

Is There Any Cultural Difference
in Problem-Solving between Hirobumi Ito
and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.?

Kazunori Oshima

This paper poses the question whether there is any cultural difference in problem-solving between Hirobumi Ito and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.¹ It first looks at one of Ito's problems and how he solved it and then at one of Holmes's problems and how he dealt with it. It subsequently attempts to answer the question whether the difference in problem-solving between the two is cultural. Its principal conclusion is that there is some cultural difference in problem-solving between Ito and Holmes.

The Political Crisis of 1881

In December, 1879, the Emperor Meiji ordered each of his councilors to submit a memorandum on what kind of constitution Japan should adopt. The contents of the memorandums submitted by the councilors were various: from that of Kiyotaka Kuroda, almost negating the establishment of the diet, to that of Shigenobu Okuma, insisting on the opening of the diet within the following two years. Ito submitted his memorandum on December 14, 1880. The memorandum was written on the principle of gradual progress and it contained an expansion of the senate and the establishment of publicly elected inspectors of the national finance.²

Ito wrote on November 22, 1880, to Kowashi Inoue, Senior Cabinet Secretary, who prepared a draft of Ito's memorandum, as follows:³ "I wish to add to the two proposals of the senate and public inspectors a general statement that an Imperial letter will make it public that the time and the way in which the constitution will be drafted and a popularly elected diet will be established are dependent entirely upon an Imperial decision. I would like to let the public know the direction in which the nation should go."⁴ The following statement of Ito further confirms his basic idea of the constitution as expressed in the letter above.

If we want to expand the Imperial policy of 1875 and at the same time prevent the nation from making too rapid a change, the present subject prays that the Emperor will open his sincere mind and let the people know the basic policy of gradual progress. It is dependent solely upon the grace of the Emperor to share the great power of legislation with the people, not something for the people to discuss for themselves. It also relies solely upon the Emperor's judgment when the popularly elected diet will be opened, not something that the people can demand. Formerly the Emperor made it public that Japan should establish a constitutional government gradually. The time when this process is completed should be some years from now.⁵

This idea of Ito's is also observed in his address to the Privy councilors at the beginning of the deliberation of the draft of the constitution on June 18, 1888. He said that Japan needed some basis for modernization, that the basis of European civilizations was Christianity, and that in Japan only the Emperor system served the purpose of such a foundation.⁶

Okuma's memorandum, which was reluctantly submitted in March, 1881, on the condition that Prince Arisugawa, the Minister of the Left, would not show it to the other state ministers and councilors before submitting it to the Emperor, was quite different from Ito's in at least two important ways. The first was a request for the immediate establishment of the diet, suggesting that year for the promulgation of the constitution, the next year for the election of the diet members, and the beginning of 1883 for the establishment of the diet. The second difference was an insistence upon a government based on political parties.⁷ As to the timing of the establishment of the diet, Ito wrote on July 2, 1881, to Tomomi Iwakura, the Minister of the Right, saying "the results as outlined in Okuma's memorandum would not be easily achieved."⁸ Ito could not agree to a government based on political parties due to his belief in making the Imperial sovereignty the basis for modernization. In addition to these basic differences between Ito and Okuma, Ito raged against Okuma for his independent behavior in which Okuma clandestinely submitted his memorandum.

The problem Ito faced at that time, then, was how to prevent the establishment of a democratic constitution of the Anglo-Saxon type while pushing for a monarchistic one of the Prussian type. The current antigovernmental democratic movement was demanding a constitution which would enable Japan to establish a diet as soon as possible. Okuma stood for the democratic trend and also for the demand that the government stop the sale of government property in Hokkaido which was being sold at a discount to former public officials. The political situation caused by the sale of the property was quite serious as evidenced by Prime Minister Sanetomi Sanjyo's letter of August 29 to Iwakura, saying

that it was the most serious problem that he had ever experienced since the Meiji Restoration.⁹

Ito wrote a letter on July 1 to Sanjyo, in which he blamed the three ministers (Sanjyo, Prince Arisugawa, and Iwakura) for their lack of leadership and expressed his desire to resign from the office of the councilor. He then wrote a letter on July 2 to Iwakura, in which he again expressed his desire to resign because he could not serve in the government with Okuma.¹⁰ Both letters took on a strong political color, urging the state ministers to make public the principle of constitution. This is because Iwakura's letter of June 21, 1881, to Sanjyo and Prince Arisugawa reveals that Iwakura had advised them to consult with Ito regarding the establishment of an organ for constitutional investigation.¹¹ On the same day Iwakura asked for the advice of Inoue on the question of the constitution. The next day Inoue sent Iwakura a paper entitled "Opinion about the Constitutional Drafting," which appeared practically in the same form as Iwakura's statement of July 5 which was submitted to Sanjyo and Prince Arisugawa.¹² On June 28 Iwakura wrote Inoue, saying that on that day he had told Ito that the latter should be responsible for drafting the constitution.¹³ In spite of Ito's expressed desire to resign in his letters of July 1 and July 2, therefore, it may well be said that the fundamental principles of "The Constitution of the Empire of Japan" had already been established by Iwakura, Ito, and Inoue at that time.

Recollecting the crisis of 1881, Ito told Ichiro Tokutomi that it had been necessary for the councilors of Satsuma-Choshu factions to unite themselves so that they might stop Okuma from going along with the radical current of the times. They secretly gathered together at Takanawa and

made a firm resolution to overcome this critical situation by signing their names and affixing their seals.¹⁴ Iwakura's letter of September 5 to Sanjyo from Kyoto, where he was then under medical treatment, confirms the situation in which "it seems to me a matter for mutual congratulation that Saigo, Ito, and Yamagata have been making strenuous efforts."¹⁵

When Iwakura returned to Tokyo on October 6, the situation developed rapidly, and at the cabinet meeting on October 9 Okuma was dismissed from office, the Imperial edict proclaiming the establishment of the diet in 1890 was announced, and the discontinuance of the sale of government property was decided without any dissent. Okuma, who was accompanying the Emperor on a tour of inspection in the Hokkaido districts, was absent from this meeting.

Ito's letter of November 22, his memorandum of December 14, and other related documents make it sufficiently clear that the Imperial edict of October 12, 1881, was the realization of Ito's cherished opinion.¹⁶ To appeal to the Emperor for the final decision was Ito's secret plan.¹⁷ He believed that it was only the Emperor who could control the antigovernmental democratic movement which reached its climax from the end of 1880 to 1881.

In addition to the crisis of 1881, there were a great number of occasions in which Ito depended upon the Emperor for the solution of his problems. The following are some of the noted examples. An early instance was at the time when an argument broke out as to whether a mission was to be sent to Korea. On October 15, 1873, the opinion of Councilor Takamori Saigo in favor of sending the mission was adopted at the cabinet meeting. On the following day Ito visited Iwakura with

Okuma and learned about the cabinet decision. Ito suggested that "if the Prime Minister submitted his opinion to an Imperial decision, the Minister of the Right should do the same since he believed his opinion appropriate for the nation."¹⁸ When the councilors, led by Saigo, demanded Iwakura, acting as the Prime Minister for Sanjyo, to come to a conclusion about the problem, Ito urged Iwakura to submit the matter to an Imperial decision. Iwakura reported to the throne and the matter was decided against Saigo and his coterie by an Imperial proclamation.

Ito often broke a deadlock by using an Imperial edict when the government and the diet were opposed to each other. For example, when a budget bill of the second Ito Cabinet was voted down and a memorial of an impeachment motion of the government to the throne was passed by the House of Representatives at the fourth Imperial Diet, the Emperor gave an Imperial message to each minister, privy councilor, and the Presidents of the House of Representatives and of Peers on February 10, 1893. The content of the edict was that 300,000 yen was to be paid out of the Imperial Court appropriations annually for six years and that one tenth of the salaries of the government officials was to be contributed for the same length of time to be used for a supplement to the expenses of shipbuilding. The rescript changed the political situation.¹⁹

The House of Representatives approved a memorial of an impeachment of the government concerning the enforcement of official discipline to the throne on December 4, 1893. Ito as the Prime Minister and Shojiro Goto as the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce submitted their resignations to an Imperial decision. The Privy Council, consulted by the Emperor, reported to the throne, criticizing the rash memorial

of the House of Representatives. In response to the report, the Emperor gave each minister an Imperial message on December 26 that it was not necessary for Ito and Goto to resign and that Goto should make efforts to enforce official discipline at the ministry of Agriculture and Commerce.²⁰

There was opposition between the government and the House of Peers as well. A tax increase bill approved at the House of Representatives was voted down at a special committee of the House of Peers on February 25, 1901. The Emperor ordered the elder statesmen to mediate between the government and the House. Finding that their efforts failed, the Emperor gave the House of Peers an Imperial proclamation that it should be reconciled with the government, which changed the whole situation. The special committee approved the bill without any amendment on March 16, and the House of Peers unanimously carried the bill on the following day.²¹

Dependence naturally leads to interdependence. The biography of Ito is full of instances in which the Emperor sought counsel of Ito. Of course, those with whom Ito associated closely, including the state ministers, councilors from Choshu and Satsuma, and Kowashi Inoue, depended heavily upon Ito for help and guidance.

Abrams v. United States

We will now turn to consider Holmes's way of solving his problem in *Abrams v. United States*.²² In this case the defendants, who opposed the American expedition of troops to Siberia after the Russian revolution of 1917, distributed in the streets in New York the pamphlets entitled "The Hypocrisy of the United States and Her Allies," and

"Workers—Wake Up."²³ In these pamphlets the defendants said that President Wilson sent cowardly troops to crush the Russian revolution and urged the workers of the world to wake up and stop producing ammunitions which would be used to murder their friends in Russia. The seven justices of the United States Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the District Court: three years in prison to one defendant, fifteen years and a \$500 fine to another defendant, and twenty years (the maximum) and a \$1,000 fine on each count to the three other defendants. Holmes and Louis Brandeis dissented.

A point in dispute in the Supreme Court decision was whether the defendants had the intention of preventing the war of the United States with Germany. The majority opinion granted that the direct purpose of the defendants was to prevent injury to the Russian cause. However, it stated that "men must be held to have intended, and to be accountable for, the effects which their acts were likely to produce."²⁴ The dissenting opinion of Holmes, on the other hand, interpreted the term "intention" narrowly and said that it could not be argued that the defendants had the intention to prevent the war of the United States with Germany unless the direct purpose of the defendants was the prevention of the war.

The other point in dispute was whether the facts of the case established that the words used in the leaflets gave rise to any clear and present danger that the unlawful objectives would be realized. Dissenting from the majority opinion that the clear and present danger test, while accepted in theory, should not be applied in practice to check the result of interfering with the war effort, Holmes stated:

When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That, at any rate, is the theory of our Constitution. It is an experiment, as all life is an experiment. Every year if not every day we have to wager our salvation upon some prophecy based upon imperfect knowledge. While that experiment is part of our system I think that we should be eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe and believe to be fraught with death, unless they so imminently threaten immediate interference with the lawful and pressing purposes of the law that an immediate check is required to save the country.²⁵

The problem which Holmes faced in *Abrams v. United States* was whether or not he should state his belief against the expected majority opinion. Holmes wrote to Frederick Pollock on November 6, 1919, describing the situation as follows: "Today I am stirred about a case that I can't mention yet to which I have sent round a dissent that was prepared to be ready as soon as the opinion was circulated. I feel sure that the majority will very highly disapprove of my saying what I think, but as yet it seems to me my duty. No doubt I shall hear about it on Saturday at our conference and perhaps be persuaded to shut up; but I don't expect it."²⁶ Thus, Holmes solved his problem in *Abrams v. United States* not by depending upon others as Ito did, but by stating his independent belief in the freedom of speech guaranteed in the First Amendment.

The fact that Holmes's independent thought and action are his belief is revealed in his speech to the students of Harvard University. He said that "only when you have worked alone—when you have felt around you a black gulf of solitude more isolating than that which surrounds the dying man, and in hope and in despair have trusted to your own unshaken will—then only will you have achieved."²⁷

The following letter of Holmes of November 2, 1928, to John C. H. Wu, Chinese lawyer, is another example in which Holmes discloses the summing up of what he has learned in life. The written communication is Holmes's response to Wu's apparent request that Holmes help three Chinese lads visiting the United States. "I fall back on the thought that no one can direct the life of another man, at least if it is a life worth living. Each has to work out his own way and if it is a good one he probably will have to suffer a good deal in the process. If I were to sum up what I have learned I think I should say: faith in faith in effort (before you see the goal or can put articulately the question to be asked)."²⁸ Holmes's belief is that one cannot depend upon others for the direction of one's life but "each has to work out his own way." Independent effort on faith, then, would be his last words.²⁹ It will be of some interest to cite here for comparison the advice Ito gave to his son Monkichi immediately before his final departure for Manchuria. The advice was, "First of all, be loyal to the Emperor."³⁰

Now let us look at Holmes's letter of November 1, 1881, to President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University in the light of his problem-solving. It was written when he faced the alternative of whether he should accept a professorship of Harvard Law School or wait for a

judgeship.

Unless you take a different view I am not inclined to wait for contingencies the arising of which might not affect my determination. I am ready to accept a professorship in the Law School on the following terms if they are satisfactory as I believe from our conversations that they are.

1. I should prefer that the professorship should be entitled of Jurisprudence but the substance of the matter is not the title but the understanding thereby conveyed that I am expected to devote a reasonable proportion of my time to such investigations as are embodied in my book on the Common Law or other studies touching the history and philosophy of law. I do not mean by the above that I should not expect to teach any particular branches of the law like the other professors which would not meet either my wishes or views of expediency but only that what I have indicated be regarded as an important part of my functions so that I may feel that time spent in that way is spent in the line of my duty.

2. The salary as I understand would be that of the other law professors viz. \$4500, and I suppose would be the result of a special endowment. As the taking of this place will invoke a pecuniary sacrifice which so far as I can foresee the future would probably in the long run be considerable I think I should ask that as soon as any law professor's salary is raised mine should be. Without repeating I think what was understood with Prof. Thayer as to raising the salary to \$5000 should be understood with me. I have to be particular on the money question as I must live on my salary. The property which I have saved being no more than a minimum fund to meet emergencies.

3. If a judgeship should be offered me I should not wish to feel bound in honor not to consider it, although I do not know that I should take it and although my present acceptance will

diminish the chance of such an offer and is for that reason against the advice of many of my friends.

4. If this letter meets your views the high respect I feel for the present faculty of the school including their presiding officer as well as the personal regard which I entertain for them will make me look forward with eager anticipation to this new calling.³¹

Holmes has clearly stated the nature of his duty, salary, and reservation of the right to take a judgeship if it was offered. As to the reservation, in fact, Holmes accepted a judgeship at the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court eleven months after his appointment at Harvard Law School. At that time President Eliot was inclined to let people understand Holmes's giving up his professorship was not fair.³² There was also some resentful response to Holmes's appointment among his Harvard colleagues.³³ Yet the fact remained that Holmes in his above-quoted letter had warned President Eliot that he would "not wish to feel bound in honor not to consider it" if a judgeship should be offered to him after he had taken a teaching post at Harvard. This letter suggests that Holmes lives in a world which can be described as contract-oriented. The difference becomes even clearer when we compare this letter of Holmes with the letter of October 17, 1889, written by Ito to Kencho Suematsu, his son-in-law, at the critical time of a treaty revision. Speaking of his resignation from the office of the President of the Privy Council, Ito said, "I am determined to become a farmer when I have resigned, forgetting politics once for all."³⁴ Evidently, Holmes's is the kind of letter that no Japanese would ever write if he were placed in the position of Holmes.

The Difference in Problem-Solving

We have found that Ito consistently depended upon others for the solution of his problems while Holmes made an independent effort to deal with his problems. The question we have to ask ourselves now is whether the difference is not simply personal but cultural.

There is support for our thesis that this difference is cultural from the anthropologist Francis L. K. Hsu's comparative study of the cultures of the United States, India, China, and Japan. Hsu regards the *iemoto*, the secondary institution, as fundamental in Japan just as clan, caste, and club are in China, India, and the United States respectively.³⁵ The core structure of the *iemoto* is defined by Hsu "as a master-disciple (client) relationship marked by mutual dependence."³⁶ Mutual dependence in Japan means that each human being is not his own master. Regardless of his age, his actions and destiny are tied to his parents, ancestors, and descendants. If the *iemoto* is the most fundamental cultural institution in Japan, as we think it is, it can logically be said that mutual dependence is the most characteristic human relationship in the Japanese culture.

Japan's kinship system is marked by the dominant father-son dyad, the dominant attributes of which are authority and continuity.³⁷ Mutual dependence is a natural outcome in a culture where those attributes are dominant because a child is dependent upon his parent, while the latter in his old age becomes dependent on his child and successor, who is now mature. Thus interdependency continues in the Japanese family where the Japanese way of life is taught and propagated.

On the other hand, Americans are often characterized as individual-centered or self-reliant by Hsu.³⁸ He says, for example, "The American,

with individual-centered world and militant self-reliance, is conditioned to view his life's problems in terms of what he himself thinks and can do. The very definition of growing-up and manhood in his world means rejection of familial protection, and dependence is a totally undesirable state for all except married women and children."³⁹ Holmes's way of looking at his life's problems is highly compatible with this statement of Hsu's about the American culture.

In contrast with the father-son dominated kinship system of Japan, the kinship system of the United States is dominated by the husband-wife dyad. This dyad alters the parent-child relationship and makes it into a temporary arrangement to be replaced when the child grows into adulthood. It is because of the dominant attributes of discontinuity and volition over continuity and authority that independence of the child is encouraged in the United States.

There is further support for our thesis from the philosopher Charles Morris' study of values through the questionnaire method which is summarized in his book entitled *Varieties of Human Value*. It shows that the value pattern of the Japanese student is quite different from the American pattern. The factor analyses indicate that the Japanese students have a higher factor score on withdrawal and self-sufficiency than other groups and the lowest factor on enjoyment and progress in action.⁴⁰ In the American sample, on the other hand, enjoyment and progress in action has a slightly higher score than any other factor. Of the other factor scores, two of them, receptivity and sympathetic concern, and social restraint and self-control, are lower than in any other of the five major samples. The score on withdrawal and self-sufficiency is very low. The United States score is the highest on self-indulgence.⁴¹ In

the American students' suggestions "the relative number of entries in the category 'orientation to self' is somewhat stronger than in any other national group, while those in the category 'orientation to society' are somewhat weaker."⁴² A careful perusal of Morris' findings convinces us that they, too, show mutual dependence and independence to be most important ingredients, respectively, in the Japanese and American worlds.

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to relate the individual behaviors of Ito and Holmes with the Japanese and American cultures respectively in the light of the question posed at the beginning of this paper. The selection of one person from each culture is admittedly insufficient. It will be necessary to make a similar comparison with more sets of individuals. In spite of this limitation, however, we have found that there is a close human relationship depending upon others in the case of Ito and that there is an insistence upon the independent thought and action in the case of Holmes. Furthermore, we have found that the different types of thoughts and behaviors of Ito and Holmes in the face of their problems are not simply personal but that they are clearly related to cultural patterns of action. The different ways of life are formed in the family since the family is the basic school of all cultures. We have been supported by some studies in explaining that the dominant attributes in the Japanese family have contributed to the development of mutual dependence and that those in the American family have tended to encourage independence.

It is true that the American ideals of independence and freedom of

the individual as expressed in Holmes's writings have contributed to the building of a great nation. It is questionable, however, that the individual's detachment from intimate relationship with other human beings has contributed to the happiness of the person. The Japanese ideals of mutual dependence and harmony as evidenced in the writings of Ito, on the other hand, have helped Japan become rapidly industrialized. The task of the Japanese, however, is to preserve traditional close human relationships with other fellow men. We believe that this relationship with our fellow human beings is fundamental and that it is important for the happiness of the individual.

Notes

1. There is no further reason for the selection of these two individuals other than the fact that we have sufficient documents to enable us to compare the behaviors of Ito and Holmes.

2. *Iwakura ko jikki* (Record of Prince Iwakura) (Tokyo: Iwakura ko kyuseki hozonkai [The Society for the Preservation of Historic Sites for Prince Iwakura], 1927), III, 681-88.

3. Toshiaki Okubo, "Meiji juyonen no seihen," (The Political Change in the 14th Year of Meiji) in *Meiji seiken no kakuritsu katei* (The Establishment of the Meiji Government), ed. Meiji shiryo kenkyu renrakukai (The Society for the Study of Meiji Records) (Tokyo: Ochanomizu shobo, 1957), I, 60.

4. *Ibid.*, 60-61.

5. *Iwakura ko jikki*, III, 199-200.

6. Kentaro Kaneko, ed., *Ito Hirobumi den* (The Biography of Hirobumi Ito) (1943; rpt. Tokyo: Hara shobo, 1970), II, 614-16.

7. *Iwakura ko jikki*, III, 702-14.

8. *Ito Hirobumi den*, II, 207-08.

9. *Iwakura ko jikki*, III, 740.

10. *Ito Hirobumi den*, II, 206-08.

11. *Ibid.*, 204-05.

12. *Iwakura ko jikki*, III, 716-29.
13. "Meiji jyuuyonen no seihen," 74-75.
14. Iichiro Tokutomi, "Ito, Okuma, Yamagata," *Chuokoron* (Central Public Opinion), 52 (1937), 280.
15. *Iwakura ko jikki*, III, 742. Saigo means Tsugumichi Saigo and Yamagata stands for Aritomo Yamagata. The other councilors who helped Ito were Kaoru Inoue and Akiyoshi Yamada from Choshu and Munenori Terajima and Kiyotaka Kuroda from Satsuma.
16. *Ito Hirobumi den*, II, 217, 223; "Meiji jyuuyonen no seihen," 144.
17. *Ito Hirobumi den*, II, 200.
18. *Ito Hirobumi den*, I, 756.
19. *Ito Hirobumi den*, II, 871-903.
20. *Ibid.*, 924-38.
21. *Ito Hirobumi den*, III, 487-99.
22. *Abrams v. United States*, 250 U. S. 616 (1919). We have selected this case simply because it is Holmes's "classic dissent." Samuel J. Konefsky, *The Legacy of Holmes and Brandeis: A Study in the Influence of Ideas* (1956; rpt. New York: Da Capo Press, 1974), p. 204.
23. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Free Speech in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1948), pp. 109-11.
24. "Abrams v. United States," in *Cases Argued and Decided in the Supreme Court of the United States* (New York: The Lawyers Co-operative Publishing Co., 1919), 63 (1918-19), 1176.
25. *Ibid.*, 1180
26. Mark DeWolfe Howe, ed., *Holmes-Pollock Letters: The Correspondence of Mr. Justice Holmes and Sir Frederick Pollock, 1874-1932* (1961; Ann Arbor, Mich.: Xerox Univ. Microfilms, 1975), II, 29.
27. Mark DeWolfe Howe, comp., *The Occasional Speeches of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes* (1962; Ann Arbor, Mich.: Xerox Univ. Microfilms, 1975), pp. 30-31.
28. Harry C. Shriver, ed., *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: His Book Notices and Uncollected Letters and Papers* (1936; rpt. New York: Da Capo Press, 1973), pp. 200-01.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 175.
30. *Ito Hirobumi den*, III, 858.

31. Mark DeWolfe Howe, *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes: The Proving Years 1870-1882* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1963), pp. 260-61.
32. *Holmes-Pollock Letters*, I, 57.
33. *Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1963), pp. 265-68.
34. *Ito Hirobumi den*, II, 696.
35. Francis L. K. Hsu, *Clan, Caste, and Club* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1963), pp. 1-11.
36. Francis L. K. Hsu, *Iemoto: The Heart of Japan* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975), p. 151.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 96.
38. Francis L. K. Hsu, *Americans and Chinese* (1953; rpt. New York: Doubleday Natural History Press, 1970), p. 10, p. 64, p. 68, pp. 70-71, and p. 98. *Clan, Caste, and Club* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1963), vii, p. 1; p. 10 and pp. 255-56. *Iemoto* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975), p. 144.
39. *Clan, Caste, and Club* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1963), p. 7.
40. Charles Morris, *Varieties of Human Value* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1956), p. 56.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 46.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 47.