

9:15

Responses to Peter T. Suzuki's articles + testimony

1981-1986

10/2

83/115

c

-RHWax

26 June 1986

The Editors, Dialectical Anthropology
Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research
65 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10003

Enclosed herewith is my comment in response to the essay
by Peter T. Suzuki, "The University of California Japanese
Evacuation and Resettlement Study: A Prolegomenon" (April
1986).

Yours truly,

Rosalie H Wax
Professor emerita, Anthropology
Washington University at St Louis

Ethics and Terrorism

Reply to Peter T. Suzuki

How shall I attempt to respond to a text (10:189-214) which contains so many flat misstatements of fact, such purposeful misinterpretation of events, and such incomprehension of the passage of time, the course of history, the ethnography of circumstance?

Dorothy Swaine Thomas was a determined and able scientist, as was Morton Grodzins, and they would have been well capable of calling Peter T. Suzuki to account, were they yet alive. Suzuki was well advised to characterize and attack persons who are no longer present to speak for themselves. George Kuratomi and Joe Kurihara, among others, would have despised Suzuki's attempt to defend -- and even laud -- a gang of fanatics who assaulted and terrorized their fellow Japanese Americans!

At my age (74) and in my state of health, I have no

inclination to defend my career. Within historical (and anthropological) context, it must now stand for itself; and I will note that within that professional context, I have been unusually frank and open about what I achieved and what I have regretted. Facing retirement, I devoted the last several years of my professional life to assembling the personal fieldnotes which I recorded during the months I spent in the "centers" where the Japanese Americans were confined during World War II. Those fieldnotes are now on deposit in the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, where with other ERS materials, they may now be consulted by qualified scholars. As is customary in such cases, that Library has attached some conditions to the usage of these materials, in order not to infringe on the privacy of those participants still alive. Persons interested in pursuing the various issues raised by the incarceration of the Japanese Americans, or by the conduct of individual persons (administrators, inmates, anthropologists), are encouraged to consult these primary sources.

As has been and continues to be customary among anthropological fieldworkers, I tried to protect the identity

of the persons with whom I worked in the Centers, and for these actors I employed pseudonyms (except where I was explicitly instructed by the person not to so do). Suzuki has chosen to attempt to breach this protection by identifying the person I called "Kira" as Kinzo Ernest Wakayama. Considering that Kira was reliably accused of inciting the young men to violence (The Spoilage, pp. 319-320) and of leading a group of terrorists who assaulted their fellow Japanese Americans, Suzuki's procedure may not be a favor, and I should trust that he has obtained the permission of Wakayama (or his heirs) for this imputation.

In order to appreciate Suzuki's assertions in their proper context, interested parties should read my Doing Fieldwork: Warnings & Advice. For example, I do not believe that I was being unobjective or unscientific because I became angry when I learned that an elderly friend had been assaulted and brutally beaten after he had told the young men to behave themselves and had advised them not to renounce their U.S. citizenship (Doing Fieldwork, pp. 155-157). I should also point out that I neither wrote nor edited any part of The Spoilage, and, that in consequence I am not responsible for

4-RHWax

"the biographical notes" included by Thomas and Nishimoto on pages 370-379; these notes do not therefore reveal my "subjective approach to some of the Tule Lake residents" (Suzuki, pp. 193-194).

Yours very truly,

Rosalie H Wax, PhD
Professor emerita

References Cited

Suzuki, Peter T.

1986 The University of California Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study: A Prolegomenon. *Dialectical Anthropology*, Volume 10, numbers 3,4 (April): 189-214.

Thomas, Dorothy Swaine & Richard S. Nishimoto

1946 *The Spoilage*. University of California Press.

5-RHWax

Wax, Rosalie H.

1971 Doing Fieldwork: Warnings & Advice. University of
Chicago Press.

RESPONSE TO SUZUKI'S CRITICISMS OF DOING FIELDWORK

I am writing in response to an article which appeared in the September 1981 issue of Dialectical Anthropology. The author of the article is Peter T. Suzuki, Professor of Urban Studies at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Professor Suzuki accuses me of committing many unethical and unprofessional acts while, under the auspices of the University of California Evacuation and Resettlement Study, I was doing fieldwork in the Gila Relocation Center and the Tule Lake Segregation Center. What is most misleading about Suzuki's criticisms is that he persistently implies that my book, Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice was intended to be a history of the Tule Lake Segregation Center. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

I wrote Doing Fieldwork primarily to give inexperienced students of anthropology and sociology some idea of the difficulties and problems - physical, mental, moral, and ethical that they must expect to encounter should they attempt to live with and study people of a different culture or people who are living in an extreme situation. Indeed, the book describes three different field situations: 1) myself working at Gila and Tule Lake; 2) my husband and myself working on a Sioux Indian reservation in South Dakota; 3) my husband and myself working among the Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma. In addition to these descriptions it contains seven chapters on such topics as theory, the ambiguities of field work, the history of field work and finding and working on a problem.

Doing Fieldwork has been praised and recommended by some of the most eminent scholars in the United States. If I cite their comments now, it is not to laud the book in the face of Suzuki's criticism, but rather to establish for the reader what genre of text it was and what were its intended goals:

In reviewing the book, Professor William Foote Whyte, of Cornell University stated:

"If I had to recommend a single book to a prospective student field worker, I would choose this volume without any hesitation. Rosalie Wax has done an extraordinarily impressive job in presenting the problems and processes of field work in a way that should fascinate the novice and yet will stand up against any criticism from fellow professionals. . .The book strikes the reader as scrupulously honest, examining the mistakes with the same care as successful field maneuvers. Especially noteworthy is her treatment of the problems of the emotional involvement of the field worker with the subjects of his study. She shows. . . that she felt passionately about what was happening to the Japanese and what ought to happen to them. . .She was far from an emotionally detached neutral observer, and yet the discipline of doing field work and keeping full notes of her interviews and observations prevented her from becoming a prisoner of her emotional commitments... Armed with the notes, in writing her research reports, she was able to gain the detachment and sense of perspective necessary for good scientific work."

Nicholas von Hoffman, in an article "The People's Right to Know," published in the Washington Post, January 12, 1972, remarks: There is "a new book in anthropology which should be read in every newsroom in America. . . He then quotes from my book: "Good fieldwork (read reporting) is not something performed by an isolated intellectual or researcher, but something created by all of the people in the social situation being studied."

Stanley A. Freed, then chairman of the Department of Anthropology at The American Museum of Natural History remarks in his review: "Although Wax's book is by far the best I have read on the problems of anthropological fieldwork, the wisdom she has distilled from a professional life-time need not be of interest only to anthropologists. Much of her advice could be absorbed profitably by anyone faced with the necessity of getting something accomplished in a strange society or, for that matter, in his own."

Rosalie Hankey's Field Notes

For the benefit of historians I might add that I only recently discovered that Dr. Thomas had not included my Tule Lake fieldnotes with the other project materials she donated to the Bancroft Library at the University of California. I, however, had kept a carbon copy of the notes and, since they are fragile and require editing,¹ I am having them typed onto a word processor so that they will be available to researchers, with, of course, the proviso that the identities of the Japanese Americans who talked to me will not be revealed. Such researchers will have over a thousand pages of verbatim statements made by Japanese Americans, during their experiences at Tule Lake. I visited about 25 persons regularly, and about thirty additional persons at intervals.

1. For the protection of my respondents I usually used pseudo-initials when I typed my notes. I was warned, on several occasions, that my notes might be appropriated by the project police.

Suzuki's Criticisms Of My Conduct As A Fieldworker

Many of Suzuki's criticism of my work at Tule Lake are misleading and some are in poor taste. For example he states p. 31: "By her own admission, while at Tule Lake, she was arrogant and deceptive while doing research among the inmates, lied to one informant, and on several occasions 'went a little crazy'."

On Going a Little Crazy

In Doing Fieldwork I describe in detail how, on one occasion, I suffered from a deep depression and, on another, I became emotionally involved to the point of irrationality. My intent in writing these descriptions was to be helpful to students and to let them know what they may encounter.

On Being Arrogant

As for my "arrogance" Suzuki does not tell the reader that it was, on only one occasion, directed at a few high ranking WRA officials and not at the Japanese Americans. When I arrived at Tule Lake for my first brief visit (February 2, 3, 1944) an assistant project director told me that I would be permitted to enter the "colony" only if I was accompanied by an armed soldier who would sit by while I conversed with my Japanese American friends. I was furious, but I got around this ruling and describe accurately and honestly how I did so. (pp. 99-101)

On Lying To An Informant

In March, I was permitted to make another visit to Tule Lake. Mr. Paul Robertson suggested that I might like to talk to some of the members of the "underground group", for example, Mrs. Tsuchikawa, at whose home the secret meetings were being held. He asked me, however, not to reveal the fact that he had made this suggestion.

I called on Mrs. Tsuchikawa and she asked me who had referred her to me. I did not wish to implicate Mr. Robertson, so I told her I had heard her name from a member of the Coordinating Committee. This was a half-truth, because I had heard her name from a member of the Coordinating Committee (R. Wax, Fieldnotes, March 21, 1944, p.2).

Suzuki's Criticism Of My Paper: "Twelve Years Later:
An Analysis Of Field Experience"

On pages 38-39 of his paper, Suzuki quotes Marvin Opler as stating in 1948, in his review of The Spoilage, that "the "loyalty-disloyalty" labels were actually misleading." Suzuki then adds "only 'twelve years later' would Wax come to the same understanding."
(39)

He then presents a long quotation from my article "Twelve Years Later: An Analysis of Field Experience":

Perhaps the most important handicap during this early period was my notion that there were two distinct varieties of Japanese, a "pro-American" and a "pro-Japanese." This incorrect idea sprang from my emotional reaction to the current anti-Japanese propaganda, a reaction which took the form of a stubborn faith that the great majority of Japanese residing in America did not look with any favor on Japan, did not seriously consider expatriation or repatriation, believed that the United States was going to win the war, and, in short, held many of the attitudes which I imagined ~~T~~ would hold in their place. The other variety of Japanese, I thought, was "pro-Japanese" and comprised a small group, inclined to violence and responsible for all the disturbances in the Centers (camps). With this group, I had been told, it would be almost impossible to make contact.

Apparently Suzuki did not read Twelve Years Later carefully for he fails to note that in the first paragraph I state; "Immediately on leaving the field (1945) I wrote a long saga describing my experience in full detail and that my article is based on this "saga". Nor does he note that my article is an analysis of how, in the first months of my fieldwork, I gradually learned that my notion about "the two distinct varieties" of Japanese Americans was utterly incorrect. Nor does he mention that in Doing Fieldwork,

(pp. 74-75) I describe how Mr. Nishimoto helped to perceive and accept the fact that my idealistic "loyalty-disloyalty" conception was incorrect and simple minded.

Suzuki's Criticism Of My Doctoral Dissertation

Suzuki also refers critically to my doctoral dissertation submitted to the Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago. In discussing my proposed dissertation, Professor Robert Redfield had suggested that I compare the developments in Tule Lake to those in Nazi Germany.² I was happy to comply because my fieldwork had convinced me that the so called "uprising" of October and November, 1943, had, on the whole, been a democratic phenomenon, involving the election of block representatives, the presentation of grievances, and a number of reasonable and communicative meetings between the Japanese American committees and the project director, Mr. Best, and the national director, Dillon S. Myer. But with the subsequent declaration of martial law on November 13, 1943, the imprisonment of suspected "agitators" in a stockade without a trial, the murder of Mr. Hitomi, and the rise of the various pressure groups, the atmosphere of the camp became increasingly authoritarian.

For example, on September 21, 1944, one of the most eminent leaders of the Sokuji Kikoku Hōshi Dan (Organization to Return Immediately to the Homeland to Serve) showed me a resegregation petition he intended to circulate among the residents, and said:

They will have to sign this. . . .If they don't sign this they will be known to be not loyal to Japan and will be told in public, "You are not Japanese." Of course, many people who don't want to go back to Japan will sign this, but then they will go in a corner

2. In 1943, Redfield published an essay protesting against the evacuation, "The Japanese Americans", American Society in Wartime (W.F. Ogburn, ed.) University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

and keep quiet." (Fieldnotes, R. Hankey, 1944)

In a footnote (p. 60, footnote 215) Suzuki implies that in my doctoral dissertation I divide the Japanese Americans in Tule Lake into "democrats" and "fascists". This is not so. But when he adds: "There were no 'fascists' or 'democrats' among the 110,000 Japanese American inmates, there were only victims", I think he is being patronizing. He implies that the people confined in Tule Lake had no political will - that they were all identically meek. Many of the people I knew were intensely political, and the social movements in Tule Lake had significantly different political goals.

But perhaps I should let George Kuratomi, the chairman of the Daihyo Sha Kai (Peoples Representative Body) speak for me. Mr. Kuratomi was confined in the stockade without trial for eight months. On September 18, 1944, after his release Mr. Kuratomi and I were discussing the hunger strikes in the stockade. He assured me: "Our motive never was so much our release, but rather to prove our innocence. . . If accused, we wanted proof of our guilt."

* * * * *

Should any reader wish a copy of my detailed response to Professor Suzuki's criticisms of my work, I will be happy to provide this on request.

Rosalie Hankey Wax
Professor Emerita, Anthropology
Washington University in St. Louis

COMMENTS ON THE TESTIMONY OF DR. PETER T. SUZUKI
BEFORE THE COMMISSION ON WARTIME RELOCATION
AND INTERNMENT OF CIVILIANS

BY

Rosalie Hankey Wax
Professor Emerita, Anthropology
Washington University at St. Louis

Omission of my Name from "The Spoilage"

In his statement Dr. Suzuki notes that my name does not appear in the text of The Spoilage. He suggests that my name was omitted because I "turned informer on one of Tule Lake's 'disloyals'".

I would like to point out that The Spoilage was co-authored by Dorothy Swaine Thomas and Richard S. Nishimoto. Listed as "contributors" on the title page are Rosalie A. Hankey, James M. Sakoda, Morton Grodzins, and Frank Miyamoto. The names of none of these individuals appear in the text. Similarly The Spoilage contains many quotations from the Community Analysis Reports composed by Dr. Marvin Opler. Yet Dr. Opler's name does not appear in the text.

Again, Dr. Suzuki asserts that I was expelled from Tule Lake "shortly after having informed on Kira". The facts are that Mr. Kira was interned in December of 1944. I was not expelled from Tule Lake until May 9, 1945. It is most unlikely that Mr. Kira's internment had anything to do with my expulsion.

WAS ROSALIE HANKEY AN INFORMER?

I wrote "Doing Fieldwork" in sections over a period of 25 years. When I added the section quoted by Dr. Suzuki I did not consult my extensive field notes from Tule Lake. When I did review these notes, I found that my memory had been unreliable. My notes indicate that I did not denounce Mr. Kira to "Department of Justice investigators". However, the story of my involvement in the Tule Lake internments is very complex; but it is essential for an understanding of what I did, and why I did it.

The Internment of Mr. Kira

Dramatis Personae in Order Presented

(I have used pseudonyms for all Japanese Americans except for Mr. Kurihara, who gave me and Dr. Thomas permission to use his name.,

Dr. Marvin Opler, Community Analyst at Tule Lake.

Stanley Kira, a Kibei, about 47 years old was a behind the scene leader of the resegregation groups. He was also rumored to be the leader of a gang of young fanatics.

Koshiro Yamashita, an Issei about 40 years old, was probably the most influential leader of the resegregation groups.

Kazuhike Itabashi, an Issei, about 57 years old, was a member of the Seichi No Ie movement which holds to an ideal of "a world of happiness, gratitude a peace." Along with other elders of his church, he urged young men not to engage in violence and advised people not to join the resegregation groups. (For information on this sect see Contemporary Religions in Japan, IV, No. 3 (September 1963, pp. 212-229).)

Joseph Kurihara, was a Nisei, about 55 years old. In April of 1944 Mr. Kurihara told me that he objected to the (first) resegregationist petition because the presenters had given no clear explanation to the people. As the months passed he grew increasingly critical. On one occasion he told me that some of the resegregationists were threatening to use force and that if they did so he would not keep quiet "even if they call me an inu (informer)".

Lou Noyes, Project Attorney at Tule Lake.

John Burling, Assistant Director of the Alien Enemy Control Unit of the Department of Justice.

* * * * *

Organizations Referred to in Text

Sokuji Kikoku Hoshi dan (Organization to Return Immediately to the Homeland to Serve). The name assumed by the resegregationists in November, 1944.

Sokoku Kenkyu Seinen dan (Young Men's Association for the Study of the Mother Country). An Association sponsored by leaders of the resegregation group. Its first meeting was held on August 12, 1944.

Hokoku Seinen dan (Young Men's Association to Serve our Mother Country). In November of 1944 the Sokoku, as it was commonly called, changed its name to Hokoku. Most non-members continued to call the organization "the Sokoku".

* * * * *

Narrative

In late Summer and early Fall of 1944 several people, including Dr. Marvin Opler had hinted to me that Mr. Kira was the leader of a gang of young fanatics "who had signed their names in blood". I visited Mr. Kira a few times and concluded that he was an underground leader of the pro-Japanese resegregationists. In late September of 1944, the Sokuji Kikoku Hoshi dan (Organization to Return Immediately to the Homeland to Serve) brought forth its second petition, asking for the signatures of all persons who wished to return to Japan immediately. On September 21 I visited Mr. Yamashita, an influential leader of the resegregation group. He told me:

"If they (the people) don't sign this they will be known to be not loyal to Japan and will be told so in public. Of course, many people who don't want to go back to Japan will sign, but then they will go in a corner and keep quiet."

Some of the responsible older Japanese American men did not keep quiet.

In a Community Analysis Report, Dr. Opler stated:

"Feeling ran so high in ward VII, that vocal anti-resegregationists

or residents of 'tough' blocks who had refused to sign were definitely on the spot. In block 73, the block manager. . .was forced by public opinion to move quietly out of his block and later resign; his secretary did likewise. In block 74. . .one aged anti-resegregationist was hit over the back of the head and knocked unconscious (October 7)."¹

On October 10, Mr. Itabashi, a frail little man, told me that he was telling the leaders of the resegregation groups: "The Japanese government is not so narrow minded as you." I was concerned and remarked obliquely that there were dangerous men in camp. Mr. Itabashi replied in a reassuring tone: "Even among themselves they are not agreed."

On the night of October 15, when Mr. Itabashi and two other older men were leaving a church meeting, they were assaulted by a gang of young men and were brutally beaten. The victims refused to name their assailants and the Caucasian Internal Security was able to accomplish nothing. The evacuee police, following the precedent that they would not involve themselves in any "political" matters, refused to handle the case.

(Subsequently I was told by a Japanese American respondent that on October 21, Mr. Kira had addressed a meeting of the Sokoku and had incited them to violence. He promised that he would take care of them if they got into trouble and quoted a Japanese proverb which may be translated as: "To help the great cause, we must destroy those who oppose it.")

On October 23, Mr. Kurihara, a friend of Mr. Itabashi, told me:

"The men (who were beaten) are keeping it under cover. The Police Department isn't doing anything about it. They were beaten because they refused to sign the petition. They were blamed. . .for influencing people against it. . . .I went to see Mr. Itabashi on Tuesday. He requested

1. Cited from "The Spoilage", p. 318.

me to let the thing die out. They fear that neither they nor their families will be safe. . . .One of our friends was going right over to beat Kira up, but we restrained him. . . .We know threats were made and we know where the threats came from."

On October 30, the son of a man, said to be hostile to Kira, was knifed by a man who was known to be Kira's right-hand man.

On November 13, I called on Mr. Kurihara. He opened the conversation by saying that he knew little because he had purposely been staying at home. He closed it by saying that he had told one of Kira's spies that he was going out two nights a week to a class on Japanese singing. He then opened the drawer of his desk and showed me a stout club, about six inches long, to which a pipe joint was attached by a leather thong. On November 20, Mr. Kurihara told me that he had talked to some of the leaders of the Resegregation Group and that he was sure that he now had Kira "shivering in his shoes".

I was obliged to leave Tule Lake on November 21 to attend a conference of the members of our study and I did not return until December 8. On the evening of the 8th I called on Mr. Noyes, the WRA Project Attorney and found him having dinner with John Burling of the Department of Justice, who had come to Tule Lake to initiate the hearings for persons who had applied for renunciation of citizenship. After Mr. Burling left, Mr. Noyes told me that in his opinion, Burling was doing a very good job. He was telling the young men that if their decision was made of their own initiative, O.K., but if it was due to pressure, they should reconsider it. Mr. Noyes also told me that Mr. Kira had not submitted a resegregation form. I was surprised, and, since Mr. Noyes knew that Kira was an important resegregationist leader, I told him jokingly that they ought to question Kira about his feelings in the presence of some of the strong arm boys in his group.

On December 12, Mr. Noyes told me that Mr. Burling had called in Mr. Kira. According to Noyes, Burling had asked Kira: "Are you loyal to Japan and willing to give your all?" Kira said "Yes". After a number of similar statements, Burling held out a resegregation form and said: "Well if that's the way you feel, here's the blank." Mr. Kira signed.

On December 14, I called on Mr. Itabashi. He gave me a detailed account of how Mr. Kurihara had coped with Mr. Kira.

"Kira was in Terminal Island before the war and so was Kurihara. So they know each other for a long time and Kurihara knows the personality of Kira and that he is always for himself only."

"He knew everything that he did in Manzanar. He knew Kira was a coward. And still he bragged himself. But Kurihara kept quiet as long as Kira didn't do any big wrong. But since Kira's followers had attacked me at night Kurihara was as mad as a bulldog. He came to me immediately the next day and said he's going to either kill him or have him arrested because he knew everything what he did in the past. I told him to be quiet and see what will happen in a month or two."

"Then a young boy was slashed. And the fellow who attacked him was one of the men who attacked me."

"And then Kira tried to attack Kurihara. He planned it and Kurihara found out. And then Kurihara was kind of alarmed. And one of the Sokoku men, a mean fellow, he and one other went to Kurihara early in the morning. Both went there and stayed there talking until two o'clock in the afternoon. And Kurihara said to them, 'I might be attacked and killed but in the meantime I might kill a couple of you. I dedicate myself to the justice and welfare of the camp. That's the only way we can keep the peace in the camp. When Itabashi and Sasaki were attacked

I was ready to punish Kira. But at the request of Itabashi and Sasaki I withheld. But now I am ready.'"

"And then he told these two men who were representatives of Mr. Kira all that he knew about Kira and his movements. He said, 'You are having as leader such a man as Kira. Do you know about this?' These two men were surprised."

"Before this, these two men had said, 'As long as we let you alone you shouldn't mind what happens in camp.' Then Kurihara was madder than ever. 'What!!!' he said. Then he told them all about Kira."

"And that was Thursday or Friday. The next morning Kira resigned for the reason that his wife had a baby and there was a lot of work to do in the house. And the baby was born about four months ago."

"Ever since Kurihara had told all about Kira, a lot of people found out what he was. The people didn't know (before) and they worshipped him highly. But now they've found out that he's a coward and just doing everything for publicity."

Mr. Itabashi then began to tell me about the stabbing that occurred on October 30.

"I understand that the father of the boy (who was stabbed) is a Sokoku man. He didn't know that the inside of that party was so rotten. When he found out how rotten the inside was he was indignant at Kira, and was speaking about it openly. That's why his son was attacked, I heard."

"The main reason Kurihara was mad was that they wronged the young people. The young people don't know anything. They do as the leaders say."

On March 22, 1946, Mr. Best, Project Director, Tule Lake, sent Dillon Myer, Director of the WRA, a 19-page essay entitled: "Joe Kurihara, 'Repatriate': His Story." In this essay Mr. Best states:

"So violently did Kurihara counsel against these organizations --- when he was asked for advice --- that word reached me that Stanley Kira,¹ acknowledged leader of the pro-Japan groups, had threatened to kill Joe. I sent a messenger to warn Joe of the rumored intention. Back came a message telling me not to worry. That everything was in hand in the colony and that he very well could take care of himself. He did, and did what he could to take care of some others too."²

Comment by Rosalie Hankey Wax

From the foregoing it may be seen that Mr. Kira was a person who had engaged in violent tactics against Japanese Americans who opposed him. Among those assaulted or threatened were some of my friends. I was naturally interested in seeing that he was restrained from further violence. But even if I had been tempted to inform on him it would not have been necessary. Mr. Best, the Project Director, and other staff members of high rank were already aware of what Mr. Kira was doing.

How I Tried to Help Mr. Wakida's Friend

In an article which appeared in the September issue of Dialectical Anthropology, Dr. Suzuki accuses me of "informing the Department of Justice Personnel at Tule Lake" in an effort to keep a young man from being interned. He does not quote my explanation: that I did this because I believed that "interning him would put him in grave physical danger."³

Here are the facts as they are recorded in my fieldnotes.

On December 27, seventy of the members of the two resegregationist organizations (64 of whom were officers) were taken to the detention camp at Santa Fe.

1. (Pseudonym inserted by me.)

2. Japanese Relocation Papers, Bancroft Library; the quotation is from p. 15 of the typescript.

3. "Doing Fieldwork", p. 168.

On January 24, Burling announced plans for another internment scheduled for January 26. I did not know of this announcement, and on January 25, I visited my friends, Mr. and Mrs. Wakida. They were in great distress, because their friend, Mr. Abo, who was an instructor in one of the Japanese language schools, was among those scheduled to be interned. George Wakida said, desperately: "I'm trying to save my friend. He's the only friend I've got. . . Abo was 100% against the Hokoku. . . .If more people like Abo are going, everybody should go." Sally Wakida put her arms around her husband and cried. They asked me if I could do anything.

Since I had spoken to Mr. Abo several times and knew he was opposing the resegregationists, I said that I would speak to Mr. Burling. I went to see Burling immediately and told him that interning Mr. Abo with a group of ardent members of the Hokoku Seinen dan might well put his life in danger. Burling refused to commit himself. But two days later, on January 26, Burling told me that before the internment:

"When he was on his way to the stockade, where the men were being kept temporarily, a man named Sato called to him through the fence. . . and said, 'You are making a big mistake Mr. Burling. It's a mistake about the school teachers.' So Burling took the man to his office. Sato explained that there were four school teachers who should not be taken to Santa Fe. These men had been fighting the Hokoku and had stood for principles of no pressure for resegregation and that they had been teaching a policy of living peacefully. After consulting Mr. Best, the Project Director, Burling released the four Japanese school teachers and Mr. Abo."