

CONSTRUCTING LOYALTY, CITIZENSHIP, AND IDENTITY: A RHETORICAL
HISTORY OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN INCARCERATION

by

Kaori Miyawaki

A Dissertation Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Communication

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

December 2014

ABSTRACT
CONSTRUCTING LOYALTY, CITIZENSHIP, AND IDENTITY: A RHETORICAL
HISTORY OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN INCARCERATION

by

Kaori Miyawaki

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2014
Under the Supervision of Professor Leslie J. Harris, Ph.D.

This dissertation reexamines loyalty, citizenship, and identity in the United States by closely reading historical materials about the Japanese American incarceration. The Japanese American incarceration is a unique and important historical event for studying citizenship and identity, since it was a moment in the U.S. history that citizens of the country were incarcerated by their government. This raises a larger question beyond the incarceration. What does it mean to be a loyal American citizen?

By closely analyzing texts generated by the U.S. government, the Japanese American community, and White American photographers, I identify multiple, conflicting meanings and implications behind the terms “loyalty,” “citizenship,” and “identity.” I argue that American citizenship in moments of crisis is grounded in performance of Whiteness and loyalty to the country. In other words, racially marginalized American citizens are asked to prove their loyalty and assimilation to White culture in order to be judged as true American citizens. Democratic actions by targeted minority groups can be denied or silenced as inappropriate citizenship performance.

This dissertation proposes two rhetorical strategies to counter misrepresented identity, loyalty, and citizenship of any minority groups. First, constructing two levels of collective identity, (1) a collective identity within a minority community and (2) a

collective identity that can be shared with both the American public and the minority community, can challenge stereotypical understandings of the minority identity. In addition, dissociation of the implied connection between certain actions (e.g. military enrollment) and loyalty can also challenge a misrepresented minority identity. Second, visual representation of a blended identity as an American citizen who respects one's racial and cultural origin with smiles, innocence, and beauty would be a potential strategy to counter the dominant understanding of their identity, since these visual features would break a mental disconnection between the American public and the minority group.

© Copyright by Kaori Miyawaki, 2014
All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Citizenship, Loyalty, and Identity in the Japanese American Incarceration	
Introduction	1
Rhetorical History	3
Citizenship and Community Construction	
Identity and Imagined Communities	6
Citizenship	8
Collective Identity and Citizenship in the United States	11
American ideals	11
American dilemma: Differentiations and exclusions	13
Japanese Americans as non-White Immigrants	16
Historical Background: Japanese Americans as Outsiders	18
Immigration, Settlement, and Discrimination:	
Conflicts between Immigrants and Natives	19
The Concentration Camps: Conflicts Escalated	20
Conflicts within the Community: The Draft and Resistance	23
Rhetoric and Citizenship	28
Preview of the Chapters	31
Chapter Two: Racialized Citizenship, Loyalty, and Identity by the U.S. Government	
Introduction	34
The Incarceration Justified by President	36
Executive Orders 9066 and 9102	38
Framing the Incarceration as a Military Necessity	40
Naming/Not Naming Identities	44
Implications of FDR's rhetoric	50
The Loyalty Screening	51
Loyalty as a Rhetorical Construction	54
Loyalty Constructed in the Loyalty Questions and the Evaluating Criteria	55
Congressional Report on "Un-American Activities on Relocation Centers"	60
Un-American Defined	62
The Pairs of American/loyal and Japanese/disloyal	68
Minority Views to the Congressional Report	71
Conclusion and Implications	73
Chapter Three: Citizenship by the Margins	
Introduction	76
Identity Construction in Social Movements	79
Loyalty and Citizenship Defined by Resisters: The Fair Play Committee	83
The Two Levels of Identification in the FPC's rhetoric	85
Identification with the internal audience	87
Identification with the external audience	91
Calling for a new collective identity	94
Redefining Citizenship	96
Citizenship Clashed: <i>The Rocky Shimpo</i> and <i>The Heart Mountain Sentinel</i>	100

Definitions as value hierarchies	103
Citizenship defined as enactment: Duty over rights	104
Citizenship defined as status: Rights over duties	110
Conclusion and Implications	114
 Chapter Four: Contested Identities through Visual Representations	
Introduction	117
Visual Rhetoric and Identity Representation	119
Loyalty, Citizenship, and Racial Identity in Photographs by Adams, Lange, and Miyatake	123
Ansel Adams, Japanese Americans as an assimilated minority	130
Dorothea Lange, Japanese Americans as victims of incarceration (censored)	135
Toyo Miyatake, Japanese Americans as happy residents	141
Reconstructing Racial Identity in Camp Photographs by Bill Manbo	148
Identity as Americans	151
Identity as Japanese descent	160
Conclusion and Implications	166
 Chapter Five: Conclusion	168
 References	174
 Curriculum Vita	188

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1: “These five Japs are among 155 trouble makers imprisoned in the stockade within the Tule Lake Segregation Center. Here they are answering roll call.” In Mydans, C. (1944, March 20). Tule Lake: At this segregation center are 18,000 Japanese considered disloyal to U.S. *Life*, 16(12), p. 25 125
- Figure 2: “Here is a student of divinity...” In Adams, A. (1944). *Born free and equal: The story of loyal Japanese Americans*. New York, NY: U. S. Camera. p. 81 132
- Figure 3: “Departure on relocation is the great adventure.” In Adams, A. (1944). *Born free and equal: The story of loyal Japanese Americans*. New York, NY: U. S. Camera. p. 54 134
- Figure 4: “Children in families of Japanese ancestry were evacuated with their parents and will be housed for the duration in WRA centers where facilities will be provided for them to continue their education.” In Gordon, L. & Okiihiro, G. Y. (2006). *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the censored images of Japanese American internment*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. p. 86 138
- Figure 5: “Part of a line waiting for lunch outside the mess hall at noon.” In Gordon, L. & Okiihiro, G. Y. (2006). *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the censored images of Japanese American internment*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. p. 170 140
- Figure 6: Three evacuee boys, guard tower, and barbed-wire fence on perimeter of residential area, looking west, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo40.jpg 142
- Figure 7: Oil storage tanks with school children, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo62.jpg 144
- Figure 8: Dancing in the auditorium, CA. 1944, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo65.jpg 145
- Figure 9: High school graduation ceremony, auditorium, 1944, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo66.jpg 147

- Figure 10: A Boy Scout, and behind him a drum majorette, at the head of a parade. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 51 158
- Figure 11: Billy Manbo with his maternal grandparents, Junzo (left) and Riyo Itano. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 10 154
- Figure 12: Billy Manbo poses in his soldier outfit with his father's model racing car. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 17 155
- Figure 13: Billy Manbo, in pilot attire, plays with a model airplane. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 95 157
- Figure 14: Billy Manbo eats ice cream in his pilot outfit. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 71 158
- Figure 15: A portrait of Billy Mando at a barded-wire fence. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 70 160
- Figure 16: A light moment during a sumo match. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 59 162
- Figure 17: At Bon Odori, dancers circle around the yagura, a mooden scaffold made specifically for the summertime festival. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 60 163
- Figure 18: No title. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. viii 165

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my cordial gratitude to Dr. Leslie J. Harris, my academic advisor and dissertation chair. She was always cheerful and supportive. I always felt better and got motivated after having a meeting with her. I also would like to give my appreciation to Dr. Kathryn M. Olson, Dr. William M. Keith, Dr. John W. Jordan, and Dr. Jasmine Alinder, my dissertation committee members. All of them were critical but supportive and gave me interesting and important insights to complete this dissertation.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my Milwaukee friends. I always had work buddies. We wrote in TA office, library, and Alterra (now Colectivo) so often. I could not complete the doctoral program without their supports and encouragements. Special thank you goes to Lindsey Harness, Ruth Beerman, Kiran Dhillon, Rachel Davidson, Kiko Omori, Mridula Mascarenhas, Jihyun Kim, Keith Dilbeck, Ali Gattoni, and Denis Grimes for working, talking about work and life, and laughing (sometimes crying) with me. Lastly, I would like to thank my husband Hiroyuki. We started dating when I started writing this dissertation, and he was always by my side throughout the writing process. Thank you so much for being supportive and respectful in my difficult times. I am very proud of being Drs. Miyawaki!

Kaori Miyawaki (Yamada)

Chapter One

Citizenship, Loyalty, and Identity in the Japanese American Incarceration

Introduction

In one sense, citizenship appears to be a transparent legal status. If one is born in the United States or U.S. territory, that person is legally a U.S. citizen. However, being American entails more than being born in the United States. This dissertation concerns a sense of American-ness that goes beyond legal status to include cultural, historical, and ideological ways of belonging. Historically, class, race, sex, and ethnicity limited citizenship status, and a variety of social movements speak to the long history of struggle in the United States for groups attempting to attain a legal status of being a citizen.

This dissertation examines how citizenship was constructed and enacted in discourses surrounding the Japanese American incarceration during World War II. The U.S. government forced American citizens of Japanese descent to move to concentration camps (or internment camps), regardless of their legal status as American citizens. This historical event suggests that American-ness is determined not merely by one's legal status. In this dissertation, I see American citizenship as a rhetorical construction and investigate multiple forms of citizenship found in the discourse of the Japanese American incarceration in relation to race and national origin. Specifically, I investigate the following questions: Who counts as a citizen, besides legal criteria? What are criteria for being a loyal American citizen? How are these criteria for citizenship constructed? How can these criteria be challenged and negotiated?

Through analyzing discourses surrounding the Japanese American incarceration, this dissertation examines citizenship as it is implicated in attempts at resistance to a

dominant system. This dissertation unpacks the puzzle of how the U.S. government justified the incarceration while referring to Japanese Americans as loyal citizens. The majority of Japanese Americans supported or followed the U.S. government's decision on incarceration, while some groups of Japanese Americans resisted. The resisters attempted to challenge the ways in which the U.S. government defined their identity, loyalty, and citizenship. I argue that the U.S. government simultaneously constituted Japanese Americans as both citizens and incomplete citizens, and the Japanese American resisters redefined ideal American citizenship and constructed their identity as true loyal American citizens.

The case study of the Japanese American incarceration speaks to questions about immigration and citizenship today, since it complicates our understanding of race, identity and citizenship during national crisis. Today, almost 12 million undocumented immigrants are living in the U.S., making immigration and citizenship a significant social issue ("Obama warns," 2004). For instance, the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act, announced on June 15, 2010 by the Obama Administration, defers deportation to unauthorized immigrants who are under the age of thirty-one, entered the U.S. before age of sixteen and have lived continuously in the U.S. for at least five years (Immigration Policy Center, 2012). This initiative has been a controversial political issue, generating discussions about how to test who can be an American citizen.

This dissertation suggests understanding citizenship as a set of performances, where each performance creates conflicting and/or contradicting understandings of citizenship. My analyses reveal that meanings of citizenship can vary depending on a person's race, national origin, and degree of assimilation to the dominant cultural norms.

Citizenship and American ideals are not universal values that all legal U.S. citizens can enjoy. At national crises, loyalty and citizenship is constructed not as a privilege or status given to all citizens but as loyalty to the nation that one must prove through certain actions. This dissertation reveals that assimilation to White American culture, military sacrifices and obeying authority were the preferred actions available for Japanese Americans during the crisis moment of WWII. The U.S. government, U.S. mainstream media, and even the Japanese American Citizen League (the most influential organization within the Japanese American community during that time) punished Japanese American resisters who performed their loyalty and citizenship through fighting against authority to achieve equality and freedom. Such understanding of citizenship construction, in particular of minority groups, provides scholars an alternative lens to evaluate citizenship as an intersection of race, national origin, and national identity.

This chapter proceeds as follows: First, it establishes a framing of how I read historical materials by introducing the concept of rhetorical history. Second, it presents an extensive literature review on citizenship in order to set up a framework of how I understand citizenship and how my analysis contributes to the citizenship scholarship. Third, it introduces history of immigration in the U.S., particularly focusing on immigrants from Japan. This section sets up a historical background and contexts of the materials I analyze in later chapters. Fourth, it presents a preview of chapters in this dissertation.

Rhetorical History

Why do rhetoricians study history? What unique contributions can rhetoricians, not historians, offer? Ray (2005) argued that rhetoricians can provide a unique

contribution to understandings of history because “the written evidence that remains---in reminiscences, private correspondence, editorial commentary, speech texts---offers the potential for the creative representation of the past event, the past ‘text’ that is ‘read’ not directly but via surrogates” (Ray, 2005, p. 9). Zarefsky (1998) further explained the relationship between history and criticism as not identical areas of inquiry, but they are overlapping circles. Rhetorical history exists in the area of overlap (Zarefsky, 1998, p. 21). Rhetorical history offers “the opportunity to see rhetoric as a perpetual and dynamic process of social construction, maintenance, and change rather than as an isolated, static product” (Turner, 1998, p. 4). Specifically, rhetorical history investigates questions such as:

how people defined the situation, what lead them to seek to justify themselves or to persuade others, what storehouse of social knowledge they drew upon for their premises, what themes and styles they produced in their messages, how their processes of identification and confrontation succeeded or failed. (Zarefsky, 1998, pp. 31-32)

By studying important historical events from a rhetorical perspective, a critic can see significant aspects about those events that other perspectives miss (Zarefsky, 1998, pp. 30-31). This dissertation intends to provide a lens to understand the Japanese American incarceration as a historical moment that meanings of American identity were contested and negotiated.

Additionally, studying individual historical cases contribute to theory. Case studies suggest models, norms, or exemplars; they offer perspective by incongruity on the ordinary cases; they yield insights that may apply by analogy either to ordinary cases or

to other extraordinary cases; and they sometimes yield a “theory of the case”: a better understanding of an unusual situation important in its own right (Zarefsky, 1998, p.25). Finnegan (2004) explained rhetorical history as “rather than using history to understand the speech, one would use the speech to understand history (p. 200). In such understanding of rhetorical history, rhetoricians offer alternative perspectives to understand historical events. The Japanese American incarceration is a unique and important historical event that tells scholars about citizenship and identity, since it was a moment in the U.S. history that citizens of the country were incarcerated by the U.S. government’s order not by committing crimes but being a racial minority. This raises a larger question beyond the Japanese American incarceration. What does it mean to be an American citizen? In which situation does the U.S. government take rights of its citizens away?

While I use rhetorical history to frame my dissertation, I do not intend to find a single “true” reading of the Japanese American incarceration. Rather I intend to offer a new perspective to read this historical event through examining rhetorical texts produced by the U.S. government, the Japanese American community, and White American journalists. Therefore, my dissertation project is designed not to merely review the particular historical event. Instead, it provides a lens that further conceptualizes how citizenship, loyalty, and American identity were constituted and contested through rhetorical acts during the event. As Von Burg (2010) contended, studying a history of movement helps us to make sense of what may be a new mode of citizenship (p. 354). Through analyzing discourses surrounding the Japanese American incarceration, this dissertation argues that loyalty and citizenship are rhetorical constructions and offers a

way to unpack meanings of loyalty and citizenship in ways that can both illuminate the past and the problems of today.

Citizenship and Community Construction

In order to discuss how my dissertation contributes to citizenship scholarship, this section first lays out an overview of current scholarship about citizenship and its relation to identity and community in general. Second, this section presents a literature review on citizenship, identity, and community specific to the context of immigrants in the United States. This section sets up a context for understanding the texts I analyze in later chapters. Lastly, this section justifies why a rhetorical approach would be the best method for investigating my research questions interwoven in the concepts of citizenship, identity, and community.

Identity and Imagined Communities

This section details literature on identity construction and community construction and their relation to my case study. An identity is a person's understanding of who he or she is (Renshon, 2005, p. 55). However, identity can be shared in individuals and the shared identity can be a foundation for constituting a community. Collective identity is a central issue for understanding human communication, since "a sense of belonging is a basic human need" (Karst, 1989, p. 4). Without knowing where to belong, one cannot answer the question of who she/he is. Therefore, exclusion from full membership of the community by labeling people as outsiders denies their very selves (Karst, p. 4). A sense of belonging to a particular community (or communities) sustains one's identity. Collective identity is not merely a collection of individual's

identity. By sharing a collective identity with others, one ensures his/her own self-identity.

Charles Taylor (2004) further explained “social imaginary” as “the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations” (p. 23). When people share identity and values, they believe they are in a society, without physically meeting with its members. In other words, communities are a rhetorical construction.

The way people imagine a democratic nation is one case of social imaginary. Benedict Anderson (1991) argued a nation is “imagined” because “the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (p. 6). Without individually knowing each member in a community, members of the community may share similar interests and identify as part of the same nation. Taylor (2004) further stated, “human beings can sustain a democratic order together, that this is within our human possibilities---will include the images of moral order through which we understand human life and history” (p. 28). Members of a social imaginary create “moral order” based on shared values and history. It is “more than just a grasp on the norms underlying our social practices...there also must be a sense...of what makes these norms realizable” (Taylor, p. 28). People who imagine they are members of a democratic nation share certain norms and moral orders, which are constructed rhetorically. In this sense, democratic nations are rhetorically constructed.

The particular case of the Japanese American incarceration provides an example of exclusion from national identity and citizenship at a moment of crisis. This case study suggests that while one believes she/he belongs to an imagined community, other members of the community might not accept her/him as a member. In case of Japanese American incarceration, mass media, such as newspapers and popular magazines, created anti-Japanese sentiment and labeled Japanese as well as Japanese Americans as outsiders and the enemy. The U.S. government attempted to calm the nation by referring to Japanese Americans as loyal U.S. citizens, thus members of the nation. This dissertation unpacks the puzzle of how the U.S. government justified the incarceration while referring to Japanese Americans as loyal citizens. This dissertation also investigates how a few groups of Japanese American resisters challenged the rhetoric of the incarceration by the U.S. government.

Citizenship

This section details literature on citizenship in democratic nations and its relation to my case study. A democratic nation gives privileges for its members/citizens, and in return citizens hold responsibilities to the nation. Nations grant their citizens' legal rights for many practical reasons: to protect them from enemies, to give them basic economic assistance, and to provide them with well-being at home and abroad (Von Burg, 2012, pp. 351-352). In this sense, citizenship is a privilege, or "right to have rights" (Arendt, 1994, p. 298). Such privileges with responsibilities create a sense of commitment to the nation.

Holding citizenship enables one to embrace a shared national identity, and a shared national identity encourages one to fulfill responsibilities as a citizen. When citizenship is discussed in social discourses, it is typically understood as specific actions,

such as voting, jury duty, campaign volunteering, and membership in volunteer groups (Asen, 2004, p. 190). However, citizenship is not merely about legal status or political actions. Asen problematized an understanding of citizenship as status and/or specific actions since it ignores changes in forms of political participation over time (p. 191). Focusing on what actions count as citizenship also directs our attention to assessing practices of citizenship and making citizenship as a zero-sum game, which certain activities are counted as citizenship and some activities are not (Asen, p. 191). Such attitude does not admit degree of difference in various contexts (Asen, p. 191).

Based on his criticism, Asen (2004) proposed that critics should ask how people enact citizenship, since such question sees citizenship not in specific acts but as a process that may encompass a number of different activities (p. 191). Following Asen's contention, I examine citizenship as an enactment, not a status. In other words, civic belonging is not conceptualized exclusively through a nation's laws, institutions, or myths but instead in individual and group *performances* of citizenship (Asen, p. 30, emphasis added). Citizenship emphasizes an "active role for citizens in the public sphere and implies their participation in public affairs" (Stieglitz, 1997, p. 185). Being a member of an imagery community requires sharing the identity and values of the community, and preferred actions to perform citizenship are determined based on the shared identity and values.

I analyze public discourses over the Japanese American incarceration as a process of citizenship. Through such analysis, I argue that citizenship is addressed, discussed, and enacted not just as a legal status but as something interwoven in national identity, racial identity, Americanism, and loyalty. Through single acts of individuals, such as

accepting the U.S. government's order, moving to concentration camps, enrolling U.S. military forces, and resisting against the U.S. government, American citizens of Japanese descent enacted citizenship. My analysis suggests that each individual did not share a single understanding of citizenship but performed citizenship in different ways. Therefore, a universal list of criteria for becoming an American citizen should not exist. Preferred actions to perform citizenship depend on contexts, such as race, national origin, norms, moral orders, and social events. Rather than creating criteria of citizenship that intend to be applicable to all cases, this dissertation investigates which action is preferred in which context as a way to perform citizenship. This analysis suggests that citizenship is not merely a legal status that is universally applicable to anyone. Rather, that citizenship is a rhetorical construction that can be changed, challenged, and contested in public discourse.

Preferred actions under the name of citizenship are not fixed. In other words, one's strong commitment to citizenship is not always evaluated positively. Even when one acts for fulfilling responsibilities of being a citizen, she/he does not always receive full citizenship. Bruner (2003) clarified that "citizenship usually requires that subjects speak the nation's language, obey the nation's laws, honor the nation's traditions, 'believe in' the nation, and be willing to make personal sacrifices on behalf of the nation" (p. 5). In addition to these cultural and civic markers, in some countries citizenship remains openly based on ethnic criteria, and those failing to meet those criteria are *de facto* aliens" (Bruner, p. 6). Therefore, regardless of one's legal status and/or political engagement for citizenship, her/his citizenship can be denied when she/he is considered as an alien or non-citizen.

Collective Identity and Citizenship in the United States

This section details collective identity and citizenship particularly in the United States in order to unpack historical contexts of my texts. The United States has been a country of immigrants. Therefore, Americans, at any given time, have different sets of identities, which are variously composed of their experiences of history, races, class, gender region, sexual identity, and life history (Stuckey, 2004, p. 3).

Historically, such diverse individual identities were reduced to an idealized identity that becomes the basis for collective actions (Stuckey, p. 3). Creating a sense of national identity or the invention of an “us” requires the creation of a “them” (Stuckey, 2004, p. 9). Therefore, defining who is an American requires defining who is not an American. The following literature reviews collective identity, community, exclusion, and differentiation in the United States. Understanding the condition surrounding national identity and citizenship in the United States sets up contexts for investigating struggles over identity and citizenship status Japanese Americans experienced.

American ideals.

Americans, it is often said, are people who are defined by and united by their commitment to the political principles of liberty, equality, democracy, individualism, human rights, the rule of law, and private property embodied in the American Creed (Huntington, 2004, p. 46). Such values were constituted and circulated through social, political, and legal discourses. Moreover, Beasley (2001) detailed that the American Creed can be described as “liberty, egalitarianism, individualism, populism, and laissez-faire” (p. 173). Beasley further argued that each American Creed is an ideograph (p. 173). Ideographs are terms which people in a community conditionally share the meanings.

McGee (1980) defined ideographs as “a political language, preserved in rhetorical documents, with the capacity to dictate decision and control public belief and behavior” (p. 5). It is “a high-order abstraction representing collective commitment to a particular but equivocal and ill-defined normative goal” (McGee, 1980, p. 15). The American Creed has been studied as an ideograph, as a language that has been dictating American citizens to respect the value of liberty, equality, and individualism. While ideographs construct shared public values and behavior, meanings attached to the American Creed are not monolithic, since ideographs are highly abstract representations. Therefore, the American Creed or American ideals are also rhetorical constructions.

These American ideals have been interwoven in practices and discourses, such as history education, presidential speeches, memorials, mass media, popular culture, and more (e.g. Berlant, 1997; Beasley, 2004; Stuckey, 2004; Doesey, 2007). Kimmelmeier and Winter (2008) argued that “liberty and freedom constitute dominant themes in American national identity, where American history is often viewed as a struggle to attain and defend freedom, or where the American military is viewed as guarantor of this freedom” (p. 861). American ideals have been rhetorically constructed and reproduced, and serve as a basis for national identity of American people.

Although the American Creed embraces American ideal values, the Constitution of the United States does not contain an explicit definition of citizenship. Rather, citizenship exists as “both enabled and constrained by existing vocabularies of motive and value and the political relationships established through discursive practice” (Jasinski, 1991, p. 80). Thus, the meaning of citizenship is not fixed, but is determined through public actions and discourses. Viewing citizenship as a way of acting rather than as a

status attribute means that even those individuals can enact national belonging and challenge the borders of the civic imaginary (Cisneros, 2011, p. 32).

American dilemma: Differentiations and exclusions.

While the American Creed has been studied as an ideograph with shared meaning in the United States, American history of differentiating and excluding immigrants suggests that equality, freedom, and citizenship are privileges that not all people living in the United States have enjoyed. Racial, gender, and sexual minorities and the working class in the United States have been struggling over citizenship (Berlant, 1997, p. 27).

While all the struggles are equally important to recognize, in discussions of American citizenship, race has been particularly a prominent component for determining one's citizenship and identity. Who enjoys full citizenship has been negotiated through public actions and discourses; however, Whiteness historically dominated citizenship discourses. This section unpacks the history of citizenship in the United States in order to recognize the relationship between citizenship and race.

Race has constrained citizenship and rights to speak in public. Smith (1997) studied history of American citizenship laws and argued that American civic identity did not feature either individual rights or membership in a republic. He noted, "America was by rights a white nation, a Protestant nation, a nation in which true Americans were native-born men with Anglo-Saxon ancestors" (p. 3). Gross (2008) further argued that immigrants in the United States faced the same strategic issues as Native Americans about identifying as "people of color" or claiming whiteness (p. 7). Whiteness and citizenship in the United States have been closely tied, and "people who were not able to

win a claim of whiteness found themselves shut out of full participation in the public sphere (Gross, p. 7).

The identity of White American-born men was shaped by contrasting their beliefs and behaviors with those of the Others (Karst, 1989, p. 2). Karst noted White, males, and native born Americans managed to maintain egalitarian ideals by defining the community in a way that excluded subordinated groups (p. 2). For example, the community of White working class was constructed by Othering Black slaves. Ways to differentiate subordinated groups were not limited to the owner/slave or White/Black boundaries since Irish, Italians, and Jews in the mid-nineteenth century were not considered White (Gross, 2008, p. 7).

As Jacobson (1999) summarized, from the 1790s to the 1840s, in an era of relatively few immigrants, Americans saw people as either White or Black. Between the 1840s and the 1920s, a period of mass foreign immigration and pervasive prejudice against various immigrant groups, a pattern of “variegated Whiteness” was emerged. Beginning in the 1920s, with immigration restriction, color again triumphed as a badge of race, and immigrants started a “Caucasian” race that encompassed diverse nationalities previously deemed racially deficient. Whiteness is not merely a White/Black binary but a social construction beyond biological characteristics of race, therefore rhetorical.

American national identity is embedded with Whiteness and masculinity. In the early national period of the United States, masculine aggression was symbolically reorganized under the banner of Whiteness (Nelson, 1998, p 15). White manhood trained men, “as part of their civic, fraternal grant, to internalize national imperatives for ‘unity’ and ‘sameness,’ recodifying national politics as individual psychology and/or

responsibility (Nelson, 1998, p. 15). Literature on Whiteness suggests that being an American is not merely being born in the United States.

In addition to unification through differentiating Others, citizenship laws are ideological. Smith (1997) argued that citizenship laws reflect aspirations of political elites who crafted the laws. The citizenship laws express civic ideologies and civic identity that empower the leaders' likely constituents (Smith, p. 6). Laws are arbitrary and rhetorical construction by those in power. Therefore, while the United States idealizes equality as an abstract value, the society defines itself through differentiating others/non-Whites. Myrdal (1944) called the White-male centered condition of citizenship an "American dilemma." White Americans were genuinely devoted to the nation's egalitarian and individualistic ideals, yet they also accepted the systematic denial of non-White's equality and individuality.

Such White-privilege can create a condition that allows the empowered to demand others to behave "normally" to be fully included. In such condition, assimilation is simply an reasonable option for the Others. Exclusion is thus framed as the product of individual choice and not as a result of institutional structures and informal practices (Stuckey, 2004, p. 15). Therefore, critics should examine if discourses frame a condition as a result of individual's choice rather than a fault of the privileged. In the particular case of the Japanese Americans' incarceration, critics should carefully examine how the incarceration was framed by the U.S. government and other agencies and if the framing directed people's attention from the U.S. government's fault to a fault of Japanese Americans. The United States at the time of the Japanese American incarceration justified its removal program as to defend national security as well as the safety of

Japanese Americans. In this framing, national security of (native) citizens seemed to be prioritized. Moreover, such framing allowed the U.S. government to present “relocating,” not “being forced to move,” as the more reasonable option for Japanese American individuals. As such, construction of discourses and framings is a key to understand how the Japanese American incarceration was justified by the U.S. government and why it was accepted by many in the United States, where idealized equality and liberty. Whiteness through differentiation in the representation of Japanese Americans’ identity should be also carefully examined in order to understand relation of citizenship and Whiteness.

Japanese Americans as non-White Immigrants.

Due to racism, Asian Americans have been struggling for their citizenship status in the United States. Japanese Americans experienced differentiation and exclusion before the World War II. Young (2004) argued that Asians and Asian Americans have been regarded as less than potential citizens and as less than full citizens (p. 6). This section summarizes the history of Asian immigration and exclusion, especially focusing on experiences of Japanese Americans in order to further understand historical contexts of the Japanese American incarceration.

In the late 19th century, Asian immigrants, especially Chinese, were excluded due to the economic fear on the West Coast. During this time, native-born Americans attributed unemployment and declining wages to Chinese workers whom they also viewed as racially inferior (“Chinese Exclusion Act,” 2014). On May 6, 1882, President Chester A. Arthur signed the Chinese Exclusion Act, which was an immigration policy that kept Chinese from entering the country (“Chinese Exclusion Act,” 2014). The law

halted Chinese immigration for ten years and prohibited Chinese from becoming U.S. citizens (“Chinese Exclusion Act,” 2014).

The story was different for Japanese immigrants, though. The United States had accepted immigrants from Japan in the late 19th century. A U.S.-Japanese treaty signed in 1894 had guaranteed the Japanese the right to immigrate to the United States, and to enjoy the same rights in the country as U.S. citizens (U.S. Department of Office, n.d. a). In 1906, however, the San Francisco Board of Education enacted a measure to send Japanese and Chinese children to segregated schools (U.S. Department of Office, n.d. a). In a series of notes exchanged between late 1907 and early 1908, known collectively as the Gentlemen’s Agreement, the U.S. Government agreed to pressure the San Francisco authorities to withdraw the measure, and the Japanese Government promised to restrict the immigration of laborers to the United States (U.S. Department of Office, n.d. a). President Colvin Coolidge signed the Immigration Act of 1924, which limited the number of immigrants allowed entry into the United States through a national origins quota. The law completely excluded immigrants from Asia (U.S. Department of Office, n.d. b.). As a result, immigrants from Japan would no longer be admitted to the United States (U.S. Department of Office, n.d. b.).

In this sense, although the United States has been celebrated as a nation of immigrants, “stochastic citizenship” or freedom to move around the world (Von Burg, 2012) was not granted in the discourse of citizenship for Asian immigrants. Immigrants have been considered not to be eligible for full citizenship due to their national origin. As immigrants demand rights and protections similar to what “natives” enjoy, native citizens suggest that “there are and should be restrictions on *who* enjoys nation-based

privileges” (Von Burg, 2012, p. 352, emphasis original). In addition, who to be “natives” is contextual. After assimilation of those “non-White” immigrants (e.g. Irish, Italian, and Jews) as White natives, the United States found new “non-White” immigrants to differentiate. Anti-Asian and later anti-Japanese sentiment rose among “native” American citizens, including those who used to be “non-White” immigrants. Japan’s attack to Pearl Harbor fueled such existing sentiment against immigrants from Japan.

Historical Background: Japanese Americans as Outsiders

The possibilities and limitations of full citizenship has been an ongoing conversation in the United States. In order understand the rhetoric of Japanese American incarceration during WWII, this section overviews history of Issei (the first generation immigrants from Japan), pre-war discrimination against Japanese Americans, the start of concentration camps, the draft call targeting Japanese Americans, and the resistance against the draft. This history reveals two different conflicts Japanese Americans experienced: (1) Conflicts between immigrants (Japanese Americans) and the natives in the United States, and (2) Conflicts within the Japanese American community.

Before getting into the history of the Japanese American incarceration, I would like to clarify that terminologies that refer to the U.S. government’s program regarding the Japanese American incarceration are controversial. The U.S. government called the incarceration an “evacuation program.” James Hirabayashi (1994), a pioneer ethnic studies scholar, argued that the U.S. government intentionally used “evacuation” for referring to the forced removal of the Japanese Americans. The U.S. government also called the camps “relocation centers.” The terms do not imply forced removal or incarceration in enclosures patrolled by armed guards. Roger Daniels (2005), a historian

who specializes history of the Japanese American incarceration, argued it is important to stop using the euphemistic terms “internment camps” and the “internment of Japanese Americans” to describe the WWII experiences of Japanese Americans, since the term “internment camp” should be used only with reference to the internment of Japanese aliens labeled as enemy aliens along with German and Italian aliens (p. 205). Following Daniels’s call, I use the term “the Japanese American incarceration” through the dissertation. I use the term “concentration camps” for referring to the camps where the U.S. government forced Japanese Americans to move.

Immigration, Settlement, and Discrimination: Conflicts between Immigrants and Natives

During the late 19th century, the population of immigrants drastically increased in the United States. In 1900, the Japanese immigrant population rose to 24,326. In 1930, the Japanese American population grew to 138,834 (Williams, 2006, p. 64). Niiya (1993) referred the period from 1865 to 1909 as a time of labor immigration (p. 5). The needs for cheaper workers in the United States and drastic increase of international trade caused such increase.

The first generation of Japanese immigrants, those who are referred to as Issei, were the pioneer generation of Japanese Americans (Ng, 2002, p. 2). Most of Issei retained a sense of Japanese identity and preserved as much as they could of the language and culture of Japan (Muller, 2001, p. 8). The second generation of Japanese Americans, or Nisei, were legal citizens of the United States since they were born in the country. They attended American schools and were educated in the same ways as other Americans

(Muller, 2001, p. 9), before the Immigration Act of 1924 obligated them to attend segregated schools.

Despite the assimilation of Nisei into American culture, Anti-Asian sentiment was on the rise in the West Coast in the early 20th century. The physical and cultural characteristics of Asian immigrants set them apart from the largely European American majority, and they tended to be targets of prejudice and discrimination (Ng, 2002, p. 1). Japanese Americans were targets of physical attacks, faced discrimination in employment, and lived in segregated neighborhood, and attended “oriental schools” (Niiya, 1993, p. 4).

In the 19th century, racism in the United States was mainly directed at the Chinese, however, coinciding with the increase in Japanese immigration and the growth of Imperial Japan’s military power, racist attention switched to the Japanese in the early 20th century (Castelnuovo, 2008, p. 3). The Japanese were viewed as “outsiders and strangers, their ‘assimilability’ was questioned, and their success in agriculture was viewed as threatening the economic livelihood of the U.S. born, non-Japanese farmers” (Ng, p. 8). Anti-Japanese propaganda descried Japanese Americans as the “Yellow Peril” (Muller, 2001, p. 11). Americans discriminated against Japanese Americans legally as well as socially. Since 1870, the law had offered naturalization only to White people. It was legally impossible for any Japanese immigrant to become a U.S. citizen (Muller, 2001, p. 8), while they could enjoy the same citizenship privilege before the Immigration Act of 1924.

The Concentration Camps: Conflicts Escalated

The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 became a catalyst for a radical increase in anti-Japanese sentiment. Resident Japanese Americans were

designated “enemy aliens,” although such labels were never applied to resident Germans or Italians (Thiesmeyer, 1995, p. 321). Japanese Americans became the most convenient scapegoat, due to their relatively small population and previously existing racism, while German and Italian Americans certainly underwent their own ordeals caused by governmental scrutiny and discrimination during the war years. It was difficult to remove German and Italian Americans from essential war industries and elections, and the impossible cost of imprisoning millions of people was another reason not to remove German and Italian Americans (Castelnuovo, 2008, p. 3). However, between December 7 and 10, 1942, the FBI swept through the Japanese American communities of Hawaii and the West Coast and arrested nearly thirteen hundred Issei men (Muller, 2001, p. 18).

With the increasing sentiment against Japan, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942. This Order did not directly mention Japanese Americans, but designated certain areas of the West Coast as areas which any and all persons may be relocated as deemed necessary or desirable (Ng, 2002, p. 18). On March 24, 1942, John DeWitt, commanding general of the Western Defense Command, issued an order confirming “all German, Italian, and Japanese aliens and all U.S. citizens of Japanese (but not German or Italian) ancestry to their homes between eight o’clock in the evening and six o’clock in the morning” (Muller, 2001, p. 21). The order also required Japanese Americans to get military authority to travel more than five miles from their homes (Muller, 2001, p. 21).

Anti-Japanese sentiment had been increasing within U.S. society. General DeWitt stated that “the Japanese race is an enemy race” (cited in Muller, 2001, p. 23), and he was not alone in his view. The call for exclusion of Japanese Americans came

first and loudest from nativist groups and economic competitors who had long opposed all Japanese immigration (Muller, 2001, p. 24). Politicians and newspaper journalists also joined the chorus for exclusion (Muller, 2001, p. 25). Media portrayal of the Japanese as the enemy fueled anti-Japanese sentiment and White fears disloyalty by Japanese Americans (Alinder, 2009, p. 53). In addition, ruthless caricatures in U. S. propaganda facilitated representations of Japanese as nonhuman or subhuman, like animals, reptiles, or insects (Dower, 1986, p. 81). In media representations, Japanese Americans were equated with the Japanese enemy (Alinder, p. 53).

Under such circumstance, President Roosevelt's Executive Order authorized removing Japanese living on the West Coast under the name of "military necessity," claiming enemy aliens were potential threats to national security during war time. The incarceration was initially framed as a voluntary resettlement, and approximately 5,000 Japanese and Americans of Japanese descent moved outside of the Western Defense Command zone (Ng, 2002, p. 21). However, the U.S. government terminated this voluntary move and took full control of the Japanese American incarceration. On February 25, 1942, anyone of Japanese descent was told to leave within forty-eight hours. This order required Japanese Americans to forfeit land, property, and businesses. As a result of the order, approximately 120,000 people moved to concentration camps in the United States (Ng, p. 38).

The removal ruined Japanese Americans financially. The U.S. government paid unskilled laborers \$12 a month, while doctors and other professionals earned \$19. The pay was extremely low compared to White personnel working at the camps. For example, a Japanese pediatrician at the Heart Mountain Hospital was paid \$228 per year while

Caucasian nurses working at the same hospital made \$1,800 per year (Mackey, n.d. para. 28).

Racism seemed to affect this policymaking. The criteria of who should be sent to the camps were determined by Colonel Karl Bendetsen, the head of the Wartime Civil Control Administration in charge of the removal. He stated: "I am determined that if they have one drop of Japanese blood in them, they must go to camp" (cited in Castelnuovo, 2008, p. 5). U. S. citizenship and loyalty to the nation were irrelevant, and race seemed to determine who qualified as full American citizens.

Conflicts within the Community: The Draft and Resistance

While the U.S. government sent Japanese Americans to the concentration camps by the evacuation program, the War Department announced an initiative to organize a segregated combat team for Nisei who wished to volunteer following President Roosevelt's order on February 1, 1943 (Muller, 2001, p. 41). In 1944, two years after the initial removal, the War Department formally announced its new policy of drafting the Japanese Americans at the camps. By this draft order, young Nisei men in the camps were compelled to enroll in the military by force of law (Muller, 2001, p. 64). The young men in the camps who received their draft notices were all American citizens (Muller, 2001, p. 8). Enrolling in military forces was often an individual choice rather than a collective action (Muller, 2001, p. 65).

The Japanese American Citizenship League (JACL), which was formed in 1929 and was the most well-known and influential Japanese American organization in the United States, decided to cooperate with the U.S. government ("Japanese American Citizenship League", 2013). The JACL made its decision to gain some influence over

government policies in the camps and to ensure a more positive reaction from the American public. Most Japanese Americans agreed with this decision (Castelnuovo, 2008, p. 103).

The reason behind the draft was the need to recruit more soldiers. The two segregated volunteer Nisei American battalions had very high casualties in North Africa and Italy in 1943 (Castelnuovo, 2008, p.20). The War Department desired replacements, but the volunteer drive in the concentration camps was low. The draft was justified by President Roosevelt's letter of February 1, 1943 to Secretary of War Stimson: "No loyal citizen of the United States should be denied the democratic right to exercise the responsibilities of his citizenship, regardless of his ancestry...Americanism is not, and never was, a matter of race ancestry" (cited in Kashima, 1996, p. 191). Although the evacuation program justified segregation based on racial origin, the draft recognized that race should not deny the duties of citizenship. The rhetoric of loyalty and citizenship of Japanese Americans by the U.S. government had been complicated in order to justify the incarceration but grant citizenship of Japanese Americans. Chapter two further investigates rhetoric of the U.S. government concerning the incarceration, loyalty, citizenship, and identity.

Responding to the draft call, more than 33,000 young Japanese Americans served in the U.S. military during World War II. Most of them were in one of three military units: the 100th Battalion, which organized in Hawaii; the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, comprised of volunteers and draftees from the ten mainland concentration camps; and the Military Intelligence Service, consisting of Japanese American workers in the

Pacific Theater (Ng, 2002, p. 55). The three units' members were all Japanese Americans, meaning they were not allowed to join units with other racial groups.

Despite their passing of the loyalty test, the U.S. military did not allow the Nisei Americans to fight with other U.S. soldiers as a team. The United States Armed Forces were officially segregated until 1948, so non-White American citizens were assigned to segregated combat teams (The National WWII Museum, n.d.). Regardless of such segregation, the Japanese American soldiers fought for the United States. As a result, the 100th Battalion served in North Africa and Italy, earning the designation of "Purple Heart Battalion" because of its heavy losses (de Nevers, 2004, p. 224). The 442nd Regimental Combat Team joined the Italian campaign at Naples and received several presidential Distinguished Unit Citations (de Nevers, p. 224).

In most of the concentration camps, there is little record of public discussions about the draft. The public image of Japanese Americans was promoted by the War Relocation Authority (WRA): "The outstanding feature of the evacuation process was the complete absence of disturbance from the evacuees. Accepting without public protest the military orders, the evacuees appeared when called and got themselves on the trains without any compulsion by the public authorities" (Okihiro, 1984, p. 220). Along with such image of submissiveness, few record of physical resistance exists. Tashima (2003) noted the culture of the Japanese American community, instilled by the first generation, was obedience and submission: "This culture of conformity was reinforced by the J[apanese] A[merican] C[itizens] L[eague]'s policy of cooperation with the government in carrying out the evacuation and interment" (p. 2013). Tashima argued that the culture of accepting an authoritative order made Japanese Americans follow the removal policy.

In addition to the Japanese culture, the Japanese American community lacked leadership that might have counseled resistance. Most of the Issei community leaders had been locked away in Justice Department concentration camps just after Pearl Harbor (Muller, 2001, p. 26). Consequently, resistance by the submissive Japanese was depicted as sporadic and uncharacteristic (Okihiro, 1984, p. 220).

However, there were several groups of Japanese Americans who rejected the draft. On January 6 1943, sixty-three men from the Poston Relocation Center in southern Arizona sent a letter to President Roosevelt decrying the draft. The letter asked President to recognize Japanese Americans as citizens first, and they will gladly serve in the army after such official recognition (Muller, 2001, pp. 44-45). Over one hundred Issei and Nisei at Tule Lake camp were arrested by refusing to comply with registration entirely or answering “no” to the loyalty question in order to oppose the draft (Muller, 2001, p. 57).

A notable group of Japanese-American resisters were called “no-no boys.” The WRA conducted loyalty screening in order to examine which Japanese Americans were “loyal” enough to serve the military and war-related industries. Japanese American men who said “no” to two confusing questions, questions 27 and 28, in the loyalty questionnaire were called “no-no boys.” Question 27 asked: “Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty, whenever ordered?” Question 28 asked: “Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States and faithfully defend the United States of America from any and all attack by foreign or domestic forces, and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor and to any other foreign government power or organization?” (Castelnuovo, 2008, p. xii). Some Nisei Americans were disturbed by these questions. Typical responses were “Yes, if my rights

as a citizen are restored” and “No, not unless the government recognizes my right to live anywhere in the United States” (Castelnuovo, p. 17). Some Nisei Americans also saw question 28 as a trap, since foreswearing allegiance to the Emperor could be seen as an admission that such allegiance had previously existed (Castelnuovo, p. 17). Answering “no” to those questions resulted in being treated as disloyal (Abe, 2000), but some refused to complete the questionnaire and others answered “No-No” to both questions (Castelnuovo, p. 17). Nonetheless, of the respondents, 77,957 residents, eighty-seven percent answered yes to the loyalty questions (Castelnuovo, p. 17).

The largest organized resistance by Japanese Americans was at the Heart Mountain camp in Wyoming. They established an organization called the Fair Play Committee (the FPC) and protested against the draft by publishing bulletins circulated in the camp, refusing to report to physical examinations, walking out of the camp’s front gate without a pass, etc. (Muller, 2001, p. 90). By June of 1944, a total of sixty-three young men from the Heart Mountain camp were in jail across Wyoming awaiting a joint trial on charges of evading the draft for insisting upon the restoration of their civil rights as a precondition to military service (Muller, 2001, p. 99). Judge Kennedy of the U.S. District Court for the District of Wyoming eventually sentenced the sixty-three Heart Mountain draft resisters to three-year terms in federal prison (Muller, 2001, p. 100).

Other than the no-no boys and the draft resisters, military resisters, who were already in the military, refused commands to begin combat training (Castelnuovo, 2008, p. xv). They refused to fight because they objected to combat service for a country that had imprisoned their families (Castelnuovo, p. 120). Their actions were categorized as disloyal by the U.S. government, and this presupposition was rarely questioned by the

media and the American public (Castelnuovo, pp. 126-127). The JACL and Japanese American veterans have traditionally considered military resisters' refusal to take combat training as more problematic than draft resistance, and military resisters have remained marginalized in their communities since they are still perceived to be disloyal and unpatriotic (Castelnuovo, p. xii).

There were conflicts over how to respond to the evacuation program and the draft within the Japanese American community. The literature suggests that a majority of Japanese Americans supported, or at least did not oppose, the U.S. government's political decisions. However, there were groups of Japanese Americans who expressed oppositions to the U.S. government. Chapter three further investigates such conflicts within the community and reveals how citizenship, identity, and loyalty were constructed differently by Japanese American advocates.

Rhetoric and Citizenship

A rhetorical lens is valuable for investigating the puzzles surrounding citizenship, loyalty, and national identity, since a sense of citizenship, loyalty, and national identity has been rhetorically constructed. Asen (2004) called on scholars to generate research questions of how do people enact citizenship, rather than asking what counts as citizenship (p. 191). From this perspective, citizenship does not appear in specific acts per se, but signals a process that may encompass a number of different activities (p. 191). Rhetorical analysis can reveal citizenship interwoven in such activities, explicitly and inexplicitly. Further, rhetoric can help identify ideologies and implications embedded in symbols, which is significant for citizenship scholarship in general. As DeChaine (2009) acknowledged, citizenship enactment "necessarily involves hegemonic struggles over the

very meaning of the term ‘citizen’ in a multipublic sphere (p. 45). My dissertation identifies meanings of citizenship and American identity through examining how citizenship was constructed and enacted in discourses surrounding the Japanese American incarceration.

A national identity is “not simply a narrative or set of narratives that subsequently prompts and justifies a wide range of actions; it is also an ongoing rhetorical process” (Bruner, 2002, p. 7). In order to understand a process of national identity construction, analyzing discourse and historical contexts surrounding national identity is significant since national identity is “incessantly negotiated through discourse” (Bruner, 2002, p. 1). Therefore, in order to understand citizenship and national identity in relation with race and crisis, I analyze social, cultural, and economic conditions surrounding my texts.

By closely reading historical materials, this dissertation intends to complicate our understanding of, citizenship, loyalty, and national identity in the United States. Loyalty, citizenship, and national identity can be understood as ideographs that are collectively shared in the community. However, meaning of each can be altered depending on contexts. My analysis will reveal multiple, conflicting meanings and implications behind those terms and argue that meanings of those terms are constantly contested and negotiated. I argue that American citizenship in moments of crisis is grounded in performance of Whiteness and loyalty to the country. In other words, racially marginalized American citizens are asked to prove their loyalty and assimilation to White culture in order to be judged as true American citizens. As Asen (2004) argued, it is significant to consider any actions, including protests against authorities, as performance of citizenship in the U.S. However, such actions are difficult in moments of crisis when

the majority of American citizens are afraid (often of certain group of people living in the country). Democratic actions by targeted minority groups can be denied or silenced as inappropriate as citizenship performance. My rhetorical analysis of the Japanese American incarceration discourses exemplifies such constrained performance of citizenship in national crisis moments and ways in which targeted groups can challenge the constraints.

This dissertation contributes to rhetorical history and citizenship scholarship in two ways: First, my reading of history of the Japanese American incarceration and resistance supplements historical accounts by focusing on rhetorical constructions of loyalty, citizenship, and national identity. My analysis provides a new example of how meanings of loyalty, citizenship, and national identity can be modified in the United States, especially in moments of crisis. This suggests that we, as members of a community, should carefully examine negative implications behind seemingly positive terms that dominate the society. For example, my analysis in later chapters reveals that being loyal to the country can entail cultural assimilation, following authorities, and willingness to military contribution. By understanding such implicit implications, we can critically examine how infringement of individual's rights can be justified. The Japanese American incarceration is a historical event that allows critics to investigate such mechanisms. Second, my study contributes to the understandings of loyal American citizenship. This study looks at citizenship as an enactment rather than status and investigates what actions loyalty, citizenship, and national identity entail. Since my analysis focuses on a racially segregated group in the United States, my understanding of loyalty, citizenship, and national identity would be applicable to other racially

marginalized groups. Infringement of human rights based on racial prejudice and discrimination is still an issue in the United States. As my later chapters argue, racism, the history of immigration and degree of cultural assimilation are significant determiners of loyalty, citizenship, and national identity. This dissertation intends to provide a process of how meanings and implications of loyalty, citizenship, and national identity can be constructed, contested, and challenged, particularly in the context of racism and immigration in the United States.

Preview of the Chapters

My dissertation will proceed as follows: Chapter two analyzes how the U.S. government rhetorically constructed the identity, loyalty, and citizenship of Japanese Americans. It examines how the U.S. government's way of understanding loyalty, citizenship, and minority identity contributed to justify the Japanese American incarceration. The texts for this chapter are: (1) President Franklin Roosevelt's public statements over the Japanese American incarceration, (2) language in loyalty screening and the WRA's evaluations of the Japanese American loyalty, and (3) Congressional Report on "Un-American Activities on Relocation Centers." I argue that FDR framed the Japanese American incarceration as a military necessary for national security and drew a boundary between Japanese Americans and the American public. I also identify the two binaries in rhetorical construction of the Japanese American identity in those texts: American/Japanese and loyal/disloyal. I argue that loyalty was associated with Americanness and disloyalty was associated with Japaneseness in the U.S. government's rhetoric, creating a nearly inseparable association of those terms. My analysis also

reveals that Japanese Americans were asked to prove their loyalty to the U.S. by demonstrating their assimilation to White American culture.

Chapter three focuses on rhetorical construction of citizenship, loyalty, and identity generated in the Japanese American community. The texts for this chapter are: (1) the bulletins published by the Fair Play Committee and (2) *The Rocky Shimpō* and *the Heart Mountain Sentinel*, the two community newspapers circulated in the Heart Mountain camp. This chapter analyzes citizenship defined by several different groups of Japanese Americans. By doing so, this chapter investigates diverse understandings of citizenship within the Japanese American community. My analysis of the FPC's rhetoric unpacks how the Japanese American draft resisters challenged the definition of loyalty and citizenship constructed by the U.S. government. I identify their two rhetorical strategies: identification and dissociation. My analysis of *The Shimpō* and *The Sentinel* investigates conflicting understandings of loyalty and citizenship within the Japanese American community. I identify two conflicting definitions of citizenship: In *The Sentinel*, the definition of citizenship created the hierarchy of duties over rights, while the vision of citizenship in *The Shimpō* privileged rights before duties.

Chapter four focuses on visual representation of the minority identity, loyalty, and citizenship. The texts for this chapter are: (1) photographs by Ansel Adams, Dorothea Lange, and Toyo Miyatake (2) snapshots by Bill Manbo, an amateur photographer incarcerated in the Heart Mountain camp. I argue that photographs by Adams, Lange, and Miyatake constructed a very specific identity for Japanese Americans: assimilating to American White culture, calmly obeying the U.S. government, and not protesting against the U.S. government regardless of the U.S. government's infringement of their human

rights. I also argue that Manbo's snapshots exemplify an alternative way of reconstructing a minority identity from insiders, by presenting their innocence, the beauty of the group's cultural origin, and respect for the dominant American culture.

Chapter five is the conclusion and implications. This chapter summarizes my arguments and offers significance of the study. Although my dissertation investigates a particular case, the Japanese American incarceration, the analysis of how citizenship, loyalty, and the minority identity had been constructed and enacted would be useful for understanding issues in different contexts. For example, as Williams (2006) argued that the post 9/11 period has seen its share of indiscriminate arrests of thousands of young Muslim "enemy aliens" (p. 73). Williams further noted that although the U.S. government did not adopt a policy of mass incarceration, "many [Muslims] have developed the same kind of loyalty strategies as Japanese Americans did following Pearl Harbor" (p. 73). We, as members of the U.S., should recognize that loyalty, citizenship, and identity are not equally enjoyed by diverse people in the U.S. As critics, we should watch what types of performance are preferred under the name of loyalty and citizenship, particularly in crisis moments. Fear and uncertainty toward a certain group of people can let the U.S. government and the American public repeat the same mistake---another incarceration of loyal American citizens or other forms of injustice.

Chapter Two

Racialized Citizenship, Loyalty, and Identity by the U.S. Government

Introduction

On December 7, 1941, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, a United States territory. A day after the attack, President Franklin Roosevelt delivered an address to Congress that declared war on Japan: “I ask that the Congress declare that [statement of war against Japan] since the unprovoked and dastardly attack by Japan on Sunday, December 7, 1941, a state of war has existed between the United States and the Japanese empire” (Roosevelt, 1941, para. 19). Although the United States was already close to joining the war, it attempted to preserve its stance of isolation and neutrality. The attack on Pearl Harbor functionally made the United States part of World War II.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, anti-Japanese sentiment increased rapidly. General John L. DeWitt, pursued power to remove all enemy aliens from zones around strategic West Coast installations (National Asian American Telecommunication Association, 2002). With strong recommendation by DeWitt, President Roosevelt signed the Executive Order 9066 dated February 19, 1942, which authorized the Secretary of War to prescribe West Coast as military zones. The order gave the military authority to remove residents. On March 18, 1942, Roosevelt signed the Executive Order 9102, which ordered the creation of the War Relocation Authority (WRA). With these two Executive Orders, the WRA removed all Americans with Japanese ancestry as well as Japanese in West Coast.

A purported goal of the incarceration was calming the fear toward Japan among the American public, particularly people living in the U.S. mainland because anti-

Japanese sentiment was more serious in the mainland than Hawaii. In Hawaii, hostility toward Japan was smaller, since people of Japanese ancestry comprised of 35 percent of the island's population (Robinson, 2001, p. 146). Honolulu FBI agents estimated the ninety-eight percent of Nisei in Hawaii would be loyal (Robinson, 2001, p. 76). Due to the Honolulu FBI agent's conclusion, only one percent of Japanese Americans in Hawaii was removed. The smaller number of incarcerations in Hawaii provides evidence that a significant goal of the Japanese American incarceration was to calm anti-Japanese sentiment.

While the incarceration seemed to attempt to resolve the anti-Japanese sentiment, the treatment of Japanese Americans violated the most basic American values of freedom and equality for all. This chapter analyzes how FDR and the U.S. government rhetorically justified a politics of violating the basic rights of Japanese Americans. More specifically, this chapter investigates the puzzle of how the U.S. government's rhetoric justified the incarceration.

First, I analyze FDR's public statements in order to understand how the Japanese American incarceration was justified. I argue that framing the incarceration as a military necessity and naming/not naming Japanese Americans' identity created the understanding of the incarceration as just. Second, I analyze loyalty screening directed by the War Department and the War Relocation Authority in order to understand how loyalty was defined and applied to formulate "proper" citizenship. I argue that in the screening loyalty was associated with Americanness and disloyalty was associated with Japaneseness. The binary of Americanness and Japaneseness did not allow Japanese Americans to be perceived loyal U.S. citizens who respect Japanese culture and traditions.

Japanese Americans were asked to behave as if they were White Americans to demonstrate their loyalty. This rhetorical construction of loyalty reveals what being an American means. By analyzing language in loyalty screening, I argue that loyalty is a pre-requisite of being an American citizen, and meanings of loyalty are determined by race, ethnic origins, and culture as well as one's willingness to contribute to the country. Third, I analyze the Congressional Report on "un-American activities on relocation centers" in order to further investigate what loyalty means and what being an American means. By examining what actions and values were considered as "un-American," I investigate what being an "American" means. In this chapter, I argue that the U.S. government's rhetoric justified the incarceration by defining Japaneseness as a polar of Americanness and dehumanizing Japanese Americans as objects who needed to be removed for national security.

The Incarceration Justified by President

Presidential statements in general define collective national identities and have the power to persuade a nation, since Presidents "enunciate as set of beliefs, values, or politics that they claim are 'natural'" (Stuckey, 2004, p. 8). It is important to President Roosevelt's rhetoric for understanding American citizenship since the presidents in the 20th century were "most concerned with the parameters of citizenship" (Stuckey, 2004, p. 5). Analyzing Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR)'s statements on the Japanese American incarceration reveal the rhetorical strategies of how the U.S. government was able to justify the discriminatory removal of American citizens.

This section investigates three texts: Executive Order 9066, Executive Order 9102, and FDR's Press Conference on November 21, 1944. These texts were selected as public

statements by FDR. The two Executive Orders are analyzed in order to investigate how the U.S. government justified the Japanese American incarceration. My analysis suggests that framing the incarceration as a way to protect national security helped FDR justify the seemingly discriminatory policies. My analysis also suggests that FDR's rhetoric on Japanese Americans' identity made the incarceration sound necessary for the American public. In order to interrogate FDR's rhetoric on Japanese Americans' identity, this section analyzes FDR's short statements on the Japanese American incarceration as a response to a question from a journalist in the press conference held on November 21, 1944. In FDR's answers, he had difficulties referring to Japanese Americans living in the camps.

National identity is important to unpack for investigating American citizenship because collective identity construction determines who are counted as citizens (e.g. Bruner, 2003, p. 5). Examining presidential statements is important for understanding how national identities as well as minorities' identities are defined in the United States because presidential statements are sites where articulations of national identity consistently appear backed by sufficient social and political power to render those articulations as matters of custom and law (Stuckey, 2004, p. 10). By analyzing how FDR rhetorically constructed national identity and the identity of Japanese Americans, this section investigates the following research questions: Beyond legal criteria, who counts as a citizen? What are the criteria for being a loyal American citizen? How are the criteria for citizenship constructed?

Executive Orders 9066 and 9102

Executive orders are actions authorized by Presidents. Neither the Constitution nor Congress defined executive orders (Contrubis, 1999, p. 1), but the House Government Operations Committee prepared the most commonly cited description:

Executive orders and proclamations are directives or actions by the President...Executive orders are generally directed to, and govern actions by, Government officials and agencies. They usually affect private individuals only indirectly...Since the President has no power or authority over individual citizens and their rights except where he is granted such power and authority by a provision in the Constitution or by statute, the President's proclamations are not legally binding and are at best hortatory unless based on such grants of authority. (United States, 1957, p. 1)

While Presidents are authorized to issue executive orders as a leader of the democratic country selected by an election, executive orders do not have power to violate any rights of individual citizens.

Although executive orders are not defined in the Constitution, past Presidents relied on Article II of the Constitution as the solo basis for issuing executive orders (Contrubis, 1999, p. 2). Article II states that "the executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States," "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States," and "he [sic] shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed" (Contrubis, 1999, p. 2). Therefore, the President's power to issue executive orders is derived from his authority as a political leader of the country who was selected

by a democratic processor. Executive power does not go beyond the power of the Constitution and laws.

During the 19th century, presidents expanded executive powers in order to lead the country in war time. Executive orders were issued mostly as supplemented acts for Congress to deal with minor details (Contrubis, 1999, p. 4). President Theodore Roosevelt, who served from September 14, 1901 to March 4, 1909, expanded the power of executive orders by defining a duty of President as doing anything that the needs of the Nation demanded unless such action was forbidden by the Constitution (Roosevelt, 1931, p. 388). With the rise of World War I, President Wilson Woodrow, who served from March 4, 1913 to March 4, 1921, expanded the discretion of the presidency under the name of emergency powers (Contrubis, 1999, p. 4). FDR further expanded executive power for his New Deal program during an economic depression and the rise of World War II. FDR justified the expansion of executive power as the powers vested in him by the Constitution, as President of the United States of America and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States (Contrubis, 1999, p. 4).

The two Executive Orders governing Japanese and Japanese Americans were issued with FDR's expansion of executive power during the crisis moment. As a response to public fears toward Japan and people of Japanese origin in the country, the General John L. DeWitt strongly recommended FDR to issue an order to remove people of Japanese origin. On February 19, 1942, President Roosevelt signed the Executive Order 9066, which gave the military authority for removal of "alien enemies." On March 18, 1942, President Roosevelt signed the Executive Order 9102. The order authorized to establish the War Relocation Authority (WRA) as to provide "the relocation of such

persons in appropriate places” (Executive Order 9102, 1942). The following two sections analyze the two Executive Orders as rhetorical texts that justified the Japanese American incarceration. In what follows I identify framing and naming as rhetorical strategies that made it possible for the U.S. government to justify the incarceration of Japanese Americans as necessary for national defense.

Framing the Incarceration as a Military Necessity

Framing directs one’s way of seeing the world. While people witness a same event, meaning of the event can differ depending on how one frames it. Within political discourse, politicians use frames to help voters make sense of their political views and complex political ideas (Lakoff, 2004, p. xv). With the understanding of framing as a rhetorical strategy, I argue that FDR framed the incarceration as a military necessity in order to justify the policy by (1) self-identifying FDR as a commander of chief, (2) setting up a context of national defense, and (3) authorizing war-related departments to conduct the removal. Understanding framing in FDR’s rhetoric leads critics to reveal objectification of Japanese Americans and disregard for their human rights.

FDR’s framing of the Japanese American incarceration as a military necessity can be found in both the Executive Orders 9066 and 9102. First, the removal of Japanese Americans was framed as military necessity through FDR’s self-identification as a Commander in Chief. In the Executive Order 9066, FDR defined himself as “President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy” (Executive Order 9066, 1942, para. 2). In the Executive Order 9102, FDR again defined himself as “President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy” at the beginning (Executive Order, 9102, 1942, para. 1). In both orders, FDR clarified his

persona at the beginning. By presenting himself as a commander in chief, the orders were framed as authoritative public statements involving military actions.

A President's transformation into the Commander in Chief of the nation is one characteristic of war rhetoric. Murphy (1992) summarized that rhetoric of war "transforms peaceful Americans into holy warriors and the president into their leader," and the Congress "formally vests the president with the broad powers of commander-in-chief" (p. 67). Although the removal of Japanese Americans was not a war, military necessity was emphasized through FDR's self-identification as a commander in chief. Although the orders did not explicitly explain connection between military necessity and the Japanese American incarceration, such use of war rhetoric could frame the incarceration as a military necessity.

Second, the incarceration was justified as part of "national defense" in the two executive orders. While no Japanese American groups publicly expressed their willingness to fight against the U.S. government and people living in the United States, the two Executive Orders framed Japanese Americans as potential enemies that could threaten the nation's security. The Executive Order 9066 started as:

Whereas the successful prosecution of the war requires every possible protection against espionage and against sabotage to national-defense material, national-defense premises, and national-defense utilities as defined in Section 4, Act of April 20, 1918, 40 Stat. 533, as amended by the Act of November 30, 1940, 54 Stat. 1220, and the Act of August 21, 1941, 55 Stat. 655 (U.S.C., Title 50, Sec. 104). (Executive Order 9066, 1942, para. 1)

This opening paragraph of the order situated the removal in a context of national defense, but how the removal of “potential enemies” in the country would contribute to national defense was absent. The Executive Order 9102 further specified the purpose of removal as: “in order to provide for the removal from designated areas of persons whose removal is necessary in the interests of national security” (Executive Order 9102, 1942, para. 1). Unlike Pearl Harbor, no serious violent acts had been generated from those who were targeted for removal. The Executive Orders did not explain why citizens of Japanese, German, or Italian origin were a national threat and how removing those citizens would contribute to protecting national security. Without any reasoning and evidence, the term “national security” functioned as an umbrella term that justified the exclusion of American citizens.

Third, the Executive Orders framed the Japanese American incarceration as a military necessity through authorizing war-related departments to conduct the removal. In the Executive Order 9066, FDR authorized “the Secretary of War to prescribe military areas” (Executive Order 9066, 1942, para. 1). Although the incarceration was a domestic issue, the Department of War took responsibility for the removal process. The West Coast was defined as “military areas” although no enemy countries had attacked that area. The President as a Commander of Chief was also responsible for determining “from which any or all persons may be excluded” (Executive Order 9066, para. 2). The Secretary of War or the appropriate Military Commander had the authority to impose power at his discretion (Executive Order 9066, para. 2). The removal was directed under the name of the Commander of Chief and the Secretary of War, although no actual “war” was happening in the West Coast.

In the Executive Order 9102, FDR further authorized to establish “the War Relocation Authority (WAR).” This implied that the incarceration became a must due to war. In the Executive Order 9102, the director of the War Relocation Authority was authorized “to formulate and effectuate a program for the removal, from the areas designated from time to time by the Secretary of War or appropriate military commander under the authority of Executive Order No. 9066” (Executive Order 9102, 1942, para. 3). The WRA was responsible for the removal, but the Secretary of War and/or military commander bound its decisions. This suggests that framing the Japanese American incarceration as a military necessity made it possible to the forced removal of Japanese Americans by war-related institutions. Infringement of Japanese Americans’ human rights was silenced within this framing by directing people’s attention to a war-threat.

The Japanese American incarceration was framed as a military necessity, and that framing allowed the U.S. government to justify the discriminatory removal under the name of national security. The Executive Order 9066 and 9102 framed the incarceration as a military necessity through FDR’s self-identification as a Commander of Chief, rhetoric of national security, and authorizing war-related departments. Although there was no sign of violent acts by those to be removed, the Japanese American incarceration was justified by the frame of national security. This war framing suggests that the Executive Orders implied Japanese Americans were Japanese and incomplete Americans. The removal of Japanese Americans was justified as a necessity for national defense, implying that Japanese Americans were potential enemies or troublemakers at least. While the two Executive Orders authorized removing “aliens” from the West Coast, they did not specify who would be actually removed. The Executive Orders did not include

any racial or ethnic categories such as Japanese, German, or Italian. The next section investigates how FDR named or did not name Japanese Americans' identity in his public statements and examine consequences of FDR's rhetoric on minority identities.

Naming/Not Naming Identities

FDR did not specify who was to be removed in the Executive Orders 9066 and 9102. The Executive Order 9066 authorized the Secretary of War and the Military Commanders to determine "from which any or all persons may be excluded" and "the right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave" (Executive Order 9066, 1942, para. 2). Although the Executive Order 9066 would allow the Secretary of War to remove American citizens with Japanese, German, and Italian ancestry, the language of the order did not mention the racial and ethnic origin of those to be removed. The Executive Order 9102 clarified who was to be removed, but it did not mention separation based on racial origins. It stated: "the removal from designated areas of persons whose removal is necessary in the interests of national security" (Executive Order 9102, 1942, para. 1). Therefore, the Executive Orders 9066 and 9102 could technically authorize removal of any persons who were evaluated as needing to be removed out of necessity by the Secretary of War, regardless of racial and ethnic origins. Despite that, only Japanese Americans, German Americans, and Italian Americans were targets of the removal.

A puzzle in the rhetorical choice is why FDR did not specify racial and ethnic categories for the removal, while the Executive Order's goal seemed to be removing Japanese Americans. This non-reference of racial and national origins could avoid possible criticisms from the American public, arguing that the removal promoted racial segregation. The rhetoric of non-racial reference would also distance who to be removed

and reduce sympathy from the American public. Without specificity of who was to be removed, it would be difficult for the American public to picture the consequences of the Executive Orders and feel sympathy to those to be removed.

Naming one's identity can direct audiences to a particular understanding of those named. McKerrow (1989) proposed that "naming is the central symbolic act of a nominalist rhetoric" (p. 105). For McKerrow, a nominalist rhetoric makes use of universal or abstract categories, such as "the poor" or "welfare queen," which do not exist but are labels. However, these labels are not merely words but are extremely powerful political and social weapons (McKerrow, 1989). Naming is a powerful rhetorical tool since "names and labels can constraint as well as enable subsequent thought and practice" (Jasinski, 2001p. 120). Naming by Presidents can be more powerful since presidential statements influence the nation's mindset (Stuckey, 2004). Through analyzing FDR's public statements on the Japanese American incarceration, I argue that FDR's rhetoric of naming/not naming identity of Japanese Americans took presence of Japanese Americans away and reduced them as Others or those who were not supposed to but happened to be in the United States.

The Executive Order 9102 repetitively referred people to be removed as "such persons." FDR's rhetoric seemingly avoided naming of people to be excluded. The Executive Order 9102 authorized the Director of the WRA to "provide for the relocation of such persons in appropriate places," "the employment of such persons," and "safeguard the public interest in the private employment of such persons" (Executive Order 9102, 1942, para. 3). The Executive Order never gave a specific name for people to be removed. After the repetition of "such persons," it referred them to "persons

removed under this Order or under Executive Order No. 9066” (Executive Order 9102, para. 8). Such avoidance of naming could take the presence of those to be removed and reduced them to being obscure mass. The rhetoric of “such persons” distanced the American public from those who were to be removed. For the American public, it might be hard to picture people to be removed as American individuals with family, jobs, and rights in the rhetoric of “such persons.” People to be removed were Others with no sign of identity, which made the American public difficult to feel sympathy with Japanese Americans.

In the two Executive Orders, identity of Japanese Americans was reduced to “such persons” rhetoric. FDR continued to avoid clear references about Japanese Americans’ identity in his other public statements. In a press conference on November 21, 1944, FDR was asked a question about the return of Japanese Americans who were incarcerated. FDR answered: “In most of the cases. That doesn’t mean all of them. And, of course, we have been trying to---I am now talking about Japanese people from Japan who are citizens” (p. 247). Then the questioner interjected as “Japanese Americans” (p. 247). FDR described those who were forced to be removed as “Japanese people from Japan who are citizens,” which could imply the distinct boundary between Japanese Americans and other American citizens. FDR stated that they were “Japanese people from Japan” first, but who happened to become American citizens. The national origin was a primary category that FDR used to refer to Japanese Americans. FDR addressed Japanese Americans as being part of the U.S. due to their status as “citizens,” but FDR did not explain how he could justify the removal of American citizens from their hometowns. This FDR’s public statement demonstrated an incongruity between

treatment and status of Japanese American. Furthermore, in the press conference, after the interjection of “Japanese Americans,” FDR continued: “I am not talking about the Japanese themselves... There are about roughly a hundred---a hundred thousand Japanese-origin citizens in this country” (p. 247). In this statement, FDR drew a boundary between Japanese and Japanese Americans. FDR acknowledged that “they are American citizens, and we all know that American citizens have certain privileges” (p. 249). However, he did not explain in what reasons the U.S. government could remove American citizens who have certain privileges. While Japanese Americans were legal American citizens, the policies pushed them into a non-citizen space where freedom was not guaranteed, and FDR’s rhetoric reinforced this ambiguity.

While FDR recognized Japanese Americans as American citizens with privileges, his rhetoric distanced them from the American public by naming and joking. FDR continued: “And they wouldn’t ---what’s my favorite word? ---discombobulate--- (Laughter)---the existing population of those particular countries very much” (p. 249). FDR differentiated Japanese Americans and “the existing population” when he discussed reentry of Japanese Americans into communities outside the concentration camps. In his words, “they” would not “discombobulate” the existing population, which implied that the Japanese Americans were not part of the communities. They were outsiders coming in. Moreover, FDR’s rhetoric also implied that those removed American citizens could potentially annoy the existing communities. The use of the word “discombobulate” also diverts public’s attention from the issue of incarceration through humor. While FDR’s rhetoric presented Japanese Americans as American citizens, it still categorized them based on their national origin. The implication of his rhetoric is that the incarcerated

Japanese Americans were potential troublemakers since they were different from the existing population. Here, identity attached to Japanese Americans was that of potential troublemakers, who could discombobulate the American public. By keeping the answers short, avoiding distinct naming on incarcerated Japanese American, and even joking, FDR's rhetoric framed the incarceration not as a serious domestic issue that all Americans should be concerned with. Instead, incarceration became a story of "those people."

Silence was another rhetorical strategy found in FDR's November 21, 1944 press conference. The press conference was one of the few opportunities where FDR made a public statement about the Japanese American incarceration. FDR's answer was very short compared to other questions he answered in other press conferences. The transcript is just a page in the complete collection of his press conferences. Even when FDR was asked about the incarceration, he avoided giving a direct answer: "That I couldn't tell you, because I don't know" (Daniels, 1972, p. 247). Although it was one of a few opportunities FDR commented on the Japanese American incarceration in public, he avoided clear answers. He was even silent sometimes.

Silence has rhetorical power to direct people's perception. Like the zero in mathematics, silence is an absence with a function, and a rhetorical one at that (Glenn, 2004, p. 4). Potential meanings for silence include: The person lacks sufficient information to talk on the topic, the person feels no sense of urgency about talking, and the person is avoiding discussion of a controversial or sensitive issue out of fear (Johannesen, 1974, p. 29). Through naming and not naming the identity of Japanese Americans, FDR's rhetoric made Japanese Americans absent from the public discourse.

FDR rarely made public statements about the Japanese American incarceration. Absence had a rhetorical function. Making few public statements could hide the controversial issue. FDR was silent, probably because the “relocation” program was not a policy that FDR actively advocated (Robinson, 2001). A historian Greg Robinson (2001) studied FDR’s political decisions about the Japanese American incarceration and concluded that FDR was distancing himself from the relocation program. FDR knew that 1944 was an election year and he did not wish to harm either his own chances at the polls in California or those of his favored House and Senate candidates by allowing Japanese Americans to return to the coast before the election (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition,” p. 6). It was the War Department and other war-related organizations that made official calls for drafting Nisei Americans, meaning FDR did not make official calls. Due to absence of FDR’s public statements, the American public had limited information and attention about the Japanese American incarceration, which made it difficult to feel sympathy to those who were removed.

When FDR mentioned Japanese Americans, FDR’s rhetoric created a boundary between Japanese Americans and the American public by implying Japanese Americans were potential troublemakers. It would be difficult for the American public to picture who would be removed and the hardship they may experience if the Executive Orders named those to be removed as “such persons.” By not-naming and naming identity of Japanese Americans, FDR’s rhetoric differentiated Japanese Americans and the American public.

Implications of FDR's rhetoric

FDR's rhetoric justified the removal of American citizens of Japanese descent under the name of "national defense" and "military necessity." It meant that majority benefits were prioritized over rights of minorities. Rights of removed American citizens were not described in the two Executive Orders. Furthermore, any logical reasoning of how removing Japanese, German, and Italian Americans would threaten the nation's security was not given in FDR's public statements. The majority-benefits implied in the rhetoric of "national security" allowed the U.S. government to avoid responsibility for explaining logics and providing evidence to justify violation of minority's human rights.

The crisis moment was a factor that pushed the majority-benefits rhetoric. Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor created a fear in the American public. People in the United States were afraid of Japan attacking to the U.S. mainland. Given this fear across the nation, FDR's rhetoric of "national defense" and its implication of "majority-benefits" were accepted by the American public, even if the U.S. government did not explain how removing Japanese Americans from the West Coast would contribute to national defense. FDR's public statements created identity of Japanese Americans as a potential threat to the nation. FDR's rhetoric drew a boundary between Japanese Americans and the American public through naming Japanese Americans "such people." Such naming reduced Japanese Americans to Others and made the American public difficult to feel sympathy with them.

Moreover, FDR's rhetorical strategies let him avoid his duty of securing rights for all American citizens. By framing the goal of the Japanese American incarceration as national defense, FDR could avoid mentioning the violation of Japanese Americans'

human rights. Public attention was on safety, not human rights of those to be removed. FDR's naming of Japanese Americans as Others also made it acceptable for American public to exclude Japanese Americans. They were coming from outside, thus not part of us/the American public. FDR's rhetoric implied that it was acceptable to remove Japanese Americans since they were not truly from our nation.

The Loyalty Screening

The Japanese American incarceration was justified as a form of national defense in President Roosevelt's public statements. Since the War Relocation Authority detained Japanese Americans under the name of national defense, it needed to examine if the Japanese Americans incarcerated in the camps were a threat to the nation. The WRA employed loyalty as a criterion to examine if individuals were a threat to the nation. Loyalty of Japanese Americans was tested through loyalty screening. Through analyzing the use of language in the loyalty screening, I argue that the loyalty screening rhetorically constructed loyalty as assimilation to U.S. culture and disloyalty as a respect for Japanese culture. The analysis suggests that loyalty can function ideologically, enforcing one particular culture as a universally just and devaluing another culture as an opposing evil.

Given negative labeling of Japanese Americans as outsiders or enemy aliens, the WRA started "the Americanization program" in the concentration camps in 1942. The program had three principal goals: "The first was to provide for the physical upkeep of the internees; the second was a longer range objective to relocate the Japanese out of the camps into 'normal' communities; and the third was to deal with hostile anti-Japanese elements, especially in the national press" (Okihiro, 1984, p.222). The WRA intended to let Japanese Americans assimilate into American life and demonstrate their loyalty

against hostile media coverage. The Americanization program was situated as an essential element to prove Japanese Americans' loyalty to the public (Okiihiro, p.222).

Loyalty of Japanese Americans was associated with assimilation into U.S. culture.

As the Americanization program proceeded, the War Department and the WRA started to conduct loyalty screening in February 1943. The purpose of the loyalty screening was "making recommendations about who was loyal enough to leave a relocation center, and determining who was loyal enough to work in a plant or industry doing sensitive war work" (Muller, 2007, p. 139). Loyalty screening was also served to find "who was so disloyal that he or she should be transferred to more restrictive confinement" (Muller, 2007, "American Inquisition," p. 6). Although the primary purpose of the test was investigating loyalty of Japanese Americans, the answers of adult respondents were also used to determine their eligibility for enlisting in the military (Ng, 2002, p. 56).

The loyalty screening asked Japanese Americans at the camps to fill in a form that listed questions about their date and place of birth, marital status, race of spouse, relatives in the United States and Japan, education, knowledge of the Japanese language, hobbies, organization membership, newspapers subscribed, and relationship to the Japanese government. Under the supervision of the WRA, all people of Japanese ancestry who were incarcerated in the concentration camps were examined.

Most of the questions on the loyalty screening were not controversial among Japanese Americans at the camps. However, the two confusing questions were controversial among Nisei Americans:

Question 27: Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty, wherever ordered?

Question 28: Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any and all attack by foreign or domestic forces, and forswear any form of allegiance to the Japanese Emperor or any other foreign government, power, or organization?

Some of the young Nisei Americans believed that Question 27 was a trick, an underhanded way to get them to volunteer for the army without realizing they were doing so (Muller, 2007, "American Inquisition" p. 35). Some young Nisei Americans were also outraged by Question 28's insinuation that they had ever had an allegiance to the Japanese emperor that they could "forswear" or renounce (Muller, 2007, "American Inquisition" p. 36).

The loyalty screening raises larger questions about race and citizenship in the United States, such as: What is asked of being American beside legal status? What is loyalty? What actions does loyalty entail? Through analyzing the use of language in the loyalty screening, I argue that the screening process rhetorically constructed a spectrum stretching from loyalty to disloyalty. My analysis reveals that loyalty was associated with Americanism while disloyalty was associated with Japaneseness. I also argue that Americanism associated with loyalty was particular to White American culture and values. In order for Japanese Americans to be accepted as loyal American citizens, they needed to demonstrate their embodiment of White American culture and values. Assimilating into White American culture and demonstrating loyalty were requirements for minority citizens to be counted as American citizens.

Loyalty as a Rhetorical Construction

The screening was set up in order to evaluate loyalty of Japanese Americans, but no distinct definition of loyalty was presented in the language of the screening. Multiple organizations were involved in forming the loyalty screening, but the WRA, the Provost Marshal General's Office, and the Western Defense Command never managed to settle on a coherent definition of loyalty (Muller, 2007, "American Inquisition," p. 3). The meanings of the term loyalty constantly shifted depending on each organization's motivations, needs, and experiences (Muller, 2007, "American Inquisition," p. 3).

Therefore, definitions of loyalty were a contingent rhetorical product. The use of definition implies the possibility of several definitions (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 214). Definitions are "rhetorically induced," and direct and deflect people's understanding of the world (Schiappa, 2003). As Zarefsky (1997) contended, "while there might be limits, still the ways in which we define our terms affects the way we think, talk, and act about the realities for which they stand"(p. 4). Therefore, a definition of loyalty can function ideologically by directing and deflecting people's views and values to a certain way.

The questions asked in the "loyalty" screening directly and indirectly construct a meaning of loyalty for Japanese Americans at that time. Even the questions that were not controversial among Japanese Americans at the camps collectively constructed an understanding of loyalty as associated with Americanness. In the loyalty screening, the Japanese Americans were asked to fill in their citizenship, race, race of their spouse, relatives in Japan, relatives in the U.S., their military services, religion, their level of Japanese language, their foreign investment, organization membership, newspaper

subscription, and if they had ever registered for Japanese citizenship. These questions suggest that race, military service, religion, and others listed statuses were considered as relevant criteria for determining loyalty of Japanese Americans.

Answers to those questions were evaluated by the point system developed by a statistician named Calvert L. Dedrick. The point system assigned “plus” and “minus” point values to the answers (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition,” p. 46). Dedrick did not approach his task from the position of objectivity. He described “the Japanese” as “our enemy within the gates” (cited in Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition,” p. 46). This also suggests that the understanding of loyalty in the screening was ideological.

This evaluation system constructed what loyalty means and should be. Eric L. Muller, a professor of history specializing in the Japanese American incarceration, provides a list of how each question in the loyalty screening was evaluated in the point system. The following section analyzes those criteria as well as questions in the loyalty screening and argues that answers that showed Americanness were considered as signs of loyalty, while answers that showed Japaneseness were considered as a sign of disloyalty.

Loyalty Constructed in the Loyalty Questions and the Evaluating Criteria

In the loyalty screening, anything related to Japan was evaluated as a sign of disloyalty. Regardless of Nisei Americans’ emotional attachment to the U.S., having Japanese relatives was counted as a sign of disloyalty. For instance, question 8 asked marital status, along with citizenship and race of spouse. If a spouse was a citizen of Japan, the answer was counted as one point minus. If a spouse was a Nisei American, one point plus. (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). Furthermore, question 12 asked about relatives in Japan. If one had a wife, children, parents, brothers, or sisters in Japan,

the answer was three minus points (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). Those questions about family constructed disloyalty as associated with Japaneseness. Moreover, in the loyalty screening, the label of disloyalty was attached to Nisei Americans for family status that they had no control over. This suggests that disloyalty was determined not by one’s performance of loyalty/disloyalty but status. Regardless of one’s commitment to the country, having Japanese members of the family was evaluated negatively.

Where Japanese Americans received education was another significant factor to determine disloyalty in the screening and the evaluation system. Question 13 asked Japanese Americans to list schools they attended. If one attended a school in Japanese territory for six months, for each two years or part thereof, it was one point minus. If a camp resident attended Japanese Language School more than three years in the U.S., it was two points minus (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). Furthermore, if one was employed as a Japanese language instructor, it was three points minus (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). In those questions, Japaneseness was associated with disloyalty. One’s locational attachment, like where they received education regardless of what subjects were taught, was a determiner of loyalty/disloyalty. This suggests that living and being educated in the U.S. territory was a component of loyalty, meaning loyalty constructed in the screening was associated with the U.S. land as a heritage. This also reveals that disloyalty was determined not by one’s performance of loyalty/disloyalty but status, which individuals could not take control over.

Japanese Americans who had travelled to Japan were negatively evaluated. If one had travelled to Japan three or more times, he or she was automatically “rejected” for

leaving the camps and involvement in war-related industry. If one never travelled to Japan, it was three point plus (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). In the screening, simple travels to a location (Japan) created an assumption of loyalty to Japan. Any movements in the geographic space deface determined loyalty of Japanese Americans. Disloyalty was strongly associated with Japanese land while loyalty was associated with U.S. land. The question also reveals that status or situation that Nisei Japanese Americans could not take control over was evaluated as a sign of disloyalty. Nisei Americans might have travelled to Japan when they were little. No matter what activities Nisei Americans might have done in Japan, their disloyalty had been accumulated each time they visited Japan.

In contrast, one’s experience in the U.S. was evaluated positively. In Question 13, while attending Japanese schools was a negative, if one received their entire education from schools in the U.S., it was three points plus. In Question 15 asking employment, if one was employed by a reputable American business doing business only in the U.S., it was two points plus. In Question 25, if one’s birth was in the U.S. or was recorded with Japanese Consulate but cancellation had been made or is pending, three plus points (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). In those questions, any experiences in the U.S. were associated with loyalty.

Nisei Americans’ affiliation with any Japanese-related customs and activities were also counted as a sign of disloyalty. Question 16 asked religion, and if one was Shintoist, it was a straight rejection (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”). This was because Shinto, during war time in Japan, was strongly tied with nationalism. Shintoists admired the emperor as God. For Buddhists, it was one point minus (Muller, 2007,

“American Inquisition”). In the evaluation system, no relation between being Buddhist and being disloyal to the U.S. was given, but it was taken as a fact. Although it would be possible to commit to the U.S. and be a Buddhist at the same time, Buddhism was regarded as a negative for loyalty. This suggests that Buddhist as a Japanese traditional religion, not its religious belief itself, was regarded as a sign of disloyalty, thus Japaneseness was associated with disloyalty. While religions popular in Japan were associated with disloyalty, Christianity was counted as a plus and associated with loyalty. In Question 16 asking about religions, if one was Christian, it was two points plus (Muller, 2007, “American Inquisition”).

In the evaluation system, military contribution was a significant sign of loyalty. Question 11 asked about relatives in the U.S. and if they were in military service. If one or more relatives in the U.S. Military Service were there voluntarily, it was counted as one plus point. It seems that military contribution was associated with loyalty. One not in the U.S. military could earn additional points if his/her family was in military service. This suggests two things: First, military service was strongly associated with loyalty; second, family was an influential determiner of one’s loyalty/disloyalty. Again, the loyalty screening evaluated one’s family status, which was out of Nisei Americans’ control, to determine loyalty.

Furthermore, I argue that loyalty was associated with Americanness and this Americanness was associated with Whiteness. Americanization had been meant Anglo-conformity, which sought to disperse the minority communities and altered their identities and culture (Berkson, 1920). Okamoto (1984) noted that the Americanization program in the concentration camps for Japanese American was about adapting to White

culture. A Japanese American must have been Christian; employed by a reputable American business; been a member of the Boy Scouts of American, Masons, Rotarian, or other recognized American Clubs; and/or been an instructor in an American sport or hobby in order to be get positive points in the loyalty screening. The positive evaluation on such cultural activities suggests that Americanization at the camps meant assimilating to White American culture. For example, “reputable American businesses” was dominated by the White population, the Boy Scouts were founded in Great Britain in the early 20th century, and professional baseball, one of the “American sports,” excluded African American players till the 1950s. Although no relationship between higher assimilation to American White culture and greater loyalty to the nation was given, it was taken for granted in the evaluation system. The degree of loyalty seemed to be associated with the degree of assimilation to White culture.

The analysis of the loyalty screening reveals a rhetorical process of how the U.S. government constructed meanings of loyalty and disloyalty. In the screening and the evaluation system, Japanese identity was associated with disloyalty, while American identity was associated with loyalty. That means Japanese identity was evaluated as the opposition to American identity, which were mutually exclusive in the evaluation system. A consequence of such rhetorical construction of loyalty was that Nisei Americans could not perform their identity as U.S. citizens and be of Japanese descent at the same time. They had no choice to present themselves as loyal U.S. citizens who respect Japanese tradition. By linking loyalty and Americanness and linking disloyalty and Japaneseness, Americanness and Japaneseness were polarized and became mutually exclusive. In this rhetoric, individuals who performed White American identity were counted as loyal

Americans. However, it was difficult for Nisei Americans to demonstrate their loyalty since disloyalty was associated with their status, such as family and place of schools, which were out of their control. This analysis suggests that individuals with certain statuses (race, gender, age, etc.) can be evaluated as disloyal, regardless of their willingness to serve for the country. Loyalty/disloyalty as a rhetorical construction can function ideologically. Through connecting Whiteness and loyalty, individuals who do not fit whiteness can be evaluated as disloyal. The next section further investigates meanings and ideological functions of loyalty/disloyalty by analyzing a Congressional report on the “relocation program.” Through examining how “un-American” was rhetorically constructed in the report, the next section reveals what was considered “Americanness.”

Congressional Report on “Un-American Activities on Relocation Centers”

The analysis above reveals that the U.S. government justified the Japanese American incarceration by framing it as national defense and drawing a line between the American public and Japanese Americans. At the camps, the loyalty of Japanese Americans was evaluated by the loyalty screening test. My analysis reveals that the loyalty screening constructed a binary of loyalty/disloyalty and American/Japanese. Loyalty was associated with White Americanness and disloyalty was associated with Japaneseness. This section analyzes a Congressional Report on Un-American Activities on Relocation Centers in order to further investigate rhetorical construction of loyalty and Americanness. The report critically evaluated the results of the “relocation” program, the Americanization program, and loyalty screening. Analyzing the language in the report

reveals how being American was rhetorically constructed by defining what was un-American.

This twenty-eight-page long report was published on September 30, 1943. It had been a year and a half since President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. The report was titled as “Report and Minority Views of the Special Committee on un-American Activities on Japanese War Relocation centers.” It was written by the Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, and Mr. Martin Dice was a chairperson. The report concerned about “Japanese subversive activities” in the concentration camps and “release of dangerous Japanese” from the camps (United States, 1943, p. 2). The report also contained a “minority view,” an objection to the report written by Herman P. Eberharter, a Congressperson.

While the committee members were for the “relocation” program, the report criticized the WRA as it did not fully accomplish its job. The report claimed that the WRA failed to utilize the results of the loyalty screening to remove “un-American” groups of Japanese Americans from the camps. The report was based on 1,000 pages of testimony in Los Angeles and Washington D.C., principally from men who were then or had been recently on the administrative staffs of the relocation centers (United States, 1943, p. 3). Therefore, the Congressional report was a collection of voices generated from administrators who had been involved in the Japanese American incarceration.

The report concluded that the WRA should remove “disloyal” Japanese Americans as soon as possible and push the Americanization program at the camps. The report claimed that the WRA had been extremely dilatory in the matter of segregating “the disloyal elements in the centers” from “those who are loyal Nisei or law-abiding

Issei” (United States, 1943, p. 4). The report was particularly concerned about the WRA’s release of Japanese Americans from the camps. One of the committee members called upon the President to “halt the then existing policy of the WRA which called for the release of approximately 1,000 evacuees per week for resettlement throughout the country” (United States, 1943, p. 3).

Through analyzing the Congressional report, this section investigates what is “Americanness,” which was associated with loyalty in loyalty screening. Through examining how “un-American” was rhetorically constructed, this analysis reveals what is “Americanness.” I argue that “un-American” was defined as anything related to Japan. The language in the report further constructed “un-American” as anything against the U.S. government. This suggests that “un-American” activities in the report referred to anti-U.S. government activities. This also suggests that being “American” did not simply mean to support American ideals. The words “loyal” and “American” implied support for the U.S. government. This section also reveals diverse opinions within the U.S. government by analyzing “the minority view” by Herman P. Eberharter, a Congressperson who disagreed with the report.

Un-American Defined

My analysis first looks at how the Congressional report defined “un-American” activities. The Special Committee was established in 1938 in order to carry on “a continuous investigation of subversive and un-American activities among the Japanese who are resident in the United States (United States, 1943, p. 1.). The report dealt primarily with “Japanese subversive activities within the war relocation centers and with the possible release of dangerous Japanese agents of espionage from these centers” (p. 2).

The language in the report suggests that un-American activities were defined as Japanese subversive activities. Here, the report seemed to create the binary of American/loyal and Japanese/disloyal by accusing Japanese subversive activities as un-American. Subversive actions could be positive American ways for social change. However, in the report, involvement in Japanese, or un-American, activities were labeled as a sign of disloyalty. The report also implied that anything un-American would be a threat to the nation. The report described the release of “disloyal” Japanese Americans as dangerous.

The connection between un-American and danger was elaborated in the report. The report accused Mr. Meyer, the Director of the WRA, of funding at least 90 instructors in Judo at a single center (United States, 1943, p.8). The report described Judo, a martial art recreationally taught as “a distinctively Japanese cultural phenomenon” which is “more than an athletic exercise” (p. 8). The report blamed the WRA as it was callously promoting cultural ties with Japan (p. 8). Even Japanese activities that were not relevant to the Empire of Japan or Japanese militarism were labeled as un-American and therefore disloyal.

Furthermore, the report reproduced the boundary between Japanese Americans and the American public. After accusing the WRA of funding Judo instructors, the report emphasized that the WRA’s funds “come ultimately from the taxpayers of this country” (p. 8). The language implied that U.S. citizens were feeding Japanese Americans with their taxes. Here, Japanese Americans were understood as less than citizens since they were not capable of paying taxes and sustaining the country’s economy, even though the inability to pay taxes was due to incarceration. No sentence in the report mentioned how Japanese Americans were contributing to the country.

The above analysis reveals that “un-American” was defined as anything related to Japan. The language in the report further constructed un-American as anything against the U.S. government. The report included a direct translation of the two letters by the Blood Brothers Corp, one of the “gangs” at the Manzener camp. These two letters were cited as an ultimate proof of disloyalty, thus providing critics clusters to understand what disloyalty meant. The following is the first letter introduced on page 6 of the report:

Think of the shame the American Government has put us into. Think of the disruption of properties and the imprisonment of the Nisei.

To start a self-government system now is nothing but a dirty selfish scheme. As the Army put us in here without regard to our own will, we should leave everything up to the Army, whether they want to kill us or eat us.

Because this is the only way the American Government can think of as a means of absolving itself from the blame of mis-conducting its affairs, the Government thought of a bad scheme, that is, this formation of self-government system.

The hairy beasts (white) are out to actually run the Government, while using you people who can be used. It is evident if you read article I of the charter, and can be proved by the facts of the past. You fellows who are acting blindly are big fools.

If you do such things as those, which tighten the noose around the necks of your fellow people, some day you will receive punishment from Heaven so beware.

**BLOOD BROTHERS CORPS WHICH
WORRY FOR THEIR FELLOW PEOPLE.**

The letter blamed the U.S. government, the Japanese American incarceration, and fellow people who did not openly resist the U.S. government. White Americans who ran the U.S. government were labeled as “the hairy beasts” that could “kill us or eat us.” Such criticism on White Americans and the U.S. government was considered as a proof of disloyalty in the Congressional report.

While the language in the letter by the Blood Brothers Corps was harsh, no words in the letter mentioned the Japanese government or even Japan. The letter did not seemingly support Japanese militarism. However, the Congressional report introduced the letter as an example of dangerous, disloyal Japanese Americans who should not be released from the camps. This suggests that “un-American” activities in the report referred to any criticism of the U.S. government and White Americans. This also suggests that being “American” did not simply mean supporting American ideals. The U.S. government required Japanese Americans to embody Americanness in very specific ways: No respect to Japan and Japanese culture should be shown, no criticism to the U.S. government and White Americans should be presented, and being loyal to the U.S. government should be demonstrated.

The second letter by the Blood Brothers Corps introduced in the Congressional report further demonstrated the implied connection between un-American and anti-U.S. government activities. The second letter showed that the Blood Brothers Corps intended to blame Japanese Americans as well as the U.S. government. The following is a translation of the second letter introduced on page 6 of the report:

Calling you fools who are running around trying to set up a self-government system.

Think back. The fact that the positions, the properties, and the honor which our fellow Japanese built up and won by blood and sweat during the past 50 years have all been stamped and sacrificed by the arrogant and insulting American Government after we have been put into this isolated spot.

For what are you beating around? What use is there for establishing self-government? Especially with such a charter so full of contradictions? Although we are ignorant people, we can foresee the tragic results which will come out of this self-government.

Remember that the majority of our people are absolutely against the self-government system. What do you think of the fact that 6 months ago, in Santa Anita, the same attempt which you are now trying, was made, to organize a self-government, but it broke down before it materialized.

Leave everything completely as the Army pleases. If you nincompoops realize the fact that you are Japanese, why don't you assume the honorable attitude which is typical of Japanese? What a shameful sight you are about to present by being fooled by the sweet words of the Government. By so doing, you are inviting suffering to your fellow Japanese.

We fellow Japanese are all like fish laid on the cutting board, about to be sliced. To jump around at this stage is a cowardly thing to do. Better lay down and let the Government do as it pleases, either cook us or fry us.

You should remain calm and conduct yourselves like nationals of a first-class power. Give more thoughts and deep reflections as to your attitude.

BLOOD BROTHERS CORPS WHICH IS
CONCERNED OVER FELLOW NATIONALS

The second letter also lamented the lack of commitment in the Japanese American community. The metaphor of Japanese Americans as “fish laid on the cutting board” to be sliced implied that Japanese Americans were powerless victims with no intent to fight back. Only the U.S. government had power to determine the Japanese Americans’ fate, either being cooked or fried by White Americans.

While blaming ignorant Japanese Americans, the rhetorical purpose of the confrontation rhetoric in this letter seemed to create unification in the Japanese American community. The second letter’s focus was on establishing the self-government by Japanese Americans, and the report labeled this attitude against the U.S. government as disloyal and dangerous. As the analysis of the first letter indicates, “un-American” activities referred to anti-U.S. government activities in the report.

Taking all the above analyses into consideration, I argue that the terms “un-American,” “disloyal,” and “anti-U.S. government” were constructed as the same category, as an antonym of loyalty, in the Congressional report. If one was evaluated as un-American, she/he was automatically considered as disloyal and anti-U.S. government. On the other hand, loyal individuals were considered as American and pro-U.S. government. The report argued that “the loyal at least should have been encouraged by every possible means to regard themselves as Americans and Americans only” (p. 8). This quote suggests that Americanness, not Japaneseness, could be associated with loyalty. The dual identity of Japanese Americans, being loyal Americans who respect Japanese culture, was silenced in the binary. This loyalty/Americanness binary ignored the

complexities of Japanese Americans' identity. For example, one who respected Japanese culture could be loyal to the nation. One who was against the U.S. government could respect American values and culture.

The Congressional report rhetorically constructed the binary of loyalty and disloyalty by detailing what are un-American, disloyal activities. Through the entire report, the special committee suggested "immediate separation of the disloyal [Japanese Americans] from the loyal [Japanese Americans]" (United States, 1943, p. 8). While the report did recognize the existence of loyal Japanese Americans, the binary made it difficult to distinguish being anti-U.S. government, un-American, and disloyal. The binary also created an implication that all individuals who were evaluated as disloyal were threats to the nation, which was not always true.

The Pairs of American/loyal and Japanese/disloyal

Analyzing the Congressional report reveals that the report reproduced the binary of American/loyal and Japanese/disloyal that loyalty screening had created. The report did not deny citizenship of Japanese Americans. Rather, it granted that "American citizens are citizens regardless of their ancestry" (United States, 1943, p. 8). Therefore, the report did not seemingly discriminate against Japanese Americans as non-citizens. Rather than separating Japanese Americans from the American public, this report blamed the WRA as it did not effectively separate disloyal Japanese Americans from loyal Japanese Americans. In this section, I argue that the report rhetorically generated the binary of loyal and disloyal and the binary of American and Japanese. The two binaries collectively constructed loyalty as something to be declared and proven.

The Congressional report clarified that there were loyal and disloyal Japanese Americans at the concentration camps. In its criticism toward the WRA about its release of the Butoku-kai members, a group of Japanese Americans that opposed to the incarceration, the report created the binary of disloyal and loyal Japanese Americans. The report blamed the WRA as “the release of these 23 Japanese is evidence of the incompetence of the War Relocation Authority to exercise proper safeguards both for the national security and for the thousands of loyal Japanese as well (United States, 1943, p. 9). The report also claimed that the WRA had been extremely dilatory in the matter of segregating “the disloyal elements in the centers” from “those who are loyal Nisei or law-abiding Issei” (United States, 1943, p. 4). In the report, there were two types of Japanese Americans: loyal Japanese Americans and disloyal Japanese Americans. This binary did not allow understanding Japanese Americans’ identity as a complex blend of appreciation to American culture and opposition to the incarceration.

Throughout the report, the existence of loyal Japanese Americans was recognized, and loyalty of Japanese Americans was associated with Americanism. The report described the WRA’s Americanization program as “educational program for positive Americanism,” and “the loyal at least should have been encouraged by every possible means to regard themselves [Japanese Americans] as Americans and Americans only (United States, 1943, p. 8). This language also suggests that the report did not admit complex identity of Japanese Americans. Identity as Americans was the identity Japanese Americans were allowed to demonstrate. This implies that respecting Japanese culture as well as American culture was not considered as behavior of loyal American citizens. Here, the report created the binary of Japanese and American. Japaneseness

and Americanness could not co-exist, while the report did state “American citizens are citizens regardless of their ancestry” (United States, 1943, p. 8).

The two binaries of Japanese/American and loyalty/disloyalty collectively constituted an understanding of loyalty as something to be declared and proven. The report used the results of loyalty screening as the single determiner of Japanese Americans’ loyalty. Moreover, judgments on Japanese Americans’ loyalty were made in order to reduce anxiety in the American public, not for a benefit of Japanese Americans. The report stated:

The steady release since July 1942 of the Japanese from the relocation centers by the War Relocation Authority, to resettle and relocate in various sections of the United States, has given rise to considerable anxiety among the people of certain sections of the Nation. This anxiety has resulted from doubts as to the loyalty of the evacuees who are being released. (United States, 1943, p. 12)

This description of anxiety in the American public suggests that Japanese Americans were considered as disloyal by default. In that situation, in order to be judged as loyal, Japanese Americans needed to actively advocate for their loyalty, while other Americans were not tested their loyalty. This suggests that understandings of the term loyalty differ depending on one’s race, national origin, and other contexts.

Moreover, without declaring their loyalty, Japanese Americans were regarded as disloyal. The report stated: “An alarming proportion of Japanese American citizens of draft age (17 to 38), frankly refused to declare their loyalty to the United States” (United States, 1943, p. 7). Not to declare loyalty to the United States was problematized in the report. No blurred line between loyal and disloyal was recognized. The report argued

that every person who was released from a relocation center should have been “thoroughly investigated and cleared as to loyalty” by a broad of agency (United States, 1943, p. 12). Japanese American individuals were obligated to “be cleared” their loyalty. They could be either loyal or disloyal, but nowhere between.

Minority Views to the Congressional Report

The Congressional report included eleven pages of “minority views” written by Congressperson Harman P. Eberharter. The minority view argued that “the report of the majority is prejudiced, and that most of its statements are not proven (United States, 1943, p. 17). The minority view criticized the majority report as its conclusions were drawn with no credible evidence. I argue that the minority view was a challenge to the U.S. government’s way of constituting loyalty and citizenship of Japanese Americans, generated by a person in the government. The minority view took a different approach for understanding loyalty and citizenship of Japanese Americans, implying loyalty and citizenship should be something to be assumed, not declared. This minority report generated from a member of the U.S. government suggests that loyalty and citizenship are rhetorical constructions, and their meanings and implications can be conflicting.

The minority view constructed citizenship as a Constitutional right, something given to all American citizens. The minority view argued: “Our Constitution does not distinguish between citizens of Japanese ancestry, or of German or Italian ancestry and citizens of English, Scotch, Russian, or Norwegian ancestry. Loyal American citizens of Japanese ancestry have the same rights as any other loyal American citizens (United States, 1943, p. 18). The minority view seemed to understand citizenship not as something to be proven but given to all American citizens.

The minority view indirectly challenged loyalty screening as a way to assess loyalty of Japanese Americans. It pointed out that “the dangerous aliens among the Japanese population on the west coast” were already removed right after the Pearl Harbor, so “all the rest were presumed to be loyal and safe” (United States, 1943, p. 17). Along with the understanding of citizenship as a Constitutional right, the minority view challenged the U.S. government’s rhetoric of loyalty as loyalty was not something Japanese Americans should have been asked to prove. Disloyalty could be assessed in “dangerous aliens” but loyalty was not.

The minority view also criticized that the majority report did not include “any evidence that any of the [released] 23 were subversive” (United States, 1943, p. 18). The minority view seemed to take the presumption of innocence. Without enough evidence to judge ones disloyal, they should be assumed as loyal citizens. With this understanding of citizenship and loyalty, all American citizens who were not evaluated as disloyal should be automatically assumed as loyal, without screening.

While the minority view provided different implications to the understanding of loyalty and citizenship, it did not challenge the underlining connection between Americanism and loyalty. Americanization of Japanese Americans was encouraged as a right thing to do in the minority view. The minority view blamed the U.S. government that segregation was not the best way to further Americanize Japanese Americans. It argued that “Americanization is best accomplished not by formal programs of education, but by the continuous day-to-day mingling of the immigrant group among the general American population (United States, 1943, p. 20). It uncritically admitted that “everybody is in favor of Americanization just as everybody is against sin” (United

States, 1943, p. 27). Assimilating to American culture was presented as the absolute just, and the complexity of Japanese Americans' identity was somehow ignored.

Although the minority view promoted Americanization, it did challenge the assumed connection between Japaneseness and disloyalty presented in the majority report. For example, the minority view pointed out that Judo was taught to soldiers in the U.S. Army, (United States, 1943, p. 21) therefore it was not necessary a Japanese activity that promoted disloyalty to the United States. It also pointed out that Japanese language was taught at the camps for the U. S. military and naval services (United States, 1943, p. 21), helping the United States to fight against Japan more strategically. This suggests that the minority view provided ways to understand Japanese-related activities as loyal activities.

Conclusion and Implications

This chapter examined the U.S. government's official documents and interrogated how loyalty and citizenship were rhetorically constructed. My analysis identified that FDR framed the Japanese American incarceration as a military necessary and drew a boundary between Japanese Americans and the American public. This chapter also identified the two binaries: American/Japanese and loyalty/disloyalty. I argued that loyalty was associated with Americanness and disloyalty was associated with Japaneseness in loyalty screening and the Congressional report. My critical reading also revealed that Americanization meant assimilating to White American culture. Japanese Americans were asked to prove their loyalty to the United States, while other American citizens never asked to fill in any loyalty tests. Although the minority view against the Congressional report challenged the tie between disloyalty and Japanese activities,

loyalty in the U.S. government's official documents was rhetorically constructed as performing White Americanness.

The above analyses answer my research questions: Who can be an American, beside legal criteria? What are criteria for being a loyal American citizen? How are these criteria for citizenship constructed in public? My analysis revealed that individuals who proved their loyalty were considered as American citizens. The loyalty was determined through one's performance of Americanness, especially White American culture. Such criteria for loyalty and citizenship were constantly constructed in FDR's rhetoric, loyalty screening, and the Congressional report. While some were critical to the criteria like my analysis of the minority view suggested, official documents by the U.S. government in general constructed White Americanness as a sign of loyalty and any Japanese-related activities and status as a sign of disloyalty.

This particular case study of loyalty and citizenship for Japanese Americans can be extended to studying citizenship of any racial minority groups in the United States. Given that assimilating to White American culture was extracted as a criterion for loyalty, any populations from foreign cultures can face similar situations. This study calls for careful examination of who are labeled as loyal citizens. One's loyalty and citizenship can be evaluated not purely by one's legal status and willingness to serve for the nation but other factors like race and national origin. Such understanding of loyalty was not explicit, since FDR as well as the Congressional report recognized Japanese Americans as good citizens. Since implications of loyalty and citizenship are not always explicit and even not intentional, it is significant to critically examine rhetorical texts and identify hidden ideologies and possible consequences.

Although the majority of Japanese Americans were silent to the constructed meaning of loyalty and disloyalty by the U.S. government, there were several groups of Japanese Americans who argued against the government as the incarceration and loyalty screening were unjust. The next chapter examines how Japanese American resisters challenged the binary of American/Japanese and loyalty/disloyalty. Their rhetorical strategies identified contradiction and unfairness the binaries had created.

Chapter Three

Citizenship from the Margins

Introduction

The previous chapter identified loyalty and citizenship as rhetorical constructions within the binaries of Americanness/loyalty and Japaneseness/disloyalty. Although the majority of Japanese Americans gave up their property and accepted the U.S. government's order of incarceration, there were groups of Japanese Americans who resisted. This chapter focuses on voices from the margin, unpacking citizenship defined and enacted by Japanese American resisters. The Japanese American incarceration and the draft created controversies in the Japanese American community, which constructed different meanings of citizenship within the community. This chapter examines rhetoric by a Japanese American resistance group and rhetoric in two community newspapers where multiple understandings of citizenship emerged.

My analysis of citizenship constructed in the Japanese American community suggests that minority groups are diverse, and members of diverse minority groups can construct multiple, conflicting understandings of citizenship. Voices from a marginalized group cannot be reduced to a single monolithic voice. Understanding such diverse meanings of loyalty and citizenship is significant, since citizens are asked to take different actions depending on how one understands citizenship. My analysis of voices generated from the Japanese American community reveals that citizenship can be constructed at least in two ways: (1) citizenship as duty and action and (2) citizenship as rights and status.

The first texts for this chapter are three bulletins created by the Fair Play Committee (the FPC). The bulletins were distributed throughout the Heart Mountain concentration camp. The FPC's rhetoric was selected for the study since the FPC was the largest group of resistance organized by Japanese Americans. While the majority of Japanese Americans at the camps did not actively oppose the incarceration and draft, the FPC was recognized as an advocate group across the concentration camps. My analysis interrogates how Japanese American resisters challenged the definition of loyalty and citizenship constructed by the U.S. government. I argue that the FPC redefined the concept of citizenship through their refusal of being drafted. While saying "no" to the draft could be seen as a sign of their disloyalty to the U.S. government, my analysis reveals that the FPC dissociated disloyalty from rejection of being drafted. The FPC insisted that one's rejection of being drafted did not mean its members were disloyal to the country.

My analysis also examines how the FPC redefined citizenship while negotiating two levels of conflicts: a conflict between the U.S. government and the Japanese American community and a conflict within the Japanese American community. Social movements tend to face the problem of having both internal and external audiences for its rhetoric. It is difficult to simultaneously persuade audiences inside and outside of one's community since each group has different interests, values, and goals (Rowland, 2002, p. 185). Rhetorical strategies for identification and audience adaptation are difficult in such contexts. With this particular case of the Japanese American incarceration, I investigate how social movement rhetoric can resolve the problem of internal/external audiences. Specifically, I investigate how dissenters can challenge an established meaning of

citizenship while maintaining identity as members of the dominant system. Through this analysis, I argue that the FPC put the two levels of identification together by claiming that its members were loyal American citizens who respected American ideals. This rhetorical strategy could bridge the emotional gap between the American public and Japanese American community.

The Rocky Shimpō and *The Heart Mountain Sentinel*, the two community newspapers circulated in the Heart Mountain camp, serve as my second texts for this chapter. Although the FPC was an organization in one of the ten concentration camps, it reached Japanese American audiences across the country because of strong editorial support by Jimmie Omura, an editor of *The Rocky Shimpō*. *The Rocky Shimpō*, published in Denver, was the newspaper that explicitly opposed the Japanese American incarceration. While *The Rocky Shimpō* supported the FPC's resistance against the U.S. government, *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* harshly criticized the FPC for what it perceived as ruining the public image of Japanese Americans. *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* reflected a pro-government perspective by arguing the resisters were "trouble-makers" (Muller, 2001, p. 81). Furthermore, the purpose of *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* was "keeping the residents advised of W[ar] R[elocation] A[uthority] policies and of maintaining morale in the center" ("Heart Mountain," 2013). This chapter investigates conflicting understanding of loyalty and citizenship found in the two community newspapers. I argue that *The Rocky Shimpō* created a definition of citizenship that values status over act, while *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* created a definition of citizenship that values act over status. The analysis suggests that meaning of citizenship may be contested even within communities that share racial, cultural, and social background.

Minority identity is particularly complicated, and by focusing on the case study of the Japanese American incarceration, I argue that definitional argument allows minorities to negotiate their place in a civic space that appears to exclude and reject them. By analyzing citizenship construction by multiple groups in Japanese American community, this chapter exemplifies ways in which minority groups accept or counter to a dominant understanding of citizenship constructed by authority.

Identity Construction in Social Movements

Social movement rhetoric creates division as well as identification. According to Kenneth Burke (1969), identification is based on differences between A and B, and A identifies with B when A recognizes B shares common characteristics and/or interests (pp. 20-21). To identify A with B is to make A “consubstantial” with B. When one says that two persons are consubstantial, both are separated individuals but jointed by common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, or attitudes (Burke, 1969, p. 21). Burke also explains that identification is compensatory to division (p. 22). Identification is possible because there is its counterpart, division. Therefore, a community construction is impossible without differentiating others who do not belong to the community. In order to construct a minority identity, one needs to differentiate the minority group from the dominant group. Therefore, primary audience of social movements is not always people who belong to the dominant system. Lake’s (1983) analysis on the Red Power movement reveals that most of the protest rhetoric was primarily directed to movement members and other Native Americans, for the purpose of gathering the like-minded (p. 128). While this rhetoric created identification within the community, it alienated White audience and left them unconvinced (Lake, p. 128). Therefore, while social movement

rhetoric can be seen as a fight against external audiences, establishing identification within internal audience is also a challenge for successful social movements.

Constructing a collective identity is one rhetorical strategy for social movements. Charland (1987) defines constitutive rhetoric as calling an “audience into being” (p. 134). Rhetoric can create a sense of community among people who had not identified themselves as members of the community. In other words, the very boundary of whom the term “people” includes and excludes is rhetorically constructed (Charland, 1987, p. 136). While constituting a collective identity can be a strategy for social movement leaders to gain supporters and make changes, unique rhetorical problems in social movement rhetoric make it difficult for the leaders to construct a unified collective identity. In regard to identification, leaders must adapt to several audiences simultaneously, including outsiders who are sympathetic, indifferent, and opposed (Simons, 1970, p. 7). However, actions that may succeed with one audience (e.g. solidification of the membership) may alienate others (e.g. provocation of a backlash) since identification always entails division (Simons, 1970, p. 1). Therefore, dealing with different levels of audiences is a rhetorical challenge in social movement rhetoric.

Confrontation rhetoric is another rhetorical strategy often found in social movements, and it reflects Kenneth Burke’s sense of division (Scott & Smith, 1969, p. 2). Confrontation occurs between the “haves” and the “have-nots” (Scott & Smith, 1969, p. 2). Leaders of the “have-nots” picture themselves as “radically divided from traditional society” and often demand to reduce the burden they experience and enter the mainstream of traditional values and institutions (Scott & Smith, 1969, p. 2). This assumes a distinct boundary between the dominant system and those involving in a social

movement. In such radical confrontation rhetoric, “the vales of those who ‘have’ are celebrated as the goals to which all should aspire,” like the right to vote, to go to college, or to find employment (Scott & Smith, 1969, p. 2). The boundary is emphasized through setting up an enemy, like the White racism for Black Power advocates and “establishment or technocracy” for students in the New Left (Scott & Smith, 1969, p. 3). As such, confrontation rhetoric in social movements typically entails division with the dominant system.

What makes the FPC’s rhetoric unique and interesting to analyze is its identification strategy. The FPC never used rhetoric of division to either the internal or external audience. Rather than constructing a boundary between “haves” and “have-nots,” the FPC’s rhetoric unified both levels of audiences. The FPC clarified in its bulletins that its members were willing to sacrifice their lives for the country’s ideals---democracy, freedom, and equality. The FPC did not ask the American public, or people who belong to the dominant system, to give up anything to share with Japanese Americans. Rather than blaming the dominant system, the FPC insisted that its members were more loyal than general Americans who were indifferent or supportive to the incarceration and the draft since they were fighting to defend American ideals.

Dissent, like the FPC’s resistance, can be regarded as a positive form of democracy. Without dissent, “there is no democratic polity of adversaries and thus no politics, only forced unity and unmitigated enmity that is the end of politics, per se” (Ivie, 2005, p. 279). However, dissent can be viewed as dangerous, especially in war time. As Ivie argues, “war in the name of democracy is a sign of a democracy’s weakness” since “a healthy democratic policy constitutes a constraint on war rather than an incentive or

excuse for war” (p. 278). War rhetoric silences dissent and discourages citizens’ participation to politics. War rhetoric can drive people to be irresponsible, mindless, and return to the simplicity of childhood (Crick & Engels, 2012). Dissent is an active challenge against such war rhetoric. In this sense, dissent by the FPC can be a form of democracy, thus it internalized American ideals even while opposing some U.S. policies.

The FPC’s rhetoric exemplifies ways in which division can be rhetorically resolved. The FPC faced the conditions for how its members “can be articulated as legitimate adversaries rather than relegated to the ‘uninhabitable identification’ of disloyal outcasts and threatening Others” (Ivie, 2005, p. 285). While establishing identification between Japanese Americans and the American public, the FPC also attempted to establish a community within the Heart Mountain camp for collective actions. The FPC faced the situation that needs to deal with different levels of identification with, in both the internal and external audiences.

Therefore, the analysis of the FPC’s rhetoric provides an example of how dissent by marginalized groups balance identification and division. The FPC’s rhetoric attempted to transcend the boundary between the minority group and the dominant group. The FPC attempted to draw identification between the community of Japanese Americans and the community of the democratic nation, the United States. The FPC’s attempt was an active contribution to democracy. In other words, dissent was a way of performing citizenship. Regardless of practical effectiveness of its rhetorical strategies, the FPC exemplifies how racial minorities in the United States can perform citizenship in a way that the U.S. government does not prefer.

Loyalty and Citizenship Defined by Resisters: The Fair Play Committee

The situation the FPC faced was unique. On February 1, 1943, President Franklin Roosevelt announced that the War Department would organize a segregated combat team for Nisei (the second generation Japanese Americans) who wished to volunteer, while Japanese Americans were incarcerated (Muller, 2001, p. 41). FDR stated that “no loyal citizens of the United States should be denied the democratic right to exercise the responsibilities of his citizenship, regardless of his ancestry” (cited in Muller, 2001, p. 41). This suggests that the U.S. government framed the draft as a “democratic right” that all American citizens, including Japanese Americans, should enjoy. The draft became something for which citizens should aspire, rather than a duty to be fulfilled. The Office of War Information regarded military service by Japanese Americans as helpful for persuading “a domestic audience that Japanese Americans could be loyal Americans” (Muller, 2001, p. 46). Although the U.S. government seemed to gradually shift its way of framing Japanese Americans from outsiders to American citizens with rights, the draft call still constructed loyalty as something to be proven through patriotic actions (military enrollment).

While being incarcerated, in late January 1944, the War Department formally announced its new policy of drafting Japanese Americans in the camps (“Heart Mountain,” 2013, para.3). Young men in the camps were compelled to be enrolled in the military by force of law (Muller, 2001, p. 64). In most of the camps, there is little record of public discussions about the draft. Compounding the limitations on formal records, enrolling in military forces was often an individual choice rather than a collective action

(Muller, 2001, p. 65). The FPC was the largest organized group of Japanese Americans that openly opposed the draft.

Since the FPC's goal was opposing unfair treatment by the U.S. government, the primary audiences of the bulletins were Japanese Americans at the camps, especially those who did not stand up against the government's policies. Even though the bulletins were created originally for distribution only to Japanese American residents at the Heart Mountain camp, the FPC had a strong editorial support from Jimmie Omura, an editor of *The Rocky Shimpō*. With Omura's support, the FPC's messages were distributed to the concentration camps across the country. Given that, the FPC received criticism as well as support from the Japanese American community. For the FPC, unifying voices in the Japanese American community was a rhetorical challenge since resistance was not a popular means of expression in the Japanese American community due to its culture that prefers submissive attitude to authorities (see Tashima, 2003). Along with the issue of community identity of Japanese Americans, the FPC also faced another rhetorical challenge to present their resistance as a legitimate act of American citizenship to the American public. The mental and physical distance between segregated Japanese Americans and the American public hindered the FPC from asking for sympathy and support from the American public. Having those rhetorical challenges, the FPC attempted to present its members as loyal American citizens and resisted military enrollment as a necessary performance of proper American citizenship. In the following analysis, I argue that the FPC's rhetoric challenged the binary of American/Japanese and loyal/disloyal through constituting a collective identity that could be shared with both the American public and the Japanese American community. Moreover, the FPC's rhetoric

dissociated the implied connection between military enrollment and loyalty by redefined meanings of loyalty and citizenship through rejecting the draft.

The Two Levels of Identification in the FPC's Rhetoric

The FPC faced a rhetorical challenge to reach the Japanese American community as well as the American public. First, the FPC's resistance was not supported by the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL), which was the most powerful organization in the Japanese American community at that time. The FPC was harshly criticized by *the Heart Mountain Sentinel*, a Japanese American community newspaper that favored the JACL and the U.S. government. *The Sentinel* reported that there was an emotional disconnection between the members of the FPC and other Japanese Americans, arguing that the majority of Japanese Americans did not support the FPC due to its radical performance. In order to have support from the Japanese American community, the FPC needed to respond to such criticism. Second, reaching to the American public was also a challenge for the FPC due to anti-Japan sentiment and the removal of Japanese Americans. The incarceration created a physical disconnect with others in the American population. Furthermore, anti-Japan sentiment also created an emotional disconnect with Japanese Americans.

In order to overcome those disconnections with the internal and external audiences, the rhetoric of the FPC put strong emphasis on identification rather than division. Collective identity can function as a way to unite a community (Charland, 1987). Given that identification always entails differentiation, articulating the bond within the Japanese American community could create differentiation from the dominant group, the American public. In addition, the incarceration generated physical and

emotional disconnection between Japanese Americans and the American public. I argue that the FPC challenged such division between the American public and Japanese Americans by emphasizing identification with American ideals and Japanese Americans. The FPC claimed that Japanese American resisters were true loyal Americans who were fighting for a more democratic American country that respects freedom for all. They performed their way of loyalty and citizenship through rejecting the draft, being arrested by the WRA, and advocating for freedom and equality.

The FPC published bulletins in the Heart Mountain camp in order to publicize the FPC's missions and philosophy. On February 8, 1944, four days after the first orders to report for pre-induction physicals arrived in the mail, the FPC held its first public meeting (Muller, 2001, p. 78). The first bulletin was published after the meeting, declared that "the very fundamentals of democracy is at stake" (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 7). In their initial public statement, the FPC framed the Japanese American incarceration as a crisis for democracy, an American ideal. The FPC's rhetoric was primary directed to the community of the Heart Mountain camp, especially for residents who were not actively resisting the draft and the incarceration. The second bulletin was published on March 1, 1944. It published the FPC messages in a question-and-answer form. The bulletin explained the FPC, its goals and its belief. According to the second bulletin, the FPC was "organized to inject justice in all the problems pertaining to our evacuation, concentration, detention, and pauperization without hearing or due process of law, and oppose all unfair practices within our center, State, or Union" (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #2, 1944, para. 1). After realizing indifference of the camp's administration, the FPC decided to state clearly that it planned to defy the draft.

The third bulletin, published on March 4, 1944, explained injustice of the condition Japanese Americans faced and stated that “we may have to engage in court actions” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, 1944, para. 9). Those statements eventually encouraged eighty-five young male resisters to refuse the draft (Muller, 2001, p. 77).

The following sections analyze the FPC’s bulletins, particularly focusing on identification as a rhetorical strategy. As social movement literature suggests, dealing with the internal and external audience is a rhetorical challenge for any groups that ask social changes. For the FPC, in order to convince the Japanese Americans or the internal audience, it needed to establish a sense of community within Japanese Americans in order to ask for collective action. At the same time, the FPC also needed to overcome the distinct boundary between the American public and Japanese Americans in order to justify their resistance as an act of loyal American citizens. My analysis identifies the FPC’s rhetorical strategies to overcome this challenge. I argue that the FPC established two levels of identification: identification with the Japanese American community and identification with all citizens in the United States. The two levels of identification challenged the binary of Japanese and American the U.S. government constructed. The FPC emphasized American ideals as shared values not only in the American public but in the Japanese American community and argued that all American citizens should have a new collective identity of “citizens who respect democracy, freedom, and equality.”

Identification with the internal audience.

The FPC needed to establish identification within the group of Japanese Americans in order to take collective actions against the draft. The FPC’s identification strategy can be found in the second bulletin, which was published after the FPC realized

indifference of Japanese American camp residents. The second bulletin was formatted as questions and answers, from Japanese Americans at the Heart Mountain camp to the FPC. The FPC kept the tone informational, since they were risking prosecution if they openly urged non-compliance with the draft (Muller, 2001, p. 79). With such a rhetorical constraint, the second bulletin could not call for action in a radical way. Instead, it emphasized shared hardships that Japanese Americans went through and established identification within the Japanese American community.

In the second bulletin, the FPC created identification within the internal audience. As an answer to the question “What has the FPC actually done and what is it doing now?” the FPC insisted that the U.S. government should admit their mistake for “*our* evacuation, detention, concentration,” and the FPC was giving *the community* service (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #2, par. 4, emphasis added). The FPC mentioned shared hardships of Japanese Americans as “our” experiences, which created a sense of collective identity. The FPC’s efforts were framed as “the community service,” implying the Japanese American community exists and the FPC’s members were serving for it.

Asking for involvement was another rhetorical strategy the FPC employed for establishing a sense of community within Japanese Americans. According to Burke (1969), by acting together, people gain “common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial” (p. 21). In the second bulletin, as an answer to the question “Do you think that the FPC can succeed in its aims?” the FPC claimed it would need active supporters to make their protest succeed. In the second bulletin, the FPC explained: “To those of you whose heart, whose interests, and whose ideals are with us in these critical times, please lend us your support, morally and materially as this is the

only way we can succeed in achieving our aims” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #2, para. 9). The FPC described support from the internal audience as the most significant support needed. While the FPC could have recruited new members in the bulletin, it did not directly ask such form of involvement. Given that the majority of Japanese American residents at camps were not actively resisting the U.S. government but accepted the situation, asking a small involvement might be more effective than asking a strong commitment to the FPC. Moreover, peer-pressure to oppose the FPC, an anti-U.S. government group, could exist at the camp. Considering such constraints, the second bulletin seemed to be carefully worded. At the end of the second bulletin, the FPC asked for donations. The FPC asked for donations technically because it recognized its members would need money if their actions resulted in a legal case. Such a call for donations also rhetorically functioned to reaffirm the community by encouraging active participations for a common goal.

For further establishing identification within the internal audience, the FPC invoked anger and frustration that could be shared among Japanese Americans. In the third bulletin, the FPC argued that “one hundred and ten thousand innocent people were kicked out of their home” and “herded like dangerous criminals into concentration camps with barbed wire fences” without any hearing and due process of law (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, para. 4.). The description of the situation by the FPC could reframe what Japanese Americans were experiencing. In the situation that the majority of Japanese American camp residents were accepting the removal and following authorities, the FPC emphasized that all of them did not need to accept the policy since they were all “innocent.” It also emphasized that the moving was not voluntary but they were “kicked

out of their home.” Moreover, the rhetorical choice to lament that the U.S. government “herded” them like animals or dangerous criminals, invoked a dehumanizing rhetoric that invited Japanese American camp residents to agree that the U.S. government was mistreating them; therefore they must be frustrated.

Furthermore, the FPC emphasized that the U.S. government was violating Japanese Americans’ Constitutional rights. The FPC expressed their anger toward the U.S. government as:

WITHOUT RECTIFICATION OF THE INJUSTICES COMMITTED AGAINST
US NOR WITHOUT RESTORATION OF OUR RIGHTS AS GUARANTEED
BY THE CONSTITUTION, WE ARE ORDERED TO JOIN THE ARMY
THRU DISCRIMINATORY PROCEDURES INTO A SEGREGATED

COMBAT UNIT! (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, para. 4, emphasis original)

The use of capital letters visualized the FPC’s anger and frustration for readers. In this paragraph, the FPC switched a reference to Japanese Americans from “innocent people” to “we.” With this rhetorical choice, the FPC emphasized that readers or Japanese American residents at the camps were not bystanders but those who were discriminated against. This rhetoric could present the FPC’s resistance not as an extreme act by radical individuals but as a rational response to the discrimination planned by concerned members of the Japanese American community. Appealing to shared hardships and frustrations would transform the draft from an individual’s choice to an unfair burden imposed on the community. This rhetorical strategy could be a response to a rhetorical constraint the FPC faced, that was indifference or criticism to the resistance against the draft generated from Japanese Americans.

Identification with the external audience.

The second challenge the FPC faced was establishing identification between the internal audience, the Japanese American community, and the external audience, the American public. Due to anti-Japan sentiment and the incarceration of Japanese Americans, negative images of Japanese Americans were generated among the American public. I argue that the FPC established identification between Japanese Americans and the American public by addressing shared American ideals and American history, such as the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

The first sentence in the first bulletin referred to American ideals and the Constitution as the fundamentals of the country. The FPC believed that “the first duty of every loyal citizen is to protect and uphold the Constitution of the United States” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 1). The reference to the Constitution could appeal to the American public in that the FPC’s members were U.S. citizens who were educated in knowledge of the United States and shared the same ideals with other American citizens. Moreover, in this sentence, the FPC seemed to question the understanding of loyalty and citizenship constructed by the loyalty screening. Assimilating to American culture and enrolling in military combat were not the only way to perform loyalty and citizenship. In the FPC’s rhetoric, protecting the Constitution is the duty that should have come first for American citizens.

In addition to the Constitution reference, American ideals were also emphasized in the first bulletin. The FPC noted that: “The cornerstone of this instrument of our government is JUSTICE, LIBERTY, FREEDOM, AND THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 1, emphasis original).

This statement emphasized the values granted by the American public. Calabrese and Burke (1992) described American democratic ideals as “the mythology of American individual freedom” (p. 62). Kemmelmeier and Winter (2008) further noted that “liberty and freedom constitute dominant themes in American national identity, where American history is often viewed as a struggle to attain and defend freedom” (p. 861). The FPC selected values that were considered as American ideals. By this, the FPC demonstrated that its members were reliable American citizens. Just as other Americans, they understood and respected American ideals.

Shared values were reinforced by acknowledging history of the country. The first bulletin included a quotation from Abraham Lincoln. It also referred to “the Declaration of Independence, The War of Rebellion, the Boston Tea Party, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Proclamation for the Emancipation of Slavery” as foundation for the country (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 4). Positing a transhistorical subject is one of the ideological effects for constituting communities (Charland, 1987, p. 140). By presenting US history as a shared knowledge and value in Japanese Americans and the American public, the FPC reaffirmed the United States as a community that protects everyone’s human rights, including minority groups like Japanese Americans. The FPC connected Japanese Americans to American history, which worked to weave a Japanese American identity as already a part of American identity.

Furthermore, the FPC referred the incarceration and the draft as a threat to the democratic nation, not just to Japanese Americans. The FPC indirectly equated the Japanese Americans’ experience with previous instances of discrimination in the United States. The first bulletin noted that “The desecration of any one of these [American

ideals] is a direct attack upon the fundamentals that molded our democratic institutions” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 1, emphasis original). The FPC framed Japanese American experience as a problem for all American citizens. The FPC cautioned that “the very fundamentals of Democracy” were at stake (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, para. 7). According to the FPC, the condition that Japanese Americans faced was a sign of a collapsing democracy, not just a violation of Japanese Americans’ human rights. Moreover, democracy was described as “our” system, including the American public as well as Japanese Americans. Democracy was presented as an absolute, which was universally valid. The FPC’s rhetoric asserted that all American citizens must believe democracy as the country’s foundation, and it presented the FPC’s goal as protecting democracy.

The Constitution, American ideals, and a shared history collectively redefined the identity of Japanese Americans. The FPC identified its members as “American Citizens of this Nation by right of birth and Constitutional grant,” and argued that “our freedom, liberty, and all rights” should be guaranteed by the Constitution (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 3). By presenting its members as American citizens who were protected by the Constitution, the FPC attempted to overcome division created by anti-Japan sentiment and the incarceration. The Nisei (the second generation) Japanese Americans were born in the United States like other American citizens, and their rights should be protected by the Constitution. The FPC attempted to transcend the discriminatory boundary based on their ethnic origin and physical appearance by creating identification based on common values and history.

Calling for a new collective identity.

Through establishing identification with both the internal audience and the external audience, the FPC challenged the understanding of loyalty and citizenship created by the U.S. government. It asked Japanese Americans to be loyal citizens who fight for justice, and called both audiences to embrace a collective identity of “citizens who respect democracy, freedom, and equality.” In the third bulletin, the FPC called for unity within the Japanese American community as well as with the American public. The FPC transformed the identity of Japanese Americans from a discriminated minority group to a group of American citizens who were capable of fighting for protecting the nation’s principles. The FPC rhetoric implied that Japanese Americans were a unique minority group, but they were part of a larger community, the United States. The FPC’s resistance was framed as an act of loyal American citizens, insisting that the members of the FPC took actions to challenge unfairness the U.S. government forced on its citizens.

The FPC framed the incarceration and the draft as a nation’s crisis, not just an issue for the Japanese American community. This further constituted a new collective identity among the American public and Japanese Americans. The FPC insisted that “the future of all minorities and the future of this democratic nation is in danger” if the incarceration and the draft were opposed immediately (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, 1944, para. 4). With inclusion of other minorities and the democratic nation as parts of the condition Japanese Americans faced, the FPC presented the hardship Japanese Americans experienced not as unique to them but danger for all minorities in the nation. This rhetoric situated the resistance in a larger context. The FPC fought not just for rejecting the immediate event, the draft to Japanese Americans, rather, it fought for the

future of all minorities in the country. Moreover, by framing the draft as a violation of democracy and the nation's principles, the FPC's rhetoric transcended the division between the American public and Japanese Americans and attempted to reaffirm the country as a community that respected freedom for all.

The construction of a collective identity of citizens who respect democracy was possible since the FPC presented Japanese Americans as citizens who respect American ideals. The FPC rejected the division between Americans and Japanese Americans, which labeled Japanese Americans who respect Japanese culture as disloyal and non-patriotic outsiders. The FPC declared that its members were "all loyal Americans fighting for JUSTICE AND DEMOCRACY RIGHT HERE AT HOME" (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, 1944, para. 6). The United States was presented as "home" for the FPC. In the FPC's rhetoric, its members were loyal citizens not because they had passed the loyalty screening and registered the combat but because they were fighting for democracy, a fundamental value of the country. Assuming that the American public valued democracy and other American ideals, the FPC redefined their identity as fighters for democracy and asked both the internal and external audience to support the FPC. The FPC further argued that its members were more American than other American citizens since they were fighting for American ideals, in spite of being denied their rights. The FPC argued that its members rejected the draft not because they were the minority that should have been protected by the nation but because they should have been treated the same as other American citizens.

The FPC's rhetoric redefined the identity of Japanese Americans as loyal American citizens who respect the nation's principles, while keeping a sense of Japanese

American community based on unique hardships. The FPC asked both the internal and external audience to embrace a collective identity of loyal American citizens who respect democracy, freedom, and equality. By framing Japanese Americans' experience as a nation's crisis, the FPC's rhetoric transcended the binary of Japanese/American and of loyalty/disloyalty. The next section further analyzes the process of how the FPC redefined loyalty and citizenship by focusing on dissociation as a rhetorical strategy.

Redefining Citizenship

As chapter two reveals, citizenship and loyalty of Japanese Americans were determined by their assimilation to White American culture and obedience to the U.S. government. Nisei American young men were asked to demonstrate their loyalty by passing registration, the loyalty screening, and enlisting in military combat in order to be regarded as loyal citizens. Although the purpose of the screening was "making recommendations about who was loyal enough to leave a relocation center, and determining who was loyal enough to work in a plant or industry doing sensitive war work," (Muller, 2007, p. 139) the answers of adult respondents also were used to determine their eligibility for enlisting in the military (Ng, 2001, p. 56). Japanese Americans had to be judged as loyal enough to participate in the military of their country. Citizenship of Japanese Americans was not merely a legal status. Their loyalty must have been proved to be considered as a complete American citizen.

The FPC's rhetoric redefined citizenship and challenged ways in which the U.S. government forced Japanese Americans to "prove" loyalty and citizenship. This section reveals that the FPC dissociated disloyalty and rejection of being drafted, as well as loyalty and citizenship. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) explained dissociation as

it “assumes the original unity of elements comprised within a single conception and designated by a single notion” (pp. 411-412). Dissociation challenges this unity by identifying a source of incompatibility between the elements (Ritivoi, 2008, p. 186). Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca introduced the “appearance-reality” pair as the prototype of dissociation, and “act-person” is one of examples they provide (p. 420). Such dissociation of concepts does not merely break links, but also assigns value to the two terms, using one to decide what the value of the other should be (Ritivoi, p. 189). I argue that the FPC dissociated rejection of being drafted (act) and being disloyal (person), which were interwoven in the concept of citizenship particular to Japanese Americans at that time. This is a dissociative argument made by the FPC.

Participating in combat for the United States was framed by the U.S. government as the preferable way for young Japanese American men to publicly demonstrate their loyalty to the nation. Rejecting the draft, in contrast, could be seen as a sign of disloyalty to the U.S. government. The FPC’s dissociation broke a link between rejection of being drafted and disloyalty to the United States. The FPC argued that “to be drafted or not to be drafted, or to[be] loyal or disloyal, are not the questions at issue” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 7). Such dissociation was especially significant in the condition that the U.S. government used the results of the loyalty screening to determine who to be eligible for military enrollment.

The FPC explicitly stated that resistance to the draft did not mean its members were disloyal to the U.S. The FPC declared that “we, the members of the FPC are not afraid to go war---we are not afraid to risk our lives for our country. We would greatly sacrifice our lives to protect and uphold the principles and ideals of our country” (Fair

Play Committee Bulletin #3, 1944, para. 4). The FPC dissociated fear of going to war and resistance to the draft. Due to criticisms and pressure from the WRA and the JACL, Japanese American readers could regard the FPC's members as being afraid of going to war. The FPC clarified that its members were "not afraid to risk our lives for our country." However, they did not take a risk of military sacrifices. Rather than serving for military combats, the FPC were serving for protecting American ideals, principle of "our" country. In this rhetoric, the FPC demonstrated that being drafted is not the only way to perform loyalty to the nation. The FPC proposed that their fighting for American ideals should be considered an alternative form of loyalty to the United States.

The FPC's emphasis on American principles and ideals could let both the internal and external audiences rethink the situation. The FPC insisted that rejecting the draft made its members loyal citizens since they were fighting for the nation's principles. The FPC declared: "We are all loyal Americans fighting for JUSTICE AND DEMOCRACY RIGHT HERE AT HOME" (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, para. 6, emphasis original). This sentence let readers realize that war to protect the nation's principles and ideals was happening "at home," so war was not just in foreign countries but also in the United States. The FPC framed the Japanese American incarceration as war against American principles happening at home.

It was the FPC's contention that citizenship should not be determined by whether a person was drafted or not. Regardless of enrollment in military services, all Japanese Americans who were born in the country should be treated as citizens with protected rights and responsibility. The problem was not the draft itself, but the absence of restoration of Japanese Americans' rights and discriminatory restrictions against Japanese

Americans (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1, 1944, para. 6, emphasis original). The FPC questioned not the draft itself but the understanding of citizenship behind the draft. The FPC insisted that it was unfair to ask only Japanese Americans to fulfill responsibility as citizens without securing basic rights. The members of the FPC were American citizens at first, and their rights, including freedom of expression, should be guaranteed by the Constitution, the same as other American citizens. Moreover, the FPC insisted that its rejection of the draft was a performance of true American ideals, since the incarceration and the draft were un-American requirements, which the FPC called “the unconstitutional acts” (Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3, 1944, para. 3). Therefore, refusing the draft was not disloyal. Rather, it an active commitment for fighting for the nation’s principles.

My analysis of the bulletins by the FPC identified ways in which the FPC challenged the binary of Japanese/American and loyal/disloyal. The FPC established identification with both the internal audience, the Japanese American community, and the external audience, the American public. The FPC asked both audiences to embrace a collective identity of loyal American citizens who respect democracy, freedom, and equality. The FPC also challenged the U.S. government’s way of understanding loyalty and citizenship as something to be proven. The FPC dissociated disloyalty and rejection of the draft by redefining their identity; members of the FPC were fighting for the nation’s principles therefore were loyal to the country. The next section examines how the FPC’s resistance was taken in the Japanese American community through analyzing two community newspapers. My next analysis further investigates the construction of citizenship and loyalty, particularly focusing on the conflicting meanings and implications interwoven in the terms citizenship and loyalty.

Citizenship Clashed: *The Rocky Shimpō* and *The Heart Mountain Sentinel*

There was not one unified response to the FPC's resistance within the Japanese American community. The FPC was judged both positively and negatively in the Japanese American community. While the FPC could recruit some new members and supporters, there was a harsh disagreement on the FPC in the Heart Mountain camp. *The Heart Mountain Sentinel*, a weekly newspaper for the camp residents, wrote that the FPC would "soon be broken and dispersed on the solid rocks of reasons and law" (cited in Muller, 2001, p. 82). *The Sentinel* was independent of the camp administration in theory but rarely challenged the War Relocation Authority (Muller, 2001, p. 81). Despite the FPC's attempts, the Japanese American community was not unified to protest. While the FPC's rhetoric exemplified ways in which minority groups use identification effectively to deal with the internal and external audience, it was still difficult to change the perspective of those who were in favor of the U.S. government.

Although the FPC did not successfully persuade all Japanese American residents at the camp, it did not mean their rhetoric failed. The FPC's way of understanding loyalty, citizenship, and identity complicated our understanding of those terms. To further understand how the FPC's rhetoric of loyalty, citizenship and civic identity was perceived in the Japanese American community and clashed with the dominant understanding of citizenship, this section examines the two Japanese newspapers distributed in the Heart Mountain camp, *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* and *The Rocky Shimpō*.

The Heart Mountain Sentinel was one of the WRA camp newspapers, which kept incarcerated Japanese Americans informed of administrative announcements, events,

news from other camps, and other necessary information concerning daily life in the camp (Heart Mountain Sentinel, 2013). It provided nearly identical coverage as official papers in other camps, chronicling social events, religious activities (both Buddhist and Christian), school, sports, crimes and accidents in addition to the WRA rules and regulations (Heart Mountain Sentinel, 2013). All editors, reporters and writers were Japanese Americans, classified as professional workers and received a monthly payment, \$12 or \$16 a month for reporters and \$19 for top editors (Heart Mountain Sentinel, 2013). All ten camp newspapers were both in English and Japanese languages (Heart Mountain Sentinel, 2013). Mizuno (2001) analyzed archival documents of the WRA and other concerned government agencies and concluded that “the WRA allowed evacuees to publish newspapers ‘freely’ without ‘censorship,’ but under the authority’s ‘supervision’ (p. 504). The earliest issues of *the Sentinel* reflected the need to help readers cope with the circumstances of their new life in the camp, and *The Sentinel* avoided controversial stories that occurred in the camp, which might be a result of the authority’s supervision (Heart Mountain Sentinel, 2013).

In avoiding certain issues and toeing the accommodationist line on others, *The Sentinel* published material that must have been pleasing to camp officials (Kessler, 1988, p. 72). When the primary Nisei 100th Infantry Battalion from Hawaii formed in June 1942 and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team of mainland Nisei was activated on February 1, 1943, *The Sentinel* devoted considerable space to stories about the Japanese American war heroes (Heart Mountain Sentinel, 2013). The draft was described as great news early in 1944, and being allowed to join the military was noted as an unbeatable opportunity for Japanese Americans to prove their loyalty (Kessler, 1988, p. 74).

The Rocky Shimpō was published in the “free zone” city of Denver, where some 5000 Japanese Americans voluntarily resettled rather than be consigned to a WRA concentration camp (James Omura, 2004). James Omura, a Nisei American journalist, wrote articles and became an editor of *The Shimpō*. Omura moved in Denver from San Francisco on March 29, 1942, after Mike Masaoka, the National Secretary and Field Executive of the JACL, named him the JACL’s “public enemy number one” at a mass gathering (James Omura, 2014). Omura continuously expressed his opposition to the JACL’s acceptance of the incarceration and the draft through writing articles against the JACL in several different magazines and newspapers before he started exclusively writing for *The Shimpō*. Omura even gave a public talk titled “Why I oppose the J.A.C.L.” in Denver on March 31, 1943 (Hansen, 2003, p. 128).

The *Rocky Shimpō*’s sales in Heart Mountain and the other concentration camps drastically increased when Omura started writing editorials supporting the FPC (Hansen, 2003, p. 129). However, Omura’s hard-hitting editorials caused the U.S. government (with WRA and JACL encouragement) to force him to resign in late April 1944. A JACL-affiliated Nisei American replaced Omura as the *Rocky Shimpō* editor (Hansen, 2003, p. 129). Omura was arrested and jailed with seven FPC leaders (Hansen, 2003, p. 129). Arther A. Hansen (2003), an emeritus professor of History and Asian American Studies, concluded that Omura was the only person among his peers in the Nikkei vernacular press who broadcasted the FPC’s resistance (p. 127).

Despite both papers being produced by Japanese Americans, the two newspapers generated two different definitions of citizenship. My analysis underlines how definitional argument functions as a way to perform citizenship and civic identity. As

Asen (2004) noted, civic belonging is conceptualized in individual and group performances of citizenship (p. 30). However, how individual and group performance of citizenship is evaluated has not been detailed. I contend that which performance is preferred or evaluated positively is determined based on definition(s) of citizenship. The two community newspapers defined citizenship differently and created different value hierarchies, which called different actions to fulfill responsibilities as citizens. I argue that *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* constructed citizenship as act-driven, noting that duty/acts should be fulfilled first. *The Rocky Shimpō*, on the other hand, constructed citizenship as status-driven, noting that rights/status should be protected first. The two different meanings of citizenship were contested in the Japanese American community. The contested definitions of citizenship disturb what citizenship means in the United States. Being born in the United States or U.S. territories does not necessarily make one a full citizen of the United States.

Definitions and Value Hierarchies

Definitions are “rhetorically induced,” and direct and deflect people’s understanding of the world (Schiappa, 2003). As Zarefsky (1997) contended, “while there might be limits, still the ways in which we define our terms affects the way we think, talk, and act about the realities for which they stand”(p. 4). Definitions frame a situation, while identifying causes, posing remedies, and inviting moral judgments about circumstances or individuals (Zarefsky, 1997, p. 5). In this sense, definitions can be powerful instruments for argument (Walton & Macagno, 2008, p. 83).

My analysis hinges on a connection between definitional argument and value hierarchies. Value hierarchies are established by “the intensity with which one value is

adhered to as compared to another” and indicate “which value will be sacrificed” should the two values come into conflict (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, pp. 81-83).

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) claimed that a single abstract principle, capable of repeated application, can establish hierarchies (p. 80). For example, repeated circulation of the principle “freedom” in the United States could establish a value hierarchy that prefers individual’s choices over control by authorities. Given the argumentative nature of definitions, one can interpret a single word in different ways, depending on her/his persuasive goals. Therefore, value hierarchies engendered through definitions can also function as persuasive devices that lead audience’s mindset to a certain direction and preferable actions.

My analysis of the two community newspapers suggests that each of the two community papers crafted a different definition of citizenship undergirded by the value pair of rights and duty. Specifically, the definition of citizenship in *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* disparaged rights and created a hierarchy of duty over rights. That definition fits the persuasive goal of *The Sentinel*, supporting the U.S. government and justifying the draft. The definition of citizenship in *The Rocky Shimpō* acknowledged rights and created a hierarchy of rights over duty. That definition fits the persuasive goal of *The Shimpō*, arguing against the U.S. government’s infringement of Japanese Americans’ human rights.

Citizenship Defined as Enactment: Duties over Rights

The citizenship defined in *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* emphasized duties of citizens over rights. Moreover, citizenship was understood as an action rather than a status. Such understanding of citizenship encouraged Japanese Americans to enact

citizenship by fulfilling duties, as opposed to simply claiming citizenship rights regarding their status in the U.S. An individual would not be considered as a citizen without acting in line with becoming a citizen. Through analyzing the editorials in *The Sentinel*, I argue citizenship as duty entailed (1) personal sacrifice in military and (2) valuing the nation as more important than individuals or community.

Although citizenship was understood as an enactment, in *The Sentinel* one action, military service was considered as an act of citizenship. In other words, resistance was not an action that would move someone toward citizenship as evidenced in *The Sentinel*'s rhetoric. For example, one editorial cites United States Supreme Court Judge Kennedy's statement on citizenship, "If they [Japanese Americans] are truly loyal American citizens, they should, at least when they have become recognized as such, embrace the opportunity to discharge the duties of citizens by offering themselves in, the cause of our national defense" (as cited in Editorial, "Years," 1944, para. 5). This statement reinforced the definition of citizenship as duty-driven. Moreover, the duties were "opportunities," which have positive implications. The military duty was defined not as an obligation that the U.S. government compelled Nisei Americans to fulfill, but opportunities that they were supposed to be willing to embrace. An individual's will was emphasized by this word choice. To be recognized as a loyal U.S. citizen, one must be willing to fulfill duties for the nation.

The Sentinel further attempted to persuade readers to understand citizenship as an action rather than as status. In the definition of citizenship by *The Sentinel*, one must do something, or perform an action, in order to obtain citizenship. Citizenship was not understood as a status, which was given to anyone when s/he was born. *The Sentinel*

praised Nisei Americans who had served in the military because they “proved” their loyalty. An editorial noted “the majority strongly feels that it must be taken in stride as our part in the war effort and that we must go even farther in proving our records as good citizens” (Editorial “Two Objectives,” 1994, para. 4). “Good” citizens are those who “prove” their citizenship by their war efforts. Such statements implied that citizenship was not taken for granted without proving it by enacting duties.

The Sentinel accused Nisei Americans who were eligible for military service but did not answer the call. It praised the U.S. government as it was “giving loyal Nisei the opportunity to prove that they are men among men,” while the U.S. army did not “need anyone of Japanese ancestry so much” (Editorial “Provocateurs,” 1944, para. 13).

Military service was described not even as duty but an “opportunity” that loyal Nisei Americans must take. This editorial further reinforced citizenship as something to be proven through performed actions, specifically by military service. In this rhetoric, not taking this opportunity was regarded as disloyal.

Moreover, although military service was voluntary, this editorial harshly criticized Japanese American resisters who chose not to be enrolled. The editorial euphemistically accused of the FPC as “whimpering weaklings who are afraid to prove themselves, and who are calling to an unanswering, unconcerned source for rights and privileges they have never before sought so fervently” (Editorial “Provocateurs,” 1944, para. 13). The editorial argued that resisters were not real men and, thus, were not worthy of full citizenship because they did not perform military service.

The analysis reveals that citizenship in *The Sentinel* presented military service as a “duty” rather than a voluntary commitment and asked Japanese American men to fulfill

the duty regardless of cost. Instead of just celebrating those who voluntarily committed to military service, *The Sentinel* verbally punished resisters who chose not to respond. Doing nothing was considered an unpatriotic action in citizenship defined by *The Sentinel*.

Doing nothing for the country was an unacceptable action in the citizenship by *The Sentinel*, and going against the U.S. government was a “rat-like” action that should not be a part of the Japanese American community. *The Sentinel* wrote:

While their [provocateurs] bulletins profess loyalty and plead good citizenship, they proceed rat-like with stealthy approach to intimidate and even threaten with bodily harm those who oppose them. (Editorial, “Provocateurs,” 1944, para. 2)

While the FPC’s attempt to perform loyalty and citizenship was somewhat pleasing; the actions the FPC took were harshly denied. *The Sentinel* reinforced military service as a good performance of citizenship through bashing other actions as useless and “stealthy,” therefore not desirable for good citizenship.

Furthermore, *The Sentinel* drew a distinct boundary between “loyal Japanese Americans” and the FPC, suggesting the FPC members were not loyal Japanese Americans:

Loyal Japanese Americans as a whole condemn the Fair Play Committee and the action of the 63 defendants as being as serious an attack on the integrity of all Nisei as the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, the treatment of allied prisoners on Bataan and other acts which have placed all persons of Japanese ancestry under suspicion. (Editorial “Two Objectives”, 1994, para. 9)

In this passage, *The Sentinel* de facto excluded anyone who would self-identity as members of the FPC since the FPC could not be understood as loyal. *The Sentinel*

equated the FPC's resistance and the attack on Pearl Harbor and argued that both were equally "sneaky" and unacceptable. That statement categorized the FPC and Japan as the same for the blame of placing Japanese Americans under suspicion by the U.S. government and the American public. Having the same ancestry, racial identity, and shared hardship did not influence on the understanding of citizenship by *The Sentinel*. The only good action for good citizenship was responding to the draft: "In our minds there is no issue in the reinstatement of selective service for the Nisei. There is only one answer and that is to respond when called" (Editorial, "Our Cards," 1944, para. 12). In the definition of citizenship by *The Sentinel*, military service is the only way to perform citizenship; therefore members of the FPC were disloyal due to their rejection of the draft.

Citizenship in *The Sentinel* created a boundary between the Japanese American community and the American public. The editorial described the Japanese American community as a special group that was distinct from the American public. In addition to differentiating the FPC and other "loyal" Japanese Americans, *The Sentinel* identified the Japanese American community as a new race in the United States. The editorial insisted that the American public should know Nisei Americans who were serving for military and noted that "we, as a new race in this nation, cannot and must not be judged by a small, disgruntled group" (Editorial, "Our Cards," 1944, para. 16). This passage created a collective identity of Japanese Americans, while differentiating it from the American public. That made it natural to encourage additional duties that other American citizens were not asked: military sacrifices with no rights granted. Presenting the Japanese American community as a new, distinctive group of the nation allowed *The Sentinel* to encourage Japanese Americans an active performance of citizenship, since the new group

needed to be known and acknowledged by the American public. In this sense, their performance of citizenship had to be admitted by the American public, or the dominant system. While the citizenship in *The Sentinel* seemingly provided Japanese Americans a means to express their citizenship, it took agency out from members of its own community. Citizenship of the Japanese American community always needed to get permission from the dominant system.

In *The Sentinel*, not only the Japanese government and the FPC but also the Nisei themselves were responsible for the hardship they were experiencing. One editorial stated: “The burden of proof does not lie with the [U.S.] government or any agency but with the Nisei themselves” (Editorial “Provocateurs,” 1944, para. 11). The editorial avoided any responsibilities on the U.S. government regarding the incarceration and the draft. Moreover, it continued: “We know by past experiences that we never were accepted too readily even in our own communities, or states. How we will be accepted after the war has much to do with our behavior now” (Editorial “Provocateurs,” 1944, para. 12). Japanese Americans were not accepted in the past, and in *The Sentinel*’s rhetoric, the responsibility was on Japanese Americans themselves, not on intolerance and racism in the country. *The Sentinel* blamed neither the U. S. government nor the American public. With citizenship defined in *The Sentinel*, Japanese Americans should have taken actions that fulfill duties to serve the country in order to achieve citizenship, while ignoring their own rights.

This definition of citizenship privileged military service and duty to the U.S., not the rights of individuals. In *The Sentinel*, the opportunity to prove citizenship was available, but the rights and status of U.S. citizens were not given to Nisei Americans.

The Sentinel did not mention the rights of Japanese Americans as U.S. citizens, nor did it consider if the U.S. government infringed on the rights of Japanese Americans with its removal policy and the draft. Rather, *The Sentinel* justified the incarceration as part of Japanese Americans' duty. The definition of citizenship in *The Sentinel* seemed to direct readers to believe they must serve the nation to be recognized as U.S. citizens, regardless of whether the nation violated their rights as citizens. The definition of citizenship also made *The Sentinel* able to argue that the resisters were disloyal and unworthy because they were not serving the nation.

The analysis of the expectations of duty reveals that (1) citizenship was not universally attainable and necessarily excluded those who did not or could not fulfill military duties, (2) acceptance of the incarceration and the draft was justified in the Japanese American community as a way to enact citizenship.

Citizenship Defined as Status: Rights over Duties

While the citizenship defined in *The Sentinel* was duty-driven, citizenship was defined in *The Shimpō* as rights-driven and valued status over acts. James Omura, the editor of *The Shimpō*, insisted that Japanese Americans were U.S. citizens, whose human rights should be protected under the Constitution, and the U.S. government infringed on their rights. In *The Shimpō*, citizenship was understood as a status rather than action. Citizenship was granted by the Constitution to all Nisei Japanese Americans regardless of their actions. Citizenship as status entailed arguments that (1) citizenship is a given, (2) rights are a prerequisite for military sacrifice, and (3) democracy over the U.S. government's policies.

Citizenship was defined as status in *The Shimpō*. Its editorial asked for “authentic and authoritative clarification of the legal status of the Nisei as citizens” (Editorial, “The Rocky Shimpō” 1944, para. 10). *The Shimpō* emphasized that rights is a prerequisite of citizenship, not something people need to earn. The editorial further clarified: “We should at all times stand firm on our God-given rights” (Editorial “Let Us Not,” 1944, para. 7). In *The Shimpō*’s rhetoric, citizenship should be given regardless of people’s performance of citizenship and cannot be taken away. Furthermore, the God-given rights are not something that the U.S. government can legitimately give or take away.

The vision of citizenship in *The Shimpō* created a hierarchy of rights over duty. In his editorials, Omura insisted that rights should be recognized and granted before one is obligated to fulfill duties as a citizen. This rights-over-duty value hierarchy was clarified as: “We further agree that the government should restore a large part of those rights before asking us to contribute our lives to the welfare of the nation-to sacrifice our lives on the field of battle” (Editorial, 1944, “Let Us Not” para. 5). Unlike *The Sentinel*, *The Shimpō* continuously insisted that Japanese Americans had the same rights as other American citizens.

The Shimpō did not completely deny Nisei’s duty to service for the country, however. It granted that Nisei should participate in military service when necessary. It argued Nisei’s rights granted in the Constitution should have been protected before the government asked them to sacrifice in the military (Editorial, 1944, “Let Us Not” para. 5). The problem was not voluntary military service but military obligations with no rights granted:

In our mind, we hold a serious doubt that the Army can legally subject to military obligations citizens whose constitutional guarantees are under technical suspension and denial in the same manner as those whose rights are recognized and fully granted. (Editorial, “The Rocky Shimpo” 1944, para. 5)

By questioning the draft, *The Shimpo* distributed the message by the FPC and reinforced citizenship as status over act. Although military service might be a performance of citizenship, rights should have been granted before the U.S. government had asked any duties for citizenship.

Defining citizenship as rights over duties, *The Shimpo* portrayed the resisters as freedom fighters. Instead of duties for military service, *The Shimpo* argued democracy should come first. In *The Shimpo*, the blame was on the U.S. government, not the Japanese government or Nisei Americans as *The Sentinel* argued. Omura wrote:

Democracy is not only a form of government, but it is also a spirit. If there is no spirit of democracy in our governmental leaders, we would not have democracy in action. Let us therefore not condemn democracy but the men who manipulate public affairs and the masses who sympathize and condone undemocratic ideals. (Editorial, “Let US Not,” 1944, para. 6)

In *The Shimpo*, the draft resisters were fighting against “the men who manipulate,” so the problem was not with the American ideals or the U.S. government in general. Rather, *The Shimpo* problematized a few bad people who violated rights and democracy in the U.S. This flips the understanding of patriotism. In *The Shimpo*’s rhetoric, challenging the few bad people within the country, rather than fighting against enemy countries, became an act of real patriotism. *The Shimpo* also problematized the unprivileged status

of Nisei Americans as U.S. citizens as a violation of democracy. In the logic of *The Shimpo*, fighting for democracy at home was more important than fighting for democracy abroad as a result of a service demand by the U.S. government.

While *The Shimpo* did not refuse military service for the nation itself, it challenged the citizenship defined by *The Sentinel*. *The Shimpo* clarified its dissatisfaction to *The Sentinel*'s view on the draft and citizenship as the editorials in *The Sentinel* tended to reflect "the views and policies of the W.R.A. rather than real attitudes and true opinions of the vast majority of west coast evacuees" (Editorial "Freedom" 1944, para. 2). Omura concluded that *The Sentinel* represented "the minority and pro-administration views" (Editorial "Freedom" 1944, para. 2). While *The Sentinel* pushed the view that the FPC was a minority that had deteriorated the image of Japanese Americans, *The Shimpo* argued that *The Sentinel*'s attitude was a minority view. *The Shimpo* further stated that "It is believed that at least 90 percent of people in the centers are opposed to the JACL" (Editorial, "Freedom" 1944, para. 7). Omura kept writing his opposition to the JACL's acceptance to the incarceration and the draft in *The Shimpo*. *The Shimpo* appealed its readers that the JACL and *The Sentinel*'s preference on the U.S. government's view was wrong and a minority opinion.

The analysis of citizenship as status clarifies (1) why citizenship should be universally attainable to anyone with a legal status of citizenship and (2) the incarceration and draft were criticized in the Japanese American community and became a controversy that disturbed the unity of the community. The two different definitions of citizenship and value hierarchies within the racial minority group prove that meanings of citizenship can be contested even in groups that tend to be considered as monolithic and unified. The

two citizenships also suggest that citizenship can call completely different actions depending on definitions of citizenship.

Conclusion and Implications

The FPC questioned not the draft itself but the understanding of citizenship behind the draft. To be drafted or not, nor to be judged as loyal or disloyal, should not be reasons for denial of citizenship. The statement on the third bulletin by the FPC showed that balancing the two levels of identification is a possible rhetorical strategy for dissent. This suggests that social movements can frame a crisis for a marginalized group as a crisis for a larger system or a community. The unfair treatment of Japanese Americans was a crisis for the nation because it was a fundamental violation of its Constitution and values.

My analysis proves that critics should understand movements beyond the binary of dissenters and the dominant system. While confrontation rhetoric is a distinctive strategy for social movements, the FPC's rhetoric demonstrates that identification and collective identity unifying the advocates, the internal audience, and the external audience can be a possible rhetorical strategy as well. The rhetorical situations for social movements tend to be more complex than merely fighting against dominant systems. My reading of the FPC's rhetoric indicates that dissent does not always reject the dominant system but becomes a part of the system. The binary of a marginalized group as an advocate and a dominant system as an opponent does not always describe the complexity of identity negotiation. In the case of the FPC, the relationship between this marginalized group and the dominant system was not a dialectical tension between destroyers of the system versus defenders of the system. The FPC rhetorically constructed their identity as

a part of the dominant system, the United States/the democratic nation. Its members were willing to accept the existing American values and never asked for reforms, such as repealing the opportunity to enroll military services. Rather, the FPC insisted they were true loyal Americans since they were fighting for equality and democracy. As this particular case demonstrates, reaffirming minority's identity as a part of the dominant system can be a rhetorical strategy for social movements.

Through analyzing the two community papers circulated in the Heart Mountain camp, this chapter identifies two conflicting definitions of citizenship. In *The Sentinel*, the definition of citizenship created the hierarchy of duties over rights, while the vision of citizenship in *The Shimpo* privileged rights before duties. Moreover, *The Sentinel* and *The Shimpo* described the draft resisters differently. While *The Sentinel* represented the resisters as shameful deviants, *The Shimpo* framed the resisters as extreme but heroic figures fighting for equal treatment. Each argument drew on different definitions of citizenship based in differing values, enforcing the hierarchy of duty over rights in *The Sentinel* and rights over duty in *The Shimpo*.

The two conflicting definitions of citizenship tell us that meanings of citizenship are negotiated and contested within and outside of a community. While Japanese Americans shared a sense of community based on their national origin, the conflicting definitions of citizenship disturbed the unity of the community. Given the unique situation of being excluded from the body politic while being asked to fulfill duties to the U.S. government, the contested definitions of citizenship also disturbed what citizenship means in the United States. Being born in the United States or U.S. territories does not make one a citizen of the United States. Citizenship can take the form of status or act,

because, as demonstrated in this chapter, both understanding of citizenship can entail preferable models of citizenship.

The historic debate over citizenship informs contemporary remembering and forgetting as well as social changes. For example, in the National Japanese American Memorial for Patriotism during World War II, the citizenship that values duties over rights seems dominant. A stonewall at the center of the Memorial inscribes the names of the military dead in order to honor their patriotic acts, while the Memorial does not include any names and/or stories of the resisters. However, a group of Japanese Americans called “Japanese American Voice” proposes that the Memorial should memorialize the resisters, demonstrating that definitions of citizenship are still negotiated and contested.

For future studies, the value hierarchies in the term citizenship should be investigated in other crisis contexts to understand what actions are called under the name of citizenship. For example, George W. Bush encouraged U.S. citizens to consume domestic products to sustain the country after 9/11. Consumption was a valued action under the name of citizenship. Definitions function as persuasive arguments by preferring a certain value hierarchy. Although a definition can be dominant in a community, as my analysis suggests, dominant definitions can be challenged by another definition that entails another value hierarchy.

Chapter Four

Contested Identities through Visual Representations

Introduction

Chapter two examines how the U.S. government justified the Japanese American incarceration and how citizenship and loyalty were rhetorically constructed through the Executive Orders and loyalty screening. Chapter three examines how the U.S. government's ways of interpreting citizenship and loyalty were challenged by the Japanese American community. Chapter three also investigates conflicting voices in the Japanese American community by analyzing two community newspapers. This chapter focuses on visual representation of minority identity along with loyalty and citizenship, examining how the identity of Japanese Americans was and was not presented to the American public. Specifically, this chapter examines how the identity of a minority group can be visually constructed. It also examines how identity constructed by members of the minority group can counter the identity constructed by the dominant (e.g. the U.S. government).

Interrogating visual representation and visual misrepresentation of minority identity further unpacks American citizenship as a performance of Whiteness and loyalty to the country. The War Relocation Authority (WRA) photographs constructed an identity of Japanese Americans as loyal American citizens through their visual rhetoric, while there was no means for Japanese Americans to deny or modify the attached identity. With my analysis of photographs of the Japanese American incarceration, I argue that the photographs represent an idealized minority identity in the United States, but it is not reflected in the cultural and emotional complexity of minority identity. I also argue that

vernacular photographs by members of minority groups can be a means to counter a dominant understanding of minority identity.

In order to examine visual intersections of an idealized American identity and Japanese Americans' identity, this chapter analyzes photographs by Ansel Adams, impounded WRA photographs by Dorothea Lange, photographs by Toyo Miyatake, and private snapshots by Bill Manbo. The four photographers were chosen for this study because each represents a unique way of depicting the Japanese American identity. Although Adams and Lange were both White American photographers, each had a different understanding of the Japanese American incarceration. Adams was an independent photographer who was famous for his landscape photographs. He was distressed by the Japanese American incarceration and obtained the permission of the WRA to visit the Manzanar camp. Creff (2004) labeled Adams's photographs as a heroic mode of representation, and Lange's WRA photographs as a tragic mode of representation (p. 46). While Lange was an official WRA photographer, her approach was not favored by the WRA, and approximately 97 percent of her photographs were "impounded" and not published at all during the war (Gordon, 2006, p.5). Adams's and Lange's works provide examples of how non-members of a minority group construct minority identity visually.

Miyatake was a professional Japanese American studio photographer who was incarcerated. He got a permission to take photographs in the Manzanar camp after nine months of surreptitious picture taking at the camp. Miyatake's works shows how an insider under the control by an authority (the WRA) constructs identity of her/his group visually. Bill Manbo was a Japanese American amateur photographer who was

incarcerated in the Heart Mountain camp. Manbo's works captured his family, social events, and views of the residential area at the camp. His snapshots were purely for personal use and pleasure, thus the WRA did not censor Manbo's photographs. Manbo's photographs exemplify ways in which members of a minority group can counter the dominant understanding of the minority group's identity constructed by the dominant group.

The rest of the chapter proceeds as follows: First, I review previous literature on visual rhetoric and rhetorical history of visual rhetoric in order to set up ways in which I analyze the photographs. Second, I introduce previous studies about the three photographers and provide a lens to read their photographs as a resource to understand visual representation of minority identity in the United States and American citizenship. I argue that "loyal" Japanese Americans were depicted as people who assimilated to White American culture and were willing to follow authority. Third, I analyze snapshots taken by Bill Manbo. I argue that his photographs reconstructed Japanese Americans' identity as American citizens who were proud of preserving Japanese traditions. This reconstructed identity challenged the binary of American/Japanese and the binary of loyalty/disloyalty. Lastly, I offer implications and explain how this analysis complicates our understanding of loyalty, citizenship, and racial identity in the United States.

Visual Rhetoric and Identity Representation

Visual materials function as rhetoric since visual images direct "the attention to one field rather than to another" (Burke, 1989, p. 116). In his *Language as Symbolic Action*, Burke (1966) encouraged scholars to study all symbolic forms such as "mathematics, music, sculpture, painting, dance, architectural styles" (p. 28). Regardless

of his call, however, visuals had not been considered as significant rhetorical texts as written speeches and documents among rhetoric scholars. Responding to such devaluation of visuals as rhetorical artifacts, *Argumentation and Advocacy* collected articles on visual rhetoric as arguments in 1996. Bridsell and Groarke (1996) suggested that visual images can be persuasive or argumentative since visuals can express meanings (p. 5). Anthony Blair (1996) further argued that visual arguments are not distinct in essence from verbal arguments (p. 38). The study of rhetoric includes the study of argument, and the concept of visual argument is an extension of rhetoric's paradigm into a new domain (A. Blair, p. 37). Lester Olson (2007) summarized the history of visual rhetoric scholarship and highlighted the importance of further studying visual rhetoric. Visuals are rhetorical, directing and deflecting how we see the world.

Race and visuals have been studied interdisciplinarily. James Baldwin (1963), an American novelist and social critic, noted that "color is not a human or a personal reality; it is a political reality" (p. 104). Race has been studied as a social construction, and visuals play significant roles to let the society believe race materially exists. Martin A. Berger, a professor of history of art and visual culture, investigated Whiteness in visuals through analyzing art that does not include nonwhite characters. Berger (2005) argued: "With 'normative' standards of thought and action those espoused by whites, people of color were always marked as deviant" in the United States (p. 174). Berger further investigated visuals and race in U.S. culture:

the discourses and structures of American society encouraged both whites and nonwhites to embrace a white perspective on the world (that naturalized the perquisites of European-Americans), even as fluctuating perceptions of biological

identity severely restricted who might and might not enjoy the benefits of being labeled white. (p. 7)

Regardless of one's race, people have embraced a white-centered perspective as neutral and dominant in the U.S.

Visual rhetorical analysis performs a significant role for doing rhetorical history. Finnegan (2004) offered that critics should conceptualize visual rhetoric as “a mode of inquiry,” which is defined as “a critical and theoretical orientation that makes issues of visuality relevant to rhetorical theory” (p. 198). This understanding of visual rhetoric as a mode of inquiry urges us “to explore our understanding of visual culture in light of the questions of rhetorical theory” (Finnegan, p. 198). A goal of analyzing visual rhetoric in rhetorical history is “the construction of a rhetorical history that accounts systematically for the ways in which images become inventional resources in the public sphere” (Finnegan, p. 198). Through the process of conducting a rhetorical analysis of visuals, critics would identify ways in which visuals contribute (or do not contribute) to develop rhetorical theory.

Finnegan (2004) proposed a method of doing rhetorical history of visual images. In her method, rhetorical history of visuals examines production, reproduction, and circulation. Critics examine production to know where images come from (literally) and why they appear in the spaces where we find them (Finnegan, p. 200). Examining reproduction acknowledges that we do not encounter images in isolation and their arrangement, but is always the result of particular editorial choices and framing of ideas (Finnegan, p. 201). In other words, critics should examine the ways that the arrangement of image, text, and caption work to create meaning in the contexts of particular rhetorical

events (p. 204). Critics also examine circulation as a fundamental to photography (Finnegan, pp. 200-201). In other words, rhetorical history of visuals examines where the image comes from, why it appears in the space, rhetorical features in the arrangement of the image, and social, political, and institutional discourses relevant to the image.

Following Finnegan's call for analyzing these contexts of historical images, this chapter reviews where the photographs came from, why and how they were censored, and how they are relevant to discourses of race, Whiteness, and loyalty in the U.S. This study does not focus on construction of Whiteness through differentiating non-whites. Rather, it exemplifies ways in which non-Whites are presented as embracing Whiteness. By reading photographs as rhetorical history of visual rhetoric, this study identifies a rhetorical strategy that allows both White and non-White racial identity to be presented as a unified identity.

This chapter offers an analysis of photographs that capture Japanese Americans as an example of minority identity representation in a crisis moment. The analysis contributes to scholarly conversations about visual representation of identities in relation to racism, power, and citizenship. Analyzing identity representation of a minority group by White American photographers, a Japanese American photographer, and a Japanese American amateur photographer provides ways in which minority identity is constructed in public and ways in which minority groups challenge images of minority identity constructed by ones that do not belong to the group.

Loyalty, Citizenship, and Racial Identity in Photographs

by Adams, Lange, and Miyatake

After Pearl Harbor, U.S. mass media portrayed Japanese Americans as equated with the Japanese enemy (Alinder, 2009, p. 53). For example, on December 22, 1941 *Life* magazine published an article titled: “How to tell Japs from the Chinese.” The article depicted Japanese using an image of Hideki Tojo, a former general of the Imperial Japanese Army and the Prime Minister of Japan during most of the war time (“How to tell,” 1941, p. 81). The Chinese were portrayed as friendly innocent victims who were taller with narrower faces and longer legs, embracing physical features that resemble White Americans. The images of Japan as an enemy country were circulated across the nation.

In such circumstances, silence may have been the best way for Japanese Americans to stay in the United States safely. Japanese Americans who raised their voices against the U.S. government were depicted negatively. One photograph that depicted Japanese American resisters was published in *Life* magazine on March 20, 1944 (Figure 1). This photograph was taken by *Life*'s photojournalist Carl Mydans. According to the article in *Life*, the men in the photographs were prisoners in the Tule Lake camp, where Japanese Americans who refused to give unqualified “yes” responses to the loyalty questions 27 and 28 were imprisoned as “disloyal” (Densho Encyclopedia, Tule Lake,” 2014). The photograph was captioned as: “These five Japs are among 155 trouble makers imprisoned in the stockade within the Tule Lake Segregation Center. Here they are answering roll call” (“Tule Lake,” 1944, p. 25).

Caroline Chung Simpson, a scholar of English and mixed race studies, analyzed the photograph in her book *An Absence of Presence*. Simpson (2001) argued that these Japanese American “trouble makers” combined the stereotypical signs of the delinquent or criminal: the leather jacket, the defiant stance, and the almost hip, indifferent gaze of the working-class urban tough occupying his corner of the street (p. 25). In addition to the image as criminal, the photograph also conjured broadly racialized images of fanatical oriental tyrants in the Fu Manchu mustache and the longer hair of the one centrally placed figure (Simpson, p, 25). While this photograph embraced some features of criminal images, the camera captured slight smiles on some of the men’s faces. Their smiles could mean they accepted the situation. The smiles also introduce a possible irony; the U.S. government arrested friendly, smiling, presumably innocent men and put them into a jail. As a result, the smile can be read as a contradiction in the photographer’s depiction of men who were seemingly criminals and represented the complexity of the situation. In the *Life* article stabilized the potential ambiguity of the image when the magazine’s editor referred to “no-no boys” as “responsible for Tule Lake’s reputation as worst of all civilian detention camps in the U.S.” (“Tule Lake,” 1944, p. 25). Furthermore, the caption for the photograph referred the men as “Jap,” equating them with the Japanese enemy. In the *Life* article and photograph, resistance against the U.S. government or fighting for freedom and equality were punished by the labels of “trouble makers,” “emery,” and “disloyal.”



Figure 1. “These five Japs are among 155 trouble makers imprisoned in the stockade within the Tule Lake Segregation Center. Here they are answering roll call.” In Mydans, C. (1944, March 20). Tule Lake: At this segregation center are 18,000 Japanese considered disloyal to U.S. *Life*, 16(12), pp. 25

However, not all American journalists reinforced such portrayals of the Japanese and Japanese Americans. Ansel Adams published a photo book titled *Born Free and Equal* in 1944, collecting his photographs taken in the Manzanar camp. The book was authorized by the WRA. The photographs and the texts were checked and approved by the Project Director of the Manzanar Relocation Center (Adams, 1944, p. 8). Adams challenged the derogatory portrayals of people of Japanese descent in U.S. war

propaganda by representing Japanese Americans as dignified and respectable (Alinder, 2009, p. 45). Creff (2004) critically analyzed Adams's Japanese American photographs and argued that Adams's selection of Japanese American schoolgirls were signs of educatable American subjects who offer the possibility of later producing tractable, cooperative, and loyal citizens of a postwar nation (p. 22). Creff also noted that Adams's photographs were a kind of visual rhetoric of the "model minority," where there were only images of loyal, successful, fully assimilated individuals and no scenes of dissent (p. 27). Alinder (2009) further argued that Adams's work reproduced dominant stereotypes of Japanese Americans, including "the perception that they were passive and thus ideally suited for domestic labor and other forms of servile work" (p. 45).

Dorothea Lange was an achieved photojournalist when she was asked to be a War Relocation Authority photographer. She was famous for her works during the Great Depression. Her *Migrant Mother*, published in 1936, gained much public attention. While Lange was hired by the WRA, she was skeptical about the Japanese American incarceration (Gordon & Okihiro, 2006). Lange avoided depicting smiling faces and often called attention to the injustice of the incarceration (Alinder, 2009).

Toyo Miyatake was a professional photographer from Los Angeles who smuggled an undercover camera by passing it as a lunch box (Creff, 2004, p. 57). Miyatake was incarcerated in the Manzanar camp and took photographs secretly for nine months until he was caught by camp authorities (Creff, p. 57). By the Manzanar camp director's approval, Miyatake became Manzanar's official photographer until the camp was closed in November 1945 (Creff, p. 57). Miyatake's works are significant as records of life in the camp from an insider's eye. Although Miyatake was granted the freedom to take

photographs of everyday life at Manzanar as an official camp photographer (“Toyo Mitatake,” 2014), his works do not seem to have been distributed to the American public. The Final Report of the Manzanar Relocation Center makes no mention of Miyatake and his photo studio (Alinder, 2009, p. 86). The National Archives hold none of Miyatake’s photographs, while it has a large collection for Lange, and Adams’s photographs are in the Library of Congress. Although Miyatake seemed to have more freedom in photographing objects and people at the camp, the majority of Miyatake’s depiction of Japanese American camp residents were similar to Adams’s, which reified Japanese Americans at Manzanar as “highly industrious, productive, and adaptable model minority subjects of incarceration” (Creff, p. 59).

Other than Lange, there were other WRA photographers and their photographs of the concentration camps were circulated in public. Audiences of these photographs included Japanese residents in the concentration camps, White communities bordering the projects, and the public at large (Alinder, 2009, p. 30). On the other hand, Miyatake’s works became popular as significant records of daily life in the concentration camp after the incarceration ended. In a time when Japanese Americans had very limited opportunities to publish their self-images and life in camps, photographs were the most influential visual representation of Japanese Americans.

Although the three photojournalists, especially Lange, attempted to depict criticism to the incarceration of Japanese Americans through their photographs, the fact that their photographs were censored before publication was a huge constraint to express any doubts about the U.S. government’s policy. The goals of the Information Division of the WRA were “the positive portrayal of WRA programs and activities” and “the

depiction of Japanese Americans as loyal citizens” in order to encourage their employment after their release (Alinder, 2009, p. 29). The U.S. government needed to demonstrate that Japanese Americans are employable human resources in order to secure jobs for Japanese Americans after they leave the camps (Alinder, p 29). The U.S. government did not prefer that Japanese Americans stay in the segregated areas and create their own communities. Alinder summarized that the task of photographers was “to portray the incarceration process as efficient and humane and present internees themselves as orderly” (p. 25). The purposes of screening were: (1) presenting the incarceration as successful in order to avoid criticisms of the U.S. government, and (2) presenting Japanese American camp residents as good loyal citizens in order to keep anti-Japanese sentiment down. As a result, WRA photographers were not allowed to photograph barbed wire, armed guards, and guard towers (Creff, 2004, p. 18).

Moreover, although a responsibility for choosing subject matter fell to the individual photographers (Alinder, 2009, p. 29), the photographers were, on the most part, not allowed to write captions by themselves. While Lange’s photographs emerged as a criticism of anti-Japanese propaganda and Executive Order 9066, the WRA caption writers generally avoided calling attention to any details in the photographs that might place the U.S. government in a negative light (Alinder, p. 36). Adams, who wrote all of the text for his book, was an exception to this general policy. Therefore, the photographers had limited authorship for their works. Photographs of the Japanese American incarceration by Adams, Lange, and Miyatake exemplify how racial identity can be visually constructed in the intersection of the U.S. government’s control and each photographer’s position on her/his subject.

Through analyzing visual rhetoric in their published censored photographs and Lange's impounded photographs, I argue that photographs of the Japanese American incarceration presented Japanese Americans as loyal U.S. citizens who were assimilated to U.S. culture and values, reflecting the U.S. government's intent. Japanese American identity was presented as being "loyal" American citizens in the photographs. The "loyalty" available to Japanese Americans entailed a willingness to follow the U.S. government's orders and adaptation to U.S. culture and values, but did not include dissent and protests as a way to demonstrate freedom, equality, and democracy. Very few WRA photographs of resisters were published during that time. By presenting Japanese Americans as "loyal" good citizens, the photographs constructed citizenship for Japanese Americans as passive acceptance of authority. Such understanding of the loyalty of Japanese Americans implies that obeying authority, accepting the rules, and acting as a workforce that contributes to the nation's economy are preferred actions available for Japanese Americans. Raising voices through protests against the U.S. government was not an action preferred for "loyal" Japanese Americans. The efforts of the photographers to depict Japanese Americans as "loyal" resulted in reproducing the binary of loyalty/Americanness and disloyalty/Japaneseness that the U.S. government pushed in loyalty screening. While Americanness was presented as a sign of loyalty, Japaneseness of loyal American citizens was silenced or ignored.

Previous literature analyzed how censored WRA photographs framed the Japanese American incarceration positively and presented Japanese American camp residents as loyal citizens. For instance, Dolores Flamiano (2010), a scholar of photojournalism, analyzed published photographs by Dorothea Lange, Ansel Adams, and

Carl Mydans and concluded that those photographs supported the incarceration as a required curtailment of civil liberties during war time (p. 23). My analysis contributes to understanding broader implications of these images, particularly as they pertain to understanding citizenship, loyalty, and racial identity in the United States. My analysis focuses on visual representation of racial identity and investigates what visual rhetorical strategies can create a minority identity as loyal American citizens, and I address implications behind such identity construction.

Ansel Adams, Japanese Americans as an assimilated minority

Photographs taken by Ansel Adams constructed Japanese Americans' identity as Christians, adapting to American and White ideal values. Adams's book *Born Free and Equal* included a number of photographs that captured Japanese Americans' faces. I selected to analyze a photograph of a young man in his book (Figure 2) since it exemplified how Christianity and the Japanese Americans' identity were presented as coherent. The photograph captured the words "Manzanar Christian Church" at the top of the board behind him. By including the words, which were written in English, viewers recognized him as a Christian. Without the top of the board, viewers who did not understand Japanese have no indication to see him as a Christian. Moreover, viewers could tell that Japanese Americans had a church even in the camps, suggesting that they were very serious about their Christian belief and its practices. The caption read as "Here is a student of divinity..." This caption also demonstrated the man was a Christian who was willing to assimilate in U.S. Christian-centered culture.

Visual features of the man in the photograph also constructed Japanese Americans' identity as non-threatening, normal, potential good neighbors. His smile presented him as a

non-threatening individual who had the same emotion as the viewers. The smile could ease the stereotypical, racist image of Japanese and Japanese Americans generated by anti-Japanese sentiment, which was the U.S. government's intent. His smile presented his identity as a friendly American man who could be a neighbor of viewers. The way the man in the photograph dressed also eased differentiation between Japanese Americans and the American public. His hair was set in a popular style for White men in the 1940s. He wore a tie and leather jacket, which reminded audiences of U.S. military fashion. These visual features depicted the man as a typical American young man who could be the same as other White American men. His body performed a particular way for being accepted as a loyal good American. While the photograph depicted the man as a typical American young man, the Japanese characters in the sign suggested to viewers that the residents in the Manzanar camp might understand both English and Japanese. While the Japanese characters could be a sign of disloyalty, by presenting them in the context of Japanese Americans' Christianity, the photograph seemed to present the man as a loyal American citizen who happened to understand both English and Japanese languages.



Figure 2. “Here is a student of divinity...” In Adams, A. (1944). *Born free and equal: The story of loyal Japanese Americans*. New York, NY: U. S. Camera. p. 81

Adams’s photographs presented the identity of Japanese Americans as obedience to authorities as well as being Christians. The photograph in Adams’s book that captured Japanese Americans who were about to leave their home and moved to an assembly center (Figure 3) is an example of an idealized minority identity representation. I argue that this photograph presented Japanese Americans as people who accepted the government’s order with no sign of dissent. In the photograph, a man on the car actively loaded luggage. This suggests that Japanese Americans were not forced but willing to move to the camps. The other individuals in the photograph looked calm, accepting the

situation and following the U.S. government's order. Their facial expressions were not recognizable, thus viewers did not see their internal/emotional struggles. In addition, the caption framed the incarceration positively: "Departure on relocation is the great adventure." By referring the incarceration as "the great adventure," the photograph avoided possible criticisms toward the ways in which the U.S. government treated Japanese Americans. The rhetoric of "adventure" created an impression that Japanese Americans moved to the camps by their own will, looking for a better future. Moreover, the telephone pole on the left side of the photograph seemed to add Christianity as Japanese Americans' identity. The shape of the pole could be read as a representation of the Cross, suggesting Japanese Americans were faithful Christians. Those rhetorical features hid the reality that the U.S. government forced Japanese Americans to move to the camps and highlighted Japanese Americans' identity as Christians who were willing to follow the U.S. government's order. Such identity representation further connected loyalty of Japanese Americans with American White culture by displaying their acceptance of the government's order with a positive framing.



*Figure 3. “Departure on relocation is the great adventure.” In Adams, A. (1944). *Born free and equal: The story of loyal Japanese Americans*. New York, NY: U. S. Camera. p. 54*

In those Adams’s photographs, being loyal seems to mean assimilating to U.S. culture and following authority/the U.S. government. Such represented identity of Japanese Americans might have softened the anti-Japan sentiment in the American public. That met the goals set up by the WRA, which focused on releasing Japanese American camp residents after the war and letting them find a job somewhere in the country. In order to make American citizens employ Japanese Americans, depicting identity of Japanese Americans as loyal, faithful, and obedient might be encouraged. Such

construction of minority identity can ignore a part of the group's identity, though.

Adams's WRA photographs did not present a sign of Japanese-ness as a positive form of loyalty.

Dorothea Lange, Japanese Americans as victims of incarceration (censored)

Most of Lange's WRA photographs were impounded, and this section analyzes some of her impounded photographs to further investigate minority identity representation by a third party. Although it was impounded, I argue that Lange's photograph of Japanese American children presented Japanese Americans as loyal citizens. One notable example of her juxtaposition of Japanese American children and Americanness is her photograph that captured Japanese American boy holding the U.S. flag (Figure 4). The boy holding the U.S. flag at the center caught viewers' attention. The flag stood out since it occupied the upper half of the photograph's space, taking a quarter of the space on the photograph. There was nothing but a wall behind the flag, which also made the U.S. flag stand out. The U.S. flag is often considered to be "representative of the principles of the justice, liberty, and democracy enjoyed by the people of the United States" (U.S. Government Printing Office, 2008), and it was dominant in this image. However, because the flag functions as a symbol, it remains open to divergent meanings, and the flag in the photograph can be also read as a symbol of the repressive government hovering over innocent children. Nonetheless, the caption that emphasized the generosity of the United States ("facilities will be provided for them to continue their education"), stabilized the meaning of the flag as a positive representation of the U.S. The display of the U.S. flag and a Japanese American child at the center created a connection with the identity of Japanese American and the core

American identity. It also connoted that the children were obedient to the repressive government.

The presence of children in the photograph could present Japanese Americans as non-threatening. Viewers could tell even children of school age expressed their patriotism and allegiance. Moreover, the race of the children in the photograph emphasized an American ideal of diversity. This photograph captured Japanese Americans as well as German Americans and Italian Americans in school. This photograph depicted children from different racial backgrounds, and it reinforced the value that the U.S. was a diverse country of immigrants. Japanese Americans were one of the great diversities.

The caption further emphasized the theme that Japanese Americans were good loyal citizens and the U.S. government treated them properly. The caption read as: “Children in families of Japanese ancestry were evacuated with their parents and will be housed for the duration in WRA centers where facilities will be provided for them to continue their education.” By mentioning the children were evacuated “with their parents,” this caption told viewers that the U.S. government did not separate families of Japanese Americans, therefore respecting their rights. The caption implied that the U.S. government fulfilled their responsibility of providing education for children of America.

While the photograph represented the U.S. government’s ways of interpreting Japanese Americans’ identity and loyalty, Lange seemed to criticize the U.S. government in this photograph, and it might be a reason the photograph was impounded. Lange took this photograph of children right before Japanese Americans were sent to the assembly center. It could be read as an irony that the country did not secure freedom of the

children who pledged allegiance. The Pledge of Allegiance during the time read as: “I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands; one Nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all” (The Independence Hall Association, 2013). The children pledged allegiance to the country which valued liberty and justice for all, while their government did not secure their freedom.

Although this photograph was impounded by the WRA, representation of Japanese Americans’ identity in the photograph seems to resonate with Adams’s works. The flag, the way the children dressed, the posture of the children, and the background all depicted these children as essentially Americans. Reciting the Pledge of Allegiance by the children was associated with Americanness, and there was no connection between loyalty and Japaneseness. There were German American and Italian American children in the photograph, and their identity was also connected to Americanness in their posture for the Pledge of Allegiance.



Figure 4. “Children in families of Japanese ancestry were evacuated with their parents and will be housed for the duration in WRA centers where facilities will be provided for them to continue their education.” In Gordon, L. & Okiihiro, G. Y. (2006). *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the censored images of Japanese American internment*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. p. 86

In addition to Americanness, Lange’s photographs also presented the identity of Japanese Americans as calm, organized, and obedient to authorities. Another of Lange’s impounded photographs that captured Japanese Americans waiting for lunch at the Manzanar camp is a notable example of such identity representation (Figure 5). The waiting line presented Japanese Americans as individuals who followed orders. Several people were sitting and some others were reading books. This suggests that they had to wait to get lunch. No entrance to the lunch hall was captured, suggesting that the wait line would be long. Regardless of the long wait line, people captured in the photograph

looked calm. There were no signs of frustration, anger, and oppositions, and the photograph presented the identity of Japanese Americans as accepting the government's order without resistance.

Body of each individual in the photograph further constructed the identity of Japanese Americans as silent followers of the rules. The woman on the left side smiled toward the camera. The children were waiting without crying or screaming. The men were calm and not contumacious. They were reading a book or looking elsewhere. The shadow in the photograph suggests that it was taken in day-time. Viewers could imagine severe hot weather there by looking at the all Japanese Americans staying in the shadows. Some Japanese Americans in the photograph put an umbrella up to avoid sunshine. Although the conditions seemed severe, there was no sign of confusion, chaos, or resistance. With those rhetorical features, this photograph depicted Japanese Americans as individuals who calmly followed orders, suggesting that loyal Japanese Americans were individuals who accepted authority. Furthermore, this lunch line photograph depicted Japanese American as assimilating to American White culture. Women and girls in the photograph wore Western-style dresses. Men at the center wore Western-style hats and clothes.



Figure 5. “Part of a line waiting for lunch outside the mess hall at noon.” In Gordon, L. & Okiihiro, G. Y. (2006). *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the censored images of Japanese American internment*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. p. 170

This photograph was impounded probably due to such represented identity of Japanese Americans as silent followers. While Japanese American camp residents in the photographs seemed clam, they also seemed like exhausted innocent victims who were mistreated by the WRA and the U.S. government. Analysis of Lange’s impounded photographs suggests that the WRA allowed a very specific identity of Japanese Americans to be published. Although Lange’s impounded photographs depicted Japanese Americans as loyal American citizens who assimilated to White American culture and were willing to follow the U.S. government, any images that made viewers

think of them as innocent victims were silenced. Idealized minority identity in WRA photographs was the racial minority who assimilated to White American culture, willing to accept the U.S. government's policies, not attempting any forms of resistance, and not practicing any Japanese customs and traditions.

Toyo Miyatake, Japanese Americans as happy residents

Miyatake was an official camp photographer who was incarcerated in the Manzanar camp. Although the camp director Merritt authorized Miyatake to take photographs freely in the camp, Miyatake's works were not distributed to the American public during the war, while he did have an audience inside the camp. His photographs gained public attention after the incarceration was ended. A common assumption about documentary photographs is that the photographer is not a member of the pictured group (Alinder, 2009, p. 90). Unlike Adams and Lange, Miyatake's works were records of the Japanese American incarceration and minority identity with a view of an insider. For the purpose of interrogating Japanese Americans' identity representation, this section focuses on Miyatake's photographs that captured Japanese Americans.

"Boys Behind Barbed Wire," photographed by Miyatake, is the most frequently reproduced photograph of the incarceration when the Japanese American incarceration history is discussed in public (Figure 6). The image of the innocent boys incarcerated behind the barbed wire and the watch tower represented the injustice of the Japanese American incarceration. Moreover, the boys' gazing out past the fence and frame presented them not just as objects of pity but defiance, determination, and hope (Alinder, 2009, pp. 92-93). Miyatake's photographs are significant historical records of how an insider of the minority group captured the incarceration and minority identity.



Figure 6. Three evacuee boys, guard tower, and barbed-wire fence on perimeter of residential area, looking west, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo40.jpg

Although his famous “Boys Behind Barbed Wire” photograph served as a way to represent the injustice as well as hope in Japanese American incarceration, images of Japanese Americans in Miyatake’s other photographs seem to reproduce the pair of loyalty and Americanness as in Ansel’s and Lange’s works. In Miyatake’s other photographs of the Manzanar camp, Japanese Americans living behind barbed wire were depicted as happy American citizens who enjoyed daily events just as American citizens outside of the camp.

Miyatake's portrayal of school children at the camp presented Japanese Americans as enjoying their time at the camp. The photograph might capture a P.E. class, given that the children in the photograph were lined up (Figure 7). The three children in front smiled as they were probably running toward a goal line. The other children were waiting in line with smiles. Their smiles and healthy bodies that enabled them to run depicted Japanese American children as happy kids who were nourished and educated properly. They looked comfortable with their clean Western-style clothes. The scene looked the same as P.E. classes across the U.S. Such critical reading suggests that although Miyatake was an insider photographer, his depiction of Japanese American identity was similar to White photographers.

This photograph could be read as a positive representation of the Japanese American incarceration, telling viewers that children were living happily in camp facilities. It could also be read as an irony that innocent children were educated in a school without sufficient facilities and supplies. One distinct feature in this photograph was its background. The oil tank and barracks behind the children could be read as symbols that reminded viewers of the condition those school children were in. The gap between happy smiling children and the camp buildings could be read as both a celebration and an irony. Unlike Lange's works that positioned Japanese Americans as innocent oppressed victims, Miyatake's photographs seemed to depict Japanese Americans as happy, assimilated American citizens even though they were unfairly incarcerated by the U.S. government.



Figure 7. Oil storage tanks with school children, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California.

Retrieved from

http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo62.jpg

Another photograph by Miyatake further depicted Japanese Americans as happy and assimilated to White American culture. This photograph captured dancing in the auditorium in the Manzanar camp (Figure 8). Dressed-up young men and women were paired up and dance. The scene looked the same as dance parties across the U.S. during this time. It is hard to tell that the dance party was held in the barbed wired camp without knowing about the history and the photographer. This photograph presented Japanese Americans as capable of performing an aspect of White American culture: ballroom

dance. Started after 1860s, close-couple dance began to expand in the U.S. and became a U.S. popular culture (Browne & Browne, 2001, p. 59). During the war time years of the 1940s, the popularity of ballroom dance continued to expand (Browne & Browne, p. 59). Ballroom dance can be read as a way to perform and prove their Americanness for Japanese Americans during the war time. Both photographs showed moments of recreation, which seem to be a type of freedom to enjoy. In both photographs, there were no signs of oppression and symbols that relate Japanese Americans with Japanese traditions and values.



Figure 8. Dancing in the auditorium, CA. 1944, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California.

Retrieved from

http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo65.jpg

Americanness was further emphasized in another Miyatake photograph, which captured a high school graduation ceremony (Figure 9). The U.S. flag at the center was a dominant symbol that caught viewers' attention. Portrayal of Japanese Americans with the U.S. flag raised in a formal ceremony presented the identity of Japanese Americans as loyal to the U.S. The U.S. flag at a graduation ceremony also told that public education at the camp was directed by the U.S. government. Although it is hard to tell a facial expression of each Japanese American camp resident in this photograph, the scene of a high school graduation ceremony with full participants and audiences suggest that education for Japanese American students were formally done in the camp and camp residents cared about education for youth. There was no sign of Japaneseness, like a Japanese flag and *hakama*, a traditional Japanese *kimono* dress in graduation ceremony, in this photograph. The absence of Japaneseness further directed viewers' attention on the identity of Japanese Americans as American citizens.



Figure 9. High school graduation ceremony, auditorium, 1944, Manzanar War Relocation Center; Toyo Miyatake Photograph Collection, Toyo Miyatake Studio, San Gabriel, California. Retrieved from http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/manz/images/photo66.jpg

While some of Miyatake's photographs in the Manzanar camp explicitly and inexplicitly conveyed his skepticism toward the U.S. government and the incarceration, the represented identity of Japanese Americans in his photographs resonated with idealized minority identity in other WRA photographs. Japanese Americans were depicted as a racial minority who were happily assimilated to White American culture. Either resistance or Japanese customs and traditions were presented as part of Japanese Americans' identity.

Reconstructing Racial Identity in Camp Photographs by Bill Manbo

The majority of WRA photographs by Adams, Lange, and Miyatake were taken at the Manzanar camp, which the WRA considered as a “model” camp among the ten concentration camps. This section analyzes photographs by Bill Manbo, an incarcerated Japanese American at the Heart Mountain camp in Wyoming, where the Fair Play Committee, a group of Japanese American resisters against the draft call, was organized. Rhetorical analysis of Manbo’s photographs explores ways in which minority identity is reconstructed by members of the minority group using private snapshots, which were not primarily intended to be used as a tool for resistance.

Bill T. Manbo was a Nisei American who was born in Riverside, California, in 1908 (Muller, 2012, p. 3). His family moved back to Japan with him and his brother and lived there for nearly two years in his early teens, but the family did not like living in Japan and returned to California (Muller, 2012, p. 3). He graduated from Hollywood High School and studied auto mechanics at the Frank Wiggins Trade School (Muller, 2012, p. 4). After graduation, he married Mary Itaya, a Nisei American dressmaking student at the Frank Wiggins School (Muller, 2012, p. 4). He started working as a mechanic in Hollywood, and in 1940, Mary gave birth to a son called Billy (Muller, 2012, p. 4). Bill Manbo and his family were incarcerated in the Heart Mountain camp, and Manbo got a job as a mechanic in the camp’s motor pool in late October 1942 (Muller, 2012, p. 9).

Manbo was an amateur photographer, not a professional documentarian or commercial photographer (Muller, 2012, p. 9) like Miyatake, who was a studio commercial photographer. Manbo’s works, which captured daily lives at the Heart

Mountain camp, are historically significant since there are few vernacular photographs taken by non WRA photographers remaining (Alinder, 2012, p. 84). It was difficult for amateur photographers to bring their cameras in the camps since possession of cameras by Japanese American camp residents was prohibited initially. At the Heart Mountain camp, the WRA regional director Joseph Smart defended Japanese Americans' right to create a photographic record of their life at the camp (Alinder, 2012, p. 84).

Following Smart's contention, Manbo's photographs were purely for recording his and his family's lives. His photographs were not published during the war time, and his photographs would have been just for private use. Manbo's intended message in each photograph is unknown since there are no captions to the photographs written by Manbo himself. His photographs originally existed as slide shows for his family and friends (Alinder, 2012, p. 88). By the mid-1950s, Manbo stopped talking about his wartime experience, the same as other Nisei Americans who experienced the incarceration (Alinder, 2012, p. 88). In absence of Manbo's narration, the photographs' explicit intentions are difficult to apprehend (Alinder, 2012, p. 88). Even though there is no record of Manbo's intent to publish his photographs to criticize the condition of Japanese Americans in the Heart Mountain camp, critics should not trivialize his works just as "private snapshots" since the actual art object is not merely the end result of an initial purpose and creators' intention (Foss, 1986, p. 329). As Blair (1999) also pointed out, "rhetoric has material force beyond the goals, intentions, and motivations of its producers" (p. 22). Therefore, criticism of any rhetorical works requires critics seeing not only a text itself, but its relationships with its audiences and social discourses in its material existence. Even if Manbo, the author of the snapshots, did not intend to make any

arguments through his works, critics can identify rhetorical features of his works in order to complicate our understanding of minority identity.

Muller (2012) argued that Manbo's work is not just an amateur photographer's snapshots but more like a documentary of his ambivalence about his own identity (p. 15). Manbo expressed his attitude in favor of protest and resistance against the U.S. government. Manbo answered the loyalty questionnaire about his willingness to swear American allegiance and foreswear loyalty to Japan as "If we get all our rights back. Who wants to fight for a c.c. camp?" (cited in Muller, 2012, p. 14). Furthermore, Mary, his wife, wrote in the space for Question 28 that asked her whether she was loyal to the U.S. as "yes...I'm a born citizen" as if the question was unnecessary (cited in Muller, 2012, p. 14). Due to those answers, Bill and Mary were called in for an interview before the loyalty hearing board. While Bill did not hide his anger over how he and his family were treated by the government, the WRA judged them as loyal to the U.S. at the end of the interview.

I extend Muller's view that sees Manbo's photographs as a documentary of his ambivalence about his own identity and argue that Manbo's photographs reconstruct identity of Japanese Americans as loyal American citizens who embrace both Japanese and American traditions and cultures. The WRA photographs rarely captured Japanese American camp residents enjoying Japanese cultural events. They rather presented Japanese Americans as assimilating to American White culture. Manbo's photographs can be understood as a challenge to the identity and binary created by the U.S. government---the binary of Japanese and American and disloyalty and loyalty. Through

analyzing Manbo's works, I argue that daily snapshots taken by members of a minority group can be a way to counter a stereotyped minority identity.

Identity as Americans

Manbo's photographs constructed the identity of Japanese Americans as lively human beings who enjoyed their life with family. One notable visual feature found in Manbo's works is color. Manbo's snapshots preserved his memory of the incarceration and family life with vivid colors. Colors helped audiences not to distance themselves, or collapse distance, from the portrayed (Alinder, 2009, p. 84). In contrast to black-and-white WRA photographs, those colored photographs could present Japanese American camp residents not as victims but living human beings who had emotion. They look less like news photographs found in media coverage but more like family snapshots.

Manbo's snapshots of events at the Heart Mountain camp constructed Japanese Americans' identity as American citizens who practiced American traditions. His photograph that captured the Boy Scout activity (Figure 10) was a distinct example of Japanese Americans' identity presented as loyalty to the U.S. as well as assimilation to American White culture. The U.S. flag was apparent evidence of loyalty to the U.S. (U.S. Government Printing Office, 2008). Furthermore, in the photograph, a young man with a Boy Scout uniform raised the U.S. flag. Behind him, viewers could see a young lady with a white female uniform for marching band. By depicting Japanese American youths practicing American traditions, this photograph presented Japanese Americans' identity as assimilating to American White culture.



Figure 10. A Boy Scout, and behind him a drum majorette, at the head of a parade.

In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 51

Manbo's portrayal of his family further constructed the identity of Japanese Americans as American citizens who practiced American customs and internalized American ideals. His photograph that captured his son and his wife's parents is an

example of his family depiction as a common American family (Figure 11). All three in the photograph wore Western-style clothes. Junzo Itano, Manbo's father-in-law, wore a clean shirt, a cardigan sweater, and a pair of brown-color pants in this photograph. Riyo Itano, Manbo's mother-in-law, wore a deep-blue Western-styled dress. Billy, Manbo's son, wore a military hat, a razor jacket, and a pair of jeans. The family's facial expressions also depicted them as a standardized American family. Billy looked toward the camera with his mouth open, a typical facial expression of children in general. Junzo's gaze was outside the frame, and he had a stern expression on his face. In contrast, Riyo smiled toward the camera and cuddled up to Billy, showing her affection to her grandson. Their bodies presented Manbo's family as a common American family. The married heterosexual couple with a grandson was an idealized form of family, and an innocent grandchild, a caring grandmother, and a dignified grandfather fit gender expectations of American family in the time. This representation of Manbo's family made viewers think the family was the same as other American family. They seemed to pose in front of their house. The yellow-painted door in the photograph let viewers imagine that Japanese American camp residents were living in barracks that were like typical American houses. Those visual rhetorical features of the photograph constructed Japanese Americans' identity as American citizens who were assimilated to American White culture.



Figure 11. Billy Manbo with his maternal grandparents, Junzo (left) and Riyo Itano. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 10

His son, Billy, was Manbo's favorite model in his snapshots. Billy's body in Manbo's snapshots is notable for further analyzing minority identity representation. Manbo's photographs of Billy depicted him as a happy American kid who enjoyed playing with American aircraft toys, American military uniforms, and ice cream. For example, Manbo's camera captured Billy sitting with his toy, smiling toward the camera wearing a U.S. military uniform (Figure 12).



Figure 12. Billy Manbo poses in his soldier outfit with his father's model racing car. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 17

Billy in U.S. military uniform depicted his identity as an American, patriotic kid who probably respected U.S. army that fought against Japan, German, and Italy. Military clothing functions to signify patriotic and military loyalty (Creff, 2004, p. 24). Civilian or military clothing and hairstyles can encode Japanese Americans in photographs as

familiar, as non-Other, as Western, indeed as recognizably American---not Asian (Creff, 2004, p. 21). Billy's innocent smile with the military uniform presented the identity of Japanese Americans as loyal to the U.S. without doubt. It was difficult to read fake-patriotism and resistance against the U.S. government and the draft from Billy's innocent smile.

Manbo took several other photographs of Billy wearing a U.S. military uniform. Although Bill Manbo was against the draft call for Japanese Americans incarcerated in the camps, he was already in his mid-thirties and had a young son, so was never drafted. Therefore, he was spared the decision about how to respond to the draft. However, the anger he expressed on his loyalty screening was consistent with the mood of the FPC (Muller, 2012, p. 16). A reason behind Billy's uniform was Sammy, Manbo's brother-in-law, who was in U.S. Army. Muller (2012) postulated that Sammy's service might let Mary and Bill to dress Billy in a military uniform in so many photographs (p. 16).

Other photographs of Billy further constructed the Japanese American identity as being assimilated to American culture and values. Billy was playing with an aircraft toy in another photograph (Figure 13). The aircraft toy was printed G-1, which was a French aircraft company that designed and produced ultralight aircraft and supplied kits. Billy in the photograph wore an aviator hat and goggles, razor jacket, a pair of jeans, and Western boots. All products in the photograph constructed the identity of Billy as an American kid who yearned for aviation and the U.S. air force.



Figure 13. Billy Manbo, in pilot attire, plays with a model airplane.

In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 95

Another photograph of Billy further constructed identity of incarcerated Japanese Americans as Americans who enjoyed American culture. A photograph of Billy with an ice cream (Figure 14) depicted Billy just as the same as other American children who loved to eat ice cream. With his small hand, he held his ice cream cone. Viewers could tell that Billy loved ice cream, with ice cream on his face. Ice cream in this photograph seems to function as a visual symbol rhetoric that represented American culture. The

Japanese American child enjoyed ice cream, an American treat, the same as other American children even though he was in the concentration camp. Furthermore, any signs of incarceration were not in the photograph. The background blue sky seems to create a positive impression for viewers, since they could tell this child did have a freedom to enjoy his ice cream outside.



Figure 14. Billy Manbo eats ice cream in his pilot outfit. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 71

Innocence of Billy in Manbo's photographs functioned multiple ways. On one hand, Billy's innocence functioned as a sign of assimilation and loyalty to the U.S. Viewers did not expect Billy, a child, to fake his love for American culture and respect for U.S. military in the photographs. Because of Billy's innocence, viewers can understand Billy's performance of American identity as an authentic representation of his assimilation to the U.S. On the other hand, Billy's innocence functioned as an irony and criticism to the incarceration. A portrayal of Billy with barbed wire (Figure 15) resonated Japanese Americans' identity as innocent, assimilated minority citizens with Manbo's critical perspective on the Japanese American incarceration. Smiling Billy at the center of the photograph wore Western-style clothes, which signified his and his family's appreciation to American culture. His innocent smile also let viewers imagine this child seemingly enjoyed his life in the concentration camp. The barbed wire Billy was holding, however, seemed to represent the injustice of the Japanese American incarceration. Billy probably did not know why he and his family were living in the camp when Manbo took this photograph. An innocent child who loved American culture, the same as other American children, must have lived behind barbed wire just because his grandparents came from another country.



Figure 15. A portrait of Billy Mando at a barbed-wire fence. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p.

70

Identity as Japanese descent

Manbo's work seems to challenge the binary of American/Japanese and loyalty/disloyalty that the U.S. government constructed. Manbo's camera captured Japanese American camp residents enjoying Japanese traditional events in the Heart

Mountain camp. Kurashige (2012) noted that the Manbo's photographs provide evidence of WRA cultural pluralism. *Bon odori* (Japanese traditional dancing in summer) and *sumo* (Japanese traditional wrestling) in his works prove that WRA did not prohibit Japanese traditions in the camps (Kurashige, p. 111). However, although Manbo's photographs captured seemingly fun moments practicing Japanese cultural events at the camp, such positive representation of Japanese culture was not publicized in the war time. While Manbo's snapshots proved that WRA photographers could take photographs of those cultural events for record as Manbo did, positive images toward Japanese traditions were rarely found in WRA photographs.

Manbo's camera recorded traditional Japanese events at the Heart Mountain camp. For example, one of his snapshots captured a *sumo* wrestling event (Figure 16). Sumo is a Japanese traditional competitive wrestling sport. It has been respected as a professional and traditional sport in Japan and has been preserved since the Edo Period (1603 to 1868). Sumo is sometimes played as a performance to dedicate for Shinto shrines. Sumo is also a common play for children in Japan. Judging from their body sizes, the two *sumo* wrestlers were not professionals, although they wore *mawashi*, a belt for sumo. Both of them were smiling, even though the man on right lost the game by getting out of the circle. This snapshot also included Japanese American audience members, smiling and seemingly enjoying the game. Smiles in this snapshot suggest that the *sumo* event was purely for entertainment. Manbo's work depicted incarcerated Japanese Americans as living human beings who enjoyed Japanese traditions. No negative image or disloyalty was attached to the *sumo* event in Manbo's snapshots. Rather, Japanese traditions were presented as enjoyable and a part of Japanese Americans' daily life.



Figure 16. A light moment during a sumo match. In Muller, E.L. (2012). Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II., Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 59

Manbo's snapshots also recorded the *bon odori* event at the Heart Mountain camp with vivid colors (Figure 17). *Bon* means a week in August that welcomes ancestor's souls and holds a memorial service for the souls ("Bon Odori," 2005). During *bon*, festivals are held in every district in every city. *Odori* means dance, and *Bon odori* is a traditional dance played in the festivals. The colors in Manbo's photograph played a significant role. The colors of various *kimono* and the triangle flags depicted the event as

a fun moment that many camp residents were involved in. Judging from this photograph, there were many Japanese Americans who enjoyed this *bon odori* event. Not only children but adults actively participated in it, the same as *bon odori* in Japan. This photograph presented Japanese Americans as a minority group that respected their cultural origin. The beauty of colorful *kimono* created a positive impression of Japanese tradition. Manbo's snapshots seem to celebrate Japanese traditions with colors and smiles.



Figure 17. At Bon Odori, dancers circle around the yagura, a wooden scaffold made specifically for the summertime festival. In Muller, E.L. (2012). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II.*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. 60

A closer shot of *bon odori* dancers further complicated minority identity representation. Manbo's camera focused on girls trying to imitate an elderly dancer standing by them (Figure 18). Viewers could see the innocence of those girls, doing their best to dance like the elderly dancer. They seemingly respected the dancer who practiced a Japanese tradition and wanted to dance like her. In this photograph, the girls represented pure respect for Japanese traditions. Such appreciation for Japanese traditions can dissociate Japaneseness and disloyalty by presenting Japaneseness as something colorful, beautiful, and enjoyable. This photograph can be read as a challenge to the stereotypical image of Japan and Japanese traditions as enemy. Japanese culture was presented as something to be celebrated, not a sign of disloyalty to the U.S. that must have been removed.

The dresses the girls wore in the photograph seem to challenge the binary of Japaneseness and Americanness. In this photograph, a girl wearing a Western-style blue dress was juxtaposed with other girls wearing *kimono*. This suggests that Japanese Americans appreciated Japanese traditions as well as American culture. Moreover, although each girl wore a different dress, a Japanese *kimono* and an American dress, all the girls respected the Japanese traditional dance and were willing to be good *bon odori* dancers. In this scene, there was no sign of disloyalty to the U.S. but a pure appreciation for Japanese traditions.



Figure 18. No title. In Muller, E.L. (2012). Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II., Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press. p. viii

Critical reading of Manbo's snapshots reveals that smiles, children's innocence, and pleasure in Japanese traditional events can challenge the connection between Japaneseness and disloyalty established by the U.S. government. Manbo's photographs reconstructed the identity of Japanese Americans as American citizens embracing both Japanese and American tradition and culture. The WRA photographs, even photographs by Miyatake, rarely captured Japanese American camp residents enjoying Japanese

cultural events. They rather presented Japanese Americans as simply assimilating to American White culture. Manbo's photographs can be understood as a challenge to the identity and binary created by the U.S. government---the binary of Japanese and American and disloyalty and loyalty. Although Manbo was not an official member of the Fair Play Committee, his snapshots exemplify another way to challenge the dominant minority identity representation constructed by authority. Beauty in traditional cultural events, smiles, and innocent children are capable of reconstructing the dominant representation of the minority identity created by authority and/or a third party.

Conclusion and Implications

The photographs by Adams, Lange, and Miyatake constructed a very specific identity for Japanese Americans. The analysis of the photographs revealed that loyalty for Japanese Americans meant assimilating to American White culture, calmly obeying the U.S. government, and not protesting against the U.S. government regardless of the U.S. government's infringement of their human rights. Although all three photographers challenged anti-Japanese depictions of Japanese Americans found in media coverage during war time, their photographs seem to have reproduced the tie between loyalty and Americanness.

The analysis of the photographs suggests that the meaning of loyalty and citizenship can be different from American ideals when these words are applied to minority groups. The analysis revealed that American ideals, such as democracy through active political participation, freedom, and equality for all, which has been constructed through the history of social movements in the U.S., was not available for Japanese Americans, even though the majority of them were U.S. citizens. This proves that

scholars should give careful consideration to the particular meanings and ideological implications the words “loyalty” and “citizenship” embrace, especially for discussing minority groups. Assimilating to the dominant culture is constructed as a preferred performance of loyalty when one does not belong to the dominant culture.

Analysis of Bill Manbo’s snapshots exemplifies an alternative way of reconstructing a minority identity from insiders. Representation of minority identity by members of a minority group can challenge the dominant, stereotypical understanding of minority identity, loyalty, and citizenship. Protests with rhetorical strategies of multi-layered identification and dissociation the FPC practiced was one way for challenging the dominant minority identity representation. Snapshots, like Mambo’s works, are another way to counter the dominant understanding of the minority identity. By presenting the beauty of the group’s cultural origin, respect for the dominant American culture, and innocence of the group, snapshots by members of the minority group can add complexity to the minority identity representation. They were assimilated into American culture, but also appreciate their cultural origin, and were loyal innocent American citizens who had lives the same as other American citizens outside of the concentration camps.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

Throughout this dissertation, I have argued that in moments of crisis American citizenship is understood as the performance of Whiteness and loyalty to the country. I proved this contention by investigating how racially marginalized American citizens were asked to prove their loyalty and assimilation to White culture in order to be judged as true American citizens. My analysis of multiple texts generated by the U.S. government, Japanese Americans, and White American journalists proved that citizenship is a rhetorical construction that can be changed, challenged, and contested. Moreover, my analysis of rhetoric surrounding the Japanese American incarceration identifies two polarized terms that consistently appeared and were modified in all texts: loyalty/disloyalty and Americanness/Japaneseness.

My analysis revealed common understandings of ideal American citizenship. Critical reading of the U.S. government's documents proved that the ideal American citizen during the Japanese American incarceration was not accepting diverse cultures and dedicated to protecting equality and freedom. Rather, it was forcing minorities to assimilate to White American culture and asking them to prove their assimilation. Language in loyalty screening particularly tied Americanness with loyalty. Evidence of assimilation, therefore loyalty, included loyalty screening, military service, and Western-style clothes and activities shown in WRA photographs. My analysis of the Fair Play Committee, *The Rocky Shimpō*, and *The Heart Mountain Sentinel* proved that Japanese Americans who violated that American ideal constructed by the U.S. government were labeled as disloyal troublemakers and were silenced or punished.

This dissertation proves that we, as members of a community, should carefully examine negative implications behind seemingly positive terms that dominate the society. In order to prevent further infringement of human rights in the U.S. or any other contexts, we should not overlook any rhetorical mechanisms that can exclude certain types of people. Such careful analysis of implications is particularly important in crisis moments, when fear and anxiety let people seek an easy answer and solution to an upcoming tragedy. In the case of the Japanese American incarceration, removing people who looked like enemy Japanese was an easy way to ease fear and anxiety in the American public.

Such close analysis of the implications in the terms loyalty, citizenship, and identity speaks to contemporary social issues in the U.S. For example, a FOX News panelist Jonathan Hoeing's comment on racial profiling has been creating controversy over the loyalty, citizenship, and identity of the Islamic population in the U.S. Hoeing referred to the Japanese American incarceration as a positive decision by the U.S. government:

We should have been profiling on September 12, 2001. Let's take a trip down memory lane here: The last war this country won, we put Japanese-Americans in internment camps, we dropped nuclear bombs on residential city centers. So, yes, profiling would be at least a good start. It's not on skin color, however, it's on ideology... We need to stop saying the enemy is not Islamic. They are. ("Terror Threat," 2014)

Even though President Reagan made an official apology to Japanese Americans by signing the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, which provided \$1.25 billion dollars for

individual payments of \$20,000 dollars to each surviving internee (de Nevers, 2004, p. 292), such commentary still is alive and broadcast nationally in the U.S. today. Therefore, the analysis of loyalty, citizenship, and identity of Japanese Americans in the incarceration period is not a story of the past. We, as current members of the United States, should have critical eyes on how the U.S. government treats racial, religious, sexual, or any other minorities in the U.S. in order to not repeat the same tragedy that the Japanese American community experienced.

My analysis of the FPC's rhetoric and Manbo's snapshots suggests ways in which minority groups can challenge the dominant understanding of loyalty, citizenship, and identity. Particularly in crisis moments, it seems difficult for a targeted minority group to raise voices in a form of social protests. Although dissent is a positive form of democracy since it calls forth citizens' participation and challenges the dominant system (Ivie, 2005), as the FPC experienced, democratic actions by targeted minority groups can be punished or silenced as disloyal or inappropriate performance of citizenship. In fact, as the FPC grew in stature, the camp administration grew more alert and began raising the specter of criminal prosecution (Muller, 2001, p. 87). The more the FPC persuaded camp residents to actively support its resistance, the more the camp administration increased caution against the FPC because of its increasing influence. Moreover, the federal courts sentenced the resisters to lengthy terms of imprisonment, most commonly two to three years (Muller, 2001, p. 5).

Although the FPC's dissent did not make an actual policy change at that time, its rhetorical strategies of identification and dissociation should be noted as a way to challenge the dominant understanding of loyalty, citizenship, and minority identity. I

read the FPC's rhetoric as a challenge to the binary of Americanness and Japaneseness and loyalty and disloyalty created by the U.S. government's rhetoric. The FPC rhetorically constructed two levels of identity: a collective identity within the Japanese American community and another collective identity that could be shared with both the American public and the Japanese American community. Moreover, the FPC's rhetoric dissociated the implied connection between military enrollment and loyalty and redefined meanings of loyalty and citizenship by rejecting the draft and fighting for democracy. Such rhetorical strategies may be a useful lesson for any minority groups that attempt to challenge the dominant understanding of their loyalty, citizenship, and identity.

Manbo's snapshots can be understood as another form of challenge to the loyalty, citizenship, and minority identity constructed by the U.S. government. Although Manbo might not have intended to use his photographs as a means to challenge authority, not like the FPC, beauty in traditional events, smiles, and innocent children seem to be capable of reconstructing the dominant representation of the minority identity. Such reconstruction of the minority identity can be a practical means for minority groups that struggle with misrepresented identity circulated in public. Today, taking snapshots is easier than in Manbo's time. In the U.S, as of January 2014, ninety percent of American adults own at least one cell phone (Pew Research Center, 2014), which allows them to take photographs of their daily life. Minority groups, especially labeled as potential enemies, disloyal, and/or non-citizens, are encouraged to take Manbo's approach. Visual representation of a blended identity as an American citizen who respects one's racial and cultural origin with smiles, innocence, and beauty would be a potential strategy to

counter the dominant understanding of their identity, since these visual features would break a mental disconnection between the American public and the minority group.

I hope that this dissertation contributes to rhetorical history and citizenship scholarship. First, this dissertation provided a critical lens to look at the history of the Japanese American incarceration. Rather than discovering new historical documents, this dissertation focused on interrogating rhetorical constructions of loyalty, citizenship, and minority identity in the U.S. by critically analyzing historical materials about the Japanese American incarceration. I hope that this dissertation helps readers to understand the Japanese American incarceration as a new critical moment for understanding loyalty, citizenship, and identity in the U.S., equally important as other famous examples such as the Civil Rights Movements.

Second, this dissertation identified a way to understand who is considered a loyal American citizen. I propose that identifying what constitutes “loyalty” when it applies for a minority group in the U.S. is the first step for understanding who can be a loyal American citizen. My analysis revealed that assimilation to White American culture was one component for being loyal. Such analysis was possible by focusing on loyalty of the minority group, since it is more difficult to see assimilation to White American culture by analyzing the White population. I also propose the identification binaries as the second step to understanding who to be a loyal American citizen. Scholars can understand what loyalty, citizenship, and identity is by knowing what is not. As I constantly argued through this dissertation, loyalty, citizenship, and identity are rhetorically constructed, meaning they always influence and are influenced by contexts. Therefore, it is important to keep examining loyalty, citizenship, and identity in different contexts. While this

dissertation identified rhetorical processes of how the loyalty, citizenship, and identity of Japanese Americans were constructed, those terms can have different meanings in different contexts.

There are a plenty of directions this research on loyalty, citizenship, and minority identity can go in the future. For example, analyzing remembrance of the FPC in the Japanese American community would be a significant work to further understand loyalty and citizenship in today's society. The memory of the FPC has not been openly discussed after the incarceration, probably because of the unfair label of "disloyal" on its members. However, the Japanese American community recently started to recognize the legacy of the FPC. Frank Abe's documentary titled *Conscience and Constitution*, featuring the FPC, would be an interesting and important text to investigate how the FPC's performance of citizenship is evaluated differently in the war time and now.

In order to further interrogate limits of the American ideal and citizenship beyond the case of the Japanese American incarceration, scholars should look at who are considered as less-citizens in contemporary society and rhetorical processes that make such humiliation possible. Creation of binaries and exclusion still is an issue that we, members of any community, should think about. For example, in the current immigration debate in the U.S., what types of people are stigmatized, what binaries were constructed, what implications do the binaries have, and what ways of performing loyalty are citizens asked? Moreover, what rhetorical strategies can a minority group take to counter the dominant understanding of its loyalty, citizenship, and identity? We should not stop reexamining American ideals, loyalty, and citizenship. The Japanese American incarceration is over, but the issues it raised are still alive.

References

- Abe, F. (2000). (director). *Conscience and constitution* [documentary]. United States, New York.
- Adams, A. (1944). *Born free and equal: The story of loyal Japanese Americans*. New York, NY: U. S. Camera.
- Alinder, J. (2012). Camera in camp: Bill Manbo's vernacular scences of Heart Mountain. In E. L. Muller. (Ed.). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II*, (pp. 83-101). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Alinder, J. (2009). *Moving images: Photography and the Japanese American incarceration*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Revised and extended edition. London, UK: Verso.
- Arendt, H. (1994). *The origin of totalitarianism*. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Asen, R. (2004). A discourse theory of citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90(2), 189-211. doi:10.1080/0033563042000227436
- Baldwin, J. (1963). *The fire next time*. New York, NY: The Dial Press.
- Beasley, V. B. (2001). *You, the people: American national identity in presidential rhetoric*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Beasley, V. B. (2001). The rhetoric of ideological consensus in the United States: American principles and American pose in presidential inaugurals. *Communication Monographs*, 68(2). 69-183. doi: 10.1080/03637750128055
- Berger, M. A. (2005). *Sight unseen: Whiteness and American visual culture*. Berkeley,

CA: University of California Press.

- Berkson, I. B. (1920). *Theories of Americanization: A critical study with special reference to the Jewish group*. Retrieved from https://openlibrary.org/books/OL13523473M/Theories_of_Americanization
- Berlant, L. (1997). *The queen of America goes to Washington city: Essays on sex and citizenship*. London, UK: Duke Univeristy Press.
- Birdsell, D. S. & Leo, G. (1996). Toward a theory of visual argument. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 33, 1-10.
- Blair, A. J. (1996). The possibility and actuality of visual arguments. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 33, 23-39. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-2363-4_16
- Blair, C. (1999). Contemporary U.S. memorial sites as exemplars of rhetoric's materiality. In J. Selzer & S. Crowley. (Eds.). *Rhetorical bodies*, (pp. 16-57). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- “Bon Odori-Japanese traditional dance.” (2005). *Japan-101: Information Resources*. Retrieved from http://www.japan-101.com/art/art_bon_odori.htm
- Browne, R.B. & Browne, P. (2001). *The guide to United States popular culture*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Bruner, L. M. (2002). *Strategies of remembrance: The rhetorical dimentions of national identity construction*. Colombia, SC: University of South Carolina.
- Burke, K. (1989). *On Symbols and Society*. J. R. Gusfield. (Ed.). Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1966). *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California

Press.

- Calabrese, A., & Burke, B. R. (1992). American identities: Nationalism, the media, and the public sphere. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 16(2), 52-73.
doi:10.1177/019685999201600205
- Castelnuovo, S. (2008). *Soldiers of conscience: Japanese American Military Resisters in World War II*. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers.
- Cisneros, J. D. (2011). (Re)Bordering the civic imaginary: Rhetoric, hybridity, and citizenship in La Gran Marcha. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 97, 26-49.
doi:10.1080/00335630.2010.536564
- Charland, M. (1987). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the people Quebecois. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 133-150. doi:10.1080/00335638709383799
- Charles, T. (2004). *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham , London: Duke University Press.
- Chinese Exclusion Act 1882. (2014). *Aspiration, aculation, and impact: Immigration to the United States 1789-1930*. Harbord University library open collections program.
Retrieved from <http://ocp.hul.harvard.edu/immigration/exclusion.html>
- Contrubis, J. (1999). Executive orders and proclamation. *CRS Reports for Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress.
- Cram, E. D. (2012). "Angie was our sister:" Witnessing the trans-formation of disgust in the citizenry of photography. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98(4), 411-438. doi: 10.1080/00335630.2012.714899
- Crick, N. & Engels, J. (2012). "The effort of reason, and the adventure of beauty": The

aesthetic rhetoric of Randolph Bourne. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 98(3), 272-269. doi:10.1080/00335630.2012.691174

Criff, E. T. (2004). *Imaging Japanese America: The visual construction of citizenship, nation, and the body*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Daniels, J. (1972). *Complete presidential press conferences of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Volume 23-25*. New York, NY: Da Capo Press.

Daniels, R. (2005). Words do matter: A note on inappropriate terminology and the incarceration of the Japanese Americans. In L. Fiset & G. M. Momura. (Eds.). *Nikkei in the Pacific Northwest: Japanese Americans and Japanese Canadians in the twenties century*, (pp. 183-207). Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

DeChaine, R. D. (2009). Bordering the civic imaginary: Alienization, fence logic, and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 95. 43-65. doi:10.1080/00335630802621078

de Nevers, K. C. (2004). *The Colonel and the Pacifist*. Salt Lake City, UT: The University of Utah Press.

Dorsey, L. G. (2004). *We are all Americans, pure and simple*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Dower, J. W. (1986). *War without mercy: Race and power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Editorial: Let us not be rash. [Editorial]. (1944, February 28). *The Rocky Shimpo*.

Retrieved

from http://www.pbs.org/itvs/conscience/resistance/rocky_shimpo/01_rash.html

Editorial: Provocateurs. [Editorial]. (1944, March 15). *The Heart Mountain Sentinel*.

Retrieved from

http://www.pbs.org/itvs/conscience/resistance/crackdown/06_provocateurs_i.html

Editorial: The Rocky Shimpo affirms its stand. [Editorial]. (1944, April 7). *The Rocky Shimpo*. Retrieved from

http://www.pbs.org/itvs/conscience/resistance/rocky_shimpo/05_affirms_i.html

Editorial: Years of uselessness. [Editorial]. (1944, July 1). *The Heart Mountain Sentinel*.

Retrieved from

http://www.resisters.com/documents/HMS_YearsOfUselessness.htm

Exec. Order No. 9066, 3 C.F.R. (1942). Print.

Exec. Order No. 9102, 3 C.F.R. (1942). Print.

Fair Play Committee Bulletin #1. (1944). Retrieved from

http://www.pbs.org/itvs/conscience/resistance/we_hereby_refuse/02_fpc_1.html

Fair Play Committee Bulletin #2. (1944, February). Retrieved from

http://www.pbs.org/itvs/conscience/resistance/we_hereby_refuse/03_fpc_2.html

Fair Play Committee Bulletin #3. (1944, March). Retrieved from

http://www.pbs.org/itvs/conscience/resistance/we_hereby_refuse/04_fpc_3.html

Finnegan, C. A. (2004). Doing rhetorical history of the visual: The photograph and the archive. In C.A. Hill & M. Helmers (Eds.), *Defining Visual Rhetorics* (pp. 195-214). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flamiano, D. (2010). Japanese American internment in popular magazines: Race, citizenship, and gender in World War II photojournalism. *Journalism History* 36(1), 23-35.

Foss, S. K. (1986). Ambiguity as persuasion: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

- Communication Quarterly* (34)3, 326-340. doi:10.1080/01463378609369643
- Glenn, C. (2004). *Unspoken: A rhetoric of silence*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Gordon, L. & Okiihiro, G. Y. (2006). *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the censored images of Japanese American internment*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Gross, A. J. (2008). *What blood won't tell*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hansen, A. A. (2003). Return to the wars: Jimmie Omura's 1947 crusade against the Japanese American Citizens League. In S. Chan (Ed.), *Remapping Asian American history* (pp. 127-152). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Heart Mountain Fair Play Committee. (2013). In *Densho Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from <http://www.densho.org/resources/default.asp?path=encyclopedia/Encyclopedia.asp>
- Heart Mountain Sentinel (newspaper). (2013). In *Densho Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from [http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Heart%20Mountain%20Sentinel%20\(newspaper\)/](http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Heart%20Mountain%20Sentinel%20(newspaper)/)
- How to tell Japs from the Chinese. (1941, December 22). *Life*. pp. 81-83.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Immigration Policy Center. (2012). The DREAM Act. Retrieved from <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/issues/DREAM-Act>
- Ivie, R. L. (2005). Democratic dissent and the trick of rhetorical critique. *Cultural Studies* <-> *Critical Methodologies*, 5(3), 276-293. doi:10.1177/1532708605276909
- Jacobson, M. F. (1999). *Whiteness of a different color*. Boston, MA: Harvard University

Press.

James Omura. (2014). In *Densho Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from

http://encyclopedia.densho.org/James_Omura/

Japanese American Citizens League. (2013). In *Densho Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from

<http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Japanese%20American%20Citizens%20League/>

Jasinski, J. (1991). Constituting citizenship through public argument: The case of the

constitutional ratification debate, 1787-1788. In D. W. Parson (Ed.), *Argument in controversy* (pp. 80-85). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Johannesean, R. L. (1974). The functions of silence: A plea for communication research.

Western Speech 38(1), 25-45. doi:10.1080/10570317409373806

Kashima, T. (1996). *Personal justice denied: Report of the Commission on wartime*

relocation and internment of civilians. Seattle, WA: University of Washington

Press.

Karst, K. L. (1989). *Belonging to America: Equal citizenship and the Constitution*.

London. Yale University Press.

Kemmelmeir, M. & Winter, D. G. (2008). Sowing patriotism, but reaping nationalism?

Consequences of exposure to the American flag. *Political Psychology* 29 (6). 859-

879. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00670.x

Kessler, L. (1988). Fettered freedoms: The journalism of World War II Japanese

American internment camps. *Journalism History* 15(2-3), 70-79.

Kurashige, L. (2012). Unexpected views of the internment. In E. L. Muller. (Ed.). *Colors*

of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II, (pp. 103-116). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Mackey, M. (n.d.). A brief history of the Heart Mountain relocation center and the Japanese American experience. *Modern American Poetry*. Retrieved from http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/poets/g_1/haiku/mackey.htm

McGee, M. C. (1980). The “ideograph”: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66, 1-16. doi: 10.1080/00335638009383499

McKerrow, R. E. (1989). Critical rhetoric: Theory and praxis. *Communication Monograph*, 56, 91-111. doi:10.1080/03637758909390253

Mizuno, T. (2001). The creation of the “Free Press” in Japanese American Camps: The War Relocation Authority’s planning and making of the camp newspaper policy. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 78(3), 503-518. doi: 10.1177/107769900107800307

Muller, E. L. (2012). Introduction: Outside the frame: Bill Manbo’s color photographs in context. In E. L. Muller. (Ed.). *Colors of confinement: Rare Kodachrome photographs of Japanese American incarceration in World War II*, (pp. 83-101). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Muller, E. L. (2007a). *American inquisition: The hunt for Japanese American disloyalty in World War II*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Muller, E. L. (2007b). *American Inquisition: The Hunt for Japanese American Disloyalty in World War II*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Muller, E. L. (2001). *Free to die for their country: The story of the Japanese American*

- draft resisters in World War II*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mydans, C. (1944, March 20). Tule Lake: At this segregation center are 18,000 Japanese considered disloyal to U.S. *Life*, 16(12), pp. 25-35.
- Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.
- National Asian American Telecommunications Association (2002). Executive Order 9066. *Exploring the Japanese American internment camp through films and the Internet*. Retrieved from <http://caamedia.org/jainternment/ww2/eo9066.html>
- Nelson, D. D. (1998). *National manhood: Capitalist citizenship and the imagined fraternity of white men*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ng, W. (2002). *Japanese American Internment During World War II: A History and Reference Guide*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Niiya, B. (1993). *Japanese American history: An A to Z reference from 1868 to the present*. New York, NY: Facts On File.
- Obama warns of “narrow window” to achieve immigration reform. (2004, May 13). *Global Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/agencia-efe/140513/obama-warns-narrow-window-achieve-immigration-reform>
- Okiihiro, G.Y. (1984). Religion and resistance in America’s concentration camps. *Phylon* 45(3), 220-233.
- Olson, L.C. (2007). Intellectual and conceptual resources for visual rhetoric: A re-examination of scholarship since 1950. *The Review of Communication* 7(11), 1-20.
doi:10.1080/15358590701211035

- Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation* (trans. J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Pew Research Center. (2014). Mobile Technology Fact Sheet. Retrieved from <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheets/mobile-technology-fact-sheet/>
- Ray, A. G. (2007). The Rhetorical ritual of citizenship: Women's voting as public performance, 1868-1875. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 93, 1-26. doi: 10.1080/00335630701326845
- Ray, A. G. (2005). *The lyceum and public culture in the nineteenth-century United States*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Renshon, S. A. (2005). *The 50% American: Immigration and national identity in an age of terror*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Ritivoi, A. (2008). The dissociation of concepts in context: An analytic template for assessing its role in actual situations. *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 44, 185-197.
- Robinson, G. (2001). *By order of the president: FDR and the internment of Japanese Americans*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Roosevelt, F. D. (1941). Pearl harbor address to the nation. *American rhetoric: Top 100 speeches*. Retrieved from <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/fdrpearlharbor.htm>
- Roosevelt, T. (1931). *An autobiography*. New York: Scibners's.
- Rowland, R. C. (2002). *Analyzing rhetoric: A handbook for the informed citizen in a new millennium*. IA: Kendal/Hunt Publishing Company.

- Schiappa, E. (2003). *Defining reality: Definitions and the politics of meaning*.
Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Scott, R.L. & Smith, D.K. (1969). The rhetoric of confrontation. *Quarterly Journal of*
22(1), 1-8. doi:10.1080/00335636909382922
- Smith, R. M. (1997). *Civil ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U. S. history*.
London: Yale University Press.
- Simons, H.W. (1970). Requirements, problems, and strategies: A theory of persuasion for
social movements. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56(1), 1-11.
doi:10.1080/00335637009382977
- Stieglitz, O. (1997). "...very much an American life": The concept of "citizenship" in the
civilian conservation crops, 1933-1942. In K. Krakau (Ed.), *The American nation-
national identity-nationalism* (pp. 185-195). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction
Publishers.
- Stuckey, M. E. (2004). *Defining Americans: The presidency and national identity*.
Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Tashima, W., A. (2003). Survey: XII. Legal history: Patriotism: Do we know it when
we were it? *Michigan Law Review*, 2007-2015.
- "Terror treats on America soil spark debate over profiling." (2014, September 20). *FOX
News*. Retrieved from
[http://video.foxnews.com/v/3796561876001/terror-threats-on-american-soil-
spark-debate-over-profiling/?playlist_id=2781265810001#sp=show-clips](http://video.foxnews.com/v/3796561876001/terror-threats-on-american-soil-spark-debate-over-profiling/?playlist_id=2781265810001#sp=show-clips)
- The Independence Hall Association. (2013). Pledge of allegiance. *US History.org*.
Retrieved from <http://www.ushistory.org/documents/pledge.htm>

- The National WWII Museum. (n. d.). African Americans in World War II: Fighting for a double victory. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalww2museum.org/assets/pdfs/african-americans-in-world.pdf>
- The United States Constitution, Amendment 14 Citizenship rights. (1868). Retrieved from <http://www.usconstitution.net/const.html#Am14>
- The United States Government Printing Office. (2008). *Our flag*. Retrieved from <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/serialset/cdocuments/sd109-18/sd109-18.pdf>.
- Thiesmeyer, L. (1995). The discourse of official violence: Anti-Japanese North American discourse and the American internment camps. *Discourse and Society* 6(3), 319-352. doi:10.1177/0957926595006003003
- Toyo Miyatake. (2014). In *Densho Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Toyo_Miyatake/
- Tule Lake. (2014). In *Densho Encyclopedia*. (2014). Retrieved from http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Tule_Lake/
- Turner, K. J. (1998). Rhetorical history as social construction: The challenge and the promise. In K. J. Turner (Ed.), *Doing rhetorical history* (pp.1-15). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- United States. (1957). 85th Cong. 1st sess. House of Representatives. Retrieved from <http://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/002139047>
- United States. Congress. House of Representatives. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities. (1943). *Report and minority views of the special committee on un-American activities on Japanese war relocation centers, September 30, 1943*. Washington: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Office. (n.d. a.). Japanese-American relocation at the turn of the century, 1900-1922. *Office of the Historians*.

Reiterated from <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1899-1913/japanese-relations>

U.S. Department of Office. (n.d. b.). The Immigration Act of 1924. *Office of the Historians*.

Reiterated from <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/immigration-act>

Von Burg, A. B. (2012). Stochastic citizenship: Toward a rhetoric of mobility.

Philosophy and Rhetoric, 45(4). 351-375. doi:10.5325/philtrhet.45.4.0351

Walton, D. & Macagno, F. (2008). Reasoning from classifications and definitions.

Argumentation, 23, 81-107. doi: 10.1007/s10503-008-9110-2

Williams, D. R. (2006). From Pearl Harbor to 9/11: Lessons from the internment of

Japanese American Buddhists. In S. Prothero (Ed.), *A nation of religions: The politics of pluralism in multireligious America* (pp. 63-78). Chapel Hill, NC:

University of North Carolina Press.

Wood, D. P. (2009). Citizenship, alienage, and personhood in the United States. In

Citizenship in American and Europe: Beyond the nation-state? Ed. by Greve, M.

S. & Zoller, M. (pp. 137-148). Washington, DC: The American Enterprise

Institute Press.

Young, M. (2004). *Minor re/visions: Asian American literacy narratives as a rhetoric of*

citizenship. Carbonadale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1998). Four senses of rhetorical history. In K. J. Turner (Ed.), *Doing*

rhetorical history (pp.19-32). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1997). Definitions. In J. Klumpp (Ed.), *Argument in a time of change: Definitions, frameworks, and critiques: Proceedings of the Tenth NCA/AFA conference on argumentation* (pp. 1-11). Annandale, VA: National Communication Association.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Kaori MiyawakiEDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy, Communication, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, expected December 2014.

Graduate Certificate of Rhetorical Leadership, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May 2011.

Master of Arts, Communication, University of Northern Iowa, May 2010.

Graduate Certificate in Women's and Gender Studies, University of Northern Iowa, May 2010.

Bachelor of Arts, Intercultural Communication, Dokkyo University, Japan, March 2006.

PUBLICATIONS

Articles

Yamada, Kaori. "Disturbing Community: Conflicting Identities and Citizenship in Japanese American Internment Camp Newspapers During World War II." *Disturbing Argument: Selected Works of The 2013 NCA/AFA Summer Conference on Argumentation, Alta, UT*. 2015. Ed. Palczewski, Catherine H. New York, NY: Routledge.

Miyazaki, Arata, and Yamada, Kaori. "Facing with Nonnativeness while Teaching: Enacting Voices of International Graduate Students of Basic Communication Courses." *Basic Communication Course Annual 25*, 2013. 245-282.

Yamada, Kaori. "Conflicting National Identities and Ideologies: A Rhetorical Analysis of the National Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism During World War II." *Carolinas Communication Annual, 28*. The Carolinas Communication Association, 2012. 126-155.

Yamada, Kaori. "Restorative Rhetoric for Ethical Rhetorical Leadership: A Critical Analysis of George W. Bush's Hurricane Katrina Speech." *Proceedings of the 4rd Tokyo Conference on Argumentation: Argumentation, the Law and Justice*. Eds. Suzuki, Takeshi, Takayuki, Kato, and Aya Kubota. Proc. of the 4rd Tokyo Conf. on Argumentation, 10 Aug. -12 Aug. 2012, Tokyo: Japan Debate Association, 2012. 128-133.

Yamada, Kaori. "Rules for Becoming a Graceful Woman: Rhetorical Analysis of the Japanese Self-Help Book *Grace of Women*." *Universitas* 5.2. Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa, 2009. <<http://www.uni.edu/universitas/currentissue/excellence.htm>>.

Yamada, Kaori. "Power of Personal Narratives: A Rhetorical Consideration of *Flags Of Our Fathers*." *Proceedings of the 3rd Tokyo Conference on Argumentation: Argumentation, the Law and Justice*. Ed. Suzuki, Takeshi, Takayuki, Kato, and Aya Kubota. Proc. of the 3rd Tokyo Conf. on Argumentation, 8 Aug. -10 Aug. 2008, Tokyo: Japan Debate Association, 2008. 287-290.

Unpublished Master's thesis

Yamada, Kaori. "Conflicting Identities and Ideologies: A Rhetorical Analysis of the National Japanese American Memorial To Patriotism During World War II," MA thesis. University of Northern Iowa, 2010.

CONFERENCES

Yamada, Kaori. "Redefining Citizenship and Community: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Dissent by the Fair Play Committee in the Heart Mountain Internment Camp." 99th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. Washington, D.C. November 2013.

Yamada, Kaori. "Situated Discourse of Citizenship in Japanese American internment." National Communication Association Seminar/Preconference. Washington, D.C. November 2013.

Yamada, Kaori. "Disturbing Community: Conflicting Identities and Citizenship in Japanese American Internment Camp Newspapers During World War II." The 2013 NCA/AFA Summer Conference on Argumentation, Alta, UT, August 2013.

Yamada, Kaori. "Domesticating Police Violence: A critical analysis of YouTube Videos and Media Coverage of the Taser Incidents in the UCLA and the University of Florida." 98th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. Orlando, FL, 2012.

Yamada, Kaori. "Special Needs or Universal Designs? : A Critical Analysis of Apple's Website on Accessibility." 98th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. Orlando, FL, 2012.

Yamada, Kaori. "Silenced Agents: An Analysis of Media Coverage on Japanese American Women during the Time of the Internment." The 36th Annual Wisconsin Women's Studies and 7th Annual UW System LGBTQ Conference, "Power, Politics, and Performance." Oshkosh, WI, 2012.

Yamada, Kaori. "Restorative Rhetoric for Ethical Rhetorical Leadership: A Critical Analysis of George W. Bush's Hurricane Katrina Speech." The 4rd Tokyo Conference on Argumentation, Tokyo, Japan. 2012.

Yamada, Kaori. "What Makes the Mascot Popular?: College Mascots, Embodiment of Masculinity, and Resistance against Gender Norms." Gender Matters Conference. Chicago, IL, 2012.

Yamada, Kaori. "Conflicting National Identities and Ideologies: A Rhetorical Analysis of the National Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism During World War II." 97th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. New Orleans, LA, 2011.

Miyazaki, Arata. and Yamada, Kaori. "Language Performance, Multiple Social Roles, and Identities: Surviving as a Researcher, an Assistant Instructor, and a Student in the Higher-education Institution." 97th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. New Orleans, LA, 2011.

Tajima, Noriaki. and Yamada, Kaori. "*Hinkaku* in Japanese Contemporary Popular Media: Recovery of National Pride, Codes of Discipline, or Media Hype of Xenophobia?" Midwest Popular Culture Association/Midwest American Association Annual Conference. Milwaukee, WI, 2011.

Yamada, Kaori. "Placement as Material Rhetoric: A Rhetorical Analysis of the National Japanese American Memorial to Patriotism During World War II" 2011 Central States Communication Association Conference. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 2011.

Yamada, Kaori. "Gendering School Mascots: Critical Analysis of Controversies of a School's New Mascot." The 35th Annual Wisconsin Women's Studies and 6th Annual UW System LGBTQ Conference. Madison, Wisconsin, 2010.

Yamada, Kaori. "Rules for Becoming a Graceful Woman: Rhetorical Analysis of the Japanese Self-Help Book *Grace of Women*." 95th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. Chicago, Illinois, 2009.

Yamada, Kaori. "Self-Reflexive Memorizing: Public Memory of World War II in *Flags Of Our Fathers* and *Letters From Iwo Jima*." 95th Annual Convention of the National Communication Association. Chicago, Illinois, 2009.

Yamada, Kaori. "Power of Personal Narratives: A Rhetorical Consideration of *Flags Of Our Fathers*." The 3rd Tokyo Conference on Argumentation. Chuo University, Tokyo, Japan, 2008.

WORK HISTORY

Graduate Teaching Assistant, at the Communication Department, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. August 2010-May 2014

Classes taught: 2 section of COMM 335 (Critical Analysis of Communication) as an instructor; 4 sections of COMM362 (Argumentation & Debate) as an instructor; 10 sections of COMM103 (Public Speaking) as an instructor; and 6 sections of COMM103 (Public Speaking) as a teaching assistant.

Office worker, at the Graduate Schools of Hosei University. April 2007- July 2008

Hosei University is one of the top six private universities in Japan. My job was answering students' questions and needs, making copies and filing, setting computer or other devices in classrooms, and contacting with professors for paper works.

Teacher of English, at Otsuma Ranzan girls' high and junior high school. April 2006-March 2007.

Ostuma Ranzan girl's high school is a private school at which most of the students aim to enter colleges. I taught English for high and junior high school students. I was responsible for five courses for junior high school students and three courses for high school students. I taught English grammars, essay writing, and public speaking.

HONORS AND AWARDS

The National Communication Association Caucus Student Travel Grant, The National Communication Association, 2013.

Graduate Student Travel Support Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2013.

The National Communication Association Student of Color Travel Grant, the National Communication Association, 2012.

Graduate Student Travel Support Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2013.

The National Communication Association Student of Color Travel Grant, the National Communication Association, 2011.

Graduate Student Travel Support Award, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2013.

The Dean's award winner, the fourth annual College of Humanities and Fine Arts Graduate Research Symposium, University of Northern Iowa, 2010.

The National Communication Association Student of Color Travel Grant, the National Communication Association, 2009.

4th place winner, the third annual College of Humanities and Fine Arts Graduate Research Symposium, University of Northern Iowa, 2009.

Department Membership Award for the National Communication Association Student Membership, Department of Communication Studies, University of Northern Iowa, 2009.

Competitively selected as a participant of Japan-U.S. Exchange Debate Tour, Japan Debate Association and National Communication Association, 2006.

AFFILIATIONS

Rhetoric Society of America, Member, 2010-present

UWM Chapter of Rhetoric Society of America, Member, 2010-present.

National Communication Association, Member, 2009-present

Japan Debate Association, Member, 2006-present

Dokkyo University, English Speaking Society, Coach, 2007-2008

ACADEMIC SERVICE

Moderator, National Communication Association Preconference Seminar “Rhetoric and the Legacies of Race in the US.” Chicago, IL, November 2014.

Demonstration debater, in the Panel “International Debate: CIDD presents the British National Debate Team.” The 100th National Communication Association Annual Conference, November 2014.

Volunteer judge, The Speech Showcase, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Fall 2013.

Volunteer judge, for Professor Yuko Wert, Fifth Semester Japanese course, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Fall 2013.

Reviewer, the Public Address Division, the 99th National Communication Association Annual Conference, 2013.

Reviewer, the Asian/Pacific American Communication Division, the 99th National Communication Association Annual Conference, 2013.

Guest speaker, for Professor Atuko Suga Borgmann, Japanese Language and Culture course, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Spring 2013.

Guest instructor, Impromptu Speeches, for Kiran Dillon’s Public Speaking course, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Spring 2013.

Graduate mentor to PhD students, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2012-2013.

Guest instructor, Argumentation, for Ruth Beerman's Public Speaking course, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Fall 2012.

Chair of the panel "Contemporary Culture and Argument." The 4th Tokyo Conference on Argumentation, Tokyo, Japan, 2012.

Reviewer, the Public Address Division, the 98th National Communication Association Annual Conference, 2012.

Volunteer judge, Regional Speech and Debate Tournament sponsored by the National Christian Forensics and Communications Association, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Feb. 2011.

Volunteer interviewee, the Mid-term project of Japanese language class, for Dr. Atsuko Suga Borgmann's Japanese course, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Fall 2010.

Volunteer, The Speech Showcase, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Fall 2010.

Guest panelist, Women in the Globalized World: A Panel Discussion, for Women's History Month Event, The Women's and Gender Studies Program, University of Northern Iowa, March 2010.

Translator of the book *Wakimae no Goyoron*. [*Pragmatics of Wakimae*]. for Dr. Cynthia Dunn, University of Northern Iowa, Fall 2009.

Guest lecturer, Gender in Contemporary Japanese Educational Systems, for Dr. Victoria DeFransisco's Gender in Communication course, University of Northern Iowa, Fall 2009.

The 2nd Saitama Inaho Cup Inter-High School English Debate Tournament, Invited Judge, 2006.

The 3rd Saitama Inaho Cup Inter-High School English Debate Tournament, Invited Judge, 2007.

The Japan Debate Association Forum on Academic Debate, 2008, Instructor.

The Japan Debate Association Forum on Academic Debate, 2008, Demonstration Debater