Citizenship education, memory, and the World War II internment of Japanese Americans

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Matthew S. Walters

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

Frances Vavrus

July 2011

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my advisor, Frances Vavrus, for her enduring patience, wisdom, and

invaluable insights throughout this project.

Gratitude is also due to friends, for without their encouragement, advice,

company, support, and faith, this project would not have seen completion.

Dedicated to my family

Abstract

Drawing on citizenship education, collective memory, and oral history literature, I describe the intergenerational exploration of lived memory in the curricular endeavor: "What is worth remembering about the past?" To demonstrate one form such consultation might take, an intergenerational group discussion was conducted with second-generation Japanese American immigrants, or *Nisei*, interned unconstitutionally by the United States government during World War II. Topics discussed included their lives before and during the internment, experiences talking about this event with non-Japanese Americans, and vision of education about the internment for future generations. The intended significance of this study is its: (1) rationalization of remembering the past as civic responsibility and thus curricular concern of citizenship education; (2) demonstration of applying intergenerational oral history methods in this exploration; (3) suggestion that empowering and encouraging students, educators, and their community to explore the past in this way may be a "grass roots" avenue worth exploring in light of criticism against history education and its role in promoting nationalist agenda; and (4) contribution to our understanding of Japanese American history.

Table of Contents

Introduction

History can carry on no successful competition with *news*, in the matter of sharp interest. When an eye-witness sets down in narrative form some extraordinary occurrence which he has witnessed, that is *news*—that is the news form, and its interest is absolutely indestructible; time can have no deteriorating effect upon that episode. (Twain, 1906)

How we understand and share the past influences our behavior as citizens. This project was inspired by ideas from a variety of academic areas, such as citizenship and history education, historiography, and Japanese American history. This chapter: (1) introduces collective memory, the framing concept of this paper; (2) presents remembering the past as a form of agency capable of counteracting, reinforcing, and pluralizing these narratives; and (3) suggests that this agency makes understanding, exploring, and sharing memory an important component of education for democratic citizenship.

The nature of collective memory

Contrary to conventional conceptions of memory as a collection of static facts stored, recalled, and forgotten, remembering the past is a process colored by socialization and language. Maurice Halbwachs (1992) argued that memory is a principally social process, explaining that our understanding of the past is continuously filtered, amplified, interpreted, and transformed through communication with others. According to Halbwachs, social context and relationships with others influence not only what is remembered, but how it is remembered. Memories, therefore, are constantly selected and reconstructed in the context of the current social climate.

Some consider the writing of history and the narration of memory to be fundamentally different. At an individual, psychoanalytic level, philosopher and theologian Michel de Certeau (1987) explained that our consciousness takes form through continuous interactions between memories forgotten intentionally and those (sometimes reluctantly) remembered. In contrast, history has, according to de Certeau, traditionally treated the past and present as discontinuous and fractured, divided into eras of discrete sequences of events and distinguishing past from present. Historian Susan Crane (1997) observed that scholars often differentiate between collective and historical memory in that the former is lived experience, while the latter is the preservation and objectification of that experience.

Many have even charged "history" with disrupting the natural operation of narration and memory. Crane (1997) argued that our preservationist culture has made it difficult to maintain any sense of historical consciousness outside that mediated to the masses by historians, obscuring the individual's role in collective remembering (p. 1375). Historian Yosef Yerushalmi (1982) wrote that collective memory keeps some memories alive while obscuring or discarding others through a natural process of selection which, he lamented, the historian "uninvited, disturbs and reverses" (p. 95). According to historian Pierre Nora (1989), "memory," in contrast to history, "is life … in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being long dormant and periodically revived" (p. 8). Nora believed we subconsciously perceive imposed historical revision as threatening to our lived memories, and in

desperation, consecrate these memories to more permanent objects in our environments, such as texts, monuments, and landmarks. These objects then become the only traces of our lost memory, signifying moments in which "memory has been torn" and rewritten by history (p. 7).

Democratizing collective memory

Memory has experienced renewed academic attention recently due to its relationship to political struggles. Edward W. Said (2000) described collective memory as "a field of activity," in which narratives of the past are "selected, reconstructed, maintained, modified, and endowed with political meaning" (p. 185). Indeed, collective memory has been appropriated by political efforts to manipulate, reinterpret, falsify, and legitimize representations of national pasts (Kammen, 1991), selectively revive or invent cultural traditions, obscure diverse national pasts (Frisch, 1989), and promote illusions of civic unity and historical continuity (Papadakis, 2008). "Who controls the present," wrote George Orwell (1949), "controls the past" (p. 35).

A largely political affair, the way our nation conceives its past then is a concern not only of historians, but educators as well. Hobsbawm (1983) explored in depth the notion of tradition as a political construction designed to establish continuity with a "suitable historic past," sometimes fictitious or distorted (p. 1). He identified three overlapping categories of invented tradition: (1) those promoting social cohesion in both real and artificial communities; (2) those legitimating or creating institutional relations of power; and (3) those inculcating particular belief systems, conventions, or values. He felt this potential for political appropriation of history and memory demands historians

consider the public ramifications of their work. By engaging in the "creation, dismantling, and restructuring of images of the past," they are engaging in political action—whether or not they are conscious of this dimension (p. 13).

In a similar fashion, the Popular Memory Group, a research team that explored the political implications of radical oral history projects in the early 1980s at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in Birmingham, England, described the importance of historical construction to political domination. According to this group:

> all political activity is intrinsically a process of historical argument and definition, that all political programmes involve some construction of the past as well as the future, and that these processes go on every day, often outrunning, especially in terms of period, the preoccupations of historians. Political domination involves historical definition. History—in particular popular memory—is a stake in the constant struggle for hegemony. The relation between history and politics, like the relation between past and present, is, therefore, an *internal* one: it is about the politics of history and the historical dimensions of politics. (Johnson & Dawson, 2006, p. 47)

In other words, oppression depends on the appropriation of the past just as the study of history cannot ignore this appropriation. It is perhaps the latter observation that is most relevant to the preparation of citizens. How then can a study of history, neglecting to consider its relationship to the "politics of history," adequately prepare students for democratic civic action?

The five findings of the symposium "Remembrance and citizenship: From places to projects," organized jointly by the Council of Europe and the European Cultural Center of Delphi in 1998, were documented by Jean-Fred Bourquin (2000). The first finding was that the diversification of communities is resulting in members turning increasingly to heritage, memory, and roots for points of reference from which to reconstruct community identities. This is an effort to contest traditional historical constructions, such as narrative rooted in nationalism, bounded by verifiable scientific fact, and promoting only the values and principles of dominant classes. The second finding was that this historical reconstruction run the risk of creating a "mirror image that is just as deformed, truncated, and falsified as official history" (p. 30). The third was that the conceptualization of heritage itself is moving from a field preoccupied with static, tangible, state-sanctified remnants of the past, to an active process guided by cultures, communities, and memory. The fourth was that inherent difficulties and contradictions exist in the promotion of equality on the one hand, and individual and community identities on the other. Finally, the fifth finding was that critical frameworks must prepare citizens to address social relationships with plural others and with the heritage, memory, and roots that influence individual and collective identities.

Perhaps, however, it is not only the geographic diversification of communities which is spawning this renewed interest in community identities, but also the imposition of some universalizing culture. Naoki Sakai (1996) also examined these deformed "mirror images," describing what he called a conspiratory relationship between the imposition of western culture, history, and ethics on one side, and the reactionary revival

of local cultural identities in Japan on the other. He noted that both phenomena appeared to exhibit the tendency to provoke distorted constructions of each other. Sakai argued not only that the imposition of a universal culture is a *prerequisite* to spawning the active construction of communal identities, but also that, due to this cause-and-effect process, these communal identities tend to form in systematic, dichotomizing opposition to the universal culture.

Whether the recent tendency to try and reconstruct communal identities is the result of increasing geographic diversification, the imposition of a universal culture, or some combination of the two, the potential for history education to play an active role facilitating this reconceptualization of familial, communal, and human heritage is worth noting. It is perhaps through the adoption of critical historical methods that history education may hope to empower students to reconstruct communal identities that are not simply mirror images of an already deformed national or global culture, but rather informed by what individualizes us, what binds us, and how the past is related to and continues to influence the shape of these identities.

Remembering the past as an act of citizenship

As the previous sections discussed, memory is an important concern of education for democratic citizenship, and it is clear that narration is both meaningful historical inquiry as well as an exercise of agency. Yet, most citizens are not involved in the creation of history textbooks, political speeches, commemorative placards, historical documentaries, and other representations of the past for the larger society. How are these

individuals to play a role in the maintenance of the intangible, politically-charged arena of collective memory and, by extension, communal identities?

According to sociologist Naomi R. White (1998), the "enslavement of a citizenry begins when its members are denied their memories and…an audience for these memories" (p. 181). Hamilton and Shopes (2008) reminded us that the interview is "but one form of memory-making" (p. xi), and narrating the past can be a powerful form of agency, as the relationship between socialization and memory is dialectic—as conceptions and knowledge of the past also influence how we behave and thus how the future unfolds (Goodin, 1996). It is my hope that this project will make the importance of this agency clear.

The importance of interviewing and testimony are particularly relevant when considering history's "linguistic turn," a methodological shift brought about by the consideration that language does not simply reflect historical context, but rather fully constitutes human conscious and historical events. In this reading, history itself can be no more usefully defined than as the sum of all historical narrative. Historian Kathleen Canning (1994) argued, however, that a material past can indeed exist, and that language only mediates this experience. According to Canning, it is through this process of mediation that agency is exercised. Africanist historian Heidi Gengenbach (2006) exemplified the application of Canning's argument, writing that elderly women she worked with saw her arrival in their village as an opportunity to "draw [her] into the skein of their remembering," and that they "were both enacting how they believed history

should be done and reenacting what they knew—and needed—to be true about the region's past" (Relations of Remembrance, para. 2).

Not only does the narration of history allow us to exercise agency, the memory guiding our testimony is, in fact, meaningful historical inquiry. For example, historian Ebigberi J. Alagoa (2001), in reflecting on his own work, called for academic historians to consider local historians as valuable sources and acknowledge "the basic rationality, diversity, and wisdom residing with the communities of study," which would require "a greater measure of humility among scholars than is normally evident in their patronizing eagerness to lay down universal laws" (p. 100). In a study of rural elderly women, Gengenbach (2006) defended her findings, writing that if the women "chose to treat me as a conduit for that lesson [in history], then perhaps instead of doubting their reliability as historians we should interrogate the historical meanings of that choice" (Relations of Remembrance, para. 2).

Gengenbach's careful words are particularly relevant to the ethical and methodological setting of this study, as they make explicit her respectful treatment of participants as wielders, rather than repositories of information about the past. Often, it seems that oral history projects, using even the most sophisticated methodological approaches and theories about how we understand the past, still neglect to make this distinction. For example, focusing on uncovering the meaning participants ascribe to experience or the impact of past events on identity transformation, while certainly valuable and meaningful research in many contexts, still may find as its assumption that the knowledge sought—the findings—are *within* the participant and must be revealed,

recorded, rendered. In other words, it is not just the transformation of identity or the meaning ascribed to experiences, the archival contribution of primary source materials or the insight of an individual's unique perspective on the past, but rather the intersubjective experience of communicating with the individuals themselves that were the anticipated "findings" of this study.

It is Gengenbach's (2006) interest in the "historical meaning of that choice" to share a past with others, along with Canning's (1994) observation that agency exists in the mediation of language that I consider important to this study, warranting the use of qualitative, humanistic methods of inquiry. Gengenbach based her methodological assumptions in the power of individuals to wield narratives of their own pasts, and Canning provided the theoretical credentials to do so by locating agency within the linguistic mediation of concrete experience—within the social construction and expression of memory.

This conceptualization of remembering as agency suggests that it is the right—perhaps even the responsibility—not only of historians, but all democratic citizens to actively share, listen, and interact with the past. By preparing students to fulfil the civic responsibility of remembering the past, citizens may be able to more democratically manage the shape of collective memories and identities. This can promote a considerably more complex relationship with the past and hopefully lay groundwork for citizens to better interpret and evaluate representations of history.

Assuming collective memory is a critical arena in any democratic struggle, I wish to learn what memories of the internment of Japanese Americans former internees

themselves consider critical to the future of our democracy: What memories of the internment do these former internees believe citizenship education should aim to inscribe on the collective memory of future generations? The memories are expected to take the form of stories, experiences, reflections, and potentially nonverbal ways of remembering. This study aims to illuminate the significant contributions intergenerational communication can make to citizenship education, and thus to the construction and maintenance of our collective memory.

This inquiry is, however, part of a larger research question that has influenced the structure of this paper to a greater degree: Assuming remembering the past, as a practice of constructing history, is indeed a critical component of citizenship education, *how* might remembering as described here be included in citizenship education curriculum? In other words, what does remembering the past actually look like as an educational activity? I hope to make apparent that while these contributions may, as knowledge often indistinguishable from the learning process itself, prove difficult to translate into "learning outcomes" or "curriculum standards," reformulating such learning specifications to focus on this process of historical exploration may be feasible. This thesis is intended to be a rough sketch of how this reformulation might look.

Literature review

This chapter reviews selected literature concerning four topics: (1) the relationship between history education and collective memory (2) citizenship education and remembering the past (3) the use of oral history in school classrooms (4) the World War II internment of Japanese Americans in history education curriculum. By examining works problematizing the role history education plays in collective memory, the need is raised for history education to consider seriously this casting. Selected citizenship education frameworks are then reviewed to suggest that learning to explore memory is not often an explicitly stated task for the education of democratic citizens. Next, works concerning the use of oral history, a common form of what might be described as remembering the past, in education are reviewed. Finally, as this project looks specifically at the World War II internment of Japanese Americans, works examining the treatment of this event by history education curriculum are examined.

The relationship between history education and collective memory

Schools are key political sites in which social change and new democratic identities are developed through learning (Giroux, 2003). Although history is "vital for all citizens in a democracy, because it provides the only avenue we have to reach an understanding of ourselves and of our society, in relation to the human condition over time" (The Bradley Commission on History in Schools, 1989, p. 21), history education in schools is rarely concerned with the complexity of the unique, yet interrelated ways individuals and groups remember the past. Loewen (1995) noted critically that textbooks are written with an "omniscient narrator's voice … insulating students from the raw

materials of history" (p. 16) and implying "a single historic truth exists, upon which historians have agreed and which they now teach and students now should memorize" (p. 249), while Said (2000) defined history education as a "nationalist effort premised on the need to construct a desirable loyalty" (p. 176). Complicating this situation further is the observation that young students often lack sufficient background knowledge and analytical capacity to contest dominant interpretations of history (Podeh, 2000). It is unsurprisingly then that this has allowed an often politically-motivated casting of history education in the transformation of national civic memories. Previously, it was suggested that history and politics are closely intertwined. This section reviews work about collective memory and history education in order to illuminate the powerful role history education curricula can have on the collective behavior and identity of a nation.

It is important to note that history education materials are often produced by historians, not educators. Yet, as Thornton (2001) pointed out, curricular concerns must be based on criteria beyond the boundaries of social science scholarship because "the mandate of the school curriculum extends beyond the more exclusively academic mission of higher education" (p. 75). In particular, Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstik (2004) argued that the inclusion of historical events in school curricula should be justified on the basis of their contributions to democratic citizenship, as there exist no neutral or objective approaches to history capable of guiding such a discussion.

Nonetheless, history education is an active institution in the political arena of memory worldwide (Thelen, 1989; Podeh, 2000). Wolfgang Jacobmeyer (1990) documented the use of education by nation-states in Europe for the past century to

construct a common heritage, patriotism, and justification for the actions of political institutions. Papadakis (2008) problematized the grand national narrative of historical continuity promoted by history education in Cyprus.

Cyprus was also the focus of Gregoriou (2004), who explored how nationalist anti-colonial discourse in post-independent Cyprus has been redeployed to foment controversy in Cyprus over representations of colonial history in textbooks. She critically examined the history of education in colonial Cyprus with the intent of exposing how educational ideas, such as the apparent superiority of Greek education, were employed by multiple colonial and anti-colonial actors for incongruous purposes. By exposing these contradictory messages, she sought, in particular, to reveal how Cyprus' "anxiety for the national self" (p. 244), while challenged by increasing global transmigration (p. 245), continues to exclude and oppress Turkish residents of Cyprus and to obstruct the true development of an appreciation for "our historical ethnic diversity and ethnic divides" (p. 245).

Regarding historical narratives in Russia, Wertsch (2002) drew upon psychologist Bartlett's (1932) work investigating story-like schemata structuring memory and narration to describe *schematic narrative templates*, or discursive structures enforcing particular narrative patterns. Schematic narrative templates are not stories from the past, but rather formats stories about the past might take. Wertsch (2007) applied this notion to show that such templates were used to revive and promulgate ancient collective memories to mobilize the Soviet Union during the Great Patriotic War. He observed that evidence of schematic narrative templates shaping our daily communication is not readily

available, and we often fail to recognize "their power to mold how we think or speak about the past" (p. 30). "The task," according to Wertsch, "is to unearth them by examination of various forms of indirect evidence" (p. 33). Wertsch (2008) applied this work in schematic narrative templates to the relationship between memory and trends in national education.

The above works make clear the complex task of unearthing the discursive operations of "historical politics," but treat the task of "repairing" curricular materials somewhat cursorily. Once the kinds of obscured schematic narrative templates, discursive apparatus of political institutions, or subtly incongruous or conflicting narratives discussed in this section have been revealed and described, how are educational materials to be altered in response? The societal corpus of history education materials, moreover, greatly outnumber those produced for classroom use, and include everything from commemorative placards and documentaries to political speeches and movies. How are aspiring citizens to be prepared to interact critically with these representations of history? Certainly the sophisticated methods applied to curricular materials in the above documents are impressive, but these analytical modes are not typically accessible to students. They also tend to choose as their object of analysis some tangible material to be critiqued, such as a textbook or official story. What if addressing this discursive manipulation of collective memories to serve political purposes lies not only in the critique of *curricular documents*, but also in questioning the *role of the curricular document* in the exploration of the past? Inspired by these works, this project attempts to

promote the act of collaboratively remembering the past to the same rank assigned to the reliance on tangible curricular programs or materials.

Citizenship education and remembering the past

Education for democratic citizenship is concerned with aspects of schooling involved in the preparation of students for citizenship in a democracy. Summarizing in question form what is perhaps a fundamental dilemma in a democracy, Parker (1996) asked, "how can we live together justly, in ways that are mutually satisfying, and that leave our differences, both individual and group, intact and our multiple identities recognized?" (Citizenship Education, para. 6). Accommodating, protecting, respecting, legitimizing, and inspiring the allegiance of multiple ethnic, cultural, and lingual identities of constituents is critical not only as an ethical democratic mandate, but because pluralism serves as a "conscience for the nation-state" (Banks, 2001, p. 7). This section reviews selected works in citizenship education and argues that remembering the past is often a neglected consideration in these works.

Freire's (2000) vision of citizenship education focused on structural critique. He described the potential of dialogue for the oppressed to liberate not only themselves but also their oppressors, as "it is only the oppressed who, by freeing themselves, can free their oppressors" (p. 56). According to Freire, oppressors create structures to impede dialogue, the absence of which divides and conquers the oppressed. However, through unity, organization, cultural synthesis, and emancipating collaboration facilitated by dialogue, the oppressed can counter and neutralize these apparatus.

Parker (1996) described three categories of citizenship education: (1) *traditional*, focusing on the attainment of values, knowledge, and skills necessary for successful citizenship; (2) *progressive*, adding to this participation in and deliberation on civic matters concerning people of diverse identities; and (3) *advanced*, promoting education addressing the parallel, dynamic tension between unity and diversity. Parker advocated this last form, suggesting a more holistic form of advanced citizenship education would focus on tensions between: spectatorship of and involvement in the public sphere, the conceptualization of democracy as an attainable (or already attained) goal and democracy as an ongoing process to be undertaken collaboratively, and cultural pluralism and cultural assimilation.

Parker, Ninomiya, and Cogan (1999) advocated deliberative curriculum-making involving groups representing diverse "political views, religion, language, gender, race, ethnicity, social status, income, and power".

Cogan and Derricott (2000) organized a multinational Delphi study of education policy makers in order to determine the desirable characteristics of 21st century citizens. Based on these results, they proposed a model of citizenship comprised of four dimensions: (1) *personal*, or the ethics and responsibilities of individuals; (2) *social*, referring to the capacity for citizens to collaborate with each other; (3) *spatial*, suggesting the need for citizens to conceptualize themselves as members of local, regional, national, and multinational communities; and (4) *temporal*, characterized by citizens capable of past, present, and future perspectives.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) conducted a two-year study of ten education programs designed to advance conceptions of democratic citizenship. The combined the results of this study with analyses of democratic theory to suggest three principle conceptions of citizenship: (1) *personally responsible*; (2) *participatory*; and (3) *justice oriented*. They illustrated these conceptions with the following example:

> If participatory citizens are organizing the food drive and personally responsible
> citizens are donating food, justice oriented citizens are asking why people are
> hungry and acting on what they discover. (p. 242)

Education for this last conception, justice oriented citizenship, may involve learning about strategies and outcomes of democratic social movements, critical assessment of societal structures (p. 240), and effective methods of communication in controversial political arenas (p. 243). However, they cautioned the interpretation of these three visions as cumulative, noting that justice oriented citizenship education does not necessarily promote personally responsible or participatory citizenship (p. 241).

I would consider my project an exercise in justice-oriented citizenship. Perhaps the above example could be adapted to suggest that if personally responsible citizens are remembering the past, participatory citizens are helping others remember, and justice-oriented citizens are asking what it is we as a society should remember, seeking out that information, and connecting it with the current world.

McLaughlin (1992) plotted interpretations of citizenship and citizenship education on a continuous linear scale from *minimal* to *maximal*. Forms of minimal citizenship education are concerned primarily with students learning about civic processes and

developing basic social morality absent discussion of societal problems, especially those related to inequalities among citizens. Maximal citizenship education, on the other hand, involves not only learning about the processes of democratic society (especially through a liberal, politically-oriented education), but also understanding, critically reflecting upon, questioning, and participating in civic activity. Although McLaughlin advocated maximal interpretations, he warned that these forms do risk overlooking debates—or presuming consensus—on a set of shared civic values (Citizenship and the Educational Demands of Diversity, para. 4).

Smith (2003) piloted an inquiry-based citizenship education model requiring students to investigate controversial, yet practical, issues in four core civic areas: (1) diversity and inclusion; (2) equality and justice; (3) human rights and social responsibility; and (4) democracy and active participation. *Knowledge* acquired through this framework is often interdisciplinary in nature, accorded value based on its relevance to the inquiry, and difficult to measure through traditional forms of learning assessment (pp. 26–27).

Political theorist Bhikhu C. Parekh (2002) focused on the importance of *belonging* in discussing citizenship, citing its importance to a stable multicultural society. "Citizenship is about status and rights," wrote Parkeh, "belonging is about being accepted and feeling welcome" (p. 342). Belonging is a component of the *dialogically constituted society*. According to Parkeh, such a society is, for the purposes of its own continued existence and integrity, fundamentally committed to dialogue, deliberation, and privileging no particular cultural perspective. The common good in such a society is

generated "not by transcending cultural and other particularities" to reach some uniform consensus, as this carries with it the threat of a diminished feeling of belonging, but rather through the "interplay [of these particularities] in the cut and thrust of a dialogue" (p. 341). In other words, the only thing holding the society together is dialogue itself.

Interestingly, Buddhist studies scholar Minoru Kiyota (1997), in his personal narrative of growing up Nisei (second-generation Japanese Americans) in the United States, also touched upon the issue of belonging in explaining why so few Issei (first generation Japanese Americans), applied for naturalization when they were finally permitted to in the 1950s. Kiyota commented that while individuals must strive for a sense of belonging to society, if this struggle is not "accepted by the surrounding social milieu, that effort is futile". When the Issei were younger, wrote Kiyota, "such a receptive environment simply did not exist in the United States" (p. 245).

Kymlicka (2003) examined tensions between ideals of what he called the *intercultural citizen* and the *multicultural state,* the former of personal development through intercultural exploration and the latter of social justice and peaceful plurality in diverse societies. He discussed three reasons these two ideals may conflict. The first is that intercultural citizens, responding to implicit aspirations of self-enrichment, may prefer to learn about cultures and languages "more distant or more powerful" than those represented in the diverse communities around them (p. 159). The second is that some groups, often religious or conservative, reject the notion that intercultural education leads to positive personal development, yet understand the necessity of the peaceful multicultural state. The third is that intercultural education for personal development

often promotes excessive exploration of deep cultural differences, neglecting to acknowledge the importance of understanding the "limits of mutual understanding" and accepting the "partial opaqueness of our differences," which, according to Kymlicka is a prerequisite for justice in the multicultural society (p. 166). Kymlicka concluded by suggesting that while intercultural education is important, it should not undermine the primary responsibility of the multicultural state to facilitate a just society.

DeJaeghere (2006) described *critical citizenship education*, which aims to prepare citizenry to address societal injustice through collaborative social change. The empowerment of students through particular forms of knowledge and participation are cornerstones of this framework, which includes critical social analysis, public engagement, and self-reflection on one's own casting and agency in relation to unjust societal structures (DeJaeghere & Tudball, 2007). She argued that four curricular approaches are necessary for critical citizenship education: (1) the exploration of marginalized knowledge to construct alternative conceptions of citizenship, relating these conceptions critically to prevailing narratives about democracy; (2) the application of these constructions by learning to view our and others' identities in the context of social relationships, power, privilege, and discrimination; (3) the facilitation of intercultural learning experiences to prepare students for social justice and engagement in diverse communities; and (4) the strategic collaboration to enact social change (DeJaeghere, 2009).

Banks (2008) drew on Clarke's (1996) notion of *deep citizenship* to propose four categories of increasingly deeper types of citizens: (1) *legal citizens* meet basic

obligations as legal residents, but are not politically active; (2) *minimal citizens* are legal citizens who vote; (3) *active citizens* not only vote, but work within existing social and political structures to support their views on political issues; and (4) *transformative citizens* aim to "actualize values and moral principles and ideals beyond those of existing laws and conventions" to promote social justice (pp. 136–137). Banks advocated this deepest level, driven by the active realization of ethical principles unconstrained by existing political structures and traditions. "The total school, including the knowledge conveyed in the curriculum," wrote Banks, "needs to be reformed to implement transformative citizenship education" (p. 137).

Osler (2008) stressed the importance of a citizenship education curriculum shaped by research in critical multiculturalism, critical pedagogy, and human rights education. She advocated education for cosmopolitan citizenship, which recognizes our global world as interconnected, accounts for multiple and changing identities and allegiances, prepares citizens ready to "engage constructively with difference" at multiple levels of organization (local, national, global) (p. 22), while acknowledging our shared rights as humans. Osler argued that we must reconceptualize as cosmopolitan not only the nation, but the local community as well.

The visions and recommendations for citizenship education described above emphasize the need to move beyond the conceptualization of citizenship as a set of skills or conventions to be acquired through education. Rather, it is argued that preparing students for active participation in society to enact change driven by the need for justice, peace, and other desirable democratic principles.

This paper suggests that many of the future-oriented, change-driven citizenship activities advocated above, such as collaboration, participation, actualization of moral principles, resistance, dialog, reconceptualization, and social engagement cannot be effectively undertaken without an intimate and nuanced relationship with the past. For example, without a wealth of diverse perspectives and memories of events witnessed, it would be difficult to imagine citizens of Parekh's (2002) "dialogically constituted society" engaged in meaningful deliberation. By considering the importance of exploring the past in a democratic way by "learning to remember" when preparing students for civic action, this project aims to play a role in fostering informed active participation in democratic society.

Oral history in classrooms

Crocco (1989) advocated the assignment of oral history projects in secondary school classrooms. She described numerous benefits of using this mode of historical inquiry in the classroom, including its ability to alleviate textbook authors' superficial modifications in response to demands for more inclusive curricula (para. 3), liven dry and depersonalized social history preoccupied with social groups and heroic individuals (para. 4), promote critical thinking, balance the "panoramic version of history [obscuring the complexity of our social past] contained in their textbooks" (para. 6), and accommodate culturally diverse classrooms. Crocco suggested that oral history is not only useful in history but can be implemented in English, math, language arts, and science.

Encouraging students to comment on their transcripts can also promote synthesis with other historical learning. Crocco (1989) explained that interviews with just a few individuals have the potential to illuminate "countervailing forces of any period," often forcing students to confront the question of why their informants may not have had the same experiences as the actors in their texts (Oral History Modifies and Enriches Our Understanding, para. 5). According to Crocco (1989), students should focus on topics of discussion rather than specific questions, keep verbal prompts during the interview brief and open-ended, listen carefully, avoid interrupting the interviewer, and follow up on points of interest as they arise in conversation (Oral History Modifies and Enriches Our Understanding, para. 7). She pointed out that oral history projects need not become fixated on complex methodological issues as, in the words of historian Linda Shopes (1980), "each interviewer develops something of her/his own style" (p. 3).

Crocco's (1989) research is informative, easy-to-understand, and essential to any teacher of history. However, the complex methodological issues she considered unimportant to the implementation of oral history projects in secondary classrooms may in fact be critical on a policy level to the promotion of oral history from a supplementary classroom activity to a historiographically rigorous component of any history curriculum.

In subsequent chapters, this project devotes considerably attention to oral history and narrative theory and methods to argue that the intergenerational sharing of the past as an educational activity is an exploration of the past not altogether divorced from current thinking in historical methods. By viewing the practice of oral history in classrooms from not only a pedagogic, but also a historiographic perspective, this project aims to target not

only educators, but also academic historians who play such an important role in prescribing history education curriculum.

Internment in history education

School history textbooks often neglect the historic roles of minority groups, including Asian Americans (Davis Jr., Ponder, Burlbaw, Garza-Lubeck, & Moss, 1986). Although we cannot always assume textbooks and other curricular material reflect what actually goes on in the classroom (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991), this section reviews studies that have sought, primarily through document review, to analyze the role the World War II internment of Japanese Americans has played in history classrooms.

Numerous lesson plans have been designed to teach public school children about the internment. For example, Joanne A. Hanson (1996) explored the potential of using children's literature to teach about the internment in elementary schools. Researchers at San Francisco State University (2001), funded by a grant from the California Civil Liberties Public Education Program, also compiled and published 25 lesson plans about the internment online. Most are concerned primarily with fostering a sense of empathy for interned Japanese Americans (JAs), promoting a deeper understanding of racism, or using the internment as a case study to teach basic historiography.

In a review of five United States history texts published between 1988 and 1992, Michael H. Romanowski (1995) found that most did not: (1) provide a complete description of the camps; (2) adequately address the issue of property loss; (3) present alternative motives for the internment; (4) question government action; (5) discuss the redress movement; or (6) situate the event in the context of democratic citizenship.

Romanowski also visited six rural midwestern high school classes to find that all teachers felt the treatment of the internment was inadequate. All six teachers prepared additional activities encouraging critical discussion about the exercise of state and military power.

In another textbook study, Masato Ogawa (2004) found that most of the six textbooks adopted by Idaho schools in 2002 failed to: (1) include adequate information about Japanese American history prior to the internment; (2) present motives for the internment aside from fear and national security; (3) explore why there was no internment camp in Hawaii; (4) discuss the absence of internment camps for Italian or German Americans; (5) provide detailed descriptions about camp conditions through photographs and narratives; (6) present the significance of the 1943 Loyalty Review Program; (7) remind the reader that more Japanese Americans became victims of violent hate crimes after the war than before; and (8) connect the internment to the issue of democratic citizenship (p. 7). While Ogawa does not explain why these particular criteria were selected or emerged from the analysis, his observation that the internment was not sufficiently contextualized within Japanese American history prior to World War II is particularly interesting and suggests avenues of exploration for the narrative inquiry in this study. Without adequate understanding of the events and national sentiment leading up to the internment, the prevention of future civil abuse of this kind may become more difficult.

Violet H. Harada (2001) also analyzed the nine most widely used U.S. history textbooks by the state of Hawaii in 1995. She found the internment received more coverage than any other Asian-American historical event (p. 12), but found little

discussion about the redress legislation passed in the late 1980s (p. 17). She noticed also that these textbook accounts generally left the reader with the impression that Japanese Americans themselves accepted the internment, omitting a history of petitions, strikes, and revolts organized by camp protestors (p. 17). (See Okada (1977) and Hironaka (2009), discussed elsewhere in this paper, for more about resistance and violence during and after the internment years.)

Certainly historical accounts, like memories, change as time passes. Historians Laura Hein and Mark Selden (2000) noted that early postwar texts presented the internment as a "military necessity conducted without bloodshed," while many published at the height of the redress movement in the 1970s and 1980s described the internment more negatively as "tragic," "a grave injustice," "shameful," "disgraceful," and attributable to "war hysteria" (p. 36).

While it is clear from these studies that textbooks should better connect the internment to overarching goals of education for democratic citizenship, encourage critique of the role the government played in the internment, and situate the internment in the context of Japanese American history prior to World War II, more analysis of curricular materials is needed in this area to understand the role the internment actually plays in U.S. history classes. In particular, Romanowski's observation that what is contained in textbooks may often fall short of what actually occurs in the classroom suggests further investigation is needed.

Furthermore, these studies, while concluding the necessity of more critical discussion concerning resistance to the internment, analyzing motives for this mass

incarceration, and contextualizing studies in terms of democratic citizenship, do seem to overlook the multitude of ways we remember the event. For example, it is telling that John Okada's *No-no Boy*, about a young Japanese American man coping with the ostracizing consequences of his refusal to be drafted out of the internment camps to fight in World War II, was virtually ignored by the Japanese American community when published in 1957, yet accepted today as one of the most influential pieces of literature about the internment.

History education about the internment it seems would benefit greatly from academic work designed to pluralize the way students learn about this event. For example, Mukai (2000) recommended that education about the internment contain six components: (1) presentation of the internment as a violation of human rights; (2) information about Japanese American immigration; (3) portrayal of Japanese Americans in the media during this period; (4) discussion the loyalty questionnaire administered to internees; (5) story of the redress movement in the 1980s; and (6) diverse perspectives on the internment. While he does not explicitly list oral history as an example of the 6th component, explorations of literature, art, and documentary are recommended, suggesting that oral history and remembering the past would fit within the spirit of this important category. This paper aims to suggest accessible methods for students to explore multiple narratives of the past and the internment, as well as produce additional information about how formerly interned JAs remember the internment.

In this chapter, research in four areas was reviewed: (1) the relationship between history education and collective memory (2) citizenship education and remembering the past (3) the use of oral history in school classrooms, and (4) the World War II internment of Japanese Americans in history education curriculum. These areas were selected because the central argument of this project, that remembering the past through intergenerational communication can make a powerful addition to citizenship education curriculum, can hopefully contribute to research in all of these areas. Oral history projects may be a simple solution for some of the concerns raised in research critical of the role history education plays in influencing collective memory by providing students with the opportunity to pluralize their perspectives on the past and engage in remembering with those possessing lived memory of events fundamentally different in nature from the state narratives promoted in citizenship education curriculum. Remembering the past as a social activity, furthermore, is important to realizing many of the tasks asked of citizenship education in the research reviewed in this chapter. While oral history in classrooms is not a new idea, reinforcing and legitimizing these educational activities as important historical inquiry with research on memory and historical methods may be a necessary pursuit should this activity find acceptance in citizenship education literature. Finally, the state of education the World War II internment of Japanese Americans, the case raised in this project, was reviewed to confirm not only that this is an often inadequately addressed area in history education curriculum, but also that the recommendations of many of these analyses overlook the importance of exploring the multitude of ways we can remember this event.

Methodology

This section presents the methodological considerations made in planning the activity presented in the following chapter. Although the term methodology typically refers to a canon of methods or tools used in the course of a study to ensure the validity of what knowledge the study has uncovered, this chapter presents methodology as a set of educational and social science theories combined to plan and embark upon a learning process to meet the theoretical standards of those disciplines. In a sense, it is the design and use of the instrument I wish to highlight (the process of shared intergenerational remembering as an act of citizenship), rather than the actual "readings" (discoveries about internment history) the instrument records. In other words, because the methodological instrument is itself a process (of learning), I feel the most important result of this study is the chronology of actually embarking on this process.

The results in the following chapter may thus be viewed in two ways. The first is that the results of this study are the additional knowledge of the internment obtained by the author. The second, and hopefully of greater significance, is that the result is the entire educational process the author went through to learn what he did about the internment. It is the second viewing I hope will prove most useful to those concerned with the improvement not only of education about the internment, but of history education aware of its position within the multiple contexts described in the previous chapter.

The process of curriculum

William H. Schubert (1982) suggested we return to the "curricular questions of antiquity: What is worth knowing, and why? How can it be pursued?" (p. 224). Certainly, this study seeks to contribute to the dialogue regarding what is worth knowing about the World War II internment of Japanese Americans, why, and how this information is obtained, but my interest is specifically in sketching an inclusive political through which understanding of this past is sought continuously and democratically.

Pinar (2004) treated curriculum not as a collection of textbooks, policies, and standardized tests, but as a "multifaceted process" involving "complicated conversation" (p. 19). I seek not to produce a tangible curricular product, but rather a narration of my pursuit to involve formerly interned Japanese Americans in the deliberation over what I should remember about the internment. I wish, in the words of Roger I. Simon (1980), to "subvert the institutionalization of curriculum" (p. 108) by concerning myself with not only the classroom but the larger cultural, political, and historical phenomenon of learning. It should be clear that curricular decisions must involve careful deliberation and diverse perspectives (Parker, Ninomiya, & Cogan, 1999), but we must also remember that this inquiry is itself ongoing and ultimately the essence of curriculum—an essence I believe informed William F. Pinar and Madeline R. Grumet 's (1976) interest in "currere," the verb form of curriculum.

This project therefore treated curriculum as the process of planning and undertaking the learning experience, rather than a tangible plan itself or set of goals to guide the construction of such a plan. Although this concept runs a recursive risk by, for example, raising concern over the process of facilitating the process of learning, I

remained content in this project with the conception of curriculum as facilitating the learning process, not necessarily in determining what is to be learned. It is important to keep in mind that such curriculum at the classroom level necessarily implicates the formulation of learning objectives at the administrative level and *vice versa*, suggesting a complex relationship between the two. Nonetheless, if remembering the past through intergenerational communication is to remain a *social* activity, it may prove critical that such treatment of curriculum as process be made explicit.

Unique relationships, encounters, and testimony

Narrative has been considered of a contextual, ephemeral, and even performative nature. Social anthropologist Elizabeth Tonkin (1992) described oral narratives as "social activities in real time" (p. 52). Literary scholar Alessandro Portelli (1991) reminded us that no two oral testimonies can ever be the same due to the transient nature of discourse (p. 55). Historian Heidi Gengenbach (2006) explained how narrative constructs experience "to make it available for particular audiences, at particular places and times" (Rural Women in Southern Mozambique, para. 4). Historian Justin Willis (1996) argued that variations in an interviewee's testimony may have as much to do with others in the room as with the interviewer. Historian Barbara Cooper (2005) treated oral narrative as fundamentally poetic, public, and performative (p. 202).

Yet historiography has been considered subject to similar constraints. Philosopher and literary critic Mikhail M. Bakhtin (1981) argued that writing—like narrative—is social and dialogic in that all statements are made among multiple persons in specific socio-historic contexts. Social anthropologist Karin Barber and historian Paulo Fernando

de Moraes Farias (1989) described texts as "indivisibly interrelated with other forms of symbolic processes" as a form of social action and cultural production (p. 13). Author Margaret Atwood (1998) stated in a lecture that even when writing historical fiction, the writer simply "can't help but be modern" (p. 1504), suggesting the impossibility of any writer escaping his or her social milieu.

Written and oral sources indeed share much in common, suggesting these processes of producing knowledge about the past are not as inherently distinct or competing as suggested above. Susan A. Crane (1997) argued that historical memory is but one form of collective memory and proposed a new mode of history production in which autobiography and history are not fundamentally distinct genres because as narrative beings, the work of historians is inevitably autobiographical. She suggested the practice of history be redefined as the "active participation in remembering and forgetting within collective memory by each member," suggesting the historical archive be used not for preservation, but "infinite selection" (p. 1385). Curriculum historian Kenneth Charlton (1977) reminded us in his analysis of the benefits of history to curriculum study, that despite skepticism toward the use of historical models, "at the very least, [the historian] uses a narrative model … not merely to exhibit his data but also to better offer an explanation of it" (p. 80). South African novelist and English Professor André Brink (1998) explained that what we know about past events is through language which, through the process of textualization, has been narrativized. "Representations of history repeat," Brink wrote, "in almost every detail, the processes of fiction" (p. 32).

An exploration of the past concerned not with exactly what happened, but rather with the various ways we understand the past and why, may further suggest the value of narrative. Portelli (1991) noted that while oral sources are not necessarily reliable in the traditional sense, this lack of reliability is itself meaningful because "errors, inventions, and myths lead us through and beyond facts to their meaning" (p. 2). Indeed, nothing can be discussed seriously in an oral history interview that has not been remembered, and there is a value in the "haphazard chronical narrative" because the interviewee is "volunteering what's foremost in his recollections" (Morrissey, 1970, p. 108). Historian Luise White (1990) wrote that arguing with an informant can be valuable as it illuminates what they care about enough to defend (pp. 20–8), that people's narratives should naturally be expected to change from time to time and from interview to interview (p. 291), and that perhaps the work of the oral historian is to sift through the possible audiences for which the narrative was intended (p. 293). Kathryn Anderson and Dana C. Jack (1991) wrote that interviewing women allows us to ask for clarification (p. 17) and "go behind conventional, expected answers to the woman's personal construction of her own experience" (p. 23). "Memory," wrote historian Paul E. Lovejoy (2006), may be "distorted for reasons worth considering". Cultural anthropologist Johannes Fabian (1995) responded to criticism of what some felt was the arbitrary interpretation of ethnographic data by explaining that such ethnographies must, at the very least, "be recognized as understanding" (p. 41). Medical anthropologist Didier Fassin (2007) suggested historians "accept the consequences of interpretations inherent to any

undertaking that aims to account for what men and women do and think," and recognize as fully as possible one's preconceived ideas (p. 124).

And yet this preoccupation with interpretation and meaning may in some ways have encouraged a renewed interest in the existence of some concrete material past, albeit one no longer wholly accessible. It is within this inaccessible space that some literary scholars have identified the potential for imagination. In a review of his own books, Brink (1998) noticed that his early works appeared concerned with a material reality and its reconstruction, his later writing textuality and different constructions of reality, and his most recent novel a partial return to the belief that "something [material] may in fact have happened," but we will never be sure of exactly what. He suggested that imagination may be our only hope in coping with inaccessible pasts. "Myth," he wrote, "may well be the only guarantee for the survival of history" (p. 42). Margaret Atwood (1998) also used imagination to write around established historical facts in *Alias Grace*, a historical novel about the conviction of Canadian Grace Marks for the 1843 murder of her employer and his housekeeper, explaining that "since there were a lot of gaps [in historical accounts of Marks], there is a lot of invention" (p. 1515).

But what happens when even invention is unnecessary? In 1956, John Okada, author of *No-no Boy*, wrote in a letter that the story of the Issei "has never been told in fiction and only in fiction can the hopes and fears and joys and sorrows of people be adequately recorded" (Okada, 1977, pp. 256–257). Decades later, author Tim O'Brien (1999) suggested that fiction may be for "for getting at the truth when the truth isn't sufficient for the truth".

However, in considering the potential of imagination and myth, it is perhaps important that we remember what de Certeau (1988) referred to as the "historiographic operation," in which episodes of sometimes false and dangerous imagination crystallizes in the historical archive over time, obscuring oppressive origins. In his study of how postapartheid South Africa might reconceptualize its past, Premesh Lalu (2008) examined the colonial archive because he felt dismissing these records as too biased for historical inquiry undermines the potential to reveal a "grammar of domination," or the ways in which the archive subjugated agency by preserving only what could be written or said, rather than what was actually said (p. 38). According to Lalu, understanding this grammar of domination can allow us to recover the silenced voices of the colonized subaltern.

Including the narratives and memories of the elderly in curricular discussions about the experiences they themselves have lived is thus not altogether theoretically or historiographically unsound. Not only has the exclusive and oppositional relationship between history and memory, literacy and narrative, been questioned by scholars, but a concern with lived memory and agency in language may actually lead to enriched understandings of the past inaccessible to traditional methods of historical inquiry.

Non-narrative ways of remembering

While most of this paper describes remembering the past in primarily narrative terms, it is important to remember that language is but one expression of memory. In Gengenbach's (2006) words, "narrative … could never articulate or substitute for memory on its own" (Rural Women in Southern Mozambique, para. 6). For example, she

considered the ways the elderly rural women she worked with remembered the past through scars on their bodies, boundaries dividing fields, and pottery. Medical anthropologist and historian Didier Fassin (2007) also described the way the AIDS epidemic in South Africa has been remembered and observed that landscapes "contain hidden histories that cannot be gotten rid of by applying a politics of forgetting" (p. 180). Anderson and Jack (1991) also found discrepancies between their memories and their recordings, because "the meaning we remember hearing had been expressed through intense vocal quality and body language, not through words alone" (p. 12).

Historian Ebigberi J. Alagoa (2001) advised respecting people's right to silence and suggested that the decision to remain silent can be meaningful in and of itself (p. 101). In particular, silence is an important consideration in dealing with complex or traumatic memories. For example, anthropologist Naomi R. White (1998) wrote that in the case of Holocaust survivor testimony, "[language] can … violate the meaning of this experience, subverting and distorting what it is being used to represent" (p. 174). In remembering the internment, it is critical that I strive to be vigilant of situations in which words become inadequate or inappropriate representatives of memory.

Conflicting interests

Narrative researchers should consider their motivations for the interview and how they conflict with those of the participant in order to find a balance not only before (Kikumura, 1986; Gluck, 1991), but during the interview (Anderson & Jack, 1991). Even what transpires after the meeting is important. If participants are "able to negotiate the terrain" of the conversation and exercise some degree of control, this ability usually ends

after the interview (Gluck & Patai, 1991). The interviewer, meanwhile, returns to her

scholarly endeavors, "having transformed women's words into various written forms, but

having also walked away—usually for good—from the situation that led her to her

subject in the first place" (pp. 2–3).

On the other hand, a *lack* of conflicting interests and motivations may also pose

problems. For example, Gluck (1991) found that the trust and shared political

commitments her Palestinian participants had in her as a fellow activist—an identity she

shared in the "volatile context of the *intifada*" to successfully build trust—often drew her

interviews away from the life histories on which her research was focused (pp. 216–217).

The very goal of my study is to encourage the continuous involvement of the

elderly in the curricular process. In line with my belief in the critical need for increased

intergenerational discourse, I hope that this study will allow me to foster educative and

friendly relationships with my participants that will continue after its completion.

Importance of involving seniors in history education

Decisions about what to teach are typically relegated to teachers, curriculum

developers, textbook authors, historians, and others often removed personally from the

event itself. Even in calls for deliberative curriculum-making involving groups

representing diverse political views, religion, language, gender, race, ethnicity, social

status, income, and power (Parker, Ninomiya, & Cogan, 1999), groups delineated by their

historical experiences are not often explicitly considered.

The irony, furthermore, of studying the past without involving the elderly among

us who have actually lived and reflected upon this past is striking. Certainly, ignoring

generational diversity in our inclusive efforts may also impact our national understanding of the past.

Consider, for example, Jan Assmann and John Czaplicka 's (1995) observation that once those possessing lived memories of an event have passed away, the collective memory of that event is fundamentally altered. Perhaps this is the point at which memory must become story For example, O'Brien's (1990) description of stories in "The Things They Carried" also suggests a certain transformation that must occur when memory is lost:

> Forty-three years old, and the [Vietnam] war occurred half a lifetime ago, and yet the remembering makes it now. And sometimes remembering will lead to a story, which makes it forever. That's what stories are for. Stories are for joining the past to the future. Stories are for those late hours in the night when you can't remember how you got from where you were to where you are. Stories are for eternity, when memory is erased, when there is nothing to remember except the story. (p. 40)

Perhaps we cannot but live in the moment. There is a quality to memory making it capable of evading artificial replication, and no amount of recording, transcriptions, videos, or memoirs can replace the time we have with witnesses of history. Involving seniors in the educational process therefore is not for the purposes of mining their reminiscences for additional archival data or material for an examination, but rather to enrich our education with the *irreproducible learning experience* of communicating with

a witness of history—an experience possible only for an increasingly limited period of time.

Some seniors may even possess qualities valuable specifically to the process of historical inquiry. According to Halbwachs (1992), the elderly are "tired of action and hence turn away from the present," allowing them time to reflect on, explore, and sharpen their memory of the past (p. 47). Margaret Mead (1974) suggested similarly that the reason humans live so long is to ensure, though the intergenerational transmission of memory, that groups benefit from the vast experience of the elderly. Gerontologist and psychiatrist Robert N. Butler (1963) observed that when people grow older, they begin to review their life histories and may become sources of great wisdom.

For decades, many teachers have sought to encourage respect for lived memory through oral history projects. Imposed academic objectives, administrative policies, and limited time have often led to such activities supplementing the textbook or demonstrating historiographic research skills rather than encouraging students to deliberate the present significance of learned pasts. Rarely have schools enacted policies to ensure those who have actually lived the past help guide our study of it.

Economic motivation to strengthen this relationship may even exist, as involving the elderly not only in history courses as supplementary primary sources, but in policy decisions designed to strengthen communal bonds may actually carry fiscal benefits. For example, while exploring the "gray peril" hypothesis, suggesting that regions with large concentrations of elderly retirees experience reduced educational funding due to self-interested seniors (Rosenbaum & Button, 1989), political scientists Michael B. Berkman

and Eric Plutzer (2004) found that "an emotional bond between residents and their community's institutions" may challenge and even override this self-interest (p. 1190).

Finally, we must not overlook the value of basic human reverence. According to Michael Fullan (2007), "tapping into people's dignity and sense of respect" is one of the ten elements of successful change in education systems (p. 44). Treating the elderly and the lives they have lived with respect may not always seem of immediate benefit in present worlds we perceive so alienated from those of previous generations, but is nonetheless a practice I believe critical to the process of education in a democratic society.

Ethical considerations

Ethnographer and political scientist Allaine Cerwonka (2007) advised the treatment of ethics not as a code of conduct but rather a process fraught with tension (p. 4). In this sense, adhering to a static list of ethical mandates in the planning stages of a project does not necessarily result in ethical inquiry. Ethics in Cerwonka's reading are far more complex, dynamic, and contextual than is typically understood in much research.

While I have sought to construct the very foundation upon which this project rests in ethical terms by, for example, departing from the objectification of participants, valuing lived experience over observed behavior, and choosing a topic related to issues of social justice, whether this pursuit is truly ethical can only be answered through careful attention, self-reflection, and vigilance throughout the act of research, rather than adherence solely to predetermined principles. Even then, if indeed racism is grounded in our very consciousness (Bell, 1993) and if oppression is inscribed in the very selection of

narrative structures at our disposal, gathering momentum through communication (Foucault, 1972), how are we to chart an ethical course of action in research? While exploration of these questions is beyond the scope of this document, I wish to make clear my understanding that ethics, like power, are dynamic, situational, and ubiquitous.

In research, there is often a perceived trade-off between the degree of ethical treatment afforded subjects and value of knowledge potentially acquired. For example, according to chapter 3 of the Institutional Review Board Guidebook, "risks to research subjects posed by participation in research should be justified by the anticipated benefits to the subjects or society" (Penslar, 1993). Although the importance of this principle should not be underestimated, and I often recognize the wisdom of its application to the political decisions of human organizations, what is perhaps less discussed in research is the relationship between ethics, methodology, and the knowledge produced or constructed.

The self may be among the more undervalued methodological considerations. Radio interviewer Terry Gross once said, "what puts [an interviewee] on guard isn't necessarily the fear of being 'found out.' It sometimes is just the fear of being misunderstood" (Russell, 1996). People share things with others for many reasons. I have long felt that one of these reasons is mutual understanding. In other words, some people share some things with an audience when they know that audience will understand. For this reason, it is important that I not only review the facts about internment history prior to the interview, but also strive for what Chinua Achebe (1988) called "imaginative identification." Jane Lazarre (1997) described this as "our capacity to understand and feel

the suffering of another even though we have never experienced that particular suffering ourselves" (p. 4). Part of respecting others is respecting their intelligence and intuition. Not only is this respect important to "ethical" inquiry, it is inextricably tied to the resulting testimony itself. This act of shared memory-making is undoubtedly affected by the presence of mutual respect among participants. I aimed to consider these pieces holistically in this process.

The effectiveness of a sophisticated ethical trajectory, while capable of charting a course of inquiry in avoidance of the most clearly defined and accepted immoralities, can provide only heuristic guidance amidst the intractable complexity of ethical inquiry. I struggled throughout this project to remain self-reflective of my positionality, sensitive to the flow of power and oppression in my relationships with participants, conscious of the ever-changing rules governing human relationships, and guided by, yet hesitant to define, the eternal human concepts of fairness and respect. Although I do not aim specifically to uncover personal histories of a private nature, sharing of sensitive information may occur. Therefore, the identities of participants were not documented. However, the number of formerly interned Japanese Americans living in Minnesota is small enough to caution dependence on this method of protecting the anonymity of participants. If a participant had unknowingly shared information I believed could potentially identify her, I discussed this with her and sought her explicit approval before including the information in this paper.

Insiders and outsiders

Ethnographers and oral historians have often debated whether being an "insider" or "outsider" is of value to social inquiry. For example, anthropologist Akemi Kikumura (1986) felt that life history research involving her Japanese American mother would have been impossible had she not been a member of the family (p. 141). Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai (1991) reminded us that the interview is social, psychological, and linguistic, and thus interviewers can benefit from having cultural knowledge about the participants (p. 9). Tonkin (1992) noticed individuals are able to articulate when they share narrative "genres" with their audiences. Disarticulation, meanwhile, occurs when people are forced to speak in unfamiliar genres (Giblin, 2004, p. 296). On the other hand, Gluck (1991) found that when interviewing female Palestinian activists, her reputation as an advocate for political change raised questions about whether this mutuality would "undermine [her] ability to function as a scholar" (p. 207), as the focus of her research at that time was not on the current political situation.

It is likely however that people possess social identities far too complex to fit any mutually exclusive description of "insider" or "outsider." Whether insider or outsider, threads both of commonality and difference exist and need to be understood and acknowledged in order to conduct successful interviews.

As the aim of this chapter was to lay the groundwork for a *process* of learning, I have chosen to discuss my own role and relationship with participants in the next chapter as I consider it part of the learning process.

Remembering the World War II internment of Japanese Americans

As previous chapters suggested, collaborative, intergenerational remembering can be a theoretically rigorous, ethical, and accessible form of inquiry if historical methods are consulted. In this section, methodological concepts influencing the design of this intergenerational inquiry into lived memory are discussed. Not only do these ideas suggest that oral history is an appropriate mode of inquiry in the context of the political and social tensions surrounding history education presented in the first chapter, but they form the foundation of important student learning that should occur prior to any attempt at undertaking such inquiry.

Preparation

To compensate for age, Richie (1995) advised good preparation to narrow the difference in knowledge about a topic as well as giving an informative introduction so that points of commonality can be located (p. 74). The purpose of this section is to familiarize the reader and myself with JA history to develop reasonable interview questions, build background knowledge allowing me to respond when participants discuss unplanned topics, and make clear to participants my commitment to the topic.

Nisei history

Before the war

Nisei are second generation Japanese Americans. While their parents, the *Issei*, immigrated from Japan, Nisei were born in the United States and were thus citizens by birth. (*Sansei* refers to the children of Nisei, and *Yonsei* are the children of Sansei.) Because all participants in this study are Nisei, this section provides a brief overview of

the Nisei experience in the United States prior to Executive Order 9066 and subsequent internment.

Migration policies enacted by Japanese and American governments made it possible for most first-generation Japanese American immigrants, or *Issei*, to enter the United States between 1890 and 1908. The majority settled in Hawaii and on the west coast. Most of this first wave was comprised of young male laborers, but wives, children, and parents of these men were allowed to immigrate until 1924. The ability to raise families led to a rapid increase in the Japanese American population. For example, in 1919, Japanese American births comprised 8 percent of all births in California that year (Strong, 1933, p. 62). These second generation Japanese Americans were referred to as *Nisei*, and the temporal proximity of their births and shared history led to a strong sense of generational identity and consciousness.

Furthermore, as historian David K. Yoo (2000) observed, the multiple spheres and identities negotiated by this generation has made it less relevant to view the Nisei as conflicted over whether they were Japanese or American, and more illuminating to ask how the Nisei "negotiated the complexities of identity formation in the toss and tumble of their times" (p. 5). Rather than cast them as historical victims to be either assimilated or disowned by mainstream America, it is perhaps more insightful to conceptualize the Nisei as "women and men who exercised decision-making power in their lives, interpreting and acting out their own history" (p. 7). Indeed, as *Nisei* Buddhist studies professor Minoru Kiyota (1997) noted in his personal account of an 11-year legal battle to regain his U.S. citizenship after renouncing it at age 21 while interned, "at times of

tremendous confusion and uncertainty, such a judgement [of whether one pledged loyalty to the United States government or whether the decision one made then was the right one] is meaningless" (p. 239).

Education was very important to Issei as it offered the best, if not only, promise of improved social status for their offspring (Yoo, 2000, p. 36). For example, school attendance rates in 1940 for Nisei children in California and Washington were consistently higher for young Nisei of all age groups, ages 5–24, than the non-Japanese American population (Thomas, Kikuchi, & Sakoda, 1952, p. 610, as cited in Yoo, 2000, p. 19). Yet, contradictions between the ideal and the reality of American education, as well as between the views of educators and students, were numerous. In particular, the Americanization of Nisei children was a priority for west coast schools. While many Nisei children excelled at school, racism and discrimination, especially in the workforce, haunted their struggle to fully "Americanize". For example, one 1938 study of Japanese American graduates of the University of California indicated that only 25 percent held jobs commensurate with their training and education (Yoo, 2000, p. 33). Some Nisei looked to Japan as a viable alternative to the bleak employment outlook in the States, but even in Japan it appears that, Nisei were, at times, looked down upon as low class offspring of peasant emigrants (Yoo, 2000, pp. 33–35).

Yoo (2000) contends that religion is an important consideration in any historical study of the Nisei, the majority of whom were either Buddhist of Christian. Not only did churches and temples provide an opportunity to network and develop leadership skills, they actually reinforced familial, generational, and racial-ethic bonds (pp. 38–41).

For some however, religion may have been a means to an end. Carl Nomura (2003) noted that his Issei mother enrolled him in Catholic school simply because she believed "Catholics provided the best education" (p. 16). Indeed, this may not be unlike Andrabi, Das, Khwaja, and Zajonc's (2005) study suggesting that one of the most important factor in parents' decisions to send children to religious schools in Pakistan (*madrasas*) was a lack of affordable educational opportunities elsewhere. While some might consider radical madrasas a far cry from American catholic schools (or not), the idea that religious choice may sometimes come secondary to decisions parents' perceive to more significantly impact children's chances of success, such as those concerning education, may be an important consideration in understanding Japanese American religious affiliations. For some struggling Issei parents, whether their Nisei children were raised Christian or Buddhist was less important than the quality of education they were to receive.

The majority of Issei adhered to *Jodo Shinshu* Buddhism, and limited opportunity to engage in American social life caused many to become active in temple life. In 1944, Japanese American Buddhists reportedly comprised over 98 percent of the approximately 56,000 Buddhists in the United States (Yoo, 2000, p. 42). In reaction to public suspicion, Buddhist groups often underwent a degree of Americanization to "soften their differences from Protestant Christianity." Although a unique Japanese American Buddhism emerged as a result, practices remained fundamentally Buddhist (Yoo, 2000, p. 44).

The Great Depression impacted most American families, and Japanese Americans were no exception. Nomura's (2003) family owned a store at the time, which, at least

until declaring bankruptcy in 1934, secured enough income to pay the lease and put food on the table. Although originally accepting only cash, Nomura's store began allowing people to purchase credit as the depression wore on and people had neither food nor money. In one particular situation, a local family and loyal customer, in considerable debt to their landlord, confided to the Nomura's that they intended to flee east in the middle of the night and expressed their heartfelt apologies for being unable to pay the balance they owed to the store. Mother Nomura not only wrote off their debt, but donated two bags of groceries to sustain them during their long drive.

In an analysis of the Japanese American press in the years leading up to World War II, Yoo (2000) observed three major race-related trends: (1) *racial responsibility*, or advocating Nisei to work hard to promote greater acceptance of Japanese Americans; (2) *racial solidarity*, or encouraging Nisei stick together in personal matters, especially dating and marriage; and (3) *racial victimization*, from which Japanese Americans suffered due to the outbreak of the Second Sino-Japanese war, and being caught in the middle of Issei support for Japan and sympathy for China among the greater American community.

Pearl Harbor and the internment

On December 7, 1941, Japanese forces attacked Pearl Harbor. Within 48 hours of the attack on Pearl Harbor, nearly 1,300 Japanese Americans were apprehended, without charge. Most were guilty by association, such as Japanese language teachers, employees in Japanese firms, and Buddhist priests. Japanese Americans also experienced frozen

assets, curfews, restricted travel, and heightened anti-Japanese public sentiment (Yoo, 2000, pp. 95–96).

Military leaders spent the next 10 weeks planning the mass incarceration, made possible when Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942, which authorized and directed the United States Secretary of War "to prescribe military areas … from which any or all persons may be excluded," and that "the right of any persons to enter, remain in, or leave shall be subject to whatever restriction the Secretary of War or the appropriate Military Commander may impose in his discretion" (Executive Order No. 9066, 1942). On March 2, a military zone was declared containing areas of Washington, Oregon, California, and Arizona within 100 miles of the West Coast (Hatamiya, 1993, p. 14). Public Law 503, which made it a misdemeanor to "enter, remain in, leave, or commit any act in any military area or military zone … contrary to the order of the Secretary of War or any such military commander" (An Act, 1942), was passed in both houses by unanimous voice vote and signed by the President on March 21 (Weglyn, 1996, p. 72). The evacuation of Japanese Americans living in the military zone, nearly two-thirds of whom were U.S. citizens, began three days later.

Over the next seven months, 16 detention centers were hastily constructed to house the approximately 120,000 Japanese Americans living on the west coast. In some cases internees were placed in horse stables, vacated only hours earlier. In addition to communal bathrooms without stalls, there were food lines, dust storms, and mosquitoes. Carl Nomura's (2003) family was sent to Manzanar and given canvas bags and to fill with straw for bedding. Manzanar was famous for dust storms, and they awoke each

morning to a room covered in a layer of sand. The stress of captivity along with the loss of homes, property, professions, and freedom led to desperate conditions. As with any human population, reactions to this stress varied greatly. While some preoccupied themselves with vegetable gardening, fine arts, crafts, studying, and other activities, not all internees were able to contain their desire to express and act upon their feelings about this injustice. Far from the images typically portrayed in public school history education—of Japanese Americans bearing this plight in uniform silence—labor strikes, riots, protests, draft refusals, and violence existed in many detention centers and internment camps, to which Japanese were to be subsequently relocated (Yoo, 2000, pp. 98, 103; Hironaka, 2009).

Yet, Japanese Americans wasted no time setting up, participating in, and modifying structures familiar to them prior to incarceration, such as schools, news presses, and hospitals. In particular, detention camp schools actually became a positive experience for some Nisei. Although many camp officials saw education as a way to continue the assimilist agenda of American education characterizing preceding decades, many college-educated, aspiring Nisei teachers, unable to find jobs prior to the internment due to racial discrimination, took the unofficial opportunities these makeshift schools provided to work in this field quite seriously. For example, teachers at Tanforan Assembly Center schools were able to work with outside school districts to secure officially-recognized grade promotions for over half of their students (Yoo, 2000, p. 100).

Many JAs turned, with greater interest, to religion, and both Buddhist and Christian congregations experienced increased attendance. The groups, furthermore,

often worked together planning activities. This relative peace between the denominations may have been due to the greater leadership role Nisei played in the camps, as well as removal of the necessity for financial competition present in their home communities (Yoo, 2000, pp. 101–102).

During the evacuation, property and belongings internees could not carry were abandoned, given away, or sold, often for much less than they were worth (Hatamiya, 1993, p. 17). Not only material assets, but established careers, college degrees, and psychological well-being were lost (Hatamiya, 1993, p. 25). According to the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco in 1942, property loss due to the internment was over $400 million (Chuman, 1976, p. 237), which is over $5 billion in 2007 currency (Sahr, 2007).

"While Pearl Harbor and World War II served as the spark," wrote Yoo (2000), "the concentration camps represented the culmination of decades of race prejudice" (p. 93). Structures in the Japanese American community, such as schooling, religion, and a sense of racial isolation (and thus inevitable solidarity) constructed during these decades, persisted to help internees cope with their experience (p. 93). Yoo (2000) noted that schooling became one of the only forms of investment Nisei could make while in the camps (p. 94).

There was not much to do in the internment. Some men, such as Nomura (2003) and Kiyota (1997) signed up to work as farm laborers. Nomura (2003) wrote at length about the bodily pain resulting from bending forward for extended periods of time:

Each day, as the hours wore on, the pain in my back got worse. Finally it became

so excruciating that I couldn't think about anything else. I looked up occasionally

to see how much farther I had to hoe before I could stand upright and enjoy the

luxury of painlessness, then I endured the agony until I got to the end of the row.

Using my left hand, I straightened the paralyzed fingers of my right hand, which

had calluses that fit the exact contour of the handle of the hoe. Then, with the

surge of circulating blood, the fingers would ache as they came back to life.

(p. 59)

The greatest anger Nomura remembers, however, was learning that German prisoners of

war, working in nearby fields, had better living conditions, better pay, and free clothes

(p. 61). Nomura (2003) remembers being escorted from Minidoka to Manzanar by an

armed guard, who spoke only to provide instructions and kept his rifle trained on him the

entire bus ride. They stopped in Reno during this transit, and Nomura recalled seeing

Italian prisoners of war walking free about the city. Nomura (2003) recalls being told by

a recruiter for a segregated infantry unit that he should enlist to prove he is not a traitor to

the United States (p. 65) Nomura (2003) was sponsored by the United Church of the

Brethren in Chicago to live in their dormitory while he searched for a job and his own

housing. He found a job working as a receiving clerk. Everything Carl Nomura's (2003)

brothers' trucking company owned, although carefully packed away, was gone when they

returned home after the internment. (p. 52)

Loyalty Questionnaire

In 1943, the War Relocation Authority (WRA) and US Army created a questionnaire, which was to be administered to all internees. The last and most troubling questions, numbers 27 and 28, were designed to assess the individual's loyalty to the United States. Question 27 was "Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty, whenever ordered?", and 28 asked, "Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces, and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor, or any other foreign government, power, or organization?" (Selective Service System, 1943, p. 4). This questionnaire, and, in particular, these last two questions, created intense confusion, anxiety, and problems between and within families. In particular, question 28 appeared to be a trick question. For Issei, who were not eligible for U.S. citizenship under the Naturalization Act of 1790, answering yes appeared to render them stateless. For Nisei, answering yes implied they had previously been obedient to the emperor, which for most made little sense, as they had lived their entire lives in the US. As it turned out, answering no to both 27 and 28 resulted in your transfer to the high security Tule Lake internment camp.

To this day, this particular topic appears difficult to discuss among Nisei. In 2010, I attended the annual Tule Lake pilgrimage with my grandmother. (Although my grandmother found work in Minnesota before the questionnaire was even administered and was able to leave the camp early, she did spend the first year of the internment at Tule Lake.) The theme in 2010 was that no Nisei (or Issei) should feel ashamed for having answered no to both questions because in a time of instability, anger, defeat,

helplessness, and chaos, people made decisions based on what they perceived to be in their and their family's best interest, and that to feel ashamed of such a decision only neglects to consider the ambiguity, threatening and presumptive wording, and extenuating context of the questionnaire.

JAs in the Military

Nearly 20,000 JAs volunteered for US military service during World War II. The majority of these recruits were from Hawaii, where JAs were not incarcerated en masse. Approximately 6,000, including my grandfather, were selected for Military Intelligence Service (MIS) and underwent intensive training in San Franciso, Fort Savage, and Fort Snelling. MIS were then sent to the Pacific theater, where they used their education and language skills to translate documents, interrogate Japanese POWs, and, in some cases, infiltrate enemy lines. Some believe the war would have been considerably longer and more deadly had it not been for the services of these primarily Nisei MIS officers (Yoo, 2000, p. 104).

For the European front, approximately 4,000 Japanese Americans were selected to form the 442nd Regimental Combat Team, which later combined with the renowned 100th Infantry Battalion, a segregated JA unit from Hawaii (Yoo, 2000, p. 106). In its 225 days of combat, the around 14,000 JAs who served in the 442nd made it the most decorated unit of its size and length of service in U.S. military history, earning 21 Medals of Honor, 8 Presidential Unit Citations, and 9,486 Purple Hearts (Go For Broke National Education Center, 2006).

After the Internment

Former Yale Law School Dean Eugene V. Rostow (1945) argued that the five most frightening propositions upon which the Japanese American exclusion program rested were: (1) three or four years of protective custody is an acceptable form of imprisonment; (2) political opinions rather than criminal acts can justify imprisonment; (3) all members of a particular ethnic group can be assumed to possess the same dangerous ideas warranting their collective imprisonment; (4) in times of war or emergency, the military has the right to decide which political opinions warrant the imprisonment of which ethnic groups; and (5) military decisions are to be executed "without indictment, trial, examination, jury, the confrontation of witnesses, counsel of the defense, the privilege against self-incrimination, or any of the other safeguards provided by the Bill of Rights" (p. 532).

Despite these military "precautions," not a single Japanese American was ever found to have committed an act of disloyalty (Montagu, 1998, p. 212) and no disloyal persons were found in the camps (Okubo, 1983, p. 212). The average length of the internment was thirty months (McClain, 1994, p. 176). While Nomura (2003) felt "somewhat embarrassed receiving money from [his] country at a time of financial crisis [in the late 1980s]," he added that such actions were an important step in reducing the chances of such civil rights abuses from recurring (p. 66).

In 1973, the Japanese American Citizens League, Manzanar Committee, and State Department of Parks and Recreation collaboratively designed a plaque for the Manzanar Relocation Camp, upon which was written, "may the injustices and humiliation suffered here as a result of hysteria, racism, and economic exploitation never emerge again."

In 1980, the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) was established in response to lobbying by the Japanese American Citizen League (JACL) to investigate how the movement to obtain reparations for property loss due to internment might proceed. The CWRIC subsequently recorded the testimonies of over 750 witnesses of the internment (Hatamiya, 1993, p. 85) and produced a report in which it was found that:

> [The internment] was not justified by military necessity, and the decision which followed from it—detention, ending detention, and ending exclusion—were not driven by analysis of military conditions. … A grave injustice was done to American citizens and resident aliens of Japanese ancestry who, without individual review or any probative evidence against them, were excluded, removed, and detained by the United State during World War II. (Kashima, 1997, p. 18)

The CWRIC proceeded to recommend: (1) the government acknowledge the injustice of and apologize for the internment; (2) those convicted of crimes as a result of resisting discriminatory treatment (such as violation of curfew) receive presidential pardons; (3) executive agencies review requests by Japanese Americans for restitution of position, status, or entitlements lost due to internment with liberality; (4) a foundation be established to sponsor research and education to better investigate and inform the public about the causes not only of the internment, but of similar civil liberty violations by nations in times of crisis; (5) each surviving intern be compensated $20,000; and (6) cost of these measures was to total $1.5 billion (McClain, 1994, p. 181). The redress

movement proved successful with the enactment by Congress of the Civil Liberties Act

on August 10, 1988, the purpose of which was to: (1) acknowledge the injustice of the

internment; (2) apologize on behalf of the people of the United States; (3) establish a

public education fund to sponsor "efforts to inform the public about the internment so as

to prevent the recurrence of any similar event"; (4) compensate former internees; and

(5) establish the sincerity and credibility in expressing concern over human rights

violations committed by other nations (United States Government, 1988). According to

the CWRIC report:

> the broad historical causes which shaped these [internment] decisions were race
>
> prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership. Widespread ignorance
>
> of Japanese Americans contributed to a policy conceived and executed in an
>
> atmosphere of fear and anger at Japan. (p. 18)

Theater history and performance studies scholar Emily Roxworthy (2008) explained the

American public's acceptance of internment events as due to its staging as a *spectacle* by

mass media and government. The public spectacle, according to Roxworthy, tends to

disengage and render passive not only its audience, but its performers as well. She drew

upon philosopher Judith Butler's (1988) interest in how performative acts, rather than

biological or enculturating concepts, constitute identity in ways specifically to promote

the actor as a "compelling illusion, an object of *belief*" (p. 520). In other words, identity

is constructed by performing in a way coherent to the public. Roxworthy explained that

this public enchantment with the spectacle of the internment perpetuated (and, to some

degree, continues to perpetuate [p. 4]) what she called the *myth of performative*

citizenship, or citizenship based on public displays of patriotism effectively obscuring the concomitant operation of biological racism (p. 107). The real trauma of the internment, according to Roxworthy, was inflicted by requiring internees to set aside the issue of social justice and perform in concert with its spectacularization to demonstrate their own loyalty to the U.S. government. The power of this spectacle was such that it kept some internees from "fully processing the material violence enacted against them" (p. 5).

About me

While the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II is just one of countless events in history involving the abuse of military and government power, it is an event of particular interest to me because my maternal grandparents were both taken out of college and interned in 1942 before meeting and settling in Minnesota. They are part of a small but active community of Japanese Americans in the Twin Cities, and I feel this connection could provide an excellent opportunity for me to meet and discuss the internment with members of this group.

When I was a child, my parents and grandparents frequently reminded me that I am a *yonsei*, or fourth generation Japanese American. I always considered these reminders curious but of no more than purely symbolic significance. I learned, however, that Japanese immigration to the United States was unique in that it occurred primarily during a small window of time around the turn of the 20th century, creating relatively clearly defined generations of Japanese American. This window opened with the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, resulting in an increased demand for Japanese farm laborers, and closed with the Immigration Act of 1924, restricting further immigration from Asia.

Moreover, Japanese American men (who outnumbered Japanese American women in 1900 by nearly twenty-four to one) were prohibited by law and other social pressures from marrying Caucasian women. Many thus relied on family in Japan to arrange marriages for the purposes of building a family, often with the help of a photo exchange (Wilson & Hosokawa, 1980, p. 54). During this period, thousands of Japanese "picture brides" immigrated to the United States, strengthening any cultural and genetic homogeneity for an additional generation. Curiosity about this familial history, along with the close personal relationship I have with my grandparents, greatly influenced my decision to investigate this particular topic.

Although my grandparents have been speaking and writing about their experiences in the community throughout much of their lives, I have few recollections of ever discussing the internment in family conversation. However, I do remember being eight years old when the 1988 Civil Liberties Act was passed, granting monetary reparation to surviving internees. I expressed childish amazement upon hearing my grandparents were to receive $20,000 dollars each from the government. In response to my reaction, my typically cheerful grandmother turned suddenly serious and replied, "well, this isn't even a fraction of what we lost." The vivid recollection of this exchange—this decision by my grandmother to depart briefly from the conventions of our relationship and permit the significance she attributed to this event flicker briefly— continues to motivate my interest in remembering and preventing civil injustice. I hope this study can play a role in encouraging educators to consider the critical importance of

fostering a nation that not only remembers past injustices of all kinds, but is also capable of identifying and disarming similar situations as they inevitably arise again in the future.

As a college student, I minored in Japanese and studied abroad in Tokyo for six months, where my interest in the history of Japan and Japanese American immigration developed further. I later volunteered for one year as an intergenerational service learning program coordinator in Minnesota through the AmeriCorps VISTA program, during which I began to perceive what I believe is a dangerous generational discontinuity in our society. At the same time, however, I also realized the significant role education can play in alleviating this tension. My hope is that this study provides a convincing basis for further involvement of the elderly in the public education process.

Finally, as a graduate student of comparative education, I have sought to heed the words of Andreas Kazamias (2001) and explore education in a historical context. Although history and history education are two different fields with different parameters, goals, and concerns, the past is always political, and I believe my studies in both areas have a great deal to contribute to each other.

Planning the interview

After consulting with my grandmother, we decided a group interview would be most comfortable for participants and help make recruitment easier since it could double as a social gathering for elderly Nisei who do not often make the trip to see each other. I felt this could work well given the social properties of collective memory described earlier. Lucas M. Bietti (2008) also used group interviews specifically to capture the

social aspects of memory in his project to explore collective memories of Argentina's "Dirty War."

While it was possible that some participants viewed me as *more* of an insider than, say, a researcher who is not Japanese American, there were many more significant factors separating me from the participants. Unlike myself, these elderly Japanese Americans lived through more and different time periods, have known racism, had first generation immigrant Japanese (Issei) parents, were educated many decades ago, and, of course, spent months or years in an internment camp—just to mention a few cursory observations of how I am very much an outsider.

Nonetheless, as the grandson of a former internee, it is perhaps my obvious commitment to human rights and interest in continuing to highlight the injustice of the internment with future generations that I think also framed me as an insider. Throughout their lives, Issei and Nisei have encountered people who are unaware the internment ever happened. They have met some who deny that it ever occurred, and others who continue to feel it was a justified precaution. Perhaps this helps explain Ronald Takaki's tongue-in-cheek title of his monumental history of Asian Americans, "Strangers from a distant shore," as experiences such as these continue to remind Asian Americans that they have and continue to be perceived as non-Americans. Sitting down with an interviewer they knew was "on their side" may in some ways have altered the conversation.

The proper "ambiance" recommended by (Henige, 2005, pp. 178–180) was sought by conducting the interviews in the comfort of a participant's home. While

interviews were expected to last approximately two hours, the participants had no problem chatting for nearly four.

Charles T. Morrissey (1970) reminded us that interviewing is difficult—during the encounter the researcher must listen, be thinking of more questions, and remember what has been covered and what remains to be discussed. This section describes the preparations I made for these interviews, keeping in mind that despite volumes of advice seeking to advise aspiring oral historians, "there is a danger of too much reliance on tools and not relying sufficiently on old-fashioned intuition" (p. 108).

Richie (1995) advised informing participants of the purpose of the interview and project beforehand (p. 63), so I prepared an introduction which was included in the interview section below. As Richie (1995) suggested, I began with open-ended questions (p. 57) about the participant's life, mixing in more specific questions later (p. 67). I aimed to engage participants in discussion concerning how they have related to and interacted with society in the past and present before considering the larger question of what they prescribe for the future of public education. One question was asked at a time, as participants generally do not answer compound questions (p. 60), and leading questions were avoided (Henige, 2005, pp. 178–180). It was important that I pursued topics of interest to the participants (Richie, 1995, pp. 68–69) and allowed the conversation to deviate from my prepared questions, as interviews rarely progress as expected (p. 59). As Morrissey (1970) reminded us, "let the interviewee talk. It's his show. Let him run with the ball" (p. 108).

Listening was critical. When reflecting on their interviews of rural women, Anderson and Jack (1991) noted that their "methods often failed to give women the opportunity to discuss the complex web of feelings and contradictions behind their familiar stories" (p. 13), so researchers needs to make sure they "allow them to talk about their feelings as well as their activities" (p. 15). It was imperative that I attempted, within the limits of my ability, to encourage conversations in which participants feel free to discuss complex thoughts and feelings. By learning as much as possible about the internment and Japanese American history beforehand, I was prepared for complex conversation requiring considerable background knowledge. Practicing beforehand with my grandmother also ensured less nervousness during the interviews, allowing me to relax and focus on the words of the participants.

In addition to this preparation, I sought to consider the role discourse plays in shaping participant voices. I aimed to foster conversation in which participants feel minimally constrained by societal conventions. Anderson and Jack observed, for example, that:

> A woman's discussion of her life may combine two separate, often conflicting, perspectives: one framed in concepts and values that reflect men's dominant position in the culture, and one informed by the more immediate realities of a woman's personal experience. (p. 11)

The interviewer has a responsibility to acknowledge these discourses and not shy away from exploring situations in which the latter perspective lies outside the bounds of what is socially acceptable to say. If this is not done, the interview will "overemphasize expected

aspects of the female role" (p. 11). According to Anderson, researchers need to ask

(1) whose story the participant is asked to share; (2) who is listening to the narrative; and

(3) and what interpretive theories they are applying. The researcher must shed preexisting

notions and stereotypes and ask what meanings participants make of their experiences,

adopting instead an attitude of receptivity (pp. 11–2). In order to heighten my own

awareness of discourses shaping the way formerly interned Japanese Americans speak

about the internment, I familiarized myself with previously published Japanese American

history and oral narratives. As Rayson (1987) has noted, the internment experience

resulted in a wealth of autobiographies written by Japanese Americans (p. 44), and thanks

to the Densho online internment history project, numerous autobiographies are available

on-line. Through close reading and knowledge of post-internment Japanese American

history, I was able to observe the way narratives were been shaped through the years by

their historical context and hopefully learn more about the changing role Japanese

Americans have had in our national consciousness.

I tried to resist the tendency to interpret and analyze while listening. According to

Anderson and Jack, one's self-reflection is not a private act, but mediated by categories

and concepts we use to evaluate ourselves—categories that have historically exercised

considerable power over our activities and language (p. 18). They realized that "the first

and the hardest step of interviewing was to learn to listen in a new way, to hold in

abeyance the theories that told [them] what to hear and how to interpret what these

women had to say" (p. 18). They believed that ideally, the process of analysis should only

come after that of listening, that attention be paid to critical points when researchers

mistakenly believe they already know what participants are saying (p. 19), and that researchers "restrict the imposition of personal expectations" (p. 20).

Anderson and Jack described three aspects of language to note when trying to understand the participant's narrative and its relationship with societal norms: (1) moral language describing the self, which aids the interviewer in considering the "relationships between self-concept and cultural norms" (p. 20); (2) "meta-statements," in which "people spontaneously stop, look back, and comment about their own thoughts or something just said" alerts the researcher to "a discrepancy … between what is expected and what is being said" (pp. 21–2); and (3) disruptions in the logical flow of the narrative, which can illuminate "assumptions and beliefs that inform the logic and guide the woman's interpretation of her experience" (p. 22).

Finally, Richie (1995) reminded us that silence can prompt the participant to continue when there is hesitation (p. 68). I strove, during the conversation, to avoid being overly verbose or controlling in order to make it easy for participants to say what they wished.

As discussed previously, I could in some ways be considered an insider. Richie (1995) advised that insiders, despite considerably knowledge of the subject matter and potential for close relationships with participants, not forget to play the role of students, asking inquisitive questions that explore areas beyond what is already known (p. 76). Anderson and Jack (1991) advise the insider to make interview strategies "particularly explicit to avoid interference" due to "similar backgrounds that include norms for conversation and interaction" (p. 14).

In order to compensate for age, Richie (1995) advised good preparation to narrow the difference in knowledge about a topic as well as giving an informative introduction so that points of commonality can be located (p. 74). Kikumura (1986) recommended focusing on events occurring prior to the maturation of the interviewer in cases where the participant is substantially older.

While the advice above was important in preparing me for the interview, I also attempted to keep in mind my feelings that individuals adopt unique roles in social situations that are sometimes difficult to predict or prescribe. I entered the interview with the conviction that advice from oral historians, experience interviewing, cognizance of my own social tendencies, and acceptance that the encounter would be unique and irreproducible would all be necessary to conduct a successful meeting.

Narrative of the interview

We met at a participant's house on a Sunday afternoon. We ordered lunch from a local Chinese restaurant, a choice that did not surprise me given the number of JA gatherings that seem to take place at Chinese restaurants. While I offered to pick them up, Grandma insisted things would be fine, and, sure enough, all participants—four Nisei in their upper 80s—arrived on time. I have chosen random names for each participant: Dorothy, Henry, James, and Carol. They were nicely dressed, though not overly so for the occasion. Lunch was delivered minutes later, and by the time I had brought the food into the kitchen, James was already showing Carol photos of his latest great grandchildren.

They certainly were a talkative bunch, especially James, who reminded me a lot of a best friend in high school in that he was funny and often the center of attention, but had a certain courage to say things hinting at the considerable depth and fearlessness of his thoughts. Henry was serious and quiet. At first, I wondered if he did not want to be here. James seemed quite happy to see him though, and it seemed Henry was the only one who could actually make James stop talking, since James seemed interested in what Henry had to say. This relationship reminded me further of the interactions between my friend and I in high school. Dorothy, Henry's wife, was also talkative and seemed a little more nervous around me than the men, though I could feel all were withholding judgement on me.

I should note my awareness of my tendency to try and see myself in other people. Certainly, my tendency to fit Henry and James into memories of my own social past is probably not shared by everyone. Whether this tendency is individual or, say, generational is not clear to me, but somehow I do feel my intercultural experiences play some role. Despite my background in anthropology and intercultural relations, there is something I find disconcerting about the preoccupation much of my past education has had with the intercultural experience. Much like postcolonial theory questions the "moral vortex" of postmodernity, there is something about an over-emphasis on pluralism that seems prone to distract us from the task of identifying with those across poorly defined and constantly shifting gendered, cultural, generational, political, etc. lines. There are times when I feel intercultural training erects barriers to this imaginative identification in the sense that there is the ever-present irony that by studying another culture, we cannot

avoid stereotyping. Even the recursive act of learning about learning culture tends to find itself constrained by its own operating definition of culture, encouraging the learner to adjust cultural experiences to fit them into whatever intercultural framework has been learned. Part of me feels that in response to this, I (and undoubtedly many of my age and educational background) have subconsciously developed a tendency to eagerly over-identify with those across these lines. There is likely a compromise to be pursued for any who wish to undertake this kind of endeavor. Much like Charles Dickens juxtaposed excessively detailed descriptions of his cookie-cutter characters in the Tale of Two Cities with the surprising case of despicable Sydney Carton's epic sacrifice to remind us of our inability to fully understand another human being, it is perhaps our task to simultaneously exercise both the power of imaginative identity and the power of humility.

As they chatted away during lunch, I remained relatively quiet, but alert, in an attempt to foster whatever rapport was possible in such a short time span, between people two generations removed. My carefulness was such that I had a hard time actually speaking up and starting the interview, especially since I was dreading disrupting the conversation, nervous about the reception my questions were to receive. Finally, I pulled my sheet of questions out and read the following introduction.

Thank you very much for coming today. I'm Matt, Mary Yoshida's grandson, and I am working on my Master's degree in educational policy at the University of Minnesota.

My thesis focuses on the idea that history education should include discussions with people who have actually experienced history. I write about how

people tell stories, remember the past, and are influenced by what they know about history.

I wanted to speak with you not only to learn more about Japanese American history, but also to learn how teachers might go about including these kinds of discussions in their history classes.

I obviously have a personal interest in Japanese American history. In particular, I can trace my thinking about the internment to a brief exchange with my grandmother when I was 8 or 9 years old. I had learned about the redress money Grandma and Grandpa were to receive from the government. I expressed a childish amazement at the sum. Grandma, whom I had known only as a person of smiles and laughter, suddenly turned serious and told me, "Well, this isn't even a fraction of what we lost." It was a brief exchange, but one that remains clear in my memory as the moment I began to realize the severity of the event and its impact on JA communities, families, and individuals.

I have spent some time studying Japanese American history, and have prepared a series of questions. However, this is just a guide. Please do not feel obligated to stay on topic.

I may take written notes from time to time to help me remember the discussion.

As expected, the conversation did not go as expected. Despite the nearly four hour meeting (which I myself had to cut short due to my own exhaustion at processing the conversation around me), I was forced to skip over half of my questions. Most times, the

conversation floated toward gossip about shared acquaintances, health issues, and humorous stories.

My fears going into the conversation were that I would run out of questions, ask or say something silly. I certainly did not run out of questions. As for saying something silly, I found I was often asked to help fill in historical details about the internment, JA history, and even the Japanese language as they sought to piece together their narratives. Yet, their tendency to turn to me when these subjects came up may, if one is not careful, deceive. More than once they commented, half jokingly, they were sure I knew more than they did. Perhaps though they said this because of the kind of knowledge they believed I might be after in an academic project. In other words, they may have resigned themselves to or even internalized the idea that their lived experiences are trivial to academic research.

Yet, and it may have been my imagination, there were times when I suspected they were making some mental delineation between what they knew they knew, and what they believed I knew. For example, there was a moment when we digressed into a conversation about a mutual Sansei acquaintance. I think not only were they surprised I knew her, but they were surprised I shared with them a particular observation about her personality. After feeling some exceedingly subtle surprise surface on their faces, I believe there was a moment when whatever cognitive processes were facilitating our conversation paused and remapped these territories.

This may be yet another reason an intergenerational remembering is not without merit in citizenship education. As educators, by supporting and treating such an

encounter as meaningful and important historical inquiry, we are encouraging not only students to value narration and personal experience, but narrators themselves may exercise their right to wield authority as witnesses of history—a right no doubt many already know they have.

Perhaps due to the group situation, the discussion stayed relatively light. Humorous stories could be found throughout, and certainly there seemed to be some reservation in everyone. I myself needed to fight my tendency to take a back seat in conversations like this. Questions I had carefully worded to uncover the various meanings they may ascribe to their experiences felt awkward voiced aloud. For this reason, I felt like things were not going well throughout the interview. Did I need to read between the lines? Should I have met with them individually, despite our feelings that this might be awkward and thus counterproductive? And yet, when reflecting later that night, part of me felt I should read less between the lines. It seemed in some ways that I was to see this as an acceptable conversation.

The first question I asked was, "what are you fondest memories of childhood?" I asked this question because I wanted to get everyone thinking about that time period, thought it would be an innocuous way to begin what had the potential to become a rather serious conversation, and was curious about potential such a simple question had to provide insight into memories playing a role in identity formation. This question seemed to catch them off guard, as, in retrospect, they were probably expecting to talk only about the internment, a subject they seemed to have had much more to say about later on.

James felt it was safer back then, which allowed him and his friends more freedom. He mentioned being able to leave the house to play or grab lunch for hours without the need to tell his parents, as they never worried. He recalled bringing fruit to the local movie theater with his friend on the weekends. Once they paid the entrance fee, they could stay as long as they would like, so would go from movie to movie for the better part of the day. Initially, they just threw the fruit rinds on the floor, but later felt bad and started bringing a garbage bag with.

For Henry, life revolved around the church, through which he played basketball and baseball. Dorothy was also active in her church. In particular, she recalls enjoying acting in a church production when she was in junior high school, performed in English and also, for their Issei parents, in Japanese. She laughed because there was one Kibei, or Nisei educated partially in Japan, in the group whom they always made play the lead role to highlight her Japanese language ability. Dorothy also cited her time in the Girl Reserves, a group that came up more than once in the conversation. I read later that the Girl Reserves was a YWCA program started in 1918 to support the war effort but came to accommodate a substantial number of Nisei women with opportunities for mainstream integration for Nisei girls and other young women in a "gendered space structured by Christian ethics" (Gayne, 2003, p. 197). Dorothy seemed to speak on this experience fondly, though never went into particular detail about their activities. It is interesting to me that a group with what sounds like a religious, assimilationist agenda would inspire such fond memories. It amazes me the powerful effect such groups can have on one's development. When I think back to my own experiences in a YMCA group, I have no

doubt they were also among my fondest childhood experiences. I certainly should have asked more about this.

Carol responded that growing up on a farm was her happiest time. This is a period of which my own grandmother also speaks often and fondly, and I have no doubt she would have answered this question the same way. For example, when people complement Grandmother on her health, she always explains with a smile that it is due to all the hard work she did growing up on a farm.

The next question I asked was: "When you were growing up, what did you and your family do that you felt was 'Japanese'? How about 'American'?" The first thing that came to most of their minds was New Year's Day. James added that his daughter still celebrates this, making sushi and eating *mochi*, or pounded rice cakes on New Year's. I was a little surprised to hear this, as had I myself been asked this question, I would have responded similarly.

Dorothy remembered being required to say certain Japanese phrases, describing this as a "headache." She was referring to *aisatsu*, which are cordial, standardized phrases Japanese say in a variety of situations. The two she remembers most clearly were *ittemaerimasu* ("I'm leaving the house") and *tadaima* ("I'm home"). She described sitting tensely and quietly with her two sisters in the bedroom while company was over, because the moment the company was getting up to leave, the girls were expected to say their aisatsu to bid them farewell. She could not remember how to say this particular phrase. Upon hearing this, everyone else began entertaining themselves by trying to remember various aisatsu.

As for "American" aspects of their childhoods, James mentioned his involvement in the Cub Scouts. However, he remembered being prevented from swimming in the pool when his troop visited the YMCA. He does not recall being given an explanation and was made to sit and wait in the hallway for hours until pool time was over—an experience undoubtedly unsettling and memorable for a young boy. Dorothy cited Girl Reserves again (clearly this was a memorable experience for her). Henry said he perceived basically everything outside of the home as American, and the others agreed.

We then began talking about church then, because this was the home away from home for them growing up. Dorothy was also sent to church, though her mother was a Buddhist, and sent her brothers to a Buddhist temple, so they would learn Japanese. However, Dorothy's brothers misbehaved a lot and were soon put in church with Dorothy. Henry and James were both raised Methodist, and Carol went to a Lutheran church. Henry again mentioned everything he did was through the church.

Next, I asked, "How would you describe your childhood relationships with non-Japanese Americans? How have your relationships with non-JAs changed over the years?" Dorothy said her only non-Japanese American friends were through school and that her neighbors were Mexicans, Chinese, and Italians. She may have thought I meant relationships with European-Americans, so I wonder if she did have friends from these other ethnic groups. Henry, having grown up in a Japanese community, also had only school friends.

James, on the other hand, grew up surrounded by whites. He said he remembers having no race-related problems in elementary school and junior high, but once high

school rolled around, something changed. For example, he mentioned that, as an Asian, he could not get a date. To me, this was an interesting confession. He framed this sort of as a joke, and yet certainly I could feel a hint of pain. Whether this pain was his, mine, or ours was not entirely clear, but in some ways I wonder if this matters. Surely emotion, like memory, has collective forms.

Next, I asked, "What goals or plans did you have in the years prior to the internment?" Strangely, no one remembers having any particular goals. My grandmother has often marvelled at the lack of direction she had when younger, but I never suspected this might have been a common Nisei phenomenon. Instead, we talked about how each came to pursue their respective careers.

Suddenly, James, continuing with the previous topic about dating, said he would have gotten beat up if he had dated a white girl. No one said anything to this, as James watched the effect of his words on everyone's faces, especially mine. He then asked if I would want to date a Japanese girl. I stammered a bit and answered that I was not particular, though I felt they stared at me with surprising intensity while awaiting my answer. While I have often been asked in Japan by Japanese men if I was attracted to Japanese women, somehow I this particular exchange felt different. Were they asking me as a JA, European American, or *Hapa* (half-Asian)? What answer did they hope to hear? What answer did they expect?

The conversation took some random turns. At some point I noted that Henry brought up the fact that he had home stayed in Japan as an older adult on a professional exchange and, despite 11 years of Japanese language school in his youth, found he could

no longer communicate well. He said that he could understand what was being said to him but was unable to reply. Once this ability was clear to his host parents, things smoothed out.

At this point, I felt inclined to ask why so many JAs were involved in education or schooling. I said that this was perhaps coincidence, but there did seem to be a large number of educators among JAs. They were not sure but speculated that because teachers afforded a very high status in Japan, they may have felt that generational legacy. Their parents, furthermore, highly stressed the importance of education. Carol noted that there were many nurses as well, and that nearly all of the women in her family were nurses.

Wanting to get moving on to the internment, I said, "I know many internees lost not only material assets, but careers, college degrees, and their sense of security. What did you lose in the internment?" James said his parents had been rather clever about ownership in the years prior to the internment. For example, when his sister was a certain age, property was purchased in her name. There were a series of transfers made to secure their assets, and so they were lucky to retain these after the internment. Yet, he felt business owners, especially those who did not own their property, lost most. Henry and Dorothy both felt that time was the most precious thing lost as their incarceration meant putting off college. James then added that what he really lost was friends. While this was again a point at which I was not quick enough to request elaboration, I suspect that having grown up in a mostly white neighborhood and having mostly white friends meant there were few familiar outside his family in the camps.

One memory that stuck in his head, however, was that the U.S. government actually paid to have his Nisei wife's piano, left behind during the evacuation because it could not be carried, shipped from California to Minnesota after the internment ended. This, in addition to the puzzling discussion earlier about who was and was not taken during the first round-up of male Isseis right after Pearl Harbor, has gotten me thinking of what seems sometimes to be the absence of individuality in many accounts of the internment. I am not describing the accounts of "reverse-racism" often slipped insultingly into anti-racism media (such as the production mentioned previously, "Baseball Saved Us") by authors to "balance" the story—presumably an artifact of their struggle to cope with some association they have with the oppressor class. Rather, I am thinking of how it is sometimes difficult to conceptualize organizations, such as the miltary, law enforcement, corporations, etc. as groups of individuals. For example, it is considerably easier to see how the round-up of Issei men was fairly random because it is likely the orders to do so were broad enough to require the discretion of law enforcement at the community level. In a similar way, I do not find the shipment of a piano across the country puzzling when I think of the seemingly chaotic behavior of large groups of individuals, i.e., organizations.

Back to the interview, James' comment above on friends was met with many nods. Loneliness, especially after leaving the camps and coming to Minnesota, appears to have been a shared experience. The thought of socialization in the Twin Cities led the conversation immediately to Father Dai, a figure that for me has reached rather legendary proportions in my mind due to Grandmother's stories. They began talking about the

group he and my grandmother, then working as a youth program coordinator at the YWCA, formed of Nisei recently relocated to the Twin Cities in the late 1940s. Father Dai was actually an Issei, but highly educated and spoke fluent English. He seemed to command considerably respect among the JAs residing in the Twin Cities during this time. They spoke of this group very fondly, and credit it with nearly all marriages and friendships they could think of in the Twin Cities JA community. Some, such as my grandfather, were in military intelligence training at Fort Snelling at the time and came to the Nicollet Avenue YWCA on Sunday evenings to socialize in this group.

I learned previously that Father Dai was very active in the community. He formed a group called the "Rainbow Club" during the 1950s. The idea of this group was simple. People of various races were to meet periodically and do fun things visibly in public, such as eating out or attending the theater. My grandparents, along with several other married couples, were a part of this. These dinners continued for decades, and nearly all of these couples have stayed good friends to this day. While I have heard about the Rainbow Club numerous times throughout the years, it is only in recent times that I have come to really appreciate its simplicity and brilliance.

For example, if we assume Father Dai was clever to the degree his reputation seems to suggest, his intentions with this group are perhaps revealing of the social climate. In other words, I suspect he was aware that combating racism can be a sensitive and slow process. In a society perhaps unused to interracial socialization, especially in a recreational context, such a group may really have turned some heads. While it is possible to see these activities as only encouraging, what Bennet (2004) might describe as

the "minimization" worldview in the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity

(DMIS), I would not be surprised if Father Dai was intuitively aware of what the DMIS

makes explicit: that people typically must progress stage-by-stage to successfully

approach more "ethnorelative" worldviews. It is perhaps not unreasonable to credit

initiatives such as the Rainbow Club with helping to lay the foundation for more

proactive civil rights movements.

As the conversation continued, I recited the following to get more of an idea

about their personal experiences in camp:

> I know reactions to the stress of internment conditions varied. I read about labor
>
> strikes, protest, and even riots. Some internees may also have coped by
>
> preoccupying themselves with vegetable gardens or crafts, while others may have
>
> buried themselves in religion, schooling, or work. In what ways did you deal with
>
> the stress of the internment? How about your parents?

James noted his parents did not show they were stressed, citing the common Japanese

phrase, *shikata ga nai*, or "there is nothing that can be done [to improve the situation]" as

an explanation of their stoicism. He then mentioned that it was his parents who lost the

most—certainly more than he did. This was not the first time I had heard this. Many

Nisei internment narratives explicitly mention how much their parents' losses exceeded

their own, as if there is a tinge of guilt over the attention and awe many Nisei have

attracted as former internees while so many of their parents passed away before

remembering and discussing the internment became socially acceptable. I assumed they

were ready to discuss the internment because they began talking about conditions at

relocation centers, such as the mud floors at Fresno relocation center, excruciatingly hot days, dust storms at Tule Lake, lack of ceilings and privacy, "bucket flush benjos" without partitions between stalls. *Benjo* means "latrine" in Japanese. It is curious that they inserted this Japanese word into their dialogue. Perhaps this was because so much Japanese was spoken in the camps due the strong Issei presence? "Thankfully," they noted, the semi-permanent internment camps to which they were subsequently moved were somewhat nicer facilities.

One interesting idea that came out of both these conversations and Nomura's (2003) autobiography was that some Issei parents may, in some ways, have had it easier while incarcerated. Dorothy remembers her mother being able to actually have a social life with other Issei and spare time to attend English language classes, which she really enjoyed. The Great Depression had put many Issei in desperate financial situations, and suddenly, it was no longer necessary for them to worry about how they would feed their children each day because food was supplied in the camps. In fact, some even found time to enjoy making *mochi*, a Japanese food made from pounding rice. Carl Nomura (2003) also recalled that while he was furious at his plight in the camp, his mother actually could relax to some degree since until this point she had spent so many years wondering what her family was going to eat next, or how they were going to pay rent and other living expenses.

I asked then, "What misrepresentations, falsifications, omissions, etc. do you continue to see about the internment to this day?" They said they do not read too much about it and have not met many people who know about it, especially in the Midwest.

The conversation moved then to the first round-up, right after Pearl Harbor. Immediately after the attack, many JA community leaders—mostly Issei—were incarcerated. Dorothy's step dad and uncles, along with Henry's dad, disappeared. Henry actually thought all Issei men were taken away, but James said it was usually just JA community leaders. I asked then if they knew why their fathers and uncles were kidnapped. Dorothy said her dad wrote a local newsletter in Japanese. Henry is not sure why his dad was taken. Dorothy mentioned a couple of times that she felt all of that was really pointless, because they did little with these men, who, after being moved from city to city for a while, just ended up in camp like everyone else.

I do not recall this round-up appearing frequently in historical accounts of the internment era, though it does seem that a relatively large number of Issei men were incarcerated without warning or reason right after the attack. Yet, in some ways this feels different from the internment, which was a public, large-scale endeavor with economic motives. Was this round-up an act of panic on the part of alarmed law enforcement and military personnel? This very much reminds me of a Muslim college friend, who was actually detained for a full month without due cause upon re-entering the country after the winter break following 9/11. This Issei round-up, as well as the treatment of Muslim Americans after 9/11, suggests to me how little loyalty to political bodies is understood.

I next asked, "How do you feel about the redress movement? Was it 'fair'? Were its goals accomplished? How could it have been improved? " They said the money ($20,000 per interned person) was of course insufficient to compensate for loss of assets, careers, and dignity. More importantly, they all agreed with Dorothy when she said she

felt it came too late (1988) for the Issei, few of whom were still alive at this time, yet they lost far more than their Nisei children. They felt that while their treatment in the camps was "decent," they again felt the loss of those years was most significant to them as young adults, forcing them to defer college and work.

James began talking about the dispersal effect the internment had on the population, sending many JAs east in search of ways to leave the camp, since securing employment or college acceptance at a location out east was a way to leave the camps. My grandmother, for example, found a job in St. Paul and was able to leave early. It was not clear to me whether he felt this was good or bad, as he initially presenting it not in an undesirable light. He then followed, however, with a recent story about an older, non-JA stranger approaching him, confirming that he was Japanese and was interned, and then telling him he thought it was good that Japanese were spread out like that after the internment. James said that the exchange struck a dischord with him and that he has not been able or willing to talk to the man since, choosing to ignore him. Surely this encounter was very much in the forefront of James' consciousness. While I do not believe this would necessarily be considered one of Anderson and Jack's (1991) "meta-statements", indicating a discrepancy between what is said and what is expected to be said, I did sense a similar dilemma in his careful observation of our faces while he told this story. I think the hardest part was that James may, on some level, not disagree completely with the man's opinion. In fact, we all probably agree on some level, being Americans and having had the same lessons on the benefits of integration over segregation, affirmative action, and intercultural experiences recited to us over and over.

What then made this encounter then so unpleasant to him and everyone at the table? Certainly there was a feeling the man was trivializing the internment, despite what was probably was not an overt attempt to offend. There was also the question of for *whom* it was good. Perhaps the integrationist rationale and rhetoric making even the suggestion of segregation "racist" cannot erase the memories of loneliness, fractured communities, and loss among the displaced.

Running out of time, I asked the most important question on my mind. I asked, "What do you hope current and future generations will remember about the internment? How should we continue to remember this injustice?" James answered that teaching in schools was important, along with teacher training, which started a conversation about their experiences speaking about the internment at local churches and schools. Carol said she used to be invited to speak about it, but that the younger teachers seem to not know about it anymore. Henry and Dorothy said they had spoken at a number of churches, Dorothy usually discussing camp life and James talked about the politics since he had actually written a paper on the legal aspects of the internment at one point. Dorothy said people were interested, but that people these days see it as an event that occurred too long ago.

I recently signed up to visit local schools and speak about the internment. To prepare for this, I asked them what kinds of things they thought I should talk about. Dorothy said they should know it is unfair and that she remembers her mother commenting that if they had been Italian, there would have been an uprising. Carol said to remember that they were citizens. James said I should try and get them to understand

what it would feel like, especially, he mentioned, the mandatory pulled shades on the trains from the relocation centers to the internment camps. This memory of sitting in darkness for days on trains to the internment camps seems to come up consistently in internment literature.

We ended the conversation then after nearly four hours. I do not feel anyone left on a sour note, which was among my most important goals for the afternoon. As everyone was preparing to part, Henry took the opportunity to ask me personally about how I liked my program and wanted to talk a bit about my goals working in education. I felt he was genuinely interested in me and I regretted somewhat that I decided to conduct a group interview, rather than meet with participants individually. Free from the tension of group socialization, individual interviews may have resulted in very different conversation and, perhaps more importantly, a greater sense of connection with participants.

While I do not regret my decision not to record the conversation, as I feel this did allow the participants to relax more, it did present challenges in remembering what was said and sometimes by whom. However, the focus of this study was not what participants actually said. Although the interview is included here as a part of the findings, what I wish readers to take away from this project is the process of intergenerational learning experience upon which I embarked. Steps such as preparatory historical research and interview scheduling are not typically considered findings in the traditional sense, but their inclusion as "findings" is what I feel makes this project ultimately about education, not history.

Conclusion

Remembering the past is important historical inquiry, though not, perhaps for the fact-finding reasons for which students are often asked to inquire about history. It requires, however, a conceptual departure from the conviction that any study of the past must be rooted in the reconstruction of some lost material reality. Surely, such reconstruction is also worthwhile historical inquiry, but, as the methodological considerations reviewed earlier suggest, it is neither the only form of such inquiry nor the one always most appropriate.

The significance to education of the kind of remembering presented here—an intergenerational encounter, conversation, performance—is less about the actual past "replicated" in the process, but rather the process of remembering itself. Indeed, as Schubert (1982) suggested, what is learned and how it is learned are perhaps fundamentally indistinguishable.

I have sought to cite academic theories and methods carefully to make the rationale behind the idea that "learning to remember is part of education for democratic citizenship" as convincing and appealing as possible to educators. Nonetheless, implementing such activities on a large scale is undoubtedly both an educational and political challenge. How is remembering the past as an act of citizenship and as an educational process to be accepted by educators? From the time approved textbooks were written to guide teachers with little academic training themselves (Cuban, 1993, p. 31), political and economic tensions have preserved the conservative nature of curricular materials over much of the history of the United States (Foster, 1999).

However, Hahn (1998) also observed that historically, social studies in the United States has seen persistent disagreement over the "relative emphases that should be placed on disciplinary knowledge, practice in reflective inquiry, and practical decision making within the social studies curriculum" (pp. 16–17). It is perhaps within this ongoing debate that activities like this project can alleviate tensions. For example, disciplinary knowledge gained by "doing one's homework" prior to the interview by reviewing history on the topic of conversation, while reflective inquiry is practiced in the interview and subsequent narration. Historical information, communication skills, friendship, and memories gained through the intergenerational process all lay the foundation for informed decision making.

Because I wanted to incorporate something of personal significance to me, I chose the World War II internment of Japanese Americans as an event I would like to better remember. Although my interview did not uncover a great deal about internment history, the entirety of the experience of remembering the internment with former internees was the intended goal.

Remembering the lived past is not just the task of students. I started this project with the idea that this was also the responsibility of teachers, policy makers, curriculum designers, textbook authors and others involved in educational administration. The democratic construction and guidance of our collective memory depends, I feel, on such involvement at all levels.

There is also a certain empowerment that comes with the distribution of methodological tools to learners, a benefit I feel floated in and out of my consciousness

during my design of this study. As Crane (1997) suggested, remembering and forgetting past events selected from the vast archive of history is the responsibility of all. I am inspired at the prospect of encouraging in citizens an understanding of narration and memory, and empowering them to construct their own learning experiences using these tools.

Perhaps most important, however, is the social aspect of this project. Is it possible for citizenship education to include social experiences in its explicit definition of learning? In this view, the intergenerational experience itself is the learning objective. This is not to say that what is "learned" in the process is unimportant, but rather that what is learned cannot and should not be separated from the task of embarking on the intergenerational exploration of remembering.

Oral history projects are relatively simple to execute and more enjoyable and engaging than textbooks for some students. Students benefit not only by enriching their understanding of the past, but by socializing with seniors, a quiet—yet powerful—group with which they more than likely have limited contact. Engaging in shared remembering with seniors—a relatively straight forward, yet powerful exercise in historical inquiry—may be one workable solution to many scholars' concerns about the manipulation, reappropriation, and legitimization of collective memory to serve political purposes.

Remembering the past as I attempted to illustrate with this project is ultimately something that requires communication to accomplish. Historical inquiry using recordings, documentaries, or other artifacts of history would constitute a separate endeavor. Furthermore, communication about the past is at once fleeting, irreproducible,

performative, yet a capable and influential player in the political arena of collective memory. Empowering students to embark on this accessible and educational exploration of the past prepares them for citizenship in a society conscious of the impact our conceptions of the past have on the decisions we make.

References

An Act. Pub. L. 503. 21 Mar. 1942. Stat. 173.

Achebe, C. (1988). *Hopes and impediments: Selected essays*. New York: Anchor.

Alagoa, E. (2001). The dialogue between academic and community history in Nigeria. In
L. White, S. Miescher, & D. Cohen (Eds.), *African words, African voices: critical
practices in oral history*. Indiana University Press.

Anderson, K., & Jack, D. (1991). Learning to listen: Interview techniques and analyses.
In S. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral
history* (pp. 11–26). New York: Routledge.

Andrabi, T., Das, J., Khwaja, A., & Zajonc, T. (2005). Religious School Enrollment in
Pakistan: A Look at the Data. .

Apple, M., & Christian-Smith, L. (1991). The politics of the textbook. In M. Apple & L.
Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.

Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New
German Critique*, *65*, 125–133.

Atwood, M. (1998). In search of Alias Grace: On writing Canadian historical fiction. *The
American Historical Review*, 1503–1516.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas
Press.

Banks, J. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education.
Journal of Teacher Education, *1*(52), 5–16.

Banks, J. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, *3*(37), 129–139.

Barber, K., & Moraes Farias, P. (1989). *Discourse and its disguises: The interpretation of African oral texts*. University of Birmingham, Centre of West African Studies.

Bartlett, F. (1932). Remembering: An experimental and social study. *Cambridge University*.

Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bell, D. (1993). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. Basic Books.

Bennet, M. (2004). Becoming Interculturally Competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward multiculturalism: A reader in multicultural education* (pp. 62–77). Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.

Berkman, M., & Plutzer, E. (2004). Gray peril or loyal support? The effects of the elderly on educational expenditures. *Social Science Quarterly*, *5*(85), 1178–1192.

Bietti, L. (2008). *Collective memory project: Social aims*. Retrieved January 21, 2008, from `http://collectivememory-project.blogspot.com/2008/07/social-aims.html`.

Bourquin, J. (2000). Report. In Council for Cultural Co-operation (Ed.), *Remembrance and citizenship: From places to projects* (pp. 29–44). Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

The Bradley Commission on History in Schools. (1989). Building a history curriculum: Guidelines for teaching history in schools. *The History Teacher*, *1*(23), 7–35.

Brink, A. (1998). Stories of history: Reimagining the past in Post-Apartheid narrative. In S. Nuttall & C. Coetzee (Eds.), *Negotiating the past: The making of memory in South Africa* (pp. 29–42). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Butler, R. (1963). The life review: An interpretation of reminiscence in the aged. *Psychiatry*, *26*, 65–76.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender consitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, *4*(40), 519–531.

Canning, K. (1994). Feminist history after the linguistic turn: Historicizing discourse and experience. *Signs*, *2*(19), 368–404.

de Certeau, M. (1988). *The writing of history*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cerwonka, A. (2007). Nervous conditions: The stakes in interdisciplinary research. In A. Cerwonka & L. Malkki (Eds.), *Improvising theory: Process and temporality in ethnographic fieldwork*. University of Chicago Press.

Charlton, K. (1977). The Contribution of History to the Study of the Curriculum. In A. Bellack & H. Kliebard (Eds.), *Curriculum and evaluation* (pp. 63–78). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Chuman, F. (1976). *The Bamboo People: The law and Japanese-Americans*. Del Mar, CA: Publisher's Inc.

United States Government. (1988). *Civil Liberties Act of 1988*. Retrieved May 25, 2009, from `http://www.civics-online.org/library/formatted/texts/civilact1988.html`.

Clarke, P. (1996). *Deep citizenship*. New York: Routledge.

Cogan, J., & Derricott, R. (2000). *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education*. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Cooper, B. (2005). Oral sources and the challenge of African history. In J. Philips (Ed.), *Writing African History* (pp. 191–215). University of Rochester Press.

Crane, S. (1997). Writing the individual back into collective memory. *The American Historical Review*, *5*(102), 1372–1385.

Crocco, M. (1989). Putting the actors back on stage: Oral history in the secondary school classroom. *The Social Studies*, *1*(89), 19–24.

Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in american classrooms, 1890–1990*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kashima, T. (1997). *Personal justice denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians*. Washington, D.C.: University of Washington Press.

Davis Jr., O., Ponder, G., Burlbaw, L., Garza-Lubeck, M., & Moss, A. (1986). *Looking at history: A review of major U.S. history textbooks*. Washington, D.C.: People for the American Way.

de Certeau, M. (1987). *Histoire et psychanalyse entre science et fiction*. Paris: Gallimard.

DeJaeghere, J. (2006). Intercultural meanings of citizenship in the Australian secondary curriculum: Between critical contestations and minimal constructions. In E. Stevick & B. Levinson (Eds.), *Reimagining civic education: How diverse societies form democratic citizens* (pp. 293–316). Rowman & Littlefield.

DeJaeghere, J., & Tudball, L. (2007). Looking back, looking forward: Critical citizenship as a way ahead for civics and citizenship education in Australia. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, *2*(3).

DeJaeghere, J. (2009). Critical citizenship education for multicultural societies. *Inter-American Journal of Education for Democracy*, *2*(2), 222–236.

Drufovka, I., & Biella, P. (2001). *Japanese American Internment Curriculum*. Retrieved from `http://bss.sfsu.edu/internment/`.

Exec. Order No. 9066, 3 C.F.R. 1092–93 (19 Feb 1942).

Fabian, J. (1995). Ethnographic misunderstanding and the perils of context. *American Anthropologist*, *1*(97), 41–50.

Fassin, D. (2007). *When bodies remember: Experiences and politics of AIDS in South Africa*. University of California Press.

Foster, S. (1999). The struggle for American identity: Treatment of ethnic groups in United States history textbooks. *History of Education*, *3*(28), 251–278.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th ed.). New York: Continuum.

Frisch, M. (1989). American history and the structures of collective memory: A modest exercise in empirical iconography. *Journal of American History*, *4*(75), 1130–1155.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4 ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gayne, M. (2003). Japanese Americans at the Portland YWCA. *Journal of Women's History*, *3*(15), 197–203.

Gengenbach, H. (2006). *Binding memories: Women as makers and tellers of history in Magude, Mozambique*. Columbia University Press. (Available online at http://www.gutenberg-e.org/geh01/).

Giblin, J. (2004). Passage in a struggle over the past: Stories of Maji Maji in Njombe, Tanzania. In T. Falola & C. Jennings (Eds.), *Sources and methods in African history: Spoken, written, unearthed* (pp. 295–311). University of Rochester Press.

Giroux, H. (2003). Public pedagogy and the politics of resistance: Notes on a critical theory of educational struggle. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *1*(35), 5–16.

Gluck, S. (1991). Advocacy oral history: Palestinian women in resistance. In S. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 205–220). New York: Routledge.

Gluck, S., & Patai, D. (1991). Language and communication: Introduction. In S. Gluck & D. Patai (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history* (pp. 7–10). New York: Routledge.

Go For Broke National Education Center. (2006). *442nd Regimental Combat Team*. Retrieved March 5, 2011, from

http://goforbroke.org/history/docs/veterans_442nd.pdf.

Goodin, R. (1996). *The theory of institutional design*. Cambridge University Press.

Gregoriou, Z. (2004). De-scribing hybridity in "unspoiled Cyprus": Postcolonial tasks for the theory of education. *Comparative Education*, *2*(40), 241–266.

Hahn, C. (1998). Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education.

.

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. University of Chicago Press.

Hamilton, P., & Shopes, L. (2008). *Oral history and public memories*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Hanson, J. (1996). *Integrating children's literature into the upper elementary social studies curriculum: the Japanese internment during World War II* (Unpublished master's thesis). Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada.

Harada, V. (2001). *The treatment of Asian Americans in U.S. history textbooks published 1994–1996*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED448072).

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

Hein, L., & Selden, M. (2000). The lessons of war, global power, and social change. In L. Hein & M. Selden (Eds.), *Censoring history: Citizenship, and memory in Japan, Germany and the United States* (pp. 3–50). M. E. Sharpe.

Henige, D. (2005). Oral tradition as a means of reconstructing the past. In J. Philips (Ed.), *Writing African History* (pp. 169–190). University of Rochester Press.

Hironaka, C. (2009). *Violence and murder in the Tule Lake Segregation Center: Three case studies of community factionalism and administrative misrule, October 1943–July 1944* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Stanford University, Palo Alto, California.

Hobsbawm, E. (1983). Introduction: Inventing tradition. In E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (Eds.), *The Invention of Tradition* (pp. 1–14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobmeyer, W. (1990). *International Textbook Research*. Göteborgs University.

Johnson, R., & Dawson, G. (2006). Popular memory: Theory, politics, method. In R. Perks & A. Thomson (Eds.), *The oral history reader* (pp. 43–53). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kammen, M. (1991). *Mystic chords of memory: The transformation of tradition in American culture*. Knopf.

Kazamias, A. (2001). Re-inventing the historical in comparative education: Reflections on a protean episteme by a contemporary player. *Comparative Education*, *4*(37), 439–449.

Kikumura, A. (1986). Family life histories: A collaborative venture. *The Oral History Review*, *14*, 1–7.

Kiyota, M. (1997). *Beyond loyalty: The story of a kibei*. University of Hawai'i Press. (Linda Klepinger Keenan, trans.).

Kymlicka, W. (2003). Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. *Theory and Research in Education*, *2*(1), 147–169.

Lalu, P. (2008). *The Deaths of Hintsa: Postapartheid South Africa and the Shape of Recurring Pasts*. HSRC Press.

Lazarre, J. (1997). *Beyond the whiteness of whiteness: Memoir of a white mother of Black sons*. Duke University Press.

Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong*. Touchstone.

Lovejoy, P. (2006). Autobiography and memory: Gustavus Vassa, alias Olaudah Equiano, the African. *Slavery & Abolition*, *3*(27), 317–347.

McClain, C. (1994). *The mass internment of Japanese Americans and the quest for legal redress*. Routledge.

McLaughlin, T. (1992). Citizenship, diversity, and education: A philosophical perspective. *Journal of Moral Education*, *3*(21), 235–251.

Mead, M. (1974). Grandparents as educators. *The Teachers College Record*, *2*(76), 240–249.

Montagu, A. (1998). *Man's most dangerous myth: The fallacy of race*. Altamira Press.

Morrissey, C. (1970). On oral history interviewing. In L. Dexter (Ed.), *Elite and specialized interviewing* (pp. 9–8). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Mukai, G. (2000). *Teaching about Japanese-American Internment*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED447066).

Nomura, C. (2003). *Sleeping on Potatoes: A Lumpy Adventure from Manzanar to the Corporate Tower*. Bellingham, Washington: Erasmus Books.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire. *Representations*, *1*(26), 7–25.

O'Brien, T. (1990). *The Things They Carried*. Boston: Houghton.

O'Brien, T. (1999). *Writing Vietnam (Tim O'Brien, President's Lecture*. Retrieved

    February 3, 2011, from

    `http://www.stg.brown.edu/projects/WritingVietnam/obrien.html`.

Ogawa, M. (2004). Treatment of Japanese-American internment during World War II in

    U.S. history textbooks. *International Journal of Social Education*, *1*(19), 35–47.

Okada, J. (1977). *No-no boy*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.

    (Originally published in 1957 by Charles E. Tuttle in Rutheford, Vermont).

Okubo, M. (1983). *Citizen 13660*. University of Washington Press.

Orwell, G. (1949). *1984*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Osler, A. (2008). Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report: Re-imagining a

    cosmopolitan nation. *London Review of Education*, *1*(6), 11–25.

Papadakis, Y. (2008). Narrative, memory and history education in divided Cyprus: A

    comparison of schoolbooks on the "history of Cyprus". *History & Memory*, *2*(20),

    128–148.

Parekh, B. (2002). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*.

    Harvard University Press.

Parker, W. (1996). "Advanced" ideas about democracy: Toward a pluralist conception of

    citizenship education. *Teachers College Record*, *1*(98), 104–125.

Parker, W., Ninomiya, A., & Cogan, J. (1999). Educating world citizens: Toward

    multinational curriculum development. *American Educational Research Journal*,

    2(36), 117–145.

Penslar, R. (1993). *Protecting human research subjects: Institutional review board guidebook*. Retrieved from

http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/irb/irb_guidebook.htm.

Pinar, W., & Grumet, M. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt.

Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Podeh, E. (2000). History and memory in the Israeli educational system. *History and Memory*, *1*(12), 65–100.

Portelli, A. (1991). *The death of Luigi Trastulli: Form and meaning in oral history*. SUNY Press.

Rayson, A. (1987). Beneath the mask: Autobiographies of Japanese-American women. *MELUS*, *1*(14), 43–57.

Richie, D. (1995). *Doing Oral History*. New York, NY: Twayne.

Romanowski, M. (1995). Beyond history textbooks: Teachers, students and the Japanese internment. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *2*(19), 35–44.

Rosenbaum, W., & Button, J. (1989). Is there a gray peril? Retirement politics in Florida. *The Gerontologist*, *3*(29), 300–306.

Rostow, E. (1945). The Japanese American Cases-A Disaster. *Yale Law Journal*, *3*(54), 9–3.

Roxworthy, E. (2008). *The spectacle of Japanese American trauma: Racial performativity and World War II*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Russell, D. (1996). *NPR's terry gross to appear at UNLV*. Retrieved from

http://cms.unlv.edu/newscenter/releases.dot?newsid=98354.

Sahr, R. (2007). *Inflation Conversion Factors for Years 1774 to estimated 2018*.

Retrieved Sunday, May 11, 2008, from

http://oregonstate.edu/cla/polisci/faculty-

research/sahr/infcf17742007.pdf.

Said, E. (2000). Invention, memory, and place. *Critical Inquiry, 2*(26), 175–192.

Sakai, N. (1996). Nashonaritei-to-bo(koku)go-no-seiji [Nationality and the politics of

(national) mother tongues]. In S. Naoki & B. de Bary (Eds.), *Nashonaritei-no-

datsukouchiku [Deconstructing nationality]* (pp. 9–28). Tokyo: Kashiwashobo.

Schubert, W. (1982). The return of curriculum inquiry from schooling to education.

Curriculum Inquiry, 221–232.

Selective Service System. (1943). *Statement of United States Citizen of Japanese

Ancestry*. Retrieved March 5, 2011, from

http://www.intimeandplace.org/Japanese%20Internment/reading/loyal

tyquestions.html.

Shopes, L. (1980). Using oral history for a family history project. *Technical Leaflet 123*.

Nashville: American Association for State and Local History.

Simon, R. (1980). Journal editing as a subversive activity: "Curriculum Inquiry" and the

curriculum field. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 107–113.

Smith, A. (2003). Citizenship education in Northern Ireland: Beyond national identity?

Cambridge Journal of Education, 1(33).

Strong, E. (1933). *Japanese in California*. California: Stanford University Press.

Thelen, D. (1989). Memory and American history. *Journal of American History*, *4*(75), 1117–1129.

Thomas, D., Kikuchi, C., & Sakoda, J. (1952). *The Salvage*. University of California Press.

Thornton, S. (2001). Educating the educators: Rethinking subject matter and methods. *Theory into Practice*, *1*(40), 72–78.

Tonkin, E. (1992). *Narrating our pasts: The social construction of oral history*. Cambridge University Press.

Twain, M. (1906). January 5, 1906. In H. Smith (Ed.), *Autobiography of Mark Twain: The complete and authoritative edition*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Weglyn, M. (1996). *Years of infamy: The untold story of America's concentration camps*. University of Washington Press.

Wertsch, J. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. (2007). National narratives and the conservative nature of collective memory. *Neohelicon*, *2*(34), 23–33.

Wertsch, J. (2008). The narrative organization of collective memory. *Ethos*, *1*(36), 120–135.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *2*(41), 237–269.

White, L. (1990). *The comforts of home: Prostitution in colonial Nairobi*. University of Chicago Press.

White, N. (1998). Marking absences: Holocaust testimony and history. In R. Perks & A. Thomson (Eds.), *The Oral History Reader* (pp. 172–182). Routledge.

Willis, J. (1996). Two lives of Mpamizo: Understanding dissonance in oral history. *History in Africa*, 319–332.

Wilson, R., & Hosokawa, B. (1980). *East to America: A history of the Japanese in the United States*. Quill.

Yerushalmi, Y. (1982). *Zäkhor: Jewish history and Jewish memory*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Yoo, D. (2000). *Growing up nisei: Race, generation, and culture among Japanese Americans of California, 1924–49*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.