

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Takuya Maeda

March 4, 2016

“For the Sake of the Children”: The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund and the Forging of a
Post-Internment, Post-Redress Japanese American Identity and History

by

Takuya Maeda

Dr. Daniel LaChance
Adviser

Department of History

Dr. Daniel LaChance
Adviser

Dr. Leslie Harris
Committee Member

Dr. Sherman James
Committee Member

2016

“For the Sake of the Children”: The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund and the Forging of a
Post-Internment, Post-Redress Japanese American Identity and History

By

Takuya Maeda

Dr. Daniel LaChance

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of History

2016

Abstract

“For the Sake of the Children”: The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund and the Forging of a Post-Internment, Post-Redress Japanese American Identity and History
By Takuya Maeda

In 1988, President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, granting an apology and individual reparations payments to the Japanese American victims of mass incarceration during World War II. This legislation was the culmination of a decades-long effort by the Japanese American community to rectify this injustice and was met by widespread celebration. In subsequent years, activists and scholars have noted that the legislation erased narratives within Japanese American history that did not fit neatly within the portrait of the community promoted by both Japanese American leaders and members of Congress: of a steadfastly patriotic, uniformly loyal, and “model minority” group who had achieved socioeconomic success and acceptance through resilience and hard work. This image was advanced in the face of evidence that indicated that there had been a much more complicated and less unified response by Japanese Americans to the incarceration. This whitewashed and one-sided narrative had not been the only interpretation of Japanese American history within the community. Early redress advocates in radical and grassroots circles had sought to recover and rehabilitate Japanese American figures and groups that had offered protest and resistance in response to government oppression. Furthermore, they recognized that true rectification for this past injustice required not only a symbolic apology and reparations but a commitment to restructure coercive and exploitative relationships between the government and disenfranchised communities.

This thesis focuses on an overlooked aspect of the legislation, the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (CLPEF), which allocated \$5 million to educate the American public about the incarceration. By making use of the archival material of the CLPEF, this thesis finds that the projects funded by the CLPEF diverged, by design, from the Congressional narratives. As the community continues to be transformed by growth in the percentage of foreign-born and mixed race members, and the incarceration moves further into the past, I argue that these more inclusive framings of community history and identity will be essential to the role of leadership on issues of civil liberties and racial justice that Japanese Americans envision for themselves in the post-redress period.

“For the Sake of the Children”: The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund and the Forging of a
Post-Internment, Post-Redress Japanese American Identity and History

By

Takuya Maeda

Dr. Daniel LaChance

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of History

2016

Table of Contents

Introduction: Asian Americans and Historiography in 2016	1
Chapter 1: “Kodomo No Tame Ni”- For the Sake of the Children	11
Chapter 2: Congressional Debate of the 1988 Civil Liberties Act	52
Chapter 3: The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund	79
Conclusion: Post-Interment, Post-Redress Japanese American Identity and History	114

*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 and tell it
We must acknowledge it and tell it*

- Hiroshi Kashiwagi, *A Meeting at Tule Lake*

Introduction: Asian Americans and Historiography in 2016

The past year has brought about both celebration and critical assessment of landmark legislation passed in 1965, that expanded the franchise (Voting Rights Act) and changed the demographic trajectory of the nation (Immigration and Nationality Act). The 2016 presidential election cycle has also started in earnest, the coverage of which has essentially been hijacked by the nativist and xenophobic rhetoric of GOP candidates, most notably Donald Trump. All of this comes at, or marks, a great sense of unease and anxiety about the demographic and cultural changes taking place in this country. At the core of these discussions on immigration and race is the question of our self-conception as a nation. How do we constitute American identity, citizenship and national memory in the 21st century? And ultimately, who gets to participate and direct this process?

As the fastest growing racial/ethnic group in the country, the Asian Pacific Islander (API) population is increasingly understood as (and understand themselves to be) an influential voting bloc in the future. In a statistic sure to surprise many, the U.S. Asian population grew 46% from 2000 to 2010, exceeding the more extensively covered growth of the Latino population during the same period.¹ While the population of Latinos, as opposed to the rate of growth, still greatly outnumbers U.S. Asians, political forecasters often assume that in the years to come the Asian vote will command the same attention and recruitment efforts currently being directed at the Latino vote. These speculative statements are made without a closer inspection of the statistics

¹ Pew Research Center. "U.S. Hispanic and Asian populations growing, but for different reasons." Accessed October 19, 2015. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/06/26/u-s-hispanic-and-asian-populations-growing-but-for-different-reasons/>

and trends behind this growth. While most (78%) of the growth in the Latino population can be attributed to U.S. births, the growth in the Asian population is largely due to international migration (61%), and from increasingly non-traditional Asian countries.² With this statistic, a unified and influential “Asian vote” or political agenda does not seem to be within reach in the near future. Beyond the already daunting structural obstacles of naturalization and voter registration exist more vexing realities of immigration that limits common political identity: ethnic heterogeneity, language diversity, and push-pull migration factors that range from refugees fleeing violence to businessmen sent by transnational corporations. The term “Asian American” was coined by activists in the 1960s who while cognizant of the heterogeneity of the group, saw the possibilities and merits of fashioning a community under that name.³ Those who are included as “Asian Americans” in 2016 represent a far more dizzying array of experiences than those activists could have imagined. What, if anything, will serve as the basis for community and identity for Asian America in the present and in the future? How will the negotiation and conversation between new arrivals and established communities, both in the context of Asian American communities (some of whom have been in the United States for as many as seven generations) and larger American society unfold? And how will Asian American communities participate in the unprecedented engagement and negotiation that is taking place between marginalized groups and mainstream America and her institutions?

Asian American Historiography

² Pew Research Center. “U.S. Hispanic and Asian populations growing.”

³ William Wei, *The Asian American Movement*. Temple University Press, 1993.

The current trend in Asian American historiography is an effort to assert that the experiences of the group are an integral and untold part of the American story, influencing its trajectory from the very beginning and continuing to shape its cultures and institutions. Within this framing, historians consistently argue that Asian Americans and their histories are “uniquely positioned” to illuminate and flesh out the full breadth of American histories and experiences.⁴ Lon Kurashige, in one of the foundational texts of Asian American studies, asserts the importance and wider relevance of the field by stating that Asian Americans are “positioned on the in-between--on the cusp, at the interstice, in the buffer zone--of Asia and America, between black and white, between old-timer and newcomer, between mainstreamed and marginalized.”⁵ Despite pervasive allusions to this unique positioning, the explicit methods historians use to answer these questions has been underdeveloped thus far. One of the main aims of this thesis is to study, in depth, historical instances in which the “positioning” of Asian Americans has given them unique license and responsibility to influence broader questions about American society and democracy. In other words, in situations in which the experiences of Asian Americans transcends the margins to enter the larger American consciousness, how have these communities characterized by great heterogeneity and generational conflict prioritized which issues are spoken to and which groups are spoken for?

Japanese American Historiography

⁴ Sucheng Chan, “Asian American Historiography.” *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 65, No. 3 (Aug., 1996): 363-399.; Erika Lee, *The Making of Asian America*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2015.

⁵ Lon Kurashige, *Major problems in Asian American history: documents and essays*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2003.

The Japanese American community and experience is a particularly useful site to begin unpacking some of these questions. To my knowledge, the Japanese American community is the only group in the United States that has affixed labels that denote generations in the country. For example, those that came to the United States during the first wave of immigration from Japan (late 19th to early 20th century) are called *Issei*, Japanese for first generation. Barred from naturalization and land ownership, and hemmed into ethnic enclaves by discriminatory laws, the *Issei* founded Japanese American communities along the West Coast through the establishment of ethnic economic and cultural institutions. Due to their positions of ownership and leadership in these community centers, they would act as community leaders and representatives in the pre-World War II period. As immigration from Japan was being significantly limited in the early 20th century with the 1907 Gentleman's Agreement and Immigration Act of 1924, the American-born offspring of the *Issei* would be called *Nisei*, or second generation. After the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, *Issei* leaders, who were Japanese nationals despite decades of residence in the U.S., were rounded up and detained by the federal government. Faced with a leadership vacuum, the young *Nisei* stepped into the vacated roles of community leadership and representation. This sudden turnover is best exemplified by the rapid ascendance of the Japanese American Citizen's League (JACL), a fledgling *Nisei* organization before the war. They would be thrust into negotiation and cooperation with the American government as officials contemplated, and then executed, the evacuation of all persons of Japanese descent from the West Coast over concerns that they posed a military threat. For their cooperation during this mass incarceration of Japanese Americans, the JACL would retain near-exclusive privilege to represent the community in front

of national policymakers in the decades to follow. This generational naming practice continues to the present day, the current iteration being *Gosei*, or fifth generation.

This unique generational naming has been imbued with communal significance, and made analytically useful to scholars, by the trauma of this dark episode, euphemistically called “internment” by government officials. The experience of internment is seen as the center of gravity for the Japanese American community and these generational names have become a sort of shorthand that locates individuals in their relation to the event of internment and the subsequent community history.⁶ For example, most of the *Nisei* would have been very young during internment, with an average of 18 years of age. *Sansei*, or third generation, were not yet born but would later take up the efforts to open community and public dialogue about the experiences of their parents and grandparents. As it would develop, much of the intragroup conflict and debate in subsequent decades would arise along these generational lines.⁷

Internment was followed in the Japanese American community with a prolonged period of silence about what had taken place. Whether it be feelings of self-blame or shame as theorized by scholars⁸ or the unique cultural response of *shikata ga nai*⁹ (translated as “it cannot be helped”), it is well-documented that the communication of camp experiences to the *Sansei* were very limited or in most cases, non-existent.¹⁰ Growing up in this uneasy silence, and inspired by

⁶ David Yoo. “Captivating Memories: Museology, Concentration Camps, and Japanese American History” *American Quarterly* Vol. 48 no. 4 (1996): 680-699.

⁷ Jere Takahashi, *Nisei/Sansei : Shifting Japanese American Identities and Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997.

⁸ Gwendolyn M. Jensen, "The Experience of Injustice: Health Consequences of the Japanese American Internment" Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado, 1997.

⁹ Harry Kitano, *Japanese Americans: The Evolution of a Subculture*. Prentice-Hall, 1969.

¹⁰ Miyoshi Nobu, "Identity Crisis of the *Sansei* and the American Concentration Camp," *Pacific Citizen*, December 19, 1980.

the 1960s civil rights and protest movements, the Sansei sought to open a dialogue around their parents' experiences, not only as a means of healing for the community but also as a means of politically galvanizing their Japanese American peers. These efforts to resurrect the memory of internment, and to locate internment within historical continuities of racism enacted against communities of color in the U.S., ran counter to the will of the community leadership, composed primarily of the aforementioned Nisei JACLers. After their controversial decision to cooperate with the federal government during the internment, the JACL had maintained that their eager accommodation of the government's wishes, along with the distinguished military service of Nisei soldiers in the American war effort,¹¹ had laid the foundation for the community's recovery and acceptance in the postwar period. The organization's politically moderate stance, as opposed to other, marginalized Japanese Americans that railed against the government for their abuse of power during and after the internment, paid dividends as the JACL was recognized by the government as the legitimate spokesperson for the Japanese American community. While the revisionist work of the *Sansei* in the 60s and 70s opened critical dialogue around internment amongst Japanese Americans, the narratives of martial patriotism and unresisting acquiescence remained entrenched in national policymaking circles as JACL leaders monopolized Congressional lobbying and organizational leadership positions.¹² By the 1980s, the previously silent Japanese American majority had been politically galvanized by the "resurrection" campaign of the Sansei, creating pressure on the JACL to adapt their depictions of Japanese American history and community to meet the demands of these new grassroots, decentralized

¹¹ The JACL had also orchestrated the campaign to convince the government to allow JAs to serve in the military during the war.

¹² Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress*. Stanford University Press, 2008.

organizations and activists. Ultimately, an uneasy coalition formed across these ideologies and generations, culminating in the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 (CLA), which secured the payment of reparations and a formal apology to those who had been incarcerated.¹³

The passage of redress legislation was rightly met by widespread celebration and congratulations in the Japanese American community. Redress on this scale was unprecedented in American history and was seen as a massive victory for marginalized groups and the protection of civil liberties. After over 40 years, the legislation brought a sense of closure to a dark episode that had loomed large over the incarcerated as well as their children. In a sense, redress had been won because of the very persistence of the scars of internment - it had sent generations of Japanese Americans on a chase for truth, vindication, and justice. That decades-long pursuit had steadily chipped away at the damage done by their wartime incarceration, in which they were wrongly accused and unjustly convicted. The culmination of these tireless efforts was the Civil Liberties Act, but after its passage there has been little of the type of critical engagement with redress and how it was won, that had led to the community's liberation. How had Japanese Americans, a numerically insignificant and politically invisible group, convinced the government to hand over \$1.5 billion in reparations when nearly all other groups before them had failed? What were the political deals and concessions made to ensure the passage of this landmark legislation? And had they actually challenged and checked the government's power over marginalized and disenfranchised groups?

With redress, the Japanese American community was no longer defined solely by the trauma of internment. They were now uniquely qualified to be a champion for the protection of

¹³ Yang Murray, 286.

the civil liberties and rights of all Americans. In light of the prior discussion on Asian American historians' invocation of the community's "unique positioning" to assert the field's relevance to a wider audience, one would think that the post-redress advocacy of the Japanese American community would be a natural avenue for inquiry and scholarship. Yet the evolution of the community - its history, its culture, and its political advocacy - since the passage of the 1988 Civil Liberties Act has received almost no scholarly attention.

Primary Research

Japanese American historians must begin to pose more critical and incisive questions about redress and think strategically about the future of the community in its aftermath. This urgency is driven, in part, by the high degree of change and flux in the community. Already, native-born, full Japanese Americans¹⁴ of all generations make up just one-third of the Japanese-descended population in the United States, with an equal number of mixed race and postwar Japanese immigrants, who are called "Shin Issei," or "new first generation."¹⁵ Astute observers have begun to note that traditional notions of community that mobilized Japanese Americans in the past are no longer applicable, and that maintenance and preservation of Japanese American culture rests with "non-traditional" members. This uncertain future demands that the community live up to the popular saying, "*kodomo no tame ni*" (for the sake of the children), which has signified for Japanese Americans the ways in which the suffering of the internees and later

¹⁴ With two JA parents.

¹⁵ Martha Nakagawa, "Service Agencies Discuss Changing Need of Japanese American Community." *AsianWeek*, August 26, 1994.
<http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P1-2267795.html>

efforts to obtain redress transcend both generations and ethnicity, providing lessons and inspiration for all Americans.

This thesis begins with an overview of the community's pursuit of redress, told through the various lobbying efforts in preceding decades that paved the way for the ultimate triumph of the community in 1988. These efforts are essential to understanding the Japanese American community's internal dynamics - its generational/ideological conflicts and group politics. Chapter 2 analyzes the 1988 CLA and the legislative process that led to its eventual passage through a review of the sparse secondary literature on the legislation and the new contribution of primary research into Congressional floor debates and the subcommittee hearing in which Japanese American representatives were invited to provide testimony. Chapter 3 introduces the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (CLPEF), a community education fund created by the 1988 CLA, that has been completely neglected in the scholarship on redress. Congress appropriated \$5 million to the CLPEF with instructions to the appointed Board that the money be used to educate the American public about the Japanese American community's history. Ten years after the passage of redress legislation, the CLPEF Board had funded 135 projects on internment and redress, including memorials, curricula, community workshops, documentaries, and academic research. The archived materials of this program provide insights into how those seeking to forge and assert Japanese American identity in the aftermath of redress conceived of the task that lay ahead. How did they interpret, and carry out, this mandate to educate the American public about internment and redress? What were the community's aspirations and priorities for Japanese American advocacy after redress? And how would the Board decide which initiatives were appropriate to serve as the intellectual, artistic, and communal basis of this new

identity? Through analysis of the paper trail left by the Board - its internal memos, meeting minutes, reports from community input meetings, personal correspondence, records of grant applications received, and press releases - which have not been previously written about, this thesis constructs the untold story of this crucial first step in defining a post-internment, post-redress Japanese American identity and history, one that takes as its *raison d'être* the fight to protect the civil liberties of all Americans, regardless of race or background.

Chapter 1: “Kodomo no tame ni”- For the Sake of the Children

Introduction

Japanese American poet Lawson Inada described the camp experience, the so-called “Loyalty Oath” in particular,¹⁶ as “a veritable civil war with no winners,” “segregating generation against generation, religion against religion, family against family, and wreak[ing] havoc on households and individuals.”¹⁷ Yet judging by the impressive median income statistics (“outwhiting the whites” according to one observer) and military decorations¹⁸ touted by Japanese American leaders and supporters in Congress, as the Japanese American community’s livelihoods and family ties had unraveled during the camp years, so they had miraculously coalesced by the late 1980s. Before the Congressional body stood a community with a greater faith in American institutions and values - the proverbial broken bone, made stronger upon recovery. Senators and representatives from both parties responded in kind, awarding legislation that granted redress by a significant margin.

Both the neat narratives of steadfast patriotism and postwar recovery, and the smooth legislative victories, 243-141 margin in the House and 69-27 in the Senate, belie a highly contentious and protracted process over 40 years in the making. First, how had the community

¹⁶ JAs in the camps were forced to answer a questionnaire about their loyalty to the U.S. and their willingness to fight overseas for the U.S. military. The wide range of responses to this questionnaire, given under extreme duress and while they were being held against their will, served to pit the community against each other in the camps and in the decades to follow.

¹⁷ William Hohri. *Repairing America: An Account of the Movement for Japanese-America Redress*. (Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1984), 136.

¹⁸ An equally dubious distinction given that such decorations are usually awarded for grievous injury and death. JA soldiers “endured a one-in-three casualty rate that was six times that of the US military at-large during World War II.” Scott Kurashige, *The Shifting Grounds of Race: Black and Japanese Americans in the Making of Multiethnic Los Angeles*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 195.

overcome the trauma that Inada had so vividly described? Second, while certainly a remarkable story, what was so uniquely compelling about the case for Japanese American redress as to bring the United States Congress to offer such an unprecedented public apology and to shell out \$1.5 billion for the cause? Surprisingly, what appears at first to be an independent process - the community comes together to demand restitution and subsequently the merits of those claims are appraised and deemed worthy by the government - are more rightly thought of as a result jointly fostered and supervised by Japanese American leaders and Congress.

This chapter begins with the story of the “breaking of the silence” - the breakthrough that ended the shame and guilt that had enveloped the internees in the postwar period. With the subsequent “resurrection” of the history of internment led by the Sansei taking their cues from the radicalism and activism of the 1960s and 1970s, the redress movement in earnest was born. The chapter then follows the generational and ideological differences as they played out within Japanese American organizations. In reviewing the Japanese American-led lobbying campaigns in the decade following this “breaking of the silence,” it is clear the leaders of these organizations had identified a uniquely Japanese American formula for legislative success. This chapter argues that these patterns, the rules that dictate Japanese American interaction with mainstream institutions, are born of the power dynamics of the wartime incarceration and have detrimental impacts on the way Japanese American advocacy is conducted and the way Japanese American history is remembered.

The “Resurrection” of Internment

The inception of the redress movement lies in what historian Alice Yang Murray has termed the “resurrection of the history of internment.”¹⁹ Preceding this “resurrection” during the 60s and 70s was a deep communal silence about the camp experience. As Japanese Americans had been freed from the camps, many were deliberately dispersed throughout the U.S. Those permitted to return to areas in which they had previously lived found that they were resented, harassed, and even subject to violent acts of intimidation. Howard Otamura, the first Japanese American employee to return to the flower market in Los Angeles, was not only harassed at work by whites but had “three gunshots fired at his residence.”²⁰ Beyond this isolation and physical obstructions to a community mobilization to protest the internment was the judgment that the experience had come of military necessity, a claim that came with the imprimatur of the Supreme Court, and remained on the books until the early 1980s.²¹ The accusation of disloyalty and the conviction implied by the incarceration had blanketed the community in shame, guilt, and silence. Under these conditions, the first generation to be born entirely outside of the camps, the Sansei, came of age in a communal vacuum of information and activism around internment. A survey of 1250 Sansei revealed that for close to half (40%) of the respondents “their primary source of information about the camps came not from parents but from books, films, and overheard conversations.”²² This set the course for a counter-intuitive development of Japanese American activism and mobilization. While Sansei activists sought similar goals to their parents

¹⁹ Alice Yang Murray, *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

²⁰ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 196.

²¹ Archival documents revealed that reports to the Supreme Court had been doctored to mislead the Court into upholding the judgments backing internment.

²² Yang Murray, 202.

and grandparents, the vindication of the community for their wrongful incarceration, their activism did not occur along the terms the past generations had envisioned. The Sansei were drawing upon new terminology, images, and concepts that were decidedly of their own generation.

As the Sansei came of age politically on college campuses and in the newly established youth district offices of the JACL, these differences in approach often came to a head. At San Francisco State, a number of Sansei were involved in the 1969 Third World Strike, organized by student groups of color in a controversial effort to develop a wide range of programs that they felt better met their needs. Their most direct adversary, the university president, was S.I. Hayakawa, himself a Japanese American (albeit Canadian-born and not incarcerated), whose conservative opposition to Japanese American activism would be a permanent feature in the decades to come. Sansei methods not only threatened the authority and representation of Nisei, like at SF State, but could also undercut their livelihoods. Historian Alice Yang Murray relays an episode in which a Nisei member saw “posters of the Black Panthers, Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara, and Cesar Chavez” at a JACL youth district office run by activist Sansei. The Nisei was not only distressed that the Sansei were aligning themselves with radical and controversial groups - many Nisei farmers were directly “threatened by Chavez’s unionization campaign.”²³

These anecdotes are representative of a broader dialogue about the “positioning” of Japanese Americans in the American racial hierarchy. By the late 1960s, Japanese Americans had been recast in the American imagination as modern day “Horatio Algers,” who were now “outwhiting the whites.”²⁴ Most potently, conservatives juxtaposed breathless descriptions of

²³ Yang Murray, 215.

²⁴ William Petersen, “Success Story, Japanese-American Style,” *New York Times*, January 9, 1966.

bootstraps success attained by Japanese Americans through “their own almost totally unaided effort,” with the supposedly self-defeating protest tactics by African Americans and the misguided policy efforts directed at so-called ghettos and slums.²⁵ In the glow of such laudatory depictions, the Japanese American leadership who had cultivated this image were disconcerted by the methods of the Sansei. For men like S.I. Hayakawa, Sansei “eagerly conforming to the radial-chic fads of their non-Japanese college contemporaries” could only portend a downward mobility in this hierarchy.²⁶ As these accounts of Japanese Americans as a “super-minority” piled up, they were met by resistance from Japanese American activists and Sansei whose racial consciousness had been awakened by other communities of color. They not only challenged the factual basis of such rosy portrayals of their community, citing bias in data selection,²⁷ but also called for community members to repudiate this “positioning” as a tool of white supremacy meant to denigrate other minorities. According to Nisei Edison Uno, the only measure to inoculate the community and its history against these manipulative efforts to justify racial oppression was to begin “speaking about the pain caused by the incarceration.”²⁸

In effect, as Sansei were coming of age during a time of widespread protest and activism, of calls for self-determination by the Black Power movement and the reclaiming of communal history and spaces by Third World Strikers, they were also confronted by calls for the Japanese American community to speak up about their own history. Yet with this history repressed by

²⁵ Petersen, “Success Story.”

²⁶ Yang Murray, 29.

²⁷ The cited statistics failed to account for the fact that JA families were more likely to be two-income households and reports ignored data that showed that JAs received less return on investment in education relative to Whites.

²⁸ Yang Murray, 194.

communal shame and guilt, Sansei were in no position to reclaim or speak up about their history. The comments of Sansei activist Warren Furutani about the omnipresent calls for ethnic groups to reclaim their history and the predicament the community silence posed for radical Sansei are illuminating. Noting that “the United Farm Workers had just marched from Delano to Sacramento [and] [t]he civil rights movement had inspired the 1963 March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom,” the question he posed to his compatriots was: “What could Japanese Americans organize around?”²⁹

Furutani and a fellow Sansei he had connected with through anti-war protests, Victor Shibata, decided on a pilgrimage to the site of a former Japanese American internment camp located 225 miles north of Los Angeles, called Manzanar. They would “clean and restore the camp’s remains” and hoped to “spark more discussion within the community.”³⁰ The conclusion of this first event in 1969, attended by more than 200 people, ensured that this youth-led pilgrimage would not go unnoticed by the community or the previously indifferent Nisei leadership. Community activist Jim Matsuoka stirred great controversy in his closing speech when he declared that due to the silence of the Nisei, the “whole generation is buried here. The Nisei Americans lie buried in the sands of Manzanar.”³¹ These comments drew the ire of the Nisei leadership for whom the silence had been seen as a virtue - a testament, not to their passivity as the Sansei had claimed, but to their remarkable resilience. Fred Hirasuna, editor of the Fresno JACL newsletter, spoke for many when he chastised the Sansei for the lack of gratitude and respect they showed for the sacrifice made by the Nisei generation. Nisei Sue

²⁹ Yang Murray, 207.

³⁰ Yang Murray, 208.

³¹ Yang Murray, 210.

Kunitomi Embrey, a pilgrimage participant in 1969 and later a member of the organizing committee for the annual trip to Manzanar, responded that what Hirasuna perceived as disrespect from entitled youth was actually frustration from the Sansei generation that the very victims who “should be in the lead working for changes in our democracy” had refused to participate in their activism.³² Another Nisei, Edison Uno, was not only a vocal supporter of the efforts of the Sansei³³ but also used his active membership in the JACL³⁴ to try to recruit the organization’s considerable resources and influence to these movements. His efforts in this regard had little success, as the vast majority of JACL membership and leadership did not “share Uno’s dedication to activist causes.”³⁵

Sansei had been led to the neglected sites of former camps through the example set by the radical, confrontational activism of groups from other communities of color. While many Japanese American leaders derisively dismissed Sansei activism as “radical-chic,” some Nisei saw in their efforts the constructive transformation of repressed memories into an “essential part” of a stronger and more robust Japanese American future.³⁶ Regardless of the merits of either characterization, this complex process is essential to understanding the resurrection of the history of internment because it brought to Japanese American history the new language, standards, and

³² Yang Murray, 211.

³³ Uno attended the first pilgrimage, wrote a series of complimentary opinion pieces in JA press and became a member of the organizers behind the annual pilgrimages, the Manzanar Committee.

³⁴ Yang Murray, 188. Despite his role as chair and board member in the JACL, Uno viewed his main contributions as being a “critic” who would “try to keep them on their toes at all times.” While ostensibly an active and involved member, he simultaneously objected to the JACL’s promotion of model minority narratives and argued that “a history of racism” and “ethnic self-hate” were the real legacies of internment.

³⁵ Yang Murray, 188.

³⁶ Yang Murray, 208.

perspectives of 1960s radical activism. This new lexicon forced a reappraisal of the accepted version of community history - which had been limited to tales of Japanese American valor in the military and “good citizenship” of their families in the camps. New interpretations of communal history with frameworks that located internment within continuities of racial oppression of other communities of color now rehabilitated narratives and figures that had previously been marginalized.

Initially, many Nisei had bristled at the alignment of Sansei activists with radical groups. Yet they were more receptive to the new interpretations that these approaches yielded, which not only placed government exploitation at the center of the incarceration narrative but also had the effect of vindicating the many Nisei who did not fit neatly into the JACL’s definition of a good and loyal Japanese American. The concept of rearticulation, a theory advanced by Michael Omi and Howard Winant, is useful in understanding this phenomenon. Omi and Winant argued that social movements are the product of the forging of a “collective identity” through the introduction of “new subjectivity” that “mak[es] use of information and knowledge already present in the subject’s mind” to offer a “different view of themselves and their world.” Locating the internment within continuities of racial oppression by the American state, within Anti-Asian sentiment before and after the war, had given renewed purchase to the injustices and grievances that the past generation had repressed. The Nisei were burdened by what Karl Mannheim called “generational location,” in which “members of a society . . . who experience the same social and historical forces limit their modes of thought, experience, feeling, and action.”³⁷ The Sansei,

³⁷ Takahashi, 10.

inspired by the “larger zeitgeist of the age,” had found a common cause that would bridge the generational gap and galvanize the community.³⁸

While these efforts had managed to strike an emotional resonance about the internment that moved Nisei to confront their silence on the subject, the reality was that this was still an inexperienced youth-led fringe movement.³⁹ Additionally, these efforts remained an insular process, in that they did not register on the radar of national politics or the American public. Certainly, the mere presence of new voices speaking within the Japanese American community was significant. For decades, Japanese American representation in national politics had been dominated by the Nisei leaders of the JACL. Through their collaboration with the government in overseeing the evacuation and internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, they had gained the ear and trust of prominent government officials. These new voices in no way replaced the entrenched lobbying pipelines and networking structures that had calcified after decades of exclusive representation by the JACL. But in the years to follow, the maturation of these “fringe” ideas and movements would force a negotiation and competition between the two camps for the authority to speak for the community. In the meantime, many Nisei found that they could no longer escape or evade the question finally raised by their Sansei children: “Why did it take you so long to do anything?”⁴⁰

Japanese American Mobilization and Lobbying Pattern

³⁸ Takahashi, 11.

³⁹ Don Nakanishi, “Seeking Convergence in Race Relations Research: Japanese-Americans and the Resurrection of the Internment,” in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy* (New York: Springer US, 1988): 159-180.

⁴⁰ Hohri, 147.

After the resurrection of internment and the breaking of the silence, Japanese Americans embarked on a spate of successful lobbying and legislative campaigns. The most significant amongst them was the 1971 repeal of Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the rescission of Executive Order 9066 in 1976, the Iva Toguri pardon in 1977, and the immediate precursor to redress, the 1981 Commission on the Wartime Relocation and Incarceration of Citizens. On the surface, this was a stunning series of victories in which Japanese Americans were finally employing their community history to advance Japanese American interests and to advocate for increased vigilance about the violations of the civil liberties of all Americans. Behind these campaigns was a well-oiled political machine that drew on the new grassroots power of Japanese Americans, but ultimately relied on the same entrenched lobbying infrastructure that had dictated Japanese American relations with policymaking institutions since the inception of World War II. During these lobbying campaigns, the promise of Sansei activism - of self-determination, history/memorialization/community-building on their own terms - was met by the cold, hard reality that three decades later, Japanese Americans were still reliant on relationships and conditions forged during the darkest periods of their history.

JACL Accommodation and Response to Internment

The JACL has long been a controversial topic of debate in the Japanese American community. For their actions during World War II, they have been characterized both as opportunistic and power-hungry Nisei who sold out their community in exchange for a seat at the table, or those filling a leadership vacuum, who were able to draw concessions, however minor, from the government despite having little to no power to dictate terms. Consensus is limited to

one issue - the outside impact that the organization had, and continues to have, on Japanese American lives.

Before the war, community power had been in the hands of *Issei*, first generation Japanese immigrants, who though barred from citizenship, had lived in the country for many decades. Japanese American community life revolved around Issei-owned cultural and business institutions. In the wake of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, these community elders and leaders were swept up and jailed by the FBI, creating a vacuum of community leadership. The young JACL Nisei, whose aspirations to community leadership had been stymied to this point by the Issei's dominance in communal and financial institutions, would quickly fill this void.

The rapid transfer of power was facilitated by ties with state authorities preemptively cultivated by the JACL Nisei as Japan-U.S. relations deteriorated preceding Pearl Harbor. Since early 1941, JACL Nisei had been in contact with these authorities, particularly the "Naval Intelligence Bureau," for whom they provided "information about community organizations and leaders."⁴¹ In an episode indicative of these close ties, when FBI agents commenced the roundup of the Issei leaders of the Central Business Association on December 7th, JACL Nisei Tokutaro Slocum accompanied the agents.⁴²

Before indicting the JACL Nisei as power-hungry, historian Scott Kurashige has argued that the circumstances of these actions deserve greater scrutiny. His findings about the delayed development of calls for Japanese American evacuation after Pearl Harbor is insightful. In the entire month of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, December 1941, the federal attorney general's

⁴¹ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 100.

⁴² Paul R. Spickard. "The Nisei Assume Power: The Japanese Citizens League, 1941-1942." *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 52 no. 3 (1983): 158.

office received just four letters calling for the removal of Japanese Americans. The month of January saw a slight increase, with thirty such letters arriving at the office. At this time, public officials such as Los Angeles Mayor Fletcher Bowron began calling publicly for the evacuation of Japanese Americans, while also declaring that informing on potentially “disloyal” members of the community was the standard for, and even the expectation of, Japanese Americans who wanted to prove their loyalty. This agitation resulted in the escalation of anti-Japanese sentiment to a fever pitch, with the attorney general’s office receiving 671 anti-Japanese letters, “the majority from [Bowron’s] Los Angeles County.”⁴³ So even as they stepped into the position of community leadership to which they had aspired, JACL Nisei found themselves immediately in a defensive position, against a hail of anti-Japanese agitation. In their failure to act in defense of centers of community⁴⁴ and to vigorously advocate on behalf of the imprisoned Issei, the JACL failed the Japanese American community. Scott Kurashige found that “to the degree these Nisei leaders were working with any strategy,” however, “they were guided by a belief in taking the actions they deemed most likely to be looked on favorably by white authorities.”⁴⁵ With the public brought to an anti-Japanese frenzy by the propaganda of government officials, the JACL Nisei were in a position to do little but hope for minimal concessions from the government.

With pressures to evacuate all Japanese Americans from the West Coast closing in dangerously, the JACL was offered participation in discussions about how the evacuation operation might be executed in exchange for the organization’s pledge to “cooperate actively”

⁴³ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 123.

⁴⁴ Japanese language schools and ethnic centers of commerce operated by Issei were seized and shut down by the FBI.

⁴⁵ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 112.

during such an event.⁴⁶ With little experience and even less power, JACL leaders “were . . . lost about what to do . . . We didn’t have the guts to go out in the open to fight about it, or even marshal public opinion,” according to Saburo Kido, the JACL President at the time.⁴⁷ The JACL’s decision to bow to the government’s wishes was utterly repugnant to many Japanese Americans, then and to this day, and was likely deserving of the criticism the organization received. Yet their actions must also be understood within the coercion and wholesale exploitation of the Japanese American community undertaken by a government sworn to protect them. To say the JACL sold out the community in exchange for power, would give too much credit to the organization. Instead, those truly in a position to alter the course of events were the public officials fomenting anti-Japanese sentiment and high-level leaders in the Federal Government, who had before them reports indicating that the defense of the West Coast did not require the removal of all Japanese Americans.

Within the Camps: Military Service

After President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19th, 1942, authorizing the forced removal and incarceration of individuals for the purposes of national defense, Japanese Americans were the only group to be removed and incarcerated en masse. They were abruptly shipped off to “relocation centers” in preparation for settlement in “internment camps.” Only allowed to bring what they could carry, Japanese Americans were forced to sell assets that they had accumulated over many decades for “ten cents on the dollar,”

⁴⁶ Spickard, 164.

⁴⁷ Spickard, 165.

or to entrust them to non-Japanese Americans.⁴⁸ By war's end, Japanese Americans had lost an estimated \$367 million in 1949 dollars, "acreage covered by Japanese farming [had] plummeted 75 percent" and while "fewer than 20 percent of Japanese Americans in the Los Angeles area had worked for whites before the war, 70 percent were doing so by 1948."⁴⁹

As the previous section noted, JACL leaders were in no position to stop this mass plunder of their community. But it must also be noted that as ordinary Japanese Americans watched their decades of hard work evaporate with the relocation order, JACL leaders were being "granted . . . access to the most desirable jobs, particularly white-collar and supervisory positions, in the centers" in exchange for their cooperation.⁵⁰ It was from these positions in the camps, and for top-level leaders who were granted freedom of movement, from outside the camps, that the JACL leadership formulated its intrawar strategy. According to historian Ellen Wu, "the cornerstone of its vision for rehabilitating Japanese American citizenship" was to convince the military command to allow Nisei, first classified as enemy aliens, to prove their loyalty through military service and sacrifice.⁵¹ JACL spokesperson Mike Masaoka offered that Japanese American military service could be in the form of "suicide battalions." The loyalty of these soldiers, he suggested, could be ensured by holding their family members as hostages. While Masaoka's draconian suggestion was rejected, the War Department offered to form a segregated Japanese American combat unit. Despite the objections to this unequal treatment, the JACL

⁴⁸ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 196.

⁴⁹ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 196.

⁵⁰ Ellen Wu, *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014),168.

⁵¹ Wu, 167.

seized on the opportunity to “present[] . . . the incontrovertible fact that there are loyal American-Japanese who are willing to fight for the U.S.”⁵²

The reclassification of Nisei to make them eligible for military service was met by a far more tepid response within the camps than anticipated by JACL leaders like Mike Masaoka. Only 6% of eligible Nisei enlisted voluntarily.⁵³ Under the guise of the “restoration of equality” for Nisei, the U.S. military then announced that Selective Service would be opened for the camps on January 20th, 1944. Japanese Americans would now be drafted into military service, even as their families and friends remained incarcerated in the internment camps. After the institution of the draft in the camps, there was no uniform response from eligible Japanese Americans. Many dutifully went through the registration process despite the obvious injustice. Knowing full well that refusal to comply was a federal crime and punishable by prison time, others decided to ignore their draft orders. Such draft resistance at camps like Topaz in Utah and Rowher in Arkansas numbered in the single digits. But other camps like Heart Mountain in Wyoming saw a legitimate political organization, the Fair Play Committee,⁵⁴ form in the aftermath of the opening of the draft. Eighty-five Japanese Americans would resist the draft from Heart Mountain and the camp at Poston in Colorado produced 106 draft resisters.⁵⁵ There were equally diverse reasons for resisting the draft. For some it was a means of ensuring that they would be able to stay with

⁵² Wu, 171.

⁵³ Cherstin Lyon. "Loyalty questionnaire," Densho Encyclopedia <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Loyalty%20questionnaire/> (accessed February 7 2016).

⁵⁴ Members insisted that JAs be freed from the internment camps before they would serve in the military. The emphasis of this organization was that they were neither un-American nor pacifist. They were willing to fight for the U.S., just not while their constitutional rights were being violated by incarceration.

⁵⁵ Eric Muller. "Draft resistance," Densho Encyclopedia <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Draft%20resistance/> (accessed Feb 7 2016).

and watch over their families in the camps. Others were so thoroughly disillusioned with their treatment at the hands of the American government, that not only did they refuse to report, they also filed to renounce their citizenship and repatriate to Japan. Whatever one's political opinions on these range of responses may be, there is no valid historical argument to be made that there was a united Japanese American response to the call to fight for the United States.

Dispersal and Postwar Period

During the internment, the Department of the Interior's War Relocation Authority (WRA) commenced a program that historian Ellen Wu has described as "state-engineered cultural and structural assimilation."⁵⁶ By dispersing internees to areas outside of the West Coast, the WRA hoped to break up the ethnic enclaves that they perceived as having given rise to the resentment, and then the hysterical suspicion, that preceded the evacuation. Between October 1942 and the end of 1944, 36,000 internees "deemed sufficiently loyal and assimilable by camp administrators" and who had "secured job offers in areas where their presence would not likely inflame local ire" were granted indefinite leaves from the camps as part of this resettlement program.⁵⁷ Both the WRA and the Japanese American leadership saw the program as a means to "push former internees to identify and associate with the white middle class."⁵⁸ For men like Mike Masaoka, this had been the plan all along. On one hand, military service by Nisei soldiers was about convincing their captors, the military leadership, that Japanese Americans were loyal subjects willing to contribute to the American war effort. But it had also been an ambitious

⁵⁶ Wu, 43.

⁵⁷ Wu, 43.

⁵⁸ Wu, 43.

public relations campaign directed at ordinary Americans, to rehabilitate the image of Japanese Americans from enemy subversives into distinguished veterans and good neighbors. As former internees were “resettled” in all-white neighborhoods thousands of miles from the West Coast communities they had called home for generations, this would be the first test of the efficacy of the PR campaign orchestrated by the JACL.

Not only was this campaign single-handedly undertaken by the JACL with little consultation of ordinary Japanese Americans, it had also exacted a tremendous toll on the community. While in the camps they been drafted into military service while their family members and friends remained unjustly incarcerated, and once in the armed forces they had “endured a one-in-three casualty rate that was six times that of the US military at-large” during the war.⁵⁹ Due to this blatantly unequal treatment, many Nisei veterans were embittered and disillusioned about their time in the military, and more broadly about their place and future in the United States. However, the postwar strategy of the JACL demanded that these “rank-and-file” Nisei veterans repress their legitimate grievances and follow the company line: “as members of a small minority whose citizenship rights could be granted or taken away at will by the state, . . . [a]ny resentment they felt would have to be kept hidden.”⁶⁰

Japanese Americans who posed an even greater threat to the “unproblematic portrayals” of the community advanced by Nisei leaders, such as No-No’s⁶¹ and draft resisters, were

⁵⁹ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 195. Here it must be noted that JACL leaders were not simply sending others into battle without making sacrifices themselves. Mike Masaoka voluntarily served with the 442nd along with four of his brothers, one of whom was killed and another severely injured.

⁶⁰ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 195.

⁶¹ No-No Boys were internees who answered “No” to questions 27 and 28 on the “Loyalty Questionnaire” that internees were required to fill out. Question 27 asked if they were willing to serve on combat duty wherever ordered and Question 28 asked if individuals would swear unqualified allegiance to the United States and forswear allegiance to the Emperor of Japan.

“deliberately cast . . . into obscurity.”⁶² Both groups were branded with the stigma of treachery and disloyalty that precluded their participation in mainstream Japanese American organizations and drew the antagonism and harassment of white Americans. The statement of Ben Takeshita, a No-No incarcerated at Tule Lake, made clear the potency of these labels. At a 1977 commemorative event, he stated that even “up to ten years ago, I would not have told anyone where I learned my Japanese nor would I have admitted that I had been at Tule Lake as a 'No-No.'”⁶³

For both the WRA and the Japanese American leadership, the success of the resettlement program was contingent on the silencing of the dissenting voices within the Japanese American community and the strict adherence of former internees to the values of the middle-class, white communities in which they were being relocated. If all went according to plan, the distinguished Nisei soldier and his family, who had patiently endured the internment camps, would be accepted into mainstream America through these tenets of “normative masculinity and femininity” and “reputable heterosexuality alongside explicit avowals of patriotism.”⁶⁴ While those who opposed the JACL’s portrayal of the community were successfully kept from obtaining organizational power, the resettlement process produced other challenges and alternatives to this rigid morality and masculinity. The most potent symbol of these divergent community narratives was the “Zoot-suit” worn by some young Japanese Americans in resettlement areas like Chicago. The

⁶² Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 197.

⁶³ Niiya, Brian, “No-no boys,” *Densho Encyclopedia* http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-no_boys/ (accessed Feb 7 2016).

⁶⁴ Wu, 51.

counterculture movement⁶⁵ signified by the distinctive Zoot-suit was the antithesis of nearly everything that Japanese American leaders had envisioned for the community after the camps. Not only were most adherents of the movement African American and Mexican American youth, it had become associated with “juvenile delinquency, moral deficiency,” and even “unpatriotic subversion.”⁶⁶ The sale of Zoot-suits had been banned by the War Production Board in an effort to ration fabric, meaning its wearers were publicly flaunting their violation of these wartime mandates. For the Japanese American leadership, this was the “wrong kind of assimilation” - resettlement was supposed to facilitate integration into the white middle class, not “kinship [with] . . . working-class brown and black folk.”⁶⁷ When the Los Angeles Zoot-Suit Riots broke out in the heart of the resettlement program, the summer of 1943, it presented Japanese American leaders with a vision of the worst possible scenario. Mexican Americans and African Americans wearing Zoot-suits were being attacked by white soldiers and civilians for attire that signaled unpatriotic attitudes and behavior detrimental to the war effort.⁶⁸

As Japanese Americans began to be released from the camps, first through the resettlement program, and later with the end of the war, the unproblematic and monolithic depictions advanced by the Japanese American leadership marginalized many in the post-camp community. While the majority, like Tule Lake No-No boy Ben Takeshita, saw no other choice than the stoic repression of their trauma and grievances, others vaunted their protest by invoking the potent symbolism of the Zoot-suit. The discontent expressed then, and decades later, made

⁶⁵ Wu, 63. “Encompassing fashion, jazz and swing music and dance, distinctive argots, and transgressions of race, gender, class, and sexuality.”

⁶⁶ Wu, 64.

⁶⁷ Wu, 49.

⁶⁸ Wu, 64.

clear that in their efforts to appease mainstream America, the JACL had trodden over and sacrificed these divergent segments of their constituency. Due to a lack of organizational clout, the challenges posed by these dissenting voices were easily deflected and defused by the JACL as it implemented its post-camp integration strategy. By “utilizing lobbying, congressional testimonies, court cases, and anti-Communism as the vehicles through which to make its claims of national belonging, the [JACL] redefined the meaning of Japanese American identity to include political moderation” and firmly established the Nisei soldier, not the Zoot-suiters, as the face of the community.⁶⁹ In this reliance on “racialized martial patriotism” to gain a foothold in mainstream America, historian Ellen Wu noted a concession by the leadership “that Japanese Americans could not eradicate their differences from whites (and hence remove lingering status disparities) but instead could only hope to endow this difference with positive meanings.”⁷⁰ The triumph of these “success story narrators” over “alternative voices,”⁷¹ and the “positive differences” now attributed to Japanese Americans would be instrumental to lobbying and legislative success in the years to follow.

McCarran-Walter Act of 1952

While public officials and fellow citizens had turned on Japanese Americans during World War II, in the postwar period there was now a domestic and international imperative to see that they were rehabilitated and reassimilated. With the specter of Communism as the new

⁶⁹ Wu, 192.

⁷⁰ Wu, 192. It should be noted that a main argument of Wu’s book is that the construction of these “positive differences” relied on explicit comparison to the “negative differences” of groups like African Americans.

⁷¹ Wu, 33. Zoot-suiters, sexual deviants, draft resisters, those who renounced citizenship, leftists, Communists, juvenile delinquents, etc.

preoccupation of politicians and citizens alike, Japan was transformed into a “bulwark of freedom” in East Asia. Once reviled as “Japs,” Japanese Americans were now “superpatriots” and models of good American citizenship. The JACL had worked tirelessly to cultivate this image on both fronts, and with this favorable public opinion and the state’s anti-Communist policy push, their efforts translated into their first major lobbying success in 1952.

The McCarran-Walter Act of 1952 proposed an overhaul of the race-based 1924 immigration laws in favor of one better suited for the fight against Communism. The central aim in this change was to allow for the strengthening of relationships with democratic and anti-Communist allies that had previously been excluded under the 1924 legislation. A crucial lynchpin in this new policy direction was the new, postwar Japan. As such, the legislation called for the reopening of the United States to immigration from Japan (under a quota) and for the granting of naturalization rights to Issei. The inability to naturalize had caused undue hardship for Issei before and during the war. They had been barred from owning land and had been subject to detention even before E.O. 9066 had been signed. After the war, granting the right to citizenship for these community elders had been among the first priorities of the Japanese American community. As such, Mike Masaoka and the JACL “vigorously pushed” for passage of the McCarran-Walter Act.⁷²

Yet in the legislative process, the bill had become much more than an update of immigration policy to meet the needs of the times. Pat McCarran, a Nevada Senator, had attached several clauses that sought to check the liberalization of immigration laws by granting authorities the power to deport and revoke naturalized citizenship in the name of national

⁷² Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 203.

security. Furthermore, his additions would also authorize funding for programs that McCarran had pushed through two years earlier in the 1950 Internal Security Act.⁷³ Title II of this legislation gave the FBI the power to “detain both citizens and aliens ‘before they actually engaged in any unlawful activities,’” if the President declared an “internal security emergency.”⁷⁴ The direct parallels to internment were obvious- not only did it “provide[] a theoretical model of emergency detention,” but Tule Lake, a Japanese American internment camp, was proposed as a potential site for detention under the law.

In 1950, the JACL had objected to Title II. But when debate about “concentration camps” and detention without due process emerged again with the funding authorization that would be provided by the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act, “Nisei leaders downplayed the concern over civil liberties” and supported the bill due to its Issei naturalization provision. Scott Kurashige noted that JACL behavior and rationale during this episode was a replica of its stance on internment: “Japanese Americans, as a small minority with little political clout, could not issue immediate challenges to national security directives. Rather, they could only hope to secure the best outcome within parameters dictated by the state.”⁷⁵

1971 Repeal of Title II

The issue of “concentration camps” and Title II of the 1950 Internal Security Act would come to the fore again in the late 1960s and early 1970s with pervasive rumors of an imminent

⁷³ Yang Murray, 254.

⁷⁴ Masumi Izumi, “Prohibiting ‘American Concentration Camps’: Repeal of the Emergency Detention Act and the Public Historical Memory of the Japanese American Internment.” *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 74, No. 2 (May 2005): 169.

⁷⁵ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 204.

“round-up of African Americans and, more generally, radicals.”⁷⁶ These stirrings caught the attention of a Japanese American activist, Raymond Okamura, who argued that the Japanese American community, as “passive beneficiaries of the Black civil rights movement, needed to mobilize for a repeal of Title II.”⁷⁷ Starting with this declaration of interracial unity and solidarity, this movement would take on a radically different tone from any preceding Japanese American lobbying effort.

The principal reason for the marked change was the groundswell of grassroots support for the repeal of Title II- a new generation of community advocates, born of the “breaking of the silence,” were now flexing their newfound political muscle. The targeting of black radicals, was perceived by Sansei activists as a government effort to “repress dissent and deprive ethnic minorities of their rights.”⁷⁸ These issues were at the nexus of the most pressing issues to this generation- the “reawaken[ing] of ethnic pride . . . and heritage” and “resist[ance to] assimilation into mainstream society.”⁷⁹ Joining with groups like the Third World Liberation Front and the Black Panther Party, Japanese American activists mounted an effective campaign, wielding their community’s first hand experience of internment with newfound confidence and inviting application of the lessons of internment to groups outside of the community.

To bring Congress to act on the repeal required more than the advocacy, however well-organized, of activists and organizations with little access to mainstream institutions and seats of power. It was ultimately Mike Masaoka and the JACL who were charged with relaying the threat

⁷⁶ Izumi, “Prohibiting ‘American Concentration Camps,’” 170.

⁷⁷ Yang Murray, 253.

⁷⁸ Izumi, “Prohibiting ‘American Concentration Camps,’” 173.

⁷⁹ Izumi, “Prohibiting ‘American Concentration Camps,’” 174.

that Title II posed for ethnic and political minorities. True to form, he fulfilled this responsibility by steering the talking points away from the concerns raised by Sansei activists and towards the model citizenship of Japanese Americans. Masaoka had initially been opposed to Japanese American involvement in the repeal of Title II, citing the “unnecessary antagonism . . . from the government and the public” that such a movement would create.⁸⁰ Forced into action by community pressure, he nonetheless was able to skillfully steer the Congressional discourse to his tried and tested rhetoric of “superpatriotism” and “model minority” behavior by the Japanese American community.⁸¹ This excerpt from the testimony of Representative Charles Gubser, describing the concerns from the Japanese American community as he introduced the Title II repeal bill in 1970 is indicative of Masaoka’s slight of hand:

“I personally have never seen a Japanese American in jail. I have never seen one on relief. I have never seen one burning a flag or a draft card or inciting a riot. I do not know of any ethnic group which adheres more rigidly to basic American principles than the Japanese Americans.”

The irony here is difficult to miss. As historian Masumi Izumi has delineated, this justification directly “contradicted the grass-roots demand for the Title II repeal, which originated from an anxiety about political repression shared by dissenting groups that *were* ‘burning a flag or a draft card or inciting a riot.’”⁸²

The Title II campaign was the product of a new force in Japanese America in the 1970s: Sansei activism. With this development, the concerns of other minority groups and radicals were

⁸⁰ Izumi, “Prohibiting ‘American Concentration Camps,’” 173.

⁸¹ A narrative that held that the uniform response by JAs in camps had been voluntary military service by those eligible and patient and acquiescent good behavior by the rest of the community.

⁸² Izumi, “Prohibiting ‘American Concentration Camps,’” 184.

now within the purview of Japanese American advocacy. This grassroots mobilization forced the JACL into the unaccustomed position of taking a stand against the government on a divisive issue that could bring backlash to Japanese Americans. Yet by the time policymakers gathered in Washington D.C. to consider the concerns of the Japanese American community, the talking points of the Sansei had been rewritten by the JACL. Despite their dubious tactics and manipulation of the community's history, the lobbying savvy of the JACL had resulted in the repeal of a controversial and dangerous provision. In the years to follow, this persistent whitewashing of history and misrepresentation of the community would become a permanent feature of Japanese American lobbying campaigns.

1976 Rescission of E.O. 9066

To reflect the changes underway in the community as the new Sansei generation came of age, the JACL allowed a "National Liberation Caucus" to be formed in 1970 as part of an "attempt . . . to bring the organization into step with" these new constituencies in the new decade.⁸³ The end of the 1960s had also created new coalitions in Japanese American advocacy, such as the mixed Nisei-Sansei composition of the Manzanar Committee, which had organized pilgrimages to the site of a former internment camp. These new cohorts, impatient and frustrated with the conservative tendencies of the National JACL leadership, recruited enough popular support to push through a JACL resolution in 1970 supporting the pursuit of reparations payments from the federal government for internment. Despite the resolution, the national leadership had no intentions of initiating a campaign for reparations in 1970. They deemed it a

⁸³ Hohri, 36.

near-impossible mission that would only create anti-Japanese American backlash and alienate the conservative politicians that the JACL needed to lobby effectively. While the faction pushing for reparations was a “renegade group” with ambitions and agendas that were far more radical than the national leadership, they were now beginning to make their presence felt in the notoriously conservative and exclusive JACL.⁸⁴ Instrumental to this breakthrough was the unconventional leadership and skills of Edison Uno, the author of the resolution. As “one of the few militant leaders of the . . . community who also had a long history of activism within the JACL,” he was uniquely qualified to find the common ground and foster cooperation between the Nisei and Sansei, as well as radicals and conservatives.⁸⁵ Despite his efforts, the opposition of the national leadership, who ultimately controlled the political connections necessary to mount the type of national campaign necessary for reparations, meant that the resolution was only symbolic for the time being. It would not be until 1973 for anyone within the organization to explore the issue in earnest- and movement would come from the grassroots activists of a local chapter rather than national leaders.

Three years after the 1970 resolution, the Seattle chapter of the JACL received a memo from the organization’s D.C. representative, Barry Matsumoto, asking what, if any, action they would like to take to pursue reparations. At their summer board meeting Cherry Kinoshita, the president of the chapter, relayed the contents of the memo and “asked, without much hope that anyone would reply,” for a volunteer to explore the issue.⁸⁶ Surprisingly, an unfamiliar face at the

⁸⁴ Brian Niiya, *Japanese American History: An A-to-Z Reference from 1868 to the Present*. (Los Angeles: VNR AG, 1993): 289.

⁸⁵ Yang Murray, 187.

⁸⁶ Robert Sadamu Shimabukuro. *Born in Seattle; The Campaign for Japanese American Redress*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001): 16.

meeting, a representative from the Asian Engineers and Technical Employees Association (AETEA), offered to conduct the research. The man was Henry Miyatake, who was not a member of the chapter, but had been sent to the meeting by the AETEA because the association was considering legal action for discrimination against Boeing, a major employer in the Seattle area. Serendipitously, Miyatake had been studying constitutional law and the internment, and even possible legal remedies, on his own. Incarcerated at Minidoka camp in Idaho as a high school student, he had been failed out of the camp school and kept from graduating for writing a Civics class paper on American society's "treatment of Blacks, and Indians and . . . treatment against Orientals."⁸⁷ Haunted and embittered by the loss of education and opportunity during his camp experience, he had begun in 1968 to discuss the incarceration and constitutional law with a friend who was an attorney. Under a constant barrage of questions from Miyatake, the attorney gave him a pass to the University of Washington Law School library and suggested that he conduct his own research. There, he read extensively about the incarceration and developed a keen interest in possible remedies for the injustice done to Japanese Americans. With this background, he jumped at the opportunity offered by the Seattle JACL for a more formal research project on these issues. After the summer board meeting, he quickly organized a committee to undertake the research called the Seattle Evacuation Redress Committee (SERC). By late 1973, SERC had created the "Seattle Plan," the first tangible and actionable reparations proposal within the JACL.

The following year, the JACL National Council established reparations as a "top priority." Reparations had received this designation two years earlier in 1972, but there had not

⁸⁷ Shimabukuro, 7.

been so much as an official “procedure[] or committee[] set up at the national level” after two years.⁸⁸ In 1974, however, with the Pacific Northwest District Council, namely the Seattle chapter led by Miyatake, having undertaken the preliminary research and created a tangible proposal, it seemed that the stars had aligned for real progress on reparations. To share his findings before the national executive board, Miyatake was sent by the Seattle Chapter to their meeting in San Francisco. Despite reparations being officially declared a priority of the national JACL, Miyatake encountered surprising resistance, and even obstruction, to his presentation. After being shortened from the hour and a half he was originally assigned, to the final 30 minutes of the meeting, he was told by national director David Ushio, “You know, we’re not in favor of what you’re doing.”⁸⁹ While discouraged, Miyatake resolved to make another push for national-level action on reparations at an April 1975 meeting of the JACL Political Education Committee, five months after the original rebuff. Slotted again for an hour and a half on the first day of a one and a half day convention, he was informed after consecutive two hour presentations on the obstacles to reparations and the JACL repeal of Title II, that his time would have to be pushed to the next day. In the end, Miyatake was granted the final 10 minutes of the convention, at which point many had already left, to make his case. After the convention, an internal memo by Kaz Oshiki, chair of the Political Education Committee, noted “no burning support” for pursuing reparations from the attendees while labeling Miyatake’s Seattle Chapter a “militant group[] . . . working without any visible support from national.”⁹⁰ Similar to their actions during the WRA resettlement program, the JACL found ways to silence views that diverged from the official

⁸⁸ Shimabukuro, 20.

⁸⁹ Shimabukuro, 21.

⁹⁰ Shimabukuro, 24-25.

narrative advanced by the organization. In the 1940s this repression had been managed through the stigmatization of dissenters with accusations of treachery and top-down cultural enforcement of aberrant behavior. This had been possible because they were recognized by the state as the legitimate spokesperson for the Japanese American community. In 1975, this subtle coercion was made less effective by the resurrection of internment history and the rehabilitation of non-JACL narratives. Instead, the organization was now engaging in more direct obstruction of dissent and burying reparations in the sinkhole of bureaucracy through empty resolutions and “priority” designations.

Rebuffed by high-level leadership who maintained that there was little support for reparations, Miyatake and the SERC now opted for a more direct approach that sought to put the question of reparations in the hands of individual Japanese Americans. In November 1975 SERC sent out 200 packages of materials related to reparations, including an explanatory audio tape and a questionnaire. Recipients included Japanese American newspapers, community organizations, public officials and JACL chapters around the country. The results obtained from 778 respondents directly contradicted assertions made by national leaders. Questioned about their “Willingness to Support Reparations,” 94.4% of respondents stated that they were “Willing.”⁹¹

While Miyatake and the SERC continued with more ground-level efforts such as the questionnaire or face to face meetings with local Japanese American organizations, they sought a more actionable issue to bring Japanese American concerns to a national audience. In Miyatake’s research on reparations, he noticed E.O. 9066 had not been officially rescinded, and “seeing a

⁹¹ Shimabukuro, 28.

great opportunity for public education, he decided that a presidential revocation was in order.” SERC identified Washington Governor Dan Evans, friend of Vice President Nelson Rockefeller and a candidate for the position before Rockefeller was chosen, as the most likely path to an audience with President Gerald Ford.⁹² After numerous meetings between Evans’ Chief of Staff Jamie Dolliver and the Seattle chapter, the Governor pledged his support. With the Governor’s recommendation for a rescission in hand, Dolliver was then able to convince the President of the worthiness of the cause. To see that Japanese Americans got credit for this campaign, Dolliver handed the final arrangements to Mich Matsudaira, the Executive Director of the Governor’s Asian American Affairs Commission. Matsudaira agreed with Miyatake’s assessment that the rescission offered “a good chance for national attention for [reparations]” and that it could provide a “platform to jump off onto . . . [reparations].”⁹³ Yet when Matsudaira contacted JACL D.C. representative Wayne Horiuchi and national director David Ushio about such a national awareness and education campaign drawing on the networks provided by local JACL chapters, he was informed that there would be no need for such communications. Instead, the national leadership would “just call some people.” Horiuchi would later explain that there was no time to mount a national campaign before the President’s rescission and furthermore, a campaign would have encouraged “every ultra right wing ‘nut’” to write the White House in opposition, when the President had already agreed to the proposal.⁹⁴

When Domestic Affairs requested that David Ushio invite those involved in the rescission campaign to the President’s February 19th, 1976 signing, he invited only those that had been

⁹² Shimabukuro, 30.

⁹³ Shimabukuro, 32.

⁹⁴ Shimabukuro, 32.

“strong supporters of JACL and strong supporters of [his].” These invitees were chosen over “people who were stabbing me in the back,” as he would explain later. As a result, absent at the President’s historic signing was Miytake and all other members of the SERC. As Mich Matsudaira would recall, the “reception room [at the White House] was filled with a lot of JACLers who were never involved beforehand, and who had even spoken out against the rescission attempt.”⁹⁵

While the repeated snubs and affronts to Henry Miyatake and the activists of the SERC are galling, the most consequential aspect of this episode was the JACL’s co-optation of a campaign seen by the progenitors as a one-of-a-kind opportunity to make clear to the American public that the internment had not been rectified- not in the hearts of Japanese Americans, and not even on the official books of the United States. The rescission campaign illustrated the JACL’s virtual monopoly on the flow of information exchanged between the Japanese American community and policymakers in Washington D.C. Furthermore, it is difficult to reach any conclusion other than that the JACL leadership was undermining the grassroots initiatives of its local activists and contradicting the will of the community. As representatives of a group finally coming to terms with, and speaking out against, state-sponsored racial injustices both past and present, the challenges to the status quo that the JACL was willing to make on behalf of the community were still circumscribed by the “parameters dictated by the state.”⁹⁶

Reparations and the National JACL in the 1970s

⁹⁵ Shimabukuro, 33.

⁹⁶ Kurashige, *Shifting Grounds of Race*, 204.

Beginning with the unprecedented resolution in 1970, the decade was marked by slow but incremental development in the strength of the reparations movement. The “Seattle Plan” formulated by the SERC in 1973 had created for the first time a tangible and actionable path for reparations. Their education and polling efforts had also made undeniable the widespread support in the community for such a program. The rescission of E.O. 9066 in 1976 had also revived awareness of the internment in political circles and the general public. But without the organizational resources and clout of the JACL, these grassroots efforts could only go so far. And as Edison Uno made clear in comments in 1975, the “JACL leadership, its lobbyists in D.C.” were still opposed despite these community developments. In fact, the “real ‘enemy’” were these influential Japanese Americans who had the power to make traction on reparations on the national stage but “who d[idn’t] want to rock the boat.”⁹⁷ While these leaders were making deterrent arguments, citing prohibitive costs, an unfavorable political climate, and potential backlash,⁹⁸ Issei were dying in alarming numbers - 200 each month.⁹⁹ Edison Uno, the “father of redress,”¹⁰⁰ also passed away in 1976 before the JACL would mobilize its resources for the cause. The ascendance of a Nisei activist and organizational outsider, Clifford Uyeda, to the position of JACL National President in 1978, however, would lead to a sudden change in the organization’s stance and the trajectory of the movement.

⁹⁷ Yang Murray, 290.

⁹⁸ Uno noted that these were the same arguments made by the JACL in their initial opposition to the repeal of Title II in 1971, another grassroots-led effort that forced the JACL into action.

⁹⁹ Hatamiya, 184.

¹⁰⁰ Yang Murray, 290.

Clifford Uyeda, a Nisei pediatrician who had avoided internment because he had been enrolled in medical school in New Orleans,¹⁰¹ had long been weary of the JACL due to their wartime actions and “celebrations of battlefield sacrifices.”¹⁰² But when he heard in 1973 about the unjust treason conviction of Iva Toguri, an American-born Japanese American who had the bad fortune to have been visiting Japan when World War II had broken out, and resolved to do something about it, he recognized that he needed the JACL’s resources and contacts. Using the “JACL’s machinery” of over one hundred chapters around the country, Uyeda commenced a national campaign for the presidential pardon of Toguri.¹⁰³ Though this marked his first efforts at advocacy under the auspices of the JACL, the campaign achieved national reach and was an overwhelming success. In 1977, four years after Uyeda had first heard of Toguri, President Ford granted her a pardon and restored her U.S. citizenship.

Beginning in 1971 with the Title II repeal and continuing in the second half of the decade with the rescission of E.O. 9066 and the Iva Toguri pardon, advocates outside the Japanese American lobbying machine, the JACL, showed they were willing to initiate their own campaigns. These grassroots activists asserted their community’s incarceration experience to constrain the government’s ability to curtail civil liberties and used this history to seek rectification. In this new decade, the rise of Sansei and the coalitions they formed with Nisei activists had put pressure on the JACL to modify its rigid, conservative stances. The President’s signature on the pardon and rescission order had put internment and the Japanese American community back in the national consciousness and an unconventional figure, Clifford Uyeda,

¹⁰¹ His family on the West Coast, however, had been incarcerated.

¹⁰² Yang Murray, 281.

¹⁰³ Yang Murray, 281.

had emerged as a leader that could orchestrate a national effort and “achieve results against long odds.”¹⁰⁴ With his election as National President in 1978, it was clear that despite the misgivings of JACL “old-timers,” the Japanese American community had set their sights on a campaign for reparations.

Redress and the Commission on the Wartime Relocation and Incarceration of Civilians (CWRIC)

Understanding that he had been elected largely due to the belief by the community that “he would breathe life” into the JACL’s “moribund” and listless efforts to explore reparations, Uyeda quickly established a National Committee for Reparations (NCR) and personally wrote “thirty-five articles for the *Pacific Citizen*”¹⁰⁵ to garner support and consensus.¹⁰⁶ As the issue took center stage in the Japanese American community with Uyeda’s election, there were a variety of conflicting opinions about the form that reparations would take. Many conservative leaders “denounced reparations for evoking ‘welfare’” and stated that they would refuse to ‘lower [themselves] to the same level as Blacks or Chicanos asking for relief and handouts.’¹⁰⁷ Mike Masaoka was also repulsed by the idea of reparations. He declared that “setting a price on the priceless sacrifice of freedom was distasteful” and the “idea of seeking individual monetary recompense *for a sacrifice we had accepted in a time of war* was disturbing.” (Emphasis

¹⁰⁴ Yang Murray, 289.

¹⁰⁵ The official newsletter of the JACL.

¹⁰⁶ Yang Murray, 289.

¹⁰⁷ Yang Murray, 292.

Added)¹⁰⁸ Other conservative leaders opined that a community trust fund could be a more appropriate means of backing the apology with compensation. The SERC's Seattle Plan saw the merits of the conservative-led calls for a community trust fund, but insisted that individual compensation be included. Ultimately, after an NCR meeting with the Japanese American members of Congress,¹⁰⁹ the JACL decided the best way forward was not direct legislation for individual compensation or even the community trust fund. Rather, they would take the safer, but more protracted, route of lobbying for a Congressional commission to study the issue before pushing for reparations. And furthermore, the campaign for Japanese American reparations would be now be called "Redress." Even with a redress proponent in the highest-ranking position within the organization, the dominant force in the JACL when it came to the execution of its lobbying agenda was still those that Uno had labeled as the "real enemy" of redress - the "Old Guard" JACLers, lobbyists in D.C., and others "who d[idn't] want to rock the boat."¹¹⁰ Uyeda's aggressive platform as National President had immediately been stalled by the conservative and risk-averse tendencies that were foundational to the organization.

This was an all-too-familiar maneuver in the eyes of William Hohri, a Nisei from Chicago. He had watched as the JACL failed to take a stand in the Civil Rights Movement and the war on Vietnam, two issues which had mobilized many grassroots Japanese Americans. The decision to support legislation for a study commission rather than redress legislation seemed to him another calculated "cop-out."¹¹¹ Hohri wanted the "JACL to understand that the Civil Rights

¹⁰⁸ Yang Murray, 294

¹⁰⁹ Senators Daniel Inouye and Spark Matsunaga, Representatives Norm Mineta and Robert Matsui

¹¹⁰ Yang Murray, 290.

¹¹¹ Hohri, 45.

Movement was for Japanese-Americans as well as blacks; that the Vietnam war came, in part, from a racism that was anti-Asian; that our concentration camp experience had set an ugly precedent Japanese-Americans could address with the authority of first hand experience.” While many were previously unaware of the decisions being made for them in closed-door meetings between the JACL and government officials, Japanese Americans “in 1979, . . . were better informed.”¹¹² Accordingly, activists in Seattle and Chicago split from the JACL redress effort to form the National Council for Japanese American Redress (NCJAR), and offered a sharp rebuke of the JACL in the process. Seattle activist Shosuke Sasaki “denounc[ed] self-serving politicians and ‘Old Time JACLers’ . . . paralyzed by fear of an anti-Japanese American backlash” as “attempt[ing] to delay, de-rail, and confuse the redress issue.”¹¹³ While creating a separate organization allowed the activists to avoid the veto power of the JACL leadership, it also meant they were foregoing established lobbyists in D.C. and the support of Japanese American members of Congress.

The grassroots effort suffered a further diffusion of power when the Chicago and Seattle branches of NCJAR split over differences about the specific form that the legislation would take. When Seattle proposed an “income-tax check off” mechanism by redress recipients that would make redress appear to be “self-funding,” Hohri condemned the plan as “tr[ying] to avoid an issue which should not be avoided: the liability of citizens for the actions of their government.”¹¹⁴ Despite the loss of support from Chicago, Seattle activists pushed forward with the manifestation of their efforts, a bill by Representative Mike Lowry, which recommended

¹¹² Hohri, 45.

¹¹³ Yang Murray, 301.

¹¹⁴ Hohri, 56.

individual reparations of \$10,000 (with an additional \$15 per each day of internment) and a community trust fund. Without support from the Japanese American members of Congress however, the bill could not gain the necessary traction and stalled. The all-important support of the Japanese American members, of course, was not an obstacle for the JACL-backed commission bill. Their bill would be signed into legislation by President Jimmy Carter in July 1980, creating a bipartisan fact-finding body called the Commission for Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC).

Alternative Voices of Redress: William Hohri's Class Action Suit and the National Coalition for Redress/Reparations

Hohri, disillusioned by the “self-funding” proposal from Seattle and the Commission approach adopted by the national JACL in 1979, sought a different course of action that would be more incisive about the twin causes of internment: racial oppression and government misconduct. He proposed a class action lawsuit focusing on a long list of governmental abuses, from “‘conspiring’ to conceal and misrepresent the ‘illegal nature of its actions by fabricating claims of ‘military necessity’” to “making false and patently racist claims concerning alleged disloyal acts and propensities of plaintiffs.”¹¹⁵ Retaining the well-known law firm of Landis, Cohen, Singman and Rauh, Hohri’s lawsuit outlined claims for the “unambiguously adversarial sum of twenty-seven billion dollars.”¹¹⁶ Further, in having excised the conciliatory language and posturing of the JACL and Congressional members, the lawsuit spoke for those who had been marginalized by mainstream Japanese America during the war. These included “No-No’s,” draft

¹¹⁵ Yang Murray, 308.

¹¹⁶ Hohri, 191.

resisters and other protestors, and those “‘radicalized’ by the social movements of the 1960s” who otherwise had no vehicle for the airing of their grievances.¹¹⁷ The oppositional spirit of the lawsuit was made evident in Hohri’s accusation that the embrace of the commission approach was the JACL “bowing to political reality in 1979 much in the way it bowed to military necessity in 1942.”¹¹⁸

Another expression of resistance to the JACL’s approach in pursuing rectification for internment was the National Coalition for Redress/Reparations (NCRP). While conservative leaders had strategically chosen the euphemistic term “redress” for their movement,¹¹⁹ NCRP’s inclusion of “Reparations” in their name was meant to “support[] others who have or are suffering from unjust actions taken by the US government.” Beginning with this branding of their organization, the NCRP could not have been more different from the JACL. In preparation for the hearings held by the CWRIC, the “JACL had urged speakers not to ‘draw comparison’ between Japanese Americans and groups like the Sioux Nation, black slaves, and Jews in the Holocaust” and to not “get verbose in condemning the government’s actions in 1942.” The NCRP, on the other hand, “exhorted Japanese Americans to demonstrate ‘Third World solidarity’ with other victims of racism and to denounce a long history of government oppression.” Rather than screening testimonies by community members in preparation for the public hearings as the JACL had done, the NCRP “sponsored workshops emphasizing a history of racism in the United States and the need for militant action against the government.”¹²⁰ While

¹¹⁷ Yang Murray, 302.

¹¹⁸ Yang Murray, 302.

¹¹⁹ Yang Murray, 292.

¹²⁰ Yang Murray, 314.

JACL leaders counseled that it was “premature to discuss monetary compensation until after the commission released its report,” the NCRR “urged participants in the hearings to demand financial redress for all internees or their heirs.” As Alan Nishio, Sansei Chair of the NCRR made clear, they strove to extricate themselves from the JACL pattern of beginning with “Well, what can we get white people to accept?” and sought to understand “the sentiments of the Japanese American community and . . . articulate that and carry that forward to Washington.”¹²¹

CWRIC Findings

As the NCJAR and the NCRR had made clear, the decision by the JACL to pursue a Congressional fact-finding commission had frustrated many community members. They argued that rectification for the injustice of internment had already been delayed for close to 40 years and more broadly, they were skeptical of the intentions of the JACL. Despite the widespread second-guessing of the organization’s decision (probably warranted given its history), the CWRIC greatly bolstered the Japanese American case for redress and amplified the community’s support for the cause. In hearings held by the nine-member, bipartisan commission in ten cities around the country, hundreds of former internees, some who had never spoken out about their trauma, provided gripping testimony about their incarceration. By many accounts, these hearings were a source of closure and healing for former internees as well as later generations. Never had they been granted an opportunity in a public forum to air grievances (and for later generations, to hear firsthand about the experiences of family, friends, and peers) that they had been forced to suppress for decades. The findings of the CWRIC, submitted in 1983, were also highly

¹²¹ Yang Murray, 319.

favorable. The Commission concluded that the internment had been orchestrated by the federal government despite “no direct military necessity for [mass] detention.”¹²² Instead, its causes had been “race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership.”¹²³ Furthermore, the final report proposed an apology from Congress in the form of a joint resolution, a fund for educational and humanitarian purposes, and in a recommendation that diverged sharply from the conservative philosophy that had led to its creation, the awarding of individual reparations payments of \$20,000 for each surviving internee.

Conclusion

By the 1980s there was little doubt that Japanese Americans had tired of the conciliatory and self-serving stances of the JACL on issues affecting their community. Now armed with the new networks and tools of protest, grassroots Japanese American organizations and activists imagined an engagement with their former (and present) oppressors on radically different terms. With campaigns in the 1970s, these groups had shown that they were willing to circumvent the JACL and provide challenges to the government in ways unprecedented for the Japanese American community. This pressure from the community threatened to encroach on the exclusive authority of the JACL and led to the election of an activist receptive to the grassroots agenda as National President. Despite this change, the reality was that the still-dominant force in Japanese American politics was the JACL “Old Guard” - men like Mike Masaoka who had

¹²² Sharon Yamato, “The Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians,” *Densho Encyclopedia* http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Commission_on_Wartime_Relocation_and_Internment_of_Civilians/ (Accessed Feb 7 2016).

¹²³ Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians* (Seattle: University of Washington Press and Washington D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997), 455.

decades-old networks and connections in the powerful institutions in D.C. and ultimately held the reins of national lobbying campaigns. Despite the efforts of a new cadre of Japanese American advocates to bring the organization to commit to a more aggressive pursuit of redress, when it came to the execution of this platform, it was the conservative ideologies and cautious approaches that were adopted. While Japanese American representatives on the stage of national politics were no longer powerless before federal officials as they had been during World War II, they were still in the practice of reverting to their original concession - that Japanese American citizenship and acceptance was conditional - in advancing their causes. Having been coerced into having to “earn” full citizenship and equal treatment during the war through superior performance on the battlefield, justice for Japanese Americans in the postwar period was once again being “earned” - if not through the symbolic use of the “Nisei soldier” narrative, then through tales of superior “model minority” behavior and “bootstraps” socioeconomic success. As Japanese Americans were readying for an uninhibited final push for redress in the 1980s, the encouraging findings of the CWRIC seemed to provide a solid foundation for legislation that rectified the injustice of internment on the community’s own terms. But what would be the impact of the decades of white-washing and manipulation of the Japanese American community and its history? How would the reliance on the JAACL and its use of one-sided history compromise the vindication of all internees - draft resisters, No-No’s, and renunciants alike - promised by redress?

Thesis Chapter 2: Congressional Deliberations of the 1988 Civil Liberties Act

Introduction

Even cloaked in euphemistic language, Japanese American redress had always been inseparable from the claims of other groups. When Senator Daniel Inouye was initially approached in 1978 about pursuing reparations, he responded that he had “grave reservations about the wisdom of proposing” such legislation due to Congress having recently heard two reparations cases, the native Hawaiian case (rejected) and Native American claims (passed).¹ At the prodding of the first generation to never have experienced the camps, Japanese Americans had just undergone a painful, yet cathartic, reckoning with a deeply repressed past- and here was the most powerful Japanese American individual in American politics pulling the emergency brake. Others well-versed in national politics (namely JACL lobbyists) also counseled against carrying the community demand for redress to Washington. What about redress prompted such “grave concerns” about even introducing legislation? The community was finally ready- what were the leaders so afraid of?

One of the earliest book-length treatments of redress, Leslie Hatamiya’s 1993 Righting a Wrong: Japanese Americans and the Passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 provides extensive insights into minds of the Japanese American members of Congress. Hatamiya draws on electoral interest analysis to explain the imposing list of obstacles bearing down on these four members of Congress. First, one of the near-universal laws of policy-making is that legislation is

¹ Shimabukuro, 40.

“most likely to pass when the benefits are concentrated in a large, organized group and the costs are dispersed among a wide number of unorganized interests.”² Redress fits few of these prerequisites. While organizational clout was disproportionately centered in the JACL, the concentration of the lobbying effort had been diluted by the splintering of NCJAR from the JACL, and even further by the rift between Chicago and Seattle. Secondly, Japanese Americans were a minuscule percentage of the American population, which would be bearing an additional tax burden for an event from over 40 years ago. The tiny number of Japanese Americans, and their concentration in just a handful of states, meant that for politicians obsessed with reelection, they would gain practically no electoral advantage with their constituents by coming out in favor of a redress bill.³

To propose a \$1.5 billion bill in the face of these odds was unappealing and risky- to do so in a fiscal crisis that would soon force Congress to pass the nation’s first binding spending constraints⁴, calling for “automatic sequestration . . . and across-the-board reductions for each federal account,” was downright laughable.⁵

Less obvious were international forces that provided less quantifiable, but nonetheless potent, impediments to a successful legislative campaign. At the peak of its postwar “Economic Miracle,” Japan was running a significant trade surplus in the 1980s with the U.S. As a result, “Japan-bashing” was an acceptable and frequent practice in the halls of Congress and in mass media. In this climate, Japanese Americans involved in the legislative process had to consider a

² Leslie Hatamiya, *Righting a Wrong: Japanese Americans and the Passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 32.

³ Hatamiya, 3.

⁴ Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Balanced Budget Act

⁵ Hatamiya, 50.

disheartening reality - that when hearing of the redress bill and its \$1.5 billion price tag, many American citizens, and even politicians, would still be unable to make distinctions between the Japanese state, and Japanese Americans. Even if they escaped this conflation that had originally caused the internment, the mention of “Japan” was sure to invite spirited opposition that had nothing to do with the actual substance of the proposal.

Yet on April 20th, 1988 a majority of both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate supported the once untouchable legislation- 69 votes in favor and 27 in opposition. Having passed the House by a similar margin, the redress bill was now on the way to President Ronald Reagan to be signed into law. In Hatamiya’s analysis of the voting records, she found that while “percentage of Asian Americans” in a Congress member's constituency was predictive of that member’s support, it was much more difficult to understand why just as many votes in favor came from members with an electorate “less than 1% Asian American.”⁶ In light of the failure of the usually potent electoral interest model, Hatamiya turned to a more journalistic approach of interviews with the key players- from members of Congress to staff and lobbyists. Her conclusions were that in the absence of either “a noticeable Japanese American (or Asian American) community []or a vocal and organized opposition,” redress became a “throwaway” vote in which members of Congress had the rare opportunity to vote their conscience.⁷ Thus, the emotional impact of face-to-face lobbying of Japanese American members (Senator Spark Matsunaga is said to have met with all Senators about the issue), grassroots appeals from regular members of the community, and the work of “surrogate Nikkei,”⁸ “someone who fought

⁶ Hatamiya, 63.

⁷ Hatamiya, 75.

⁸ “Nikkei” is another term for JA and is used interchangeably.

alongside Japanese American soldiers . . . and knew what [they] had gone through” was unusually effective in garnering support from members of Congress.⁹

Members of the Japanese American political brain trust had universally balked at a legislative pursuit of redress in the early 1980s. The timing was all wrong- the country was on the verge of fiscal crisis and a Republican President known for his conservative racial policies was in office. Yet the legislation was ultimately met by a widespread embrace from both sides of the aisle and signed by President Reagan. While Hatamiya’s account provided important insights from first-hand accounts by key players, this transformation of redress is worthy of further investigation and the posing of questions beyond the scope of Hatamiya’s analysis. In the decades to follow, the work of a handful of scholars would address the gnawing concerns that arise upon reading Hatamiya’s cheerful account. The rest of this chapter is dedicated to this body of scholarship, from the burgeoning work on reparations and apologies,¹⁰ and why/when/to whom states award them, about the potential folly of “engaging the state to rectify state-implemented inequalities,”¹¹ and more broadly the “limits of the nation-state as an instrument of justice.”¹² Additional scholarship on the international levers and forces that have compelled nation-states to commit resources and attention to domestic racial strife will also be introduced.

Secondary Literature

⁹ Hatamiya, 155.

¹⁰ Alice MacLachlan, “The State of ‘Sorry’: Official Apologies and their Absence” *Journal of Human Rights* Vol. 9 no. 3 (2010): 373-385.

¹¹ Victor Bascara, “Cultural Politics of Redress: Reassessing the Meaning of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 after 9/11.” *Asian American Law Journal* Vol. 10 Issue 2 (2003): 188.

¹² Bascara, 197.

For many Japanese Americans “interest in redress faded soon after President Reagan signed the 1988 Civil Liberties Act, a common attitude being, ‘I’ve got mine.’”¹³ This statement in 1998 by Sachi Seko in the JACL’s *Pacific Citizen* certainly undersells the post-redress advocacy of Japanese Americans in the defense of civil liberties and to ensure that the internment did not fade from public memory. But to the extent that Japanese Americans employed the historical memory of internment in political discourse (which they had done to great effect before redress), it was almost exclusively in response to events and proposals that invoked direct comparisons to Japanese American internment, such as then-General Attorney John Ascroft’s call for internment camps for Muslim Americans after 9/11. This narrow view of internment - as an out-of-character, wartime mistake - had been the dominant interpretation in the redress legislative process. In Congress, internment had been rendered as a singular tragedy in American history. Similarly, members of Congress emphasized the steadfast patriotism of Japanese Americans - their unparalleled military heroics and the way they had rebuilt their communities without complaint. This discourse had been strenuously cultivated by both the conservative Japanese American leadership and Congress and had the intended impact of limiting the applicability of redress to other past (and on-going) injustices and to the claims of other groups. Internment had been a momentary lapse in judgment in a trying time for the country and did not indicate that racial prejudice was foundational and persistent in American society.

Yet there had been alternative interpretations of internment and redress by Japanese Americans that rejected such a neat dichotomy between the past and present, between their experiences and those of other communities of color. From Sansei activists who identified the

¹³ Eric K. Yamamoto, “Racial Reparations: Japanese American Redress and African American Claims” *Boston College Third World Law Journal* Vol. 19 no. 1 (1998): 483.

internment within a continuum of racial prejudice and exploitation; to “Zoot-suiters” who rejected state-administered assimilation into the white middle class by aligning with “working-class brown and black folk”; to the NCRR who during the commission process worked to undo the JACL-led muzzling of the Japanese American community; to William Hohri, whose \$27 billion class action suit railed against governmental abuse, these alternative voices had articulated a different vision of the history of internment. Redress and its pursuit, became not only a symbolic remedy of past injustice, but a bulwark against an ever-present threat. So what of this important legacy of internment and redress history? To uncover its fate takes little investigation. Tell-tale signs of the primacy of the white-washed history presented by Japanese American leadership and Congress are plastered all over the legislation. First, the redress bill had been named H.R. 442, after the 442nd Infantry Regiment, a segregated all-Japanese American unit, which suffered an unparalleled number of fatalities due to a pattern of deployment in the most dangerous of combat situations, and thus retains the dubious privilege of being the most decorated military unit in American history. As if this were not enough, the House vote on H.R. 442 was scheduled to coincide with the bicentennial of the signing of the Constitution. The achievement of redress was far from a moral reckoning. It was closer to a PR campaign about the triumph of American government and a validation of the righteousness of its systems and principles. The internment was being highlighted to serve as juxtaposition to a present absent of such racial prejudice and state oppression.

As early as 1992, two years after the first payments were made to the oldest surviving internees, Japanese American commentators had cautioned that “reparations law’s salient meanings lie not in the achievement of payments and apologies . . . or in symbolic constitutional

victories, but in the commitment of recipients . . . to contribute to broad-based institutional and attitudinal restructuring.”¹⁴ This exact point, of course, had been a constant refrain throughout the redress movement for non-JACL redress groups like the NCRR and William Hohri’s NCJAR. Considering the one-sided version of internment history adopted by the legislation, to what extent had this ambitious expectation of redress been thwarted and compromised before the community could undertake the work? How was the excision of these grassroots and radical redress narratives intertwined with the bill’s ascendance from politically untenable to one with an unprecedented number of co-sponsors?¹⁵

Perhaps due to the sense of closure and finality that the 1988 legislation brought, there has been little critical engagement with redress and how it was won. Before redress, the Japanese American quest for justice, fueled by never-ending skepticism of government motives, of tireless efforts to fill and recover silences in the historical record, had yielded documents that overturned Supreme Court decisions¹⁶ and had freed an entire community from shame and guilt repressed for decades. Post-redress, the literature has been limited to the work of several pioneering legal scholars, all of whom contributed to a 1998 symposium held by the *Boston College Third World Law Journal* titled “The Long Shadow of *Korematsu*,” and which remarkably makes up the bulk of the work on the subject.

¹⁴ Eric K. Yamamoto, “Friend, Foe or Something Else: Social Meanings of Redress and Reparations” *Denver Journal of International Law and Politics* Vol. 20 (1992): 224.

¹⁵ During the floor vote in the Senate, Senator Inouye announced his belief that “this is the first time any measure has reached this stage with 73 cosponsors.”

¹⁶ See Thomas, Fujita-Rony, “Destructive Force: Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga's Gendered Labor in the Japanese American Redress Movement” *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* Vol. 24, no. 1 (January 2003): 38-60.

The aforementioned 1992 article by Eric Yamamoto titled “Friend, or Foe or Something Else: Social Meanings Of Redress And Reparations,” provided the first enumeration of the possible interpretations of redress in its immediate aftermath. The celebratory atmosphere described previously fits into what he deemed the “salutary views” of redress: primarily that the Constitution works, that the state is “ultimately responsive to peoples’ rights” and “societal mistakes can be transformed . . . into social progress.”¹⁷ Importantly, Yamamoto noted that these “salutary views” are from an “unstated vantage point,” that of mainstream America. At this point, he introduced the “critical views,” which asks of redress two questions: 1. What is the impact of redress “on institutional and legal structures of government power to restrict fundamental freedoms of minorities in the United States?”¹⁸ 2. What is the impact of redress on “societal attitudes towards and actions concerning Asian Americans?”¹⁹ While he stressed that the impact of redress was yet undetermined, he offered two examples that suggested that the “critical views,” which by their nature are marginal and at risk of being suppressed, demanded greater attention. On the restructuring of governmental power, he pointed to the activities of the FBI during the Gulf War which had ended in 1991, a year before publication of the article. The FBI had engaged in an “aggressive campaign of interrogation of Iraqi Americans . . . , implying by manner and style a presumption of disloyalty by reason of race.”²⁰ Furthermore, in actions “resembling the . . . disastrous approach in *Korematsu* in 1944,” the Supreme Court had sanctioned these abuses through “its deference to unsubstantiated government assertions of

¹⁷ Yamamoto, “Friend or Foe,” 229.

¹⁸ Yamamoto, “Friend or Foe,” 230.

¹⁹ Yamamoto, “Friend or Foe,” 230.

²⁰ Yamamoto, “Friend or Foe,” 234.

necessity.” On the second question of societal attitudes toward Asian Americans, he cited aggressive “Japan-bashing” by politicians due to the perceived economic threat posed by Japan and alarmist public discourse about the “Japanizing” of America as evidence that after redress, Asian Americans were “once again permissible targets.”²¹

In 1998, the *Boston College Third World Law Journal*, a legal periodical dedicated to “discussing legal issues affecting people, cultures, and institutions that share a common history of colonialism, oppression, under-representation, and marginalization,” held a symposium titled “The Long Shadow of *Korematsu*.” Further inquiry into the subject of the legacy of redress, from its connection to African American and Japanese Peruvian reparations was greatly advanced by the research conducted for this occasion. Of particular interest to this paper, are two articles, by Chris Iijima and Eric Yamamoto, that uncovered the subtext of the enthusiastic support for redress from members of Congress.

Chris Iijima

By contextualizing close analysis of the Congressional discourse with the JACL’s “accommodation” of government injustice before, during and after the war, Iijima argued that redress was a “reward [for] acquiescence, rather than the righting of wrongs” that it was celebrated as.²² With redress, Japanese American leadership had once again been made complicit in allowing the internment experience to be turned into yet another illustration of the “model minority” myth- the exploitative use of Asian Americans to resolve claims made by other

²¹ Yamamoto, “Friend or Foe,” 236.

²² Chris Iijima, “Reparations and the ‘Model Minority’ Ideology of Acquiescence: The Necessity to Refuse the Return to Original Humiliation” *Boston College Law Review* Vol. 40 (1998): 397.

communities of color that racial prejudice and oppression are fundamental and persistent in American society. Furthermore, Iijima dismantled the redress legislative process as an abuse of history. In the face of widely-available evidence²³, the JACL and members of Congress essentially erased all mention of Japanese American resistance and protest both during and after internment. These “heroic ‘others,’” such as draft resisters and No-No boys, which redress activists had recovered and reclaimed, were excluded, while “reference to the heroism and success of the segregated Japanese-American Army unit, the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, [was] typical.”²⁴ All in all, Iijima concluded this was no oversight but a pernicious and calculated doctoring of the historical record to further conservative ideologies and to send a message to other communities of color that this was an exceptional case with no application to their grievances. He saw a contradiction within the purported aim of redress - “to discourage the occurrence of similar injustices and violations of civil liberties in the future”- and the celebration of accommodation of government injustice as the bill was being deliberated. He concluded that the Japanese American leadership and Congress had both missed the most important lesson of internment, and asked: “Should not the lesson that we as a nation learn from the experience . . . be that when injustice happens we should listen better to the dissenters and the protesters against that injustice?”²⁵

²³ Iijima cites the following as a sample of the well-documented instances of resistance and protest within the camp. 1. farm strike at Tule Lake in 1942 2. construction strike at Tule Lake 9/3 1942, petition and mess hall “slowdown” at Tule Lake 4. strike at Poston 5. riot at Manzanar, machine guns fired by soldiers, ten wounded and two killed 6. strike by coal crew at Tule Lake 7. strike at Tule Lake over working conditions that injured 29 and killed 1 8. 200 person hunger strike over imposition of martial law

²⁴ Iijima, 397.

²⁵ Iijima, 409.

Eric Yamamoto: Racial Reparations

Eric Yamamoto's contribution for the same symposium, "Racial Reparations: Japanese American Redress and African American Claims," also explored how redress became an ideological tool to bolster the status quo. He suggested that Japanese American leadership, and Japanese Americans in general, were part of a "transactional exchange along the lines of 'we'll admit you into the club for now if you don't challenge our exclusion of others.'"²⁶ The most important contribution of his piece was that it made clear that the work of redress was not finished. While the redress campaign may have succeeded in an "adjustment of individual attitudes towards [this particular] historical injustice," the connection and application of these lessons to other injustices, and "fundamental realities of power," was not inevitable.²⁷ Here, he anticipated the aforementioned limiting of Japanese American advocacy to cases with explicit parallels to their internment experience. Yamamoto argued that post-redress Japanese American advocates needed to be vigilant, not in searching for an exact replica of internment, but for the warning signs that communities might be vulnerable to political disenfranchisement and economic exploitation. Furthermore, he stressed that the legacy of redress will be decided by the extent to which "Japanese Americans--community and legal organizations, media, politicians, educators . . . len[d] organizational help and political and legal muscle to the movements of others."²⁸

²⁶ Eric K. Yamamoto, "Racial Reparations: Japanese American Redress and African American Claims" *Boston College Third World Law Journal* Vol. 19 no. 1 (1998): 501.

²⁷ Yamamoto, "Racial Reparations," 479.

²⁸ Yamamoto, "Racial Reparations," 484.

Cathleen Kozen

Many scholars have established that American policy towards racial minorities has always been tightly coupled with strategic international considerations - from efforts to appease allies, to fight communism, and to provide evidence that America's claim to global moral leadership is justified.²⁹ Cathleen Kozen's 2012 article, "Redress as American-style Justice: Congressional Narratives of Japanese American Redress at the End of the Cold War," found that redress was no exception to this pattern. Kozen argued that the Congressional spectacle and lofty language of redress was not simply self-congratulatory but also "produced by and for particular global historical forces and international audiences."³⁰ Not only did the ahistorical Congressional depiction of internment and redress seek to undermine the validity of the claims of other vulnerable domestic groups, it also was meant to project "global imaginings of an international humanitarian regime of which the US would reign as its just and moral leader."³¹ Redress was a particularly potent means of taming the unsavory elements of the past, and through "amnesic remembering," redress legislation could "ultimately imbue [the internment episode] with a heroic finale to serve as representative proof of the essential good of the nation."³²

Like Iijima, Kozen also concluded that the exclusive focus on Japanese American's "accommodation" and "superpatriotic response," despite "much documentation of the resistance

²⁹ See Scott Kurashige on FDR's antidiscrimination bill during war effort in 1941, Derrick Bell, "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma" (1980), and Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*.

³⁰ Cathleen K. Kozen, "Redress as American-style justice: Congressional narratives of Japanese American redress at the end of the Cold War" *Time Society* Vol. 21, no. 2 (March 2012): 114.

³¹ Kozen, 115.

³² Kozen, 110.

tactics employed by internees,” was a calculated decision. The “rehabilitation and reassertion of a particular brand of American exceptionalism - one that rested on the production of the US as a mighty, just and, specifically, racially inclusive nation” demanded that these narratives be sacrificed “to enable the prevailing narratives.”³³ To Kozen, this “signal[ed] both the political limits of redress as a radical politics toward global justice and the need for an alternative paradigm.”³⁴

Primary Research: Senate and House Floor Votes

Kozen’s closing argument is particularly disheartening- at present, reparations represents the outermost fringe of the political imagination. Of the policy options currently being discussed to combat racial disparities and inequities, reparations are often dismissed out of hand as being politically impossible.³⁵ Reparations for Japanese Americans was, as community leaders and members of Congress made abundantly clear, not meant to address racial inequality in the present but to rectify a historical injustice. Even with these more limited aims, there are serious doubts about the legislative process’s ability to facilitate historical discussion that disabuses the story of Japanese Americans of the misinformation and distortions that had been woven into these narratives.

In reading the floor debate in the House and Senate before their respective votes on the redress legislation, one encounters endless references to the naming of the bill after the 442nd

³³ Kozen, 106.

³⁴ Kozen, 116.

³⁵ See Ta-nehisi Coates, “Why Precisely is Bernie Sanders Against Reparations?” *Atlantic*, January, 29, 2016. <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/01/bernie-sanders-reparations/424602/>

Infantry Regiment and soaring rhetoric about the vote occurring on the bicentennial of the signing of the Constitution. These two elements were included in the preface to nearly every statement. The detrimental impact of focusing exclusively on these points has been addressed previously. Once the members moved past this exaggerated pomp, the misinformation and ignorance evident in their statements was more alarming. The comments of even those in support pointed to an incredibly simplistic and one-sided understanding of the Japanese American response to internment. Congressman William J. Hughes, in his enthusiastic support for the bill, noted that “these fellow citizens accepted this treatment with grace and dignity, and never flagged in their loyalty to the United States.”³⁶ Senator Pete Wilson, a co-sponsor of the bill, began his statement of support by describing the decision to incarcerate Japanese Americans as “a terrible failure of judgment,” but one that “seemed entirely reasonable” at the time.³⁷ The main finding of the CWRIC, of course, had been that the decision to evacuate and incarcerate were made *despite* reports from the FBI and Naval Intelligence that Japanese Americans posed no threat to domestic security and that exclusion on an individual basis was sufficient. Contrary to Wilson’s statement, the decision, if based on defense and security considerations, had been an irrational one. Somehow both supporters and opposition opened their statements with similar arguments: that we must be wary of using 20/20 hindsight to judge actions taken by national leaders during the chaos and panic after Pearl Harbor. Appeals to this “balanced” understanding of the circumstances littered the entire deliberation.

A common complaint in many of the statements was that many of the historical actors were not able to offer their account of these events and justify the actions being condemned by

³⁶ *Cong. Rec.*, 100th Cong., 1st sess., 1987, vol. 133, pt. 17: 24288.

³⁷ *Cong. Rec.*, 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1998, vol. 134, pt. 6: 7545.

the legislation. A particular point of anguish for many in the opposition was that distinguished leaders in American history, such as President Franklin D. Roosevelt,³⁸ were being judged without the ability to defend themselves. These commitments to a comprehensive and nuanced historical evaluation did not extend, however, to the wide swaths of the incarcerated population, such as “draft resisters,” renunciants, repatriates, and protestors, who had been systematically erased from the Congressional record. The closest that the members came to broaching the subject was in Senator Spark Matsunaga’s recounting of the many hardships faced by Japanese Americans in the camps. Particularly traumatizing for the community were the “internees who were shot and killed by camp guards because they inadvertently wandered too close to the camp barbed wire fences.”³⁹ Of course, Japanese Americans had been killed by the camp guards for less innocuous reasons, such as when soldiers fired into a crowd of rioters during the guards’ crackdown on the “Manzanar Riot/Uprising.”⁴⁰

It is needless to say that even the mention of these silenced narratives at this point in the process would have been a startling and unimaginable departure from the internment and redress story that had been sold to members of Congress and their constituents. Citizenship and belonging had been earned, or at least proven, by the “grace and dignity” with which Japanese Americans accepted their internment and through military sacrifice that made the segregated Japanese American unit the single most decorated unit of its size. Redress was being awarded based on these narratives. The statements by the members of Congress made this clear. Here, we

³⁸ Signed E.O. 9066

³⁹ *Cong. Rec.*, 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1998, vol. 134, pt. 6: 7547.

⁴⁰ The riot/uprising had been triggered by the arrest of Harry Ueno for the beating of JACL official Fred Tayama. Besides the killing of two rioters and injuries to many others, the riot/uprising led to the institution of martial law at Manzanar.

must ask, how had Japanese Americans been coerced again into the acceptance of a double standard, more subtle, but a double standard nonetheless, that citizenship and civil rights had to be earned for those who did not fit neatly into mainstream America?

A look at the Japanese American representatives permitted in the halls of Congress offered some clues in this regard. In the Subcommittee Hearing held by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations on H.R. 442, the only civilian Japanese Americans invited to provide testimony were Mike Masaoka, representing the Go For Broke Nisei Veteran Association, and through the unusual granting of a request to have two representatives from one organization, Harry Kajihara and Grace Uyehara, National President and Executive Director (Legislative Education Committee) of the JACL.

The danger of being cast as the “model minority,” aside from the harm it does to other vulnerable groups as a tool of white supremacy, is the crippling of the ability to make autonomous decisions about how the community will be represented. The tenuous position of the “model minority” inevitably leads to dependency and the imposition of the will of dominant powers on the community. These final stages of the redress movement, and the community representatives invited to participate, are perhaps the best illustration of this, and what was meant by Iijima when he suggested that the enduring theme of redress was “reward [for] acquiescence rather than the righting of wrongs.”⁴¹

By all accounts, both perpetration and accommodation of government injustice had been rewarded in the aftermath of internment. The wholesale exploitation of the Japanese American community was a mere blip on the radar for the architects of the program whose “failures of

⁴¹ Iijima, 397.

political leadership” nonetheless saw them take ever more powerful positions after the war.

Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy⁴² subsequently became president of the World Bank and U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, John L. DeWitt⁴³ was made full General by a special act of Congress for his service during World War II, and California Attorney General Earl Warren⁴⁴ would go on to become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

On the other side, cooperation with the government by leaders like Mike Masaoka yielded communication channels to Congress, the Executive branch and political networks with the well-connected. The JACL, minted with the government stamp of legitimacy and authority, would go on to monopolize the power to represent the community for decades thereafter. The postwar fate of those who resisted and protested the injustice of internment could not have been more divergent. They were ostracized by mainstream Japanese America, and systematically kept from positions of institutional leadership. Thus, it should be no surprise that the Japanese Americans providing testimony on redress were two veterans of the 442nd Infantry Regiment⁴⁵, two current leaders of the JACL, and the former spokesperson and face of the JACL during World War II⁴⁶.

Subcommittee Hearing

⁴² McCloy was a strong supporter of internment and had dismissed a report stating the Navy and FBI’s finding that JAs presented no security risk.

⁴³ Commanding general of the Western Defense Command and a main architect of internment.

⁴⁴ Vocal proponent of internment and provided faulty evidence which was cited by DeWitt in his influential report on the need for internment.

⁴⁵ Senators Daniel Inouye and Spark Matsunaga

⁴⁶ Mike Masaoka

The hearing on April 29th, 1987, in the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations to which H.R. 442 had been assigned, was a case of “one step forward and two steps back.” In reading the record, it was quickly apparent that the smaller size of the subcommittee was more amenable to in-depth discussion and engagement with the substantive aspects of the bill. Comments and questions by the members were more informed and revealed a greater facility with the findings of the CWRIC. Most importantly, misinformed comments were challenged, if not corrected on the record- something that would not happen on the floor of the House and Senate later in the process. With the supportive and sympathetic leadership of subcommittee chair Representative Barney Frank (MA), the presence of Japanese American members of Congress was not merely superficial or symbolic (as it would be on the House and Senate floor), and they were able to exercise their authority and familiarity with both internment history and the legislation itself. One of the most remarkable moments came when Representative Norm Mineta addressed in his testimony that a Department of Justice task force had recently recommended the “mass round-up and incarceration of certain nationalities for vague national security reasons” replete with “rolls of barbed wire, cots, tents, et cetera” already on the site of a proposed location in Louisiana.⁴⁷ This statement was very much against the grain of accepted practice in the deliberations of the bill. The lessons of internment, members of Congress made clear, were not to be applied to present-day practices, because such a singular

⁴⁷ Hearing before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, HR 442, Civil Liberties Act of 1987, 100th Cong., April 29, 1987, 56.

and uncharacteristic mistake had no contemporary parallel. Instead, the lessons were to be a safeguard for an always unspecified and unnamed future threat.⁴⁸

The obfuscation of the findings of the CWRIC with pleas to give proper due to the complexity and context of the decisions made by wartime leadership, unchallenged in the floor debates, found no audience with the subcommittee. Subcommittee Chair Barney Frank dedicated considerable time to chastising the statement of the representative of the Department of Justice (DOJ), Richard K. Willard, the Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division. To the DOJ's objection to wartime leadership being "accused of dishonorable behavior" in the CWRIC report, Rep. Frank stressed that the fixation on the judgment of the legacy of individuals missed a larger point about the forces that gave rise to the internment. He stated:

"Part of what I think we want to say is, part of the problem was, it was a racist society, and we ought to recognize the poison that comes when a society is racist. . . It is not that we had an unusually unrepresentatively prejudiced group of leaders at the time, we had leaders who probably, unfortunately, shared prejudices that were widespread in the society, and that's one of the things that we're trying to talk about, that when racial prejudice is at a fairly high level in this society . . . bad things can happen."⁴⁹

Rep. Frank's point raises questions about the silencing of another unsavory aspect of internment history in the Congressional discourse- the role that local politicians, business leaders, and

⁴⁸ To see evidence of the total inability of members of Congress to grasp the "systemic" and "institutional" racial prejudice that was a primary cause of internment, see the comments of Congressman Dan Lungren who was the one active member of Congress on the CWRIC: "If we believe or we lead our Nation to believe that this decision by Franklin Delano Roosevelt was primarily in response to racial prejudice, we mistake his decision, we do ourselves a disservice because we take no lessons out of this to apply to the future. If it is as simple as that, we did not need a commission. If we in fact believe that to be true (race prejudice as primary cause), it will give us no lessons for the future because we are all against race prejudice." This is an example of the simplistic and misguided view "racist acts" by individuals are the only manifestation of "racism". Even if one does not engage in actively racist behavior, they cannot extricate themselves from fundamental systems and institutions that are founded on racist principles and assumptions.

⁴⁹ HR 442, *Hearing*, 160.

ordinary Americans, in some cases neighbors to Japanese Americans, were agitating for their removal during the war.

The takeaway from analyzing this portion of the hearings was that while the subcommittee was still unable to facilitate a truly honest and open reckoning with this episode, the discussions held were far more forthright, cutting through the diversionary noise of the floor debates. Credit must be given to the strict marshaling of discussion by Rep. Frank and the Japanese American members of Congress. The civilian Japanese American representatives, however, did little with their opportunity to challenge and expand the narrow and sanitized interpretation of the issues at hand. Considering the ties of the three civilian Japanese Americans to testify with the conservative JACL, this was hardly surprising. While the testimony of JACL National President Harry Kajihara was generic in this regard, the statements by Grace Uyehara, Executive Director of the JACL Legislative Education Committee, and Mike Masaoka, representing the Go For Broke Nisei Veterans Association, not only contained dubious historical statements but also direct advocacy for Congress to adopt a doctored and one-sided narrative of internment, and is deserving of further scrutiny.

The Question of Precedent

The statements of the Executive Director of the JACL's Political Education Committee, Grace Uyehara, were narrowly focused on allaying the concerns and objections to the proposed legislation by members of Congress. Her testimony was almost entirely devoted to the thorny question of precedent- whether Japanese American redress would open the floodgates to claims from other groups victimized by government injustice. She was firm in stating that she and the

Legislative Education Committee believed these fears to be unfounded. Her explanation for this belief will be astounding to any half-serious student of American history: she suggested that “when we look for cases of people alive today who were themselves directly injured by the Federal Government because of their race or ethnicity, the incarceration of Japanese Americans stands out as unprecedented.”⁵⁰

The rest of her testimony, if less objectionable on factual grounds, was equally compromised by her desperation to appease those who might oppose the bill. The “ethnic or race basis” of individual reparations payments had been a point of contention for much of the opposition in the legislation’s formulation. To those opponents, she had the following statement:

“The \$20,000 payment to each individual is not to be made on an ethnic or race basis. The payments are to be made only to those individuals who were victims of Executive Order 9066. This is an important point. . . . Precisely, because the original injustice was to treat everyone of Japanese descent on the basis of race without individual review or due process, it is important to remember that the principal remedy **reverses** this and provides compensation to those specific individuals who were victims of specific discrimination by the federal government.”⁵¹

Uyehara’s discussion of this “reversal” was at best a circuitous and nonsensical slight of hand, and at worst, accommodation of the efforts to neutralize the indictment of racial prejudice and exploitation that any redress legislation must take as its central critique. To be certain, strategic lobbying required the careful tuning and adjustment of arguments and evidence to garner the broad support necessary for passage. And the JA leadership’s calculation that they had to trod over the claims of other groups in order to achieve redress was illustrative of a coercive and manipulative relationship. Nonetheless, this testimony must be seen as the squandering of one of

⁵⁰ HR 442, *Hearing*, 243.

⁵¹ HR 442, *Hearing*, 271.

the precious few opportunities afforded to Japanese Americans to foster more critical introspection and reckoning within the Congressional discourse.

Mike Masaoka

Masaoka dedicated much of his testimony to the historical production of narratives. He rejected the creation of an official history of internment “confined to what may have been known or thought to be known at just one particular moment in time and never changed and/or corrected as later developments dictate.”⁵² Yet his stated respect for the historical process was tempered by his fervent commitment to ensure that the Japanese American chapter of the American story be a patriotic one. Rather than seeking a nuanced or balanced account, Masaoka argued that the historical record of the internment should “be as upbeat as possible, affirmative as sentiments will permit, and patriotic and as pro-democracy and American as the actual conditions warrant,” rather than “critical and negative as possible.”⁵³ More specifically, he argued that “Japanese American war veterans should be utilized as representative of the evacuee population” that would “perform so well that as a racial minority we gained from the Congress and the courts more in the way of civil and human rights, social acceptance, and equal opportunities for ourselves and our posterity than we ever dreamed of in the prewar era.”⁵⁴ Afforded an opportunity to make clear that the original concession by the wartime JACL, that Japanese Americans would prove and earn rights of citizenship and equal treatment, had been based on the

⁵² HR 442, *Hearing*, 350.

⁵³ HR 442, *Hearing*, 352.

⁵⁴ HR 442, *Hearing*, 353.

fundamentally unjust terms offered by the government and American society, Masaoka instead doubled down on his actions and agreed to the same concession in redress.

Later, he argued against “attempting to revise the evaluation of the evacuation experience by denouncing the cooperation, collaboration, and 100% Americanism of those who though reluctantly and with unanswered questions, participated in the 1942 evacuation process without violence and unique demonstrations.”⁵⁵ Besides this claim that the “evacuation process” was conducted “without violence and unique demonstrations” being verifiably untrue, the statement was also revelatory of his earlier statement against an “official” and static history of internment “confined to what may have been known or thought to be known at just one particular moment in time and never changed and/or corrected as later developments dictate.”⁵⁶ There, he was not endorsing the Sansei-led reevaluation of internment in the 1960s and 1970s which was responsible for igniting the redress movement.⁵⁷ Instead he was championing something closer to the philosophy that “the ends justify the means.” Despite fierce criticism from many Japanese Americans, Masaoka had maintained for over 40 years that “we had no real alternative to [the] cooperative and collaborative activity” undertaken by the wartime JACL. Redress, with its extended discourse on the present-day success of Japanese Americans in Congress and in the media, was the perfect forum for the final vindication of his wartime actions.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ HR 442, *Hearing*, 353.

⁵⁶ HR 442, *Hearing*, 350.

⁵⁷ Bascara, “Cultural Politics of Redress,” 202. “More than simply writing that “chapter” into American history, internment became perhaps the prime example of how revisionism had to be a more fundamentally radical procedure than simply adding facts we had not previously known.”

⁵⁸ HR 442, *Hearing*, 354.

To Masaoka, the knowledge that the historical narratives of redress would contribute not only to Japanese American history, but American history, signaled that there were greater imperatives and responsibilities in the formulation of these narratives beyond aiming for historical comprehensiveness. He was willing, his statements made clear, to sacrifice the controversial and less palatable, but no less integral, aspects of his community's history to the amnesic demands of nation-building. That he did so as an advocate for a community victimized by a state-run program of racial discrimination and exploitation, at hearings meant to hold the state accountable for those actions, is alarming. In his comments about the selection of narratives to be included in the historical record of internment, he was alluding to the flexibility and discretion inherent in the historical interpretation of events. Yet to the historian, and more importantly, the countless Japanese Americans who counted on him to faithfully represent and articulate their grievances, Masaoka's self-serving cherry-picking of historical facts is unacceptable and tragic.

Floor Debate and Subcommittee Hearing

In this chapter, I sought to build on Kozen's findings by bringing to the same source materials, Congressional narratives, an awareness of the long, complex history of Japanese American lobbying efforts described in Chapter 1. On the floor of both the House and Senate, comments by members of Congress revealed a very elementary understanding of internment history and the redress movement. It was clear that the Congress's preoccupation with a careful weighing of context and bias in the historical evidence only extended to the judgment of venerated American leaders, and there was little awareness that entire groups of Japanese

Americans and episodes in the community's history were being erased by the legislative process. Supplementing this analysis with the testimony of civilian Japanese Americans, given in a subcommittee hearing before the floor votes, clarified that erasure of the less savory elements of internment history was not necessarily a top-down, executive decision imposed by members of Congress. In this hearing, representatives from the Japanese American community, once again dominated by current and former JACL leaders, decided on the path of least resistance to redress - to double down on questionable actions during the war and to abandon the principles articulated by the grassroots progenitors of the movement. But to say that this strategy was the result of decisions made by the individuals in the hearing room would be ahistorical. While the subcommittee hearing offered the best chance for an authentic discussion of the desires of the community and the correction of doctored historical narratives, the tenor of the hearing was largely predetermined by the decades-long negotiation between Japanese American leadership and the policymaking institutions of the state. By the time the redress movement had reached these final stages, not only were these community representatives too personally invested in these narratives, support from Congress and the American public had been made contingent on adherence to this tightly-regulated, sanitized script. Japanese American negotiation with government institutions in previous decades, where progress was often made at the expense of community history as well as other groups, explains why when Japanese Americans seemed to have achieved the ultimate victory of redress, they remained unable to challenge and check the government's power to coerce the community into accepting a double standard.

Conclusion

The passage of the 1988 Civil Liberties Act was largely viewed as a remarkable political and communal triumph. The passage of the legislation with its formal apology and \$1.5 billion appropriation intact was certainly worthy of celebration. Yet to suggest that the legislation that was signed by President Reagan, was the “redress” that grassroots supporters and activists galvanized the community around, is disingenuous. All involved in the process had conceded that the legislation was meant to be “symbolic” - the impossibility of fully repairing the damage done by internment was accepted by all. But the promise of this “symbolic” gesture was that 1.) it would provide some measure of closure and recompense to the victimized and 2.) ensure that such violations of civil liberties did not occur again. In reading accounts of the redress movement, it is evident that the entire process - community mobilization, CWRIC hearings and findings, enactment of legislation, and receipt of individual payments - relieved many in the Japanese American community of feelings of shame, guilt, and anger that had plagued them for decades. On this front, the symbolic gesture of the legislation was a resounding success and deserving of the accolades and honors bestowed upon those that made it possible. The efficacy of the legislation in providing safeguards and checks against the violation of civil liberties and the exploitation of vulnerable segments of American society, however, is almost certainly overstated. Ultimately, the reliance on the ahistorical narrative of steadfast “superpatriotism” and blanket statements about the postwar success of Japanese Americans, failed to reverse the original injustice of the imposition of a double standard on the community. That the alternative, of including Japanese American resistance and protest, and thus making the central theme of redress that all Americans, regardless of race, nativity, religion, and ideology are equally deserving of the protections afforded them as citizens, was viewed as too radical, too politically and socially

untenable, should be incredibly disconcerting. With knowledge of this silenced history, the government's assertion that it is committed to ensuring that the violation of civil liberties and the exploitation of vulnerable communities does not occur again, can only be read as half-hearted, if not entirely disingenuous.

Thesis Chapter 3: The Civil Liberties Public Education Fund

Introduction

The previous chapter argued that the legislative process was a forum in which the ambitious vision of redress, to restructure institutions and bring about introspection and change in American social attitudes, could not be realized. This possibility was raised by previous scholars like Chris Iijima and Eric Yamamoto within just a few years after the passage of legislation. Furthermore, they stressed that to act as if changes in the government's treatment of marginal communities would "flow naturally and inevitably" from redress legislation, would compromise the legacy of the movement.¹ As a criterion to evaluate Japanese American advocacy in the post-redress era, Eric Yamamoto offered the following question: "Have the Japanese Americans--community and legal organizations, media, politicians, educators-- lent organizational help and political and legal muscle to the movements of others?"²

Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (CLPEF)

Ironically, Japanese American efforts to forge a new path forward in the aftermath of redress would be jump-started by the legislative process so roundly criticized by these commentators. While the vast majority of the \$1.5 billion authorization had been earmarked for individual reparations payments of \$20,000 to the victims of internment, the bill had also allocated \$5 million for a community trust fund, named the Civil Liberties Public Education

¹ Yamamoto, "Friend or Foe," 241.

² Yamamoto, "Racial Reparations," 484.

Fund (CLPEF).³ The money was to be used to “sponsor research and public educational activities . . . so that the events surrounding the evacuation, relocation, and internment” of Japanese Americans and “the causes and circumstances of this and similar events may be illuminated and understood.”⁴ The \$5 million would be disbursed through a grant program to organizations and individuals with projects that met these objectives.

To date, there has been little to no scholarly attention paid to the CLPEF.⁵ One African American scholar has noted that in awarding an education fund to “address an injustice suffered by an entire ethnic group,” Congress diverged from the individual/criminal law paradigm⁶ that it had strictly adhered to with the rest of bill and unwittingly created “a stronger precedent” African American reparations. Otherwise, the analytic value of the CLPEF has gone unrecognized.⁷ To understand the neglect of the CLPEF by researchers, we must look to the history of the “community fund” in Japanese American discussions of redress. For much of the redress movement, the Fund was a symbol of compromise and moderation. It was used by opponents of redress and conservative supporters alike as a means of undercutting the demands by radicals and grassroots activists that true redress must include individual compensation. For both supporters

³ The bill had authorized \$50 million for the fund, but the amount that was ultimately appropriated was \$5 million. Understandably this was not received well by the JA community.

⁴ *Civil Liberties Act of 1988*, Public Law 100-383, 100th Congr. (August 10, 1988).

⁵ The CLPEF is one of the subjects of a journal article and Ph.D. dissertation by Alexandra Wood, a researcher in the field of International Education. The central topic of both the article and dissertation are a comparison of American and Canadian approaches to redress.

⁶ Under this paradigm, only individuals who are directly injured by the accused party would be eligible for a legal remedy. For example, only those who were themselves “excluded, evacuated, and interned” would receive redress payments. But in establishing an education fund, which would serve as a legal remedy for the entire Japanese American community in 1988, “all of whom may not have suffered from the injury,” the legislation diverged from this paradigm.

⁷ Vincent Verdun, “If the Shoe Fits, Wear It: An Analysis of Reparations to African Americans.” *Tulane Law Review* Vol 67. no. 3 (1992-1993): 657.

and the opposition, the central assumption in discussions of the community fund was that it would inevitably be administered by the JACL. This decidedly un-revolutionary history dampened community enthusiasm for what the CLPEF could accomplish and likely precluded the academic interest of those like Iijima and Yamamoto.

Yet as it would turn out, due to the composition of the Board appointed to the CLPEF and the relative autonomy that it was granted, the funded projects would mark a significant departure from the tightly-controlled narratives constructed during the legislative process. It would also be a crucial step in placing the power of representation back in the hands of the community. As such, it allows us to test the underlying hypothesis of this thesis: that the Japanese American history touted in Congress had been a leadership-led muzzling of the community and a betrayal of the movement's founding principles. This hypothesis holds that once the power to tell the Japanese American story was put back in the hands of the community, there would be a different interpretation of both internment history and the meaning of redress.

The CLPEF actually allows for an even more extensive investigation of the post-redress Japanese American community. Through analysis of the paper trail left by the Board - its internal memos, meeting minutes, reports from community input meetings, personal correspondence, records of grant applications it received, press releases - we are provided insights into the negotiation between members of the Japanese American community (researchers, activists, artists, political organizations) and the Board, about what post-redress Japanese American advocacy might look like and what its priorities should be. Here was a concrete example of the "unique positioning" that many Asian American academics have alluded to - an instance in which they were thrust into the American consciousness and afforded a rare opportunity to speak

to a national audience. How did the CLPEF Board and the project executors interpret and carry out this mandate to educate the American public about internment and redress?

Appointments and Board Composition

The legislation called for eight members to be appointed to the CLPEF Board by Presidential appointment. These appointments also required a Senate confirmation before the Board could be finalized. After the sitting President at the time of enactment, Ronald Reagan, and his successor, George H.W. Bush, did not name a Board, the appointments finally were deemed a priority of the Clinton administration. Beginning in the fall of 1995, the White House Office of Presidential Personnel (OPP) solicited potential candidates from staff of Japanese American members of Congress, staff from the national JACL, and the Association of Asian American Studies (AAAS), among others. The points of emphasis for the composition of the Board included geographic representation, gender balance, and to be inclusive of the many diverse experiences within the Japanese American community.⁸ Once a final slate was compiled, they were sent to the Nikkei members of Congress for approval and submitted to the White House chief of staff. After another round of negotiations, the President finalized the Board in early January of 1996 through recess appointments, which allowed for the bypassing of Senate confirmation.⁹

The finalized eight-member CLPEF Board consisted of Dale Minami, a civil rights attorney based in San Francisco who had led the effort to have the Korematsu verdict overturned

⁸ Martha Watanabe (Deputy Director of CLPEF), e-mail message to author, February 28th, 2016.

⁹ Recess appointments are only valid for 2 years, a shorter term than would be granted with Senate confirmation.

in 1983; Susan Hayase, a Seattleite and grassroots activist with the NCRR during the redress movement; Father Robert Drinan, former Congress member from Massachusetts and member of the CWRIC¹⁰; Leo Goto, a restaurateur and philanthropist from Denver; Elsa Kudo, a Peruvian Japanese internee¹¹ and activist living in Hawaii; Kelly Kuwayama, a 442nd veteran¹² from New York; Peggy Nagae, a Oregon-based attorney who had overseen the re-opening the wartime case of *Yasui v. United States* in 1983; and Don Nakanishi, a UCLA professor and head of its Asian American Studies Center. Due to the 8-year delay in the appointments of the Board, and the negligible attention that the CLPEF had received in the first place, there was little controversy within the Japanese American community about these appointments.¹³

Getting Started

Once appointed, the Board was faced with an immense task. The Board had to set up offices on both coasts, coordinate effective communication between 8 members spread out throughout the country, and hire an Executive Director and Administrative Assistant. Most

¹⁰ Drinan was strong supporter of the CWRIC's recommendation that redress include individual compensation.

¹¹ The story of Peruvian Japanese, who were forcibly removed from their home country of Peru to be detained in the United States was not included in the Civil Liberties Act. They would later receive an apology and reparations, albeit at the lower amount of \$5000. The inclusion of Kudo is the most surprising and unexpected choice amongst the appointees. The absence of a JAACL official on the Board is also very surprising.

¹² Board Chair Dale Minami commented after the CLPEF had closed that Kuwayama, despite being a Nisei veteran was surprisingly a proponent of the most radical and non-traditional projects that the Board received.

¹³ Brian Niiya, "They Didn't Blow It," *Rafu Shimpo*, March 5, 1997.

Niiya, a regular columnist at the JA newspaper *Rafu Shimpo*, noted that the "appointed board turned out to be a reasonable cross-section of leaders from the Japanese American community" and that "whoever put it together carefully balanced the various political and interest groups which run through the community."

importantly, they had to create a strategy to equitably disburse of the \$5 million fund, while maximizing the impact of these precious federal dollars to educate the public about internment and redress. To do this, they had little more to guide them than the following clause from the legislation:

To sponsor research and public educational activities, and to publish and distribute the hearings, findings, and recommendations of the Commission, so that the events surrounding the evacuation, relocation, and internment of United States citizens and permanent residents aliens of Japanese ancestry will be remembered, and so that the causes and circumstances of this and similar events may be illuminated and understood.¹⁴

When the CLPEF closed down in August 1998 as mandated by the legislation, they had accumulated an impressive list of accomplishments. They had republished and redistributed Personal Justice Denied, the publication detailing the CWRIC's findings, making it widely accessible. They had distributed \$3.3 million to 132 recipients through the grant program, providing seed money to realize innovative projects around the country. The remaining hearings and testimonies before the CWRIC had been transcribed thanks to a contract from the CLPEF, and a curriculum summit had convened educators and researchers from around the country to share ideas, best practices, and to advance teaching about Japanese American history. A national Day of Remembrance¹⁵ in Washington D.C. had also been sponsored.¹⁶

For the purposes of this thesis, the grants program is of the greatest interest. While the other components of the CLPEF were meant to leverage existing materials by increasing

¹⁴ *Civil Liberties Act of 1988*, Public Law 100-383, 100th Congr. (August 10, 1988).

¹⁵ The anniversary of the signing of E.O. 9066

¹⁶ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. *Final Report to the President and the Congress*. Washington, D.C.: CLPEF, 1998. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

accessibility and collaboration, the grants program was where the Board was able to exercise their discretion in choosing new projects “to tell the redress story.” Beginning with an introduction to the administration and operations of the grant program, the following section will delve into the strategic decisions made by the CLPEF Board. How did interpretations of internment and redress differ amongst the Board members? As with the Congressional narratives, we are once again attentive to the silencing and promotion of different narratives by the governing body- now the CLPEF.

Administrative Details

Grant Categories and Criteria¹⁷

The grant program sought applications from seven categories under two themes. Included under the first theme of Education were:

- a) Curriculum Initiatives: “efforts to incorporate the history and lessons of the World War II exclusion and detention . . . as part of the American public education curricula”
- b) Institutional and Landmark Initiatives: “preservation of historic landmarks, development of commemorative monuments and cultural institutions as permanent focal points, on-going catalysts for public education, and repositories for culture and artifacts”
- c) Community Development: “efforts to provide a legacy of remembrance for future generations, thus continuing a process of recovery from the trauma and stigma of . . . exclusion and detention” AND “sustain a dynamic, regenerative source of public education for the American public and future generations”

¹⁷ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Grant Program Guidelines and Application. San Francisco, CA: CLPEF, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

- d) Arts and Media: “variety of media and the arts to creatively and strategically appeal to a broad American public while enhancing and enriching community based educational efforts” (Excluding projects targeting K-12)

The second theme was Research:

- a) Research Projects: “encourage scholarly inquiry and projects related to the variety of experiences and impact of exclusion and detention . . . as well as its relationship to the experiences of other populations, so that causes, circumstances, lessons and contemporary applications of this and similar events will be illuminated and understood”
- b) National Fellows Program: 15 “fellowships of \$10,000 each” to “support and encourage the development of a new generation of scholars”
- c) Research Resources: “To support the continued development of scholarly work on this subject by augmenting and making more accessible currently available archival and research resources”

Panel Review¹⁸

For the purposes of reviewing the hundreds of applications received under these categories, the Board turned to a panel review system. 15 review panels of 3 individuals each were assigned to each funding category (size of grant sought) and sub-theme (enumerated above). Panelists included university professors, attorneys, civil rights activists, politicians, teachers, artists, actors and individuals involved with the CWRIC. These individuals were selected from a pool of candidates submitted by Board members and CLPEF staff. Panelists were checked for potential conflicts of interest, such as involvement or affiliation with a proposal

¹⁸ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Grant Program Guidelines and Application. San Francisco, CA: CLPEF, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

submitted to the CLPEF. In a press release, the Board explained that 44% of panelists were from outside of California and 49% were women: least one individual from both of these demographics was included on each panel.¹⁹

Panelists were instructed to grade the proposals they were given according to criteria prioritized into three categories, “must,” “should,” and “encouraged.” The criteria flagged with highest priority were 1.) consistency with the “stated intent and purposes of the CLA of 1988/mission of the CLPEF Board,” 2.) compliance with relevant timelines and policies, and 3.) “experience, knowledge and qualifications to conduct . . . quality educational and/or research activities related.” The characteristics that proposals “should” have included ability to maximize impact, build upon existing materials, include a variety of experiences, and provide linkages with experiences of other populations. “Encouraged” characteristics included involvement of former detainees, adoption of a national strategy, and development of multicultural/local/regional consortia. These scores would then be sent to the Board for the final decision on which programs would be funded and for what percentage of the funding request.

Timeline

In its entirety, the grant program operated on extremely strict timelines. The guidelines and criteria for the grant program were announced on October 7th, 1996, with applications due December 13th, 1996. The panel reviews were conducted during the remainder of December and January 1997- with the final Board deliberations taking place from February 3rd to February 7th,

¹⁹ I could include the actual names of panelists or do a more thorough analysis on the panelists because the original agreement with the panelists stated that their identities would be kept confidential.

1997. On February 21st, 1997, the application program came to a close, with the CLPEF publishing a press release titled, “CLPEF Sends Out 103 Award Letters for Grant Program.”²⁰

In the months preceding the roll-out of the grant program, the Board also convened community meetings to detail the Board’s ideas about the grant program and to solicit input. Between April and July of 1996, the Board hosted four to five such meetings each month, with individual members responsible for their respective regional jurisdictions. All in all, Board members had face-to-face meetings with community members in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, San Jose, Honolulu, East Bay, Chicago, Sacramento, New York, and Denver. Additionally, the Board convened full-member meetings on strategy, outreach, and administrative issues on April 1st, May 4th in Washington D.C., and July 12th to 13th in Seattle. It is these meetings, where the views of these appointees, among them a 442nd veteran, a former Congressman, a Ph.D., a grassroots activist, and a Peruvian Japanese internee, had to be reconciled into a coherent vision about the program’s execution. Where did the CLPEF stances and interpretations fit into the overall historiography? Did the program’s Congressional origins and sponsorship limit the narratives that the CLPEF was willing to fund? What about the articulation of grassroots and activist perspectives, which had always struggled for representation on the national stage? These questions are the subject of the next section of this thesis.

Strategy

Early Board Meetings

²⁰ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. “*CLPEF Sends Out Over 103 Award Letters for Grant Program*”, February 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

From the outset, it was apparent that the CLPEF Board viewed its work as a departure from, and even a response to, the narratives disseminated through the legislative process. In its first Board meeting on April 1st, 1996, the members declared that their role was to “give voice to those who never had a voice before.”²¹ As examples of such silenced narratives they provided the “stories of resistors (sic), no-no’s,” which had been excluded entirely from the Congressional record. The Board also envisioned having a role in “public policy.” They wanted to properly contextualize the “redress movement in relation to contemporary American society” and recognized that the “model minority [narratives] promulgated by media” obfuscated redress’s relevance and “link[s] to other events and people.” While members of Congress and select Japanese American leaders had sought to establish “model minority” narratives as the norm in Japanese American experience, the CLPEF intended to broaden representation, illuminate why these narratives had been promoted, and include other stories that had been sacrificed along the way.

In these early Board strategy sessions, the members displayed an impressive command of the unique characteristics of the Japanese American community, and the challenges and opportunities that the CLPEF program faced as a result. Alongside the recovery of silenced “voices,” Board members placed great emphasis on what the program could do for “posterity” and how it might serve as a “catalyst” for broader change.²² The culmination of a decades-long effort to obtain redress, and the retirement of many longtime leaders from their positions had placed additional stresses on a community long divided by regional and generational differences.

²¹ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes, April 1, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

²² Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes, May 4, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

The CLPEF recognized the urgency of ‘involv[ing] younger generations,’ as well as an opportunity to sponsor networking and collaboration opportunities between disparate groups in the community with the program funding.

The Board’s vision for its work as a “catalyst” was even more ambitious. Within the context of both “Asian Pacific American community/politics” and “civil rights coalitions,” they recognized that the success of the Japanese American movement for redress had established a precedent that would reverberate in other communities and inform their respective issues. This demanded that Japanese Americans “take a leadership role as [the] ‘conscience of America’” and to contribute to defining “Asian Pacific American role/voice/leadership” in national discussions. Anti-immigrant legislation and violence were offered as examples of current issues that Japanese Americans had a responsibility to address. This perception that Japanese Americans and their history could serve as an inspiration and model for other groups had also been shared by members of Congress and Japanese American leaders during the legislative process. Under their interpretation, however, Japanese Americans were worthy of emulation because they were a “super-minority” impervious to the systemic discrimination and institutional racism that other American racial groups claimed were obstacles to their advancement in society. Thus, the Japanese American experience was offered as evidence that no radical restructuring of the status quo was required- it was the minority communities themselves that needed to be reformed. In total opposition to this view, the CLPEF was claiming that the path for other groups illuminated by the history of Japanese Americans was one that led to their grievances being heard and legitimized, rather than neutralized.

Strategic Plan

After these initial Board meetings on goals and strategy in the spring and early summer of 1996, discussions of regulations, policies, and compliance with federal regulations increasingly dominated internal communications. Strategic considerations shifted to a focus on how to “maximize limited funds” and avoid inefficient spending on redundant or overlapping projects. Now past the preliminary planning stages, the Board was increasingly conscious of the scarcity of both resources and time in executing their vision for the program. While the bold and inclusive initiatives that the Board had dreamt up required refining and shaping into more actionable steps, they survived this push for practicality, and were ultimately adopted in the “Strategic Plan” finalized on August 16th.²³ In the document, the Board interpreted the task assigned to them by the CLA to contain four main components- 1.) the education of non-JAs²⁴ 2.) promotion of psychological healing within the JA community 3.) revitalization of JA community organizations 4.) the illumination of the connections between JA experience and the experiences of other groups. The separation of the “education of non-JAs” and “illumination of the connections between JA experience and experiences of other groups” is noteworthy. While members of Congress had assumed that greater public awareness of the internment in and of itself would guarantee that similar violations did not occur in the future, the Board recognized that this was far from an inevitable outcome. To ensure that the lessons of internment were not theoretical but applied, the Board noted that there had to be long-term “collaboration between JA organizations and other organizations engaged in . . . the preservation of civil liberties” and

²³ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. “Strategic Plan,” August 16, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

²⁴ JA is short for Japanese American, and is commonly used with the Japanese American community.

public efforts to “stimulate examination/discussion/thinking about the JA experience and current issues.”

The Strategic Plan also revealed that the Board, through these deliberations, arrived at great clarity about the fact that the 8-member body could not possibly account for the diversity of needs and perspectives in a dynamic and changing Japanese American community. Executive Director Dale Shimasaki advocated for the inclusion of a clause in the document “acknowledg[ing] that the JA community is not static.” As examples of the pressing changes and new issues in the community, he cited the “growth in the Hapa [mixed race] population, the tensions in SF with the Korean community, . . . development in J-Town [Japantown], etc.”²⁵ As such, it was essential to the development of the grant program that members go out into the community to understand and “reconcile public needs/wants” with the Board’s own appraisals.

Community Input

To inform community members about the grant program and to ensure that the Board was responsive to the community, the Board created an outreach and publicity campaign. This effort included editorials by Board members in ethnic press, such as the *Nichi Bei Times*, and regular press releases updating the community on developments in the grant program as well as relevant deadlines. Most importantly, the Board members held face-to-face community meetings to provide a forum for community members to ask questions and to provide input on the execution of the program. The members held 14 such meetings in cities around the United States.

Unfortunately, only two reports from these community meetings, Susan Hayase’s meeting in San

²⁵ Email from Dale Shimasaki to Dale Minami, “Strategic Plan,” August 16, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

Jose and Don Nakanishi's meeting in Los Angeles, have been archived. While certainly not a representative sample, the reports offer insights into the reactions of the community to the grant program and the type of impact they envisioned it having. The central points of discussion in each meeting also reveal the different concerns of Japanese Americans in Los Angeles and San Jose, the former long recognized as the center of Japanese American politics and the latter a hotbed of more local and grassroots efforts. Furthermore, they allow for an analysis of how responsive the Board ultimately was to the wishes articulated by the community.

San Jose Meeting²⁶

Susan Hayase's community meeting in San Jose was the fifth such meeting held by the Board nationwide. She reported that in attendance were representatives from "the local chapter of the JACL, the Nihonmachi Outreach Committee (the local representative of the NCRR), the Japanese American Resource Center (the local Japanese American historical group and museum), the Asian American Educators Association, the few other local social service agencies, and the new elected board president of the Japanese American National Museum." Having worked with NCRR during the redress movement, Hayase was a qualified advocate and sympathetic ear for these organizations, who were on the periphery of Japanese American power and leadership centralized in major cities like Los Angeles and San Francisco. In her opening statement, she clarified to the attendees that due to her background, she "felt an obligation to bring a grassroots perspective to the board." As such, discussion of the steps that could be taken to ensure the preservation of grassroots voices and recognition of the contributions of smaller organizations dominated the meeting. To compete with the national reach of projects from larger organizations,

²⁶ Email from Susan Hayase to CLPEF Board Members, "Report-back" meeting held in San Jose on 4/17/96," May 1, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

one attendee suggested forming “regional coalitions” of smaller organizations. Another suggestion to ensure access to the CLPEF funds for smaller organizations was the designation of a portion of the funds to be used exclusively for these groups.

Another interesting comment noted by Hayase in her report to the Board concerned using the platform of the CLPEF to organize a national “Day of Remembrance” on the anniversary of the signing of E.O. 9066. Such a campaign would “link together national and local . . . organizations” and “bring together regions rather than divide them.” Most notably, the attendee recommended that the Board reach out to African American leaders and organizations to investigate the steps they had taken to make “Martin Luther King Day a reality.” This type of interracial collaboration and exchange of information had been incredibly important for grassroots redress groups like the NCRR, and Asian American groups more generally during the 60s and 70s. Yet the Japanese American leadership had sought to dissociate themselves and their claims for redress from other racial groups and their grievances against the government, African Americans in particular. Thus, the CLPEF’s attitude toward engagement with these organizations would be a litmus test providing insights into the Board’s understanding of redress.

Los Angeles Meeting²⁷

Board member Don Nakanishi, professor of Asian American studies at UCLA, held his community meeting at the Los Angeles Japanese American Cultural and Community Center. The distribution of funding was also a central topic in this meeting. The substance of the suggestions, however, reveal much different concerns. While there was mention of “little people (presumably

²⁷ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. “CLPEF Meeting Minutes at Los Angeles Japanese American Cultural and Community Center,” April 30, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

those outside of institutions like universities) who were interested in doing research on internment,” many of the comments addressed the need for projects to have national scope and impact. One proposal suggested that due to the small amount of funds available (\$5 million), the Board focus on “national impact” grants of “approx. 1 to 2 million [dollars] each” given to “corporations or institutes.” Another suggested that there be a focus on organizations that were “instrumental in the redress movement” by designating a portion of the funds to be “for projects about groups that pioneered the redress efforts.” This emphasis on projects with national impact, which would necessarily be carried out by large organizations, is indicative of the strong influence of long-standing, mainstream Japanese American institutions within Los Angeles. But some attendees also cautioned that for the CLPEF Board to achieve true national reach, projects had to venture outside of traditional Japanese American enclaves, into areas that had little interaction with Japanese Americans and their history.

Los Angeles attendees also had perceptive input in discussions of project content and subject matter. They hoped that CLPEF materials would make a concerted effort to “provide educational linkages between Japanese American communities with other international and domestic communities” concerned with human rights and racism. Collaboration with organizations like the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles, a Holocaust history and research center, was cited as an example. Potential international linkages included “providing internment materials in Japanese,” in response to a “great deal of interest by Japanese Nationals on the internment and the 442nd Infantry.” Here it is noteworthy that Japanese-language projects brought to mind Japanese nationals, rather than the sizable population of postwar immigrants

from Japan who resided in Los Angeles.²⁸ Nakanishi also reported that another concern was the need for the CLPEF to address that “a great deal of the historical materials have had an assimilationist perspective which corrupts the authenticity of the internment materials.” The commenter asked that the Board make clear that “research must be of an Asian Americanist perspective.”

From just two of the fourteen meetings, community stakeholders assigned to the CLPEF an incredibly ambitious agenda. The CLPEF projects had to have long-term national impact, while ensuring that local and grassroots voices were not lost in the process. With just \$5 million, the community expected the lessons of Japanese American history to be made accessible to international audiences, and to permeate American counties and towns with nary a Japanese American. They had to do all of this while resisting the simplification of their history, which often obfuscated the “Asian Americanist perspective” necessary to illuminate the full lessons of the internment experience. The successes, and failures, of the CLPEF Board in meeting these expectations will be evaluated in the following section.

Results

On March 15th, 1997, Brian Niiya, regular columnist for the Japanese American newspaper *Rafu Shimpō* wrote a highly complimentary review of the work of the CLPEF Board.²⁹ The grant funding decisions had been released a month earlier, in February, and Niiya’s review of the funding led him to write, “On the surface, the board and their evaluators have done an outstanding job of partitioning up the money, funding a bewildering variety of approaches

²⁸ A discussion of the implications of this oversight is included in the Conclusion of this thesis.

²⁹ Niiya, Brian. “They Didn’t Blow It,” *Rafu Shimpō*, March 5, 1997.

toward educating the public about the internment of Japanese Americans.” Furthermore, “with \$5 million and the implicit right to tell the story of the redress movement at stake,” the Board had succeeded in “carefully balanc[ing] the various political and interest groups which run though the community.” As evidence of this balance, he cited statistics that showed that “projects proposed by the Japanese American National Museum were funded for about the same amount as a project proposed by the National Japanese American Historical Society,” “a draft resister project was funded as were several Nisei veteran based projects,” and an “NCRR history project was funded as was an NCJAR-related project and a number of JACL related projects.” In reviewing the decisions made by the CLPEF Board, there is no doubt about their consistent ability to strike this careful balance. In terms of geographic diversity (a concern voiced in the LA community meeting), they funded initiatives from 21 states, an impressive achievement considering Japanese Americans are heavily concentrated in major, coastal cities. Additionally, there was no evidence of bias towards California-based proposals- 29% of applications from California were funded, as opposed to 28% from all other states. Of the eight proposals fully funded at the requested level, only one was from California.³⁰ Another metric brought up in community meetings was diversity in grant sizes. By creating three categories (Beacon- Up to \$250,000, Torchlight- up to \$100,000, Candlelight- up to \$25,000), with review panels only responsible for one category, the Board was able to ensure that grassroots and local proposals were considered on their own merits.

While these statistics were an impressive testament to the Board’s efforts to be impartial, when they were appointed to the CLPEF they had been given a much more ambitious task. They

³⁰ Email from Dale Shimasaki to CLPEF Board, “Grant Funding, by Percent of Request,” March 19th, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

were to oversee what was likely to be the most significant one-time investment made into Japanese American cultural and historical production. Their decisions would determine the trajectory of Japanese American historiography after redress and shape representation of the internment experience in literature, film and theater. How successful was the Board in meeting the qualitative and substantive goals that they had set? From the first Board meeting, a priority had been to use the platform and resources of the CLPEF to “give voice to those who never had a voice before.”³¹ A review of the funded projects reveals that this emphasis was well-reflected in the decisions made by the Board.³² Included were projects that directly addressed divisive issues and brought them to mainstream audiences, such as a documentary on resistance in the camps to be shown on PBS, and a biography of Joseph Kurihara, a Manzanar dissident and repatriate to Japan. \$100,000 was awarded to a multimedia effort to tell the story of the “Heart Mountain Resisters,” who refused to be drafted until they were freed from the camps. A research project on the infamous “Loyalty Questionnaire,” the subject of resentment and division in the community even many decades later, was funded. So was a digital presentation and video project on Tule Lake, the camp where those labeled as “disloyal” had been transferred. Being attached to Tule Lake had led to the ostracization of many Japanese Americans from mainstream community organizations and positions of leadership. Additionally, the Board funded six projects on Latin Americans of Japanese descent, who were forcibly removed from their home countries and either illegally detained in the U.S. or repatriated to Japan against their will. Alongside the erasure of resistance and protest from the Congressional narratives of internment, the exclusion of this

³¹ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes, April 1, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

³² Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. *Final Report to the President and the Congress*. Washington, D.C.: CLPEF, 1998. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

group from redress legislation had been a point of furious criticism.³³ Due to the unconventional appointment of a Japanese Latin American (JLA) internee to the Board, Elsa Kudo, the plight of JLAs became a central issue for the Board and one of the many untold stories that it wanted to bring to light. In fact, Dale Minami's personal files from his time as Board Chair are filled with news clippings and relevant documents about JLAs.

While the recovery of these silenced or lost narratives were of great importance to the Board, they also expected to forge a new path forward for the Japanese American community. They imagined that Japanese Americans could serve as the "conscience of America" and as a catalyst that could bring communities together to form enduring civil rights coalitions. This sense of responsibility was a product of the community having been put through the injustice of internment, but it was equally informed by Japanese American experiences during the redress movement. The community mobilization around internment had been initiated by Sansei inspired by the political activism and protest of other groups in the 60s and 70s. They "emulated the grassroots tactics developed during the black freedom struggle" to galvanize the community and turned to the suppressed history of internment "to reclaim their own distinctive culture as the blacks were doing."³⁴ Nisei William Hohri, who would later file a class action suit on behalf of all internees, had gotten his start in political activism when he participated in James Meredith's march to Jackson, Mississippi. Witnessing the "courage of black marchers who chanted 'black power' with anger and pride," Hohri recognized that Japanese Americans needed 'to understand

³³ Japanese Latin Americans would later receive an apology and individual reparations payments, albeit at a lower number than JAs, \$5000.

³⁴ Yang Murray, 201.

the past and affirm ourselves as people.”³⁵ And as the movement began to make serious headway on the national stage in the 80s, the NCRR (National Coalition for Redress/Reparations) purposefully included “Reparations” in their name, not simply as a sign of solidarity but as a result of coordination with other communities of color victimized by racial prejudice and exploitation. In light of this inescapably interracial and inter-ethnic history³⁶, and the close ties that bound these groups together at the grassroots level³⁷, the Board stressed the need for “outreach to non-JAs, and to encourage a wide range of groups and folks to apply for these grants and to share (and learn from) our incarceration experience.” Furthermore, they saw the CLPEF funding as a means of institutionalizing these connections. In their Strategic Plan, they called for the setting of a foundation for long-term “collaboration between JA organizations and other organizations engaged in . . . the preservation of civil liberties.”³⁸

Judgements of the success of the CLPEF in forging these new partnerships and civil rights coalitions is much less clear cut.³⁹ While certain funding categories, like “Landmarks and Institutions,” can be expected to be JA-exclusive, in a category like “Community Development,” there is a conspicuous absence of partnerships and collaboration with non-Japanese American groups. Of the 17 projects funded under this category, only two featured groups that worked with non-Japanese American groups. The first, Asian Pacific Youth Leadership Project, sponsored a

³⁵ Yang Murray, 303.

³⁶ Commented on by community members in meetings in both San Jose and Los Angeles.

³⁷ Shimabukuro, 114. “Because of Seattle’s early restrictive housing laws, many of the area’s Asian and African Americans had grown up together, forming friendships and political alliances. Cross-racial, cross-ethnic ties were created early.”

³⁸ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. “Strategic Plan,” August 16, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

³⁹ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. *Final Report to the President and the Congress*. Washington, D.C.: CLPEF, 1998. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

conference for high school students on the “theme of the JA internment experience and redress to enable . . . participants to recognize contemporary discriminatory policies against Asians and Asian Americans.” The second project, “Transforming Barbed Wire,” included the Gila River Indian Community and the Colorado River Indian Tribes. This partnership was less about forging new connections and had more to do with the fact that the Japanese American internment camp at Gila River had been placed within an existing Native American Reservation. These disappointing results would be the subject of discussion amongst the Board only after the decisions had been finalized. The substance of these discussions will be explained in full later in the chapter.

More imaginative and pioneering approaches were evident in the projects funded under the “Curriculum” category. Perhaps because educational (secondary/post-secondary classroom) settings require everyday engagement with a diverse audience, less true for organizations serving or catering to a specific group, it seems educators were better prepared and more willing to take on these fresh interpretations. Funded initiatives sought to break down potential barriers of race, nationality and language. This approach was exemplified by City College of San Francisco’s (CCSF) staff development program, titled “Lessons From Japanese American Internment: Understanding Discrimination Through Personal Stories and Cross Cultural Comparison.” The program would provide training for faculty to present about internment to African Americans and Latinos, and even “non-English speaking Chinese and Vietnamese.” A program by Joe Chung Fong even took into account the potential barriers posed by nativity and duration in the U.S. He proposed lectures and articles directed at the large population of “post-1980 overseas Chinese immigrants in San Gabriel Valley” in California, to understand their experiences as Asian

immigrants in relation to treatment of Japanese Americans. Another project targeted at introducing recently arrived groups to Japanese American internment and Asian American history in general was the “APEN ‘Story Cloth’ Project” by the Asian Pacific Environmental Network Foundation. The organization proposed the creation of a “storycloth based on autobiographical story of refugees and Laotian girls growing up in the U.S.” Former internees would participate and this activity would serve as the basis of an “ongoing exchange of oral histories between [the] JA and Laotian community in West Contra Costa County.” To advance the teaching and curriculum materials of internment even further, the Board decided to hold a Curriculum Summit in August of 1997. All grantees were in attendance, as were those who had applied but not received funding. This provided an unparalleled opportunity for networking amongst like-minded educators and the exchange of best practices and information.

Results Conclusion

All in all, despite resource and time constraints, the Board was successful in much of what it set out to do. They distributed the grant funding in an impartial and balanced manner. Formed by a legislative body that had systematically erased many consequential narratives and individuals from the historical record, the CLPEF was able to write these stories and figures back into Japanese American history. This not only provided healing and redemption for many marginalized in the legislative process, but also ensured that future generations would be bequeathed a fuller, more complex history to grapple with. Creative “Curriculum Initiatives” funded by the Board brought the story of internment to different groups who might otherwise not have access to such materials. Other parts of the Board’s ambitious agenda were more elusive.

Partnerships and participation from non-Japanese American groups and organizations were not realized in the “Community Development” grants and “Research” projects could not effectively incorporate the perspectives and experiences of other groups. The latter goal was always going to be an uphill battle- not many researchers and institutions had the capacity to engage with the experiences of other groups and to compete in a grant program against Japanese American researchers that specialized in the field. More glaring was the inability of the grant funding to create pioneering partnerships and institutionalize collaboration between Japanese Americans and present-day “vulnerable communities,” viewed by the Board as a crucial step towards the protection of civil liberties. These omissions would be recognized by the Board members soon after the announcement of grant decisions in February of 1997.

Two months after the announcement of the decisions, on April 28th, Susan Hayase reached out to the other Board members on this issue.⁴⁰ She wrote, “I think that the implicit point of our legislatively-mandated mission is to do what it takes to prevent future abrogations of constitutional rights, and several of our grant criteria were meant to address this, especially with regards to non-Japanese American communities, ones that I would term ‘vulnerable’ communities.” Hayase expressed her disappointment that the Board “didn’t get any proposals that directly address[ed] bridging the gap between Japanese American camp and redress experiences and potential contemporary parallels such as Arab Americans during the Gulf War (and in the context of on-going Middle East conflict,) Mexico/Latino immigrants, Asian immigrants, African American reparations campaign, etc.” This introspection and internal review was the result of news on March 31st, 1997 that \$340,000 in leftover funding from the amount

⁴⁰ Email from Susan Hayase to Dale Shimasaki, Dale Minami, and Don Nakanishi, “Budget Ideas,” April 28, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

earmarked for individual payments would be reverted to the CLPEF. With uncertainty about when the office in charge of individual redress payments would officially process the transfer of these leftover funds, the Board decided that another round of the grant program was not feasible. Instead, the funds would be allocated through “Board Initiatives,” project ideas submitted by the board members to maximize the accessibility and impact of the work that the CLPEF had sponsored thus far and to fill any gaps that they had identified. Given an opportunity to correct some of their oversights, Hayase stressed the need to “focus on communities, groups that serve and are concerned with ‘at-risk’ communities and individuals that have or may soon experience possible constitutional rights violations and hate crime.” “All people of color communities,” she explained, “continue to be at risk.” This framing of redress, as not simply the rectification of past injustice but as having the potential to protect vulnerable communities from the ever-present threat of racial prejudice and exploitation, ran counter to Congressional depictions of redress. In the halls of Congress, threats to civil liberties akin to the internment of Japanese Americans were always imagined to be in some vague, unnamed future. This, of course, had served to gloss over on-going government abuses of power.

Other “Board Initiatives” proposed by members included the sponsorship of the Nisei Baseball Research Project’s exhibit to be shown at the Baseball Hall of Fame, creation of a permanent repository for CLPEF projects, production of an oral history project on redress, a second round of National Fellows, and sponsorship of a conference for Research and National Fellows grantees.⁴¹ The “Board Initiative” proposed by Hayase based on the concerns detailed in her April 28th email to the Board will be detailed in full.

⁴¹ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. “CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes,” December 5, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

Hayase's "Bridging the Gap- Reaching Out to Under-Represented Groups"⁴²

With this proposal, Hayase envisioned reaching out to the "blind spots" in the CLPEF's programming. Beyond the "broad outreach" of the Board's efforts to that point, there had to be a concerted effort to target under-represented groups that were "politically vulnerable in ways that parallel the pre-camp situation of Japanese Americans." For example, the "vast majority of the ways that [the CLPEF was] currently attempting to get the word out," "fiction, newspaper articles, textbooks" and the "plays, the concerts, the museum exhibits, . . . [and] films" would not reach many in this target demographic due to their lack of English proficiency. Beyond issues of language, Hayase advised that any effective effort would had to take into account the "political pressures that frequently have the effect of dividing [under-represented] peoples and putting them into competition with one another." Due to the widespread perception that Japanese Americans were an exceptional "model minority" group, a view popularized by both national media and Japanese Americans themselves, and further confirmed by Congressional redress, making "historical parallels" with non-Japanese American groups was insufficient. Only by clarifying the contemporary implications of internment/redress and "addressing needs relevant to the particular group" could they hope to make a personal and meaningful impression. Furthermore, she argued that the traditional format of Japanese Americans simply lecturing other groups was not only "potentially . . . arrogant" but was "less convincing for many people." Thus, "build[ing] partnerships with influential organizations and individuals from under-represented groups" was essential. As illustration, she suggested having "a Latino constitutional scholar"

⁴² Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "CLPEF Board Agenda," December 5, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

provide their own analysis to “endorse the concepts and testify as to their relevance to Latinos.” As for institutional steps that the CLPEF could take to ensure that the most “vulnerable communities” had adequate exposure and familiarity with the relevant lessons of internment and redress, Hayase offered two ways forward. First was reaching out to the many “Legal Defense Education Funds” operating in the U.S. Not only might they be interested in “jointly developing . . . original materials” for the cause but could also contribute by “adding subtitles to existing documentaries” and serving as “a vehicle for distribution or promotion within targeted groups.” A second path outlined by Hayase was to “investigate the possibility of including this issue in the curriculum for citizenship classes.” Such a step would make internment and redress a permanent and fundamental issue through which these under-represented groups would be introduced to American history and the Constitution.

The many potential pitfalls and obstacles delineated by Hayase in this “Board Initiative” illuminated why the CLPEF received so few satisfactory applications that engaged non-Japanese American partners and could effectively reach these so-called “vulnerable communities.” But her proposal also showed that with more efforts at strategic outreach, going beyond community input meetings to recruit and plan alongside non-Japanese American groups, the CLPEF could have more effectively encouraged these types of proposals during the grant program.⁴³

Peter Kiang

With the reverted funds, the Board was in the fortuitous position of being able to assess their successes and failures and to correct some of their initial oversights. Along with the Board

⁴³ The only documentation in the Minami papers about direct outreach to non-JA organizations was an email from Don Nakanishi to Dale Shimasaki suggesting that they send members to meet with the Director of LA’s Museum of Tolerance.

initiatives discussed above, the Board also gave a second round of consideration to a proposal that had initially been rejected. UMass Boston's Peter Kiang had heard about the leftover funds as an attendee of the Curriculum Summit hosted by the CLPEF and wrote to Dale Shimasaki in November 1997.⁴⁴ Shimasaki circulated the letter to the Board members asking for their input. Kiang's request for another review of his proposal was based on the fact that the CLPEF had not funded a single New England-based project and because the reviewers' comments he received in the formal appeal process⁴⁵ "seemed to reflect largely California-based, Japanese American perspectives and rather traditional notions of teaching and curriculum."⁴⁶ Peter Kiang's description of his original project, included in the letter, is as follows:

a locally-targeted demonstration project based on a 'training of trainers' education model that will enable three respective teams (five members each) of K-12 teachers, Asian American youth, and immigrant community leaders to initiate curriculum design and dissemination projects among their own constituencies - focusing on lessons from the internment experience and their application to contemporary issues and challenges of ethnicity, loyalty, democracy, and leadership. Supported by project staff and structures at UMass Boston, including two university courses dedicated to the project, team members will design a teacher resource guide and worldwide website, high school Heritage Month activities, bilingual resource materials for newcomer communities, and constituency-targeted training workshops."

⁴⁴ Letter from Peter Kiang to Dale Shimasaki, "Possibilities of supporting a curriculum project in New England," November 28, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

⁴⁵ Held immediately after the announcement of the grant decisions.

⁴⁶ The Board's internal assessment of the panelists, cited earlier, showed that Kiang's critique was, at least statistically, unfounded. Despite the heavy concentration of JAs in California, 44% of the panelists were from outside of California. There is, however, some evidence to suggest that the Board did not do much to communicate to the panelists that the CLPEF was hoping to fund projects that not only engaged with JA history in innovative ways but also brought the history to new audiences. This strategy adopted by the CLPEF was a significant departure from most other JA efforts and the failure to communicate this to the panelists may have been one of the reasons that many aspects of this ambitious vision went unrealized. This possibility will be addressed in greater detail later in the discussion of Kiang's proposal.

Kiang's full proposal, also included with the letter, detailed his experiences teaching the history of internment to a diverse group of students. Kiang cited a role-play activity held in his Asian American Studies courses in which "each student takes on a role as an Issei parent or Nisei son/daughter or Kibei⁴⁷ son/daughter in a family group and responds to the loyalty questions." He reported that "the issues and conflicts that arise over identity, family responsibility, cultural values, and social status make for immediate and powerful learning" and students "often conclude for themselves that those who responded "no-no" and those who answered "yes-yes" to questions 27 and 28 both made very courageous decisions under impossible circumstances with tragic consequences." These personal insights about family dynamics also allowed students to connect the "Issei generation's dramatic loss of family status and influence in camp with the overturning of today's immigrant family structures in which parents lose their power and children are forced to take on adult-like decision making roles because of their bilingual/bicultural skills."

Beyond this experiential learning, his courses also stressed the broader connections in policy and history between Japanese American internment and the government's treatment of immigrant and "newcomer" communities. For example, "forced dispersal policy of Southeast Asian refugee resettlement during the 1980s, the urban renewal policies of the 1960s" echoed the "assimilationist ideology embedded in the intentional dispersal of the Japanese American population after camp." The project design of his CLPEF proposal would be building off these successes in making the lessons of internment accessible to other groups in the present day.

Additionally, a unique asset of the proposed project was that the "immigrant leader team,"

⁴⁷ American-born Nisei who had been sent back to Japan to receive their education. They were believed to be the most dangerous of the Nisei population during the war and were specifically targeted by federal authorities.

responsible for developing “bilingual and/or bicultural curriculum materials,” would have individuals from the wide array of ethnic communities that the Asian American Studies program had connections with. According to Kiang, they expected leaders from “Haitian, Vietnamese, Russian, Salvadoran, and Cambodian” communities to participate. Ultimately, they envisioned the project “building . . . multicultural, multigenerational, working relationships” amongst these groups, all based on the history of internment and redress.

Unsurprisingly, the Board members were impressed with the proposal. Susan Hayase stated that the project “fulfill[ed] many of the concerns” that she had raised about the dearth of projects targeting “under-represented” communities.⁴⁸ Another Board member, Don Nakanishi, agreed with Hayase and suggested that Kiang’s project be woven into her Board Initiative.⁴⁹ This enthusiastic support from the members for a proposal that had initially been rejected raises questions about what had happened during the original review process. Kiang’s appeal, through which he gained access to panelist grades and comments on his proposal, had revealed that the grades had been so low that the proposal had not made it out of the panel review to be considered by the Board.⁵⁰ After attending the Curriculum Summit held by the CLPEF in August of 1997, Kiang had also realized that in comparison to the projects that had been funded, his was “too out of the box for the reviewers to engage with.” The Board’s highly favorable assessment of the proposal after the grant program had concluded, suggested that there was some disconnect between the respective visions of the Board and the panelists. A document distributed to the

⁴⁸ Email from Susan Hayase to Dale Minami, “National Archives Press Release,” December 15, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

⁴⁹ Email from Don Nakanishi to CLPEF Board, “Peter Kiang proposal,” December 8, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

⁵⁰ Peter Kiang, e-mail message to author, February 22nd, 2016.

panelists, titled “Review Guidelines for the Grant Program,” offered insights into the instructions given by the Board.⁵¹ In the document, the Board pointed the panelists to the CLPEF’s mission statement, pulled straight from the 1988 legislation.⁵² Yet in the Board’s official “Strategic Plan,” finalized in August of 1996, they had interpreted this mission statement to contain 4 main components: 1.) the education of non-JAs 2.) promotion of psychological healing within the JA community 3.) revitalization of JA community organizations 4.) the illumination of the connections between JA experience and the experiences of other groups.⁵³ This strong emphasis on the involvement of non-Japanese Americans and the impact of CLPEF projects on other communities was lost in simply pointing panelists to the mission statement, which reduced these priorities to one vaguely-worded mention of “similar events” to internment. So while the Board had been careful to compile a geographically diverse and gender-balanced panel, they neglected to communicate that their goals were different than those of previous Japanese American projects that the panelists may have worked on.

It is clear that if the CLPEF was to create positive disruptions in the modus operandi of Japanese American advocacy, as the Board had envisioned, greater attention to these details was required. Kiang’s proposal and appeal also prompted concerns about whether other innovative projects may have gone unfunded due to this disconnect between the Board and the review panelists. Unfortunately, there was no way to conduct similar investigations of other unfunded

⁵¹ Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. “Review Guidelines for the Grant Program” Undated. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).

⁵² “The purpose of the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (CLPEF) is to sponsor research and public educational activities and to publish and distribute the hearings, findings, and recommendations of the CWRIC so that 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.”

⁵³ See section titled “Strategic Plan” earlier in the chapter for in-depth analysis of the document.

proposals because these applications were designated as “Temporary” materials of the CLPEF, and destroyed upon termination of the Fund.⁵⁴ Neither of the two archives of the CLPEF, the private collection held by Dale Minami and the collection of applications stored at the Japanese American National Museum in Los Angeles, contained these unfunded applications as a result.⁵⁵ Kiang’s proposal proved to be the one exception because the Board decided after the initial rejection by the review panel to fund his project as a “Board Initiative.”

The absence of these unfunded applications was significant because it precluded direct analysis of the exact choices that the CLPEF made- to fund a particular narrative/ideology/ interpretation, at the expense of another. This would have allowed for a more robust assessment of whether this decision-making of the CLPEF marked a departure from the dominant practice of erasing certain elements of the community’s history as was politically expedient. The extensive analysis of the Board’s internal communications, Board meetings, and strategy documents in this thesis, however, did mitigate the absence of the unfunded applications by providing insights into the underlying strategies and thought processes that ultimately shaped these decisions. Along with the review of the funded projects earlier in the chapter, this investigation represented the most comprehensive study of the CLPEF possible, given the available materials.

Conclusion

The second chance offered by the reverted funds ultimately yielded mixed results. The Board decided against funding Susan Hayase’s proposal to dedicate the leftover funds to efforts

⁵⁴ National Archives and Records Administration. “Request for Records Disposition Authority- Civil Liberties Public Education Fund” June 19, 1998. Archivist of the United States. Job Number: N1-220-98-8.

⁵⁵ A request by the author to conduct research in the museum’s collections was denied.

that would “bridge the gap” between Japanese Americans and current-day “vulnerable communities.”⁵⁶ Instead the Board chose to fund projects creating a repository of completed CLPEF projects, a redress oral history project and a second round of 9 National Fellows. As was mentioned previously, Peter Kiang’s proposal was also funded as a “Board Initiative.”

In the ambitious agenda that the CLPEF Board proposed for itself, it had adopted a framing of internment and redress that was oppositional to Congressional interpretations of the same events. The Board rejected Congress’s assumption that the forces that had led to the internment could only be imagined in some unnamed future, in situations where the nation was under extreme duress. Instead, the achievement of redress meant that Japanese Americans now had a responsibility to be leaders and catalysts for greater justice in “vulnerable communities,” who faced threats similar to the pre-war Japanese Americans. As Board Member Susan Hayase would make clear in a later interview, they wanted to “arm [vulnerable communities] with something that they could use in their defense.”⁵⁷

This approach was made especially important in light of scholarship that noted that the Congressional interpretations silenced, misconstrued, and obfuscated elements of Japanese American history for its own self-serving purposes.⁵⁸ Namely “to make redress a demonstration of how the system can correct itself without radical change; that is, without hurting the status

⁵⁶ Dale Minami’s papers contained only the final decisions made by the members on the “Board Initiatives.” In personal interviews with the author, Mr. Minami could not recall why the proposal was ultimately rejected and Susan Hayase herself could not be reached for further information.

⁵⁷ Susan Hayase, interview by Glen Kitayama, “Redress as a tool against injustice” (video) Densho Visual History Collection, September 12, 1997, <http://archive.densho.org/Core/ArchiveItem.aspx?i=denshovh-hsusan-01-0011>.

⁵⁸ See David Glassberg, “Public History and the Study of Memory” *The Public Historian* Vol. 18 no. 2 (Spring, 1996): 7-23. On the maintenance of status quo through the production of an “official history” by “government agencies such as the military and National Park Service.”

quo.”⁵⁹ In the previous chapter, this thesis sought to demonstrate that this was actually the outcome of an implicit agreement in asymmetrical negotiations between Japanese American leadership and D.C. lawmakers. Not only did these leaders monopolize the power to speak for the Japanese American community, they had routinely whitewashed the community’s history and their present state in exchange for a seat at the table. The question that this thesis brought to the CLPEF in this chapter was as follows: When the “right to tell the redress story” was put in the hands of the community, would there be a different depiction of internment and redress and a more genuine articulation about the ambitions and needs of the community? This review of the CLPEF Board’s operations shows that they recognized this need for the recovery of silenced voices with their programming, and that the community responded with applications for precisely these sorts of projects.

The Board’s missteps, particularly its inability to realize its vision to forge new partnerships and enduring civil rights coalitions with non-Japanese American groups, also made clear that there remained many challenges and obstacles to the post-redress role of leadership that many Japanese Americans had envisioned for their community. In 2016, 18 years after the operations of the CLPEF, these are capacities that still need to be developed and nurtured, but attentiveness to both the successes and failures of the CLPEF illuminates a path forward. As internment moves further into the past, and the Japanese American community continues to evolve demographically, there is an urgent need to be strategic about the development of a post-internment, post-redress Japanese American identity and history.

⁵⁹ Bascara, “Cultural Politics of Redress,” 192.

Thesis Conclusion: Post-Internment, Post-Redress Japanese American Identity and History

In a *New Yorker* review of historian Erika Lee's *The Making of Asian America (2015)*, published in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, Karan Mahajan wrote:

“There are now, in a sense, two Asian Americas: one formed by five centuries of systemic racism, and another, more genteel version, constituted in the aftermath of the 1965 law. These two Asian Americas float over and under each other like tectonic plates, often clanging discordantly.”¹

The introduction of this thesis spoke about these transformative, yet little-recognized, changes afoot in the Asian American community. While these findings were most likely eye-catching to many, particularly that Asian Americans were growing at a faster rate than the Latino population, these statistics do not capture the impact soon to be felt in Asian American politics, institutions, cultures, and histories. And in spite of growth and flux that pales in comparison to other Asian American groups, Japanese Americans, because of their unique history, may be confronted with the most imposing set of uncertainties.² The enduring indivisibility of Japanese American identity and the camp experience is evident in the community's unique response to these changes. New (post-1965) Japanese immigrants to the U.S. are labeled “Shin Issei” (*New first generation*) to differentiate them from the first generation Issei that arrived on these shores before World War II. Because these generational names have long served to locate individuals in

¹ Karan Mahajan, “The Two Asian America,” *New Yorker*, October 21, 2015. <http://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/the-two-asian-americas>.

² The population of some Asian groups in the U.S. have multiplied in recent years due to international migration. Immigration from Japan, relative to many of the other Asian countries has not been as significant.

relation to the camp experience, and served as a shorthand for political worldview and ideology concerning Japanese American issues, the affixation of “Shin Issei” places these new immigrants firmly outside of these ties that bind the community. With new data that 40% of Japanese Americans are now foreign born,³ to treat and conceive of Shin Issei as marginal newcomers or a transient phenomenon is no longer a tenable position.⁴ As this conclusion will illuminate, this marginalization hampers the long-term objectives and ambitions of the post-redress Japanese American community.⁵ Furthermore, recent events have shown that the distance maintained between the “two Asian Americas” referenced above, and the absence of efforts to share and pass along the accumulated communal knowledge about the historical treatment of Asian Americans in the U.S., and of equal importance, the Asian American resistance and fight for justice, has inflamed tensions between Asian Americans and other minority groups. The Asian American position in the domestic racial hierarchy, always amenable to the will and expediencies of dominant groups, is being renegotiated and reformulated in this period of renewed introspection

³ Center for American Progress. “Who Are Japanese Americans?” April 2015. <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/AAPI-Japanese-factsheet.pdf>.

⁴ Tomo Hirai, “The Evolving Face of San Jose and the South Bay” *Nichi Bei Times*, September 20, 2012. <http://www.nichibei.org/2012/09/the-evolving-face-of-san-jose-and-the-south-bay/>.

“There are three major components to Japanese Americans,” he said. “The longstanding Japanese Americans — the second, third and fourth generations who married within JA communities — represent a shrinking third of the population. They used to be the majority of the population, but not anymore. The next third are Japanese Americans who arrived in the U.S. as war brides, or those who are of mixed heritage. The final third and growing contingent is the Shin-Nikkei, or those who have arrived after 1965.”

⁵ National Coalition for Redress/Reparations (NCRR) changed their name to Nikkei for Civil Rights & Redress to better reflect their post-JA redress mission. The JACL’s current mission statement reads: “The JACL monitors and responds to issues that enhance or threaten the civil and human rights of all Americans and implements strategies to effect positive social change, particularly to the Asian Pacific American community.”

about race in America.⁶ By failing to address and adapt to these changes, Asian Americans are again at risk of being a source of division and distrust among these vulnerable communities, rather than a catalyst to bring these groups together.

Local Communities and Global Forces

To date, the minimal attention that “Shin Issei” and their relationship to the “old-timer” Japanese American community has received has been in the field of transnational studies. Effective analysis of this interaction, of local communities coming into contact, and friction, with global and transnational forces, requires a complex set of tools and frameworks that are still in their early stages of development. Few have the facility with the diversity of source material (in language, methodology, etc.) necessary to conduct incisive analysis on the subject. This review of the attempts to grapple with the destabilizing effect of the “Shin Issei” on Japanese American understandings of identity and community illuminates some of the shortcomings and oversights in the current scholarship.

Takashi Machimura, in the edited volume, Global Japan: The Experience of Japan’s New Immigrant and Overseas Communities (2003), dedicates a chapter to the unique social milieu of multicultural and transnational Los Angeles. To understand the Japanese American community in the present day, he recognizes the importance of the centuries-long history of labor flows out of Japan, specifically the differences in the various waves of immigration. Early Japanese emigration in the 19th and early 20th century was made up largely of migrant laborers. After a series of restrictions with the 1907 Gentleman’s Agreement and the Immigration Act of 1924,

⁶ Fostered by groups like Black Lives Matter, there are now nationwide debates about police brutality, environmental racism (Flint Water Crisis), as well as increased attention to immigration policy and racial minorities in the 2016 presidential debates.

immigration from Japan would be revived in 1965 with the Immigration and Nationality Act. Subsequently, corporate expatriates, with their considerable economic footprint, have become the most conspicuous demographic amongst post-1965 Japanese immigrants. Machimura argues that their belonging to a different economic strata, and the ability of these expats (with corporate sponsorship) to create for themselves a self-sufficient “localized Japan,” with its own educational, commercial and social institutions, is the source of their distance from the native Japanese American community.⁷ By relying primarily on analyses of transnational financial investment and publications by Japanese Business Associations in California, Machimura arrives at this “bird’s eye view” interpretation. The sociological literature (mainly from Japanese academics) that he uses to supplement his research, begins to complicate this model of the insular and detached expatriate community. But his work is limited by being insufficiently attuned to ground-level social and cultural dynamics. Machimura concludes the chapter with the most recent development in this immigrant/expat community- the retreat of Japanese corporate investment and presence in these “localized Japan” enclaves.⁸ A product of the post-”Economic Miracle” retrenchment of overseas investment by Japanese firms, this withdrawal has forced “Shin Issei” into an unfamiliar engagement with local communities. The result is what Machimura terms a “social cleavage” among this group, with some being incorporated into the native Japanese American community, while others restrict their lives to their (now limited) corporation-sponsored bubble.⁹ With the “shrinking numbers of Japanese expatriate staff and

⁷ Takahashi, Machimura. “Living in a Transnational Community within an Ethnic City: Making a Localised ‘Japan’ in Los Angeles,” in *Global Japan: The Experience of Japan’s New Immigrant and Overseas Communities* (New York: Routledge, 2003): 151.

⁸ Machimura, 151.

⁹ Machimura, 153.

economic basis of a localised ‘Japan,’” Machimura warns of the uncertain future of this “imagined transnational community” and its interactions with the native Japanese American population.¹⁰

A useful article in light of some of the oversights of the previous work is Tritia Toyota’s “The New Nikkei: Transpacific Shin Issei and Shifting Borders of Community in Southern California (2012).” A scholar at UCLA, Toyota’s sources are more local, despite the transnational subject and scope, and include interviews with both long-term residents of Sawtelle, a traditional Japanese American enclave in Los Angeles, as well as Shin Issei now residing in the area. Her methodology allows insights into the tensions wrought by the influx of Shin Issei into these traditional Japanese American enclaves - spaces suffused with historic and symbolic significance for native Japanese Americans through shared histories of “exclusion, incarceration, resettlement, and redress.”¹¹ Rather than focusing on the economic and physical transformation that has followed the introduction of Shin Issei, the challenges that this new group poses to Japanese American understandings of identity and group membership take center stage. In Toyota’s work, the gentrification and commercialization of these ethnic enclaves is simply the most tangible marker of the friction between the two groups. But always underlying these physical changes to the geography are more deeply rooted beliefs about history and identity. Her interviews with long-term Japanese American residents clarify that the source of frustrations and tensions are due to forces less visible in the physical landscape, and ultimately tied to the traumas imposed upon Japanese Americans by internment. The following quote from a long-term

¹⁰ Machimura, 154.

¹¹ Tritia Toyota, “The New Nikkei: Transpacific Shin Issei and Shifting Borders of Community in Southern California” *Amerasia Journal* Vol. 38 no. 3 (2012): 16.

Japanese American resident with regards to the Shin Issei highlights that the crucible of internment, and the choices made in the face of questions about loyalty, citizenship, and belonging, continue to be the boundaries around which the Japanese American community organizes itself:

“Take loyalty, if you asked everybody to hold up the (American flag), how many of them would do it, even the ones who are naturalized? I’ll bet you not very many.”¹²

As long as the internment and the Japanese American community continue to be defined by this victimization, rather than the advocacy in its aftermath and a shared commitment to fight against unequal treatment and racial prejudice, there will be no place in the community for Shin Issei and other “non-traditional” members.

As the statistics at the beginning of this chapter made clear, this hybridization and increasing pressure on traditional boundaries show no signs of slowing down. As early as 1994, commentators had noted that demographic changes were forcing longstanding social service agencies and other Japanese American institutions to evolve to meet the needs of new Shin Issei and multi-racial populations. Taken with the analysis from the transnational scholars, it is clear that demographic and physical changes to the community and communal spaces continue to outstrip the evolution of the historical and cultural basis of group membership. The consequence is that new immigrants are seen as part of an unwanted and invasive influx, rather than newcomers that might be incorporated into the existing community. While some have noted that the maintenance and preservation of Japanese American culture and history rests with these “non-traditional” members, dialogue and collaboration between the two disparate groups remains

¹² Toyota, 19.

elusive. For example, in the CLPEF community input meeting held in Los Angeles, the idea for creating internment and redress materials in Japanese was raised by members of the community. The targets of these materials, however, were to be Japanese nationals **in** Japan, and not the significant population of Shin Issei residing in the area and reliant on such translations for access to this history. If the goal of post-redress Japanese American advocacy is to ensure that the legacy of internment and redress are enduring, and that the spirit of those experiences live on in non-Japanese American communities, these oversights almost certainly imperils that mission. Even as Japanese American organizations post-redress are adopting as their *raison d'être* the protection of civil liberties, particularly within vulnerable communities, they are abetting the growth of a historically illiterate sub-population amongst them. These newcomers are unlikely to have nuanced understandings about racial minorities and their relationships with the state, as well as the fraught relationships among minority groups themselves. By ignoring this community divide, a product of the 1965 immigration legislation and thus a feature of many Asian American communities, Japanese Americans place themselves at risk of being made into a wedge that further separates minority groups, rather than the lynchpin of a new united front against racial oppression and exploitation.¹³ The recent case of the Chinese American community's response to the conviction of NYPD Officer Peter Liang for killing an unarmed African American man, Akai Gurley, is illustrative in this regard.

Akai Gurley and Peter Liang: Post-1965 Immigrants and Asian American Historiography

¹³ For more on post-1965 Asian immigration, see Morrison G. Wong, "Post-1965 Asian Immigrants: Where Do They Come from, Where Are They Now, and Where Are They Going?" *The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol. 487 (Sep., 1986): 150-168.

On November 20, 2014, rookie police officer Peter Liang and his partner were assigned to a routine patrol of Brooklyn's Louis H. Pink Houses, one of the most neglected and dangerous housing projects in New York.¹⁴ As they approached an unlit stairwell, Liang unholstered his weapon. A sudden noise to his left startled Liang as he rounded the corner, and his Glock 9mm discharged. The bullet ricocheted off the staircase wall and hit Akai Gurley, climbing up the stairs with his friend Melissa Butler. The bullet entered Gurley's heart and he collapsed two floors below. Once Liang and his partner reached the fifth floor and found Gurley wounded, they failed to both call in the shooting, and to perform CPR, as police officers are trained to do. Instead they argued over who would make the call to their supervisor, as Gurley's friend, Melissa Butler, attempted to perform CPR. Gurley would die from the lethal bullet wound to his heart.¹⁵

On January 28th, 2016, as Liang's trial was under way, journalist Max Rivlin-Nadler noted that "the usual throng of supporters from the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (police union), and its boisterous head Pat Lynch was nowhere to be seen." At previous police misconduct trials, Rivlin-Nadler continued, the PBA "had put itself directly in the spotlight to broadcast its steadfast faith in the near total infallibility of police officers." A former NYPD officer at the trial echoed Rivlin-Nadler's observation, stating that "the PBA is obviously

¹⁴ Ben Feuerherd, "Living in Fear at the Dark and Deadly Hellhole Houses." *New York Post*, November 22, 2014. <http://nypost.com/2014/11/22/tenants-live-in-fear-at-the-notorious-pink-houses/>.

¹⁵ Chris Fuchs, "Former NYPD Cop Peter Liang's Guilty Verdict Leaves Community Divided" *NBC News*, February 13, 2016. <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/former-nypd-cop-peter-liang-s-guilty-verdict-leaves-community-n518056?hootPostID=d3ef1e53659a3ea9707f9da415b295d0>.

absent.”¹⁶ Also during the trial, Liang’s family dismissed the lawyers appointed to him by the PBA due to “perceived unresponsiveness.”¹⁷

On February 11th, 2016, Liang was found guilty of manslaughter and official misconduct, carrying a maximum sentence of 15 years. The NYPD promptly fired him from the police force. The conviction marked the first for a NYPD police officer in a fatal civilian shooting since 2005. In a time of contentious national debate about police brutality, specifically the killing of unarmed black men, the fatal shooting of Akai Gurley, an unarmed black man, at the hands of police, was at once all too familiar -- and jarringly atypical in the guilty verdict and the race of the cop. Nowhere was this shock felt more strongly than in Asian American communities, a demographic notoriously silent on police brutality against African Americans. Nine days after the guilty verdict, thousands of Chinese Americans around the country took to the streets to protest the conviction with signs that read “Justice for Peter Liang!,” “One Tragedy Two Victims,” and “No Scapegoating!,” often in both English and Chinese. As some observers noted, the unprecedented demonstrations failed to clearly articulate exactly what the protestors were angry about: Did they believe the manslaughter conviction was unjust and want Liang exonerated as implied by the signs describing the “Two Victims”? Or was the anger directed at the fact that Liang did not receive the same protections afforded white officers and had been made into a “Scapegoat”? Regardless of the protestors’ intentions (and there likely was not a unified stance amongst them), it seems that their anger was being aligned with, if not co-opted by, conservative groups. Reports from Brooklyn, the site of one of the largest demonstrations in

¹⁶ Max Rivlin-Nadler, “Police Union Turns Its Back on Cop Who Killed Innocent Man in Brooklyn Stairwell.” *Gothamist*, January 28, 2016. http://gothamist.com/2016/01/28/akai_gurley_liang_trial.php.

¹⁷ Phoenix Tso, The “Splintered Messages of the #Justice4Liang Movement. *GQ*, February 24, 2016. <http://www.gq.com/story/peter-liang-akai-gurley-aftermath>.

the country, with 10,000 to 15,000 demonstrators, noted that “there were pro-police forces speaking at the rally” who were “suggest[ing] that the current climate of antagonizing the NYPD resulted in Liang’s conviction.” Furthermore, some Chinese demonstrators sported “All Lives Matter” signs, a phrase, the report noted, “often used to downplay the epidemic of excessive force against the black community.” Echoing the confusion at the clumsy and disjointed messaging of the protest, the journalist wondered, “Do these demonstrators understand that context? Would they care that they might be aligning the pro-Peter Liang movement with one often viewed as racist?”¹⁸

There are Asian American groups that support the conviction, such as the Committee Against Anti-Asian Violence (CAA AV). For them, the most instructive context and history within which to situate the Liang trial is the nation’s long history of state violence against African American communities, which has yielded a modern system of policing that routinely exercises excessive force and brutality against these communities. While noting the “clear disparities in the way that Liang was treated,” the CAA AV maintains their support for the conviction, stating, “Asian and Asian-American communities cannot be complacent with the current inherently flawed criminal justice system.” Long the only, though little recognized, representatives from a community in which most were indifferent to the plight of black victims of police brutality, they are now being drowned out by this sudden mass mobilization of Asian Americans awakened to the issue by a baptism by fire.

A 22-year old Chinese American supporter at a pro-Liang demonstration, in a widely published speech, sought to clarify exactly what they were protesting. She stated, “We are not

¹⁸ Phoenix Tso, The “Splintered Messages of the #Justice4Liang Movement. *GQ*, February 24, 2016. <http://www.gq.com/story/peter-liang-akai-gurley-aftermath>.

asking for white supremacy. We are not asking to be included in this cycle of systemic injustice.” This, of course, is an utterly ahistorical view that ignores the way in which the blissful ignorance of Asian America before the conviction of Liang, a period in which they were silent on the killing of unarmed African Americans at the hands of police, was afforded by their willing and eager participation in this very “cycle of injustice.”¹⁹

Here lies the “unique positioning” cheerfully touted by Asian American academics, as it is lived out by ordinary members of the community. It is laid bare when illusions about Asian Americans’ “adjacency to whiteness,” that they are on a “quick march to whiteness,” are shattered, and they are drawn into the inevitable engagement with America’s racial hierarchy and its fundamental white supremacy. It is a confrontation that exposes their naiveté and forces them yet again into the compromising position of “original humiliation”²⁰- of conditional citizenship, of concessions driven by the philosophy that “half a loaf is better than none at all.”²¹ Asian Americans still lack the political power, the organization, the language, and history to fight for true justice, for themselves, and for other groups. In this absence, misguided actions and short-sighted solutions reign supreme.

In the bilingual pro-Liang signs in the immigrant communities of Brooklyn, and other cities like it, and the desperate and exasperated efforts of long-standing Asian American groups

¹⁹ See Ellen Wu, and Asian American reliance on differentiating themselves from blacks as a means of advancing their interests.

²⁰ Chris Iijima’s term for the powerlessness of JAs during the incarceration.

²¹ Greg Robinson, “The Great Unknown and the Unknown Great: Remembering the McCarran-Walter Act.” *Nichi Bei Times*, July 11, 2013. <http://www.nichibeitimes.org/2013/07/the-great-unknown-and-the-unknown-great-remembering-the-mccarran-walter-act/>.

This quote was from JACL VP Thomas Hayashi about the JACL’s support of the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act which was seen by critics as sacrificing the civil liberties of other groups for JA priorities such as Issei Naturalization.

who counsel the consideration of a broader context and history in their support for the conviction, we are witnessing these “Two Asian Americas” come to life and facing each other for the first time. The dichotomy is nothing so neat as two generations of Asian Americans divided by the 1965 immigration bill-- it is also the chaotic accident scene of the collisions of two understandings of Asian American history. As of yet, the only clear outcome is that the “Asian Americanist,” social justice perspective, the few that have stood in solidarity with other communities of color against state oppression and police brutality, have come out the worse for wear, overwhelmed by a majority indifferent to appeals to history and context.

The perception by other non-Asian minorities that these haphazard and often incoherent demonstrations are yet another sign of Asian American indifference to their plight, and signs of co-optation by, and alignment with, conservative/racist groups that have no real interest in advocating for Asian Americans, should serve as a clarion call to the Japanese American community. Their politics is one that has long downplayed the ways in which the fates of all communities of color are intimately connected. On one hand, progress for Japanese Americans has often come at the expense of others, but Japanese Americans have also contributed to, and benefitted from, advancements won by communities of color. If this history, in all its richness - in its contradictions, and its episodes of shame and triumph - is not bequeathed to all children of Japanese America, native-born and newcomer, the post-redress mission to serve as a stalwart ally on the side of justice and fair treatment is threatened. Japanese American history, even harnessing its untapped sources and narratives, cannot provide a clear roadmap to follow in a situation like the Liang conviction. But it can bequeath a more complex, more self-aware

understanding of their “positioning” in American history and society and better prepare future generations for honest and just engagement with their fellow citizens in the years to come.

Bibliography:

Primary Sources

1. *Civil Liberties Act of 1988*, Public Law Public Law 100-383, 100th Congr. (August 10, 1988).
2. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes, April 1, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
3. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes, May 4, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
4. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "CLPEF Meeting Minutes at Los Angeles Japanese American Cultural and Community Center," April 30, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
5. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "CLPEF Board Agenda," December 5, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
6. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "CLPEF Board Meeting Minutes," December 5, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
7. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. CLPEF Grant Program Guidelines and Application. San Francisco, CA: CLPEF, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
8. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "CLPEF Sends Out Over 103 Award Letters for Grant Program", February 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
9. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. Final Report to the President and the Congress. Washington, D.C.: CLPEF, 1998. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
10. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "Review Guidelines for the Grant Program" Undated. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
11. Civil Liberties Public Education Fund. "Strategic Plan," August 16, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
12. Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians*, Seattle: University of Washington Press and Washington D.C.: Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, 1997.

13. Kiang, Peter. E-mail message to author, February 22nd, 2016.
14. Email from Dale Shimasaki to CLPEF Board, "Grant Funding, by Percent of Request," March 19th, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
15. Email from Dale Shimasaki to Dale Minami, "Strategic Plan," August 16, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
16. Email from Don Nakanishi to CLPEF Board, "Peter Kiang proposal," December 8, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
17. Letter from Peter Kiang to Dale Shimasaki, "Possibilities of supporting a curriculum project in New England," November 28, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
18. Email from Susan Hayase to CLPEF Board Members, "Report-back" meeting held in San Jose on 4/17/96," May 1, 1996. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
19. Email from Susan Hayase to Dale Minami, "National Archives Press Release," December 15, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
20. Email from Susan Hayase to Dale Shimasaki, Dale Minami, and Don Nakanishi, "Budget Ideas," April 28, 1997. Dale Minami Papers, Private Collection. Held by Dale Minami (San Francisco).
21. Susan Hayase, interview by Glen Kitayama, "Redress as a tool against injustice" (video) *Densho Visual History Collection*, September 12, 1997, <http://archive.densho.org/Core/ArchiveItem.aspx?i=denshovh-hsusan-01-0011>.
22. National Archives and Records Administration. "Request for Records Disposition Authority-Civil Liberties Public Education Fund" June 19, 1998. Archivist of the United States. Job Number: N1-220-98-8.
23. Niiya, Brian. "They Didn't Blow It," *Rafu Shimpo*, March 5, 1997.
24. US Congress. House. *H.R. 442: Hearing before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations*. 100th Cong., April 29, 1987.
25. US House. *Congressional Record*. 100th Cong., 1st sess., 1987. Vol. 133, pt. 17: 7555-7631.
26. US Senate. *Congressional Record*. 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 1988. Vo. 134, pt. 6: 4317-4440.

27. Watanabe, Martha, e-mail message to author, February 28th, 2016.

Secondary Sources

1. Bascara, Victor. "Cultural Politics of Redress: Reassessing the Meaning of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 after 9/11." *Asian American Law Journal* Vol. 10 Issue 2 (2003): 185-214.
2. Chan, Sucheng. "Asian American Historiography." *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 65 No. 3 (Aug., 1996): 363-399.
3. Fujita-Rony, Thomas. "Destructive Force: Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga's Gendered Labor in the Japanese American Redress Movement" *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* Vol. 24, no. 1 (January 2003): 38-60.
4. Glassberg, David. "Public History and the Study of Memory" *The Public Historian* Vol. 18 no. 2 (Spring, 1996): 7-23.
5. Hatamiya, Leslie. *Righting a Wrong: Japanese Americans and the Passage of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
6. Hohri, William. *Repairing America: An Account of the Movement for Japanese-American Redress*. Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1984.
7. Izumi, Masumi. "Prohibiting 'American Concentration Camps': Repeal of the Emergency Detention Act and the Public Historical Memory of the Japanese American Internment." *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 74, No. 2 (May 2005): 165-194
8. Iijima, Chris. "Reparations and the 'Model Minority' Ideology of Acquiescence: The Necessity to Refuse the Return to Original Humiliation" *Boston College Law Review* Vol. 40 (1998): 385-401.

9. Kameyama, Eri. "Acts of Being and Belonging: Shin-Issei Transnational Identity Negotiations." MA diss., UCLA, 2012.
10. Kozen, Cathleen K. "Redress as American-style justice: Congressional narratives of Japanese American redress at the end of the Cold War" *Time Society* Vol. 21, no. 2 (March 2012): 104-120.
11. Kurashige, Lon. *Major problems in Asian American history: documents and essays*. Houghton Mifflin, 2003.
12. Kurashige, Scott. *The Shifting Grounds of Race: Black and Japanese Americans in the Making of Multiethnic Los Angeles*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
13. Lee, Erika. *The Making of Asian America*. Simon & Schuster, 2015.
14. Lyon, Cherstin. "Loyalty questionnaire," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Loyalty%20questionnaire/> (accessed Feb 7 2016).
15. Machimura, Takahashi. "Living in a Transnational Community within an Ethnic City: Making a Localised 'Japan' in Los Angeles," in *Global Japan: The Experience of Japan's New Immigrant and Overseas Communities* (New York: Routledge, 2003): 147-156.
16. MacLachlan, Alice. "The State of 'Sorry': Official Apologies and their Absence" *Journal of Human Rights* Vol. 9 no. 3 (2010): 373-385.
17. Muller, Eric. "Draft resistance," *Densho Encyclopedia* <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Draft%20resistance/> (accessed Feb 7 2016).
18. Murray, Alice Yang. *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.
19. Nagata, Donna. "The Japanese-American Internment: Perceptions of Moral Community, Fairness, and Redress" *Journal of Social Issues* Vol. 46 no. 1 (1990): 133-146.
20. Nakanishi, Don. "Seeking Convergence in Race Relations Research: Japanese-Americans and the Resurrection of the Internment," in *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy* (New York: Springer US, 1988): 159-180.

21. Niiya, Brian. *Japanese American History: An A-to-Z Reference from 1868 to the Present*. Los Angeles: VNR AG, 1993.
22. Niiya, Brian. "No-no boys," *Densho Encyclopedia* http://encyclopedia.densho.org/No-no_boys/ (accessed Feb 7 2016).
23. Nobu Miyoshi. "Identity Crisis of the Sansei and the American Concentration Camp," *Pacific Citizen*, December 19, 1980.
24. Saito, Natsu Taylor. "Symbolism under Siege: Japanese American Redress and the Racialing of Arab Americans as Terrorists." *Asian American Law Journal* Vol. 8 no. 1 (January 2001): 1-29.
25. Shimabukuro, Robert Sadamu. *Born in Seattle; The Campaign for Japanese American Redress*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001.
26. Spickard, Paul R. "The Nisei Assume Power: The Japanese Citizens League, 1941-1942". *Pacific Historical Review* Vol. 52 no. 3 (1983): 147-174.
27. Takahashi, Jere. *Nisei/Sansei : Shifting Japanese American Identities and Politics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1997.
28. Toyota, Tritia. "The New Nikkei: Transpacific Shin Issei and Shifting Borders of Community in Southern California" *Amerasia Journal* Vol. 38 no. 3 (2012): 2-21
29. Wei, William. *The Asian American Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.
30. Wong, Morrison G. "Post-1965 Asian Immigrants: Where Do They Come from, Where Are They Now, and Where Are They Going?" *The Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol. 487 (Sep., 1986): 150-168.
31. Wood, Alexandra. "Rebuild or Reconcile: American and Canadian Approaches to Redress for World War II Confinement" *American Review of Canadian Studies* Vol. 44 no. 3 (2014): 347-365.
32. Wood, Alexandra L. "*After apology: Public education as redress for Japanese American and Japanese Canadian confinement.*" PhD diss., New York University Press, 2013.
33. Wu, Ellen. *The Color of Success: Asian Americans and the Origins of the Model Minority*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

34. Yamamoto, Eric K. "Friend, Foe or Something Else: Social Meanings of Redress and Reparations" *Denver Journal of International Law and Politics* Vol. 20 (1992): 223-248.
35. Yamamoto, Eric K. "American Racial Justice on Trial - Again: African American Reparations, Human Rights, and the War on Terror." *Michigan Law Review* Vol. 101 no. 5 (March 2003): 1269-1337.
36. Yamamoto, Eric K. "What's Next?: Japanese American Redress and African American Reparations" *Amerasia Journal* Vol. 25, no. 2 (1999): 1-17.
37. Yamamoto, Eric K. "Racial Reparations: Japanese American Redress and African American Claims" *Boston College Third World Law Journal* Vol. 19 no. 1 (1998): 477-523.
38. Yamato, Sharon. "The Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians" *Densho Encyclopedia* http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Commission_on_Wartime_Relocation_and_Internment_of_Civilians/ (Accessed Feb 7 2016).
39. Yoo, David. "Captivating Memories: Museology, Concentration Camps, and Japanese American History" *American Quarterly* Vol. 48 no. 4 (1996): 680-699,
40. Verdun, Vincent. "If the Shoe Fits, Wear It: An Analysis of Reparations to African Americans." *Tulane Law Review* Vol 67. no. 3 (1992-1993): 597-668.

Web Sources

1. Center for American Progress. "Who Are Japanese Americans?" April 2015. <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/A-API-Japanese-factsheet.pdf>.
2. Feuerherd, Ben. "Living in Fear at the Dark and Deadly Hellhole Houses." *New York Post*, November 22, 2014. <http://nypost.com/2014/11/22/tenants-live-in-fear-at-the-notorious-pink-houses/>.
3. Fuchs, Chris. "Former NYPD Cop Peter Liang's Guilty Verdict Leaves Community Divided" *NBC News*, February 13, 2016. <http://www.nbcnews.com/news/asian-america/former-nypd-cop-peter-liang-s-guilty-verdict-leaves-community-n518056?hootPostID=d3ef1e53659a3ea9707f9da415b295d0>.
4. Hirai, Tomo. "The Evolving Face of San Jose and the South Bay" *Nichi Bei Times*, September 20, 2012. <http://www.nichibeitimes.com/2012/09/the-evolving-face-of-san-jose-and-the-south-bay/>.
4. Mahajan, Karan. "The Two Asian America," *New Yorker*, October 21, 2015. <http://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/the-two-asian-americas>.

5. Momomedia. "CLPEF Background." Accessed October 19, 2015. <http://www.momomedia.com/CLPEF/backgrnd.html>
6. Nakagawa, Martha. "Service Agencies Discuss Changing Need of Japanese American Community." *AsianWeek*, August 26, 1994. <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P1-2267795.html>.
7. Pew Research Center. "U.S. Hispanic and Asian populations growing, but for different reasons." Accessed October 19, 2015, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/06/26/u-s-hispanic-and-asian-populations-growing-but-for-different-reasons/>
8. Rivlin-Nadler, Max. "Police Union Turns Its Back on Cop Who Killed Innocent Man in Brooklyn Stairwell." *Gothamist*, January 28, 2016. http://gothamist.com/2016/01/28/akai_gurley_liang_trial.php.
9. Robinson, Greg. "The Great Unknown and the Unknown Great: Remembering the McCarran-Walter Act." *Nichi Bei Times*, July 11, 2013. <http://www.nichibeitimes.com/2013/07/the-great-unknown-and-the-unknown-great-remembering-the-mccarran-walter-act/>.
10. Tso, Phoenix. The "Splintered Messages of the #Justice4Liang Movement." *GQ*, February 24, 2016. <http://www.gq.com/story/peter-liang-akai-gurley-aftermath>.