

CHAPTER VI

COMMUNITY GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

The emergence of community organization within the framework of administrative controls was a slow and difficult process. The direct supervisory controls extended to housing, food, employment, public relief, law and order, maintenance, fire protection, transportation, industrial and agricultural production, budgeting and finance, property, health services, education, and others. In only three areas of community life was any measurable degree of responsibility extended to the evacuees. Through a community-owned cooperative the distribution of those goods and services not furnished directly by the Government was placed in evacuee hands. Through recreational associations, at several centers, athletic and cultural activities were organized, directed, and partly financed by the residents. Through community government opportunity was given for political organization and expression. In tracing the emergence and growth of the latter, some discussion must be devoted to the civil-service staff to whom was assigned the administrative and technical responsibility of center management.

A. The "Administration"

References to the "administration" have appeared many times in this record of community government. Of the three major systems of relationships at each center, that one between the administrators and the administered was the most dynamic and explosive of all. The history of community government is the history of the attempt to adjust and systematize the relations between these two segments.

The "appointed personnel" was the term used to describe the civil-service employees of the War Relocation Authority and their families. This small group of three to four hundred persons at each center provided a sharp contrast to the several thousand persons of Japanese descent. This group gradually came to possess many advantages of a superior variety. It lived in "staff housing," an area of better constructed and larger quarters than the "barracks" of the Japanese. Families lived in apartments with facilities for housekeeping while single staff members housed in barracks rooms or dormitories ate at a staff dining hall. Its civil-service remuneration--even though that remuneration did not include housing, food and other perquisites--was many times greater than the \$16 or \$19 per month paid the evacuees. There were separate recreational facilities and most centers had an "A.P." club. There was a freedom of movement and absence of restriction not accorded the evacuees. In summation, in every way it was the dominant controlling group occupying a real and symbolic position of superiority and separated from the evacuee community by many barriers.

Occupying the top position of this group was the project director. In him was vested the responsibility for all phases of center life and operation. His authority was not always final and his decisions were subject to policies and programs formulated by the national staff. Except in details, he had little discretion to amend or modify the orders issued as administrative instructions. He was also subject to pressures from his own staff, from the evacuees, and to a lesser extent from an intangible thing called "the public." He was frequently much more sensitive to maintaining good public relations than to the pressures emanating from the community. The staff pressures were those inevitably arising in a situation of this kind. They came from conflict of personalities, interpretation of policies, attitudes, methods of procedure, and intrastaff politics. Several project directors have commented that they were required to spend fully three-quarters of their time on staff problems.

Any attempt to describe common patterns of administrative attitude and behavior suffers from the danger of over-simplification. The personalities and experiences of the project personnel varied widely. There were some who had had a long career in Government service. There were others who had had no previous governmental experience. There were those who tended to be paternalistic; some were dictatorial and still others approached problems in a democratic fashion. Some were well-trained and efficient, others inefficient and incapable. In spite of these differences, there were certain similarities appearing as recurring constants influencing the behavior of all personnel: the necessity to conform to the policy and program determined by the national staff; the need to maintain cooperative relations within the staff and between the staff and the community; the ever present threat of public criticism.

Attitudes of the "administrator" were frequently the controlling influence in relations with the evacuees and specifically the community councils. It is the practice of any administrator to utilize the administrative hierarchy for the accomplishment of his objectives. Usually, he secures cooperation by explanation and persuasion, but sometimes it is necessary to resort to the use of threats and even elimination of recalcitrant members of the organization. No successful administrator can long allow organized opposition within his staff to prevent the accomplishment of his objectives. That these objectives were determined for the project directors made little difference except in the demand on his ingenuity to gain their acceptance with both his staff and—something new to most administrators—a community.

The administrators, from long habit, extended the administrative viewpoint to include the community council. Protests from the council

that its function was to represent and work for the welfare of the residents were sometimes brushed aside by an administrator who sought effective methods of reaching his objectives. This philosophy and its results were all too clearly seen and described by one project director as follows:

"From all appearances the council seems to be undergoing that process of disintegration which besets every attempt to set up a liaison group between the administrator and the administered. Because of necessity the administration must rule by fiat, the residents, at first optimistic, soon recognize the fact that the liaison group has not power to enforce the residents' interests when these interests are counter to the administration. The net result is that the liaison group, afraid of arousing the residents' overt animosity, becomes progressively more cautious and, as its reliance upon buck-passing increases, progressively less effective in furthering administration policies."

Many of the crises which developed at the centers arose because of the failure of the project directors to recognize the conflict between the utilization of the council as an administrative arm and the function of the council as representative of the residents' interests. There was, in fact, little appreciation that the interests of the residents could logically or desirably be different from those of the administration. In fact, these interests were frequently widely divergent and found expression in conflict between the administration and the community council.

Administrators who were in the habit of eliminating opposition from their staffs by whatever means were needed, were not always able to use the same techniques to bring the community councils into line because each proceeded from basically different assumptions. Project directors viewed opposition as expressions of individual obstructionism and not as signs of community disquiet. In one such instance a request was made to the National Director for permission to remove four individuals who were suspected of activities inimical to and critical of the administration. The project director admitted that it was impossible to develop any concrete evidence as to their subversive activities, but he maintained that their behavior convinced him that the project would be better off with their removal. These four individuals included the chairman and vice chairman of the community council and the other two were members of its executive committee.

Administrators frequently rationalized their behavior by stating that no one can bargain with the United States Government. They assumed that attempts to secure modifications of policies were in some measure

a flouting of the authority of the Government and should be suppressed. Sometimes they took the position that the policies laid down by Washington were beyond their control and they had no choice except to enforce them. There were occasions, however, when they transmitted protests from the community to the attention of Washington. A common attitude on the part of many administrators, when complaints were made to them was, "if you don't like conditions here you can relocate."

As is true of most administrators, the project directors used a number of techniques to secure compliance with the policies and procedures of the Government. These techniques included persuasion, threats, coercion, passive inaction, compromises and attempts to split the unity of the evacuee community by ignoring or bypassing the complaining groups, especially the council.

Persuasion, through consultation and discussion, was the most frequently used technique. One example where the interests of the community were involved brought agreement for reduction in consumption of gasoline and the use of motor equipment. The order had originally created considerable resistance from evacuee drivers and stimulated fears within the community that essential services would be curtailed. Agreement was reached, however, by working out the problem with the community council and pointing out the advantages which would accrue, as well as emphasizing that no essential activities would suffer. It was shown to be to the advantage of the evacuees that by careful use, there would be equipment to supply food to the mess halls, transport workers, and to provide transportation for events such as funerals and weddings. It was pointed out that the same rules applied to the appointed personnel as to the evacuees, and under the existing conditions this was a sensible and desirable procedure. With only minor protests from some of the evacuee drivers, a marked reduction in the consumption of gasoline was achieved.

Bargaining, accompanied by compromises and concessions, was a technique used by some project directors. At one project, a shortage of labor was overcome by an agreement that if the administration would pay overtime, the council would recruit sufficient labor to cultivate and harvest crops. Special privileges, such as food or clothing, were oftentimes demanded and given in order to recruit workers for distasteful jobs. If these arrangements were made with the community council it assumed the responsibility for securing labor.

The use of passive resistance or inaction was effective where the welfare of the residents outweighed the interest of the administration. Situations arose, for example, where it was impossible to recruit workers to collect garbage. The administration took the position that as far as it was concerned it was unimportant whether garbage was or was not collected. It was quite willing to provide trucks and to pay

workers, but if the community remained disinterested, then the administration was also disinterested. Threats on the part of certain groups of workers, particularly drivers of coal or food trucks to strike unless their demands were met were frequently ignored by the administration, which took the position that this was an operation of direct concern to the community, and if coal was not delivered or food provided to the mess halls, then the people would freeze or starve. In such situations the responsibility for solving the problems rested with the community and not the administration. There were some reverse situations where the council attempted to force action from the administration to solve food and fuel shortages.

The ultimatum technique, accompanied with actual or implied threats, was another of the devices used by some administrators to get action or agreement from the council. This technique was used in many situations and varied from simple demands to direct threats.

One of the more dramatic situations illustrating the use of this technique occurred at Minidoka where the project director created an issue around completion of the gymnasium and set off a chain of events which had widespread repercussions. The construction of the gymnasium had been allowed to drag along because of its low priority in relation to staff housing, hog pens and chicken houses. Organized pressures from both staff and evacuees began to appear in the summer of 1944. There was common agreement that early completion of the gymnasium for community use was desirable and that something should be done. An abortive attempt was made to arouse interest by the announcement of a joint staff-evacuee "Build the Gym Week." This proved an unhappy affair since only a few staff members and no evacuees appeared for the volunteer work. It was reported that staff members while working made slighting remarks about the efficiency of evacuee labor and that these were overheard and caused bad feelings. Too, the staff volunteers refused to be supervised by the evacuee foreman in charge, with the result that he walked off the job in a huff.

The project director, in the meantime, had secured an agreement with Washington that unless community interest to complete the gymnasium was demonstrated by an adequate number of workers, the gymnasium would be boarded up. Having secured this agreement, he addressed a communication to the community council advising it that it was to the community's interest to finish the construction of the gymnasium; that it was the community council's responsibility to provide workers, and that unless action was immediately forthcoming, the gymnasium would be left unfinished. This ultimatum, as it was interpreted by the council, aroused deep resentments and many of its members advocated that the council resign in protest against the dictatorial attitude of the project director. The situation was saved by the chairman of the

council who hoped to overcome the ill-feeling generated by the administration and wanted the gymnasium completed for center use. The council members addressed a letter to the project director, advising him of their willingness to cooperate. Their resentment, however, was reflected in the reply, a portion of which is quoted below:

"The council has gone on record, unanimously, as regretting and resenting the fact that you have chosen to approach the council on this matter with an 'or else' ultimatum. We are told that in the meeting of the Manpower Commission held October 25, 1944, you emphasized the fact that your memorandum to the council actually was intentionally an ultimatum seeking to guarantee, 'or else,' and that you felt that you would 'just as soon board up the gymnasium right now' as the easiest method whereby to discharge your administrative responsibilities. We fail to understand the psychology which prompted you to adopt such tactics in dealing with the council; surely you are not so naive as to believe that either the council, or the evacuee residents as a whole, can best be moved to action under the brunt of dictatorial ultimatums?

"We might make the comment, incidentally, that majority opinion among residents clearly indicates a resentment towards the administration which is blamed for the fact that this project's gymnasium is at this late date still in the process of construction, while gymnasiums at all other projects (according to popular understanding) were completed and in use since long ago. The delay here is being attributed to the project administration's lack of sincerity in the matter of evacuee welfare, as manifested, specifically in the tardiness with which the construction was commenced despite having plans, materials, and abundant labor available during the early months of the project, in the substantial reduction of evacuee workers assigned to gymnasium construction via terminations ostensibly made necessary by budgetary limitations, and in the diverting of the reduced number of evacuee workers from the gymnasium to the construction of resident housing for the appointed personnel and for other work.

.

"The council will participate in the recruiting of additional workers for gymnasium construction, via the 'Irrigator,' and via block commissioners who were called to a joint meeting held specifically for this purpose on October 27, 1944, and, in consideration of probable best

results, Mr. Ishimitsu and his men are to 'spearhead' the recruiting campaign. In spite of the manpower shortage now existing here, therefore, the community council now feels reasonably certain that the gymnasium will be completed for service, or in readiness to hold a function, on December 31, 1944."

The project director's reaction to the council's position as contained in his weekly report of October 21-28 was as follows:

"The administration's ultimatum of course put the council members squarely on the spot insofar as they were, for a change, unable to pass the buck either back to the administration or on to any group of residents. This is not to say that they did not try—they tried valiantly—but they were hedged on one side by a deliberately uncompromising position on the part of the administration and on the other by the residents' desire for the gym, and—thanks to the editor of the Irrigator's Japanese section—by the residents' knowledge that the completion of the gym depended upon the council's action. The gym, therefore, will be completed December 30."

The confidence on the part of the project director that the gymnasium would be completed by the deadline was premature. Utilizing the known desire of the community to complete the gymnasium, he instituted an unannounced system of time checking which recorded the actual hours worked. When this became known by the workers and was brought to the attention of the council, which protested the method adopted, he justified his position on the grounds that he was responsible for expenditure of Government funds and that this responsibility included payment for work actually performed. Protests of the council that this system of time checking had never previously been used in any other activity and was not then being used except in the case of the workers at the gymnasium failed to influence the project director. Other issues also intruded including the status of the evacuee foreman who had for many months carried the burden of construction work and his relation to the additional Caucasian supervisors placed on the job. The regular crew walked off the job and new workers could not be recruited. Negotiations between council, workers, and administration continued, but with no success.

The council hoped to break the impasse by an appeal to the National Director. Its communication stressed not only the difficulties existing between the administration and the workers, but also its position as a successful mediating body. This last was made explicit in the paragraph which read:

"The council was required to accept responsibility for the construction of the gymnasium, but it was never consulted thereafter before changes were made, and its advice calculated to avoid trouble was not accepted. The prolonged attempt to reconcile the stands of the administration and the workers has resulted in general demoralization of those who took part in the arbitration, and a further reduction of confidence in the council on the part of both the administration and the residents. If this final attempt at settlement of a relatively minor issue fails, it is clear that the usefulness of the council in aiding smoother relationship between the administration and the residents has approached its end. With a number of difficult problems already in sight, there seems to be little use for the present members to stay in office if this matter cannot be solved."

The reply from Washington was in the form of a teletype (Message No. 499) dated December 2, 1944, signed by the Director and addressed to the project director at Minidoka:

"Reurtel November 29. Report of community council on gymnasium construction was not considered to require any reply from Washington and involves decisions which can only be made at project level. The decision on the construction was well outlined in page 3 of Mr. Utz's letter of October 25, 1944, and my phone conversation of November 27 authorized you to continue in your attempts to secure full council and community support in completion of work but no change in official position was possible so far as adhering to deadline established. In view of work stoppage and delays in negotiation completion by date set now seems impossible. Please assure Chairman Fujii for me that we consider council cooperation of paramount importance and that only desire of administration is to work out common problems on basis of common understanding and mutual assistance."

Work was not resumed and the gymnasium remained unfinished. The council suffered loss of prestige in the community by its failure. The council chairman was the scapegoat--to such an extent that the community held a mock funeral for him and erected a cross symbolizing a tombstone in memory of what the community termed "an administrative stooge and dog." Needless to say, the chairman was not a candidate for reelection.

Another technique which was used by some project directors was that of "passing the buck." A common complaint of councils was that whenever difficult administrative problems affecting the community

arose, the project director would place the responsibility for solution upon the council. Illustrative of this technique was the attempt of the project director at one center to make the council responsible for moving residents from a particular block that had been designated for school use. After thinking the matter over and discovering that any action on the part of the council would make it very unpopular with the residents, the council passed the responsibility for the decision back to the administration. There it was laid away quietly, and nothing was done about evacuating the barracks that were wanted.

Although several other techniques were used, reference should be made to the one of "do nothing." If, for example, the community council addressed a communication to the project director requesting certain administrative action, the letter or memorandum was sometimes filed away without comment or reply. If, of course, the council pressed for some decision, then it was necessary to use any one of several approaches to indicate the unwillingness of the administration to take the desired action.

Project administrators in some cases failed to understand or accept the fact that community councils were basically political bodies, or that members were sensitive to the demands of the community and retained their prestige and status only to the extent that they were able to convince their constituents that they had won concessions from the administration. The most successful councils were those led by the most skilled practitioners of the political arts. These leaders rewarded and punished, made deals and compromises, used cajolery or threats, avoided or joined issues, depending upon the wisdom of the moment. They too, along with the administrators, learned the uses of coercion, passive resistance, or of persuasion, and used these devices against administration or community as the need demanded. This behavior won approval or condemnation from administration or community as it coincided or clashed with their respective objectives.

Councils composed of politically mature members were much better able to discharge their functions for the welfare of the residents and in the interests of smooth administration. The maturity, however, came only with experience gained from false starts, missteps, crises, and successes. It was in part a product of increased stability of both administration and community, producing an environment in which known factors could be evaluated against current situations, and a course of action agreed upon. Success in dealing with situations won for the council confidence from both the administration and the evacuees. The confidence was not granted, however, upon the basis of successful political manipulation; it was given in recognition of the council's promotion of the objectives of either one group or the other.

Although a number of those who lived and worked in this scheme of things attempted to utilize the councils to accomplish their objectives, it is not clear that many evacuees or administrators ever really understood the fundamental political basis of council action. Although elected by the residents and representative of them, the council had to be more than a representative body. Encouraged and established by the administration and listed on the organization charts as a section in the community management division, it could not be an arm of the administration and survive. The councils were subject to pressures from two sources which were oftentimes opposed in their objectives. Only as the councils were able to soften, reconcile, compromise, or divert, were they able to survive. In two instances the opposing pressures were so great that the councils did not survive, and there were a number of less dramatic situations where disaster was only narrowly diverted.

B. The "Council"

Community government was an attempt to provide a formally organized mechanism to maintain systematic relations between the administration and the evacuee community. As such it was a reflection of and a contribution to community organization. Through organization, it could respond to and reflect community sentiments. To the extent that it succeeded in this double role of organization and reflection of evacuee sentiments, it fulfilled its function with both the community and the administration.

Basic to its successful functioning was the understanding and utilization of the principles of joint participation and responsibility on the part of administration, councilmen and the evacuee community, all three. If it can be said that the administration all too frequently failed to keep the council adequately informed as so consciously or unconsciously prevented its members from assisting in making decisions which affected the community, it may be said with equal appropriateness that the council or individual councilmen often failed to keep the people informed or to develop interest in meeting new problems. Joint efforts, to be successful, were as much an imperative of council-community relationships as of administration-council relationships.

Essentially the community attitude was that the council should win concessions for a population that felt aggrieved and often oppressed. The success of the council's efforts was measured by the extent to which it obtained redress of grievances, negotiated complaints and won favors from the administration. In this role the council could not appear to be too cooperative with the administration, nor could it afford to agree to the imposition of new controls which might prove repressive. The council was expected to maintain toward administrative action an attitude compounded of latent hostility and eternal vigilance, and to make occasional strong protests. In contrast, the project

administration conceived of the council as a group created to explain policy and procedure in favorable terms to the residents and to assist the administration in achieving its objectives.

The position of the community council in the social organization of the relocation center prevented it from meeting completely the expectations of either the residents or the administration. With the passage of time, it became representative of the community, a negotiating body to resolve the conflicting interests, and an advisory body to the administration. It was perhaps inevitable—with the council obliged to enact this triple role—that there should have been occasional charges by members of the community that the council was cooperating too closely with the administration, and, on the other hand, charges by the administration that the council was obstructionist or subversive.

There is evidence that this definition of its function was understood by a number of the more able council members. The address of the chairman of the council at Central Utah at the induction ceremonies in the summer of 1944, recognized this position as the only effective basis of council action. In his speech he declared:

"The community council realizes that the problems of today and problems to come are and will be much graver and more serious than those of the past two years. With this fact in mind, the present council has begun their serious thinking in terms of the welfare of the residents.

"The council is not and will not work for the self-interest of any individual or group of individuals but for the mutual and general welfare of the all. We will welcome any suggestions and criticism that are constructive and helpful at any time, through your councilmen or direct to the office of the council in Block # 1.

"We will use every means available to inform the residents on every subject that is brought to us, the action that is being taken, and the progress and the final decision. We will make every effort to follow through on every problem and issue so that we may be able to write its finale to the satisfaction of the residents.

"The present council has decided that in order to perform its duties for the general welfare of the residents, it is necessary that we have: (1) solidarity of councilmen; (2) support and confidence of every resident; (3) support and confidence of every organized group in the center."

.....

"To the members of the administration--

"There may be times when the residents' request be considered unreasonable. We want the administration to appreciate the fact that these requests will be made only after thorough and careful investigation, study, and analysis. Only those which we believe are reasonable shall be presented.

"Any request the council determines is out of reason will not be brought to the administration. We believe this is the council's responsibility.

"Once we determine it is a reasonable request we wish the administration to appreciate this fact and grant us favorable consideration, otherwise, the council shall be placed in a most difficult position. Mainly, because of lack of confidence which will be greater on part of the residents. In case our request cannot be granted, we expect the administration to give us justifiable facts in black and white.

"I believe there must be a mutual understanding for better relationship.

"With mutual understanding between the residents and the council, between the administration and the council, I, as chairman can assure the administration of the council's sincere desire to put forth every effort toward the harmonious and peaceful operation of the center.

"On this basis then, this council hopes to be able to leave a record to be proud of . . ."

Council growth could be measured by an increasingly efficient organization and effective system of relations between it, the administration and the community. At Gila River, there evolved an executive board composed of the chairmen and three members from the councils at Butte and Canal camps. This board of eight members met each week with the project director. At these meetings, the project director announced new policies, discussed procedures, and asked and received advice on questions affecting the community. Opportunity was provided for the members to present current problems to the project director and thus to direct his attention to questions which were of immediate concern to the residents. Council chairmen then reported at a subsequent meeting of the community council the problems discussed at these executive sessions. As an example of subjects covered in these discussions, one meeting was devoted to evacuee property complaints, Japanese language

classes, shortage of doctors, segregation problems and program, explanation of food situation during the summer months and replacement of appointed personnel by evacuees.

The project director spoke favorably of the cooperative attitude of the council and on one occasion invited the chairman of the Butte council to address a staff meeting called to discuss labor problems. At this meeting, the council chairman made explicit the responsibility of the appointed staff to utilize efficiently evacuee labor. He commented that any breakdown in service or supply was a reflection on the ability of appointed staff and would reflect adversely in their civil-service standing. He offered the advice of the council and the manpower commission in solving labor problems but made it clear that these evacuee bodies were advisory only and not administrative. He explained that the interest of the residents was in an efficiently managed center where goods and services should be adequately and efficiently supplied, and that it was from this view that the council concerned itself with this problem. Although his speech carried a threat and a demand to the appointed personnel to do their job, it coincided with the sentiments of the top administrative group which expressed its approval of his remarks. Although this period of well-organized relations with mutual understanding and agreement on many problems between the administration and the council was not marked by any serious crises, there did develop suspicion of one chairman by the residents. When the time came to elect a new council, he was not renominated by his block.

In contrast to well-developed relationships at Gila River, the council at Minidoka in December 1944 was at loggerheads with the administration. This had come about as a result of controversy surrounding the construction of the gymnasium, the dismissal of the community activities staff by the project director and other problems. The situation was sufficiently serious for the council to send a letter to the Washington office explaining the situation and asking for assistance. After reviewing the "joint responsibility" function of the council and referring to an appropriate paragraph from the community government handbook, the letter stated:

"For several months the council has been experiencing increasing difficulty in maintaining a working relationship with the administration. Underlying this lack of rapport seems to be some differences in the interpretation of the function of the community council. In the first place, very rarely has the council been consulted before hand on any matter. When the council was consulted, and it advised the administration as to the proper method of approach, it was often considered as being 'uncooperative,' or as shirking its responsibility.

"During the recent months, the common pattern has been for the administration to make its plans without consulting the council. The council would then be asked to help effect a program in which it did not participate in the planning stage. Criticism of such a program by the council would often be ignored, or difficulty would be experienced in withdrawing the program without disrupting the plans of the administration. It should be noted that the criticism of the council was usually directed, not at the program itself, but the way in which it was attempted.

"While this state of affairs has not caused any serious disruption of life within the project, the community council feels that its duties have been overlooked. The advice and recommendations of the community council have been ignored by the administration. The increasing reaction of the residents is to look upon the council as the tool of the administration rather than a body which protects their welfare. On the other hand, members of the council are not able to present protests against the administration when they consider it to be in the wrong without fear of being accused of stirring trouble.

"The community council members feel that steps must be taken immediately to clarify their position."

The reasoning of the council is better understood if it is realized that the community attitude was that either the council was ineffectual and therefore useless, or that it continually gave in to the administration and failed to represent community interests. The project director was even approached with the proposal that he permit the council to win some minor point in order to restore resident confidence. This advice went unheeded. Except for minor matters, the council withdrew from further attempts to seek solutions to problems through the administration during the remainder of its history.

C. The "Official Functions"

Issued in November 1943, the Handbook for Community Government outlined these functions for the community council: legislative, judicial, advisory, communication, planning, and ceremonial. Councils did discharge these functions to a greater or lesser extent, and in so doing made significant contribution to the organization and sanctions of the community.

The legislative and judicial functions which loomed so large in the early discussions on policy constituted only a minor but

nevertheless important part of council activity. Through definition of asocial behavior and the punishment of violators, the council gave expression to certain moral attitudes. The councils defined offenses against property and persons, made regulations governing traffic and sanitation, and legislated on other matters of direct community concern. One such example was an ordinance passed by the Poston Community Council prohibiting the keeping of pets in close proximity to habitations. Several blocks registered protests. The council heard the petitioners, but insisted that the ordinance be observed, and increased the penalty for its violation. As another example, the Central Utah council classified bingo as gambling and prohibited it. Two blocks which had scheduled bingo contests previous to the passage of the regulation ignored the council and continued with their plans. The chairman then requested enforcement by the project director and asked that, if necessary, the military be called in to prevent the bingo game. The issue was successfully negotiated and no arrests were made.

The judicial commission, although infrequently used, provided another opportunity for the crystallization of community sentiment. A few gambling, traffic violation, theft, and assault cases were heard. Juveniles who got in trouble at one center were ordered to give up zoot suits and were given a hair cut as punishment. This action met with community approval and apparently solved the immediate problem of delinquency.

In the performance of its advisory function, the council brought the full expression of community sentiment to the administration. Administrative acceptance depended on factors which have been already discussed.

Perhaps the most important of all these functions was that of communication. The community councils by reason of having a direct channel to the project director and with entree to all portions of the administrative hierarchy and the community was in a better position than any other group to transmit community sentiment, and to learn administrative policy and procedure. The election of councilmen on a block basis made it relatively easy to utilize block meetings to transmit information and learn residents' attitudes and problems. Some councilmen conscientiously kept their residents informed of all activities. Others made little effort to work with or for their block people.

Planning in conjunction with the administration was primarily on a day to day basis. The long-range planning was retained by the administration and was a responsibility of technicians who did not welcome "lay" or council interferences. The most significant planning efforts were those concerned with the future of the Japanese in America, and little or no assistance was provided by the administration in this sphere.

The council's role in ceremonial activities filled a definite community need. The numerous memorial services held to honor the Nisei soldiers who died overseas were ordinarily sponsored by the council in conjunction with patriotic groups. Induction ceremonies for departing servicemen were also council-sponsored. The dedication of new buildings, observance of holidays and other special events, were either under the direct sponsorship of the council or held with its cooperation. The block councilman always attended each funeral in his block, and bereaved families frequently sent letters of appreciation to the council.

D. The Techniques of Action

In actual experience the establishment of the prerogatives of the community council was a slow process. Pressures from the administration, the community, or from within the council itself frequently produced crises, from which there came precedents for future action. Councils assumed, for example, that they had full freedom to conduct their own meetings without interference and to hold public meetings within the center. Only at Granada was this right questioned by the administration, and there, after a stormy period, it was granted.

The prerogatives of the council in relation to administrative affairs were much more limited. A situation involving the activities of the council and administration at Topaz illustrates the process by which precedents were determined. The council made an investigation of the hospital and as a result demanded the dismissal of the chief medical officer. The ensuing discussions between the council and the project director were concerned not alone with the dismissal of the individual in question, but with the relation of the administration to the council and their respective responsibilities. The project director granted that the council had the right to investigate conditions at the hospital in terms of the relation of the hospital as a public institution to the welfare and needs of the residents. From such investigations, the council could call attention to the existing conditions and make recommendations for improvement of the hospital as a public institution. On the other hand, the project director insisted hospital management was a technical and administrative problem, the complete responsibility for which rested with the administration. This being the case, the demand for the dismissal of the chief medical officer was out of order and beyond the legitimate consideration of the community council.

The council chairman and his committee took the position that their fundamental interest was the welfare of the residents. The residents had lost confidence in the chief medical officer and held him responsible for what was considered to be inadequate organization of health services. They asked for his removal. They were disturbed, too, that the hospital administrators took refuge behind the plea of

technical qualifications and responsibilities.

Hospital administrators maintained that the community council, composed of laymen, was not qualified to judge the adequacy of hospital services and that such judgment could be made only by qualified technical supervisors; the problem, since it was both technical and administrative, was thus beyond the concern of the council. If this contention had been accepted, its effect would have been to deny to the council the right to investigate conditions on the basis of community welfare. The project director appeared as the arbitrator in this conflict of the technical staff versus the political body and took a position which modified the claims of each.

The role of the community council in community affairs became defined through similar trial and error procedures. A number of autonomous or semiautonomous evacuee groups were formed in response to certain community needs. Among these we find community enterprises, community activities, religious organizations, Boy Scouts, P. T. A., and similar associations. These groups were engaged in activities which affected to greater or lesser extent all the residents of the center. On the basis of its claim to promote and protect the welfare of all the residents, the community council at several centers regulated or entered into the activities of a number of these groups. The council at Gila River, for example, ruled that the Red Cross membership drive and collections for the Community Fund should be the only recognized fund-raising activities within the center. The council at Topaz found itself in controversy with the Red Cross and raised certain questions regarding the utilization of funds collected by that organization. At most centers, the relations between the council and community enterprises were cordial, but there were two examples of actual or threatened investigations of community enterprises management by the council which were justified on the basis of protecting the welfare of the residents. In the first, the issue was satisfactorily settled by an explanation from the enterprises, and in the second, the administration ruled that the matter was beyond council jurisdiction.

Regulatory activities of the council sometimes extended to individual behavior. There were two centers which adopted resolutions limiting the amount of money to be given as gifts at funerals, weddings, or other events. This was impossible of enforcement, but it did serve the purpose of expressing a community attitude that competitive gift giving was inappropriate in a relocation center.

The techniques by which the council governed its affairs with the administration and the community resembled those used by the administration in its relations with the council. Councils issued ultimatums, made demands, bargained, and compromised with the administration as the occasion permitted. It was seldom, however, that the ultimatum or

demand technique was effective. Councils on occasion employed passive resistance and sometimes ignored requests or orders emanating from the administration. For example, one council received an order from the project director to cease collection of funds for the hospital welfare association. The chairman of the council, to whom the order was addressed, placed the memorandum in his desk and no action was taken. The collection of funds continued and was ignored by the administration. In its advisory capacity, the council used the art of persuasion. It also "passed the buck" on certain difficult or controversial problems to the administration.

Councils often found it necessary to seek an expression of confidence or to determine a course of procedure by seeking action from the residents. In important issues it was the practice for each block councilman to hold a block meeting at which discussion frequently resulted in agreement. At a subsequent meeting of the council, each member would report the decision of his block and the action decided upon. There are, however, a few examples where the council found itself in disagreement with block decisions, and as a result held additional meetings with further explanations in an attempt to secure community acquiescence to the council's point of view.

One of the most difficult tasks of the council was to prevent hasty action on the part of either the community or the administration. It is obvious that if an issue became joined it would be impossible for the council to fulfill its function as a negotiating group seeking suitable compromises. In this role, the council was a buffer, a safety valve, and a device for the regulation of conflict. It was an institution through which the antagonisms and aggressions of both the administration and the community could be released without doing essential harm to either. As long as it could control these divergent pressures until resolution of the differences was achieved, the council's position was assured.

There are many examples of attacks on the council by either members of the administrative staff or residents of the community. The attacks from the community were ordinarily taken care of in good time and by methods which the council understood and could use. The attacks by administrators were more difficult to control. In the examples which we have, it was only in the event that these attacks simultaneously threatened the position of the project director that administrative action was taken. The charge by an assistant project director that the chairman of the community council was an agitator brought unity to the community and support for the council but no administrative disciplinary action. When the same administrator questioned the position of the project director, it was not long until the former's resignation was secured.

E. Community Participation through Community Government

The participation of large numbers of evacuees in the problems of the community was achieved through community government. The description of formal organization by which this participation was organized has been purposefully left until after the analysis of the relations between the council and the administration and the community was made.

Almost immediately following the election of the first council at each center and the selection of council officers, a number of standing committees drawn from council membership were appointed. These varied in number from 6 at Minidoka to approximately 20 at Gila River. The organization plan at the latter center duplicated almost exactly the structure of the administration. The system of numerous standing committees was found to be unworkable and was later reduced to the appointment of chairmen for administration, works, and welfare. As problems arose in any of these fields, temporary committees were appointed to investigate the situation and report to the council.

There gradually developed at all centers a number of council-appointed groups which included noncouncil members. These were created in response to recurring problems of wide community interest. The council at Gila River established 10 permanent bodies including the judicial commission, juvenile board, juvenile guidance commission, recreation association, health board, public relations committee, manpower commission, resettlement advisory committee, food committee, Butte community fund committee. These groups were distinct from regular council committees in that their membership was in large part drawn from noncouncil members. These bodies, under council sponsorship, worked for the welfare of the residents. Some of these commissions included members of the appointed staff either as full committee members or as advisers.

The community council at Rohwer followed a slightly different plan in its organization. Committees were established for agriculture, education, food, fuel, health, investigations, and welfare, and there were in addition a judicial commission, a labor relations board, a resettlement planning commission, and an executive board of the council. The fuel committee and the board of health included one member from each block, who in most instances were not members of the council. The other committees included a majority of members who were not councilmen. The Rohwer and the Gila River plans differed in one major respect: at Rohwer the committees, commissions, and boards were directly supervised by the council and made their reports to that body; at Gila the council delegated to these groups the right to initiate action.

Variations of these systems were found at other centers. The council at Central Utah created a labor relations board which included members drawn from the labor committee of the council plus one representative elected by each of the operating divisions. This total group met weekly and from its discussions, the labor committee presented plans and recommendations to the council which were then presented to the administration. There also developed at Central Utah a pattern of electing one or more members from each block to form committees concerned with special community problems. There are several examples of such groups including the committee of Japanese nationals, a committee of citizens, and a committee for the consideration of problems arising from center closing. Although these groups originally received their impetus outside the council, they eventually became a part of council organization.

Through the exercise of functions derived from the community-approved charters, through a trial and error learning process of the prerogatives of the council and those of the administration and the community, and through organization created in response to needs, the structure of community government remained an emerging and growing segment of relocation center organization. If there had been sufficient time, there would have evolved at all centers, as there did at Poston, two well-organized structures, the administration, and the community, related to each other through council, block managers, and an evacuee coordinating hierarchy representing both groups. Even at Poston, however, there was never created a community structure that was sufficiently strong to resist the enforcement of administrative policies. In part, this was because the community was itself divided on many issues, and in part because the survival of the relating structures depended upon compromise and adjustment, and the politicians who performed this function were unwilling to let issues destroy the position from which they could operate. If there had been established an evacuee organization representing all centers, operating on a national level with relations with other American groups, and able to bring and enforce pressures upon the national administration of the WRA, then the center councils might have been able to negotiate to better advantage the issues arising out of administrative decision. The next chapter is a discussion of the beginnings of the movement in this direction.