

## UNPREDICTABLE MAN

EVER since human beings have considered it desirable to busy themselves with the problems of the welfare of one another—either singly or in groups—there have been strenuous efforts to predict how people would or *ought* to behave, under the "proper" conditions. Even the most well-intentioned utopian planners have tried to show how men might be "moulded" to the form that is "best" for them. This does not exclude ostensible believers in "freedom," for rare indeed is the advocate of freedom who does not go on to propose why freedom is precious and how it should be used.

The difficulty is probably this: Only men who are themselves really free in a subjective or psychological sense are able to allow true freedom to others. Usually, the freedom of a dominant group of people requires the conformity of other groups which are without power. To justify itself, the dominant group defines freedom as conformity to its own way of doing things, becoming exceedingly indignant when any other conception of freedom is offered.

White Americans, for example, have certain large and expansive notions about their freedom and about the best way to pursue the "happiness" which the Declaration of Independence assures them it is their right to pursue. White Americans have established certain "ground-rules" for the game of pursuing happiness, and these rules are said to contain the essences of freedom. If you don't care to play according to those rules, you are likely to be charged with hating freedom and with wishing to subvert the American Way of Life.

The American Indians have always pursued their happiness according to other rules. We shall not say that the Indian rules are better or worse than ours, but only that they are *different*. The

Indians, on the whole, don't believe in private property. They don't believe in competition. They don't even believe in "majority rule." These are attitudes which, while not universal, are at least characteristic enough to be called "Indian." How, then, can the Indians enjoy freedom in a society which is supposed to be *based* upon these ideas?

So far as we can see, allowing freedom to one another becomes an almost impossible task so long as the decision of who is "right" is felt to be important in planning for freedom. Freedom, in order to exist at all, must be recognized as a higher value than being right, or even righteous. This follows logically from the fact that neither rightness nor righteousness attaches to any human act unless it is free. Rightness and righteousness are moral values, and morality and freedom are indivisible. A constrained act is not a moral act.

In this context, then, let us look at the history of the relationships of the United States with the American Indians—who are now about 450,000 people in a population totalling 160,000,000. A brief but broadly accurate summary of those relationships is provided by John Collier, former Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in an essay that will appear in a volume published to honor Manuel Gamio, noted Indianist of Mexico. Mr. Collier summarizes the policies of the United States and their consequences for the Indians:

The United States commenced by affirming (as Bartolomé de Las Casas and the Laws of the Indies had done) the right of the Indians to a group self-determination, to liberty in all matters of conscience, and to cultural freedom within the wider commonwealth. Thereafter, the United States reversed its original, basic policy, and for some eighty years tried, by numerous pressures and temptations, to annihilate the Indians culturally and to atomize every form of Indian group life and property possession; while much the same trend and effort

went forward in most of the Indo-American countries after their independence from European empires had been achieved. And then, commencing thirty years ago, the United States moved backward and also forward toward its earlier, basic policy of acknowledging and assisting the dynamic grouphood and cultural aspirations of its more than 300 Indian tribes and groups; . . .

And across nearly the same years, and intensifying into the present, many of the Indo-American countries initiated, and sometimes carried far forward, a similar if not identical return to basic policy. That record is told in the successive actions of the Inter-American Indian Conferences, beginning with Pátzcuaro in 1940, and in the indispensable publications of the Inter-American Indian Institute which Manuel Gamio serves as director. Merely as one example, the new-old policy and experience are, as it were, distilled into the new Agrarian Code of Bolivia.

The curious thing about this account, for many readers, will be the sense of distance and unfamiliarity which separates them from these efforts and events. Historic changes, presumably, were taking place, yet except for a handful of specialists and devoted people who labored for Indian freedom and welfare, no one knew that they were really going on!

Actually, a nation—and nations—were leaving the imprint of public decision concerning human freedom upon the pages of history. The human love of freedom was being articulated by men who were doing the best they knew, although with the imperfect tools of legislation, bureaus, and agencies, and with equally imperfect human administrators. It was nevertheless an act by organized societies to honor the principles for which they stood. Then, in the United States, came another reversal:

. . . finally, dating from four years ago, the United States commenced again to abandon and denounce its basic policies toward the Indians; to discourage and even to destroy outright the hundreds of Indian group institutions, aboriginal and also thoroughly modern; to resume the individualization and atomization of the Indian group-possession. The struggle in the United States concerning this reversion to a policy both authoritarian and nihilistic

has only started, is not ended, and its final outcome is clouded in doubt; and it has, I suggest, a hemisphere-wide interest because of the historical parallels outlined above. Through looking at the immediately present Indian situation in the United States, Indo-American countries may place themselves, as it were, on their guard against similar potentialities of reversion within their own borders.

The record of what occurred between 1933 and 1950 among the American Indians is almost unbelievable. Mr. Collier does what he can to explain the statistics:

Through the year 1928, and probably a little longer, the Indians were still a "vanishing race." Their death rate was exceeding their birth rate. In the seven years after 1933, the Indian death rate fell by 55 per cent. The Indians became the fastest-increasing long-established ethnic group in the country. No increase of hospital, public health or field medical services accounted for this extreme demographic change-over. Better nutrition was a factor, doubtless, because the economic upsurge of the Indians after 1933 brought more and better food. But the decisive variable was a psychological one; from expecting to perish, and on the whole wanting to perish (such being the known intent of the all-powerful government and, indeed, of the white society), the Indians changed to wanting and expecting to live, to believing in themselves and in the white society, to individual and group purposiveness.

The reversal of policy was apparently notable enough for the previously destructive "white society" to win the faith of many Indians! Fundamental to this change was the reversal of the Government's Indian land policy:

In 1887, the Indians held title to 140,000,000 acres, which included irrigated lands, dry-farming and grazing lands as good as any in the United States. Between 1887 and 1933, the Indians lost to the whites 90,000,000 of their acres; and the lost lands were their best lands. Nearly half of their remaining landholdings of 52,000,000 acres was desert or semi-desert country. These losses ensued directly, and by government intention, from the forced individualization of the Indian properties under the so-called land-allotment statutes. In 1933, allotment was stopped by administrative action, and in 1934 the Indian Reorganization Act prohibited any future allotment. Instead of melting away at two million

acres each year (on the average), the Indian landholding increased, between 1935 and 1940, by almost two million acres each year.

During the same period, Indians took back lands they had been leasing to the whites for a pittance and raised their own livestock cooperatively. The Apaches of Arizona and New Mexico became leaders in animal husbandry and cattle and range economics. Before 1933, individual Indians had borrowed over seven million dollars from the Government, and sixty per cent of the total amount was never paid. Under the Indian Reorganization Act, Indians began borrowing cooperatively, as tribes and tribal corporations. By 1954, they had received a total of twenty-four million dollars, of which only fifty thousand was charged off as uncollectable. The Indians are now the Government's best credit risk. Collier remarks "The superiority (for Indians if not for all men) of group action and group responsibility is suggested by this before-and-after credit record of the Indians."

Why, then, have these policies been attacked, and a return begun to the "land-allotment" and "assimilation" philosophy of generations ago?

Mr. Collier has three explanations for the change. The most obvious explanation lies in the fact of the fast-increasing value of Indian lands. The Indians have timber worth hundreds of millions of dollars, while the mineral wealth of the Indian holdings reaches to unknown billions. The grazing lands of the Indians are also coveted. Only by destroying the barrier (provided by the Indian Reorganization Act) to sale of Indian property can acquisitive whites gain title to this land.

The drive to get this wealth, however, proceeds under the high-sounding claim of offering the Indians the *full* benefits of American civilization. America, it is said, is a great "melting pot" where all men can achieve equality and freedom by being "melted down into one, single, homogeneous and interchangeable image." The demand that everyone who lives on the North

American continent submit to this reduction to type is a moralistic compulsion which sees obstructive stubbornness in any other point of view. As Mr. Collier says: "Americans view Indians as their 'wards' on whom it is their right and even their duty to impose their melting pot assumptions."

The third explanation, however, involves a condition which is hardly noticed in this connection, yet is possibly the most important of all. Mr. Collier writes:

This condition holds good of most of the operations of the Federal government in the United States; and it is, I believe, creeping up upon the greater part of the world. The condition is that bureaucracy, now all but omnipotent, has in the past decade or so taken to itself, or actually generated, a philosophy of social action—the philosophy of the all-ruling blue-print. The administrator within the United States bureaucracy is an autonomous being who practices an "art" of administration valid everywhere in all its details, an art which not merely does not seek to inform itself about life in its manifoldness, diversity and "wildness," but goes further; it is the opponent, engaged in a contest with life's variety and spontaneity, and activity and ubiquitously seeking to replace human social life with blue-print. The philosophy, objective, and values of administrative bureaucracy, now in the United States developed into a "high-brow" career, are, in the field of Indian life, lethal indeed, and toward the Indian Reorganization Act and the Indian New Deal, are a poison compounded of tepid good will and intellectual ignorance.

This, then, is where the present finds us out in relation to the American Indians. Greed, a specious conception of "Americanism," and a spreading mania for centralized control of human beings from behind office desks are the forces which belie our claims of devotion to freedom. The most encouraging thing about the present, so far as white culture is concerned, is the presence among us of men who see the importance of freedom to be "unpredictable" and "nonconforming," and are willing to devote their lives to its defense. The encouragement we may gain from the Indians themselves is best put by Mr. Collier:

It is my belief that the United States Indians, who like the rest of the Indians have outlived nearly every long-lasting disaster that could be, will outlive the present, which is perhaps the most coldly all-searching onslaught of them all. Indians, like all human beings, exist not only behaviorally and in the manifest moment. They exist in the deeps of biological and spiritual man, and they seem to die but do not die. Indian ethos and individual and group genius is not going to be permanently beaten, if the evidence from Columbus until now has any validity. . . Significant social experimentation, oriented toward universal man in his world, may be interrupted, even seemingly killed and buried, by essentially irrelevant events. Indeed, it nearly always is thus interrupted, or even killed and buried, soon or late. Not therefore is its yield of discovery destroyed. Dawning social science experimentation, mature and holistic, will advance in its slow dawn for ages to come; the world's hope is in it; and the yield, in principle and method, of its myriadly frustrated endeavors, will not be lost.

Mr. Collier's paper throws an interesting light on the work and responsibilities of the Indian Bureau. For one thing, it illustrates the fact that an arm of the modern State can attempt, however imperfectly, and with whatever failures—failures readily admitted by Mr. Collier—to remove the barriers to a natural expression of cultural qualities among peoples who have suffered thwarted lives at the hands of others. This is a great idea—so fine that one hardly expects it to find practical embodiment, if for only a few years, in our time.

**REVIEW**  
**"MAHATMA GANDHI—THE LAST  
 PHASE"**

FOR those seeking further detail of word and deed in the life of Gandhi, Pyarelal's 750-page volume of this title, published by Navajivan Press (Ahmedabad 14, India) will be a valuable acquisition. Its extremely reasonable price is \$5.00.

Author of several previous works on Gandhi, Pyarelal served for a long time as Gandhi's private secretary, and after Mahadev Desai's death became editor of *Harijan*. His intimate history of Gandhi is balanced in sentiment and entirely devoid of sensationalism, being directed in general to Indians rather than Westerners, and in particular to those disciples of Gandhi who have sensed that the better their knowledge of their preceptor, the better their capacity to aid India in her long period of difficult rebirth. The brief Gandhi quotation chosen for the flyleaf by Pyarelal is most appropriate:

I recognize no God except the God that is to be found in the hearts of the dumb millions. . . . And I worship the God that is Truth . . . through the service of these millions.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, a life-long companion of Gandhi and distinguished in service as India's president, contributes an introduction which, among other things, illustrates how the mind of an Indian "politician" of the Gandhian school continues to work. Any book about Gandhi is, of necessity, a treatise on Satyagraha. Dr. Prasad offers this account of the Gandhian approach to "non-violence":

The theory of Satyagraha is nothing new. It was elaborated and enunciated long ago by Patanjali. Gandhiji's credit lies in the fact that he demonstrated its potentialities for solving individual and social problems, not only by living it himself but by evolving a technique by which it could be practised by the people at large and successfully teaching them its use. The method and procedure had to be changed from time to time to suit varied environment, circumstances, causes and problems that needed to be

tackled, and above all according to the varied human material involved in each case. But the fundamental principle remained the same throughout. Gandhiji never attempted to write a systematic treatise to elaborate it but provided innumerable demonstrations of it in its application from day to day to the problems that arose and called for solution—problems which concerned individuals no less than the community, the country, and humanity at large. The reluctance was due to the inherent nature of Satyagraha itself. Satyagraha is a living principle; it cannot be summed up in inflexible set formulas. It has to be cultivated by following a discipline, a way of life. It calls for correct understanding of the principles, but more than that their correct application to different situations and problems. It was, therefore, not the theory that mattered but its practice. "As a matter of fact," wrote Gandhiji, "my writings should be cremated with my body. What I have done will endure, not what I have said and written. I have often said . . . that even if all our scriptures were to perish—one *mantra* of Ishopanishad was enough to declare the essence of Hinduism, but even that one verse will be of no avail if there is no one to live it."

It may surprise Western readers to learn how many of Gandhi's close friends and admirers were British officials. When the time came for the English to relinquish political control in India, Gandhi received a pressing appeal from the British Cabinet Delegation, asking his counsel on how to go about the business of removing their arms, governing bodies, and officials. The leader of the Cabinet delegation, Lord Pethick-Lawrence, added a personal message, referring to his "friendship which began some forty years ago," and Sir Stafford Cripps, another member of the Delegation, wrote: "I feel the very heavy burden of our present efforts and the necessity for all the help that we can have, and no help can be more welcome and wise than that which you can give." Throughout the ensuing negotiations, the British statesmen often deferred to Gandhi's gentle suggestions, apparently because they trusted his judgment better than their own!

Pyarelal's personal interpretation of Gandhi's character occupies but a small proportion of the book, and there is no mention of the author's importance as a close associate. For both these

reasons, perhaps even the uninitiated reader can sense that Pyarelal was the right man to compile a volume on "the last phase of Gandhi's life." Especially interesting, however, are Pyarelal's comments on Gandhi's asceticism:

There are two well-known approaches to life—that of negation or elimination and that of affirmation or synthesis. Gandhiji's critics represented the former, Gandhiji was an embodiment of the latter.

Gandhiji was singularly free from any trace of morbid self-mortification. He regarded unruffled serenity and cheerfulness as the natural state of one who is in tune with the infinite. "When observance of Brahmacharya becomes natural to one . . . a person should be free from anger and kindred passions. The so-called Brahmacharis that one generally comes across, behave as if their one occupation in life was the display of bad temper." He had nerves extremely sensitive to pain. But the iron will in him transmuted his aesthetic sensitiveness and deep compassion for the weak and the suffering into a relentless self-discipline and self-denial which was often mistaken for self-mortification and self-suppression by casual and superficial observers, but was as different from either as chalk is from cheese.

People sometimes talked thoughtlessly of his "asceticism." Whatever it was, it was not devoid of "spiritual gaiety" which, as all who came into close contact with him found to be irresistibly infectious. He carried with him everywhere not only the power but also the sweet graces of his basic disciplines. His asceticism never gave him a morbid dread of his fellow creatures but liberated him into the largest possible circle of pure and noble relationships.

That Gandhi was a forceful man, even though an entirely non-violent one, there can be no doubt. Both these aspects of his character became plain during the time of Muslim-Hindu rioting. While the popular Indian press was giving lip-service to the Gandhian ideal of non-violence, and cautioning against vengefulness or reprisal, belligerence was forming beneath the surface. Instead of warning the Muslims of what their policies might eventually cost them in the way of bloodshed, Gandhi went about seeking justice for isolated Muslim minorities in Indian-dominated areas. This did not always meet with Hindu approval. There were those who suggested that

Satyagraha was all very well as a kind of "religion," but politics was a *practical* matter. Gandhi, they said, was only confusing things by "preaching" at a time when one must be hardheaded. Ironically enough, some writers even accused Gandhi of "exploiting" the Muslim crisis! Pyarelal comments:

Several correspondents had written to Gandhiji that he was utilising his prayer meetings for disseminating his political ideas. Gandhiji answered that he had never suffered from any feeling of guilt on that account. Life could not be divided into watertight compartments, nor could ethics be divorced from politics. They acted and reacted upon each other.

Another friend had argued that his "sermons" on religious toleration were all beside the point and unnecessary since the quarrel between the Hindus and the Muslims was not religious but political; religion had only been used to excite and exploit popular passions. Granting that the issue was political, replied Gandhiji, did it mean that all rules of decency and morality should be thrown to the winds? If they did not learn to settle their political differences decently and in a comradely spirit, only abject slavery would be their lot.

After the prayer meeting was over, Gandhiji stayed on to collect money for the Muslim refugees. The crowd was big and there was such a rush that it was feared many would be crushed. It was a touching sight to see men, women and children in spite of the jostling and the pushing, make their way steadily towards Gandhiji; old women untying a copper from the corner of their tattered *saris* to hand it to him with trembling hands and glistening eyes. That evening's collection came to nearly two thousand rupees.

## COMMENTARY

### A DREADFUL HABIT

IN the paper quoted in this week's lead article, John Collier remarks that the prevailing assumptions about "Americanism" have had the effect of making many people view "the Indian Reorganization Act and its philosophy and even its happiest, most practical results, as a revolt against the American way."

The provisions of the Indian Reorganization Act are summarized by Mr. Collier in *The Indians of the Americas*:

The Indian societies were to be recognized, and be empowered and helped to undertake political, administrative and economic self-government.

Provision was made for an Indian Civil Service and for the training of Indians in administration, the professions and other vocations.

Land allotment was to be stopped, and the revestment of Indians with land was provided for.

A system of agricultural credit was to be established, and the needed funds authorized.

Why should a program of this sort give offense to Americans? First of all, for those who have neither interest in the Indians nor acquaintance with their history, such "special treatment" may seem without justification. While many Americans probably agree that the Indians should have an equal chance with others to "get ahead," they are either unable or unwilling to understand that the Indians are not, by and large, "individualists," and seek to practice another way of life. It is, then, the fact that the Indians are *different* which brings the difficulty.

This feeling, and a resentment of any sort of "special privilege," open the way to acceptance of misleading propaganda and to righteous rejection of allegedly "Un-American" methods. Some years ago, to take an example, a tempest was raised—mostly by and in the newspapers—concerning the conditions of the Navajo Indians. The Navajos did have problems, among them need for food and clothing, but they had little need for the sort of

"investigation" that was encouraged by the commercial press. A Los Angeles *Times* reporter went to the Navajo Reservation in Arizona and returned to write about the "Soviet-type" consumer cooperatives the Navajos were operating!

The fact is that the co-op is one socio-economic form evolved by Western civilization which nearly all Indians take to naturally. The co-op is a mechanism which the Indians are able to understand, since it represents a *group* solution for a common problem.

Only the irresponsibility of cultural delusions of grandeur could permit such misrepresentation of the Indians and the Indian Bureau, for the implication of the story was that the Bureau was insidiously introducing communist methods among the Indians! Actually, the co-op is far too autonomous and self-reliant a type of economic enterprise to find a place in Soviet Russia.

Such misrepresentation and "smearing" are of course unfortunate; in this instance, however, it was probably without much effect, being too trivial to be taken seriously; but the *mood* of objections of this sort is consistently maintained by ignorant writers and propagandists.

But worse than the misrepresentation is the terrible impoverishment of mind that it reveals. Why should supposedly intelligent men—successful Americans *must* be intelligent!—fear and wish to attack co-ops or any other type of group socio-economic organization which minority groups like the Indians may adopt?

A really "secure" people would welcome all sorts of experimentation and every variety of social and economic enterprise. Are the foundations of the American economic system so uncertain that some little co-ops run by Indians in an Arizona desert must be exposed as a "threat" to the American Way of Life?

What incredible timidity! And what appalling self-righteousness!

Some readers may think that a great deal of space in MANAS has been devoted lately to the special subject of the Indians. We feel, however, that the story of American relationships with the Indians provides valuable opportunity to understand ourselves. For this story confronts us with our own failures while at the same time ruling out the familiar excuses and self-justifications. The real trouble, it seems to us, is that the Americans who make a habit of discovering the menace of subversion and "Un-Americanism" in practically every sort of deviation from conventional activities are people who are starved for deep convictions and who are trying to fill their emptiness with the shallow emotions of righteous "crusades."

It is a lack of faith in the strong fibres of American freedom that produces these anxieties. Actually, a co-op as big as General Motors might be the most exciting thing that could happen on the American economic scene! Co-op people probably won't agree, since bigness is by no means the co-op ideal, but enthusiasm for diversity would at least be evidence of a daring and a willingness to experiment, as well as of a confidence in the freedom we talk about so much. What good is a freedom so frail that it can never be used to try anything new?



## *CHILDREN* ... and Ourselves

WE have often wondered at the glib manner in which child psychologists sometimes advise parents to provide more "love and affection" for their children. Aside from the fact that this is something that cannot always be done simply by "trying," there seem to be many more needs which the parent *can* supply, however deficient he may be in spontaneous "affection."

But perhaps we now understand what the psychologists are getting at. At least, it has been borne in on us in numerous ways that the many forms of discipline which children need so badly can be worked toward *only* when a child feels "emotional security"—when he knows who he is and that he belongs. This is why trading words about various "methods of discipline" is so often a waste of time. Discipline *may* be beneficially strict whenever conditions permit. *But conditions never really permit unless the child feels basically at home in life.*

In the schools we encounter a similar situation, while theorists argue the contrasting virtues of "permissiveness" and "discipline." Children who are sure of their place in the world desire to grow up and welcome their increased responsibility. But the children whose lives are without sure relationships, whose parents have not tied the lives of their children to their own, are likely to be only disturbed by disciplinary measures in the classroom. It all comes back to the fact that children *are*, in an essential sense, rational beings, and must have a context for discipline—and who at least sense that reason and meaning are present in their surroundings. We see no other way to explain why extraordinarily strict discipline sometimes works so well, although an increasing number of modern educators feel that great freedom must be allowed to children during their early years.

We have been mulling over the implications of a quotation from Pearl Buck's *My Several*

*Worlds*, printed here on Dec. 5—the following sentences in particular:

Babies ate what they pleased and when they pleased, and little children led a heavenly life. The Chinese believed that it was important to allow a child to cry his fill and vent all his tempers and humors while he was small, for if these were restrained and suppressed by force or fright, then anger entered into the blood and poisoned the heart, and would surely come forth later to make adult trouble. . . . Right or wrong, these spoiled children emerged like butterflies from cocoons at about the age of seven or eight, amazingly adult and sweet-tempered and self-disciplined. They were able by then to hear reason and to guide themselves in the accepted ways. Since they had not been disciplined too soon, when they reached the age of learning they progressed with great rapidity.

But the Chinese children of whom Mrs. Buck is speaking knew that they truly "belonged"—had an integral part in the life of the family. Further, they were surrounded with the atmosphere of order and discipline by way of the life of the family, so that instead of bedlam being added to bedlam, as is so often unfortunately true in our own homes, noise and confusion were never wholly dominant. In fact, if parents are well ordered in their own lives, it is quite possible that they often enjoy spontaneous outbursts from the very young—while the children, as soon as they develop a capacity for emulation, can best show their progress toward adulthood by demonstrating a capacity to conform to family ways of behavior. The parent who disciplines his children without disciplining himself at the same time risks the future hope that the child will learn what *self-discipline* means.

*A Reader's Digest* (December) article reveals a basic distinction between traditional Chinese culture and the *mores* of most fairly well-to-do Americans—both in relation to basic goals and in relation to wealth. Morton Hunt summarizes the results of an inquiry into the psychology of "classroom cheating" undertaken by Dr. Howard Lane of New York University:

Schools cannot teach children to be honest when there are conflicting values at home. While making a study of classroom cheating in a Midwestern community some years ago, Dr. Howard Lane of New York University let the children grade their own papers, then checked to see how many answers had been changed. A group of children from well-to-do middle-class homes, shockingly enough, were proved to have cheated far more than a group of reform-school kids. Why? Because in the "good" homes, while honesty was given lip service, success was the main goal. The children had seen their success-driven parents tell lies to promote their interests, give flattering welcomes to people they despised and do a hundred similar things. Under such circumstances honesty simply doesn't "take."

Mr. Hunt is witness to the truth of what Mrs. Buck calls "knowledge as ancient as a thousand years":

What can make a child grow up to be callous, selfish or cruel? Many things, most of them within the home. Psychologists agree that a basic liking for people can be created or prevented *during the child's first year of life*. If an infant is always handled gently, fed when hungry, comforted when miserable, he begins to get a fundamental trust in others and an unshakable liking for human beings. Parents who are impatient, easily angered or too busy to spend time with their children are building characters with sand. It is the child's love of his parents that makes him want to adopt their best traits and learn the qualities they urge upon him. No outside agency or expert can supply that love.

Mr. Hunt credits psychiatric researchers with making another important distinction. When thousands of London children were evacuated to communities in the country, and were therefore necessarily subjected to some type of regimentation in the interests of order, "psychiatrists found that the children did indeed learn such aspects of behavior as how to be ingratiating, to yield to authority, to get along with one another. But these qualities were used only to suit the needs of the moment, and were in no way comparable to such deep and permanent traits as generosity, compassion, self-sacrifice."

So, all in all, the wealthiest countries of the world are, by a strange quirk of fate, apt to be the

most lacking in the qualities necessary to a maturing personality. Statistics on mental instability, after all, only reveal the projection of emotional malnutrition from the earliest years. According to a report by Dr. William Menninger (*New York Times*, Dec. 1, 1956), the present mental health toll includes about fifty per cent of all patients who consult family physicians. One-third of the nation's total bill for medical care is incurred by mental illness, with many States devoting between ten and twenty-five per cent of their operating budgets to cope with mental and emotional difficulties—while in New York State, the richest and most "civilized" of the forty-eight, the figure has now climbed above thirty-five per cent. California mental hospitals gain 18,000 additional patients every year, or a new case every twenty-nine minutes. There are at least nine million people in the United States with mental and emotional disorders, and one out of every twelve children born each year will at some time during life suffer a mental disorder requiring hospitalization. It seems likely that the failure to understand what the "backward" Chinese have always known is responsible for much of this disorder. A child cannot be expected to grow toward maturity without the presence in his parents of calmness, a sense of purpose, and the integrity fostered by self-discipline.

## *FRONTIERS* Anatomy of a Myth

WHEN, a few years ago, American newspapers reported that "Tokyo Rose" had been returned to this country from Japan to be tried for treason, most readers, like ourselves, probably reflected upon what seemed the unhappy if deserved disgrace of this woman. Whatever happened in her trial, she would be hated, and ever thereafter held in contempt. How could she have failed to realize what would happen to her, at the end of the war? Was she really deluded into supposing that the Japanese would win?

The woman known as "Tokyo Rose" was convicted and sent to prison. Then, on Jan. 28, 1956, when she was granted parole, the *New York Times* reported that the U.S. Government had announced its intention of beginning deportation proceedings against her.

Whether or not it was at this time that William A. Reuben, a San Francisco journalist, first became interested in the case of "Tokyo Rose," we do not know. It is plain, however, that the proposed deportation proceedings moved him to gather material relating to "Tokyo Rose" and to publish what he found himself. Following, according to Mr. Reuben, is her story.

She was born Iva Toguri in Los Angeles, California, on July 4, 1916, of Japanese parents. She obtained her schooling in Southern California, in Calexico, San Diego, Compton, and Los Angeles. She attended the University of California in Los Angeles, was awarded a B.A. in 1940, and did graduate work in biology there during the following year. In her childhood and youth, she showed no interest in politics. She belonged to no political organization, her sole affiliation being with the Girl Scouts of America. Her only political act was to register and vote in the 1940 presidential election.

In the summer of 1941, she traveled to Japan to visit her mother's sister, then believed near death. She made the trip to please her parents. She had no passport, having been given instead a Certificate of Identification by the U.S. State Department. On Dec. 1, becoming alarmed at the tensions between

the United States and Japan, she applied for clearance papers to return home, but was unable to obtain them in time to sail on the *Tatsuta Maru*, which left for America on Dec. 2. A few days later, with the attack on Pearl Harbor, war broke out. When the Japanese police requested her to take out Japanese citizenship, she refused, asking instead to be interned as an enemy alien. Months later she again attempted to be evacuated to the United States. Apparently bureaucratic delays prevented. Another evacuation ship left Japan in September, 1949. This time she was unable to secure passage because she could not pay the fare of \$425 in advance, being now without funds. Her family in America could not help; along with 120,000 other Americans of Japanese descent, her parents were isolated in a relocation center.

So Iva Toguri remained in Japan. Throughout the war she was visited by the Japanese thought-control police two or three times weekly. It was hard for her to obtain work because she could not speak Japanese. She was living with her aunt and uncle, but eventually they asked her to move. Her well-known pro-American attitude was embarrassing to them. There were not only the thought-control officials, but the children of the neighborhood shouted at her an epithet meaning "American spy!"

Eventually she got work as a monitor of American-language broadcasts at the Domei news agency. Later, as a result of a contest, she won a job at Radio Tokyo. No one has ever been found who could testify that in all this time in Japan Iva Toguri said anything hostile to the United States.

In 1943, the Japanese Army decided to expand its 30-minute short-wave program to a full-dress show of an hour and fifteen minutes. The Army had combed the POW camps and found three allied prisoners with radio experience—an Australian battalion commander, an American captain, and a lieutenant in the Philippine Army. These men were ordered to conduct the broadcast on pain of death for refusal. They did what they were told. The program called for a female voice. The three POW's in charge knew Iva Toguri. She had been friendly toward them, and while at first they were "very suspicious" of her, they eventually came to trust her

"completely" and "absolutely." She was given a voice test and selected for the program. She protested that she did not want to broadcast, but the Australian officer assured her that she would do nothing against her own people. She was told that she would only read the script written for her by the POW's, mainly introducing musical items.

The story now moves to another level. After the war, American correspondents searched Japan looking for the notorious "Tokyo Rose." They couldn't find her. An AP correspondent sent home the report that "'Tokyo Rose' is a figment of the fertile imagination of the propaganda office. . . . 'Tokyo Rose' was any number of different girls who spoke the English language."

Two reporters, however, were more insistent. They offered rewards for a "Tokyo Rose" story. An official of Radio Tokyo produced a "Tokyo Rose," but as the American correspondent who thus claimed to "solve" the Tokyo Rose Mystery admitted in court, this official did not say whether he had found "a Tokyo Rose or the Tokyo Rose." It was Iva Toguri.

Shortly after her identification as "Tokyo Rose," Iva Toguri was arrested by the U.S. Army. She made a statement, it was checked, and she was released. Then, a month later, on Oct. 17, 1945, she was arrested on orders from Washington. The warrant charged suspicion of treason. She was held in Sugamo Prison absolutely incommunicado for ten weeks, until Dec. 25. Then for ten months she was permitted to see no one except her husband—Felipe D'Aquino, a Portuguese national whom she had married earlier in the year—for twenty minutes once a month. Then, on May 1, 1946, the Army gave her full and unconditional clearance. This did not, however, bring her release, for the Department of Justice had begun its own investigation independent of the Army. She was finally cleared by the Justice Department and released from prison after thirteen months of confinement. The official telegram releasing her said, "No prosecution contemplated."

At last free—or apparently free—Iva Toguri D'Aquino applied for an American passport in order to return home. There were many delays. Then, on August 16, 1948, Attorney General Tom Clark

announced: "The only American-born girl to whom American troops in the Pacific are believed to have applied the name 'Tokyo Rose' will be brought to this country to face a treason charge."

Iva Toguri D'Aquino was brought to trial in San Francisco on July 8, 1949. She was prosecuted by Special Assistants to the Attorney General and by the U.S. Attorney for Northern California. Three San Francisco lawyers defended her. She was charged with providing aid and comfort to the Government of Japan by broadcasting with intent to undermine the confidence and morale of American troops, from November, 1943 to August, 1945. Eight overt acts were charged.

Following is William A. Reuben's summary of the trial:

Iva Toguri D'Aquino produced evidence showing that she had been stranded in Japan against her will; that she had never renounced her American citizenship; and throughout the war years she was always pro-American; that throughout the time she was at Radio Tokyo she had, at severe personal risk, smuggled food, cigarettes, medicine, blankets and delivered favourable war news to the allied prisoners of war at Gamp Bunka: that the Japanese Army had issued orders transferring her from the accounting department to the "Zero Hour" program; and that she had no choice—short of suicide—but to accept. The defendant herself testified that she had broadcast under the name "Ann" or "Orphan Ann," never as "Tokyo Rose." She testified that she "never" had any treasonable intent, denied ever committing any treasonable act or ever broadcasting any news item or propaganda. Every word she ever spoke on the Japanese radio, she said, was read from a script which had been written either by Major Cousens, Captain Ince or Lieutenant Reyes. These three former prisoners testified as defense witnesses and fully corroborated the defendant's testimony. (Ince, who was on active duty in the rank of major at the time of the trial, had been promoted immediately after his liberation. . . . None of the 27 allied prisoners of war who broadcast on Radio Tokyo was ever punished by his government.)

Reuben also says that one of the reporters who was originally instrumental in pinning the label "Tokyo Rose" on Iva Toguri D'Aquino was sent to Japan by the Department of Justice and was

responsible for the re-opening of the case. He was not, however, called as a witness by the prosecution, nor was any evidence given to show why the case should have been re-opened after earlier clearances of the defendant by both the Army and the Department of Justice. Reuben further contends that two witnesses were bribed to testify falsely before the grand jury which returned the indictment of Iva Toguri D'Aquino, saying that this was proved by the defense in court.

Reuben continues:

The all-Caucasian jury, which took four days to decide upon a verdict, acquitted the defendant of seven of the eight counts. The one act of which she was found guilty and sentenced to ten years imprisonment was based on the testimony of two former Americans who had renounced their citizenship after World War II began, to become Japanese nationals, and propagandists. (If, like them, the defendant had either during or after the war renounced her American citizenship, she could of course not have been tried by a U.S. court for treason.) The overt act that Iva Toguri D'Aquino was convicted of consisted in her having allegedly broadcasted the following 25 words sometime in October 1944, following the battle of Leyte Gulf:

"Now you fellows have lost all your ships. You really are orphans of the Pacific. Now, how do you think you will ever get home?"

It is worth noting that the prosecution's case was based on the oral and uncorroborated testimony of two witnesses, Kenneth Oki and George Mitsushio, both of whom testified that the defendant had committed eight treasonable acts. Thus the conviction rests on the testimony of two witnesses who, in seven of the eight counts, had their accusations rejected by the jury as untruthful.

An odd feature of the trial of Mrs. D'Aquino is the fact that many of the records which were in the possession of the Government at the time when she received full clearance have since disappeared. The recordings made by a U.S. monitoring station in Hawaii of the entire 340 broadcasts made by the defendant in "Zero Hour" were said by the federal prosecution to have been destroyed as a matter of "routine," and program scripts which she had turned over to the Army officers in 1945, and which she

tried to subpoena for her trial, were found to be "lost."

Some sort of climax to this affair is provided by the present determination of the Government to deport Mrs. D'Aquino to Japan. In the New York *Times* report of this move, this sentence appeared: "Immigration officials said they knew of no precedent for an attempt to denaturalize and deport a native-born American citizen." The deportation proceedings, presumably, are now going on.

On the face of the record supplied by Mr. Reuben, this is an incredible affair. Who could possibly profit by the persecution of one lone woman who was unfortunately stranded away from home, and who acted with more courage than most women—or men—would have done? Reuben seems to think that the trial of "Tokyo Rose" was a Democratic response to Republican criticism charging "softness" to spies and traitors—why had there been no post-war cases of treason or espionage? We don't know about that. Perhaps there are "extenuating circumstances" which explain somewhat, if they do not excuse, the Government's action. Perhaps—but we cannot imagine what they are. The fact seems to be that a victim had to be found, that some obscene species of symbolism in our natural life had to be ratified by the courts. The myth of Tokyo Rose had to have a "logical" ending, sin must always be punished in a land of righteousness and justice. And if there is no available sinner, the myth demands that we invent one, or improvise a bit. That is the only sense—if it is sense—that we can make out of the case of Tokyo Rose.