Japanese American Internment: A Tragedy of War

Amber Martinez
Kennesaw State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/etd
Part of the American Studies Commons, Social History Commons, and the United States History Commons

Recommended Citation
JAPANESE AMERICAN INTERNMENT:
A TRAGEDY OF WAR

A Reflexive Essay
Presented To
The Academic Faculty

Amber Martinez

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in American Studies

Kennesaw State University
(May, 2014)
College of Humanities & Social Sciences
Kennesaw State University
Kennesaw, Georgia
Certificate of Approval

This is to certify that the thesis/project of

__________________________
Amber Martinez

has been approved by the committee for the capstone requirement for the
Master of Arts in American Studies
in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Thesis/Project committee:

__________________________  ________________________
Member  Date  
__________________________  ________________________
Member  Date  

4/21/14  4/21/14
Japanese American internment in the United States during World War II affected thousands of lives for generations yet it remains hidden in historical memory. There have been surges of public interest since the release of the internees, such as during the Civil Rights movement and the campaign for redress, which led to renewed interest in scholarship investigating the internment. Once redress was achieved in 1988, public interest waned again as did published analysis of the internment. After the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan began, American pride and displays of homeland loyalty created a unique event in American history. In the country’s outrage, people whose appearance was labeled as Arab were cast overnight as villains or cohorts. This was hauntingly familiar to Japanese Americans who experienced similar treatment during the days following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

These similarities affirm the findings of authors who have written on the economic, political and social environment of pre-World War II United States, internment, and the effects of internment on ideas about citizenship, loyalty, and immigration. Yet public knowledge and discourse on the causes, events and results of internment American citizens remains minimal. The precedence of a country interning its own citizens is a topic that needs to be analyzed and presented in an easily accessible place for students, educators and the public. An on-line exhibition is a useful tool to accomplish this. An on-line exhibition is easily accessible to a large portion of the public as well as being an interactive tool that young adults respond to as an educational tool. An on-line exhibition also allows for the use of photographs, maps, and links to further websites. A visually appealing website will attract viewers however the content is what will make this website educational as well as interactive and inspiring. The purpose of creating
the on-line exhibition is to reach the masses to educate them about past mistakes and the results of wartime propaganda, racist hysteria and the long-term effects on Japanese Americans.

The literature written about the history of Japanese Americans and their internment during World War II can be grouped together by their subject matter. Ideas about democracy, citizenship, loyalty, civil rights and memory have evolved since World War II. Events like the internment of thousands of American citizens based on race challenged previously heralded titans of American ideology like freedom, inalienable rights and autonomy. Historical scholarship about the event provides background on the people, places and events that shaped the internment. Texts from the last decade have focused on examining why internment was possible, the effects on internees and the public, and the implications for the future of American responses to attack. Interestingly, each author chooses their own terminology which questions the effectiveness of internment scholarship. Despite terminology debates, internment scholarship has followed a distinct evolution of analysis that does more than evaluate the causes and effects of internment. It shows the changes in methodologies, research subjects, and an ideological evolution.

Historically, internment scholarship must begin with a basic evaluation of the events and people involved. Greg Robinson wrote *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans*, and his text uses historical analysis to bring a critical examination of FDR to scholarly discourse. Robinson contends that previous scholarship has centered on the logistics of internment rather than looking at the person who made the decision to intern—President Franklin D. Roosevelt. While other authors explore the prejudices of the public, FDR manages to maintain his good image. Robinson’s book contains eight chapters that analyze everything from FDR’s racist tendencies in his fireside chats, the complete reversal of his democratic principles,
and his disinterest in the results of internment upon Japanese Americans. Robinson chooses to divide the book chronologically to look at those problems.

The book begins with Robinson’s conjecture that racism against Japanese Americans had been on-going since before World War II began. Racial slurs, antagonistic attacks, and ignorance of culture all attributed to an unstable environment. Japan’s crushing defeats in the Pacific theatre was causing military, political and media leaders to publish propaganda warning against Japanese espionage. This heightened already tense anxiety levels particularly on the West coast. Pearl Harbor was the spark that ignited racial hysteria. Media outlets labeled Japanese Americans as a race of traitors waiting to assist Japan from the inside. FDR, writes Robinson, contributed to this hysteria in his fireside chats with reporters. Robinson provides documentation from such an evening to show that FDR was a product of the nation he was reared, and he condemned Japanese Americans without proof.

Rather than focus on FDR’s actions during internment which were limited to reports, Robinson spends considerable time discussing the results of internment on FDR’s decision. Robinson writes that history would glorify FDR’s leadership, but limit his involvement in interning American citizens. As the country progressed into the Vietnam and Korean wars, discourse began to circulate that defined FDR in a less than favorable light. Americans against the wars questioned the authority of a government to draft its own citizens while denying some ethnicities equal rights. Robinson writes that historians went back to the last draft in World War II to compare events and found presidential leadership lacking. He says that FDR failed in his presidential duties to all American citizens. He succumbed to his ingrained racist tendencies and the pressures of racial hysteria. Robinson writes that FDR’s failure to be the moral and
constitutional compass for the American people damaged America’s reputation for democracy, free will, and equality.

Despite the impressive collection of materials Robinson uses to prove his case for stricter investigations into FDR’s role in internment, his argument places too much weight on the role of one person. His contention that FDR failed at his duties of moral and constitutional beacon is an interesting look at the role of the president for the American people. Robinson does not spend enough time discussing the change in the importance of image for American presidents due to modern inventions like television and film. The use of television by political leaders changed American politics forever, and the public’s response to a visually strong and relatable president would impact their decision process. Despite these shortcomings, Robinson’s text does provide a useful index of sources.

Greg Robinson has published numerous books on the Japanese American experience in America, and he continues his historical analysis with a broader subject. In his book *A Tragedy of Democracy: Japanese Confinement in North America*, Robinson writes a concise historical account of the pre-war racial atmosphere, removal and internment, release and finally redress. Robinson separates the book into seven sections dealing with each stage of the internment. Rather than focus on when the internment decision was made, he starts by describing anti-Japanese sentiments prevalent at the time. He says this is where all scholarship should begin because while Pearl Harbor was the catalyst for removal and internment, racial prejudices and fears provided the unstable environment needed to encourage action. The unique situation of second generation Japanese conflicted with anti-Japanese propaganda. Second generation Japanese, *Nisei* in Japanese, were United States citizens and therefore eligible for protection under the Bill of Rights. However due to racial hysteria caused by decades of prejudice and an
act of war *Nisei* were stripped of their inalienable rights. Robinson believes his conjecture that racial prejudices and hysteria were the reason Executive Order 9066 was signed removing those of Japanese descent.

Robinson moves from his theories on why removal and internment were supported to the legal and social ramifications of the removal and internment process. Unlike other historical texts on internment, Robinson spends considerable time evaluating the removal efforts in Hawaii, Canada, Mexico and South America. The United States’ decision to intern Japanese Americans gave license to other countries to follow suit. Hawaii’s large Japanese population provided a unique situation in that Hawaii leaders decided not to intern Japanese to prevent a massive labor force problem. Canada’s response to the United States’ internment of Japanese Americans was harsher than any other American country. Robinson writes this is due to a lack of a Bill of Rights. Despite the United States’ decision to ignore the basic tenants of the Bill of Rights, there was still the knowledge that the rights existed and applied to the *Nisei*. According to Robinson, this knowledge kept the actions of United States’ law makers from resorting to harsher measures like Canada.

The subject of the next few sections is camp life. These descriptions are not unique from other scholarship. In fact, the bulk of internment literature centers around this topic alone. Robinson acknowledges this and spends this section analyzing the draft of *Nisei* soldiers. The United States, after interning legal American citizens along with their first generation families, demanded that *Nisei* join the military. Robinson writes that *Nisei* would have proudly defended the United States on the battlefield like their Hawaii counterparts, but they wanted all of their rights returned and the release of their families. The legal problems alone would be enough to write many books on, writes Robinson. Once again in a unique situation in comparison to fellow
American countries, the United States decision to draft from a group classified as dangerous and a threat was not replicated in other countries like Canada and Mexico. While he does not expand on these theories in depth in this text, it is clear Robinson feels the Canadian refusal to allow *Nisei* soldiers to serve would further distrust of Japanese post-war because they would not have the proof of loyalty through service as the United States *Nisei* did.

Finally, the end of the war and confinement as well as redress concludes Robinson’s examination. Robinson utilizes these final chapters to describe the events of release and dispersion efforts. Racism, he writes, continued to play a role in the release of the prisoners. Those Japanese Americans who renounced their American citizenship faced deportation to a country they had never visited or could not remember. Families faced separation, no income prospects, homelessness and fears of racial recriminations. Robinson believes there are further long-lasting results of internment. Pre-war first-generation Japanese encouraged education and advancement for their American citizen children. Post-war first and second generation Japanese were forced into menial labor positions, discriminated against in schools, and moved into urban slums far from the homes from which they were removed. Canadian internees faced much harsher conditions upon release. Robinson believes the United States Congressional leaders encouraged reintegration of internees to re-patriotize them as American citizens. Canadian leaders were pressured by public racial hysteria and prejudice to continue the alienation of released internees. As a result Canadian redress efforts were limited. Robinson writes that what redress proves is that citizen rights are in flux based on wartime situations.

Robinson’s findings mostly support his proposed purpose in writing this text. His argument that this text will provide the stimulus for Japanese American historical analysis is a little presumptuous as it is such an obscure topic in the broad genre of American World War II
history. His text does serve the scholarly community well in its documentation of continental
American internment, however it does lack a theoretical examination that would be expected for
his projected expectation that his book would be a catalyst for further discussion. This is at odds
with his statements in the introduction that this text was a concise and readable text to benefit the
masses of readers unfamiliar with internment. Robinson does correct this lack in his follow-up
book on life after camp.

By examining several texts by the same author the progression of internment scholarship
is visible. Greg Robinson continues his research with *After Camp: Portraits in Midcentury
Japanese American Life and Politics*. Departing from his familiar format of chronological
progression and examination, Robinson chooses to divide this book into case studies. What is
also unusual about this book for him is that he focuses much of his research on Canadian cases.
Robinson writes that his purpose in writing this book, in comparison to his previous efforts, is
that the effects of internment have not been adequately examined. The case studies showcase the
effects on Japanese Americans in areas such as politics, labor, economics, society and education.

Robinson begins with essays that examine the aftermath of internee release from the
camps. His first case study portrays FDR and political leaders conspiring to scatter Japanese
Americans around the country to mitigate racial retaliation, isolated pockets of potential threats
and a multitude of returning families to the West coast. Nisei, writes Robinson, find their voice
post-war because their parents lacked citizenship rights. Despite the Nisei leadership, internees
faced harsh conditions upon release from camp. Robinson contends this was due to efforts by
FDR and political leaders to disperse internees so they would better assimilate into white society.
The results of this assimilation are the subject of Part II. Japanese American families had
maintained an isolated community that attributed to a strong influence of culture. Nisei were
educated in non-Japanese schools which helped them post-war to assimilate the way FDR envisioned, but it was their exposure in post-war slums that would alter the Nisei lifestyle.

Part III’s case studies analyze the effects of dispersion into slums on the Japanese American redress movement. Exposure to other civil rights campaigns directly influenced Nisei efforts to organize and achieve redress for internment. Robinson challenges stereotypes of Japanese complacency by showing their efforts in the African American civil rights movement. Interestingly, Japanese Americans did not identify with Mexican Americans who they saw as job competition. Mexican Americans in return refused to support Japanese Americans because of their assumption that Japanese Americans did not consider themselves to have a distinct culture. Civil rights advocates amongst the Japanese Americans aided the African American effort for equality. However upon the success of the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 achieving Japanese immigrant citizenship and the 1988 success of the redress movement, Japanese American involvement waned and the African American community criticized their lack of efforts once they were successful in getting what they wanted. Many Nisei remained loyal to the cause of civil rights for all races, however the majority of popular support went down drastically as families tried to move on from redress.

Robinson’s departure from his usual format was successful for this kind of subject. Case studies allow him to prove his point with specific data he chooses to present, however they do lack enough critical examination of Japanese American and Mexican American differences. Immigration is a popular and contentious subject of debate, and a more critical analysis would have been a helpful start to discuss the effects of that relationship on citizenship efforts. Robinson’s tendency to focus on mainly Canadian events is not practical given his use of United States civil rights efforts. Robinson contends that these sources are new and shed important light
on new theories about the results of internment. However Canadian documents should be examined in relation to Canadian civil rights efforts not those in the United States. There are many differences in the campaigns as well as the system of government.

Moving away from historical analysis alone, historians have begun to focus on the social and political implications of the internment upon Japanese Americans, American citizens, the country’s international image, and finally the mental repercussions of Nisei internment. National ideologies are challenged by authors who contend that the internment was more than a cautionary decision to protect Japanese Americans from racial hysteria and the public from possible Japanese espionage threats. The following authors divert from Robinson’s theory that race was the cause of internment. They critically analyze a breakdown in democracy and human rights with other explanations than race.

Brian Hayashi’s book *Democratizing the Enemy: The Japanese American Internment* analyzes the results of two ethnographic studies completed at two internment camps. Using these two studies, Hayashi contends that it was not complacency or a cultural tendency to meekness, but an acceptance of an organized power structure that provided for internment. Tami Tsuchiyama and Togo Tanaka were students at universities during the internment. Both ethnographic studies conclude with results that there were two main groups with the camps. The “governors” maintained control through an ingrained need to rule and reciprocate possible violence against captured Allied forces by Japanese. The “governed” supplicated to internment because of the fear of being deported back to an unknown Japan if the Allies won, or, if Japan succeeded in winning and invading America, being ruled by an unfamiliar country who would view them as outsider despite their heritage.
Hayashi deduces that their findings have a broader reach than expanding the conversation from racism and power. Internment affected issues such as land and water rights as well as stunting political rights for internees. Hayashi questions the idea of loyalty in a governor/governed dynamic. He writes that the definition of loyalty evolved through the internment based on outside political influences on camp governors, internee rebellion, and the status of the war effort abroad. By evaluating internment under these parameters Hayashi changes the image of the docile Japanese American internee in historical memory. He thinks that the lack of serious revolt by Japanese American internees has been glorified as a positive part of their culture. Hayashi believes internment was more than a civil rights violation. It manipulated historical memory of Japanese Americans, who in turn, he writes, began to ingrain that personality description upon themselves. Hayashi concludes his discussion with the American idea of democracy that carried various meaning to Japanese Americans pre-war, internment, and post-war. Pre-war Nisei believed they were citizens thus were constitutionally protected. Internment proved to them that democracy is as fluid as the events and politicians controlling the country. Camp experiences with governors altered their perception of democracy and their place within it. Post-war Japanese Americans would have a drastically different view of democracy than a white American particularly after 1952 when citizenship was granted.

Hayashi’s ideas are far removed from the popular ideas of racial hysteria and military necessity. Moreover his use of internment ethnographic studies to critically analyze a historical event with sociological interpretations of a power structure challenges the reader to see internment as more than a part of history. Hayashi contends that internment’s effects were felt for generations in America, and their reach was not limited to people. The use of land, water and resources as well as the removal of an entire race from a region affected the economic and social
environments of the country. Hayashi’s work does fail in its reliance on ethnography. He does not explain to the reader the limitations, biases and faults that can be found in ethnographic studies. This would have been useful information to provide when asking the reader to use an interdisciplinary approach to analyze a sensitive subject.

Also utilizing an interdisciplinary approach to internment, Cherstin Lyons moves the conversation to the mostly unknown acts of rebellion by Japanese Americans. Her book *Prisons and Patriots: Japanese American Wartime Citizenship, Civil Disobedience, and Historical Memory* examines the events at three specific camps that would define Japanese American rebellion and affect the governance of all the camps. The term “prison” does not connote simply a detention of criminals to Lyons. She concludes from her research that the popular use of the name “internment camp” is incorrect. Lyons writes that camps should be called detention centers and those put in them detainees. From that distinction, Lyons narrows her focus to three particular camps. She gives both their government name and the local name for each: Central Utah (Topaz), Granada Camp (Amache), and the Colorado River camp (Poston). Within each camp a particular story of rebellion is examined for its broader impact on Japanese Americans, the United States, and the world.

Lyons begins with a description of the Japanese generational names to give background on the prewar power structure. Second generation Nisei led vastly different lives than their parents. The proficiency with the language, education, and exposure to the dominant culture influenced their image of themselves. Whereas their parents were acutely aware of the lack of citizenship, Nisei were ingrained with the knowledge that they were American citizens with rights. When removal and internment began, Nisei ideology was shattered. Despite their prewar citizenship, their loyalty was questioned. Lyons writes that despite their loss of rights, Nisei
were still required to follow American laws and statutes. Then the draft orders were issued to Nisei. This placed Nisei in a tenuous position with not only the government but their families. Lyons contends that the sudden change in their citizenship status angered Nisei who challenged authority, but also dealt with the fears of their first generation families. Parents and grandparents wanted to ensure proper treatment post-war whether the Allies won or lost. To do so, they encouraged their Nisei children to join the military. If they refused to be drafted Nisei would have legal consequences and familial concerns for their safety in the camps.

Lyons uses the story of a group of Nisei men called the Tucsonians who refused the draft as well as the story of Gordon Hirabayashi to illustrate Nisei who were labeled as traitors for refusing the draft. To understand the social and political implications of their story Lyons frames her discussion around American ideologies of loyalty, citizenship and democracy. Nisei legal status and their rights were stripped when Executive Order 9066 was signed. Despite this, the military demanded Nisei join the army to protect a country that had labeled them as dangerous and a threat to their homeland. Lyons defines citizenship as a fluid idea that evolves with a person throughout their life. The meaning of citizenship changes with a person’s experiences, their country’s economic and political climate, and military action. A person’s loyalty is determined by their citizenship status, and civil disobedience is based on a person’s understanding of their citizenship and loyalty. Nisei men who refused the draft understood that they had been stripped of inalienable rights because of their heritage. What the military failed to understand is that their idea of loyalty had altered when they had been stripped of their democratic rights. Despite their allegiance to the United States they saw themselves as patriots defending the reinstatement of democratic rights for their fellow Japanese Americans.
History as well as other detainees did not immediately see their actions as heroic. They were labeled as traitors. Gordon Hirabayashi and the men of the Tucsonian group experienced the rejection of their country, public vilification, and the rejection of their families in some cases. They refused the draft and were sentenced to prison as traitors. When they were released they encountered families who did not want to claim a draft dodger as a member when they were already struggling to reenter society. Lyons writes that the men would remain ostracized until the Vietnam War protests shed a new light on their situation. Here Lyon brings her discussion full circle back to the fluidity of the meanings of citizenship and loyalty, the power of propaganda, and political jockeying. The imprisoned traitors had evolved in status to heroes within a few decades because ideas about the reasons for civil disobedience had evolved along with the public understanding of loyalty and citizenship.

Lyon, like Hayashi, challenges scholars to reexamine the power of citizenship, loyalty, democracy, civil disobedience over time to see that it evolves with the economic, social and political environment of the time. Lyon would benefit with a better discussion of loyalty as opposed to citizenship, because in the case of the Japanese Americans who refused to be drafted their loyalty to their country never waivered. It was the evolution of their citizenship that changed, and caused them to take drastic measures but never losing their patriotism. Historical memory of these men returned to obscurity after the 1988 successful lobbying for redress. Lyon’s text returns their efforts to the fore in a time when ideas of nation, democracy, immigration and personal rights are again evolving.

Anthropological fieldwork performed during the internment provides details from inside the camps, however, in the case of the next two books, fieldwork carries the prejudices and expectations of those on the outside. A group of authors compiled a unique pictorial
documentation of internment. *Confinement and Ethnicity: An Overview of World War II* focuses attention on sites of internment that are usually passed over by scholars for the more famous sites like Tule Lake. The United States Army’s Wartime Civil Control Administration (WCCA) controlled the assembly centers, the War Relocation Authority managed the relocation centers, and the remaining internment camps were left to the Justice and War Departments. It is these last camps ran by the Justice and War Departments that are the focus of *Confinement and Ethnicity*.

These camps held internees from Hawaii, Alaska, Latin America and peoples of German and Italian descent. The United States based the legality of transferring internees from other countries by way of the Alien Enemies Act of 1798. It gave the United States authority to confine certain people based on a perceived threat from them if the United States was at war with the country of their ancestors. These camps remain mostly un-researched because their relatively low inmate count compared to the larger assembly centers. These camps housed mostly non-Americans unlike the assembly and relocation centers who held mainly American citizens. Due to their status as foreign nationals most inmates were hesitant to talk about their time in the Justice and War Department camps out of fear of removal again. Documentation was also scarce until recently when the government began releasing more files. These hurdles were cleared by the team of authors who set out to document these camps.

Jeffery F. Burton, Mary M. Farrell, Florence B. Lord and Richard W. Lord compiled data from over forty-five camps and presented this data in conjunction with photographic documentation to supplement the written data. It is this combination of sources which makes this text unique. Photographic documentation is critical to visually capturing a place in history that will fade because of development, souvenir hunters removing artifacts, erosion, and other
destructive elements. Along with the photographs the authors use other unusual documents in an effort to give the reader a clear view of the camps. Some of the sources they include are blueprints, charts, maps, reflections on the time from outsiders, relic descriptions from both Japanese and English perspectives, and transliterations. All these elements combine to create an image of an event that the authors write is an American experience rather than just a Japanese American story. They come to this conclusion by stating most of the camps held American citizens, on American soil, and were guarded by Americans. This conclusion is important, they write, because it keeps asking the reader to look critically at this time and see that they have the power to prevent such an event from happening again.

This text was a massive undertaking for the authors because of the sheer amount of volume, pictures, data and analysis. While it is comprehensively exhaustive it still manages to prod the reader to think critically about these camps and their effect on the United States today. The authors used their individual specialties in history, ethnography, anthropology and sociology to create a book that presents a complete story. However it is lacking the personal touch that limiting your scope can achieve. The information presented can overwhelm the reader which defeats their purpose of creating a book that would inspire introspective thoughts about race, democracy and citizenship.

Lane Ryo Hirabayashi narrowed her focus to one person’s ethnographic study during internment. *The Politics of Fieldwork: Research in an American Concentration Camp* analyzes the life of Dr. Tamie Tsuchiyama. Hirabayashi’s focus on Tsuchiyama is deliberate, because she thinks there has not been enough analysis of the effects of fieldwork on the researcher rather than the researched. Tsuchiyama is unusual in the history of the over thirty anthropologists employed by various entities to compile data on Japanese American life inside the camps. To analyze
Tsuchiyama, Hirabayashi utilizes personal letters, reports, field notes, interviews, secondary and primary sources about the era and the subject.

Tsuchiyama was a doctoral candidate at the University of California at Berkeley when she was hired by the school’s Japanese Evacuation and Resettlement Study. Her location was the Colorado River Relocation Center (Poston), and she began her work in 1942 there. She was the only female researcher of Japanese descent employed by the study. After a few short years she resigned from her position, finished her doctorate, and never published anything about the internment. Hirabayashi frames Tsuchiyama’s story in the context of colonial science. Hirabayashi contends that because she was female and Japanese American she was exploited by the study to get data for her white supervisors. Hirabayashi thinks these pressures are what led to Tsuchiyama’s resignation and her refusal to publish any of her findings. Ethical conduct and political pressure in a grant funded study cause strain on the researcher, and Hirabayashi believes this is where the critical analysis is needed to critique ethnographic studies.

Hirabayashi includes a great deal of biographic information about Tsuchiyama. She does this on purpose to settle Tsuchiyama’s experiences and her moral stand within the context of the era. By understanding the limitless potential Tsuchiyama possessed, Hirabayashi feels her stunted academic career was more significant. Hirabayashi does realize the limitations of placing a call to rethink anthropological exploitation on one person. Tsuchiyama’s situation was unique because of her gender, education, and ethnicity, but she still carried her own biases as well as the pressures of working for the study. Hirabayashi’s text is improved by the inclusion of this warning to her readers. Critically analyzing one methodology requires a proper respect for the vices of the methodology utilized to analyze. The same applies to photographic evidence.
Dorothea Lange’s photographs are well known even if most people do not recognize her name. Her photographs of the Great Depression are haunting and captured the desperation of a displaced majority of the population. Turning her efforts to documenting the removal and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II would culminate in the restriction of her photographs. Lange was fiercely loyal to her administration whom she worked for documenting national events. Linda Gordon and Gary Y. Okihiro edited a book of essays and photographs of Lange’s work during the internment. Both editors provided essays to accompany the compilation of photographs. Gordon’s essay is a historical recounting of Lange’s life with some critical analysis of the era. Okihiro’s contribution was an essay focusing on the unique situation of Japanese in Hawaii.

Gordon introduces the reader to the importance and influence of Lange’s photographs through some of the most tumultuous decades in United States history. Gordon contends Lange’s photographs of Japanese American internment are a visual testimony of her distaste for internment. Lange vehemently protested the internment of Japanese American internment which resulted in photographs showing the internees as victims rather than the propaganda image of dangerous threats. The government did not want these images made public as public support of the war was bolstered with the removal of Japanese Americans. Politicians and military leaders had succeeded in placing a face on the fears of invaders. The stark photographs of families did not fit the image of a national threat. While their publication would not have altered American involvement in World War II they would have given a face to the victims of internment.

Okihiro’s essay also takes a historical approach to disseminating the usual facts given, however he isolates his information to a discussion of the unique situation in Hawaii. As Robinson states in his texts, Hawaii opted against internment due to their large number of
Japanese Americans manning their work force. This decision aided in the number of Japanese Americans joining the military to fight. Their squadron was highly decorated upon the end of the war. Despite the mainland fear of espionage, Hawaii’s squadron of Japanese American soldiers fought for the same country interning their fellow Japanese Americans. The difference, according to Okihiro, is the mainland believed the propaganda from political leaders inciting fear of invaders.

Japanese Americans endured more than physical losses with the internment. Okihiro contends that the emotional and mental repercussion of the vilification of their race impacted such things as self-esteem, image, and respect for their heritage. The image of a docile Japanese American internee continued post-war and release. Okihiro believes this is because of the destruction of self-worth by internment, and their fear that if they spoke up the internment would happen again. Remaining silent and re-assimilating continued until the campaign for redress was successful. Okihiro maintains that Japanese Americans believed the redress meant the United States had recognized its wrong, and this recognition would prevent internment from happening again. Okihiro finishes with the connection of racial profiling that began in 2001 to the disparagement of Japanese Americans based solely on their appearance. Okihiro warns once again the United States is reacting to racial hysteria.

Gordon situates Lange within the context of internment giving faces to the claims. While Okihiro gives voice to victims of a political, military and public attack of the Japanese American identity. Understanding this text’s main focus is the photography of Lange is important. While the essays are helpful to unfamiliar readers they do not offer new critical analysis of the internment itself. Gordon lacked a critical look at Lange’s life which would have been important in understanding her decision to protest internment. Okihiro’s essay does provide more critical
analysis which is useful in placing the faces in Lange’s photographs with the understanding of the loss of self-worth in internment.

The final two books are unusual for Japanese American scholarship. Compiling presenters from the International Conference on Relocation and Redress in Salt Lake City, Utah in 1983, editors Roger Daniels, Sandra C. Taylor and Harry H. L. Kitano presented in their first edition a collaborative examination of multiple facets of internment. The first edition of the text was published in 1986, and this is reflected in the initial final chapter’s subject on the campaign for redress. A second edition of the book was published in 1991 after the campaign for redress was successful in 1988. The editors added a final chapter detailing the efforts of redress supporters and the importance of redress for Japanese Americans and their descendants.

The text is broken initially into eight parts to include topics like prewar Japanese America, relocation, life in the camps, Japanese American reaction to internment, the effects of internment, and finally the redress campaign. Within each section, conference presenters and outside scholars chosen for inclusion in the text offer insight through anthropology, sociology, psychology, and historical analysis to expand the dialogue on Japanese American internment. This approach was sometimes difficult to appreciate while trying to connect the ideas of the authors in each section. Japanese American historical analysis lacks cohesion between authors on everything from terminology to effects of redress. The lack of guidance from the editors as to why each author was chosen and what they add to the story was disappointing. However the ideas presented, despite their organization, benefit internment dialogue.

Lastly, Michi Nishiura Weglyn’s book *Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America’s Concentration Camps* takes a startling approach to the internment dialogue. Weglyn’s book takes
the reader through a fact-overloaded journey through internment. Weglyn’s emotional rhetoric is laced through each of the chapters detracting from the usefulness of the information she presents. Weglyn chose to focus on the sensationalized aspects of internment by providing documents and quotes to prove her thesis. Weglyn contends that the United States did not intern Japanese Americans due to racial hysteria, military necessity, or to protect them from public reprisals. Weglyn says internment was for one purpose only—to round up all Japanese Americans to use them as a bartering chip against Japan in the hopes American prisoners of war would be treated better.

Weglyn does present thought-provoking questions, but her inflammatory language and aggressive writing style is distracting. Also lacking is enough information setting up the prewar atmosphere of the United States. If she is going to make the claim that the United States interned its own ethnic citizens to be used as barters for white soldiers in war she should have set up the prewar racial, economic, political and social atmosphere. This would help situate her readers and help her argument. Weglyn also fails to see the fault at isolating her theory of internment to one reason. She limits the dialogue and forces her to look at information from one side only. Her experiences in an internment camp surely framed her style of writing, but if that was the case this text should be viewed as a personal narrative and reflection rather than a historical analysis.

The published scholarship on Japanese American internment is varied in style, audience and intent. While most authors choose to situate internment in a historical analysis there are some who bring an interdisciplinary approach. The difficulty in studying Japanese American internment is the lack of centralized information available for researchers. When I began researching texts for the literature review I had to start with Robinson’s books and look at their bibliographies to find further sources. What is publicly presented on the internet on websites is
succinct and fails to offer readers critical analysis. This is where there is a need for researchers, educators, and students. The internet is the main research tool for most people around the country today. The internet has a wide-reaching net, and it is the perfect platform to create a comprehensive on-line exhibition about Japanese American internment. The website will be arranged under major topic as I will show below:

I. Introduction:

Japanese immigrants and their Japanese American citizen children and grandchildren were interned from 1942-1945 within the continental United States and Hawaii. They were interned based on racist hysteria that had been building for decades and culminated with the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941. There were only suspicions of duplicity, but those were enough to begin removing Japanese families from their homes on the West coast. There had been no crime committed and no due process was given to Japanese American citizens despite their Constitutional rights. By 1945, over 100,000 Japanese immigrants and Japanese American citizens had been interned. Internment revealed the strength of the interned, the racist fears of the American public, and the bravery of those who stood against the tide of public opinion. The study of Japanese American internment provides a historical catalyst for research and introspection about democracy, citizenship, and constitutional rights in the hope that by understanding the past a dialogue can be established to prevent a recurrence.

II. Prewar

Understanding prewar life and the events that led to Japanese American internment during World War II is important for a critical analysis of the period. Japanese began immigrating to Hawaii around 1885 after immigration bans from Japan were lifted. Japanese
wanted to leave Japan because of the harsh social, political, and economic environment of the 1868 Meiji Restoration. The return of imperial rule with the Meiji Emperor was met with disapproval by large numbers of Japanese. Japanese arrival was not positively received by Hawaiians. The Hawaiian Revolutions that entangled Hawaii placed Japanese immigrants against the white and native populations. Culminating in the Bayonet Constitution of 1887, Japanese were denied constitutional rights such as voting. As the population of Japanese immigrants and their children increased they began to immigrate to the United States in larger numbers to escape the escalating environment in Hawaii and to find employment. In Japanese, these Japanese immigrants are called Issei while their children are known as Nisei. Third generation Japanese Americans are Sansei.

Japanese faced similar challenges upon reaching the mainland. The influx of Japanese immigrants expanded the manual labor market, and white laborers resented Japanese immigrants who were given the same job for a lower wage. Procuring mainly manual labor positions, Japanese immigrants worked in agriculture, fishing, and fruit farm labor. While they worked amidst the community, Japanese immigrants were not welcomed. In response, immigrants formed communities with the larger populace. These communities provided a traditional and familiar environment for immigrants who faced prejudice daily. Fiercely proud of the heritage yet determined to become American citizens, Japanese immigrants and their children embraced American ideals of democracy, entrepreneurship, and the duties of citizenship despite prejudice.

Japanese immigrants and their children faced prejudice and racism that was exacerbated by events they could not control in Japan. Newspapers and radio programs presented Japanese immigrants as dangerous. They were labeled as enemy sympathizers. Despite protestations of
American pride the Japanese community was relegated to the status of undesirable and untrustworthy for citizenship based on prejudice escalated by popular media and local government. The United States government’s restrictive immigrant laws aided in diminishing rights and provided a legal predecessor for prejudice, racism, and exclusion in communities. Acts enacted by Congress progressively limited immigrant rights. Fearful of overpopulation by foreign peoples, the United States passed the Immigration Restriction Act of 1921 that capped immigration at 3%. Following escalating public tension, Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1924 that limited immigrants to 2% total population within the United States. These acts gave legal backing to the escalating racist hysteria plaguing the nation.

Fear of the ‘yellow peril” or “yellow terror” continued to influence lawmakers. “Yellow peril” was originally applied to Chinese immigrants by white Americans who feared they would be taking jobs, lowering minimum wage, and conquering the country. However as tensions with Japan escalated the title was transposed on to Japanese immigrants. California began limitations and surveillance with the California Alien Land Act of 1913 that prohibited aliens who could not become citizens from owning property. This act paved the way for harsher immigration laws. The harshest of the laws enacted during “yellow terror” was the Asian Exclusion Act of 1924. As part of the Immigration Act of 1924, the Asian Exclusion Act further delineated the restrictions placed on Asian immigrants. These restrictions included the denial of citizenship to Japanese and the end of Japanese immigration in 1924. The acts would provide fertile soil for racist hysteria after Pearl Harbor.

III. Exclusion:
Until December 7, 1941, the United States had maintained its indirect intervention policy regarding the war in Europe and the Pacific by assisting financially and providing supplies. However as Japan began its invasion of surrounding countries with surprising tenacity Americans would be drawn further into the fray. The United States began negotiations with Japan in early 1941 that would continue throughout the year with both sides refusing to cede any important concessions. Ultimately, Emperor Hirohito approved an attack on the United States naval fleet. On December 7, 1941 Japan bombed the naval port of Pearl Harbor in Hawaii. Battleships, cruisers, destroyers, anti-aircraft ships, and aircraft were targeted and sunk. Over 2,000 people were killed and almost that many wounded. When the smoke cleared, Pearl Harbor was a sea of ruptured metal and bodies. This image would spur the United States into war—a war abroad and at home.

December 7, 1941 would indeed be “a date which will live in infamy” as President Franklin D. Roosevelt said for Japanese immigrants and their children. The Japanese attack on the United States naval base would send shockwaves throughout the country further inciting “yellow peril” fears. Despite Japanese immigrants showing no signs of treason, they were categorized as enemy combatants living within the United States. Within four days Americans had declared war on not only Japan but against the Axis powers in Europe. Americans were no longer against intervention—they wanted revenge. Propaganda appeared encouraging service and to never forget those who were lost at Pearl Harbor. Along with service inspired propaganda, news outlets printed racial attacks on Asian immigrants. American media both national and local would print racist political cartoons, editorials, and warnings against all Japanese regardless of citizenship. A racist frenzy capitalizing was gripping the nation.
The fear of attack from Japanese living on west coast of the United States and Hawaii was heightened by propaganda and west coast politicians playing on war-time fears to achieve removal. Congressmen and military leaders joined the dialogue which placed West Coast racial fears in newspapers and conversations around the country. Anti-Japanese sentiments allotted agencies like the J. Edgar Hoover directed FBI public and political backing to search Japanese homes for links to Japan and conspiracies to attack from within the United States. Believing educated, English speaking Issei and Nisei to be the most critically dangerous, hundreds of teachers, religious and community leaders, even newspapers owners were arrested and placed on trial. For Nisei, the United States was their legal home. As legal citizens, the search and seizure of their property as well as detention without just cause violated their Constitutional rights.

President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942. This allowed the military and local police to begin removing people from specific areas deemed sensitive to attack. The order was not specific to a race however the majority of those arrested and those removed were of Japanese ancestry. Documenting Japanese Americans was the first step of removal, and General John L. DeWitt of the Western Defense Command spearheaded the mass documentation and removal of Japanese Americans from what he determined were over 100 areas in peril from its Japanese American residents. The creation of the Wartime Civil Control Administration (WCCA) was created with Colonel Karl R. Bendetsen as its head. Bendetsen began the systematic removal from 108 areas deemed “exclusion zones” by De Witt.

The United States military began removing Japanese immigrants and Japanese Americans in 1942 from designated restricted zones. These initial restricted zones were coastal as they were considered under the greatest threat from their Japanese inhabitants. Removal began with such
speed that families could only bring what they could carry. Notice of removal was posted in
newspapers and on flyers posted throughout communities. Families were forced to leave behind
all aspects of their previous lives that they could not fit in a suitcase. Many items left behind
were pillaged and lost forever. For Japanese Americans, family and history were pivotal to their
culture. When forced to choose between family photographs and clothing the choice was clear.
However, the loss of these only perpetuated their isolation and incited further anger over their
treatment. Once documented and rounded up, Japanese Americans were placed on trains to take
them their first stop—assembly centers.

IV. Internment:

Assembly centers were established as the first stop for the thousands of Japanese
Americans arriving on trains. The centers were created out of public areas like racetracks and
fairgrounds and were by no means sanitary or prepared for the number of people they received.
The War Relocation Authority (WRA) worked to prepare the camps, but many were not ready
and certainly not prepared for the housing, feeding, and medical care of over 100,000 internees.
In the assembly centers, internees were faced with limited bedding, little food or water readily
available, and cramped spaces. Not only had legal United States citizens been stripped of the
Constitutional rights without due process. Bendetsen and De Witt were grossly unprepared for
their mission to rid the West Coast of Japanese.

The War Relocation Authority (WRA), created with Executive Order 9102 issued by
President Roosevelt, oversaw the construction of ten internment camps. These camps were
designed to be the final stop after the WCCA assembly centers. However, the camps were often
unprepared for the number of internees, the difficulties in feeding such a number, and the
medical and educational needs of the internees. The WRA leaders determined that internees could work outside of the camps once they were cleared of being a flight risk. Many of the jobs were agricultural in nature, and the workers were paid insufficient wages. Housing consisted of barracks style housing as opposed to the initial plan of individual homesteads. Communal lodging was useful for the WRA to contain internees, and barracks living did allow for a community camp life.

Dillon S. Myer replaced Milton Eisenhower as director of the WRA camps which opened in 1942. These internment camps were directed by Dillon S. Myer. Upon arriving to the camps, internees were met with the stark reality of internment. Housing consisted of barracks-style rough construction with no plumbing or place to prepare meals. Families were unprepared for the changing climates of the camps to which they were sent. With only the possessions they could carry, families did not have adequate clothing, bedding, blankets, or even the simplest toys for their children. As internment lengthened internees were able to purchase these items by order. Depending on the camp, internees were allowed a certain amount of freedom like this. Many were allowed to leave the camp to work in the surrounding communities. Educated business owners were forced to take manual labor jobs in an effort to regain some income for their family to be able to buy the items them could not bring with them.

Many families attempted to create a semblance of normalcy within the camps. The home was a prewar central point of Japanese culture. Men and women attempted to turn the barracks into make-shift homes. However it was socializing with other internees that helped lift the spirits of internees. Social events such as dances, sports, religious ceremonies, graduation celebrations, weddings, and funerals were events attended by most internees at the camps. Camps would also
have programs for children that encouraged civic responsibility like the Boy Scouts. For families with children, these organized events brought a small amount of stability in the uncertainty. Children would go to school, play after school, and participate in theatre, sports, and music. This gave internees a moment to feel like anything other than inmates. These few hours could not circumvent the indignity of internment, but they could provide psychological and emotional relief until their release.

Children were educated within the camp by white educators and assessed Japanese educators. The camps were not prepared for long-term internship so camps did not have the budget to adequately educate the large number of interned children. Thousands of children were forced to use small schoolrooms without proper books and materials. Curriculum was democracy-based in an effort to instill patriotic ideals in the minds of Japanese children—many of whom were Sansei, or third generation Japanese American. However school did provide children a sense of normalcy. Children would participate in after school programs, socialize with their peers, and continue their education. Parents were hopeful internment would not be lasting. They wanted their children to be prepared for post-internment life and an education was the best way to do that. If citizenship rights were returned, educated children would have opportunities as citizens.

The War Relocation Authority began questioning internees in 1943 with a questionnaire designed to determine eligibility for military service. Despite having no proof of their disloyalty, Japanese Americans were interned by the United States and then subjected to questions of whether they would be trustworthy candidates. Many felt the questions asked were vague and others only asked to gain written proof for deportation. Why should they serve in the military
that had interned them and their families? What incentive was there? However, if they did not
serve would that not be confirmation of their loyalty to Japan and not the United States? These
concerns meant some Nisei men refused to answer the questionnaire, and were imprisoned in a
maximum security camp. Given the option to renounce their citizenship and be deported to
Japan, thousands of Nisei and their families chose this option rather than stay in the camps.
Many Japanese American families would be separated by not only land but generational
decisions about loyalty and patriotism.

Surrounded by barbed wire and armed military personnel, Japanese Americans were
reminded daily of their status as internees. Imprisoned for committing no crime, Japanese
Americans faced a constant reminder of the injustice of their situation. Issei, most of who had
never been granted citizenship rights, wondered why they would stay in a country that clearly did
not want them there. Their Nisei children could not image returning to a country they had never
known but were uncertain of their future in their own country. The fear of uncertainty preyed on
the minds of families who were severely disillusioned with the American ideals of freedom,
equality, and democracy. A small number of families renounced their citizenship and left the
United States. Making such a monumental decision based on fear was the culmination of
indignities forced on Japanese Americans.

Internees who expressed their anger vocally and defiantly to the guards were transferred
to a maximum security camp like Tule Lake. The number of internees who revolted against the
War Relocation Authority’s military aptitude questionnaire was larger than expected. Tule Lake
became the camp most associated with the resistance when camp leaders began transferring
questionnaire refuters. Guards reacted with harsh retribution against uprisings. Tule Lake was
inhabited by a large percentage of Japanese American citizens and their children. At Heart Mountain, men resisted the draft on the basis they had been stripped of their rights as citizens so they could not be drafted. They were tried, convicted, and sentenced to a federal prison. This would alienate them from their families who may have encouraged service as well as stigmatize them among Japanese Americans who proudly served in the military.

Despite misgivings about service during internment, many Nisei chose to serve in the military. They primarily composed the 442nd Regimental Combat Team focused in Europe. While most soldiers had families at home, Japanese American soldiers served with the knowledge that their families were interned in camps like traitors. To prove their captors wrong and to also prove their loyalty to the United States Japanese Americans volunteered to serve the country that had stripped their Constitutional rights. Not only did they serve, but they served with distinction. The unit was awarded eight Presidential Unit Citations, and over twenty soldiers in the unit received the Medal of Honor. Dubbed the “Purple Heart Battalion” postwar, the Japanese Americans who served fought not only foreign but domestic enemies in order to prove their loyalty. Their prize was not a medal but their acceptance as American citizens with Constitutional rights.

V. Postwar

The successful United States Supreme Court case ruling regarding the internment of American citizens against their will forced the government to end internment on December 17, 1944. Proclamation Number 21 preempted the verdict which was seen as in favor of the rights of citizens over government fears during war. The joy of release was tempered by the overwhelming task of going back home. The United States government gave each internee $25
and a train ticket. However many Japanese Americans settled around the area of the camps as they had found jobs during their internment. Fear also kept many families from returning to their West coast homes. Reports of attacks on returning internees were published in newspapers and repeated amongst the released internees. Japanese Americans also had to contend with returning veterans entering the job and housing markets with them. Preference was usually given to returning veterans over Japanese American internees.

Internment affected every aspect of Japanese American life. When removal began, many families had to sell their properties at a severe financial loss, or, if they were lucky, they would be able to find a neighbor or friend who would take care of their possessions while they were away. The United States government announced they would provide storage for belongings however the offer came too late for many families. Government storage was often unsecure leading to theft and destruction of property. The income loss during internment impoverished many families. Internment effectively reduced the economic status of an entire race of people in a relatively short period of time. Postwar stigmatization alienated returning internees by isolating their employment to manual labor and menial occupation whereas prewar internees had been doctors, pharmacists, lawyers, business owners and educators.

Issei had worked tirelessly to create a strong prewar community that encouraged Nisei to educate themselves and become land and business owners. Issei understood owning land guaranteed rights and privileges to which they were not eligible. However internment shattered that American illusion for many. Unlike their parents, Nisei would not remain within prewar close-knit communities of Japanese Americans. Integrating into postwar society meant spreading out across the country, and becoming part of a diverse community. The prevalence of postwar
racism and prejudice continued, and Japanese Americans found similar ground with African Americans struggling through the Jim Crow era. The Jim Crow laws confined African Americans as subhuman even after emancipation. African Americans across the country were coming together to end segregation. The Civil Rights Movement inspired Japanese Americans to join the fight for equality. They wanted recompense for financial loss as well as changes to the law to prevent something like that from happening again—to them or another ethnicity.

The Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) was formed prewar in 1929. Despite assisting the United States government in identifying possible Japan-sympathizers and harshly rebuking draft resisters during internment, the JACL would become a major postwar proponent of civil rights, equality, and redress. This was due to a restructuring of JACL leadership roles post internment. Taking inspiration again from the Civil Rights movement sweeping the country, The JACL placed younger Nisei into leadership roles that would alter the course of action taken by the organization. Nisei were unique in that they had been citizens but had been interned regardless. Belief that the Constitution would protect and serve them was no longer an option.

Japanese Americans reintegrated into the communities that had incited racist propaganda which led to their internment. Unlike returning veterans, Japanese Americans were not welcomed back nor were they given assistance to acclimate themselves to postwar life. There were many Japanese Americans who filed suit against the United States government beginning in 1943. The earliest cases focused on specific issues curtailing the activities and rights of Japanese American citizens. These cases were overruled and internment was implemented. Not until 1976 did a president acknowledge any wrong-doing in the internment of Japanese Americans. President Gerald R. Ford issued a formal apology for the internment and stripping of
Constitutional rights during World War II. It took another 10 years for Congressional action regarding internment redress.

President Jimmy Carter was receiving increased public outcry for redress and a formal Presidential apology before aging internees passed away. In response, President Carter approached Congress to initiate an investigation regarding the causes and repercussions of internment. Congress created the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians in 1980 to investigate whether redress was owed to Japanese Americans. The Commission looked at internment from Executive Order 9066 to the impact internment had financially on Japanese Americans. Three years later they released their conclusion in *Personal Justice Denied*. Despite prewar hysteria surrounding a possible military threat from Japanese Americans, the report concluded that there was no need for internment. Instead, the report showed that prejudice, hysteria, and an extreme miscarriage of justice on the part of political leaders had been the reasons behind the internment of American citizens without due process. The Commission recommended a formal Presidential apology, financial redress, and a plan for public education to prevent future generations from committing the same mistakes.

President Ronald Raegan signed H.R. 442 presented by Congress on August 10, 1988. The Civil Liberties Act of 1988, as it is better known, came to fruition from the results of the Federal Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. The commission deduced what Japanese Americans had known from the beginning—their internment was based on nothing more than war and racist hysteria. The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 provided redress in the amount of $20,000 to be paid to each surviving internee. It took ten years for claims to be paid to over 80,000 internees. Was a check for $20,000 enough considering the staggering
financial losses inflicted on Japanese Americans? Was a presidential apology a suitable recompense for the destruction of American ideals? These questions are still being debated today, especially with the events post-9/11 in the United States.

VI. Memory:

Why is Japanese American internment important to American Studies?

The legal, social, and economic influence of Japanese American internment is a rich field of study for American Studies scholars. Indeed, the interdisciplinary nature of American Studies lends itself well to the intricacy of internment. The literary achievements of internees and their children have reshaped American literary tradition. Their story contradicts the great American tale of freedom, democracy, and equality. From autobiographies to fictional stories of internment, Japanese Americans have documented with heartbreaking realism how racism and war hysteria directly affected generations of families. Correspondingly, film and theatre have been a way for internees to express the pain and humiliation of internment to a wider audience. Legal ramifications of internment and subsequent court rulings altered Constitutional law and would be an example of the effects of war hysteria. Japanese Americans were confronted with how white Americans viewed them as well as changed how they viewed themselves in relation to their Constitutional rights. Internment challenged their view of their place in society. Release from internment and redress would not change the disruption of Japanese Americans communities. The establishment of new communities post-internment changed the social, political, and economic landscape of American cities. The experiences of internees would reverberate through future generations. It was imperative to encourage public education,
dialogue, and remembrance. The experiences of Japanese Americans in World War II would serve as an example of the perils of war hysteria post-9/11.

The kaleidoscope of emotions post-9/11 evoked memories of Pearl Harbor in American memory. Tempering the volatile voices of hysteria were reminders of the effects of vilifying a group of people for the actions of a few. Unlike the post-Pearl Harbor days and months, the American public was able to see, in part from the lessons learned from Japanese American internment, the pitfalls of isolating and interrogating American citizens. Americans were accessing historical memory and utilizing it to prevent another blight on American history. However, as Japanese American internees grow older and the physical reminders of internment disappear historical analysis and dialogue becomes more pivotal to understanding the malleability of the Constitution during times of war and terror.

Most intriguing about the analysis of Japanese American internment is the study of how Americans relate to and use their Constitution. Undeniably the United States Constitution has been both an influencer of modern democratic societies. By analyzing the evolution of how Americans utilize their Constitution through multiple lens and juxtaposed against theories like Marxism, structuralism, Derrida’s deconstruction, the post-structuralism of Lecan, Foucault, and Butler, and modernism and postmodernism ideas of culture, art, and religion scholars can see the effects of popular theories, history, and literature have on dominant societies. This influence allows citizens to challenge monuments of United States history like the Constitution. Is this unique of Americans? These questions are all evolving with research and with modern public influence.

VII. Oral History
Oral histories are a major component of Japanese American internment history. The efforts of historians and families to retrieve these memories is vital to keeping the memory of internment alive but also to provide verbal proof of the results of racism and wartime hysteria. The oral histories were conducted by Kennesaw State University undergraduate students. They will be uploaded to this page as they are completed.

**VIII. Camps and Centers:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIVILIAN ASSEMBLY CENTERS</th>
<th>SANTA ANITA RACETRACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARCADIA, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIG FRESNO FAIRGROUNDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRESNO, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARYSVILLE/ARBOGA, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS CAMP</td>
<td>MAYER, ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERCED CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OWENS VALLEY, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARKER DAM, ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINEDALE ASSEMBLY CENTER</td>
<td>PINEDALE, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOS ANGELES COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POMONA, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL LIVESTOCK EXPOSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTLAND, OREGON</td>
<td>CAMP HARMONY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUYALLUP, WASHINGTON</td>
<td>SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALINAS, CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>TRANFORAN RACETRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKTON, CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>TULARE, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANISLAUS COUNTY FAIRGROUNDS</td>
<td>TURLOCK, CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOODLAND, CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELOCATION CENTERS</th>
<th>GILA RIVER WAR RELOCATION CENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANADA WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>COLORADO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.K.A “AMACHE”</td>
<td>HEART MOUNTAIN WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WYOMING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Relocation Centers</td>
<td>Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEROME WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANZANAR WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIDOKA WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>IDAHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTON WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROHWER WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOPAZ WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>UTAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULE LAKE WAR RELOCATION CENTER</td>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETENTION CAMPS</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRYSTAL CITY, TEXAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT LINCOLN INTERNMENT CAMP,</td>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT MISSOULA, MONTANA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT STANTON, NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Isolation Centers</td>
<td>Leupp, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab, Utah</td>
<td>A.K.A. Dalton Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Stanton, New Mexico</td>
<td>A.K.A. Old Raton Ranch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Bureau of Prisons</th>
<th>Catalina, Arizona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Leavenworth, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNeill, Island Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United States Army Facilities</th>
<th>Angel Island, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Mcdowell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Blanding, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Forrest, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Livingston, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMP LORDSBURG, NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMP MCCOY, WISCONSIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE, ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT BLISS, TEXAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT HOWARD, MARYLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT LEWIS, WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT MEADE, MARYLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT SAM HOUSTON, TEXAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORT SILL, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRIFFITH PARK, CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONOLULU, HAWAII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAND ISLAND, HAWAII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRINGTON, OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. Maps:

- WCCA Assembly Center
- Unused facility
- WRA Relocation Center
- WRA Isolation Center
- WRA Temporary Camp or Other WRA Facility
- Justice Dept., U.S. Army, or Other Facility
X. Sources:
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**Films/Theatre**

PBS filmed a documentary accompanied by a website chronicling Japanese American internment through the experiences of interned children.

http://www.pbs.org/childofcamp/history/index.html?PHPSESSID=032e01e0d9275e2e1d447e604074cc9c

*Allegiance: A New American Musical* is a musical theatre production following the story of Japanese American internment.

http://www.allegiancemusical.com/japanese-american-internment

This is a film about Japanese American internment—specifically the relocation camp of Poston.

http://www.passingposton.com/

**On-line Resources**

The Smithsonian Institute produced an on-line tool to assist educators presenting Japanese American internment. “Letters from the Japanese American Internment” provides historical background augmented with letters from internees.

http://www.smithsonianeducation.org/educators/lesson_plans/japanese_internment/

The Library of Congress developed a teacher’s guide to aid educators teaching Japanese American internment. The Library of Congress site has a collection of primary sources as well.
The University of California has an extensive collection of photographs as well as analysis of Japanese American internment.

The National Archives website provides access to a large collection of photographs as well as tools to aid researchers on Japanese American history as well as Japanese American internment.

This website provides interpretations of Japanese American internment as well as audio and visual accounts of the event.

The National Park Service provided an on-line teacher’s aid to assist in instructing students about Japanese American internment.

This site contains interviews students participated in with Japanese American internees.
Relocation Center Websites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELOCATION CENTERS</th>
<th>USEFUL WEBSITES—NOT EVERY CAMP HAS A DESIGNATED WEBSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANZANAR</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/anza/index.htm">http://www.nps.gov/anza/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULE LAKE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/tule/index.htm">http://www.nps.gov/tule/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTON</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce10.htm">http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce10.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GILA RIVER</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce4.htm">http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce4.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce6.htm">http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce6.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINIDOKA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nps.gov/miin/index.htm">http://www.nps.gov/miin/index.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.preservationidaho.org/advocacy/minidoka">http://www.preservationidaho.org/advocacy/minidoka</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROHWER</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce11.htm">http://www.cr.nps.gov/history/online_books/anthropology74/ce11.htm</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project has been the culmination of my education in the American Studies program. I was able to see the themes and scholarship I had learned in my first semester define my analysis of Japanese American internment. I had a rich scholarly base by which to examine internment through an interdisciplinary approach. This broadened my audience as well as provided different voices to research. It is my hope to continue this interdisciplinary approach as well as the subject of Japanese American internment through my doctorate degree.
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