

6-9-2016

"Yes, No, Maybe": Loyalty and Betrayal Reconsidered: The Tule Lake Pilgrimage

Ella-Kari Loftfield

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hist_etds

Recommended Citation

Loftfield, Ella-Kari. "'Yes, No, Maybe': Loyalty and Betrayal Reconsidered: The Tule Lake Pilgrimage." (2016).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hist_etds/47

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in History ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Ella-Kari Loftfield

Candidate

History

Department

This thesis is approved, and it is acceptable in quality
and form for publication:

Approved by the Thesis Committee:

Professor Melissa Bokovoy, Chairperson

Professor Jason Scott Smith

Professor Barbara Reyes

“YES, NO, MAYBE—”
LOYALTY AND BETRAYAL RECONSIDERED:
THE TULE LAKE PILGRIMAGE

By

Ella-Kari Loftfield

B.A., Social Anthropology, Haverford College, 1985

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
History

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May, 2016

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my father, Robert Loftfield whose enthusiasm for learning and scholarship knew no bounds.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of many people. Thanks to Peter Reed who has been by my side and kept me well fed during the entire experience. Thanks to the Japanese American National Museum for inviting me to participate in curriculum writing that lit a fire in my belly. Thanks to Martha Fenstermacher and the Teaching American History grant that paid for a good portion of this degree. Thanks to Lore Loftfield DeBower who was not my first but my most devoted editor and proofreader. Thanks to all of the staff at the UNM Department of History who filled in paperwork I had overlooked and helped me manage missed deadlines. But most of all, thanks to Professor Melissa Bokovoy who introduced me to an entirely new field of research, the field of commemorative studies. Her support and encouragement, and the occasional huevos rancheros at The Frontier always came at just the right time.

“YES, NO, MAYBE—”
LOYALTY AND BETRAYAL RECONSIDERED:
THE TULE LAKE PILGRIMAGE

By

ELLA-KARI LOFTFIELD

B.A., Social Anthropology, Haverford College, 1985

ABSTRACT

This project aims to explain how the contemporary Tule Lake Committee commemorates and honors the Japanese Americans who found themselves incarcerated at the Tule Lake Segregation Center in northern California after “failing” the loyalty questionnaire administered to them by the War Relocation Authority during World War II. The Tule Lake Committee holds biennial pilgrimages which have become increasingly popular in the last decade. A “thick description” of the 2010 pilgrimage and an analysis of the pilgrimage themes shows how the Tule Lake Committee honors the experience of Japanese Americans whose history was written out of the collective memory in the post war years. This reinsertion of dissent into the collective memory of the wartime experience of Japanese Americans by the Tule Lake Committee highlights the importance of analyzing history from all perspectives.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
A Clarification of Terms	3
An Acknowledgement of the Sources and the Use of Names	6
The Disclosure	10
Social Memory Studies	15
The Memorialization of the Japanese American World War II Experience	22
Chapter 1 – A History of Injustice: Discrimination, Internment, Loyalty, Segregation, Draft, Renunciation	30
Early Immigration and a History of Racism against the Japanese.....	32
Response to the Attack on Pearl Harbor	35
Detention Shifts Power within the Community	37
The Loyalty Questionnaire	41
Segregation, Draft, and Renunciation	47
Chapter 2 – Establishing a Narrative of Patriotism and Resiliency	54
The JACL and the Postwar Narrative: Organizational Carriers of Memory	56
Governmental Collusion	63
Silence Dominates Individual Lives	64
Other Narratives Fade	66
Summary	72
Chapter 3 – Challenging the Historic Narrative as Incomplete	77
Civil Rights Era: Empowerment and Identity	78
Nisei Lobby for Legislative Changes	79

Students Seek Identity and Solidarity	82
Historians Revisit the Narrative.....	87
Two Nisei Women Draw Attention to the Story	89
Farewell to Manzanar	89
Years of infamy: The untold story of America’s concentration camps	90
The Impact on the Narrative	92
Redress Era: Activists Force the Government to Reconsider the History	94
Activists Call for Redress	95
The Commission, Their Charge, Their Process	99
The Government Dramatically Alters the Official History	100
Other aspects of the narrative remain	104
Significance of the commission and the report.....	106
Impact on the Narrative	107
Chapter 4 – Experiencing the Narrative at Tule Lake.....	115
The Sources for the Historic Tule Lake Pilgrimage	117
Richard Katsuda.....	118
Stan Shikuma	119
Sachiko Takita	120
Early Pilgrimages Stir an Awakening.....	121
Early Tule Lake Committee Promotes Education and Activism	124
The Tule Lake Committee and the Pilgrimage in Transition	135
Some Lasting Changes from a Decade of Transition	140

Conclusion	142
Chapter 5 – Protecting and Preserving a Unique Site of Segregation	148
Memorialization Debate Continues	149
The Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism Controversy	149
The Narrative Continues to Broaden	153
Counter definitions of patriotism	153
An apology from the JACL.....	154
Grants promote deeper understanding	155
The perfect storm	156
The Tule Lake Committee Reorganized	156
Satsuki Ina.....	158
Hiroshi Shimizu	160
Barbara Takei.....	162
Impact of the New Leadership.....	164
Relationship between the Tule Lake Committee and the National Park Service	166
The Committee Organizes Pilgrimages Around Increasingly Controversial Themes	171
Chapter 6 – Loyalty and Betrayal Reconsidered at Tule Lake: Conclusion.....	171
The Contemporary Pilgrimage.....	173
Day 1: The Bus Ride.....	174
Day 1: Arrival, Registration, and Dinner	181
Day 1: The Formal Welcome.....	182
Day 2: Visiting the Tule Lake Segregation Center Site.....	185

Day 2: Lunch at the Fairgrounds and a Memorial Service	187
Day 2: Reflections Group	189
Day 3: Intergenerational Discussion Groups	200
Day 3: Afternoon Sessions.....	202
Day 3: Performance	203
Day 4: Bus Ride Back.....	203
Conclusion: The Impact of the Contemporary Pilgrimage	204

Introduction

Almost every American knows that Japan bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 and that as a result, the United States entered World War II. Many people know that within months President Roosevelt had issued Executive Order 9066 which created an exclusion zone on the west coast. This exclusion zone, in turn, necessitated the removal of over 100,000 Americans of Japanese descent to the interior of the United States where the U.S. government housed them in “relocation camps.” Some Americans know that during the war a significant number of Japanese American men fought heroically in a segregated unit within the U.S. Army. For most Americans, this is the extent of their understanding of what happened to Japanese Americans within the United States during World War II.

But even that basic outline raises questions. How does a population go from being forced to leave their west coast homes as potential spies to decorated war heroes? Why are those the only aspects of the story that most Americans know? What happened in between those events and as a result of those events?

What only a few Americans know is that in order to qualify to enter the army, potential soldiers of Japanese descent had to pass a loyalty questionnaire. Even fewer know that this same loyalty questionnaire was then used to segregate the people who “failed” it from the rest of the incarcerated Japanese American population. Those who failed the questionnaire were moved to the War Relocation Authority camp in northern California called Tule Lake. Almost no one knows that over four times as many Japanese American citizens renounced their United States citizenship while held in these relocation camps then voluntarily enlisted in the army.¹

The story of the Japanese American wartime incarceration is complex and deeply buried: few Americans know the extent to which the government violated the civil liberties of its citizens let alone understand the terrible ruptures that occurred within the Japanese American community as a result of those policies. In 1978, a group of Japanese Americans seeking to understand, commemorate, and share this complex story began organizing pilgrimages to Tule Lake: they called themselves the Tule Lake Committee. This thesis seeks to show how commemorations by this fluid group have changed over time and how the contemporary pilgrimage reconsiders traditional interpretations of loyalty and betrayal.

The first chapter of this thesis begins with a brief, yet necessary and inclusive, summary of historic anti-Japanese sentiment in the United States and details the policies that characterized mass incarceration during the war. Chapter 2 analyzes how the predominant narrative of patriotic compliance, service and resiliency was established despite the incompleteness of the narrative. Chapter 3 considers how the civil rights movement led the Japanese American community to political activism on behalf of others and ultimately to call for redress and reparations for their own community. Chapter 4 analyzes the historic Tule Lake Committee and pilgrimage in relationship to the larger movement. Chapter 5 examines the continuing debate within the Japanese American community over memorialization of the wartime experience and illustrates how the reorganization of the Tule Lake Committee has influenced the way that these events are memorialized at Tule Lake. Finally, Chapter 6 provides a description of a contemporary pilgrimage and seeks to demonstrate how the Tule Lake Committee uses the pilgrimage to honor those in the Japanese American community who suffered both at the hands of the government and later through the postwar erasure of their experience. The pilgrimage today directly confronts stories of segregation,

renunciation, and postwar alienation and the Committee has, through their work with the National Park System assured that this inclusive narrative will survive the test of time, at least in this location.

This thesis chronicles how the members of the Tule Lake Committee of the 1970s helped resurrect the story of the mass-incarceration of Japanese Americans. In the 1980s, the Committee used the pilgrimage to demand the government insert the wartime incarceration into official memory and pay reparations. During the 1990s, pilgrimage organizers restructured the pilgrimage format and sought to create a place of healing and challenge the idea of ubiquitous resiliency.

Since the millennium, however, as a result of both personal and archival research, the current members of the Tule Lake Committee have a deeper understanding than ever before of the significance of Tule Lake. Those incarcerated in Tule Lake not only experienced greater trauma during the war than most Japanese Americans but have, within the Japanese American community, lived with the stigma of Tule Lake their entire lives. The present-day committee has deliberately created a space, a time, and place where they privilege the story of those most marginalized by the narrative of wartime patriotism and postwar resiliency. At Tule Lake stories of resistance are told, commemorated and honored.

A Clarification of Terms

Any work about the wartime experience of Japanese Americans will require a guide to some of the language being used. To begin with there are some basic words in Japanese that bear defining.

- *Issei*: first generation Japanese American, born in Japan, living in the US, and, under discriminatory naturalization laws, unable to become U.S. citizens

- *Nisei*: second generation, born in the US to Issei parents, U.S. citizens due to having been born on U.S. soil
- *Sansei*: third generation, born to Nisei parents, also U.S. citizens
- *Kibei*: Nisei who returned to Japan for some or all of their education, though citizens, often bilingual and culturally more Japanese than other Nisei
- *Nikkei*: all Japanese immigrants and their descendants

Though these words are of Japanese origin, they will not be italicized in the paper as they are widely used in English language documentation of the Japanese American experience.²

The Japanese terms used to designate different generations and experiences of Japanese Americans are relatively simple in comparison to other terms that need clarification. Scholars writing about the World War II experience of Japanese Americans must take a position as to the most appropriate terminology to describe what happened to Japanese Americans during the war. Were Japanese Americans “evacuated” or “forcibly removed?” Were they “assembled” or “detained?” Were they “interned” or “incarcerated?” Did they live in “camps” or “prisons?” These words clearly conjure completely disparate experiences. So the terminology matters. The terms used by the United States government were intentionally euphemistic from the outset of the program.³

The facilities in which the vast majority of Japanese Americans were confined during the war were technically *concentration camps*. A concentration camp is “a barb-wire enclosure where people are interned or incarcerated under armed guard” where no distinction is made between citizen and alien.⁴ Most authors who avoid this term say they do so in deference to the experience of the Jews during the Holocaust.⁵ Of course, *concentration camp*, in that context, is itself a euphemism for a *death camp*.

In addition to being the most legally accurate term, there are a number of other good reasons to use the term *concentration camp*. An *internment camp* is, by law, a camp that houses citizens of foreign countries. The Department of Justice and War Department ran a number of such camps during the war where Issei were legally detained as well as some German and Italian nationals. The distinction of how one can deal legally with a foreign national versus a citizen is partially what led the government to enact a law whereby Japanese American citizens, living within the United States, could renounce their citizenship, so this is an important distinction to make. The euphemistic terms disguise the violation of Japanese American citizens' rights and the illegality of government policy.

The terms also work to downplay the devastating effects that the loss of property, personal freedom, and individual rights had on the imprisoned population as well as the anxiety and uncertainty with which the incarcerated population faced each day of their imprisonment. This minimization of the trauma renders the story of dissent and resistance among Japanese Americans to be a self-indulgent overreaction rather than a courageous resistance to an egregious government policy. In other words, the very nature of the euphemistic terms silences the stories of dissent by rendering dissent an unreasonable response to the circumstances in which Japanese Americans found themselves.

This thesis will use terms like *detainee*, *prisoner*, *detention*, and *confinement*, rather than euphemistic words like *evacuee*, *internee*, and *relocation*. This is in keeping with current practices that began with Dr. Roger Daniels, an early advocate for new terminology in the publication of his book *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* (1971).⁶ In addition, *Densho*, a free on-line encyclopedia edited by Brian Niiya and launched in 2012 whose mission includes, "...providing concise, accurate, and balanced

information on many aspects of the Japanese American story during World War II,” endorses avoiding “overtly euphemistic terms.”⁷ This encyclopedia includes articles by the most prominent scholars of the wartime incarceration period which are “... linked to relevant primary and secondary materials from the *Densho* archive and from other websites that include still and moving images, documents, databases, and oral history interview excerpts as well as standard bibliographical sources.”⁸

As seen throughout the thesis, the terminology used to address the wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans reflects U.S. government attempts to justify incarceration by describing the camps during the war with deceptively benevolent language. Academic investigations of the 1970s, the success of the redress and reparations movement of the 1980s, and the commemoration of the experience over the last 70 years have challenged this language with varying degrees of success. The language used to describe the Japanese American experience is not incidental or accidental but intrinsically connected to the establishment of one narrative over another.

One final note on spelling is necessary. The segregation center at the heart of this thesis is the Tule Lake Segregation Center. However, a nearby town is also called Tulelake but is spelled as a single word as is the nearby Tulelake Civilian Conservation Corps Camp.

An Acknowledgement of the Sources and the Use of Names

In the spring semester of 2010, I had the pleasure of taking a graduate seminar at the University of New Mexico called “Gender, War, and Memory” with Professor Melissa Bokovoy. My final project in that class concerned an analysis of the building of the Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism in Washington, D.C. on federal land donated by Congress. The manner in which the Japanese American wartime experience was commemorated had

been of growing interest to me since I was recruited to write curriculum about the World War II era Santa Fe Department of Justice Camp for the Japanese American National Museum.

My interest had always lain, however, with the Japanese Americans who seemed to get the least attention: those who had been deemed “troublemakers” and “disloyal.” I loved the idea of analyzing a memorial for my master’s thesis and discovered that there was a pilgrimage that summer to the Tule Lake War Relocation Authority camp where those deemed “disloyal” had been segregated. I studied the website and emailed the man who was coordinating the pilgrimage bus from Seattle. I let him know a little about my connections to the topic and the reason that I wanted to make the pilgrimage with his group. Stan Shikuma responded almost right away. Pilgrimage registration had already closed but he would contact the rest of the board on my behalf and see first, if there was room for me, and secondly, if the board approved of my participation as a participant-observer of the pilgrimage.

Within the week, Shikuma let me know that I was free to register for the pilgrimage and that the board had approved my participation. Much of the analysis of the modern pilgrimage comes from my participation on this 2010 pilgrimage. In descriptions of this pilgrimage, I use the complete names of pilgrim organizers with whom I have had subsequent interviews and formal IRB agreements. If material is publicly available about participants in this or other pilgrimages, I use the full names of those participants. For observations made at other 2010 pilgrimage events when participants are freely interacting with one another say for example on the bus trip, or the conversations in the cafeteria, I have used only first names to delineate participants and those first names are pseudonyms. I have deliberately chosen Japanese names for pilgrims whose names were Japanese and English

names for pilgrims whose names were English. In some cases, pilgrims had designated Anglicized versions of their Japanese names and in these cases, I made an effort to provide an appropriately ambiguous name. Despite the public nature of the pilgrimage, participants often undergo deeply personal responses to being there. Any discussion of events that took place at other pilgrimages are either the result of interviews or published pilgrimage materials.

In 2012, I conducted formal interviews with about a dozen people, both pilgrimage organizers and pilgrimage participants. All but one of these individuals approved of the use of their names in my work. One additional pilgrim asked that I get his approval for the use of any direct quotes from his interview. In the process of completing the written work, the division between participant and organizer became clearer and clearer. When I mention the work of the organizers, whose mission is open and public, I use their full names. When I write about the experiences of individual pilgrims, I use only first names and they are pseudonyms.

In 2013, I was asked to present a youth oriented workshop at the Japanese American National Museum conference in Seattle, Washington. Many of the Tule Lake Committee members with whom I had made the pilgrimage in 2010, and subsequently interviewed were also presenting at the conference. I attended some of their formal presentations about the progress of the pilgrimage and had an opportunity to learn from the National Park Service about development plans for the site while at this conference.

I am also indebted to the on-line encyclopedia regarding all aspects of Japanese American culture and history, *Densho*. This encyclopedia, funded both by federal and state grants, continues to grow in both breadth and depth. Any topic regarding the experience of

Japanese Americans can be accessed through a simple search and each entry contains links to other related entries as well as bibliographic information. Many of the articles are written by scholars who have reworked their larger writings into manageable website passages. For example, the passage regarding the Tule Lake Segregation Center is written by Barbara Takei, one of the pilgrimage organizers.

The most difficult material to collect, however, related to the historic pilgrimages to Tule Lake. Stan Shikuma had helped organize every pilgrimage since 1979 and his knowledge of the broader aspects of the pilgrimage was invaluable. Then in talking to one of the primary leaders of the pilgrimage, I learned that Sachiko Takita a UCLA doctoral student from Japan had completed her dissertation about the Tule Lake Pilgrimage in 2007. Her dissertation, *The Tule Lake Pilgrimage and Japanese American Internment: Collective Memory, Solidarity, and Division in an Ethnic Community* earned her a Ph.D. in sociology. Not only was she a “participant observer” in the pilgrimages that took place from 1993 to 2006, she conducted extensive interviews with past and current Committee members and had access to all the Committee meeting minutes that have been kept over the years. After the completion of her degree, she returned to Japan but has, from time to time, attended subsequent pilgrimages to Tule Lake often serving as an interpreter for monolingual attendees from Japan.⁹

Takita’s conclusion is that campaigns for redress in the 1980s encouraged a single unified story of internment to focus on what she calls the “redemption of ‘injustice’” and that the resulting culture of commemoration of internment as injustice becomes the national memory of the United States and its wartime mistakes.¹⁰ This view is shared by other scholars like Alice Yang Murray who has written extensively on the redress process. Takita

suggests that in contrast to this earlier unification of the story during the period of redress, it was the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 that galvanized the Japanese American community to deliberately change the manner in which the wartime experiences of those incarcerated at Tule Lake would be commemorated and memorialized during the biennial pilgrimage to the site. She argues that the attacks resulted in a broadening and deepening of the story told at the Tule Lake Pilgrimages.

Although Takita attended the 2006 pilgrimage, the 2004 pilgrimage is the last that she analyzes in her dissertation. She believes that the 9/11 attacks serve as a turning point in the pilgrimage which culminates in the 2004 pilgrimage. In fact, the first post 9/11 pilgrimage is of limited success. I believe that other events, largely within the Japanese American community itself, galvanized pilgrimage organizers leading to a dramatic and noticeable shift in the tone and tenor of the pilgrimage from 2004 onward.

The Disclosure

The curriculum consultant looked over each of his shoulders, leaned in, and whispered, “Oh, my parents were Kibei – I’m sure they were No-Nos.”

This brief encounter occurred in summer 2005 when I was writing middle school curriculum for the Japanese American National Museum regarding the United States’ Department of Justice (DOJ) internment camp in Santa Fe. More than 5,000 Japanese American men were incarcerated there during World War II.* The DOJ camps around the country, with the exception of the Crystal City, Texas camp, housed only men, most of whom were community leaders from Hawaii and the West Coast. It was run by the

* The War Relocation Authority (WRA) camps to which West Coast families of Japanese descent were sent and with which more Americans are familiar, were under civilian control within the Department of the Interior.

Immigration and Naturalization Service. Legally, the DOJ camps could only house resident aliens.¹¹ Most of the men sent to the camp were 40 years old or older during their period of imprisonment. The average age was 52 in the 1940s.¹² This made it difficult to collect first-hand accounts to use in the curriculum. To hear that this man's father had been incarcerated in the Santa Fe camp was thrilling as well as startling.

The consultant, a teacher and facilitator for the museum's curriculum project, and I had worked together during two successive summers, yet he mentioned this fact only after our last session, during our farewell luncheon. He went on to explain that his father had been sent to the Santa Fe camp but the two of them had never spoken about that experience. My colleague had never asked his father about the Santa Fe camp and, now, with the death of his father, it was too late. Though his mother was still living, he acknowledged that he would probably never ask her about it either. At this moment, I indelicately asked a question that, I now know, is rarely if ever asked in Japanese American society: "How did your parents respond to the loyalty questionnaire?" Ironically, we were having lunch in the Japanese American National Museum, an institution dedicated to memorializing the Japanese American experience; and surrounded by well-intentioned educators whom the museum had recruited to write curriculum to teach about those experiences to school-age children across the country. Yet, this man had lowered his voice, checked around him, and leaned toward me to say, "Oh, my parents were Kibei. I'm sure they were no-nos." This single whispered sentence spoke volumes not only about the complexity of the experience of Japanese Americans during World War II, but, in particular, about the forces at work that have shaped how that experience is remembered, memorialized, and conveyed to successive generations.

From his demeanor, I concluded that this consultant was concerned that he might be revealing too much. He had disclosed that his parents were Kibei, which means that despite having been born in the United States and being U.S. citizens, they had returned to Japan for their education, which made them culturally more Japanese than other second-generation Japanese Americans (Nisei). He believed they had probably been deemed “disloyal” by the U.S. government because of their answers to the loyalty questionnaire, a document which the government required all imprisoned Japanese Americans over the age of 17 to fill in and submit to camp administrators starting in early 1943.¹³ But he disclosed more than that fact. His quiet and cautious admission revealed a little known aspect of Japanese American internment. The story of those who answered anything other than an unqualified “yes” to the loyalty questionnaire had been silenced. The story of people like his father had been so thoroughly buried that even this man, a Stanford graduate, respected community activist, redress movement leader, had been unable to learn much about the men and women who made that choice, and he felt obliged to whisper about his parents’ response on the questionnaire more than sixty years after the questionnaire was administered.

In my research for the curriculum module, I learned that the youngest men to serve time in the DOJ camp in Santa Fe were part of a large group of men deemed “trouble-makers” who were transferred to the Santa Fe camp from the Tule Lake War Relocation Authority (WRA) Camp.¹⁴ During World War II, the U.S. government had set up a network of 10 camps to detain and intern ethnic Japanese of the western United States. This included all permanent residents of Japanese descent, both foreign-born Issei, who, denied the right to become naturalized citizens, were all aliens, and their U.S.-born children, the Nisei, who were citizens.¹⁵ Tule Lake was one such WRA camp but in 1943, the War Relocation

Authority transformed this “relocation camp” into a center for those who had been labeled “disloyal” and renamed it the Tule Lake Segregation Center.¹⁶

In response to a desire on the part of some Japanese Americans to serve in the military, the War Department decided to use a questionnaire designed by the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI) to determine eligibility. The ONI believed the questionnaire could establish a Japanese American’s loyalty to the United States.¹⁷ The answers to the 28 questions determined which internees were “loyal” enough to leave camp either to enlist in the army or fill migrant labor jobs. It became known in the camps as the loyalty questionnaire. The internees who as a result of their responses to the questionnaire were deemed to be “disloyal,” were then transferred to and imprisoned at the Tule Lake Segregation Center. Usually their families accompanied them.¹⁸ Chapter 1 covers the specific nature of the questionnaire and its capricious implementation.

Many Americans know little about the experience of Japanese Americans during the war, and even those who do are unlikely to understand the subsequent stigma attached to wartime residency at Tule Lake. I had stumbled upon the camp accidentally working on the curriculum for the Santa Fe camp. The most important primary source that I planned to use with my students was a memoir from a woman whose husband, despite his U.S. citizenship, was among the “troublemakers” transferred from Tule Lake to Santa Fe. It was a heartbreaking oral history of Violet de Cristoforo whose husband had been incarcerated in Santa Fe and whose entire family had ultimately been expatriated to Japan after the war.

De Cristoforo (née Kazue Yamane) and her family had been incarcerated in Arkansas but were segregated to Tule Lake after refusing to answer the questionnaire. She recalls that at the request of her husband, Shigeru Matsuda, she simply wrote at the bottom of the

document that she sought expatriation to Japan. Once transferred to the newly configured segregation camp at Tule Lake and observing camp life, Matsuda and many others noted that some of the WRA employees appeared to be stealing supplies designated for the internees. In addition to trying to physically stop the smuggling, they argued that the democratically elected leaders of those incarcerated in the segregation center ought to be able to meet with camp officials to discuss their concerns. Her memoir implied that these acts of protest were enough to earn a large number of these “troublemakers” a transfer to the camp in Santa Fe.¹⁹

On reflection, I realized that this type of story was missing from most of the sources I had collected from both the public library and museums. This questionnaire, its history, segregation camps, and protests, are conspicuously absent from the narrative accounts of the Japanese American experience.

What forces had silenced the story of “disloyalty,” “resistance,” and “dissent” and caused the consultant, almost 70 years after-the-fact, to only reluctantly share his parents’ story? What caused the individual, familial, and communal silence? I was even more perplexed when several years later I reconnected with my summertime colleague when he was passing through my hometown, Albuquerque. Over pie, in a local restaurant, removed from Los Angeles and the museum, my colleague comfortably discussed his family history, even explaining that he thought he had the reputation of being a “radical” within the Japanese American community. Why was the story safe to share over pie in Albuquerque but not in the Japanese American National Museum in Los Angeles? I realize now that the Japanese American community has battled over how, where, and when the Japanese American World War II experience is to be remembered and commemorated from even before the war ended.

This educator didn't feel that the museum was the place to discuss his family's story: the museum itself acted as censor.[†]

I had no answers, only questions, and a profound understanding that there was far more to the story than most of our curriculum work revealed. I wondered if this was how all historical narratives are constructed. Does one story, embraced and privileged, become the predominant narrative, and, in turn, that narrative silences others? How do dominant narratives emerge? Who or what privileges one narrative over another? I had so many questions that I decided to return to school to pursue a graduate degree in history. I learned that scholars spend lifetimes challenging the dominant narratives by digging deeper, changing lenses, establishing new frameworks and seeking out new sources. The work historians do that challenges the dominant narratives, however, rarely seems to reach the public. Historians may write history but their professional efforts often bump up against "memory." It suddenly made sense. Most Americans have not heard of the loyalty questionnaire because the Japanese American community, or a significant portion of it, chose to embrace a narrative that emphasized patriotism and loyalty. Stories of dissent, resistance to authority, and defiance would hinder their full acceptance in society as the citizens they were and possibly justify the wartime incarceration. Therefore, these stories were left untold.

Social Memory Studies

How do communities, and the individuals in those communities, guide and shape memory? Many theorists have tackled that question. In 1980, an English translation of

[†] I learned later that the museum was initially funded by Nissei veterans from World War II. At the time I wrote my curriculum unit the timeline featured on the museum website did not even mention the loyalty questionnaire, I had to rework the timeline for use in my unit because I planned to emphasize the questionnaire and segregation.

Maurice Halbwachs' *The Collective Memory* was published; social scientists have added to and argued over the groundbreaking book ever since, building upon and contesting Halbwachs' theories on memory production in the decades following its publication. At the core of the work is the now widely accepted premise that "...a remembrance is in very large measure a reconstruction of the past achieved with data borrowed from the present..."²⁰ In other words, because of the influence that the present has on an individual's capacity to remember, memory is an unreliable and inaccurate guide to history or historical fact. In addition, Halbwachs detailed how an individual memory is distorted when it becomes subsumed in the larger collective memory of a group. Not all memories endure: some are privileged, others are buried or never disclosed, and some may even be forgotten.

Halbwachs identified the process through which some memories are given greater significance than others. Remembering is dictated by both the social group in which the person participated when the event happened and the social group in which the memory is preserved through the recounting of the event. Since memory occurs primarily through dialogue and performance within social groups, the most durable memories are those which are held in "harmony" by the most people, the memories that are talked about and shared. In this way, individual or even communal memories, which contradict the more accepted narrative, become submerged or silenced. Memory, therefore, becomes a question of social power.²¹ Taken to the extreme, some social scientists reject the notion that individual memories have any value, arguing that the cultural context of memories is so strong that individual memory is insignificant.²²

Halbwachs posits that individuals carry both their own memories and those of the larger group. He distinguishes between a memory that a person has experienced which he

calls “autobiographical memory” and a memory which is not based upon personal experience but which he calls “historical memory.” Because the term “historical memory” may be associated with “formal history,” Halbwachs calls the memories that individuals attain through social interactions “collective memory.” Social scientists engaged in memory work have argued over exactly what this term means for years.²³

Scholars in different fields interpret and build on Halbwachs in diverse ways. For historians, Halbwachs provided a model of historical investigation that has enjoyed a boom in recent decades. Halbwachs acknowledged that commemorations, because they are self-conscious acts of assigning meaning and significance, are the sites where social groups deliberately privilege one set of memories over another. Halbwachs himself conducted research into the pilgrimage sites of the Holy Land. In his book *La Topographie*, he showed how these sites interacted with and changed the oral tradition. With this work, Halbwachs became a historian despite himself, and generated a new field of historical inquiry, the field of commemorative studies in which historians are fully aware of the “manipulative aspect of commemoration.”²⁴ Few dispute that social groups influence and shape individual memory, but social scientists disagree over what forces impact memory production, what actors exercise what kinds of agency in the production of memory, and what value individual memories have for researchers. For oral historian Anna Green, accepting that there are many forces at work shaping memory is only a first step in the investigation, “...the interesting issue is not that individuals draw upon contemporary cultural discourses to make sense of their lives, but *which* ones and *why*.”²⁵

The first and earliest studies of commemorations focused on the role of the state in dictating memorial forms. Often, these memorials were designed to produce a unified

national identity. Eric Hobsbawm's and Terence Ranger's *The Invention of Tradition* is an example of this type of research. In Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, the author, for example, interprets the tombs of Unknown Soldiers to be sites where the government evokes the sacrifice required of citizens but also persuades citizens to die for their country.²⁶

Social historians contested the ability of the state to control the narrative completely and shifted the paradigm. John Bodnar was one of the first to challenge the concept that the state is able to produce "official history" without interference. As a historian of "ordinary people," he challenged the idea of an entirely state-centered approach to memory studies. In his 1992 book, *Remaking America*, he explains how "official" and "vernacular" memories intersect to form what he calls "public memory." "Official memory" is a product of cultural leaders and authorities who need to mythologize the state's rule and maintain the loyalty of its citizens. "Vernacular memory" represents the need of individuals and the communities in which they live to explain events and incidents that directly impact them. "Public memory" is where official and vernacular memories intersect. The Vietnam War Memorial, he contends, illustrates perfectly how vernacular memory interacted with official memory to produce a site of public memory.²⁷ Bodnar asserts that public commemoration "involves a struggle for supremacy between advocates of various political ideas and sentiments."²⁸

Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, worked throughout the 1990s to determine and explain how collective memory is produced and they place an even greater emphasis on what Bodnar would call the "vernacular." In the commemorative process, they established their own terms and directly challenged historians who overemphasize the state's role in the production of memory. Their 1999 book, *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, includes a chapter called "Setting the Framework," in which Winter, building upon the work

of anthropologists, identifies groups of what they call “secondary elites” who often challenge the state driven narrative. “The state is ever-present, but it is neither ubiquitous nor omnipotent.”²⁹ Winter argues that the agency that these groups of secondary elites exercise is the primary driver in what he terms “collective remembrance” which is “...the outcome of agency, as the product of individuals and groups who come together, not at the behest of the state or any of its subsidiary organizations, but because they have to speak out.”³⁰ Their motivations for speaking out may vary. Winter and Sivan assert, “They act in order to struggle with grief, to fill in the silence, to offer something symbolically to the dead, for political reasons.”³¹ But the public nature of the acts is paramount because “Whoever expresses his memories in the public space leaves a deeper impact than those who keep (or who are kept) silent.”³² For Winter and Sivan, social agency determines both that which is remembered and that which is forgotten.

The Popular Memory Group based in Birmingham adds to the discussion through an examination of how individual memories are formed. It stresses the need for individuals to “compose” a past that is socially acceptable. Cultural scripts define the acceptability of the story. Public media, under the influence of civil society, the state, and popular images, help write those scripts. Once the scripts are composed, individuals may lose the capacity to separate their “private memories” from the pervasive “public representations.”³³

The question remains; how do communities, and the individuals in those communities, guide and shape memory? Halbwachs establishes that it is not individuals alone who shepherd and shape it. Those who espouse a state-centered approach, like Hobsbawm and Ranger, believe that the building of a national unified narrative by governmental bodies is the driving force in the production of memory. The social-agency

framework, epitomized by the work of Bodnar and Winter, emphasizes the capacity of *secondary elites* to produce a public or vernacular narrative through interaction with the state driven narrative. In popular-memory theory, the media help establish the cultural scripts that are going to be followed as individuals recount their life-stories.

Henry Rousseau, in his book *The Vichy Syndrome*, recognizes all of these actors. Rousseau argues that there are *official carriers* of memory that are generally organized by national or local governments, *organizational carriers* of memory who work in groups to promote an often static image of the past, and *cultural carriers* of memory that tend to give voice to individualistic views of the past though these messages tend to be more implicit than explicit. Rousseau adds that *scholarly carriers* of memory also impact the narrative in particular if the work influences textbooks or curriculum development. In all cases, Rousseau notes, the carriers (or vectors) of memory participate in an interactive process. Carriers of memory both propose and reflect "...a given state of the national memory and a particular representation of the event."³⁴

When these paradigms are articulated side-by-side, it is clear that separating agency in this way is not only fruitless, but obfuscating. Clearly, the state, social groups, and the media all influence memory and these forces do not work in isolation from each other. T. G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper draw this conclusion in their work, *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (2000). The three authors convincingly argue that the agents of memory production rarely remain in neat compartments but continuously interact with and intersect each other. The authors also suggest that a fourth agent of memory production, *transnational* forces, must be considered as well.³⁵ In his 2003 article, "Entangled Memories: Versions of the Past in Germany and Japan, 1945-2001," Sebastian

Conrad, argues that the United States has influenced Japan's World War II narrative to exclude years of aggressive military and cultural imperialism; instead, Japan's narrative history of the war begins, as does the United States' narrative, with the bombing of Pearl Harbor.³⁶ Ashplant argues that nation-states are not the only transnational forces shaping memory. Other groups, such as non-governmental organizations can influence the narrative especially regarding issues of civil or human rights. They conclude that the three separate paradigms outlined above need to be applied simultaneously while also considering transnational influences.³⁷

For oral historians like Anna Green, this framework, though inclusive, undervalues the individual's ability to contest the dominant narrative. Her 2004 article seeks to return the individual to the center of memory production. She worries that when Halbwachs' theory is taken to the extreme, the conclusion is that all stories of dissent and protest would gradually fade from memory, but this is not her experience. She acknowledges that the act of remembering has cultural, social and psychological components; human beings do remember what others remember, remember socially acceptable pasts, and remember in ways that serve as self-protection. But Green worries that the conflation of collective memory and individual memory has left no space for the conscious and reflective individual to "contest" the predominant narrative. Her experience as an oral historian leads her to the question, "Can individual memories challenge dominant narratives?" Her answer is an emphatic "yes!"³⁸

Who and what then shapes the "collective memories" people hold? The answer as to how communities and individuals shape and shepherd memory is long and complex; the state, peer groups, social power, social setting, the media, academics, and individuals are all factors that interact across time and space to affect collective memory.

Because academics have played such an important role in challenging the narrative of the wartime experience of Japanese Americans, Rousseau's terminology is best suited to this thesis. I will use the terms *official carriers* of memory to describe the role of the government in shaping the narrative. *Organizational carriers* of memory is the term I will use to represent those groups who Winter describes as "secondary elites." *Cultural carriers* of memory include, among others, filmmakers and authors, and *scholarly carriers* of memory are the myriad academics who have contributed so much to the story of Japanese American history. As Green acknowledges, individuals have an important role in the shaping of and challenging of the narrative. I will call those people, *individual carriers* of memory.

The Memorialization of the Japanese American World War II Experience

In particular, who has shaped the "collective memory" regarding the Japanese American World War II experience? In the collective remembrance of the confinement of Japanese Americans during World War II all of the forces, state, communal, individual, and scholarly, have played a role. Politicians had good reasons, both transnational and domestic, to brush the entire episode of the mass incarceration under the rug. Civic groups, using already existing popular war-time cultural scripts of heroic patriotism, told a marketable story that would help ease Japanese Americans back into American society, though the story was far from complete.

In an effort to fight for civil rights for the entire Japanese American community, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), led by Japanese American veterans of the war, took control of the Japanese American wartime narrative. The forced removal, the loss of property, the incarceration of tens of thousands is barely mentioned in the post war years while the military heroism of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, a segregated Nisei

battalion, is celebrated in White House ceremonies and movie theaters around the country. Simultaneously, the loyalty questionnaire, the draft, draft resistance, and renunciation of citizenship are simply ignored. This careful omission of the events leading up to the formation of the battalion creates the impression that the 442nd was an all-volunteer group. As Japanese Americans rebuilt their lives and homes, there was no time or space to mourn lost property, broken families, disrupted lives or lost opportunities.³⁹

In the 1960s, as third generation Japanese Americans (Sansei) came of age, some asked about the “camps” to which their parents made only a few vague references. Asian American students in Los Angeles and the Bay Area, empowered by both the Civil Rights Movement and the Third World Strike of the 1960s, and in search of a cultural heritage and cause, organized pilgrimages to California War Relocation Authority (WRA) Camps both at Tule Lake and Manzanar. These students demanded a more inclusive curriculum be taught at their universities. Academic activism mirrored student activism; scholars wrote “revisionist” histories questioning the necessity of government policy and the abuse of power. A few Nisei began to share their experiences and dig into the history as well.⁴⁰

Other Nisei, fearing the incarceration of civil rights activists, drew on their experience and memories to prevent the government from detaining the civil rights champions of the 1960s under the same pretense used to incarcerate Japanese American citizens during the war. Effective political advocacy for civil rights leaders necessitated the reintroduction of the history of the wartime imprisonment of Japanese Americans into the public sphere.⁴¹ The reclaimed familial stories by the Nisei featured tales of the round-ups, forced removals, surrendering of property, and incarceration. At the same time, Sansei were seeking not only the story of incarceration but also stories of resistance to imprisonment. However, the

silence was so deep, that many believed there had been no resistance at all. The compliance and acquiescence of their parents and grandparents dismayed the generation of 1968. Some argue that the student movement peaked in 1968 but that was not the case for Asian American students in California. Many of the student activists energized in the late 60s remained active as they moved into graduate work and grass roots organizations in the communities where they attended college. Many remained active through the 1970s and into the 1980s as well.

Ultimately, successful activism led to calls for monetary redress for those incarcerated during the war. The JACL, the most conservative of the groups calling for redress, agreed to petition the U.S. Congress to establish a commission to investigate the government's wartime policies. In 1980, under intense pressure, the U.S. government created the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) to examine the wartime policy and its effects, determine culpability, and make recommendations regarding reparations. The hearings that accompanied this government investigation provided an opportunity for individuals to testify in cities across the United States.⁴²

The CWRIC published an extensive report summarizing and analyzing over 700 testimonials and thousands of hours of research. President Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 (H.R. 442) into law on August 10, 1988. The law awarded monetary compensation to victims of the confinement policy, and established the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (CLPEF).⁴³ The CLPEF intended to distribute \$50 million in grants for projects related to the incarceration of Japanese Americans during the war. Funding was slated for curriculum and media projects, landmark restoration, community development,

research, and national fellowships. By 1994, when funds were finally appropriated, intense lobbying had whittled the funding to only \$5 million. Ultimately the CLPEF oversaw the distribution of a total of \$5 million in grants between April 1996 and the close of the program in November, 1998,⁴⁴ a mere ten percent of the expected expenditure.

Yet, despite a full Congressional inquiry, a lengthy report, robust academic literature, the clamoring of activists, and the distribution of educational funds, the story of Japanese American resistance to their wartime incarceration is still often discussed by Japanese Americans themselves in hushed tones as is the loyalty questionnaire. The opportunity to reclaim that story through the men and women who lived the experience, who filled in the questionnaire, is slipping away. A sense of urgency prevails today as the Japanese Americans who as young adults were directly impacted by the relocation policies are aging and dying. With the help of filmmakers, artists, authors, museum directors and pilgrimage organizers, some of the men and women who lived the experience are challenging the stories that emerged in the 1940s and 1950s of unparalleled compliance, loyalty and resiliency; they are giving voice to a story of resistance, dissent, and trauma where and when it feels safe to do so.

Tule Lake is an obvious site to “remember” and commemorate these experiences. Tule Lake Segregation Center, the only camp designated to house all those deemed disloyal, is the most logical place for the Japanese American community to contest the narrative of patriotic compliance, service, and resiliency. Since 1978, Tule Lake Committee members, based in and around the California Bay Area have organized and conducted pilgrimages to the camp site. Over the years, pilgrimage organizers have had diverse reasons to encourage others to visit Tule Lake and pilgrims have equally diverse reasons to attend: among other

reasons, they come to mourn, to end the silence, to honor the dead, and to further political agendas.⁴⁵

Benjamin Franklin said, “A man who tells half the truth often tells a great lie.”

Challenging the dominant narrative, based on just such a half truth, is hard work; changing it permanently is even harder. What narrative regarding Japanese American Internment will be passed to the next generation and the one after that is anybody’s guess, but the Tule Lake Committee, through their frequent pilgrimages, publications, and activism, and the National Park System, in their work with the Committee, are hoping to make it an inclusive narrative that acknowledges the trauma experienced by tens of thousands of people, honors diverse expressions of patriotism, and allows for the healing of a fractured community.

¹ Barbara Takei. "Tule Lake," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Tule%20Lake/> (accessed Dec 7 2015).

² Densho Encyclopedia contributors, "Nisei," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Nisei/> (accessed Jul 6 2015).

³ Greg Robinson, "War Relocation Authority," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/War%20Relocation%20Authority/> (accessed Jul 8 2015).

⁴ Tetsudan Kashima, *Judgment without Trial: Japanese American Imprisonment during World War II* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 8.

⁵ Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008), 105.

⁶ Roger Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 6.

⁷ Densho Encyclopedia contributors, “Do Words matter? Euphamistic Terminology,” *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/terminology/> (accessed Jul 6 2015).

⁸ Densho Encyclopedia contributors, “About the Encyclopedia,” *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/about/#tosprivacy> (accessed Jul 6 2015).

⁹ *Tule Lake Pilgrimage 2012: Understanding No-No and Renunciation*, Pilgrimage Program.

¹⁰ Sachiko Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage and Japanese American Internment: Collective Memory, Solidarity, and Division in an Ethnic Community" (PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 2007), 33.

¹¹ Kashima, *Judgment without Trial*, 8.

¹² Richard Melzer, "Casualties of Caution and Fear: Life in Santa Fe's Japanese Internment Camp, 1942-46," in *Essays in Twentieth Century New Mexico*, ed. Judith Boyce DeMark (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1994), 224.

¹³ Cherstin Lyon, "Loyalty questionnaire," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Loyalty%20questionnaire/> (accessed Jul 11 2015).

¹⁴ Melzer, "Casualties of Caution and Fear," 224.

¹⁵ Robinson, "War Relocation Authority," *Densho* (accessed Jul 8 2015).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Lyon, "Loyalty questionnaire," *Densho* (accessed Jul 11 2015).

¹⁸ Robinson, "War Relocation Authority," *Densho* (accessed Jul 8 2015).

¹⁹ Violet DeCristoforo, "Tule Lake," in *And Justice for All: An Oral History of the Japanese American Detention Camps*. ed. John Tateisha (New York: Random House, 1984), 125.

²⁰ Maurice Halbwachs, "Historical Memory and Collective Memory" in *The Collective Memory* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), 69.

²¹ Patrick H. Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory* (Burlington: University of Vermont, 1993), 79.

²² Anna Green, "Individual Remembering and 'Collective Memory': Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates," *Oral History* 32.2 (2004): 35-44.

²³ Key examples of the debate can be found in Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, "Setting the Framework" in *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); T.G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper, "Framing the Issues" in *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (London: Routledge, 2000).

-
- ²⁴ Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory*, 80.
- ²⁵ Green, "Individual Remembering," 42.
- ²⁶ Ashplant. "Framing the Issues," 8.
- ²⁷ Bodnar, *Remaking America*, 14.
- ²⁸ Ibid, 13.
- ²⁹ Winter, "Setting the Framework," 30.
- ³⁰ Ibid., 9.
- ³¹ Ibid., 18.
- ³² Ibid., 28.
- ³³ T.G. Ashplant et al "Framing the Issues," 13.
- ³⁴ Henry Rousseau, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991) 219-221.
- ³⁵ Ashplant, "Framing the Issues," 53.
- ³⁶ Ibid.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 54.
- ³⁸ Green, "Individual Remembering," 41.
- ³⁹ Cherstin Lyon. "Japanese American Citizens League," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20American%20Citizens%20League/> (accessed Dec 7 2015).
- ⁴⁰ Martha Nakagawa. "Camp pilgrimages," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Camp%20pilgrimages/> (accessed Dec 7 2015).
- ⁴¹ Masumi Izumi. "Repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 ("Emergency Detention Act")," *Densho Encyclopedia* [http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20\(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22)/) (accessed Dec 7 2015).
- ⁴² Alice Yang. "Redress movement," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Redress%20movement/> (accessed Dec 7 2015).

⁴³ Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, *Personal Justice Denied* (Wash., D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), 18.

⁴⁴ Sharon Yamato. "Civil Liberties Public Education Fund," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Civil%20Liberties%20Public%20Education%20Fund/> (accessed Jul 8 2015).

⁴⁵ Winters and Sivan, "Setting the Framework," 18.

Chapter 1 – A History of Injustice:

Discrimination, Internment, Loyalty, Segregation, Draft, Renunciation

The bus ride to Tule Lake
in the night over dark highways...
was a movement back in time
back to the years 1943, 44, and 45
when I was 19, 20, and 21...
Tule Lake, Tule Lake—that
was a name I dared not mention
spoken warily, always with
hesitation, never voluntarily.
But you have made it
a common name again
of a small sleepy town
that it was
before we came here
before we were confined here
before it became *Tule Lake*
Relocation Center
before it became *Tule Lake*
Segregation Center
for *disloyal* Japanese Americans. (1975)

—Excerpt from “A Meeting at Tule Lake” by Hiroshi Kashiwagi ¹ (emphasis added)

In these opening lines from his poem “A Meeting at Tule Lake,” the poet and playwright Hiroshi Kashiwagi describes an early pilgrimage to the place where he and his family were confined during World War II. * Kashiwagi wrote this poem during the night on

* Hiroshi Kashiwagi wrote the poem, “A Meeting at Tule Lake” during a 1975 student led pilgrimage to the site. In 1942, Kashiwagi graduated from high school in Loomis, California and was sent with his mother and his siblings to WRA Camp at Tule Lake. His father, who had tuberculosis, was never well enough to join the family there. As the oldest, Kashiwagi, age 19, became the de facto head of household. As a group, the family refused to complete the loyalty questionnaire the U.S. government distributed. Kashiwagi ultimately renounced his U.S. citizenship which he regained only after a twenty year legal challenge. He testified at the 1981 [Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians](#) hearings. He has written essays, plays, and poems about his wartime incarceration experiences. His dedication

a bus trip to the Tule Lake Segregation Center site in 1975. He had been asked to participate in the student led pilgrimage back to the camp where he had been incarcerated as a college-aged man himself. Without hesitation, he identifies and names the unique nature of the Tule Lake Camp: it is a “segregation center” that housed “disloyal Japanese Americans.” A young man from Loomis, California, at the time the war started, Kashiwagi’s poem takes the reader not just “back in time” to the war, but across the postwar years when he “dared not mention” the name Tule Lake. In these few lines, he identifies an aspect of the War Relocation Camps often overlooked in the literature – the unique role that Tule Lake played as the only segregation center for “disloyal” Japanese Americans. Kashiwagi acknowledges the shadow that the name “Tule Lake” has cast within the Japanese American community ever since. The poet suggests that the pilgrimage may have the power to neutralize a phrase once spoken with such hesitation and wariness. To grasp the power the phrase “Tule Lake” has to silence a Japanese American incarcerated there during the war requires an understanding of the long history of racism and exclusion endured by Japanese Americans in the United States.

Any discussion of the confinement of Japanese Americans and the diversity of responses to it necessitates a movement even further “back in time” to identify the deep roots of discrimination endured by Asian Americans in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The modern reader can only understand the choices Japanese Americans made, either to obey or resist government policy, within the appropriate historical context. In addition, the long history of discrimination (and the hope to ameliorate some American prejudice) influenced

to the Tule Lake Pilgrimage has earned him the unofficial title of “Poet Laureate of Tule Lake.”

the manner in which this period would be commemorated and memorialized in the postwar years by the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), the state, and the media.

The Japanese American community understood very well the depth of racism which it faced in the United States and this understanding impacted both the response to their forced removal and how that removal was remembered and commemorated. In the 1980s, the federal government acknowledged the role of racism in the wartime detention of Japanese Americans as legalized by President Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066. An official government investigation conducted by the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) regarding the mass removal and detention of Japanese Americans concluded:

The promulgation of Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and the decisions which followed from it – detention, ending detention, and ending exclusion – were not driven by analysis of military conditions. The broad historical causes which shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership.²

This story of remembrance and omission begins with the “race prejudice” that contributed ultimately to the confinement of more than 100,000 Japanese Americans.

Early Immigration and a History of Racism against the Japanese

Japanese immigration to the United States began after Admiral Perry forced Japan to open up to trade with the United States in the 1850s. Early Japanese immigrants flooded into Hawaii where they worked as agricultural laborers. Immigration to the west coast of the United States (predominantly to California) began in earnest in the 1880s and 1890s.³

This first generation of Japanese immigrants, known as the Issei, was born in Japan. Federal law, sustained by a 1922 Supreme Court ruling, *Ozawa v. United States*, prohibited this group from obtaining citizenship in the United States, on the basis of race.⁴ Both the

U.S. Congress and those in the Nativist Movement hoped to exploit this labor force to build the West and then return these laborers to their native countries. This desire played out both nationally and regionally.

The majority of Issei who came to the mainland settled in California, Oregon and Washington. In these states white civic leaders legislated against the assimilation of both Japanese and Chinese immigrants. In 1906, following the earthquake, the San Francisco city council passed rules requiring that ethnic Japanese attend the already segregated Chinese schools. The outraged Japanese government protested to President Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt, desperate to salvage his plan for the Pacific trade empire he hoped to establish once the Panama Canal opened, intervened. Embarrassed internationally by this ruling, and angered that a city government could single handedly jeopardize his foreign policy goals, Roosevelt negotiated a “Gentlemen’s Agreement” that allowed the Japanese government to “save face” by curtailing the *emigration* of Japanese men to the United States in lieu of the United States banning *immigration* of Japanese men.⁵ The Japanese government agreed to limit the number of men granted permission to leave Japan so long as the U.S. did not impose official limits on the entry of Japanese men to the United States. Under this agreement, Japanese women were permitted, if engaged to be married, to immigrate to the United States. This “picture bride” era of Japanese immigration lasted from 1908 until the Immigration Act of 1924 became law. This act, among other things, banned all immigration from Asia to the United States.⁶

State legislatures were making life difficult for Asian immigrants even before the federal immigration ban was passed. In 1913, California (followed by Washington State) outlawed land ownership by non-citizens. These laws specifically targeted Asian immigrants

since they were the only immigrants unable to become citizens. Asian immigrants easily circumvented these laws by placing land in trust of second-generation citizen children. Anti-Japanese coalitions on the West Coast, in an effort to close this loophole, went so far as to lobby, unsuccessfully, to amend the Constitution to deprive children born in the United States of their natural citizenship right unless both parents were “race eligible” for citizenship.⁷

Japanese immigrants understood their peculiar and tenuous position as non-citizens. Issei and Nisei alike worked to achieve acceptance and strengthen their standing on the U.S. mainland. For example, Issei discouraged the Japanese government from granting automatic Japanese citizenship to their American born children in hopes of eliminating the charge that their children, due to their dual nationality, had any allegiance to Japan. These men and women viewed automatic Japanese citizenship as a burden not an advantage.⁸

In response to the dramatic rise in Nativism associated with the First World War, six older Nisei (having already earned college educations) formed the American Loyalty League in 1918. This organization stressed loyalty and encouraged Japanese American assimilation at the close of World War I. Despite the efforts of the organization, the Immigration Act of 1924 legislated the complete exclusion of Asian immigrants from the United States. The American Loyalty League held a national convention in 1930 at which time it rechristened itself the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL). As the name stressed, members had to be American citizens and this citizenship distinguished them from their immigrant parents.⁹ The JACL invented the “I Am an American” holiday prior to Pearl Harbor and direct U.S. involvement in World War II.¹⁰

Not only were Japanese Americans assimilating, the Japanese American population was never a terribly large or imposing presence anyway. The 1940 census recorded almost 127,000 Japanese Americans living in the continental United States; of those, about 63% were citizens by birth, the remaining 37% were, because of discriminatory naturalization laws unable to attain citizenship because they were born in Japan. In addition, almost 158,000 Japanese Americans lived in the territory of Hawaii and just over 250 lived in the territory of Alaska. Outside of Hawaii, California had the highest concentration of ethnic Japanese but at their peak, Japanese accounted for 2.1% of the entire population of California. By 1940, in fact, that percentage had slipped to only 1.6% of the population in California and very few were eligible to vote: either they were non-citizens or had not reached voting age.¹¹ In other words, Japanese Americans were not, proportionally speaking, a significant percent of any mainland state's population.

Because most were either ineligible for citizenship or too young to vote, they had almost no political power. Aware of the prevalent racism and their lack of political power, many college aged Nisei worked deliberately to assimilate and prove their loyalty. However, neither their low numbers, nor the years the Nisei spent distinguishing themselves from their non-citizen parents mattered after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor.

Response to the Attack on Pearl Harbor

Japanese Americans, especially those on the West Coast of the continent, faced racism in their daily lives. The fears that this racism might be institutionalized even further were realized immediately after Japan bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941; within hours of the bombing, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) picked up more than 700 men, born in Japan but living, working, and raising families in Hawaii. These Issei, by

nature of being non-citizens, could legally be detained without charges being brought. Within days, the FBI had incarcerated over 2,000 men as "enemy aliens."¹²

The United States government also targeted leaders in the Japanese American communities on the West Coast for arrest. The FBI arrested political, civic and religious leaders, for example, newspapermen, and Japanese language instructors. The FBI also arrested judo club members, believing that these clubs were military in nature. The military rationale given for these detentions was that Japanese Americans would constitute a "fifth column" and divulge military secrets to the Japanese.¹³

Given the history of anti-Japanese sentiment on the West Coast and the early success of Japan in the war, there was strong public sentiment, fanned by the nativist California press to create a military zone on the west coast from which Japanese Americans would be prohibited from living. Initially, authorities considered simply telling Japanese Americans they had to leave the coast. Officials would designate a military zone from which all Japanese Americans would be excluded but the government would not dictate where Japanese Americans lived outside of that zone. Western state governors assumed most would stay as close to their former homes as possible and this made them anxious. "Exclusion" from the coast did not itself necessitate incarceration in camps but western states, with the exception of Colorado, refused to accept the displaced population, so the policy of the relocation of Japanese Americans was dropped in favor of a policy of "confinement." Nothing was done at the national level to reassure the public that the ethnic Japanese posed no threat to the country and so the growing calls by both the media and civic groups for their forced removal went virtually unchallenged.¹⁴

Two months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, on February 19, 1942, President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066. The order authorized the military to create an exclusion zone within which no ethnic Japanese or Japanese Americans could reside. This zone encompassed thousands of Japanese American families in California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona regardless of their citizenship. Japanese Americans who resided outside of the exclusion zone were not impacted by this executive order, and in fact, for a time, families within the exclusion zone could voluntarily move into the interior United States rather than face government relocation and internment.¹⁵

Japanese Americans in the continental United States but outside the exclusion zone were not impacted. In Hawaii, the site of the Pearl Harbor attacks of December 7, no such measures were taken. The 158,000 Japanese Americans in Hawaii constituted over 30 percent of the population of the islands and were an integral part of the economy so internment was never considered as an option in Hawaii. Though individuals were picked up on a case by case basis, there was no wide-scale detention; instead the government imposed martial law to control the population soon after the declaration of war and all Japanese Americans in the National Guard of Hawaii were discharged.¹⁶

Detention Shifts Power within the Community

Ultimately, approximately 110,000 Japanese Americans, foreign born first-generation Issei, second-generation citizen Nisei or third-generation Sansei, sold or abandoned almost all they owned and moved under duress, first to “assembly” centers and then to concentration camps run by the War Relocation Authority (WRA), a civilian organization developed in response to Franklin Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066 establishing an exclusion zone on the west coast. Japanese Americans sent to the WRA facilities were surprised that the

government made no distinction between the Issei (non-citizen, thereby “alien”) generation and their U.S. citizen children, the Nisei. The U.S. government blurred the constitutionally illegal treatment of citizens by referring to the Nisei as “non-alien” rather than as “citizens.”¹⁷ The indiscriminate nature of this systematic removal and detention was debilitating and frightening. One Japanese American activist, whose Kibei parents were sent to the Manzanar War Relocation Authority camp before being transferred to Tule Lake Segregation Center, remembers his mother telling him that she and his father had no way of knowing what to expect as they were loaded onto trains with the black-out curtains drawn. As far as she knew, they were being taken to the desert to be shot.¹⁸

Detention in the camps shifted the balance of power within the Japanese American community from the Issei to the Nisei; this diminution of the Japanese tradition of honoring and respecting age was the first of many cultural affronts precipitated by detention. Understanding the more tenuous nature of their position as “aliens” many Issei prematurely relinquished “...their power and status to the younger generation.”¹⁹ After all, their sons and daughters were culturally more American than they were and had a better command of English as well as a public school education. Since the government arrested many Issei in the months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, many households were already being headed by women or oldest sons. The traditional heads of households, the Issei who were held in Department of Justice camps run by the INS communicated with their families via censored letters, and many of them spent much of their time trying to reunite the family by wading through a maze of government red tape. Reunification options included a combination of repatriation and expatriation of the whole family to Japan, relocation of the family to the DOJ

camp in Crystal City, Texas which was equipped to house families, or the release of the Issei father to the War Relocation Camp where his family was being held.²⁰

The final shift of generational control was orchestrated by the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL). This organization positioned itself to become the official spokesman for the detained community, even though its own membership policies discriminated against a substantial portion of this community, the Issei. Almost immediately after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the JACL took a proactive or offensive position. Leaders of the group wrote to President Roosevelt touting their patriotism, refused any contributions from Issei, created a “Committee on Intelligence” through their Anti-Axis Committee, and established a liaison with the FBI.²¹ At this time of national crisis, Japanese American leaders could either counsel resistance to government policy or acceptance of it. As Roger Daniels points out in his seminal 1971 book, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II*, neither position was risk free.²² The JACL threw their full support behind acquiescence with government policy.

The JACL chose acceptance of government policy and cooperation with government agencies in the hope that this cooperation would lead ultimately to acceptance of Japanese Americans as full members of society with all the rights of a citizen after the war.²³ The JACL, hoping to serve as the spokesman of the besieged community, exaggerated their membership numbers to “impress” the government and gain legitimacy. Leaders of the group reported a membership of 20,000 when, in fact, they had only 7500 members at the beginning of the war.²⁴

The United States government willingly embraced JACL claims to represent the Japanese American community. In February and March of 1942, the U.S. government held

eight days of hearings in four West Coast cities. Representative John Tolan of Oakland, California chaired what became known as the “Tolan Committee Hearings.” During the hearings, James Omura, a Japanese American journalist who had voluntarily relocated to Denver prior to the evacuation order and removal, tried to convince the Committee that the JACL did not represent the community. Omura was the only Japanese American called on to testify who was not a member of the JACL. Whether purposefully or unwittingly, the Tolan Committee had legitimized the JACL’s claim to represent the Japanese American community.²⁵

The JACL position that cooperation was a means through which the community could prove its loyalty aligned well with government detention policy; the JACL and the WRA had a symbiotic relationship despite the eroding wartime membership of the JACL. By the end of the war, only 1700 retained their membership in the organization, down from 7500 at the start of the war, a good indication that much of the Japanese American community did not value JACL’s wartime activities and leadership.²⁶ At the Heart Mountain WRA camp in Wyoming, for example, an alternate citizens group unsuccessfully tried to force its local JACL to step aside.²⁷ In several communities there was outright physical conflict between the JACL members and others in the Japanese American community. One of the most significant instances of violence within the camps occurred in the Manzanar camp on December 6, 1942 when reputed JACL informers who worked closely with camp officials were attacked by other inmates. Ultimately 16 camp “agitators” were moved to isolation centers after the incident and 65 JACL “informers” were placed in protective custody.²⁸

During the war, the JACL worked doggedly with officials both inside and outside of the WRA to influence policy and, as a result, had a privileged position within the detention

centers. Not only had a generational shift occurred with the transference of power from the Issei to the Nisei, but the JACL worked to consolidate that transfer of power into their own hands. They were often the first to arrive at various detention sites and organize them which often meant they had secured the best jobs before others moved into the sites. When other Japanese Americans challenged the authority of the JACL within the detention centers, the JACL leaders often received special treatment from WRA officials. They negotiated the terms under which Nissei would be accepted into the military.²⁹ As Halbwachs suggests, memory is a function of social power exercised both at the time of the event and at the time of remembering. The JACL's consolidation of power would influence not only how events unfolded during the war, but how those events would be remembered and commemorated after the war.

The Loyalty Questionnaire

One of the JACL's main goals was dispensation for Japanese Americans to serve in the armed forces. The creation of an all Nikkei military unit, however, required proof of the loyalty of a group of men that the government had already detained due, ostensibly, to their questionable loyalty. Military service required proof of loyalty. After the December 7, 1941 bombing of Pearl Harbor, mainland military commanders had the option of either discharging any Japanese Americans soldiers under their command or stripping them of their guns and assigning them to menial tasks.³⁰ In the spring of 1942, draft-age Nisei despite their citizenship lost their I-A service eligibility and were re-classified as IV-C (aliens ineligible for the draft).³¹ The JACL launched a campaign to restore the right of Japanese Americans to serve in the military. This would be the best way to prove loyalty beyond a doubt and ease the reintegration of ethnic Japanese into American society after the war.

Many government officials agreed and so, less than a year after issuing Executive Order 9066, President Roosevelt promoted the creation of a racially segregated military unit of Japanese Americans and then called on Japanese American men to *volunteer* for the Armed Forces.³²

The government, however, had a problem. Having confined over 100,000 Japanese Americans on the premise of “military necessity,” volunteers could hardly be inducted without proving their loyalty. So, in conjunction with the lifting of the military ban, the U.S. War Department instituted the use of a questionnaire to be completed by all male internees over the age of 17 in order to determine their loyalty and thereby their eligibility to fight for the United States.

The War Department understood the inherent unfairness of releasing only detainees able to serve in the military and the department was anxious to avoid accusations of using Japanese American men as “cannon fodder.” So a broader application of the questionnaire seemed appropriate. The War Relocation Authority, feeling pressure to reduce operating expenses, took the opportunity to administer an almost identical questionnaire designated as the “Leave Clearance” application to all internees over the age of 17. The hope was that by administering the questionnaire *carte blanche* it could expedite the release of workers from the detention centers. There was a previous policy of releasing prisoners from the WRA camps if they signed contracts to work in areas outside the exclusion zone, especially in the agricultural sector for which no questionnaire was required. By October, 1942, 10,000 Japanese Americans had left camp for seasonal work in the agricultural sector.³³

Whatever the government’s intent, though, the questionnaires caused great confusion and division within the incarcerated communities either due to wording or administrative

posturing.³⁴ The springtime process of getting everyone in the camps over the age of 17 to fill in a questionnaire became known as “registration” and the questionnaire itself was known informally as the “loyalty questionnaire.”³⁵

Camp by camp comparisons of responses to the questionnaire show dramatically different results: where camp administrators were trusted, and where concerns regarding the questionnaire were treated respectfully, internees tended to view the questionnaire as a legitimate way to secure their leave from camp. In detention centers where the administrators were not trusted, and where the prisoners were strong-armed into answering the questionnaire, the formal questionnaire appeared to be one more way in which the government could ensnare an already anxious population. Some even feared that affirmative answers on the questionnaire would result in an immediate release from camp into areas where they were not only unwelcome but unable to make a living and potentially even in physical danger. In all cases, the poorly written questionnaire was given to internees on very short notice and those answering the questionnaire had no clear explanation of how the responses would be used.³⁶

Historians have concluded that of the ten WRA Camps, the administration at the Tule Lake Camp did the worst job of presenting and explaining the questionnaire. This failure left the already disenfranchised internees worried. Some thought that the questionnaire was one more trick. The most insecure feared it might result in their immediate expulsion from the detention center and back into a hostile country without the means to support themselves.³⁷ Initially prisoners in Tule Lake were told that those seeking repatriation or expatriation to Japan did not need to register. Within the week, leaders in the community had collected hundreds of questions that the inmates had regarding the questionnaire and submitted them to

the authorities. When the questions went unanswered, a petition was circulated among the detainees to boycott the registration process. The next day, the authorities met with the detainees and answered some of the questions but added, incorrectly, that under the Espionage Act, anyone who failed to register could face a \$10,000 fine and/or twenty years in prison. Two days after that, administrators announced that registration would take place by the “blocks” in which people lived. Block 42, known to be the center of resistance in the camp, was scheduled to register first on the following day.³⁸ Rather than reassuring the community by backing off the registration deadlines and taking the time to answer questions, camp administrators escalated the confrontation by threatening inmates with the Espionage Act and targeting the most resistant block first. Rumors circulated wildly throughout the detention center. The registration process at Tule Lake began to spiral out of control.

Scholars have concluded that two questions were especially problematic. Question 27 asked, “Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty, wherever ordered?” Question 28 asked “Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attacks by foreign or domestic forces, and foreswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor, or any other foreign government, power or organization?”³⁹

Issei, who were not allowed to become citizens in the United States, were fearful they might end up without a country at all, or thought that question 28 was a trick to get them to admit that they had been, in fact, until recently, loyal to the emperor. Their children, in turn, could perceive that a “yes” to those questions might cause them to be separated from their parents who said “no.” Others were infuriated at how the government had treated them and could not give an unqualified “yes.” Many of those actually wrote on the questionnaire the

conditions under which they would be willing to serve the United States military effort. They might be considered a “yes, no, maybe.” Some simply avoided the questionnaire altogether and refused to answer it. Those who answered both question 27 and 28 “no” became known as “no-nos,” but in the eyes of the government and the JACL, any person who did not respond “yes, yes” was deemed “disloyal.”⁴⁰

Evidence suggests that the JACL did nothing to encourage the WRA to address concerns regarding the questionnaire. The JACL was eager for the U.S. government to allow Japanese Americans to enlist and saw the questionnaire as a means to this end. The JACL was interested, as well, in using the results of the questionnaire for their own political advancement, as a way to identify and segregate anti-JACL factions within the camps.⁴¹

Camp officials hoped that the questionnaire would be a first step in closing the camps, as young men and women left to join the military, the auxiliary forces, or the workforce. Dillon S. Meyer, the director of the WRA, shocked by the results of the registration process, faced a new dilemma when registration was complete. Over 68,000 people (87 percent of those eligible to complete the questionnaire), were deemed loyal through their unconditional responses on the form. Meyer expected only 2,000 respondents would answer negatively but instead close to 10,000 refused to answer, qualified their answers, or answered negatively.⁴² However, there was a clear ambivalence even within families who had proven their loyalty on the questionnaire with their “yes-yes” response towards voluntary military service: though there were over 23,000 men of draft age in the camps, only 1,256 volunteered when given the chance to do so despite WRA estimates that 6000 would voluntarily enlist.⁴³ Refusing to volunteer was one way to protest government treatment. In Hawaii, with roughly 30 percent more Nisei eligible for the draft, nearly

10,000 Nisei, whose families were not incarcerated, volunteered for service.⁴⁴ Clearly, mass-incarceration of the mainland Japanese Americans dampened their enthusiasm to join the military.

The WRA now had to decide what to do with all those who had been deemed disloyal. Ultimately, the WRA officials, with the support of JACL, decided to segregate this group. At Tule Lake, due largely to the poor administration of the questionnaire, 42 percent of the incarcerated population was in this position. Significantly, that number included about 20 percent of the draft-age Nisei men.⁴⁵ Since Tule Lake had the highest number of those deemed disloyal and was equipped to handle a large population, the government decided to move all disloyals from the other WRA camps to Tule Lake.

People “failed” the loyalty test for many reasons. Among those deemed disloyal were those who were pro-Japan, those who simply wanted restitution of their civil rights, and family members of those deemed disloyal. Others might simply have refused to participate due to confusion, or under the belief that the best way to keep the family together was to have a unified response.⁴⁶ Though Tuleans deemed loyal were encouraged to relocate to another camp, 4000 loyal Tuleans chose to stay on in Tule Lake rather than move, presumably because they had already built a life for themselves and did not anticipate how bad conditions would be under segregation. Ultimately, those 4000 loyals lived side-by-side with over 14,000 people who, in the words of the CWRIC were for a variety of reasons “unwilling to *profess* loyalty.”⁴⁷ (emphasis added)

On July 15, 1943, the directors of the WRA decided that the Tule Lake Relocation Center would be converted into the Tule Lake Segregation Center. In preparation for the change in status, tanks arrived, fences were reinforced, and guard towers were quadrupled.

Those actions set the stage for even greater tension and distrust between the incarcerated population, who had been determined to be disloyal and those charged with supervising them.

Segregation, Draft, and Renunciation

Transferring all disloyals to Tule Lake, while leaving 4000 loyals in camp, led to even greater problems at the detention center. In September and October of 1943, 15,000 people were moved in and out of the facility. In October, one inmate, a Japanese American farmworker, was killed in an accident and other farmworkers from within the camp went on strike for safer working conditions. Japanese Americans from other WRA sites were brought in to harvest the crops that the Tuleans had refused to harvest; these Japanese American strikebreakers were housed off site and earned many times what the Tuleans were being paid. On November 4th, an event described as a riot broke out after three inmates, presumably trying to prevent camp personnel from stealing food designated for the inmates, were severely beaten by camp administrators. The following day, a stockade was established and on November 13, martial law was declared; the Army took control of the camp. The War Relocation Authority camp had transformed into a Segregation Center and then was subsequently placed under military control.⁴⁸

Six months after the decision to segregate, in January 1944, the government, although still holding tens of thousands of Japanese Americans in WRA camps, reinstated the draft for Japanese Americans and military service to the United States was no longer optional. In Tule Lake, martial law had been lifted the week before this announcement. Despite the revocation of martial law, the Army retained control of the stockade where roughly 200 men were being

held.⁴⁹ The resumption of the draft would further divide the Japanese American community both at Tule Lake and in other detention centers.

Ultimately, in some capacity or another, over 30,000 Japanese Americans served in the U.S. military by the end of the war and established an astounding record of valor. There were, however, over 250 Japanese American men, already deemed loyal on account of the questionnaire, who refused initial induction into the army to protest the treatment of the Nikkei community. A large percent of the draft resisters who had already sworn their loyalty on the questionnaire, were from two WRA camps, Heart Mountain in Idaho and Poston in Arizona. At Heart Mountain a committee within the camp provided support for the young men who chose to resist induction.⁵⁰ The Heart Mountain resisters faced trial together and, upon being found guilty of draft resistance, ended up in jail together. A majority of these draft resisters served time in federal prison as a result of their actions. In an ironic turn of events, the judge ruled in a comparable trial of Tule Lake draft resisters, that it was unreasonable for the U.S. government to expect those who were drafted out of the detention centers to serve in the military since they were, after all, being detained by the same government who was now asking them to serve in uniform. The judge released them back to the Tule Lake camp.⁵¹

Meanwhile, tensions continued to grow at Tule Lake with pro-Japan forces forming military groups and marching through camp for daily exercise. Fully expecting that they may be expatriated to Japan, and fearing that their children would be unprepared for life in there, parents organized Japanese language schools. The government formulated a way by which they believed they could defuse these tensions which they attributed almost entirely to a small pro-Japan sector of the camp. In 1944, the government passed a law that allowed Nisei

and Sansei to renounce their citizenship.⁵² Renunciation of citizenship would allow the government to transfer pro-Japan citizens to Department of Justice Camps as enemy aliens, thus concentrating the most radical elements of the camp's population into other facilities better prepared to handle them prior to expatriation to Japan.

Some detainees and historians report that Japanese American "extremists" at Tule Lake began to put real pressure on camp residents to renounce their U.S. citizenship, but there is evidence that, once again, it was mismanagement on the part of camp administrators and rampant rumors that led over 5000 Nisei and Sansei in Tule Lake to renounce their U.S. citizenship.⁵³ Whether the result of fear that they would have to leave camp with little means to support themselves, utter disgust at the way the government had treated them, or belief in the rumors that all Issei would be deported without their families, over 70 percent of the Nisei population at Tule Lake renounced their birthright American citizenship.⁵⁴

Japanese Americans did not have a single common experience during the war: the experience in the camps and with confinement differed dramatically by location, generation, and disposition. Within the camps, there was a struggle over who would represent the incarcerated population but the JACL was recognized, at least by the government, to be the representative body and the recognition gave this group a certain legitimacy and authority. As policies changed, in part influenced by the JACL, it fell to camp personnel to explain those policies and reassure the detainees about the purpose of the loyalty questionnaire and the intentions of the government but not all camp directors were equal to the task. For detainees who were most offended, angry, or confused by the registration process and who refused to submit an unqualified yes-yes, segregation was their new reality. Then the leaders of the War Relocation Authority with the blessing and support of the JACL, packed 18,000

people twice dispossessed and betrayed by their own government into a camp built to house 15,000 where riots, martial law, draft and draft resistance, stockades, prisons within prisons, renunciation of citizenship, repatriation and expatriation, Japanese language schools, and pro-Japan military clubs became part of daily life.

The vast majority of Japanese Americans, whatever their feelings on their wartime incarceration, did not endure the hardships endured by the 18,000 segregated at Tule Lake. The treatment of Japanese Americans during the war was shameful, but at Tule Lake the level of coercion, betrayal, and trauma reached new heights. The issues of resistance and loyalty stirred up initially by confinement, then by the loyalty questionnaire, then by segregation, then by the draft and, ultimately by renunciation, divided the Japanese American community in ways that remained largely unresolved both during the war and afterwards.⁵⁵ Since the Japanese American community was divided regarding how to respond to internment and enlistment during the war, it is hardly surprising that they were divided, as well, when it came to remembering and memorializing their experiences in the years that followed.

For those segregated to Tule Lake the deliberate omission of their story began almost at once. One group in particular suffered the stigma of Tule Lake: those who had spent the entire war there. Detainees who were moved in from another camp after segregation, or those who were transferred out to another camp after the loyalty questionnaire, could always identify the other camp as their wartime home when socializing with other Japanese Americans. For those who spent the duration of the war at Tule Lake, their detention there was only a part of their burden.

Tule Lake, Tule Lake—that
was a name I dared not mention
spoken warily, always with
hesitation, never voluntarily.⁵⁶

¹ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American: A Memoir and Selected Writings* (San Mateo: Asian American Curriculum Project, 2005), 167-168.

² United States, *Personal Justice Denied* (Wash., D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), 18.

³ Roger Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 6.

⁴ Shiho Imai. "Naturalization Act of 1790," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Naturalization%20Act%20of%201790/> (accessed Jun 15 2015).

⁵ Greg Robinson, *A Tragedy of Democracy: Japanese Confinement in North America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 14.

⁶ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 4.

⁷ Ibid., 35.

⁸ Robinson, *A Tragedy of Democracy*, 20.

⁹ Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008) 105.

¹⁰ Robinson, *A Tragedy of Democracy*, 28.

¹¹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 4.

¹² Tetsuden Kashima, *Judgment without Trial: Japanese American Imprisonment during World War II* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 47.

¹³ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 27.

¹⁴ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 9.

¹⁵ Brian Niiya. "Voluntary evacuation," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Voluntary%20evacuation/> (accessed Jun 15 2015).

¹⁶ Jane Scheiber and Harry Scheiber. "Martial law in Hawaii," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Martial%20law%20in%20Hawaii/> (accessed Mar 26 2014).

-
- ¹⁷ Kashima, *Judgement without Trial*, 9.
- ¹⁸ Richard Katsuda (son of Tule Lake internees, pilgrimage attendant in 1978, and 2012, Tule Lake Committee member and pilgrimage planner 1979, 1980, 1981), in discussion with the author, March 2013.
- ¹⁹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 300.
- ²⁰ Kashima, *Judgment without Trial*, 44.
- ²¹ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 40.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 79.
- ²³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁴ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 120.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 108.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 120.
- ²⁷ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 120.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, 106.
- ²⁹ Densho Encyclopedia contributors. "Lim Report," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Lim%20Report/> (accessed Oct 14 2015).
- ³⁰ Brian Niiya. "Japanese Americans in military during World War II," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20Americans%20in%20military%20during%20World%20War%20II/> (accessed Jul 19 2015).
- ³¹ Eric Muller. "Draft resistance," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Draft%20resistance/> (accessed Jul 19 2015).
- ³² United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 13.
- ³³ Megan Asaka. "Resettlement," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Resettlement/> (accessed Jul 19 2015).
- ³⁴ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 13.
- ³⁵ Cherstin Lyon. "Loyalty questionnaire," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Loyalty%20questionnaire/> (accessed Jul 19 2015).

-
- ³⁶ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 194.
- ³⁷ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 114.
- ³⁸ John R. and Reiko Katsuyoshi Ross, eds., *Second Kinenhi: Reflections on Tule Lake*, (San Francisco: Tule Lake Committee, 2000), 16.
- ³⁹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 191-192.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., 192-194.
- ⁴¹ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 117.
- ⁴² United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 195.
- ⁴³ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 78.
- ⁴⁴ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 17.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid., 195.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., 193.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., 15.
- ⁴⁸ Ross and Ross, eds., *Second Kinenhi*, 17.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 124.
- ⁵¹ Barbara Takei. "Tule Lake," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Tule%20Lake/> (accessed May 12 2014).
- ⁵² United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 248.
- ⁵³ Ibid., 250.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ Tetsuden Kashima, "Japanese Americans Return Home, 1945 to 1955: Readjustment and Social Amnesia," *Phylon* (1960-) Vol.41, No. 2 (2nd Qtr., 1980): 112.
- ⁵⁶ Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American*, 168.

Chapter 2 – Establishing a Narrative of Patriotism and Resiliency

There were deaths and births
and lovemaking in the firebreak
with the warden's flashlight
shining on you.
Yes, and movies, socials,
dances, sports, card games
and religion.
Sewing classes, flower
arrangement, doll making
wood carving
beauty behind barbed wires.
Recreation was big
it was encouraged.
"Keep 'em busy
keep 'em occupied
keep 'em sane!"
But a Chronicle reporter
observed: "There are
18,000 mental patients living
in confinement at Tule Lake."
So it is right that I remember
and tell it. (1975)

—Excerpt from "A Meeting at Tule Lake" by Hiroshi Kashiwagi ¹

In this portion of the poem, Kashiwagi reminds his readers that for four years, the War Relocation Authority (WRA) facilities were home to tens of thousands of people. There were deaths and births, and sports and dances and people created "beauty behind barbed wires."

Life continued but had been irrevocably disrupted. The movies, carving, and games were a necessary distraction from the fact of their detention, which interfered with more serious pursuits. The final lines in this stanza are a sharp reminder that the population was held there against their will like inmates in an asylum and that this story has largely gone

untold. In 1975, thirty years after his release, Kashiwagi decides that it is time to remember and tell the story of detention. This deliberate decision stands in sharp contrast to the pervasive silence in the Japanese American community regarding their wartime detention.

Why did the story of detention have to be recovered? Japanese Americans had not forgotten their wartime confinement but public opportunities to commemorate and memorialize that experience were all but non-existent. Instead, in the immediate postwar years, the story of Japanese Americans during the war becomes a story of military service. This story all but eclipses more complex and accurate accounts of what it was to be Japanese American in the United States during World War II.

In *The Vichy Syndrome*, Henry Rousseau identifies four different vectors or carriers of memory: official carriers, organizational carriers, cultural carriers, and scholarly carriers. Like many minority groups throughout history, Japanese Americans would capitalize on their military service to fight for full citizenship rights. The Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), as an organizational carrier of memory, worked hard to commemorate and honor military service, deliberately omitting details that would have complicated the story and weakened their claims to full participation in society as citizens. The JACL narrative barely mentions the Japanese American wartime incarceration and when it does mention it, dismisses it casually as a well-intentioned mistake then emphasizes how Japanese Americans proved themselves to be good Americans first through their accommodation, then through their military service despite overt discrimination, and finally through their resiliency.

The federal government, carriers of official memory, whether in the office of the president or through the awarding of military honors, reinforced these aspects of the story. Even Hollywood would promote and commemorate the military sacrifice of the Japanese

American community with the help of the JACL. Academics and artists, as scholarly and cultural carriers of memory, tried unsuccessfully in the post-war years to complicate or challenge this narrative.

The JACL and the Postwar Narrative: Organizational Carriers of Memory

Rousseau argues in *The Vichy Syndrome* that national or local governments are most often the official carriers of memory. At the close of the war, however, neither the national nor the local governments had any interest in retaining memories of or commemorating the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans. In many areas, equipment, fixtures and barracks were auctioned to the highest bidders and the camps physically disappeared. Removal of the physical sites of incarceration, which were remote to begin with, was the first step in the silencing of the wartime incarceration of tens of thousands of people. With few physical reminders left standing, it was easy to pretend the entire episode had never happened. The keepers of official memory, the government agencies responsible for the incarceration pursued the dismantling of the sites and thereby, the memory of incarceration.

Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan in the essay, *Setting the Framework*, argue that groups they call “secondary elites” frequently challenge the state driven narrative. They might challenge the narrative to confront grief, fill the silence, make an offering to the dead, or for political reasons.² The state driven narrative, however, suited the JACL perfectly so long as Japanese American military service was lauded as an important piece of the “good war” narrative. When the state did refer to the experience of Japanese Americans during WWII, it emphasized the wartime record of Japanese Americans. In a July 1946 ceremony at the White House, Truman praised the segregated all Nisei 442nd Regimental Combat Team (the 442nd), “You fought not only the enemy, but you fought prejudice—and you have

won."³ The state made no mention of detention but celebrated Japanese American heroism. Every medal awarded the 442nd served as a government endorsed commemoration. In fact, the WRA organized speaking tours of veterans who had served with members of the 442nd RCT.⁴

The JACL assumed the role Rousseau describes as the organizational carrier of memory though they had little in the state narrative to confront. These organizational vectors of memory work to unify the personal memories of group members and then actively and passively promote that unified memory. As the master of the narrative, the JACL worked actively to determine both what details would be included and what details would be excluded from the narrative.⁵

Inclusion of the heroics of the 442nd in the national narrative served very specific political ends: the JACL would lobby successfully for many legislative changes on behalf of Japanese Americans in the years after the war. The JACL took command of the narrative and they constituted a very powerful group whose power would grow through the acceptance of the narrative they crafted. However, the JACL deliberately silenced any memorialization that they feared could derail their political agenda or their social power within the community.

The JACL had worked closely with the War Relocation Authority (WRA) to shape and influence government policy in regards to incarceration as well as military enlistment during the war in the hopes of achieving full integration into American society after the war.⁶ In a sense, the accommodation that the JACL encouraged during the war was a prepayment for greater civil rights and political power following the war. Mike Masaoka who served as National Secretary of the JACL during the war became the most iconic representative of the

organization when he accepted the position of chief Washington lobbyist for the organization.⁷ His role and experience are a good illustration of the intersections between the government, the media and his group. Masaoka authored the JACL “creed,” an ultra-patriotic pledge of faith in the U.S. government, helped establish the segregated all Japanese American 442nd Regimental Combat Team (RCT), and unsuccessfully promoted the creation of a World War II Japanese American suicide force.⁸

Masaoka wrote the introduction to Dillon S. Meyer’s 1971 narrative of his wartime experience as head of the War Relocation Authority (WRA) which indicates how closely connected the two men were.⁹ Meyer’s book, *Uprooted Americans*, established a narrative along the lines that “all’s well that ends well.” In other words, however misguided the incarceration of Japanese Americans might have been, this community as a whole, seemed to have made the best of a bad situation and were leading successful postwar lives.¹⁰ The JACL worked so closely with the WRA that Meyer and Masaoka often sound like members of a mutual admiration society. Masaoka in the preface to Meyer’s book even praises the success of the WRA camps suggesting that the camps provided opportunities that Japanese Americans would otherwise never have had.¹¹ Many former inmates echo this theme when they talk about “camp.” Historians during the 1970s observed the close connection between the JACL narrative and state versions of the narrative like that offered by Myers. Roger Daniels in his seminal 1971 book, *Concentration Camps USA*, acknowledges the deep connection between the two narratives when he refers to positions taken by the organizations as the “JACL-WRA line.”¹² This partnership continues after the war with the line between the official and organizational carriers of memory remarkably blurred.

The JACL shaped the narrative during the war and wasted no time streamlining the narrative after the war ended. At the July 1946 JACL convention, the first post-war national convention they held, leadership read a prepared statement from President Truman. In it he said of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team (RCT), "Their service is a credit not only to their race and to America, but to the finest qualities in human nature."¹³ High praise indeed. The JACL, however, also actively discouraged contention of the narrative they were promoting when they publicly denounced draft resisters, No-Nos and renunciants at the same 1946 convention.¹⁴

The JACL rightfully emphasized the military service of Japanese Americans. What gives the narrative staying power is that the details of Japanese American military service were not exaggerated; they were accurate and impressive. The segregated combat team (which included the 100th Battalion) was proportionately the most decorated military unit in the history of the United States for its size and length of service.¹⁵ The unit won seven Distinguished Unit Citations, twenty-one Medals of Honor, over 4,000 Purple Hearts, 29 Distinguished Service Crosses, 588 Silver Stars, and more than 4,000 Bronze Stars. In addition, they won the hearts and minds of many Texans when they saved a Texas Regiment known as the "Lost Battalion." The 442nd RCT did what two previous units had been unable to do, break through German lines and save the 200 stranded Texans.¹⁶ In fact, in 1947, the JACL helped erect the first memorial to the 442nd in Bruyeres, France, a town liberated by the 442nd during their rescue of the Lost Battalion. The town later renamed the road leading to the monument as the "Rue du 442^{ème} Regiment Americain."¹⁷

Details that would have complicated or detracted from this story of military service were simply omitted. No distinction was made between Japanese Americans from Hawaii

and Japanese Americans from the continental United States. The disparity of the rate of volunteerism between the two populations is also missing. Failure to mention the draft makes it seem as if all these young men volunteered. All traces of resistance or dissent are left out and dissenters are then officially denounced by the JACL at the 1946 national convention.

Daniels suggests that these actions created a “successful myth” of un-questioned cooperation.¹⁸ The truth that lies behind the myth lends credence to the myth. What makes this a myth then is the selection of the details, not the inaccuracies of the details selected. What Daniels called a myth, however, has the potential to become what Maurice Halbwachs called “collective memory” because the most durable memories are those held in “harmony” by the greatest number.¹⁹ The successful coalescence of collective memory, however, does not erase individual memory. Halbwachs understands this, but acknowledges that the memories that are shared and promoted can push personal memories or “autobiographical memories” that contradict the narrative deep underground. And certainly, the “successful myth” does make recounting memories that run counter to the collective memory less socially acceptable. A public condemnation of resistance from the most recognized group of Japanese Americans silenced those who were in a position to contest the narrative by adding to the complexity of the story. As Halbwachs suggests, the creation and nurturing of communal memory is a question of social power and the JACL held the social and political power in the Japanese American community following the war.

Why would the JACL be so deeply invested in an erasure of the camp experiences in all its iterations? First, a minority of vocal Japanese Americans both inside and outside of the camps criticized the JACL during the war for their accommodationist strategy.²⁰ In fact,

enrollment in the JACL declined dramatically during the war indicating a lack of faith in the organization.²¹ If the JACL could capitalize on military participation to improve the lives of Japanese Americans post-war it would not only vindicate their war-time behavior but elevate the group's status in the post-war world.

Secondly, the JACL had a genuine desire to improve conditions in the United States for Japanese Americans and launched a concerted effort to do this after the war. The JACL created the Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) in 1946 with Mike Masoaka heading the Washington based legislative lobbying group.²² The committee focused on inter-racial marriage bans, alien land laws, compensation for assets lost during the mass incarceration and, most symbolically, managed to pass the Immigration Act of 1952, which allowed the Japanese born Issei to become naturalized American citizens.²³ This is an impressive list of accomplishments suggesting that the JACL memorialization strategy was an effective one. This effectiveness, in turn, reinforces the narrative. T. G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper argue in *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (2000) that the agents of memory production rarely remain in neat compartments but continuously interact with and intersect each other.²⁴ In the case of the JACL this interaction both with the government and media was not only deliberate but effective as well.

Hollywood Reinforces the Narrative

The JACL had help in shaping and solidifying the narrative of patriotism and resiliency. The carefully crafted JACL narrative followed the cultural scripts of wartime and post-war America which made it an easy narrative both to build and for the population to hold onto. Hollywood had coordinated with the Office of War Information (OWI) to produce war material whether it be newsreels, documentaries, or propaganda; movies about wartime

sacrifice and valor abounded. Soon enough, Hollywood told their own version of the story of Japanese American service and sacrifice in the war.

The JACL and Hollywood worked together towards this end. Masaoka, the publicist for the 442nd during the war and lobbyist for the JACL, served as a consultant on the film, *Go for Broke!* which was released in 1951. This film was instrumental in establishing the narrative of the unbridled patriotism of Japanese Americans during the war despite the discriminatory and harsh treatment of Japanese Americans. Masaoka, in his autobiography, *They Call Me Moses Masaoka*, says the film was perhaps his single most important public relations project.²⁵ His 1987 autobiography title indicates he was a man of no small ego but belies the fact that there was no consensus as to his role as a civil rights leader for Japanese Americans.²⁶

The film tells the story of how a white officer, initially disappointed to be leading a Nisei regiment, comes to admire and defend his men. In addition, the movie chronicles the heroics of the regiment in the Italian theater during the war. Many of the actors were, in fact, decorated members of the 442nd. Early in the movie, there are scenes at Camp Shelby, where the mainland Nisei soldiers briefly discuss the incarceration of their families but the scene is so brief it would be easy to miss. The emphasis of the film is how the heroics of these men earns their acceptance by white officers and the acknowledgement that they are patriotic Americans fighting against fascism. A review of the movie in the *New York Times*, praised the movie as, “A respectful and rousing tribute to the men of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team...this picture presents a forceful lesson in racial tolerance and friendliness.” These soldiers were, as the review articulates, “fundamentally Americans” and the movie “achieved precisely the affection, the understanding and the tolerance for them that they deserved.”²⁷

The film also served effectively as the basis for what Anna Green terms the “durable memories...held by the greatest number of people...” both inside and outside of the Japanese American community.²⁸ By nature of its widespread release and popularity, this movie guaranteed that the story of the 442nd RCT would endure when other memories receded.

Governmental Collusion

The government said little about the detention centers despite having documented conditions in them during the war. The WRA hired, the noted depression-era photographer, Dorothea Lange, to photograph the camps in the hopes that these images would not only justify the incarceration policy but also demonstrate the reasonable conditions of “relocation.” Lange took thousands of photographs of the removal, transport, and internment of Japanese Americans.²⁹ Not all of these photographs garnered government approval however: those responsible for public relations impounded the photographs that highlighted the desolation, isolation, and anger present in the camps. The government released these photographs over fifty years later.³⁰

In addition, transnational forces prompted the United States government to remain silent about the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans. The United States found itself almost immediately engaged in a new and less easily defined “cold” war with its former wartime ally, the Soviet Union. In addition, once the Japanese evacuated China, the civil war there resumed and the communist forces led by Mao Zedong proved victorious. It was essential that the United States have an ally in Asia. The new Truman administration was faced with the fact that communism had spread not just to those parts of Europe liberated from Germany by the Soviets but also that China was lost to communism and could potentially become an important ally of the Soviets.

Secondly, the story of internment hardly helped the government's campaign to contrast itself effectively against a Soviet government that continued to imprison political enemies, track down "fascists", i.e. members of national militias who had collaborated with the Nazis, and intern returning Soviet POWs, allies. As the United States government and its allies pointed to Soviet abuses it kept silent about its wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans.

These developments provided excellent reasons to say little in regards to the wartime treatment of Japanese Americans; acknowledgement of wartime detention might alienate a potential ally, lend credence to our enemies' criticisms, and highlight the nation's hypocrisy.

Silence Dominates Individual Lives

Japanese Americans, with some important exceptions, and for a variety of reasons, generally remained silent about their detention. Tetsuden Kashima has characterized this period of erasure as a time of "social amnesia" which he defines as "...a group phenomenon in which attempts are made to suppress feelings and memories of particular moments or extended time periods."³¹ For Japanese Americans intent on integration into a society which until recently excluded them, it was imperative to stress themes of patriotism, sacrifice and "American-ness." Kashima confirms that when the former detainees talked about the camp experience they usually focused on the "...trivial, the humorous or non-threatening moments."³²

When Japanese Americans left the camps, either through the work leave program or at the end of the war, the WRA counseled them to avoid living in ethnic enclaves and to relocate to other parts of the United States.³³ Those who left before the end of the war, mostly young and educated Nisei, still faced exclusion from the west coast and largely

relocated to Illinois, Michigan, and Ohio.³⁴ Of the seventy-five thousand still in detention when the federal government rescinded the exclusion order, approximately two-thirds returned to the west coast.³⁵ Though encouraged to avoid living in ethnic enclaves, by the end of the war, Chicago, Denver, New York, and Salt Lake City all had significant Japanese American populations.³⁶ Individuals were likely to meet other Japanese Americans in these new locations with very similar detention experiences since their relocation was often determined by where they had been detained and when they received permission to leave. This influenced the ways in which individuals would remember and recount their wartime experience. Fully half of the incarcerated population did not return to their home states following the war. If, as Maurice Halbwachs suggests, memory is a function of the social group in which we live, and requires dialogue and performance, living isolated lives would serve forgetting rather than remembering.³⁷ Even Japanese Americans living near each other had numerous reasons not to talk about their wartime experiences; what a conversation might reveal could be painful or even dangerous.

There was shame associated with the experience and little point in calling attention to it. One detainee made the analogy many years later that those imprisoned were like rape victims who do not willingly broadcast their victimization.³⁸ Some parents feared that discussing their experience with their children would make their children resentful on their parents' behalves, thereby alienating the children from the society in which their parents were now raising them in a way the parents had been alienated themselves.³⁹ As the Cold War began and Senator Joseph McCarthy's red scare gained momentum in the late 1940s, criticizing the government, for any reason, seemed more unwise than ever.⁴⁰

The danger of drawing attention to oneself was not just emotional or political. Japanese Americans still suffered racial discrimination and even violence in the postwar period. From January to June 1945, 31 major attacks on Japanese Americans were reported in California alone and as late as 1950, despite legal gains, "...there were more than 500 federal, state and local laws and ordinances aimed directly or indirectly against resident Japanese."⁴¹

Social amnesia is no surprise to historian Anna Green who explains that three primary factors influence what individuals remember. First, people remember what others remember. Secondly, due to our social nature, people tend to remember that which is socially acceptable. Finally, a psychological need for self-protection influences what people are willing to remember. Considering this, it is no surprise then, that "...the most durable memories tended to be those held by the greatest number..."⁴² Green concludes that in a desire to build an 'affective community,' individuals are most likely to remember that which is in 'harmony' with others. After the war, the majority of Japanese Americans did not return to their previous homes or communities and found themselves having to establish new communal ties.⁴³ Memories of concentration camps, imprisonment, and deprivation of basic rights did not match with the memories of most Americans who believed the United States had fought the "good war."

Other Narratives Fade

An inclusive historical narrative of the Japanese American World War II experience gained no traction in the United States despite robust documentation of the detention centers. First, the war interrupted everyone's lives and people were anxious to move on. During the war, the government had painted a barbaric and racist vision of the Japanese. News of war

atrocities such as the Bataan Death March and prisoner of war camps fueled anti-Japanese sentiment. The government had not contested the conflation of Japanese and Japanese American before the war and so this anti-Japanese sentiment transferred in many cases to Japanese Americans. Pictures of Japanese American detention centers paled in comparison with the images emerging from Germany. A sympathetic audience was hard to find so the story simply faded.

Documentation of detention existed. Photographs of the camps abounded. The government published many of Lange's images and she was not the only professional photographer at work in the detention centers. Ansel Adams documented detention as well. He asked for and got permission from the director of the Manzanar WRA camp to document conditions there. He published *Born Free and Equal: Photographs of the Loyal Japanese Americans at Manzanar Relocation Center* in 1944. A critic of the mass incarceration, his images portray the dignity, resiliency and American-ness of the detained population. Adams hoped to facilitate the reintegration of Japanese Americans into the broader society after the war so he deliberately avoided images of despair or anger. Some criticized Adams for having too much sympathy for the Japanese Americans while others considered his work to be too uncritical of the government. The book did well in the Bay Area, but there was little distribution of the book beyond that region.⁴⁴

Documentation of resistance, coercion, confusion and resentment existed as well. The segregation of 12,000 Japanese Americans who had "failed" the loyalty questionnaire had been recorded, and in at least one case in a widely read national magazine. The March 20, 1944, edition of *LIFE* magazine featured an article entitled "Tule Lake Pressure Boys." This ten-page story featured interviews with Nisei slated for repatriation to Japan as well as

photos from the Tule Lake stockade, and a variety of “daily life” images.⁴⁵ Although this article deals extensively with the issue of repatriation to Japan it never discusses the government policy allowing citizens to renounce their citizenship.

Social scientists working for the War Relocation Authority wrote their own account of the internment era for the government in *Impounded People: Japanese Americans in the Relocation Centers* published in 1946, which included a 12-page section on Tule Lake.⁴⁶ The conclusion drawn in this government account is, unremarkably, that the internment was a well-intentioned mistake on the part of the government.⁴⁷

Dorothy Swaine Thomas, an anthropologist from the University of California at Berkeley, studied the effects of incarceration on the Japanese American community almost from the moment that Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066.⁴⁸ A staff of almost two dozen, including some Japanese Americans living in the camps, collected information regarding the effects of detention and subsequent divisions within the Japanese American community. It was known as the Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study (JERS).

After the war, Swaine outlined three books based on her team’s research and the resettlement of Japanese Americans. One would focus on those who relocated to the Midwest during the war as a means to leave camp; another would examine those who returned to the Pacific Coast after the war. The first one, however, would focus on those who chose to move to Japan after the war, *The Spoilage*.

Published in 1946, this study chronicled the fates of the one in six Japanese Americans who felt compelled to return to Japan and/or renounce their citizenship. Published in 1946, many criticized *The Spoilage* for its methodology and ethical lapses on

the part of its imbedded researchers.⁴⁹ Despite the criticisms, the book served as the basis for research about dissent decades later.

The second one, *The Salvage*, was published in 1952 and told the story of the roughly 60,000 Japanese Americans, who chose to leave the camps during the war for, homes in the east and mid-west. The third volume, *The Residue*, intended to follow those who refused relocation in the mid-west and went back to their west-coast homes after the war, but it was never completed.⁵⁰ According to historian Alice Yang Murray, these histories generally “laud the motives and goals of camp officials” and “praise Japanese American forbearance and cooperation.”⁵¹

A Counter Narrative is Soundly Rejected

Henry Rousseau, in *The Vichy Syndrome*, suggests that cultural carriers of memory function on a very different level from either organizational or official carriers and that their messages are often implicit rather than explicit.⁵² John Okada’s 1957 novel *No-No Boy* is a prime example of this. Ten years after the end of the war, Okada, a Japanese American World War II veteran, challenged the narrative generated by the JACL and embraced by veterans like himself with a powerful and disturbing novel. This novel, as the title suggests, documented the trauma experienced within the Japanese American community as a result of their removal, confinement, and tests of loyalty.

Executive Order 9066 forced Okada, born in Seattle in 1923, along with his family, to the Minidoka WRA camp in Idaho. He quickly obtained leave to attend college in Nebraska. Eventually he left school to serve in the military and served as a translator after attending the Military Intelligence Service language school at Camp Savage in Minnesota. After the war, he earned his bachelor’s degree in English from the University of Washington.⁵³ As both a

yes-yes and a veteran, why did he write this novel from his privileged position? What did he intend to document?

John Okada's *No-No Boy* opens with a young man, Ichiro, returning to his home town of Seattle after having served time in federal prison for refusing to serve in the armed forces. As he gets off the bus, he runs into a childhood acquaintance, another Japanese American. After a brief exchange, the friend, realizing that the protagonist was a draft resister spits in his face and walks away.⁵⁴ This opening scene reveals the open secret in Japanese American communities, the existence of men and women who chose to defy the United States government instead of serving a government that had treated them as potential traitors and as a threat to the very state in which they were citizens.

The novel features a number of Japanese Americans, both male and female, who have diverse responses to internment, conscription, and enlistment and demonstrates that many of the characters never recover from their wartime experiences, whether in faced in battle or in detention. Ichiro explains his "no-no" on the loyalty questionnaire was the means to honor his mother who is vehemently Pro-Japan and who despite evidence to the contrary still believes that Japan won the war. When confronted with the truth, she takes her own life. Ichiro's little brother will not talk to him and is eager to join the army as soon as he can to redeem his family's honor. Ichiro's love interest, a young Japanese American woman is married to a war veteran who failed to return to her following his enlistment. Ichiro befriends a Japanese American veteran who dies because of complications from injuries sustained in the war. It suggests, as well, that others face a life of alienation and rejection by the Japanese American community because of their resistance to the U.S. government policy of confinement and/or conscription.

Only a thousand copies were printed, yet many of those remained unsold. The JACL condemned the book in its newspaper, *The Pacific Citizen*.⁵⁵ Though Okada never refers to the JACL, the bullies in the novel are Japanese American super-patriots who bear a striking resemblance to JACL leaders. Ironically, draft resisters also disliked the book. First, Okada conflated the answering “no” to questions 27 and 28 on the loyalty questionnaire with that of draft resistance.⁵⁶ In fact, most draft resisters had “passed” the loyalty questionnaire and this is why they were eligible for the draft. Ichiro, the draft resister in the novel, refuses the draft because of his torn allegiance between his culturally Japanese mother and the American society that rejects him. For draft resisters who had proven their loyalty with “yes-yes” answers, but who deliberately took a principled stand against the government, Ichiro’s failure to pass the loyalty test devalued their conscious decision to defy the country that had violated their civil and political rights while telling them that the war was being fought to uphold democratic values.⁵⁷ The novel conflates the stories of the no-nos and the draft resisters and one might surmise that Okada himself misunderstands or misinterprets the actions of these two distinct groups. As a result, some criticize the historical accuracy of the novel but it bears noting that Okada broke the silence, the taboo, by titling his novel, the *No-No Boy*.

No-No Boy did little to disrupt or alter the ubiquitous JACL narrative of unparalleled patriotism. It was a commentary not just about the atrocities visited upon Japanese Americans by the United States government but a commentary about how the Japanese American community had turned on itself. It was truly a novel ahead of its time. The JACL condemned it.

Summary

Which of the representations of the Japanese American experience received the greatest attention and acceptance following the war? Hollywood's version of the story, which dovetailed so beautifully with the story that both the government and the JACL promoted, became the accepted and dominant narrative. *Go for Broke!* was a commercial success and even earned an Academy Award Best Screenplay nomination for author Robert Pirosh. During the 1950s and early 1960s, national self-congratulation permeated the textbooks in regards to World War II so authors omitted any reference to the detention of Japanese Americans.⁵⁸ Three voices – the government, the JACL, and the media – influenced by worldwide events, joined together to establish the narrative that Japanese Americans had not only shown resilience and loyalty, but had been able to capitalize on their wartime experience by turning those experiences into opportunities.

As a result of early postwar articles and discussions about and memorialization of the 442nd as the exemplar of Japanese American patriotism, community and national elites focused commemorative activity on the heroism and sacrifice of this regiment. Even those Japanese Americans who did not fight during the war could embrace the commemoration of these heroics. The fact that many Nisei had not volunteered for duty but had been conscripted and that almost 90% of those who served were from Hawaii was deliberately omitted. Embracing this narrative required the silent absence of the men who had resisted the draft, the families who had “failed” to prove their loyalty, and those who renounced their citizenship. The mass incarceration of Japanese Americans was merely a footnote to the military heroism of the 442nd battalion and resistance had been written out of the story altogether. The story of the 442nd became the story of Japanese Americans.

In decades to come, however, as other groups challenged the discriminatory nature of American society as well as the government, activists would resurrect the story of Japanese American incarceration during the war as a cautionary tale.

¹ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American: A Memoir and Selected Writings* (San Mateo: Asian American Curriculum Project, 2005), 167-168.

² Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, "Setting the Framework" in *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 30.

³ Greg Robinson. "Harry S. Truman," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Harry%20S.%20Truman/> (accessed Jun 23 2015).

⁴ United States, *Personal Justice Denied* (Wash., D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), 260.

⁵ Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008), 105.

⁶ Densho Encyclopedia contributors. "Lim Report," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Lim%20Report/> (accessed Dec 9 2015).

⁷ Shiho Imai. "Mike Masaoka," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Mike%20Masaoka/> (accessed Jun 23 2015).

⁸ Roger Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 24.

⁹ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 103.

¹⁰ Dillon S. Myer. *Uprooted Americans: The Japanese Americans and the War Relocation Authority during World War II*. (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1971), 284.

¹¹ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 103.

¹² Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 122.

¹³ Greg Robinson. "Harry S. Truman," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Harry%20S.%20Truman/> (accessed Dec 9 2015).

¹⁴ Cherstin Lyon. "Japanese American Citizens League," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20American%20Citizens%20League/> (accessed Dec 8 2015).

¹⁵ Franklin Odo. "442nd Regimental Combat Team," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/442nd%20Regimental%20Combat%20Team/> (accessed Aug 30 2015).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Abbie Grubb. "Japanese American World War II military service memorials," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20American%20World%20War%20II%20military%20service%20memorials/> (accessed Aug 30 2015).

¹⁸ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 105.

¹⁹ Maurice Halbwachs, "Historical Memory and Collective Memory" in *The Collective Memory* (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), 69.

²⁰ Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA*, 105.

²¹ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 120-121.

²² Brian Niiya. "Anti-Discrimination Committee, JACL," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Anti-Discrimination%20Committee,%20JACL/> (accessed Jun 23 2015).

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ T.G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper, "Framing the Issues" in *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (London: Routledge, 2000), 53.

²⁵ Mike Masaoka and Bill Hosokawa, *They Call Me Moses Masaoka: An American Saga* (New York: Morrow, 1987), 215.

²⁶ Shiho Imai. "Mike Masaoka," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Mike%20Masaoka/> (accessed Aug 26 2015).

²⁷ Bosley Crowther, "'Go for Broke!,' Tribute to War Record of Nisei Regiment, Opens at the Capital" *The Screen in Review*, *New York Times*, May 25, 1951, <http://www.nytimes.com/movie/review>

²⁸ Anna Green, "Individual Remembering and 'Collective Memory': Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates," *Oral History* 32.2 (2004): 38.

²⁹ Jasmine Alinder. "Dorothea Lange," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Dorothea%20Lange/> (accessed Jun 23 2015).

³⁰ Jasmine Alinder. "Dorothea Lange," *Densho Encyclopedia*.

³¹ Tetsudan Kashima, "Japanese American Internees Return, 1945 to 1955: Readjustment and Social Amnesia," *Phylon* (1960-), Vol. 41, No. 2 (2nd Qtr., 1980): 107-115, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/274964>.

³² Ibid, 113.

³³ Greg Robinson. "War Relocation Authority," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/War%20Relocation%20Authority/> (accessed Jun 23 2015).

³⁴ Megan Asaka. "Resettlement," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Resettlement/> (accessed Nov 7 2015).

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Maurice Halbwachs, "Historical Memory," 69.

³⁸ Don T. Nakanishi, "Surviving Democracy's 'Mistake': Japanese Americans and the Enduring Legacy of Executive Order 9066," *Amerasia Journal*, 19:1 (1993); 7-35, 15.

³⁹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 18.

⁴⁰ Ibid, xix.

⁴¹ Bill Hosokawa, *Nisei: The Quiet Americans*. (New York City: William Morrow, 1969), 84.

⁴² Green, 38

⁴³ Megan Asaka. "Resettlement," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Resettlement/> (accessed Nov 7 2015).

⁴⁴ Nancy Matsumoto. "Ansel Adams," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Ansel%20Adams/> (accessed Sep 18 2015).

⁴⁵ *LIFE magazine, March 20, 1944 issue, Vol. 16, No. 12* <http://home.comcast.net/~eo9066/1944/44-03/TuleLakePressureBoys.html>

⁴⁶ War Relocation Authority, *Impounded People: Japanese Americans in the Relocation Centers*, 1946. <http://digital.lib.usu.edu/cdm/ref/collection/Topaz/id/7501>

⁴⁷ Alice Yang Murray, "Historians and Internment; From Relocation Centers to Concentration Camps," in *What Did Internment of Japanese Americans Mean?* ed. Alice Yang Murray (Boston, MA: Bedford/St.Martin's Press, 200), 20.

⁴⁸ Densho Encyclopedia contributors. "Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20American%20Evacuation%20and%20Resettlement%20Study/> (accessed Jun 23 2015).

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Tom T. Sasaki, review of *The Salvage*, by Dorothy Swaine Thomas, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 55, No. 4, (October, 1953) 597-599.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/663798>

⁵¹ Alice Yang Murray, "Historians and Internment; From Relocation Centers to Concentration Camps," in *What Did Internment of Japanese Americans Mean?* ed. Alice Yang Murray (Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's Press, 200), 20.

⁵² Henry Rousseau, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 220.

⁵³ Patricia Wakida. "No-No Boy (book)," *Densho Encyclopedia*
[http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-No%20Boy%20\(book\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-No%20Boy%20(book)/) (accessed Jun 23 2015).

⁵⁴ John Okada, *No-no Boy* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007), 5.

⁵⁵ Frank Chin, "Narasaki's No-No Boy vs John Okada's No-No Boy", *ChinTalks*,
<http://chintalks.blogspot.com/2010/04/narasakis-no-no-boy-vs-john-okadas-no.html>
(accessed June 23, 2015)

⁵⁶ Question 27 asked, "Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty, wherever ordered?" Question 28 asked "Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attacks by foreign or domestic forces, and foreswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor, or any other foreign government, power or organization?"

⁵⁷ Barbara Takei, personal interview with the author. April 2013

⁵⁸ Kyle Roy Ward, *History in the Making: An Absorbing Look at How American History Has Changed in the Telling over the Last 200 Years*. (New York: New Press, 2006), 174.

Chapter 3 – Challenging the Historic Narrative as Incomplete

Yes, it's right that we're here
to see first hand where
18,000 of us lived
for three years or more
to see again
the barbed-wire fence
the guard towers, the MPs
the machine guns, bayonets
and tanks, the barracks
the mess halls, the shower rooms
and latrines.
Yes, it's right to feel
the bitter cold
of the severe winters
the warmth of the pot-bellied
stoves and the dust storms
how can we forget
the sand biting into our skin
filling our eyes and nose and mouth
and ears, graying our hair
in an instant. (1975)

*-Excerpt from "A Meeting at Tule Lake" by Hiroshi Kashiwagi*¹

In these lines, Kashiwagi addresses what life was like for over 110,000 incarcerated Japanese Americans during World War II. Though he spent his wartime years at Tule Lake, the description he provides here speaks to the experience of anyone sent to a War Relocation Authority camp. The camps were all surrounded by barbed wire, and guards watched from towers at each one. The barracks were all the same; the mess hall, latrines and shower rooms were all built from the same blueprints either by men hired from the local community or hired from within incarcerated population. All the camps were in desolate places, built on lands that no one else found desirable; wind swept plains, hot deserts, and mosquito invested swamps housed tens of thousands for "three years or more." Kashiwagi first delivered this

poem in 1975 when student activists asked him to participate in a pilgrimage back to Tule Lake. The poem and the pilgrimage sought to reinsert the story of those lost years into the historical narrative of Japanese Americans in the United States.

The story of the exclusion of Japanese Americans, their forced removal, and their detention reenters the national consciousness during the civil rights and student youth movements of the 1960s and 1970s. During this time, an era in which old institutions and prejudices were challenged, when faith in government reached new lows, individuals like Kashiwagi, working with groups like the Asian American Political Alliance, began to uncover the experiences of their parents and grandparents or dared to remember their own incarceration. Searching out the WRA camps, exposing long buried traumas of displacement, internment, resistance and dissent, and revealing the financial, cultural, and familial ruins meant confronting and contesting the comfortable and familiar story of great patriotism and heroism. Over the next twenty years, activists and academics worked doggedly to bring forward other stories, other narratives, other memories much less pat, comfortable, and convenient for their communities and their government.

Civil Rights Era: Empowerment and Identity

The civil rights movement, taking root in the 1960s, would impact both the Japanese American community and academic institutions. In this age of activism, a few Nisei who had experienced wartime incarceration first-hand would begin legislative campaigns to prevent the government from abusing its power again.² Student activists viewed activities as diverse as the war in Vietnam to the commercial development of old ethnic neighborhoods in West Coast cities that threatened Chinatowns and Little Tokyos as evidence of the imperialistic behavior of white America. In response, they organized a Pan-Asian student movement.³

Knowing that current policies did not exist in a vacuum, Sansei sought out stories of incarceration, sometimes they asked their parents and grandparents, but mostly they relied on strangers to answer their questions. There were a handful of Nisei who were willing to talk or write about their wartime confinement, like the poet Hiroshi Kashiwagi. Together the Nisei, who had experienced internment first-hand, and the larger groups of Sansei, excavated the past and found a history that was considerably more complex and traumatic than the story that only had room for patriotic compliance and universal resiliency.⁴

Edison Uno served as an important bridge between the Sansei and the past. As a teenager, Uno spent over four-and-a-half -years or, as he liked to relate, 1,647 days in detention. At the time the war started, one of Uno's siblings, an older brother, was in Japan working for the Japanese Army Press Bureau.* The FBI picked up his father soon after the attack on Pearl Harbor, incarcerated him at the Department of Justice camp in Crystal City, Texas for the duration of the war, and then continued to detain him well after the Japanese surrendered due to his son's connection with the Japanese military. Edison Uno, reluctant to leave his father in the Crystal City camp alone, remained with him until his release. One of the guards in Crystal City told Uno that, as far as he knew, Edison, was the last American *citizen* to be released from any of the concentration camps. He and his father left the camp in the fall of 1946, more than a year after Japan had surrendered.⁵

Nisei Lobby for Legislative Changes

During the civil rights movement, a number of Japanese Americans identified a threat to individual justice that they could no longer ignore. When federal authorities began to

* Many Japanese American families had close relatives stranded in Japan during the war and this often influenced their answers on the loyalty questionnaire.

consider using a Cold War era piece of legislation known as the Emergency Detention Act (Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950) to detain civil rights leaders it garnered the attention of some Nisei who had themselves been detained during World War II.⁶

Under the 1950 acts, the government designated six sites, including the Tule Lake Segregation Center, where, in an emergency, civilians could be interned by the U.S. government. Little was made of this Act until the late 1960s when the U.S. government considered detaining civilians once again. In May 1968, the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) reported that “mixed communist and black nationalist elements” were launching guerrilla type operations. Before his assassination, Martin Luther King, Jr. and other black leaders began to express publicly their fears that the Emergency Detention Acts might be invoked to incarcerate leaders of the civil rights movement.⁷ Black civil rights leaders were not the only targets. Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst was quoted in *Atlantic* magazine in July 1969, “if student activists interfered with the rights of others they ought to be ‘rounded up and put in a camp.’”⁸

Despite the impulse to maintain their traditional silence regarding their own unjust incarceration, a number of Nisei felt a responsibility to speak out and work to repeal the Emergency Detention Acts which echoed Executive Order 9066. One Nisei to champion the repeal of the Emergency Detention Acts was Raymond Okamura who took his appeal to the only lobbying group in Washington concerned with Asian affairs, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL). Their primary lobbyist in Washington, D.C. was still Mike Masaoka. When Okamura wrote to Masaoka and suggested that the repeal of the Acts was an important legislative issue for the JACL to take up, Masaoka replied that if Okamura wanted to join the JACL he would find that the organization had a process by which

members could, through a series of steps, propose legislative agendas. Okamura joined the local chapter of the JACL and began to pursue the repeal.⁹ He and Mary Ann Takagi created the Ad Hoc Committee for Repeal of the Emergency Detention Act within the JACL.¹⁰ Edison Uno joined Okamura and Takagi on the *ad hoc* committee. They were determined that what had happened to Japanese Americans during World War II would not happen again to anyone.

This ad hoc committee was often at odds with the national leadership of the JACL. The traditionally conservative JACL worried about wasting the organization's time and energy on a fight that they were not sure they could win. They also feared aligning themselves with what seemed to them to be some very radical groups.¹¹ When Masaoka suggested that the Committee submit all of their plans to him, committee leaders reminded Masaoka that he, as the JACL lobbyist did not determine policy but was hired to lobby for the policies behind which the JACL membership had rallied. Masaoka had always influenced policy as well as represented the group, so this grass roots campaign over which Masaoka did not have complete control represents an important contestation of traditional JACL power. As local chapters of the JACL endorsed the repeal, the momentum swung against the more conservative members of the JACL and at the 1968 national JACL convention, the League endorsed the repeal.¹² Okamura correctly assessed the need for the kind of political clout the JACL could bring to the fight. The four year campaign, working with other civil rights advocates, proved successful and Congress repealed Title II in September 1971.¹³

The campaign stimulated a broad alliance between Nisei activists, Pan-Asian student organizations, and the civil rights leaders that the activism sought to protect. The JACL, the only lobbying group working on behalf of any Asian Americans, however, relied on the story

of Japanese American wartime patriotism to foster political and public support for the repeal campaign, reinforcing the dominant narrative of military service and civic compliance in order to achieve the desired result.¹⁴

Students Seek Identity and Solidarity

In the 1960s, united by the unpopular war in Vietnam, students throughout the western world questioned many of the ‘sacred cows’ of an earlier wartime period; German students questioned the civilian and military collaboration with the Nazis and their allies, French students highlighted civilian complicity in the Holocaust, and American students protested against the segregation of and discrimination against African Americans in the Armed Forces during World War II. Memories long suppressed and too painful or impolite to remember began to surface as the generation of 1968 challenged existing histories and narratives. Asian American students, especially in California, were no exception and these groups often had close ties to Nisei activists.

Edison Uno, in particular, had strong connections to the student youth movement of the 1960s. Uno earned a degree in political science from Los Angeles State College, and by 1964, was the operations manager of the University of California San Francisco Student Union.¹⁵ He championed efforts to create ethnic studies departments within his and other academic institutions. Uno taught classes at a number of universities in the Bay Area about the wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans, and exhorted students to “...join multiethnic and multiracial coalitions to combat racism and imperialism.”¹⁶

Uno’s message fell on a fertile ground that had been prepared by the generation of 1968’s willingness to question authority. Many Sansei, some of whom were born in the camps but many of whom were born after the camps, wanted to understand their

community's story and history and wondered about and were distressed by the deafening silence of their parents' generation. These students wanted to know why their parents and grandparents had, apparently, done nothing to protest their incarceration and why textbooks ignored the topic altogether.¹⁷ Not only did the Sansei question the silence, they were angry at the culture of accommodation that was prevalent in their homes and communities. So few were willing to speak of resistance that these students were sure there never had been any resistance of which to speak. As Sansei Kevin Kondo explains, "I couldn't understand why they just packed up and went without resistance."¹⁸ Sansei Barbara Takei, born in Detroit in 1948, and educated at the historically African American institution, Howard University, during the civil rights era, sums up her attitude this way, "I was mad as hell."¹⁹ The assumption by this generation that there was no resistance, no dissent, is proof of the effectiveness of the postwar silencing. As they began to ask more questions and seek answers to the question of why didn't their parents, their grandparents resist, they found the draft resisters, the no-nos, and the protestors, some of whom had sat stoically and sorrowfully across from them their entire lives. The question still remained; was it time to remember?

In the midst of this, the mainstream media were hailing Asian Americans as the "model minority." An article in the *New York Times Magazine* in 1966 suggested that Japanese Americans had "out-whited the whites" but scholars argue that traces of this argument develop almost immediately after the war.²⁰ The theme was picked up by *U.S. News and World Report*, and revived in *Newsweek* and *TIME* in the 1970s. In every case, the idea that Asian Americans were an extremely successful minority was imposed from outside the group.²¹ The model minority mantle celebrated a narrative of resiliency and in real ways absolved the government of culpability.

The articles about the success of Asian Americans implied that if Asian Americans could make it in the United States despite the severe discrimination that they had faced, then anyone could make it. It was a reiteration of the “all’s well that ends well” postwar narrative. In addition, the JACL relished the media’s assessment of Asian American success as vindication of the JACL’s wartime activities.²² Once again, despite efforts to challenge the narrative, mainstream media, perpetuated a refined, yet familiar story of patriotic resiliency. The narrative had become a weapon to implicitly criticize minority groups who had been unable to overcome institutionalized discrimination.

In California, the generation of 1968’s distrust of authority, culminated in the student strikes at San Francisco State University (SFSU) in 1968 and at the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) in 1969. These two Bay Area institutions were the center of a great deal of activism. In March 1968, a coalition of students from the Black Students Union, the Mexican American Student Confederation, the Philippine American Collegiate Endeavor, the Intercollegiate Chinese for Social Action, the Latin American Students Organization, and an American Indian student organization formed the SFSU Third World Liberation Front (TWLF). By the summer, a new campus organization, the Asian American Political Alliance (AAPA), a pan-Asian student group, had joined the TWLF as well.²³ The term “Third World” embodied the concept that minorities in the United States were the victims of imperialism every bit as much as populations living in territory under U.S. jurisdiction, like Puerto Rico, or Guam, or potentially Vietnam.²⁴ In other words, minorities within the country were a colonized people. Student activists in the AAPA understood the model-minority label was a double-edged sword meant to simultaneously separate them from their

Third World cohort while suggesting that other minority groups had no one but themselves to blame for their own failures.²⁵

The AAPA chapter in Berkeley was the first to use the concept “Asian American” to unify what had always been discrete ethnic organizations. The term, “Asian American” intended to invoke a Pan-Asian identity. While Asian American students were challenging local, national, and international government policies, they sought to discover possible defining moments within American history that could be utilized to create a “collective history” of Asian Americans out of their disparate American experiences.²⁶

During the late 1960s, activists within the Asian Movement began to commemorate the detention era, even though, by their own admission there was very little understanding of what they were commemorating. Warren Furutani, a JACL student leader, and Victor Shibata, a University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) student, recalled that the movement was looking for some kind of symbolic march in which to participate as they searched “...for a defining experience which shaped Japanese American identity.” The two of them realized that Manzanar, one War Relocation Authority site of wartime incarceration, was only 200 miles from their homes in Los Angeles and the pair began to plan a pilgrimage. In 1969, Furutani and Shibata organized the first pilgrimage to Manzanar and invited some Nisei to participate.²⁷

In December about 200 people, including Nisei activists Edison Uno and Sue Kunitomi Embry (a wartime resident of Manzanar) drove by car and bus to the site.²⁸ The most dramatic evidence of the wartime incarceration and postwar silencing was a bullet-riddled monument marking what had been the Manzanar cemetery. There they listened to the handful of Issei and Nisei who travelled with them.²⁹ Moved by the experience, Furutani

and Embrey established the Manzanar Committee in 1970. Uno joined them soon after. The Committee worked with scholars and published educational materials, including *The Lost Years: 1942-1946*, in an attempt to tell a more complete account of and educate the public about the wartime experiences of Japanese Americans. This pamphlet included a piece written by Embrey based on the work of Roger Daniels, an early and important scholar of the incarceration period, as well as articles from the Manzanar camp newspaper and wartime protest literature criticizing the camps.³⁰

The Committee's second goal was to win California State Historical Landmark status for the camp.³¹ The site achieved this in 1972 but the Manzanar Committee fought with the state for over a year regarding the wording on the plaque. The contentious terms were "hysteria," "racism," and "concentration camps" and each one was eventually adopted for the text.³² These terms directly contested the official justification of military necessity as the reason for the removal of tens of thousands of Japanese Americans from their homes. The inscription also repudiated the euphemistic language adopted during the war and still in use in official publications like Dillon S. Meyer's 1971 memoir of his time as director of the WRA.³³ Over a thousand participants a year now attend this day long pilgrimage which has been held annually since 1969. Manzanar achieved National Historic Landmark status in the 1990s, an interpretive center opened in the old Manzanar High School Auditorium in 2004.³⁴

A pilgrimage to the Tule Lake WRA camp also took place in 1969. Tule Lake, however, was more remote and less accessible than Manzanar. Stan Shikuma, an early participant on the Tule Lake Pilgrimage and a principal organizer of the pilgrimage during the last 40 years, says that in the early years the Asian American student activists who attended this pilgrimage knew that the site had been a "segregation" center but had little idea

of what that really meant and how it distinguished Tule Lake from other War Relocation Authority centers.³⁵ The “camp” experience was so little understood or discussed that it was difficult for even intellectually curious university students to grasp the complexities of internment and dislocation.

Given the nature of the connections between the narrative established by the JACL and the federal government it is possible to argue that this emerging group of activists serve as a new carrier of memory. In order to fill the silence in which they had grown up, these politicized students turned to a few individuals who were willing to break the silence and challenge the narrative. These groups became what Henry Rousseau identifies as organizational carriers of memory whose commemorative activities would challenge the narrative established by the JACL, the preeminent organizational carrier of the World War II memory of Japanese Americans.

Historians Revisit the Narrative

These generational and cultural shifts were mirrored by a change of academic focus across the country. As a direct result of the student demands (and successful strikes), universities across the country developed Ethnic Studies programs, instituted new faculty hiring guidelines, and changed admissions programs.³⁶ Important and groundbreaking scholarship regarding confinement directly benefitted from the new academic focus. Roger Daniels’ *Concentration Camps U.S.A.* was the first volume published in the Berkshire Studies in Minority History series. In this book, Daniels not only discusses the loyalty oath and the segregation of “disloyals” to Tule Lake, but he made an important distinction about the kinds of opposition Japanese Americans expressed. He distinguished the principled resistance of those fighting for the restoration of their rights as *left opposition* as opposed to

the *right opposition* of pro-Japanese resistance.³⁷ Other historians, like Arthur Hansen, turned to oral histories as a means to reclaim voices not represented in earlier accounts. As Rousseau points out in *Vichy Syndrome*, scholars are also vectors of memory.³⁸ Subjects participating in oral history interviews, in particular, have the opportunity to challenge the monolithic narrative as Green suggests, or voice what Halbwachs calls their “autobiographical memories.”

This new scholarship documented a wide variety of responses to internment and discredited the government's longstanding contention that mass incarceration was a military necessity. The work contextualized the removal of Japanese Americans within the story of racism and the term “concentration camp” replaced earlier more euphemistic terms like “assembly center,” and “relocation camp.” Stories of resistance and dissent were included in the works.³⁹

In addition to these academic voices, students entering Asian Studies programs were likely to read John Okada's *No No Boy*, which had been rediscovered in the early 1970s by two Asian American students, Lawson Inada and Frank Chin. In 1976, two printings of the novel, each of 3000 copies, sold out. The book has become a staple in Asian American Studies and has been subsequently reprinted many times. The most recent edition of the book was published in 2014 and can be purchased both in hard copy and on Kindle. It includes an introduction that chronicles the poor reception the book had in the 1950s and its subsequent elevation to the “first Asian American novel” and addresses how the author confronts the monolithic JACL narrative.⁴⁰

Two Nisei Women Draw Attention to the Story

In the 1970s two Nisei women who had both spent part of their childhoods in War Relocation Authority camps would write important accounts of the wartime detention of Japanese Americans. One reinforced the narrative established by the JACL and the other challenged it. Michi Nishiura, a teenager when the evacuation order came, left camp to attend college and wrote her book after years of primary source research at the National Archives. Jeanne Wakatsuki, a pre-teen during the war, wrote her novel after being prompted to remember her days at Manzanar by questions from her nephew. Their books were as different as their experiences and their research.

Farewell to Manzanar

In 1973, Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston published a memoir, *Farewell to Manzanar*, about her family's experience during the war. Like so many other former prisoners, she decided to write the memoir of her family's incarceration at the Manzanar War Relocation center when her Sansei nephew asked about what had happened to the family. Houston was seven when her family was sent to Manzanar so her "memoir" relied upon earlier written official reports such as Dillon S. Myer's 1971 account of his years heading the War Relocation Authority. Working with her husband, author Jim Houston, she deliberately wanted to "educate" the public and felt it was important to win the sympathy of her readers. The book portrays all the "No-No's" as pro-Japan radicals without consideration of other possible motives for failing the loyalty questionnaire. Houston even declares that history has proven the wisdom of the JACL recommended acquiescence because, "the most effective way Japanese Americans could combat the attitudes that put them in places like Manzanar was to shed their blood on the battlefield."⁴¹ The 1973 edition of the book explicitly

pronounces that "...history has proved the JACL was right."⁴² *Farewell to Manzanar* was made into a movie and aired on the National Broadcasting Corporation (NBC) in 1976.

Though this movie was the first time that many in mainstream America had ever heard of the mass detention of Japanese Americans, some saw the book and movie, which reinforced the earlier and less complete story of detention as more harmful than helpful. Raymond Okamura, who fought successfully for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act, fiercely criticized the 1976 made-for-television movie. Pro-Japan imperialists are the camp bullies and the only voiced resistance to the loyalty questionnaire, implying once again, that resistance or dissenting views were not only rare, but illogical and unreasonable. War Relocation Authority Camp administrators, on the other hand, are portrayed as sympathetic and understanding in comparison to the hot-heads whom the film clearly blames for any violence in the camps. Frank Chin, who in 1976 with other members of the Combined Asian American Resources Project reprinted John Okada's *No-No Boy*, joined in the criticism, accusing the Houstons of "selling out."⁴³ Given the fact that Houston was seven years-old when she entered camp, it is easy to see that the earlier memorializations of camp life had a deep impact on what she presents as her own "memory" of the events. In turn, her narrative, presumed to be what Halbwachs would call an "autobiographical memory" carries the weight of an eyewitness account though it was strongly influenced by the mainstream commemorative activities of the JACL. The collective memory, in this case, becomes her personal memory.

Years of infamy: The untold story of America's concentration camps

Michi Nishiura Weglyn was born in California but graduated from high school while confined at the Gila River WRA center in Arizona. With the help of the National Japanese

American Student Relocation Council, Weglyn got permission to leave camp to attend Mt. Holyoke College in Massachusetts. When her family relocated to Seabrook Farms in New Jersey, Weglyn joined them there.⁴⁴ Driven by a desire to determine the government's motive behind the mass confinement of Japanese Americans, Weglyn conducted years of research at the National Archives before publishing her book *Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps*, which included reproductions of many of the documents she found most significant. The title, *Years of Infamy*, is a direct reference to the "Day of Infamy" speech Roosevelt made after the attack on Pearl Harbor and rebukes Roosevelt for the *years* of suffering that Executive Order 9066 engendered. Originally, Weglyn had been unable to find a publisher. But in another example of how cultural shifts make space for new voices, William Morrow, of New York, decided to publish a book that was openly critical of the government once the Watergate Scandal had hit the nation.⁴⁵ *Years of Infamy* first hit bookstores in 1976 the same year that *Farewell to Manzanar* reached the American television audience.

Although not an academic historian, Weglyn conducted extensive research at the National Archives, the Franklin Roosevelt Library, and the New York City Library. Weglyn quotes long passages from governmental reports and personal interviews. She includes the Munson Report in the appendix. This report, delivered to the president before the attack on Pearl Harbor unequivocally denying the potential of fifth column sabotage, is probably the single most damning document that Weglyn includes. It proves that Roosevelt knew that he was not acting out of military necessity when he signed Executive Order 9066 which called for the removal of Japanese Americans from the exclusion zone. She concludes that the decision to exclude Japanese Americans and confine them in concentration camps was based

upon racism and political expediency: western governors were unwilling to admit Japanese Americans into their states and the military exclusion order meant that Japanese Americans had to be moved somewhere. Weglyn also exposes the trauma that the loyalty questionnaire caused, and documents resistance at Tule Lake.⁴⁶ Here was the story of resistance that the student activists sought.

Some people criticized Weglyn's subtitle, *The **Untold** Story of America's Concentration Camps*, saying that the story of confusion, resistance, and dissent, and government culpability had been told before by historians like Daniels and Hansen. But her books reached an important audience of Japanese Americans that the academic books could not reach. Okamura, who with Edison Uno, led the grass roots campaign to repeal the Emergency Detention Act, praised the book as a "...major breakthrough for the telling of Japanese American history from a Japanese American perspective."⁴⁷ The book was the first to reach a large audience of former detainees.⁴⁸

The Impact on the Narrative

The civil rights era resulted in an awakening and empowerment of activists who challenged government policy both past and present and academics who challenged how those policies had been recorded and discussed. Challenging the historical narrative was not the cause but the effect of this awakening. Newly radicalized Asian American student groups with very little understanding of what Japanese Americans had experienced during the war sought sites of cultural significance to Asian Americans. In the end, no sites seemed as powerful as the sites of their parents' wartime detention. As this younger generation began to question the adults around them, a handful of Nisei made important contributions to

the scholarship and to acts of commemoration centered on their wartime incarceration experience.

Activists and academics challenged the narrative and memorialization culture established in the post war years, but new iconic, and powerful stories also emerged in mainstream America that reinforced the earlier narrative. After 1945, the carefully crafted story of heroic and successful Japanese Americans, strengthened by their confinement, persisted in national magazines and newspaper portrayals of the model minority and this characterization was deliberately used by the JACL to create the political momentum required to overturn the Emergency Detention Act. Articles about Asian Americans as the model minority may have angered activists as evidenced below but reinforced in the wider public the concept that confinement had done little to affect Japanese American success.

Henry Rousseau explains in *The Vichy Syndrome* that organizational carriers of memory are often “attached to a rather static image of the past.”⁴⁹ When Asian American activists challenged the previously established narrative, the JACL was reluctant to accept any modification to the narrative they had promoted so wholeheartedly. When Bill Hosokawa, Mike Masaoka’s personal friend and chronicler, prepared to publish his history of the Nisei in 1969, his working title, *Nisei: The Quiet Americans; The Story of a People*, came under attack for reinforcing the “model minority” stereotype. He considered changing the title until he learned that the JACL Ethnic Concerns Committee (a committee formed in 1968 by Sansei and Nisei dissidents within the JACL) was planning to boycott the book if he retained the working title.⁵⁰ In his own act of resistance, he left the title alone, and published it as it was. The old vanguard within the JACL embraced the term “model minority” and

wore the mantle proudly believing that it validated the strategy of compliance they urged throughout the war.⁵¹

The film adaptation of *Farewell to Manzanar*, aired on national television in 1976, even more so than the 1973 book by the same name, rejects the experiences of those who did not fit within the box of "compliant and patient" Japanese American. The broader American population had no memory of the war or internment, so this movie was often *the* educational opportunity to form an opinion or judgment about the policy. Professor and historian Alice Yang Murray at the University of California at Santa Cruz reports that when she surveys students in her college classes today, the students who have *any* knowledge of the confinement of Japanese Americans are most likely to say that what they know comes from exposure to *Farewell to Manzanar*⁵².

By the mid-1970s, many voices sought to challenge and broaden the overly simplified and incomplete narrative of the Japanese American World War II experience as established in the post-war era. As a whole, the country had far greater access to information regarding the detention of Japanese Americans during the war than ever before. Academics and activists had successfully reinserted the "mess halls, the shower rooms, and latrines" into the World War II experience of Japanese Americans. They had taken pilgrimages to those sites and seen the footprints of those buildings. The national discourse did make space for the story of confinement and detention but used this story as a means for celebrating the compliance and resiliency of Japanese Americans, thereby reinforcing the earlier narrative.

Redress Era: Activists Force the Government to Reconsider the History

While mainstream America was reading in *Newsweek* about "model minorities" and watching *Farewell to Manzanar* on NBC, activists were reading *Years of Infamy* and

building a case against the federal government. The coalition of Nisei and Sansei activists who spearheaded the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act did not set out to rewrite history: their primary goal was to confront a government that had overtly abused its power during the war and was threatening to use the same draconian measures on contemporary activists. In addition, activists challenged the cultural imperialism they found in government supported educational systems, arguing that standard university curricula was insensitive and irrelevant.⁵³ The repeal of the Emergency Detention Act invigorated these activists who soon succeeded in getting a pardon for Tokyo Rose (Iva Toguri)[†], the broad expansion of Ethnic Studies programs, the hiring of minority faculty to tenured academic positions, and the protection and revitalization of ethnic enclaves that were threatened by gentrification.⁵⁴ Some of these activists believed the time was right to force the government to acknowledge that confinement during World War II was not a “well-intentioned mistake” but a serious wrongdoing, a wrongdoing so egregious that redress and reparations were essential.

Activists Call for Redress

Edison Uno was the first person to publicly call for redress and reparations for Japanese Americans incarcerated by the U.S. government during World War II. In 1970, about the same time he and other activists were working to dismantle the Emergency Detention Act, Uno authored a resolution within the JACL calling for redress and reparations.⁵⁵ Though the JACL officially endorsed Uno’s call for redress, it committed

[†] Nisei Iva Toguri was visiting Japan when the war broke out. Stranded in Japan, the Japanese government used her to make English language broadcasts meant to demoralize American troops. Upon her return as a prisoner to the United States, she was tried and convicted of being the infamous “Tokyo Rose” and served six and a half years in prison. The jury never heard any of the broadcasts and witnesses were reportedly pressured into testifying.

neither time nor money to the movement. JACL insiders like Mike Masaoka and Bill Hosokawa were actually opposed to ever pursuing monetary reparations for the Japanese Americans incarcerated during the war. But Uno believed Michi Weglyn's book *Years of Infamy*, published in 1976 provided the evidence needed to secure some type of compensation or redress for the victims of Executive Order 9066. The book has even been called the "Bible of the Redress Movement."⁵⁶

Uno, Weglyn, and others had energized a whole generation during the 1970s. Many of the events that these activists organized served the dual purpose of educating the public and drawing attention to the issue of redress. Student and community activists initiated commemorative events regarding the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans designed to draw attention to the story of internment and pressure any Japanese Americans with political capital, whether lobbyists like the JACL, or the growing number of Japanese Americans in congress, to demand redress. In 1978, activists expanded their repertoire of commemorative activities in order to draw attention to this cause. On November 25, 1978, activists in Seattle, Washington held the first "Day of Remembrance" to commemorate the day that President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. The organizers hoped that education would lead the public to support the redress movement. Over 2000 people attended and participated in a "removal" reenactment.⁵⁷ A "Day of Remembrance" event is now held annually in 20 cities across the nation, including Washington, D.C. "Days of Remembrance" now take place on or near February 19 to coincide with the date that Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066.⁵⁸ The pilgrimages, reunions, and "Days of Remembrance" all sought to educate the community and pressure those with political power to take action.

By the late 1970s, new and more progressive national leadership at the JACL prepared to push for redress *and* reparations, despite some resistance from the old guard in the JACL. Japanese American politicians, the most notable being Senator Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii, who as a member of the 442nd Battalion lost an arm in battle, worried that the country was not appropriately prepared to meet these demands for a conversation about compensation for Japanese Americans. He felt the case for reparations was not yet strong enough. He proposed a strategy that would delay action but might increase the chances of passing redress legislation. He, and others, convinced Clifford Uyeda, the national JACL President, and John Tateisha, chair of the new JACL Redress Committee to postpone the request for reparations. These politicians suggested that the JACL ask the government to set up a commission to study the wartime treatment of Japanese Americans rather than lobby immediately for any monetary compensation.⁵⁹ The traditionally conservative JACL did just this. The result was the creation of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) and the birth of two new organizations that thought the JACL was moving too slowly, the National Council for Japanese American Redress (NCJAR) and the National Coalition for Redress/Reparations (NCRR).

Alice Yang Murray, a distinguished and prolific twenty-first century scholar of the confinement era, explains in *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* that the three groups that sought redress had quite different secondary goals and concerns. In Seattle (and Chicago), activists and scholars opposed to the perceived “stalling” on the part of the JACL, organized the NCJAR. Led by William Hohri, NCJAR pursued the idea of redress through the courts. Their legal arguments and documentation shored up the case for reparations and their call for \$220,000 of compensation

to each victim made more modest claims seem reasonable. In California, it was Sansei activists, radicalized during the Civil Rights Era, who formed the third group, the NCRR. This grassroots organization (which included a large number of the same people who planned the regular pilgrimages to both Manzanar and Tule Lake) sought to encourage a diverse group of Japanese Americans to testify at the commission hearings. NCRR also petitioned for additional hearings, provided translators and transportation for those who were going to testify, helped people prepare to testify, and engaged in extensive letter writing campaigns to assure monetary compensation.⁶⁰ The JACL provided political muscle through their lobbyists in Washington, D.C.

The differences in these groups often left them in conflict with each other in regards to what demands should be made of the government and what narrative should be promoted in order to meet those goals. Ultimately, however, these three organizations, coming at the issue from three different angles, each played a role in achieving monetary redress for Nikkei imprisoned during the war.⁶¹

Due to pressure from this wide variety of organizations coupled with the intense scholarship of the previous decades, the government was ultimately forced to address the narrative directly. In 1980, the government committed to a full investigation into the causes and effects of Executive Order 9066. In July of 1980, President Jimmy Carter signed into law the congressional proposal authorizing the formation of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC). It was the JACL's political clout and lobbying power that convinced the government to create a commission to investigate both the causes and consequences of the mass detention. Ironically, the commission, clearly intended to buy time and sympathy, proved to be of singular importance in contesting the earlier

government position that detention and confinement of Japanese Americans had been a well-intentioned mistake. But the government did not undertake this self-analysis without prompting from these well-organized and persistent groups. These same groups watched closely as the commission hearings proceeded.

The Commission, Their Charge, Their Process

The nine-member Commission, chaired by a prominent D.C. lawyer, included among other impressive participants, a former Supreme Court Justice, two former senators, a current federal Congressman from California, as well as a judge (the only member of Japanese heritage), a reverend and a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.⁶² The primary focus of the commission was to “...analyze the official government contention, historically accepted, that the exclusion, forced removal, and detention of Americans of Japanese ancestry were justified by military necessity.” In addition, the commission was tasked with writing an official report of their findings and making recommendations for redress if they deemed it necessary.⁶³

The Commission conducted the investigation on two parallel paths: the collection of personal testimonies and the review of both primary and secondary sources regarding internment. Between July and December of 1981, over 750 people testified before the commission during twenty days of hearings held in ten U.S. cities.⁶⁴ At the same time, researchers were digging deep into archives and reviewing the burgeoning historical literature regarding the World War II experiences of Japanese Americans. Angus Macbeth, Special Consul to the commission, aided by a group of researchers, was charged with compiling the research into a comprehensive report. The findings were published on February 24, 1983 titled *Personal Justice Denied* and the follow-up *Recommandations* were

made public in June of the same year.⁶⁵ In Macbeth's introduction to the report, he thanks many people for their participation in the research and also notes the contribution that, among others, Raymond Okamura and Michi Weglyn made and he notes that both Roger Daniels and Bill Hosokawa served as early readers of the drafted report.⁶⁶ In other words, the commission's work, relying heavily on previous scholarship, was thorough, inclusive and carefully crafted.

The Government Dramatically Alters the Official History

In a government report that opens with a summary, the assumption is that many people will read only the summary. So an analysis of the summary, both for what it includes and omits, is key. The introductory summary to the report opens with a tribute to the military service of Japanese Americans during World War II and follows that with the assertion that this service won acceptance for Japanese Americans after the war; this serves to validate the JACL accommodationist strategy and but could also be seen as an implicit criticism of those who did not serve. The summary provides an eloquent list of all the ways in which Japanese Americans suffered due to their wartime incarceration though it does not include the rupture of the Japanese American community itself in the list. There is a deeply sympathetic discussion of the terrible conditions at Tule Lake and it discusses the renunciation policy later in the report.

The commission published the first part of their report, their findings, in February, 1983 and the second part, their recommendations, four months later. These reports were compiled into a single publication in 1997, called *Personal Justice Denied*, with a preface by Tetsuden Kashima of the University of Washington, who praised the report for its authority, thoroughness, and influence. The officially authorized report was researched for over 18

months by a large and competent staff and it has influenced subsequent economic, legal, and international policy, as well as promoted new academic foci.⁶⁷ In his preface to the 1997 report publication Kashima, praises the report for drastically altering the “official position held for some four decades.”⁶⁸

The report tackles head on the same question that Michi Weglyn used to frame her investigation for *Years of Infamy*. Was the World War II detention of Japanese Americans a military necessity? On page 18 of the 24 page summary of the 350 page report, just after a break in the text, the report says,

The promulgation of Executive Order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and the decisions which followed from it – detention, ending detention, and ending exclusion – were not driven by analysis of military conditions. The broad historical causes which shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership.⁶⁹

The argument that the removal of Japanese Americans from their homes and their confinement in prison camps throughout the country, was due to military necessity, is soundly rejected. Though the phrasing is direct and clear, it is also made politically more palatable through some very discreet linguistic modifications. The phrases that had been so controversial ten years earlier while the Manzanar Committee negotiated with the State Landmarks Department over the plaque at that site have been tempered: “hysteria” became “war hysteria” and “racism” became “race prejudice.”

The report begins front and center by saying there was no military necessity for the detention of Japanese Americans and it contests many other aspects of the narrative as well. It challenges the idea that Japanese Americans have been resilient and are none the worse for their experience. In the final chapter, titled “After Camp,” the report directly confronts the idea of the “model minority” having been rewarded for their perseverance. The report

summarizes data that suggests that despite high levels of education, there is still a significant income gap between Japanese Americans and their white peers with comparable education levels.⁷⁰

The report completely rejects the idea that silence is evidence of healing. “It became obvious that a forty-year silence did not mean that bitter memories had dissipated; they had only been buried in a shallow grave.”⁷¹ Thus the report suggests that silence might represent denial, lost faith, shame, and/or self-loathing.⁷² The final paragraph in the report summarizes the impact that incarceration had on a full generation,

“Before evacuation.” “After camp.” Words signifying the watershed in the history of Japanese Americans ... It is the central experience which has shaped the way they see themselves, how they see America, and how they have raised their children.⁷³

The report also tackles the issue of the loyalty questionnaire. In the summary, the commission addresses the issue of the loyalty questionnaire powerfully and succinctly using text quoted directly from a later chapter in the report.

Understandably most evacuees probably had deeply ambiguous feelings about a government whose rhetorical values of liberty and equality they wished to believe, but who found their present treatment in painful contradiction to those values.⁷⁴

This passage is followed by long quotes from three different testimonials about how ugly things became in the camps after the camp administrators distributed the loyalty questionnaire and lays the blame for the botched deployment of the questionnaire at the feet of the government. The report ends this section with a careful explanation of the segregation of those who were “unwilling to profess loyalty” to the “Tule Lake camp, which rapidly became a center of disaffection and protest against the government and its policies—the unhappy refuge of evacuees consumed by anger and despair.”⁷⁵

The deeply contentious loyalty questionnaire is discussed in greater depth and sympathy in Chapter 7 “Loyalty: Leave and Segregation.” This section provides a comprehensive list of all the reasons not to have answered “yes, yes” to questions 27 and 28 on the questionnaire. It concludes “[the questionnaire]...broke apart the community of evacuees by forcing each to a clear choice—a choice that could be made only by guesswork about a very uncertain future.”⁷⁶ This aspect of the report is important for two reasons: first, it is a rare acknowledgement that the community was rent asunder by the loyalty questionnaire and second, it suggests that no one could make a choice based on anything other than supposition.

Chapter 9 “Protest and Disaffection” is a relatively short section divided into three subsections: “The Draft” is one page, “Renunciation” is four pages long, and “Repatriation and Expatriation” is also one page. The material in this section comes almost exclusively from *The Spoilage* by Dorothy Swaine and Richard Nishimoto and *Years of Infamy* by Michi Weglyn.

Personal Justice Denied draws the same conclusion that *The Spoilage* drew 35 years earlier, renunciation was largely the result of pressure from pro-Japanese Kibei within the camp. That conclusion, however, is inconsistent with the other findings presented in the report. The report admits that pro-Japan pressure had little effect upon renunciation and that it was the announcement that the camps would close within the year that spurred a jump in renunciation. For families segregated at Tule Lake, camp closure would precipitate two potential problems: Nisei children expected to be separated from their Issei parents, and anyone who returned to his or her prewar home was potentially in physical danger due to continuing anti-Japanese sentiment. Apparently, many in Tule Lake saw the way to avoid

both problems was to remain in camp and the way to remain in camp was to renounce your citizenship. The report adds, at the end of the paragraph, that some might have used renunciation as a way to express “resentment.”⁷⁷ Despite the reports’ stated conclusion, it was not pro-Japanese pressure that caused citizens to renounce their citizenship but a combination of resentment and fear caused by potentially deliberate mismanagement and/or bullying on the part of the administration.

Other aspects of the narrative remain

There are two key ways in which the report reinforces the narrative established in the immediate post war years. The first is the choice of language and terminology. The activists and scholars of the civil rights era had worked hard to use accurate legal terminology to describe the experience. Japanese Americans had been detained and confined in “concentration camps” without the benefit of trial or individual review. The CWRIC report speaks twice about the decision to use what they admit themselves are euphemistic terms such as “evacuees” and “relocation camps.” In the introduction, the explanation is that the committee wanted to “...mirror accurately the history of the time and to avoid the confusion and controversy a new terminology might provoke.”⁷⁸ In a long footnote following the first paragraph in Chapter 1 “Before Pearl Harbor” the argument is that “concentration camp” today has such different connotations that it would be “inaccurate and unfair” to use this term to describe the camps where Japanese Americans were detained.⁷⁹ The report does not even use the term “internment camp” but chooses the even more euphemistic “relocation camp” to describe the centers.

In addition, the report continues to emphasize the World War II military record of the Japanese American population and asserts, as fact, how valuable this service was in securing

their acceptance in postwar America. On the third page of the 24 page “summary” of the report *Personal Justice Denied*, the commission emphasized the loyalty of Japanese Americans which was “...demonstrated beyond any doubt by the record of Nisei soldiers, who returned from the battlefields of Europe as the most decorated and distinguished combat unit of World War II.”⁸⁰ In the introduction to Chapter 10 “Military Service” the statement is made that 33,000 Nisei served in the military during World War II. Having established that over 110,000 Japanese Americans were incarcerated during the war, the fact that 33,000 served seems impressive indeed. The more detailed truth that the 33,000 figure also pulled from the 160,000 Japanese Americans living in Hawaii, who volunteered at high rates remains unmentioned. Prior to the reinstatement of the draft for Japanese Americans in early 1944, fewer than 1000 mainland Japanese Americans volunteered for the armed forces. During the same time period, in Hawaii, where the government predicted lower enlistment rates, over 10,000 Nikkei voluntarily enlisted.⁸¹ The omission of details dramatically affects the overall narrative.

The Japanese American Citizens League long contended that quiet accommodation to detention and confinement and military participation would benefit Japanese Americans in the long run. It was the premise behind cooperation. It is why the JACL accepted the euphemistic language the government adopted. This language makes the mass detention sound charitable and makes accommodation more reasonable than resistance. In the opening summary, the report asserts that the demonstration of loyalty on the battlefields “...was of immense practical importance in obtaining postwar acceptance for the ethnic Japanese.”⁸² This assertion is repeated in the opening paragraphs of Chapter 10, “Military Service.” The evidence given to support this conclusion coming at the end of the same chapter, is entirely

anecdotal, and actually does more to prove that returning soldiers continued to face racist remarks and discriminatory treatment than that it won universal acceptance for Japanese Americans. It goes on to give two examples of how veterans themselves, not the Japanese American community at large, gained acceptance by virtue of their individual service.⁸³ This kind of “half-truth” serves the established narrative of unbridled patriotism well but may serve as an implicit criticism of those who challenged the JACL wartime policy of accommodation, thereby silencing that story once again.

Significance of the commission and the report

The CWRIC had immediate, significant and even astonishing consequences for Japanese Americans. As a result of the CWRIC investigation and report, and many hours of work on the part of activists, the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 was passed by Congress and signed into law by President Reagan. The act called for a public apology to all displaced persons, a \$20,000 reparations payment to each camp survivor, and the establishment of a public education fund.⁸⁴ President Ronald Reagan, in signing the bill said, “Here we admit a wrong. Here we affirm our commitment as a nation to equal justice under the law.” It is a remarkable admission, and for many Americans, the ceremony surrounding the signing of the law was the first that they had heard of the incarceration of Japanese Americans during the war.⁸⁵ The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (CLPEF) was created to oversee the use of the money and fund appropriate projects that contributed to the understanding of this tragic event.⁸⁶ This group is responsible for the publication of the 1997 edition of the CWRIC report *Personal Justice Denied*.

Though an increasing number of Japanese Americans had broken their silence regarding their wartime experiences, this official government sponsored investigation opened

the floodgates for many who had never discussed their incarceration before. Much of the testimony included phrases like, “I have never mentioned this to anyone before...”⁸⁷

Whether intended to slow the call for redress or not, once the CWRIC was established, the collective Japanese American community, whether active in a redress group or not, rallied to the cause. The Commission hearings became the focus of the community in the early 1980s. Once the hearings ended and the Commission made its report, the same groups exerted pressure on the U.S. Congress to pass landmark redress legislation through pilgrimages, Days of Remembrance, legal challenges, letter writing campaigns, and general publicity. The groups seeking redress used these commemorative acts as political tools. It was a fight that took almost the entire decade and it was not until the early 1990s that the first reparation checks were issued.[‡] These were all significant legislative achievements but the testimony of hundreds of witnesses and the report itself had the potential to widen the narrative more than ever before. The government had finally weighed in and acknowledged culpability for the wartime confinement of thousands of people. This new government report, as an official carrier of memory, broadened the narrative in important and critical ways.

Impact on the Narrative

During the 1960s, 1970s, and the 1980s, all the carriers of memory weighed in on the narrative of the World War II experience of Japanese Americans. The Civil Rights movement, and threats to leaders of that movement served to mobilize both Nisei who had been incarcerated during the war and Sansei who searched for evidence of resistance to the

[‡] Many in the community are still fighting for reparations to a number of Japanese Latin Americans, handed over by their governments to the United States, who spent their war years in U.S. DOJ camps.

wartime policy that cast shadows in their homes. These students and their Nisei teachers became organizational carriers of memory who demanded that the story of the wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans be commemorated. Among other things, they organized pilgrimages and fought for historical markers. In addition, they influenced the academics who served as the scholarly carriers of memory. Student demands led to the development of ethnic studies programs and the diversification of textbooks. Some historians began collecting oral histories from those who had lived through the experience. Roger Daniels and Michi Weglyn wrote transformative books about the wartime confinement of Japanese Americans that replaced earlier euphemistic terminology and they wrote on all aspects of the experience including resistance. Students had resurrected *No-No Boy* which became a staple in Asian Studies courses.

Most remarkably, these same forces which were transforming the narrative ultimately pressured the federal government, as an official vector of memory, to write a government-sanctioned document that would help establish a collective memory of the confinement era. Though the Commission made a deliberate choice to reject the terminology used by the most progressive academics, the publication of *Personal Justice Denied* is remarkable and resulted in both a formal apology to those incarcerated during the war and monetary compensation as well.

Though the narrative was broadened substantially by organizations, academics and even the government itself, there were ways in which the old narrative continued to thrive. The most visible cultural representation of the confinement era was the novel and television movie *Farewell to Manzanar*, which tended to oversimplify the experience and reinforce the JACL narrative. And, ironically, in an attempt to get the Civil Liberties Law passed, all of

the groups fighting for passage played up the military heroism of Japanese Americans. Passage of the legislation practically mandated an endorsement of the monolithic story of Japanese American patriotism. In fact, the resolution as proposed in the House of Representatives was named H.R. 442 in honor of the all Nikkei 442nd Regimental Combat Team.⁸⁸ The implicit message was that reparations were not necessarily owed because the government had perpetrated a great injustice but that somehow reparations were due to Japanese Americans because they had served so loyally in the armed forces.

Ultimately, the calls for redress prompted the government to reassess the history of internment and rewrite an official account of it. Organizations like the JACL, the NCJAR, and the NCCRR participated both in calling for this reassessment and in monitoring the progress of the commission. In addition to individual testimonials, many individual scholars and activists made contributions to the process as well. Though the new report, *Personal Justice Denied*, included overwhelming and damning evidence against the government, and sympathetic accounts of the confusion in the detention centers surrounding loyalty and renunciation, it did not contest the admittedly euphemistic terminology, although this may seem minor in relation to all the book achieved, the language has particular power to marginalize the story of dissent.

¹ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American: A Memoir and Selected Writings* (San Mateo: Asian American Curriculum Project, 2005), 167-168.

² Raymond Okamura, Robert Takasugi, Hiroshi Kanno, and Edison Uno, "Campaign to Repeal the Emergency Detention Act," *Amerasia Journal*, 2:1 (1974):71-94.

³ "Asian American Movement 1968." Asian American Movement 1968 <http://aam1968.blogspot.com/>. (accessed Aug 02 2012).

⁴ Masumi Izumi. "Repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 ("Emergency Detention Act")," *Densho Encyclopedia*

[http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20\(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22)/) (accessed Dec 7 2015).

⁵ Alice Yang. "Edison Uno," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Edison%20Uno/> (accessed Jun 25 2015).

⁶ Okamura, "Campaign to Repeal," 75.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid, 85.

⁹ Okamura, "Campaign to Repeal," 75.

¹⁰ Masumi Izumi. "Repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 ("Emergency Detention Act")," *Densho Encyclopedia*
[http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20\(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22)/) (accessed Sep 26 2015).

¹¹ Okamura, "Campaign to Repeal," 78.

¹² Masumi Izumi. "Repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950 ("Emergency Detention Act")," *Densho Encyclopedia*
[http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20\(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Repeal%20of%20Title%20II%20of%20the%20Internal%20Security%20Act%20of%201950%20(%22Emergency%20Detention%20Act%22)/) (accessed Sep 26 2015).

¹³ Okamura, "Campaign to Repeal," 72.

¹⁴ Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008), 233-234.

¹⁵ "Uno, Edison. OAC." Uno, Edison.
<http://socialarchive.iath.virginia.edu/xtf/view?docId=uno-edison-cr.xml>. (accessed April 05 2013).

¹⁶ Alice Yang. "Edison Uno," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Edison%20Uno/> (accessed Apr 6 2013).

¹⁷ Barbara Takei personal interview with the author, March 2013.

¹⁸ Michi Nishiura Weglyn, *Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999), 280.

-
- ¹⁹ Barbara Takei interview.
- ²⁰ Tetsuden Kashima, *Judgment without Trial: Japanese American Imprisonment during World War II*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003), 107.
- ²¹ Ibid.
- ²² Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 218.
- ²³ "Asian American Movement 1968." <http://aam1968.blogspot.com/>.
- ²⁴ Angela Rose Ryan, "Education for the People: The Third World Student Movement at San Francisco State College and City College of New York," (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 2010), 8.
- ²⁵ Don T. Nakanishi, "Surviving Democracy's 'Mistake'," *Amerasia Journal*, Vol 19, no.1 (1992): 11.
- ²⁶ *The Manzanar Committee*, "About Us," http://www.manzanarcommittee.org/The_Manzanar_Committee/About_Us.html (accessed June 25, 2015)
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Kelli Nakamura. "The Lost Years: 1942–1946 (book)," *Densho Encyclopedia* [http://encyclopedia.densho.org/The%20Lost%20Years:%201942%E2%80%931946%20\(book\)](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/The%20Lost%20Years:%201942%E2%80%931946%20(book)) (accessed Nov 8 2015).
- ³¹ *The Manzanar Committee*, "About Us."
- ³² The Manzanar state historical plaque reads as follows; "Manzanar In the early part of World War II, 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were interned in relocation centers by executive order NO. 9066, issued on February 19, 1942. Manzanar, the first of ten such concentration camps, was bounded by barbed wire and guard towers, confining 10,000 persons. The majority being American citizens. May the injustices and humiliation suffered here as a result of hysteria, racism and economic exploitation never emerge again. California Registered Historical Landmark NO. 850 Plaque placed by the State Department of Parks and Recreation in cooperation with the Manzanar committee and the Japanese American Citizens League, April 14, 1975."
- ³³ Shiho Imai. "Dillon Myer," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Dillon%20Myer/> (accessed Sep 26 2015).

-
- ³⁴ *The Manzanar Committee*, "About Us."
- ³⁵ Stan Shikuma, personal interview with the author, April 2013.
- ³⁶ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 218.
- ³⁷ Roger Daniels, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 118.
- ³⁸ Henry Rousseau, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 222.
- ³⁹ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 235.
- ⁴⁰ Patricia Wakida. "No-No Boy (book)," *Densho Encyclopedia*
[http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-No%20Boy%20\(book\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-No%20Boy%20(book)/) (accessed Dec 7 2015).
- ⁴¹ Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston and James D. Houston, *Farewell to Manzanar: A True Story of Japanese-American Experience during and after World War II Internment* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), 61-63.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 227.
- ⁴⁴ Sharon Yamato. "Michi Nishiura Weglyn," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Michi%20Nishiura%20Weglyn/> (accessed Sep 26 2015).
- ⁴⁵ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 244.
- ⁴⁶ Michi Nishiura Weglyn, *Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1996), 134-174.
- ⁴⁷ Okamura, "Campaign to Repeal," 78.
- ⁴⁸ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 244.
- ⁴⁹ Rousseau, *The Vichy Syndrome*, 220.
- ⁵⁰ Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment*, 214-217.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 219.
- ⁵² Ibid., 226.
- ⁵³ Stanley Shikuma, personal conversation with the author on the 2010 Tule Lake Pilgrimage, July, 2010.

-
- ⁵⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵⁵ Alice Yang. "Edison Uno," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Edison%20Uno/> (accessed Dec 7 2015).
- ⁵⁶ Sharon Yamato. "Michi Nishiura Weglyn," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Michi%20Nishiura%20Weglyn/> (accessed Apr 14 2013).
- ⁵⁷ Martha Nakagawa. "Days of Remembrance," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Days%20of%20Remembrance/> (accessed Jun 25 2015).
- ⁵⁸ Martha Nakagawa. "Days of Remembrance," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Days%20of%20Remembrance/> (accessed Apr 27 2013).
- ⁵⁹ Alice Yang. "Redress movement," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Redress%20movement/> (accessed Dec 7 2015). Houston
- ⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ⁶¹ Ibid.
- ⁶² Yamato, Sharon. "Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians." *Densho Encyclopedia*. 22 Oct 2013, 17:15 PDT. 4 Jun 2015, 08:12
<<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Commission%20on%20Wartime%20Relocation%20and%20Internment%20of%20Civilians/>>.
- ⁶³ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, Prologue, *Personal Justice Denied* (Washington, D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), xi.
- ⁶⁴ Tetsuden Kashima, Foreword, *Personal Justice Denied* (Washington, D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), xvii.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶⁶ Angus Macbeth, Introduction, *Personal Justice Denied*. (Washington, D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), xxx.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., xx.
- ⁶⁸ Kashima, Foreword. *Personal Justice Denied*, xvii.
- ⁶⁹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied* (Wash., D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), 18.
- ⁷⁰ CWRIC
- ⁷¹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 297.

-
- ⁷² Ibid., 299.
- ⁷³ Ibid., 301.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., 13.
- ⁷⁵ Ibid., 15.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid., 211.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., 249.
- ⁷⁸ Macbeth, Introduction, *Personal Justice Denied*, xxviii.
- ⁷⁹ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 27.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid., 3.
- ⁸¹ Brian Niiya. "Japanese Americans in military during World War II," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20Americans%20in%20military%20during%20World%20War%20II/> (accessed Jun 2015).
- ⁸² United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 13.
- ⁸³ Ibid., 259.
- ⁸⁴ Sharon Yamato. "Civil Liberties Act of 1988," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Civil%20Liberties%20Act%20of%201988/> (accessed Jun 2015).
- ⁸⁵ Peggy Loftfield in personal conversation with the author, July, 2010.
- ⁸⁶ Prologue. *Personal Justice Denied*. Wash., D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997. xi.
- ⁸⁷ United States, *Personal Justice Denied*, 13.
- ⁸⁸ Sharon Yamato. "Civil Liberties Act of 1988," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Civil%20Liberties%20Act%20of%201988/> (accessed Jun 2015).

Chapter 4 – Experiencing the Narrative at Tule Lake

I wish I could share
the feeling I have now
with the Issei and Nisei
they who lived here
they who do not speak of it
who pass it off
as a good time experience.
Whatever we did here
the commitments we made
loyal or disloyal
compliance or resistance
yes or no
it was right!
Because the young people
make it so
because they seek the history
from those of us who lived it.
So we must remember it
and tell it
we must acknowledge it
and tell it. (1975)

*—Excerpt from “A Meeting at Tule Lake” by Hiroshi Kashiwagi*¹

Kashiwagi captures the ways in which the narrative of the mass wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans has changed over time in this portion of his poem “A Meeting at Tule Lake.” Kashiwagi’s poem reveals the pattern of selective remembrance within the Japanese American community in the postwar era. In the period of erasure that directly follows the war, many simply will “not speak of it.” Then there are those “who pass it off as a good time experience.” This is the kind of rehearsed and “socially acceptable” collective memory that oral historian Anna Green describes in her article “Individual Remembering and ‘Collective Memory’.” This kind of remembering serves as self-protection because the experience itself was painful or there is danger in recounting the darker details.² Kashiwagi, as Green

predicts can happen, challenges both the silence and the established narrative declaring that whatever the decisions individuals made during the war were “right.” In his experience, not all the choices Japanese Americans made during the war have been deemed “right” and he is eager to participate in this reevaluation of history.

In the years since the war, groups within the Japanese American community with social power embraced a master narrative of compliance, patriotism, and resilience. Silenced by both official and organizational carriers of memory, the government and JACL respectively, were the experiences of the no-nos, the draft resisters, and the renunciants; those stories were not even considered acceptable let alone honorable. In his 1975 poem, Kashiwagi acknowledges that there were diverse responses to removal and incarceration, and challenges the privileged, monolithic narrative of patriotic accommodation, and also asserts that the complete spectrum of responses was “right.”

In this portion of the poem, he is no longer talking about the ubiquitous physical details that unified all the War Relocation Authority (WRA) camps: the guard towers, the barbed wire fences, the mess halls, and the latrines. He has introduced the psychological details that distinguished Tule Lake from all other camps: disloyalty and resistance. He is willing to speak openly of the diversity of choices and experiences because the young people who “seek the history from those of us who lived it” emboldened him to do so. He felt that the activism and interest of the students of the 1970s created an opportunity or space to unsilence these other memories. The unacceptable is now not merely acceptable but even revered. It is not just Kashiwagi whom the young people ask to speak, so he exhorts “those of us who lived it” to reexamine our own accounts of internment in order to tell the difficult

story of the loyalty oath and the stigma attached to those unwilling to answer an unqualified “yes-yes,” and their subsequent detention in the Tule Lake Segregation Center.

So we must remember it
And tell it
We must acknowledge it
And tell it.³

This portion of the poem also illustrates the reluctance of Issei and Nisei to return to the site of incarceration. In 1975, Kashiwagi was one of only a handful of Nisei to make the trip back to Tule Lake. He cannot “share” his feelings with those who will not participate. What Kashiwagi doesn’t know is that within a quarter century, former detainees will constitute a majority of the pilgrimage participants who journey every other year to Tule Lake.

This chapter examines the first thirty years of official pilgrimages to Tule Lake and evaluates of the breadth, scope, purpose, and impact of those pilgrimages. These pilgrimages, coordinated since 1978 by a group calling themselves the Tule Lake Committee, largely reflect the commemorative activities and political activism taking place in the rest of the country. Despite the unique “segregation” status of those who lived in Tule Lake, understanding that experience and celebrating it, will not yet take center stage even when visiting the site of segregation itself.

The Sources for the Historic Tule Lake Pilgrimage

This chapter relies heavily on the research and memory of three people. Richard Katsuda attended the first Tule Lake Committee pilgrimage in 1978 and then joined the Committee soon after. Stan Shikuma attended his first pilgrimage in 1979 and has either attended or planned each subsequent pilgrimage. Sachiko Takita was a participant observer of

the pilgrimage from 1993-2006 while earning her Ph.D. in sociology at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Richard Katsuda

Richard Katsuda had already graduated from Stanford University when he made his first pilgrimage to Tule Lake in 1978. As an undergraduate, he took a class from Edison Uno regarding the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II but he felt little connection to his Japanese American peers, though intellectually he understood the significance of the confinement era. As he explains it, he was alienated and cynical and even chose to live in the Chicano dorm on campus rather than the Asian dorm. While working at the Stanford University Press after graduation, friends asked if he wanted to attend a presentation about the upcoming pilgrimage being made by a group called the Tule Lake Committee; he attended the meeting, and then the pilgrimage.⁴

Katsuda characterizes the emotional impact of the 1978 pilgrimage, which he attended with friends, as a “life-changer.” He felt himself a part of the Asian community in a way that was new, and that inspired him both personally and politically. In his words, he knew that after the pilgrimage he would have to “do something.” And he did. He became the associate director of the San Jose Yu-Ai Kai Japanese American Senior Center, where newfound surrogate grandparents made him part of their families. He was a founding member of the San Jose Nihonmachi Outreach Committee (NOC) to whom he presented a post pilgrimage report in 1979. He also joined Bill Sato, Kathy Shiroy, Kathy Inamasu, and Jay Wong on the newly formed Tule Lake Committee and helped to plan multiple pilgrimages.⁵

In 1980, he helped organize the National Coalition for Redress/Reparations (NCRR); through this organization, he helped recruit and prepare older Nikkei to testify about their wartime incarceration to the congressionally configured Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC). He moved to southern California in the mid-1980s and remained active in the Japanese American community. He worked at the Japanese American National Museum (JANM) with teachers, including the author, building state specific curriculum regarding the Japanese American World War II experience. He did not attend another Tule Lake Pilgrimage until 2012.⁶ His absence during the post redress era gives him an opportunity to draw comparisons between the first pilgrimages and the contemporary pilgrimage.

Stan Shikuma

Stanley N. Shikuma was born in 1953 in Brogan, OR and was raised in Watsonville, California. Like many third generation Japanese Americans, or Sansei, he learned very little about the War Relocation centers at home from his parents but he was influenced by an older cousin and his older sister. Shikuma's cousin participated in the Third World Strike at San Francisco State (1968-69) and his sister was part of the Ethnic Studies and the Asian American Movement at UCLA (1970-1974).⁷

As an undergraduate at Stanford, Shikuma recruited Edison Uno, Nisei activist, to teach an extension class at Stanford. Shikuma, started graduate school at the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) in the fall of 1978 and there joined the Asian Student Union (ASU). He participated in his first pilgrimage to Tule Lake in the spring of 1979. At around the same time, he read Michi Weglyn's book *Years of Infamy*. From these experiences he

knew that the Tule Lake Segregation Center held special significance in the history of internment. He also knew that his mother had been interned there prior to segregation.⁸

Shikuma has attended and/or organized every official pilgrimage to the site since 1979 which makes him uniquely qualified to address the changes he has witnessed in the pilgrimage. In addition, Shikuma has made formal presentations about the genesis and evolution of the pilgrimage to a variety of audiences. He is currently on the Board of Directors for the Tule Lake Committee.⁹

Sachiko Takita

Sachiko Takita, as a visiting scholar from Japan, did not attend her first pilgrimage until 1993, but her extensive research into the history of the Tule Lake Committee and the evolution of the pilgrimage for her sociology doctoral dissertation, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage and Japanese American Internment: Collective Memory, Solidarity, and Division in an Ethnic Community” provides important material for this analysis. A “participant observer” on the pilgrimages that took place from 1993 to 2006, she conducted extensive interviews with past and current Committee members. She also had access to all the Committee meeting minutes that have been kept over the years. In addition, she conducted and analyzed post-pilgrimage surveys of the participants.¹⁰

Takita’s personal experience with the pilgrimage offers important first-hand accounts of the post redress era pilgrimages, but her extensive research into the history of the pilgrimage, and access to the Tule Lake Committee archives is key to understanding the historical arc of the pilgrimage. In addition, she analyzed the robust ethnic press accounts of the early pilgrimages that serve as a window into the ethnic community and represent the

discussions taking place within the Japanese American community regarding the manner in which they have remembered and their World War II experiences.¹¹

Early Pilgrimages Stir an Awakening

The first pilgrimage to Tule Lake was, like Manzanar's first pilgrimage, held in 1969. Warren Furutani who organized the first Manzanar pilgrimage assisted with planning this Tule Lake pilgrimage which was organized by Asian American Concern, a student group from the University of California, Davis (UC Davis). Like the pilgrimage to Manzanar, Tule Lake became a site for a pilgrimage primarily because it was the closest potential pilgrimage site to a large and active group of Asian American students both in the San Francisco Bay area and in the Sacramento area. However, Tule Lake, just south of the Oregon border, at a distance of 300 miles from U.C. Davis, and 360 miles from the Bay Area, was not easily accessible for a day trip; this may explain, in part, why Tule Lake did not become the site of regular pilgrimages as quickly as Manzanar did.¹²

The second pilgrimage to Tule Lake five years later, in 1974, was organized by the Northern California/Western Nevada District of the Japanese American Citizens League. This pilgrimage had about 200 participants, was featured in *TIME* magazine and was followed up by a post pilgrimage community forum in San Francisco that was attended by about 450 people. In 1975, Asian American students from 10 Bay Area campus Asian Student Unions organized a student led pilgrimage that included a nine-mile march from the Tulelake-Butte Valley fairgrounds to the camp.¹³ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, the poet whose work opens each chapter of this paper, was invited by the student activists who organized this second pilgrimage to travel with them. It was during the overnight bus trip from the Bay Area that Kashiwagi penned his poem, "A Meeting at Tule Lake," and while others pulled

out their sleeping bags early the next morning and slept, he made a more legible second draft of the poem on a legal pad from which he read it later in the day to the assembled group. It was at the direct bidding of the students that he sought to record and “tell” of his experience in Tule Lake.¹⁴

After this pilgrimage Edison Uno and Raymond Okamura, longtime partners in their efforts to repeal the Emergency Detention Act, sparred about the meaning of the 1975 pilgrimage in the ethnic press.* When Uno wrote about the 1975 pilgrimage in the *Hokubei Mainichi* in May of 1975, Raymond Okamura responded with an article titled, “The Ugly Side of Tule Lake.” Okamura was disappointed that Tule Lake had been treated during the pilgrimage “...as if it was indistinguishable from the other camps; it was where prisoners were in constant defiance and protest; it was the most brutal and repressive of all the camps; and in the end it was the most tragic.”¹⁵ For Okamura, the pilgrims had missed the point. Stan Shikuma acknowledges that during the early pilgrimages, those who attended were new to the history of detention and confinement and did not have a good understanding that Tule Lake was of particular importance to the wartime experience of Japanese Americans.¹⁶

The ethnic press also featured accusations by some Nisei that the Sansei were simply trying to stir things up when the “pleasant memories” were all that former prisoners chose to remember and recount.¹⁷ The Sansei did want to know more about the experience and did find it difficult to get a majority of Nisei to talk about it beyond the “good time experience” Kashiwagi comments on in his poem. This conflict over what should be remembered and how still lingers at Tule Lake.

* There is a long tradition of bilingual Japanese American newspapers, and in the 1970s there were two daily newspapers being produced for Japanese American readers in San Francisco, the *Hokubei Mainichi* and *Nichi Bei Shimibun*.

Kashiwagi's poem hints at a stigma attached to Tule Lake, and even references the loyalty questionnaire, but it would take a knowledgeable person to process all of those references during a single reading of the poem. Kashiwagi reveals in his poem the nature of the difficult choices that people had to make, but he is careful never to reveal his own personal choices, perhaps because that revelation would still be too dangerous, or bring shame to his family. The terrible conditions and the contentious decisions are dealt with in an abstract rather than personal manner. For most attendants, the distinction between Tule Lake and the other WRA camps was too much to process, hence Okamura's criticism.

A 1976 pilgrimage was sponsored by the Japanese Christian Church Federation of Northern California.¹⁸ Three official pilgrimages in seven years, each organized by a different group, prevented the deep understanding of the significance of Tule Lake, as a site of segregation. Okamura hoped that pilgrims to Tule Lake would have an understanding of the distinction that Tule Lake had as a site of segregation but that level of understanding would be impossible to achieve without consistent and knowledgeable leadership.

Then, in March, 1978, a new coalition organized a pilgrimage. They called themselves the Tule Lake Committee. The group blended members of the Committee Against Nihonmachi Eviction (CANE) of San Francisco and the Northern California Region of the Asian Pacific Student Union as well as others.¹⁹ Most committee members were in college or just out of college but still active politically in their communities. In some iteration or another, the Tule Lake Committee has hosted twenty official Tule Lake pilgrimages since 1978.²⁰ Over the last twenty-five years, committee membership has changed, pilgrimage activities have changed, even the goal of the pilgrimage has changed but all have been hosted

by a group calling themselves the Tule Lake Committee. This demonstrates a degree of continuity missing from the earliest years of pilgrimage to Tule Lake.

Early Tule Lake Committee Promotes Education and Activism

Student activists in the San Francisco Bay Area during the 1960s and 1970s were instrumental in challenging what they saw as outdated college curriculum, U.S. imperialist foreign policy goals, and local redevelopment plans that came at the expense of ethnic enclaves and historically significant neighborhoods. As these students graduated, many remained in Northern California and continued their work as community activists, seeking to preserve ethnic neighborhoods or prevent evictions of Asian immigrants from increasingly valuable inner-city real estate. These activists often coordinated their efforts with the college groups in which they had recently been active members.²¹

The Tule Lake Committee drew participants from the Northern California Region of the Asian Pacific Student Union, the San Francisco community group Committee Against Nihonmachi Evictions (CANE which later became the Japanese Community Progressive Alliance), and ultimately from the San Jose Nihonmachi Organizing Committee (NOC) as well. The founding principles of the committee were to “Expose the racist incarceration of the Japanese people during World War II as part of their history of oppression and resistance in the United States.”²² The main goal of these early Tule Lake Committee pilgrimages was to “correct the history books and to educate and politicize participants.”²³ “Correcting the history books” meant the reinsertion of the story of mass-incarceration, not necessarily the story of resistance to mass-incarceration. The many layers of silencing made the full story hard to excavate and to explain. Once pilgrims learned about the wartime detention, the

organizers wanted participants to return home and do something about this historic injustice.²⁴

After hosting their first pilgrimage in 1978, the Tule Lake Committee (TLC) was officially incorporated in 1979 and this group has hosted all the official pilgrimages during the last 35 years.²⁵ The 2014 pilgrimage was the 20th official pilgrimage hosted by the TLC. In 2013, the committee described themselves as a “...diverse, volunteer, intergenerational group of Nikkei Americans dedicated to sharing the transformative experience of the Pilgrimage.”²⁶

The committee publicized their first official pilgrimage both on college campuses, where Richard Katsuda heard of the pilgrimage and decided to attend, as well as through the ethnic press. The 1978 pilgrimage was scheduled for June 3 and 4. On June 2, the TLC published an article outlining their goals in the *Hokubei Mainichi*, one of the San Francisco area Japanese American newspapers:

The TLC has two principles which guide our work for the pilgrimage:

1. Expose the racist incarceration of the Japanese people during WWII as part of their history of oppression and resistance in the U.S.
2. Learn from the experiences of the past to draw lessons for our struggle today.²⁷

This statement appeared on the front page of the paper. Remarkably, an editorial, criticizing the Committee organizing the pilgrimage appeared above this article! The author of the editorial, Howard Imazeki, editor of the English section of the *Hokubei Mainichi* criticized the group for an apparent lack of “humility and intellectual curiosity” and argued that the “concern” that they show is forced and insincere.²⁸ Imazeki, an Issei who taught during the war at the Navy Language School in Boulder, Colorado believed strongly that Japanese

Americans should move on and make the best of their lives despite whatever had befallen them during the war.²⁹

This reluctance or inability to confront the narrative due to reticence on the part of the Nisei is reflected in the demographic profile of the pilgrimage. Sachiko Takita suggests that at most twenty percent of the pilgrims were former camp inmates and Stan Shikuma believes it was even less than that recalling that about 90 percent of the early pilgrims were pan-Asian students with only a sprinkling of former internees. These early TLC pilgrimages, he says, were ethnically diverse, attracting a broad spectrum of Asian American students (Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos) who were in the ASU and a small number of progressive students outside those organizations, as well as recently graduated community activists.

Generationally speaking, however, the pilgrimage had little diversity.³⁰ There were some Nisei in this group and some shin-Issei, newcomers or post-war immigrants from Japan, who were active in the local Japan-towns that activists were seeking to preserve and protect. As the pilgrimage sought to attract monolingual Japanese speaking Issei who had been incarcerated at Tule Lake, these more recent immigrants from Japan sometimes served as translators for monolingual Japanese speaking Issei and English speaking Sansei.³¹

The pilgrims stayed at the Tulelake Fairgrounds in Tulelake, California. The goal was to recreate, to some degree, the experience of internment. Students spent the night in a single large open space, stretched out in sleeping bags, shared crowded toilet facilities, and stood in long lines to get the mediocre food the organizers had prepared. Shikuma remembers that they posted sentries who stood two hour watches at every corner of the building; these sentries were not an attempt to recreate the war-time experience but designed to keep the pilgrims safe. Pilgrimage organizers were concerned that someone in the surrounding area

might want to disrupt the pilgrimage in some way although they never did experience any problems.³²

At the time of the 1978 pilgrimage, the redress movement seemed to be stalled. In July of that year, the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) endorsed a demand for redress of \$25,000 for each person incarcerated during the war but nothing seemed to be happening. Frank Chin, who with Lawson Inada had rediscovered John Okada's *No-No Boy*, encouraged the Asian American community in Seattle, Washington to re-enact the removal of Japanese Americans from downtown Seattle to Puyallup in order to draw attention to the redress cause. With the approval of the mayor, the first "Day of Remembrance" ceremony was held in Seattle in November, 1978. By 1979, there were seven Days of Remembrance events across the country including the San Francisco event which was the first to take place on February 19, the anniversary of the day on which President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 which initiated the exclusion and removal of Japanese Americans from the west coast.³³ These events gave committee members additional venues for promoting the pilgrimage and a definite purpose for hosting it.

On January 1, 1979, the *Hokubei Mainichi* published the results of a survey they had administered regarding the redress movement. Of the 300 subscribers they surveyed, only 59 people responded, most anonymously, but the majority of those favored seeking redress from the government even if that meant digging up the past. The lack of response and the fact that most respondents chose to remain anonymous suggests a deep ambivalence about what a redress movement might reveal. The article concludes, "Without redress, without confrontation, the issue will continue to grow between and divide us."³⁴ The reference is vague, tepid, and ambiguous, but this author's concern is not the division between Japanese

Americans and the state, but the divisions within the Japanese American community itself and the author suggests that the only solution is “confrontation.”

The second TLC run pilgrimage occurred in 1979 and coincided with the unveiling during the Memorial Day weekend of a state historical marker at the site. For many years, this marker was the only official recognition of the existence of the detention site at Tule Lake. As such, it represented a great achievement and, it naturally played a part in drawing attention to the redress movement. A Memorial Day dedication undoubtedly created the opportunity to recall the military sacrifices of Japanese Americans veterans.

The Northern California-Western Nevada District Council of the Japanese American Citizens League (NCWN-JACL) had been instrumental in getting the marker approved, designed and built and regional officers of this organization attended the Memorial Day dedication. There was contentious debate over whether the marker would call the camp a “concentration camp” which it does, but the State Historic Research Commission’s desire to note the special status of Tule Lake as a segregation center was overruled by Herbert Rhodes the director of the State Department of Parks and Recreation.³⁵ The marker reads:

Tule Lake was one of ten American concentration camps established during World War II to incarcerate 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry, of whom the majority were American citizens. Behind barbed wire and guard towers without charge, trial or establishment of guilt, these camps are reminders of how racism, economic and political exploitation and expediency can undermine the constitutional guarantees of United States citizens and aliens alike. May the injustices and humiliation suffered here never recur.³⁶

The designation as a state historical site was seen as a victory by most but this first official Tule Lake memorial minimizes, in important ways, the significance of Tule Lake. The marker is an example of the competition between vernacular and official memory that contributes to the creation of public memory that John Bodnar discusses when he says that

commemoration “involves a struggle for supremacy between advocates of various political ideas and sentiments.”³⁷ This new state and JACL sanctioned memorial actually adds another layer to public memory that ultimately makes establishing an accurate narrative harder than ever. This inscription actually makes the unique story of Tule Lake that Okamura insists be told, harder than ever to recover.

In this case, key language can be considered a win for those trying to overcome the erasure of the camps in American memory, but this marker which could be placed at any of the ten WRA camps simply by changing the name of the camp, actually minimizes the story of confusion, resistance, and trauma that characterized Tule Lake Segregation Center both physically and semantically. The erected monument is placed parallel to the road and there are no markers indicating its existence in the miles leading up to it. There is no clear turnoff but only a dirt shoulder on which to pull over. The marker is placed on Highway 139 which is used only by the local population and tourists coming to see the Lava Beds National Monument.³⁸

By 1980, the pilgrimage was directly tied to the redress effort: many TLC members, including Richard Katsuda, were instrumental in the formation of the National Coalition for Redress/Reparations (NCRR). The NCRR focused their efforts on preparing people to testify before the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) and collecting testimony from those unwilling or unable to testify before the Committee itself. Fearing that the congressional commission would only hear from political elites hand-picked by the JACL, the NCRR concentrated their energies on collecting “memory” for redress. They did this both through the publication of pilgrimage materials they had collected and through recruiting, preparing, and transporting individuals to the congressional hearing sites.

This work dovetailed with the work that the TLC was already doing. In 1980, the TLC published *Kinenhi* a collection of images and personal narratives from the 1978 and 1979 pilgrimages to Tule Lake. *Kinenhi* means “tower of memories.” Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan’s 1999 book, *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century*, identifies that groups will mobilize around commemorative events “...to struggle with grief, to fill in the silence, to offer something symbolically to the dead, for political reasons.”³⁹ The Tule Lake Committee published *Kinenhi* in 1980 for all of those reasons; it is a way to capture and make permanent the previous pilgrimages at which pilgrims struggled with the grief of oppression, filled the silence of the post-war period of erasure, offered prayers and poems to the dead, and sought to energize the redress movement.⁴⁰

This commemorative book begins with a nine-page historical overview of the Japanese American experience in the United States with specific attention paid to the loyalty oath and the designation of Tule Lake as a segregation center. No specific reference is made to the renunciation of citizenship in the historical narrative, although a detailed timeline of the Tule Lake Segregation Center incorporates specific events at Tule Lake into the larger narrative of the wartime detention. The timeline features many events at the segregation center that distinguishes it from all the other camps, including the fact that 5,500 Nisei renounced their citizenship and most of those lived at Tule Lake. It is unclear if the timeline and the narrative were written by different authors but the omission, deliberate or not, of the renunciation issue in the opening narration is a lost opportunity to contextualize this most egregious policy.

The bulk of the book is organized into eight sections of direct quotes from pilgrims who participated in the 1978 and 1979 pilgrimages. Each section opens with an introduction

that provides some detail to contextualize the quotations for the reader. This introduction is followed by the quotes and appropriate primary source photographs from the 1940s. The quotations and images address the following topics: mass incarceration, first impression of Tule Lake, the loyalty questionnaire, the designation as a segregation center, everyday life, renunciation, repatriation, and the end of the war and return from camp.⁴¹

Twenty-one pilgrims contributed to the reflections and a profile of each participant is featured following the reflections section in the book. Nineteen of the quoted pilgrims are Japanese Americans. These include one Issei who was probably in his thirties when the war started, thirteen Nisei who all appear to have been between 8 years-old and 21 years-old when the war started: at least five of these individuals would not have been old enough at the time of the loyalty questionnaire to have been required to fill it out. Five of the participants were Kibei between the ages of 21 years-old and 35 years-old.

These profiles suggest that there was a wide variety of wartime experiences represented on the pilgrimages. It is clear from the profiles that at least nine of the participants were in Tule Lake after it became the Segregation Center and while also clear that five of the contributors either left camp before the loyalty questionnaire was administered or were deemed loyal because of it. One Kibei who never lived in Tule Lake actually volunteered for the army before the draft was reinstated. Of the five men whose quotes are included in the section on renunciation, it is clear that three of them renounced their U.S. Citizenship. The two Kibei who clearly renounced, did it in protest and one of them has never been able to bring himself to ask for his citizenship back despite having lived his whole life in the United States. The Nisei who clearly renounced his citizenship, Hiroshi

Kashiwagi, the poet featured in the opening to the chapter, says that he regretted it almost immediately.⁴²

The authors include twenty pages documenting the pilgrimages themselves so the book becomes not just a commemoration of the wartime incarceration but of the pilgrimages too. Photographs and quotes indicate that there were a number of Tuleans (people who had lived in the camp) who did not contribute to the reflections section but who did participate in the pilgrimage and who shared their thoughts about the pilgrimage itself with the organizers. The book also features Hiroshi Kashiwagi's poem "A Meeting at Tule Lake" as well as two poems by pilgrims on the 1979 pilgrimage. "Poem for the Survivors of Tule Lake" written by Richard Oyama specifically mentions the redress movement and in the conclusion to the book the word reparations is used.

As the 1980s progressed, the pilgrimage, and the diversity represented there, would eventually take a back seat to the political agenda of achieving redress.⁴³ Diversity became a potential liability and organizing the pilgrimage became a distraction.

The 1980 pilgrimage was summarized in the *Nihonmachi Sentinel* (a Japanese American newspaper) as having included a variety of groups speaking on reparations who stressed the idea that the "key to winning reparations/redress is unity among the Japanese."⁴⁴ Of course, the desired "unity" may be a reference to encouraging all former internees to demand redress, but the effect of such a call for unity could necessitate a return to a monolithic interpretation of exclusion and confinement. Sachiko Takita notes in her dissertation that the formal presentations regarding redress at the pilgrimage preceded the informal sessions in which participants were asked to remember their wartime experiences. Takita's suggestion is that having identified a specific purpose for sharing memories, the

memories recounted would naturally converge. Maurice Halbwachs would suggest that the memories that are talked about and shared become collective memories and that they reflect social power. If the organizers of the pilgrimage have already established a purpose for the informal discussions, those discussions would naturally influence the reminiscences.⁴⁵ In 1981, with all efforts focused on the CWRIC hearings, there was no pilgrimage to Tule Lake. There was a pilgrimage in the spring of 1982 before the CWRIC issued its 1983 report *Personal Justice Denied* and another pilgrimage in 1984 after the report was published.

The hearings impacted the pilgrimage in two somewhat contradictory ways. First, the hearings “unlocked the door” and created the desire on the part of many individuals to recount what had happened to them during the war. So, in 1982, in addition to a growing number of Nisei, a number of Issei began participating in the pilgrimage as well. The organizers realized that the accommodations, though adequate for students, would no longer satisfy the needs of all the pilgrims. In 1982, for the first time, some pilgrims stayed in hotels and hunting lodges in the Tulelake area rather than at the fairgrounds.⁴⁶ By 1984, pilgrims were staying in hotels as far away as Klamath Falls, Oregon where there were more and better facilities. Students generally continued to stay at the fairgrounds but a great deal of energy had to be spent driving pilgrims to and from the sites.⁴⁷ This transition from a student centered pilgrimage of exploration to a multi-generational pilgrimage made up of former detainees affected the content of the pilgrimage and the venue: clearly pilgrims would still visit the site, but sleeping bags at the fairgrounds were no longer adequate.

The pilgrimage theme in 1984 was “Turning the Tide in ’84.” In the brochure, the TLC lists three principles of unity around which they have organized: educate the public about historic and on-going racial oppression of the Japanese in the U.S.; build broader

support for redress; and defend our communities.⁴⁸ The discussion groups specifically attempted to draw parallels between the Japanese American World War II experience to contemporary discrimination of minority groups and explained that, “The movement to win redress and reparations for the concentration camps’ experiences is part of the struggle for justice and equality for all people.”⁴⁹ As the pilgrimage theme indicates, the group believes that with the publication of the report, 1984 will be a key year in winning political support for redress.

Though former internees were encouraged to attend, the work of the pilgrimage was clearly political at this time. The emphasis was not on the recovery of memory, or even on education of the public except as those two served the goal of redress. As Susan Hayase, one of the pilgrimage organizers pointed out to Sachiko Takita in an email in 2002, “...the goal was to win redress, and the political goal was for people to understand the fundamental political situation and the fundamental constitutional situation.” The complexity and nuance of the Tule Lake experience was considered simply too complex a narrative to be politically expedient.⁵⁰

The Commission hearings, however, also caused a shift in focus within the Japanese American community. Consumed by the business of capitalizing on the Commission findings to push for redress, the organized pilgrimages came to an end in 1984. By September 1988, the redress bill had been passed and signed into law. Japanese American activists had won symbolic monetary compensation for all the surviving victims of Executive Order 9066 as well as an apology. In addition, the government had legislated funding be provided for the education of the American public in regards to the internment experience.

The Tule Lake Committee and the Pilgrimage in Transition

The pilgrimage to Tule Lake was revived in 1991 spearheaded by one of the community groups in San Jose, California, that had long been associated with it, the San Jose Nihonmachi Outreach Committee (NOC) though still under the auspices of the Tule Lake Committee. Other individuals participated from the East Bay, San Francisco, and Sacramento. Stan Shikuma, who had moved to Seattle, worked on the pilgrimage from there.⁵¹ This group hosted a pilgrimage in 1991, and again in 1994, 1996 and 1998 ultimately creating a biennial pilgrimage schedule.⁵² But this was clearly a decade of transition: both in the composition and interest of the TLC membership and in defining a purpose for the pilgrimage now that the battle for redress was won. Whether due to disinterest, or a lack of focus, or the search for a mission, the Tule Lake Committee struggled during the 1990s.

The pilgrimage of the early 1990s was a community organized event which was specifically targeted to Japanese Americans. While there was less ethnic diversity among pilgrimage participants, there was greater and greater age diversity. The pilgrimage continued to include a site visit, education regarding the basic facts of internment, and discussions regarding the abuse citizens faced at the hands of their own government.⁵³

During the 1990s, many who had been active in the TLC during the redress era left the committee if they had not already moved on. (Richard Katsuda, for example, had moved to southern California in the 1980s.) Many new committee members were part of another organization called the “Sansei Legacy Project.” This group was founded by two Sansei pastors in California, Michael Yoshii and Diana Akiyama. Their group emphasized the need to recover community and family histories, provide support regarding identity issues, and

examine the legacy of internment.⁵⁴ There was a strong crossover membership between the Sansei Legacy Project and the Tule Lake Committee during this period.

The 1991 pilgrimage was held September 27-29 and the theme was, as though making a case that winning redress was not the end, “Our Journey Continues.” In the pilgrimage brochure the Committee wrote, “We should draw inspiration from those who endured and those who resisted relocation and internment. Every former evacuee has a story to share, and we invite you to share them.” The reference to the fact that everyone has a story to share is vague, but both those who “endured” and those who “resisted” are invited to speak. The broader purpose of the pilgrimage now included an effort to heal those impacted by internment through the telling of their stories. Over 350 people participated and, for the first time, returning internees made up the majority of the pilgrims. In addition, more people wanted to attend than the 350 the committee was able to accommodate.⁵⁵

The 1991 pilgrimage introduced a new activity, the Intergenerational Discussion Group or IDG. Stephanie Miyashiro, member of both the Sansei Legacy Group and the TLC, was an ardent advocate for the IDGs. These facilitated group discussions were meant to focus on how pilgrims were feeling about their experiences and were intended to provide a safe and structured way in which people in older generations who had direct connections to the camp, could share their stories with younger pilgrims. Everyone would have a chance to speak in these groups, but listening well was an integral and celebrated part of the process. The purpose of the IDGs, according to Miyashiro, was to facilitate hearing everyone’s stories and, therefore, promote recovery from the trauma of the internment experience.⁵⁶

On the 1991 pilgrimage schedule, the IDGs followed a tour of the camp, and preceded a workshop on “resistance” in the camps. This placement seems to suggest

memories stirred up by the visit to the camp may have been more pressing than stories of resistance which did not receive an official “endorsement” until later in the day. The day ended with a Cultural Program in the evening. The next day, a memorial service was held in the morning before pilgrims went their separate ways.⁵⁷

The struggle to define a purpose continued to plague the committee while planning for the 1994 pilgrimage. While some desired to use the pilgrimage to confront the divisions that remained in the Japanese American community, others expressed temerity. For example, during a January planning meeting, the group discussed the alienation of the no-nos at the hands of the rest of the Japanese American community but ultimately rejected this as a theme for the pilgrimage. The final mission statement as printed in the 1994 pilgrimage brochure reads:

Even with the monumental redress victory and payment of reparations to former internees, wounds still have not healed...we request that you keep this in mind as we open dialogue on issues that may remain painful and difficult to many...⁵⁸

The committee acknowledges the failure of the redress victory to address the division within the Japanese American community but addresses these “wounds” so vaguely that only insiders could possibly understand the reference. But the committee neither speaks of the “no-no boys” or “renunciation” directly nor how the silencing of those narratives is the source of the wounds and/or trauma to which they refer.

Following the 1994 pilgrimage, the organizers asked participants to complete a survey. Out of 300 participants, 170 participants completed the survey. Of those, 89% were Japanese American. Of the Japanese American participants, 38% were Nisei (first generation born in the U.S.), 7% were Kibei (born in the U.S. but educated in Japan), 35% Sansei (second generation born in the U.S.) and 9% Yonsei (third generation born in the U.S.).

Takita used the results of the survey to write a general description of those who participated, "...pilgrimage participants primarily included Japanese American Nisei and Sansei whose personal and family lives had been affected by the internment and who were not active during the redress movement."⁵⁹ Participants were overwhelmingly Japanese American but not activists by nature.

These demographics reflected the ways in which the TLC advertised the pilgrimage. The pilgrimage was marketed to Japanese Americans specifically and was purposeful in attracting multi-generational families. Despite significant Kibei attendance, this group who had historically been blamed (or credited, depending on the perspective) for the strong resistance at Tule Lake was still subject to censorship. On September 24, 1994, the *Rafu Shimpo*, a bilingual daily newspaper from Los Angeles, published an article criticizing the actions of the Kibei and renunciants at Tule Lake: a participant in the 1994 Tule Lake pilgrimage authored the article.

After the 1994 pilgrimage, many of the core organizers who had been active in the pilgrimage for decades, left the committee often citing a desire to spend more time with their families as the primary reason for leaving the group.⁶⁰ But Sachiko Takita identifies their discomfort with the "therapy-oriented" nature of the IDGs as contributing to their departure.⁶¹ Survey responses indicated participants in the pilgrimage also found the IDGs problematic. Takita recorded commentary that indicates that despite the training the facilitators had, the IDGs were wildly unpredictable: the facilitator could dominate, a participant might dominate (especially frustrating if not a former internee), Caucasian participants made some people uncomfortable, stories were still self-censored.⁶² The IDGs, despite the intention, did not appear to create space for the most painful of the experiences

nor were they able to confront the well-rehearsed stories of resiliency so many internees had performed for decades.

For the 1996 pilgrimage, the committee, for the first time, hired someone to chair the committee but things went badly. During one planning session, the paid chairman left a meeting after suggesting that the rest of the group ought to decide whether or not they wanted his continued leadership. By the time he returned to the meeting, the group had decided they did not want his leadership and let him go.⁶³ Another committee member, Linda Soji stepped in to chair the 1996 pilgrimage. Takita, after participating in an April 1996 planning meeting, characterized the committee as having diverse reasons to participate in the pilgrimage but that there were neither “principles of unity” identified nor strong leaders.⁶⁴ The theme the committee adopted that year “Fifty Years Later” is extraordinarily non-committal and apolitical. There was no published mission statement in 1996. Without a clear purpose, mission or leadership, pilgrimage planning limped along.

During the planning for the 1996 pilgrimage, a post-redress participant, Jimi Yamaichi stepped in to rally the committee. Jimi Yamaichi attended his first pilgrimage in 1991. Yamaichi was born in 1922, so by the time the United States joined the war, he had already graduated from high school where he had pursued a vocational education in carpentry. Jimi was the fourth child in a family of ten children. His second oldest brother, had been drafted into the U.S. Army before Pearl Harbor; after the bombing, his brother was sent to Fort Riley in Kansas and issued a wooden gun to participate in drills. Yamaichi and the rest of his family were sent first to the Pomona Assembly Center and from there to the Heart Mountain Relocation Center in Idaho. Yamaichi was in Colorado picking peaches when the rest of his family was transferred to Tule Lake after segregation. When Yamaichi

joined them there in the fall of 1943, camp administrators quickly recognized and capitalized on his carpentry skills. He eventually led a crew of about 250 people, had access to a car for getting to and from different worksites, and ultimately built a concrete jail within the camp despite his incredulity that the administrators wanted him to build a “prison within a prison.”⁶⁵

Sensing the flagging enthusiasm of his fellow committee members, Yamaichi chastised the group suggesting that the committee of mostly Sansei were making a lot of commotion and show, but that those in his generation knew it took a team of horses to pull a wagon and it felt to him that he was the only horse pulling. He managed to rally the group and the pilgrimage took place as planned over the July 4 weekend in 1996.

Evaluations of the 1998 and 2000 pilgrimages conducted by Sachiko Takita indicate that participants continued to feel that the pilgrimages were not getting at the heart of the Tule Lake story. The material was neither complex nor controversial and people felt generally dissatisfied with the content.⁶⁶

Some Lasting Changes from a Decade of Transition

Despite the difficulties and the transitional nature of the 1990 pilgrimages, important programming and leadership changes were initiated in this decade and the Tule Lake Committee published *Second Kinenhi: Reflections on Tule Lake*.⁶⁷ This book, at 164 pages, is fully twice as long as the original.

The 1996 pilgrimage was the first to be held over the July Fourth weekend and last four days. In the opening remarks that year at the pilgrimage, David Mitoma stressed the metaphoric importance of holding the event over the July 4th weekend.⁶⁸ (Shikuma acknowledges that this long weekend is also good for practical reasons as well.)⁶⁹ The four

day program begins with the bus ride to the Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) from multiple locations including San Jose, Sacramento, San Francisco and Seattle. The bus ride itself is part of the pilgrimage experience. Pilgrims can participate without riding the bus, but they are discouraged from doing so as the bus trips are full of commemorative activities that build understanding and community. Upon arriving at OIT, there is a welcome session and dinner. There are two full days of activities that include a visit to the Tule Lake Segregation Center site, the IDGs, a memorial service, as well as topical discussion sessions and/or lectures which all culminate on the third and final night with a cultural performance. Pilgrims leave on the morning of the fourth day, closing the pilgrimage out in the manner it started, with a bus ride away from the camp.

In the 1990s, there was a growing sense that the site itself would soon be lost. The determination that all committee members had to preserve the physical site manifested itself in the establishment of the Tule Lake Preservation Committee in 2002. This sub-committee was tasked with protecting what was left of the segregation center and pursuing both financial and political assistance to facilitate that preservation.

In addition, during the 1990s, some key individuals would make their first official pilgrimages with the group. Satsuki Ina who was born in Tule Lake and Hiroshi Shimizu who lived as a toddler in Tule Lake after segregation took their first pilgrimages to Tule Lake in 1994. Ina became an organizer of the pilgrimage rather than just participant in 2000 when her movie *Children of the Camps* was screened during the pilgrimage.⁷⁰ Shimizu participated in some planning for the pilgrimage but identifies 2004 as the point at which he became a “reluctant leader” of the organization.⁷¹ Barbara Takei had taken a disappointing personal pilgrimage to Tule Lake before attending the 2000 pilgrimage. She was

disappointed by the official pilgrimage as well.⁷² She was likely one of the survey respondents who felt the pilgrimage had failed to get at the particular importance of Tule Lake. All three of these individuals would by the millennium, be committed to preservation of the site and improvements of the pilgrimage. All three serve today on the seven-member Board of Directors of the Tule Lake Committee. Jimi Yamaichi and Stan Shikuma are two of the remaining four board members.⁷³

Conclusion

Early pilgrimages to Tule Lake were attempts to rediscover the story of confinement and help to define an Asian American experience. Activists used commemorative acts like the pilgrimage as a means to promote political action. With the incorporation of the Tule Lake Committee, greater consistency in organization allowed for a more diverse and complex story to emerge as seen in the 1980 TLC publication *Kinenhi*. The political push for redress, however, created the need for unification of the narrative and also diverted efforts away from the planning of the pilgrimage to passage of a reparations package.

When the Tule Lake Committee rekindled the pilgrimage in 1991, the oft stated purpose was to promote healing but there was a reluctance to name directly the nature of the injury. The committee faced something worse than only one horse pulling, they faced horses pulling in different directions.

During the 1990s, there was a conscious determination by the committee to use the pilgrimage as a cathartic experience and help individuals “heal.” This sort of “therapeutic” experience was fostered by the IDGs. The idea was clearly that opening up was powerful medicine. The time of public politics was over, and an age of personal healing had arrived. But people still seemed reluctant to bare their souls. During a June 8, 1996, training for IDG

facilitators, Takita identified agreement amongst the facilitators that the pilgrimage work was specifically intended to make space for the “bad” memories in particular.⁷⁴ But, many of the core facilitators were uncomfortable taking on this kind of role. The IDGs were relatively “private” experiences and participants were asked not to share the content of the IDG they attended with people outside the room. The private and secluded nature of the remembering makes confronting a monolithic narrative very difficult: vague and imprecise encouragement to share was not enough to make it happen. This runs counter to the very public nature of the activist era pilgrimages.

Confronting a monolithic narrative on your own, though not impossible, is difficult. The men and women who had been so long silenced were reticent. The idea of personal healing through revelation is reasonable but in the case of those who resisted the draft and renounced their citizenship at Tule Lake, and then were criticized by the post-war Japanese American community, it would take more than the well-intended encouragement from an IDG facilitator. Confronting this narrative and creating space to celebrate resistance would take educated and fearless leadership.

¹ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American: A Memoir and Selected Writings* (San Mateo: Asian American Curriculum Project, 2005), 167-168.

² Anna Green, "Individual Remembering and 'Collective Memory': Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates," *Oral History* 32.2 (2004): 38.

³ Kashiwagi, *Swimming*, 167.

⁴ Richard Katsuda, personal interview with the author, March, 2013. (Ironically, it seems very likely in retrospect that the reason that Richard never felt much connection to the Japanese American community may well be because his parents, kibbei who ended up at Tule Lake after originally being sent to Manzanar, were not a part of any postwar Japanese American community themselves. Richard remembers that a local Japanese American clergyman never interacted with his family much, but on hearing that Richard had been accepted at Stanford, actually sought out his father to congratulate him.)

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Stan Shikuma, personal interview with the author, April 2013.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Tule Lake Committee. "About Us," <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Dec 2015)

¹⁰ Sachiko Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage and Japanese American Internment: Collective Memory, Solidarity, and Division in an Ethnic Community" (PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 2007), 33.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Martha Nakagawa. "Camp pilgrimages," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Camp%20pilgrimages/> (accessed Sep 27 2015).

¹³ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 81.

¹⁴ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, e-mail message to author, April 10, 2013.

¹⁵ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 91.

¹⁶ Shikuma interview.

¹⁷ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 88.

¹⁸ Martha Nakagawa. "Camp pilgrimages," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Camp%20pilgrimages/> (accessed Mar 20 2015).

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Shikuma and Katsuda interviews.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 103.

²³ Shikuma interview.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 104.

²⁶ Tule Lake Committee. "About Us," <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Mar 2013)

-
- ²⁷ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 103.
- ²⁸ Ibid., 102.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Shikuma interview.
- ³¹ Katsuda interview.
- ³² Stan Shikuma interview.
- ³³ Martha Nakagawa. "Days of Remembrance," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Days%20of%20Remembrance/> (accessed Sep 27 2015).
- ³⁴ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 109.
- ³⁵ Ibid., 112.
- ³⁶ Taken from photograph of the monument.
- ³⁷ John E. Bodnar, *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 14.
- ³⁸ Cynthia Cervantes, "Tule Lake: A Memorial to the Forgotten," in *Global Memoryscapes*, ed. By Kendall Phillips and G. Mitchell Reyes (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 2011), 127.
- ³⁹ Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, "Setting the Framework" in *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 18.
- ⁴⁰ The Tule Lake Committee, *Kinenhi: Reflections on Tule Lake* (San Francisco: Tule Lake Committee, 1980).
- ⁴¹ Ibid.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 159.
- ⁴⁴ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 132.
- ⁴⁵ Patrick H. Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory* (Burlington: University of Vermont, 1993), 79.
- ⁴⁶ Shikuma interview.

-
- ⁴⁷ Ibid.
- ⁴⁸ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 153.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., 161.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Shikuma interview.
- ⁵² Ibid., 181.
- ⁵³ Shikuma interview.
- ⁵⁴ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 175.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., 181.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., 184.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., 191.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., 224-227.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., 200.
- ⁶¹ Ibid., 192.
- ⁶² Ibid., 194.
- ⁶³ Hiroshi Shimizu, personal interview with the author, April 2013.
- ⁶⁴ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 209.
- ⁶⁵ Jimi Yamaichi, personal interview with the author, April 2013.
- ⁶⁶ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 232.
- ⁶⁷ John R. and Reiko Ross, *Second Kinenhi: Reflections on Tule Lake* (San Francisco: Tule Lake Committee, 2000).
- ⁶⁸ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 210.
- ⁶⁹ Shikuma interview.

⁷⁰ Satsuki Ina, personal interview with the author, April 2013.

⁷¹ Shimizu interview.

⁷² Barbara Takei, interview with the author, March, 2013.

⁷³ Tule Lake Committee. “*About Us*,” <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Dec 2015)

⁷⁴ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 215.

Chapter 5 – Protecting and Preserving a Unique Site of Segregation

So we are here
the Abalone mountain
the Castle Rock
the dry bed lake
where tules still grow.
But the barracks
where are the barracks?
And where Apt. 40 05 D?
Home once so long ago
sold? Demolished? gone.
Little remains
except what's trapped
in our heads
far back somewhere.
I'm glad I made this trip.
Somehow I feel a meeting of youths
your youth, your energy
your enthusiasm, your
sense of justice
with the youth that I was
idealistic, intense, angry. (1975)

—Excerpt from “A Meeting at Tule Lake” by Hiroshi Kashiwagi ¹

In these passages from his poem, Hiroshi Kashiwagi speaks to the power that a place has to evoke memories of one's past. For first time visitors, however, the landscape may be reluctant to give up its secrets. It is difficult to contextualize the cement outline of a laundry facility. For Kashiwagi, who lived there, the landscape is sufficient to open the floodgates. “Little remains” at Tule Lake today but the landscape itself is enough to evoke memories of his life there when he was “idealistic, intense, angry.”

This passage from Kashiwagi's poem address two important issues that the Tule Lake Committee has deliberately tackled since 2000. First, dedicated efforts have been made to preserve the site. The Committee has raised money, fostered community partnerships in the

area, and achieved first, National Historic Landmark status and soon after that, National Monument status for the site.² Secondly, the Committee has directly confronted the concepts of “loyalty” and “betrayal” imposed first by the government during the war and echoed by a divided Japanese American community after the war in regard to those segregated to Tule Lake. The pilgrimage committee has worked to ensure that the unique nature of Tule Lake as a site of segregation, and all that segregation there entailed, is never again overlooked.³ Pilgrims make pilgrimages for a variety of reasons; they may seek spiritual or personal enlightenment but more and more the emphasis of the Tule Lake pilgrimage is to pay homage to the men, women, and children who spent their war years detained in this remote corner of California and who subsequently endured years of alienation from their own community.

Memorialization Debate Continues

The Tule Lake Committee of the 1990s struggled to identify a purpose for the pilgrimage behind which everyone on the committee could rally full-heartedly. There was a general commitment to the idea that the pilgrimage needed to provide a space for healing but not everyone was able or willing to identify or name what experience had left the deepest wounds. Similar debates about the meaning of the wartime experience of Japanese Americans were taking place across the country during the same time period. The memorialization wars taking place at the national level would ultimately have a great impact on the development of the contemporary pilgrimage to Tule Lake.

The Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism Controversy

In 1988, a group of Japanese American veterans who formed the 'Go for Broke' National Veterans Association introduced, with the help of Senator Daniel Inouye and Representative Norman Mineta, a bill which would authorize a war memorial to honor

Japanese American servicemen. The "Go for Brokers" are organizational carriers of memory whose membership largely helped to define the postwar narrative established by the Japanese American Citizens League. The Commemorative Works Act, however, prohibits the establishment of military memorials dedicated to specific ethnic groups so the National Park Service, which had final authorization of the project, rejected this proposal.⁴

With the power of the education plank of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 behind the cause, the bill was amended to encompass the entire wartime experience of the Japanese American community; this memorial would tell the story not only of military sacrifice but of wartime detention. The amended proposal was to create "A Monument to Honor the Patriotism of Japanese Americans in World War II."⁵ The bill passed and congressional land was donated for the memorial. The original veterans' organization renamed themselves the National Japanese American Memorial Foundation (NJAMF) to reflect the broader mandate of the project.⁶ The war memorial would serve as a civil rights memorial as well.

In 1994, the NJAMF began a fundraising campaign for a memorial that promised to be "a cause behind which we can all unite." The community responded. The mission of NJAMF was

...to create under congressional statute a memorial to the loyalty, courage, sacrifices and contributions to the greatness of this nation, made by Americans of Japanese ancestry and their immigrant parents during World War II, despite injustices rooted in ethnic prejudices, and as a commitment to an ever greater America.⁷

More than 20,000 people contributed over 13 million dollars in order to create a memorial on federal land to fulfill this mission.⁸

This mission statement was an inclusive statement designed to appeal to a wide variety of donors. Gone are the distinctions between veterans and civilians, men and women,

Issei and Nisei. The entire community showed courage and made sacrifices and suffered injustice during World War II. The theme of patriotism to emerge here is simply the "commitment" they had to an ever-greater America. Draft resisters, Supreme Court appellants, and other protestors are, after all, showing a commitment to a "greater America."

The memorial, however, did not serve to unite the Japanese American community for long. By 2000, Francis Sogi and Kelly Kuwayama, veterans of World War II and original board members of the NJAMF wrote and published a pamphlet called *Japanese Americans Disunited: How a Memorial to Unify the Japanese American Community Became a Symbol of Disunity*. In the pamphlet, they describe the process by which they felt the executive board circumvented the dissenting voices on the larger 35-member board to approve contentious language and quotations included within the memorial.⁹

The primary area of contention was the decision to include a quote from Mike Masaoka from a piece he wrote called the *Japanese American Creed*. The contents of the inscription aside, Mike Masaoka, as wartime spokesman for the JACL, was a lightning rod. Though no one ever intended to memorialize overt acts of resistance at the site, a quote from Masaoka, whose organization had urged passive cooperation with the government, suggested the formation of Japanese American suicide battalions, and spied on behalf of the War Relocation Authority (WRA), was too much for more than a quarter of the board members. Rita Takahashi, among those who dissented, put it this way, "It's wrong to inscribe the Memorial with his name if we are trying to promote civil constitutional rights and include a quotation that runs counter to that."¹⁰

The dissenting members of the board took the battle to the internet where they formed an organization called Japanese American Voice, collected over a thousand signatures of

protest and requested that the National Park Service intervene.¹¹ The park service would not interfere and the inscriptions were carved. Admiral Mel Chiogioji, the chair of the NMJAF was pleased, "The National Park Service endorsement means that we can proceed together with the mission of dedication our Memorial to patriotism by the November 9 target date."¹² The determination to dedicate the memorial on Veteran's Day, November 9, 2000 even though the memorial would not be finished until the following summer shows clearly that certain foundation members had never abandoned their desire to build a war memorial that commemorated military service rather than build the civil rights memorial for which they received permission.

In October 2015, the NJAMF website still featured this mission statement.

The National Japanese American Memorial stands in our nation's capital as a Memorial to Patriotism. Our vision is to remember forever the Japanese American history of patriotism and perseverance for posterity. We respectfully invite you to join us in carrying out our mission.

NJAMF's Mission: To tell our story of service and sacrifice in protecting the Constitutional rights of all Americans.¹³

There are striking differences in the initial 1994 and the contemporary mission statements. Gone is any direct reference to "injustice" and though the concept of sacrifice persists, the loyalty, courage and contributions mentioned in the first statement have been conflated into the single word, "service." The word "service," formed from the same root word for servitude and servile, is often associated with military duty, and narrows the scope of the memorial considerably by implying that formal military service is the highest and most noble contribution possible: this implied hierarchy of sacrifice is not evident in the 1994 mission statement.

In addition, the mission statement is accompanied by a strange introduction that uses the word "patriotism" twice: this charged word is conspicuously absent from the first mission statement. Though the statement refers to "protecting Constitutional rights" of Americans, and this can be accomplished through demanding rights in the courts, in the vernacular, many associate such phrases with men and women in combat fighting to defend American freedoms. Finally, the sacrifice of the "immigrant parents" who could neither be citizens nor assume military duty is erased in the newer statement. In other words, the debate over how the wartime experience of Japanese Americans should be commemorated remained contentious and divisive in 2000.

Henry Rousseau in *The Vichy Syndrome* suggests that organizational carriers of memory like the veterans who formed the core of the NMJAF are often attached to a static version of the past.¹⁴ This same core group formed the bulk of the JACL following the war and so this memorial in Washington, D.C., around which many in the Japanese American community hoped they could rally became, in a very real way, the last stand for the post-war narrative of patriotism and resiliency.

The Narrative Continues to Broaden

Counter definitions of patriotism

Scholarship and commemorative activities, however, had blossomed since the redress era. Many of these works sought not only to provide a complete picture of wartime lives lived behind barbed wire but also sought to redefine what it meant to be patriotic during this ordeal. The goal was to memorialize far broader and often neglected stories from within the wartime experiences of Japanese Americans.

Frank Abe wrote, directed and produced the film *Conscience and the Constitution* a documentary about the draft resisters from the Heart Mountain War Relocation Authority center. Abe was active in the redress era and organized the Seattle 1978 Day of Remembrance with Frank Chin and Lawson Inada that sparked the widespread commemoration of Executive Order 9066. Abe's father was detained at Heart Mountain where he had donated to the Fair Play Committee (FPC), the group formed to support draft resisters. His documentary, released in 2000, directly challenged the JACL assertion that draft resistance was an act of cowardice and celebrated it instead as an act of patriotic dissent.¹⁵ Eric Muller published his account of draft resistance in the camps, *Free to Die for Their Country*, in 2001 using academic scholarship to do what Abe had done in the film.¹⁶

An apology from the JACL

Debate over a JACL apology to the Japanese American draft resisters of World War II had waged for decades.¹⁷ In 2000, the national leadership of the JACL decided it was time to make an apology. Then in May of 2002, in a formal ceremony held in San Francisco and attended by about 300 people, Floyd Mori, the national president of the JACL recognized each of the 27 draft resisters present at the ceremony for his courage and determination to stand against injustice.¹⁸ Frank Emi, who as a member of the Fair Play Committee at Heart Mountain had promoted and encouraged resistance to the draft, and who had been found guilty of conspiracy to violate the Selective Service Act during the war, spoke at the ceremony.¹⁹ He and fellow resister Yosh Kuromiya spoke at the ceremony and called the apology an important step but merely a first step in the healing of the community.²⁰ The apology was specifically geared to the men who during the war had passed the loyalty questionnaire by answering "yes-yes" and then deliberately refused the draft. Excluded from

this apology, therefore, were all those who had failed the loyalty questionnaire, been sent to Tule Lake on account of that failure, and those who had renounced their citizenship when given the chance.

Grants promote deeper understanding

The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 called for \$50 million in grant monies to be spent educating the public about the World War II experiences of Japanese Americans. Due to budget cuts, the fund only granted \$5 million between April, 1996 and the close of the program in November, 1998.²¹ In 1998, however, the California Legislature passed the California Civil Liberties Public Education Act that established the California Civil Liberties Education Program (CCLPEP). The CCLPEP's mission was to

“...sponsor public educational activities and development of educational materials to ensure that the events surrounding the exclusion, forced removal, and internment of civilians and permanent resident aliens of Japanese ancestry will be remembered, and so that the causes and circumstances of this and similar events may be illuminated and understood.”²²

Between 1998 and 2011, the CCLPEP distributed close to \$9 million to over 360 individuals and groups who were researching and presenting the story of the wartime experiences of Japanese Americans. Many grants focused on the collection of oral histories, the preservation of sites of memory like Tule Lake or “assembly centers,” the development of websites, or the writing of curriculum for all school ages. But the CCLPEP also awarded plays and documentaries, children's books, graphic novels, board games and law school casebook projects financial support.²³ These federal and state grants funded meaningful research into and diverse representations of the Japanese American wartime experience, often funding many years of related work.

Some grant recipients received both federal and California grants for their projects. Frank Abe's *Conscience and the Constitution* and the Densho Encyclopedia which strives to document all aspects of the Japanese American experience in a comprehensive on-line encyclopedia are two such examples. Unfortunately, under economic duress, the California legislature stopped funding CCLPEP in 2011.

The perfect storm

These three factors, the continuing debate over how to memorialize the wartime experience of Japanese Americans, the JACL apology to draft resisters, and funding for research and projects regarding the Japanese American experience would galvanize the Tule Lake Committee. As the population that was incarcerated at Tule Lake aged, dedicated members of the Committee sought opportunities to both learn from and honor those incarcerated there during the war. The Committee also worked tirelessly to help as many former inmates return to the site and share their stories on the pilgrimage as possible. The unique position that Tule Lake held as both a site of wartime segregation and then of postwar alienation became the primary focus of the pilgrimage for there was no more appropriate place to tell that story than at the site itself.

The Tule Lake Committee Reorganized

In 2007, in between pilgrimages, the Tule Lake Committee officially reorganized itself to reflect changes that had been underway for about a decade. A new Board of Directors includes Hiroshi Shimizu (President), Barbara Takei (Chief Financial Officer), Roy Ikeda (Secretary and Chair of the Preservation Committee), Satsuki Ina, Eugene Itogawa (since retired and replaced by Ken Nomiya), Stan Shikuma, and Jimi Yamaichi. Shimizu, Takei, and Ikeda constitute the Executive Board. A larger coalition called the Tule Lake

Group is mobilized during the very active pilgrimage season to prepare for that biennial event.²⁴

Roy Ikeda, who retired from his law practice the same year the committee reorganized itself, was the chief architect of the new structure and also chairs the Preservation Committee.²⁵ Eugene Itogawa, who was on the board for the CCLPEP, also worked for the California Historic Preservation Office. Ken Nomiya, who took Itogawa's place on the board in 2014 was born at Tule Lake to Kibei parents in 1942 and attended his first pilgrimage in 2006.²⁶ Stan Shikuma, who attended his first pilgrimage in 1979 represents the historical memory of the pilgrimage itself. Jimi Yamaichi, who while incarcerated in Tule Lake served as the leader of the construction crew that built the jail, has a special emeritus position on the board.²⁷ This new organization was not, however, a turning point as much as it was the culmination of changes that began in the 1990s. Satsuki Ina, Hiroshi Shimizu, and Barbara Takei spearheaded that change and their evolution from pilgrims to pilgrimage organizers warrants explanation. Two of the three had lived at Tule Lake as toddlers and their parents had renounced their citizenships. The third, born after the war, was the daughter of a pre-segregation Tulean and a member of the 442nd.

In her 2008 essay "The Generation of Postmemory," Marianne Hirsch defines postmemory as the internalization through stories and images and of traumatic events that a previous generation experienced to the generation that follows them. This transmission can be so deep as to constitute memories in their own right.²⁸ The Tule Lake Committee has always been predominantly Sansei and members have always been politically active, but this leadership with very direct connections to the segregation experience constitutes a change. Tuleans have, whether intentionally or not, and despite their silence, transmitted a

dramatically different story to their children than the vast majority of Japanese Americans transmitted to theirs. It is that story of alienation and rejection, not just by the American government, but also by the Japanese American community that is now the focus of the pilgrimage.

Satsuki Ina

Satsuki Ina was born in Tule Lake Segregation Center. Her parents, both Kibei, renounced their citizenship while incarcerated there. In the late 1960s, she was attending the University of California at Berkeley when the student strikes began. Her parents summoned her home for a talk. They revealed to her at that time that her father had spoken up at a block meeting while incarcerated in the Topaz War Relocation Authority camp and then the family was transferred to Tule Lake, presumably because someone had told the authorities what he had said in the meeting. Her parents cautioned her against speaking out. It was the first time that her parents had spoken to her about their wartime experience.²⁹

In 1994 Ina took her first pilgrimage to Tule Lake to mark her fiftieth birthday. During the 1994 pilgrimage, she was recorded on video as speaking specifically to the experience of the Kibei, “The Kibei were doubly silenced, silenced in the American society, and silenced in the Japanese society. They were the victims of stereotyping.”³⁰ A trained and experienced psychotherapist, when she asked pilgrimage organizers what she could do to help with the pilgrimage, they asked if she would help provide training for the Intergenerational Discussion Group (IDG) leaders, which she did. In 2006, the committee needed a bus monitor from Sacramento, so she volunteered for that position as well.³¹

Through the 1990s, Ina, both therapist and university professor, conducted intensive workshops with adults who in childhood were incarcerated with their families in camps. Ina

documents the facilitation of one of these intensive three-day sessions in the 1999 film, *Children of the Camps*. In her experience, “Former internees report lifelong struggles with chronic depression, psychosomatic illnesses, low self-esteem and the stresses of over-achieving.”³² This film was screened at the 2000 Tule Lake Pilgrimage and though it does not directly address the issues of either resistance or alienation within the Japanese American community, it certainly offers a counter narrative to the concept of post-war resiliency: the very title of the movie, *Children of the Camps* suggests that the group one might expect to be most resilient, has not recovered well and, in fact, has been burdened by the JACL adopted mantle “model minority.” In part, Ina suggests, healing has been delayed because, “Consonant with Japanese American values, these individuals have internalized their suffering in an effort to secure their acceptance in their own country.”³³ Despite their age at the time of their confinement, or their parents’ desires to shield them from incarceration stories, Ina’s documentary establishes that this group has suffered as a result of their alienation and the silence that surrounds the confinement era.

In the 2002-2003 fiscal cycle, she received a \$30,000 grant from the CCLPEP to develop a new documentary film about her parents based on poetry, diary entries and the letters her parents exchanged while her father was separated from the family.³⁴ Some of these letters eluded censorship because they were sewn into the cuff of a pair of pants that went back and forth between the couple for repairs. This film *From a Silk Cocoon: A Japanese American Renunciation Story*, addresses her parents’ renunciation of citizenship and their subsequent petition to stay in the United States and avoid expatriation to Japan. It was released in 2005 and screened at the 2006 pilgrimage.³⁵ Since then, bus monitors have shown the film during the long drive to the Oregon Institute of Technology and it is also

screened during the pilgrimage. She received another grant in 2010-2011 to write a book about her family's experience.

In an interview in 2013 she talked about having only an ancillary role in regards to the pilgrimage, but her deep understanding of the trauma caused by detention, the effect that the renunciation process had on families, and the role that Tule Lake residency played in the post-war lives of Japanese Americans was key to the transformation of the pilgrimage. Her compassionate documentation of her parents' story does the unthinkable when it discusses renunciation openly and sympathetically. The stage is set for others to come forward and tell their stories because the taboo has been brilliantly broken in a well-crafted love story. The use of primary sources gives the sense of personal disclosure but because the story is recorded, that revelation is safely achieved potentially prompting others to reveal their own deeply buried renunciation stories. In addition, for some time now, she has conducted on both Friday and Saturday evening a "Reflections" group that strives to get beneath the carefully rehearsed narratives that former Tuleans had perfected over the years.

Hiroshi Shimizu

Hiroshi Shimizu also attended his first pilgrimage to Tule Lake in 1994 and admits that he did not know much about the place of pilgrimage despite some deep connections to the site. He was born in 1943 in the Topaz War Relocation Authority camp. As a means to keep the family together, his family asked to be repatriated to Japan. So, in 1943, the entire family was sent to New York as part of a prisoner exchange program only to discover that the ship on which they expected to sail, *The Gripsholm*, was already full. The family was then sent to the Rohwer, Arkansas WRA camp and ultimately to Tule Lake after segregation began. His father, Iwao Shimizu, a Kibei, renounced his U.S. citizenship while there. When

the Tule Lake Segregation Center closed after the war, the Shimizu family was transferred to the Crystal City, Texas, Department of Justice camp where Edison Uno once babysat the now 4-year-old toddler in 1947. After the family's release from Crystal City in November 1947, Iwao Shimizu moved his family to San Francisco and started up the *Hokubei Mainichi*, a Buddhist leaning ethnic press newspaper printed in both English and Japanese.³⁶ This newspaper eventually featured the debate about the meaning of the 1975 Tule Lake pilgrimage.

In 1965, Shimizu went to San Francisco State University (SFSU) where he participated in the Black Student Union because, like Richard Katsuda, he felt little affinity to other Asian students. The U.S. Army drafted Shimizu in 1966. Although 95% of all electronics and aviation specialists were sent to Vietnam at the time, he was posted to Europe. After he completed his service, he returned to SFSU and graduated in 1972. He knew Satsuki Ina growing up in San Francisco because he and Ina's brother were in the same Boy Scout Troop sponsored by the Konko Church which was the only troop that did not require church membership to participate in the club.³⁷ Children of those deemed "disloyal" often faced alienation from other Japanese Americans. With little knowledge of the confinement era, the loyalty questionnaire, segregation or renunciation, they had no way to know that the source of this alienation was the result of their parents' wartime choices. There is no scholarship on the communities that former Tuleans may have built but it seems clear that some communities were forged, as for example, the local Boy Scout troop cited above. Whether the adult members of these communities talked about their experience with each other is unclear, but they certainly remained silent with their children.

Shimizu was loosely associated with planning the 1996 pilgrimage and remembers Jimi Yamaichi exhorting the group to pull together like a team of horses. He was somewhat more involved in running the 1998 pilgrimage and since 2004 he has chaired the pilgrimage planning committee because, he says, no one else stepped forward to do it. He currently serves as the President of the Board of Directors of the Tule Lake Committee though he characterizes himself as a reluctant leader.³⁸ He used a 2006-2007 CCLPEP grant to develop a workshop for teachers in the Tulelake Basin. He is listed as the contact for several other grants in the CCLPEP that were awarded to the Tule Lake Committee for preservation purposes.³⁹

Barbara Takei

Barbara Takei also has a personal connection with the Tule Lake camp: her mother was detained there prior to segregation, but left for Amache (officially the Granada War Relocation Authority camp in Colorado) after the loyalty questionnaire, presumably having said “yes-yes.”⁴⁰ Takei’s father was drafted into the U.S. Army before the attacks on Pearl Harbor; he was one of over 5,000 Nisei who had either volunteered or been conscripted before the open declaration of war.⁴¹ He was not discharged as some Japanese American soldiers were after the attacks, but sent to Camp Shelby while the army figured out what to do with him. Her father ultimately ended up in the 442nd Regimental Combat Team. Takei was born in Detroit in 1948 and grew up there influenced by the community activism of Chinese American and communist party leader, Grace Lee Boggs, who Takei calls a “professional revolutionary.” Steeped in the Detroit civil rights movement, and feeling great affinity for marginalized minority Americans, Takei chose to go to Howard University, the historically black university in Washington, D.C.⁴²

In the late 1980s, while headed to the Ashland Oregon Shakespeare Festival with her husband and children, the family detoured to Tule Lake. She was excited to see the camp but she had difficulty finding it. When she stopped to ask directions at local stores, no one seemed to know what she was talking about until someone finally made a reference, she recalls, to the “Jap camp” being “over there” someplace. There was no signage announcing the 1979 State Monument marker and, once located, the marker made no mention of segregation. She could not identify where the camp had been and which buildings, if any, were original. It was a disappointing pilgrimage.⁴³ Others reported similar disappointments in their *personal* visits to the site given that the site seemed to have all but disappeared.⁴⁴

Takei was dismayed by the experience but a seed was planted on that personal pilgrimage which would come to fruition years later. Ten years after her initial visit to Tule Lake, Barbara Takei, along with her friend Judy Tachibana, a journalist whose uncles had been incarcerated at Tule Lake after segregation, applied for and received a \$17,000 grant to write *A Visit to Tulelake*, a guide book for pilgrims making a personal journey to the site. At the time they wrote the grant proposal, the two authors did not know that the detention center, unlike the nearby town, was written as two words. As part of their research for the guide book, Tachibana and Takei attended the 2000 Tule Lake Pilgrimage. As they visited and researched the site, Takei and Tachibana imagined the electric charge that a pilgrim might experience when reading a hand scrawled message on a prison wall in the “jail” that still stands at Tule Lake. Without the guide, that message would remain hidden in the unimpressive concrete building with the chain link fence surrounding it.⁴⁵

On her first official pilgrimage in 2000, Takei was impressed by the amount of work that went into hosting the pilgrimage but found the results disappointing. The programming

seemed unfocused and chaotic to her. Her bus monitor had never been on a pilgrimage before. A Jewish man dominated the Intergenerational Discussion Group she attended. And on the site tour her guide was reading off a script. At the pilgrimage, however, Pat Shiono, a long time Tule Lake Committee member distributed a flier about fundraising for the preservation of the concrete jail that still stands at the site. Takei knew Eugene Itogawa through the CCLPEP grant program and knew that he also worked for the State Historic Preservation Office. It may not have been her intent, but Takei was soon networking on behalf of the preservation of Tule Lake. While she and Tachibana continued researching and writing the guide, she began her association with the Tule Lake Committee.⁴⁶

Takei and Tachibana, both together and separately, have won multiple CCLPEP grants enabling them to collect oral histories from renunciants, coordinate the Tule Lake National Monument website, pursue research at the National Archives, preserve the stockade at Tule Lake and publish a second edition of the guidebook that she and Tachibana wrote, called *Tule Lake Revisited*.⁴⁷ Takei is now the Chief Financial Officer of the Board of Directors of the Tule Lake Committee and serves in that capacity on the Executive Board. In addition, she writes all the press releases for the committee as well as many other written materials associated with both the Tule Lake Segregation Center experience and the pilgrimage. Over the last decade she has become one of the preeminent scholars on Tule Lake as evidenced by her current collaboration with Roger Daniels on a new book about the camp, which is tentatively titled “Tule Lake, America’s Worst Concentration Camp.”⁴⁸

Impact of the New Leadership

This new leadership has achieved dramatic success in regards to clarity of purpose and the preservation of the site over the course of the last ten years. They have forged

important relationships with state and federal agencies, raised money for preservation, and earned grants to continue research and writing regarding the issues of singular importance to Tule Lake. Most importantly, they have organized a half dozen pilgrimages that are so powerful that registration for the 350 spaces generally closes within the week that it opens, at which point potential pilgrims must put their names on a long waiting list and hope a spot becomes available.⁴⁹

Together, this group of leaders, most with personal connections to Tule Lake, has made a powerful impact on how Tule Lake is commemorated and has a clearly defined mission statement which was refined and published in 2013.

The role of the Tule Lake Committee (TLC) is to (sic): (i) to educate the general public of the government's forced and unconstitutional imprisonment of over 120,000 men, women and children of Japanese ancestry into ten concentration camps; (ii) to recognize the unique role of the Tule Lake camp, which was converted into a segregation center to incarcerate those from all of the camps who resisted their imprisonment and were deemed disloyal; and (iii) to preserve the history and experiences of the inmates of the Tule Lake Segregation Center and their struggles to cope with an unjust imprisonment and harsh conditions of the Segregation Center and their rejection by their own government.⁵⁰

The Committee's goals are clear and direct. Exposure of the government policy of exclusion and detention is merely the first part of the mission. Where many previous pilgrimages stopped, the current pilgrimage begins. The second part of the mission is to fully explain the unique role that Tule Lake played as a segregation unit designed to house resisters. In regards to this mission, the TLC redefines patriotism to include not just draft resisters but those who protested their treatment on the loyalty questionnaire prior to the reinstatement of the draft and those who renounced their citizenship as a final protest against their treatment. Finally, the committee hopes to honor those who endured unjust incarceration and rejection "by their

own government.” Segregation and rejection are at the heart of the commemorative experience, not at the margins.

This transformation of the pilgrimage over the last ten years has had an impact. Registration for the 2002 Pilgrimage was open until the day of the pilgrimage.⁵¹ In 2014, registration was opened and closed within two weeks as all the pilgrimage spots had been filled months before the pilgrimage was to take place.⁵² Registration for the 2016 pilgrimage will open appropriately on February 19, the anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066 and will likely close within the week as soon as all the spaces have been reserved.⁵³

Relationship between the Tule Lake Committee and the National Park Service

On February 19, 1992, the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of Executive Order 9066, the Manzanar War Relocation Authority camp earned National Historic Site status.⁵⁴ Some, like Hiroshi Shimizu, believed that the National Park System (NPS) was satisfied that Manzanar could serve as the representative site of the wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans. So Shimizu was surprised to learn otherwise when he met David Look, the head of Cultural Resources within the Pacific West Region of the NPS at the 2000 Manzanar Pilgrimage. Shimizu who was making a presentation about the Tule Lake pilgrimage had the chance to talk to Look at a pre-pilgrimage reception.⁵⁵ The NPS had evaluated the value of landmark designation to a number of detention sites. A 1999 National Park Service publication titled, *Confinement and Ethnicity: An Overview of World War II Japanese American Relocation Sites* concluded that 35 different sites “Are evocative of this very significant, if shameful, episode in U.S. history, and all appear to merit National Register of Historic Places or National Landmark status.”⁵⁶

Just months after that meeting, Barbara Takei would take her first pilgrimage to Tule Lake and pick up a flier about raising money to preserve the site. She later arranged a meeting with Eugene Itogawa at the California Historic Preservation Office (CHPO) which Shimizu and others from the committee attended with her.⁵⁷ When Itogawa suggested that the Tule Lake site warranted federal designation, Shimizu remembered having met David Look earlier that year.⁵⁸ By late 2000 about a half dozen concerned individuals associated with the Tule Lake pilgrimage, including Shimizu, Itogawa, Takei, Jimi Yamaichi and Pat Shiono met with Look and then they began the process of applying for National Landmark Status.⁵⁹

Shimizu remembers that the group had to educate Look as to the singular significance of the site as a segregation center but Takei says that once he understood the significance, he became a key advocate for the site.⁶⁰ Tule Lake Committee members began attending annual conferences that were held in California designed to support those who were trying to achieve National Landmark Status. They also began attending meetings about the Historic Landmark status in the Tulelake Basin to help build support within the local community.⁶¹ In 2005, the National Park Advisory Board Landmarks Committee recommended that both Tule Lake and Amache (the Granada War Relocation Authority camp in Colorado) be designated as National Historic Landmarks.⁶²

The Tule Lake Committee was instrumental in crafting the inscription that appears on the Landmark plaque. The Committee members who worked on the plaque inscription, however, did not all agree with each other in regards to the wording. The NPS preferred not to use the term “concentration camp” on the marker despite the fact that the State Historical Marker used that term and some members from the Tule Lake Committee were anxious to

honor that NPS request. Shimizu remembers the debate over that term was heated in comparison to the discussion of the term “segregation center.” Tule Lake had been given Landmark Status because of its unique role as the only segregation center in the country.⁶³ “Segregation Center” made the final cut but “concentration camp” did not. The full inscription reads:



TULE LAKE
SEGREGATION CENTER
HAS BEEN DESIGNATED A
NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK
THIS PROPERTY POSSESSES NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE
IN COMMEMORATING THE HISTORY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DURING WORLD WAR II, NEARLY 120,000 PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY
WERE INCARCERATED WITHOUT TRIAL OR HEARING. THOSE WHO RESISTED
THE UNJUST DETENTION WERE SEGREGATED AND IMPRISONED AT TULE LAKE.
MORE THAN 24,000 MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN WERE CONFINED HERE.
2006
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR⁶⁴

Despite the absence of the word “concentration camp” none of the old euphemisms are used to downplay the severity of the experience. This inscription accomplishes what the Tule Lake Committee had been learning to do in their pilgrimage work. First, briefly explain the wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans and then quickly follow that up with an explanation as to what makes Tule Lake so different from the other camps. People were “incarcerated” and “imprisoned” without “trial or hearing.” There is no disguising or dismissing what happened in Tule Lake despite the absence of the phrase “concentration camp.”

Barbara Takei’s voice was instrumental in the debate over the inscription. Takei is candid in her belief that it is the role of the Tule Lake Committee to push the NPS to tell the story accurately. She also assumes that the Committee’s demand for the use of the correct and accurate terminology gives the NPS representatives that she works with the “cover” that they need to make it happen.⁶⁵ The plaque was dedicated at the 2006 Tule Lake Pilgrimage.⁶⁶ With that success behind them, the committee geared up for the process of achieving National Monument status for Tule Lake.

It takes an act of Congress to become a National Park. So in 2006, Hiroshi Shimizu began thinking about the first steps he and the Committee would have to take to achieve National Park Status.⁶⁷ Two events, however, would make his efforts unnecessary. Around 2006, Jon Jarvis, at that time director of the Pacific West Region of the NPS, appointed David Kruse as the Superintendent of the Lava Beds National Park located only a mile from the Tule Lake site. Tule Lake National Historic Landmark was now his responsibility. Kruse, says Shimizu, had a reputation for getting things done; for example, he was credited

for securing easier highway access to Manzanar.⁶⁸ Not only was he a mover and a shaker, he was clearly an advocate for preserving and accessing sites of detention.

In addition, as President George W. Bush finished out his second term in office, he was considering establishing a National Monument called “Victory in the Pacific” that would include five sites in Hawaii and 3 sites in Alaska that together told a story of heroism and sacrifice in achieving victory in the Pacific theater of World War II. A president can, by executive order, circumvent the long congressional process of earning National Park Status by granting National Monument Status. Shimizu says that no one he has spoken to will take credit for suggesting that Tule Lake be included in this unusual multi-site Historical Monument, but someone did just that.⁶⁹

At the dedication ceremony, Jon Jarvis talked about the need for the NPS to preserve not just sites of physical beauty but also places of “sorrow and concern.”⁷⁰ He added, regarding the battle for recognition:

...it was a slog. There were many tense moments as to whether or not it was in or out, what the boundaries were going to look like, concerns about private property rights, concerns about naming, and some people who just didn’t get it.⁷¹

Whether it was Jarvis or Kruse, or someone else who suggested the inclusion of Tule Lake into this new monument, Floyd Mori, Executive Director of the JACL takes credit for solving the problem of what to call the park. His suggestion that the “World War II Victory in the Pacific National Monument” should instead be the “World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument” was adopted as Tule Lake became the ninth site included in the park.⁷² The inclusion of the term “valor” in the umbrella name for the nine sites has ultimately achieved the acknowledgement for which the Committee has longed. Valor suggests courage and determination, fearlessness and fortitude: this is exactly the kind of recognition the Tule

Lake Committee has sought for those incarcerated at Tule Lake. The name sanctifies their actions there.

The NPS began making plans for the park right away as did the Tule Lake Committee. The two groups have formed an alliance. In the 2008-2009 fiscal cycle, the Tule Lake Committee wrote for and received a grant from the CCLEP to help the NPS set-up the website for the new park.⁷³ This grant provided the Tule Lake Committee influence over both the choice of language and the shape of the narrative that would appear on the NPS website. In 2009, the NPS held a three-day meeting and work session with historians Roger Daniels and Don Hata and members of the Tule Lake Committee to discuss the vision and mission for the site.

As the years have progressed, the NPS broadened the number of constituents it talked to and by 2012, they were holding numerous meetings in a variety of locations in order to get feedback from the public. At these meetings, speakers had the chance to stress the unique role that Tule Lake played in the wartime and post wartime experience of Japanese Americans.⁷⁴ The Tule Lake Committee encouraged former pilgrims to attend these meeting so that they could influence the direction the park would go.⁷⁵

Finally, in 2013, the NPS published, shared, and took comment on their five year general management plan.⁷⁶ The influence of the Tule Lake Committee is clear and unambiguous.

The Committee Organizes Pilgrimages Around Increasingly Controversial Themes

Richard Katsuda, who attended and planned pilgrimages during the 1970s and 1980s returned in 2012 because of the “buzz” he had heard regarding the modern pilgrimage.⁷⁷ Why had the pilgrimage created a buzz? How had the pilgrimage changed? Was it a result

of the terrorist attacks of 9-11 as Sachiko Takita suggested in her sociology dissertation? Or had something else happened? The theme of the 2000 pilgrimage was “Honoring Our Living Treasures, Forging New Links.” This theme is clearly intended to generate multi-generational participation in the pilgrimage but there is no direct reference to what experience should be honored. The programming that year included a screening of *Children of the Camps* and informational programming on unfinished redress for Japanese Latin Americans.* Though there was a vague sense that the pilgrimage should be a site of healing, this is the pilgrimage that as Takei’s first official pilgrimage, she characterized as unfocused.

In 2002, the first pilgrimage held after the attacks of September 11, 2001 the theme was “Patriotism and Loyalty Revisited.” Pilgrimage organizers were deliberate in drawing connections between a post Pearl Harbor America and a post 9-11 America. “For some, the events of September 11th make this year’s theme all the more timely....Tule Lake Pilgrimage 2002 revisits the complicated ideas of patriotism and loyalty in a time of turmoil, as we honor all of the difficult choices people had to make to survive.”⁷⁸ At the memorial service held in 2002, there was talk of a need “...to bring together different people who experienced different things during a travesty of war --from resisters to those who were active in military...”⁷⁹ Takita acknowledges that despite the chosen theme, members of the Tule Lake

* Even before the United States declared war on Japan, President Roosevelt sent FBI agents as legal attachés to various U.S. embassies in Latin America. When war broke out, Latin American countries who sided with the Allies had to determine what to do with Japanese nationals and citizens of Japanese heritage within their borders. Peru, in particular, found the easiest solution was to send them to INS camps in the United States. This population did not receive an apology or redress as a result of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 but as a result of a 1999 class action lawsuit, *Mochizuki, et al. v. USA*, the United States government agreed to pay each Latin American prisoner \$5,000. Stephen Mak. "Japanese Latin Americans," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20Latin%20Americans/> (accessed Oct 13 2015).

Committee continued to tiptoe around the issue of “renunciation” both in committee meetings and on the pilgrimage itself. It is difficult to honor renunciants if no one is willing to say the word out loud. Barbara Takei who was helping with the pilgrimage for the first time remembers that by May only 100 people had signed up to attend.⁸⁰ The terrorist attacks did not appear to unify the Japanese American population who continued to have difficulty talking about the deepest wounds left by post segregation incarceration at Tule Lake. Coincidentally, but perhaps more importantly to the development of the pilgrimage, two months after the 2002 pilgrimage, the JACL made a formal apology to the Japanese American draft resisters of World War II.⁸¹

By 2003, Barbara Takei had used CCLPEP grant monies to publish a guide book to Tule Lake and begin an oral history project centered on collecting the stories of renunciants. For every ten renunciants she contacted only one was willing to talk to her.⁸² The deliberate exclusion of Tuleans from the apology continued to silence their story. As she gained confidence and expertise, and came to understand how the population at Tule Lake had been silenced, she became an advocate for speaking out on behalf of this marginalized community. The men and women who had faced the loyalty questionnaire and then renunciation were aging and there was little time left to honor them personally or capture their stories. In October 2003, the Committee met to discuss potential themes for the 2004 pilgrimage. Though the committee ultimately agreed on the theme, “Citizens Betrayed,” some core committee members were worried about being perceived as “unpatriotic.”⁸³ This concern, raised sixty years after the end of the war and twenty years after the CWRIC hearings, demonstrates the lasting power and long reach that the JACL narrative had in the Japanese American community.

This theme in two words forces the reader to reconsider who had betrayed whom. Japanese Americans did not betray their country, their country betrayed them, over and over again. The government betrayed these men and women first through their forced removal and detention, next through the loyalty questionnaire and ultimately by encouraging them to renounce their citizenship. Culpability has been reassigned and laid squarely at the feet of the government. The renunciants, who for so long had been considered “disloyal” are vindicated.

The 2004 pilgrimage was a turning point in other ways as well. In 2004, the pilgrimage held its first cultural performance at the Ross Raglan Theater and invited all of Klamath Falls to join in the celebration if they chose. In 2004 Barbara Takei began to manage publicity for the pilgrimage and that included detailed explanations of the themes; Hiroshi Shimizu took the lead role in organizing the pilgrimage.⁸⁴ And in 2004, when the son of Wayne Collins accepted an award on behalf of his father, the San Francisco lawyer who single handedly fought for the restoration of the citizenship of the majority of renunciants, Hiroshi Kashiwagi stood up and announced for the first time publically that he had renounced his citizenship. Barbara Takei recalls that the audience was sobbing.⁸⁵ Renunciation, the last “skeleton” in the Japanese American closet, had come out of the closet.

Building on the success of the 2004 pilgrimage, the 2006 pilgrimage theme was “Dignity and Survival in a Divided Community: Remembering the Tule Lake Segregation Center.” This pilgrimage coincided with the dedication of the National Historic Landmark plaque which distinguishes Tule Lake’s role as a segregation facility.⁸⁶ The theme addresses the division in the Japanese American community directly. Satsuki Ina’s film *From a Silk Cocoon*, in which she tells the story of her parents’ renunciation of their citizenship, was first

screened at the pilgrimage that year and has become a mainstay of the pilgrimage ever since.⁸⁷ It is a poignant way of addressing renunciation and creating a memorial space for those who wish to tell their or their families stories. Through Ina's movie, her parents took their places next to Kashiwagi on the Tule Lake renunciation stage in 2006.

The 2008 pilgrimage theme was simply, "The Tule Lake Segregation Center." The programming that year centered on the unique status of Tule Lake. The Committee, however, was working hard by this time to attract the men and women who experienced Tule Lake as a site of segregation. The Committee made concerted efforts to attract former internees who were impacted directly by the loyalty questionnaire by waiving the pilgrimage fee for anyone over the age of 80 at the 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2012 pilgrimages. The committee ended that practice in 2014 in part because that population is increasingly frail but a pilgrim would have to have been closer to 90 today to have been directly impacted by the loyalty questionnaire.⁸⁸ The Committee is dedicated to commemorating the experiences of those who as young adults confronted the loyalty questionnaire; paying for the registration of pilgrims who were preteens during the war does not advance that agenda.

The Committee held an additional pilgrimage in 2009, in order to accommodate more pilgrims and celebrate the unexpected achievement of National Monument status. The 2009 theme was simply, "Shared Remembrances." For the first time, taiko drumming "called the tribe" to the welcome ceremony.⁸⁹ Ironically, pilgrims who were confined at Tule Lake predate the invention of taiko drum ensembles.[†]

[†] Although taiko drums had traditionally been used in Buddhist religious ceremonies, Daihachi Oguchi, a Japanese jazz drummer invented the taiko ensemble known as kumi-daiko in 1951. In 1968, Seiichi Tanaka, a recent Japanese immigrant to San Francisco established the first American taiko ensemble. By 1973, there were two taiko ensembles in

The 2010 theme, “Sharing the Untold Stories of Tule Lake,” echoed the previous theme but with the suggestion both in the theme and in the publicity that was circulated that the Committee had genuinely created a space where it was safe for people to shed their sanitized versions of their wartime experiences. Six years had passed since the emotional revelation by Kashiwagi that he was a renunciant but many former Tuleans were still reluctant to share the worst of their experiences.

The 2012 theme was as direct as possible, “Understanding No No and Renunciation.” This theme had been considered and rejected as early as 1994.⁹⁰ Now, however, it served to draw a number of people to the pilgrimage. One 2010 pilgrim, Kaz, returned in 2012 when he saw the theme; he himself had served in the U.S. Army during the occupation of Japan following the war. During a plenary event during this pilgrimage, Takei actually asked all members of the audience who had renounced their citizenship to stand and receive an ovation from the rest of the crowd. She deliberately did not provide those in the audience that she knew to be renunciants advanced warning of this because she feared they might tell her not to do it or over think whether or not they wanted to stand. She thought that the spontaneity of the request might be a catalyst. In fact, people whom she did not know to be renunciants stood, over a dozen in all.⁹¹ Kaz described this as the highlight of the pilgrimage.⁹² Richard Katsuda, who made his return to the pilgrimage that year said this moment was simply “electrifying.”⁹³ When registration for the July 2014 pilgrimage opened in February of that year, all 400 spots filled within two weeks.⁹⁴

San Francisco and one in San Jose. Most participants were Sansei, encouraged, ironically, to honor their grandparents and parents with an art from that, though at its root was Japanese, was essentially a post-war invention.

The themes alone cannot explain the overwhelming response that the pilgrimages have garnered. As committee members have learned more and more about the unique circumstances of Tule Lake they have committed themselves to creating a space for the most difficult and traumatic memories to surface. The diversity of personalities leading the committee have enabled the group to support this process via a wide variety of innovative programing and comprehensive education. Observations made at the 2010 pilgrimage epitomize and illustrate the power of the diverse yet comprehensive contemporary pilgrimage.

¹ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American: A Memoir and Selected Writings* (San Mateo: Asian American Curriculum Project, 2005), 167-168.

² Barbara Takei. "Tule Lake," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Tule%20Lake/> (accessed Dec 12 2015).

³ Tule Lake Committee. "About Us," <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Dec 2015)

⁴ Geraldine Shu, "Visit to the National Japanese American Memorial," *North American Post*, Vol. 62, Issue 18: 4.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ National Japanese American Memorial Foundation, "The Memorial," Japanese American National Memorial Foundation, <http://njamf.com/index.php/the-memorial> (accessed May 11, 2010).

⁷ Francis Sogi and Kelly Kuwayama, both U.S. Veterans of World War II were original board members of the National Japanese American Memorial Foundation. After disagreements over the inclusion of a contested inscription on the memorial, and failed attempts to have the National Park Service intervene in regards to those inscriptions, they wrote a pamphlet to explain the process by which the board had made their decisions. This pamphlet, *Japanese Americans Disunited: How a memorial to unify the Japanese American community became a symbol of disunity* which has no clear publishing date or place, is available on the internet at a website that Sogi, Kuwayama, and other dissenting board members established called *Japanese American Voice: Making Our Voices Heard*. <http://javoice.com/> (Ironically, this site no longer seems to exist , 2015.)

⁸ Ibid.

-
- ⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰ "United States Parks Service Releases Statement that Masaoka Inscription Will Stay," *North American Post*, July 29, 2000.
- ¹¹ Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008) 430.
- ¹² "United States Parks Service Releases Statement that Masaoka Inscription Will Stay," *North American Post*, July 29, 2000.
- ¹³ National Japanese American Memorial Foundation, "Mission Statement," Japanese American National Memorial Foundation, <http://njamf.com/index.php/about-the-foundation> (accessed Oct 8, 2015).
- ¹⁴ Henry Rousseau, *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991) 222.
- ¹⁵ Conscience and the Constitution – the real story of the Heart Mountain resisters. "About Us – Production Staff," <http://resisters.com/about-us/production-crew/> (accessed Dec 2015)
- ¹⁶ Eric Muller, *Free to Die for Their Country: The Story of the Japanese American Draft Resisters in World War II* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001).
- ¹⁷ Cherstin Lyon. "JACL apology to draft resisters," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/JACL%20apology%20to%20draft%20resisters/> (accessed Oct 8 2015).
- ¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁹ Esther Newman. "Frank Emi," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Frank%20Emi/> (accessed Oct 8 2015).
- ²⁰ Lyon. "JACL apology to draft resisters," *Densho Encyclopedia*
- ²¹ Sharon Yamato. "Civil Liberties Public Education Fund," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Civil%20Liberties%20Public%20Education%20Fund/> (accessed Jul 8 2015).
- ²² California State Library, "California Civil Liberties Public Education Program" <http://www.library.ca.gov/grants/cclpep/about.html> (accessed Jul 9 2015)
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Barbara Takei, personal interview with the author, March 2013.

-
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ “The Genki Spark Tule Lake Pilgrimage Report Back: Ken Nomiyama’s Story,” YouTube video, 26:21, from a presentation by Ken Nomiyama, posted by “The Genki Spark,” October 8, 2014 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QqKgotw5C9I>
- ²⁷ Tule Lake Committee. “*About Us*,” <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Mar 2015)
- ²⁸ Marianne Hirsch, “The Generation of Postmemory.” *Poetics Today* 29, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 106-107, <http://www.columbia.edu/~mh2349/papers/generation.pdf>. (accessed Dec 2015).
- ²⁹ Satsuki Ina, personal interview with the author, April 2013.
- ³⁰ Sachiko Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage and Japanese American Internment: Collective Memory, Solidarity, and Division in an Ethnic Community” (PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 2007), 217.
- ³¹ Ina interview.
- ³² Satsuki Ina, Children of the Camps, “The Project” <http://www.pbs.org/childofcamp/project/index.html> (accessed Jul 9 2015)
- ³³ Ibid.
- ³⁴ California State Library, “CCLPEP Grant Recipients” <http://www.library.ca.gov/grants/cclpep/files/CCLPEPGrantsFY98-99%20thruFY10-11.pdf> (accessed Jul 9 2015)
- ³⁵ Ina interview.
- ³⁶ Hiroshi Shimizu, personal interview with the author, April 2013.
- ³⁷ Shimizu interview.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ California State Library, “CCLPEP Grant Recipients,” <http://www.library.ca.gov/grants/cclpep/files/CCLPEPGrantsFY98-99%20thruFY10-11.pdf> (accessed Jul 9 2015)
- ⁴⁰ Takei interview.
- ⁴¹ Eric Muller. “Draft resistance,” *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Draft%20resistance/> (accessed Nov 11 2015).
- ⁴² Takei interview.

-
- ⁴³ Ibid.
- ⁴⁴ Comments from two 2010 Tule Lake Pilgrimage participants interviewed by the author in 2013.
- ⁴⁵ Takei interview.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ Barbara Takei and Judy Tachibana, *Tule Lake Revisited: A Brief History and Guide to the Tule Lake Concentration Camp Site* (San Francisco, Tule Lake Committee, 2012).
- ⁴⁸ Barbara Takei, email message to author, November 2015.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Tule Lake Committee. "About Us," <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Mar 2015)
- ⁵¹ Takei interview.
- ⁵² The Genki Spark: The Genki Spark Tule Lake Pilgrimage Report Back: Ken Nomiya's Story, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QqKgotw5C9I> accessed Oct 9, 2015
- ⁵³ Takei email.
- ⁵⁴ Glen Kitayama. "Manzanar," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Manzanar/> (accessed Dec 12 2015).
- ⁵⁵ Shimizu interview.
- ⁵⁶ J. Burton, M. Farrell, F. Lord, and R. Lord, "Confinement and Ethnicity: An Overview of World War II Japanese American Relocation Sites," National Park Service, http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/active_learning/explorations/japanese_internment/confinement_ethnicity_nps_sm.pdf (accessed Dec 2015)
- ⁵⁷ Takei interview.
- ⁵⁸ Shimizu interview.
- ⁵⁹ Takei interview.
- ⁶⁰ Shimizu and Takei interview.
- ⁶¹ Martha Nakagawa, "Tule Lake Dedicates WWII Valor Monument," The Rafu Shimpō <http://www.rafu.com/2009/07/tule-lake-dedicates-wwii-valor-monument-2/> (accessed July 2010)

-
- ⁶² Shimizu interview.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ Plaque photograph
- ⁶⁵ Takei interview.
- ⁶⁶ Nakagawa, "Tule Lake Dedicates WWII Valor Monument."
- ⁶⁷ Shimizu interview.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰ Nakagawa, "Tule Lake Dedicates WWII Valor Monument."
- ⁷¹ Ibid.
- ⁷² Ibid.
- ⁷³ Takei interview.
- ⁷⁴ U.S. Department of the Interior, "Tule Lake Unit of World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument General Management Plan", Summer 2013, Newsletter #1 (Seattle, 2013).
- ⁷⁵ Two 2010 Pilgrimage participants, contacted in 2013 by the author reported this encouragement and their participation in one of these meetings.
- ⁷⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, Tule Lake Unit of World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument Five Year Strategic Plan 2013-2017 (Seattle, 2013).
- ⁷⁷ Richard Katsuda, personal interview with the author, March, 2013.
- ⁷⁸ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 245.
- ⁷⁹ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 250.
- ⁸⁰ Takei interview.
- ⁸¹ Lyon, "JACL apology to draft resisters," *Densho Encyclopedia*
- ⁸² Takei interview.
- ⁸³ Takita, "The Tule Lake Pilgrimage," 250.

⁸⁴ Takei interview.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ina interview.

⁸⁸ Shimizu interview.

⁸⁹ Takei interview.

⁹⁰ Takita, “The Tule Lake Pilgrimage,” 190.

⁹¹ Takei interview.

⁹² A 2010 Pilgrimage participant, contacted in 2013 by the author reported this.

⁹³ Katsuda interview.

⁹⁴ Takei interview.

Chapter 6 – Loyalty and Betrayal Reconsidered at Tule Lake: Conclusion

Yes, it's right to recall
the directives
of the War Relocation Authority
their threats and lies
the meetings, the strikes
the resistance, arrests
stockades, violence, attacks
murder, derangement
pain, grief, separation
departure, informers
recriminations, disagreements
loyalty, disloyalty
yes yes, no no, no yes
Issei, Nisei, Kibei.
These are words now
but they were lived here.

—Excerpt from “A Meeting at Tule Lake” by Hiroshi Kashiwagi ¹

In this passage from his poem, Kashiwagi lists the affronts that Tuleans in particular faced during their incarceration. He points out what is so easy to forget, that what are just words now were once experiences, unfolding in real time. Decisions were made without the benefit of hindsight; there was no way to know whether, if, or when things might be set right. The barrage is almost unbearable.

The unique and painful experience of incarceration at Tule Lake is the primary focus of the contemporary Tule Lake Pilgrimage. Organizers of the pilgrimage have instituted workshops and refined programming to ensure that anyone who makes the pilgrimage understands the barrage faced by the men and women who were detained there. Committee organizers, however, do not aim merely to expose the harsh government policies and alienation, they seek to honor all those incarcerated at Tule Lake as resisters and heroes. To

them, Tuleans were dissenters and dissent is patriotic; each Tulean is heroic by virtue of having survived incarceration at Tule Lake.

Cherstin Lyon, in her book *Prisons and Patriots* which focuses on a group of draft resisters from the WRA camps in Arizona, makes a compelling case that given the reclassification as IV-C Enemy Aliens many Nisei who refused an unqualified “yes-yes” on the loyalty questionnaire were early draft resisters despite there being no official draft.² The TLC mission statement broadens that definition and implies that all who were deemed “disloyal” were actively resisting. There were, however, as *Personal Justice Denied* points out, myriad reasons that a respondent might have “failed” the loyalty questionnaire aside from active resistance. Many may have failed to answer an unqualified yes-yes because they were confused or coerced. In addition, those who renounced their citizenship may have done so out of anger as an act of defiance or out of fear that they would be sent out of camp to a hostile world, separated from their family.

In the forward to the 1994 edition of *The Vichy Syndrome*, Stanley Hoffman discusses how during the postwar years in France, there was a time during which the myth that the Vichy government was full of resisters coexisted with the counter myth that all were collaborators. Though the counter myth attracted some attention, ultimately it was discarded for being every bit as inaccurate as the initial myth. Both were ultimately discarded because the reality “...was infinitely more complex than either myth suggests.”³ The same can be said of the wartime and post-war experience of Japanese Americans, especially those incarcerated at Tule Lake.

The Contemporary Pilgrimage

A pilgrimage is first, and foremost, a journey. The journey itself is an integral part of the experience. The journey to Tule Lake, which partially mirrors the evacuation experience of Japanese Americans during the war, is as important as the arrival. During the journey individuals attain an education, if not enlightenment, and the people who endured the hardships of segregation are honored through the journey. Finally, the site itself, is sanctified by the visitors.

The Tule Lake Pilgrimage is not for everyone. It is not “history-lite.” This four-day pilgrimage is a full immersion into a different time and place. It is a commemorative event that seeks to challenge the narrative that the only patriotic Japanese Americans were those who served the country that had stripped them of their civil rights, and then bounced back quickly after the war due, in part, to opportunities that arose from internment and military service. It offers the counter-narrative that dissent is also patriotic and it honors those who suffered first at the hands of the federal government and then at the hands of their own community through the deliberate erasure of their wartime experience.

The observations that follow were made by the author who attended the 2010 pilgrimage as a participant-observer with the permission of the Board of the Tule Lake Committee. This pilgrimage can serve as a representative example of the contemporary pilgrimage. A “thick description” of this pilgrimage provides an opportunity to analyze the active contestation of the postwar memory by the pilgrimage organizers. In some portions of the programming, pilgrimage organizers present a counter-narrative, that all Tuleans were resisters. The description that follows seeks to show how pilgrims themselves interact with

both the narrative and the counter-narrative during the pilgrimage and reconcile both with their own experiences.

Organizers are identified by their full names but pilgrim participants are identified by first names only and these are pseudonyms. The bus monitor is not identified other than as an official Tule Lake Committee member as this would make identification of pilgrims who spoke on the bus easier as well. Direct quotations indicate that the speaker, a Tule Lake Committee organizer was recorded at an open and public event. Paraphrasing is always used to represent unrecorded material taken from notes. When events are repetitive, predictable, and ongoing, the present tense is used. When reference is made to specific events or a particular speech, the past tense is used and the pilgrimage year is identified.

Day 1: The Bus Ride

Within the Tule Lake Committee website, and through the registration process found on the website, potential pilgrims learn that participation in the bus ride is an integral part of the pilgrimage experience: time after time, pilgrims are cautioned not to miss this important community building and educational experience. In addition to building community, the bus monitor is also responsible for establishing norms for the pilgrimage. On arrival at the bus, pilgrims are given simple paper tags with strings attached reminiscent of the tagged Japanese Americans waiting to be loaded, like baggage, onto busses and trains to remote and unknown destinations. Though the bus is comfortable and air-conditioned with video monitors and a public address system, the monitors ask participants to cast their thoughts back to the moment when families were pulled away from their homes and communities seventy years earlier, when the prisoners had no sense of when or even if they would return.

First, pilgrims learn how to “read” each other’s name tags and lanyards. Anyone with a red lanyard was over 80 years old (or a member of the Tule Lake Committee) and might need preferential treatment in lines. A yellow name tag means that the wearer lived at the Tule Lake center during the war. These two indicators mean that prior to any introduction, every pilgrim knows who on the pilgrimage had first-hand experience of Tule Lake and if that experience was as a child or as an adult: this simple color coding system is a powerful icebreaker since often all it takes to start a conversation is a simple, “I see that you lived at Tule Lake.”

Each bus had two or more experienced Tule Lake Committee Bus Monitors to officiate during the ride. Much of what they do is “housekeeping” like taking role, organizing lunch, or telling pilgrims about the dorms, but they are, in ways, spiritual guides. There are six or seven busses coming from San Francisco, Berkeley, San Jose, Sacramento, and Seattle. Pilgrims board the busses in the morning and arrive by 6:00 P.M. in time for dinner at the Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT). The trips take between eight and ten hours each and most of that time is used building knowledge, understanding, and community.

Even before the bus leaves the lot, more experienced pilgrims, eager to build community, pass snacks up and down the aisle of the bus. Prompted by the passing scenery, the monitor explains how Japanese Americans from the area ended up at any one of the ten detention camps set up by the War Relocation Authority (WRA) during World War II. The story unfolds as the pilgrims travel from coastal cities to the inland of California as guides educate pilgrims by narrating the story of the 110,000 Japanese Americans who were sent to concentration camps during the war. Much of this is achieved in the first half of the bus ride.

After this orientation, assuming that most on the bus did not already know the story of Tule Lake as a site of segregation, the bus monitor discusses the government's decision to segregate "loyal" from "disloyal" Japanese Americans based upon a questionnaire designed by the Department of War in order to determine which young men would be eligible to volunteer for the army. This segregation, the monitor tells the passengers, resulted in the transformation of the Tule Lake War Relocation Center into the Tule Lake Segregation Center which became the home to over 14,000 Japanese Americans who were deemed "disloyal," and an additional 4,000 "loyal" Japanese Americans who did not want to transfer to a different camp. The monitor is setting the stage for relating complex and interwoven historical narratives that correspond with the second stated goal of the Committee. "...to recognize the unique role of the Tule Lake camp, which was converted into a segregation center to incarcerate those from all of the camps who resisted their imprisonment and were deemed disloyal..."⁴ This was all accomplished in the first morning of the four-day pilgrimage.

The monitor introduces a short documentary film, *From a Silk Cocoon*, by Satsuki Ina and discusses the factors in the film that are especially "salient" to the Tule Lake Pilgrimage like segregation and renunciation. The monitor speaks personally, of the difficulty that Kibei or Japanese Americans born in the United States but educated in Japan, like his mother, would have had in answering the loyalty questionnaire. He acknowledges both how complex and divisive the history is, but gently and with humor he made the space to honor all stories

...the whole question about no-no and renunciants and reversing renunciation and being deported and regaining citizenship, those things are all things that are fairly unique to [the] Tule Lake Camp experience and they are all things that have seldom

been talked about or rarely talked about there is...still... a lot of stigma attached to a lot of that even within or maybe especially within the Japanese American Community.⁵

The monitor addresses the idea of divisions within the Japanese American community gently but directly.

As evidence of just how divisive this history is, he explains that Ina's uncle, a veteran and a personal friend of his, will not, despite the monitor's encouragement, attend the pilgrimage nor will he watch his niece's movie about his relatives who renounced their U.S. citizenship. The monitor explains how these divisions within the Japanese American community came to be a focus of the pilgrimage.

So on the pilgrimage we know that there is (sic) a lot of different experiences and a lot of different feelings about what went on and we look at it as a healing experience so that we try to be open and to listen to everybody's story because everybody has stories and their own experience. And, try to make a welcoming atmosphere where those stories can come out, and try not to pass judgments on anyone. When you go home, you can do that, but on the pilgrimage we try to keep it as open as possible so that stories can come out.⁶

Permission to judge each other once the pilgrims return home gets a chuckle out of the audience and disarms the crowd, but the monitor has made his point.

This was all on the bus before lunch on the first day of the pilgrimage. After lunch, groups of four are directed to introduce themselves to each other and then designate one person in the group to introduce the whole group. This strategy allows individuals to let someone else reveal their story to the larger group, especially useful if the story is an uncomfortable one. All of the presentations of the morning made it more likely that people would speak freely and openly, and that everyone on the bus has a basic understanding of the loyalty questionnaire and renunciation. The introductions reveal a great deal about the diversity of the stories on the bus, speak to the power of the pilgrimage, and reflect the make-

up of the pilgrimage participants as a whole. If the bus ride began with these introductions, pilgrims would likely be far more reticent.

Most pilgrims are travelling with someone else: there are couples, siblings, colleagues, and extended multigenerational families, which, it turns out the Committee has been deliberate to attract. On my bus, the first man to speak, Earl was born after the war but was attending the pilgrimage with his older sister who had been born at Tule Lake, his father Walter, a Kibei, whom he described as a “yes-no boy,” his younger half-sister and her young son. Earl, as the son of a “yes-no boy” clearly knew quite a bit about the confinement experience, had visited Tule Lake once, and had been on a pilgrimage to Minidoka. His father’s desire to attend the 2010 pilgrimage prompted Earl to register and encourage his siblings to attend as well. Interestingly, Earl acknowledged that some of the stories that his father was telling the group were new to him. This was an important reminder of the role that this pilgrimage has in prompting people to break their silence or speak beyond the carefully crafted remembrances they have developed over the years.

Next Linda spoke. As a member of a Japanese American Association, she had received an email publicizing the pilgrimage which she had forwarded to her friends and family hoping to get a group interested in attending. Her parents had never spoken about their experiences in the camps and were both deceased. Her cousin Holly (who was travelling with her husband) and their aunt Yoko, who was the youngest child in the family at the time of the incarceration, were all making the trip with her. The family was initially incarcerated at Tule Lake but was later transferred to the Minidoka WRA camp when Tule Lake became a segregation center.

The multigenerational dimension of the pilgrimage was reinforced when Kathy's family introduced themselves. Kathy and two of her sisters were accompanied by their mother, Nancy, and Kathy's niece Brittany. Their father, who had passed away earlier that spring, had attended the pilgrimage the previous year with the family. Their father was already a medic in the army when Pearl Harbor was bombed. Remarkably, he was not discharged like so many other Japanese Americans were after the declaration of war on Japan. While his parents and younger brothers were interned at Tule Lake, they renounced their citizenship and returned to Japan at the close of the war. Kathy's father was never incarcerated at Tule Lake or any other War Relocation center. As Kathy explained it, her uncles all returned to Japan, married Japanese women, and ultimately moved back to the United States and regained their U.S. citizenship. Her father, though, unable to understand the experience his family had at Tule Lake, had spent his life feeling that he had been abandoned by his parents and brothers. Nancy, their mother, had been interned in Arkansas and released to attend college in Tennessee. This family on its own served as an example of the diverse experiences and complex responses people had during the incarceration period. One of Kathy's uncles was travelling on another bus and planned to meet them at the pilgrimage with his wife, two sons and two grandchildren. As Kathy explained it, the pilgrimage provided their family with the means to discuss very traumatic family history and alleviate some of the pain they had lived with for so long.

Over time, astute pilgrims notice that if someone began their incarceration at Tule Lake and then ended up in a different camp, like Heart Mountain or Minidoka, this was a way of saying, without saying it, that they had been deemed "loyal." The inverse is also true: if someone incarcerated in Jerome ended up in Tule Lake, they were clearly considered

“disloyal.” One group of 4000 however, began their incarceration at Tule Lake and passed the loyalty questionnaire but never left Tule Lake simply because they chose not to relocate to a different WRA camp after segregation. This kind of coded talk seems to have been common in the Japanese American community when the name Tule Lake came up. After all, the larger population in general, knows little about the camps, less about the questionnaire, and next to nothing about segregation. After the war, those in the Japanese American community associated Tule Lake with resistance or disloyalty and this knowledge became embedded in generational memories and silences, a kind of post memory.

During the bus trip, the depth of racism Japanese Americans experienced, the complexity of the decisions people were forced to make and the validity of all possible responses is stressed time and time again. In *Personal Justice Denied*, the CWRIC made it a point to establish that there were no right or wrong answers to the questionnaire; all the answers were bad because the questionnaire itself was poorly composed and ill-advised. In addition, it became clear that people had made the decisions that they had made for many different reasons.⁷ Although some organizers of the pilgrimage hope to draw out and emphasize the heroic nature of resistance at Tule Lake, pilgrimage participants themselves contest that counter-myth with their own stories which emphasize their resiliency, confusion, or sense of hopelessness. The interactive nature of the pilgrimage reinforces what Hoffman said when introducing *The Vichy Syndrome* about reality being infinitely more complex than any single narrative can express.⁸ The pilgrimage provides a chance to hear people’s diverse stories, learn to acknowledge them, and create an opportunity to heal some of the divisions that resulted not only from detention but also from the silencing of the story of segregation.

Day 1: Arrival, Registration, and Dinner

All the busses arrive at OIT between 4:30 and 6:00 P.M. Once at the college, pilgrims register, receive room keys, meal cards and an impressive brochure that provides the pilgrimage schedule and maps, as well as a selection of primary and secondary source materials about the Tule Lake Segregation Center. (This brochure always features direct testimonials related to the loyalty questionnaire and renunciation.)

Meals provide another opportunity to meet new people and learn about all aspects of the Tule Lake experience. The round tables that accommodate ten people are especially conducive to good conversation. I witnessed one pilgrimage organizer challenge pilgrims who were there officially from the Japanese American National Museum as to why there had never been representatives from the museum on earlier pilgrimages. At another table, a professor from the University of Washington, who was presenting a lecture later in the pilgrimage, was joined by a man who said nothing but passed documents around the table that indicated he had been incarcerated at Tule Lake and then transferred to the Santa Fe Department of Justice Camp: these included his reclassification card as a IV-C alien ineligible for the draft. The older man's son told the group that he had just learned that his father had kept a journal, in English, of his experiences in Tule Lake and Santa Fe. The professor, a Japanese American, was unwilling to ask the older man how he had responded to the questionnaire or why he had been transferred to Santa Fe. Once the table cleared, I asked the Tulean both questions; the older pilgrim confirmed he had been a "no-no" and was transferred he said because of his participation in "Hoshidan," a reference to his membership in a military-style exercise group that deliberately staged their morning exercises in front of the administrative buildings at the camp.

Encounters like these indicated the power of the postwar silencing and divisions within the community. Representatives from the Japanese American National Museum, established largely at the outset by Nisei veterans, were challenged by committee members for a perceived conspicuous absence. A Yonsei learned that his father had kept a diary and still had it only when they were preparing to return to the site of incarceration 70 years later. An educated Japanese American's unwillingness to ask about a person's response to the loyalty questionnaire even at the site of segregation spoke volumes. The tension surrounding silencing, segregation, and alienation is profound.

Day 1: The Formal Welcome

At the 2000 pilgrimage, Barbara Takei was disappointed that there was no formal beginning to the pilgrimage. Under her influence, the contemporary Welcome Program now begins with taiko drumming, which Takei characterizes as the "calling of the tribe" and the entire welcome program takes about an hour. After the drumming at the 2010 pilgrimage, Takei greeted the crowd and spoke mostly from prepared remarks. She began by explaining the colored lanyard and tag system to the entire group and prompted people to pay close attention to and interact with the red lanyard/yellow tag group in particular. "They are our living treasure and they are the people that tell us the history of Tule Lake." She announced that on the 2009 pilgrimage there had been about 50 former internees over eighty-years-of-age on the pilgrimage but that in 2010 there were closer to 60 in that category. The audience applauded that announcement.

Having identified the "living treasure sitting" in our midst, she made a direct statement as to the purpose of the pilgrimage, "...the pilgrimages are about healing: healing ourselves individually as well as healing our community. You know our community has

been divided for nearly the last seventy years based on the government's distinction of those who were loyal and those who they say were disloyal..."⁹ This aspect of postwar alienation is strangely missing from the current Committee mission statement, though it is addressed frequently on the pilgrimage. After explaining the difficulty people had with questions 27 and 28 she added, that the ten percent of the incarcerated Japanese American population who failed to answer these questions "correctly" had

suffered for their lifetime with being marginalized and written out of Japanese American history... their ...choices have never been acknowledged as valid choices. And that, I think, is part of the goal of the pilgrimage to help pilgrims to understand the value, the importance of the choice that people made to resist, to protest the unjust incarceration using that loyalty questionnaire."¹⁰

The real culprit, she said, was the U.S. government. She hoped that all the pilgrims would return to their communities and "help a larger audience understand... that people who chose to dissent also had courage and integrity."¹¹ Regardless of the no-nos' original intent or potential confusion over the questions, Takei and the Committee often ascribe the same motive to each respondent; they were both courageous and patriotic for taking a stand against the government. Takei regularly emcees the Welcome Program and always confronts the subjects of segregation, renunciation, and alienation despite the discomfort that her audience might sometimes feel.

As part of the welcome program, Takei introduced a number of people whom pilgrims needed to know, either because they were coordinating programs or making presentations. Hiroshi Kashiwagi, the "poet laureate" of Tule Lake, whose poetry introduces each section of this thesis, spoke for a few minutes. Takei explained that Kashiwagi was one of the very few people who had openly discussed the renunciation of his citizenship which he acknowledged publically for the first time at the 2004 pilgrimage. (A careful reading of his

poem shows that though he talks about all the issues confronting detainees at Tule Lake, and all the choices people had to make, he does not actually reveal his own choices.) In unscripted remarks, Takei explains how the renunciants had suffered not only at the hands of the government but also at the hands of the Japanese American community because “. . . the stories of dissent have been called our dirty laundry . . . there is an unnamed Japanese American organization who should probably apologize not only to draft resisters . . . but should probably be apologizing to the people segregated in Tule Lake, but don’t get me started.”¹² This comment was a reference to the JACL’s formal apology in 2002 to Japanese American draft resisters.¹³ The JACL has made no such apology to those incarcerated at Tule Lake. The audience seemed to hold their breath while waiting to see how others would respond to her comments. The audience ultimately laughed but not all for the same reasons.

Takei continued to introduce people who spoke briefly about events listed in the program guide and she outlined the procedures for the next day’s trip to the camp site. One of the speakers that she introduced described the Intergenerational Discussion Groups that would be meeting on the third morning. She provided instructions about active listening and then had people in the audience pair up to practice it; one person spoke for a minute and then the listener repeated what had been said to the original narrator. Then the pair reversed their roles. This activity served to get all the pilgrims to think about what it means to listen.

Then Takei introduced a representative of the National Japanese American Historical Society (NJAHS) who would be conducting oral history interviews during the pilgrimage. This work was being sponsored by a grant that the Tule Lake Committee and the NJAHS had received. There were two people available to conduct the interviews in either English or

Japanese. Each participant would receive a DVD of their interview. This commitment to recording these stories fulfills the third goal of the Tule Lake Committee mission.

...to preserve the history and experiences of the inmates of the Tule Lake Segregation Center and their struggles to cope with an unjust imprisonment and harsh conditions of the Segregation Center and their rejection by their own government.¹⁴

Not only were there people to record the stories but they could be conducted both in Japanese or English. Receiving a copy of the interview also served to get people to participate.

The remainder of the welcoming program deals with the nuts and bolts of the pilgrimage, an advertisement for the Tule Lake Pilgrimage Sales Room, and a review of the program highlights. After the formal welcome, the crowd breaks up and there are slide shows of the camp, movies about the detention era, paper crane folding, social mixers with refreshments, and even a high school reunion. Most remarkable, though, in an acknowledgement that some Japanese Americans from Tule Lake had left the United States for Japan, there is a session in Japanese for attendees on the pilgrimage who do not speak English. There is little recognition in the Japanese American community that some Japanese Americans were repatriated to Japan both during and after the war, both before and after the renunciation program. The fact that people in Japan have a connection to Tule Lake and that the pilgrimage is advertised there is revelatory in and of itself. Those who make the pilgrimage from Japan have diverse reasons for coming: they may have been born in Tule Lake, may have been married to someone incarcerated in Tule Lake, or may have been renunciants themselves.

Day 2: Visiting the Tule Lake Segregation Center Site

The next morning, the pilgrims board the busses for the first trip to the actual site. The six busses start in different areas and each complete a circular route through the camp,

stopping for passengers to disembark at several locations. Much of the camp has vanished. The busses all stop at “Block 73.” (All of the WRA camps were arranged in a block system. A number of barracks formed a block around the common laundry rooms, restrooms and canteen.) Though nothing but the concrete foundations of some of the common buildings remain, a number of the pilgrims have emotional responses to the space and work hard to imagine the location of the neighboring block where their family lived. There are concrete slabs where the laundry rooms, mess halls, and latrines were located in the center of each block. But participants on the bus are often anxious to identify some memorable feature like the “firebreak,” or the furthest section of blocks which were called ‘Alaska’ during camp days. At one stop, Earl realized that the block he was in was adjacent to the block where his family had lived during the war. He became increasingly excited and demanded confirmation that he had his directions right as he walked towards what he thought was the site of his family’s wartime home. He was born after the war, but the emotion evoked by the visit was palpable as he thought of his family living in such conditions.

One building which remains largely intact is the jail within the stockade area. During the camp tour, Jimi Yamaichi stands outside the still sturdy jail which he helped build at the behest of camp administrators, and explains that this building has survived because he used fresh water in mixing the concrete for the jail rather than the ditch water which administrators had him use for most other construction. Yamaichi rather apologetically explains that he led a construction crew in the Tule Lake camp and considered saying no when asked to build a jail. He recounts that when the camp administrators suggested that if his crew would not build the jail, someone else’s crew would to it, he reluctantly agreed to build what he called the “jail within a jail.”¹⁵ At this stop on the 2010 pilgrimage, I

witnessed a middle-aged man, Ted, with whom I had travelled on the bus, ask a question and then make a speech about how charitable and helpful the administrators at the Tule Lake Segregation Center had been. It seemed unusual that he would be so defensive of the men who were essentially his wardens but he was tenacious in their defense; Ted was only 8-years-old when the war began.

The camp tour also includes stops at the state historic marker and the Tulelake Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) Camp. (Spelled as one word, like the nearby town.) During the war the CCC camp was used for a variety of purposes: housing Italian and German POWs, and providing temporary accommodations for Japanese Americans who were brought as strikebreakers to Tule Lake from other WRA camps when the Tule Lake residents went on strike and camp authorities needed to harvest the crops. Eventually, it also housed some Tule Lake resisters who refused to complete the loyalty questionnaire. This structure has been incorporated into the National Monument and provides an additional site to commemorate the complex stories of Japanese American resistance and governmental betrayal, in this case, the story of strikebreakers from other detention centers and the deliberate isolation of resisters.

Day 2: Lunch at the Fairgrounds and a Memorial Service

The pilgrims have lunch at the Tulelake-Butte Valley Fairgrounds catered by the Tulelake Volunteer Firefighters. At the fairgrounds, the pilgrims can participate in *mochi* making, *taiko* drumming, and/ or *obon odori* dancing.* In 2014, the Committee opened this event to the public free of charge.¹⁶ While at the fairgrounds, pilgrims visit the Museum of

* These are all traditional Japanese arts and foods. Their interactive nature provides pilgrims as well as visitors from the community, who are now regularly invited to the picnic, an opportunity to build community.

Local History which houses a barracks and a guard tower from the camp. The museum also has an exhibit curated by a local woman about the Tule Lake Camp which was funded by a CCLPEP grant. This is the temporary home to the NPS headquarters for Tule Lake so park materials regarding Tule Lake and a few books are available for purchase at this location.

The Committee hosts a memorial service at every pilgrimage. On the 2010 pilgrimage the service was held at the Klamath Falls cemetery where three children who died at Tule Lake are buried. On subsequent pilgrimages, the memorial service has been held at the site of the camp cemetery. Though the cemetery at Tule Lake has very few physical features to mark the site, the service there is a way in which to sanctify an important space that has been long neglected. At the 2010 memorial service, three ministers officiated, including a Buddhist bishop. In his comments, Bishop Koshin Ogui clearly confronted the “all’s well that ends well” version of detention that he has heard so many former detainees tell. He attempted to invert the well-rehearsed story that many Japanese Americans tell of the opportunities that they gained through their incarceration by comparing it to the story of a rape victim. In his fictionalized story, a rape victim goes to the hospital to be cared for after the trauma of her rape. There she meets a nice doctor with whom she falls in love. Eventually, the woman and the doctor are married and raise a family together. The bishop argues that you would never hear this woman talk about her rape as “a blessing in disguise” because it led to her happy marriage and family life. Ogui finds it inconceivable that Japanese Americans have somehow convinced themselves that their incarceration was a blessing. His analogy was intentionally provocative.

Once again, pilgrims were asked to reconsider the narratives they have told over the years. In fact, on the pilgrimage many incarcerated at Tule Lake told stories of how their

wartime experiences gave them the opportunity to attend college and become architects and/or engineers rather than inherit their fathers' farms and/or laundry services. I overheard at least one pilgrim say that she did not understand why they were not allowed to remember it the way they remembered it. This comment reflects the ability of pilgrims to contest the narrative that the TLC promotes. This confrontation of rehearsed versions of the story is best illustrated in another pilgrimage activity, the Reflections Group.

Day 2: Reflections Group

On the first two evenings of the pilgrimage, Satsuki Ina facilitates a "Reflections Group." The program guide says explicitly that the doors will be closed at the designated time and that no one will be allowed to enter late. The chairs in the room are arranged in concentric circles.

Ina explains the organizing principle behind the concentric circles of chairs. The inner-most circle is for pilgrims who were incarcerated at Tule Lake. The next circle is for individuals who were incarcerated at any other confinement center. The outermost circles are for pilgrims who never lived in a War Relocation center. Those in the inner circle are clearly the center of attention and are given a privileged position — a distinction the Intergenerational Discussion Groups do not make. Ina asks of the people in the inner circle, "Who would like to go second?" Everyone laughs gently and one pilgrim or another will begin a narrative. Many of the pilgrims in the center recount stories that they have already told during the previous two days. In fact, these stories are, to a large degree, well-rehearsed, "composed" narratives. Two of the nine participants at the 2010 pilgrimage actually read their statements. Ina, however, anticipates this and is prepared to move each speaker a little deeper into their own memories.

At the end of each account, Ina gently probes each pilgrim's narrative in order to get under the surface of these stories and to reveal aspects of the narrative that even those telling the story have either not considered before or have been unwilling to express. The theme for the 2010 pilgrimage was, after all, "Sharing the Untold Stories." The theme itself was an acknowledgement of exactly what Anna Green, an oral historian, and others describe when interpreting memories--the role that social groups play in shaping individual memories. Green explains that individual remembering is influenced by three primary factors. First, people remember what others remember. Secondly, people tend to remember that which is socially acceptable. Finally, a psychological need for self-protection influences what people are willing to remember. Considering this, it is no surprise then that "...the most durable memories tended to be those held by the greatest number..." Green concludes that in a desire to build an 'affective community' individuals are most likely to remember that which is in "harmony" with others.¹⁷

In this case, though, all the previous pilgrimage programming is designed to build a new affective community which serves to make the story of segregation, anger, betrayal, trauma, rejection, renunciation, protest, and confusion acceptable. Everyone has been asked to reserve judgment. The pilgrimage organizers work deliberately to make sure all stories are socially acceptable by directly confronting all that happened at the Tule Lake center. The role of the Sansei who manage the pilgrimage is to build an affective community in which all participants feel their stories will be honored. Stories of resilience though are often gently challenged as insincere or rehearsed, hence the woman's comment that she wanted to remember it the way that she remembered it.

At the 2010 pilgrimage, the first to speak was the man who had defended the center's administrators at the jail site earlier that day. He was just a boy during the war. Ted told about his search, as soon as was possible, of the records from camp that could explain why his family had remained at Tule Lake after segregation; it turned out that though his father had been a "yes-yes," his mother and an older sister had failed to register at all and the family remained together at Tule Lake after segregation. He emphasized that he was only a child and therefore, had little understanding of the controversies swirling around him. Ina asked what it meant to him to discover how his family had answered the questionnaire.

"Disappointed" said Ted who explained that he had never asked his parents about their decisions, and now it was too late. He then went on to explain that after segregation, life in the camp changed dramatically for the worse. He was pulled out of the WRA school and enrolled in the Japanese Language School and he participated in "pro" Japan activities of which he is now, in his own words, "ashamed." When Ina asked about the shame that he felt, he spoke at length, ultimately, however, getting back to his mother's failure to fill in the questionnaire. In his seventies, he still blamed his parents for causing him to carry the "disloyal" label all of his life. Ina pointed out that a hallmark of intergenerational trauma is the unspoken rule that the experience is not to be discussed, and the silence is how the trauma gets passed down, unresolved.

It turns out that the next speaker, Henry, who was 19 when Pearl Harbor was attacked, was the uncle that Kathy spoke of on the bus. He began with a brief description of his family and the timeline of their removal from the west coast. He said that when the question of loyalty came up, his parents gave up any idea of staying in the United States. So his parents and three of his four brothers renounced their citizenship and were transported

back to Japan following the war. He choked up talking about his older brother, Kathy's father, who had only recently passed away. Henry's older brother, an army medic who retained his position after Pearl Harbor, was the only family member who stayed in the United States.

Regaining his composure, Henry went on to describe the rest of his life as having "turned out well." After ten years of working for Pan Am in Tokyo, he was transferred to San Francisco where he worked to regain his citizenship. He ended by taking stock of his life, 40 years with Pan Am, four sons and seven grandchildren. But when Ina spoke, it was to emphasize that his tears were nothing to be afraid of but simply the product of suppressed emotion and energy being released, and this prompted him to add more. He explained how his older brother admitted at the previous pilgrimage to having held something in his stomach all his life, a hurt and anger at what he perceived to be an abandonment by his family. Ina took this opportunity to remind the audience of the ways in which families were separated and "fractured" by the experience.

The next man to speak, Thomas, was attending the pilgrimage largely because he was celebrating his 65th high school reunion while there. He was a vivacious and cheerful product of the Tri-State High School, which earned its name because it accommodated students from California, Washington and Oregon. He unabashedly embraced the idea that his life was irrevocably changed for the better by his experience during the war. He was 14 years old when the war started and destined to inherit his father's laundry business. He had, in part because of his educational opportunities in camp, gone on to become an engineer instead. He said that he had never felt bitter and that his camp experience had allowed him to make Japanese American friends which he had never had before because he had grown up in

what he called a “Caucasian” area. He joked that at camp, he had greater competition in school because his fellow Japanese American students studied more than his white classmates had ever done. It was a cheerful and well performed story of his life. I had sat next to him at the Welcome Ceremony and had heard him recount essentially the same story the previous day.

As he wrapped up this narrative, Ina asked him about how the time in camp affected his family. It was obvious that even this simple question took him outside of his practiced narrative. He began by talking about some of the physical aspects of daily life in the camps then added that he never heard his father complain one time about their circumstances. His mother, on the other hand, said something to him *once* that had a lasting impact. One day when he returned home having purchased a U.S. war bond, his mother said something like, “You should not support a country that has done this to you.” So, as a young man, he cashed in this war bond and bought, instead, a lifetime subscription to Reader’s Digest that he still receives to this day; it was not obvious that he connected this monthly delivery to his time in detention. He did, however, give Reader’s Digest an earful when they once tried to charge him for his subscription. This speaker made no reference to the loyalty questionnaire and was likely too young to have been required to fill it out which undoubtedly impacted his experience. He ended with the comment that home is not a place, it is the people around you. He believed that the internment experience had made the Japanese American community stronger; this comment went uncontested.

Thomas’ heartening commentary was immediately contrasted by the next speaker who had been a young man at the time of internment and was directly confronted by the loyalty questionnaire and the draft. Curtis began reading from a prepared statement that the

“Day of Infamy” was not December 7 (Pearl Harbor Day), but February 19, the day that President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 which led to the relocation of all Japanese Americans from their homes on the west coast. This inversion of Roosevelt’s famous line echoes Michi Weglyn’s title for her book that proved the removal of Japanese Americans was not a military necessity, *Years of Infamy*. He ended with the statement that he was “madder than hell.” He indicted the president and the Supreme Court for having betrayed Japanese Americans. He told the story of refusing to answer the loyalty questionnaire despite great pressure to do so and how he and others who refused to sign were rounded up. The older men were taken to the local jail while the younger men were taken to the CCC camp just down the road. One night at the camp, the prisoners were roused about midnight, and told to assemble under the spotlights where they found they stood surrounded by armed soldiers and feared that they were about to be shot. This was all because he refused to complete the loyalty questionnaire. Curtis clarified when Ina asked about it, that he had never renounced his citizenship, and that yes, he was still mad as hell.

Next to speak was Ted’s sister, Aiko. She chose to read her story straight from a memoir she had written for a cultural center near her home. She talked about how the train ran across their farm and how she got her wish to ride in a train for the first time, when the family was shipped to the assembly center. Passing across their land, her father commented that it was going to be a good strawberry season and that he hoped they would be back in time to harvest the berries. Their trip took four days and it was in her words a time of “sadness and uncertainty.” She mentioned that at the end of the war, only 12 of the original 70 Japanese American families from the area, returned home. Her family had purchased their farm before laws were passed prohibiting Asian land ownership so they were able to

return home, but it was to a town that was quite different and in her narrative it was a town in which she felt less accepted than she had before the war. Ina took the opportunity to ask the audience to reflect on this aspect of the internment story: the sometimes total disruption of established and close-knit communities and the fear and anxiety that must have accompanied going home.

Next to speak was Mitsue. A girl of eight when she entered camp, she recalled her family's experience as tenant farmers in California. She remembered ironically that she was learning in school about the pilgrims' quest for freedom about the same time her father was taken, for unknown reasons, from them and placed in the Department of Justice Camp in Santa Fe where he remained for about eighteen months. She said that the family was almost deported. She explained that her father understood his predicament this way, "I no longer belong in Japan. I am not an American citizen. I am an American Indian." She explained that her father felt that he had been dispossessed. She ended, however, by adding that she was the first in her family to go to college, and while there, she spoke to one of her professors who had converted to Catholicism about her own possible conversion to Catholicism. The professor understood that Mitsue longed for acceptance and counseled her that even if she became a Christian, people might not be any more accepting of her. The implication was that she felt alienated and was willing to convert simply to overcome that sensation and create a community for herself.

Laura spoke up next. She talked about being in "Alaska" which was the farthest corner of the camp and having frozen fingers in the winter and trying to ski in the firebreak after a heavy snowfall one time. Her most vivid, lasting, and memorable impression, however, was of a convoy of trucks tearing into the camp while she was walking home one

day. The soldiers jumped out and yanked three or four 18 year-old men out of a barrack and hustled them into the jeep. At that time an older, stately Japanese man in a tea colored kimono, assisted by his wife and daughter came out and told the soldiers, “Just tell Uncle Sam that we have a whole army here.” This was a story that Laura had told many times before and it was polished, I had heard it on the bus. Then Laura turned to Ina and said, “How has it affected me? That’s your big question, right?” Ina laughed and said, “How did you guess?” Ultimately Laura admitted that there had been times in her life that she had asked herself, “Why did this happen to me? Why was I born Japanese?” As far as Laura was concerned, however, her sister, who was 16 when they first went to camp, was still “hung up” about who she was despite being a very successful CEO of a bank.

The next to speak was Sachi who had a very different perspective. What she called her mother’s hypochondria left Sachi largely responsible for her siblings while in camp. She painstakingly described the latrines, their distance from the barracks, and the process of doing laundry for the entire family. But worried that she would have nothing “new” to say during the next day’s intergenerational discussion group, she ended her remarks abruptly. Ina’s response to this was to ask the audience to think about how quickly some of the interned had to grow up.

The next man, Kaz was from a part of California that he characterized at the time of the war as “redneck territory.” Kaz had finished one year of community college when the war started and his family was sent directly to Tule Lake Relocation Center. He found the place oppressive so within months of his arrival, he had left to harvest apples, and then stayed on in the same area to harvest sugar beets. When he returned to camp in the spring, he found the atmosphere to be worse than ever. In fact, pro-Japanese men were putting so much

pressure on his parents to influence his registration responses that he moved within the camp to live with a friend some distance from his parents.

But he never stayed long in camp. While in Utah, working at a meat company, he was impressed by the friendliness of the Mormons there but remembered sitting at a breakfast counter in a café when a black man sat down near him. He overheard the counter help tell the man that he could not serve him. Kaz said that this was a real eye-opener: Japanese Americans were not alone. He was drafted from his home town, and then was recruited into the Military Intelligence Service and trained in Fort Snelling where the recruits were well liked by the locals. Though the war ended before his training was done, he served in Japan during the occupation.

When Ina asked Kaz to elaborate about having to move within the camp to reduce the pressure on his parents, Kaz talked about “rabble-rousers.” One man who had pressured his parents to get him to resist the draft or renounce his citizenship, ended up in Jerome with his parents after segregation, presumably, because he had been deemed “loyal” through the questionnaire, despite his provocative rhetoric in camp. Kaz said that he learned from this experience not to trust what you are told and to always question what you hear and see in the media. This point was further driven home by his interaction with those in Japan he considered to have been “brainwashed” by the government. This is the same pilgrim who made a point to attend the 2012 pilgrimage because the theme “No-No and Renunciation” was of such great interest to him. He acknowledged in an interview that the most touching moment of the 2012 pilgrimage was when Barbara Takei called for the renunciants in the audience to stand and the crowd gave them a standing ovation.¹⁸

As those in the inner circle finished their stories, Ina identified a theme that she had heard in the various narratives and used it to knit the stories together. Many of the speakers had made judgments about the good guys versus the bad guys. “Who were the good guys? Who were the bad guys?” she asked both the speakers and the audience. She reminded the group that at Tule Lake information was strictly controlled and people had to make decisions based on incomplete and misleading information. She asked, “Who were these people in terms of their identification with Japan? With the United States?” She challenged everyone in the room to try to get beyond labels like “rabble rouser” and such. The terms of loyal and disloyal had been imposed arbitrarily and the story was far more complicated than those terms could ever reflect.

The second circle of speakers was generally younger, less time was dedicated to their stories, and few faced any kind of interrogation from Ina. This was largely because of time. Each speaker touched on themes that had already arisen. One man, born in Tule Lake, had returned to Japan with his family to live in the Hiroshima area and remembered wearing the cowboy outfit that a relative sent for his birthday only once before his mother sold it on the Black Market to buy food.

The next man to speak was the son of a “no-no” who had volunteered to serve during the Vietnam War, he said, in a way, to atone for his father’s earlier decision. It was while at the officer’s club in Saigon, that he learned that during World War II, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team had saved a Texas Regiment, known as the Lost Battalion, in Italy. The Texas officers, who told him the story, showered him with gifts that weekend simply because he was a Japanese American serviceman who shared a heritage with members of the 442nd. The

shame he felt for what he perceived to be his father's lack of patriotism and his ignorance of the valor of the 442nd were striking.

Next a woman, born in Tule Lake, explained how she had run across a recipe at home that called for two dozen eggs, and was told it was a recipe from "camp" but she never understood that "camp" was not just "camping" until she went college. (This example illustrates how powerfully the euphemistic terms used by the government were able to mask the true nature of the confinement experience both during the war and after it.) Her parents were Kibei and she acknowledged that for her father, saying "no" must have been difficult because he had been trained all his life to respect authority. She, too, remained confused as to the significance of the events and regretted not having asked more questions.

Once all those in the second circle had spoken, Ina wrapped up the session. She acknowledged that there is renewed urgency to talk about the issues since 9-11 and that telling the story is just the beginning. She encouraged everyone to continue speaking up and hoped the evening served as inspiration to everyone in the room. Finally, she thanked all the speakers for being "our teachers." Ina was unwilling to let a story teller simply replay a story that they had grown accustomed to telling which are carefully rehearsed and sanitized memories. Her follow-up questions were always gentle but could still produce push back from participants who though willing to examine new perspectives generally retained their basic narratives.

Since the 1990s, through the use of Intergenerational Discussion Groups (IDGs), members of the Tule Lake Committee had hoped for a depth of conversation that could lead to the healing of the pilgrims who participated in them. The IDGs were problematic but the Reflections Group was structured in a way that managed to elicit thoughtful commentaries

and long forgotten memories because it was designed specifically to do just that. First, the facilitator is completely versed in the history of Tule Lake and has a deep understanding of the burden that Tuleans have carried for years. Ina draws on her experience with survivors that ultimately led to her film, *Children of the Camps*, when she conducts these reflection groups.¹⁹

Though this is not a psychotherapy session, Ina has always understood that the revelations made in this group can be powerful and overwhelm those telling their stories. That is why Reflections Groups are only scheduled in the evening: she is available to stay with participants as long as necessary once the audience leaves. The pilgrimage, she pointed out in an interview, is after all a return to the “scene of the crime” a place of remembrance. Ina sees her role as being to support those telling their stories, protect each participant from criticism, and manage the story so that those participating and those observing have a sense of coherence.²⁰ Though Ina mediates the memories of each speaker, as well as shapes the experience with her narrative transitions, pilgrims themselves interact in that process and make meaning for themselves.

Day 3: Intergenerational Discussion Groups

On the second morning at OIT every pilgrim attends an “Intergenerational Discussion Group.” Pilgrims are assigned to a specific group of about 10 people. Leaders have been trained to run the groups and the sessions are scheduled to last three hours. Families, who arrive in large numbers, are able to request that they all be assigned to the same group. During this session, people are encouraged to speak of the trauma that they or their families have endured as a result of internment. The group sits in a single circle and the facilitator starts off by reminding the group that what is said in the IDGs is personal and confidential

and should not be repeated outside of the room. This is an aspect of the groups that Barbara Takei had found bewildering during her first experience on the pilgrimage in 2000.²¹ If the purpose of the groups is healing, then they require a trained facilitator. If the purpose of the groups is performative, keeping them confidential eliminates their power to transmit memory. In keeping with the confidential nature of the pilgrimage, I will not provide a description of the commentary in my group.

However, two interesting things happened before my IDG began that were noteworthy. “Kaz” from the Reflections group the night before, introduced himself to the facilitator. She repeated his name softening the vowel sound to give it a Japanese pronunciation. When he corrected her, she explained that the way she was saying it was more Japanese. He simply replied, “But I’m American.” Many of the Japanese affectations that the Sansei facilitators assume seem to be irritants to a generation who spent most of their lives proving themselves to be good Americans. I recognized most of the participants in my group from either the bus, the cafeteria, the Reflections group or the general sessions. However, I did not recognize the woman next to me so I struck up a conversation. She was born after the camps and was sharing a dorm room at this pilgrimage with her mother’s best friend. When I explained my project, she spoke candidly of her uncle who had been a draft resistor. She said that he had never married and that in her mind, that was the result of the lifelong alienation that he felt. She had encouraged him to come to the pilgrimage or to watch Frank Abe’s film, *Conscience and the Constitution*, but he had declined both offers. When I contacted her after the pilgrimage in the hopes of interviewing her, she was unwilling to grant an official interview.

These brief encounters prior to the “confidential” IDG, about which I will not write, serve as two important reminders. First, pilgrims bring their own experiences with them and as important as it was for the facilitator to feel a linguistic connection to Japan, it was equally important for the former Tulean to announce his “Americanness.” Secondly, the pilgrimage does encourage people to tell stories of resistance that they may be unable or unwilling to share outside of that space.

Day 3: Afternoon Sessions

After lunch on the third day, pilgrims are brought together again in a large group for a general plenary meeting. In 2010, Lawson Inada led an audience interactive session intended to illicit “deeply buried untold memories of Tule Lake.” The implication being, once again, that the pilgrims hadn’t really shared their true feelings. This large group setting that lacked intimacy was relatively unsuccessful in drawing out new or buried stories. During the 2012 pilgrimage, this general session, which started as a panel discussion about the psychological trauma of the wartime incarceration, ultimately included the adoption by the audience of a resolution authored by Don Hata a retired history professor and Soji Kashiwagi, the son of Hiroshi Kashiwagi. The resolution called on the pilgrims to recognize that those who took their stand in Tule Lake were both courageous and patriotic. This received a standing ovation.²²

This last general session is followed by a wide variety of workshops. These workshops might address unfinished reparations business, the direction the national park is taking in developing the Tule Lake site, the legality of the U.S. wartime policies, the treatment of Japanese Canadians during the war, the impact of internment on interracial families, poetry writing and more.

Day 3: Performance

After dinner on the third evening, the pilgrims board the bus for the Ross Raglan Theater in Klamath Falls. The “Cultural Program” is a culminating event that, while celebratory in nature, still teaches, instructs, and honors. The current TLC has actively sought to build relationships with the community in Klamath Falls and beyond so the public is invited to attend this event. Hiroshi Shimizu, president of the Tule Lake Committee serves as the emcee. A former inmate of Tule Lake, known by his followers as the Japanese Bing Crosby, croons some fabulous hits from the past. Lawson Inada and Hiroshi Kashiwagi read from their works. The evening includes several songs played on the *koto*, a stringed Japanese instrument. There is dancing and storytelling, and other pieces developed with funding from CCLPEP grants. The evening ends with a blistering performance by the Tule Lake Taiko drum group. The performances are moving, rousing and ultimately celebratory.

The pilgrims then return to OIT. The lobby at the student union building remains open after the cultural program for participants eager to continue to socialize: many people take advantage of this opportunity. There is a reluctance to say goodnight because that brings the end of the pilgrimage closer.

Day 4: Bus Ride Back

On the last day, after an early breakfast, people board their busses and head back to where they started their pilgrimage. The bus trip home is less structured and more people sleep, but group photos are taken at picturesque stops and people promise to stay in touch with their fellow pilgrims.

Conclusion: The Impact of the Contemporary Pilgrimage

Commemoration of the wartime experience of Japanese Americans has evolved over the last 70 years. Over that time, official, organizational, scholarly and cultural carriers of memory have left their mark. As the years have passed, the narrative has broadened and grown more inclusive, diverse, and, thanks to the internet, more accessible. Scholarship regarding the Japanese American experience burgeoned starting in the 1970s and though this scholarship may not have reached the public directly, official, organizational and cultural carriers of memory have capitalized on the research to tell an ever widening story of the confinement era.

Initially, the government and the JACL colluded on a story of Japanese American patriotism and resiliency. That story was not inaccurate but it was incomplete. It served both the needs of the government and the JACL very well and created space for important legislative work on the part of the JACL who capitalized on the very real heroism of Japanese Americans during World War II. The JACL's definition of patriotism, however, was so narrow as to silence other stories of suffering, loss, and anger. When John Okada's *No No Boy* challenged this narrative in the 1950s it was swiftly condemned by the JACL but sales of the book also make it clear it was too soon for the population in general.²³ The government as the official carrier of memory and the JACL as the dominant organizational carrier of memory constructed a narrative that effectively silenced other memories for years.

With distance and a change in circumstances, the federal government has rewritten the collective memory that it carries and transmits. In *Personal Justice Denied*, the federal government presented a compelling and sympathetic history of the detention era that laid the groundwork for an official apology and a payment of reparations to all surviving victims of

the wartime policy of confinement. But the commitment to a complete telling of the story runs deeper than just this meticulously researched document. Federal and state grants have funded projects that have, in turn, become vectors of memory themselves. In addition, the National Park Service has concluded that dozens of confinement sites are worthy of protection. In particular, their work to secure Tule Lake's National Monument status was extraordinary. *Personal Justice Denied* and the diversity of park sites both indicate a commitment to a comprehensive and inclusive account of the wartime experiences of Japanese Americans. Though in *Personal Justice Denied*, the Commission chose to use the admittedly euphemistic language that the government endorsed during the war, this was certainly influenced by political necessity. Today, though the government still resists the use of the term "concentration camp" in official signage, in cases where there is an opportunity to explain the usage of the terms, like on websites and in published materials, the term often appears contextualized by commentary about language and its power. Today, the NPS is working closely with the Tule Lake Committee to ensure that this very dark chapter in the confinement story gets presented respectfully and completely.

Rousseau argues that organizational carriers of memory may be committed to a static version of the past. This is certainly true of the veterans who formed the core of the postwar JACL and who spearheaded the construction of the National Japanese American Memorial in Washington, D.C. fifty years after the end of the war. Members of organizations, however, age and pass on, and so the organizations themselves develop and change. Current JACL leadership has contributed to the inclusion of more nuanced and complex versions of Japanese American history than ever before: there has been an official apology to the draft resisters, JACL leaders proved critical in the inclusion of Tule Lake in the Valor in the

Pacific National Monument. In 2013, the JACL published a booklet called *Power of Words Handbook: A Guide to Language about Japanese Americans in World War II* in which it rebukes earlier usage of euphemisms even by their own organization.²⁴

Cultural carriers of memory have benefitted both from the scholarship of the last four decades and from government funded grants. Movies like *Conscience and the Constitution*, and *Children of the Camps* redefine patriotism and contest the idea of universal resiliency. *No No Boy* has been reworked as a play, though Frank Chin, who with Lawson Inada first discovered the novel in the 1970s, criticizes the reworked ending as overly optimistic. The specter of the Model Minority remains, however, and *Farewell to Manzanar* casts a long shadow.

Since the 1960s, new organizations have challenged the story of patriotism and resiliency established so effectively by the JACL in the period right after the war. Student activists established pilgrimages to both Manzanar and Tule Lake. During the redress era, the NCRR and the NCJAR fostered the collection of a wide variety of testimony and ensured that the CWRIC considered it. The National Japanese American Museum along with many other groups sponsor curriculum writing and distribution.

Despite all the coverage in the academic literature, and vindication in *Personal Justice Denied*, and an official apology to draft resisters by the JACL, most of those who spent their wartime years at Tule Lake Segregation Center remain silent. Those incarcerated there rarely volunteer that information. It remains for many inconceivable to ask, “How did you sign the loyalty questionnaire?” or say the word “renunciation.” Michi Weglyn was invited to the 1998 Tule Lake Pilgrimage and though she could not attend, she sent a letter to be read aloud that year. It was subsequently included as the preface to *Second Kinenhi*:

Reflections on Tule Lake published by the Tule Lake Committee in 2000. In her letter she said,

I cannot tell you how long I have agonized over the injustice sweepingly imposed on Tuleans – meaning the cruel stereotype of “disloyalty” cast on those of you who were consigned to Tule lake, after it had been turned into a maximum security “segregation center”...It is curious that rarely, if ever, do I run into anyone who volunteers the information that “I am from Tule Lake”...I marveled at the courage of Tuleans...I have tried through the years to have others share my pride in Tuleans who fought back, who refused to be silenced. But there are times when I felt I was speaking into the wind.²⁵

Over twenty years after her book *Years of Infamy* which is credited as the bible of the redress movement was published and ten years after reparation checks were distributed, Japanese Americans that she meets will still not willingly admit to her that they were incarcerated at Tule Lake. Weglyn is not just surprised that the story remains untold, she is surprised that the story is not celebrated and is saddened to think that there is such lingering shame in the community.

The contemporary Tule Lake Committee shares Weglyn’s sentiment. As an organizational carrier of memory the Committee has matured and developed over the years just as other organizations have: where once the Tule Lake site was experienced as just one of many War Relocation Authority centers, it is now demarcated as a site of segregation. Current leadership has a deep postmemory connection to the trauma associated with the site and the postwar silencing experienced by their parents. Given their personal connection to that trauma and how difficult it has proven to reinsert this story into the larger narrative, they are sometimes incredulous when pilgrims retain their cheerful resiliency stories: given the deep nature of the silencing. The group continues to be an all-volunteer organization and with extraordinary dedication to the carefully crafted mission they have developed. This

Committee is the organizational carrier of memory for one of the most painful aspects of the Japanese American wartime experience, the experience of the men, women and children incarcerated at Tule Lake. Inherent in that commitment is preservation, both of the stories and of the site.

The Committee recognizes that they are at a crossroads: the power of the pilgrimage in the last decade has been due, largely, to the presence on the pilgrimage of the men and women who lived at Tule Lake. These “living treasures” and “teachers” are passing on and the emotional intensity that they bring to the pilgrimage will pass with them. Today even octogenarians were too young during their incarceration to have been required to fill in the loyalty questionnaire. Ironically, this will also provide the Committee greater control of the narrative presented at Tule Lake since there will be no voices which insist on telling only humorous stories of resiliency. This Committee who takes their charge so seriously, who have created a “buzz” in the Japanese American community, who have garnered such interest that registration closes within the same week that it opens, will find a way to preserve both the place and the stories, and honor both. This Committee understands the power of Tule Lake and the power that a pilgrimage to the site can have. They understand what Hiroshi Kashiwagi expressed in 1975 on his first pilgrimage to the place of his wartime incarceration and renunciation.

It's a happy meeting...
I sense an immense feeling
of continuity with
you –all of you.
Yes. It's right, it's right
and I'm glad I came
back to Tule Lake
with you.²⁶

¹ Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American: A Memoir and Selected Writings* (San Mateo: Asian American Curriculum Project, 2005), 167-168.

² Eric Muller. "Draft resistance," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Draft%20resistance/> (accessed Nov 11 2015).

³ Stanley Hoffman, "Foreword", *The Vichy Syndrome: History and Memory in France since 1944*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994), iv.

⁴ Tule Lake Committee. "About Us," <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Oct 2015)

⁵ Tule Lake Pilgrimage bus monitor, recorded during the 2010 pilgrimage.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ United States, *Personal Justice Denied* (Wash., D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), 15.

⁸ Hoffman, Foreword, *The Vichy Syndrome*, iv.

⁹ Barbara Takei, the official welcome recorded at the 2010 Tule Lake Pilgrimage.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Cherstin Lyon. "JACL apology to draft resisters," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/JACL%20apology%20to%20draft%20resisters/> (accessed Dec 12 2015).

¹⁴ Tule Lake Committee. "About Us," <http://www.tulelake.org/> (accessed Dec 2015).

¹⁵ Jimi Yamaichi, recorded on the 2010 pilgrimage outside the jail.

¹⁶ Barbara Takei, email message to author, November 2015.

¹⁷ Anna Green, "Individual Remembering and 'Collective Memory': Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates," *Oral History* 32.2 (2004) 38.

¹⁸ A 2010 Pilgrimage participant, contacted in 2013 by the author reported this.

¹⁹ Satsuki Ina, personal interview with the author, April 2013.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Barbara Takei, personal interview with the author, March 2013.

²² Ibid.

²³ Patricia Wakida. "No-No Boy (book)," *Densho Encyclopedia*
[http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-No%20Boy%20\(book\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-No%20Boy%20(book)/) (accessed Dec 12 2015).

²⁴ Cherstin Lyon. "Japanese American Citizens League," *Densho Encyclopedia*
<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20American%20Citizens%20League/> (accessed Dec 12 2015).

²⁵ Michi Nishiura Weglyn, "Preface to the Second Edition," *Second Kinenhi: Reflections on Tule Lake* (San Francisco: Tule Lake Committee, 2000).

²⁶ Kashiwagi, *Swimming in the American*, 167.