’s procedures, however, most library staff considered materials censored only

if there were actual deletions or suppressions made to the text. In some cases, they
decided that materials fitting this description were unique and held them separately from
the rest of the collection. In other cases, after cataloging, staff placed books that had
deletions or suppressions on the open library shelves.

Fukuda also emphasized in her report that the East Asia Collection belonged to
the wrong administrative division of the Library. She considered it imperative that the
Collection no longer fall under the organizational umbrella of the Catalog Department.
One implication of being in this department included the obligation to produce a
minimum number of catalog cards per week. The role of the East Asia Collection’s staff,
however, involved working with unique materials and included many other additional
duties that most catalogers never dealt with, such as selecting new materials for the
collection, meeting visitors, and answering reference questions. Obviously, these duties
precluded East Asia Collection staff from producing the minimum number of card
catalogs required of their co-workers. The “conflicting aims” of the Catalog department
and the East Asia Collection created a good deal of tension.

In August of 1969, Fukuda prepared an additional special report on the state of
the newspapers and magazines and set out ideas for how to go about microfilming them.
She stated that these periodicals included a conglomeration of issues published between
1946 and 1949, whose “completeness...is its most distinguishing feature, which cannot be
duplicated in Japan or anywhere else.” She noted the presence of markings for
censorship or deletion, and stated that these papers occupied roughly one-third of the
entire East Asia Collection, but “are getting deteriorated and are a source of dust and fire hazard, thus, prohibiting repeated handling.” According to Fukuda, as of June 1969 a checklist of 2,417 titles had been confirmed and crosschecked against previous listings. She admitted that “since the materials were scattered in the shelving it is difficult to find whether we have all the titles in the list or not.” She finally concluded that it would cost an estimated $12,000 to $12,500 dollars for the microfilming expenses, which would result in estimated 403,500 to 420,000 frames. In addition, Fukuda cited the need for a staff that could identify and classify the newspapers by proper geographical locality, and said that the total time needed for preparation, filming, and editing after the films were completed would take about 2 years. Her dedication and ambition in calculating these figures are truly notable, given the conditions she worked in. This remarkable efficiency and progress is yet another reason why Fukuda is so well remembered by her former colleagues.

Fukuda and her staff began to implement these recommendations by tackling the magazines. They separated the magazines into two groups: those in published form (which had been subject to post-publication censorship), and those in the form of manuscripts or galley proofs which had been singled out for suppressions or deletions (pre-publication censorship). All magazines, whether censored before or after publication, had PPB-prepared worksheets attached to them. These worksheets indicated the name of the publication, the publisher and place of publication, plus telling comment sheets on the political inclinations of the editorial staff (i.e. “right wing,” “left wing,” or “neutral”), and whether or not the issue was in violation of the press censorship code.
Publishers were notified by letter if their publication violated the censorship code, and these supporting documents were attached to each magazine issue. East Asia Collection staff labored at detaching these PPB documents and worksheets from the published (post-publication censored) magazines. The sheets were placed in file cabinets or stacked in piles in the corner of the room.\textsuperscript{108}

It was in the spring of 1969 that Jack Siggins, a PhD candidate in Far Eastern Language and Literature and Library Science at the University of Chicago, first heard about the Japanese materials from Theodore McNelly, who had come to Chicago to speak. McNelly invited Siggins to come down to Maryland and see the collection in person. Siggins was looking around for a dissertation topic, and this collection seemed to combine two of the things he was most interested in: censorship, and Japan. He eagerly accepted McNelly’s offer.

Siggins said in an interview that the first time he met Fukuda, she was delighted to find “this gaijin [foreigner, non-Japanese]...who read and spoke Japanese and was

\textsuperscript{108}The PPB documentation attached to the magazines represents an extremely valuable source of information about the censorship procedure. Although UM Library staff did not know it at the time, these documents are related to the CCD records that were then held at the Federal Records Center in Suitland, Maryland (now at the National Archives and Records Center in College Park, Maryland). Information about the magazine processing procedure comes from Hisayo Murakami, "Memorandum: Window to Gordon W. Prange Collection and Archive," Records of the East Asia Collection, University of Maryland Libraries, 1991, and from Jack Siggins, interview with the author, Feb. 10, 2006.
really interested in the collection and in the history” of Allied censorship. “She was looking for somebody who could be the champion of this collection,” he said.109 Fukuda, already looking to move on her next project as Head of the Japanese Collection at the University of Michigan’s library, did not want to leave the East Asia Collection without a strong advocate. She managed to convince Rovelstad that he needed not only to hire Siggins but also to bestow on him his requested title, Head of the East Asia Collection (EAC). Rovelstad, perhaps fearing of what would be inside the next wrapped package if he refused, acquiesced to Fukuda’s requests. On Christmas Eve of 1969, Naomi Fukuda officially resigned as head of the EAC. Siggins took charge three and a half months later, on April 13, 1970.

Chapter 4: 1970-1976, Triumphs and Setbacks

The 1970s were not the best of times for most research universities, and the University of Maryland was no exception. The era is negatively associated with a PhD glut, enrollment declines, and overall economic “stagflation.” The decade did also bring federal tuition aid, however, and, to the great relief of many young college-aged men, an end to the draft. Most notably, perhaps, the 70s ushered in a phenomenon that continues to the present—an increased degree of government oversight of research universities. The government dollars that research universities had accepted so readily in the 50s and 60s had strings attached. Increased paperwork meant increased bureaucratization of research institutions.  

As Maryland grew in the 1970s, life and politics at the University and in the Libraries also grew more complex. Though the East Asian Collection made great strides in some respects, the early 70s was also time of conflict, frustration, and even destruction.

The arrival of Jack Siggins cemented a budding relationship between the Far Eastern Library at the University of Chicago and the East Asia Collection at the University of Maryland. Siggins had earlier participated in a program to cultivate librarians with expertise on East Asia, conceived of by the distinguished Chinese

---

professor and librarian Tsuen-Hsuin Tsien. The relationship between these two universities continues to be significant up to the present, as staff members, ideas, and even materials, have flowed in both directions between Chicago and College Park over the decades.\footnote{In Chapter 5 I discuss a program for the exchange of duplicate materials with the University of Chicago's Far Eastern Library during the late 1970s. Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries.}

Siggins convinced Library Director Rovelstad that although the basement might be an acceptable space for books and papers, he and his people needed more proper office space. He managed to obtain two small offices on the top floor of McKeldin. There was no room for the materials in the main area of the library, he was told, but he could have one office for himself and K.Y. Fan and Connie Galmeijer could share another, while the rest of the staff continued to work in the basement.

Jack Siggins told me that when he came to Maryland the collection was “hugely unorganized.” He explained, “We had trouble just getting the crates open, getting the stuff on the shelf, and getting rid of the crates […] we just put the stuff on the shelves, and then we started to organize it. We put the monographs over here, the newspapers over here, the magazines over here, the pictures over here, the children’s literature over
here. We spent an awful lot of time just getting this stuff into categories, broad categories.”

In June 1970, six weeks after his arrival, Siggins sat down at his new desk in his new office and wrote an annual report for his supervisor, Eleanor Smith, the Head of the Catalog Department. In the report, he noted that original book cataloging was done for nearly all of 1,263 titles in 3,821 volumes, but that roughly 22,000 volumes of the “special collection” remain uncataloged. It seems then that the term “special collection” referred to Gordon Prange’s unbound materials—precisely the works which should have been the number one priority, according to Kaneko and Fukuda. The reason for this clearly had to do with the nature of cataloging. New books are relatively quick and easy to catalog—all of the key publication information appears on the spine and the title page. This is not so for rare serials and manuscript materials, unique newspapers or defunct single-issue magazines. The “unbound,” “other,” or “special” collection would have been far more difficult to catalog on an item-by-item basis.

Siggins understood his new job to be building a true East Asian Collection at the UM Libraries. With the memory of the excellent Chinese holdings at Chicago fresh in his mind, his top recommendations for Smith focused on the acquisition of additional

Chinese language materials in order for the Collection to support faculty needs. He pointed out that although there were nearly equal faculty requests for Chinese and Japanese materials, the ratio of Japanese to Chinese materials was nearly four to one. He also advocated a less restrictive access policy to current periodicals, stating that users should be able to browse through current magazines and newspapers without staff assistance.

In the June 1970 report, Siggins also made recommendations for the “special collection.” He said that “the sorting and listing of periodicals should be continued” and that uncataloged books should continue to be processed and incorporated into the “general collection.” This sorting and listing of periodicals refers to the magazines and to the separation of PPB documents that were attached to each issue. The project also included inserting the magazines into acid-free envelopes and returning them to a strict alphabetical order, undoing Fukuda’s previous subject-category based reorganization. Siggins reiterated Fukuda’s point from the previous year that “the requirement of organizing material in the Special Collection and the obligation to respond to demands made of the EAC by faculty and students conflict with the goals and purposes of the Catalog Department.” He pleaded for the freedom for the EAC to determine its own
Less than one month after writing this report, these myriad problems were nearly rendered moot by the events of one wet evening.

### 4.1 An “Unnatural Disaster”

On the afternoon of Thursday, July 9, 1970, heavy rains began to fall in College Park. Within a matter of hours, three to five inches of water dumped on the campus. Drains in the parking lot behind the McKeldin Library clogged, and water backed up into the window wells in of the building’s basement. The intense pressure finally broke the glass panes, sending a torrent of water into the basement. Library staff discovered the leak at 6:00 pm. Hours later, Siggins received a phone call telling him that the EAC had been flooded. He arrived at 10:00 pm to survey the damage. By that time, most of the water had drained off, and clean up of puddles was already underway. Everything that had been within roughly eight inches off the floor had been soaked, with the most serious damage done to the “special collection” in the north end of the stacks.

Under bright blue skies the next day, cleaning began in earnest. Staff spread wet materials out to dry on every free surface—shelves, tables, desks, filing cabinets. Some

---

even went outside, onto the lawn. Mud, silt, trash, and dead insects covered the floor. Although staff made some attempt to clear the floor, according to Siggins this effort was “half-hearted and poorly organized.” He felt reluctant to ask EAC personnel to continue their regular duties in the basement until the physical plant staff had had the chance to clean more thoroughly.

Siggins initial survey of the damage claimed that 1,600 uncataloged books, 3,000 journals, and nearly 100 containers of newspapers got wet. In addition, water damaged the 11 file drawers of censorship documents and 400 documents on shelves. While Siggins hoped that most of the journals and books would dry out, he feared that the soaking might “accelerate the deterioration process.”

“The censorship documents constitute the most serious damage,” he wrote in a report days after the flood. “Because of their uniqueness and value to the researcher, a monetary value cannot be placed on the loss of any part of them. Eleven file drawers or roughly 25 to 30 percent of these documents suffered serious damage. The loss included manuscripts, censored journals, and papers,” he wrote. In an interview, Siggins also emphasized the significant loss of pictures. “We lost a lot of photographs,” he told me. “When the water hit the paper it glued them together, and they were not recoverable.
There were pictures of the people who worked at the censorship; there were photographs with [censorship] marks on them, if there were any suggestions of criticism.”

Siggins was furious to learn, in the weeks following the disaster, that McKeldin’s basement was in fact known to be prone to flooding, and that water had entered before in such a manner repeatedly. Had materials been lost this way previously, in the 50s or 60s? No one knew for sure. He recommended that all materials be raised at least 12 inches off the ground and that the entire basement be thoroughly swept and mopped before work was resumed. “It is even more imperative now that the censorship documents be microfilmed, especially those which were damaged by the water.” On July 20, 1970, in a later addendum to the initial damage report, he attempted to place a monetary value on the loss to the East Asia Collection by the flooding, clearly prompted to do so by his superiors. While he stressed the difficulty of quantifying the damage in terms of dollars (how does one measure the cost of an accelerated process of deterioration?), he put a rough estimate on the working hours lost.

In the end, the total losses included one file drawer of photographs and documents, 50 percent of a 20-month run of Japanese newspapers, and serious damage to an estimated 2000 uncataloged books which were still in the wooden crates in which they

had been they had been shipped from Japan in 1950. The condition of the books was still an unknown, since they were soaked but were underneath the weight of all the other books on top of them. Two weeks after the flood, they had still not been dug out and exposed to air.  

At this point, steeped in frustration and a growing anger, Siggins made a decision to start publicizing the fact that this collection was not getting the care or respect from the University that he felt that it deserved. He called in the press, igniting a publicity campaign that became a source of controversy for the University for years to come. As a new staff member in charge of a long-neglected corner of the Library’s holdings, Siggins felt that publicly shaming the higher-level University administration was the only way to get around the cautious and somewhat passive Howard Rovelstad, whom he regarded as the biggest roadblock to the progress of the collection.

Local newspapers and the campus paper, *The Diamondback*, did turn out to cover the story of the flood damage, and they captured many details effectively. In other ways, they managed to get the story just plain wrong. The prevalence of misinformation would

---

115 For this section I relied on the "Preliminary Report on damage to East Asia Collection by basement flooding, July 9, 1970" and the subsequent addendum, both prepared by Jack Siggins, July 14, 1970, Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries.
have great implications as Japanese newspapers picked up the stories from the American press, repeating and even adding to some of the factual distortions.

For example, a July 30, 1970 article in the *Washington Evening Star* stated that the East Asia material “was saved from Army bonfires in 1950,” an inaccurate rumor that would reappear in press reports over the years. At the same time, the article captured the devastating nature of the flood quite effectively. The reporter spoke mainly with Siggins, who emphasized the uniqueness of the Japanese censorship documents. “You can’t put a monetary value on this,” he said. “Most of this stuff is irreplaceable.” For the photograph that accompanied the article, Siggins explained, “we wanted something that would grab peoples’ attention in the photograph. So, what I did was get this very attractive young woman who worked in the delivery area in the back room. When the photographers came out, we put some of these things on the tables. She didn’t know anything about this stuff...well it was just perfect because it got all kinds of attention.”

On the same day, an article ran in the *Washington Post* with a much more positive headline, “Md. Library Tries to Dry Books Damaged in Flooded Basement.” The Post reporter spoke mainly with Howard Rovelstad’s office. Rovelstad hardly mentioned the East Asian Collection, and the uniqueness of Japanese materials received no mention at all.
Soon after the flood, in August 1970, Shigeru Morizono, the latest Library Trainee from Keio University, returned to Japan. He had already cut down his schedule from full time to part time in March of that year in order to concentrate on his studies for the MLS degree. It seems that he wanted to stay on at Maryland but that it could not be arranged, perhaps due to a broken arm. Yayoi Cooke’s status changed from a part-time permanent employee to a part-time temporary employee. Siggins recalled Yayoi Cooke
and Connie Galmeijer as excellent employees. “Cooke was very competent but very quiet, and hard-working,” he said. The collection “meant a lot to them, and they were pleased to have something to do with it—this was very apparent.”

4.2: The Repatriation Movement

The tenth Librarian of Congress, political scientist Luther Evans, believed strongly that original source materials should reside in the countries of their creation. During his tenure in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Library of Congress chose to repatriate numerous collections of international materials seized in wartime or, materials that, in Evans’ view, the Library acquired “under questionable circumstances.” It was also under Evans’ administration that the Library assisted Japan in founding the National Diet Library, in 1947. Even after Evans left the office of Librarian to become director-general of UNESCO in 1953, the legacy of his perspective on repatriation of materials lingered in the international library communities into the 1960s and 70s. In addition,


the U.S. National Archives and Records began returning documents captured by the Americans during the 1940s to the Japanese government during the 1950s and 60s.¹¹⁹

I asked Jack Siggins if any Japanese had expressed to him the opinion that Maryland should return the East Asia Collection materials to Japan. He replied, “almost every single one of them; almost everyone who came.” He explained that the Japanese East Asia Collection staff never expressed such opinions, but he was “sure they felt that way.” Siggins said, “When the National Diet’s person came the first time and looked at it, when we had government officials from Japan, the ambassador...almost all of them said ‘Well you know, this really needs to be returned to Japan.’ There was a campaign in Japan as a matter of fact, a publicity campaign, as I recall, off and on. Every time an article would appear about the fact that there was this wonderful collection at the University of Maryland, I would hear ‘well, this really needs to come back.’ [...] What they did not understand...is that it is just as much a part of American history as it is about the Japanese.”¹²⁰

Librarian and former EAC staff member Eizaburo Okuizumi remembered reading a telegram that the National Diet Library sent to Jack Siggins soon after the 1970 flood.

Ostensibly, the message was an expression of sympathy for the loss of materials in the disaster. “But I think this message was misinterpreted,” Okuizumi said in an interview. “The National Diet Library said that the best thing was to keep this material in a physically safe environment. At this time, the Library of Congress had already been sending originals back to Japan, so the Diet Library was thinking Maryland should have done the same.”

Okuizumi explained that the main Japanese proponents of the repatriation of the Prange materials were “politicians, or some journalists or researchers. The staff of the National Diet Library or government people, they understood it was the University’s property because of the San Francisco Peace Treaty. Under that treaty, everything related to the U.S. Army’s activity belonged to the United States. [...] So, the majority of public servants understood why such material went to Maryland, or to Library of Congress. They understood. But beyond that, some activists insisted [...] in their articles or sometimes in radio broadcasting.”

Three months after the flood, on October 16, 1970, Naomi Fukuda wrote to Jack Siggins from her new post in the Japanese section of the Asia Library at the University of

121 Eizaburo Okuizumi, telephone interview with the author, March 2, 2007.
122 Eizaburo Okuizumi, telephone interview with the author, March 6, 2007.
Michigan. “The Japanese people want the materials back,” she wrote, in reference to the Japanese materials in the East Asia Collection. “They are right, but the Americans ought to make a study of it.”

On the same day, she wrote to Rovelstad, thanking him for the kindness he showed to Library Trainee Morizono, echoing to him the theme of returning some of the East Asian Collection’s materials to Japan: “At least everyone tried to keep [Morizono] to have the listing of periodicals finished for the sake of the Japanese people. They think they have better facilities to take care of those materials. I think it is true, but since you have them in the United States and since the collection is a part of the history of the Occupation it should be studied before it is returned if it ever [is to] be returned.”

It is not surprising that, in the wake of the flood coverage, Fukuda and some other Japanese felt the collection should go back to Japan, where it would ostensibly be cherished and utilized. Because the PPB materials contain numerous works created by Japanese, it is logical that some Japanese felt stung by the fact that the collection was on American soil and under American control. In a way, it was as if the Occupation is still going on, decades later. Neglected in their crates, un-cataloged on a basement shelf, the

---


Prange materials spent many years hidden in plain sight, a kind of censorship redux. It echoed the power structure of the Occupation period: the domination of the American military victor over the defeated nation. The Collection, in this light, looked like the spoils of the victor.

From another point of view, however, the Collection was never Japanese at all. The PPB was a division of GHQ/SCAP, and therefore the rights to all office records created by the Occupation belonged to the U.S. Army, not to Japan, as Okuizumi noted. Still, some Japanese politicians and journalists became upset by the presence of so much of Japan’s postwar cultural heritage in libraries and museums abroad. Fukuda, motivated by her desire to see these precious resources well cared for and used—and perhaps by her frustrations with the University of Maryland Libraries—seems to have been among them.

Fukuda conceded that if Maryland did not plan to send the books and materials to Japan, at the very least the University should encourage greater access and study of the materials: “It will be a great contribution on the part of the University to study the major censored materials in relation to the part it played in the Occupation. I am sure Mr. Siggins has already done a lot toward completing his work, and I hope you will encourage him to keep up his studies.”

Siggins found it difficult to keep up his writing

__________________________
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for his doctorate, however, given the weight and time commitment of his new responsibilities. He did not finish his dissertation, opting for the career of librarian over that of academic faculty member. Through the Committee on East Asian Studies, at least, Siggins and Mayo continued to carry Fukuda’s torch.

4.3 Gordon Prange and *Tora! Tora! Tora!*

Gordon Prange’s input, notably absent during the late 60s when he became absorbed in his own work and teaching, reappeared after the flood. He had spent the interim years busily researching and writing what he hoped would someday be a book about the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor from the Japanese perspective. Prange began this research while he was still in Japan working for the G-2 Historical Section. As he conducted interviews with Japan’s former military leaders for the *Reports of General MacArthur*, he realized that he was one of very few people in the world who had the access and the resources to discover the Japanese side of the Pearl Harbor story. He became determined to tell that story, and started doing his own historical work on Pearl Harbor whenever he could find a spare moment away from his G-2 duties.

Two years after returning to Maryland, in 1953, Prange had negotiated a book contract with McGraw-Hill to publish what he hoped would be the definitive account of
the Pearl Harbor saga. He used his relationships with the Japanese architects of the attack to continue his research and interviews in-depth. In the end, Prange had seventy-two interview sessions with Commander Monoru Genda of the First Air Fleet, and forty sessions with Admiral Sadatosji Tomioka, an expert on the naval side of the attack. He also conducted fifty interview sessions with Captain Mitsuo Fuchida, a leader of the air attack who actually came to stay with the Prange family in Maryland for four months in 1964.126

In 1966, after much delay, the U.S. Government Printing Office finally allowed the publication of the *Reports of General MacArthur*, the volumes documenting the general’s campaign in the Southwest Pacific that Prange had worked on under Willoughby, back in the mid-to-late 1940s. During his lifetime, MacArthur refused to give permission so that the *Reports* could be published, citing inaccuracies in the text and a need for further editing. After he died in 1964, the government decided to move forward with publication, even without the “correction he deemed desirable.”127

Prange chose to start publishing his preliminary findings on Pearl Harbor in the popular periodical *Readers Digest* in October and November of 1963 under the title

“Tora! Tora! Tora!: The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor.” That same year, Readers Digest reprinted the articles as a thin 64-page booklet—succinct and interesting, but not a “serious” scholarly publication. By 1969, a much more substantial 391-page book version of Tora! Tora! Tora!, focusing on the Japanese side of the story, had been translated into Japanese and published by Readers Digest Japan. For the English version, however, his editors insisted that the manuscript needed the addition of the American side of the Pearl Harbor story. According to Donald Goldstein, that request is what bogged Prange down and kept him from being able to publish the full epic during his lifetime.

Despite the fact that the full English language version of the book Tora! Tora! Tora! was not yet forthcoming, 20th Century Fox bought the rights to adapt the Reader’s Digest articles into a screenplay. On September 20, 1970, the film Tora! Tora! Tora! premiered in Honolulu, and the Prange family flew to Hawaii for the opening. The University of Maryland Department of History screened the film in the old Hoff Theater,


128 At least three editions of the Japanese version, translated by Masataka Chihaya, have been published: in 1969, in 1970, and in 1991. The first edition was published under the title Tora Tora Tora: Shinjuwan Kishu Hiwa, and the second two were titled Tora Tora Tora: Taiheiyo Senso Koshite Hajimatta. (OCLC WorldCat, 2007).


free of charge at the time of release. While the Japanese portions of the film were originally going to be directed by Akira Kurosawa, he ended up declining in favor of director Kinji Fukasaku.\textsuperscript{131} Though critics disagreed on the overall effectiveness of the film, most were struck by its insistence on historical accuracy and attention to detail, which the director carefully retained from Prange’s manuscript. Many were also impressed by the special effects, and the film won the Academy Award for Best Visual Effects in 1970.

The widespread release of the film version of \textit{Tora! Tora! Tora!} had the consequence of giving Gordon Prange a new position of popular fame and influence from which to assert his authority and draw attention to the plight of the Japanese materials. In a 1971 headline in the campus paper, the \textit{Diamondback}, Prange is identified not by name but as “‘Tora’ author.” As in the 1970 flood, the \textit{Diamondback} provided a welcome opportunity to rail against a perceived University indifference to the valuable Japanese materials. Prange and Siggins both gave interviews, and the resulting article highlights Prange’s personal dissatisfaction with the treatment of the collections. “I never expected when I began shipping them back that the University would take 20 years to process them,” he said. “It’s not fair to the students and scholars from the U.S. and Japan to leave the collection unprocessed.” He went on to explain that “other Universities are known by

\textsuperscript{131} Marlene Mayo, note to the author, April 14, 2007.
the collections they have,” a statement which reinforces the notion that Prange fought the “battle of the books” back in 1950 as much for the reason of augmenting Maryland’s reputation as any other.132

Though he lived for his research, writing, and teaching, Prange had a growing sense of discontentment with his job in the History Department from the late 60s onward. Aubrey C. Land, head of the Department until 1964, had begun pressuring Prange about what he perceived as a lack of published scholarly research. Prange and Land were “great enemies,” according to George Callcott, “who almost never saw eye to eye,” causing a great deal of tension in department meetings.133 Land and other members of the History Department felt Prange’s lack of publishing productivity had a negative impact on the reputation of the Department. Perceptions of Prange by his colleagues did not necessarily improve when David Shannon took over as head of the History Department from 1965 to 1968, nor under his successor, Frank Harber, who served from 1968 to 1971. Prange did not take much stock in what his colleagues thought, however. He kept to himself, preferring to spend long hours writing in his study at home to lunches or conversation with his colleagues at the office.


133 George Callcott (professor of history at the University of Maryland), interview with the author, March 27, 2007.
Meanwhile, in the early 1970s the Committee on East Asian Studies was working through the issue of East Asian language teaching on campus, attempting to improve Chinese instruction and introduce a beginning course in the Japanese language. Marlene Mayo explained that CEAS managed to get the name of the language program changed from “Oriental and Hebrew” to “Chinese and Hebrew.”

“We were lobbying for a full time Japan person,” Mayo explained, “and we wanted an external review.” On approval by Dean Robert Corrigan (at that time called Provost) Hans Bielenstein, an early China historian from Columbia, came in to conduct the review. Based on Bielenstein’s report, the head of the Chinese program was removed from his position, and Corrigan granted approval for the creation of four tenure-track positions to develop the Chinese language and the Japanese language and literature. Corrigan’s support for the study of East Asian language “has been the greatest gift we have ever had,” Mayo said.  

Throughout these years of change, one thing that varied little was Gordon Prange’s enviable teaching schedule. While most faculty members taught three courses a semester, Prange only had to teach two. He kept the rest of the week free, so he could

134 See Martha Ross, CLIO at College Park.
135 Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.
pursue his research activities on Pearl Harbor. When Walter Rundell assumed the role of head of the Department of History in 1971, he used his authority to apply increased pressure on Prange, intending to shift Prange’s focus from perpetually researching the attack on Pearl Harbor in favor of actually publishing what he had written so far. But Rundell, like Prange’s frustrated publishers at McGraw-Hill, found that the stubborn scholar could not be convinced to cease research on the *Tora! Tora! Tora!* project, which had grown into a projected multi-volume epic tale. In 1973, Prange went over the head of his History Department colleagues and wrote an eight-page letter to UM president Wilson Elkins, asking for a meeting that would allow him to defend the quantity and scope of his research and writing projects. At the end he added, “I should also like to discuss a problem concerning myself that has arisen in the History Department—one which could develop in such a way that I might choose to leave the University within the near future.” Prange added that he would regret going, “but if matters got out of hand it could work out that I would have no other choice.” In the end, Prange did stay with Maryland, perhaps as much out of a pragmatic desire to hold on to his pension benefits as

---

136 Keith Olson (professor of history at the University of Maryland), conversation with the author, November, 2006.

137 Gordon Prange to Walter Rundell, March 1, 1972, Box 9, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.

138 Gordon Prange to Wilson Elkins, March 1, 1972, Box 9, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
out of his old loyalty to the institution. After all, Maryland was the only university post Prange ever knew or would know.

While he frequently had troubles with his colleagues, students were another story. They did not care about how many articles or books he had published: they loved his dramatic stories and attention-grabbing antics. One of his “systems” for guaranteeing good class attendance involved wearing a different colorful patterned vest for every lecture. On the first day of each class, Prange took out his wallet, opened it up, and pulled out a twenty-dollar bill. He held the money up in front of the class until all eyes were on him, and then announced that if anyone caught him wearing the same vest twice during the semester, there would be twenty dollars for each person who noticed it. Apparently he had a closet full of vests, all cut by a tailor from the same pattern, each more colorful and outrageous than the next. When it came time to get dressed for school, he chose the vest at the far left hand side of the closet. When he took it off at night, he

---

139 According to Theodore McNelly, Prange was quite well informed about the issue of faculty contracts and pensions. Once, upon receiving an offer from another University, McNelly consulted Prange in order to ask his opinion. Prange explained to McNelly exactly how much retirement money he would lose by leaving the UM pension system—it was clearly a topic that Prange had weighed in his mind before. Theodore McNelly, conversation with the author, December 2006.
returned the vest to the closet on the far right, ensuring he would go all semester without repeats. ¹⁴⁰

This theatrical approach to teaching ultimately paid off with good attendance and loyalty; students used to pack his lectures. Allegedly, some of them even came wearing togas on Fridays, others, evening gowns and tuxedos; they may have been geared up and ready for the weekend fraternity parties but were still unwilling to skip their favorite history class. ¹⁴¹ Some of Prange’s colleagues derided the vest gimmick, however, finding such eccentricities absurd or clownish and not befitting a serious scholar. Still, the long-term devotion that Prange gained from his students is nothing short of remarkable. A curator at the University of Maryland Libraries’ Special Collections division confessed that she has had requests from former students asking for copies of his picture, simply because “they loved him” and wanted to have a memento. Students frequently sent him letters, cards and notes thanking him for being such a special influence in their lives, and Prange kept many of these letters in his files for the rest of his life. One young man, a senior in the College of Business and Management, wrote, “Remember that when you so

¹⁴⁰ While I heard the topic of the colorful vests mentioned by numerous interviewees, this rendition of the story comes courtesy of Keith Olson (UM Professor of History), conversation with the author, December 2006.

touchingly proclaim your love for your students, we feel the same for you...professors such as yourself make institutions of higher learning worthwhile.”

4.4 The Library and the Committee for East Asian Studies

Jack Siggins concluded soon after his arrival that Gordon Prange’s other professional distractions meant that he could be relied upon only very occasionally for help in publicizing the plight of the East Asia Collection. Siggins needed a greater platform from which to plead for resources, and CEAS provided that platform. Mayo recalled in an interview that the 1970 flood was the event that spurred both her and Siggins into taking a more activist role on behalf of the East Asia Collection; as the language school issues gradually were resolved, she channeled her energy ever more intensely into the Library aspect of the Committee. In return, she found Siggins to be a dependable ally in promoting East Asian Studies on campus, noting that university administrators tended to listen to him when he spoke. “He had a beard, so it helped,” she said.

143

142 Frederick J. Boos to Gordon Prange, April 2, 1976, Box 9, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.

143 Marlene Mayo, conversation with the author, July 31, 2006.
In November of 1971, working through the Committee, Siggins compiled a summary of proposals entitled “The University of Maryland East Asia Collection: Problems and Solutions.” It focused mainly on facilities issues and the ongoing inadequacy of the basement as a home for the documents. The document highlighted the need for the Library to prevent further damage from water, mold, and dirt, and to provide better physical access to both users and staff. Siggins hoped that the Committee would soon have the ear of higher-ups in the University Administration.

Graduate and undergraduate students also supported the efforts of the Committee on East Asian Studies’ throughout the 1970s. “It was in the era that students were being activists, the Vietnam era, and some of it spilled over into trying to promote East Asian Studies or Asian Studies,” Marlene Mayo explained in an interview. “Some students went around and knocked on the doors of some deans, and said ‘Why do I have to go to another campus to learn Chinese or Japanese? Why can’t we learn it here and learn it properly?’” According to Mayo, the students working together with the faculty made “a wonderful combination.”

“It really worked in the early 1970s,” she said. “Jack [Siggins] was on board, so the Library was involved, really pushing. And so we were able to really improve

144 Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006.
Chinese, we were able to start Japanese [...] I think there was just an immediate meeting of the minds over both the academic goals and the Library’s goals.”

In February of 1971, a new Library Trainee joined the East Asia Collection from Keio University, Taeko Terashima, replacing Morizono. Siggins continued to write regularly to Naomi Fukuda, keeping her abreast of the latest developments in the Library. In June of 1971, he sent her a clipping of the “Tora author” article from the Diamondback, featuring himself and Gordon Prange. That same year Siggins secured an “oral agreement” with Justin Williams, former chief of the Government Section of GHQ/SCAP, that he would donate his valuable personal papers to the East Asia Collection. This donation proved a double-coup, as Williams also had temporary possession of the papers of Charles Kades, who played a major role in the drafting of Japan’s 1947 constitution.

In 1974, Library Director Howard Rovelstad announced his intention to retire. Soon after, Siggins was promoted from head of the East Asia Collection to Assistant Director for Public Services. Later, he would become the Public Services Division’s associate director. He also took part in the search process for a replacement Library Director and eventually helped to hire Dr. H. Joanne Harrar, from Georgia, whom everyone called “Jo.”

__________________________

Ibid. 108
In early autumn of 1974, the last of the Japanese Library Trainees came to Maryland from Keio University, on Naomi Fukuda’s guidance. Unlike his predecessors, who had been mostly interested in literature and therefore preferred to spend their time in the EAC cataloging literature books, Eizaburo Okuizumi came from a social science background. He became fascinated by the primary source historical materials—the newspapers, pamphlets, and documents—of the PPB. Working with the crumbling, dirty, and disorganized newspapers did not put him off as it had some of his peers. Meanwhile, the Library administration decided that another full-time EAC staff member was called for. Okuizumi applied for the position, and the Libraries hired him. He severed his connection to the Keio exchange program and became a full-time staff member at McKeldin library in 1975; he would stay at Maryland for another decade.

Since they now had the enthusiastic Okuizumi full time, the Library decided to discontinue their support for the Japanese Library Trainee Program between Keio and SLIS. This put Okuizumi in an awkward position—he felt personally responsible for the discontinuation of what had been a unique opportunity for young Japanese librarians to gain skills and to study in the United States. Keio University wanted the program to continue, and they did not hide their displeasure with the decision. Okuizumi explained, “they lost an opportunity to foster young librarians.” Okuizumi became determined to compensate for the cancellation of the Trainee program by spending his own career
helping young Japanese librarians come to American university libraries whenever possible, just as Naomi Fukuda did before him.146

In 1974, work began in earnest on the newspapers. Over the course of the next 10 years, assistants and part-time student assistants who were fluent in Japanese sorted and compiled roughly 80 percent of the newspaper holdings. They cataloged the newspapers using a system of 18,000 index cards, on which they recorded the name of the newspaper in Japanese characters and Roman letters, as well as the publisher and place of publication in Romanized letters. They translated specific information, including the volume number and date, into English.147 The remaining newspaper holdings were more challenging to categorize, as those were published by groups such as “labor unions” and “youth organizations.” They were stacked on shelves in the same order that they were unpacked from the wooden boxes.

His own promotion meant that Siggins had to replace himself as Head of the EAC. Siggins and Mayo recruited Frank Joseph Shulman, a PhD student in Far Eastern History with a Masters in Library Science at the University of Michigan, who had recently gained a distinguished reputation as a bibliographer. In 1974, Shulman had


published a well-received annotated bibliography on Western language sources for the study of the Allied Occupation of Japan, co-edited with the distinguished professor of political science, Robert Ward.\textsuperscript{148} Mayo recalled feeling sure that Maryland could lure Shulman with the position, while Siggins remembered that Shulman was not entirely certain he wanted to take a job as a librarian while his bibliography career was taking off. Siggins reassured Shulman by insisting that he could continue doing his “bibliography on the side.”\textsuperscript{149} In 1976, Shulman accepted the position and packed his bags for Maryland. The staff now consisted of Yayoi Cooke, Connie Galmeijer, K.Y. Fan, Eizaburo Okuizumi, and Frank Joseph Shulman.


\textsuperscript{149} Jack Siggins, interview with the author, February 10, 2006.

Despite his initial uncertainty about coming to Maryland, Shulman threw himself into his role as Head of East Asian Collection once he arrived. He immediately fired off a barrage of letters to his extensive network of professional contacts at various universities and libraries around the world. Aware that the bulk of the collection was of Japanese origin, he targeted Japanese scholars in particular. Shulman’s polite prose reflected a Japanese-inflected sensibility, eloquently indirect and unfailingly formal. In his letters, he included articles, copies of his publications, and generous offers to share his small apartment with out-of-town visitors.

He also frequently hosted dinner parties at his apartment in College Park Towers, an apartment complex where Mayo and many other University faculty and staff lived. “We called it Shulman Bunko,” (the Shulman Library) Siggins recalled, because the small apartment was so filled with East Asian books and publications. Shulman’s willingness to promote the EAC through his correspondence and by fostering a network of friendly relationships with colleagues and scholars was a significant contribution.

According to Mayo, Siggins and Shulman formed “a very good team.” In 1975, under the auspices of the Committee for East Asian Studies, the group decided to try to

raise money for the East Asian Collection by applying for a three-year grant from National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to provide additional staff to catalog the book collection. Shulman and Siggins compiled statistics related to the Collection, while Mayo really started to investigate the collection’s history, “so that I could make a rationale and create an argument.” They submitted the proposal just in time: Siggins hand-delivered the document to the door of the NEH in order to meet the deadline.  

The NEH accepted the proposal, and the Libraries took over administration of the grant money. The East Asia Collection was able to hire Ellen Nollman to do the cataloging work; she stayed on staff for the next five years. The successful grant proposal not only provided the Collection with much-needed funds for staffing, but also provided some “boiler-plate” language for subsequent grant proposals to the NEH and the Japan Foundation.  

Under Shulman’s guidance, the daily cataloging and organization work continued much as it had under Siggins. Shulman relied on experienced staff, especially Okuizumi, as he continued to pursue his bibliographic projects as well as his leadership of the EAC, just as Siggins had promised him he could. In an interview, Shulman explained that he never lost interest in creating bibliographies, and that he has continued doing 

\footnote{Marlene Mayo, note to the author, April 14, 2007.}
bibliographic research and writing throughout his career. “I have had two careers, in effect,” he said, “a dual track.” Shulman felt that the UM Libraries did not support the bibliographic side of his efforts, however, nor did budgets allow for other professional development opportunities during that era. He recalled wanting to travel to Japan to secure connections and participate in conferences, but the Libraries could not provide him with the time off or the money. He became more acutely aware of a divide on the campus between “librarians” and “faculty.” The University simply did not expect or encourage librarians to engage in scholarly research and publishing.153

Shulman’s expertise in bibliography did serve him well when it came to collection development and the selection of general reference resources. He bought as many key reference books on East Asia as he could manage to squeeze into the EAC’s budget. The cataloging and processing of the “unbound” materials continued during the 1970s and 80s. Occasionally, staff members still found PPB paperwork tucked inside the Occupation-era magazines. Shulman explained that in most cases the paperwork had

152 Ibid.

153 The situation is ironic when considering that in 2007, UM librarians have University faculty status. The professional activities and publishing that Shulman felt discouraged from taking part in during the 1970s and 1980s have now become job requirements for librarians. Frank Shulman, interview with the author, November 9, 2006.
been taken out years earlier, but “in some cases it had perhaps been folded up, it was not evident, and [if] you were going through a magazine, you’d find it.”154

Shulman attempted to maximize the EAC’s book holdings not only through the purchase of new volumes but by entering into a relationship of materials exchange with the Far Eastern Library at the University of Chicago. Such projects are common among academic libraries: institutions makes lists of materials among their holdings that either are duplicates or considered less desirable, and they trade with each other to fill in the gaps in each other’s collections. From the beginning of the project, Shulman expressed concern that they ship no books with “censorship markings” from Maryland’s side. Okuizumi surveyed the eligible volumes, checking them on a list as “censored” or “non-censored” before approving that the “non-censored” books for shipment to Chicago. From 1976 to 1980, the records of the East Asia Collection indicate that the two libraries exchanged over 580 volumes.155

Though he was no longer working directly with the Collection, Jack Siggins continued to advocate for the EAC from his role in the Public Services office. He explained that he “convinced Harrar that the East Asia Collection needed its own reading room, it was so important; so, we took up a whole floor of McKeldin. On all the major

154 Ibid.
floors there were reading rooms, and I reorganized the whole building to get the East Asia Collection set up on the north wing.” Despite granting the Collection this expanded space, Siggins felt that Harrar, whom he had helped hire, was not as supportive as she might have been. “There was some resistance on the part of Dr. Harrar,” Siggins said. “She never was much of a supporter of the East Asia Collection.”

5.1 Naming the Gordon W. Prange Collection

While the late 1970s represented a time of new staff, space, and grant money for the EAC, they were bittersweet years for Gordon Prange. Though only in his 60s, he was already nearing the end of his life, a fact that he may have sensed. His feelings about the Library, sour since the Hornbake affair, seemed to hit a new low in 1974, when he was forced to pay the Library $151.45 in “alleged fines and book losses.”

His obsession with still-unpublished Pearl Harbor epic he was calling *Tora! Tora! Tora!* consumed all of his free time and energy, yet he was such a perfectionist that he would not agree to let it go to print. In fact, he had also started at least three other books as side projects in the meantime, on the Battle of Midway, Captain Mitsuo Fuchida, and Willoughby’s old

---

155 “Chicago Exchange” folder, Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries.


157 Gordon Prange to Walter Rundell Jr., January 5, 1975, Box 16, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
obsession, the spy ring led by Richard Sorge. In 1976, Prang’s publisher McGraw-Hill finally grew so frustrated after more than twenty years of waiting for Prange’s manuscript, they decided to write off the $20,000 in advances they had given the scholar over the years and cut off communications with him altogether.\footnote{Information here and in the following paragraphs on Prange’s relationship with his publisher come from Carl Bode, "Quest for the Day of Infamy: A Historian’s Obsession with Pearl Harbor," \textit{The Washington Post}, December 6, 1981, and Donald Goldstein, interview with the author, March 23, 2007.} Prange optimistically continued to send chapters to his editors, but heard nothing in return. In a 1977 letter to Eizaburo Okuizumi Prange wrote, “I can’t begin to tell you what a tremendous relief it will be to have this massive work off my back. I have devoted so much time, money, and energy to it over the years it has all but devoured me. But, it has been worth it.”\footnote{Gordon Prange to Eizaburo Okuizumi, October 21, 1977, Box 9, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.} He found quiet solace outside of his work and study by tending to the immense rose garden at his University Park home, which consisted of over five-hundred bushes.

In additional to whatever scholarly and professional dissatisfactions may have plagued Prange in the late 1970s, personal problems and health troubles also began to play a role in siphoning off his once-abundant energy. He continued his work, but a major surgery in mid 1976 kept him from devoting the kind of time and effort to his writing and teaching that he would have liked. Only two years later, in May of 1978 at
the age of 68, doctors diagnosed Prange with prostate cancer. He began his last battle: fighting the disease that would eventually claim his life. On hearing of Prange’s illness, Donald Goldstein, a former student who had become an old family friend, contacted the family and asked if there was anything he could do to help. Prange asked Goldstein if he could find a way to resume negotiations with McGraw-Hill.

In an interview, Goldstein denied the legend of a dramatic “deathbed scene” in which Prange asked he and his longtime typist Katherine Dillon for assistance. Rather, Goldstein explained, Prange wanted and expected to keep working on his manuscript, but his health problems and bad relations with his publisher both seemed prohibitive. Prange did not have a literary agent, so Goldstein and Dillon agreed to go to New York to make Prange’s case to the publisher. They proposed condensing Prange’s projected four-volume work on Pearl Harbor into a single volume. McGraw-Hill accepted, and Prange’s former students went to work, paring down tens of thousands of typescript pages into a unified manuscript.

Aware that Prange would probably soon retire, but not knowing how ill he actually was, the Committee for East Asian Studies, now chaired by Marlene Mayo, came up with the idea of honoring Gordon Prange’s contributions to UM by naming the collection of Japanese materials in his honor. The CEAS members understood that in so doing they could take a step towards undoing the errors of the past while drawing new attention to the rare Japanese materials. This would not only honor the man but also assuage his dissatisfaction, and bring the powerful force of his legacy as a much-loved
teacher behind the collection. It was both a strategic move and a sincere one. They submitted their request to the Regents of the University of Maryland in 1978; after some discussion over whether or not a collection should be named after a living person, the Regents acquiesced.

Once the University announced the naming of the collection, congratulations to Prange came pouring in from all sides. Flattered and delighted by the honor, he seemed to let go of his frustrations with the Library and the University. Robert A. Corrigan, the Dean (then called Provost) of the Division of Arts and Humanities wrote in a congratulatory letter, “You helped preserve a portion of Japan’s national heritage which might otherwise have been totally lost.” Not only that, Corrigan went on to point out, but the presence of Prange’s gift acted as a catalyst for the growth of the entirety of the Library’s East Asian Collection. Prange replied that his “only concern” back when he acquired the material was for Maryland’s library, which “was sorely in need of help of every possible kind.” He went on to explain to Corrigan that “after a long period of frustration and waiting for these materials to be processed and made available to the scholarly world, I am glad that...important steps are being taken to do exactly that.” He publicly singled out Harrar, Siggins, and Shulman for praise. He also mentioned that he himself had valuable materials among his own personal papers: he would like to donate them to the University of Maryland. This would not be the first time or the last time that
he expressed such wishes. Siggins even visited Prange’s home office to survey his personal research materials, including the interviews with Japanese military officers conducted as part of his Pearl Harbor research. “My mouth just watered, because it was such a profound collection,” Siggins said. “I talked to him, but he always put stuff off.”

In July of 1978, Library Director Joanne Harrar wrote to congratulate Prange, saying, “As a late-comer to the University of Maryland, I have been appalled at the neglect, benign or otherwise, which seemed to be the Collection’s plight for so long.” Harrar’s concern for the collection seems to have come to her quite late, according to the memories of Siggins and Shulman. Compounding the problem of the Library Director’s lack of enthusiasm for the EAC was the fact that there seem to have been interpersonal problems between Harrar, EAC staff members, and other Library administrators. Several former Libraries’ staff members have confided that her tenure was marked by quarrels and feuds. Prange, as a faculty member looking in on the Libraries, was pleasantly surprised, however, when he met her at the 1979 Collection dedication ceremony. He remarked in a note to her that “no one would believe that such a young-looking and attractive woman could be the Director of Libraries at a major university…one generally

visualizes a librarian as bespectacled and dusty.” Indeed, the note itself bears witness to Prange’s forced reassessment of the role of a female Library Director, as Harrar’s title clearly had to be re-typed with the appropriate “Dr.” instead of “Ms.” Prange concluded the letter by saying that “later in the summer” he would write to her about donating his personal papers.162

In fact, Prange had been looking for a home for his personal papers throughout the 1970s. He and Anne both kept up a long correspondence with archivists at the University of Iowa; they were considering depositing the papers there, due to a continued sense of loyalty to their home state and to that institution.163 In a 1972 research visit to Stanford University to visit the library of the Hoover Institution, Prange struck up a conversation with Franz G. Lassner, the Director of Archives. After the visit, Prange wrote to remind Lassner, “You may recall that we had a short talk about my Pearl Harbor materials.” He explained that he enjoyed Palo Alto very much, and had even considered retiring to California someday, so depositing his papers there might make some sense.164

162 Gordon Prange to H. Joanne Harrar, May 23, 1979, Box 16, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
163 Gordon W. Prange biographical file, University of Iowa Archives, Special Collections Department, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
164 Gordon Prange to Franz Lassner (Hoover Institution), 1972, Box 9, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
This prestigious and well-funded institution took a proactive approach after that, sending Prange follow-up letters on the topic through the years, in 1974, and again in 1977. The 1977 letter from Director of the Institution Charles G. Palm emphasizes that “we would be honored to establish a collection here under your name.”

When Prange received Stanford’s 1977 inquiry, he forwarded it to UM Chancellor Robert L. Gluckstern in order to let him know that other institutions were interested. In the same letter, he also referred to inviting Gluckstern and other UM staff to a “rose-viewing party.” He wrote that he hoped to one day invite Gluckstern, the library director, and the EAC staff to such a party once he regained his full strength and energy, and he repeated this sentiment in his correspondence to many others around this time.

Sunday, May 6, 1979, marked a moment of triumph for Prange and for the University of Maryland Regents. That was the day the official ceremony was held to name the Japanese materials “The Gordon W. Prange Collection: 1945-1949.” University President John S. Toll attended, as did former University President Wilson H. Elkins, who spoke in Prange’s honor. As chair of CEAS, Mayo used her personal connections to secure Japanese scholar and minister to the United Nations Sadako Ogata as a speaker.

\[165\] Charles G. Palm (Hoover Institution) to Gordon W. Prange, December 2, 1977, Box 16, Papers of Gordon W. Prange, Special Collections, University of Maryland Libraries.
Finally, Prange himself gave an emotional speech in which he summarized the circumstances under which he obtained the materials for Maryland. He explained that although he never imagined at the time what an important collection it would turn out to be, he now felt that the founding of the collection might possibly have been the single greatest achievement of his career. After the celebration was over, for a while Prange pursued the idea of founding a “Japan Institute” on the College Park campus, with the Prange Collection at its heart. He spoke and wrote about it in tones that echoed his enthusiasm for the founding of a military institute, thirty years before. Had he not grown even more ill, the notion might even have come to fruition.

By late 1979, Prange had turned over full responsibility for the editing and publishing of his book to Goldstein and Dillon. In May of 1980, Gordon Prange passed away. His family requested that in lieu of flowers donations be sent to the Gordon W. Prange Collection at the University of Maryland. With his writing left in Goldstein and Dillon’s hands, the Tora! Tora! Tora! that Prange had been striving towards for so many years yielded a multitude of remarkable separate works, including the richly detailed At Dawn We Slept, published in 1982. Some consider this work to be the most authoritative account of the events leading up to Pearl Harbor. It is certainly one of the most popular;


After Gordon Prange’s death, arrangements to deposit his personal papers in a library became complicated because he had signed no document assigning the right to his papers to any University. Yet it seemed that after the 1979 ceremony, Prange had made up his mind to give them to Maryland. He had written to the University President, the Provosts, and the Library Director, each time mentioning his willingness to discuss donating his large collection of research materials so that scholars could have access to them. His papers are indeed a rich resource for any scholar of World War II in the Pacific. In addition to materials he amassed from other archives and from the army, he has a great deal of personal correspondence with Japanese and Allied military personnel. Many of them were key historical actors, and their personal relationship with Prange provided an intimacy and humanity.
5.2 The 1980s: Commemoration and Change

While the naming ceremony had served as a public milestone for Prange, for CEAS, for the University, and for the Libraries, little changed in the daily work of EAC. Shulman forged ahead in the early 1980s, now supervising both the general East Asia Collection and the newly distinct Gordon W. Prange Collection. While it seemed that in some way, though the granting of a distinct name, the archival quality of the Prange Collection was finally being acknowledged, the biggest initial impact of the naming ceremony was new publicity. The library did not yet start to run the Collection as an archives, with the attendant security and focus on preservation that archives require. The PPB’s Japanese books continued to stay on the open library shelves in the regular East Asia Collection stacks. Japanese media outlets carried news stories about the Collection, and publishing companies became intensely interested in its contents. In 1980, one Japanese publisher, Yushodo, offered to microfilm a portion of the pre-publication censored magazines—the galley proofs and manuscripts—but only those pages that were considered “most historically and educationally significant.” Yushodo paid for the costs of the microfilming, but then retained the right to sell copies of the microfilm in the United States and Japan. Under the terms of the agreement, McKeldin received no copy

of the microfilm but instead received a sum of money for the purchase of additional reference books.\textsuperscript{168} The staff of the EAC prepared worksheets documenting information about the magazines and censorship documents for microfilming. They shipped it all to a Bell & Howell microfilming facility in Wooster, Ohio. The microfilming took the company roughly one year to finish 160,000 pages.

In 1982, Jack Siggins left the UM Libraries to become the Assistant Director of Yale University Libraries; there he would meet Hideo Kaneko and learn that, by chance, they had both once been in charge of Maryland’s East Asian Collection. Soon after Siggins’ departure, in 1983, the Libraries formally transferred the EAC from the Public Services Division to the Special Collections Division. In December of 1983, Okuizumi announced that he would soon be leaving for a job at the Far Eastern Library at the University of Chicago; he departed in 1984.\textsuperscript{169} In 1985, the Libraries’ hired Kenneth Tanaka to replace Okuizumi; he would also take on additional cataloging duties.

Mayo and Shulman both participated in the Association for Asian Studies (AAS), with Mayo serving on national-level committees and Shulman especially active with the mid-Atlantic regional branch (MAR/AAS). Both continued to make important

\textsuperscript{168} Details of the Yushodo agreement recounted here come from Marlene Mayo, note to the author, April 30, 2007, and Eiko Sakaguchi, email to the author, May 1, 2007.

\textsuperscript{169} Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries.
connections with Japanese scholars, politicians, and curators of other East Asian library collections. These relationships would draw attention to and admiration for the valuable assets of the Prange Collection. However, tensions in the Libraries’ administrations stymied extensive collaboration.

Another NEH grant brought new funds to the East Asia Collection, and in 1986, the Libraries hired Hisayo Murakami as a “Library Assistant for Japanese Publications,” a technical assistant position. A native of Japan and married to a Japanese-American, she had earned a B.A. in Political Economics from Rikkyo University, and worked for the Mitsui Company in Tokyo from 1952 to 1963 before moving to the United States. Like several Library Assistants who had worked with the collection before, Murakami did not have a professional background as a librarian or archivist, but her native fluency in Japanese and her deep interest in the contents of the Collection made her a welcome addition to the EAC staff. Between 1985 and 1989, Murakami and the rest of the staff worked under the grant to catalog education texts and education-related materials from the unsorted Prange Collection books, identifying roughly 10,700 volumes and preparing bibliographic data.¹⁷⁰

On April 24 and 25, 1987 the College Park campus hosted a celebration to honor the 40th anniversary of the Japanese Constitution. It featured a panel of former participants in the Allied Occupation, including Charles Kades, Justin Williams, Sr., and Beate Sirota Gordon, famous for her participation in drafting Japan’s model constitution in 1946, when she was only twenty-three years old. The Libraries also hosted two displays of rare documents. One, in McKeldin Library, drew from the East Asia Collection, especially the papers of Kades and Williams. The other, at University of Maryland University College’s Center of Adult Education in College Park, curated by Marlene Mayo with financial support from the Department of History, displayed documents from the Prange Collection and the National Archives. These two exhibits highlighted a number of the key documents, photos, cartoons, pamphlets contained within the Libraries, for the benefit of students and visitors.171 Unfortunately, the celebration also highlighted security and organizational problems in the Collection, as during preparations for the event key documents went missing: either lost, stolen, or misplaced during their transport for reproduction. An atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust began to brew.

By several accounts, after Siggins and Okuizumi’s departures, the late 1980s represented a challenging era for the history of the Gordon W. Prange Collection, with striking high points but also worrisome lows. A microfilm order for bombing records from the collection by a Japanese group from Nagasaki resulted in poor quality images, and the group threatened to sue the University. Some the administrative and interpersonal issues that had plagued the Libraries started to come to a head.

In March of 1990, the Collection welcomed a prestigious visitor: the former Prime Minister of Japan Noboru Takeshita. A cadre of Japanese news reporters accompanied Takeshita, along with representatives from the Japanese Embassy and the Japanese Ambassador to the United States. Shulman and Murakami received the group, led them on a tour, and introduced them to the contents of the Collection. Only three months later, in June of 1990, responsibility for the Prange Collection was transferred away from the Special Collections Department and back to the Technical Services Department. This time, however, the collection was not grouped with the Cataloging but rather with the Preservation Division, under Preservation Officer Dr. Paul Koda.


The reorganization continued in 1991, when Library Director Harrar removed Frank Shulman as head of the East Asia Collection, transferring him to the Cataloging Department. The decision shocked some Libraries’ staff, who knew Shulman’s long-standing commitment to building the Libraries’ East Asian resources. Shulman’s departure from the EAC resulted in a brief power vacuum before Harrar chose Hisayo Murakami to manage the Collection. After five years as an assistant, Murakami now became manager, though her responsibilities encompassed those of a curator as well. Murakami dedicated herself to the Prange Collection with intense loyalty, working endless hours in the McKeldin basement despite the poor air quality amid the disintegrating newspapers. With expert guidance and assistance she made great strides in reversing the microfilming debacle, and she produced the first written history of the “Gordon Prange Collection and Archive,” based on the extensive documentation left by Shulman, plus interviews with Anne Prange, Hideo Kaneko, K.Y. Fan, Yayoi Cooke, Joanne Harrar, and University Archivist Anne Turkos.174

Along with Murakami’s new title came an increased burden of responsibility. As mentioned earlier, the PPB materials in the Prange Collection were still integrated with the East Asian Collection in many ways. Circulation policies and security for the rare

174 Ibid.
PPB materials had always been somewhat subjective—in the 1970s and 80s, if a researcher wanted to see some portion of the special collection, they procedure had simply been to “ask Jack,” or “ask Frank.” Because of the frequently shifting position the Collection occupied within the Libraries’ organization, this “special collection” had never truly been run like one, with lockers for users’ bags and pens forbidden, for example, to prevent damage or theft. Without the built-in support these sorts of explicit special collections policies provide, when Murakami assumed responsibility for the Collection she may have sometimes felt that she had to defend the materials against potential threats like damage or theft by her own vigilance and will.

Through the history of Murakami’s oversight over the Gordon W. Prange Collection in the early 1990s, it becomes clear how the issue of access to materials can become something personal for both library staff and researchers. In the early 1990s, the Libraries closed the Prange Collection for preservation purposes, though they continued granting some researchers limited access to materials. Marlene Mayo became upset, as the closure disrupted her research as well as some research planned by her graduate student, Haruko Taya Cook. From Mayo’s perspective, access to the Collection was granted inconsistently and unfairly. From the point of view of Murakami and the Collection staff, ongoing requests to see large quantities of materials by Mayo and other UM researchers stood in the way making progress on the much-needed preservation work. The situation became tense, with Mayo contacting University administrators and giving an interview to the *Diamondback* to voice her grievances.
Murakami and Mayo had both invested years of their lives in the fate of the Prange Collection, and each felt personally connected to it and responsible for it, professionally and emotionally. After working so closely with Jack Siggins to promote the East Asia Collection through the Committee on East Asian Studies in the 1970s and 80s, it is not surprising that Mayo felt entitled to have continued access to the holdings without interruption. Murakami, however, was the person authorized to act as the gatekeeper, not Mayo. She controlled users’ access compelled by both a sense of professional responsibility for the safety of its contents, and by its connection to her own personal culture and heritage as someone who had lived through the Occupation in Japan. Mayo’s wish was for the contents of the Collection to be made widely known through uninterrupted academic scholarship. Murakami was concerned with protecting the rare and fragile materials, taking the long-term view. Though the two frequently did not see eye to eye during these years, it is striking how deeply both of them cared about the Prange Collection materials.

Chapter 6: 1991-2007, Postscript

In April of 1992, the Office of the Director of Libraries took direct control over the Prange College, giving it a status outside the usual organizational hierarchy. Years of carefully cultivated Japanese relationships over the years were finally beginning to result in truly substantial grant money from Japanese sources. In 1992, the National Diet Library of Japan contributed $1,500,000 in a four-year joint project with UM Libraries to microfilm the magazines. Harrar and Murakami, accompanied by a Development
Officer, Mary Holland, traveled to Japan and personally met with representatives from the National Diet Library in order to thank them for their support. They also sought further preservation support by meeting with the Japan Foundation and the Center for Global Partnership. Renovation of the McKeldin library was completed in 1993, and the project of separating Prange Collection materials from the rest of the EAC in order to treat them as a true archives or special collection finally began in earnest. That same year, the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership contributed a $1,000,000 grant to go towards microfilming and cataloging the newspapers. The Libraries secured and additional $531,000 NEH preservation grant for the project.

In 1996, Dr. Charles Lowry replaced Joanne Harrar, in the process reinventing the Library Director’s position as “Dean of Libraries.” The title of Dean granted Lowry greater access to the upper echelons of UM administration. He also succeeded in allowing librarians to gain faculty status, bringing to the UM Libraries not only the prestige but also the pressures of the “faculty” title. Lowry felt that emphasizing the professional and

\[\text{\textsuperscript{175}} \text{Library Matters (3, No. 12), June 27, 1997.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{176}} \text{Records of the East Asia Collection, UM Libraries, and Marcia Duncan Lowry, “Preserving the Prange Collection: A Trip Across the Pacific in Search of Friends,” Library Issues, Fall 1998, } \]

scholarly research of librarians themselves would be one way to raise respect, visibility, and resources for the Libraries at UM. A historian by training, Lowry is very concerned with Special Collections. Lowry travels to Japan frequently, and in his speeches and articles, he always mentions the Prange Collection as being high on the Libraries’ priority list.

In a tragic turn amid what were otherwise years of great improvement for the Prange Collection, Hisayo Murakami died unexpectedly in June of 1997. Her colleagues in the Libraries continue to speak of her memory with great fondness and affection.

The current staff of the Gordon W. Prange Collection has worked together as a team to carry on the best aspects of the work that their predecessors began, forging connections, and facilitating collaborations with governments, organizations, and foundations in Japan and the United States. In 2001-2002, the Collection put on a series of the acclaimed exhibits. In 2002, for the gallery exhibit “Rebuilding a Nation: Japan in the Immediate Postwar Years, 1945-1949,” staff worked with the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities to create an impressive companion web site.

Marlene Mayo also still works diligently to try to maintain the connection between the Department of History, East Asian Studies, and the Gordon W. Prange Collection on the Maryland campus, though in a department with few scholars and students of East Asia, it is often an uphill struggle. In 2003, she initiated the creation of two 20th century Japan research awards under the auspices of the Nathan and Jeanette
Miller Center for Historical Studies and the University of Maryland Libraries. Nine scholars have taken advantage of the awards, for $1500 each, since 2004. Mayo also brings her Japanese history classes to view the Prange Collection, concerned that young scholars become aware of the censorship that occurred under the Allied Occupation and of the existence of this valuable resource on the campus. Mayo is still mindful of her charge from David Shannon, forty-one years after he hired her.

Chapter 7: Parallel Professional Developments in History, Information Science, and Archives

In a recent article, Sarah Tyacke notes that among academics in fields outside of archival and information science, “although the ‘fetishism of the document’ and other lively arguments about the content of archives and documents continue, the actual nature of archives and how we get them is not apparently of interest. This seems odd, as without them very little history, or documentary, or textual analysis can be written at all.”¹⁷⁸ It is true that one rarely comes across a work of archival history or a discussion of the nature of archives outside of the small world of archival publishing and journals. Perhaps this is not due to disinterest, but to an assumption that there really is not much to know that cannot be intuited, by common sense. Historians take for granted an understanding of what archives are. But do most they understand for sure?

Tyacke notes that one common source of confusion about archives may be the fact that “in the public’s mind the distinction between libraries and archives has become quite blurred, the two words commonly being used interchangeably. One of the reasons for this must be that manuscripts and archives are often present in libraries together, and both are manuscript, which obscures their specific purposes. This has not been helped by

the classification of library materials into book and non-book which again lays emphasis on the physical characteristic of the items rather than on the content: a case of the medium not the message.\footnote{Ibid., 3.} If anything, the Gordon W. Prange Collection makes clear that physical characteristics and formats (book, Japanese language) often drew more attention than the fact that the PPB materials were archival in nature; hence a good deal of the PPB materials were intermixed with a normal, circulating vernacular language collection. The Collection, however, was always an archives, even though it was not treated as such for most of its history. If a book can be archival, then what are archives, exactly?

“Archives are the Documents accumulated by a natural process in the course of the conduct of Affairs of any kind, Public or Private, at any date; and preserved thereafter for reference, in their own Custody, by persons responsible for the affairs in question or their successors.” Sir Hilary Jenkinson provided this classical definition in 1948.\footnote{Ibid., 3.} Though the profession has moved past Jenkinson’s implied neutrality and passivity, his definition laid the groundwork for modern archival theory in the English-speaking world. Several years later, T.R. Schellenberg, the most influential American archival thinker of the 20th century, defined archives as “all documentary materials, regardless of physical
form or characteristics, which were produced or accumulated for a specific purpose but have enduring value for purposes other than those for which they were produced or accumulated.”

Schellenberg amplifies Jenkinson’s definition by explaining that archives have a utility and value for researchers that extends beyond what their creators originally intended for them. Taken together, these two definitions provide a framework for beginning to examine the contents of the Prange Collection from the perspective of archival science.

The first thing to note is that Gordon Prange constructed the collection that would come to bear his name. He chose sets of items that he believed would have enduring value, and sent them to Maryland. Therefore, his collection as a whole can be characterized as an “artificial collection” in archival terms: rather than accumulating by the Jenkinsonian notion of a “natural process” (e.g. the functioning of a government office), Prange made a series of value judgments as he selected and gathered items and series according to his interests and the availability of the materials.


The censored PPB materials within the Prange Collection, however, represent what is called an “organic collection,” an accretion of records that grew out of the PPB’s business process, and comprises a subset, which makes up the bulk of this larger “artificial” grouping. The subset is made up of U.S. military records, and part of America’s cultural legacy. The PPB’s Japanese language materials underwent “archivalization” through the censorship process, and they became GHQ/SCAP government records. Typically, rare books are not considered archival because they have been published and are, therefore, not unique. However, any book that came through the PPB for censorship review is unique: only two copies were ever submitted for review, and only one of them was kept for PPB reference. Whether approved or suppressed by the censors, each of these items is evidence of a process that the PPB undertook in the course of its conduct of affairs from 1945 to 1949. Therefore, all of the PPB materials, regardless of physical form or characteristics, by virtue of being reviewed for censorship and kept by GHQ/SCAP, are in fact Occupation records.

As the records of a specific bureaucratic organization, the PPB materials had, at one time, an original physical arrangement and intellectual order imposed on them by the records’ creators in GHQ/SCAP. That original order may have been partially obscured by the packing process in Japan from 1950 to 1951. Then again, it may have been respected, because the archivist of the G-2, Louis Doll, was advising Prange during that time. Regardless, that original order is all but completely lost today, thanks to continual organizing of the materials by generations of well-intentioned librarians, historians, staff, and volunteers.
Organization is essential to librarians. The stacks would be chaos without it. But to an archivist, organizing is something done by the original creators of the records. Archivists do not reconfigure completely organizational schemes; their job is simply the “arrangement” of an existing scheme. To disturb the original order forever alters the meaning of the records—an archival taboo. Yet that is exactly what happened with the PPB records.

Prange’s gift was an archives, but for many years the UM Libraries treated it as a regular library collection. They allowed the Japanese language classification to trump the archival classification, and for decades treated the books as one might treat any foreign-language books. This decision had drastic repercussions.

Hindsight gives us an unfair advantage here. While it is clear that the UM Libraries did not quite know how do deal with the archival nature of the Prange Collection from the beginning, they can hardly be blamed, given the relative infancy of the archival profession in the United States at that time. The archival nature of the Prange Collection materials was probably was not apparent to Rovelstad or to many other people. When librarians see a book, they do not immediately think of it as a possibly unique historical record. They see something that is to be cataloged as soon as possible so it can be made accessible to patrons—that is the nature of their profession. Researchers depend on them for that. Therefore, much effort went toward cataloging the books and getting them out on the shelves; meanwhile the newspapers and magazines, in far more urgent need of preservation work, languished in their acidic pinewood boxes.
Yet, in the 1960s, the first two Japanese librarians to work with the materials, Hideo Kaneko and Naomi Fukuda, both emphasized the preservation of the newspaper and “unbound” (manuscript) materials as the top priority in their reports to Library administration. Frank Shulman continued this advocacy. All trained librarians, they nevertheless immediately honed in on the archival nature of the materials and advocated preservation as the number one priority. Administrators above them, however, either did not recognize the significance of the materials, or felt too financially constrained to take the kind of urgent and sweeping action that the heads of the EAC recommended.

7.1 Concepts in Archival Science Applied

I have alluded above to several “bedrock” archival concepts. In order to see how they might have been applied, in this case, to the Prange Collection, it might be worth enumerating three of the biggest ones.

1) Provenance/Authenticity: The principle of provenance means that in order to guarantee their authenticity, there must be a controlled and unbroken chain of custody over the materials.

In order to guarantee authenticity, an institution has to keep close physical safeguard over unique items. Prange’s sturdy crates did a fine job, for many years, in preventing alteration or loss of materials. After the crates were opened and the East Asia Collection founded, PPB copies of Japanese books were placed in the open stacks and able to circulate outside the library. Over time, some of the books had their censorship
markings rubbed away or smeared from repeated handling by a variety of users. Furthermore, some books were eventually damaged from use and had to be re-bound. These new bindings sometimes replaced or obscured the PPB stamps and markings.\textsuperscript{182}

This principle of provenance dictates that archival materials absolutely cannot circulate outside of the library. Circulation means pages get torn out, marks made, existing censorship markings potentially rendered meaningless. Unbroken custody, by contrast, ensures that the markings are trustworthy. If patrons were allowed to take archival books and materials out of the building for perusal, it posed not only a risk of damage, but actually rendered the whole collection less reliable.

2) \textbf{Original order}: Because these materials—even the books—were gathered as the result of a set process, they had to have accumulated in some order. It might have been chronological…but not necessarily.

GHQ/SCAP had protocols for the keeping of files, and the PPB must have had their own method of organizing the censored materials and accompanying paperwork. The organization scheme of the CCD records at the National Archives may provide some

\textsuperscript{182} Information about access and circulation policies comes from the Records of the UM Libraries, East Asia Collection, UM Libraries, from Marlene Mayo, interview with the author, April 12, 2006, and from Frank Shulman, interview with the author, November 9, 2006.
clues. Perhaps the PPB employed subject categories. After all, suppressing information, opinions and emotions was not the only reason that censorship review took place; it was also a means of discerning public opinion and uncovering illegal operations. Categories by subject or by another method might have served the PPB well in their endeavor. As an anecdotal example, current Curator of the Prange Collection Eiko Sakaguchi made a remark to me about how certain records indicate that the PPB had placed materials about acupuncture under the category of “hobbies,” but that subsequent rearrangement of the materials moved the records on acupuncture to “medicine.” She made the point that although this might be where Americans would class acupuncture today, the classification scheme used by GHQ/SCAP could have been a telling source of information about past attitudes.

3) Aggregate description: For the purposes of cataloging, Archivists describe a collection working from large to small. First they describe series of items, then sub-series, then folders, and finally, if time and resources permit, individual items.

If the principle of aggregate description had been opted for, instead of plunging immediately into item-level cataloging, the custodians of the Prange Collection might have been able to give intellectual access to descriptions of their collections much sooner. “Series” allow researchers to focus on a larger intellectual grouping of materials with a common quality, such as coming from a certain part of an organization, or falling within a particular period. The work of learning about the individual items could have been left for researchers to discover themselves, at least until the more detailed, item-level
cataloging could be undertaken. Murakami, for one, argued strongly in favor of series level description in order to give researchers access to the Collection as soon as possible, but the Libraries’ Technical Services Division felt strongly that each periodical or volume should have its own catalog record.\(^{183}\)

Item level cataloging for unique items is expensive, time-consuming, and burdensome. This is especially true when the items are in a non-Roman alphabet like Japanese. The catalog entries must be Romanized, and/or translated into English, partially or in full. For many years, the staff of the Prange Collection labored under burdensome cataloging standards.

### 7.2 Government Records and the Collection’s Legal Status

Today, donors of archival collections usually fill out a legal document, a “deed of gift,” which officially transfers the records and other materials into the hands of the repository. This is a precaution born of an increasingly litigious culture, but it makes sense that the transfer of important documents should be itself documented. In 1950, however, a verbal agreement and a handshake probably sufficed in many circumstances. While I have not been able to locate any legal or military documents that formally

\(^{183}\) Amy Wasserstrom, conversation with the author, May 3, 2007.
transfer the rights to the PPB materials from GHQ/SCAP to the University of Maryland, this absence is not a guarantee that such a document does not exist. For example, in a 1949 letter, Prange refers to General Willoughby writing personally to President Byrd, presumably about the collection. However, this letter does not appear in Byrd’s papers in the archives—Byrd’s files being remarkably thin. A duplicate may possibly exist in Willoughby’s papers at the MacArthur Memorial in Virginia, at the National Archives in College Park, or at some other location, but if it does, I have not managed to locate it.

The US Code, Title 44, Chapter 21, enacted June 30, 1949, deals with the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and the rights and responsibilities of this organization with regard to historical materials. “Historical materials” are explicitly defined as:

“books, correspondence, documents, papers, pamphlets, works of art, models, pictures, photographs, plats, maps, films, motion pictures, sound recordings, and other objects or materials having historical or commemorative value.”

Furthermore, Title 44 goes on to state that:

“In the event that a Federal agency is terminated and there is no successor in function, the Archivist [of the United States] is authorized to relax, remove, or impose restrictions on such agency’s records when he determines that such action is in the public interest.”\(^{185}\)

An example of a “terminated Federal agency,” GHQ/SCAP had “no successor in function.” Most of the remaining records of the Occupation came through Federal Records Centers to the National Archives. They were then made available for researchers in the late 70s, as is “in the public interest.” Hundreds of large Records Center cartons of G-2 Civil Censorship Division records now make up part of Record Group 331 at the National Archives II in College Park, Maryland. There is no detailed finding aid for this collection available online, but a NARA staff member printed me a copy of the series inventory. To someone unfamiliar with the records, the names of the individual files are maddeningly obtuse: how can a folder be called “censorship” when the whole series is about censorship? Still, it is abundantly clear from the inventory that this collection represents a companion to the records sitting in the McKeldin Library’s basement. The National Archives II in College Park has the records of the PPB’s censorship of radio broadcasting and theatrical works and the policy records; the evidence of Japanese book and periodical censorship are at the University of Maryland, less than two miles away.

Typically, governments want to hang on to their archives. UNESCO and the International Council on Archives (ICA) have formalized the idea that the records of a government always belong to that government as the concept of the “inalienability and imprescriptibility of state records.”

Public archives are public property, part of the public domain, and therefore inalienable and imprescribable. These qualities of archives may, depending on the law of a given country, be made explicit in an archival law. The National Archives should have a right to replevin (or, at least, a right to make copies) of public archives which have gone astray. ¹⁸⁶

Government records “went astray” en masse after WWII, all over the world. This phenomenon provided the impetus for the formation of the International Council on Archives in the first place. As the well-known archival consultant and ICA member Trudy Huskamp Peterson told me, “Everybody has something of somebody else’s.”¹⁸⁷

Dozens of archival repositories, both public and private, have records of the Allied Occupation among their holdings: Maryland is not alone. While these repositories reap the benefit of having interesting historical collections to offer researchers, they also struggle with the legacies of the governments or organizations that created the records.

¹⁸⁶ Ketelaar, Eric, “Ch. 17 Archival and records management legislation and regulations” Selected guidelines for the management of records and archives: A RAMP reader.

¹⁸⁷ Trudy Huskamp Peterson, conversation with the author during an archives research seminar taught by John Fleckner, College of Information Studies, University of Maryland, spring 2006.
During the 1950s and 60s, the University of Maryland struggled to provide users with full access to the Prange Collection—literally a government duty. In taking on the Prange Collection, the University (unknowingly) accepted responsibility for a collection that should receive the most public level of user access, as it might have at NARA. After all, censorship was a government policy, so it makes sense that reaping its consequences and sharing information afterward should have been, at least in part, a government responsibility.

7.3 A Case Study for the Information Professions

The Prange Collection is unique, but the issues it faces are certainly not unique. All archives, to some degree, have ambiguities in their origins, significance, and status. Frequently, the reaction by staff of archival repositories to any legal or ethical uncertainty is to clamp down and restrict access, or go into a public relations “spin” mode to avoid exposing a dubious history. However, archives would be better served to embrace transparency and encourage open, public dialogue about their collections. Librarians and archivists share a quest to provide reliable information, the root source of human knowledge. The solemnity of their mission means that they cannot be afraid to discuss hard questions or to expose some of the secrets that their collections may hide. Yet many are afraid—afraid of discomfort, confrontation, or of being judged for past mistakes. Perhaps some fear losing grant money, losing custody of materials, or missing opportunities for future donations. Still others may fear a loss of ownership to researchers over the way that particular historical documents are interpreted. I sensed hesitancy and
guardedness among some of my interviewees for this project, probably due to a few of these exact fears. Yet the story of this collection is bigger than the story of these individuals and their concerns.

Like many archivists of his generation, T.R. Schellenberg, quoted briefly earlier, first trained as a historian. He earned his PhD in history from the University of Pennsylvania in 1934 before going on to spend most of his career as an archivist at the U.S. National Archives and Records Service (NARS, later to become the National Archives and Records Administration, NARA). Schellenberg’s life is an example of how intimately connected the work and the concerns of historians and archivists are. Yet, in the generations of professionals since his, how frequently disparate has been their awareness of the work that goes on in one another’s chosen field. Professional training for archivists evolved over the decades from a subset of the history discipline to being grouped with the “information professions,” especially librarianship. Today, many archival positions require a Masters degree in Library Science. When we add another group of professional norms and standards—those of librarians—into the mix of people who work with special collections like the Prange Collection, the motivations, values, and priorities become even more complex, even contradictory. While all three professions, history, archives and libraries, are concerned with the preservation and dissemination of human knowledge, each goes about facilitating that mission in such a distinct way. It is not surprising, therefore, that confusion can sometimes occur, particularly in the world of the research university where they often share the same space and compete for resources.
In the United States, archivists were the last of these three formally to professionalize and take on their own distinct identity. The American practice of archival science grew out of the discipline of history in the 1930s, its central tenets and practices being developed from modifications to the European record-keeping tradition combined with trial-and-error experimentation. Records managers split professionally from archivists in the 1950s. Government archivists and records managers later formed their own professional associations in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{188}

For all the diversity of archival jobs and disagreement over who can call themselves an archivist, it is clear that the work and professional principles of archivists, records managers and manuscript curators are fundamentally different in many of their principles and practices from the work of librarians and historians. In short, archivists deal in aggregate and approach their collections from a holistic perspective, respecting the organizational schemes of the records creators. Librarians focus on individual items as self-contained information packages, and tend to be more concerned with the selection of items, rather than just letting a series accrete. Historians, like archivists, are interested

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}{188}{For one account of the rise of the archival discipline in the United States Richard Cox, \textit{Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Archives and Records Management} (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2000).}
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
in the life of their sources as part of the historical record, but they are not necessarily trained to manage archival collections.

The Gordon W. Prange Collection needed an archival perspective from the beginning, but it had to wait for many decades.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1 Why Archival Histories Matter

Current archival thinkers like Terry Cook and Richard Cox have argued for a need for more written histories of archives. They believe such histories could help scholars to understand that archives are frequently founded both intentionally and serendipitously. Cox complains that “the quality of research on American archival history has been uneven, and the quantity not very impressive.” While he focuses his call on recruiting scholars from within archivists’ professional ranks, he also notes a “growing interest by those outside the archival and records profession in the historical evolution of writing, records, record keeping, archives, and historical sources.” He notes that the nature of research in the history of archives must be interdisciplinary, but that archivists have much to contribute, as they “may have a greater sensitivity to professional issues that provides insights others might lack.”189

Terry Cook observes, “Societal or collective memory has not been formed haphazardly throughout history, nor are the results without controversy. Historians in a postmodernist milieu are now studying very carefully the processes over time that have

determined what was worth remembering and, as important, what was forgotten, deliberately or accidentally. Such collective ‘remembering’ and ‘forgetting’ occurs through galleries, museums, libraries, historic sites, historic monuments, public commemorations, and archives—perhaps most especially through archives.”

The history of the Gordon Prange Collection is a story of such collective remembering and forgetting, or sometimes, remembering and suppressing. The varied approaches to gaining physical and intellectual control over the Collection evolved over time, in the context of changing professions and professional standards, leaving it in the condition it is in today: preserved, but not perfect.

8.2 Postwar Reflections and Relations

Today, Japan is in the midst of re-examining its wartime legacy. This is evidenced by the regional uproar over the whether Prime Minister Koizumi or Abe visits the Yasukuni shrine honoring Japanese war dead, discussions of military re-armament, and by the ongoing debate over revision of school history texts. Historical evidence of the sort found in archives is one of the few antidotes to the revisionists’ proposed omissions or obfuscations.

__________________________

In the U.S., too, memories of the post-WWII period have been brought to bear on the present. As this country and others remain mired in the occupation of Iraq, some historians and pundits have looked to the occupation of Japan for some kind of guidance, a model for successful policies, despite the obvious dissimilarity between the two situations. The most relevant lesson to be learned from the occupation of Japan, in this case, may revolve around the issue of archives and records. GHQ/SCAP censored the Japanese press, but they also preserved a portion of Japan’s literary legacy and cultural heritage in the process. Helping the Iraqis to protect their own records provides insurance against future historical distortions. Being careful and systematic with the disposition of all of the coalition’s occupational records by giving them directly to the archives of countries with a commitment to care for them properly is an obligation and duty.

One of the main truths that the story of the Gordon Prange Collection reveals is the fact that without specific and enforceable norms for disposing of government records, their fate is left to hazard. The Prange Collection was lucky in one sense, because there were always people who cared about it. Had the collection gone to a larger or more prominent research institution than the Maryland of the 1950s, or to the National Archives, it might have been better cared for and utilized. Then again, the situation might have been far worse. Flooding can happen anywhere. Employees are always
fallible. The collection could have been split up, “reorganized,” or buried among masses of competing collections.

Had the books and manuscript materials been left in Japan in 1950, they might have been scattered throughout a variety of local libraries. The unbound records would likely have been made inaccessible to the public, or possibly even destroyed. One of the reasons the Prange Collection is so valuable is because the collection is all in one place, and this probably would not have been so if it were in Japan. But today, thanks for microfilming and digitization projects underway, the materials are broadly accessible for an international research audience.

Curator of the Prange Collection Eiko Sakaguchi explained in an interview, “If this was left in Japan, as a whole, I don’t know if it could have existed as it is.” She feels no remorse that this cultural treasure is not in Japan. “At least in America, you know how to treat information,” she said. “You believe in giving access to people, and that materials are here to be used. This is what I learned doing library courses in Western countries. We are here for the users, the reason we preserve is for the materials to be used.”


191 Eiko Sakaguchi, interview with the author, February 8, 2006.
I asked her what reaction Japanese users have when they visit the Prange Collection. She said that everyone uses the same word: sugoi. “Every single person says sugoi desu ne,” she explained. The expression can be translated as “wow,” though literally the word sugoi means great, terrific, awesome; but it also carries the sense of being overwhelming, and can even be used, like the English word terrific, to express something frightening due to its immense power. “I think this word tells all,” she said.
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