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Introduction

On August 15, 1945, the Emperor of Japan surrendered to the Allied Forces. This marked the beginning of the Allied Occupation of Japan, lasting until April 28, 1952. While the occupation was technically run by the Allied Forces consisting of the United States of America, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, China, the British Commonwealth, France, and Poland,\(^1\) the physical occupation was carried out by the American military with American civilians providing support. This arrangement may be due to the American military's primary role in the Pacific theater of operations, known to the Japanese as the Great Pacific War, despite the longer history of war between China and Japan as well as the extended political history of Japanese relations with the Soviet Union.

Censorship of Japanese publications began immediately. General Douglas MacArthur, formerly the Supreme Allied Commander for the Southwest Pacific Area, became the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP, an acronym which is also used to refer to the Occupation's management in general) and oversaw all operations of the Allied Occupation until his retirement in 1951. Beginning with SCAP's assumption of control over the country, MacArthur instituted a secret system of censorship over Japan, organized and run by the Civil Censorship Detachment (CCD). The CCD oversaw pre-publication censorship of all newspapers, radio scripts, plays, films, literature, fine art, and international news, as well as smaller publications including club brochures and school newspapers. The CCD also monitored private communications, including personal mail. The CCD's censorship would shift towards post-

\(^1\) By the end of World War II, both Poland and France had been invaded and occupied by the Axis Powers and were primarily members of the Allied Forces in name only. By the time of the Allied Occupation of Japan, the main powers within the Allied Forces were America, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China. China and the Soviet Union, however, had very little if any influence on the Allied Occupation.
publication censorship beginning in 1947 and eventually cease altogether in 1949 as the Occupation itself began to wind down.

The pre- and post-publication censorship of every piece of published material required that the CCD maintain at least one copy of all materials submitted for inspection in their records. After the conclusion of the censorship program and the dissolution of the CCD, the Chief of the Historical Branch of SCAP, Gordon W. Prange, gained permission from MacArthur and his chief of intelligence, Charles A. Willoughby, to collect the records of the CCD and ship them to the University of Maryland at College Park, where Prange was a professor of history on leave to serve with the Allied Forces. Over the next two years, Prange and workers hired by the military to assist him packed the censored materials and accompanying paperwork into shipping crates, sending the materials to the University of Maryland. Although Prange would never use the collection for his own research or work, it was eventually named the Gordon W. Prange Collection in his honor.

At the university, the collection sat in a disused basement until the early 1960s, when attention began to be drawn to its neglected existence. Over the next fifty years, multiple generations of library staff and history professors would work together to organize and describe the collection, attempting to make it accessible to researchers both intellectually and physically. Beginning in the mid-1990s, preservation and description work would begin to focus on digitization of the materials in order to reduce handling of the original documents and facilitate easier access for researchers, including the many Japanese scholars interested in the collection.

The history and content of the Gordon W. Prange Collection creates an interesting topic for postmodern analysis. Postmodernism and its approaches to archives focus on the conscious
and subconscious subjectivity inherent within any collection of archival materials. According to postmodern thought, this subjectivity is present within all collections from the appraisal and accessioning of some materials over others, to the materials' arrangement, description, physical and intellectual accessibility, and use. While many archivists strive for objectivity throughout their management of collections, postmodernism posits that no person can be wholly free from subjectivity and inherent bias, forcing archivists to abandon their intellectual stance as neutral guardians of history for a more proactive position as shapers of historical narratives and collective memory. Because the collection is a comprehensive and complete record of SCAP's censorship of the Japanese publishing world during the Allied Occupation of Japan, there is no inherent bias within the collection's materials regarding the severity or justifiability of the censorship program itself. However, the varied history of the collection's management, description, and accessibility does allow for the possibility of a wide range of subjectivity to arise from the actions of those archivists, librarians, and historians who have shaped it.

The collection's comprehensiveness, coupled with the unusual history of arrangement and description since its creation in the late 1940s and early 1950s, creates a unique and interesting point of study from a postmodern perspective. Because of its inherent lack of bias, any subjectivity discovered within the collection or its potential effects on literature covering the censorship activities of SCAP would be attributed to the conscious or subconscious subjectivity created by those archivists in charge of the collection. If no subjectivity is apparent, or if that subjectivity has no meaningful effect on the literature that uses the collection, then the central postmodern question that concerns archives - that of the role of an archivist's subjectivity in creating and maintaining collections - may be dramatically lessened in its importance.
However, the Gordon W. Prange Collection may be useful to a postmodern perspective on archives and their collections' use in historical academia beyond answering the simple and deeply important question of archival subjectivity's potential effect on literature. Another main postmodern discussion concerning archives is their tendency in the twentieth century to support mainstream narratives, particularly national narratives, and assist in the work of erasing alternate narratives or perspectives on historical events. This was seen in the archives' subjective selectivity of materials to preserve and the archivists' arrangement and description, which often focused on those historical figures and events commonly held as important, sustaining the narrative that had shaped those decisions. The Prange Collection itself may offer a counter narrative to the more mainstream concept of the Allied Occupation and how Japan was democratized by the United States and their allies in the immediate postwar period.

This thesis seeks to answer these questions of postmodern archival thought by examining the Gordon W. Prange Collection, its history and use, as well as those major factors that influenced its creation and arrangement. The collection's use within historical literature will be analyzed and compared to that literature commenting on the censorship activities of the postwar period without using the collection as a resource. This analysis allows for basic conclusions to be drawn concerning questions of conscious and unconscious subjectivity and counter narratives within archival contexts as they are discussed and addressed from a postmodern perspective, furthering the concept of a postmodern archives.
The Civil Censorship Detachment

The Gordon W. Prange Collection is comprised of the documents censored by the Press, Pictorial, and Broadcast Division (PPB) of the Civil Censorship Detachment (CCD) under the command of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Forces in the Pacific (SCAP)'s direct supervision during the first four years of the Allied Occupation. The Allied Occupation began in August 1945 immediately following the official surrender of Japan to the Allied Powers. General Douglas MacArthur, who had overseen much of the Pacific War, was placed in charge of this second, American-led government that would operate alongside and above the Japanese government for the next seven years. SCAP, also referred to in the literature as General Headquarters, or GHQ (the acronym most commonly used by the Japanese), officially began post-publication censorship of the Japanese press on the very first date of the occupation, September 2, 1945. Due to a lack of Japanese-speaking ground forces, pre-publication censorship could not be established over the Japanese-language press and was limited to the English-language *Nippon Times*. This censorship was put in place as they announced freedom of the press by ordering the Imperial Japanese government to abolish all forms of censorship it was operating.

While officially denouncing censorship of the press, SCAP soon after issued the "Freedom of Speech and Press Directive," which was later used as the foundation for both the "Code for Japanese Press" and the "Radio Code for Japan," both of which were issued within a fortnight of the original directive. Whereas the original directive merely called for "an absolute minimum of restrictions" focusing on false news stories, criticisms of SCAP/GHQ, military

---

movements of Allied troops, and anything that "disturbed the public tranquility," the second round of censorship guidelines embodied by the "Code for Japanese Press" and "Radio Code for Japan" was stricter in its regulations and simultaneously, maddeningly vaguer. These codes were written to read very democratically; they appear to merely establish ways to ensure that the press is maintaining a neutral perspective while reporting the facts, perhaps the ultimate goal of a democratic press. However, these codes gave no instructions detailing what particular topics beyond criticism of the Allied Powers or Allied troop movements would be censored.

The vague wording of the codes granted the CCD expansive powers pertaining to what would be censored under the new regulations after the CCD's official censorship began on October 8, 1945, just over a month after SCAP began its occupation and post-publication censorship. As opinions, political stances, and other variables shifted, so too did the many targets of the CCD's censorship activities. More specific guidelines for censorship were handed out on a regular basis to the CCD's examiners in the form of key logs, lists of banned subjects, phrases, or words. These logs were changed often and without warning, making censorship a constantly shifting barrier that editors, publishers, authors, and all others involved in the creation process outside the CCD would have had a difficult time understanding, as they were never allowed access to or made aware of these key logs themselves.

---

4 It is interesting to note that this first directive immediately banned discussion of military movement, despite having been issued a month after the end of World War II. Why was it so important that Allied troop movements remain secret? Precisely who was SCAP trying to keep in the dark with this ban? Of course, understanding why a foreign occupation banned discussion of its military movements seems, on the surface, rather straightforward, and perhaps that is all there is to it.


6 This would be a more believable analysis if other portions of the CCD were not responsible for censoring private mail, fine arts, performance art, and other fields of personal expression in which objectivity is neither intended nor necessarily desired.

The CCD was comprised of two branches to better manage the full scope of their operations: the Press, Pictorial, and Broadcast Division and the Communications Division, which itself was comprised of several smaller divisions. Most notable among these divisions were the Postal Division, which ran the country's postal service and spot-checked approximately 330 million pieces of mail, and the Telecommunications Division, responsible for wiretaps and telegram censorship. The Press, Pictorial, and Broadcast (PPB) Division was responsible for all printed media. It is important to note here the full scope of the censorship of the CCD.

Censorship for the CCD included all printed material, including newspapers, books, magazines, radio or theatrical scripts, movie scenarios (although films were also censored after being filmed), printed pamphlets from clubs or organizations, want ads, baseball box scores, and even weather forecasts. According to Eiji Takemae, a Japanese author and historian who lived during the occupation and focused his career on it, "In mid-1947, at the height of its activities, PPB was scanning on a monthly basis (pre- and post-publication) 16 news agencies, 69 daily newspapers, 11,111 non-daily news publications, 3,243 magazines, 1,838 books, 8,600 radio programmes, 673 films, 2,900 drama scenarios and 514 phonograph records." The PPB appears to have been the most active division of the CCD, employing the majority of its workers. The majority of the CCD's employees were native Japanese citizens or Korean nationals living in Japan. At the height of its censorship activities, these two groups comprised 93% of the CCD's workers. These workers made up the lowest rung on the censorship ladder, known as examiners. It was their job to read each piece of potentially published material in its native Japanese and translate any passages that included suspicious or questionable language. These translations were given to the examiner's supervisor, who would review the offending material. The review process, which could include as many as 31 steps moving within the chain of command, could end with

---

approval, suppression, full or partial deletion, or an indefinite hold. In fact, this chain of command for censors could potentially reach as far as Douglas MacArthur himself, who was famously involved in a censorship debacle involving criticism of Emperor Hirohito. Articles cleared with or without alterations were returned to the publishers, while a second copy, annotated to reflect the censors' decisions and alterations, was kept on file at the CCD. All of this illustrates that while the structure of the CCD and its operations was itself very organized and structured, the actual censorship itself was, according to most sources, haphazard and erratic at most times.

During the first two years of its operations in Japan, the structure of the CCD was primarily geared towards pre-publication censorship. Beginning in late 1947, the process of shifting publications individually from pre-publication censorship to post-publication censorship began. This shift ended in 1948 with the final newspapers - primarily Communist or ultra-leftist newspapers - moved to post-censorship. Post-publication censorship offered very different

---

9 Takemae, Inside GHQ, 386-7, and Kerkham, Eleanor, "Censoring Tamura Taijirō's Biography of a Prostitute (Shunpuden)" in Hutchinson, Rachael, Negotiating Censorship in Modern Japan (New York: Routledge), 156. There is also extensive anecdotal evidence that suggests that problematic pieces that did not expressly contain anything justifiably censorable were often put on hold until they were so outdated as to be no longer worth publishing. This tactic, a clear abuse of power, indicates a willingness to manipulate the system towards American goals of censorship rather than specific ideas of free speech, and will become a problematic issue for analysis of the effects of censored materials, as these materials may have eventually been marked as "cleared" despite the unofficial delay effectively censoring the pieces.

10 Criticism of the Emperor was at first encouraged among the press, in an attempt to help the Japanese move away from worshipping him as a god. However, once the U.S. government decided to maintain Emperor Hirohito as a figurehead leading the Japanese government (much the way the Queen Mother in England is maintained), criticism of the Emperor was quickly censored. Several sources discuss a particular incident in which MacArthur personally allowed an article discussing the Emperor to be published; when he saw it in the papers the next day, he furiously demanded that all issues be pulled - against his own previous consent. For details, see Sharalyn Orbaugh, Japanese Fiction of the Allied Occupation (Leiden: Brill), 51. A similar incident occurred when the CCD passed an editorial in a Japanese-language newspaper warning against the hero worship of General MacArthur, likening it to the worship of the Emperor. When the editorial was reprinted in an English-language newspaper, General Charles Willoughby, MacArthur's Chief of Intelligence and head of the Civil Intelligence Section (the parent section of the CCD), pulled the entire issue and claimed the article was "not in good taste." For further details, see Sorenson, Lars-Martin, Censorship of Japanese Films During the U.S. Occupation: The Cases of Yasujirō Ozu and Akira Kurosawa (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press), 100.

11 The erratic or haphazard nature of the censorship conducted by the CCD is discussed in multiple sources, including Sōzō Matsuura, Eiji Takemae, John Dower, Richard B. Finn, Kyoko Hirano, Monica Braw, Kazuo Kawai, Sharalyn Orbaugh, Jay Rubin, Hugo Passin, and many others.
hazards for the Japanese press than the pre-publication censorship previously enforced. Whereas pre-publication censorship may hold up a single article too long to be published or require that item to be heavily altered, with post-publication censorship, any offending material might carry as punishment suspension of the publication as a whole for anywhere from one day to several weeks,\textsuperscript{12} which could financially destroy a smaller publication - particularly as the publication could not publicly acknowledge censorship or SCAP as the cause of its sudden silence. In short, pre-publication censorship might block a single article from being published by either overt suppression or an extended delay in the review process, while post-publication censorship carried the far more sinister threat of total suspension and potential ruin over a single article deemed inappropriate. This post-publication censorship would be removed and the CCD ended as a division of SCAP on 31 October 1949, following orders given to SCAP in mid-1948 by the United States government.\textsuperscript{13} Despite this being the official end of censorship, SCAP maintained the threat of censorship returning throughout the remainder of the occupation.\textsuperscript{14}

It was at this point that Gordon W. Prange, then the chief of the G-2 Historical Section and lead historian for SCAP, with the assistance of General Charles Willoughby, the Chief of Intelligence and head of G-2, requested permission from General MacArthur to take ownership of the CCD's records of censored materials to deposit it at the University of Maryland at College Park. Prange was currently a professor on official leave from that institution. MacArthur granted


\textsuperscript{13} Takemae, \textit{Inside GHQ}, 391.

\textsuperscript{14} Takemae, \textit{Inside GHQ}, 392.
this permission, and Prange spent two years organizing the collection before shipping it to the University of Maryland at College Park. ¹⁵

The story of the Gordon W. Prange Collection diverges at this moment from the history of the Occupation and its censorship program. And yet several questions arise within this history after the official termination of the CCD. For instance, while published accounts of censorship have been published by Japanese authors and journalists who worked under the CCD's censorship, why are there no memoirs or testimonials written by the Japanese citizens or Korean nationals who worked as the main force of the CCD across Japan? Certainly these people could not have spoken up publicly or in writing while the censorship was occurring, but during the post-censorship Occupation period (1949-1952) or after, as accounts of the atomic bombs and their aftermath (both medical and mundane), texts that had been wholly censored or banned during the Occupation period, were being published, these thousands of former CCD employees had the opportunity to speak about their experiences within the censorship machine.

It is around this time that certain aid programs were instituted in Japan and other American-occupied areas, including Government Aid and Relief In Occupied Areas (GARIOA) and the Fulbright Program. There is a possibility that these programs, ostensibly intended for those sick, starving, or academically meritorious, may have been used as a means to help maintain the censors' allegiance to America and ensure their silence. However, this theory would be difficult to investigate and nearly impossible to prove, especially as the censors were officially employees of the Japanese government, regardless of the truth of their employment under SCAP within the CCD.

Gordon W. Prange

Gordon W. Prange was a well-known historian before his work with the collection that would eventually bear his name. Born in 1910, his school studies focused primarily on the German and Russian languages and European history, completing a Ph.D. in 1937. His position at the University of Maryland prior to his service in the Navy and later the Occupation was in teaching European civilization and history courses. His service in the Navy began with his enlistment after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, at which time he took a leave of absence from his professorship at the university and began the Columbia School of Military Government's naval officer training program. He was to be deployed in November of 1945 to Taiwan, but was reassigned to intelligence work in the Statistics and Reports Section of GHQ after a storm forced his ship to remain in Yokohama. It was after this tour of service ended that Prange took the civilian position of Chief Historian of the Historical Branch, G-2 Intelligence Section. Much of the official work he performed as the Chief Historian for SCAP caused some level of criticism amongst his colleagues; Prange was known to be very possessive and secretive about his research materials, most likely out of concern that others would use them to publish before he would be able to. This guarded possessiveness towards his research materials are reflected in his treatment of the Prange Collection during his tenure at the University of Maryland as well.

In 1949, nearly three years after he had taken the position of Chief Historian, Prange was promoted to be Chief of the Historical Branch, placing him under direct supervision of Charles A. Willoughby. Willoughby would later assist in Prange's request to MacArthur to obtain the records of the CCD. In fact, Prange had begun sending research materials he had acquired

16Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 8-16.
privately back to Maryland in early 1949 and had begun to show an increasing interest not just in the Pacific War but the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the Allied Occupation.  

By late 1949, Prange was becoming obsessed with obtaining the CCD's materials, writing furiously to the president of the University of Maryland, Harry C. Byrd, attempting to persuade him of the materials' importance. Prange leveraged his personal relationship with Willoughby and promises acquired from President Byrd to beat out multiple other institutions' bids for acquiring the materials, including the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University. Prange then spent the next two years (and large portions of the Occupation's budget) to sort out, crate up, and ship over the materials from Tokyo to the University of Maryland's library in College Park. There is some debate as to why Prange, an American scholar with no understanding of the Japanese language, would strive so ardently to acquire this collection for his institution. Some sources believe that not only would the office's English-language correspondence be beneficial to Prange's historical research but that bringing such a unique collection to the university would help alleviate the potential criticism from Prange's fellow history professors and the administration that might have built up during his nearly decade-long leave of absence. Other sources believe that the collection was meant to attract both Willoughby and MacArthur into donating their own personal papers to the university, creating a strong foundation for a military collection that would benefit a campus situated close to Washington, D.C.

---

17 Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 28-30.
18 Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 29-34.
19 It is important to keep in mind that much of the English-language material from the CCD's collections would have also touched upon their second objective: gathering intelligence on the Japanese people during the Occupation. Much of this might have been useful to a historian who would specialize in Pacific War history, using in particular interviews with Japanese military servicemen.
Interestingly, Prange himself seems to have been something of a packrat. Snyder notes that "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."\(^\text{20}\) Many of these materials now also reside at the University of Maryland, albeit in an altogether different collection and library than the Gordon W. Prange Collection: they are instead considered the Gordon W. Prange Papers and are held in the university's Hornbaker Library.

Despite his vital role in obtaining the CCD materials for the University of Maryland, Prange's role within the shaping of the collection primarily ends here. When the collection was finally unpacked and arranged in the early 1960s, his role was minimal and unclear. His final act of participation was to assist in the final stages of writing a report for the university's administration in 1964, the majority of which was authored by Hideo Kaneko. When the report received no feedback or comment from the administration, Prange felt that he and his work had been slighted. This would eventually cause a small disconnect between Prange and the University of Maryland, causing a distance between the historian and the institution. This rift would exacerbate small issues within the relationship until just before Prange's death, although his lack of interaction with the collection means that there is no evidence to indicate that the rift affected the collection's treatment in any way.

During the 1960s, when the Prange Collection was first being opened, sorted, and attempted to be brought under intellectual control, Prange himself was using other research materials he had obtained during his work in Japan to write the manuscript that would eventually

\(^{20}\) Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 41.
become *Tora! Tora! Tora!*, a monograph that is still considered one of the definitive accounts of
the Pearl Harbor attack. The manuscript first appeared as a series of manuscripts in *Readers
Digest* in late 1963, while the full manuscript was not published until 1969. Even then, Prange's
English-language editors were unhappy with the manuscript, and would continue working on it
with Prange until his death. 20th Century Fox also purchased the rights to adapt the original
articles into a screenplay, which premiered in Hawaii in 1970. It was not until this film, which
won the Academy Award for Best Visual Effects, catapulted Prange to some level of fame that
he would again attempt to influence the collection that would soon bear his name. Prange gave
an interview in which he expressed dissatisfaction with the level of neglect with which the
collection had been treated by the University of Maryland up to that point.21 After this slight
push for better conditions, Prange continued his research on the Pearl Harbor attacks.

Prange was under constant criticism from his colleagues within the History Department at
the University of Maryland, as well as the various Heads. While he was well loved as a history
professor by his students, he taught only two classes per semester, rather than the three required
of all his fellow faculty members. And while his research continued on the Pearl Harbor story, he
would never publish a completed manuscript in his lifetime: for Prange, there was always more
research to be done.22 This culminated in the late 1970s, when the publisher McGraw-Hill and
his editors cut off all communication with him despite having paid him a $20,000 advance some
twenty years prior. Then, in 1976, Prange was diagnosed with prostate cancer. Donald Goldstein,
an old student of Prange's, teamed up with Prange's typist, Katherine Dillon, to reopen
negotiations with McGraw-Hill and once again secure a book deal for Prange. What had become

21 Sandra Fleishman, "'Tora' Author: Documents' donor unhappy with collection's treatment,"
*Diamondback*, October 20, 1971.
22 Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 98-104.
a four-volume epic was accepted on the condition that Goldstein and Dillon edit it down to a single volume, for which the original deal had been made.23

Then, in 1978, Marlene Mayo and the Committee for East Asian Studies submitted a proposal to the administration of the university that the collection of Japanese materials be renamed the Gordon W. Prange Collection: 1945-1949, in honor of the man who had begun the collection by bringing the CCD's records and other materials to the university. This helped close the distance between Prange and the institution that had begun in 1964, and assured his support of the collection's continued description and arrangement. It was this gesture, officially recognized in May 1979 with a dedication ceremony, that convinced Prange to donate his personal papers to the University of Maryland Libraries as well. Due to his own beginnings in Iowa as much as the distance he felt towards Maryland, Prange had been considering donating his papers to the university at which he had attained his bachelor's degree, the University of Iowa.

Just over one year after the dedication ceremony that renamed the collection in his honor, Gordon W. Prange passed away on May 15, 1980. His personal papers were eventually donated to the University of Maryland. Although he had never officially made the decision to do so, he had written of it in letters to the president, provosts, and Library Director. Shortly after Prange's death, Goldstein and Dillon began publishing the edited manuscripts they had been working on for nearly four years. In the end, they would publish multiple volumes based on Prange's manuscripts, including *At Dawn We Slept: The Untold Story of Pearl Harbor*, *Miracle at Medway*, and *God's Samurai: Lead Pilot at Pearl Harbor*, among others. His research interests in later years expanded beyond the Pacific War and Pearl Harbor to include the Sorge spy ring,

23 The information contained within this and the following paragraphs is taken from Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 116-124.
an research interest previously maintained by his Occupation supervisor, General Charles A. Willoughby. This interest culminated in another book published posthumously with the assistance of Goldstein and Dillon entitled *Target Tokyo: The Story of the Sorge Spy Ring*. It is the only book authored by Prange that does not focus on actions taken during the Pacific War itself. Despite having an educational background in European history and having taught in that field, Prange is now best remembered for the obsession with Pearl Harbor and the Pacific War that he gained during his time with SCAP.
Postmodernism in Archives

What is archival subjectivity? Beginning in the postmodern era, the question of any human being's ability to objectively experience any event or physical item has been called into question. All human experience, according to the postmodern perspective, is subject to the senses, previous experiences, thoughts, and emotions of that human which is experiencing it. The postmodern theory of subjectivity has had wide-ranging effects on professional thinking and approaches in a multitude of fields, including psychology, sociology, and recently archives. In the past, archivists have been viewed (and have viewed themselves) as objective gatekeepers of material and information; without passing judgment on their collections, archivists preserve the materials and maintain access to the information recorded therein for future generations of scholars and genealogists. However, with the rise of the idea of postmodern subjectivity, the concept of archivists as objective guardians has been called first into doubt, then into question, and finally dismissed as a false, utopian dream: everyone is bound by their experiences, and therefore everyone - including archivists - must be subjective in their thoughts and actions. This has caused an identity crisis within the archival academic community.

Discussion of archival subjectivity seems to have become a major theme in the academic archival literature only in 2001\(^{24}\), when Terry Cook published his article "Archival science and postmodernism: new formulations for old concepts" in the first issue of the journal *Archival Science*. Cook's article is a professed "personal reflection rather than a sustained piece of original research,"\(^{25}\) claiming more to be an overview of the paradigm shift occurring in the profession due in part to postmodernism and in part to computerization. Much of this piece discusses

\(^{24}\) Although it does begin to arise in the 1990s, if not as predominantly.

postmodernism in general, but includes a discussion of the archivists' need to move "away from identifying themselves as passive guardians of an inherited legacy to celebrating their role in actively shaping collective (or social) memory." The article also includes a discussion of Derrida's and Foucault's work in postmodernism, much of which is pertinent to the postmodernism-induced effects on archival work. However, much of the general postmodern work discussed - and other postmodern works more specifically focused on archives and archival history - is not authored by archivists, a gap into which Cook has been invited to step. While his discussion is more focused on postmodernism itself, rather than archival subjectivity, this is still the first time the subject is touched upon within archival academic literature itself.

Cook went on to publish a second article in the same year in a more professional tone concerning "Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives." In this second article, Cook discusses what postmodernism might mean in an archival context and suggests how this idea of postmodernism might affect archives as time passes. Arguing that partially due to its popularity in other humanities and social sciences fields, Cook believes it is impossible for the archival profession to continue ignoring postmodernism and its potential ramifications on the archives: "Postmodernism is an opening, not a closing, a chance to welcome a wider discussion about what archivists do and why, rather than remaining defensively inside the archival cloister." After trying to show postmodernism and its consequences in this more positive light, Cook explains that postmodernism is essentially an awareness that history, including the present, is comprised of multiple narratives: "Because of these revolutionary [technological] developments, there is also a growing awareness of other voices, other stories, other narratives, other realities -- other

26 Ibid., 4.
than those that traditionally have filled school readers, history books, museums, public
monuments, popular media, and archives."28 This discussion of multiple narratives introduces a
new line of postmodern thought into archival academic literature that was previously ignored.
The concept of multiple historical narratives also draws a stronger connection between archives,
archival work, and the effect of subjectivity within archives.

The use of archives to support the narratives described in professional, academic histories
creates a two-way relationship: archives consciously or unconsciously support the official history
narrative, and therefore the questioning of official history means questioning the archival sources
from which their authority stems. Subjectivity is a logical continuation of this concept of
postmodernism as a rejection of singular narratives and an embrace of a multifaceted view of the
world, particularly as it applies to national narratives as depicted by museums, public
monuments, history books, and archives: "the archive is now seen increasingly as the site where
social memory has been (and is) constructed -- usually in support, consciously or unconsciously,
of the metanarratives of the powerful, and especially of the state."29 The use of archives to
construct a specific narrative without being able to also construct separate narratives from
alternate perspectives is the major result of archival subjectivity: archivists collecting materials
that document only the powerful while ignoring the "little people" and minorities that have lived
throughout the ages. Even those collections that include alternate perspectives may have them
inaccessible or difficult to discover due to descriptions focusing solely on those figures
traditionally accepted as being of historical value, e.g. the white male presence in Western
archives.

28 Cook, "Fashionable Nonsense," 23.
29 Cook, "Fashionable Nonsense," 27.
Discussion of subjectivity continued with the publication of Michelle Light and Tom Hyry's article "Colophons and Annotations: New Directions for the Finding Aid." In this article, Light and Hyry "argue that finding aids present only singular perspectives of the collections they describe and fail to represent the impact of archivists' work on records and subsequent reinterpretations of collections by archivists and researchers."\(^{30}\) The main thrust of the article discusses how, despite the development of Encoded Archival Description (EAD) allowing the structure of electronic finding aids greater flexibility than traditional, print-based finding aids, previously established descriptive structures eliminate a vast array of potential new additions or alterations to finding aids that would "allow practicing archivists to acknowledge the inherent subjectivity of archival work."\(^{31}\) Light and Hyry argue that because of this traditional structure, finding aids have two major failings: a traditional finding aid does not discuss "the impact of the processor's work"\(^{32}\) on the collection, including weeding and rearrangement both intellectually and physically; and the finding aid represents "but one viewpoint on a collection."\(^{33}\) While the first main issue can be simply solved by including the processing archivist's notes on what s/he did to the collection during processing, the second problem requires the inclusion of alternative perspectives within what has always been a document created primarily by a single author.

Similar to Cook's initial article, this third and fourth forays of academic archives literature into the topic of archival subjectivity is focused on a slightly different point in the wider field of postmodernist perspective within archives. Whereas Cook's article was focused more broadly on postmodernism and its effects on archives, Light and Hyry focused exclusively on finding aids and the process of arrangement and description, ignoring other issues of

\(^{31}\) Light and Hyry, "Colophons and Annotations," 216.
\(^{32}\) Light and Hyry, "Colophons and Annotations," 217.
\(^{33}\) Light and Hyry, "Colophons and Annotations," 217.
subjectivity during appraisal, processing, accessibility, or reference work. In the same year as
Light and Hyry's work, Elisabeth Kaplan also published an article. Kaplan's work compares
postmodern thinking in the field of anthropology to how "archival practice has remained
curiously bound up in modes of thought and practice distinctly rooted in nineteenth-century
positivism." Kaplan's main points are similar to those of Cook's second article: postmodernism
can no longer be ignored, the isolationism that has insulated the archives profession from it
should be reversed, and archivists should welcome interdisciplinary discussions concerning
questions of representation and subjectivity within the archives.

Tom Nesmith also published an article in 2002 discussing postmodernism in archives.
Nesmith, however, is more optimistic than either Light and Hyry or Kaplan, reporting that
archivists have in fact taken the first steps towards a postmodern reevaluation of standard
archival practices. "Postmodernists emphasize the idea that there is no way to avoid or neutralize
the limits of the mediating influences that shape our understandings of our worlds. This
postmodern outlook suggests an important new intellectual place for archives in the formation of
records, knowledge, culture, and societies." Nesmith advances the optimism Cook feels, the
opening of the shell, to its next step: archives will adapt to the postmodern criticism of single
narrative collections by becoming storehouses of documents that record multiple narratives, and
in so doing their authority and influence will not be diminished but instead expanded.

Later pieces discuss postmodernism and subjectivity with a more nuanced scope. Joseph
Deodato in 2006 agrees with Cook's analysis that an increased digital presence is helping to shift
archives into a postmodern school of thought. Deodato's work is the first to have a detailed
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34 Elisabeth Kaplan, "Many Paths to Partial Truths: Archives, Anthropology, and the Power of
35 Tom Nesmith, "Seeing Archives: Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives," The
discussion of subjectivity within most of the archival process, including appraisal, arrangement, and description. Deodato points out that while appraisal has been admitted to be a subjective activity, postmodern thought concerning arrangement and description are still considered objective practices. Deodato does continue Light and Hyry's discussion of finding aids as subjective, single perspective documents providing access to collections. Deodato's discussion of archival subjectivity is the first to be focused on subjectivity itself and on more than one step in the archival process, making it the most nuanced discussion on archival subjectivity of the early 2000s.

Most recently, Terry Cook has returned to the discussion. In his 2011 article, "The Archive(s) Is a Foreign Country: Historians, Archivists, and the Changing Archival Landscape," Cook discusses the differences between historians' and archivists' perspectives on archives and archival collections, culminating in a call for these two professions to come together to recognize that "archives are not unproblematic storehouses of records awaiting the historian, but active sites of agency and power."36 In this, Cook completes what he began ten years earlier by not just raising awareness for the new postmodern outlook within archives, but giving out a call to action in recognizing how archives subjectively function in a postmodern society and attempting to address those issues. This concept of archival subjectivity put forth by Cook may exist on multiple levels of archival work, including appraisal, accessioning, arrangement and description, use, preservation and conservation, and de-accessioning decision-making. Essentially, at any point in the process of archival treatment of materials - what is commonly referred to as the archival materials' life cycle - wherein the archivist is making a decision or judgment call, subjectivity enters and may affect the outcome.

This widespread issue of subjectivity within every aspect of archival collections' management is the reason behind using the Gordon W. Prange Collection as the focus of a postmodern analysis of archives. The materials within the collection show no subjective bias on the topic of Occupation censorship performed by the CCD, and as the collection was originally asserted to be a complete record of the CCD's work in their main office in Tokyo, the materials themselves hold no inherent bias that would affect the literary output of scholars using the collection. Therefore, if any bias is detected in said output, it can be assured that it filtered into the collection through the subjectivity of the archivists and historians that have shaped the collection from its inception in 1949 until its use by scholars. This subjectivity may have been brought into the collection through its original arrangement, subsequent attempts at intellectual or physical arrangement, preservation and access decisions, and use facilitated by archivists or curators working with researchers to identify materials appropriate for research. It is important to note that the entirety of the collection has not yet been brought under intellectual control, that is to say it is not wholly described. Decisions that have been made about what materials are given priority for arrangement and description are another source of subjectivity within the collection as well.

It is important to discuss as well that this subjectivity altering archival collections and thereby shaping historical narratives may be conscious or unconscious. As previously mentioned, archivists have long strived for objectivity and true neutrality when dealing with materials within their collections. While true objectivity is deemed by postmodern thinking as an unattainable utopia of thought, many archivists may be affecting their collections only unconsciously. This unintentional bias is perhaps more sinister than the issues raised by conscious, intentional subjectivity: while obvious or glaring issues arising from the straightforward effects of conscious
subjectivity may be easily observed and reversed, unconscious subjectivity may be harder to identify and ameliorate. These issues of conscious and unconscious subjectivity and their effects on the behavior of archivists touch upon all aspects of archival materials' life cycle, including appraisal, accessioning, arrangement, description, and accessibility.

Questions of what is accessible not only physically but intellectually fall into a separate realm of archival academic discussion, most notably the topic of unprocessed or hidden collections. Elizabeth Yakel describes hidden collections as "materials that either have not been entered into an online catalog or if retrieved are only located by searching under a collective title. They are also un- or under-processed primary sources." In the case of the Gordon W. Prange Collection, while some of the materials are accessible for researchers at the item-level or higher in multiple online databases, much of the collection is as yet wholly unprocessed, allowing no access within discovery tools or reference interviews with supervising archivists.

A white paper published by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in 2003 describes the issues with hidden collections in great detail. Of particular note is its twofold definition of access. While access is often referred to in the archival field as the ability to view the material, either physically or virtually, the white paper also includes "a means of discovery--through such surrogates as descriptive metadata, word of mouth, and references in the literature--that a particular body of information exists." The concept of access therefore covers not only allowing researchers to come to the institution to view materials, or else allowing researchers to view them by reproduction request or through immediate online access, but also allowing researchers to discover the collection and the information contained therein. This paper would
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37 Yakel, Elizabeth, "Hidden collections in archives and libraries," 95.
also inspire a conference entitled "Exposing Hidden Collections" held by the ARL later that same year.

This white paper was itself inspired by a 1998 ARL survey of research libraries, in which "the special collections professionals [the survey] consulted were nearly unanimous in naming unprocessed and uncataloged collections as one of the most critical issues they faced. They were equally clear in lamenting the lack of urgency this problem seemed to inspire beyond those having to grapple with it on the front line." This survey occurred the year after Hisayo Murakami passed away suddenly in the midst of her work to microfilm the Gordon W. Prange Collection's newspapers and magazines, and might shed some light on why the Prange Collection gained so little traction with the McKeldin Library and University of Maryland administration prior to the 1990s.

The survey, white paper, and subsequent white paper-inspired conference held in September 2003 may have been part of the inspiration for the digitization project of the Gordon W. Prange Collection that began in 2005, a part of the trend they apparently inspired on the topic of hidden collections in the library/archives field in general. One of the several recommendations that arose out of the white paper and conference was the need for inter-institutional collaboration and pooling of cataloging and description resources between libraries, which may also be linked to the McKeldin Library's cooperation with Japan's National Diet Library to digitize the books in the Prange Collection. A similar survey of Florida libraries and archives in 2000 prompted the state to apply for two separate LSTA grants, one of which funded a 2001-2002 project to create collection-level catalog records for 700 archival collections, while the second funded a 2005-
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2006 project to educate professionals on the creation and use of Encoded Archival Description (EAD)-encoded finding aids.\textsuperscript{40}

One other possible outgrowth of the sudden explosion of hidden collections awareness might be the most discussed article within archival academia in the 21st century: Mark Greene and Dennis Meissner's "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing." Greene and Meissner's incredibly momentous article described in stark detail the plight of archives: "Cataloguing is a function which is not working.\textsuperscript{41} According to the authors, too much material is coming in, and archivists are taking too much time to describe too few collections, causing a backlog that could never be completely worked through. The authors go on to describe a new approach to processing, commonly referred to as MPLP, which is still hotly debated in the archival literature today. MPLP suggests minimum requirements to consider a collection "processed" and, therefore, open to researcher use. While MPLP technically fulfills one of the two definitions for access, it left many archivists uncomfortable with how little intellectual control over the materials was established. Five years into the debate on MPLP, Robert S. Cox published an updated version of MPLP, called maximal processing, in an article entitled "Maximal Processing, or, Archivist on a Pale Horse." In his article, Cox describes the use of the "minimal processing" procedures of MPLP as a foundation for approaching collections. After basic processing, if a collection required more detailed attention, Cox's maximal


\textsuperscript{41} Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Revamping Traditional Archival Processing," \textit{The American Archivist} 68 (2005), 208.
processing allows archivists to return to the collection.42 Both MPLP and maximal processing seem to have grown out of the sudden attention paid to those collections hidden in the backlog of many special collections and archives across the globe.

While several of the approaches that developed out of the sudden push for exposure of hidden collections are inapplicable or inadvisable for the unique situation of the Prange Collection, much of the definition of a hidden collection is applicable to the collection, as are many of the access concerns that accompany the label. These concerns and complications will be explored in greater depth at a later point in this thesis. For now, let us turn our attention to what the Gordon W. Prange Collection actually contains, as well as where and how those materials were created.

**History of the Gordon W. Prange Collection**

Susan Southard, author of *Nagasaki: Life After Nuclear War*, estimates that the Gordon W. Prange Collection holds "15 million pages of print media from 16,500 newspapers, 13,000 periodicals and bulletins, and 45,000 books and pamphlets, plus innumerable photographs, political advertisements, and other documents." Many of these items are accompanied by documents created in the process of censorship, including translations of and notes on questionable passages, which themselves number approximately 600,000 in scope. These materials have been further supplemented by the archivists and curators in charge of the materials by the acquisition and integration of the personal papers of some Americans who served during the Allied Occupation. Taken altogether, it is easy to see why this vast collection may be difficult to obtain intellectual control over.

The collection was first formed by Gordon W. Prange himself. After obtaining possession of the materials from General MacArthur and his Chief of Intelligence, Charles Willoughby, Prange spent two years sorting, boxing, and shipping the materials that had once comprised the records of the CCD back to the university at which he taught, the University of Maryland at College Park. Interestingly, it seems that Prange also shipped back materials from outside the CCD's collections: personal acquisitions the historian believed would be of significant value for research in years to come, materials from the G-2 Intelligence Section's library, military bulletins
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43 Southard, Susan, *Nagasaki: Life after Nuclear War* (New York: Viking), 145. Official estimates on the Gordon W. Prange Collection's website at the University of Maryland are actually slightly higher in most cases, including over 18,000 newspapers, 13,800 magazine titles, 71,000 books and pamphlets (nearly double that of Southard's estimate), 640 maps, 285 posters, 10,800 photographs, ephemera, English-language material, and the 600,000 pages of associated, censor-created materials. Many of the following citations for this section refer to Sara Christine Snyder's thesis, "Odyssey of an Archives." For an alternative source of information, both Sōzō Matsuura's 戦中・占領下のマスコミ and Kanji Nishio's *GHQ 焚書図書開封* volume 1 give descriptions of the history of the collection, its holdings, and practices for use. Snyder's thesis is primarily used for quotations to facilitate English-language use of this thesis.

and reports, geographic surveys, and other publications. All of this material was sorted into over 500 wooden crates and sent by ship, train, and truck to the University of Maryland library, where no staff members could read Japanese and there was no room to house the materials appropriately, forcing the collection to be abandoned in an unused basement room. In fact, the library had at the time no Special Collections, and the university had no East Asian Department. This physical isolation and lack of intellectual control meant that use of the collection was, at first, almost certainly impossible. Despite this, President Byrd and Prange overruled the protests of Library Director Howard Rovelstad and forced the library to accept the materials. Most of these materials remained crated and untouched until the opening of the university's new library building, the McKeldin Library, in 1958.

The materials were first opened in 1961 after the university had begun to show interest in creating its own East Asian Studies program, primarily due to the motivation provided by the professors, graduate students, and library staff, namely Theodore McNelly and Chun-Tu Hsueh, alongside David Farquhar and Kenneth Folsom. Despite his focus on pre-modern China, it was Professor Farquhar, who left the university in 1964, who began the unpacking and sorting process of the Prange collection. This was the first time the materials were arranged in a library space and was done with the help of student workers until 1962, at which point approximately 300 of the crates had been unpacked and sorted "roughly by type of material."

45 Sara Christine Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives: What the history of the Gordon W. Prange Collection of Japanese materials teaches us about libraries, censorship, and keeping the past alive" (MA thesis, University of Maryland, 2007), 44. While the library had no Special Collections department or section, it was by this point an official repository of government documents, which are often considered under the Special Collections umbrella today as they are generally non-circulating.
46 It seems that the fate of a library remains unchanged, even in the 21st century, as stories of university or college presidents accepting gifts of collections from donors (particularly wealthy ones) and forcing them on overworked, under-spaced libraries and archives are still prevalent throughout academia.
47 McNelly would eventually write at least one piece on the Allied Occupation, "Induced Revolution."
48 Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 55-57.
Farquhar having some level of reading ability in Japanese, he never published anything using the Gordon W. Prange Collection. In 1963, Farquhar was replaced as the man primarily responsible for the collection by the McKeldin Library's first full-time Japanese librarian, Hideo Kaneko. Kaneko, alongside a single part-time assistant, began the onerous task of assessing the collection and preparing a report for submission to the university's administration. Prange, who worked with Kaneko on this draft of the report, submitted it in January of 1964 but never received any response or acknowledgement concerning it.

Kaneko would later submit a revised version of the report in October 1964. This report, beyond being a description of the scope of the collection, included recommendations for further action, including treatment plans and a proposed collection development policy geared towards the creation of a comprehensive East Asia Collection. The treatment plans included the need for immediate preservation and processing, particularly of the newspapers and magazines that were already deteriorating. Kaneko went so far as to recommend microfilming of these materials, although this step would not be taken in earnest until the 1990s with the assistance of Japan's National Diet Library. In 1966, Marlene J. Mayo was hired as the first full-time Japanese history professor at the University of Maryland and began to work alongside Kaneko on the preservation and access of the collection. Preservation in particular remained a major issue, as the conditions in the storage space where the collection was kept - the basement of McKeldin Library - were less than ideal: it was "dark, filthy, and prone to flooding, with messy piles of

49 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.
50 Kaneko, "East Asian Collection."
51 Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 64-65. Mayo is yet another scholar who worked at the University of Maryland, with the collection in specific, who would later write scholarship concerning the Occupation and censorship utilizing the Gordon W. Prange Collection.
materials and boxes teetering precariously on high shelving.\textsuperscript{52} While the quality of the materials themselves was never high, considering the paper shortage during the Occupation period, the extended period during which the materials were housed in what would now be considered highly problematic conditions could only have hastened the deterioration of much of the material.\textsuperscript{53} Despite these deplorable conditions, the collection would not be moved for nearly another decade.

Kaneko and McNelly applied for a grant in 1966 to begin processing the collection, requesting $225,000 from the Ford Foundation for a five-year plan to "bring this collection under bibliographic control."\textsuperscript{54} The grant was denied, however, and in 1968 Kaneko left the University of Maryland to become head of the East Asia section of Yale University Library and was replaced by Naomi Fukuda. Fukuda was the first to take steps towards fixing the conditions in which the collection sat, writing annual reports on the disposition of the collection and what progress had been made in arrangement, description, and preservation. These annual reports included a push for a more concentrated effort at sorting and cataloging the books, newspapers, and magazines present within the collection. They also included a portion of what appears to have been a heated discussion concerning what constituted "censored" materials, and what should be done with these. Some librarians and administrators wanted to keep censored materials separate from the general collection, while others wanted to place them on the open library shelves with circulating materials.\textsuperscript{55}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[52] Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 67.
\item[53] Snyder also points out that, even once the library's main floors had air conditioning installed in 1966, the basement floor where the Prange Collection was housed continued without even this basic HVAC control.
\item[54] Records of the East Asia Collection, University of Maryland Libraries.
\item[55] The discussion of what constitutes censorship revolved around the concept of self-censorship and whether the very existence of the CCD - and the authors', editors', and publishers' knowledge that any materials they put out would eventually be censored - constituted censorship, or whether only those materials that actually showed
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Fukuda advocated for a shift in the responsibility and management of the collection, which was at the time under the supervision of the Catalog Department. She also began to work extensively with the magazines in the collection, preparing them to be microfilmed. Some of this work included removing sheets of information filled out and attached to each issue of those magazines that fell under the post-publication censorship the CCD conducted in the latter half of 1948 and most of 1949. After beginning much of this work, Fukuda resigned at the end of 1969 and gave her post to Jack Siggins, a doctoral candidate recently introduced to the collection by Theodore McNelly.

By the time Siggins began working with the collection in 1970, portions were still housed in crates, completely unorganized and untouched by library staff. Siggins continued the tradition of writing annual reports, noting in his report from June 1970 that much of the cataloging was complete for the bound books within the collection, while hardly anything from the unbound, pre-publication material had been cataloged in any way. Siggins also made recommendations for the collection, asking that the unbound materials continue to be sorted and cataloged while the published books are processed and placed in the general collection with other circulating materials. Finally, Siggins began placing individual issues of magazines into acid-free envelopes for preservation, the first time archival techniques are used to preserve the materials.56 In this, Siggins may be the first to begin working towards a stronger preservation program for the collection rather than placing full resources into the arrangement and description as Kaneko and Fukuda had done.

---

A major flood on campus that occurred in July 1970 pushed issues of preservation for the collection to the forefront: anything within eight inches of the basement floor had been submerged in water for several hours, included large portions of the Prange collection. Siggins counted some 1,600 uncataloged books, 3,000 journals, and 100 containers of newspapers with innumerable issues held within, as well as 11 drawers of censorship documents and another 400 documents shelved with the material had been damaged. Also included among the damaged materials were an entire drawer of photographs, none of which were recoverable. While the flood was a deplorable incident, it galvanized Siggins and Mayo to work together more actively in support of the collection.

Another result of the 1970 flood was slightly happier. Due to the sudden damage caused by the flood, Siggins managed to draw some public attention to the collection. The publicity campaign Siggins started in July of the same year would cause problems for the University of Maryland over an extended period, including beginning a repatriation campaign that continued sporadically. According to an interview with Siggins, "almost everyone who came" from Japan to conduct research in the collection - including the National Diet Library of Japan's representative - stated that the collection should be repatriated. The campaign in Japan generally arose "every time an article would appear" discussing the collection and describing its contents. The collection has also been linked to multiple discoveries within the Japanese mainstream media, contributing to a much stronger awareness of its existence in the general public of Japan.

---

57 Records of the East Asia Collection, University of Maryland. Siggins identified the censorship documents as the most important material to have suffered damage, as they were completely irreplaceable. He estimated 25-30 percent of them had been damaged in the flood.
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In 1971, Siggins submitted to the administration a report summarizing issues with the current status of the East Asia Collection at the library, including the Prange Collection. Much of this focused on basic preservation requirements that would help protect the collection from further damage caused by the unsuitable environment. The partnership between Siggins as Head of the East Asian Collection and Marlene Mayo as a professor of Japanese history, along with the help of students who, in the spirit of supporting diversity that swept universities in the early 1970s, felt the call to aid East Asia Studies at the University of Maryland, managed to secure the beginning of a Japanese Studies program and a further focus on the East Asia Collection within the library.

Beginning in 1974, sorting efforts turned from the magazines that Fukuda had begun work on in 1968 to the newspapers that, until then, had been mostly ignored. Over the span of a decade, approximately 80 percent of the newspapers within the collection were sorted and compiled. In the same year, Siggins was promoted to Assistant Director for Public Services, and hired as his own replacement as Head of the East Asia Collection Joseph Shulman, who had recently published a well-known bibliography on the Allied Occupation of Japan with Robert Ward. 60

Siggins, Mayo, and Shulman worked together in 1975 to apply for a three-year grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to assist in cataloging the collection. Unlike previous funding requests Kaneko had applied for, this one was approved. The grant allowed the library to hire a cataloger to work exclusively with the Japanese materials in the East Asian Collection. The hired cataloger, Ellen Nollman, continued working with library staff for two
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60 This is yet another author whose work is reviewed by this thesis due to its connection to the Allied Occupation and the Prange Collection.
years after the grant funding ended to organize and catalog primarily the unbound materials from the collection, work which continued into the 1980s. Shulman was also the first supervisor of the collection to make an official distinction between books from the CCD collections that bore any mark of censorship, including merely the stamp of the CCD, from those books that had been purchased or obtained from other sources. It was during this period that Siggins in his new position managed to obtain a Reading Room to house the East Asia Collection, finally moving the collection from the basement it had sat in for over 25 years.

Another milestone for the collection that occurred in the late 1970s was the naming of the collection. As previously mentioned, Marlene Mayo and the Committee for East Asian Studies submitted the proposal to the college to name the collection in honor of Gordon W. Prange, who had recently been diagnosed with prostate cancer. The proposal was accepted, and a dedication ceremony was held on May 6, 1979. The naming served to heal the rift between Prange and the University of Maryland, and it was a sincere gesture of appreciation and respect towards a man who was a beloved professor and famous historian. Nevertheless, the naming also created a wave of publicity for the collection, serving as an implied statement of support from Prange. This implication of support helped to bolster awareness of the collection both at the university and more widely, giving Mayo and Siggins hope for further support for preservation and cataloging efforts.

Despite the naming ceremony and subsequent boost in publicity, very little changed for the collection itself. Published volumes that were ostensibly portions of the now distinct Gordon W. Prange Collection continued to be shelved among the rest of the East Asia Collection and circulate. While the library continued its own sorting and cataloging, the university began looking for alternative, non-traditional methods that might prove more cost effective. The
university accepted the offer of a Japanese publisher by the name of Yushudo to microfilm some of the censored pre-publication materials free of charge and retain the exclusive right to sell copies of the microfilmed materials. McKeldin Library did not even receive a copy of the finished product, which took a year to complete. Little progress was made on the collection until a National Endowment for the Humanities grant was awarded in 1985, allowing the library to hire Hisayo Murakami. Murakami worked as a cataloger with the other library staff until 1989 to identify and catalog educational materials within the Prange Collection, sorting out some 10,700 volumes.61

In 1987, Marlene Mayo organized an exhibit of materials from the Prange Collection and the records of the National Archives to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the new Japanese Constitution and to highlight some of the Prange Collection's important pieces. Several documents went missing during the preparation for the exhibit, although it is unclear if they were misplaced or stolen. By all accounts, the late 1980s was a difficult time for the Collection, particularly as Siggins and long-time library employee Eizaburo Okuizumi both left the library. While the loss of both of these staff members was somewhat mitigated by Hisayo Murakami, who would work with the collection until her death in 1997, it was nonetheless a tense period for the Prange Collection.

Finally, in 1990, management of the Prange Collection was reorganized under the Preservation Division. For the first time in its existence, the collection was being managed from what might be considered an archival standpoint. Then, in 1990, Frank Shulman was removed from his position as Head of the East Asian Collection and replaced by Murakami and transferred to the Cataloging Department. Murakami was undoubtedly devoted to the Prange

61 Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 125-127.
Collection. She had been cataloging it for five years and would be the first to restrict access in support of preservation, but the loss of Shulman was still a surprise.\textsuperscript{62} It was under Murakami that the Prange Collection was officially closed for preservation purposes, although limited access was still granted to some researchers. This is perhaps the first time that preservation is prioritized over physical access to the collection, a strong difference between Murakami and those supervisors of the collection who came before her.

Beginning in early 1991, McKeldin Library partnered with the National Diet Library of Japan to attempt to preserve these materials while also providing access. These attempts have included microfilming of the magazine and newspaper portions of the collection, which began in 1992 and finished in 2001, and the current ongoing project of digitizing the books section of the collection, which began in 2005. These projects have themselves been overseen by multiple directors, similar to earlier work supervised by the previous supervisors of the collection, from Hideo Kaneko to Frank Shulman.

Despite the efforts at organizing and describing the Gordon W. Prange Collection, it can still be easily understood as a hidden collection, particularly in reference to the definition given by Yakel, which emphasizes materials that either are not discoverable online or only discoverable en masse, under a collective title. While these processing projects have met with varying levels of success, the whole of the collection is under-processed, with entire portions still un-processed. And while some materials are available on a plethora of online databases, much of that work appears at a collection- or series-level description, i.e. "under a collective title."\textsuperscript{63}

Expanding on Yakel's definition to include issues of access in both the sense of physically

\textsuperscript{62} Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 129-130. It is interesting to note that, despite Shulman having a secondary career as a bibliographer, this shift into cataloging still came as a surprise to his coworkers and staff.

\textsuperscript{63} Yakel, "Hidden collections and libraries," 95.
accessible and intellectually aware of the collection and its contents brings in further confirmation of the Prange Collection as a hidden collection.

Certainly issues of access in both meanings of the word appear within the Prange Collection: some portions of the collection are closed off to researchers for various reasons, while others are entirely unprocessed, discouraging all but the most dedicated of scholars from attempting to plumb their depths. The lack of online description, coupled with the overabundance of online databases representing differing portions of the collections at differing levels of descriptions also impedes access, as it is difficult to know even the collection's described contents. Some of these issues may be due to preservation issues as well as the collection's immense size. Issues also arise in engaging intellectual control: while search tools will often allow researchers to view records and occasionally digitized copies of individual items, there are 19 distinct search tools available for accessing different portions of the collection separately, including newspapers, magazines, books, pamphlets, censored materials, and English-language materials. Many of these provide incomplete access as well. The webpage which lists the search tools available for censored materials includes a disclaimer stating, "The censored materials lists are updated as new materials or information are discovered. Please contact prangebunko[at]umd.edu with corrections to these lists."\(^{64}\) This disclaimer does imply that the collection continues to be partially unprocessed despite efforts over the past 24 years to describe and preserve it fully.

The preservation attempts on the collection, while promising to allow more accessibility in the future, prove to be an access issue in the present: materials currently being digitized, the

71,000 books ongoing digitization project that began in 2005, have been inaccessible to researchers since the project began. Similarly, the Allied Occupation scholar John W. Dower wrote in 1999 that, "due to the deteriorating condition of materials, the Prange Collection has been essentially closed to researchers since the early 1990s." Most likely this statement was in reference to the microfilming of the newspapers & magazines that occurred between 1992 and 2001. As there was a combined total of over 30,000 newspaper and magazine titles within the collection, these would account for the majority of the collection's published materials, leading Dower to state that the collection was "essentially" closed. The statement may also refer to Murakami's decision to close the collection to most researchers in order to preserve the materials. Fortunately, much of the microfilmed material has now been made available to Japanese researchers through the National Diet Library's copies.

A question soon arises as to whether microfilmed materials will later be digitized as well; while microfilming was still a popular preservation technique in the 1990s, very few institutions now use microfilm in this manner, instead preferring digitization for its ability to send copies electronically to interested researchers, as well as the ability to post them online for immediate access. Naturally a collection as large as the Prange could not be hosted online in its entirety without a robust digital presence and budget, but since current preservation efforts are geared towards the digitization of books, whether those materials that were microfilmed will also be digitized at a later date is a pertinent question to consider. This would naturally continue to increase accessibility of the collection, particularly if the scans were OCR (optical character recognition) enabled, allowing for inline text searches.

---

Issues of access date back to the creation of the collection itself by Prange. Originally packed by Prange and laborers hired by SCAP, the collection was shipped to the University of Maryland with almost no description or inventory accompanying the vast majority of the crates.\textsuperscript{66} As we have seen, the life cycle of the Gordon W. Prange Collection has been inconsistent and often dangerously neglectful; for the majority of the materials' existence they have been placed in perilous preservation conditions, and the deterioration of much of the poor-quality paper has been expedited incalculably. The collection has also been cataloged and made accessible in erratic fits and starts, with different catalogers working under a variety of supervisors, many of whom held different views on what was the highest priority for establishing intellectual control and providing access for researchers. This leads to far more opportunities for archival subjectivity to enter the description and arrangement of the collection than is often seen.

\textsuperscript{66} Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 34-41.
History of Postwar Censorship Literature

While World War II and the immediate postwar period, including Sino-American relations and the Allied Occupation of Japan, are often discussed and analyzed in historical and political discourse, the CCD and its censorship activities are far more often overlooked than included in the discussion. Nevertheless, the discussion of censorship begins as early as 1960 and continues until today. This review of the literature concerning the Allied Occupation and in particular those works discussing censorship with or without the use of the Gordon W. Prange Collection will provide a basis for postmodern analysis approaching the concept of conscious or unconscious bias within the Prange Collection noticeably affecting the literature.

The first discussion of Allied censorship during the Occupation period comes from Kazuo Kawai in 1960. Soon after Kawai publishes *Japan's American Interlude*, Edwin Reischauer, a well known Japanese scholar in his own right, published his book, *The United States and Japan*, which mentions censorship very briefly. Next to join the rank of scholars discussing censorship is Sōzō Matsuura's first work, *Occupation Speech Suppression* (*Suppression of Speech under the Allied Occupation*), in 1970, followed by his second work, *Historical Treatise of Postwar Journalism: Personal Experience and Research on Publishing*, in 1975. Kageyama Masaharu's *Occupation Democracy: Suppression and Overcoming* (*Democracy under the Allied Occupation: Suppression and Overcoming*) in 1979 begins a wave of publications over the next two decades, including works by some twenty different authors, including Jun Eto, Jay Rubin, Theodore Cohen, Theodore McNelly, Robert Spaulding, Marlene Mayo, Kyoko Hirano, and John W. Dower. The 21st century also sees a burst of activity, with two dozen works by various authors, including new publications from John W. Dower and a
massive volume by Eiji Takemae. While these works make up a very small segment of the total literature concerning the Allied Occupation, they span over fifty years of historical scholarship, and the approaches shift with the field itself. The authors themselves also come from various backgrounds, including those who were present for the censorship (on both the censoring and censored sides of the equation) as well as historians and scholars approaching the topic from a more distanced perspective.

Kawai was a journalist writing during the Occupation period, and writes primarily from personal experience with SCAP/GHQ and their censorship program. He notes that "the American military censors suppressed all except laudatory comments in the Japanese press...Some of the present author's own editorials were thus suppressed." Because he is writing from personal experience, Kawai does not utilize archival sources to support and authenticate his claims, and the Prange Collection itself was still in unopened crates in the basement of the old University of Maryland Library awaiting rediscovery.

Kawai's lack of outside sources also shifts his work from a primarily academic historical account into an eyewitness account. While eyewitness accounts and memoirs are often considered far more emotionally charged and direct than an academic history might be, they are also sometimes criticized for being more focused on a single perspective and lacking the more removed stance and potentially less subjective perspective of a historian writing from archival sources. Kawai's complete lack of archival sources distances his work from those that follow because of this distinction between memoir and academic history.

---

Sōzō Matsuura, Masaharu Kageyama, and Jun Etō also discuss the censorship from the perspective of authors writing during the Occupation. Etō's 1980 work in particular is the first to be accepted into the historiography as a major work on the subject of Occupation censorship, and as such it is referenced as a touchstone by scholars writing within the field after its publication. The choice of Etō over Kawai by subsequent historians may attest to the distinction between Kawai's dependence solely on personal memory and Etō's use of sources to reinforce and flesh out his own experiences. Etō's piece is also one of the first to discuss the impact of the CCD's censorship activities on the culture of Japan, evidencing the newfound schools of thought that had arisen within the cultural turn of the 1960s and 1970s. Masaharu Kageyama published 占領下の民族派:弾圧と超克 (The Occupation's Democracy: Suppression and Overcoming) in 1979, a book which focuses primarily on Occupation censorship and suppression of texts without the use of the Prange Collection. It is also particularly interesting that Kageyama himself does not discuss the CCD by name despite citing Matsuura's work from 1970, which does.

Both Etō and Matsuura continue to publish on the topic, with publications in the 1970s and 1980s. Matsuura is the first Japanese author from the Occupation period to utilize the Prange Collection, describing his use of the collection in his 1984 book 戦中・占領下のマスコミ (Mass Communications During World War II and the Allied Occupation). Etō was next to follow suit in using the collection, citing it in his 1989 work 閉ざされた言語空間 : 占領軍の検閲と戦後日本 (The Space within Closed Language: The Allied Occupation Censorship and Postwar Japan). The works by Etō, Kageyama, Matsuura, and Kawai comprise a unique subsection of works discussing the Allied Occupation's censorship, as they lived under it and later published
historical accounts, attempting to both remain objective\(^{68}\) while discussing the secret censorship they witnessed firsthand.

Edwin O. Reischauer provides the first published account by an American who witnessed and participated in the Occupation and also straddles the line between history and memoir as a counterpoint to Kawai, Matsuura, Kageyama, and Etō. Reischauer, a well known figure within postwar Japanese history, documents his time in Japan in his 1965 book *The United States and Japan*. Censorship is a far less important portion of this text, mentioned only in passing. It is interesting to note that no American sources discuss censorship at all until the 1980s with the exception of Edwin Reischauer. Reischauer's account, however, includes mostly incorrect information about the censorship program, claiming that the Occupation forces "resorted to a system of post-publication censorship which in practice proved more limiting to free expression of opinion than a frank pre-publication censorship would have been,"\(^{69}\) while in fact the majority of the CCD's operations was pre-publication censorship, including all of their work until 1947. Since Reischauer, like Kawai, does not cite any sources for his information, it is impossible to tell whether this misinformation was a purposeful attempt to downplay the CCD's censorship activities or merely the effect of the intervening fifteen years on Reischauer's memory. Whether due to his faulty memory or a conscious attempt to write censorship out of the Allied Occupation, Reischauer's comments go unchallenged possibly because the Prange Collection is still being unpacked and discovered at this time.

By the 1980s, however, the Prange Collection has been renamed, enjoyed some publicity, and has been used for at least two works published in the early 1980s. Robert Spaulding, another

---

\(^{68}\) The supposition that all three authors attempted to remain objective is based on the fact that their works are published as historical accounts, most of which utilize historical sources and none of which are styled as memoirs or personal accounts.

American who had worked within SCAP during the Occupation, spoke at a conference in 1988 to defend the CCD, its censorship of the Japanese media, and the Occupation at large. This aggressive defense of the Occupation, made in as public a manner as academic history ever seems to have, shows a backlash of the older generation against the idea of a cultural history. In an attempt to shift the discussion back towards the grand political narratives that dominated history before the cultural turn, Spaulding's main defense of censorship ignores the issues of its cultural impact and instead focuses on SCAP's use of censorship as a defense mechanism against a Japanese population intent on attacking the Occupation, maintaining focus on politics to the detriment of culture. Whether this shift back towards an older historical narrative is intentionally geared as a defense of the CCD or merely an unconscious bias towards the analytical approach with which he was most comfortable is unclear.

Similarly, Herbert Passin, another member of the generation that had implemented the censorship, discusses the CCD in passing in 1990, stating that it struggled between "the Occupation's (negative) mission of 'suppression of ultranationalistic ideology' and its (positive) mission of promoting democracy." This frames the discussion concerning the CCD within a removed, aerial view of a government struggling with different ideologies. This focus on politics rather than culture mirrors the approach used by Spaulding two years prior. By the time Passin is writing, the Prange Collection has been used in four separate works by distinct authors.

Jacob Van Staaveren is the final American author to write from personal experience, publishing his book *An American in Japan: A Civilian View of the Occupation* in 1994. Interestingly, his book does not actually mention the censorship activities of the Occupation or the CCD itself, despite the fact that Van Staaveren worked in the civilian-run Civil Information

---

& Education Section, which worked closely with the CCD in shaping the works published during the Allied Occupation. This is particularly interesting given the small bursts of publicity that the Prange Collection, and consequently the CCD's operations, had received before Van Staaveren published his work. Despite the fact that the activities of the CCD had by this time been established and generally known to at least some degree within the scholarly literature, Van Staaveren chose to ignore this. Perhaps he felt his role as a civilian excluded him from making comments on the military actions taken by SCAP.

The first American not openly involved with the censorship activities to publish a work touching on censorship was Ray Moore, who edited a collection entitled 天皇がバイブルを読んだ日 (The Day the Emperor Read the Bible) in 1982. Moore, and those scholars who contributed to his book, felt that it was important to collect scholarly works written by the Japanese people specifically geared towards a Japanese audience that focused on the Occupation as a moment in Japanese history rather than American. The Occupation had always been viewed as an American endeavor and, as such, a part of American history. While its effects on Japanese culture and development are often discussed after Moore's compilation was published, especially in regards to Japan's economic development, most accounts seem to frame the Occupation as American history while ignoring its presence as a part of Japanese history. In this way, Moore's attempt to organize a selection of works written by the Japanese people as a part of Japanese history is momentous. This also ties into the repatriation movements that have sporadically arisen in Japan since the Prange Collection's existence at the University of Maryland was publicized. Whether Moore's collection of Japanese works framing the Occupation as a

---

moment in Japanese history helped spur on one or more of these repatriation movements is unknown, in particular since this compilation strived to avoid any American resources.

Following Moore's publication, Jay Rubin published in 1985 an article entitled "From Wholesomness to Decadence: The Censorship of Literature under the Allied Occupation." Rubin is the first American to publish a work that cites the Prange Collection for research. Rubin also cites Etō, implying a synthesis of archival and eye witness testimonials within his research. This piece is followed by a book published in 1987 by co-authors Theodore Cohen and Herbert Passin, *Remaking Japan: The American Occupation as New Deal*. While Passin did have personal and immediate connections to the Allied Occupation, Cohen did not. Despite this lack of personal experience on Cohen's part, the Prange Collection was not used or cited. Theodore McNelly, who worked directly with the Prange Collection beginning in the 1960s, published in the same year as Cohen and Passin's book an article the mentioning the CCD, but with no citations or references to the collection he had been involved with for the past twenty years.

The 1990s see a large increase in the amount of literature concerning the censorship that occurred during the Allied Occupation. The literature is also highly varied in its main topics, with some works focusing on specific topics or fields of study that were censored and others focusing on the lasting cultural effects of censorship. Sey Nishimura writes in 1989 about the impact of censorship and suppression of information on medical treatments of patients suffering the effects of the atomic bombs. Monica Braw, in her 1991 monograph entitled *The Atomic Bomb Suppressed: American Censorship in Occupied Japan* discusses similar medical concerns but also brings in American concerns about operating a censorship program while promoting
democracy.\textsuperscript{72} The same year, Marlene Mayo published a short work focusing entirely on the impact censorship had on Japanese literature entitled "Literary Reorientation in Occupied Japan: Incidents of Civil Censorship." Richard Finn attempts in 1992 to merge the cultural impact on the Japanese media with the larger-than-life figure of General MacArthur. The 1990s include a multitude of works by American scholars on the topic, including JoAnn Garlington's "Press Censorship in Occupied Japan: Democracy Contradicted" in 1995, \textit{The Confusion Era: Art and Culture of Japan During the Allied Occupation, 1945-1952} by Mark Sandler in 1997, and Canadian author Janice Matsumura's \textit{More than a Momentary Nightmare: The Yokohama Incident and Wartime Japan} in 1998. Mark Sandler's 1997 compilation discussing the art and culture of Japan during the Occupation exemplifies the full effects of the cultural turn, as the work mentions the CCD's role in censorship only very briefly, preferring to discuss its impact rather than the structure that produced it.

The 1990s also see the beginning of John Dower's shift of focus towards postwar censorship. Already a published and well known historian focusing on Japanese post- and interwar history, Dower begins to discuss the CCD and its role in the Allied Occupation of Japan with his 1999 monograph \textit{Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II}. Thirteen years later, Dower would also publish \textit{Ways of Forgetting, Ways of Remembering: Japan in the Modern World} as further discussion of the Occupation's long term effects on Japanese culture.

By the mid-1990s, cultural approaches to history have taken full effect. Yoko Thakur writes in 1995 concerning the immediate impact of censorship on history textbooks and how it affected Japan's national narrative. Despite being published during Murakami's closure of the
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collection for preservation purposes, Thakur's work does cite the Prange Collection. Mire Koikari uses a cultural approach similar to Thakur's in order to discuss the concept of feminism and how it may or may not have been transferred to Japanese culture during the Occupation, albeit without the aid of the Prange Collection's materials. The next year, Andrew Gordon released a history of Japan from the Tokugawa period through the twentieth century, placing Occupation censorship into a larger context than previously explored. Gordon's book is the exception to the cultural approach rule. Perhaps because he attempts to cover such a large expanse of time, he focuses on Japanese political history and therefore has little reason to use the collection.

The works published in the early 21st century continue the cultural trend. The increasing availability of the Prange Collection, both on microfilm and through digitized materials, sees a burst of citations in the literature as well. In 2002 Yuki Tanaka published a book focusing on Japanese "comfort women" and the Occupation's censorship of their existence. In 2006, James Brandon focused on the effects of censorship on the traditional Japanese theatre style known as Kabuki, discussing the myths of how it survived censorship and its existence today. Sharalyn Orbaugh in 2007 focuses her work in a similar manner, turning her attention to Japanese fiction during the Allied Occupation and how censorship has affected that genre of writing. In the same year, another exception to the cultural approach is published by Takeshi Matsuda entitled *Soft Power and its Perils: U.S. Cultural Policy in Early Postwar Japan and Permanent Dependency*. Interestingly, despite the political roots Matsuda attributes it to, his emphasis is still on long term cultural effects.

Continuing into the 2000s, Lars-Martin Sorenson published a study focusing on two cinema directors in 2009, using the film magazines accessible within the Prange Collection as a
basis for his work. Sorenson also acknowledges that while "objectionable content declined rapidly and steadily throughout the first years of the occupation," this could be attributable to self-censorship and subversive content being "shrouded in ambiguousness in order not to place as well the author of the article as the makers of the film in question at risk." Sorenson does not remark upon how much material is accessible or inaccessible within the Prange Collection, although such information would be difficult for him to estimate without the assistance of the collection's supervising archivists.

The second decade of the 21st century has continued to see strong publications on the topic of censorship with cultural approaches, both with and without use of the Prange Collection. Mark McLelland in 2013 studies romance and sexuality during and after the Allied Occupation, and how SCAP's censorship of films strongly affected how Japan has viewed these concepts since. Rachael Hutchinson's work in 2013 is perhaps one of the most extensive discussions in the 21st century of the censorship system and its effects. Hutchinson focuses particularly well on the dual censorship system of the Civil Intelligence and Education (CI&E) "encouraging one ideology" while the CCD suppressed all others. Hutchinson also touches on censorship of the atomic bomb, much as Monica Braw and others have done before her. The author also provides a succinct summary of the discussion amongst scholars concerning "how liberal the atmosphere of Occupation publishing really was," calling on such familiar names as Etō, Dower, Sugimori, Rubin, and Mayo. Overall, Hutchinson's piece is a strong contribution to the discussion of Allied Occupation censorship. Her use of the collection is nearly a foregone conclusion, considering her mastery of the works discussing censorship that have come before.

75 Hutchinson, Negotiating Censorship, 9.
The most recent work discussing censorship also utilizes a cultural approach as well as the concept of a micro history. Susan Southard published in 2015 a book entitled *Nagasaki: Life After Nuclear War*. This work focuses heavily on the censorship concerning the atomic bomb, similar to Braw, Nishimura, and Hutchinson. However, Southard approaches this from primarily the perspective of how this censorship affected daily life in Nagasaki during and after the occupation, perhaps completing the cultural turn away from politics and government and towards the cultural impact on the daily lives of the average citizen.

The Japanese scholars were just as busy as their North American counterparts. In the same year as Moore's compilation, Toshio Nishi published a monograph entitled *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan, 1945-1952*. Similar to previous works by Japanese authors, this was an English volume discussing the Occupation period, including the censorship program. While Nishi references Matsuura's work, discussing his assertion "that GHQ only permitted as news [about the atomic bombs] the official American claim that the two bombs shortened the war and that they were for the sake of peace,"76 Matsuura is not referenced in other materials. While Nishi cites Matsuura's earlier works, he is writing two years before Matsuura will publish anything using the Prange Collection. Nishi also does not cite the collection himself. Being one of the earlier pieces of Japanese scholarship, Nishi also uses a much more politically oriented approach to the history of the occupation.

Kyoko Hirano, however, writes a discussion of censorship in 1992 that views censorship as an issue of "inconsistencies and contradictions, which made life difficult for those involved at

---

the time but are interesting to study over four decades later," seemingly to dismiss the issues of long-lasting impact on Japanese culture despite his more culturally-based approach and use of the Prange Collection. A decade later, Takemae Eiji's thorough history is published in honor of the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the Occupation, *Inside GHQ: The Allied Occupation of Japan and its Legacy*. In this work, Eiji discusses censorship in great detail, describing the origins, structure, and goals of the CCD, as well as how it operated throughout its lifetime. While this review of the CCD takes a much more structuralist view of the censorship, Eiji works hard to ensure that the reader understands the long-reaching and lasting effects this censorship has had on Japanese culture since.

Japanese scholars who began writing after the Occupation, thereby viewing it wholly as a historical event and not tying it to personal experience, begin with Takakuwa Kōkichi in 1984. Despite the fact that his work focuses entirely on censored or suppressed newspaper articles and includes a detailed monthly timeline of SCAP activities, there is no mention of the CCD throughout the book. This is particularly interesting to note, as mentions of the CCD in Japanese literature begin as early as 1970 with Matsuura's work. While his 1970 work did not use the Prange Collection, Matsuura also had another publication released the same year as Kōkichi, one which included using the Prange Collection and in fact includes a chapter specifically describing his experiences performing research with the collection in Maryland. This further highlights Kōkichi's reticence to discuss the CCD or use its materials in his own treatment of censorship, as previous scholars have not only discussed the CCD in the past but are now actively using the Prange Collection, proving that it is accessible to some degree to Japanese scholars by this time.

---

The next published work to discuss censorship was published by Japan's Foreign Ministry Special Materials Section in 1989 and consisted of a compilation of documents important to the management and occupation of Japan. These included multiple documents discussing censorship, including the original Press Code for Japan. However, no mention of the CCD is included in the volume. After this government publication, there is an 11-year lapse in Japanese scholarship from scholars without any personal connection to the Allied Occupation, ending in 2000 when Waseda University and Ritsumeikan University held symposiums and published much of the work presented therein. Of particular note in the symposiums' publication is a statement that the organization of the collection is entering into what may be its final stages of arrangement, description, and digitization at the time.\(^7\)

Noriko Akimoto Sugimori also contributes unique scholarship to the field in the early 2000s. Sugimori focuses on censorship as one factor influencing the decline of honorifics used when referencing the Emperor Hirohito and his imperial household in newspapers. Her 2008 article states that "the results imply that the decrease in honorific use was not part of an official censorship policy but rather that the Japanese censors working under the Occupation forces and newspaper editors might have simplified them on their own initiative."\(^9\) This conclusion lends itself to earlier discussions within the scholarship of self-censorship among editors and publishers prior to sending work to the CCD, as well as the individual agency of censors

\(^7\)早稲田大学と立命館大学 (Waseda University and Ritsumeikan University), 占領期の言論・出版と文化：＜プラング文庫＞展・シンポジウムの記録 (Occupation Period Language, Publishing and Culture: Record of Symposiums on an Exhibit of the Prange Collection) (Tokyo: 早稲田大学, 2000), i. The original quotation translated above reads: "コレクションは、小村上寿世はじめ多くのスタッフの手によって整理が進まれ、現在整理作業はほぼ最終段階に入っている。"

operating without the knowledge of their English-speaking supervisors. This is also supported by the fact that American military personnel who were in charge of censorship work were also most likely unaware of the more complex aspects of Japanese honorifics, and as such may not have been aware that the emperor and royal family were given honor in this way. Sugimori would continue publishing works discussing the Allied Occupation and its effects on the use of Japanese honorifics used to refer to the Imperial Family in newspapers and other published media during the Occupation through 2011. Much of Sugimori's research is based on materials from the Prange Collection.

Aside from Sugimori's work, Katsuoka Kanji (2004), Takeshi Matsuda (2007), Industries of Toyama (2007), Nishio Kanji (2008), Hamano Yasuki (2008), Iwamoto Kenji (2009), Yamamoto Takeshi (2013), and Hiroshima City Cultural Society Art and Literature Committee (2013) all also contribute meaningful pieces of scholarship to the discussion of Allied Occupation censorship, with some of them utilizing the Prange Collection in their research. Several of these sources appear to be more tertiary accounts, citing many of the more renowned scholars that published over the past thirty years, including Dower, Hirano, and Takemae. Matsuda's piece is of particular note, however, not only because of its publication in English but also its strong defense of censorship as a legitimate tactic for the dissemination of democratic ideas and the shaping of a democratic society. Despite this strong stance on censorship, Matsuda does not cite or seem to be aware of the existence of the Prange Collection. Nishio Kanji's 11-volume work is also noteworthy, not only due to its extent but also its rather radical attack on censorship as a strong counterpoint to Matsuda's support of censorship. Nishio Kanji likens the

---

80 It is also interesting to note that Matsuda's book was handled by the Woodrow Wilson Center Press, which is primarily based out of Washington, D.C., less than an hour's drive from the McKeldin Library and the Prange Collection.
suppression and censorship during the Allied Occupation to book burning, writing an 11-volume set entitled *GHQ焚書図書開封* (Books Suppressed by GHQ Opened, literally GHQ’s Burnt Books Unsealed) highlighting the allegedly hidden history of the Pacific War that the Allied Occupation attempted to remove from published history.

While literature about the censorship that occurred during the Allied Occupation began primarily with assertions of its existence and structure, it evolved quickly into a discussion of its lasting cultural impact. When cultural impact first begins to be discussed, evaluating its impact is dismissed as impossible and deemed "a difficult task, one that is complicated by such intangibles as psychological pressure and self-censorship." And in the 21st century, we begin to see scholars delving into specific portions of Japanese culture to help gauge exactly how lasting that impact has been.

---

Analysis of the Gordon W. Prange Collection's Use

Use of the Gordon W. Prange Collection appears almost as haphazard and erratic as scholars claim the censorship of the CCD itself was. While the existence and structure of the CCD appear to have become common knowledge within the scholars of postwar Japan and the Allied Occupation, the collection itself is far less likely to be mentioned than the organization and activities it describes. Of the 38 scholarly works discussing the Civil Censorship Detachment's censorship activities, 18 cited or discussed the Prange Collection, while 20 works - approximately 53% of all works mentioning the CCD - did not. Another 13 works mentioned postwar censorship without discussing the CCD. This means that of a total of 51 works discussing censorship during the Allied Occupation, 75% of books discussing censorship mention the Civil Censorship Detachment, while only 35% cite or discuss the Prange Collection specifically.

While it may seem as though the location of the collection might sway more American scholars into utilizing it, on the contrary it seems as though primarily Japanese scholars have used the collection. Twelve of the eighteen works that openly cite or discuss using the Prange Collection were written by Japanese scholars, some written in English while the majority are written in Japanese. Similarly, of the twenty scholars who mention the CCD but do not use the Prange Collection, eight are Japanese and twelve are American. Of the eight Japanese scholars who did not use the collection, only two of them were writing recently enough to have been able to utilize the digitized materials that the National Diet Library of Japan began working with the University of Maryland on in 2005. These numbers would seem to imply that Japanese scholars are far more willing to manage the trip halfway across the world to the east coast of the United States in order to use the collection. Some of this difference may be attributable to Snyder's
assertion that the collection is somewhat famous in Japan, while it lacks a nationwide reputation here in the United States.

In her thesis on the history of the Gordon W. Prange Collection, Sara Christine Snyder writes that the collection, while used for scholarship concerning Japan during the Occupation period, does not exist with "any kind of national-level awareness" in America.\textsuperscript{82} Snyder contrasts this with its fame in Japan, where it has been making headlines since the 1960s and creating political discussions concerning the repatriation of "a treasure of Japanese cultural heritage."\textsuperscript{83} In fact, Snyder notes that a repatriation campaign has existed "off and on" in Japan since at least the 1970s. However, under the terms of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, all documents relating to the Allied Occupation belong to the United States, meaning that anything that bore the mark of the CCD and its censors was officially American property. This lack of awareness in the general public may still be affecting issues of accessibility for the collection, as budding scholars or "armchair historians" seeking to become better versed in the Allied Occupation may not be lucky enough to stumble upon the Prange Collection's existence.

Certainly part of the issue of access with the Prange Collection is connected to its incomplete and disparately located descriptions. As previously stated, no less than 19 different databases include descriptions at varying levels of detail for portions of the collection. These databases are only discoverable on the Prange Collection's website and are not included in bibliographic utilities such as WorldCat or ArchiveGrid. Moreover, the print edition of the collection's description, which only pertains to specific materials, is not freely available but must be purchased. The fact that the vendor is a Japanese publisher is another potential roadblock to

\textsuperscript{82} Sara Christine Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives: What the history of the Gordon W. Prange Collection of Japanese materials teaches us about libraries, censorship, and keeping the past alive" (MA thesis, University of Maryland, 2007), 5.

\textsuperscript{83} Snyder, "Odyssey of an Archives," 6.
consider for American or English-speaking scholars seeking out the collection. Finally, if a scholar is perseverant enough to physically locate and visit the collection, some portions are closed to researchers for preservation or digitization work, leaving the scholar once again with a partial collection to work with. It is important to note, however, that these issues of access are overcome by visiting Japanese scholars fairly regularly.

Another factor to be considered in a comparison between American and Japanese scholars is the language barrier inherent in the Prange Collection's materials. While the material produced by CCD monitors and their supervisors includes English-language translations, annotations, and documentation concerning censorship and suppression decisions, the vast majority of the material within the collection are written in Japanese. Certainly there is some research that a scholar without any fluency in Japanese could perform within the collection, such as compiling statistics on the specific numbers of items censored and the violations that were most commonly handed down as reasons for censorship. However, no in-depth analysis of those interpretations is possible without a strong grasp of written Japanese. Any English-speaking, non-Japanese-speaking scholars who use the collection in such a manner may have a skewed understanding of the collection's materials due to this lopsided approach to research. Without the ability to read and analyze the original documents for themselves, the scholars' analysis of the collection would also be affected by the subjectivity of the censors and translators working on the collection.

To complicate matters, the Japanese written language underwent four major reforms during the Allied Occupation, beginning in 1946 and continuing until 1951. These included a pronunciation realignment, a limitation on commonly used kanji, a revision of kanji forms from classical Chinese into slightly simplified forms, and an approved list of kanji and pronunciations
to be used in Japanese names. While these reforms were not as strikingly different as what occurred during the Meiji Restoration of the late 18th century, they are enough to give many a scholar pause if they approach research from prior to or during these reforms. That is to say, a scholar with basic skills in reading modern Japanese might approach the Prange Collection without the knowledge that the written Japanese encountered within the collection will vary significantly from that which the scholar has learned, creating more difficulties concerning the language barrier anyone not versed in older forms of Japanese will have to face. Naturally, most scholars of postwar Japanese history are cognizant of these language reforms as a portion of the historical landscape for that particular period, especially if they are scholars of Japanese history who have taken the time to learn the Japanese language.

These issues, including physical and intellectual access concerns, are not necessarily issues of subjectivity. However, they may be indications or factors affecting the usage statistics for the Gordon W. Prange Collection. These issues must be kept in mind when the assessment of specific scholarly works that do or do not use the collection is performed. Approximately one third of the literature reviewed that discusses postwar censorship mentions or uses the Prange Collection, as opposed to roughly three quarters of the literature mentioning the Civil Censorship Detachment itself. This vast difference in usage for a collection documenting the existence of an organization so clearly integral to the discussion may be partially caused by these concerns as well as any archival subjectivity that is affecting access, both physically or intellectually. A closer review and comparison of those scholars writing on censorship and the CCD who did and did not use the Prange Collection will provide a better look at whether the subjectivity present within the collection is having a significant effect on said literature.

Differences In Literature That Did and Did Not Use the Collection

How the Gordon W. Prange Collection has been used in literature and what factors may have affected its use (or lack thereof, in some cases) is an important foundation for establishing what effect archival subjectivity present within the collection may be having on scholarship using the collection. However, the next step in analyzing this subjectivity is an in-depth review and comparison of the literature itself. If archival subjectivity within the Prange Collection is affecting scholarship, a clear delineation between those scholars who utilized the collection and those who did not should be present within the literature. This delineation will be most observable within the scholars' final judgment of the Civil Censorship Detachment and its censorship activities.

An interesting second avenue to analyze is the works of those scholars who used the collection for some works and not for others. Depending on whether they used the collection in earlier or later works, it may be possible to see how their judgment of the CCD and censorship changed after use of the collection. Unfortunately, the only two scholars who used the Prange Collection in later publications and not in earlier pieces are Jun Etō and Sōzō Matsuura. Neither Etō nor Matsuura change their opinions on the censorship preserved in the Prange Collection after its use, although Matsuura does describe in detail his visit to the Prange Collection for research. In his first publication, Etō includes a very emotional statement concerning the CCD:

"Who gave the American Occupation authorities the right to punish the dead as well as the living? Who gave them the authority to scrutinize the innermost depths of a man whose only fault was that he fought for his country? Who gave them the authority to delete and suppress the
thoughts and emotions that emanated from him? These questions can leave no doubt in the mind of its readers as to Etō's personal feelings, having lived through the censorship program. This conviction is further tempered and supported by his later use of the Prange Collection as well.

Scholars who used the Prange Collection primarily viewed the censorship activities in a negative light, preferring to focus on what was suppressed, censored, and potentially lost forever to Japanese culture. Most scholars using the collection came down very negatively on the CCD, while a few were lighter in their recriminations. One notable exception to these two sides of negativity was Jay Rubin, who writes in his 1985 article "From Wholesomeness to Decadence: The Censorship of Literature under the Allied Occupation" that the Occupation and its censorship program allowed a golden age of literature to occur in Japan. Rubin is the first American and second overall scholar to use the Prange Collection in his research. Perhaps his early use of the collection, as an initial foray into the collection's materials, left him in a position where he felt it was better to remain more neutral and avoid taking a strong stance in one direction or the other.

The first scholar to use the collection is in fact Sōzō Matsuura, one of the Japanese scholars who had written and published during the Occupation and consequently under the CCD's censorship program. Matsuura's third book published on the topic of Allied Occupation censorship, Mass Communication During the War and Occupation, is his first work to mention use of the Prange Collection. Interestingly, his first book, Suppression of Speech Under the Occupation, mentions the CCD while his second, Historical Treatise on Postwar Journalism:

Research and Personal Experience of Publishing, does not. This strange progression from discussion of the CCD to a more general discussion of publication censorship before returning to a discussion of the CCD using the Prange Collection as part of the larger issue of Japanese censorship during and before the war is unique to Matsuura as a scholar and will be examined more closely.

Several of the scholars using the Prange Collection approach censorship from a general overview. Etō, Dower, Katsuoka, Nishio, Hutchinson, and Yamamoto all approach the work of the censorship in a broader manner, discussing the overall program rather than focusing on censorship of a particular medium or topic. Yamamoto's work in 2013 is perhaps the broadest, discussing not only the censorship activities of the CCD, but also their intelligence and propaganda activities as well. Etō, Dower, Katsuoka, and Hutchinson provide general overviews of the structure and work of the CCD, with examples of various topics and mediums that were censored. Etō's approach focuses on analyzing what has been censored and what those suppressions might imply, similar to Katsuoka's approach of uncovering those topics that the CCD had attempted to suppress through its censorship program. In contrast, Dower focuses more on what slipped past the censors unnoticed (or unchallenged, at least), combining this with a comparison between the Occupation postwar and Imperial interwar censorship programs. Dower's main conclusion in this comparison is that while the CCD's censorship was in some ways less severe than Imperial censorship, it was in other ways much worse. Hutchinson uses a

---

86 John W. Dower's works are another set wherein the author uses the Prange Collection for some and not for others. However, Dower utilizes the Prange Collection in 1999 and does not reference it in his 2012 work, perhaps because he feels he has already used it.


88 Dower's main points concerning the CCD censorship being worse is due to the secrecy of the CCD censorship and its erratic decisions concerning what topics would be censored when, creating a false sense of freedom of speech for the general public and potentially heavier self-censorship and more pronounced hesitancy in
similar approach to Dower, giving a structural description of the organization and its activities and highlighting specific instances of censorship, in her case censorship concerning the atomic bombs, while comparing it to Imperial censorship. She also mentions its comparative leniency and contrasts it to shifting ideological grounds for censorship and "unlisted but frequently employed" censorship topics, as well as issues with the individual censors working for the CCD. In all of these ways, Hutchinson and Dower mirror each other.

The most notably distinct scholar employing a general overview approach to their use of the collection is Kanji Nishio. Nishio, who is known in Japan as being something of a radical scholar, dedicates an entire section of the first volume of his 11-volume work, *Books Suppressed by GHQ Opened*, to the Prange Collection, its genesis story, and its use today. The remaining volumes of his work are dedicated to unearthing and describing the history of Japan and the Pacific War that Nishio believes were suppressed by the CCD and SCAP at large. An important early indication of Nishio's radical stance is the use of the word 焚書 (funsho) in the title of his work, which means books destroyed by fire, or the result of book burning. Nishio refers to the work of the CCD as book burning and the works suppressed by their censorship activities as having been burned. This is of course allegory, as the majority of works suppressed by the CCD are intact in College Park, Maryland. Nishio's point, perhaps, is that in suppressing these works and then shipping the records of their existence halfway around the world, the CCD and Gordon W. Prange have made these works as inaccessible to the Japanese public as burning them would have done. Nishio's attempt to return the history suppressed within these works back to the public awareness of Japan would seem to support this interpretation.

---

publishing potentially objectionable content on the part of authors, editors, and publishers. For more detailed information, see John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: The New Press, 1999), 405-440.
Naturally, the compilation of materials from symposiums held by Waseda University and Ritsumeikan University are more generally themed, based on the topics of speech and culture. Unlike works primarily authored by a single author or team of authors, the records of these two symposiums represent the collected research and work of multiple, individual scholars pursuing a variety of research and analysis using distinct methods and approaches. Any culminating piece of work attempting to record such disparate topics must be considered a more general piece of scholarship itself.

The remaining eight pieces of scholarly work utilizing the Prange Collection approach the topic of censorship from either a specific medium or a specific topic. Nishimura, McLelland, and the Hiroshima City Cultural Society Art and Literature Committee all approach the concept of censorship from a specific topic, whereas Hirano, Thakur, Industries of Toyama, and Sorenson analyze censorship through a specific medium. Sugimori's approach actually straddles this distinction, as she focuses on the decreasing use of honorifics when referring to the Emperor and Imperial Household but analyzes this specifically through newspaper articles. This slight difference in approach notwithstanding, the majority of these scholars, some of whom have once again written more than one work, reach similar conclusions on the Allied Occupation's censorship.

Sey Nishimura's article focuses on censorship of the medical field and the medical effects of the atomic bomb, generally through medical journals but also with mentions of photography as well as a discussion of how SCAP attempted to change Japanese medical practices. Her final conclusion on the Allied Occupation's censorship program is that censorship might have been

---

performed in the name of benefitting Japan, and the censors might have been "convinced they [the CCD] made democracy possible in Japan. When viewed this way, the censors seem to have held values higher than those they practiced...But also professing adherence to high ideals were the prewar Japanese censors."\textsuperscript{90} These final sentences in her article seem to imply that, regardless of the intentions of the CCD and "the Japanese nationals who worked for CCD [and] thoroughly spotted and faithfully translated the material," the true result of this censorship was a "dictatorial and insulting" attempt to control Japanese culture and everyday life, similar to how censorship attempted the same under Imperial rule.\textsuperscript{91} Nishimura's declaration here is one of the most outspoken recriminations of the CCD and its censorship activities while still maintaining some level of distance and neutrality.

Similar to Nishimura's work, the book edited by the Hiroshima City Cultural Society Art and Literature Committee focuses specifically on the censorship that pervaded everyday life in Hiroshima after the dropping of the atomic bomb. While this particular work does not conclude with any sweeping condemnation of the CCD and its work, it does discuss the organization at length in its preface. The Prange Collection is also discussed and used for research throughout the work.

McLelland's article, on the other hand, does not hesitate to bring the Prange Collection's weight to bear on his topic. McLelland focuses on dating, democracy, and romance, particularly between Japanese citizens and visiting American soldiers or civilians. He discusses how the Allied Occupation government used censorship, among other tactics, to pressure Japanese

\textsuperscript{90} Nishimura, "Medical Censorship," 20-21.
\textsuperscript{91} Nishimura, "Medical Censorship," 20-21.
women into viewing "marriage and childrearing...as women's patriotic duty." McLelland also discusses the use of censorship to cover up any violence or obscenity "when reference was made to fraternization between U.S. troops and local women or when reference was made to the supposedly loose morals of "Caucasian" women." He also mentions the suppression of articles written in reaction to depictions of lovemaking between Japanese women and American men. These examples and others throughout McLelland's article make his implication clear: censorship was used to emasculate Japanese men, protect the virtue of white Americans, and shape the culture and desires of the Japanese. While there is again no outstanding condemnation of these practices, it appears that McLelland is less than pleased with these tactics.

Unlike Nishimura, the Hiroshima City Cultural Society Art and Literature Committee, and McLelland, the authors Hirano, Thakur, Sorenson, and the Industries of Toyama approach censorship through specific mediums. In the cases of Hirano and Sorenson, censorship of films is the primary focus, while Thakur focuses on textbook censorship and Toyama Industries focuses on regional magazines. Hirano withholds from too strong a conclusion on the CCD and censorship, although there is no sentiment or sense of approval. Thakur, however, intimates far more disapproval for the actions undertaken in regards to the textbooks as well as "all teaching materials...all media, including film and radio" that fell under the jurisdiction of the CCD. Similarly, the Industries of Toyama work focuses on what was censored by the CCD, its control of the national mail service, and issues of where the materials have ended up. This does not paint a positive picture of the CCD, nor does it provide any sort of defense of its activities.

Sorenson, who focuses on the directors Yasujiro Ozu and Akira Kurosawa and their work under the CCD's censorship, yields similar results to Sugimori. Rather than drawing a strong conclusion about how censorship affected these directors, Sorenson merely states that "objectionable content declined rapidly and steadily throughout the first years of the occupation." However, Sorenson seems to believe that this decline in objectionable content is more due to self-censorship at the hands of authors and editors rather than any steps the CCD themselves have taken. This conclusion is similar to Sugimori's conclusion that the use of honorifics in reference to the Emperor and Imperial Household in newspapers declined less because the CCD officially wanted it to and more because Japanese censors and newspaper journalists and editors were doing so themselves. Both Sorenson and Sugimori believe that the self-censorship prevalent throughout Japanese media is a product of the censorship imposed by the CCD. This belief is stated by several other scholars, including Kawai, Takemae, Dower, Orbaugh, Mayo, Rubin, and Hutchinson.

The consensus between the 18 works that use the Gordon W. Prange Collection is not unanimous in its condemnation of the CCD and its censorship activities. Rubin in particular is defensive of the censorship, claiming it helped to foster a golden age of Japanese literature. Similarly, Sugimori and Sorenson find that for their respective mediums, the censorship had little or no direct effect. Both Sugimori and Sorenson do believe that the censorship pressured Japanese publishers and authors into a strict regime of self-censorship, a theory supported by Dower, Etō, Takemae, Orbaugh, Mayo, and Rubin. The most defensive of the censorship practice, Rubin admits that "evaluating the practical impact of any censorship is a difficult task,

---

one that is complicated by such intangibles as psychological pressure and self-censorship.\(^96\) In this, Rubin not only supports the arguments of both Sorenson and Sugimori but admits the weakness in his own theory in regards to theirs: while actual censorship may not have been harsh, the self-censorship that occurred because of the censorship structure put in place by SCAP and maintained by the CCD is impossible to gauge, leaving the true impact of censorship impossible to understand.

As the number of works discussing censorship without the use of the Prange Collection number some 33 in number, a work-by-work analysis will not be presented. However, as some of these works are authored by the same scholars working with the collection and previously analyzed, while others are counted among the ranks of the CCD and SCAP itself, it is clear from an initial overview that no unanimous consensus on the CCD is to be reached within their ranks. Even if those authors who would later or had previously utilized the collection, the remaining works cannot reach a clear agreement on whether there was any positive or negative impact on Japanese culture and life made specifically by the censorship program.

---

Analysis of Archival Subjectivity Within the Collection

Perhaps there is no clear delineation between how scholars using the collection feel in regards to the CCD's censorship activities in comparison to how scholars not using the collection feel. However, the nearly united front of the former, in comparison to the chaotic disagreement within the latter, may suggest some form of influence or effect caused by utilizing the Prange Collection. This influence may merely be the effect of more exhaustive and thorough research as compared to research that has left a large collection out, whether by ignorance or by design. Certainly many of the access issues previously discussed may have prevented these scholars from utilizing the Prange Collection properly.

According to postmodernism, unconscious subjectivity is a constant and omnipresent side effect of human existence based upon our frame of reference for experiencing the world. As such, unconscious subjectivity must exist within an archival context, as it must exist everywhere humans go. Conscious subjectivity, as it is seen within an archival context, consists of purposeful alterations to archival materials and can be avoided by mindful archivists. If conscious subjectivity exists within the Prange Collection, it may have occurred at several points within the collection's lifecycle. These points include its creation, arrangement, description, how it is presented to researchers by the archivists in charge of reference, any physical access restrictions on the materials, and issues of general awareness of the collection's existence. An analysis of several of these points has already occurred, and a brief overview of each will help locate any potential points of subjectivity.

There is little concern that conscious subjectivity might have been introduced to the collection during its original arrangement by Gordon W. Prange or his workers. All biographical
notes concerning Gordon W. Prange himself, as well as the genesis story of the Prange Collection itself, would seem to clear Prange of any conscious subjectivity. Prange's obsession with historical documentation and near-paranoia on allowing others to use sources he wanted for his own scholarship would seem to indicate that his personal interest in this particular collection was slim or none, as he was neither protective of the collection nor particularly concerned with its disposition after shipping it back to Maryland. His actions concerning the collection's preparation for shipment, namely adding more material he thought historically valuable, would also seem to indicate that he did not consciously attempt to alter the historical record of the censorship program but rather attempted to expand its coverage.

Similarly, while the arrangement and description of the collection is incomplete and fragmented, this seems less because of any subjectivity imparted by the archivists managing the collections than because of the immensity of the collection and the lack of institutional support provided to the archivists until their recent partnership with the National Diet Library of Japan, after which digitization appears to have proceeded much more smoothly than previous attempts. The work of Kaneko, Fukuda, Siggins, Shulman, Murakami, and their workers does not appear to have ever been meant to obfuscate or hide any particular portion of the Prange Collection, despite some decisions that would appear dubious or uncertain under modern archival standards.

In fact, what currently presents itself as a fragmentary and incomplete description of the collection may upon its completion be similar to what Light and Hyry propose in their article. Light and Hyry argue that "finding aids present only singular perspectives of the collections they describe and fail to represent the impact of archivists' work on records and subsequent
reinterpretations of collections by archivists and researchers.\textsuperscript{97} Naturally, this collection has had large amounts of reinterpretation as items have been reorganized, shifted, rearranged, and described by generation after generation of archivist.

However, as several generations have left behind descriptions of their work, culminating in the 19 databases that currently describe large portions of the Prange Collection, there is no one voice within a single finding aid describing the collection in the way that Light and Hyry claim is the insufficient status quo for archives. Instead, multiple voices are speaking about the organizational structures they have imposed while describing the materials in the collection. Even if these descriptions are incomplete, they passively describe the organizational structure subjectively imposed by the archivists by specifying what materials are grouped into which databases together. In other words, the structured descriptions of the materials describes the structure imposed by archivists while at the same time, the multiple descriptions allow a descriptive voice to multiple authors, avoiding issues of singular subjectivity within the collection's finding aid. The multiple descriptive voices may help work around the unconscious subjectivity present within any one author's description by highlighting different aspects within each description.

However, the concern presented by both Cook and Kaplan that misrepresentation within discovery tools and descriptions of the collection may suppress voices traditionally considered unimportant or worthless to historical research is still present. Many of the descriptions and discovery tools for the Prange Collection predate the emergence of postmodernism in archival practice. While some of the oldest descriptions may be most suspect in this regard, even those

\textsuperscript{97} Michelle Light and Tom Hyry, "Colophons and Annotations: New Directions for the Finding Aid," in \textit{The American Archivist} 65 (2002), 216.
descriptions written most recently may require careful scrutiny to ensure conscious or 
unconscious subjectivity is not heavily affecting the collection's descriptions.

The fragmented description present across 19 databases is an imposing issue, but speaks
to the archivists' dedication in making all the material accessible online rather than an attempt at 
complicating matters beyond the hope of researchers to unwind the mystery. While these 
databases are not yet complete in their description of the collection, nor are they equal across all 
portions of the collection insofar as the level of detail, they are an attempt to exert intellectual 
control over it. Certainly subjectivity at this point could enter into the equation of scholarly 
research, as researchers who rely entirely on the incomplete databases may be left with an 
inappropriately unfinished conception of what the collection holds. This is perhaps most 
dangerous with the database of censored books, which the website admits is only a partial list.98 
Nonetheless, the incompleteness of the databases is not kept secret from researchers, so a dutiful 
 scholar would be aware of the need to visit the collection and use the physical materials for a 
better understanding of what they entail.

This option is, of course, made more difficult by the physical access restrictions on the 
original materials. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the collection was physically open to 
researchers who were willing to brave the deplorable conditions in which the collection was kept. 
Beginning in the 1990s, however, as the collection was becoming more intellectually accessible, 
physical access to the materials was first completely restricted and later restricted in sections. 
These restrictions could certainly alter the interpretations a visiting scholar might make, 
especially as the section currently closed to researchers is the entirety of the books. However,

---

98 "Censored materials - Prange | UMD Libraries," last modified January 20, 2016, 
http://www.lib.umd.edu/prange/search-tools/censorship-materials
these potential points of scholarship-altering effects are the unintentional byproducts of logical access restrictions. These restrictions are in this case unavoidable: the materials are restricted because they are either currently undergoing digitization or are in need of preservation or conservation work and likely to be damaged by researcher use.

The last and perhaps most important point of the Prange Collection's lifecycle in which archival subjectivity may enter is the general public's awareness of the collection. Certainly the American public itself is almost entirely unaware of the collection's existence, and it could be easily argued that American scholars working on postwar Japanese history were similarly ignorant of it until recently. However, both the Japanese public and Japanese scholars have been aware of the collection for decades, and its recent digitization work, minimal online presence, and more widespread use within the literature have helped raise the level of awareness surrounding this collection in America. This reflects much of the optimism felt by Tom Nesmith in 2002: archives have begun to take "an important new intellectual place...in the formation of records, knowledge, culture, and societies."99 The symposiums held by Waseda University and Ritsumeikan University, as well as the work published by the Industries of Toyama and Hiroshima City Cultural Society Art and Literature Committee, indicate an increasing awareness in Japan of the importance of the Prange Collection in particular. While the public's awareness was also indicated by the repatriation movement occasionally reemerging in Japanese society as discussed by Snyder, these symposiums seem to indicate that the general awareness is increasing once again. Ray Moore's compilation, whose individual authors agreed to attempt writing about the Occupation using Japanese sources to better situate the period within Japanese history, is

similarly indicative of the rising need to utilize appropriate archives in order to better understand the multiple narratives at play within any given situation.

Overall, the collection does not seem particularly prone to archival subjectivity, except perhaps in the online description portion of the lifecycle, namely the disparate and incomplete database descriptions. Access issues of a similar nature are also problematic and may cause some distortion in scholarly research, especially when paired with the intellectual access issues raised by the database concerns. While these issues may qualify the Prange Collection as a hidden collection by Yakel's definition, it does not necessarily imply conscious or intentional archival subjectivity so much as a lack of resources and support in publicizing the collection. Prange's work in securing the collection and organizing it for shipment also does not seem overtly biased, nor does the work performed by the multiple archivists who have managed preservation, arrangement, and description of the collection since the 1960s. These points of concern may also be cleared up as work on the description of the collection continues and awareness of its existence increases.

Continuing the analysis from a postmodern perspective, the Prange Collection may function as a collection countering the traditional role of archives, which are "usually in support, consciously or unconsciously, of the metanarratives of the powerful, and especially of the state." The censorship activities the Prange Collection documents were carried out in secret, and it is almost certain that the United States government would have preferred that the historical narrative concerning the Allied Occupation of Japan remain focused on the apparent eagerness of the Japanese to democratize and America's easy success in the endeavor without the complicating inclusion of SCAP's covert censorship and surveillance activities. In maintaining

\[100\] Terry Cook, "Fashionable Nonsense," 27.
the physical records countering the U.S. Government's official stance of democratizing Japan, the collection's general existence counters archival subjectivity. The materials themselves are also neutral; unlike materials written from a specific perspective, such as diaries, correspondence, or other commonly preserved materials, there is no inherent bias within the censored materials supporting the narrative of freedom of speech or of tyrannical censorship and suppression. In this way, multiple narratives can be interpreted and supported within the materials, allowing for the subjectivity of historians and readers to enter into the equation.
The Gordon W. Prange Collection contains a record of the Civil Censorship Detachment's censorship activities for the first four years of the Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945-1949. This collection began when Gordon W. Prange secured permission from Generals Charles Willoughby and Douglas MacArthur to ship the records of the CCD to the university at which he was employed as a professor, the University of Maryland at College Park. After sitting in a basement unopened for ten years, the collection was rediscovered and arrangement and description work began. This work has continued through today, while the collection has been being used by scholars of post-war Japanese history.

While there is no definitive distinction meaningful to a postmodern approach between scholarship that used the Prange Collection and scholarship that did not, it is clear that some effect on the research has galvanized the former group into a rough agreement on the impact of the Civil Censorship Detachment's activities on Japanese culture. However, it seems that this effect is not due to any conscious or unconscious subjectivity introduced to the collection based on the work of the archivists who have arranged, described, and made it accessible over the past 50 years. Some subjectivity is surely present in the current descriptions of the collection, introduced by problematic intellectual and physical access to the collection itself. These problems, however, are being worked on by the archivists, and are not purposefully created roadblocks for researchers but unconscious forms of subjectivity that are present within all archival collections.

An in-depth analysis approaching the scholarly literature utilizing the Prange Collection to discuss censorship activities during the Allied Occupation from a postmodern perspective,
coupled with a review of that literature focusing on the same topic without utilization of the collection, yields some results regarding possible influences of the collection on that scholarship. In particular, while those scholars who do not use the collection for research on the topic appear uncertain as to whether the suppression and censorship of Japanese media had a lasting negative effect on Japanese culture, those scholars who used the collection agree almost unanimously that it has, differing primarily in what that effect is and how strongly it has impacted Japan since. This indicates that if there is any conscious or unconscious bias shaping the Prange Collection due to arrangement, description, or access, it is minimal enough to have little or no effect on literature that uses the collection: affirmation of censorship is not an effect of bias but of confirming these activities using the materials that document them, materials that comprise the Prange Collection in its entirety.

Postmodernism posits a connection between the inherent biases of archivists and theoretical biases within collections affecting research based on archival materials. Analysis of the Gordon W. Prange Collection, its history, and its use, suggests that while there may be a connection between archivists' inherent biases and the arrangement, description, and accessibility of archival collections, the effect on collections does not affect scholarship using archival materials. The Prange Collection does serve another important role in furthering postmodern discussions of archives and the archives' role in research. While no evidence supporting the postmodern fear of archivists' biases affecting scholarship was found from the arrangement, description, or accessibility of the collection, the question of appraisal and accessioning decisions affecting archival research still looms. The Prange Collection was chosen in particular because of its comprehensive holdings concerning the censorship activities of the CCD; other collections do not benefit from this level of completeness concerning the historical record, while
untold collections have been refused or deaccessioned due to an archivist's bias, forever altering the landscape of archival material. Whether these decisions have affected research and literature is perhaps impossible to say.

However, analysis of the Prange Collection does present evidence regarding a different facet of postmodern archival thought: the use of archival collections to support counter narratives, alternative descriptions of historical events that run against the popular or national narrative found in school textbooks and popular media. While historical narratives concerning the Allied Occupation of Japan generally credit the democratization of Japan to American benevolence or various stereotypes of Japanese culture, the materials housed within the Prange Collection support the alternative narrative of a country forced to adopt democracy through complete censorship and control of published media. This counter narrative serves a strong role in a postmodern archives by opening the history of the Allied Occupation to further discussion, creating a space in which open debate concerning the events of the Occupation and their short- and long-term effects on Japanese and American culture is possible. This discussion allows for a more in-depth analysis of the Occupation, creating potentially stronger research and literature in a multitude of fields due to the more rigorous academic debate allowed through the collection's existence and use.
Appendix I: Table of Books Reviewed and Data Gathered

This table includes all books and articles reviewed concerning the Allied Occupation. Books are arranged by mention of the Gordon W. Prange Collection, the CCD, and censorship respectively, as well as by year. Titles appear in the original language; translations of Japanese titles can be referenced in the bibliography. Full publication information is also available within the bibliography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Censorship?</th>
<th>CCD?</th>
<th>GWPC?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matsuura, Sōzō</td>
<td>戦中・占領下のマスコミ</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin, Jay</td>
<td>&quot;From Wholesomeness to Decadence: The Censorship of Literature under the Allied Occupation&quot;</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eto, Jun</td>
<td>閉ざされた言語空間：占領軍の検閲と戦後日本</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nishimura, Sey</td>
<td>&quot;Medical Censorship in Occupied Japan, 1945-1948&quot;</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirano, Kyoko</td>
<td>Mr. Smith Goes to Tokyo: Japanese Cinema under the American Occupation, 1945-1952</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thakur, Yoko H.</td>
<td>&quot;History Textbook Reform in Allied Occupied Japan, 1945-1952&quot;</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dower, John W.</td>
<td>Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>早稲田大学と立命館大学</td>
<td>占領期の言論・出版と文化：プランゲ文庫展・シンポジウムの記録</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>勝岡寛次</td>
<td>抹殺された大東亜戦争：米軍占領下の検閲が歪めたもの</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>実業之富山, editor</td>
<td>占領期の地方雑誌：プランゲ文庫で辿る足跡</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>杉森（秋本）典子</td>
<td>&quot;占領はどのように新聞の天皇への敬語を簡素化させたか－検閲前と</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>西尾幹二</td>
<td>GHQ 焚書図書開封</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLelland, Mark</td>
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