

CONTENTS

	<i>Foreword: Valorizing the Vernacular by Lane Ryo Hirabayashi</i>	vii
	<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
	<i>Note on Usage and Formatting</i>	xiii
1	Writing-to-Redress: Attending to Nikkei Literacies of Survivance	3
2	Recollecting Nikkei Dissidence: The Politics of Archival Recovery and Community Self-Knowledge	35
3	ReCollected Tapestries: The Circumstances behind Writing-to-Redress	57
4	Me Inwardly before I Dared: Attending Silent Literacies of Gaman	77
5	Everyone . . . Put in a Word: The Multisources of Collective Authority behind Public Writing-to-Redress	113
6	Another Earnest Petition: ReWriting Mothers of Minidoka	165
7	Relocating Authority: Expanding the Significance of Writing-to-Redress	193

VI CONTENTS

<i>Appendix A: Heart Mountain Fair Play Committee’s “Manifesto”</i>	215
<i>Appendix B: Letter drafted by Min Yasui for the Mother’s Society of Minidoka</i>	217
<i>Appendix C: Revision of letter from the Mother’s Society of Minidoka that was sent to authorities</i>	219
<i>References</i>	223
<i>Index</i>	243

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL
NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

1

WRITING-TO-REDRESS

Attending to Nikkei Literacies of Survivance

Much of the past is, of course, irrevocably silenced: gestures, conversations, and original manuscripts can never be recaptured. Silence and silencing still greet us in every library, every archive, every text, every newscast—at every turn . . . Still, while most of the female and male tradition has been regrettably lost, enormous amounts of material survive.

—Glenn (2004)

As we suspected, contrary to the stereotype, Chinese and Japanese immigrants were a literate people from literate civilizations whose presses, theaters, opera houses, and artistic enterprises rose as quickly as their social and political institutions. They are not few. They are not gone. They are not stupid. They were only waiting to be asked.

—Chan (1991)

[T]he more he questioned her, the more he was her accuser and murderer. The more he killed her, the deeper her silence became. What the Grand

Inquisitor has never learned is that the avenues of speech are the avenues of silence. To hear my mother, to attend to her speech, to attend the sound of stone, he must first become silent. Only when he enters her abandonment, will he be released from his own.

—Kogawa (1981)

Two years into my PhD program, a bunch of us TAs are sitting around our six crammed-in desks in the windowless office we share talking about dissertation ideas. When I say I've been thinking about the political writing in the World War II incarceration camps, about the loud and quiet ways literacy helped Japanese Americans perform rhetorical activity, Adam asks if I've read *Unspoken*, Cheryl Glenn's (2004) new book on the "rhetoric of silence." I'm intrigued, having read Glenn's (1997) *Rhetoric Retold* and her efforts to "regender" the rhetorical tradition. But I also know that work has now been done in Asian American studies on the issue of silence for several years, as poets, artists, activists, and scholars have long complicated quiet, orientalist model minority-type representations of people racialized as Asian.¹ The litany of titles speak, yell even: *Breaking Silence*, *Breaking the Silence*, *Shedding Silence*, *YELL-oh Girls!*, *Aiiiiieee!*, *The Big Aiiiiieee!*, *Tell This Silence*.² I ask Adam if Glenn cites *Articulate Silences* by King-Kok Cheung (1993), one of those lit theorists I read back in the day, not for any class or paper but because I was trying to understand patterns I saw in my life. A highly influential Asian American feminist literary critic, Cheung is the kind of author I would expect to see in a feminist rhetorician's account of silence's rhetorical possibilities. Adam hands me a library copy off of his shelf. I search the index. I flip through the text. No Cheung. No Asians. No Asian Americans. A rhetoric of silence.

From Unit 5

Japanese American Internment and the Problem of Cultural Identity: Testimony of the Interned

WRITING ANALYTICALLY

2. Write a paper in which you discuss the options open to people who suffer injustice because of their membership in a particular group . . . You should also consider which Nikkei responses (if any) might be useful to other oppressed groups. Alternative: Write a dialogue between X and Y concerning what people ought to do in response to an injustice . . . Write

yourself into the dialogue if you wish.
 (Bizzell and Herzberg 1996, 748)

This absence. This presence. Perhaps I shouldn't be surprised by Glenn's negligence. It's just that, as Elaine Richardson so perfectly recalled Fannie Lou Hamer, I'm "sick and tired of being sick and tired" (Richardson 2003, ch. 1). I didn't enter the PhD program with plans to focus on Asian American writing, didn't enter with great concern that the first voice I heard wasn't "my own." Tired of the navel-gazing expected of so many US-trained poets, I wanted the right to reach beyond myself, wanted to recognize myself in others, wanted to come back to writing through the ways I had come in—through that felt identification with the lives of other people. Not lives of the *Other*, just lives beyond my own skin: *El otro soy yo, el otro soy yo . . .* rhetorics of solidarity integral to the political life in which I had been raised, I wanted them back . . . *el pueblo unido*, panethnicity, common ground, *International Examiner*, coalition politics, *internacionalismo . . .*

But I had thought, perhaps too naively, that by now, by the twenty-first century, by the time I entered the doctoral program in composition and rhetoric, the voices I would hear, at the very least, would *include* my own. I assumed, by now, in this day and age, when Asian Americans have supposedly made it, supposedly surpassed any gap that exists, supposedly need no affirmative action to ensure that their bodily and historical presence is accounted for in all institutions of higher education, that the voices, the rhetorics, the literacies, and the composition struggles of "my" people (read: *our* people) would be attended to, would not be relegated to independent study, final seminar papers, individually tailored reading lists for prelims—in short, restricted roads of individual inquiry, special interest topics, segregated study.

Fill in the gap.

This is a ~~text about~~ literacy practice.

This is a ~~text about~~ Japanese American writing.

This is a ~~text about~~ symbolic-meaning making and exchange.

This is a ~~text about~~ yearning for more than what we have now.

This is a ~~text about~~ standpoint.

This is ~~a text about~~ struggle.

This is ~~a text about~~ history.

And this is consciously performative,
strategically essential,
romantically engaged,
and strongly objective.³

Mira Chieko Shimabukuro

Dissertation Proposal

Relocating Authority: Japanese Americans Writing to Redress Mass Incarceration

In spring 1942, a few months after the United States officially joined World War II, the US government rounded up 110,000 of its residents of Japanese ancestry—two-thirds of them legal citizens—and sent them to what has been called, at different times by different people, internment, concentration, or incarceration camps. These incarcerated immigrants and their US-born children have often been culturally and politically constructed as the “Quiet Americans” (Hosokawa 1969), implicitly and explicitly suggesting that they not only passively consented to the institutionalized racism embodied by the camps but fully succumbed to the cultural oppression brought about by the racist hysteria during the so-called good war. However, many incarcerated Nikkei (those of Japanese heritage) resisted the racist logic of internment and often did so in writing. Even as the US government’s War Relocation Authority (WRA) controlled the location of Nikkei bodies, the composition of diaries, poetry, short fiction, petitions, letters, manifestos, and political demands all served as means by which Nikkei writers sought to redress the circumstances of camp and regain the authority to determine the course of their lives. As one body of rhetoric yet to be analyzed in comp/rhet or literacy studies, such camp-generated writing will serve as the focus for this dissertation.

I’m not exactly sure why, within the field of composition and rhetoric, our understanding of the uses of writing by US-based writers racially constructed as Asian has been so under-theorized. Even as some Asian American

compositionists began to publicly reflect on their personal teaching and literacy histories (Chiang 1998, Lu 1987, Okawa 1998), for the most part, Catherine Prendergast (1998, 51) was correct when she noted in the late 1990s that “Asian-Americans don’t exist in composition studies.” Nor did we seem to exist in “the rhetorical tradition” (Bizzell and Herzberg 2001), “the legacies of literacy” (Graff 1987a), or “the nineteenth-century origins of our times” (Graff 1987b) despite the fact that people of Asian ancestry have been composing English-language texts in what is now called the United States since at least 1878, when Chinese merchants petitioned the state of California for the establishment of schools their children would be allowed to attend (Odo 2002, 33). As Jamie Candelaria Greene (1994) pointed out, these kinds of Anglocentric biases in and “misperspectives” of US literacy distort perceptions that serve as foundations for current and future policies, practices, and theories related to the teaching and history of writing.

Fortunately, over the past ten or so years, a few comp/rhet scholars have started to account for the “ways with words” (Heath 1983) generated within and out of Asian American communities by examining Asian American writing and rhetoric, as well as their sociocultural histories and contexts, through the lenses of specific genres, contrastive cultural rhetorics, and community-based literacy practices (Mao 2006; Duffy 2007; Young 2004). Subsequent dissertations have continued in this vein, using ethnography, oral history, close readings of literature composition studies, and other cultural texts to highlight the “solidarity” rhetoric of Asian American student activists (Hoang 2004), the multimodal cultural rhetorics of a Filipino American community organization (Monberg 2002), Asian American literary performances of literacy (Hiramine 2004) and “hyperliteracy” (Hasegawa 2004), and subject positions available to Asian American composition teachers (Yoon 2003). And in 2008, LuMing Mao and Morris Young brought us the first anthology on Asian American rhetoric, subsequently honored with an honorable mention for the MLA 2009 Mina P. Shaughnessy Prize. The first anthology to showcase the multiple ways that “Asian Americans use language to perform discursive acts and . . . develop persuasive and other rhetorical strategies to create knowledge and to effect social, political and cultural transformations,” *Representations: Doing Asian American Rhetoric* also “illuminat[ed] . . . those conflicting, ambivalent moments . . . central to Asian American discursive experiences” (Mao and Young 2008, 3).

All of the work described above attends to the ways race/racism, ever-evolving cultural concepts, and material historical processes shape the contemporary rhetorical choices US-based Asians have made with their writing. But despite the fact that both academic and independent scholars working in Asian American communities have long argued that early Asian American history (pre-1965) is rife with written activity,⁴ as a field we still have little theoretical understanding of the literacy practices and/or rhetorical interventions of US-based Asians during this period. This historical gap is important to address for a couple of reasons, the least of which is simply a matter of historical accuracy. But the other reason has to do more with a tenacious stereotype—that of the “perpetual foreigner.”

Aside from the model minority, this stereotype has probably been the most redressed representation in the history of pan-ethnic Asian American consciousness. This redressing took place, for example, in the capitalized proclamation “WE ARE NOT NEW HERE,” serving as the kickoff to the first section of *Aiiieeeee!*, the first anthology of pan-ethnic Asian American literature (Chin et al. 1974). With this proclamation, the editors explicitly and implicitly called attention to the fact that some of our communities (mainly Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino but also some Korean) have been in the United States for over a hundred years and are four, five, six generations deep, more than many white families. In terms of literacy and rhetoric, this kind of historical depth means, whether we know it or not, our contemporary discursive experiences reflect the century-long legacies of sugar cane plantations, Gold Mountain, Chinese-built American railroads, Japanese-cultivated farmlands, Pinoy (Filipino) labor struggles, anti-Asian exclusion acts, the prisons of Angel Island and World War II “internment” camps, Americanization initiatives between the two world wars, and the rise of urban Chinatowns and Little Tokyos. Amidst these legacies, depending on the complex trajectories our lives have taken, our heritage language might come to us as foreign—that is, our Spanish might be better than our Cantonese or we might be more naturally versed in African American “talkin and testifyin” than the compressed images of Japanese haiku. But no matter how long “our” people have been in the United States, many of us will be asked, at one time or another, “where are you from?,” meaning not what state, what city, what ’hood, but what *country*. In other words, despite the fact that people of Asian ancestry have taken part in this nation-state since before it even was a nation-state,⁵ many folks of Asian ancestry continue to be

complimented on the use of their own first language (English) or asked how long they've been in their country of birth (the United States).

This perpetual state of foreignness in which US-based Asians often find themselves can even be detected in comp/rhet where, aside from the studies mentioned earlier, Asians have tended to attain visible subjectivity only as international or ESL/ELL students. While the dynamically complex and heterogeneous, transnational, translangual (Lu and Horner 2013), code-switching, and code-meshing (Young 2007) realities of international and/or immigrant students are vital for all composition teachers to understand, if people racialized as Asian are only understood through the prism of national/cultural difference, we risk perpetuating the myth that Asian/American experience is a new phenomenon.

Which is why writing about early Asian American discursive practices can be a performance of Asian American rhetoric itself, a way to "bring about material and symbolic consequences" (Mao and Young 2008, 3). In order to do so, though, I have had to rely heavily on the interdisciplinary efforts of those working in Asian American studies, which, like comp/rhet, is a relatively young discipline born out of the civil rights and liberation struggles of the 1960s and 1970s. The recovery of early Asian American writing began in the 1970s when Frank Chin, Jeffrey Paul Chan, Lawson Fusao Inada, and Shawn Wong, four writers and the soon-to-be editors of *Aiiieeeee!* (Chin et al. 1974), began searching for literary ancestors who might prove to be part of a hidden tradition of Asian Americans writing about being Asian American (Partridge 2004). The poetry and prose that they found convinced them, as well as scholars in the newly emerging field of Asian American studies, that "Asian Americans have been writing seriously since the nineteenth century" (Chin et al. 1974, xxi). Literary recovery work since this initial declaration has only bolstered their claim as more and more English- and Asian-language prose and poetry authored by US-based Asians have been retrieved from the "spectre of lost history" (Chang 1996, xiv) to be anthologized, summarized, and analyzed by both academic and independent scholars (Chang 1996; Lawrence and Cheung 2005; Yogi 1997; Chan et al. 1991).

The clustered concept of "Asian American," though, is relatively recent, coined during the pan-ethnic Asian American movement beginning in the late 1960s as part of the mass social movements of the time (Espiritu 1992). As such, conceiving of Asian American writing composed before that movement

as a composite body of work means one must imagine a rhetorically collected and conceived community (Anderson 1991) of writers that did not necessarily imagine themselves as belonging to that particular community as they put their words onto the page. Instead, even as pan-ethnic Asian American writers/rhetoricians may have dealt with similar topoi of anti-“yellow” racism, bicultural tensions/celebrations, embraced/rejected orientalism, or cultural/political “rhetorics of citizenship,” they were just as often responding to ethnic-specific cultural, political, and historical exigencies. And as far as the continental Nikkei community is concerned, there has been no greater ethnic-specific exigency than their mass incarceration during World War II.

My choice of language here, *mass incarceration*, over the more popularized term of *internment* is twofold. As a number of camp scholars have pointed out, a wide variety of euphemisms have been used throughout history to mask the reality of Nikkei imprisonment during World War II. While terms like *evacuation* and *relocation* are particularly problematic for their harmless tone, the inaccuracy of the word *internment* significantly hampers our understanding of the injustice. As Densho explains, “The commonly used term ‘internment’ is misleading when describing the concentration camps that held 120,000 people of Japanese descent during the war. ‘Internment’ refers to the legally permissible detention of enemy aliens in [a] time of war. . . . [Y]et two-thirds of the Japanese Americans incarcerated were U.S. citizens.” Tetsuden Kashima and others have pointed out that, technically, these “imprisonment centers” were *concentration camps*, or “barbed wire enclosure[s] where people are interned or incarcerated under armed guard” (8), and many activists over the years have taken this framing up, simultaneously arguing that the Nazi-run camps should be referred to as *slave* or *death camps*. But to avoid initial confusion, I have followed both Densho and Kashima’s lead here and chosen *incarceration camps* to refer to the imprisonment centers that held both immigrant Japanese nationals (“enemy aliens”) and their US-born descendants (US citizens).

Initially, I chose *mass incarceration* to emphasize the ways in which the community was rounded up *en masse*. That is, all persons of Japanese ancestry who lived on the West Coast in 1942 were subject to this experience. It was not, even on the surface or for public show, the imprisonment of “crime”-committing individuals. But conversations about terminology are, of course, important, and they are ongoing. Had my first writing of the book taken place alongside the rise of the Black Lives Matter movement, current discussions of the

school-to-prison pipeline, growing awareness of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) “family detention centers” (Ina 2015), and the mainstream appeal of Michelle Alexander’s (2011) *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*, I might have chosen a different term or addressed the connection between Nikkei and African American and Latino experiences of incarceration more head-on throughout my entire manuscript. But I am also swayed by more recent arguments that *mass incarceration* masks both the severity of prison conditions and the “triply selective” manner in which race, class, and place shape who is more likely to be locked up under the contemporary carceral state (Wacquant 2010; Cooper 2011; Forman 2012; Gottschalk 2015). In this way, I believe Loïc Wacquant’s term *hyper-incarceration* better addresses the *targeted intensity* of current imprisonment practices in black and brown communities, while the term *mass incarceration* better addresses the World War II imprisonment of Nikkei persons *en masse*.⁶

Regardless, my project is not a comparative study on the rhetorics of terminology and euphemisms—though this would indeed make an excellent focus for another book. Instead, the focus of this book is on how Nikkei incarcerated *redressed* the conditions of their imprisonment and how they used literacy to do so.

To understand Nikkei rhetorical uses of literacy, however, one needs to begin before the period of mass incarceration. More than one social historian of Japanese American communities have reminded their audiences that starting with camp means starting with victimhood, eliding a rich and complex pre-war history where Issei (first or immigrant generation) forefathers and foremothers engaged in both domestic and transnational struggles to carve out material, cultural, and ideological space to improve both their lives and those of their children (Ichioka 1988; Azuma 2005). Literacy and rhetoric played a large role in such struggles, as historians such as Yuji Ichioka (1988), David Yoo (2000), and Eiichiro Azuma (2005) all reference an active Nikkei vernacular press dating back to at least the 1880s, when an ideologically heterogeneous collection of both Japanese-language and bilingual newspapers began to circulate. In addition, Nisei literary writers found a public stage in *Current Life*, a San Francisco-based magazine published and edited by writer James Omura, who dedicated himself to showcasing Nisei literary writing in English (Chin 1991). Meanwhile, haiku and senryu writing clubs also developed in at least California and Washington, where Issei and Nisei writers met regularly to write, read,

and workshop their poems and then vote on the evening's best (De Cristoforo 1997a; J. Kobayashi 2005; Honda 1989; Yamada, Yasutake, and Yasutake 2002). These vibrant glimpses of bilingual rhetorics left by both literary and social historians of Asian and Japanese America suggest that Nikkei communities up and down the West Coast were teeming with the written word.

Regardless of this prewar history, interdisciplinary studies of Nikkei experiences during World War II have dominated the landscape of Japanese American history and Asian American studies, with over a thousand books published on the subject (Hayashi 2004, xiv). Despite this abundance of material, relatively few scholars have focused their analyses on the ways written words were broadly used by incarcerated in camp, even though "writing flourished" within this key period and location of Japanese American history (Chin et al. 1974, xxi). While independent writer-scholars Chin et al. (1974, xxliii) provided us with initial assertions that uniquely Japanese American symbolic structures were codified in such print genres as "camp newspapers, literary magazines, diaries and journals" by writers who would later help make up the literary canon of Asian America, their only close reading and/or analysis of camp-generated texts is in their second book, where Chin (1991) contrasts the written perspective of the Heart Mountain Fair Play Committee (FPC) with that of the Japanese American Citizens League in his rhetorically polemic discussion of "real" and "fake" Asian American writing.

Other valuable work dealing with camp writing has come in the form of anthologies and memoirs. While some anthologies have collected and translated Japanese-language poetry by Issei writers (De Cristoforo 1997a; Soga et al. 1983), others have included English-language poems, letters, and diary excerpts as part of general collections of pre- and post-camp writing on the experience (Inada 2000; Harth 2001). In addition, two books—a more recently published poet's memoir and a collection of camp-era writings by a former Stanford professor—provide self-portraits of established Nikkei writers during World War II (Chang 1997; Suyemoto 2007). As helpful as all of these texts are in illuminating several subjective perspectives on incarceration, none of them offer an analysis of camp writing as forms of literacy or rhetoric.

In terms of work that involves more scholarly analysis, several literary, cultural, and historical scholars have included camp-generated texts as part of discussions of non-camp specific themes (Arakawa 2005; Schweik 1991; Yamamoto 1999; Lawrence 2005; Yoo 2000). Three studies have explored the

ways incarceration impacted, shaped, and framed various types of Japanese American discourse (Suzuki 1976; Ono 1992; Lain 2005), but only one part of one of those examines writing composed behind the barbed wire of the camp. Aside from this brief discussion on the Heart Mountain draft resistance bulletins, scholarly studies dealing with nonliterary writing in camp are limited. Two studies by Louis Fiset (1997, 2001) look at the censorship of mail going in and out of the camps. Articles written by history of journalism scholars examine the level of censorship at play in camp newspapers (Mizuno 2001, 2003; Kessler 1988; Omura 1989), but as these studies argue, the Nikkei community never had complete control over these War Relocation Authority-sponsored newspapers, even though, as communication studies scholar Danny Toshio Molden (1998) argues, the papers still served as a significant rhetorical site for the shaping of “internee identity.”

Other scholarly studies that focus on writing in camp examine the work of more literary writers. In their work on the well-published Nisei poet Toyo Suyemoto, Susan Schweik (1989) and John Streamas (2005) focus on cultural and historical contexts for understanding the poet’s political intentions in her body of camp-written work. Two dissertations also employ discussions of cultural, historical, and political contexts to their close readings of writing in camp. The first examines literary texts written in Japanese as evidence of the maintenance of bicultural identity through the internment era (J. Kobayashi 2005) and the second employs “critical rhetorical analysis” to analyze the “ethos of trustworthiness” strategically developed by the Nikkei writers and the publisher of *TREK*, a literary magazine published and distributed out of the Topaz camp (Card 2005). Work by Schweik, Streamas, Kobayashi, and Card is extremely valuable to our sense of incarcerated as rhetorical actors, but because they focus only on those who already identified and would have been recognized as Writers, these studies do not offer a broad enough picture of the multiple ways the Nikkei community as a whole may have regularly used writing in order to redress the conditions of mass incarceration.

Over the past ten years, work on mass incarceration by comp/rhet-identified scholars in our own field of interdisciplinary affiliations has started to emerge. Hui Wu (2007) published an article in *College Composition and Communication* on “Writing and Teaching behind Barbed Wire,” focusing more on the agency of the white instructor than her students, as she speculated on the political intent behind the teacher’s pedagogy. More personally grounded,

Gail Okawa has published several pieces from her ongoing research project that began with looking into government records on her Hawai'i-based grandfather's World War II arrest and imprisonment (Okawa 2003, no. 269; Okawa 2008, no. 270; Okawa 2011, no. 584).

While all of this work is extremely valuable to our sense of Nikkei literacy under mass incarceration, even in Asian American studies we are still left without a clear picture or theoretical framework for how incarcerated Nikkei, as a collectively disenfranchised and mass imprisoned group, actively *used* writing on their own terms, as somewhat separate from government agents, in order to survive and/or resist the conditions in which they had forcibly been placed. Trying to determine this use, trying to trace the shape of what literacy meant to the recovery of Nikkei authority and what it still means, has not been easy. At least, not easy to explain.

Sure, there are the archives, the discourse analysis, the interviews, the oral history collections, the books upon books upon books. And like any good researcher, I have used these, as you will see in what follows. But James Paul Gee once told us grad students in a Discourse Analysis class that a good deal of good research comes down to *taste*. But how does one lay *taste* bare? Sure, there's Pierre Bourdieu's (1991) distinction and habitus and all that great class-based analysis. But what does *taste* feel like? How does Jacqueline Jones Royster "recognize an important story when [she] see[s] it" (Royster 2000, ix)? With what is she trying "to make better sense?" (Royster 2000, 9)? Aside from the library catalogs and book reviews and advisors' directives and archives' stamp of authority, what tells us *something is missing*? How do any of us know *it's more complicated than that*?

FROM LISTENING TO ATTENDANCE: STRETCHING TOWARD RELEVANCE

A preliminary step in making sense is learning to look, listen and look again, to think well, and to speak as though knowledge is now and has always been in the making.

—Royster (2000)

How do any of us know? Krista Ratcliffe (2005) tells us we must "rhetorically listen," must "assume a stance of openness" in the interest of "cross-cultural

exchange" (1), must "listen . . . with the intent to understand" (33). And Ratcliffe does listen, does self-reflect, does carefully consider the experience of the women of color to whom she attempts to rhetorically listen in the interest of cross-cultural dialogue. However, while Ratcliffe's framework does seem to be inherently feminist, her *rhetorical listening* seems to be better suited for those with more privilege, for those who can use it to "foster *conscious* identifications with gender and whiteness in ways that may, in turn, facilitate cross-cultural communication" (Ratcliffe 2005, 2, emphasis in original). It also seems highly individualized, between one author/speaker and one reader/listener in one moment of exchange. As Terese Guinsatao Monberg recently pointed out, Ratcliffe's listening is somewhat dependent upon "women of color being audibly or visibly present" (Monberg 2008, 86). In other words, the one moment of exchange is contingent upon work being recorded and published (in print or on video or online) and/or people being in the vicinity of each other. There's no way of knowing how representative this voice being rhetorically listened to is, no way of gauging the collectivity that surrounds its articulation, the jostling sponsorship that made it possible, the particular ideologies it embraces or eschews.

When Ratcliffe reads Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston's autobiography of mass incarceration, for example, she "listens" for the "competing cultural logics of the Manzanar camp culture and the dominant white culture," which allows her to "not only question the fairness and legality" of Houston's "situations" but to "ask [her]self, once again, if and how [she] ever participate[s] in white discourses in ways that might unknowingly erase the desires and material existence of others" (Ratcliffe 2005, 40). While Ratcliffe displays an admirable self-reflectivity about the "competing . . . logics" represented in the book, what's missing is a discussion of the ways such logics are complicated by the text's own rhetorical context. Explicitly composed for a mass US audience, Houston's "autobiography" was coauthored by her white husband, James Houston, whose name appears on the cover and who has been quoted as saying that when the couple was writing, they purposely de-emphasized "the political" in lieu of "the personal" since "everyone can relate to that" (Friedson 1984, 53). As the couple purposely composed their text to be the first on incarceration with broad, mainstream appeal, their strategic move to only emphasize the personal certainly had its own rhetorical underpinnings, but it also raises questions regarding the *range* and *depth* of "cultural logics" one

may be able to “hear” in Houston and Houston’s text. As Traise Yamamoto (1999, 106) has argued, many Nisei autobiographers like Jeanne Houston have often been, understandably, quite “selective in their use of personal detail and guarded in their criticisms of white America” given their anticipation of “a potentially defensive and hostile white American audience.” When Ratcliffe points us toward this text, we do not “hear” it amidst a chorus of other incarcerated voices; we do not see where the microphone is plugged in; we do not know who has “spoken” before.⁷ We also do not know how expensive or cheap or easily found this memoir is over others, like those penned by the Issei, whose adult lives were more dramatically impacted by the imposition of camp. Houston’s autobiography is only one individual expression of the “competing cultural logics” written from the perspective of one adult remembering one seven-year-old’s experience of camp.

This is not to say there is nothing to learn from these reconstructed memories, or to denigrate in any way the epistemological or rhetorical potential of memory and memoir. It is not even to argue over the degree of representativeness of Houston’s (and Houston’s) (auto)biography. It is only to note the epistemological limitations, the embedded yet somewhat unacknowledged, individualist leanings of Ratcliffe’s approach. While Ratcliffe’s model of rhetorical listening certainly holds value for the classroom, it still seems predicated on an assumption that a plethora of voices that should be rhetorically listened to will have the access they need to that shared rhetorical space, that microcosm of the public sphere. As far as I can tell from the past ten years of teaching, access (both in terms of the bodies of students and teachers of color *and* of materials in multiculturalized curriculum) continues to override the good intent behind Ratcliffe’s model.

Yet, to be clear, I fully appreciate Ratcliffe’s (2005, 28) desire for a deeper form of “intersubjective receptivity” in the face of mass injustice. My discussion here simply reflects a quest for a methodology to find a more relevant model. Monberg finds feminist rhetoricians of color, like Royster and Malea Powell, to be of more assistance in coming to more culturally and politically relevant models of “listening” but also observes that this trope of receptivity, as put forth by feminist historiographers of rhetoric, often conflates *what can be heard* with *what can be seen*: “[M]ost forms of listening have largely rested in seeing—seeing women at the podium, seeing women’s texts, seeing women’s words in print before they can be heard. But seeing

is only one part of the dynamic equation when listening for/to women's voices . . . beyond what is immediately visible and documented" (Monberg 2008, 86–7). Monberg then moves to pull listening and seeing apart to argue for the value of oral history as a method in rhetorical recovery projects and the critical importance of listening-with-intent as one becomes immersed in the tapes and transcripts of one's living historical subject/s. For Monberg, oral history becomes a particularly rich "rhetorical site" for those working in Filipina/o American communities. Careful to avoid inscribing orality as inherently Pinay/Pinoy (Filipina/o), Monberg nonetheless calls attention to the "traditions of orality" and how they have been "put to *different uses* . . . in order to carry history, cultural memory, and tradition" in the face of both transnational and US-domestic colonization (92). Through this politically historicized discussion, Monberg formulates what she earlier foreshadows as a "culturally contingent context" of listening (86), a more specific form of "intersubjective receptivity" than has yet to be theorized by other feminist rhetorical theories of listening.

Following Monberg, I too want to call attention to the conflation of listening and seeing in order to theorize a more culturally and politically relevant model of intersubjective receptivity. However, unlike Monberg's important move of pulling apart sight and sound in order to foreground the recovery potential of oral history, I want to keep these modes of reception together but give their symbiosis a new name.

RHETORICAL ATTENDANCE: A CULTURALLY RELEVANT MODEL OF NIKKEI INTERSUBJECTIVE RECEPTIVITY

I have learned to engage in a painstaking process of recovery and reconstruction; to use multidisciplinary sources; to count experience variously, especially when the people whose experience it was are no longer alive and when did not always leave clear records of themselves. I have learned to cross-reference tidbits of information in making sense of evidence; to recognize an important story when I see it; to develop strategies for retelling it respectfully despite the inevitable missing pieces. What I have learned best, however is the value of two virtues: the importance of caring about "the subject" and the importance of patience.

—Royster (2000)

To travel with confidence down this route the most reliable map I am given is the example of my mother's and Grandmother's alert and accurate knowing. When I am hungry, and before I can ask, there is food. If I am weary, every place is a bed . . . A sweater covers me before there is any chill and if there is pain there is care simultaneously. If grandma shifts uncomfortable, I bring her a cushion.

"Yoku ki ga tsuku ne." (Fujita 1985; You really notice/are aware/are attentive, aren't you?) Grandma responds. It is a statement in appreciation of sensitivity and appropriate gestures."

—Kogawa (1981)

From working in the Japanese American community, I have learned to listen just as much to what is not said.

—A. Ito

Through her concept of "culturally relevant pedagogy," education theorist Gloria Ladson-Billings argues for a vision of teaching that facilitates academic prowess as well as "cultural competence" and a "sociopolitical or critical consciousness" (Ladson-Billings 1995b, 483) that students can use to "challenge the status quo of the current social order" in the interest of "collective . . . empowerment" (Ladson-Billings 1995a, 160). Following one of my many reads of Ladson-Billings, I realized that I had been searching for a relevant method and methodology not just of teaching but of inquiry. As a *hapa haole* (mixed blood, Asian/Pacific Islander, and white) Yonsei (fourth generation) partially raised by a father who grew up in Hawai'i but went on to become an activist and community historian of the Japanese American redress movement, I have spent a lot of time living both within and on the margins of West Coast Nikkei communities, reconstructed and re"imagined" (Anderson 1991) after World War II. My living "within" identification has meant a constant embodiment of what Nancy Hartsock (1998) refers to as "outrage and observation" over racist acts and representations, including those motivated by what Frank Chin and Jeffrey Chan (1971) have called a "racist love" of orientalist others and model minorities. My on-the-margins-of-the-Nikkei-community identification (margins are relational, not inherent) has, however, meant a constant anxiety over whether I really have anything to say or any right to say it. But as in all good contradictions, it is my

marginal position that makes me struggle, fuels the drive for a better way, a better method. It is the anxiety, coupled with knowledge, that willing listeners await, that makes me know *this had better be good*.

My search has meant a degree of ongoing, extracurricular attention to Asian American and Japanese American culture and history. Never one to major in Asian American studies or focus my schooling in such a way that I would be graded on such a search—really, the threat of a low grade over something so intimate, I think, was too much to bear—I tried to keep up for many years but in a low-profile manner. You won't find Japanese American subjects on my transcripts, won't see them if you rifle through my old papers. But that doesn't mean that I was not constantly reflecting on Japanese Americanness, doesn't mean I was not *in attendance* at the rhetorical sites of its meaning continuously and contestedly being made.

Dictionary.com:

ATTEND

–verb (used with object)

1. to be present at: to attend a lecture; to attend church.
2. to go with as a concomitant or result; accompany: Fever may attend a cold. Success attended her hard work.
3. to take care of; minister to; devote one's services to: The nurse attended the patient daily.
4. to wait upon; accompany as a companion or servant: The retainers attended their lord.
5. to take charge of; watch over; look after; tend; guard: to attend one's health.
6. to listen to; give heed to.
7. Archaic. to wait for; expect.

–verb (used without object)

8. to take care or charge: to attend to a sick person.
9. to apply oneself: to attend to one's work.
10. to pay attention; listen or watch attentively; direct one's thought; pay heed: to attend to a speaker.

11. to be present: She is a member but does not attend regularly.
12. to be present and ready to give service; wait (usually fol. by on or upon): to attend upon the Queen.
13. to follow; be consequent (usually fol. by on or upon).
14. Obsolete. to wait.

Etymology:

- a. c. 1300, "to direct one's mind or energies," from O.Fr. *attendre* "to expect, wait for, pay attention," from L. *attendere* "give heed to," lit. "to stretch toward," from ad- "to" + *tendere* "stretch" (see *tenet*). The notion is of "stretching" one's mind toward something.

In two separate works of Asian American literary criticism, both Gayle Fujita and King-Kok Cheung highlight the trope of attendance in *Obasan*, Joy Kogawa's (1981) novel about the complex array of silences carried in the memories of mass incarceration by Canada's Nikkei community. For Fujita, "the essence of Kogawa's 'brilliant artistic tour de force,' as one of many impressed reviews put it, is Naomi's [the protagonist] nonverbal mode of apprehension summarized by the term 'attendance.' This sensibility, rooted in Naomi's *nikkei* inheritance and her before-the-war Vancouver home, is therefore not simply the novel's stylistic achievement but a form of Japanese Canadian and American culture" (Fujita 1985, 34). Following Fujita, Cheung devotes a chapter in *Articulate Silences* to Kogawa's use of "attentive silence," which, she writes, seems to be

related to the Japanese notions of *sassi*, "a mental function of catching a sign from a speaker" . . . and *ishin-denshin*, "telepathy" or "sympathy, quiet understanding." . . . As a noun *sassi* can be translated as "conjecture, surmise, guess, judgment and understanding what a person means and what a sign means"; in its verb form, *sassuru*, "its usage is expanded to mean 'imagine, suppose, and even sympathize with, feel for, and make allowances for' . . . The phrase *ishin-denshin*—literally "by means of heart to heart"—has Chinese roots . . . it describes an "immediate communication (of truth) from one mind to another, or "a tacit understanding." (Cheung 1993, 146)

As Cheung (1993, 146) further explains, "Attentive silence in *Obasan* incorporates the visual sensitivity and the anticipatory responsiveness implied in *sassi*, the intuitive understanding implied in *ishin-denshin*, and the empathy

implied in both,” which is all to say that “[v]isual attendance . . . is inseparable from thoughtfulness and [a] poised hand. Far from suggesting passivity, this form of silence entails both mental vigilance and physical readiness” (147).⁸

In this way, I offer up *attendance* or *attending (to)* as another rhetorical model of the deeper forms of intersubjectivity reception that Ratcliffe and Monberg (following Royster and Powell) seem to be calling for. From a methods perspective, I cannot abandon the visual (or conflate it with the aural/oral) because my focus is print literacy and the ways in which its material forms allowed for the rhetorical processes of social justice under discussion. From a methodological perspective, however, I find myself reaching for the most relevant framework I can muster, one that allows for the development of both cultural competence and political consciousness that can serve the interests of collective empowerment and social change. If Fujita (1985, 39) is right, if “attendance [is] the *nikkei* legacy,” then perhaps it can “support” me, as it did for the central character of *Obasan*, “in [my] moment of . . . need.”

Listening also assumes someone has spoken, and this is not always the case when it comes to literacy. For many folks in comp/rhet, and perhaps Western intellectual traditions in general, not speaking is quickly equated with silence, which is then seen as the exact and only converse of speech. That is, the word *silence* becomes a stand-in signifier for an absence of words or verbal activity. While Glenn’s (2004, 4) claim that “silence is absence with a function” helps continue the recovery of silence as a valid rhetorical art, my point is that the verbal activity of literacy can be both full of words and silent at the exact same time. As Cheung noted within her larger discussion of silence’s “articulate” possibilities, the character for *silence* in Chinese and Japanese is not so much the opposite of *speech* than it is the opposite of “‘noise,’ ‘motion’ and ‘commotion’” (Cheung 1993, 8n11). We are reminded, via Cheung, that silence is not simply the *absence of verbal action* but the *absence of noise*. This distinction is important as we remember that writing signals an activity and a body of work where its participants can, if they choose, both “speak” and remain silent at the exact same time. That is, with writing, words can verbalize feeling and thought all the while never making any outward noise or commotion. As Cheung (26) writes at the end of her introduction to the work of three Asian American women writers, two of whom confront the legacy of incarceration in their postwar written work, “[o]f particular note in [these] works is the inverse relation between spoken and written expression.

Many of their characters . . . distill onto the page what they cannot say out loud. [While many characters] have trouble speaking or *telling* their life stories . . . they all excel on paper: their unspoken emotions break into print.”

While this option of “break[ing] into print” whenever one is unable to speak will be discussed in more depth in chapter 4, I call attention to it here to suggest how much we might miss—all those “unspoken emotions” “distill[ed] onto the page”—if we *lost sight* of the visual aspect of attendance.

In addition, by relying solely on the trope of listening, one might “unknowingly erase” its relationship to the tropes of visibility and invisibility expressed in Asian Americanist rhetoric that arose out of the civil rights, liberation, and women’s movements that spanned the 1960s to the early 1980s:

Mitsuye Yamada in *This Bridge Called My Back* (Yamada 1983, 40, emphasis added):

We need to *raise our voices* a little more, even as they say to us “This is so uncharacteristic of you.” To finally *recognize our own invisibility* is to finally be on the path toward *visibility*.

people are *still looking right through and around us*, assuming we are simply tagging along. Asian American women still remain in the background and we are *heard but not really listened to*.

Frank Chin, Lawson Fusao Inada, Jeffrey Paul Chan, and Shawn Wong in *Aiiieeeee!*:

America’s dishonesty—its racist white supremacy passed off as love and acceptance—has kept seven generations of Asian-American *voices off the air*, off the streets, and praised us for being Asiatically *no-show*. A lot is lost forever. But from the few decades of writing we have recovered from seven generations, it is clear that we have a lot of elegant, angry, and bitter life *to show*. We know *how to show it*. We are *showing off*. (Chin et al. 1974, xvi)

All aspects of one’s intersubjective receptivity are required in order to avoid “looking right through and around” as we learn to *pay attention to, be present at, take care of, apply oneself to*, or, going back to the concept’s etymology, *stretch toward*. It is this “stretching toward” that I think both Ratcliffe and Monberg are getting at, stretching toward with mental vigilance, with physical readiness, with intent. Rhetorical attendance.

pay attention, be present, take care, stretch . . .

My own approach began with paying attention to what had already been done in Japanese American studies in both academic and community-based sites of scholarship. This meant combing secondary sources on camp experiences, camp writing, and camp resistance. With over a thousand manuscripts on the subject, I started by focusing solely on “resistance,” and as my research evolved, I returned to various sources from other angles to fill in the gaps that I recognized from previous attendances. As Victor Villanueva (2004) writes, “*Memoria* is a friend of ours,” and so I came to rely on my friend to tell me *something is missing*, to attend to what was *not* said, to bridge/stretch/direct my energies from my socially shaped but ephemeral intuition toward the concrete material sources that could more easily be shaped into shared knowledge.

Days of Remembrance . . .

Remnants of Portland’s J-town . . .

Fifty Years Before, Fifty Years After . . .

Camp Notes, Legends, Syllables . . .

“Gaman, be strong, moto gaman iko, neh . . .”

The Pacific Citizen . . .

Layout tables, the back-lit Tetris-shaped text . . .

Wing Luke. Wooden barracks, enclosed space . . .

The International Examiner . . .

Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga . . .

Years of Infamy . . .

Uncle Homer, Auntie Chisao, Auntie Peggy . . . a table filled with talk-talk-talk

We are all filled with such attendances, filled with an abundance of epistemological potential. With such fleeting memories, we can learn to “look, listen and look again” and “recognize . . . invisibility” in our research. For me, this translates into a conscious move to claim the memories, my friends—these lifelong attendances of Japanese American writers writing, Asian American performances and texts, Nikkei and pan-Asian American activist rhetorics and material events.

As the daughter of two activists who eventually separated but admirably negotiated split custody *kodomo no tame ni* (for the sake of the child), I was often taken along to meetings, demonstrations, and political and cultural events. My father also took me to his work in the offices of the *Pacific Citizen* and the *International Examiner*, two community vernaculars. As such, my attendances were physical—as in, I was *present at*—but not always fully conscious, as I did homework, listened to music, played on computers, or drew pictures in many of these sites. And yet, like all of us, my cultural/political knowledge was being shaped by the social milieu in which I found myself. Memories were being formed, experiential knowledge was taking root. And this knowledge would be plural, these memories, many; and they would be hard to footnote or cite and yet just as vital as any textual source embedded in what still seems to remain the most legitimate forms of academic inquiry.

ANNOTATED ATTENDANCES

Days of Remembrance (1978). Multnomah County Exposition Center. Former assembly center for Portland, Oregon's Nikkei residents during World War II. Portland's first mass public redress event, including former incarcerated speakers, music, performances, and paper replicas of incarcerated numbered tags pinned to people's clothes. The safety pin pokes my skin, the number flaps in the wind.

Layout tables at the *Pacific Citizen* and *International Examiner*, (1985, 1991). Los Angeles, California, and Seattle, Washington. My father serves as editor, organizing Nikkei and Asian American news. I sit on the floor drawing until he tells me to look at something, shows me how to use algebra to fit columns of Tetris-shaped text in between the square ads. I become used to seeing certain words in print: *camp, commission, 442nd, pilgrimage, hearings, reparations, redress*.

E.O. 9066, Fifty Years Before, Fifty Years After (1992). Wing Luke Asian Museum. Seattle, Washington. My father builds a replica of a barrack as part of the Wing Luke's exhibit on camp. I stop by while he's in progress, touch the tar paper walls, sit on the floorboards, feel the cramped space, imagine the dust storms everyone has talked about. When he is done, some former incarcerated will tell him it's too nice; others will break down in tears.

Family dinner with one of the mothers of redress, Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga, and her husband, Jack Herzig (1996). Arlington, Virginia. On the East Coast for a family reunion, my father calls Aiko and Jack to have dinner. All fifteen of the Shimabukuros, my father and his siblings and all of us kids, meet the Herzigs for dinner. All I know about Aiko at the time is what my father has told me—that she played a “very important role” in redress, something about finding documents in an archive. As we eat, I am struck by the serious warmth and generous spirit of a Nisei woman I will later learn the government called a “destructive force.”

Conversations about the restrictive and expansive meanings of *gaman* with family and friends (1972–2008). Portland, Oregon. Los Angeles, California. Seattle, Washington. I first learned *gaman* as “endure” or “bear with it” or “suck it up.” *We will not gaman anymore!* A common rallying cry during the redress movement, as many former incarcerated spoke to the concept as an ideal mode of behavior behind the barbed wire. But lately, rumblings about the term suggest greater complexity with the word implying the cultivation of internal—psychological, spiritual—strength. A good friend recently told me to think of it as “self-dialogue,” a way to process the pain internally so as not to impose one’s suffering on others around you that suffer as well. That is, to individually *gaman* is to develop the psychological and spiritual endurance necessary in order to collectively survive any hardship.

The talk-talk-talk of my father and other redress activists at meetings (1979–1984). Portland, Oregon. Flyers, envelopes, stamps, address labels, coffee and soda, bento boxes from Anzen, inarizushi, leftover pickled ginger wrappers, used disposable hashi, half-empty bags of kakimochi, all the makings of a Nikkei meeting. There is much to do, always much to do. But everyone is working, talking, laughing, sometimes saying nothing because nothing needs to be said. I lay under the folding tables, doing my homework, ears open, waiting . . .

But this is not all that there is.

Attendance doesn’t stop with these epistemologically rich memories of widely varied and sometimes fleeting moments of intersubjective receptivity. Attendance is vigilant, not passive. One must “apply oneself,” must “stretch one’s mind,” must be “consequent of” what has come before and “follow” with something new.

ATTENDING TO NIKKEI LITERACIES OF SURVIVANCE: WRITING-TO-REDRESS

To attend to the word *redress* in the Japanese American community, I must note its semantic identification with the grassroots reparations movement that began in the 1970s and culminated in the 1988 passage of the Civil Liberties Act. However, Lane Ryo Hirabayashi (1998; see also Nishimoto 1995) has suggested that the collective struggle for redress actually began during the camp period,⁹ basing his argument on a historical document that formally articulates demands/requests for compensation. And, as I learned from doing editorial work on the book my father would eventually come to write about the Seattle origins of the redress and reparations movement, the word *redress* means more than compensation for a wrong; broader connotations include the more abstract definitions of “to set right,” “to adjust evenly again,” or “to remedy or relieve” (Shimabukuro 2001, v). While anyone active in the Nikkei community has long experienced, or at least heard about, the cathartic effects of various stages of the recognized redress movement, as I attend to my memories and to Hirabayashi, as well as to the writing I have both read over the years and more recently recovered in the archives, I would argue that much self- and community-sponsored Nikkei writing from camp suggests a constant use of what I am calling *writing-to-redress*. That is, much writing from camp can be seen as the codification of a desire to set right what is wrong or to relieve one’s suffering from the psychological and physical imposition of forced “relocation” and incarceration. In this way, Nikkei writers in camp were engaged in their own version of a “rhetoric of survivance,” or the use of language/writing to “survive + resist” (Powell 2002) the conditions of mass incarceration.

As a politically and culturally relevant model of Nikkei literacy, writing-to-redress points to an ongoing literacy practice, what literacy theorists define as a “socially regulated, recurrent, and patterned [set of] things that people do with literacy as well as the cultural significance they ascribe to those doings” (Brandt and Clinton 2002, 342). Taking this kind of practice approach to analyzing literacy requires one to shift their focus away from decontextualized texts to the ways people use writing. As one way of using writing that has developed into a pattern over the past sixty years, writing-to-redress is akin to Jacqueline Jones Royster’s Afrafeminist model of “literacy as sociopolitical action,” which allows for the understanding that

a “consistency of oppressions . . . has been paralleled by a consistency of responses,” of which “the use of literacy for social and political change” has been one (Royster 2000, 59). But, as I’ve argued earlier, in order to see/listen for/become aware of this sociopolitical action in Nikkei community history, we must attend to the historical, material, and cultural particularities impacting the ways incarcerated Nikkei knowingly and unknowingly participated in the socially regulated, recurrent, and patterned activity called writing-to-redress.

Given the particularly complex dynamics of the Nikkei community’s post-war “partly real and partly mythical silence” (Chin et al. 1974, viii), realities and myths discussed in the next chapter, attending to the “silent” speech of writing allows us to take heed of and then follow the verbal and rhetorical activity often covered up in the history of our community. We can recover the “quiet” ways people wrote their inner worlds, organized emotion-thought, verbalized dissent, and sharpened awareness of the community’s hardship, all in private manners, as guns pointed in at them from the guard towers and barbed wire. We can also recover the “noisy” texts that did “talk back,” boldly entering the public sphere, daring to draw the line and say *enough*. And through oral histories and interviews with survivors, we can recover the stories behind these texts, the sheer will and inner strength it took to take both private and public rhetorical action and put it in print. We just need all of our faculties to do so.

The notion is of stretching one’s mind toward something

Like historical ethnographers of literacy, I am working across time, not fully able to take part in participant-observation, instead attending to the collective efforts referred to throughout this introduction. What makes rhetorical attendance somewhat different than historical ethnography is the explicit infusion of personal memory and cultural know-how that, together, create a felt sense about the ways we conduct research. In other words, rhetorically attending one’s subject requires an explicit awareness and mention that culture and experience inform our decisions about when to ask questions and when to stay silent, about how to contemplate the implications of our work and anticipate the feelings of those with whom we stand. As such, lifelong conversations and eavesdroppings matter as much as feminist rhetorical theory and New Literacy studies. Metaphors embedded in Nikkei poetry, fiction,

music, visual art, and cultural practices matter as much as Asian American studies. Across and between not just the disciplines but the moments of our lives, we can learn to look, listen, and look again. This is how we attend to the no-shows, to the what is not said . . .

In order to perform this rhetorical attendance of writing-to-redress, I begin with a close examination of the politics of archival recovery projects for the post-WWII Nikkei community in “ReCollecting Nikkei Dissidence: The Politics of Archival Recovery and Community Self-Knowledge.” Contextualizing my choice of archival methods, I explain how Japanese American dissidence during the war has historically been downplayed to the extent that the range of Nikkei resistance to incarceration is still relatively unknown. Historically, this lack of knowledge has been exacerbated by the fact that for several decades after World War II, much of the community still believed the government’s rationale of “military necessity” for their imprisonment during the war. It was not until the 1970s and 1980s that the community’s collective awareness regarding the government’s lie started to shift as part of a larger social movement for redress and reparations. This movement was greatly facilitated by the archival recovery of government documents by two former incarcerated, Michi Weglyn and Aiko Herzig-Yoshinaga, neither of whom were professional scholars but whose scholarship dramatically affected political events. Taking methodological lead, inspiration, and authority from these two mothers of redress, I consider what it means to perform archival recovery work within a community still recovering from history.

Chapter 3, “ReCollected Tapestries: The Circumstances behind Writing-to-Redress,” traces some of the social, historical, political, material, and cultural conditions helpful for understanding the activity of writing-to-redress. As noted in the introduction, much of the knowledge shared in this chapter has been exhumed or theorized during and since the redress movement. Detailing prewar community literacy networks, political “blueprints” that laid the groundwork for incarceration, specific material conditions of camp life related to literacy, and cultural “clusters” (Mao 2006) informing writing-to-redress, this chapter is a backdrop for the analyses that follow.

My fourth chapter, “Me Inwardly before I Dared: Attending Silent Literacies of Gaman,” points to one form of dissidence recovered in private forms of writing-to-redress. Such self-sponsored writing as diaries, letters to friends, and unpublished poetry was regularly used by incarcerated to gaman,

or actively endure by withholding one's emotional reaction to the conditions of mass incarceration. This chapter begins with a discussion of the contested rhetorics of *gaman* and the ways it has been interpreted and translated as an admonishment to either endure/accept or persevere through oppressive conditions. This discussion of *gaman* is then developed into a culturally relevant conception of agency and resistance. The theoretical frameworks of King-Kok Cheung, James C. Scott, and Malea Powell all help to illuminate how Writing-to-Gaman served to enable a Nikkei rhetoric of survivance, where incarcerated could both psychologically resist and physically survive by privately articulating their complaints and disillusionment while maintaining both a degree of cultural competence and a veneer of compliance as the US military stood watch.

Chapter 5, "Everyone . . . Put in a Word: The Multisources of Collective Authority behind Public Writing-to-Redress," examines the collective nature of more public forms of writing-to-redress. Theorizing the ways groups of politically marginalized writers come to generate a group-based authority, I draw upon the theoretical frameworks of Abdul R. JanMohamed and David Lloyd's minority discourse, Deborah Brandt's literacy sponsorship, and various scholars' work on authority and petition writing to extend our understanding of the ways public literacy activities are collectively authorized by both friendly and hostile sources as well as those that sponsor literacy from above and amass authority from below. After showing how collective authority gave rise to a number of public writing-to-redress texts and activities, I then apply these concepts through a critical discourse analysis of a text collaboratively written in response to the military draft by the Heart Mountain Fair Play Committee. While the collectivity surrounding the emergence of the literacy activities discussed in this chapter counter a commonly held perception that camp resistance was numerically insignificant, the chapter's analysis also provides a new take on the ways oppressed peoples generate the authority to write back under adverse conditions.

In chapter 6, "Another Earnest Petition: ReWriting Mothers of Minidoka," I build upon chapter 5 by examining the ways collaborative revision serves the process of writing-to-redress. First reviewing the ways women's protest activities have been particularly downplayed in camp history, I then piece together the story of the Mother's Society of Minidoka, an organization made up of predominately Issei (first generation and thus, by law, noncitizen) women

who were all mothers of the incarcerated men subjected to the military draft. As some of the first incarcerated to respond in writing to the announcement of the draft, the Mother's Society first enlisted a male Nisei (second generation and citizen) lawyer to serve as a kind of ghostwriter for their letter-petition to the government. However, according to one source, the women found the original version "too weak" and thus decided to rewrite the letter completely. I analyze both drafts in this chapter, focusing on the ways the mothers re/vised (Young 2004) motherhood and their legal relationship to the United States in the final letter-petition.

In chapter 7, "Relocating Authority: Expanding the Significance of Writing-to-Redress," the focus moves forward in time as I argue that the materiality of writing-to-redress has allowed for its continuance as a rhetorical practice. Drawing on work by activity theorist Yrjö Engeström, literacy theorists Deborah Brandt and Katie Clinton, and multicultural education theorist Tara Yosso (2005), my final chapter highlights the ways the rhetorical force behind writing-to-redress has been re-activated by activist-descendants. After a brief theoretical discussion, I examine three such re-activations that took place across a range of contemporary public forums, including a museum exhibit, community newspapers, a classroom curriculum, and a poetry collection. By calling attention to such rhetorical re-activations, I highlight the potential of literacy to "talk back" to both the authorities of the present and the would-be authorities of the future. Finally, to close, I discuss the ways my own work functions as writing-to-redress, as I position my own critical literacy development in the expanding legacy of Nikkei literacies of survivance.

In this way, over the course of this book, I hope to highlight how writing-to-redress does more than encode or preserve a response. It also serves as a means to expand a rhetorical, and thus, political activity: the collective struggle to relocate authority away from one's oppressors and back into the community itself. This collective struggle, this relocating of authority is an activity in which I see all aspects of this study taking part, including my choice of methodology, rhetorical attendance, and my choice of methods, archival research. While the community-specific politics of my chosen methods are the subject of the next chapter, let me close by performing one more rhetorical attendance: the material sites of my research.

I followed my readings of secondary sources into the always-growing archives. Community archives first, university archives second. Scholars like

Jessica Enoch and Lane Ryo Hirabayashi remind us that attending to materials in an archive means attending to the social position of the archive, an active site of rhetorical remembering and forgetting (Enoch 2008; L. Hirabayashi 1998). I would add that attending to the question of access can also tell us a great deal. Hints can be found in both the discourse and the Discourse¹⁰ of the repository—the naming of its purpose and instructions for its use. Always recognized as a site of official history, the university-based archives I attended required multiple forms, agreements, signatures, “certain restrictions on availability and use,” “permissions,” “adequate” identification, “prohibitions,” lockers, passing through locked doors, pre-paged boxes, notarized photocopies, and inspected laptops. Parking was difficult. Material was recalled from off site. Knowledge protected, sealed off, contained.

In contrast, the community archives that I used relied on a different Discourse. The Hirasaki National Resource Center at the Japanese American National Museum was formed in 1999 “to ensure that the story of Japanese Americans *remains accessible* to everyone” (Japanese American National Museum n.d.). Permissions were required for reproduction but materials were stored on site, and there was no limit to what I could page in a day. By default, the door to the archive room was left open, but I could close it if I liked. Nobody made me open my laptop when I left; nobody had to check my identification. The other archival site I accessed was online. Densho’s mission is to “preserve the testimonies of Japanese Americans who were unjustly incarcerated during World War II before their memories are extinguished” (Densho 1997b). But the word *densho* means “to pass on to the next generation” or “leave a legacy,” and when one clicks on “About Densho” on the website’s homepage, one learns how the mission evolved from simply a desire to “document” these oral histories to that of a desire to “educate, preserve, collaborate and inspire action for equity.” Densho uses digital technology to both “preserve *and* make *accessible* primary source materials” and they “*encourage use* of these resources to *expand* awareness of our country’s diverse history, to *stimulate* critical thinking, to *develop* ethical decision-making skills, and to help ensure that democratic principles are upheld now and in the future” (Densho 1997a). Access, expand, stimulate, inspire.

This is not a comment about the best way to ensure that sources last. It is a comment about what it means to ensure that knowledge is not kept away from *the people* (this strategic essentialism, another rhetoric of solidarity). It is

a comment about the accessibility of knowledge, especially for those whose lives, whose communities, make up the material roots of that knowledge. It is a comment about the importance of attending to a need to not simply *preserve* knowledge but to *use* it, *expand* it, and *pass it on*.

NOTES

1. See, for example, work by Keith Osajima (1988), Stacey Lee (1996), David Palumbo-Liu (1999), and Chang and Au (2008).

2. *Breaking Silence: An Anthology of Contemporary Asian American Poets* (Bruchac 1983); *Breaking the Silence: Redress and Japanese American Ethnicity* (Takezawa 1995); *Shedding Silence: Poetry and Prose* (Mirikitani 1987); *YELL-Oh Girls! Emerging Voices Explore Culture, Identity, and Growing Up Asian American* (Nam 2001); *Aiiiiieeee! An Anthology of Asian-American Writers* (Chin et al. 1974); *The Big Aiiiiieeee! An Anthology of Chinese American and Japanese American Literature* (Chan et al. 1991); and *Tell This Silence: Asian American Women Writers and the Politics of Speech* (Duncan 2004).

3. For discussions of “strategic” uses of essentialism, see Spivak (1987, 205). The notion of “strategic romanticism” comes to me via the work of Jacqueline Jones Royster (2000, 13), who attributes the concept to Amy Shuman and a paper she delivered at the 1997 Colloquium on Women in the History of Rhetoric at Ohio State University. For discussions of “strong objectivity,” see Sandra Harding (2004).

4. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 signaled a dramatic change in Asian America, as it “removed ‘national origins’ as the basis of American immigration legislation” (S. Chan 1991, 145), ending a de facto race-based exclusion policy. While the act resulted in a massive influx of immigrants and refugees from the Asian continent, this group’s composite makeup was shaped by the act’s new set of immigration preferences, including those given to family members of already permanent residents and citizens; refugees; “professionals, scientists and artists of ‘exceptional ability’”; and “workers, skilled and unskilled, in occupations for which labor was in short supply in the U.S.” (S. Chan 1991, 146). As such, 1965 marks a dramatic shift in Asian American communities, both in terms of numbers of people and amounts of transnational cultural capital—that is, people of Asian origins were entering the United States with very little cultural capital (in the case of many refugees) and with very much (in the case of professionals and many others of “exceptional ability”).

5. Asian American studies scholar Stephen H. Sumida writes that Filipino/as have been in the land now called the United States since the 1760s, when a group of

Pinoy sailors jumped ship in Louisiana while it was under Spanish rule. There they “found refuge in the bayous, where they built homes over the waters like the homes they knew back in their islands” and came to be locally known as the ‘Filipino Cajuns.’” The arrival and settling of these “Manilamen” predates the American Revolution, making their descendants even eligible to become Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution (Sumida 1998, 87–88).

6. Hopefully, though, this project can also provide insight to those working on the literacies and rhetorics of those impacted by contemporary hyper-incarceration policies.

7. As Elaine Kim notes, *Farewell to Manzanar* was published immediately following the civil rights movement, during a period when several Japanese American texts were published and “critical reception was shaped by political concerns at a time when people of color vociferously seeking justice and equality could be shown the example of the non-militant approach of the ‘model minority.’” In this context, Kim argues, the book was celebrated for its “‘lack of bitterness, self-pity or solemnity’ in portraying the wartime incarceration of Japanese Americans” (Kim 1990, 150–51).

8. While I want to be clear that I am primarily reading for a US-based Nikkei practice in intersubjective receptivity, the Japanese origins of which stem from Meiji era codes of behavior and evolved via US-based processes of xenophobia, class struggle, and racial formations, I am taken with the cultural parallels evident in Roichi Okabe’s discussion of rhetorical competence in contemporary Japan: “rhetorically sensitive communicators . . . are noted for emphasizing the importance of the role of ‘perceiver’ more than that of a message sender. They are putting up various antennas, so to speak, to perceive and to accurately tune in to the faintest of signals emitted from their audience even on the nonverbal level . . . The rhetorically competent communicators as sensitive perceivers, therefore, always attempt to adjust, adapt, and accommodate themselves to their audience. In a culture of *sasshi* or *omoiyari* (both words meaning ‘considerateness’), to communicate competently means for the rhetorically sensitive in Japan means to perceive the inexplicit . . . *Sasshi ga ii*, or ‘being a good mind-reader,’ and *omoiyari ga ary*, or ‘being considerate about others’ feelings,’ are both considered virtues in the Japanese construct of rhetorical sensitivity” (Okabe 2007, 80).

9. While both academic and independent Japanese American redress scholars have noted that individual articulations for monetary redress were made quite early by Joseph Y. Kurihara and Kiyoshi Okamoto, both Nisei men (Maki, Kitano, and Berthold 1999; Hohri 1988), Hirabayashi’s discussion is based on Richard Nishimoto’s recounting and textual inclusion of a collective document in one of his “autoethnographic” reports as a participant-observer in the Japanese Evacuation

and Resettlement Study spearheaded by Dorothy Swaine Thomas at the University of California, Berkeley. Nishimoto reports that the document was collaboratively written during the All Center Conference in 1945 by both Issei and Nisei men as the WRA prepared to shut the camps down.

10. James Paul Gee (2008, 3) explains that Discourses (as distinct from discourses) “are ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing . . . accepted as instantiations of particular identities.” While Discourses “include much more than language” (2), “[l]anguage makes no sense outside of Discourses and the same is true for literacy” (3).

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL
NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION