

**EXORCISING GHOSTS PAST ON THE ROAD TO A MORE
ETHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY TODAY AND A SANER
ANTHROPOLOGY TOMORROW (a 15-minute presentation)**

**Paper for the session ETHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY: PAST,
PRESENT AND FUTURE (organized by Professor Leslie
Sponsel, University of Hawaii; chair: Poranee Natadche-
Sponsel, Chaminade University)**

**American Anthropological Association Annual
Meeting, San Jose. Saturday, November 18, 2006,
1:45-5:30 PM.**

By:

Peter T. Suzuki

**The Frederick W. Kayser Professor of Urban Studies Emeritus
School of Public Administration
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Omaha, NE 68182-0276
psuzuki@mail.unomaha.edu**

My paper is divided into 4 parts.

PART I:

My background [page in brackets, next page, will not be read]

b. Seattle, 1928

**Interned: Camp Harmony, Puyallup, WA; Minidoka Relocation Camp,
In 1944 at age 15, I left Minidoka alone under the War Relocation
Authority's Relocation Program and went to Michigan in order to
attend a normal high school on the outside.**

**A.B. degree, Columbia College, Columbia University, February
1951**

M.A. in Anthropology, Columbia, 1952

**Took courses taught by: Morton Fried, Joseph Greenberg,
Douglas Haring, Alfred Kroeber, Margaret Mead, Elman Service,
Harry Shapiro, Julian Steward, Wm. Duncan Strong, & Charles
Wagley**

Yale University 1952-53

M. Phil. (*Doctoraal*) in Anthropology, Leiden University, Holland, 1955

**Ph.D. (*Doctoraat*) in Anthropology, Leiden University, Holland,
1959**

**Fieldwork in Turkey, Holland, West Germany, Belgium, San
Francisco's Japanese & Chinese communities, LA's "Little Tokyo,"
East Berlin, Omaha's Black Community, Eastern Berlin, Nebraska's
Indian reservations**

Continuous member of AAA since 1956

[Studied at Holland's oldest university thanks to a Hendrik van Loon Fellowship from the Dutch Ministry of Education; a Fulbright Fellowship; a John Hay Whitney Foundation Fellowship and a research assistantship at the Instituut voor Culturele Antropologie.

Some 80 publications in scholarly journals; on, e.g., Turks in Turkey & Turkish workers in West Germany and Holland; on various aspects of West Germany, Holland, and Belgium including Flemish & Dutch haiku; urban planning, urban transportation, urban housing, human relations, etc.; on Ruth Benedict & her Japanese American aide Robert Seido Hashima (see Virginia Young's book on Benedict, 2005, University of Nebraska Press); on human relations in E. Berlin shortly after the collapse of the Wall & human relations offices in eastern Berlin shortly after German reunification; on linguistics that includes 2 articles in *Anthropological Linguistics*; on unregulated taxicabs in the U.S., that included a participant-observation study for 18 months as a p/t driver in Omaha's Black-operated jitney system (I am the only one to have undertaken a study of a Black-operated unregulated cab based on participation-observation research); on various aspects of the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Sioux Tribes of Nebraska; plus other research-based subjects.

18 years as book review editor of *European Studies Journal*; served term as board member of General Anthropology Division.]

**PART II: MY ½ -PAGE AD IN *ANTHROPOLOGY NEWS*,
“Anthropologists Must Confront, Openly Discuss, and Teach the
Truth,” September, p. 24.**

In February ‘06, I met the deadline to submit my ad for publication in the April issue, where space for it had been reserved, and for which I was willing to pay \$800. I had already paid \$175 to a computer specialist to format my ad to the specified requirements. I received no response to 2 of my inquiries regarding its status shortly after I had submitted the ad. In May, realizing that my ad had been suppressed, I notified numerous anthropologists across the nation about the suppression of my ad. The ad appeared in the September issue without my prior knowledge and free of charge despite the disclaimer attached to the ad that it had been a paid ad.*

***[The following will not be read.]: While I was in Australia in October, 2006, the president of the AAA left a message on my cell phone stating that the whole affair was due to a misunderstanding and an error. I emailed him to ask what he meant; to date, I haven’t received a response.**

PART III: THE CAMP ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Including advisors/consultants, some 25 anthropologists were engaged by the War Relocation Authority (WRA), the agency that managed the internment camps; they comprised the largest number of cultural anthropologists ever engaged by the Government.

Except for the 2 Niseis (Niseis are offspring of the immigrant generation). All those mentioned below were anthropologists. (Omitted: sociologists who acted unethically.)

The largest division of the WRA was headed by Anthropologist JOHN PROVINSE. Within this division was the Community Analysis Section (CAS). Each of the 10 relocation camps had a CAS with a social scientist, the community analyst (in the vast majority of cases, an anthropologist). The basic function spelled out for the community analysts was “...to analyze culture patterns existing in the community” [1]

JOHN F. EMBREE, the first head of CAS, in his guidelines for the analysts, wrote of the need to “...preserve the confidence of ...informants,” and that analysts “should be interested in why and not who” [2]. To what extent he really meant this is questionable because shortly after the Section was formed in the spring of 1943, he offered the CAS to serve as a conduit of information to the FBI [3].

Shortly after this, in a confidential memo, also to the FBI, Provinse recommended that the FBI keep tabs on internees who had left the camps under the WRA’s relocation policy and had moved to places other than the restricted West Coast and any “trouble makers” be sent to the special isolation camp of Leupp in AZ [4].

EDWARD SPICER who replaced Embree after the latter had resigned, in 2 separate memos, provided the names of possible trouble makers, totaling 32, to the proper authorities [5] and established criteria as to what constituted “security risks.” [6]. Provinse also participated in identifying trouble makers [7]. One analyst expressed

concern to Spicer for having to gather intelligence data on internees which this sociologist felt would have been more appropriate for the FBI to undertake [8].

G. GORDON BROWN, Gila Camp, AZ, worked for this camp's administration when he was put "...in charge of maintaining the accuracy of all lists of those to be removed to Tule Lake," a segregation camp in CA for defiant internees for eventual deportation to postwar Japan and was also appointed to a "special review committee" which judged cases of removal to Tule Lake, CA [9], despite the admonition that analysts "must never take on any administrative functions" [10]. In 1949, he was a co-author of a statement on ethics published in *Applied Anthropology/ Human Organization*.

JOHN deYOUNG, Minidoka Camp, ID, sent the names to Spicer of those who had protested conditions in that camp in a signed petition to the Spanish Consul, the neutral observer of the relocation camps. In all, he wrote 3 documents, one marked "Restricted," on the protestors. Spicer then forwarded de Young's memos to Provinse, who, in turn, sent the information to the director of Minidoka Camp [11].

E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, Granada Camp, CO, requested from this camp's official "...a list of the names and addresses of the boys...who failed to answer the Selective Service call, giving the date of the delinquency". He then analyzed the list to draw up a map showing the locations of the evaders; he then passed it on to the official. This was in addition to a lengthy classified report on the subject of evaders which was sent to that camp's director [12].

WESTON LA BARRE, Topaz Camp, UT, spent just 44 days there after which he wrote a lengthy paper published in *Psychiatry* 1945, whose thesis was that the Japanese were abnormal and neurotic. He identified 19 neuroses of a sick people and used behaviors he had observed among the internees to prove his thesis. He purposely failed to discuss the conditions at Topaz --- which were terrible even as relocation camps went -- and dismissed them with the statement, "To be sure, these people were in an artificial situation...." [13]. (Embree, Spicer, and the psychiatrist/anthropologist Alexander Leighton, Poston Camp, AZ, in separate publications also wrote in so many words that the internees were mentally ill. Also, Leighton was an early advocate of sending "disloyals" to a special camp for ultimate deportation to postwar Japan.) [14] With the assistance of a Nisei staff member of the CAS, LaBarre drew up color coded maps showing where trouble-makers lived, including the nine who had signed a petition submitted to

the Spanish Consul; maps which were praised for their usefulness by the camp director [15]. The director was also pleased with LaBarre because he had worked closely with the camp's attorney regarding certain internees [16].

BERKELEY'S JAPANESE AMERICAN EVACUATION AND RESETTLEMENT STUDY (JERS)

This secret research project, headquartered on the Berkeley campus, and partially funded by the University, was in operation from 1942-48. In today's dollars, it was a multi-million dollar project. In addition to some 25 Nisei field researchers in various camps, there were 2 Berkeley anthropologists of note.

ROSALIE HANKEY (later WAX) at Tule Lake Camp, CA, informed on two internees by turning their names over to the FBI. Kinzo Ernest Wakayama (b. in Hawaii) whom she intensely disliked (pseudonym *Kira*, in her writings) eventually ended up in postwar Japan; there he was "denationalized" under duress. In *The Spoilage*, a JERS book, Hankey labeled him "effeminate." Yet this man had been a WWI vet who had fought in France and had been awarded the European Campaign Medal, was married with children, and with his wife, was one of the first to challenge in court the constitutionality of the ethnic cleansing of the West Coast [17]. She also admitted lying to an informant [18] and wrote numerous lies about Violet Kazue Matsuda (pseudonym *Tsuchikawa* in her writings) whom she disliked as well. In *The Spoilage*, she is characterized as "stubborn and proud," as though these were criminal traits (it turned out that she was not a useful informant for Hankey). The lies about her had terrible consequences for her and her family. In a 1992 article, based on archival materials, she confronted Wax with the truth. Wax blamed Director Thomas & her assistant in her one-paragraph response. Wax admitted that "she went a little crazy" while at Tule Lake [19].

ROBERT F. SPENCER Gila Camp, AZ, passed information on internees to the director of Leupp, the director of the isolation camp in AZ [20]. After the war, in a journal article on Japanese American speech, concluded that because his informants used broken English, they were "feeble minded." [21]. Was also probably the only anthropologist who referred in writing to his subjects as "Japs." [22]

The JERS Nisei researcher CHARLES KIKUCHI greatly admired by non-Japanese American scholars because he was not the so-called typical Nisei: did not speak Japanese, had self-hatred because he was Japanese, hated Japanese culture, hated Isseis and Kibeis (Kibeis

are Niseis who had spent time in Japan), and because he was a “liberal.” On 4/27/42, in his diary condemned Jews who had bought things from Japanese prior to their removal --- although this was an unsubstantiated rumor --- as “money grubbers,” and “Kikes’ who should be “castrated.” On 5/ 27/42, he started a rumor in the temporary camp Tanforan, that an Issei had “tried to set the place afire for revenge for his incarceration in camp” [23]. When the Army ordered all signs in Japanese be taken down in the temporary camps, wrote on 6/23/42, “All Jap signs taken down, Hurrah!”[24]. Later sent by Director Dorothy Thomas to Chicago to head a JERS study of the internees who had moved there. In short order, passed on a sensitive JERS document to an FBI informer. The document eventually ended up in J. Edgar Hoover’s hands[25].

Another Nisei with JERS, TAMOTSU SHIBUTANI, floated a false rumor about a fellow JERS Nisei, who became infuriated when he found out about it and bitterly complained to Director Thomas [26]. In retrospect, it seems they were using the temporary camp where they were interned as a social laboratory. Shibutani parlayed the study of rumors into a Ph.D. dissertation, and later, into a book, *Improvised News: A Sociological Study of Rumor* (1968).

One would be hard put to find a *single word* anywhere by anthropologists on the unethical activities of the camp anthropologists or JERS as a covert project. (Whenever a secret project is mentioned by anthropologists, it is *always* Project Camelot, which was *never* implemented). [27] For example, in a section on wartime anthropology and ethics, Carolyn Fleuhr-Lobban’s chapter makes no mention of the camp anthropologists, nor is there in the book she edited on ethics and anthropology. [28] David Price wrote that the WRA anthropologists had worked abroad, when, in fact, not a single one had. [29]. (In late September after I had submitted a draft of this paper, Price sent me a draft of a chapter for me to review; it deals with a few of the camp anthropologists. It would be gratifying should his work portend a new trend. I respectfully urge Ethicist Fluehr-Lobban and other anthropologists to follow his lead.) George Stocking’s history of American anthropology dismisses the WRA anthropologists in one sentence. [28] At last year’s AAA meeting in the session “WWII Anthropology,” no mention was made of the camp anthropologists by anthropologists comprising the panel. It was a journalist on the panel, however, who, although not mentioning the unethical activities of the camp anthropologists, devoted his allotted time to them.

How effective this blackout policy has been is shown by this recent example. In response to my ad, an email of September 2 from a Syracuse University anthropologist, a full professor, included this statement: "I'm not sure what the purpose of your advertisement is...." In other words, she was saying, "So what, if the camp anthropologists acted unethically or that JERS was a clandestine research project."

PART IV: CONCLUSIONS

For a more ethical anthropology today, anthropologists need to deal with the past.

If a person keeps denying a reality for 25 years or longer, one can conclude that this would be a neurosis. By the same token, for a less neurotic and saner anthropology tomorrow, the truth of the past must be confronted. And if anthropologists fail to exorcise ghosts past, future generations of anthropologists eventually coming across the true facts will feel betrayed and will realize anthropologists' professed concerns over ethics are pretentious and ring hollow.

Any or all of the following 3 reasons could account for the self-imposed censorship being practiced: 1) it is taboo for anthropologists to criticize their totems and Berkeley; 2) the truth is unpalatable; 3) just as many of the camp anthropologists believed, contemporary anthropologists also believe that the 110,000 internees deserved exactly what they got.

Finally, I call on the Ethics Committee and the Executive Board to consider the matter and to issue a statement of apology ---- as have done the past 4 U.S. Presidents (during the Bush I administration, in addition to an apology, each former internee was awarded \$20,000 as redress) --- to the surviving members of the 110,000 whose race and ethnicity were our only crimes because our incarceration as criminals was further vitiated by the unethical activities of members within our own profession who worked in the camps.

I am very grateful to Professor Sponsel for sticking his neck out to include me in his session.

\

NOTES

1. Suzuki, 1981, "Anthropologists in the wartime camps for Japanese Americans : A documentary study," *Dialectical Anthropology* 6: 44.
2. Suzuki 1981: 43
3. Suzuki 1981: 60 n223
4. Suzuki 1986b, "When black was white: Misapplied anthropology in wartime America," *Man & Life* 12 (1 & 2): 5. Frivolous reasons were often used to send internees to Leupp, the special isolation center 30 miles from Winslow, AZ, operated by the Justice Department. In one case, an internee in Gila Camp, AZ, was sent there because he called a White nurse an "old maid. In another instance, 13 Kibeis were sent thee without any changes against them. Suzuki 2005, *Linguistic Change in a Unique Cohort: Isseis, Kibeis, and Niseis in the WWII Internment Camps*. Omaha: School of Public Administration, University of Nebraska at Omaha, p. 31.
5. Suzuki 1981: 30; Suzuki 1986b:4. On March 23, 1943, a special dinner was held in many camps. It was to honor those who had volunteered for the all-Nisei 442nd regimental Combat Team that was being formed (my older brother was a volunteer ----he fought with the 442nd in Italy and France and returned w/ a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart; my other brother fought the Japanese and returned w/ a Silver Star & a Purple Heart). It was a memorable event because special dinners were provided only on Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays and because my father, although not a man of the cloth, was asked to give the invocation in Japanese presumably because he was a father of a volunteer and had studied theology in Japan and in his youth had been a volunteer for the Salvation Army in Japan that included standing on street corners playing an instrument). I remember seeing a White man present at the dinner. In the mid-70s, while doing research at the National Archives, I came across a report

**“Volunteer Banquet, Block 42 [Minidoka], March 24, 1943....”
By E.H.S. Minidoka Community Analysis Report No. 4.
Washington, D.C. Community Analysis Section
(mimeographed); National Archives, Record Group 210. It
turned out that the White man I saw was Edward H. Spicer,
who spent 6 weeks at Minidoka and had authored the report.
Our Minidoka address was 42-10-E (Block 42 Barrack 10,
Room E.**

6. Suzuki 1981: 51 n74
7. Suzuki 1986b: 4
8. Suzuki 1981: 50 n65
9. Suzuki 1981: 30
10. Suzuki 1981: 44
11. Suzuki 1981: 28; 49 n46
12. Suzuki 1981: 30
13. Suzuki 1980, “A retrospective analysis of a wartime ‘national character’ study,” *Dialectical Anthropology* 5: 37. This documents the especially bad conditions at Topaz Camp, UT, totally ignored by LaBarre. One included the killing with a single rifle shot by a guard a 63-year old man because he was within several hundred feet (sic) of the barbed wire fence, an incident that took place a month before LaBarre’s arrival. While LaBarre was at Topaz, a similar incident took place but the internee was not hurt. Yet, LaBarre tried to picture a segment of the internees as “terroristic.” Several months earlier, the entire camp had been in turmoil because of a loyalty oath everyone over 17 had to sign. In the same period, a day-care center in Block 37 for 45 pre-schoolers was shut down that caused a protest meeting of the affected parents. The internees had also been protesting the animal offal as meats being served to them on a regular basis. LaBarre himself had authored a report on the crowded housing conditions in Topaz. He also pointed to suicide as a masochistic [neurotic] trait of the Japanese; yet in the history of Topaz, there was not a single case of suicide or attempted suicide.
14. Suzuki 1981: 36; 54-55 n141. On Leighton as an early advocate of segregating “disloyals” by sending them to a special camp, Suzuki 1981: 44 n53. Tule Lake Camp became the “segregation center.” Within it was a “stockade,” which was an infamous prison where harsh treatment was meted out

to those sent there (Violet Matsuda de Cristoforo's brother was severely beaten while imprisoned in the stockade; see note 19 on de Crisotoforo) (on the stockade, see Michi Weglyn 1976 *Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps*. Morrow. Chapter 10 and *passim*).

15. Suzuki 1986b: 4-5
16. Suzuki 1981: 51 n77
17. Suzuki 1986a, "The University of California Japanese Evacuation & Resettlement Study: A prolegomenon," *Dialectical Anthropology* 10: 193, 195, 210 n47. In response to my article on JERS, whose efficacy I had questioned, UCLA's Asian Studies Program convened a conference on JERS on the Berkeley campus, November 1987. It was on this occasion that one of the Niseis who had been w/ JERS revealed that JERS had been a secret project (see Note 19). On Wakayama, see "Recompense for my loyalty," Ms. 1979, revised 1981; and Suzuki 1986a: 195-97.
18. Suzuki: 1981: 31
19. Suzuki 1981: 31; for "stubborn and proud," see Suzuki 1986a: 194; for Violet de Cristoforo, see, for example, "J'accuse," *Rikka: Cross-Cultural Journal* 1992 13 (1): 16-37. Rosalie H. Wax, 1992, "Response by Rosalie H. Wax," *Rikka: Cross-Cultural Journal* 13 (1): 31 (a one paragraph response in which she blames Dorothy Thomas & Richard Nishimoto, whose names appear as co-authors of *The Spoilage*, (1946: University of California Press) but the book deals almost exclusively with Tule Lake Camp, where Hankey was the principal field worker. She is also listed as a contributor to the book. Furthermore many of the same observations on "Kira" and "Hanako Tsuchikawa" and in almost the exact wording appear in Wax 1971 *Doing Fieldwork*. University of Chicago Press. For Violet Matsuda de Crisotoforo, see also, Suzuki 1989, "For the sake of inter-university comity: The attempted suppression by the University of California of Morton Grodzins' *Americans Betrayed*," in: *Views from Within: The Japanese American Evacuation & Resettlement Study*, ed. by Yuji Ichioka, UCLA Asian American Studies Center, pp. 121-22 n85 (this is the publication that resulted from the conference on JERS held at Berkeley in November 1987)

20. Spencer, letters to F.F. Frederick, Leupp director, 9/20/43; 2/10/43, microfilm Reel 66, JERS (California State Library, Sacramento).
21. Suzuki 1986a: 201; for an analysis of Spencer's equally bizarre article, on the Berkeley Buddhist Church, see Suzuki 1981: 37-38; 1986a: 201.
22. Suzuki 2005: 65 n14.
23. Suzuki 2005: 62-63 n7
24. Suzuki 2005: 17
25. Suzuki 2005: 63
26. Suzuki 2005: 62
27. E.g., Leni M. Silverstein, 2004, "Uncensuring Boas," *Anthropology News* November, p. 5-6; see also Note 29.
28. C. Fleuhr-Lobban 1991, "Ethics & professionalism," in *Ethics & The Profession of Anthropology*, ed. by C. Fleuhr-Lobban University of Pennsylvania Press. Pp. 20-21. One of the contributors to the book is an anthropologist of Japanese descent; one of his research specialties regards Asians (Fluehr-Lobban 1991: 282). This book is also replete with references to Project Camelot (*passim*)
29. D. Price 2001, "Lessons from World War anthropology," *Anthropology Today* 17(3): 17
30. George W. Stocking, Jr., 1992. *The Ethnographer's Magic & Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. University of Wisconsin Press, p. 165. He cites Edward H. Spicer's 1979 article "Anthropologists and the War Relocation authority," which is the official version on the WRA anthropologists, a publication I have shown to have significant serious defects (Suzuki 1981: *passim*). He also cites Orin Starn's 1986 "Engineering Internment: Anthropologists and the War Relocation Authority," *American Ethnologist* 13: 700-20. Alexander Cockburn, the journalist on the panel of "WWII Anthropology," made a telling comment about Starn's article. He stated that what he got out of the article was the WRA anthropologists were "very efficient." Starn's article is the "safe" article on the camp anthropologists because it does not go into their unethical activities; therefore, whenever an article on camp anthropologists is cited, it is precisely this piece.

