In re Takao Ozawa.

NATURALIZATION OF A JAPANESE - SUBJECT.

SECOND BRIEF
by
TAKAO OZAWA -- PETITIONER

WITH REGARD TO MORAL QUALIFICATIONS. I was exceedingly sorry when I read Mr. Thompson's Brief, and was very sorry, that that which I wrote with good will was taken in ill will.

In his brief, he states that I had threatened the United States with the Government of my country, Japan, if I was not allowed to become a citizen of the United States. I am very sorry to say that this statement is far from the truth; for, while writing the last part of my First Brief, (pages 29, 30) I never thbught of, or dreamed of threatening the United States. In fact, I never felt the least necessity in so doing.

If a school girl knows by heart, all the questions on a black-board, she will not dare take the risk of trying to copy from her book in order to pass the examination. If a boy has more apples than he wants, he will not cry to his mother for more. In short, if the supply exceeds the demand, there is no necessity in making a demand for more supply. The same rule can justly be applied in my case.

After I studies the naturalization laws carefully, I realized that I was more qualified than required by the law, that is:

FIRST. In the naturalization law of 1906, Sec. 4, Part 2, declared that if the petitioner has filed his declara-

tion before the passage of this Act, he shall not be required to sign the petition in his own handwriting. As I filed my declaration about four (4) years prior to the passage of the Act, I am not required to sign my petition in my own handwriting. But I can sign my own name; moreover, I can write a letter, or letters, or write stories in English. Hence I am more qualified than required by the Law on this point.

SECOND. Again: Section 8 declares that no alien shall hereafter be naturalized or admitted as a citizen of the United States who can not speak the English language; provided that the requirements of this section shall not apply to any alien who had, prior to the passage of this act, declared his intentions to become a citizen of the United States, in conformity with the law in force at the date of making such declaration. Thus, by law, I am not required to speak the English language. But as I have attended American schools for nearly eleven years, I can speak the English language. Hence, I am more qualified than required by law on this point also.

THIRD. And again: Section 4, Part 4 says, it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting any alien to citizenship that immediately preceeding the date of the application, he has resided continuously within the United States, five years at least, and within the State or Territory where such court is at that time held, one year at least. But I have been continuously in the United States for over twenty-one (21) years, (from the end of July 1894 to the end of August 1915) and over nine years in this Territory of Hawaii, (from May 1906 to August 1915). Hence I have been in the United States nearly sixteen years, and in this territory nearly eight years, more than the required term of residence. Thus I have been here a very much longer time than is required by law.

AS TO MY CHARACTER. I neither drink liquor of any kind, nor smoke, nor play cards, nor gamble, nor associate with any improper persons. My honesty and my industriousness are well known among my Japanese and American acquaintances and friends; and I am ~~always~~ always trying my best to conduct myself according to the Golden Rule. So I have all confidence in myself that as far as my character is concerned, I am second to none.

AS TO MY ATTACHMENT TO THE UNITED STATES. In name, General Benedict Arnold was an American, but at heart he was a Traitor. In name I am not an American, but at heart I am a true American. I set forth the following facts that will sufficiently prove this. (1) I did not report my name, my marriage, or the names of my children to the Japanese Consulate in Honolulu; notwithstanding all Japanese subjects are requested to do so. These matters were reported to the American Government. (2) I do not have any connection with any Japanese churches or schools, or any Japanese organizations here or elsewhere. (3) I am sending my children to an American Church in place of a Japenese one. (4) Most of the time I use the American (English) language at home, so that my children cannot speak the Japanese language. (5) I educated myself in American Schools for nearly eleven years by supporting myself. (6) I ex-communicated myself from my brothers and sisters, all living in Japan, for nearly seventeen (17) years. (7) I have lived continuously within the United States for over twenty one years. (8) I chose as my wife, one educated in American Schools here, instead of one educated in Japan. (9) I have steadily prepared to return the kindness which our Uncle Sam has extended me; that is, the United States gave me a good, free education for nearly eleven years. It is this education which enables me to support my family: so it is my honest hope to do something good to the United States before

I bid a farwell to this world.

All the above stated facts are absolutely true; and they will sufficiently prove that I have a strong attachment to the United States.

Besides all these facts, when I found the true meaning of the term "Free White Person" while reading the Congressional record of 1790 and also the Articles of Confederation, I keenly felt as though I found the KEY to disclose the true intents of the Congress which enacted the first naturalization law of 1790; in which the term "Free White Person" was first used. (ref. Naturalizations in the U. S. By Franklin 1906) Thus I am more qualified than required and I have good character, and strong attachment to the United States, and I have also found the key to disclose the true intents of Congress. So that while writing the last part of my first brief, (pages 29-30) I never felt the least necessity of threatening my second home, viz., the United States, in order to be admitted therein. Therefore, I can conscientiously swear that the statement that I threatened the United States, etc., is "absolutely untrue."

Then, with what intentions did I write the last part of my first brief (pages 29-30)? After comparing the "WILL BE" results of humiliating and those of treating fairly, then I wrote "For the safety and honor of the United States, I sincerely hope that the United States will treat Japanese "fairly". I never thought of, nor dreamed of threatening the United States. In fact at that moment I had exactly the same feeling toward this country as the former President Roosevelt had, when he wrote in his annual message to Congress in 1906 in the matter of the school question in San Francisco. He wrote as follows:

"Not only must we treat all nations fairly, but we must treat with justice and good will, all immigrants who come here under the law----------. Especially do we need to remember our duty to the strangers within our gates----------. I am prompted to say this by the attitude of hostility here and there assumed toward Japanese in this country.----------. It is most discreditable to us as a people and it may frought with the gravest consequence to the nation."

This is the opinion of a true American.(ref. History for Ready Reference and Topical Reading Vol. 7 539). In writing his message, was he thinging of himself in order to increase his reputation? Decidedly not. He was thinking more of the welfare of the United States than his own affairs. Similarly, while writing my first brief, (pages 29-30), rather than my own affairs I was thinking of the safety and honor of our Uncle Sam, to whom I owe more than to the Emperor of Japan. And it is my honest wish to do something good to the United States before I bid farwell to this world. The above statement is absolutely true, and it will prove that I had written the last part of my first brief, with good intentions, to advise the United States; in the same sense as the former President Roosevelt wrote to Congress, in regard to the Japanese School Question in San Francisco. And I have no doubt that if any person read my first brief (pages 29-30) carefully with good will, he will find that I had written it with good will.

WITH REGARD TO LEGAL REQUIREMENTS. (1) I am not demanding. (2) I am humbly asking for admission and recognition as a citizen, for ever since I received the declaration of intention papers; for over thirteen years, faithfully attaching to my oath, I was always trying my best in qualifying myself to become a good and useful citizen of the United States.

(3) Section 2169, Revised Statutes of the United States says, the provision of this title shall apply to aliens being free white persons, and to African Nativity, and to persons of African descent. Section 2169, Revised statutes of the United States has been misconstrued and not properly digested in the following cases:

62 Fed. 126.
163 Fed. 922.
174 Fed. 834.
178 Fed. 245.
213 Fed. 355.
6 Fed. 256.
Fed cases 104.
71 Fed. 274.
171 Fed. 299.
30 Wash. 234.
171 Fed. 294.

I Any law enacted by Congress is a written statement, in which true intents of the majority of legislators present are expressed, in a condensed form. So every word in the law must be considered; and the best way to find the true intents of Congress, is to read the Congressional record in which the opinion of the legislators are expressed. But hardly any judge tried to find out why and in what sense the limiting word "Free" was used before the words "white person"; and hardly any judge read the Congressional record of 1790. It was the Congress of 1790, who enacted the first naturalization law, in which the term "free white person" was first used. Therefore in order to find the true meaning of the term "Free White Person", and also the true intent of Congress, we must read the Congressional Record of 1790. But scarcely any judges have read or have studied the said record, so that when ever they are confronted by aliens wishing to be admitted, they always make many guesses. It is upon these guesses that they build their final decisions, dressed up nicely with Blumenbach's or others' race classifications.

It is an undeniable fact that 3x3 is always equal to nine. Every judge will agree to this. But in construing the

naturalization law they disagreed with each other. Some admitted Syrians on the ground that they are one class of the Caucasian Race; but others refused them on the gournd that they are not European. The difference of their opinions is largely due to the fact that they did not read the Congressional record of 1790; in which the meaning of the Term "Free white person" and also the intents of the Congress can easily be found. Some Judges declared that the term "Free White Person" was used to mean Caucasian Race, according to Blumenbach's classification.

Ref. 178 Fed. 245 -- Bessho vs. U. S.
62 Fed. 126 -- In re Saito.
179 Fed. 1002-3 In re Ellies.

Some declared that it was used to mean European.

Ref. 213 Fed. 315 -- In re Dow.

Most of them construed the term "Free White Person" as any "White person", notwithstanding each term has entirely different meanings. The former indicates a good quality of a person, and the latter designates the color of a person, but not quality, as shown in the following cases.

Ref. 62 Fed. 126 -- In re Saito.
Fed. case 104 -In re ah Yup.
198 Fed. 715-- In re Young.
231 Fed. 356-- In re Dow.
(See my First Brief Pages 5, 6, 15, 16.)

In my first brief, I have clearly proven that the Term "Free White Person" derived from the term "Free Inhabitant" used in the Articles of Confederation with the meaning as "Respectful White Person", and it was mainly used to exclude improper or unrespectful white persons. (ref. First Brief P. 15.) (2) And also that the term "Free White Person" does not mean any white person. (ref. First Brief P. 6.) (3) And also I attempted to prove that the first naturalization law of 1790 was not based on any race classification, and the term "Free White Person" was not used to exclude any race.

But now, with more firmer grounds, I am going to prove that the first naturalization law was not based on any race classification, and that all decisions based on any race classification must fall to the ground. (1) Blumenbach's race classification was published during the American Revolution, in 1781, in Germany, in the German language. But it was not transalated into English in America until 1798, by Coldwell, and in London in 1807 by Elliotson. (Ref. Encyclopedia Britania Vol.III p 841.) Hence his classification was certainly not generally known or current in the United States in 1790, (ref. 213 Fed 359) (2) No College or University taught Anthlopology until after the middle of the Nineteenth Century. The firt American Institutions in which systematic instruction in Anthlopology was introduced were Harvard and Clark University in 1888 and 1889. (ref. Cyclopedia of Education Vol II 61.) (3) Neither college nor university taught French until 1783, German until 1825. At Harvard about this time (1783) the first significant change in the Colonial curriculum permitted those who were not preparing for the Ministry to take French instead of Hebrew. But the modern languages were regarded with suspicion, both by the defenders of the classics and by the defenders of the Orthodox religions.

In 1825 Charles Follen, a German scholar, became the first instructor in German, at harvard College. Until the first decade of the nineteenth century, the influence of the German upon the American education did not become evident. (Ref. Cyc. Ed. Vol. II page 61; also The National Cyc. of Amer. Biography, Vol. VII, 289). (4) There ware thirty (30) Senators and sixty-three (63) Congressmen in 1790. But all those who went to College or Universities were graduated before 1780, as shown in the list of Senators and Congressmen. All those who did not go to Colleges or Universities were either soldiers or self-educated lawyers. Only a few of them came from England and Scotland; and all the rest were born

in the United States. Reference the National Cyclopaedia American Biography volume 11 to XIII.

The German language was not taught until long after 1800 A D., and Anthlopology was not taught until very long after 1800; and Blumenbach's race classifications was not transalated into English in America until 1798, until nine years after the firts naturlaization law was made, and until 1807 in England; and all Senators and Congressmen who went to colleges or universities were graduated from their colleges before 1780, (that is before Blumenbach's classification was published in 1781) as shown in the list; and at the time his work was published, all Americans were very busy in fighting for their independence. Judging from the above stated facts we are now absolutely certain that neither Senators nor Congressmen knew nothing about Blumenbach's race classification at the time they were making the first naturalization laws of 1790; in which the Term "Free White Person" was first used and is still used in the law of to-day. Therefore, we are now absolutely certain that the first naturalixation law of 1790 was not based on any race classicication, and the term "Free WEite Person" was not used to exclude any race. It was mainly used to exclude non-respectable white persons, in the same sense as the term "Free Inhabitant" was used in the Articles of Confederation to exclude paupers, vagebonds, and fugitives from justice.

II And again, judging from what legislators had said before they made the first naturalization law of 1790, we will come to the same conclusion as above. (See first Brief Pages 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 13.)

In the course of discussion in Congress of 1790, in regard to naturalization, Madison says: "They would induce the worthy of mankind to come, the object being to increase wealth and strength of this country; those who weaken it are not wanted.

Roger Sherman said: Congress would not compel the State to receive emigrants likely chargeable.

Now, is the term "the worthy of mankind" confined to europeans, or to people of European descent? I do not believe so, for I have good reasons to prove it. General Benedict Arnold was a fo European descent of a good family, but he became a traitor. Hence he was a person not wanted. On the other hand Booker Washington was a poor black ~~salve~~ slave and ~~was~~ is of African descent; but he has done a great deal of good to the United States, by uplifting the standard of his race, by means of higher education. So he is now known to every country as a great educator, Hence he is the person wanted by our founders of this great republic. Dr. Takamine and Dr. Noguchi who are natives of Japan have contributed good services to the medical world in America; so that they are respected by many of the people in the Eastern States. In the Eastern States we find many chargeable Europeans, but hardly any chargeable Japanese, have been found in the United States. During the past seven years from a prominent company in this city, six dishonest men were discharged. Out of these, five were European, and only one was a Chinese.

Judging from all these facts, we will naturally come to the conclusion that the term the "worthy of mankind" or not chargeable persons are not confined to Europeans or people of European descent. The worthy of mankind is wanted by all nations; but in the law of 1790, the person wanted was expressed in the term "Free White Person. So that the term "Free White Person" must mean the WORTHY OF MANKIND, or not chargeable persons.

Any person who is accustomed to swear, always usess these words without any serious meaning to them. There are some who are accustomed to say "Jesus Christ, what is the matter with you?". But the term Jesus Christ used here, is not used to mean Our Saviour Jesus Chirst. Without any meaning it is used in order

to help the expression coming after, viz., what is the matter with you. And again, any lady, who is accustomed to buy white shelled eggs all the time may say at a store, "Give me white eggs," because she is accustomed to say so. But in most cases, any person who wants fresh eggs for eating does not care whether the eggs are white or not. They only want eggs of good quality. If a person wants white eggs in order to hatch white chickens, he will or must mention the name of breed he wants, for white hens do not always lay white eggs. It is true that white leghorns lay white eggs all the time, but white oppingtons lay light brown eggs. On the other hand, a black minorcha hen always lay white eggs.

Therefore in order to get white chickens, the person must state the name of the breed he wants, for the color of the egg does not indicate breed.

Similarly if the Congress of 1790 wanted only European races, it would have stated so in the law. But when we read the Congressional Record of 1790, we will find that no race question was brought up. Legislators wanted the worthy of mankind to come, that is, men who would do their best for the welfare of the country. Hence, of three words, "Free White Person", the limiting word "Free" which indicates the quality of the person, had more consideration than the word white which designates the color only. From this fact, we can safely infer that the term white was simply used to distinguish black people from other people, as it was used in the Arkansas Statutes in 1891, and also in the Constitution of Oklahoma 1891. (See first Brief p16, 26, 27) and also as it was accustomed to be used in the census of those days.

Massachusetts	White	Negro	1764
Rhode Island	"	"	1748
Rhode Island	"	Black	1774
Conneticut	"	Negro	1756
Conneticut	"	Black	1774
New Jersey	"	Black	1771
New Jersey	"	Salve	1786
Maryland	"	Black	1755

(See 174 Fed. 834 In re Halladjian)

Hence the term "Free White Person" was not used to exclude any race. It was simply used to exclude non-respectable white persons. And again if the term "Free White Person" was used to exclude all races except the Caucasian race, there is absoluetly no necessity of making a law to prohibit any race, or races from naturalization.

III But in 1882 the Chinese prohibition law was made, and it is still in force. The necessity of keeping the Act of 1882 in force will sufficiently prove that Chinese were always included within the meaning of "Free White Persons". Otherwise the Act of 1882 ought to be repealed. Hence the term "Free White Person" was not used to exclude any Mongolian race.

Thus from three sources I have clearly proven that the naturalization law of 1790 was not based on any race classification and the term "Free White Person" was not used to exclude any race at all. It was mainly used to exclude non-respectable persons or ~~not~~ chargeable persons. And the word white was used simply to distinguish black from the other people as it was used in the Statutes of Arkansas, and also in the Constitution of Oklahoma.

Since there is no law prohibiting Japanese from naturalozation, and also there is no Supreme Court decision against Japanese from naturalization, I sincerely hope that the United States will admit me, for I am now thoroughly Americanized, as the result of my long and steady preparation of over thirteen years to become a good and useful citizen of the United States.

WITH REGARD TO BLUMENBACH. Blumenbach was a German, who never came to America, nor went to China or Japan; in fact, he never went out of Europe. Hence he did not know the people living in the distant lands. His work largely depended upon persons brought before him. So that his work can hardly be depended upon. In re Dow 213 312 Fed. 357, District Judge Smith says: "The scientific conclusion of Scholars of the present day is that the inhabitant of the Caucasus are to be classed with the Mongolian races and not the European; so that Blumenbach derived his term from a skull more likely to have been Mongolian than European, or it may be that the skull of some traveller or captive in the Caucasus. This Blumenbach's classification has hardly ~~and~~ any merit at the present day. (Ref. 174 Fed. 835 also Ripley - The Race of Europe)

WITH REGARD TO CHINESE PROHIBITION LAW OF 1882. To apply the Chinese prohibition law of 1882 upon Japanese is unquestionably unjust, for the following reasons. The Act of Congress of May 6, 1882 says -- Hereafter no state court or Court of the United States shall admit Chinese to Citizenship. And again the treaty of December of 1894 between the United States and the Empire of China states: -- In pursuance of Article 3 of the immigration treaty between the United States and China signed at Peking on the Seventeenth day of November 1880, it is hereby understood and agreed that Chinese laborers or Chinese of any other class either permantntly or temporarily residing in the United States, shall have, for the protection of their personal property, all rights that are given by the law of the United States to citizens of the most favored nation, except the right to become a naturalized citizen.

Now any person, who can read the law and the treaty of 1894 stated above, will easily understand that the law of 1882 was made against the Chinese "only", not against any nation. Of course, if Japan had been, or has been, or is under the protection of or under the rule of the Chinese Empire (now called the Chinese Republic) as Korea is to Japan at the present time, the Act of 1882 will justly be applied upon any Japanese subjects. Any person who has read the History of Japan will know that the Japanese Empire has never been conquered by any nation for the past 2500 years. During this long time she has been ~~laways~~ always independent. As present she is one of the five great powers. Hence to apply the law made against ~~China~~ Chinese upon any Japanese is absolutely unjust. And I have no doubt that every true Christian and every true American will agree with me.

WITH REGARD TO JAPANESE ALREADY NATURALIZED. It is an undeniable fact that many Japanese were naturalized in the United States, but their cases were not reported in either State report or in the Federal Report. Why? There are many people who were naturalized in Hawaii since this territory was annexed to the United States; ~~and~~ but very few are reported. Why? Because many people were naturalized without any trouble. Hence, the cases not reported are strong proof that the applicants in such cases were always regarded as "free white persons". The reason why Japanese cases were not reported will also strongly prove that Japanese were always incluede within the meaning of Free White persons.

I have strong proof for my statement. Dr. Katsunuma of Honolulu told me that he received his first papers at Idaho, and the second papers, that is naturalization papers, he received without any trouble at ~~Nevada~~ Utah in 1895. He told me that he was asked nearly the same questions as I was asked here.

S.B.P. at request of S. Ozawa.

1 There are many Japanese who were legally naturalized as shown in the list of Naturalized Japanese (Ref. First Brei f Pages 31 32.

2 All Japanese naturalized hitherto were always included within the meaning of "Free White Person". So that there was no trouble in admitting them. Hence the cases never reached the Supreme Court.

3 All Japanese cases were not brought up to the Superior Court, so that the Superior Court had not the chance to sanction the cases.

4 The Superior Court can not allow the naturalization of any aliens, unless the case be brought to the Superior Court to be tried.

Since there is no Supreme Court decison against Japanese from naturalization , and there is no law prohibiting any Japanese from the naturaligation , and also I am now throughly Americanized as the result of my long and Steady preperation of over thirteen years to become a good and useful citizenoof the United States . I Sincerly hope that my petition for naturalization shall be accepted.

Respectively subimitted,

Takao Ozawa.

The Petitioner.

THE UNITED STATES SENATORS 1789-91.

Name	Elected Place	Birth Place	Date of Birth	College or Ed.	Date of Grad.
Adams, John	Pres.	Mass.	1735	Harvard	1755
Basset, Richard.	Del.	Del.	D1815	Well ed.	
Butler, Pierce	S. C.	Ireland	1744	Brit. Army	
Corroll, Charles	Md.	Md.	1737	France	
Dalton. T.	Mass.	Mass.	1738	Harvard	1755
Dickinson, P.	N. Y.	Md.	1739	Law Ed.	
Ellsworth, O.	Conn	Conn	1745	Yale	1766
Elmer, Jonathan	N. J.	Penn.	1745	Pen. U.	1771
Fen. William	Ga.	Md.	1748	Self Ed.	
Foster, Theo.	R. I.	Mass	1752	Brown's	1770
Gunn, James	Ga.	Vir.	1739	Conn.	1774
Grayson, Wm.	Va.	Va.	1736	Oxford	
Hawkins, Benj.	N. C.	N. C.	1754	Princeton	1776
Henry, John	Md.	Md.	1750	"	1769
Izard, Ralph.	S. C.	Eng.	1742	Cambridge	
Johnson, Wm.	S. C.	S. C.	1727	Yale	1744
Johnston, S.	N. C.	Scottland	1733	Columbia	
King, Rufus.	N. Y.	Md.	1755	Harvard	1777
Langdon, John	N. H.	N. H.	1741	Grammar School.	
Lee. Richard H.	Va.	Eng.	1732	Wakefield	
Maclay, Wm.	Pa.		1737	Lawyers Ed.	
Monroe, James	Va.		1758	Wm & Marys	1776
Morris, Robert.	Pa.	Eng.	1734	Fair Ed.	
Paterson, Wm.	N. Y.		1745	Princeton	1763
Read. Geo.	Del.		1733	New Rochell	
Stanton, Joseph	R. I.		1739	Served in F & I war.	
Strong, C.	Mass.		1745	Harvard.	1764
Walker, John	Va.		1744	Good Ed.	
Wingate, Paine	N. H.		1739	Harvard.	1759

THE NAMES OF THE FIRST CONGRESSMEN

1789-91

Names	Place Elected	Birth Place	Date of Birth	Educ.	Date of Grad.
Ames, Fisher	Mass.	Mass.	1758	Harvard N	
Ashe, John R.	N. C.	do	1720	Soldier	
Benson. Egbert	N. Y.	do	1746	Kings Col.	1765
Bland, Theo.	Va.	do	1742	Edinburgh.	1774
Baldwin, A.	Ga.	do	1754	Yale	1774
Bloodsworth, T.	N. C.	do	1736	(No Opp.)	
Bourne, B.	R. I.	do	1755	Harvard N	1775
Boudinot, E.	N. J.	Phil.	1740	Common School	
Brown, John.	Va.	do	1757	Wash. Col. Princeton.	
Burke, Aedanus	S. C.	do-	1743	Lawyer.	
Cadwalader L.	N. J.	do	1743	Soldier	
Carrol. D.	Md.	do	1756	Classical Ed.	
Clymer, G.	Penn.	do	1739	Soldier	
Fleyd, W.	N. Y.	do	1734	Soldier.	
Foster, A.	N. H.	Mass.	1735	Harvard N	1756
Gale, George.	Md.	do	----	Founder of Oncida Tns.	
Gerry Elbridge.	Mass.	do	1744	Harvard.	1762
Gile. W. B.	Mass.	do	1762	Sidney Col. & Princeton.	
Page, John	Va.	do	1744	Wm & Mary's.	
Parker, Josiah	Va.	do	1744	"	
Portrige, Geo.	Mass.	do	1740	Harvard.	1762
Schuman James	Penn.	do	1757	N. Jersey	1775
Scott, Thomas	Penn.	do		Yale	1765
Sedwich, Theo.	Mass.	Conn.	1746	Yale	1765
Seney, Joshua	Md.	do			
Sevier, John	N. C.	do		Fredericksburg	1745
Sherman, R.	Conm.	Mass.	1721	Self Educated.	
Sinnickson. T.	N. J.	do		Classisal Ed.	

THE NAMES OF THE FIRST CONGRESSMEN

1787 91

Name	Elected Place	Birth Place	Date of Birth.	College or Ed.	Date of Grad.
Smith, Wm.	Md.	Mass.	1758	Law in Eng.	
Smith. Wm.	S. S.	do	1762	Minor College.	
Steele, Jno.	N. C.	do			
Stone, M. J.	Md.	do	1747	Law	
Sturges, J	Conn.	do	1740	Yale	1759
Smiter, Thos	S. C.	Verginia	1734	Soldier	
Sylvester, P	N. Y.	do			
Thacher, G	Mas	Me.	1754	Harward	1776
Trunchull, J	Conn.	do	1740	Harward	1759
Gilman., N	N. H.	N. H.	1755	Army	
Goodhue, B	Miss.	Mass.	1748	Harward	1766
Griffin, S	Va.	do			
Grant, J	Mass.	do			
Hartley, Thos	Penn.	do	1748n	Soldier	
Hathons, J	N. Y.	do			
Heister, D	Penn	do			
Hugar, D	S. C.	do			
Huntington, B	Conn.	do		Lawyer	
Jackson. J	Ga.	Eng.	1757	1772 Soldier	
Lawrence, J.	N Y	do			
Lee, R B	Va.	do			
Leonard, G	Mass	do			
Livemore, S	N.H.	do	1732	Princeton	1752
Madison, J	Va.	do	1751	Princeton	1772
Matthews, G	Ga.	N. Y.	1739	Soldior + Governor.	
Moor, A.	Va.		1752	Law.	1774
Muhlenburg, J. P.	Penn.		1746	Soldier, Halle.	
Muhlenburg, Frederick	Penn.		1750	Halle.	1770
Van Rensselaer	K. K.	New York.	1763	Yale	
Tucker, T.	S. S.		1745	U. of Eng.	
~~Vruicg~~, J.		Del.	1758	Ed. in America.	

THE NAMES OF THE FIRST CONGRESSMEN

1789-91

Names	Place Eelcted	Birth Place	Date of Birth	Education	Date of Graduation
Wadsworth, J.	Conn.	Conn.	1743	Soldier & Seaman	
White, Alex.	Va.	Va.	1738	Fair Ed.	
Williamson, H.	N. C.	N. C.	1735	Col. of Phil.	1757
Wynkoof, Henry	Penn	Penn.	1737	Classical Ed.	

In The United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii

In the Matter of the application of Tatao Ozawa for Naturalization

Brief of Applicant

SEP -2 1915

Filed,
at 2 o'clock and 00 minutes P.m.
A. E. MURPHY, Clerk
By H. L. Davis
Deputy Clerk.