

Photocopy and Use Authorization

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Idaho State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further state that permission for extensive copying of my dissertation for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of my academic division, or by the University Librarian. It is understood that any copying or publication of this dissertation for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

Memory and Salience of Japanese and Japanese American Internment in the 21st Century

by

Chadwick A. Pearsall

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Arts in the Department of Political Science

Idaho State University

Summer 2022

Committee Approval

To the Graduate Faculty:

The members of the committee appointed to examine the dissertation of CHADWICK A. PEARSALL find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Mark K. McBeth, D.A.
Major Advisor

Donna L. Lybecker, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Susan Goslee, Ph.D.
Graduate Faculty Representative

Human Subjects Committee Approval

October 27, 2021

Chadwick Pearsall
Political Science
MS 8073

RE: Study Number IRB-FY2022-42: History, Narrative, and Policy

Dear Mr. Pearsall:

Thank you for your responses to a previous review of the study listed above. I agree that this study qualifies as exempt from review under the following guideline: Category 2.(i). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording).

The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

This letter is your approval, please, keep this document in a safe place.

Notify the HSC of any adverse events. Serious, unexpected adverse events must be reported in writing within 10 business days.

You are granted permission to conduct your study effective immediately. The study is not subject to renewal.

Please note that any changes to the study as approved must be promptly reported and approved. Some changes may be approved by expedited review; others require full board review. Contact Tom Bailey (208-282-2179; fax 208-282-4723; email: humsubj@isu.edu) if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Ralph Baergen, PhD, MPH, CIP
Human Subjects Chair

To my wife, Chelsea, and my parents, Joel and Nikki.

Your support, encouragement, and belief sustained me through this process.

Acknowledgements

It's appropriate that this dissertation, which touches on collective memory and racial injustice, begin with a land acknowledgement. The land on which Idaho State University's Pocatello campus sits is within the original Fort Hall Reservation boundaries and is the traditional and ancestral home of the Shoshone and Bannock peoples. I acknowledge the Fort Hall Shoshone and Bannock peoples, their elders past and present, their future generations, and all Indigenous peoples, including those upon whose land the University is located. I offer gratitude for the land itself and the original caretakers of it. As a student at this university, I affirm my ongoing commitment and responsibility to teach accurate histories of the regional Indigenous people and of the University's institutional relationship with them.

I couldn't have asked for a more supportive family. Chelsea, this dissertation wouldn't have been possible without you. There were times when you picked me up off the floor and kept me going. Through it all you have stuck with me and cheered me on. This accomplishment of mine is something we share. Mom and Dad, you nurtured my curiosity and encouraged my development as a student and as a person. You made sacrifices so I could have better opportunities. To my siblings, who were always happy to discuss things other than graduate school with me, which was a welcome distraction. Michelle, Nekoda, and Odin, thanks for watching Tali so I could research and write. A special acknowledgement to my grandparents, who have passed. When I started this process there were three of you with me. I'm sorry none of you got to read this, but you all played an important part in it.

Thank you to my dissertation committee for sticking with me. Mark McBeth, I was your graduate assistant my first semester of graduate school. Since then you've guided me through team-teaching, co-publishing my first article (with you), comprehensive exams, and this dissertation. Donna Lybecker, without your guidance I wouldn't have made it through graduate school. Thanks for letting me be your advisee, even though I wasn't an IR student. Susan Goslee, thanks for stepping in and serving on the committee of a student you'd never met, when one of my original committee members had to withdraw.

There are a plethora of educators who impacted me on my academic journey. ISU's Political Science Department including Wayne Gabardi, Kellee Kirkpatrick, James Stoutenborough, Jeff Callen, and Earl Phippen. My history professors throughout the years, Kevin Marsh, Erika Kuhlman, Paul Sivitz, Kathleen Kole de Peralta, and Christian Esh. Steve Shaw, Mark Gismondi, and Joe Bankard, without your letters of recommendation and the things you taught me I wouldn't have been admitted to graduate school. Professors like Ben Fischer, who was the first to tell me I had what it takes to succeed in graduate school, Ed Crawford who pushed me to study abroad at Oxford, and Jennifer Chase who helped me avoid a potentially disastrous semester as a pre-med student. Some of the most impactful teachers came into my life at a younger age. I was introduced to the discipline of political science in high school by Steve Eyer, who had students reading Hobbes and Locke. Maybe most importantly, I owe an immense debt of gratitude to my fourth-grade teacher, who recommended I get tested for reading proficiency, and the people who worked with me at Sylvan Learning Center. You took me from a two-year reading level deficit to someone who completed a doctoral degree.

In addition to the usual family, friends, and mentors, I want to recognize the crucial role played by the people who are often overlooked. I would not have graduated were it not for the political Science department's administrative assistants. Michelle Winmill Munoz, Caroline Stutzman, and Adell Washburn, you kept me on track from day one to graduation. Thank you to Noywah Flint, who cleaned my office and the department for much of my time at ISU. And to the countless other cleaning and maintenance staff whose labor was vital to my academic endeavors.

A big thank you to all those who helped with the research for this dissertation. My former students at College of Eastern Idaho who were willing to be interviewed for this project. Ciara Collins and Kevin Hynes for helping me with methods literature.

Finally, my graduate school experience was greatly enriched by my fellow graduate students, many of whom became good friends. Travis Taylor, you helped me navigate multiple courses and reminded me to never get too high or low. Krystoff Kissoon, your friendship nourished me even more than the many meals we shared. Clint Cooper, I could never repay you for helping me hang in there when I wanted to quit. And Jill Kirkham, I never imagined we would grow to be lifelong friends when we first met. We took turns dragging each other towards the finish line. As usual, you made it to the final hurdle first but made sure I wasn't left behind. Thanks for your help, counsel, encouragement, and most of all your friendship.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------|
| List of tables..... | viii |
| Abstract | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review | 17 |
| Chapter 3: Historical Context | 27 |
| Chapter 4: Methodology | 46 |
| Chapter 5: Results | 56 |
| Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions..... | 72 |
| References | 82 |
| Appendix A: Human Subjects Material | 90 |
| Appendix B: Interview Questions..... | 93 |
| Appendix C: Tables | 96 |

List of Tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 3: Participant characteristics | 50 |
| Table 5.1: Narrative selection and self-reported knowledge | 57 |
| Table 5.2: How students learned about internment | 60 |
| Table 5.3: Influence of historical memory on current policy views | 68 |
| Table C1: Character identification in Japanese and Japanese American internment | 96 |
| Table C2: Character identification in immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border | 97 |
| Table C3: Character identification in possible reparations for US slavery | 99 |

Memory and Salience of Japanese and Japanese American Internment in the 21st Century

Dissertation Abstract—Idaho State University (2022)

At the heart of this project are questions regarding memory and knowledge of Japanese and Japanese American internment during World War II. A sample of fifteen College of Eastern Idaho (CEI) students were interviewed to see how they remembered internment and whether their memories were accurate. CEI's campus is only 150 miles away from an internment site, Minidoka National Historic Site, and all but one study participant attended high school in a state which was home to an internment camp (e.g., Idaho, Utah, California, and Colorado).

Participants were asked how they viewed two current policy issues with parallels to internment (immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery) and whether their views are influenced by their memory and knowledge of internment. The Narrative Policy Framework was used to examine how participants viewed narratives, history, and current policies. Cognitive science and collective memory were also central to this project.

This dissertation shows that internment is not a salient event to the participants. Most participants had some memory and knowledge of internment, but it was disjointed. A majority of participants could select the most accurate narrative of internment, in a relatively artificial testing environment, but they failed to recall wider details and facts contained in the narrative when asked open-ended questions. Even the details participants did recall existed as orphans, unattached to any wider story arc or narrative structure (i.e., characters, a plot, and a moral), and over half of the participants who identified the correct narrative of internment repeated the erroneous claim that military threats necessitated the exclusion and internment of Japanese and

Japanese Americans. There is also little connection between internment and the two current policy issues. Though some participants said their views on the current policy issues were influenced by internment, their explanations were vague and failed to make substantive causal connections between their knowledge of internment and current policies.

Keywords: Japanese internment, Narrative Policy Framework, collective memory, Idaho

Chapter 1: Introduction

People are trapped in history and history is trapped in them.

—James Baldwin, “Stranger in the Village”

Human beings participate in history both as actors and as narrators... In vernacular use, history means both the facts of the matter and a narrative of those facts, both “what happened” and “that which is said to have happened.” The first meaning places the emphasis on the sociohistorical process, the second on our knowledge of that process or on the story about that process.

—Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*

At its most basic level this dissertation looks at what people know about the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII, what narratives they construct using the facts they know, and what connections, if any, people make between Japanese and Japanese American internment and either of two current policy issues (immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery). This dissertation also seeks to understand how narrative elements, like those articulated in the Narrative Policy Framework (NPF), potentially influence people’s policy views. The NPF has previously been used to analyze narratives that were constructed specifically for contemporary policy debates, but this dissertation is unique in that it looks at historical narratives which were not created for current policy debates; a previously unexplored application of the NPF.

I came to this dissertation topic primarily through two events in my life. The first was an interaction with a church congregant shortly after moving to eastern Idaho in 2016. A middle-aged man asked me what I did for a living. I told him I was a graduate student at Idaho State University (ISU). He asked if I had heard about the Middle Eastern ISU students who were

arrested for making a pipe bomb; an event I had no knowledge of. The man proceeded with his story, made a derogatory comment about Middle Eastern students, and mentioned that he “hoped the US government was monitoring foreign students closely.”

In an attempt to find common ground and conclude what was becoming an increasingly uncomfortable interaction, I tried to steer the conversation towards a historical touchstone where we might find agreement. “I don’t know anything about ISU students and a pipe bomb,” I said, “but we want to be careful not to paint with a broad brush and demonize an entire group of people. Look what happened with the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during World War II. The US Government overreacted to racialized fears and profiled an entire ethnic group of people, unjustly detaining them for years in internment camps.” He looked at me with a puzzled expression. “That’s not what happened,” he replied. “The US Government put them in camps to keep them safe from hate crimes until the war was over.”

I stared at the man with bewilderment and surprise, unable to conceal either expression. I know this because my wife, twenty feet away and engaged in a conversation of her own, noticed my expression and intervened to free me from the conversation. This interaction startled me and made me question; how could someone living in eastern Idaho, less than two-and-half-hours from the site of the Minidoka National Historic Site, be so misinformed about what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII? The man was aware of Japanese and Japanese American internment, knowing some facts about the event, but his overarching narrative of the event was inaccurate. To him the US Government was the hero of the story, benevolently sheltering and protecting Japanese and Japanese Americans from hate crimes until the war was over. Far from being victims, in his retelling of the story, Japanese and Japanese Americans were

beneficiaries of the government's care for them. His narrative and recollection of internment bore little resemblance to actual events, but it doubtlessly shaped how he saw the world.

The second event which drove me to this topic was a statement from Senator Ted Cruz in the wake of the 2016 Brussels bombing. Cruz was campaigning to be the 2016 Republican presidential nominee when the bombing happened, so a press release from his campaign was to be expected. In his statement he called for the US to, “empower law enforcement to patrol and secure Muslim neighborhoods before they become radicalized.” He also called for the US to, “secure the southern border to prevent terrorist infiltration” (Cruz 2016). Having studied Japanese and Japanese American internment, Cruz's comments left me feeling unsettled. I was also aware that most people were less familiar with this history and would not be experiencing the same sense of discomfort. I began to realize my views on government policies were significantly influenced by my study of history and understanding of past events. If Japanese and Japanese American internment had not been a research interest of mine, Cruz's comments would not have given me pause, at least not for the same reasons. The comments might still have concerned me from a civil liberties standpoint, but my first thought would not have been that what Cruz was proposing sounded similar to events in the 1940s. In light of these two formative stories from my past, this dissertation seeks to discover what people know about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII and if it impacts the way people view current public policy.

This dissertation is inherently interdisciplinary. It uses concepts, frameworks, and theories from fields including political science, history, public administration, sociology, and psychology. Real-life issues are complex and rarely limited to one discipline or area of expertise. Accepting this fact means our investigations, and any proposed solutions, must be

interdisciplinary as well or we risk reducing the issue's complexity and only analyzing a small part of a multifaceted system. Our best chance of understanding the intricacies of the world around us lies in interdisciplinary approaches.

There is also an argument about pedagogy and the structure of formal education in this dissertation. If we acknowledge that most problems are interdisciplinary, then formal educational training must also be interdisciplinary. The 21st century requires an education system that recognizes the complexity of the world and prepares students to analyze and work within complex systems. For example, addressing climate change involves disciplines as seemingly unrelated as biology, economics, and political science, just to name a few. Confronting racial inequalities in the US requires knowledge of history, economics, sociology, psychology, and political science. When it comes to preparing students to understand and thrive in a world of complexity, the Doctor of Arts (DA) program in political science at ISU, with its multidisciplinary emphasis and requirements, serves as a model for this type of education. This dissertation fits squarely within the interdisciplinary and pedagogical training traditions of the DA.

There are five research questions central to this dissertation. The questions revolve around what is known and remembered about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII, what narratives have been constructed in relation to the event, and whether those memories and narratives influence current policy views. The research questions are as follows:

RQ1: Are participants able to select the most accurate narrative of Japanese and Japanese American internment when presented with two opposing narratives of the event?

RQ2: How did participants learn about Japanese and Japanese American internment?

RQ3: What details do participants know about Japanese and Japanese American internment and are those details accurate?

RQ4: Do participants view internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans, immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, and possible reparations for US slavery narratively, with characters including heroes, victims, and/or villains?

RQ5: Are participants' current policy views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery influenced by their memory and understanding of Japanese and Japanese American internment?

Research for this project was conducted using semi-structured one-on-one interviews.

Qualitative methods were selected because this dissertation seeks to better understand *how* and *why* individuals form and use historical narratives. The format of semi-structured interviews, with a blend of closed and open-ended questions, allowed participants to express themselves in their own words, while also allowing the interviewer to ask follow-up questions for added depth and clarity (Adams 2015). Although a quantitative study of this topic would shed light on *what* people think, it would be less likely to determine *why* the individuals think that way and *how* it affects their views on policy.

When it comes to determining the ideal sample size for qualitative research such as this there are many guidelines but no hard-and-fast rules, because the scope and content of qualitative research varies drastically (Morse 2000). Some of the literature on qualitative research and sample size advocates that researchers pursue saturation, the point at which gathering new data becomes redundant and superfluous. While saturation may seem like the solution to debates over sample size, determining when saturation has been achieved proves a difficult task. Variables such as the experience level of the researcher, to determine when interviews are no longer producing nuanced differences in responses, and an inability to prove saturation pose significant challenges to the method (Mason 2010). There are also practical limitations that impact sample size, like the amount of funding available and the timeline for finishing the research; both of which were relevant factors to determining the sample size for this dissertation. In the end a sample size of fifteen one-time interviews was chosen for this dissertation. This number was

consistent with the findings of Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) who discovered that data saturation for much of their coding occurred in as little as six to twelve interviews. Their findings suggest that when the population surveyed has a high level of homogeneity, a relatively small sample size can produce findings that are as robust as those drawn from a larger sample.

The research for this dissertation was ruled exempt and approved by the Idaho State University Human Subjects Committee (HSC) (IRB-FY2022-42). The HSC approval letter can be found in Appendix A. After receiving approval from ISU's HSC, the research proposal was again reviewed and approved by a committee at College of Eastern Idaho (CEI), the school where study participants were enrolled. All interviews were conducted between November 15, 2021 and January 21, 2022. Participants were voluntarily selected from one of three courses which I taught at CEI between the fall of 2020 and the spring of 2022. Participants had enrolled in one or more of the following courses: Introduction to Sociology (SOC 101), American National Government (POLS 101), and Women in US History (HIST 201). Participation in the study was completely voluntary and had no bearing on students enrolled in the course(s).

In addition to the examples at the beginning of this chapter, the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans was selected for two reasons. First, it was an event that, depending on how it was remembered, could potentially influence participant's current policy views. One example of this, as highlighted earlier, is how my own memory of the event has informed my personal policy views. Another example is the connections that groups such as the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) have made between Japanese and Japanese American internment and current policy issues (Japanese American Citizens League 2020). The second reason this event was selected is because there is a geographical connection between the participants interviewed and Japanese and Japanese internment. The campus of CEI is just over

150 miles, less than a two-and-a-half-hour car ride away from the Minidoka National Historic Site, one of the ten permanent internment sites established by the US government during WWII to confine Japanese and Japanese Americans. I was curious to learn what study participants knew about the events that had taken place less than 80 years ago in the state where they were enrolled in school.

Going into the interviews I had low expectations of participant knowledge related to the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. That said, ignorance of internment was not an indictment on study participants themselves. Even Hanako Wakatsuki, who became the National Park Service's Chief of Interpretation and Education for the Minidoka National Historic Site, recounted her own ignorance related to internment. Growing up Hanako knew about Japanese and Japanese American internment. Four generations of her family were confined in internment camps during the war and her great aunt, Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston, wrote the well-known book *Farewell to Manzanar*. Although she grew up in Idaho, and was aware of her family's history, Hanako knew nothing about Minidoka until college. "I never learned about Minidoka or the Japanese American incarceration experience during my primary and secondary schooling... I felt betrayed by the Idaho school system where I had never learned that the state that I grew up in had the same type of prison camp where my great-grandmother, great-grandparents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles had been incarcerated" (Wakatsuki 2020, 187). Hanako's story illustrates that what individuals know is the product of a community and that community's collective memory.

As Trouillot's epigraph at the beginning of the chapter illustrates, people's individual and collective narratives are not usually crafted by credentialed historians. These narratives are often influenced by laypersons; the storyteller, the artist, the propagandist, etc. The narratives inherent

in public and academic history act as filters between past events and contemporary narratives (Gilbert 2017). People know this to be true experientially; having knowledge of past events does not necessarily translate to the construction of accurate historical narratives and memory. One oft-cited example is the difference between Civil War history and Civil War memory (Blight 2001). A person who knows the dates of the Civil War (April 12, 1861-April 9, 1865), the leaders of the Union and the Confederacy (Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis), and which battles were deadliest (Gettysburg, Chickamauga, Spotsylvania, and The Wilderness), could still subscribe to an inaccurate narrative that slavery was not the cause of the Civil War. We see this scenario demonstrated among self-styled “Civil War historians” and reenactors (Horwitz 1998). It is naive to believe that past events have a straight-line connection to memory. The fallibility of memory and narratives highlight why historical records and historical thinking are important, because not all narratives are equally accurate or valid. Although memory is malleable, truth is not simply a matter of opinion or belief.

There were multiple false narratives surrounding Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII. The most pronounced narrative was that Japanese and Japanese Americans were interned due to military necessity. Other narratives include Japanese and Japanese Americans being interned for benevolent reasons (e.g., to protect them from violence during WWII) or that the internment camps were idyllic settings where prisoners enjoyed a lifestyle preferable to that of the average American during WWII.

One example of the narratives propagated during the 1940s comes from *Cornet*, a general-interest monthly magazine published by Esquire Inc. with a large readership at the time. In October 1942, the magazine ran an article entitled “Concentration Camp—U.S.A. Style” which was ambivalent about internment. The article includes an illustration with racist

depictions, which were common at the time, of Japanese and Japanese Americans as buck-toothed and smiling while working in the fields and playing baseball in the camp. The first quote of the article comes from a man held in the Manzanar War Relocation Center, who had previously worked as a technician for a large Hollywood studio. ““I like to tell you about this camp. Nice place to live. It’s better than Hollywood. Snow on the mountains is bright. Every day 80 to 85’” (M. Evans 1942, 51). The article goes on to highlight that people held in the German concentration camps of Boergermoor or Dachau do not give similarly complementary reports of their conditions. The article ends by portraying the camps as utopian democratic communities. “They are learning self-government by writing their own constitutions and putting them into effect. They are holding court over their fellow internees. They are policing their camps and maintaining justice... [at Manzanar] they have established their own copy of that truest microcosm of democracy, the New England town meeting” (M. Evans 1942, 53-54).

Contemporaneous accounts crafted by the government and popular media, like the one from *Cornet*, pushed false narratives of internment. For many reasons, which will be expounded in chapter 3, these false narratives remained largely uncontested until the release of the report by the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) in 1983. The CWRIC stated unequivocally that there was no military necessity to remove Japanese and Japanese Americans from the West Coast and wrote a scathing review of the conditions faced by the people held against their will in internment camps.

The final piece of this dissertation examines if, or how, participant views on current policy issues are influenced by their understanding of internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. The two current policies examined in this research are immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery.

The relationship between immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans has been highlighted by some of the same people who were interned during WWII. Chizu Omori, a writer living in Oakland who was interned as a child, traveled to Fort Sill, an army base in Lawton, Oklahoma, to protest the detention of immigrant children. When asked why she was protesting she responded, “Well, some of us just thought, because of our particular history, that we had, you know, the moral authority to go in and say, well, you’ve done it to us, so don’t repeat history” (Garcia-Navarro 2019). David Inoue, the executive director of the Japanese American Citizens League (JACL) said of border separations and detention, “This is something that’s deeply personal for many of us. The incarceration experience where families were very similarly torn apart as they were put in the camps and the lasting scars that many people carried from that, has led to deep emotional and visceral reactions” (Grigsby Bates 2018).

Similar protests, of border separation and detention policies, have been held in southern border states. Protests often include members of Japanese American, Native American, and Jewish American communities (Lee 2019). These three distinct racial and ethnic communities all have their own histories of trauma relating to detention and separation. Japanese Americans see parallels between immigrant detention and internment during WWII, Native American communities see similarities to Native American boarding schools, and Jewish Americans are reminded of how the Holocaust brought about family separation and detainment. Other possible connections between immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and Japanese and Japanese American internment include the furor around Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s comments about border detention facilities being “concentration camps” and the Biden

Administration's decision not to compensate families who were separated at the border during the Trump Administration.

On June 8, 2019, Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez tweeted, "This administration has established concentration camps on the southern border of the United States for immigrants, where they are being brutalized with dehumanizing conditions and dying. This is not hyperbole. It is the conclusion of expert analysis" (Ocasio-Cortez 2019). The tweet linked to an *Esquire* article in which Andrea Pitzer, a historian of concentration camps, says, "We have what I would call a concentration camp system... and the definition of that in my book is, mass detention of civilians without trial" (Holmes 2019). In the same article another historian says, "Things can be concentration camps without being Dachau or Auschwitz." The debate over the meaning of the term "concentration camp" is reminiscent of debates following the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans. In the 1940s the term "concentration camp" was used interchangeably with other terms such as "relocation center" and "internment camp" (Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians, hereafter CWRIC [1983] 1997, 27). The controversy over referring to these facilities as "concentration camps" happened after WWII, when people in the US became aware of Nazi concentration camps which functioned as extermination camps.

The final tie-in between immigrant detention and internment dates back to 2021, when the Biden Administration agreed to negotiate with lawyers for immigrant families seeking reparations for the forced separation experienced during the Trump Administration. An October article from the *Wall Street Journal* (Hackman, Viswanatha, and Gurman 2021) claimed the Biden Administration was considering paying \$450,000 to each family adversely affected by the Trump Administration's zero-tolerance policies. This story led to swift public backlash from Republicans. The figure which appeared in the article was likely taken from what some lawyers

representing separated families were asking for, rather than any number the government had considered paying. In December, amid political fallout, the Biden Administration ended talks of monetary compensation. The families seeking damages from the US government are now left to pursue their cases via the court system (Blitzer 2021; Montoya-Galvez 2022). The possible connection between this situation and internment is that after years of campaigning, those interned during WWII eventually received monetary redress and an apology from the US government.

The link between reparations for US slavery and the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII is rather straightforward. As mentioned previously, the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians recommended, one-time payments of \$20,000 to all surviving persons excluded from their residence by Executive Order 9066 (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 463). The 1988 Civil Liberties Act made the recommended reparations a reality. The decision to pay reparations was not without controversy. The CWRIC recommendation for monetary redress was the only part of the report, including the recommendations, not unanimously endorsed by all members of the commission. Representative Dan Lungren opposed monetary reparations because he worried it would establish a precedent for other mistreated groups, such as American Indians and others, to seek government compensation (Houston 1986).

The movement for reparations for US slavery might have been the type of thing Representative Lungren had in mind when he worried about establishing a precedent for reparations. In the spirit of the Civil Liberties Act, which passed the year before, Representative John Conyers Jr. introduced a bill titled, “Commission to Study Reparations Proposals for African Americans Act” in 1989. The bill has since been resubmitted in every subsequent session of Congress, by Conyers himself until his death in 2019 and by Representative Sheila

Jackson Lee thereafter. The text of Conyers' original bill is longer than subsequent versions, but in general it calls for the US Government to acknowledge the consequences of slavery from 1619-1865 and to establish a commission to examine the lasting impacts of slavery and make recommendations to Congress of possible remedies (Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African Americans Act 1989). On June 19, 2019, the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties held a hearing on H.R. 40, the "Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act." The hearing included testimony from Ta-Nehisi Coates, whose 2014 *Atlantic* article, "The Case for Reparations," is credited as bringing the idea of reparations for slavery and subsequent racial injustices, to the fore again in the national consciousness. Others who testified included Senator Cory Booker, actor and activist Danny Glover, legal experts, economists, and civil rights leaders. The same House committee held another public hearing on the bill in 2021.

This dissertation proceeds in the following manner: Chapter 2 includes a review of relevant literature and a discussion of the theoretical framework of the dissertation. Importantly, literature on public policy theory, the science of cognition, history, and memory studies anchor the project. Chapter 3 gives an overview of the historical record of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII. Chapter 4 is a justification and explanation of research methodology and data collection. Chapter 5 contains the research results. Chapter 6 includes discussion of the results, conclusions that can be drawn, and suggested areas for future research.

A Note on Language and Terminology

It is important for me to clarify some of the terminology used in this dissertation. Almost every book about Japanese and Japanese American internment has a section dedicated to language and terminology (see CWRIC [1983] 1997; Ng 2002; Murray 2008). Every author must

make a decision to use or avoid terms like “relocation centers,” “internment camps,” or “concentration camps” to refer to the permanent facilities where Japanese and Japanese Americans were confined during the war.

The report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians used the terms “relocation centers” and “evacuation” because they were officially designated terms and appeared most frequently in government records. The commission also acknowledged that the government terms were euphemisms deliberately used to mask the fact that Japanese and Japanese Americans were confined and kept under armed guard (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 27). In an attempt to more accurately convey the detainment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII some authors, such as Roger Daniels, persist in using the term “concentration camps.”

When choosing terminology to use for this dissertation I had to work backwards from language that would be easily understood by participants in oral interviews. If I had been pursuing a purely historical project, with no interview component, I may have used different language, but this project necessitated language use that would be easily understood during oral interviews. It also seemed intuitive that I would be consistent in the language used in the interviews and the write-up of the wider project. I chose to use the term “internment” because I believed it would be widely understood during my interviews. It is also worth noting that the official title of the Minidoka site was once “Minidoka Internment National Monument,” which shows that “internment” was widely used in official language. Using the term “internment” is a middle ground between government euphemistic terms like “relocation,” loaded terms like “concentration camps,” and terms like “incarceration,” which I believe may have confused participants. Finally, the term “internment” is widely used specifically in the context of Japanese and Japanese American confinement during WWII. For example, the Merriam-Webster online

dictionary has three examples where “internment” is used in a sentence and all three examples are about Japanese and Japanese American confinement during WWII.

When it comes to referring to the population who was targeted for internment, I chose to use the slightly wordy label “Japanese and Japanese Americans.” The CWRIC report frequently used the term “Nikkei” to refer to Japanese immigrants and their descendants, but I did not believe the term would be widely known by participants. “People of Japanese descent” failed to capture the fact that more than half of the people interned were American citizens by birth. “Japanese aliens,” although a term used frequently during the 1940s, always struck me as inappropriate because it centers the person’s immigration status without referencing the fact that Japanese immigrants were barred from becoming US citizens until the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act. Possibly the most accurate label for those targeted for internment would have been something like, “US residents from Japan, who were ineligible for citizenship, and American citizens of Japanese descent,” but even I found that too awkward to use repeatedly in interviews.

A few other terms which frequently appear when discussing Japanese and Japanese Americans are Issei, Nisei, Sansei, and Kibei. Issei is the term used for first-generation immigrants from Japan. As mentioned earlier, Issei were barred from becoming naturalized US citizens until 1952. Nisei are second-generation Japanese immigrants. Culturally and legally Nisei existed in two worlds and were often dual citizens of the United States and Japan. Sansei are third-generation Japanese immigrants, who made up the smallest number of those interned in the camps. The majority of Sansei were born as part of the postwar “baby boom” generation. Kibei was the term used for children of Japanese immigrants who were largely raised and educated in Japan. Often Kibei were Nisei who were sent to live with family in Japan. During

WWII Kibei were viewed with suspicion, as some in the US military and government viewed them as likely agents of Japanese, though this fear proved to be unfounded.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter is an overview of the frameworks central to this project as well as some of the wider literature dealing with narrative, cognitive science, and collective memory. The chapter starts with the Narrative Policy Framework; what it is and how it functions. Next is an exploration of the literature regarding cognitive science and decision-making. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of collective memory, with special attention paid to Marc Howard Ross' framework for collective remembering and forgetting.

Narrative Policy Framework

In addition to focusing on history and memory this dissertation also focuses on the power and function of narrative. Since the 1990s the term “narrative” has seen a rapid increase in its usage within academia (Ryan 2007). The study of narratives exists across academic disciplines including philosophy (e.g., Dennett 1991; Lyotard 1984), psychology (e.g., Brock, Strange, and Green 2002; Bruner 2002; Green and Brock 2005), politics (e.g., Safire 2004; Shanahan, et al. 2018) and healthcare (e.g., Hinyard and Kreuter 2007). Literary scholar and critic Marie-Laure Ryan (2007, 29) lays out eight specific conditions that distinguish narratives from other forms of literature:

1. Narrative must be about a world populated by individuated existents.
2. This world must be situated in time and undergo significant transformations.
3. The transformations must be caused by non-habitual physical events.
4. Some of the participants in the events must be intelligent agents who have a mental life and react emotionally to the states of the world.
5. Some of the events must be purposeful actions by these agents.
6. The sequence of events must form a unified causal chain and lead to closure.
7. The occurrence of at least some of the events must be asserted as fact for the storyworld.
8. The story must communicate something meaningful to the audience.

These eight criteria are a good starting place for narrative, especially when it comes to literary criticism, but narrative can be simplified and streamlined when applied to other fields such as politics and policy analysis. For example, Shanahan, et al. (2018, 176) distill the essential elements of a narrative in the NPF to include setting, characters (heroes, villains, victims, etc.), a plot (beginning, middle, and end), and a moral (a solution).

When discussing narrative this dissertation uses the definition and parameters laid out by Shanahan, et al. in the NPF. There are several reasons for this choice:

1. The NPF asserts that humans are inherently storytelling beings (“homo narrans”) (Shanahan, et al. 2018, 179). Speaking of the increasing attention given to narrative, comparative literature professor Peter Brooks said, “narrative is one of the principal ways we organize our experience in the world – a part of our cognitive tool kit that was long neglected by psychologists and philosophers” (Safire 2005). Psychologist Donald Polkinghorne agrees that narrative is, “the primary scheme by means of which human existence is rendered meaningful” (Polkinghorne 1988, 11).
2. The NPF highlights that narratives work on three levels (micro, meso, and macro). The micro level focuses on how individuals are affected by narratives, the meso level examines how narratives are used by groups (e.g., interest groups, the media, and politicians), and the macro level looks at how large, shared narratives (e.g., colonialism and manifest destiny) shape entire societies and systems (Shanahan, et al. 2018, 179-180; 185; 195).
3. The NPF focuses on public policy. The NPF holds that (1) social construction is a vital part of public policy, (2) those social constructions are bounded, rather than infinite, and (3) policy narratives have elements that are generalizable (setting, characters, plot, and moral) (Shanahan, et al. 2018, 178-179).

The NPF has been used to analyze numerous policies since being developed in 2010 (Jones and McBeth 2010). The framework has been applied to contemporary policy issues such as US education policy (Ertas 2015), US gun policy (Merry 2016), US nuclear policy (Gupta, Ripberger, and Wehde 2016), US environmental policy (Crow, et al. 2017), and is now widely used in non-US settings including Belgium (Esposito, et al. 2021), Russia (Schlaufer, et al. 2021), and Indonesia (Leong 2015). Each of these studies examines narratives crafted for

contemporary policy debates. What this dissertation seeks to discover is whether past narratives about a historical event (Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII) affect how people view current policy debates (immigrant detention at the US-Mexico border and reparations for US slavery). This dissertation is unique within political science and NPF studies because it looks at historical narratives which were not created with current policy debates in mind. Historical narratives and their influence on individual attitudes toward contemporary policy debates have largely been absent in NPF literature. This dissertation starts to fill this gap in the literature.

Additionally, the NPF has only one study (McBeth and Pearsall 2021) exploring the connection between narrative and teaching. McBeth and Pearsall (2021) demonstrate the importance of narrative to help students think critically about political issues, especially helping them differentiate between accurate and inaccurate narratives. Yet, the authors found that students, even when given a theoretical understanding of the power of narrative (e.g., confirmation bias, bounded rationality, and heuristics), were still prone to choose a less accurate narrative even when they have been taught that the information contained in the narrative is not factual.

Cognitive Science

The NPF is based on postulates about how cognitive processes work at the micro level of analysis. These postulates are largely based on established cognitive science studies. This dissertation uses a few concepts from these studies including bounded rationality, heuristics, and confirmation/disconfirmation bias (Shanahan, et al. 2018, 181-182). The illusory truth effect (Hasher, Goldstein, and Toppino 1977) is another theory relevant to this dissertation, but it is not

included in the NPF. Many of these cognitive theories build upon one another to explain how people experience the world and make decisions.

Bounded rationality is a rebuttal to modern economic theory that views humans as “homo economicus” (i.e. rational beings) and is largely based on the classic decision-making work of Herbert Simon (1957). Whereas modern economic theory asserts that people consistently make rational, self-interested, choices in pursuit of their desired goals (Zak 2008, 158), bounded rationality makes the counterclaim that humans’ ability to maximize and pursue their interests are far from reliable. Bounded rationality highlights the fact that humans are incapable of having perfect knowledge, face temporal restraints that necessitate decisions be made before sufficient knowledge is gained, and are unable to accurately predict the outcomes of decisions and actions (Selten 2002; see also Simon 1957).

Because of bounded rationality, people are forced to use heuristics, which are mental cues or shortcuts, when it comes to making decisions. Heuristics enable individuals to make “fast, frugal, and computationally cheap decisions” and, when matched to particular environmental structures, allow people to be ecologically rational (Gigerenzer 2002, 37; see also Kahneman 2011, 109-98). Political psychologist Marc Howard Ross (2018, 43) argues that narratives themselves operate as heuristics. “Narratives meet many needs, and people are likely to rely upon them when they are disoriented and struggling to make sense of events in situations of high uncertainty and stress.” Although heuristics serve a purpose, especially evolutionarily speaking, they do not necessarily produce correct outcomes, as they rely heavily on information available at the time, past experiences, expertise and training, and biological biases (Shanahan, et al. 2018, 181). Heuristics allow people to do the best they can, given the limitations of bounded

rationality, but that is a far cry from the rational decision maker, championed by modern economic theory and rational choice theorists.

Confirmation and disconfirmation bias are also examples of non-rational cognitive processes. Taber and Lodge (2006), for example, found evidence of both confirmation and disconfirmation bias in their research. Participants in their study self-selected arguments to read that they agreed with (confirmation bias) and would refute arguments they disagreed with, while uncritically accepting arguments they supported (disconfirmation bias). Jonathan Evans (1989, 41) claims that “confirmation bias is perhaps the best known and most widely accepted notion of inferential error to come out of the literature on human reasoning.” Famous English philosopher and scientist Francis Bacon even wrote about confirmation bias as early as the 1600s, although the term was not used until much later (Nickerson 1998, 176).

The illusory truth effect comes from research which found that statements, both true and false, repeated throughout sessions with participants were rated as having more validity than non-repeated statements (Hasher, Goldstein, and Toppino 1977). Subsequent research found that illusory truth effects occurred even when people knew better, and that knowledge was insufficient to protect against its powerful effects (Fazio, et al. 2015; Fazio 2020). One study showed that false stories which were familiar, because they were repeated multiple times over the course of the study, resulted in the creation of false memories, with people misattributing the story to something they knew before participating in the study (Polage 2012). These recent studies give credence to the quote from Gustave Le Bon ([1895] 1960, 125), which he attributes to French military and political leader Napoleon Bonaparte. “It was Napoleon, I believe, who said that there is only one figure in rhetoric of serious importance, namely, repetition. The thing

affirmed comes by repetition to fix itself in the mind in such a way that it is accepted in the end as a demonstrated truth.”

These cognitive processes all illustrate how humans are nonrational information processors and flawed decision-makers. This partially explains why people are captured by narrative. Humans do not have all the information in any given situation, and even if they did they would not possess the ability to process that information in a purely rational manner. Because humans have cognitive limitations, narratives are able to play a vital role in how people perceive the world and act in it.

Collective Memory

The term “collective memory” comes from French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs ([1950] 1995) who coined it in the first half of the twentieth century. Since then sociologists, historians, and political scientists have expanded the literature on collective memory, applying it to contexts across multiple disciplines. Ross (2018) asserts that collective memory is more than the aggregate of individuals’ memories, but also includes narratives, ritual expressions and enactments, and displays in its public commemorative landscape. While acknowledging the importance of narratives, sites, and texts, Crane (1997) focusses more on the role of the individual in collective memory. According to Crane, “all narratives, all sites, all texts remain objects until they are ‘read’ or referred to by individuals thinking historically” (1997, 1381). As these two scholarly viewpoints illustrate, collective memory, like the NPF, operates at the micro level (individual), the meso level (community), and the macro level (national or global).

Historian Alon Confino (1997) reminds us that collective memory is inherently political. He defines collective memory as, “a subjective experience of a social group that essentially sustains a relationship of power. Simply stated, it is who wants whom to remember what and

why” (Confino 1997, 1393). Collective memory reflects past and present power dynamics in ways that can be read and interpreted. Far from being random, collective memories are cultivated and sustained as an expression of power.

Political psychologist Marc Howard Ross (2018) used the principles of collective memory to analyze the process of forgetting, and later recovery of memory, related to the legacy of slavery in the northern United States. Ross highlights the importance of narratives, ritual expressions and enactments, and displays (e.g., historical sites and museums) in the public commemorative landscape. These three things can spur and nurture collective memory, which allows memory to persist in a group context across generations. For Ross narratives, commemorations, and physical sites act as a reinforcing feedback loop. If one, or multiple, parts of the loop are missing there is an increased chance of collective forgetting, rather than collective remembering. Ross (2018) attributes the collective forgetting about slavery in the northern states to the small number of narratives transmitted across generations, the lack of ritual reenactments or expressions, and a physical landscape largely devoid of sites and objects associated with slavery.

Ross (2018) is quick to point out that the same mechanisms which lead to forgetting, or what Confino might call the suppression of certain memories, can be reversed to foster increased collective memory. Physical sites and objects play a crucial role in this cycle of remembering. “The rediscovery of physical sites and objects is a powerful tool in memory recovery, providing people with a place to recount narratives about the past and objects—even fragments of objects—to link the past and present in emotionally meaningful ways. In addition, rediscovered sites can become important locations for the performance of rituals and ceremonies marking the past and

connecting it to people alive in the present” (Ross 2018, 21). Research by Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998) further supports Ross’ claims.

Affirming the role of emotion and the importance of physical sites to collective memory, a study by Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998) found that people felt a strong connection to the past when visiting a museum or historic site. The only thing that elicited more connection to the past was gathering with family (Rosenzweig and Thelen 1998, 20). The study also found that people viewed museums, which are often associated with physical historical sites, as the most trustworthy source of history; ahead of personal accounts from family members, eyewitnesses, college history professors, high school teachers, nonfiction books, and movies and TV programs (Rosenzweig and Thelen 1998, 21). According to Rosenzweig and Thelen, museums and historical sites, “gave visitors a sense of immediacy—of personal participation—that respondents associated with eyewitnesses; they evoked the intimacy of family gatherings; and they encountered an interaction with primary sources that reminded respondents of independent research” (Rosenzweig and Thelen 1998, 105).

In addition to the importance of physical sites, Ross (2018) highlights the crucial role narratives play in collective memory. His description of narratives, and their function, has much in common with the NPF’s definition of narrative. He describes narratives as, “explanations for events, large and small, in the form of short, commonsense stories... Crucially, narratives are infused with strong emotions that communicate far more than historical details” (Ross 2018, 43). As evidenced in his description of narratives, Ross asserts that collective memory has potential affective ability, but only if the memory is perceived as applicable by individuals and group members. As Ross puts it, “collective memories are about emotionally salient events and persons in the past that have particular relevance to how a group understands itself and the challenges it

faces in the present and future. These accounts are not simply trivial historical details about the past. They convey crucial social, political, and moral lessons that can be important resources in present struggles” (Ross 2018, 33). Ross uses the example of 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington to illustrate the affective potential of collective memory, and how it can be used as both a priming and framing device (which are part of the cognitive science toolkit acknowledged by the NPF).

Collective memories matter because they connect people in a society and can facilitate collective action. Consider the case of the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington. Within a few hours, they were described as sneak attacks similar to Pearl Harbor in 1941, easily prompting people to believe that such an attack warranted a military response. The fact that in 1941 a major country had initiated the attack and in 2001 the attack came from a terrorist group and not a state was not seen as significant. Hence, when the Bush administration announced it would launch an attack on Afghanistan, the American public had already been prepared to overwhelmingly support the idea. (Ross 2018, 47)

How events are remembered is vitally important. When reading the quote from Ross it is hard not to hear the echoes of Confino reminding us that collective memory, and how it is deployed, is not politically neutral. Collective memory has the ability to inform and empower, but also to mislead if abused or misapplied.

This dissertation will examine the process of forgetting and remembering Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII using the framework established by Ross, which focuses on narratives, ritual expressions and enactments, and displays in the public commemorative landscapes. This project also takes to heart Confino’s reminder of the political nature of memory and the power dynamics at play in collective memory. My hypothesis is that most people know little about internment for a variety of reasons; the way history is taught in most schools, the lack of collective memory of internment in most communities, the underdevelopment of physical sites of internment, and the relative absence of ritual expressions, enactments, and commemoration of internment. It is worth noting that none of these factors is

inevitable, and I would argue that these things can, and should, be changed moving forward. An increase in the collective memory of internment could also have a positive impact on future public policy.

Chapter 3: Historical Context of Internment

History of Japanese in America

To understand the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII it is important to understand the history of Japanese immigration to the United States, going back to the mid-1800s. Japanese immigrants began arriving in California in the 1860s, but immigration rates remained low. According to US census records, there were only 148 Japanese immigrants living in the United States in 1880. Most of the earliest immigrants from Japan were men who arrived in search of wealth they could bring back to their families in Japan.

It is worth briefly mentioning some of the history of Chinese immigration to America, because as historian Ronald Takaki (1998) says, “What happened to [the Chinese] in the nineteenth century represented the beginning of a pattern for the ways Asians would be viewed and treated [in America]” (Takaki 1998, 80). Labor agitation in the mid-1800s led to legislation in California, where a majority of Chinese immigrants resided, which was intended to harass Chinese immigrants and make it harder for them to earn a living in the US. In 1882 the US Congress passed the Chinese Exclusionary Act, which prohibited immigration from China for a 10-year period, even though Chinese immigrants accounted for only 0.002 percent of the US population two years earlier (Takaki 1998, 110). When the exclusion act expired in 1892, Congress extended it for 10 years in the form of the Geary Act. The extension was made permanent in 1902 and lasted until 1943 when Congress, recognizing that China was now an ally in WWII, repealed the exclusionary acts. As mentioned by Takaki, the scapegoating and exclusion of Chinese immigrants foreshadowed the treatment Japanese and Japanese Americans would face.

The number of Japanese immigrants living in the US grew slowly, only reaching the thousands in the 1880s, and still numbering fewer than 25,000 Japanese nationals by 1900 (Library of Congress 2022). When the wealth immigrants sought failed to materialize, they changed their plans and put down roots in their new homeland. They became involved with small farming operations and businesses, brought their wives from Japan, and created families and communities in America (Matsumoto 2000). In 1908 the “Gentlemen’s Agreement” restricted the immigration of Japanese men, but left the door open for women until 1924, when the National Origins Act of 1924 excluded all Japanese immigrants. Immigration from Japan to the United States was not permitted again until 1952, with the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

Immigration from Japan was staunchly opposed by a vocal segment of people in California, as had been the case with immigration from China. In 1905 the Asiatic Exclusionary League, which would go on to become the Japanese Exclusionary League, was formed when delegates from 67 organizations met in San Francisco. Within three years of its founding the League had over 100,000 members and 238 affiliated groups, most of which were labor unions (Shibutani 1978, 21-2). Historian Roger Daniels ([1962] 1977, 27-8) drew a throughline between the creation of the League and the events that followed. “From the League’s formation... until after the Second World War, there was in California an organized anti-Japanese movement that would eventually draw support from all segments of the state’s population.”

California’s Alien Land Law Act of 1913, which was tightened in 1920 and 1923, prohibited noncitizens from owning land, and in some cases even leasing for more than three years. The law took advantage of the fact that first-generation Japanese immigrants, Issei, were unable to become United States citizens due to the language of the Naturalization Act of 1790, which limited naturalization to, “any alien, being a free white person.” Following the US Civil

War, the Naturalization Act of 1870 expanded citizenship rights to include “aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent,” but remained silent on other races. In 1922 the US Supreme Court ruled, in *Ozawa v. United States*, that people born in Japan were ineligible for US citizenship, a ruling which remained the legal interpretation until the passing of the McCarren-Walter Immigration Act in 1952.

History of Japanese and Japanese American internment

The bombing of Pearl Harbor, on December 7, 1941, led the United States to enter World War II and go to war against Japan. Within hours of the attack the U.S. government began rounding up prominent leaders of the Japanese American community (e.g., Buddhist priests and Japanese language school teachers). Immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor some military and political leaders began to spread rumors of espionage and sabotage in the lead-up to the attack. Immediately following the attack on Pearl Harbor Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox went to Hawaii on a fact-finding mission. On December 15, 1941, he told the press, “I think the most effective Fifth Column work of the entire war was done in Hawaii with the possible exception of Norway” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 55). “Fifth Column” activity referred to sabotage from within the country by a group sympathetic to the country’s enemy. The CWRIC report states that Knox’s statement was not only unfounded, but also ignored the fact that Japanese Americans in large numbers had come to Hawaii’s defense during and immediately after the attack. Although Knox’s statements were false, they led to a spate of sensational press headlines which framed Japanese and Japanese Americans as a threat to national security (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 56).

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 (EO 9066), which authorized the Secretary of War to create military exclusion zones. The exclusion

zones established in the wake of EO 9066 included Alaska, Hawaii, southern Arizona, and half of Washington, Oregon, and California. Eventually all of California would become a military exclusion zone. This area became known as the Western Defense Zone. Although the order did not explicitly mention Japanese and Japanese Americans, they were the intended target. When President Roosevelt heard that the exclusion of Germans and Italians was being considered he intervened to say that control of foreign national residents was, “primarily a civilian matter except of course in the case of Japanese mass evacuation on the Pacific Coast” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 287).

Along with the ability to forcibly evict people from military zones, EO 9066 mandated that the Secretary of War, “provide for residents of any such area who are excluded therefrom, such transportation, food, shelter, and other accommodations as may be necessary.” At first the government encouraged Japanese and Japanese Americans to voluntarily move out of the military zones. Although some families and individuals did move voluntarily, the majority of the Japanese and Japanese Americans living in these areas either refused to move or did not have the ability to sell everything and move on such short notice.

From March through August, of 1942, General John DeWitt, Head of the Western Defense Command, issued 108 exclusionary orders that facilitated the forceful removal of all Japanese and Japanese Americans residing in the Western Defense Zone. Residents were given a week to either sell their businesses, properties, and possessions, or make arrangements for their safekeeping until they returned. At the end of the specified week, they were ordered to report with only what they could carry (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 11). Japanese and Japanese Americans were given tags, bearing the number that had been assigned to them, and instructed to attach the tags to their possessions. In her diary Hatsuye Egami wrote:

[W]e Pasadena Japanese have ceased to be human beings—we are now simply numbers or things. We are no longer “Egami” but the number 23324. A tag with that number is on every suitcase and bag. Even on our breasts are tied large tags with this same number—23324! Again, a sad and tragic feeling grips my heart! (Egami 1995, 20)

With so many people needing to be relocated, and without any permanent facilities to house them, relocation became a two-step process. Step one involved the removal of all Japanese and Japanese Americans from their homes in the military exclusion zones. The army’s Wartime Civil Control Administration (WCCA) established fifteen “assembly centers” and two “reception centers” to house internees. These centers were located in close proximity to the exclusion areas and utilized preexisting structures; often fairgrounds, race tracks, or old stockyards which had been modestly retrofitted to house large numbers of people on short notice. A common practice was for animal stalls to be converted into barrack-style housing.

At times, especially as the temperatures increased in spring and summer months, the stench from the converted animal stalls became almost unbearable and some people developed severe allergies and asthma as a reaction to living amongst hay and horsehair (Suyemoto 2007). Violet De Cristoforo recounted her experience of being pregnant at the Fresno Assembly Center, where summer temperatures reached 110°:

[W]e were under a tar-paper roof. The floors were built right on top of the racetrack. And there was the manure, and there were cracks in the floor, so that every bit of the summer heat... pushed the smell up. It was unbearable, the heat and the smell, and being pregnant and very weak, I sheltered myself under the bed and put wet towels on myself as much as I could. Some days we would dig into the ground and get into the ground. (De Cristoforo 1999, 125)

After spending up to a few months in an assembly center, internees were moved to one of ten internment camps. The internment camps, unlike the assembly centers, were built by the War Relocation Authority (WRA) and were farther from internees’ former places of residence. The ten relocation camps were Topaz, Utah; Poston and Gila River, Arizona; Amache, Colorado; Manzanar and Tule Lake, California; Heart Mountain, Wyoming; Minidoka, Idaho; Denson

(Jerome) and Rohwer, Arkansas. The report from the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) noted that the WRA required the sites to be located on federal lands where large-scale agricultural programs, worked by internees, would be able to benefit the public (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 156). Historian Roger Daniels ([1971] 1991, 96) explained the condition of the chosen sites: “That these areas were still vacant land in 1942, land that ever-voracious pioneers and developers had either passed by or abandoned, speaks volumes about their attractiveness”. All camps, except for Jerome and Rohwer, were in arid desert locales, leaving them subject to dust storms and extreme temperatures. The two camps located in Arkansas were situated in swampy lowlands which provided their own unique challenges (Matsumoto 2000, 481). Sufficient to say, the climates where internees were confined varied wildly from what they had grown accustomed to on the West Coast.

The geography and natural environments were not the only differences that interned people had to contend with. There was little else provided to those interned other than what they had been able to carry with them. The housing conditions, often referred to as “Spartan,” were far from ideal (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 11). The standard housing arrangements consisted of barracks measuring roughly 20 feet by 120 feet, which were subdivided into four to six rooms, containing nothing more than one steel cot per person and a wood burning stove. Each room housed eight people, on average, and the dividers between rooms rarely went the entire way to the ceiling, essentially eliminating any illusion of privacy (Matsumoto 2000, 481). Each block had a mess hall, bathroom facilities, and a recreation hall. A woman with children wrote during her time at Heart Mountain, “[W]e had an awful cold wave and it was about 20° to 30° below zero. In such weather, it’s terrible to try going even to the bath and latrine house... I’d say welcome to anyone to try living behind barbed wire and cooped in 20 ft. by 20 ft. room... We do

our sleeping, dressing, ironing, hanging up our clothes in this one room” (Matsumoto 2000, 482).

A passage from the CWRIC report stopped well short of praising the conditions in the internment camps. Of the food and clothing provided to internees the report said simply, “Perhaps the best that could be said of the meal system is that no one starved... No one froze either” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 163).

In addition to physical hardships there were social and emotional trials faced by internees. One of the most welcome additions after arrival were shower curtains, which allowed residents of the camps some level of privacy in the showers. The complete lack of privacy afforded to residents in the restrooms and the showers was frequently bemoaned. Many residents chose to shower early in the morning or late at night to have as much privacy as possible. The *Manzanar Free Press*, the camp newspaper for the Manzanar Internment Camp, proclaimed, “At last—Manzanar’s womenfolks will be able to have complete privacy in the rest rooms. Fifty dozen shower curtains, made by sewing project workers... are awaiting installment in the women’s shower rooms... Partitions for lavatories have already been installed” (“Shower Curtains Promised” 1942).

Throughout the war “military necessity” was used as the main justification for the exclusion and internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans. As mentioned in the CWRIC report, the case for military necessity was most clearly outlined in three sources: General DeWitt’s February 14, 1942, recommendation to Secretary Stimson for exclusion; General DeWitt’s *Final Report: Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast*, 1942; and the government’s brief defending Executive Order 9066 in the *Hirabayashi v. United States* case before the US Supreme Court (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 6).

Two months after the attack on Pearl Harbor General DeWitt sent a communication to his superior recommending exclusion. It is worth letting DeWitt's words speak for themselves.

In the war in which we are now engaged racial affinities are not severed by migration. The Japanese race is an enemy race and while many second and third generation Japanese born on United State soil, possessed of United States citizenship, have become "Americanized," the racial strains are undiluted. ... That Japan is allied with Germany and Italy in this struggle is not ground for assuming that any Japanese, barred from assimilation by convention as he is, though born and raised in the United States, will not turn against this nation when the final test of loyalty comes. It, therefore, follows that along the vital Pacific Coast over 112,000 potential enemies, of Japanese extraction, are at large today. There are indications that these were organized and ready for concerted action at a favorable opportunity. The very fact that no sabotage has taken place to date is a disturbing and confirming indication that such action will be taken. (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 6)

The CWRIC report eviscerates DeWitt's arguments in two ways. First, the report highlights the fact that DeWitt's claim of ethnicity determining loyalty is an evaluation to be made by sociologists and historians, not the military. To illustrate this point further they note that DeWitt's theory about ethnicity determining loyalty is easily refuted by the actions of German Americans in the First World War, who remained overwhelmingly loyal to the US. Second, the report highlights that the only evidence DeWitt provides to back his claim that "indications" suggest ethnic Japanese "are organized and ready for concerted action" is that nothing of the sort has yet taken place (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 6-7). This justification for total exclusion is bizarre and illogical.

In his 1943 *Final Report*, General DeWitt made another attempt to justify the military necessity of exclusion. Using a more scattershot approach, he cited a variety of factors to justify exclusion: "signaling from shore to enemy submarines; arms and contraband found by the FBI during raids on ethnic Japanese homes and businesses; dangers to the ethnic Japanese from vigilantes; concentration of ethnic Japanese around or near militarily sensitive areas; the number of Japanese ethnic organizations of the coast which might shelter pro-Japanese attitudes or

activities such as Emperor-worshipping Shinto; and the presence of Kiebei who had spent time in Japan” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 7). The first two factors, although of possible military concern, were dismissed by the government agencies responsible for looking into them. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) concluded that there were no identifiable cases of signaling from shore and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) stated that their searches, while confiscating arms and contraband mostly comprised of items frequently in the possession of law-abiding civilians, had uncovered no dangerous persons that “we could not have otherwise known about” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 7). The claim that exclusion was done to protect Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII will be dealt with separately below.

General DeWitt’s remaining claims to justify military necessity were used again in the government’s brief for *Hirabayashi v. United States*. The fact that Japanese and Japanese Americans lived near militarily sensitive areas, the existence of Japanese ethnic organizations on the West Coast, and the presence of Japanese Americans who had spent time in Japan, were far from being grave threats. The CWRIC report concluded that “none [of these facts] supports the claim of disloyalty to the United States and all were entirely legal... In short, these social and cultural patterns were not evidence of any threat to West Coast military security” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 8).

A secondary rationale used to justify the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans was that removal and internment were essential to protect the Japanese and Japanese American population of the West Coast. This justification shows up in DeWitt’s 1943 *Final Report*, McCloy’s papers from 1942, Secretary of War Stimson’s 1947 autobiography, the writings of Tom Clark in 1976, and McCloy and Bendetsen’s testimonies to the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians in 1981 (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 89; Murray 2008, 17).

Each of these claims is easily dismissed. The claim of protection for Japanese and Japanese Americans was never publicly made at the time to justify mass exclusion. The CWRIC summarized it well in their conclusion stating, “There had been some acts of violence against ethnic Japanese on the West Coast and feeling against them ran high, but ‘protective custody’ is not an acceptable rationale for exclusion. Protection against vigilantes is a civilian matter that would involve the military only in extreme cases... Moreover, ‘protective custody’ could never justify exclusion and detention for months and years” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 7).

Ending detention and exclusion from the West Coast of Japanese and Japanese Americans and closing the camps proved a difficult task. By October 1942, the US position in the war had grown stronger and there was no threat of Japan invading the West Coast, yet over 100,000 ethnic Japanese remained confined in camps. The crux of the issue came back to the initial justification for exclusion and confinement. The CWRIC report sums it up well:

If the government took the position that race determined loyalty or that it was impossible to distinguish the loyal from the disloyal because “Japanese” patterns of thought and behavior were too alien to white Americans, there would be little incentive to end detention. If the government maintained the position that distinguishing the loyal from the disloyal was possible and that exclusion and detention were required only by the necessity of acting quickly under the threat of Japanese attack in early 1942, then a program to release those considered loyal should have been instituted in the spring of 1942 when people were confined in the assembly centers. (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 12-13)

Rather than going with either policy entirely, a compromise position was struck, which was logically inconsistent with both ways of thinking. Internees would be eligible for release, following completion of a loyalty examination, but they would not be allowed to return to their homes on the West Coast. The loyalty examination consisted of a questionnaire developed by the War Department and the WRA, after the military allowed Japanese Americans to enlist in a segregated volunteer combat team at the end of 1942. Starting in the spring of 1943 the loyalty questionnaire was given to all internees. Although the questionnaire was poorly worded, with

questions 27 and 28 causing confusion and frustration, a large majority of internees were labeled as “loyal” and eligible to leave camp after completing the questionnaire.

Although Secretary Stimson, Assistant Secretary McCloy, and General Marshall all concluded there was no justification for West Coast exclusion from the spring of 1943 onward, it took until May of 1944 for Secretary Stimson to present this position to the President and Cabinet (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 15). Finally, in December, and only after President Roosevelt had been reelected the previous month, the exclusion of Japanese and Japanese Americans from the West Coast was ended. Public Proclamation Number 21, issued on December 14, 1944, ended General DeWitt’s mass exclusion orders. Following the proclamation the government moved to close all internment camps within the next year. “After encouraging everyone to leave and scheduling closing dates for each camp, the WRA finally gave the remaining evacuees train fare to the point of their evacuation, and made them leave” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 241). By January of 1946 all the internment camps had been closed, except for Tule Lake which continued to house internees who the government believed remained a threat.

Whether returning to their previous homes or starting from scratch, the release from confinement was not an easy transition for most Japanese and Japanese Americans. “Almost everyone experienced some form of material loss and had limited resources to pick up the pieces of their lives that they left before the evacuation” (NG 2002, 99-100). In 1948 the US Congress passed the Evacuation Claims Act, which allowed people of Japanese ancestry who had been interned to receive compensation from the US government for losses incurred due to internment. The main problem was that former internees needed documentation proving their losses. Few individuals had this type of documentation, for understandable reasons, and the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) had already destroyed most of its income tax records from 1939-1942 by the time

the act went into effect in 1948. These IRS records could have been used to prove the value of property and earnings from that period, but without them only a small percentage of people received any compensation for their losses (Ng 2002, 100).

The coming of age of third-generation Japanese Americans, Sansei, was important to how internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans is remembered. Most Sansei were born after the war and had little knowledge of the wartime experiences of their parents and grandparents. Influenced by movements for civil rights and women's rights, and against the Vietnam War, many Sansei became socially and politically active. They began to learn more about Japanese American history, including internment during WWII. During the early 1970s the first Manzanar pilgrimages occurred. As Ann Muto said, of a pilgrimage to Tule Lake in 2000:

[L]asting impressions of the pilgrimage include the courage of the older Niseis [sic] who were willing to go back into their past and share their memories, painful or not, with others. Their willingness to open up made it easier for others to share some of their own pain. I was impressed with the commitment of the younger members of the pilgrimage, who were unwilling to let the sacrifices of their parents and older generations be forgotten. (Ng 2002, 106)

As historian Roger Daniels points out, the movement for reparations likely started in the late 1960s with small groups of Japanese Americans in Southern California, San Francisco, and Seattle started advancing the idea that Japanese and Japanese Americans should be compensated for their treatment during WWII. Daniels also mentions that although the word "reparations" was sometimes used the term that was settled on was "redress" (Daniels [1971] 1991, 188). In the lead-up to the Japanese American Citizens League's (JACL) 1978 convention in Salt Lake City, one of their committees published a pamphlet advocating for redress. The pamphlet compared the treatment of Japanese Americans and German Jews during WWII, and while acknowledging that German Jew were subjected to extermination camps and Japanese Americans were not, it continued to press the point. "Both were imprisoned in barbed wire compounds with armed

guards. Both were prisoners of their own country. Both were there without criminal charges, and were completely innocent of any wrong-doing. Both were there for only one reason—ancestry” (Daniels [1971] 1991, 188). The connection was then drawn to the fact that the government of West Germany promised to pay vast financial sums to German Jews for redress. The call was made for the US government to do something similar, “to acknowledge the mistake by providing proper redress to victims of injustice, and thereby make such injustices less likely to reoccur (Daniels [1971] 1991, 189). By the spring of 1979, although not seeking direct monetary redress, the JACL’s National Committee for Redress announced a plan to lobby Congress to appoint a commission to study the exclusion and internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII.

In 1980 the US Congress passed Public Law 96-317 which established the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC). The commission was directed to:

1. review the facts and circumstances surrounding Executive Order Numbered 9066, issued February 19, 1942, and the impact such Executive Order on American citizens and permanent resident aliens;
2. review directives of the United States military forces requiring the relocation and, in some cases, detention in internment camps of American citizens, including Aleut citizens, and permanent resident aliens of the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands; and
3. recommend appropriate remedies. (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 1)

After conducting more than 750 interviews with witnesses and having unprecedented access to government files related to internment, the commission released its final report and recommendations. The report concluded that, “Executive order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and the decisions that followed from it—exclusion, detention, the ending of detention and the ending of exclusion—were not founded upon military considerations. The broad historical causes that shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership” (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 459). The commission recommended:

1. Congress and the President acknowledge that a “grave injustice” was done and publicly apologize;
2. presidential pardons for anyone convicted of violating the racially discriminatory curfew or exclusion orders;
3. renewal of entitlements lost due to internment;
4. establish a fund for further research and dissemination of information about what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII;
5. and to have Congress provide funds for a one-time payment of \$20,000 to each surviving internee. (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 462-64)

All recommendations were unanimous, except for the final recommendation of monetary compensation, which Representative Daniel Lungren opposed. Rep. Lungren opposed the recommendation because he believed reparation payments would set a precedent for other groups who had been discriminated against, such as American Indians (Ng 2002, 108).

Legislation to appropriate funds to victims of internment was introduced in 1983. By 1988 legislation relating to redress had passed through both the US House of Representatives and the US Senate. President Ronald Reagan signed the Civil Liberties Act that same year, which provided for one-time payments of \$20,000 to be made to the roughly 60,000 surviving internees. In addition to providing monetary compensation to victims of internment, the Civil Liberties Act contained a formal apology by Congress on behalf of the US Government. The first redress payments were made in 1990 at a public ceremony and accompanied by a letter from President George H. W. Bush which read, “A monetary sum and words alone cannot restore lost years or ease painful memories... We can never fully right the wrongs of the past. But we can take a clear stand for justice and recognize that serious injustices were done to Japanese Americans during World War II” (Ng 2002, 163).

History of Minidoka

An examination of the Minidoka Internment Camp serves two purposes. First, it provides more of an in-depth look into the life cycle of one of the ten internment camps. This is helpful

because although each camp had a unique story and set of circumstances, there are many similarities between the camps. Secondly, Minidoka is examined in detail because it is the site closest to the participants who were interviewed for this dissertation.

Minidoka was built in the high desert of south-central Idaho, on land owned by the US Bureau of Reclamation. The camp was in operation from August 10, 1942, to October 28, 1945. Camp population peaked on March 1, 1943, at a total of 9,397 people, with 10,295 people held in the camp over the course of its operation. The scale of the camp was such that shortly after opening Minidoka became the eighth largest city in Idaho. Most of the people held in Minidoka were from Washington, Oregon, and Alaska. Over half of those interned in Minidoka were from the Seattle metro area alone, with another large portion hailing from Portland. As for infrastructure, Minidoka was situated on 33,000 acres and included over 600 buildings (e.g., barracks, schools, hospital, post office, theater, fire station, gas station). There were also roughly 250 acres of farmland located north and east of the barracks.

The Morrison Knudsen Corporation was awarded a \$4.6 million contract to construct the barracks, hospital, administrative buildings, and roads leading to the camp. The camp was roughly three miles from end to end and contained forty-four blocks. Each block was roughly the same, with twelve 20 by 120 foot barracks each divided into six apartments. Blocks also had a communal dining hall, laundry and sanitary building, and a recreation hall. Interspersed throughout the blocks were churches, stores, libraries, theaters, and ball fields. When internees began to arrive in August of 1942 the camp was still unfinished. Laundry rooms lacked hot water, new pipes broke so frequently that a wagon was on standby to supply kitchens with water, several blocks had no lights, and it took until December for the camp to have an adequate supply

of coal. Another thing that remained unfinished was the sewer system, which meant the camp lacked flushing toilets until January of 1943 (Niiya 2021).

At one point there were five miles of barbed wire and eight guard towers surrounding the camp. An internee remarked of the fence, “Why should they build such a thing out here, no one will try to escape from this camp... I don’t see the sense in the government wasting all that metal to keep us cooped in” (Fukuhara 1942). The fence was a major source of contention in the camp. When the first internees arrived in August of 1942, the camp had no fence, and although there had been no major incidents, a five-foot barbed wire fence was erected starting in November, along with eight guard towers. Frustrated internees began to sabotage the fence by cutting wires and uprooting posts. Although the fence was completed in December, by April of 1943 much of the fence was removed to allow access to the farming area and was never replaced. Similarly some of the guard towers were never completed and were rarely used (Niiya 2021).

Most of the people forced to live in Minidoka had never been to Idaho and were unsure of what to expect. Students later recalled their hopes of what Idaho would be like. “I wanted to go to a place where it was nice and green with trees all over. I dreaded the idea of going to hot place where we would roast and get all brown” (Hirabayashi 1942). Their first impressions of Idaho and Minidoka almost always fell short of expectations. “Day break finally came and with it came a strange new country. Instead of seeing beautiful mountains as we did the day before, the scenery had changed to barren desert full of sagebrush” (Fukuyama 1942).

The one thing mentioned by almost every Minidoka internee was the dust. “The first week it was very dusty and I was hoping for rain. The second, third fourth etc. weeks were also dusty” (Akagi 1942). “The first thing we noticed as we entered the camp was not the people, or the barracks, but the dust, yes the dust was really awful” (Fukuyama 1942). “It was so dusty for

the first month and a half I had to take a shower every day so I wouldn't be white with dust" (Kawachi 1942). Dust, mud, wind, heat, and cold were just some of the natural elements that internees were forced to deal with in their new environment.

Over the course of the war Minidoka earned a reputation as a "good" camp for several reasons. There was relatively little unrest in the camp, especially when compared to Manzanar and Poston where there were major incidents. Minidoka was second only to Amache in percentage of "yes" answers to Question 28 on the loyalty questionnaire, which asked internees to affirm their allegiance to the United States. A final distinction was that Minidoka had the highest rate of volunteers for the US Army, which also led to the highest number of casualties suffered by any camp population. More than 300 army volunteers accounted for 25% of the total from WRA camps, despite Minidoka only having 7% of the population (Niiya 2021).

Even though West Coast restrictions had been lifted, on January 1, 1945, Minidoka's population remained high at 7,770. As was common in other camps, older Issei and families with young children were most reluctant to leave. In September camp administration started serving some internees with three-day eviction notices. By October 1,482 internees remained at Minidoka. As historian Robert C. Sims recounts, the final family was reluctant to leave Minidoka, "probably because they really had no place to go" (Sims 2020, 18). The camp director had the family arrested by the Jerome County sheriff and they spent a night in jail before being placed on a train, along with their possessions, bound for the West Coast.

Following the closing of the camp the property was returned to the US Bureau of Reclamation in February 1946. The land was subdivided into lots roughly 90 acres apiece and awarded to WWII veterans. Each homesteader also received two barracks, which were

refashioned and used in a variety of ways. Forty-three lots were awarded in 1947 and forty-six more in 1949.

The recognition and commemoration of the Minidoka site grew slowly and incrementally though the years. In 1976 Minidoka took the first step on its journey to wider recognition. The Idaho State Historical Society, who was compiling a Statewide Inventory of Historic Places, added Minidoka to their list. On July 10, 1979, a six-acre parcel of land owned by the US Bureau of Reclamation was added to the National Register of Historic Places. The following month around 500 people gathered for a ceremony that included the installation of a plaque on what remained of the guard station at the camp entrance. A memorial at the site was dedicated in May 1990, in front of a crowd of over 600 people as part of the Idaho State Centennial Project. The Minidoka Internment National Monument was created by President Bill Clinton as one of his final acts in office, in January of 2001. The new national monument covered 73 acres and became the 385th unit of the National Park Service. The Minidoka site achieved its final designation, as the Minidoka National Historic Site, through a 2008 act of Congress which saw the area expanded once again with the acquisition of another 137 acres. The act of Congress also designated the eight-acre Bainbridge Island site, in Washington, as a satellite unit of Minidoka.

The physical site has also continued to evolve. In 2011 a new Honor Roll, replacing the original which had been lost, was installed to commemorate the service and sacrifice of Minidoka internees to the war effort. The following year a 1.6-mile interpretive trail, complete with twenty-three informational panels, was finished. A reconstructed guard tower was created at the site in 2013. The site also includes a refurbished barracks building and mess hall from Block 22. Finally, in early 2020, a permanent visitor center, which includes a theater and an exhibition space, was opened in what had been a camp motor repair shop. In addition to the infrastructure

improvements at the site the creation of the group Friends of Minidoka (FOM) has been pivotal.

The group exists to be an independent source of programmatic and other support for the National Park Service at Minidoka. In 2003, the same year FOM was founded, the group helped to spearhead the first annual pilgrimage to the site. The Minidoka Civil Liberties Symposium, organized by FOM, Boise State University, the National Park Service, and ACLU Idaho began in 2005 and continues to host annual events.

Chapter 4: Methodology

Human subjects approval and recruitment

The research for this dissertation was ruled exempt and approved by the Idaho State University Human Subjects Committee (HSC) (IRB-FY2022-42). The HSC approval letter can be found in Appendix A. After receiving approval from ISU's HSC, the research proposal was again reviewed and approved by a committee at College of Eastern Idaho (CEI), the school where study participants were enrolled. Once the research design received approval from both institutions, an announcement and invitation to participate in the study was posted on Canvas, CEI's learning management system (LMS), for the fall 2021 courses I was teaching at that time. The same announcement and invitation to participate in the study was emailed to former, current, and future students who were registered for my spring 2022 courses (the announcement is provided in Appendix A). Students receiving the email had been enrolled in one or more of three courses I taught at CEI from 2020-2022; Introduction to Sociology (SOC-101), American National Government (POLS-101), and Women in US History (HIST-202).

Participation in the study was completely voluntary and had no bearing on the grades of students enrolled in the courses. Participants were also told they could withdraw from the interview at any time. In order to participate in the study participants had to be at least 18 years of age. Each interview began by asking the participant to verbally confirm they were at least 18 years of age, had read the full consent form, and were comfortable with the interview being recorded. All participants answered these three questions in the affirmative before interviews proceeded.

Confidentiality was also covered in the written material sent to prospective participants. Complete anonymity was not possible due to the nature of the study, and the fact that it involved

interviews, but the main researcher was the only person with access to the video and/or audio recordings. After the interviews were recorded they were coded, and all identifiable information was removed before any data was shared.

Of the 234 students who were invited to participate in the study, 17 volunteered for interviews. One student withdrew from the study before their interview was conducted, citing busy work and school schedules as the reasons for not participating. Another student failed to show up for their interview and did not respond to a follow-up email inviting them to sign up for an alternative interview time if they still wished to participate in the study. In the end, the study included 15 participants, which was the minimum sample size target.

Sample and participant characteristics

This study utilized a voluntary response sample for a couple of reasons. First, the study was qualitative, making it less important to use a probability sampling method. Second, the research for this project was unfunded and lacked the resources necessary to conduct more expensive and time-intensive sampling.

When it comes to determining the proper number of interviews needed for qualitative research there is some level of consensus. Most scholars interviewed by Baker and Edwards (2012), including Les Back, Andrea Brock, Uwe Flick, Jennifer Mason, Charles C. Ragin, Paul ten Have, and Harry Wolcott, were all in agreement. Unfortunately they concurred that the number of interviews is not fixed and their answer to the question, “how many qualitative interviews is enough?” was “it depends.” Morse (2000, 3) cites the “quality of data, the scope of the study, the nature of the topic, the amount of useful information obtained from each participant, the number of interviews per participant, the use of shadowed data, and the qualitative method and study design used” as important factors that influence sample size. An

extremely large number of articles, book chapters, and books recommend conducting between 5 to 50 interviews (Dworkin 2012). Rather than targeting a specific number of interviews, some researchers advocate for the concept of saturation, defined by Glaser and Strauss (1967) as being the point at which “no additional data are being found whereby the sociologist can develop properties of the category” (Glaser and Strauss 1967, 61). Charmaz’s (2006) definition of saturation as the point at which “gathering fresh data no longer sparks new theoretical insights, nor reveals new properties of core theoretical categories” seems to be most precise and useful in helping qualitative researchers determine sample size (Charmaz 2006, 113). Furthermore, factors that influence saturation include the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the population being sampled, the scope of the study, the nature of the topic, the experience of the researcher, how much money is budgeted for the study, and the timeline faced by the researcher (Dworkin 2012; Morse 2000).

Since the research for this dissertation needed to receive pre-approval by the ISU HSC, the proposal necessitated a target number of interviews rather than simply the target of saturation. After consulting with Mark McBeth, the chair and advisor for this dissertation, it was determined that 15 interviews would be a sufficient minimum sample size for this research project. Although 15 interviews are on the lower end of recommendations for qualitative research, it is a defensible decision, which Howard S. Baker and Harry Wolcott argue is the most important part of selecting a qualitative sample size (Baker and Edwards, 2012).

Nonetheless, determining at what point saturation occurs is a long studied and debated topic among qualitative researchers. Research conducted by Mason (2010) examined a sample of 560 PhD studies, from a database of abstracts accepted for higher degrees in Great Britain and Ireland since 1716, to determine how many interviews it took to achieve saturation. Mason

narrowed his sample from over 500,000 entries by using only studies which were conducted by a single researcher, listed the exact number of interviews conducted, and involved no more than one interview per participant. In total 127 studies, or 22.6%, interviewed 15 participants or less. Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) found that in interviewing 60 women, for a project on reproductive health care in Africa, 34 of their 36 codes were identified in their first six interviews, with a thirty-fifth code identified after twelve interviews. Francis, et al. (2010) point out that the number of interviews Guest, Bunce, and Johnson needed for saturation was possibly even less than 12, somewhere between 7 and 12, because analysis of Guest, Bunce, and Johnson's interviews was conducted in sets of six. The findings of Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006, 78) led them to declare that for samples with a high level of homogeneity "a sample of six interviews may [be] sufficient to enable development of meaningful themes and useful interpretations." Conversely, Alder and Alder suggest a range of 12 to 60 interviews (Baker and Edwards 2012, 10). Finally, Francis, et al. (2010) demonstrated saturation in a study with 13 participants, through their use of a two-part system for assessing when saturation has been achieved.

This dissertation is able to employ a smaller sample size for a variety of reasons. First, it utilizes a theory-based content analysis rather than attempting to create a new theory as is done in grounded theory research. The dissertation and research rely heavily on categories and theoretical concepts borrowed from the NPF and Ross' framework of forgetting. Second, the study incorporates non-interview sources in addition to the interviews conducted. The examination of artifacts (e.g., magazines, diaries, government records) and observation of historical sites are important parts of the overall research project. Third, the structured nature of the interviews, with all participants being asked a similar set of questions, allows for saturation

to be achieved with a smaller sample size. Fourth, as mentioned by Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) sampling of homogenous populations can lead to early saturation, and the sample used in this dissertation was fairly homogeneous.

All study participants were either currently enrolled at CEI or had been enrolled within the last year. The age of participants ranged from 18 to 49 years of age, with a mean age of 30.46 and a standard deviation of 10.68. Most participants (13, 86%) identified as female. Almost all participants (14, 93%) identified, at least in part, as White. A single student identified as solely Hispanic or Latino, another as both White and Hispanic or Latino, and two students identified as White and Asian or Pacific Islander. See Table 3 for participant characteristics.

Table 3: Participant characteristics

| Participant Code | Age | Gender | Race or Ethnicity | Interview Length |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| P01 | 20 | Female | White | 00:16:12 |
| P02 | 19 | Female | Hispanic or Latino | 00:19:19 |
| P03 | 34 | Male | White, Asian or Pacific Islander | 00:26:15 |
| P04 | 26 | Female | White | 00:21:23 |
| P05 | 22 | Female | White | 00:14:40 |
| P06 | 35 | Male | White | 00:26:00 |
| P07 | 36 | Female | White | 00:21:48 |
| P08 | 49 | Female | White | 00:19:10 |
| P09 | 18 | Female | White, Hispanic or Latino | 00:13:46 |
| P10 | 30 | Female | White, Asian or Pacific Islander | 00:15:09 |
| P11 | 26 | Female | White | 00:20:39 |
| P12 | 48 | Female | White | 00:20:24 |
| P13 | 46 | Female | White | 00:17:15 |
| P14 | 19 | Female | White | 00:19:38 |
| P15 | 29 | Female | White | 00:23:15 |

Note: The mean age of participants was 30.46, with a standard deviation of 10.68, and a range of 18-49 years old.

There were positives and negatives to using this sample for my research. Positives include the diverse age profile of participants and the fact that almost all participants were familiar with me, having had me as a professor. Disadvantages of using this sample were the lack

of diversity when it came to gender and race or ethnicity of participants. One final aspect worth mentioning is that all study participants had at least some college experience, whereas only 63% of the general US population, over the age of 25, has at least some college experience (“Educational Attainment in the United States: 2021” 2022). In short, the sample was whiter, more female, and more highly educated than the general US public.

Interviews

All interviews were conducted by the author and sole researcher of this project, who is a White male in his early thirties. Interviews were conducted between November 15, 2021, and January 21, 2022. Study participants were drawn mostly from a pool of current and former students in the hopes of increasing comfortability and openness during the interviews and eliciting more candid responses. Interviews were conducted using GoToMeeting video conferencing software, which allowed participants to be interviewed at a time and in a place of their choosing. Although the interviewer appeared on video during the interviews, participants were given the choice of whether they wanted to enable their video sharing.

The interviews were semi-structured and contained a combination of closed and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions included, “Did you learn about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII in school?” and “Are your views on possible reparations for US slavery influenced by your understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII?” Examples of open-ended questions included, “What details do you know about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII?” and “If you had to identify any heroes, victims, and/or villains in the story of immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, who would be the heroes, victims, and/or villains?”

The interviews were divided into four parts based on content. The first, and longest, part focused on what participants knew about internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. The second part covered participant knowledge and views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border. Part three was structured similarly to section two but focused on participant knowledge and views on possible reparations for US slavery. The final part contained general demographic questions about the participant. Interviews ranged in time from 13 minutes and 46 seconds to 26 minutes and 15 seconds (refer to Table 3 for full details). Although the two male participants gave the longest interviews, this is almost certainly because they were the only participants who had visited physical sites of internment. In this case gender is a “red herring” rather than the cause of interview length.

At the beginning of the interview, after confirmation of consent, participants were presented with two different narratives of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII. Participants were instructed to read both narratives and select which one was most accurate. The narratives were as follows:

1. Executive order 9066, signed by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1942 after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, allowed for the exclusion of Japanese and Japanese Americans from the West Coast. By 1946 over 120,000 people were housed in relocation and internment camps. There were two main reasons for the exclusion order. First, Japanese and Japanese Americans on the West Coast posed a military threat. Second, the US government wanted to protect Japanese and Japanese Americans from hate crimes while the US was at war with Japan. In 1983 the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) found, “Executive order 9066 was justified by military necessity, and the decisions that followed from it... were founded upon military considerations. There was no evidence of race prejudice, war hysteria or failure of political leadership. Our report finds the government acted properly on the information available at the time.”
2. Executive order 9066, signed by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1942 after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, allowed for the exclusion of Japanese and Japanese Americans from the West Coast. By 1946 over 120,000 people were housed in relocation and internment camps. There were two main reasons for the exclusion order. First, was government overreach that violated the rights of citizens and “resident aliens.” Second, the perceived

threat posed by Japanese and Japanese Americans was overestimated, at least in part, due to racism against people of Japanese heritage. In 1983 the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) found, “Executive order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and the decisions that followed from it... were not founded upon military considerations. The broad historical causes that shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership.”

The narratives were created based on historical records and were written in a way that would make them structurally similar. When the two narratives were being written Narrative 2 was written first, based on information and quotes found in the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) report. Narrative 1 was written second and in a way that would make it appear stylistically similar to Narrative 2, while also containing inaccurate details. Narrative 1, the less accurate narrative, contains erroneous narratives about internment (e.g., “Japanese and Japanese Americans on the West Coast posed a military threat” and “the US government wanted to protect Japanese and Japanese Americans from hate crimes”). Narrative 2, the more accurate narrative, contains quotes from the actual 1983 CWRIC report, while Narrative 1 is written using similar language, but the content has been switched to the opposite of the report’s conclusions (e.g., “executive order 9066 was justified by military necessity” and “there was no evidence of race prejudice”).

As mentioned, great care was taken to make the two narratives as structurally similar as possible, to reduce the chances of participants choosing a narrative for non-content reasons. Narrative 1 contains 146 words while Narrative 2 contains 141 words. The Flesch–Kincaid readability scores, which analyze the complexity of a passage of English text, also shows that the two narratives are similar in structure (Kincaid, et al. 1975). Narrative 1 has a Flesch Reading Ease score of 24.3 and a Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score of 14.4, while Narrative 2 has a Flesch Reading Ease score of 18.3 and a Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level score of 15.6. In addition to showing that the two narratives are written in a similar style, the Flesch-Kincaid scores show

that the narratives contain relatively complex language. This is largely a result of the narratives using language which appears in the CWRIC report. The complexity of the language in the narratives is not a cause of concern for two reasons. First, all participants were enrolled in college courses where they were frequently exposed to complex language. Second, the structure of the interviews allowed participants to ask the researcher for clarification if any of the language used was confusing to them, although none of the participants sought such clarification.

After participants selected the narrative they believed to be most accurate, they were asked to explain why they chose that narrative. Smith (2017) illustrates why participant answers need to be accompanied by explanations in order for the researcher to know what knowledge or proficiency the participant actually has. For instance, in this study participants had a 50% chance of selecting the correct narrative even if they knew nothing about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII. Smith (2017) showed that some students used test-taking strategies, such as guessing and process of elimination, to arrive at their answers. He concluded, “Many students arrived at correct answers with little knowledge of the topic, and some students showed considerable understanding of a topic but still missed the items” (Smith 2017, 1277).

In order to accurately measure participant knowledge and memory of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII, participants were asked follow-up questions including what details they knew about the internment and how they would tell the story of internment to someone who knew about WWII but had not heard about the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans. The answers to these questions allowed the researcher to discern which participants had actual knowledge of the events and/or accurate memory and which participants simply reasoned their way to making their narrative selection. See Appendix B for a full list of interview questions.

Transcription and coding

Interviews were conducted orally using video conferencing software. The software created digital recordings and automated transcripts of the interviews. After the interviews were conducted each transcript was systematically examined and any transcription errors were corrected by the researcher. The choice was made to leave participant quotes as given, even though the speech is informal and at times the grammar is poor or incorrect. The only changes made to participant responses were to abridge quotes for brevity and clarity.

Coding was done by the lone researcher on this project. Most of the coding was straightforward, but there were times when decisions on coding had to be made. For example, when it came to the sources and resources used by participants to learn about internment the decision was made to group them into larger categories (e.g., school related resources and online resources) when interpreting the results. Something similar was done when interpreting narrative characters identified by participants (e.g., US government or some part of the government). Although participant responses were grouped into categories for interpretation, the original responses remain in the tables (see Appendix C).

When interpreting open-ended questions such as, “what details do you know about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII” and “If you were to tell someone the story of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII, how would you tell it?” the decision was made to identify themes which emerged from participant responses. Themes included Pearl Harbor, military necessity, the threat posed by Japanese and Japanese Americans, and reparations. Overall, there were relatively few decisions that needed to be made regarding how the interviews were coded.

Chapter 5: Results

Participant selection of internment narratives

Most participants (12, 80%) were able to correctly identify the more accurate narrative (narrative 2) when presented with two options. Narrative 1 contained false and disproven claims, taken from the historical record, for exclusion and internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. Narrative 2 contained direct quotes from the congressionally authorized CWRIC report. Participants had differing ways of explaining their selections, with some citing knowledge and information about internment itself, while others used heuristics based on their knowledge and understanding of US history.

I feel like [narrative] one is what, like you're taught, like the government, kind of was like, they're like, "oh, we're doing it for these reasons." But [narrative] two is what I feel like has been more exposed and what people that went through it have shared, that was what it was for, I guess. So [narrative] two is more accurate. (P15, 29)

I picked narrative two, because it focuses a little more on racism while the first one said that the US said there is no racial prejudice, which I don't think is necessarily true, because racism and prejudice against races has been, like, a recurring theme throughout US history. So, I don't find that to be 100% true. (P01, 20)

Participants also rated their knowledge of Japanese and Japanese American internment on a scale of 1-10. Overall, participants had a mean average score of 3.9, with a standard deviation of 1.67, when it came to self-reported knowledge of internment. It is worth noting that the twelve participants who correctly identified the most accurate narrative had a lower self-reported knowledge score (3.75) than the three participants who incorrectly identified the most accurate narrative (4.5). These results are due in part to the fact that the participant with the highest self-reported knowledge score (6.5) selected the incorrect narrative, while the three participants with the lowest knowledge scores (1, 2, 2) all selected the correct narrative.

Table 5.1: Narrative selection and self-reported knowledge

| Participant Code | Internment Narrative | Knowledge 1-10 (Internment) |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| P01 | Correct | 3.5 |
| P02 | Correct | 4 |
| P03 | Correct | 6 |
| P04 | Incorrect | 4 |
| P05 | Correct | 2 |
| P06 | Correct | 5 |
| P07 | Correct | 3 |
| P08 | Correct | 2.5 |
| P09 | Correct | 1 |
| P10 | Correct | 2 |
| P11 | Correct | 5.5 |
| P12 | Incorrect | 6.5 |
| P13 | Incorrect | 3 |
| P14 | Correct | 4.5 |
| P15 | Correct | 6 |

Five participants (33%) made their choice of narrative based on something other than the content of the narrative, indicating their decision was due to structural or stylistic elements of the narratives. Three of the five participants who made their choice for non-content reasons selected the correct narrative (narrative 2) while the other two participants selected the incorrect narrative (narrative 1).

[Narrative 2] had a little bit more information than the first one. (P09, 18)

Because [narrative 1] seemed to have more information in it... just seemed to explain it better. How, what happened. (P13, 46)

[Narrative 1] was just to the point. I agreed with the second [narrative] more, but it was more emotional, and it seemed to be more personal. There's a lot of more opinions instead of just facts. (P12, 48)

It is important to restate that both narratives were written with the same level of detail and structured to be almost identical, except for content differences. As mentioned in the methodology chapter (chapter 4), the narratives had similar word counts, Flesch Reading Ease scores, and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level scores.

To summarize, participants on average rated their knowledge of Japanese and Japanese American internment at a modest level. Most participants were able to select the more accurate narrative (narrative 2) of Japanese and Japanese internment when presented with two contrasting narratives. Though many participants made their selection based on the content of the narratives, some made their choice based on how the narratives were written.

Learning about Japanese and Japanese American internment

Since knowledge and historical memory are developed in a number of different ways, the interviews contained a series of questions intended to understand when, where, and how participants learned about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII. The main themes and trends are explored below.

School

Participants had varied experiences when it came to learning about Japanese and Japanese American internment. A majority of participants (9, 60%) learned about it at some level of formal schooling. Six participants (40%) learned about internment, at least briefly, in high school. One participant learned about internment in grade school, another in middle school, and another in college. Six participants (40%) do not recall being taught about internment in school.

High school it was brushed over. Yeah, it wasn't like we had a whole, like, chapter, or day on it. It was like, "and then they went to an internment camp," and then it was like, "and move on." (P15, 29)

All but one participant (14, 93%) attended high school, either exclusively or for a time, in a state that was home to a Japanese and Japanese American internment camp. States represented by participants which contained former internment camps included Idaho, Utah, California, and Colorado. One participant attended high school in both New Jersey and California, while another student was raised and attended school in Germany.

Sources and resources

There were a wide array of sources and resources cited by participants as having helped them learn about Japanese and Japanese American internment. Seven participants (46%) mentioned school-related resources and activities (e.g., textbook, book, class discussion, writing assignment, specific courses [history, government, sociology]). Six participants (40%) talked about using online resources (e.g., internet, YouTube, social media). Learning from friends and family was noted by four participants (26%). Visiting the sites of Japanese and Japanese American internment camps was mentioned by two participants, both of whom gave the longest interviews. One participant (P03, 34) specifically mentioning a visit to the Minidoka internment camp.

My mother made [visiting an internment site] a huge priority for us because of her Oriental descent and then being from Hawaii, she's just like, "this is history, and before it gets destroyed, we need to see it." (P03, 34)

My son got a book from a teacher he had. And he said, "Did this really happen?" And I'm like, "well, let's look into it." And then we started doing some family researching, some genealogy and found family that had been there and participated. So then it was more horrifying, like, that our ancestors were awful like that. So then we read a few more books about it, but yeah before that I didn't know anything. (P12, 48)

My grandfather and George Takei, oddly enough. I learned a lot about internment from him. Watched a lot of Star Trek when I was a kid... I did a lot of internet research, you know, growing up in the age of technology, and all that... There was like a few pages on [internment in the textbook] when we were learning about World War II. (P11, 26)

A third of all participants (5, 33%) claimed there were no sources or resources, or none they could recall, that they used to learn about internment.

To summarize, most participants learned about Japanese and Japanese American internment at some level of schooling, usually high school, although there were a considerable number who never learned about internment in school. Of those who learned about internment in

school a majority learned about it in high school. School-related resources, online resources, and conversations with friends and family were listed as the main sources for learning about internment.

Table 5.2: How students learned about internment

| Participant Code | Covered in School? | High School State | Additional Learning/Sources |
|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---|
| P01 | High School | ID | Textbook Videos |
| P02 | High School | ID | N/A |
| P03 | Middle School | ID | Family Minidoka site Internet Friend's family (Grandparents were interned) |
| P04 | High School | ID | Grandfather Research paper Class discussion |
| P05 | No | ID | N/A |
| P06 | No | UT | Friend (Friend's extended family were interned) Internet |
| P07 | No | UT | Books Film Documentaries |
| P08 | High School | Germany | N/A |
| P09 | No | ID | N/A |
| P10 | High School | CA, NJ | Textbook |
| P11 | Gradeschool | CA | Grandfather George Takei Internet Textbook |
| P12 | No | ID | Son's schoolbook YouTube videos Documentaries |
| P13 | No | CO, ID | N/A |
| P14 | College | ID | College courses Social media |
| P15 | High School | ID, UT | College course Book News articles Social media |

Details known and remembered about Japanese and Japanese American internment

Memory is complex and operates at both the individual and collective level. In an effort to understand their memory of Japanese and Japanese American internment, participants were

asked a series of open-ended questions and encouraged to talk about what they knew of internment. Questions such as, “what details do you know about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII” and “If you were to tell someone the story of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII, how would you tell it?” In answering these questions a variety of themes emerged.

Pearl Harbor, military necessity, and the threat posed by Japanese and Japanese Americans

Seven participants (46%) mentioned the attack on Pearl Harbor in their interview. It is not surprising that Pearl Harbor was mentioned as it was a catalyst for the United States going to war against Japan, has been featured in multiple movies including the 2001 blockbuster “Pearl Harbor,” and has its own national day of commemoration.

I know about Pearl Harbor, and I know about the camps that Japanese Americans were put in. That’s kind of it. (P05, 22)

It’s basically like a concentration camp in our own country for Japanese American people in response to Pearl Harbor and the war. (P11, 26)

The attack on Pearl Harbor was also used by some participants to justify the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans. Seven participants (46%), including the participant who was educated in Germany, mentioned the spurious threat posed by Japanese and Japanese Americans as a reason for exclusion and internment.

During World War II, you know, America went to war with Japan, among others. All of a sudden, the Japanese people that did live here in the United States posed a problem for the government. (P08, 49)

I would basically, start with Pearl Harbor. You know, it was an attack on Pearl Harbor. And because of that, national security was taken into consideration by the President. He signed, I think it was an executive order, that basically kidnapped everybody from, like all the Japanese Americans from their homes, because they were afraid that these people were nationalistic to Japan and they were also going to pose threats to the nation. They put them in camps until they realized that the threat was no longer there. (P14, 19)

After the bombings and Pearl Harbor, the administration did an assessment on possible people who could be like Japanese, I don't know how to, how would you say that? Anti-American spies, almost. And so they rounded up all of the known American Japanese families and put them all in these camps, in order to like control their exposure to the rest of the world, kind of thing. (P07, 36)

The claim that Japanese and Japanese Americans posed a threat, which was used at the time to justify forced internment, was refuted in the CWRIC report and much of the academic literature. It is interesting that all seven participants who cited military necessity as a reason for forced internment correctly selected the more accurate narrative of Japanese and Japanese American internment (narrative 2). None of the three participants who selected the less accurate narrative of internment (narrative 1) mentioned military necessity. One possible reason that the participants who selected the incorrect narrative did not mention military necessity was because they gave shorter responses to the questions and their responses lacked detail. On the other hand, participants who selected the correct narrative usually gave more thorough responses where they were more likely to state an incorrect detail.

Reparations

Three participants mentioned reparations for Japanese and/or Japanese Americans. One participant mentioned reparations having been paid to Japanese and Japanese Americans who were placed in internment camps. Two participants noted that they would be in support of reparations being paid to Japanese and/or Japanese Americans, without realizing that reparations have already been paid.

I think my sister told me one time that they paid back some of Japanese Americans because of, how they took away their rights, just because the government thought they were a threat. (P02, 19)

Seeing some kind of a reparation come about from that for the people that were involved in those internment camps. I would support that... Japanese Americans that were put in those internment camps where it was done unjustly... they probably should get some kind of reparation in my opinion. (P06, 35)

Assorted details

There were other details mentioned by participants that did not fit a single theme but were still worth highlighting. Three participants mentioned the harsh living conditions faced by Japanese and Japanese Americans in the internment camps.

I know the internment camps were nowhere near as nice from the stories I've heard from friends and family members of friends, and stuff like that. Internment camps were not as nice as they tried to make them sound. They were more or less just a step above being in a prison. (P03, 34)

Although the treatment of the Japanese wasn't as bad as, per se, like Nazi Germany with the Jews, it was still like pretty gross living conditions. (P07, 36)

Only one participant (P03, 34) referenced there having been an internment camp in Idaho; Minidoka. This participant also mentioned having visited the historical site. A single participant (P09, 18) said they had never heard of Japanese and Japanese American internment before the interview. "Never learned about [internment]. I just read about it right now."

Individual participants

Although highlighting details by theme gives a perspective on what participants knew collectively, it does not show us what individual participants knew about Japanese and Japanese American internment. In order to convey what individuals knew I will share two cases. These particular cases were selected for a few reasons. Both participants rated their knowledge of Japanese and Japanese American internment at a four, the average for all participants, and recalled learning about internment during high school. On the other hand, the participants selected differing internment narratives as most accurate and recalled contrasting levels of detail about internment.

P02 was a nineteen-year-old female who identified as Hispanic or Latino. She learned about Japanese and Japanese American internment in high school and rated her knowledge of the

subject as a four. When asked why she selected narrative 2 (the correct narrative) as most accurate she responded, “I remember talking about it, I think, it was in one of my classes about how like the government did that and I’m not sure, but I think that afterwards... the government had to talk over, if they were allowed to take away citizens’ rights, just because they posed a threat, if they came from a certain race.” When asked what other details she knew about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII she said, “After the attack on Pearl Harbor, there were many people who are fearful of the Japanese Americans because they didn’t know if the Japanese Americans were on like the American side or the Japanese side. So, I guess they thought they could attack America again any second. So Franklin Roosevelt signed the order, and they took them to, like this place, I guess you could call them camps, so they could like stay away from the Americans and they isolated them.” When asked how she would tell someone the story of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII she responded, “I’d just tell them that the government was afraid of the Japanese Americans. So they just isolated them.” Other details mentioned by the participant included the fact that the US government had paid reparations to some of the people who had been held in internment camps.

P04 was a twenty-six-year-old female who identified as White. She learned about Japanese and Japanese American internment in high school and rated her knowledge of the subject as a four. She mentioned that history was one of her favorite subjects in high school and that she took two extra history classes. When asked why she selected narrative 1 (the incorrect narrative) as most accurate she responded, “From just what I can remember back when we were learning about that, I just remember it was about keeping the peace and not so much about race as much as the second [narrative] was stating.” When asked what other details she knew about Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII she said, “Not a whole lot, to be quite

honest.” When asked how she would tell someone the story of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII she responded, “I would honestly have to do a refresher to be able to tell the story because I would like to give it more accurately than from what I can vaguely remember.”

To summarize, there are many differences between how much, and which details, participants knew and remembered about the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. Many of the participants mentioned the attack on Pearl Harbor and/or the spurious threat posed by Japanese and Japanese Americans, which led to their exclusion and internment. Multiple participants noted the harsh conditions faced by the people interned in the camps. Some participants mentioned reparations for people who had been interned during WWII, but only a single participant knew that reparations had already been paid.

Narrative characters and character selection

During the interview, participants were asked to select any heroes, victims, and/or villains they saw in the stories of internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII, immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, and possible reparations for US slavery. See Appendix C for tables with full participant responses.

Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII

Only one participant (P01, 20) mentioned any heroes in the story of internment, although their answer seemed to be more focused on WWII in general than the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans. Most participants (13, 86%) mentioned victims, with Japanese and Japanese Americans being identified as the victims by twelve (80%) of the participants. More than half of the participants (10, 66%) mentioned villains, with all ten participants indicating the US government, or some part of the government (e.g., the President, the Supreme Court), as the

villains. The only participants not to identify any characters in the story of internment (P04, 26 and P13, 46) also both selected the incorrect internment narrative (narrative 1).

Immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border

Less than half of the participants (6, 40%) mentioned heroes in the story of immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border. Heroes identified by participants included border patrol agents, people bringing publicity to immigrant detention, and those providing humanitarian aid to immigrants. All participants (15, 100%) mentioned victims of border detention. Participants selected immigrants as the victims of border detention, with three participants specifically choosing children of illegal immigrants as the only victims. A majority of participants (10, 66%) mentioned villains in the story of immigrant detention. Slightly more than half of the participants (8, 53%) selected the US government, or some part of the government (e.g., the President, those operating detention centers), as the villains. Three participants selected illegal immigrants as the villains.

Possible reparations for US slavery

In general, participant responses to questions of possible reparations for US slavery tended to focus more on slavery in general, rather than possible reparations as the question had asked. A third of participants (5, 33%) mentioned heroes in the story of possible reparations for US slavery. Three participants selected people working for reparations as heroes, while the other two participants selected President Lincoln. Most participants (11, 73%) mentioned victims in the story of reparations. Victims selected included people who had been enslaved, the descendants of enslaved people, and Black people in general. Over half of the participants (10, 66%) mentioned villains in the story of possible reparations. Amongst the villains selected were

enslavers, President Andrew Johnson, the Founding Fathers, people who are opposed to reparations, and systems of oppression.

Character types

In all three cases the most often identified character was victims. Participants identified victims in the stories of internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII (13, 86%), immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border (15, 100%), and possible reparations for US slavery (11, 73%). Villains were also identified by a majority of participants. The number of villains was consistent across all three cases (10, 66%). Heroes were not identified at a rate anywhere near that of victims or villains. The only villain identified in the story of internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII was related to the war, rather than internment. Less than half of participants (6, 40%) selected villains in the story of immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and only a third of participants (5, 33%) selected villains in the story of possible reparations for US slavery. There was also more consensus when it came to who the victims were in each case. There was less agreement over the three cases as to who the villains and heroes were, although there was more consensus around the selections of villains in comparison to heroes.

To summarize, most participants identified narrative characters in the stories of internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII, immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, and possible reparations for US slavery. Victims were most frequently identified, followed by villains and heroes. Overall, participants identified the most characters in the story of immigrant detention (31), followed by possible reparations for slavery (26) and internment (24).

Influence of historical memory on current policy views

After being asked about their knowledge and views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery, participants were asked, “Are your views on (immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border or possible reparations for US slavery) influenced by your understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII?” Participants who said their current policy views were influenced by their understanding of internment were asked to elaborate on their answer. A total of four participants claimed their understanding of at least one of the two current policy issues was influenced by their understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. Two participants answered “yes” to both questions, while two other participants answered “yes” to one and “no” to the other.

Table 5.3: Influence of historical memory on current policy views

| Participant Code | Knowledge Score 1-10 (Internment) | Knowledge Score 1-10 (Immigrant Detention) | Views on immigrant detention influenced by internment? | Knowledge Score 1-10 (Reparations for Slavery) | Views on reparations for slavery influenced by internment? |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| P01 | 3.5 | 3 | No | 1 | No |
| P02 | 4 | 4 | No | 5 | No |
| P03 | 6 | 4 | No | 3 | No |
| P04 | 4 | 5 | No | 7.5 | No |
| P05 | 2 | 4.5 | No | 5 | No |
| P06 | 5 | 4 | No | 2 | Yes |
| P07 | 3 | 3.5 | No | 2 | No |
| P08 | 2.5 | 2 | No | 1 | No |
| P09 | 1 | 7 | No | 5 | No |
| P10 | 2 | 3 | No | 2 | No |
| P11 | 5.5 | 5.5 | Yes | 5.5 | Yes |
| P12 | 6.5 | 4 | Yes | 3.5 | No |
| P13 | 3 | 5 | No | 7 | No |
| P14 | 4.5 | 5.5 | Yes | 2 | Yes |
| P15 | 6 | 3 | No | 2 | No |

Japanese and Japanese American internment and border detention

Three participants claimed their views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border were influenced by their understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII.

Because I did a lot of the unpacking of the whole “Japanese thing” when I was a lot younger, so I had to realize these things as I grew older and see them in current things that are happening... Like I said earlier, we don’t live in a vacuum. You know, these things... time is cyclical in almost a sense. So a lot of current things that are happening have already happened, and we’ve dealt with them in ways that can be applied now, or they could be circumvented to avoid situations that we would regret, like Japanese internment. It’s just way [*sic*] of viewing humans, are humans, are humans, you know? Like, things are going to keep happening. But we have to do our best to learn from the past and see them in the future so that we can avoid them. (P11, 26)

I’d say maybe the racial bias would be influenced, but I honestly think that, in both those situations, the people who are victimized are people. They may not be White people, but they should be treated the same. I think that’s where a lot of the bias comes in for people who are like, “oh, they’re immigrants. Oh, they’re not American,” it’s because they’re not White American. (P14, 19)

I see some similarities and I don’t want [border detention] turning into [internment]. And so, perhaps, but not wholly. (P12, 48)

Although P12 answered the question in the affirmative, and explained the possible connections she saw between immigrant detention and internment, she also said that before being asked the question she, “would’ve never connected those two.” Even though P12 said their views on immigrant detention were influenced by their understanding of internment, their explanation failed to illustrate any real influence. Another participant (P11) spoke mostly about their view that history is cyclical, and people should learn from the past. The most substantive explanation given for how their views on immigrant detention were influenced by their understanding of internment was given by P14, who highlighted how those being held in confinement in both cases were seen as “other” (e.g., immigrants, people of color, and not American).

Japanese and Japanese American internment and possible reparations for US slavery

Three participants claimed that their views on possible reparations for US slavery were influenced by their understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII.

Probably because the Japanese internment is such a core part of how I learned to empathize with communities that I don't belong to. I learned about it so young, and it was something that I could reflect back on. (P11, 26)

Like I said, there should be some sort of compensation or reparation done [for US slavery]. I just don't really know what it is. So I guess that would be influence, because I believe that Japanese internment should have reparations done as well. (P14, 19)

Seeing some kind of a reparation come about from that for the people that were involved in those internment camps. I would support that... Japanese Americans that were put in those internment camps where it was done unjustly... they probably should get some kind of reparation in my opinion. (P06, 35)

As mentioned earlier, two participants (P14 and P06) made connections between reparations for Japanese and Japanese American internment and possible reparations for US slavery, without realizing that reparations have been paid for internment during WWII. Rather than illustrating how their understanding of internment influences their views on reparations for slavery, their answers make the opposite case. A response which showed a causal connection between memory of internment and current policy views might be something like, "Reparations were made to those who suffered the injustice of internment and I believe similar reparations should be made to those who suffered the effects of enslavement." Instead, the two participants who mentioned reparations for people who were interned showed a lack of knowledge of internment and were simply stating that they favored reparations in both cases. The remaining participant (P11) made a vague connection between the empathy they developed by learning about internment and how that empathy shapes their views when it comes to reparations for US slavery.

To summarize, most participants said their views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery were not influenced by their understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. Although four participants claimed their views on current policy issues were influenced by their understanding and memory of internment, their explanations of those influences were widely divergent and failed to explain causal connections between their knowledge of internment and current policies.

Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions

History is to the nation much as memory is to the individual. The individual who loses his memory doesn't know where he came from or where he's going and he becomes dislocated and disoriented. Similarly, a nation that forgets its history is disabled in dealing with the present and the future.

—Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.

Indeed, historical narratives arise from the willingness or desire of communities to remember or forget.

—Katherine Howlett Hayes, *Slavery Before Race*

This final chapter will revisit the research questions, discuss the main findings of the study, and suggest ways to incorporate the findings into new pedagogical practices and future research. As stated in chapter 1, this dissertation was always intended to be multidisciplinary, and in that spirit, this chapter touches on collective memory, history, political science, public policy, psychology, sociology, and pedagogy. It is my hope that after reading this you will have answers to the always pertinent questions, “why should I care?” and “where does this research lead?”

Revisiting the Research Questions

RQ1: Are participants able to select the most accurate narrative of Japanese and Japanese American internment when presented with two opposing narratives of the event?

A large majority of participants were able to identify the most accurate narrative when presented with two options. Some participants used information they knew about the event when making their selection while others used heuristics, such as the knowledge of racism throughout US history. Additionally, five participants made their selections based on factors not related to

content. This latter finding could be due to the fact that these participants had little or no content knowledge of the event or because they analyzed the structure of the narratives and used test-taking strategies as research by Smith (2012) has shown.

RQ2: How did participants learn about Japanese and Japanese American internment?

A majority of participants learned about Japanese and Japanese American internment at some level of formal schooling, most frequently in high school. School-related resources and activities, as well as online resources, were often cited as having helped participants learn about internment. A handful of participants said they learned about internment from family and friends. Finally, two participants mentioned having learned about internment by visiting sites of internment.

RQ3: What details do participants know about Japanese and Japanese American internment and are those details accurate?

It is interesting to note that although most participants identified the correct narrative about internment, many had difficulty recalling specific details. When presented with open-ended questions meant to gauge what participants knew about internment, most participants gave relatively short responses, one to three sentences in length. Some participants mentioned Pearl Harbor, vague details about internment camps, fear of spies, and the government's role in internment, while others said they did not remember any details about internment. Almost all participants struggled when asked to tell the story of internment as if they were telling it to someone who knew about WWII but had never heard of internment. This demonstrates that, on the whole, whatever limited knowledge participants had about internment was not cohesive enough to make an impact on their current views. Even participants who identified the correct narrative only minutes earlier were unable to recall details from that narrative. When asked to retell the story of internment multiple participants even contradicted information in the narrative

they chose. The narrative they selected contained the following quote from the CWRIC report, “Executive order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and the decisions that followed from it... were not founded upon military considerations.” In spite of that, a handful of participants still mentioned military necessity as a legitimate concern leading to exclusion and internment.

RQ4: Do participants view internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans, immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, and possible reparations for US slavery narratively, with characters including heroes, victims, and/or villains?

A majority of participants identified victims and villains in all three cases. Some participants also identified heroes, but heroes were named at a much lower rate than either victims or villains, especially in the case of Japanese and Japanese American internment. One possible reason immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border elicited the highest level of character identification is because it was widely covered in the media and is an emotionally charged issue. Overall, there is evidence to suggest that participants viewed all three situations through a narrative lens when it came to characters. That said, character identification varied depending on the event or policy.

RQ5: Are participants’ current policy views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery influenced by their memory and understanding of Japanese and Japanese American internment?

Few participants indicated that their views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery were influenced by their memory and understanding of internment. There was a small group of participants who said their current policy views were influenced by internment. One participant said learning about internment early in life showed them history could be used to avoid repeating similar mistakes. They also mentioned that learning about internment helped them empathize with communities they do not

belong to themselves. Another participant noted that in both cases, internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans and immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, people were being singled out because of race, ethnicity, and immigration status. Overall, even participants who said their current policy views were influenced by their knowledge of internment failed to explain and justify their responses. There is little evidence to suggest that participants' memory and knowledge of internment influenced their current policy views.

Discussion

In addition to answering the research questions, interviews yielded theoretical insights which help us better understand historical memory and narrative. These takeaways allow us to consider how people learn about the past and the potential role of narratives in educating people about issues such as Japanese and Japanese American internment. There are four main findings which warrant further discussion.

First, most participants had some memory and knowledge of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII, but it was disjointed. A majority of participants could select the most accurate narrative, in a relatively artificial testing environment, but they failed to recall the facts contained in the narrative when it came to retelling the story of internment. Even the facts that participants did recall existed as orphans, unattached to any wider story arc or narrative structure (i.e., characters, a plot, and a moral). Not surprising, given the fractured nature of their memory of internment, participants struggled to recount the story of internment. Historian and educator Wilfred McClay (2021) has provided an explanation for why this happens.

Memory requires a grid, a pattern of organization, a structure within which facts arrange themselves in a particular way, and thereby take on significance. Above all, it requires that we possess stories and narratives that link facts in ways that are both meaningful and truthful, and provide a principle of selection—a way of knowing what facts are worth paying attention to. That is how and why we remember the most meaningful things. Without such patterns, the facts are unremembered, or arrange themselves haphazardly—

and the past takes on the dismal form Emerson described as “an unrelated succession”—history as one damned thing after another.

Without narratives to link them together and give them order and meaning, facts are either forgotten or unable to be used for anything other than answers on a test or for trivia.

One possible reason participants possess disassociated facts is due to the way history is often taught in the US, especially at the primary and secondary level. Standardized tests often ask students to provide or identify facts, rather than asking students to explain events and their impacts. There are other, and I would argue better, ways of teaching students which avoid rote memorization of facts. For example, McBeth and Pearsall (2021), Eyler (2018), and Lang (2016) all highlight the importance of narrative as a teaching aid in the classroom.

Second, amongst participants there was a persistence of the erroneous claim that military threats necessitated the exclusion and internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII. Even some participants who criticized the conditions of internment repeated the idea that internment was necessary due to the threat of sabotage from the Japanese and Japanese American community. As mentioned previously, every participant who cited military necessity had begun the interview by selecting the narrative which clearly refuted the claim that internment was needed to deal with military threats.

A possible explanation for this puzzling pattern is the aforementioned illusory truth effect (Hasher, Goldstein, and Toppino 1977). Military and political leaders, both at the time and in the years following, continued to claim that exclusion and internment were due to military necessity. The illusory truth effect demonstrates that even known untruths, if stated repeatedly, are perceived as being more valid. Even something as counterintuitive as the repetition of the fact that military necessity was unfounded can lead people to remember the idea of military necessity

and think it was justified. The illusory truth effect illustrates that even when accurate information is taught, cognitive processing can act in non-advantageous ways.

Third, there is almost no connection between internment and the two current policy issues (immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border and possible reparations for US slavery). This finding is not surprising given the fact that participants have little memory or nuanced understanding of internment. It logically follows that someone cannot make connections between an event they know little about and anything else, such as current public policy. Even though some participants said their views on the current policy issues were influenced by internment, their explanations were vague and failed to make substantive causal connections between their knowledge of internment and current policies. In order for messaging that seeks to link internment and current policies to be effective, there must be a more robust collective memory around what actually happened surrounding internment.

Preliminary findings show that people might be able to make connections between internment and current policy, but in order to do so most people would need a deeper understanding of internment. For example, some participants said their memory of internment had not previously influenced their views on policy but indicated that it might in the future. When asked if their views on immigrant detention at the border were influenced by their understanding of internment, one participant said, “I see some similarities and I don’t want it turning into that,” but also confessed they would have never seen the connection between immigrant detention and internment before being asked the question. This demonstrates that knowledge and memory of the past are political, with the ability to affect future policies and uses of government power. For example, if more people knew about reparations made to Japanese and Japanese Americans for internment, there may be more support for reparations relating to US

slavery. Although there is potential for groups like the JACL to use historical narratives to advocate for policy change, this dissertation suggests they will struggle to gain broad support, especially outside of the Japanese American community, with messaging campaigns drawing parallels between internment and immigrant detention until there is a greater collective memory of internment amongst the larger American public.

Fourth, the interviews illustrated the importance of historical sites to collective memory. The two participants who mentioned having visited sites of internment had the most to say in their interviews. Only a single participant mentioned the Minidoka camp. This lack of knowledge of Minidoka is not surprising considering that until 1979 there was no commemorative site, and until 2020 there was no permanent interpretive center associated with the site. Given the importance of physical sites as places of memory, ritual, and education (Rosenzweig and Thelen 1997; Ross 2008) it is reasonable to predict that the establishment of Minidoka as a National Historic Site, and its subsequent development, will increase collective memory about internment, especially in Idaho.

Conclusion

Overall, this dissertation shows that the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans, even within three hours of a physical site of internment, was not a salient event to the participants interviewed. This conclusion would be disappointing to the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians who recommended that an educational fund be established to teach the lessons of internment and guard against civil liberties abuses (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 463). There are still things to be learned from internment which could be applied to current policy issues like detention, reparations, and any number of issues involving civil liberties. Unfortunately, in order to learn lessons from internment people need to have a more in-

depth memory and understanding of internment than the participants interviewed. Although the current state of collective memory relating to internment seems rather grim, there are ways to increase collective memory and the perceived salience of internment.

The increased recognition and resources dedicated to the Minidoka National Historic Site, and other physical sites across the country, could play a crucial role in nurturing the collective memory of Japanese and Japanese American internment. As Ross (2018) notes, the recovery of physical sites provide locations for the performance of rituals and ceremonies, the recounting of narratives, and a place for people to encounter objects that connect them to the past. In the context of internment, one of these rituals and ceremonies is the annual pilgrimage to Minidoka and other internment sites. These pilgrimages are an important way that people, especially in the Japanese American community, keep the memory of internment alive. Physical sites also provide opportunities for activities such as school field trips, where students can come face-to-face with their local and regional history in ways that are more impactful than reading from a textbook or watching a documentary. It is not a coincidence that the two participants with the most to say in their interviews both mentioned visiting physical sites of internment.

In addition to physical sites another thing that could grow collective memory would be to teach about internment using narrative. Using narrative elements like those identified in the NPF (i.e., plot, characters, and moral) are more impactful than teaching history as a series of names, dates, and details. Ross (2018) and Slovic (2007) both highlight the importance of individual narrative accounts and the unique psychological impact they have on people. There are a variety of nonfiction and historical fiction books that involve internment which could be used to increase collective memory of internment. A sampling of books that fit the brief, while also showcasing the diversity of written narrative genres, include Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston's memoir *Farewell*

to *Manzanar*, John Okada's historical fiction classic *No-No Boy*, Kristina McMorris' historical fiction romance *Bridge of Scarlet Leaves*, Traci Chee's young adult historical fiction *We Are Not Free*, Miné Okubo's groundbreaking illustrated memoir *Citizen 13660*, and George Takei's graphic novel memoir *They Called Us Enemy*. These narrative works could also be taught in English and literature courses, as is often the case with books like Elie Wiesel's holocaust memoir *Night* and Anne Frank's diary.

This dissertation shows that history is fertile ground for further NPF studies. Examinations of how effective historical narratives remain, like this dissertation demonstrates, could be explored for a number of other cases. The NPF could also be used to analyze the use of narrative throughout history and the effect it had on policy. For example, a more in-depth exploration of the role narrative played in the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII is definitely warranted. As the CWRIC report concluded, "General DeWitt relied heavily on civilian politicians rather than informed military judgements in reaching his conclusions as to what actions were necessary, and civilian politicians largely repeated the prejudiced, unfounded themes of anti-Japanese factions and interest groups on the West Coast" (CWRIC [1983] 1997, 8). Rather than exclusion and internment being a rational response to the threats of war, the military and government pursued a policy that wasted energy, personnel, and resources when they could have been used to fight the war. In this case the personal prejudices and confirmation bias of General DeWitt led to policy that affected over 100,000 people.

There are a plethora of applications of the NPF in the present, but an exploration of historical case studies would enrich the NPF literature. The methodology used to investigate the uses of narrative in the past will look slightly different from much of the current methodology

used for NPF studies, but the NPF has demonstrated an ability to be multidisciplinary, and methods like content analysis would still be applicable.

From the outset this dissertation sought to make a contribution to the literature on collective memory (especially as it pertains to Japanese American internment), the Narrative Policy Framework, and the discourse around the applications of narrative in pedagogy. The study found that a majority of interview participants could select the most accurate narrative about internment, but struggled to provide details or retell the story of internment. Memory of internment was fractured and inconsistent, with many participants selecting the correct narrative but later refuting some of the central facts of the narrative. Participants made few connections between internment and either immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border or possible reparations for US slavery, presumably because their memory and understanding of internment was so deficient. In light of these findings, I made suggestions for ways that collective memory of Japanese and Japanese American internment can be nurtured, including teaching about internment using narrative, the further development of physical sites of internment, and covering content related to internment in courses other than history.

References

- Adams, William C. 2015. "Conducting Semi-structured Interviews." In *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, 4th edition, eds. Kathryn E. Newcomer, Harry P. Hatry, and Joseph S. Wholey, 492-505. Wiley Online.
- Akagi, Jim. "My First Experience in a War." *Children of Minidoka: Student Essays*. University of Washington.
<http://lib.washington.edu/specialcollections/collections/exhibits/harmony/minidoka/essays/akagi.pdf>.
- Baker, Sarah Elsie and Rosalind Edwards. 2012. "How Many Qualitative Interviews Is Enough? Expert Voices and Early Career Reflections on Sampling and Cases in Qualitative Research." *National Centre for Research Methods*. Working Paper.
- Baldwin, James. 1955. "Stranger in the Village." In *Notes of a Native Son*, 163. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Blight, David W. 2001. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Press.
- Blitzer, Jonathan. 2021. "Why Biden Refused to Pay Restitution to Families Separated at the Border." *The New Yorker*, December 22. <http://newyorker.com/news/news-desk/why-biden-refused-to-pay-restitution-to-families-separated-at-the-border>.
- Brock, Timothy C., Jeffery J. Strange, and Melanie C. Green 2002. "Power Beyond Reckoning: An Introduction to Narrative Impact." In *Narrative Impact: Social and Cognitive Foundations*, ed. Melanie C. Green, Jeffery J. Strange, and Timothy C. Brock, 1-15. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bruner, Jerome S. 2003. *Making stories: law, literature, life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Commission on Wartime Relocation and internment of Civilians. *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians*. 1983/1997. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African Americans Act 1989, H.R. 3745, 101st Cong. (1989).
- Confino, Alon. 1997. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *The American Historical Review* 102(5): 1386–1403.

- Crane, Susan A. 1997. "Writing the Individual Back into Collective Memory." *The American historical review* 102(5), 1372-85.
- Crow, Deseraï A., John Berggren, Lydia A. Lawhon, Elizabeth A Koebele, Adrienne Kroepsch, and Juhi Huda 2017. "Local Media Coverage of Wildfire Disasters: An Analysis of Problems and Solutions in Policy Narratives." *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 35(5): 849-71.
- Cruz, Ted. 2016. "Sen. Cruz: We Need a Coherent Campaign to Utterly Destroy ISIS." *U.S. Senator for Texas Ted Cruz* [press release], March 22.
http://cruz.senate.gov/?p=press_release&id=2617.
- Daniels, Roger. 1971/1991. *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- , 1962/1977. *The Politics of Prejudice: The Anti-Japanese Movement in California and the Struggle for Japanese Exclusion*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- De Cristoforo, Violet. 1999. "Violet De Cristoforo: Tule Lake." In *And Justice for All: An Oral History of the Japanese American Detention Camps*, ed. John Tateishi. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.
- Dennett, Daniel C. 1991. *Consciousness Explained*. New York, NY: Back Bay Books.
- DeWitt, John L. 1943. *Final Report: Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast, 1942*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Dworkin, Shari L. 2012. "Sample Size Policy for Qualitative Studies Using In-Depth Interviews." *Archives of Sex Behavior* 41: 1319–20.
- "Educational Attainment in the United States: 2021." 2022. United States Census Bureau, February 12. <http://census.gov/data/tables/2021/demo/educational-attainment/cps-detailed-tables.html>
- Egami, Hatsuye. 1995. *The Evacuation Diary of Hatsuye Egami*, ed. Claire Gorfinkel. Pasadena, CA: Intentional Productions.
- Ertas, Nevbahar. 2015. "Policy Narratives and Public Opinion Concerning Charter Schools." *Politics & Policy* 43(3): 426-51.
- Esposito, Giovanni, Jessica Clement, Luca Mora, and Nathalie Crutzen. 2021. "One Size Does Not Fit All: Framing Smart City Policy Narratives within Regional Socio-Economic Contexts in Brussels and Wallonia." *Cities* 118: 14.

- Evans, Jonathan St. B. T. 1989. *Bias in Human Reasoning: Causes and Consequences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Evans, Michael. 1942. "Concentration Camp—U.S.A. Style." *Coronet* 12(6): 51-54.
- Executive Order No. 9066, Fed. Reg. 31. (1942).
- Eyler, Joshua. 2018. *How Humans Learn: The Science and Stories Behind Effective College Teaching*. Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press.
- Fazio, Lisa K. 2020. "Repetition Increases Perceived Truth Even for Known Falsehoods." *Collabra: Psychology*, 6(1).
- Fazio, Lisa K., Nadia M. Brashier, B. Keith Payne, and Elizabeth J. Marsh. 2015. "Knowledge Does Not Protect Against Illusory Truth." *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 144(5), 993–1002.
- Francis, Jill J., Marie Johnston, Clare Robertson, Liz Glidewell, Vikki Entwistle, Martin P. Eccles, Jeremy M. Grimshaw. 2010. "What is an Adequate Sample Size? Operationalising Data Saturation for Theory-Based Interview Studies." *Psychology and Health*, 25(10): 1229-45.
- Fukuhara, Henry. 1942. "Freedom." *Children of Minidoka: Student Essays*. University of Washington.
<http://lib.washington.edu/specialcollections/collections/exhibits/harmony/minidoka/essays/henry-fukuhara>.
- Fukuyama, Tom. 1942. "On December 7." *Children of Minidoka: Student Essays*. University of Washington.
<http://lib.washington.edu/specialcollections/collections/exhibits/harmony/minidoka/essays/fukuyama1.pdf>.
- Garcia-Navarro, Lulu. 2019. "A Former Child Interned Protests Against Detention of Migrant Children." *National Public Radio*, June 30. <http://npr.org/2019/06/30/737393569/a-former-child-interned-protests-against-detention-of-migrant-children>.
- Gigerenzer, Gerd. 2002. "The Adaptive Toolkit?" In *Bounded Rationality: The Adaptive Toolbox*, eds. Gerd Gigerenzer and Reinhard Selten, chapter 3, 37-50. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gilbert, Lisa. 2017. Twitter post. November 28.
twitter.com/gilbertlisak/status/935579409838477313.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

- Green, Melanie C., and Timothy C. Brock. 2005. "Persuasiveness of Narratives." In *Persuasion: Psychological Insights and Perspectives*, 2nd edition, ed. Timothy C. Brock and Melanie C. Green, 117-42. London: Sage Publications.
- Grigsby Bates, Karen. 2018. "For Some Japanese Americans, Border Separations Are Déjà Vu." *National Public Radio*, June 20.
<http://npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2018/06/20/621972727/for-some-japanese-americans-border-separations-are-deja-vu>
- Guest, Greg, Arwen Bunce, and Laura Johnson. 2006. "How Many Interviews Are Enough? An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability." *Field Methods* 18(1): 59-82.
- Gupta, Kuhika, Joseph Ripberger, and Wesley Wehde. 2016. "Advocacy Group Messaging on Social Media: Using the Narrative Policy Framework to Study Twitter Messages about Nuclear Energy Policy in the United States." *Policy Studies Journal* 46(1): 119-36.
- Hackman, Michelle, Aruna Viswanatha, and Sadie Gurman. 2021. "U.S. in Talks to Pay Hundreds of Millions to Families Separated at Border." *The Wall Street Journal*, October 28.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. [1950] 1995. *La Memoire Collective*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Hasher, Lynn, David Goldstein, and Thomas Toppino. "Frequency and the conference of referential validity." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 16(1): 107-12.
- Hayes, Katherine Howlett. 2013. *Slavery Before Race: Europeans, Africans, and Indians at Long Island's Sylvester Manor Plantation, 1651-1884*. New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Hinyard, Leslie J., and Matthew W. Kreuter. 2007. "Using Narrative Communication as a Tool for Health Behavior Change: A Conceptual, Theoretical, and Empirical Overview." *Health Education and Behavior* 34(5): 777-92.
- Hirabayashi, Edna. 1942. "A Review." *Children of Minidoka: Student Essays*. University of Washington.
<http://lib.washington.edu/specialcollections/collections/exhibits/harmony/minidoka/essay/s/hirabayashi1.pdf>.
- Holmes, Jack. 2019. "An Expert on Concentration Camps Says That's Exactly What the U.S. Is Running at the Border." *Esquire*, June 13. <http://esquire.com/news-politics/a27813648/concentration-camps-southern-border-migrant-detention-facilities-trump/>.
- Horwitz, Tony. 1998. *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*. Sydney, Australia: Hodder Headline.

- Houston, Paul. 1986. "Japanese-Americans Ask Reparations." *Los Angeles Times*, April 29. <http://latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1986-04-29-mn-2249-story.html>.
- Japanese American Citizens League. 2020. "JACL Denounces the Continued Detainment of Children and Their Families by ICE." *Japanese American Citizens League* [press release], August 6. <http://jacl.org/statements/jacl-denounces-the-continued-detainment-of-children-and-their-families-by-ice>.
- Jones, Michael D. and Mark K. McBeth. 2010. "A Narrative Policy Framework: Clear Enough to Be Wrong?" *Policy Studies Journal* 38(2): 329-353.
- Kahneman, Daniel. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Kawachi, Mits. 1942. "My Experiences during the First Year of War." *Children of Minidoka: Student Essays*. University of Washington. <http://lib.washington.edu/specialcollections/collections/exhibits/harmony/minidoka/essay/s/mits-kawachi>.
- Kincaid, J. Peter, Fishburne, Robert P. Jr, Rogers, Richard L. and Chissom, Brad S. 1975. *Derivation of New Readability Formulas (Automated Readability Index, Fog Count and Flesch Reading Ease Formula) for Navy Enlisted Personnel*. Naval Technical Training Command Millington TN Research Branch.
- Lang, James M. 2016. *Small Teaching: Everyday Lessons from the Science of Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Le Bon, Gustave. 1895/1960. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
- Lee, Kyung Mi. 2019. "Japanese Americans Survived Internment in WWII. Now They Protest Migrant Detentions at Border." *The Sacramento Bee*, July 25.
- Leong, Ching. 2015. "Persistently Biased: The Devil Shift in Water Privatization in Jakarta." *Review of Policy Research* 32(5): 600-21.
- Library of Congress. 2022. "The U.S. Mainland: Growth and Resistance." *Library of Congress*. <http://loc.gov/classroom-materials/immigration/japanese/the-us-mainland-growth-and-resistance/>.
- Liotard, Jean-Francois. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mason, Mark. 2010. "Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 11(3), Art. 8.

- Matsumoto, Valerie. 2000. "Japanese American Women during World War II," in *Unequal Sisters: A Multicultural Reader in U.S. Women's History*, eds. Vicki L. Ruiz and Ellen Carol DuBois. New York, NY: Routledge 478-9.
- McBeth, Mark K. and Chadwick A. Pearsall. 2021. "Using the Narrative Policy Framework in the Teaching of Introduction to Politics." *Journal of Political Science Education* 17(sup1): 880-96.
- McClay, Wilfred. "History as a Way of Knowing." *Law & Liberty*. <http://lawliberty.org/history-as-a-way-of-knowing/>.
- Merry, Melissa K. 2016. "Constructing Policy Narratives in 140 Characters or Less: The Case of Gun Policy Organizations." *Policy studies journal* 44(4): 373-95.
- Montoya-Galvez, Camilo. 2022. "Migrant families separated under Trump face elusive quests for reparations under Biden." *CBS News*, May 11. <http://cbsnews.com/news/immigration-family-separations-reparations-lawsuits/>
- Morse, Janice M. 2000. "Determining Sample Size." *Qualitative Health Research* 10(1): 3-5.
- Murray, Alice Yang. 2008. *Historical Memories of the Japanese American Internment and the Struggle for Redress*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Naturalization Act of 1790, H.R. 40, 1st Cong. (1790).
- Naturalization Act of 1870, H.R. 2201, 41st Cong. (1870).
- Ng, Wendy L. 2002. *Japanese American Internment During World War II : A History and Reference Guide*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Nickerson, Raymond S. 1998. "Confirmation Bias: A Ubiquitous Phenomenon in Many Guises." *Review of General Psychology* 2(2): 175-220.
- Niiya, Brian. 2021. "Minidoka." *Densho Encyclopedia*, December 16. <http://encyclopedia.densho.org/Minidoka>.
- Ocasio-Cortez, Alexandria. 2019. Twitter post. June 8. <http://twitter.com/AOC/status/1140968240073662466>.
- Polage, Danielle C. 2012. "Making Up History: False Memories of Fake News Stories." *Europe's Journal of Psychology* 8(2), 245-50.
- Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Rosenzweig, Roy and David Paul Thelen. 1998. *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Ross, Marc Howard. 2018. *Slavery in the North: Forgetting History and Recovering Memory*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. 2007. "Toward a Definition of Narrative." *The Cambridge companion to narrative*, 22-35. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Safire, William. 2004. "Narrative." *The New York Times Magazine*, December 4. <http://nytimes.com/2004/12/05/magazine/narrative.html>.
- Schlauffer, Caroline, Dilyara Gafurova, Ekaterina Zhiryakova, Marina Shikhova, and Nina Belayeva. 2021. "Narrative Strategies In a Nondemocratic Setting: Moscow's Urban Policy Debates." *Policy studies journal*.
- Schlesinger Jr., Arthur M. 1998. "National Humanities Medal." *National Endowment for the Humanities*. <http://neh.gov/about/awards/national-humanities-medals/arthur-m-schlesinger-jr>.
- Selten, Reinhard. 2002. "What is Bounded Rationality?" In *Bounded Rationality: The Adaptive Toolbox*, eds. Gerd Gigerenzer and Reinhard Selten, chapter 2, 13-36. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Shanahan, Elizabeth, Michael D. Jones, Mark K. McBeth, and Claudio Radaelli. 2018. "The Narrative Policy Framework." In *Theories of the Policy Process*, 4th edition, eds. Chris M. Weible and Paul A. Sabatier, 173-213. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Shibutani, Tamotsu. 1978. *The Derelicts of Company K: A Sociological Study of Demoralization*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- "Shower Curtains Promised." 1942. *Manzanar Free Press*, June 13.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1957. *Models of Man: Social and Rational- Mathematical Essays on Rational Human Behavior in a Social Setting*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sims, Robert C. 2020. *An Eye For Injustice: Robert C. Sims and Minidoka*, ed. Susan M. Stacy. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Slovic, Paul. 2007. "If I look at the mass I will never act": Psychic numbing and genocide. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 2(2): 79-95.
- Smith, Mark D. 2017. "Cognitive Validity: Can Multiple-Choice Items Tap Historical Thinking Processes? *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(6): 1256-87.

- Suyemoto, Toyo. 2007. *I Call to Remembrance: Toyo Suyemoto's Years of Internment*, ed. Susan B. Richardson. New York, NY: Rutgers University Press.
- Taber, Charles S., and Milton Lodge. 2006. "Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3): 755-69.
- Takaki, Ronald T. 1998. *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Wakatsuki, Hanako. 2020. "Okage Sama De." In *An Eye For Injustice: Robert C. Sims and Minidoka*, ed. Susan M. Stacy, 187-98. Pullman, WA: Washington State University Press.
- Zak, Paul J. 2008. *Moral Markets: The Critical Role of Values in the Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press

Appendix A: Human Subjects Material

October 27, 2021

Chadwick Pearsall
Political Science
MS 8073

RE: Study Number IRB-FY2022-42: History, Narrative, and Policy

Dear Mr. Pearsall:

Thank you for your responses to a previous review of the study listed above. I agree that this study qualifies as exempt from review under the following guideline: Category 2.(i). Research that only includes interactions involving educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior (including visual or auditory recording).

The information obtained is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

This letter is your approval, please, keep this document in a safe place.

Notify the HSC of any adverse events. Serious, unexpected adverse events must be reported in writing within 10 business days.

You are granted permission to conduct your study effective immediately. The study is not subject to renewal.

Please note that any changes to the study as approved must be promptly reported and approved. Some changes may be approved by expedited review; others require full board review. Contact Tom Bailey (208-282-2179; fax 208-282-4723; email: humsbj@isu.edu) if you have any questions or require further information.

Sincerely,

Ralph Baergen, PhD, MPH, CIP
Human Subjects Chair

Chadwick,

This morning in PAC, we reviewed your proposal. We wanted to let you know that we are supportive of the academic process and are thrilled that you are at this stage in your education. Your proposal has been approved! You may proceed with your plan.

Please let me know if there are any changes to your research that would require adjustments to the student population you are interviewing or the method for such interviews.



Lee Stimpson

Director of Institutional Effectiveness

W 208.535.5425

lee.stimpson@cei.edu

Students,

The following is an opportunity to help with some research I'm conducting for my doctorate. The announcement also doubles as a notification of consent.

Consent Form

Dear Participant:

I am asking you to participate in an interview being given to individuals in Professor Pearsall's POLS 101 course. **Interviews are completely separate from any course requirements in American National Government (POLS-101-02). Participation is entirely voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time. There is no reward for participating or consequence for not participating. Your participation, or lack of participation, will not impact your grade in any way. Once you start the interview, you may stop at any time.**

The purpose of this interview is to further Prof. Pearsall's dissertation research and help him complete his doctoral degree. The interview will include questions about how you remember past events and what your views are on current events and policies in the United States. The interview will take 15-30 minutes to complete and is conducted using GoToMeeting conferencing software.

The interview can be done with or without video, as audio is all that is required. The interview will be recorded. The recorded interviews will be transcribed and identifiable information, such as the student's name, will be left out. After each interview is transcribed, the recording will be erased. Prof. Pearsall is the only person who will have access to the recorded interviews and interview transcripts.

For further information regarding this research please contact Prof. Pearsall at (208)899-9692 (or email chadwick.pearsall@cei.edu).

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Idaho State University Institutional Review Board at (208)282-2179.

If you agree to be interviewed, you are consenting that you are at least 18 years old and that you have read and agreed to this consent form.

Interviews will take place from November 8 through December 18, 2021. Meeting times will be available from 8am-8pm Monday-Saturday. If you are unable to meet during any of those times, but would like to participate, please email Prof. Pearsall (chadwick.pearsall@cei.edu) to find a time that works for you. To sign-up for an interview click on the following link (<https://calendly.com/chadwick-pearsall/30min>). After you have scheduled an appointment, you will be sent a Zoom meeting link.

Appendix B: Interview Questions

Japanese and Japanese American Internment During WWII

- Which of the two narratives is most accurate? Narrative 1 or narrative 2?
 1. Executive order 9066, signed by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1942 after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, allowed for the exclusion of Japanese and Japanese Americans from the West Coast. By 1946 over 120,000 people were housed in relocation and internment camps. There were two main reasons for the exclusion order. First, Japanese and Japanese Americans on the West Coast posed a military threat. Second, the US government wanted to protect Japanese and Japanese Americans from hate crimes while the US was at war with Japan. In 1983 the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) found, “Executive order 9066 was justified by military necessity, and the decisions that followed from it... were founded upon military considerations. There was no evidence of race prejudice, war hysteria or failure of political leadership. Our report finds the government acted properly on the information available at the time.”
 2. Executive order 9066, signed by President Franklin Roosevelt in 1942 after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, allowed for the exclusion of Japanese and Japanese Americans from the West Coast. By 1946 over 120,000 people were housed in relocation and internment camps. There were two main reasons for the exclusion order. First, was government overreach that violated the rights of citizens and “resident aliens.” Second, the perceived threat posed by Japanese and Japanese Americans was overestimated, at least in part, due to racism against people of Japanese heritage. In 1983 the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC) found, “Executive order 9066 was not justified by military necessity, and the decisions that followed from it... were not founded upon military considerations. The broad historical causes that shaped these decisions were race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership.”
- Why did you select the narrative you chose as most accurate?
- If you had to identify any heroes, victims, and/or villains in the story of Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII, who would be the heroes, victims, and/or villains?
 - Why did you identify certain individuals and/or groups as heroes, victims, or villains?
- On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is “I’ve never heard of it” and 10 is “I’m an expert on it”) how would you rate your knowledge of Japanese and Japanese American internment during WWII?

- What details do you know about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII?
 - When did you learn about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII?
 - Did you learn about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII in school?
 - Other than school, where else did you learn about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII?
 - What sources and resources did you use to learn about Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII?
- Where did you grow up? Was it rural or urban?
- What state, or states, did you attend high school in?
- If you were to tell someone the story of Japanese and Japanese American Internment during WWII, how would you tell it? Imagine the person you're telling has never heard about this event.

Immigrant Detention on the US Side of the US-Mexico Border

- What are your views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border?
 - What information, sources, etc. helped you to form those views?
- On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is "I don't know anything about it" and 10 is "I'm an expert on it") how would you rate your knowledge of immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border?
- When did you form your current views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border?
- On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is "I don't really have an opinion on it" and 10 is "I have very strong opinions on it") how strong are your current views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border?
- If you had to identify any heroes, victims, and/or villains in the story of immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border, who would be the heroes, victims, and/or villains?
- Are your views on immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border influenced by your understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII?
 - If so, in what ways?

Possible Reparations for US Slavery

Define a term. Reparations are, "the making of amends for a wrong someone has done, by paying money to, or otherwise helping, those who have been wronged."

- What are your views on possible reparations for US slavery?
 - What information, sources, etc. helped you to form those views?
- On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is "I don't know anything about it" and 10 is "I'm an expert on it") how would you rate your knowledge of possible reparations for US slavery?
- When did you form your current views on possible reparations for US slavery?
- On a scale of 1-10 (where 1 is "I don't really have an opinion on it" and 10 is "I have very strong opinions on it") how strong are your current views on possible reparations for US slavery?

- If you had to identify any heroes, victims, and/or villains in the story of possible reparations for US slavery, who would be the heroes, victims, and/or villains?
 - Why did you identify certain individuals and/or groups as heroes, victims, or villains?
- Are your views on possible reparations for US slavery influenced by your understanding of what happened to Japanese and Japanese Americans during WWII?
 - If so, in what ways?

Demographic Information

- How old are you?
- What is your gender identification (female, male, or other)?
- What is your ethnicity (White, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Native American or American Indian, Asian / Pacific Islander, or other).

Appendix C: Tables

Table C1: Character identification in Japanese and Japanese American internment

| Participant Code | Heroes (Internment) | Victims (Internment) | Villains (Internment) |
|------------------|--|--|--|
| P01 | “Anyone who fought in the war; on both sides.” | “Anybody that was effected by the war.” | N/A |
| P02 | N/A | “Japanese Americans.” | “President Franklin Roosevelt... for signing that order (EO 9066).” |
| P03 | N/A | “The victims... would be the Japanese themselves because of what they were put through.” | “Those people who had to, who willingly and voluntarily put people into those internment camps.” |
| P04 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| P05 | N/A | “Japanese people living in America.” | N/A |
| P06 | N/A | “The American Japanese people.” | “The American government.” |
| P07 | N/A | “The Japanese people, Japanese Americans especially.” | “The administration.” |
| P08 | N/A | “The people... of Japanese descent.” | “The government.” |
| P09 | N/A | “The Japanese.” | “The President.” |
| P10 | N/A | “Japanese who were in the internment camps.” | N/A |
| P11 | N/A | “Japanese American people.” | “The president and the order (EO 9066).” |
| P12 | N/A | “The Japanese.” | “The villains would be us, our government.” |
| P13 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| P14 | N/A | “Japanese Americans and Japanese people living, working towards immigration.” | “President and the Supreme Court who decided that that was constitutional.” |
| P15 | N/A | “Japanese Americans.” | “Anybody in the government that took to attacking the Japanese in America because it was, like, attacking their own people.” |

Table C2: Character identification in immigrant detention on the US side of the US-Mexico border

| Participant Code | Heroes (Border Detention) | Victims (Border Detention) | Villains (Border Detention) |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| P01 | “The people who are brave enough to... apply for citizenship and actually move to a whole different country.” | “The people that aren’t granted access or have to go through the struggles of trying to get citizenship, that might get caught illegally passing.” | “The US government.” |
| P02 | N/A | “The people being held at those places... at the border.” | N/A |
| P03 | N/A | “The children are the biggest ones I see, because they’re following their parents... I have a hard time saying that someone was a victim when they made the willful choice to break the law. But children didn't make the willful choice, they were just following Mom and Dad's instructions.” | “The American government and those who choose to cross the border illegally.” |
| P04 | “The US.” | “Children that... got brought here illegally.” | “Illegal immigrants.” |
| P05 | N/A | “Immigrants, people trying to move to America.” | “The people that are executing those situations, like the people who are running those centers.” |
| P06 | “Border patrol agents. The Latinos that are crossing the border into America, into the United States, for reasons to help better their life and their family’s life.” | “Mexicans or Latinos who cross the border.” | N/A |
| P07 | “The people who really exposed what was happening... I don’t know if it was necessarily the media, or certain senators, but I know there was some exposure that was unheard of at that point.” | “The people trying to escape horrible conditions only to be put in them and taken away from family.” | “The administration at the time.” |
| P08 | N/A | “The immigrants, the children.” | N/A |
| P09 | N/A | “Immigrants.” | “The government overall, specifically the President in some way.” |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| P10 | N/A | “If we wanted to dive down the rabbit hole, and we say these illegal immigrants are coming with children who don’t necessarily have a choice I’d say the children would be the victims.” | “People breaking the law. So it doesn’t matter if they’re Hispanic, or European, or Canadian... Crossing of the border illegally would make them the villain.” |
| P11 | N/A | “The people who are just trying to find a better life and escape things that they need to... and that are trapped and torn from their families.” | N/A |
| P12 | “The ones that are on the ground working and trying to make a difference... Taking kits, and delivering food, and trying to help the in between stages while they're in detention.” | “Those that are just trying to get a better start for their lives and their families.” | “Again I would think that the US, we're the villains.” |
| P13 | N/A | “Hispanics or Mexicans that are crossing the border and get detained... especially children who have no idea what’s going on.” | “Trump.” |
| P14 | “The people who are standing up for it and making a lot of noise, whether that be on social media, or if that’s a real legitimate like platform like people like AOC, and legislators who are really standing up for it.” | “Victims, obviously, are the families and the people who are being detained and sent to those centers, specifically children because you hear a lot about children who are separated from their families.” | “Policymakers and some of the presidents, I know that even during the Obama Administration, they had these same kinds of camps.” |
| P15 | N/A | “The victims are those being detained and any other family members that are outside of it... Hispanics in general.” | N/A |

Table C3: Character identification in possible reparations for US slavery

| Participant Code | Heroes (Slavery Reparations) | Victims (Slavery Reparations) | Villains (Slavery Reparations) |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| P01 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| P02 | “The people working, and finding solutions, to make those reparations.” | “African Americans.” | “The people who don’t want to do reparations.” |
| P03 | “Would have been Lincoln, because he was trying to do things to help.” | “Slaves. Lincoln” | “Andrew Jackson” [<i>sic</i>] (Andrew Johnson) |
| P04 | N/A | “Slaves.” | “Slave owners.” |
| P05 | N/A | “People that were slaves.” | “The Founding Fathers who started all of that.” |
| P06 | “Even maybe if I don’t agree with the bills, I would say people fighting for the people that are fighting for those bills that are getting those bills presented to congress and things like that, they’re heroes fighting for human rights.” | “Slaves. If I could understand more about generational fallout from things like slavery, then current African Americans could be victims.” | N/A |
| P07 | N/A | “All the people that were affected and enslaved and all of the generations after.” | “The patriarchal White men.” |
| P08 | N/A | “Slaves.” | “White slave owners.” |
| P09 | “The presidents that abolished slavery.” | “Slaves.” | “The people who participated in slavery, like the owners.” |
| P10 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| P11 | N/A | “Black communities and people who have been squashed... prison industrial complexes and, there’s a lot to go into.” | “The systems that have been working to keep people oppressed. Like I brought up earlier, the home loans from the ’60s on and stuff like that. The systems of oppression.” |
| P12 | “It would be those that are trying to pass laws and make recommendations for us to help.” | “Those who we have taken advantage of and kept down.” | “Those of us who are still stuck in our old traditions... Those who are stuck in the past and who won’t look to the future to try and make it better.” |
| P13 | N/A | “Slaves.” | “White Americans.” |
| P14 | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| P15 | N/A | N/A | N/A |