

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

JUN 5 1942

DATE: May 5, 1942

FROM: JHW

TO:

| | | |
|-----|------|-----|
| RBF | copy | RM |
| REE | | RFE |
| AB | | AB |
| ME | | |
| | | |
| | | |

COMMENTS:

SUBJECT: STUDY OF FORCED MASS MIGRATION OF JAPS ON THE PACIFIC COAST

Three requests for funds have been directed to The Rockefeller Foundation in connection with the moving of Japs on the Pacific Coast:

1. Professors Taylor and Thomas of the University of California have asked RF to "take charge of efforts to arrange (or make possible) the transfer of academic folk to other universities so as to continue contact with intellectual Caucasians."
2. The Friends Service Committee, having been asked by Mr. Eisenhower of the Federal Relocation Authority to take charge of transfer of students to other colleges, has asked (through Clarence Pickett) RF to provide funds for that purpose.
3. The University of California (President Sproul) has asked for \$45,000 a year for at least a three-year period to enable its faculty to study the economic, governmental and sociological aspects of this first forced mass migration in this country's modern history.

All of these requests have been declined.

On Thursday and Friday I discussed the whole problem at length with Professor Dorothy Thomas of the Gianinni Foundation of the University of California, who had come on at my suggestion. From the discussion it appeared that the significant part of the study proposed by President Sproul was the part which had to do with the sociological effects of this mass migration on the people concerned. The methods are not clearly worked out yet and probably cannot be without considerable exploratory field work.

(Professor Thomas' statement is appended). But the study would be under the joint direction of Professor Lowie, the eminent anthropologist, and Professor Thomas, an excellent sociologist. Both are of first rate competence and have the reputation of coming through with good work.

Professor Thomas' statement reduces the funds requested from \$45,000 a year to a maximum of \$14,000 and a minimum of \$9,500 per year. They would like a commitment for three years.

It is proposed to study the problem at two centers and to use former students of Professors Lowie and Thomas (some Japanese and some Caucasian) as field workers. The government would appoint these people as its employees but on a part time basis with regular part time duties at first at the reception center (Tanforan Race Track) and later at the permanent relocation center (Tule Lake in northern California). These six (or ten) field workers would thus be what is technically known as "participant observers", being paid by the University of California for their field work duties.

There are too many unanswered questions of method in this for me to be prepared to recommend a three-year grant. But I would like to see the problem explored and am prepared to recommend a grant-in-aid of \$7,500 with which, with the aid of some funds from the University of California, from the Rosenberg Foundation in California, and from the SSRC they could "carry on" for nearly a year and work out the problems of method and test out the value of such a study.

The following considerations make me ready to experiment to the extent of a grant-in-aid: -

1. Twenty-five years from now historians galore will be trying to write the history of this incident. By then, - if nothing is done now, - most of the real material, - which is ephemeral, - will be lost and the histories will be written solely on the documentary material and be consequently deficient.

2. I anticipate that the next twenty-five years will reveal a vastly more intolerant attitude toward minorities. That this country, through the RF, was sensitive enough to the human rights of those we officially hate, to arrange for a careful study of the effects of this forced mass migration on these Japanese, will stand out in contrast to the concentration camp techniques of other countries.
3. Many people predict that there will be more forced mass migrations in this country as well as in Europe after the war. If so, we should learn what we can from this experience.
4. I would consider that such an investment would not be without values in terms of international relations with Japanese after the war. (The Japanese have already conveyed their thanks via the Spanish embassy to the Friends Service Committee for the three hostels set up by the Friends to aid the human handling of the displacement of Japanese.)
5. Professors Lowie and Thomas feel that the study of these families under severe strain will throw much light on many problems of a sociological and anthropological nature. (See Professor Thomas' memorandum) JHW is open-minded on this, - not yet completely convinced, but willing to be shown.
6. The West Coast has never developed work in Sociology. Dorothy Thomas is the first Sociologist to be appointed at California. She is competent and a small investment in her would have some values.

So I recommend a grant-in-aid of \$7,500. If it doesn't come through, the money will not have been wasted. If it does, we shall probably wish to make a two-year additional grant, the total not to exceed \$28,000. But the only commitment now would be to examine the progress made by the beginning of 1943.

JHW:SR

Enclosure

5/5/42

Memorandum from ME re JHW's request for
Comments on his memo to RBF re Japanese study
as well as on proposal itself

Re:

JHW-RBF memo.

If you're committed to give something to the project,
I think your memo. to RBF does not make a very strong
case. These are the questions that come to me:-

1. I wonder on what basis it is assumed that "we will
be more intolerant 25 years from now regarding
minorities"? If we are to "win the peace" as well
as the war, would not greater tolerance or provision
for minorities be expected?
2. If you are assuming an allied victory, why do
you anticipate more forced migrations here and
in Europe, post war, - particularly here? What
groups would be involved? Why?
3. Isn't the international relations value of an
investment in such a study questionable? If it were
an investment for a Friends' Service or similar
project, where the humanitarian aspects were predom-
inant, there might be some such value. The sociologi-
cal-anthropological study - as an objective study -
would not be so concerned and considered.
4. Is developing Sociology as a discipline on the
West Coast a pressing legitimate emergency consider-
ation?
5. In cutting down their revised minimum budget of
\$9500 to \$7500, is it fair to the sponsors? Can they
then be expected to produce the results which they
say will take a minimum of \$9500? Perhaps the as-
sumption is that the difference will come from other
sources. It might also give them an "out" if we
decided after their exploratory investigations, that
they did not come up to expectations and that further
support would not be forthcoming. They could say
that we didn't give enough to do what they had hoped.
6. SS has turned down other applications designed
to study particular racial groups in this country, -
e.g. Jews, as being contrary to RF policy. might not

the same reasoning apply here?

Re: The study itself.

Most of these comments are those which I gave you orally Friday.

1. Does the study imply that resettlement is permanent,- i.e., are the Japanese not to be allowed to return to their original homes? Many of them are American citizens. If permanent, the study might go on for years.
2. Unless basic data on "normal" activities and behavior are already available, from what base is "change" to be recorded?
3. The methods proposed require a high degree of cooperation. How sure are they that they can get it? The ordinary or normal limitations of the proposed methods are several. (See SSRC comments in connection with "Prediction of Personal Adjustment.")

The dual role of the "participant observers" and government employees is an unusual one for such a study. In this case, the already suspicious character of the subjects (and naturally so under the circumstances) may be enhanced by such an arrangement, which involves direct personal contact with the subject in the interview, etc. This dual role will make it more difficult for the subjects to distinguish between Government and university personnel, and challenge the sponsor's claim for assumption of better cooperation with university personnel than with Government.

4. I am inclined to think that if it is decided to go ahead with the project, ~~that~~ an exploratory study on a much more restricted basis could be made to determine whether or not cooperation with the sponsors can be secured.

ME

JH

re. D. Thomas - Japanese proposal

I realize I have not shared conversations about many points, the presentation to you, and I also realize that to you friends, partners and better a person seeing a basis for leverage might find some. With every desire to keep you in this situation, I deeply regret that I still do not find in this new material the support or assurance I feel you should have, that no one has, and a scientific project of RF standard. I would hope I am wrong but I still see much more of pressure than thoroughness, more personality than objectivity, more emotion than objectivity, more of rationalization than of logic. — the all way originates in warm and commendable impulses.

- The specific things that still trouble me relate mainly to feeling to improve the project's objectivity, despite the time and warnings given:
1. The questionable personnel set-up (chiefly students, university actors admitted to work as ^{informal} government employees) in place of the proposal's acknowledged ^{value} that the persons being observed were not cooperate with government officials.
 2. The questionable ability of participants observers to capture accurately and especially from such delicate and delicate conditions — anything of substantial scientific or genuine value.
 3. The uncertain attitude, and purpose of government
 4. The inexistence (as against your kindness and warnings) that personnel reputation can now be paid only by private acts. Scientific leaders do attach importance to RF name.
 5. The very probable continuing and expanding RF participation and growing.
 6. The extreme validity — under such conditions — of the considerations you name, or the applicability of results to the purposes you list.

Such considerations would inevitably have to affect my recommendations of the proposal came to me abrupt and superlatively. The situation as it now exists calls for some affirmative action, however, I would feel that such action might most safely and properly be taken in the direction of a better defined and better organized exploratory study, of definitely limited scope and duration (no future replication), using the same superlative personnel perhaps but most importantly sponsored and administered in the SSI with no use of RF name. — as AB, I think, is prepared to suggest.

RFT