Publics in the Making: A Genealogical Inquiry into the
Discursive Publics of Japanese Canadian Redress

by

Jennifer Matsunaga

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Sociology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2011, Jennifer Matsunaga

Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-83084-0
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-83084-0

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Secondary literature on Japanese Canadian redress includes trace references to public support; however, the literature fails to scrutinize the composition or involvement of the public to any meaningful degree. In this thesis I use a genealogical approach (Foucault 1977; 1991) to theorize the constitution and involvement of publics in justice-making. In order to tie an analysis of publics together with an analysis of discourse, I employ the concepts of discursive publics and counterpublics (Warner 2002). Through the analysis of lists present in redress materials of the 1940s and the 1980s, I argue that redress discourse shifted between these points from a predominantly rationalist discourse to a subjectivist one. Through these differences we can equally perceive a shift in redress authority from publics to counterpublics. I demonstrate that the shifts in redress discourse and discursive publics in these two moments correspond to different understandings of and interaction with the dominant discourse of assimilation.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to many people and regret that I cannot fit everyone on this page! First, my sincere thanks to Dr. William Walters. I became a stronger and more confident student from the teaching and guidance I received from you throughout this project and in class. Your knowledge, experience, insight (and humour!) have been invaluable to me over the years. Next, I am grateful to Dr. Jennifer Henderson for challenging me to dig deeper and to explore this topic from angles I had not considered. Your knowledge and guidance enabled me to better my work immensely. I hope to embody those qualities I value in you both as academics, professors and individuals, in my own career one day.

To my daughter, Lily Chen, thank you for being my beautiful source of fuel and for graciously putting up with the many late nights and weekends I spent working on this. To my mother, Diane Matsunaga, thank you for your strength and for being the key enabler and cheerleader of my dreams. To my father, Ray Matsunaga, thank you for opening my eyes to the richness of our family heritage and the obligation we have to treat people with respect. It is out of my love and respect for you that I chose this project. To my brother, Jason Cooley, thank you for inspiring me to have a political spirit and a passion for writing. Without these, I would never have completed this degree. To my brother, Todd Matsunaga, thank you for always keeping me musically and creatively intact; this is the stuff my happiness is made of.

Finally, in loving memory of my grandmother, Tami Matsunaga, I dedicate this work. I give thanks for how she taught me the importance of family and for her box of mismatched buttons – Letting me play with these buttons as a child now symbolizes the first stirrings of the appreciation I have for what can be enjoyed about differences.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Appendices.....	vii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: A Review of Literature on Japanese Canadian Redress.....	5
1.1 What is Redress?	5
1.2 “What Counts as Reparation?”: Redress as Justice-form vs Redress as Justice-making .	7
1.3 “Who is Involved in the Act of Setting Right?”: An Examination of Japanese Canadian Redress 1943-1988	18
Chapter 2: A Theoretical Framework for Examining History and the Public	25
2.1 History and the Public	25
2.2 Traditional vs. Effective History	26
2.3 A Genealogy of Redress Discourse	31
2.4 Warner’s Publics and Counterpublics	36
Chapter 3: Making Redress Publics of Rationalist Discourse	44
3.1 Preliminary Analysis: Two Moments of Listing the Grounds for Appeal.....	46
3.2 MEMORANDUM TO OFFICIAL DISCOURSE: Secondary Redress Publics	
Rationalizing Redress	51
3.3 Analysis: “To the Prime Minister of Canada, And Whom it May Concern:”	58
3.4 Analysis: “What About the Japanese Canadians?”	64
3.5 Conclusions of this Analysis	69

Chapter 4: Making Redress Publics of Subjectivist Discourse.....	74
4.1 SCRAPBOOK OF REDRESS DISCOURSE: Primary Redress Publics Subjectivizing	
Redress	77
4.2 Analysis: “Dear Mr. Mulroney”	85
4.3 Analysis: Justice In Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians	95
4.4 Conclusions of this Analysis	98
Conclusion	102
Appendices.....	106
Appendix A	106
Appendix B.....	108
Appendix C.....	109
Appendix D	110
Appendix E.....	111
Appendix F	112
Appendix G	114
Appendix H	116
Appendix I.....	118
Appendix J.....	119
Appendix K	120
Appendix L.....	121
Appendix M.....	123
Appendix N	125
References.....	126

List of Tables

Table 1	Key Comparisons between Traditional and Effective Histories.....	30
---------	--	----

List of Appendices

Appendix A..... 106

Appendix B. 108

Appendix C. 109

Appendix D. 110

Appendix E. 111

Appendix F. 112

Appendix G. 114

Appendix H. 116

Appendix I. 118

Appendix J. 119

Appendix K. 120

Appendix L. 121

Appendix M.123

Appendix N. 125

Introduction

As an eleven year old, I understood the word “redress” only as being related to the fact that my family was able to buy a new furnace for the house earlier than expected. I can remember hearing Knowlton Nash on the CBC News reporting on the redress campaign and my dad on the telephone with my uncle Bob asking about the forms he had to fill out. I also remember the uneasiness dad expressed over the application since he was “only a kid” when “it” happened. Though I had very little understanding of what “it” was at the time, I would later learn “it” was the internment of roughly 22,000 Japanese Canadians, the “repatriation” of some 4000 of them, the confiscation and selling of their property by government, and a dispersal policy which resulted in a loss of identity, language and a sense of community (JAC 2005).

Later, I came to understand the word “redress” to mean *justice* for Japanese Canadians that involved Brian Mulroney and the National Association of Japanese Canadians (NAJC). Today, I understand “redress” to mean, not only that 1988 settlement that made our home a bit warmer, but a complex network of publics, formed by discourse and engaged in justice-making effort that required great socio-political struggle, new understandings of identity, and the development of new discourses through which to understand injustice and its possible resolutions.

I arrived at this understanding of redress through the development of this thesis which presents a genealogy of redress discourse and a theorization of the publics and counterpublics involved in its creation and circulation. Most broadly, I question the references made to “the public” in redress discourse. Some of the literature on Japanese Canadian redress, covered in Chapter 1, cites the public as integral to the success of the

1988 settlement and assigns it agency and power. The public however, has been left untheorized in these accounts. The dispersed sentences and paragraphs that implicate the public call out for more attention in their stark contrast to the full texts and chapters that unpack the relationship between the federal government and Japanese Canadians. Since there has been no examination of the public in redress literature, this thesis addresses the following questions: “What is the public referred to in redress discourse?” and “How is the public involved in redress?”

In order to answer these questions I created a theoretical framework that informed my analysis particularly on the historical complexity of redress, the involvement of discourse and understandings of publics. Genealogies, as articulated by Michel Foucault (1977; 1991), are critical projects that emphasize the narrowness of the historical lens through which we view the past. “Chapter 2: A Theoretical Framework for Analyzing History and the Public” explains that genealogies encourage analysis of how historical narratives are constructed and how certain events are emphasized and others suppressed or marginalized. The chapter further describes that genealogies examine flows of power and struggles between dominant and subjugated discourses.

The genealogical approach guided me to conceive of redress as something beyond that 1988 settlement. Instead, I chose to examine redress more broadly, understood generally as ‘acts of setting right’ and from two distinct moments, being, the 1940s and the 1980s. Doing so situated my analysis in configurations of justice-making effort and other attempts of injustice repair. Analysis was thus concerned with those knowledges obscured by official historical accounts, particularly as it relates to the involvement of various publics in redress.

Having covered the genealogical aspect of the framework, Chapter 2 then elaborates on Warner's (2002) conception of publics and counterpublics. Warner's elucidation of these concepts pointed me towards understanding and analyzing publics as addressed by redress discourse through the analysis of redress materials. Warner argues that publics only exist as addressed by discourse and that different discursive or textual forms matter to the kinds of publics addressed and constituted.

With this in mind, I identified that lists (of injustices, dates, figures, people and so on) serve as a dominant textual and organizational form employed by redress discourse. "Chapter 3 – Making Redress Publics of Rationalist Discourse" contains my analysis of three lists created in the 1940s that I have treated as redress material. These lists include a memorandum (1946 – reproduced in *Obasan* [Kogawa 1981]), a letter to the Prime Minister (CCJC 1945) and a pamphlet entitled *What About Japanese Canadians* (Norman 1943). These lists were analyzed for the discourses they revealed and the publics circulating these discourses in this early moment of justice-making.

"Chapter 4 – Making Redress Publics of Subjectivist Discourse" then comparatively presents my analysis of three lists created in the 1980s which were also treated as redress materials. These include a list of newspaper headlines featured in the book *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981), a letter to the Prime Minister (1987) and a redress campaign brief titled *Justice in Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians* (NAJC circa 1987). Comparison of the lists presented in chapters 3 and 4 illustrate a shift both in the publics circulating redress discourse between the 1940s and the 1980s and in redress discourse itself.

Analyzing redress discourse as a site of public intelligibility sets this analysis apart from both the common textual focus of discourse analysis and from contemporary understandings of redress. In the first case, examining publics tied to discourse embeds discourse analysis in a sociological space concerned with audiences and relationships. It brings forth the question of and focus on the imagined audiences that discourse addresses, rather than simply discourse itself. In the second instance, publics unsettle redress as being the result of the complaints raised by racialized citizens and the reactions of government. Rather, analysis of redress discourse and its publics emphasizes the complex social interactions taking place between individuals, groups, and discursive publics all involved in justice-making.

In this thesis I demonstrate that redress discourse shapes redress to be something very particular, involving specific dichotomies of justice-seekers and justice-givers, justice sought and justice served. It thus eliminates the possibility of considering the involvement of publics to any significant degree. This is particularly the case where redress is examined primarily as a justice-form (i.e. a particular settlement). Though analyses of specific justice-forms (such as apology and compensation) are necessary to the understanding of redress, these justice-forms have been made to seem natural to redress. I therefore argue that analysis which moves away from studying these now seemingly naturalized justice-forms and moves towards redress as justice-making is highly productive. This focus yields a more nuanced understanding of redress constituents. It reveals a myriad of subtle yet greatly important acts and results as well as the work of publics and counterpublics in justice-making.

Chapter 1: A Review of Literature on Japanese Canadian Redress

1.1 What is Redress?

What is redress? In the minds of many Canadian citizens, this term might conjure images of Prime Ministers shaking hands with representatives and leaders of ethnic communities. Redress might inspire thoughts about injustices that took place in the past. Such images and thoughts would have come from highly publicized redress settlements such as the Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement, the Indian Residential School Settlement and most recently, the Chinese Head Tax Redress. Generally, in its noun form, “redress” refers to “reparation or compensation for a wrong or consequent loss” (OED 2009a). If one were to analyze redress according to this definition, the focus would be concentrated on justice-*form(s)* such as financial compensation. The verb form, “to redress”, refers to the act of setting right, repairing or rectifying (injuries, damages, harms etc.) (OED 2009b). In this light, the grounds of analysis would shift towards action. Analysis would circulate instead around those actions performed to achieve a justice-form; it would be more concerned with justice-*making*. A couple of questions come to mind with respect to these definitions: What counts as “repair”? Who is involved in an “act of setting right”?

Always in view of the Japanese Canadian manifestation of redress, this chapter has five objectives that were structured around the two questions above. First, I examine “What Counts as Repair?” by briefly presenting examples of federally generated redress discourse. I do so in order to demonstrate how a justice-form centred understanding of redress can lend itself too easily to state-centric assumption and nation-building rhetoric.

Second, it will demonstrate the variability of what counts as justice through a summary of some literature on Corrective (Urban Walker 2006) and Restorative (Miers 2001; Urban Walker 2006; Weitekamp 1993) Justice paradigms. I will contrast financial compensation in these two paradigms in order to demonstrate that different justice paradigms generate different meanings of justice-forms. Any particular justice-forms should therefore not be thought of as natural to redressing historical injustice. Third, I then discuss apology as a particular justice-form that is prominent in secondary literature analyzing Japanese Canadian redress. Political apology is one justice-form within the framework of redress that counted as a form of repair.

Having highlighted some pitfalls of justice-form-centred analysis, this section then moves to the fourth objective of this chapter which is to explain my particular focus on redress as justice-making. I examine the five modes of human rights practice described in a Global Justice (Kurasawa 2007) paradigm as a stepping stone for this chapter to explore redress as active justice-making. Secondary literature in this area includes analyses which examine acts of remembering and memorialization as vital to redress, as well as histories of Japanese Canadian redress. Establishing a focus on justice-making moves analysis away from overly localized understandings of redress (in terms of either particular justice-forms or particularly generated contexts) and reorients it towards those who worked to achieve justice.

This reorientation is critical to this project as it leads to considerations of publics. The section covering the question “Who is involved in an act of setting right?” further reviews secondary historiographical material that currently exists on Japanese Canadian redress in order to isolate what is taken-for-granted in these accounts. In this vein, I note

the predominance of and focus on the NAJC and the Prime Minister of Canada in redress discourse and explore how this interaction helped to shape what we count as redress today. Though redress discourse includes the public as involved in acts of setting right, it has been left unexamined and untheorized and thus requires some attention. The fifth and final objective of this chapter is to present different conceptualizations of the public in order to discourage assumptions that “the public” is an ever-present, naturally existing and homogeneous body capable of action.

1.2 “What Counts as Reparation?”: Redress as Justice-form vs Redress as Justice-making

Redress discourse at a federal level paints historical injustices with broad strokes, particularly after these injustices have been redressed. For example, in 2006, Chinese Canadians received an official apology from Prime Minister Stephen Harper and individual compensation for eligible applicants, to redress the Chinese Head Tax. This Head Tax redress was achieved after years of campaign efforts to emphasize the injustice of allowing the government to profit from racism (CCNC n.d). This profit was generated between 1885 and 1923 when the Canadian government collected \$50 (which increased to \$500 in the later years) from each Chinese immigrant to Canada (Dyzenhaus and Moran 2005:3). This Head Tax was created to deter and prevent Chinese immigration to the country. The total amount of money collected by the government from it was \$23 million (7). Only three years after Harper’s apology, the website for Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2009) put its stance on the Chinese Head Tax to text, calling it “an unfortunate period in Canada’s past” however, it was redressed through apology and

compensation to “eligible applicants” which thus “formally turn[ed] the page” on that period.

As another example, in 1988 Japanese Canadians received a redress settlement for the many injustices suffered between 1942 and 1949. Examples of these injustices would include: confiscating their property; ending the printing of Japanese language newspapers; restricting their movement with dusk to dawn curfews; removing them from their homes and dispersing them throughout the BC interior in internment camps and/or relocating them to various locations in Canada; revoking the citizenship of many and exiling many to Japan (NAJC 2005). Today, twenty-three years after the signing of the redress settlement, Japanese Canadian redress appears on federal government websites primarily in relation to the Community Historical Recognition Program (CHRP)¹ wherein it is the only named and specific example of an “ineligible project” for their program funding (CIC 2010b) – another strong testament to the page having been turned by redress on that period of history.

With the “unfortunate” pages in Canada’s history book turned by the shaking hands of redress agreements, Federal redress discourse can then look to the contributions that Chinese and Japanese Canadians (for example) made to the building of the Canadian nation. The CHRP supports and propagates this rhetoric of national contribution by

...strategically interpret[ing] a range of marginalized constituencies’ redress movements as campaigns seeking a place in the national narrative of Canada, rather than concrete reparations for state-inflicted damages. The program hails particular named groups as communities in pursuit of state recognition of isolated injuries and opportunities to renew dignity

¹ The CHRP is a program ending in 2012 designed to provide funding to educational and commemorative projects to “ethno-cultural communities affected by historical wartime measures and/or immigration restrictions applied in Canada ... which, while legal at the time, are no longer consistent with Canadian values.” (CIC 2010a)

through public pedagogy promoting their “contributions to building this country” (Henderson & Wakeham forthcoming:27).

For example, in 2008 the Honourable Jason Kenney delivered a speech in honour of Asian Heritage Month. In this speech, he stated that the cultural diversity, not the countless hours of labour performed, of the “Asian community” in Canada was “one of the reasons why people of Asian origin have been such an important part of building this country” (CIC 2008:par 6). Later in this speech, he linked civil and political justice achieved by Chinese and Japanese Canadians, not to their various and long-standing redress efforts, but emphatically to having served the country in the Canadian Armed Forces (CIC 2008).

These brief examples demonstrate how federal redress discourse enables a glossing-over of the past and a retooling of redress to the needs of nation building. Redress thus appears as one way for a state to mediate the paradox between two treatments of the past; in one treatment, using positive historical memories such as moments of celebration or triumph to build a sense of national cohesion and “motivate communal sentiments” and in another, to avoid or deny those parts of collective memory that include the failure of a nation and its leaders (Thompson 2009:196). In the Canadian sense, redress as a mediator between historical injustice and feel-good memories is highly productive. It has shaped “a social paradigm appropriated by hegemonic discursive formations for the purposes of framing the Canadian nation-state as a leader in the “‘globalisation’ of forgiveness,” modeling values of civility and tolerance for the world” (Henderson & Wakeham forthcoming). Redress, understood in its specific justice-forms (such as the apology, the compensation and so on) offers a material demonstration of the attitude and understanding that no further obligation is due to those wronged. However,

redress examined primarily from this justice-form position risks overly localizing its definition as a mechanism of state rather than an achievement of justice for those wronged.

Financial compensation, for example, is one form that justice can and often includes. Corrective and Restorative Justice paradigms can be used to examine this justice-form. I explore these justice paradigms in the proceeding paragraphs not to settle on one or the other, but to demonstrate how different justice perspectives yield different manifestations and understandings of justice-forms. I offer these contrasts to emphasize that justice-forms are neither naturally nor inevitably manifested as redress for historical injustice. First (and most commonly), Corrective Justice treats compensation or compensatory redress within a juridical model (Urban-Walker 2006:377). It emphasizes a relationally proportional link between compensation and injury (379) and must define a metric of loss (384) in order to adequately compensate. Moreover, the wrongdoer compensates the wronged in order to “wipe the slate clean” (377). Compensatory justice proceeds from a place that assumes a social base-line state of order and justice, wherein disturbances to that state will be subject to mechanics of justice (such as giving compensation) that are presumed to return the situation to order (383). Finally, a corrective justice framework is unable to easily manage the typical historical injustice claims, as this framework was “never meant to deal with either a massive scale of serious mayhem or a protracted and brutal subjugation and mutually ramifying indignities and atrocities that characterize oppressive and violently repressive systems” (380).

Restorative justice, in contrast, a fairly recently developed paradigm (383), proceeds from the “reality of violation, alienation, and disregard among human beings.

Its central concept of ‘restoring relationships’ supposes that it is disregard or violation of acceptable human relationships that stands at the core of its agenda, practically and philosophically” (382). It is also a concept that is confusedly discussed under other terms such as “reparative justice” or simply, “redress” to name a couple (Miers 2001:88). Despite the unsettled label this justice paradigm assumes, an extensively growing body of literature suggest six core values span all terms. Some of these core values include, developing resolutions that are “owned” by (i.e. developed by and meaningful to) those directly involved and building capacities of those involved to actively do justice, rather than leaving it up to experts, professionals or the state (383).

Contributors to the restorative justice model have developed and applied it primarily to a criminal justice, victim/offender realm (Weitekamp 1993; Miers 2001). Some, such as Margaret Urban Walker (2006) however, advocate the application of this model specifically for cases of historical injustice. She finds that restorative justice is a more robust model able to handle the multifaceted nature of historical injustices, especially those rooted in racism (387). The complexities of these historical cases to be redressed or repaired include damaged and distorted relationships; deeply rooted historical pain, anger and hostility; and blocked or non-existent channels for dialogue between sides (388-389). Specifically, she argues that this model is superior for handling historical injustice cases as compared to the corrective justice model (387).

As with corrective justice, financial compensation is a justice-form typical of restorative justice (Weitekamp 1993; Thompson 2008). Some argue, however, that an offer of apology is a central element (see for example Thompson 2008). Others consider a range of both symbolic (apologies, museums, monuments etc.) and economic forms

(financial compensation, claim settlements etc.) as reparative, or restorative forms of justice (Howard-Hassman 2006). These variations mark the contingent nature of restorative possibilities. Our understanding of restorative justice-forms come from historically situated “model claims” beginning with reparations for Holocaust survivors and more recently, from reparations for Canadians and Americans of Japanese descent (Torpey 2006:7). In all cases such as these a common concern was/is to consider what forms of redress would be appropriate given the injustice; determining bodies must ensure that “[r]eparations policies must be politically feasible, but neither can they appear as cheap buyouts or fail to address victims directly and to validate their experience of suffering and specific experience of injustice, lest they add further moral insult to moral and material injury” (Urban Walker 2006:380).

Since financial compensation is a justice-form common to both corrective and restorative models of justice, it is worth emphasizing the distinction that exists between the meaning each holds of this form. To reiterate, financial compensation within the corrective model, is a disbursement of money to the wronged, intended to be proportional in amount to the degree of the wrong or suffering assumed. It is also meant to “wipe the slate clean”. In a Corrective world, financial compensation should, in effect, be sufficient to set right, repair or to rectify. In comparison, financial compensation in a restorative framework acts both instrumentally to “pay back” and symbolically as a gesture that attempts to reinforce or represent sincerity, in the reparation of relationships (384-385). Importantly, in a restorative justice framework, compensation “in some cases, signif[ies] full recognition, respect, and concern to victims. In other contexts, material reparation

might be unnecessary, and in no cases is it, by itself, sufficient for signalling appropriate moral regard” (385). Context is therefore highly relevant to restorative justice.

The 1988 Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement mobilized financial compensation in a more restorative understanding than a corrective one. The fact that it was a package that included several justice-forms meant to repair the relationship between a government and its citizens, seats it strongly within this understanding as well. Analyses which include or focus on Japanese Canadian redress examine a range of justice-forms comprised within this settlement. For example, one line of justice-form inquiry considers Japanese Canadian redress as part of the global advent of political apologies. Within this context, several texts focus singularly on the formal apology offered by former Prime Minister Mulroney (James 2008; Blatz, Schumann & Ross 2009; Cunningham 1999).

This focus on political apology has been dubbed the “age of apology” (Brooks 1999; Gibney et al. 2008), or the politics of apology (Wethey 2002; Nobles 2008), referring to what appears to be a “...rapid proliferation of political apologies since 1995...” (Gibney et al. 2008: 2). These accounts situate political public apology on a grand historical platform; this platform holds for example, an “...age and a time that seeks to establish political truth...” (Gibney et al. 2008: 1) In this line of thought, redress in the form of apology is understood to be a “matrix of guilt and mourning, atonement and national revival.” (Brooks 1999: 3)

These texts also analyze the overall significance and meaning underlying this emergent apologetic form of accountability and recognition. In these accounts, the apology to Japanese Canadians is but one instance examined among others as researchers

attend to either uncovering the meaning and importance of these apologies, (Tavuchis 1991; Blatz, Schumann & Ross 2009) to constructing a typology, (Cunningham 1999) or to accounting for the proliferation of these instances (Gibney et al. 2008). Each of these studies relies on examining several instances of the phenomena of political apology, including the Japanese Canadian instance as one among a crowd.

The first paragraphs of this section knit together examples of redress discourse at a federal level and tied them to further examples of nation-building rhetoric. The purpose of that knitting was to represent the contours of a blanket understanding of redress as a particular justice-form (ex. the 1988 Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement) that covers cold years of redress effort, struggle, successes and failures and casts them off under the comfort of a warm resolution. Considering federally generated redress discourse as tied to nation-building rhetoric in conjunction with the contingent nature of redress in its justice-form underscores how redress can be taken for granted as a natural product of healthy government citizenship relationship and an act of federal benevolence.

Centralizing understandings of redress around its noun form seems to render its recipients passive. It places attention first on the giver of redress and secondly on the receiver. This is troublesome. Henderson and Wakeham (forthcoming) remind us that, “the culture of redress in Canada was borne not of reflexive state initiatives but, rather, by the ingenuity of citizens who, through complexly inter-connected political work, prompted a national reckoning with structures of socio-economic and cultural inequity and injustice” (6). What this statement emphasizes is the importance of maintaining focus on redress as generated out of the collaborative and collective efforts of individuals,

rather than being swept into an understanding of redress as a settlement delivered by the hard work of government initiative.

In order to examine the collaborative and collective efforts of individuals, rather than the form redress assumed, I turn to the five modes of human rights practice typical of a Global Justice (Kurasawa 2007) model. Importantly, this model couches the topic of justice in the realm of human rights which the previous justice frames did not necessarily imply or offer. In this perspective, Kurasawa (2007) seeks to “counter the top-down predilections of formalism that produce an experientially and culturally thin account of socio-political life,” by “making sense of the realities of participants involved in the social labour of global justice, their intentions and the meanings they give this labour” (8). This account of justice is participatory, meaning-sensitive and action-oriented.

He advances five modes of human rights practice as being “the work” of global justice. “A mode of practice” he explains, “is composed of and framed by patterns of discourses, ethical principles and socio-political rituals” (12). Moreover, he emphasizes that modes of practice are modular in that they apply to various settings and contexts (12). These five modes of human rights practice include the complicated and contingent acts of bearing witness, forgiveness, foresight, aid and solidarity (Kurasawa 2007:16).

They are

characterized by a considerable degree of overlap and interdependence, to the point of being mutually constitutive; engagement in one mode of practice is facilitated a great deal by the performance of the labour that defines the others and, conversely, the inability or unwillingness to enact one of them renders its counterparts more difficult to enact while weakening the prospects of an alternative world order. Taken together, then, bearing witness, forgiveness, foresight, aid and solidarity form a distinctive constellation of normatively and socio-politically emancipatory actions, which take part in the arduous, contingent and perpetual undertaking that is the work of global justice. (22)

The characterizing of these five practices emphasizes the active work involved in achieving justice. It moreover emphasizes the interconnectedness of that work. This interconnectedness can be attributed to their common features of intersubjectivity and publicity. Intersubjectivity emphasizes the dialogical recognition between those who experience injustice and those who take these experiences and convert them to political demands (18). Publicity involves the work of civic associations to create public space for the debate and discussion of human rights (18).

While I understand these modes of practice were presented as patterned socio-political and normative actions at work and at the core of global justice work, I abstractly consider these five modes of practice to *become* justice-forms when they are achieved or enacted. For example, Kurasawa (2007) explains that bearing witness breaks the peril of silence and gives voice to injustice; forgiveness disables the threat of vengeance and enables reconciliation; and solidarity meets cultural assimilation with strength in a recognition of pluralism (16). Following these examples, could the justice-making actions of bearing witness and its result - a broken silence - not also be considered a justice-form; is it not an act of setting something right? Could bearing witness or the ability to break silence not also be considered redress then? Perhaps these forms of justice-making, though more subtle and less publicized than 'Redress Settlements', are just as important to understand as justice-forms in and of themselves.

Representing what I considered to be redress understood more as justice-making are two bodies of analysis on the concept of Japanese Canadian remembering, memory and memorialization as a form of or integral to redress and the actual histories of

Japanese Canadian redress (these will be treated in the next section). The material examined in these areas, in contrast to that which examines apology, is authored predominantly by Japanese Canadians. This literature is a move away from justice-form-centred analysis and a move towards justice-making analysis. On the subject of memory, Roy Miki (1998) writes: “Redress, the word, functioned as a conceptual rupture that initiated as well as necessitated what was a massive subjective act of remembering to remember.” (196) Pamela Sugiman (2004) asserts that “... the Redress Movement itself was built in large part on the concept of memory” (383). She situates memory as a social process that is selective in that we are socialized through school curricula and museum exhibits (for example) as to what we should remember or should forget (364).

Understanding memory in this way, one can see how the publishing of Japanese Canadian internment memories strengthened the collectivity of the movement and attributed to its success. It did so by creating a new narrative that allowed the dominant discourse of the internment’s past to be mediated (383). As another example, Kirsten Emiko McAllister (1999) explored the way that grassroots efforts, in creating and maintaining forms of memorialization, have the effect of developing culturally specific forms of healing (434).

Without intention of minimizing the significance and symbolic meaning that an achieved redress settlement generates, this thesis brackets analysis of redress as a justice-form in order to examine redress as a configuration of justice-making effort and other forms of injustice repair. As my goal for this project is to see how those involved in justice-making could be understood differently, I included Kurasawa’s (2007) human rights as practices to offer an understanding of justice as action-centred with the target of

analysis being the work of justice seekers and the products and results of that work. Thus I understood that analysis of redress as justice-making would allow me to analyze the different players involved in acts of setting right.

1.3 “Who is Involved in the Act of Setting Right?”: An Examination of Japanese Canadian Redress 1943-1988

Conducting research based on the term “Japanese Canadian Redress” yields a repertoire of secondary historiographical materials that are substantially bound to an understanding of redress within a particular time and space as well as involving particular actors. Specifically, the material focuses almost entirely on either aspects of the 1988 Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement itself (Hall 2004; Dewing 2009; Sevy & Torpey 2004; Blatz, Schumann & Ross 2009) or on NAJC redress efforts between 1977² (Miki & Kobayashi 1991) and the signing of the previously mentioned redress settlement in 1988 (see for example McAllister 1999a).

This limited temporal focus (1977-1988) present in the material can be attributed to at least a couple of things. First, it seems only logical to focus on the achieved settlement and climax of redress efforts in conjunction with those actors directly involved in its attainment. Next, the amount of available material from which to study Japanese Canadian redress dramatically increased and gained widespread attention in Canada during this 1970s – 1980s period of time, especially in the mid-to late-eighties (Miki 2004:169). This increase in materials can be linked to the 1970s release of government

² *Justice In Our Time: The Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement* situates the beginnings of the redress movement in 1977 with the Japanese Canadian Centennial Project Redress Committee. The NAJC website identifies 1983 as a year where the association began to explore redress possibilities, which was linked to influences by the Japanese American redress movement developing at the time (JAC 2005).

wartime files which included the internment records (CRRF 2004). Having been made available to the public for the first time, these files could now be studied by academics such as historian and lawyer Ann Gomer-Sunahara (2000), who could generate a detailed account of the injustices suffered by Japanese Canadians through the use of the government's records (JCA 2005). During this time Japanese Canadian individuals as well as their Associations also printed and distributed a myriad of materials ranging from official campaign briefs (NAJC 1987), to novels (for example Kogawa 1981), to printed napkins calling people to rally in Montreal (S. Okuda, personal communication, March 2, 2011).

Of the material reviewed, there are notably two texts that offer an account of redress that covers a broader spectrum of efforts beyond those of the NAJC and the limited 1977-1988 time frame. These texts are *Redress: Inside the Japanese Canadian Call for Justice* (Miki 2004) and *Justice in Our Time: The Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement* (Miki and Kobayashi 1991). These texts (especially the former) chronicle redress efforts dating as far back as the 1940s from groups such as the Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians (CCJC) and the Japanese Canadian Citizens for Democracy (JCCD) as well as from individuals such as Roger Obata, founding member of the JCCD and first president of the National Japanese Canadian Citizen's Association (NJCCA) (Miki 2004:107).

It is important to note, however, that though these texts discuss other times, instances and forms of repair or of setting right, they do not count these as "redress", rather they were considered as inadequate and/or flawed resolutions or failed attempts that came short of the final 1988 resolution that was labeled "redress". Therefore, those

individuals and groups involved in earlier attempts to set right, though recognized for their distinguished efforts, are overshadowed by the successes of the NAJC and the 1988 settlement. This further shapes our understanding of the concept of redress as being highly dependent on a particular outcome and those actors tied to that outcome.

This concept of redress, as a particular method of governing historical and political injustice, was thus framed by the 1977-1988 material as primarily involving and concerning the nationally representative association (i.e. NAJC and Japanese Canadians) and the Prime Minister. However, the public was another actor embedded within this process as a party involved in acts of setting right, though it was neither directly addressed nor examined. During times of heightened redress effort³, *the public* was understood as the receiver and holder of important (Japanese Canadian) narratives (Sugiman 2004: 384), as an actor that perceives and can give credibility and validity (McAllister 1999a: par 1), as an agent capable of forming bad impressions (Miki 2004: 64), as an entity that can learn (125), as an agent capable of anger not to be stirred (153), as a subject that can be educated (217), as a body lacking awareness of the issues surrounding the internment years (235), as an actor that is fickle and capable of “turning on you” (298) and as something that supports an issue, event or group (281). Despite being given agency, power and place in redress discourse however, this public is left untheorized.

Just as I chose to bracket the justice-form understanding of redress and its focus on the 1988 settlement, I have similarly bracketed the assumption that those involved in

³ I primarily use Roy Miki's *Redress: Inside the Canadian Call for Justice* to offer examples for problematizing the notion of the public simply because above all other texts examined, it offers both the most comprehensive account of interaction with the public in terms of redress and one that extends beyond the NAJC years.

redress were “Japanese Canadians” represented by the NAJC and the Prime Minister of Canada. Instead, I have chosen to examine and consider redress as involving publics, thus, enabling a more nuanced and fluid view of those involved in acts of setting right. Analyzing the players involved in justice-making as publics, rather than fixed ethnic groups or government bodies, makes a critical difference in how we understand redress. It does so by emphasizing the ever-changing and ongoing project of generating, circulating and maintaining redress discourse among Japanese Canadians and non-Japanese Canadians alike. Examining publics involved in justice-making thus blurs assumed and counter-productive divisions between ‘ethnic minority’ citizens and ‘ethnic majority’ citizens.

Redress discourse implicates *the public* as a singular body or actor composed of a seemingly faceless mass of individuals holding something in common. At the time of internment, this describes *the public* as spoken for, referred to and called upon by politicians. For example, the BC government would cite “the public” as being in support of internment measures despite never having conducted any survey of British Columbians. Instead, officials presumed that “public opinion conformed to their own prejudices and with the rhetoric of their previous campaign” (Gomer-Sunahara 2000: 28). Conversely, when redress effort heightened, *the public* was understood to hold those characteristics of agency previously mentioned: the ability to think, learn, act, judge, react and so on.

Though secondary historiographical material on Japanese Canadian redress involves the public as a body instrumental to acts of setting right, studies of the public argue that it in fact does not exist, stating that it is actually a “phantom” rather than a

“fixed body of individuals” (Lippmann 2009:67); that assigning it agency is an “extraordinary fiction” (Warner 2002:123); or that it is lost, being incapable of “identifying and holding itself” for any length of time, due to the multitude of issues, details and technical matters before it (Dewey 1954:137). What is being denied by these claims has less to do with a denial of all things “public” and more to do with emphasizing that this notion of a pre-existing, pre-formed, homogeneous and static entity refers to something that does not in fact exist. Rather, a multitude of publics exist and are in a constant state of formation and dissolution.

There is some variability as to how publics are understood to come into existence. In one understanding, publics are thought to be called into being in relation to a problem (Maares, 2005; Dewey 1954; Lippmann 2009). This understanding would include those individuals brought together by the issue of inadequate political response to a particular injustice. Once that injustice was made right, that public would cease to exist. This view of publics requires that the public have a means of recognizing itself as a public and thus align itself with a particular aspect. Lippmann (2009) for example, suggested that simple and objective tests might be applied to issues in order to “help [the public] decide where it will enlist” (p. 98). “The signs must be of such a character that they can be recognized without any substantial insight into the substance of a problem. Yet they must be signs which will tell the members of a public where they can best align themselves so as to promote the solution. In short, they must be guides to reasonable action for the use of uninformed people” (p. 68). In this quotation, the public is thought to be composed of uninformed and ultimately incapable individuals, brought together by aligning with particular sides on issue.

In an historical understanding, individuals formed a sphere of publicity, through rational-critical debate that critiqued various forms of printed communication (Habermas 2007). This understanding greatly limited the membership of publics to only those who were educated, property-owners (23). Contrary to the uninformed public mentioned above, this public is formed exclusively of those deemed to have adequate knowledge and rational capacity (Habermas 2007; Dewey 1954). This understanding treats those within the “sphere” as the ideal for influencing political decision-making. There are obvious issues with this understanding; for one, it “provides a privilege for unmarked identities: the male, the white, the middle class, the normal” (Warner 2007: 167). Those belonging to minoritized groups based on gender, ethnicity, sexuality, class and ability (etc.) are typically muted and pushed to the fringe by virtue of those traits that make them “particular” and “bodied” (166).

More broadly, publics are thought to exist by virtue of being a connection between strangers joined together as addressed by discourse that is presented through various forms of address such as newspaper, radio, novels, television, billboards, fashion, art, and music (Warner 2002:7). This understanding of publicity opens up a broader range of public possibility. It asserts that publics are “constituted through mere attention” where “attention is the principal sorting category by which members and non-members are discriminated” (87). In this light, the combined attention to a given discourse then requires continued, refreshed and renewed attention; this is an important point to highlight as it implies that publics involve **work**. In order for publics to stay “alive” they must continue the circulatory motion of its discourse (88).

Further articulation and deeper grounding of the public in theoretical understanding follows in the next chapter. For now, I have briefly presented variations of meanings of “the public” and means by which publics come to exist in order to emphasize that “the public” cannot be a concept left processed by common-sense. In sum, this chapter has presented a range of literature that intersects and orbits around the subject of Japanese Canadian redress. Beginning most broadly (or perhaps, most distantly from the goal of redress), this chapter examined federally generated redress discourse and linked it to nation-building rhetoric. The goal of this discussion was to emphasize a state-centric understanding of redress wherein the work of those who campaigned in support of redress as well as those who ultimately received it are relegated to the background by the foregrounding of the importance of this justice-form *as delivered by government*.

Corrective and Restorative Justice paradigms were presented in order to emphasize the variability of justice-form and to discourage assumptions that these forms are natural to redress. The justice-form itself (financial compensation for example) might be employed within any justice framework, but the meaning that form takes on and holds for the receivers differs drastically. A Global Justice framework was then presented as a segue into considering not justice-forms as central to analysis, but justice-making. The five modes of human rights practice were listed in this light, in order to move analysis away from studying those forms of justice that have been made to seem natural to redress (apology, compensation, policy and so on) and towards an understanding of redress as justice-making, which includes a myriad of more subtle yet greatly important acts and results.

Having examined redress in the context of justice-form versus of justice-making in “What Counts as Repair?”, the chapter then moved on to determining “Who is Involved in an Act of Setting Right?”. Usually, the NAJC, Japanese Canadians and the Prime Minister are advanced as those involved in setting things right. However, the story is not so simply acted. While histories of redress mention “the public”, individuals and groups as having been involved in attempts to set right, they are overshadowed by the successes of the NAJC and the 1988 settlement. Moreover, other past acts of setting right were considered inadequate and/or flawed resolutions or failed attempts that came short of the final 1988 resolution that was labeled “redress”. Thus, redress discourse shapes redress to be something very particular, where our understanding of the concept is highly dependent on a particular outcome and those actors tied to that outcome.

Having established that redress discourse is highly dependent on the 1988 settlement and the relationship between the NAJC and the federal government, I argue that a genealogical understanding of Canadian redress discourse will offer insight into subtle yet powerful and highly productive configurations of justice-making as well as other understandings of justice-forms, that though perhaps not adequate as final resolutions, certainly stand as critical points of enlightenment along the way.

Chapter 2: A Theoretical Framework for Examining History and the Public

2.1 History and the Public

In this chapter, I build on key points raised in the previous chapter by examining theoretical principles that underlie notions of history and of the public. I have divided it into three sections which manage the historical complexity of redress and the character of the public present in redress discourse. Firstly, I contrast the concepts of traditional and effective history (Foucault 1977) in order to demonstrate the value in and importance of developing an effective history of redress discourse. Secondly, I then present a genealogical approach (Foucault 1977, 1991; Walters forthcoming), discussed primarily via the concepts of emergence, discourse and struggle, as a means to accomplish this task. Specifically, I argue genealogy to be the approach of choice for managing both the historical elements and the untheorized place of “the public” in redress discourse.

Thirdly, in order to ground the meaning of the public or publics in a frame of relevant literature, I examine theorizations of publics as generated by discourse (Habermas 1991; Warner 2002). I describe tensions between understandings of publics that are, on the one hand, rooted in rationality, non-particularity and disembodiment and those rooted in affect, particularity and embodiment on the other. I then proceed by listing and describing seven defining features of publics generated by discourse. Finally, I conclude by describing the additional defining characteristics of counterpublics (Warner 2002).

2.2 Traditional vs. Effective History

Much of the history reviewed in the previous chapter generated a meaning of redress that was justice-form centred and driven by the context of the 1988 settlement. I

consider the histories presented to be traditional histories of Japanese Canadian redress.

Foucault explains that traditional histories

go back in time to restore an unbroken continuity that operates beyond the dispersion of forgotten things... to demonstrate that the past actively exists in the present, that it continues secretly to animate the present, having imposed a predetermined form to all its vicissitudes. ...it [attempts to map] the destiny of a people. (146)

Within traditional understanding of history, having *arrived* at redress in 1988, the federal government can be understood as having achieved part of its destiny in becoming an exemplar of multicultural tolerance, social justice and democracy. To this effect Roy Miki (2009), a Japanese Canadian scholar and contributor to the latter years of redress, laments that

[r]edress was a thing in the future. When it was done, there was a loss because that history then got absorbed into the official history of Canada. And that official history, of course, to a certain extent is mediated and managed by the state. So here we were in the House of Commons, a group of individuals who had been wronged by the state, in a sense offering up our history to that state so that the state could "redeem" itself. The state - and, at that moment, the nation - strengthened itself by taking ownership of redress. And that's where the loss occurs, because now Japanese Canadians were a manifestation of the official narrative and were no longer in a condition of lack. The history that got absorbed into the nation and got to be retold through the official history is both ours and no longer ours. (4)

In the above passage, Miki explains that redress took on a new meaning of federal redemption, nation-strengthening and official Canadian narrative. Redress was no longer solely understood as being justice for Japanese Canadians but as progress for the federal government.

Effective histories, as opposed to traditional ones, encourage the bracketing of official historical accounts of redress. They emphasize the ever-changing nature of

existence and its various perspectives, dispersions and differences, leaving things “undisturbed in their own dimension and intensity” (Foucault 1977: 153). Traditional accounts predominantly synthesize Japanese Canadian redress into a binary relationship between the federal government and Japanese Canadians. This is an overly simplistic and static account. It implies that an ever-present government or federal body managed redress claims. It assumes that Japanese Canadians en-masse were a cohesive group of like-minded people working in unison to achieve one goal: “Redress” as a specific justice-form. It supports a racial and political distinction between us (“white” Canadians, national representation, the “common good”) and them (“Japanese Canadians”, national Japanese-Canadian representation, “special interests”) by not including the presence of the ‘others’ who were actively involved in justice-making for Japanese Canadians. It does not include others (to label particular others: “Whites”, “Performing Artists”, “Blacks”, “Academics”, “Jewish”, “Journalists”, “Members of Parliament” and so on) that mediated this Government/Japanese Canadian binary in their own justice-making and justice-supporting ways. Effective history then turns away from that binary relationship and looks toward these ‘others’.

Foucault describes history as being “effective to the degree that it introduces discontinuity into our very being... [Effective history] will uproot its traditional foundations and relentlessly disrupt its pretended continuity. This is because knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting” (154). The literature reviewed in the previous chapter demonstrated how traditional redress histories placed primacy on a justice-form centred understanding of redress which obscures nuanced understandings of the concept itself. I stated in that chapter that I will adopt a justice-making understanding

of redress, wherein I consider redress as involving the various acts and means of setting right. Doing so, I argued, will situate analysis in configurations of justice-making effort and other forms of justice repair and thus, will cut open traditional redress histories. To achieve this “cutting”, I examine knowledges obscured or unconsidered by official historical accounts. In this light, I proceed in my analysis with the understanding that constellations of justice-making effort, though perhaps interconnected, are not assumed to be precise steps moving forward toward a specific outcome.

Finally, Foucault (1977) contrasts traditional and effective histories in terms of “proximity and distance” (155). Traditional histories, he argues, focus on “the noblest periods, the highest forms, the most abstract ideas, the purest individualities” (155). It is in this vein that the majority of historical literature reviewed in the previous chapter is situated. The “noblest period” in redress history was between 1977 and 1988. The “highest form” of redress was the Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement. The “most abstract idea” was redressing historical justice. The “purest individualities” were Prime Minister Brian Mulroney representing the Government of Canada and Art Miki representing the National Association of Japanese Canadians.

Effective history in contrast, “shortens its vision to those things nearest to it but in an abrupt dispossession so as to seize it at a distance” (155). Effective history will therefore appear to examine those things that are less romantic, glamorous or showy. It will critically examine those things that are perhaps overlooked in their simplicity or considered too common-place for historical analysis. In this light, an effective history of redress discourse looks to ordinary artefacts of redress, such as a redress briefing document and consider it with “new eyes”. Such a document would normally be

understood as a means of disseminating information about redress in order to eventually obtain redress. An effective history, however, would encourage examination of this document from other perspectives, possibilities and the achievement of other ends. For example, it would be used to understand and articulate the interaction between the discourses addressed in the brief and the publics it addresses.

“Table 1: Key Comparisons between Traditional and Effective Histories” summarizes the key differences between these two histories, which I covered in the previous paragraphs. In so doing, Table 1 distinguishes and locates the key theoretical elements of this thesis. The elements listed in the left column are those that the literature covers extensively, which I have largely bracketed. The elements listed in the right column are the foci of this thesis.

Table 1: Key Comparisons between Traditional and Effective Histories

Traditional history of JC redress Blatant, self-evident, reinforced	Effective History of JC redress Subtle, obscure, forgotten
Studies the NAJC and Federal Government	Studies the public referred to but taken for granted in the literature
Focus on period between 1977⁴ and 1988	Examines period between 1942 (first year of internment) and 1988 (year of settlement)
Focuses on the settlement (justice-form)	Focuses on other instances and attempts (justice-making)
Justice understood as achieved through negotiation with the government	Justice understood as made through a myriad of actions and the products of that action

⁴ *Justice In Our Time: The Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement* situates the beginnings of the redress movement in 1977 with the Japanese Canadian Centennial Project Redress Committee.

I extract the key concepts of history and the public from Table 1 as foundational pieces of this project. These two concepts are the concepts around which I have built my theoretical framework. While the previous paragraphs employ effective history in contrast to traditional history, what follows is an explanation of a genealogical approach as a means of critically analyzing the past and conceptions of the public. Following this explanation of genealogy, I represent different theorizations of the public.

2.3 A Genealogy of Redress Discourse

Just as effective histories strive to break apart or cut the boundaries enforced by traditional histories, so do genealogies. Though I have separated effective history and genealogy, I understand them to be one in the same. To write a genealogy of this or that is to create an effective history. I made this division for the sake of ease in comparing and contrasting traditional historical analysis with a Foucauldian approach. Where traditional histories examine events as having a fixed time and date such as the bombing of Pearl Harbor or the signing of the redress agreement, genealogy/effective history treats events as the processes and emergence of particular understandings of a thing (for example, Foucault studied incarceration) which enable and constrain human activity and behaviour in particular ways (1991: 76).

This emergence is a principle point of focus for genealogy. Specifically, *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History* (1977) explains that the objective of genealogy is to isolate and examine different points of emergence, where emergence is understood as “the entry of forces; it is their eruption, the leap from the wings to the center stage” (149-151). Moreover, an emergence cannot be treated as the end result of a long culmination

of events or the 'final term of historical development' (148). The importance of this aspect of genealogy is that it is instructive of looking for points of emergence, that there will be, perhaps inevitably, other instances of the phenomena in question. Examining an emergence with a broad view in terms of time and/or space allows the opportunity to see this phenomena emerging at other points in the past, perhaps in different forms, understandings or circumstances.

Genealogical analysis operates according principles of understanding rather than by concrete methodological rules and guidelines (McHoul and Grace 1997; Saar 2010; Walters *et al.*). I have enumerated a couple of these principles above through effective history. I now add the analysis of discourse and of struggle as two other key components of genealogical inquiry. Foucault understood discourse in terms of bodies of knowledge that are created and perpetuated by specific social, historical and political conditions (McHoul & Grace 1997). Discourse is thus no longer an innocuous concept commonly understood in terms of systems of language and grammar (McHoul & Grace 1997), but a concept generated and reproduced through networks, decisions, admissions and omissions. Discourse in this understanding denotes power, though it is only as powerful as the degree to which it can be digested as self-evident (Foucault 1991). Furthermore, in his version of historical analysis, Foucault's "general theme isn't society but the discourse of true and false, by which [he] mean[s] the correlative formation of domains and objects and of the verifiable, falsifiable discourses that bear on them; and it's not just their formation that interests [him], but the effects in the real to which they are linked" (1991: 85). In this sense, redress embedded within a discourse of national progress forms a domain of redressed subjects, having the effect of demonstrating Canada's tolerant and

multicultural society. It attests to and reinforces this “truth” and strives to cut away all else.

To illustrate the concept of discourse as a powerful body of knowledge which enables and constrains individuals in particular ways, race and assimilation discourses subjected Japanese Canadians over the course of many years. This view appears to have been supported by Canadian institutions such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and BC Provincial Normal School of Vancouver. To these discourses, I turn to a program aired on the CBC on May 25th, 1944, entitled “The Case Against the Enemy Aliens” (Ewing 1944). In it, Dr. John M. Ewing, Psychology instructor at British Columbia Provincial Normal School of Vancouver (later to become the University of British Columbia), set out to “objectively” and “factually” list the ways that Japanese Canadians are “wholly unlike ‘us’” and the reasons why persons of Japanese racial origin should be “repatriated” to Japan with restrictions placed on those who would stay in Canada. These restrictions would include barring the possibility of obtaining Canadian citizenship (even though the majority were already Canadian citizens), of owning land or property and of gathering in large communities.

The strength of his argument for repatriation rested in its portrayal as being factual and self-evident. It leaned on the ‘obviousness’ of physical and cultural markers as indicators of how Japanese Canadians would never be accepted into (white) Canadian society and would never be fully ‘Canadian’. Certainly it was ‘white’ Canadians that Dr. Ewing addressed as his imagined public in this program. This is one example of how public discourses of race and assimilation, through address, could demarcate boundaries between Japanese Canadians and dominant publics. Prior to the conclusion of the radio

program Dr. Ewing assured that “the basic argument *needs no further support*. Let me in closing state the conclusions *forced upon us* by the facts. In doing so I would like to emphasize one thing. They are neither personal nor emotional so far as I am concerned, but *simply logical*. You will bear me out when I say that no prejudice and no passion has entered this talk” (Ewing 1944, my italics). The rationalist language Dr. Ewing uses and the obviousness he cites for the decision to repatriate Japanese Canadians renders this grave decision as one that feels effortless, unquestionable, apolitical and rational.

This quality of ease through which discourse circulates, obscures the struggle required to raise it to a status of truth. This erasure of struggles, contestation, resistance, marginalization and conflict is another principle focus of genealogy. “Genealogy as the recovery of forgotten or erased struggles” (Walters forthcoming), locates and resurrects moments and forms of struggle that were preludes to something being considered common, unquestionable, normal or obvious. I would like to especially highlight a couple of features of this style of genealogy that make it particularly relevant for the purposes of this research.

Walters (forthcoming) emphasizes that ‘genealogy as struggle’ not only examines the *how* of struggle but complicates the *who*. He notes that it is “possible and important to construct genealogies in which groups are present and active. ... [Groups] are never given in advance but always in the process of making and being made under contingent circumstances and in combination with particular materials” (22). The first point I wish to make with respect to the previous statement is that genealogy does not take identity as something that is fixed; rather, as something made and remade according to agreements and contestations (22). This understanding critiques and counters the tendency of

traditional history to concern itself with “the purest individualities” (Foucault 1977: 155), with unchanging identities, with overly-simplistic relationship binaries (**us** vs **them**) or with homogeneous, catch-all understandings of identity such as “Japanese Canadians” and “the public”. Rather, genealogies examine the struggle that underpins these identities and what of those identities became acceptably (or unacceptably) displayable: Ethnicity? Rationality? Emotionality? Citizenship? Moreover, struggle implies action and in this sense, considers identity-formation as linked to forms of justice-making.

The next point I wish to make concerns how genealogies examine “particular materials”. The examination of the interaction between circumstances and materials grounds this critical analysis in the world of materiality, the empirical and moves it away from the idealistic. This focus emphasizes the materials used, as well as their effects and conditions, in particular struggles and instances of transformation. Archival materials open a wide range of possibility for examination. Whereas other means of inquiry might focus on analyzing social change via interview, direct observation, or survey, genealogy in its material orientation, seeks to trace change through subtle, perhaps unconventional focal points such as paper napkins printed with redress slogans and circulated by the patrons of local bakeries and restaurants.

In summary, genealogies bracket the findings and narratives of traditional histories by examining the past without imposing assumptions of continuity or destiny; by observing how meanings and perspectives change over time; by analyzing those things that are seemingly everyday or common but with new eyes; by treating events not as fixed dates but as processes of emergence; by understanding discourse as bodies of

knowledge that are powerful in their ability to be left unquestioned; and by describing struggles that allowed one meaning, form or discourse to rise above the rest.

As Henderson and Wakeham (forthcoming) point out, examination of particular instances of redress that fail to consider the past of this phenomenon in Canada, risk burying the complexities of struggle and setback involved in its achievement under the sweeping celebration of the moment (3). Though Japanese Canadian redress has been historicized through the work of the redress movement in the 1980s and as a conclusion to histories on Japanese Canadian internment, these accounts do revolve around that redress movement of the 1980s and the NAJC/Government of Canada relationship. Further historicizing of this emergent form of redress is thus necessary in order to illuminate publics involved in the struggle for redress.

A genealogical approach offers a unique set of principles through which to historicize Japanese Canadian redress. It has the ability to circumvent the pitfalls of reproducing official discourse on redress and to broaden our understanding of this phenomenon beyond that to which it has been discursively bound. Based on the principles enumerated in this section, a genealogy of redress discourse will examine resistance and contestation to official discourses and asks by what materials and methods did redress discourse circulate? What practices assured its coherence and comprehensibility? Whom did it include, involve impede or inspire? With this last question, I turn to the second key concept of my theoretical framework, the public.

2.4 Warner's Publics and Counterpublics

In the previous chapter, the section entitled “Who is Involved in the Act of Setting Right?” questioned references made to the public in redress literature which assigned it agency, power and place. In particular, I argued that the public is a concept taken for granted as a naturally existing and pre-formed body left untheorized in this literature. To illustrate this assumption, I presented different conceptualizations of the public. Particularly, distinctions were made between “the public” and “publics” as treated by theorists of the public. Between these two variations of understanding, there is somewhat of a consensus among theorists of the public (although not in the literature on redress) that “the public” as a pre-existing, pre-formed, homogeneous and static entity does not, in fact exist. Rather, it is a “phantom” (Lippman 2009) and that assigning it agency is “an extraordinary fiction” (Warner 2002:123).

This section examines meanings of the public as theorized by both Michael Warner (2002) through his text on “publics and counterpublics” and Jürgen Habermas (2007) in his examination of the decline and ultimate end of the “Bourgeois Public Sphere”. I will compare and contrast their work in terms of both the meaning and formation of publics. Ultimately, I use Warner’s understanding of publics and counterpublics as conceptualizations against which to analyze publics present in Japanese Canadian redress discourse.

Through the characteristics ascribed to the Bourgeois Public Sphere and its function, characteristics of publics formed within it can be deduced. Habermas (2007) summarizes that the Bourgeois Public Sphere “exists between civil society and the State” monitoring state authority through informed and critical discourse *by* the people (xi). He states moreover that the public sphere’s “decisive mark was the published word” (16). I

would like to emphasize four defining features of publics gathered from these statements about the public sphere. Firstly, the public is, in this account, contingent upon and forms through discourse. This is a different understanding from a common one that assumes an ever present public body. Next, Habermas qualifies discourse with the words “informed” and “critical”. These two qualifications of discourse assume a host of characteristics such as someone who is educated, has access to current information as well as the means to understand that information, and is able to think critically, perhaps rationally and objectively. Thirdly, the emphasis on the published word being the decisive mark of the public sphere, again assumes a public that is educated, literate and resourcefully able to purchase or obtain published materials. To this effect, Habermas does emphasize that the public sphere was exclusionary from the beginning in being a “reading public” (23). Finally, he ascribes power to the public sphere through the responsibility it holds in monitoring state authority.

The Bourgeois Public Sphere was, in more specific terms, a sphere where private people come together as a public, against or opposed to public authority in debate over rules governing commodities, exchange and social labour (27). The public sphere is therefore assumed to be a locale of tension and resistance between the state and its citizenry. Habermas argues that the public sphere rested upon people’s public use of their reason and that their claim to power was the ability to produce this rational-critical debate (28). It is moreover a place characterized by rational-critical debate and consideration for the “common good” (6) and “common concern” (36).

I find the limiting of subjects for public debate to only those issues that are considered to be ‘common’ to be an important delimiter. This criteria of commonality

normalized public debate to concern only that which dominant publics, composed of educated, rational, resourceful and financially capable individuals, deemed to be of concern. Warner (2002) emphasizes that the public sphere Habermas described was “structured by a logic of abstraction that provides a privilege for unmarked identities: the male, the white, the middle class, the normal” (167). This structured logic of abstraction refers to the active creation of common concern as including and involving only those unmarked by their identities. Those individuals attempting to politicize issues of race in the public sphere, especially those who have been racialized, however, cannot meet this criteria of disembodiment as racism locks the identity of individuals to their physical markers. Moreover, Warner asserts that rational-critical debate itself “is a neutral, relatively disembodied procedure for addressing common concerns, while embodied life is assumed to be private, local, or merely affective and expressive” (51). The public sphere, for Habermas then, makes no place for the affective or expressive, the particular or the bodied.

What this examination has yielded thus far are understandings of publicity that are contingent on the traits of those involved and concerned. In this vein, there exists some tension between two points that I will summarize as the non-particular vs. the particular. The non-particular understandings of publics adhere to the values of rational discourse, common-concern and the ability to disengage from focus on particular personal traits and/or identities. I add that these non-particular understandings of publics are framed by liberal ideology and serve to encourage notions of “the public” as a homogeneous totality. Janine Brodie (1996) calls the implied resident of such a totality “the ordinary Canadian”. The non-particular values of rational discourse and common-concern are

akin to those traits which characterize the “ordinary Canadian”, as “disinterested, seeking neither special status nor treatment from the state. He is not raced, sexed or classed: he transcends difference” (394). Discursively deploying “the public”, in this understanding, further marginalizes and invalidates groups seeking redress. For example, when British Columbians were contesting the internment orders, the BC government cited the public as being in support of these measures, despite there having never been any survey of British Columbians conducted. Instead, they presumed that “public opinion conformed to their own prejudices and with the rhetoric of their previous campaign” (Gomer-Sunahara 2000: 28).

In contrast, the ‘particular’ understandings of publics that Warner advances, “necessarily entail and bring into being realms of subjectivity... Their protocols of discourse and debate remain open to affective and expressive dimensions of language” (Warner 2002:58). This form of publicity, and by this I mean a state of being public, is thought to include those minoritized by the characteristics of the public sphere; those who are acutely aware of their otherness or “subordinate status” via tension with a larger public (56).

The acute awareness of subordinate status marks one of the characteristics of counterpublics. The contentious characteristics of publics, especially the non-particular vs. the particular, mark key distinctions between what Warner contrasts as publics and counterpublics. The previous paragraphs discussed dominant publics as those with the ability to take their lifeworlds for granted and to assume a sense of universality (122). This universality speaks to the use of “the public” as an assumption that all are included within it as well as the constancy of its discourse. Counterpublics on the other hand, are

particular and are marked by conflict with the norms that surround them (63). Moreover, their existence hinges on a discourse of transformation related to their subordinate status (122).

Discourse, in both Habermas' and Warner's accounts, is the site of a public's creation. Habermas described the formation of the public sphere as born from the development of print and publishing. The circulation of critique on cultural forms such as art, literature, as well as news, the critical assessment and discussion that ensued (particularly as it developed to critique the operations of the state) would bring together individuals who gained consciousness of their status as a public. Warner adds to this foundation by elaborating on seven features of publics as generated, supported and dissolved by discourse.

These features implicate discourse in particular ways that I will briefly enumerate. For the sake of summarization, I have categorized the first four as features that are largely responsible for characterizing publics and the last three as spatial and temporal indicators.

Warner's first four features are as follows:

1. A public is self-organized;
2. A public is a relation among strangers;
3. The address of public speech is both personal and impersonal;
4. A public is constituted through mere attention;

The first point in the list emphasizes that publics must be generated independently from state institutions of law and citizenship for example (Warner 2002: 68). In this light, discourse is understood to be independent from official streams of production (i.e. state production). The second point emphasizes the need for discourse to address those imagined and requires constant imagining (76). A discourse is not public if it is intended

for specifically identifiable people. The third point emphasizes that in order for discourse to generate a public, it must address people in both personal and impersonal ways. In engaging with public-making discourse, one must understand themselves to be engaging with it as a direct addressee and as someone among a possibility of many others. In this sense, discourse addresses our private thoughts and indicates that “our subjectivity [has] resonance with others, and immediately so” (77). This facet of discourse generates a sense of public cohesiveness. The fourth point is a critical one as it emphasizes that attention is the key “sorting factor” (87). You are part of a public if you pay attention to its discourse. Moreover, it is now understood that publics cease to exist when attention ceases to be paid to its discourse.

Warner’s final three features are as follows:

5. A public is the social space created by the reflexive circulation of discourse;
6. Publics act historically according to the temporality of their circulation; and
7. A public is poetic and world-making

The fifth point clarifies that discourse should not be understood in dyadic terms (i.e. addresser and addressee). Rather Warner emphasizes that it is not the text or address itself that constitutes a public, but its links to other texts and forms of address. The linkages made between discourses are indicative of an interactive space of creation which has “potentially infinite axes of citation and characterization” (91). This feature includes a reference to the temporality of public discourse in that it is understood to be manifested in the present and “oriented to the future” (94). The sixth feature emphasizes the pace in which the discourse operates (for example the pace of discourse generated by peer reviewed journal compared to that of newspaper headline is drastically different).

Warner links the punctuality of discourse to its relation to politics: “the more discourse indexes the punctuality of its own circulation, the closer a public stands to politics” (97). Finally, public discourse is performative and poetic. This is a key point which Warner uses to distance himself from Habermas’ realm of public understanding. While address in the public sphere is “ideologized as rational-critical dialogue” (115), address involves, in actuality according to Warner, a variety of poetic and expressive forms. However this feature of discourse emphasizes that it is the rational-critical forms of discussion which obtain more “prestige and power” than the poetic-expressive forms as they are more easily generalizable and useable at an institutional level (116).

These seven features of publics serve as a framework upon which to build an understanding of both the publics created by redress discourse and the creation and circulation of redress discourse as a vital component of justice-making. For Warner, both publics and counterpublics are theorized to form around these seven points of discursive understanding. Their differences rest however, on the context of their differential relation to dominant or larger publics. Counterpublics, as mentioned previously, are publics marked by the circulation of discourse that is inherently transformative. They also differ from publics by their contention with larger dominant publics and their constitutive norms (112). Considering this struggle, my analysis will evaluate whether redress discourse forms publics or counterpublics and if this dynamic changed over time. The publics involved in justice-making that I ‘encounter’ in my analysis will be compared and contrasted against public and counterpublic understandings.

Chapter 3: Making Redress Publics of Rationalist Discourse

In Chapter 1, I demonstrated that analyses and official historical accounts of Japanese Canadian redress typically rely upon a justice-form understanding of redress. As such, redress was contextually understood as a particular justice-form (comprised of a range of restorative measures) bestowed by government to Japanese Canadians, as negotiated with the National Association of Japanese Canadians (NAJC). It was specifically understood to mean that “all members of [the] community who were unjustly treated during the war years ... receive[d] some form of compensation” (Miki 2004: 139). I demonstrated furthermore that redress was thus delimited to a temporal span of 1977 to 1988. I concluded by describing and attaching my work to a justice-making understanding of redress and noted that much of the literature in this vein concerns memory and memorialization as well as histories of redress as composed by Japanese Canadians.

The second chapter rationalized the importance of pushing the boundaries of this limited timeframe and of complicating the bilateral representation of redress by employing a genealogical approach (Foucault 1977; 1991). Adopting this approach will allow both the meaning of redress and the relationships involved therein to be examined particularly as processes of emergence, discourse and struggle. In order to bypass “traditional” treatments of redress as a justice-form, I advanced the understanding of redress as its composite practices. This was understood to be within a frame of justice-making (i.e. acts of setting right) rather than of justice-form. Analysis will show that this broadened meaning of redress reveals other forms and attempts of justice-making as well

as persons involved, dating as far back as 1942 (the same year the internment period began).

I also presented theorizations of the public in this second chapter in order to set a framework for understanding publics and counterpublics (Warner 2002). According to Warner (2002), publics and counterpublics only exist by virtue of being addressed by discourse. They are moreover the paths for its circulation (92). Publics and counterpublics differ however by the contexts of their discourse. According to Warner, the discourses that constitute, create and circulate via dominant publics are normative and replicate these norms. Conversely, contention with the discourses of larger dominant publics and their constitutive norms is the marker of a counterpublic (112).

Counterpublics are aware of their subordinate status and the circulation of their discourse is thus intently transformative. Due to these points of tension, analysis will evaluate whether redress discourse forms publics or counterpublics and if this changed over time.

To work within this framework, I examined several types of redress materials in order to gain an understanding of the publics involved in justice-making. While a wide range of redress materials exist (including both textual and audio-visual materials), I chose text-based materials, as they are the most accessible form of redress communication in both moments. Generally, I reviewed secondary materials to gain a clear picture of how the history of redress tends to be told (See for example, Miki 2004; Miki & Kobayashi 1991; Miki, Kobayashi & NAJC 1989). Particularly, I analyzed communication materials (letters to the Prime Minister) and publicity materials (redress pamphlet and briefing documents).

3.1 Preliminary Analysis: Two Moments of Listing the Grounds for Appeal

During preliminary analysis, I established that there are two distinct periods of redress discourse represented in historical redress narratives, though these narratives do not necessarily identify them as such. I loosely divided these two periods of redress discourse such that the first period spans the 1940s to the 1960s and the second period spans the 1970s to the 1990s. My intent was not to create fixed start and end dates within which to explore redress discourse. Rather, based on the literature reviewed, loose ranges were sufficient for guiding and informing my understanding of the shift I perceived to have occurred between these two periods.

In order to keep my research within manageable scope, I chose two ‘moments’ within these periods. The first moment chosen within the period from the 1940s to the 1960s includes redress materials from the 1940s. I labelled this first moment as *rationalist*, based on the tendencies of the discourse that I perceived in redress materials of the time. Conversely, the second moment chosen within the period from the 1970s to the 1990s, includes redress materials from the 1980s. I labelled the second moment as “*subjectivist*”, again for the predominant tendencies of the discourse of this decade. I chose these two decades simply because they appeared to be the most active justice-making moments, which contained the greatest amount of material to examine. This should by no means suggest that no justice-making effort took place within the 1950s to the 1970s. Rather, in the first moment, there was an abundance of possible material to analyze due to the currently unfolding nature of injustices and efforts to have them cease. In the second moment, there was an abundance of material produced and circulated by

various participants of the redress movement, which generated unprecedented attention on both Japanese Canadian redress and history.

The important rationalist/subjectivist distinction between these two moments, which I will elaborate on in the coming chapters, only became evident through an analysis of the materials involved in justice-making. I must emphasize however, that these are not mutually exclusive divisions. Both moments contained evidence of ‘the rationalist’ and ‘the subjectivist’; however, they differed significantly in the degree of emphasis used in discourse. Redress materials generated in these two moments reflect this difference. Analysis will show that the publics, as generated by and circulating these materials, differed as well. I therefore employed these two moments to compare and contrast redress materials and their publics in order to arrive at a different and nuanced understanding of redress.

Specifically, I chose the following redress materials for analysis:

- **Communication materials:** Two letters written to the Prime Minister were chosen for this category. The first letter was written in 1945 to Prime Minister Mackenzie King by the Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians (CCJC). The second letter was written to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney in 1987 by NAJC President Art Miki .
- **Publicity material:** Two documents which publicized redress, demonstrating why redress is valid and critical, were chosen for this category. The first document was a pamphlet printed in 1943 entitled *What About the Japanese Canadians?* (Norman 1943). The second document is a communication brief entitled *Justice in Our Time: Redress for Japanese Canadians* and was printed in 1987 (NAJC 1987).

I chose these documents as I considered them to be artefacts that show how redress discourse responded to dominant discourses of race and assimilation, thus forming specific kinds of redress publics. Justice-making, based on these two categories of materials, involved politicizing injustices through raising awareness and drawing

attention to the issues, as well as through demonstrating support. These documents were also chosen for their ability to be directly comparable across the two moments established (i.e. two letters to the PM, two publicity documents). Next, they represent their place within their respective moment, not only by being temporally located within the appropriate timeframe, but in how they demonstrate an emphasis placed on rationalist versus subjectivist discourse.

In addition to those materials mentioned above, *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981) is an award-winning novel published prior to the 1988 redress settlement, which registers as a significant piece of justice-making material. It was the first Canadian novel published on “Japanese [Canadian] evacuation, internment, and dispersal during the Second World War” (Kogawa 1981: inner cover) and an important document used for gaining redress support. Significantly, two Members of Parliament read passages from this novel in the House of Commons as part of the announcement of redress (Miki and Kobayashi 1991).

I have set this novel apart from the materials presented above as it is an artefact of justice-making that, as a single document, demonstrates the discourse of both moments. Not only does it include the Secondary Redress Public voice and rationalistic discourse of the first moment, but enhances it with the voice of Primary Redress Publics and subjectivist discourse characteristic of the second moment. Equally, the materials previously presented were non-fiction, whereas *Obasan* is a fictional document. The fictional nature of the novel however rests mainly with the details of the characters. The events and many of the persons contained within (government officials for example) are real (Kogawa 1981:n.p.). Therefore, I uniquely employ the use of this artefact of justice-making to introduce and articulate the characteristics of each of the two moments.

Moreover, though fictional, the human interaction presented within this novel is salient and warrants special attention in this analysis, particularly as it pertains to understandings of the public.

In examining redress materials across these two moments, I observed that lists featured heavily in these materials as a dominant textual and organizational form. While there are a number of other aspects and elements of redress material one could analyse, I have further refined my inquiry around the analysis of these lists specifically, as I see them to be original and critical sites I can use to demonstrate a shift in redress discourse between the two moments and thus a shift in publics.

Listing is an active practice of recalling, writing, prioritizing, categorizing, numbering and organizing. As mnemonic devices, lists can assist in the remembering of the injustices of the past and in framing this past within the context of redress in the relative present. Beyond their ability to assist with memory formation and recall, lists also give a weight of importance and can generate a sense of objectivity through the presentation of facts and figures. Lists can succinctly present and demonstrate a multitude of buried, obscured or forgotten events, dates, figures, occurrences, voices, experiences, memories and supporters of redress. Moreover, the greater the number of points strategically enumerated in a list (i.e. the more reasons given, the more actions taken, the more injustices suffered, the more times denied etc.) the more weight and strength the list would hold.

Conversely, lists also simplify and synthesize complex ideas into short and easily remembered terms (such as the Ten Commandments or the four Fundamental Freedoms laid out in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms). The simplification and

materialization of ideas into the form of a list facilitates the communication and mobilization of its contents among people. The simplistic form of a list, thought of here as an immutable mobile (Latour 2005; Law 2005), helps to ensure that its presentation, contents and intended meaning are retained as it circulates among interpreting eyes and across time and space. Accomplishing this, lists are then able to mobilize a range of people for a cause (for example). What is significant about the potential immutability of a list is that a complex array of highly ‘mutable’ work lies beneath or as Law (2005) analogizes, “all the (indispensable) invisible work that lies below the waterline” (337). It is the invisible work of discursive publics lying beneath the surface of redress discourse, which I examine in the lists analyzed in this chapter.

This chapter and the next represent two moments in redress history that are marked by the emphasis they place on rationalist or subjectivist treatment of the grounds for appeal. The result is a perceived shift in redress discourse and thus a shift in the publics of these discourses. The practice of listing and the resultant lists assembled in different textual forms of communication are thus argued to have been a vital and critical means of reflexively enabling redress publics to become self-aware.

I also argue that listing is an intersubjective practice by virtue of how the lists can be added to, refined or shaped by many people. With this in mind, the interactive (net)work of justice-making between what I refer to as Primary and Secondary Redress Publics is discernible through analysis of lists. I define Primary Redress Publics as composed of Japanese Canadians involved in justice-making effort and Secondary Redress Publics as the concerned ‘others’ involved and in support. Finally, the analysis in these two chapters will further demonstrate that lists were an important means of

managing and controlling the reception and understanding of information presented in redress materials.

3.2 MEMORANDUM TO OFFICIAL DISCOURSE: Secondary Redress Publics

Rationalizing Redress

The titular use of ‘memorandum’ suggests that this analysis chapter examines documents that address official knowledge and official discourse. However, it is also a reference to a document, which I use as a placeholder for this chapter. The final three pages of *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981) contain an “excerpt of a memorandum sent by the Cooperative Committee for Japanese Canadians (CCJC) to the House and the Senate of Canada” (248). The CCJC was part of a Secondary Redress Public active in the first moment of redress⁵. As you may recall, I defined Secondary Redress Publics as publics formed by non-Japanese Canadians who were involved in justice-making on behalf of Japanese Canadians. I include the final three pages of *Obasan* below as I consider the ten-point list contained within these pages as typical of the first moment of redress, marked by rationality. Though somewhat lengthy, I have reproduced this memorandum, to serve as an example typical of the lists this section engaged (See Appendix A for original appearance in the novel). The memorandum is dated April 1946:

It is urgently submitted that the Orders-in-Council [for the deportation of Canadians of Japanese racial origin] are wrong and indefensible and constitute a grave threat to the rights and liberties of Canadian citizens, and that Parliament as guardian of these rights and the representative of the people, should assert its powers and require the Governor-in-Council to withdraw the Orders, for the following reasons.

1. The Orders-in Council provide for the exile of Canadian citizens.

⁵ I offer a more detailed description of the CCJC and their work in the following section.

The power of exile has not been employed by civilized countries since the days of the Stuarts in England. So seriously was it then viewed that the Habeas Corpus Act makes it a serious offense for any official to exile a British subject.

2. The Orders and the proposed exile of Canadian citizens constitute a violation of International Law and as Mr. Justice Kellock and Rand have stated, involves invasion of another's territory, and the violation of sovereign rights.

The Congress of the United States has no power to exile citizens, and the British Parliament has not, even in the gravest emergency, found it necessary to assume such a power.

3. The Orders-in-Council put the value of Canadian citizenship into contempt. They cancel naturalization in a wholesale manner, and without any reason.

At this time when the Parliament of Canada will be considering legislation designed to enhance the value and dignity of Canadian citizenship, these Orders will have precisely the opposite effect.

4. The Orders-in Council are based upon racial discrimination. Deportation on racial grounds has been defined as a crime against humanity, and the war criminals of Germany and Japan are being tried for precisely this offense, amongst others.

5. The proposed deportations are in no way related to any war emergency.

The necessity of removing persons of Japanese origin from the coastal regions during the war, was referable to the emergency, but now that hostilities have ceased for some time, it cannot possibly be suggested that the safety of Canada requires the injustice of treating Canadian citizens in the manner proposed.

The Prime Minister has himself made it clear that no instances of sabotage can be laid at the door of Japanese Canadians.

If any of those concerned have been disloyal, there is ample power under the Immigration and Naturalization Acts for their deportation after proper inquiry into individual cases.

Many Japanese Canadians have already settled in the Prairie Provinces and in Eastern Canada and have no desire to return to B.C. There is therefore no need for fear of concentration on the Pacific Coast as in the past.

6. The Orders for deportation purport to be based on alleged requests to be sent to Japan. It is suggested that the signing of these requests indicated disloyalty. This is far from the truth. The signing of the forms was encouraged as an act of co-operation with the Government of Canada. The very form used, implied that the Government approved and sought the signing of these forms. Those who refused to sign were described as uncooperative, and denied privileges accorded to those who did sign. For the Government, which through its agents obtained and sought the signing of these forms, to claim now that they indicated disloyalty, would be to implicate the Government itself in the encouragement of a disloyal attitude.

7. The Orders constitute a threat to the security of every minority in Canada.

8. The Orders cannot be enforced without grave injustice and inhumanity to innocent persons.

9. The effect of these Orders will be to cause lasting hostility to Canada throughout the Orient where racial discrimination is deeply resented. The future of Canada's international relationship may depend on the revocation of these Orders.

10. The Orders are directly in contradiction of the language and spirit of the United Nations Charter, subscribed to by Canada as well as the other nations of the world and are an adoption of the methods of Naziism.

Respectfully submitted,
James M. Finlay, Chairman
Andrew Brewin
Hugh MacMillan

Of the many angles from which one could possibly analyze this memorandum, for current purposes and to not overextend the scope of this section, I wish only to particularize it from the vantage point of discourse. In so doing, I will emphasize what bearing this list has on publics and will use it as a placeholder that gives an idea of the type of list I argue is typical of this first moment.

Warner (2005) emphasizes that discourse commonly stylizes publics as conversations (97). This memorandum, written in formal address, reads as points of clarification and response to an unread/unheard conversation. The reader of this text understands there to be a ‘conversation’ taking place with respect to ceasing deportation orders. I noted this by, for example, references made in point #5 regarding the “fear of concentration” and the “necessity of removing persons of Japanese origin from the coastal regions” also stated in point #5⁶. These two examples point to two key discourses that this redress document highlights and addresses: assimilation and national security discourses.

⁶ One can also observe the present-day relevance of noting the issues raised in point #2 vis à vis current multiculturalism discourse. This list point specifically identifies how Canada was acting more harshly than Britain or the US with respect to their (‘ethnic’) citizens. Foundational to multiculturalism discourse is the assertion that “[it] has been a fundamental element in the make-up of Canada since its beginnings” (CIC 2009). Multiculturalism is further naturalized to be a system of Canadian values that “reaches out to Canadians and newcomers” and “develops lasting relationships with ethnic communities” (CIC 2011). Multiculturalism discourse thus generates a historical constancy to these values which point number two in this list clearly challenges.

The reference made to the “fear of concentration”, links the reader to a discourse of assimilation. Assimilation discourse was striking and blatant in this first moment of redress history. Particularly, the underlying assumption as to why Japanese Canadians should be dispersed or expelled⁷ had to do with the belief, supported by Prime Minister King (Miki 2004:49), that if Japanese Canadians were “no longer visible, they would no longer generate racial hostility in white Canadians” (Miki 2004:43). This ‘visibility’, enhanced by large ‘concentrations’ of Japanese Canadians, served to reinforce fears about ‘visible minorities’’ purported inability to assimilate.

Finally, the reference made to the necessity of removing Japanese Canadians from the coastal areas points to a discourse of national security. National security served as the grounds for measures taken against Japanese Canadians by government, though these measures extended beyond the end of the war and despite government officials, politicians and other authorities such as the RCMP, knowing that they posed no actual threat (Miki 2004: 89).

These two discourses mobilized by the federal government during these early years of struggle, would have formed a formidable sense of a public *against* Japanese Canadians. Warner clarifies that “not texts themselves create publics, but the

⁷ Walters (2002) demonstrates that historically, different forms of expulsion have been rationalized under various practices such as **exile** (for example, as a form of punishment and means of enforcing security in ancient Greece), **expulsion of the poor** (related to poor policy in early modern Europe), **corporate expulsion** (used to police religious affiliation of a population such as with the expulsion of Jews in various European countries between the 13th and 15th centuries), **transportation** (as a technique of social regulation and state-building in eighteenth century Europe) and **population transfer** (means of managing ethnic and racial minorities for national homogeneity). Population transfer was a governmental means of expulsion made policy in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century (273). However, it was also practiced in Canada during this time, through the targeted expulsion of Japanese Canadians rationalized by their unassimilable “racial-ethnic essence” (274). Walters argues that it is instructive to trace historical lines of expulsion in order to unsettle presentist understandings, which assume they are reserved specifically for aliens or traitors.

concatenation of texts through time. Only when a previously existing discourse can be supposed, and when a responding discourse can be postulated can a text address a public” (90). That the CCJC, their lawyers and other supporters would be able to compose this memorandum as a response to at least the discourses mentioned above indicates that this redress document addresses publics in support of state measures to remove Japanese Canadians from British Columbia. The response to assimilation and national security discourses present in this document also demonstrate that the CCJC and others tied to the creation of the memorandum were part of an existent redress public, which responded to this discourse. This is a significant point as government bodies projected the support of “the public” as social totality, with respect to their measures. Publics clearly existed, however, that struggled against those measures and the state’s deployment of, for example, national security discourse.

It is significant that this memorandum addressing the House and the Senate makes very negligible reference to particularities of Japanese Canadian injuries, details, or experience. Instead, this document abstracts the situation out to mainly a level of national interest, one that draws in comparative references to other nations like the United States, Britain, Germany and Japan, as well as to other bodies of authority such as international law and the United Nations. It draws attention to implications for national policies on citizenship and the broad concepts of rights. For example, the introductory paragraph emphasizes that the Orders-in-Council are a “grave threat to the rights and liberties of Canadian citizens”. The memorandum ends with a statement linking the Orders-in-Council to Nazi totalitarianism.

State measures developed to control Japanese Canadians were targeted, specific and particular to this group. However, this document that addresses the very bodies responsible for that specific focus, abstracts these measures out to a realm of ‘common concern’. This abstraction brings to mind Habermas’ constitutive characteristics of the public sphere. Reason and rationality used in the public sphere have traditionally represented a threat to domination (Habermas 1991:35), where domination was thought to dissolve into “pure reason” (88). Following this line of a rational approach seems fitting in this instance, as deployed to resist and oppose the acts of domination referred to in this document. Warner emphasizes that “publics more overtly oriented in their self-understandings to the poetic-expressive dimensions of language [...] lack the power to transpose themselves to the generality of the state” (116). This statement acknowledges that it is desirable on some level to “transpose” particularity to a level of supposed state non-particularity.

In Habermas’ account, rational-critical debate in the public sphere was reserved for the non-particular, “the white, the middle class, the normal” (Warner 2002:167). Though the true subject of this memorandum is particular to Japanese Canadians, lawyers rationalistically emphasize the non-particular aspects of the issue, in order to make the subject relevant to the dominant public it addresses. Based on the information I have presented in these last two paragraphs, I note that redress discourse has three important characteristics. First, it places a primacy on rationalism. Second, it argues points by abstracting the particulars of Japanese Canadian experience out to a level of ‘common concern’. Finally, redress discourse requires Secondary Redress Public voice, such as

that of the CCJC and its lawyers, to represent and circulate redress discourse within dominant publics, on behalf of Japanese Canadians.

To elaborate on this last point, representation of voice (and corresponding lack of voice) was critical to redress discourse and the publics engaged in justice-making. A large portion of justice-making efforts exercised by Primary and Secondary Redress Publics involved bearing witness to the injustices of the past and present. Bearing witness involves the complex work of giving voice, managing interpretation, generating empathy, encouraging remembering and assuring prevention (Kurasawa 2007: 25). The lack of redress discourse that included direct Japanese Canadian voice, typical of this 1940s moment, is indicative of and intimately tied to the use of Secondary Redress Publics and their voice in justice-making.

Obasan symbolically represented this silence or lack of Japanese Canadian voice through the titular character Obasan. Obasan is the Japanese word for “aunt” and in the novel, she is the character that serves as a representation of the inner, deeply personal and unspoken experiences and effects of state measures on Japanese Canadians. Obasan is characterized for much of the novel as resolute in her silence, “her language remain[ing] deeply underground” (32), though her gestures, postures and expressions betray the memories and experiences contained within her. Moreover, it is only through the assumptions, imaginings and representations of Naomi, her niece (the narrator), related to Obasan’s silence, that the reader comes to understand this voicelessness.

This use of another’s voice to speak on behalf of the ‘voiceless’ is critical to understanding this first moment of redress. Whether considering the use of the niece’s representative voice for her Obasan or the CCJC’s representative voice for Japanese

Canadians, this giving of voice as part of bearing witness was crucial to the creation and circulation of redress discourse. I wish to make a cautionary note and point of clarification on this notion of silence or voicelessness however. One shortcoming of the use of representative voices is that this representation might further engrain assumptions that those being spoken for, in fact, have no voice. It might reinforce the notion that they are somehow themselves incapable of self-representation and that ‘others’ naturally and necessarily must speak on their behalf. This is false. In actuality, it was not that all Japanese Canadians were silent against the measures enacted against them. Since the moment restrictions began in the forms of relocation, internment, family separation and ‘repatriation’, one can find clear instances of Japanese Canadians speaking out (see Miki 2004 and Kobayashi and Miki 1991). What was blocked was not their voice or ability to speak, nor was it an incapacity to think rationally, but a blocking of the circulation of their voice in circuits of dominant discourse. Thus, ‘others’ who were able to freely create within and engage with fields of dominant discourse, formed key redress publics in this moment. These Secondary Redress Publics in this first moment, served the crucial role of introducing and indexing early redress discourses of struggle, domination and justice within the circulation of dominant public discourses.

3.3 Analysis: “To the Prime Minister of Canada, And Whom it May Concern:”

(Archival material, Thompson 1945a)

The Injustice

In 1945, Prime Minister King put Order-In-Council PC7355 to use to “repatriate” Japanese Canadians to Japan (Miki 2004:103; Miki and Kobayashi 1991: 46-47; Archival

material, Thompson 1945b). RCMP officials posted repatriation notices from the Department of Labour and distributed repatriation forms around the internment camps in order to have Japanese Canadians sent to Japan (Miki 2004: 101). Further to notices posted in “conspicuous places” regarding repatriation, the Commissioner of Japanese Placement, T.B. Pickersgill, would provide reminders to Japanese Canadians by form letter, of the positive effect taking advantage of “voluntary repatriation” would have. For example, in a letter dated March 28th, 1945, he writes: “This assured assistance from the Government, as outlined in the repatriation notice, will mean to many who desire repatriation, relief from unnecessary anxiety and it will allow them to plan for their future, and that of their children, along economic, social, and cultural lines which they fear may be denied them were they to remain in Canada” (Miki and Kobayashi 1991). In effect then, the Commissioner was making the choice to take advantage of the order appear to be a naturally obvious choice, lest they be denied a free and secure future in Canada.

The injustices of this repatriation plan were several. Firstly, this plan aimed to “repatriate” Canadian citizens to a foreign country; a country many Japanese Canadians had never seen. The Vancouver Consultative Council for Co-operation in Wartime Problems of Canadian Citizenship (hereafter referred to as the VCC) emphasized that the purpose of Bill 15, clause 3(g) would “make legally possible the revocation of citizenship and the deportation of Canadian citizens of Japanese origin” (Archival material, Thompson 1945b). Specifically, it would give the Governor-in-Council the power to “revoke the Canadian nationality of, and to deport, *any* resident of Canada” (Gomer-Sunahara 2001, my italics). Furthermore, the signed repatriation forms were later used as

“proof” of Japanese Canadian disloyalty to Canada without consideration of conditions under which these forms were ‘voluntarily’ signed or coercion used to garner signatures. An example would be the either/or scenario presented to Japanese Canadians – either go to Japan, as paid for by the government which included a living allowance and reimbursement from the sale of property, or face uncertainty in Canada (Miki 2004). This uncertainty would be exacerbated by the lack of information offered about the option to stay in Canada ‘east of the Rockies’. As an example, John Nihei wrote to Pickersgill in 1945 with questions about remaining in Canada. These questions included:

Do we have free choice of living space? Do we have any security after we move into the new place? Will our children have equal education? If you send us to the most anti-Japanese locality, if anything happens to me or my family, who’s going to be responsible? The government? Or are we just out of luck? (Miki & Kobayashi 1991: 48)

Pickersgill would respond to these questions by saying, “If you have those worries, sign it (the repatriation form), and your worries are all gone” (Miki & Kobayashi 1991: 48). Records show that 4,319 Japanese Canadians were ‘repatriated’ (Miki & Kobayashi 1991:47) before Prime Minister King rescinded the orders in the House of Commons on January 24, 1947 (Miki 2004: 111).

Justice-making for this Injustice

Several different groups and individuals would be involved in justice-making efforts in response to this injustice. Examples of these groups include the Japanese Canadian Committee for Democracy (Toronto-based group), the Vancouver Consultative Council for Co-operation in Wartime Problems of Canadian Citizenship (hereafter referred to as the VCC) (Vancouver-based) and the Cooperative Committee on Japanese

Canadians (hereafter referred to as the CCJC) (Toronto and Winnipeg offices) (Archival material, Thompson 1945-1948). Of these, I will focus on the CCJC.

Warner explains that groups differ from publics. Groups exist through membership; as long as there is membership, there exists a group. Publics on the other hand exist only by virtue of being addressed by discourse (87). Moreover, the discourse that addresses publics must continue to circulate and extend that circulation lest that public “dwindle to a group” (106). Though the CCJC was a group, their involvement in the circulation of redress discourse made them a formative part of a Secondary Redress Public by virtue of their efforts to generate and circulate redress discourse on behalf of Japanese Canadians during the 1940s.

The CCJC was a group formed in Toronto in 1943 (Fowke 1952:4) that would bear witness to several of the injustices facing Japanese Canadian during the forties. Their focus began primarily with the issue of finding employment for Japanese Canadians arriving in Toronto from the BC camps. However, their scope expanded to include redress for lost property as the result of internment and protesting the “repatriation” of Japanese Canadians to Japan. It is topical to note that when the CCJC petitioned against the repatriation plan, the government responded by informing the committee that it would have to “awaken the public to the seriousness of the situation before it could hope to move the government.” (Fowke 1954: 14). This statement attests to the lower status of a group versus that of a perceived public.

This statement also attests to the state strategically invoking “the public” as a social, homogeneous totality, that is unified in its disinterest in or opposition to rescinding the repatriation orders. According to Warner, when any public “is taken to be

‘the’ public, those limitations invisibly order the political world” (107). In this respect, the speaker of this statement has projected both his social location and his attitude of disinterest and/or opposition onto the notion of ‘the public’, thus ordering and characterizing the understanding of that social totality. Warner argues “the projection of a public is a new, creative, and distinctly modern mode of power” (108). This type of power was manifested through choosing political inaction based on a requisite of public support.

This section examines a letter written to the Prime Minister by the CCJC as redress material. Though it is undated, the CCJC would have written this letter circa 1945 when the repatriation orders began. This letter appears in a file of CCJC correspondence (particularly from Co-chairman Thelma Scambler), meeting minutes, and CCJC Bulletins (Archival material, Thompson 1945-1948).

This letter was a petition to the Prime Minister and like the memorandum presented earlier in the chapter, employed a list format. Lists are present in this joint petition letter in both paragraph and bullet form. Listing in paragraph form was reserved for the presentation of information attesting to the strong record of Canadian citizenship Japanese Canadians possessed. Bullet form was used to list references to government action. Listing information differently by paragraph or bullet form guides the reader to different types of information in different ways. Bullet-form listing of government actions is succinct and gives the impression that these points are given or indisputable. The paragraphed sentences however emphasize discursive points that are disputable and require clarification.

Two letters appear in this copy and they would presumably have been sent together. The first was written in the voice of persons “born in Canada and naturalized Canadians of Japanese origin” and the second was written in the voice of the children of Japanese Canadians, on behalf of their parents. Taken together, these two letters represent both generations of Japanese Canadians in Canada at the time - *issei* (first generation) and *nisei* (second generation) respectively.

Much like the 1946 memorandum presented previously, these lists are responding to a discourse of assimilation. The lists counter this discourse indirectly by enumerating traits and behaviours that were aligned with norms of good Canadian citizenship. Adherence to these norms were indirectly demonstrated by affirming “intention and readiness to fulfill duties and responsibilities”, to “have children well educated after Canadian standards”, to “appreciate highly the democratic way of life” and by reminding that Japanese Canadians had “given most of their lives ... upwards of 40 years... in assisting in the building of the basic industries in BC (lumbering, fishing, and farming)”.

The letter directly addresses assimilation discourse through following statement:

whereas our parents as a group have shown characteristics common to immigrant groups of other races, clannishness, lack of facility in the use of the English language, failure to appreciate the customs and habits of the Canadian people and an anxiety to succeed in the economic sense...

This statement also demonstrates the purposeful overshadowing of the voice of the *Issei* or the “naturalized Canadians of Japanese origin” by the voice of the *Nisei* or, those “born in Canada”. The letter strategically reproduces assimilation discourse by admitting to the lower or lesser citizenship status of the *Issei* through their inability and unwillingness to assimilate appropriately.

Whereas the memorandum previously examined emphasized rationalist discourse through fact-stating and focusing on points of common Canadian concern, on the surface these letters offer a more particular view of the repatriation issue; they offer a view particular to Japanese Canadians rather than Canadians in general. Despite the particularity present in these letters however, they leave the official discourse of assimilation intact, which was understood to be for the good of the nation and thus, was of common concern. Rationalism is therefore maintained in these letters, through the listing of those points, which support and reinforce assimilation discourse. Moreover, the list-form itself, as one that is organized, summarized and presumably presenting only the most crucial points in some prioritized fashion, renders personal details in a rationalist form.

3.4 Analysis: “What About the Japanese Canadians?”

(Norman 1945)

The Injustice

What About the Japanese Canadians? (Norman 1945) is a 31 page pamphlet located in the digital archives of the University of Saskatchewan⁸. At the time of the printing of this 10c pamphlet, internment continued and the repatriation efforts previously discussed were underway. In addition, the introduction to this pamphlet highlights how

8

http://www.usask.ca/diefenbaker/galleries/virtual_exhibit/bill_of_rights/docs/what_about_a_japanese_canadians.pdf

the federal government's treatment of Japanese Canadians had been related by some to the Nazism that had unfolded in Germany (6). The author, Howard Norman, writes:

We have stumbled, maybe unwittingly, the first step towards Nazism. The fact that we have not allowed the Japanese to starve, that we have given them excellent medical attention... does not alter the danger of the principle we have established: Canadian citizens by law can be deprived of certain legal rights on the grounds of race. This is one of the cardinal points of Nazism. The guarantee that we do not take the second step is the redress of injustices we have committed against them, and the restoration of their rights as citizens. (6)

This statement is another example of redress discourse abstracting particular issues to one of common concern – Nazism. In this light, failure to redress Japanese Canadians threatened to subject the Canadian state to comparison with Nazi totalitarianism. In response this time to racist discourse, attributed directly to Nazism in the above quotation, the pamphlet proceeds by showcasing common racist beliefs, understood to be held by 'white' Canadians, about Japanese Canadians. It then counters this racist discourse by de-emphasizing and diluting Japanese Canadian particularity through statements on how they are 'like us'.

Rationalizing Redress for this Injustice

Howard Norman is another member of a Secondary Redress Public who would bear witness to the injustices facing Japanese Canadians. Among other efforts, he would produce this pamphlet for distribution in Vancouver, with the help of the Vancouver Consultative Council for Co-operation in Wartime Problems of Citizenship (hereafter referred to as the VCC). Norman authored this pamphlet in response to the racist treatment of Japanese Canadians that had been occurring since 1942. Of particular interest, the pamphlet would also be distributed in Toronto by the Cooperative Council on

Japanese Canadians, in their efforts to put an end to the repatriation issue (Fowke 1952). Howard Norman, was a Minister of St. George United Church in Vancouver and was described in the Foreword to this pamphlet as having resided for many years in Japan, as someone who spoke the language fluently and as someone who was “qualified to discuss our Japanese problem with the authority of an expert” (3).

The pamphlet lists 31 commonly held racist misconceptions about Japanese Canadians as people, the situation of their internment and so on, followed by a corrective response. These 31 list points were divided into six categories of racist misconception including: “Background”, “Assimilation and Dual Citizenship”, “Economic and Social Aspects”, “Military Conditions”, “The Japanese-Canadians Since 1941”, and “International and Commercial Aspects”. The entire pamphlet follows this listing form of racist statement followed by corrective response.

For example, point #10 lists the common statement that “The Japanese Cannot Be Assimilated” (see Appendix B). Though the intention of the response was well-meaning given the context of the pamphlet, this author fails to critically assess assimilation discourse, like the authors of the letters to the Prime Minister. Thus, assimilation discourse remains intact within a public of redress discourse. The first paragraph of the clarifying response emphasizes the assimilability of Japanese Canadians and the already successful assimilation of the children. The second paragraph underscores that assimilation is a two-way process, through both the person to be assimilated and the “community which assimilates him”; it is noted that it is frequently the fault of the latter when assimilation fails (11).

The intended audience of this pamphlet is ignorant and racist ‘whites’, noted by the inclusive voice which uses the term “we” to include the author and reader. This was noted by the statement “We whites run this country” (13). As an indicator of the ignorant and/or racist characteristic being addressed, the tone of this pamphlet is highly critical, if not sarcastic in parts. This tone was noted especially in response to the racist statement/belief #24 (see Appendix C) that “we housed them well, built hospitals for them, paid their dependents relief, and educated their children” (19). The response to this statement is as follows: “If housing two families that did not know each other before, in tarpaper houses, eighteen feet by twenty-four, is good housing, we did. (This has happened in many cases.) Making dependents of our most industrious racial minority is not a praiseworthy performance” (19).

Norman accompanies this critical tone with an overall tone of support for and protection of Japanese Canadians. Statements such as “much of the dislike of Orientals in British Columbia is synthetic; it is whipped up by political rabble-rousers or less reputable publicists” (15-16 – See Appendix 15-16) or “children have been the greatest sufferers” (19) are examples of this. It is important to note however that the latter of those two statements refers to the children suffering as the result of being exposed to a “maximum of Japanese family influence, and a minimum of contacts with whites, especially white children” (19). Thus, a benevolent assumption that it would be best for Japanese Canadians to become as much like ‘white’ Canadians as possible flavours these supportive redress efforts at this time. Though present-day redress discourse does not consider these efforts to be redress, we should not dismiss them as they, and others like them, were the important justice-making efforts, rooted within their space and time.

The practice of listing in this pamphlet addresses readers personally using the intimate ‘you’, through statements such as “it is up to you and all good Canadians” (22), “let the candidates in your riding” (27), and “you want a square deal for all Japanese Canadians” (27) (see Appendix E). However, in reality, Norman composed the pamphlet to a completely imagined audience of strangers. As he could not know strangers’ views and interpretation of the material in advance, he would have worked to present information as clearly and concisely as possible; to encapsulate the discourse so that the audience interprets its meaning as closely as possible to how it was intended (Warner 2002: 122). Warner notes that “strangers are less strange if you can trust them to read as you read or if the sense of what they say can be fully abstracted by how they say it” (116). A list is a unique textual form that concisely communicates information in a manner that is presumably synthesized down to the most relevant, factual and important information. Lists are then perhaps the best-suited form of written communication with which to generate redress publics. The simple presentation and format of lists, as well as the reader’s expectation of that simplicity, can control the variations of interpretive possibility.

Since there is no Japanese Canadian voice for redress contained within the pages of this pamphlet, the author’s voice becomes representative. This voice is both supportive and paternalistic. The pamphlet emphasizes the powerlessness and voicelessness of a people, leaving the reader with the impression that Japanese Canadians require being spoken for and protected. This artefact of rationalist discourse used for justice-making mobilized representative voice to disrupt racist discourse present at the time of this pamphlet’s publication. Listing in this pamphlet thus offers a ‘pre-digested’

statement and response ‘conversation’ between dominant publics and redress publics. When the representative voice of a redress public dually comes from a member of a dominant public, it could have the effect of facilitating and speeding up the process of rationalizing redress in the minds of others.

3.5 Conclusions of this Analysis

The analysis presented in this chapter yielded an understanding of redress discourse, which addressed, to varying degrees, discourses of assimilation, race and national security. Of these three, race and assimilation discourses were most salient in the materials examined. One goal of the publics circulating redress discourse was to overcome and replace these dominant discourses. I demonstrated in the analysis of *“What About Japanese Canadians?”* that redress discourse challenged the basis of racist discourse. Anti-racist discourse circulated at this time in response to Nazism. This would have facilitated the work of Redress Publics. In contrast, the materials examined showed that Secondary Redress Publics left assimilation discourse intact. They failed to question the logic or foundation of this discourse. In other words, redress publics never questioned or criticized assimilation itself, rather, they attacked the assumption that Japanese Canadians were unable to assimilate into Canadian society. As such, redress publics themselves actually served as conduits for the circulation and further entrenching of a dominant discourse of assimilation. Redress Publics would address and counter official assimilationist discourse and its dominant public, while maintaining a curious adherence to it in this moment.

Secondary Redress Publics, the concerned ‘others’ who were involved in Japanese Canadian justice-making, served as the representative voice of Japanese Canadians in justice-making efforts. They responded to injustice by appealing to a rationalist public discourse. Secondary Redress Publics accomplished this by erasing the specificity of Japanese Canadian identity and their experiences of injustice from redress discourse and by generating redress discourse that listed injustices and their remedies at a level of national or international relevance.

However, behind the scenes of these rationalistically presented and highly abstracted lists were personal interactions and sufferings, and the sharing of stories, experiences and emotion. These ‘personal’ elements of justice-making, including the meaningful connections formed between Primary and Secondary Redress Publics through the intersubjective work of listing, may have been assumed but this was not represented in the material. Instead, the personal elements of justice-making remained “the invisible work that lies below the waterline” (Law 2005), so to speak. Although “*What About Japanese Canadians?*” represented some of this personal and interactive work of justice-making, it maintained assimilationist discourse that favoured de-particularizing Japanese Canadian particularity.

I argued that listing was an important means of presenting information in a way that controls how its receivers would interpret that information. Lists encapsulate information in succinct and direct format, able to make a complex situation into an ‘easy read’. They guide the reader’s attention to only those points listed and away from considering their opinion of Japanese Canadians, prejudiced or otherwise. The lists of this moment were tools enabling a rationalist and objective presentation of a situation,

which the dominant public could have easily dismissed as not of common or national concern.

Finally, I find that redress material examined in this moment complicates Warner's (2002) criteria of counterpublics. As explained in the previous chapter, Warner identifies counterpublics by their contention with the norms and discourses of dominant publics. Redress material examined in this moment certainly fits this criterion. This is especially true when examined from the perspective of Primary Redress Publics. From this perspective, Primary Redress Publics suffering the unjust actions of the federal government were in contention with the norms and discourses of dominant publics. As was shown in this analysis, one major point of contention between dominant publics and Primary Redress Publics was the perception that Japanese Canadians would not be able to fit into the norms ascribed by assimilation discourse. They were considered indelibly marked by racial embodiment and therefore, at odds with the normal image of Canadian citizenship.

However, if examined from the perspective of Secondary Redress Publics circulating redress materials within spheres of dominant discourse, we can no longer consider Warner's criteria of being in contention with dominant publics so straightforwardly. Secondary Redress Publics, if understood as largely constituted by white, Christian Canadians (as they were in the materials examined for this analysis), were constituted at least partially by members of dominant publics. They would have been included within the imagined audience generated when invoking "the public" as a homogeneous Canadian totality.

Further, I offer three more of Warner's counterpublic characteristics that the representative voice of Secondary Redress Publics dilutes or nullifies:

- **“Many counterpublics lack the power to transpose themselves to a generality of the state” (116).**

This analysis has shown, particularly through the analysis of the memorandum first included, that Secondary Redress Publics speaking for Primary Redress Publics accomplished raising Japanese Canadian issues to the generality of state. By way of appealing to violations of International Law and the rights and liberties of citizens, the memorandum to the House and the Senate transposes the ‘repatriation’ of Japanese Canadians to the generality of the legal and political rights of citizens.

- **“[A counterpublic’s] discourse in other contexts would be regarded with hostility” (119).**

Redress discourse circulated by Secondary Redress Publics can, at minimum, dilute hostility. In the materials analyzed, Secondary Redress Publics mediated and integrated redress discourse and the dominant discourse of assimilation. The goal of Secondary Redress Publics appears to have been to abstract redress discourse to the generality of citizenship (as in the memorandum) while asserting the ability of Japanese Canadians to assimilate into Canadian society (through the letter and the pamphlet). These two points evidence an overall redress agenda to erase the specificity of Japanese Canadians in the minds of “the public”. This attempted erasure of Japanese Canadian specificity coupled with the messages circulating in the public sphere by people who were otherwise members of

dominant publics would help to mitigate hostilities that could have arisen in response to redress discourse.

- **“Ordinary people’ are presumed not to want to be present for this kind of talk – you know in advance people will be unwilling...” (119).**

The very power of Secondary Redress Publics seems to rest in the fact that they can be categorized or generalized as “ordinary people”. I understand “ordinary people” in this statement to be synonymous with notions of the majority or ‘the public’. However, we have also seen that liberal ideology roots this ordinariness in a specific preference for homogeneity. This homogeneity is a disengagement from ‘personal’ concerns, a preference for non-particularity, “the white, the male, the middle class, the normal” (Warner 2002), or what Brodie (1996) calls the Ordinary Canadian who seeks no special status or treatment from the state (394). As circulators of redress discourse, Howard Norman, the VCC and the CCJC, largely met some or all of the criteria of inclusion into this realm of the ordinary.

Therefore, I argue that redress publics were publics in this first moment, rather than counterpublics, despite the contentious nature of the issues involved. I find that further consideration should be given to Warner’s counterpublics vis à vis representative voice (i.e. those speaking for a group). His development of counterpublics appears only to consider discursive Primary Counterpublics whose identity is central to the contentious relationship with dominant publics.

However, my analysis highlights that we cannot solely consider publics and counterpublics from one perspective or angle. Had I analyzed material generated and

circulated predominantly by Primary Redress Publics, the counterpublic criteria would have more directly applied. This section would have been about Primary Redress *Counterpublics*. However, Secondary Redress Publics were the primary generators and circulators of the materials analyzed for this chapter's analysis. Redress discourse thus diverted public attention from the specificity of Japanese Canadian racial identity towards general violations of citizenship. This discourse deflected contention and hostility based on racial identity by emphasizing ordinariness and generalities. In this moment, redress discourse included the use of representative voice, a rationalist presentation of redress discourse and the continued maintenance and circulation of dominant assimilation discourse.

Chapter 4: Making Redress Publics of Subjectivist Discourse

The previous analysis chapter examined lists advanced in redress materials which were used to shape and manage a rationalistic redress discourse in the early moment of redress. The publics generated by and circulating this discourse were examined in order to gain an understanding of how publics are involved in acts of setting right. I argued that redress publics in this early moment were publics, rather than counterpublics. I found that this was especially the case when viewed from the justice-making work of Secondary Redress Publics involved in generating and circulating redress materials. I argued, furthermore, that Secondary Redress Publics, speaking for Japanese Canadians, had the unique ability to introduce and index redress discourse within the realm of dominant discourse.

Secondary Redress Publics would present redress discourse in rationalist fashion by abstracting the particularity of Japanese Canadian experience, culture and injustice to a more generalized discussion of violations of citizenship. Secondary Redress Publics, as understood through the redress materials analyzed, further obscured the racial, cultural and experiential particularity of Japanese Canadians by attesting to their assimilability. Redress discourse in this early moment was, therefore, characterized by a rationalist non-particularity and attempted objectivity that enabled, circulated and maintained a discourse of assimilation. We can furthermore understand justice-making in this first moment to have been concerned, not only with ceasing the repatriation orders, but with proving that the dilution of Japanese Canadian specificity was possible, contrary to the discourse of assimilation circulating at the time.

The present chapter, “Scrapbook of Redress Discourse: Primary Redress Publics Personalizing Redress” articulates my analysis of lists present in redress materials of this second moment. I present the second list from *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981) below which will serve as the placeholder for the characteristics most typical of redress discourse in this 1980s moment. Of these characteristics, I noted that lists examined in this second moment of redress no longer fit the rationalist list form where, for example, points are solely listed numerically or in some logical sequence. Rather, that rationalist form of listing emerges in this moment’s redress materials as one piece, among others, in a collage⁹ of particular, personal and affective details. In this moment, the lists offer

⁹ I use the term “collage” based on one list I came across in my research, situated in a 1987 Montreal publication entitled *Tribune Juive Magazine d’actualité culturelle*. This “collage” presents four pages of quotations extracted from interviews with Japanese Canadians. Though the magazine labels it a collage, I consider this to be a **subjective list** of Japanese Canadian voices. Perhaps this points to a general assumption of the list form, where a ‘list’ connotes factual content in rationalist language presented as

firsthand accounts of injustice rather than an abstraction of it to a universal arena of understanding. I therefore examine a shift from Secondary Redress Publics to Primary Redress Publics generating and circulating these new additions to redress discourse.

This chapter then analyzes a letter to the Prime Minister entitled “Dear Mr. Mulroney” and a redress campaign brief titled “Justice In Our Time: Redress for Japanese Canadians” for how they demonstrate bearing witness and what this means for our understanding of the public at this time. As stated in the previous chapter, it is important to keep in mind that the division between these two moments does not imply that one moment was strictly rationalist and the next strictly personal or affective, rather that there was a shift in the perception of acceptable grounds for appeal and the publics communicating these grounds.

In this moment, listing supplemented with images and testimonies prove to be a simple, highly productive and effective way of indexing particularity and subjectivity into public discourse. In the previous chapter, I advanced the list as a textual form that supported a rational and logical framework for succinctly communicating complex information. In this chapter, through examining the inclusion of non-rational, personal or affective information to the lists, the use of lists as a dominant textual form of communication was further solidified in its importance. Listing continued to manage interpretive possibilities, even in communicating personal content, thought to be highly open to interpretation.

unquestionable. Conversely, the collage as a form might connote expressive or affective content in subjectivist language that is open to interpretation. Due to the structure and scope of the project, I decided not to include this list in this chapter’s analysis. I have instead included the first two pages of this list as Appendix F for consideration.

This chapter describes moreover how publicity was a key enabler of the emergence of a subjectivist redress discourse in this second moment. Redress discourse during this time, as developed and circulated by Primary Redress Publics, would circulate within the “punctuality of the headline” (Warner 2008). This was directly enabled, I argue, by the publicizing of the simple, abbreviated and organized form of the list.

4.1 SCRAPBOOK OF REDRESS DISCOURSE: Primary Redress Publics

Subjectivizing Redress

In this chapter, the titular reference to a scrapbook is the general frame in which I will communicate key characteristics of this second moment of redress. A scrapbook is a “book of blank pages for sticking cuttings, drawings, or pictures in” (OED 2008). The purpose underlying the scrapbook is of course to preserve memories in order to be able to revisit and share those things that were once thought important. Scrapbooks are most provocative after they have been weathered with time and semi- or completely forgotten. Their power is in the potential they offer for rediscovery. The scrapbook is also a direct reference however, to pages 41 and 42 in *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981). This passage will serve as a placeholder that characterizes the lists in and publics of this second moment of redress (see Appendix G for original appearance in the novel).

In the brief passage reproduced below, Naomi, the narrator and protagonist of *Obasan*, describes the items she is viewing in an old scrapbook, handed to her by her Aunt Emily. Attesting to the historical and non-fictional information interlaced within the fictional narrative of *Obasan*, Kogawa based the contents of Aunt Emily’s manuscript and scrapbook, referred to in the passage below, on the personal writings of Muriel

Kitagawa (Harris 1990) published in *This is My Own: Letters to Wes and other Writings on Japanese Canadians 1941-1948* (Kitagawa and Miki 1985). The proceeding passage brings Primary Redress Publics to the foreground, or those publics formed by the subjects of the injustices to be redressed. These two pages in *Obasan* present a list of newspaper headlines and offer insight into how Japanese Canadians were active in their own justice-making.

Excerpt from *Obasan*, pp. 41-42 reads:

Before I could finish more than a few pages of her manuscript she handed me an old scrapbook full of brown and brittle clippings. The headlines crackled as I read them aloud.

“Bar Japs from B.C.”

“Claim Deportation of Japs Violates International Law.”
Some of the statements were underlined in faded blue-black ink.

“June 21, 1944. It seems highly disturbing that without debate and with agreement by all parties, the House of Commons adopted a clause in the new bill dealing with elections which will disenfranchise men and women of Canadian birth. This Bill 135....No other democratic country has such legislation....”

Words of Stanley Knowles (CCF Winnipeg North Centre) were circled.

“What is at stake here today is not so much the rights of Japanese Canadians who have moved from B.C. to other parts of Canada, but rather the basic concept of democracy and our belief as a nation so far as our belief in the franchise is concerned”

Mackenzie King’s words were also marked.

“...There would have been riots at the polls at the time of the election when any of those Japanese presented themselves for that purpose [to vote] and certainly it was taking the part of wisdom to see that nothing of the kind should take place...”.

The thin wafers of paper were fragile with old angers. Crimes of history, I thought to myself, can stay in history. What we need is to concern ourselves with injustices of today.

[....]

If Aunt Emily with her billions of letters and articles and speeches, her tears and her rage, her friends and her committees – if all that couldn't bring contentment, what was the point?

This passage is rich with information relevant to both the 1940s and 1980s moments of justice-making. The discussion that follows focuses firstly, on the symbolic relationships feeding this passage and secondly, on the way that the past is presented in this list, in both the previous moment's rationalist address and in this moment's subjectivist address.

Two of the novel's characters are present in the above passage: Aunt Emily, Obasan's sister and Naomi (the narrator and niece of Obasan and Aunt Emily). Whereas in the previous chapter I described Obasan as representative of voicelessness and how the reader came to understand Obasan's silence through the voice of Naomi, Aunt Emily is representative of being vocal and of activist voice; Aunt Emily's character needs no representation. The contrast between the two aunts is described by Naomi as "one [who] lives in sound, the other in stone. Obasan's language remains deeply underground but Aunt Emily, BA, MA, is a word warrior. She's a crusader, a little old grey-haired Mighty Mouse, a Bachelor of Advanced Activists and General Practitioner of Just Causes" (32).

Aunt Emily is the vehicle through which the reader is directly introduced to and educated on Japanese Canadian history and justice-making. It is Aunt Emily's scrapbook of "brown and brittle clippings" that we sift through with Naomi. Through Aunt Emily, we are made aware of Primary Redress Public effort that had taken place over decades: "All of her life, it seemed to me, Aunt Emily toiled to tell of the lives of the *Nisei* in Canada in her effort to make familiar, to make knowable, the treacherous yellow peril

that lived in the minds of the racially prejudiced” (40). Though the redress materials examined in the first moment lacked direct Japanese Canadian voice, this passage emphasizes the existence of Primary Redress Publics responding to racist discourse all along.

Aunt Emily’s scrapbook, originally compiled to chronicle injustice, is now her way of educating her niece on the range of injustices suffered; a justice-making torch she hands down to the next generation so to speak. Through the five old headlines listed by Naomi, the scrapbook makes known that Japanese Canadians faced deportation (through headline #1), disenfranchisement (through headlines #3, #4, and #5) and hate (through headlines #1 and #5).

Aunt Emily’s vociferous and passionate characterization, her dedicated practice of compiling information for the sake of justice-making and the sharing of her scrapbook are however met with Naomi’s seemingly dismissive and devaluing attitude towards justice-making as evidenced by the statements: “Crimes of history, I thought to myself, can stay in history. What we need to is to concern ourselves with injustices of today” and “...what was the point?”. I visualize this indifference as the blank, white pages of the scrapbook that have not yet actively gathered memories. With respect to justice-making, whereas Obasan represents silence and Aunt Emily represents vocal activism, indifference and repressed memory are characteristic of Naomi’s character. This indifference and forgetting are symbolic of liberal indifference to the particularities of justice, especially as it pertains to the past. Freeman (2008) argues that natural-law, in which the concept of human rights is usually located, “ignores or at best marginalizes historical injustices” and “fails to take historical injustice seriously” (47). Generally, in

this understanding priority is given to a more just future than to reconciling the past. Specifically, some argue that “difference-blind liberalism suffers from an amnesia that overlooks crimes of the past in designing social policies for the present” (53).

If we consider Naomi’s character in light of the analysis of Secondary Redress Publics in the previous chapter, we now have a better idea of the incredibly nuanced composition of redress publics. Japanese Canadians were not all ‘naturally’ in support of redress. Rather, many were neutral or opposed to redress for various reasons (Miki 2004). This neutrality or indifference was typically attributed to an attitude of caution “against ‘rocking the boat’” (Kogawa 1981: 35). Naomi voices the preference of hiding, with “eyes downcast as we seek the safety of invisibility” (32). Likewise, non-Japanese Canadians were not all indifferent or opposed to redress. Many had maintained unwavering support and active involvement in justice-making over the years which I elaborated on in the previous chapter.

Besides the symbolic relationships feeding this passage, the juxtaposition of the rationalist address characteristic of the first moment with the narrator’s subjectivist address offers specific insight into differences between redress discourse of the 1940s and the 1980s. We see this contrast through the 1940s headlines buttressed by the current (1970s) voice of Naomi. The novel thus represents the past both rationally and subjectively, displaying both reason and emotion. This dual representation of the past is another characteristic element of redress discourse in this second moment and part of justice-making work in which redress publics were engaged.

The 1940s newspaper headlines Naomi reads from the scrapbook are a reminder of the rationalistic redress discourse created in and circulating during the first moment.

Each of the newspaper headlines (with the exception of the first one), appeal to rationalism by erasing the specificity of Japanese Canadian plight in order to abstract the injustices out to a level of common, national, international or seemingly universal concern. As was similarly pointed out in the memorandum of the previous chapter, this list of headlines refers to international law or legal authority, to rights of citizenship, to other democratic countries, and most saliently, point #4 which blatantly states “what is at stake here is not so much the rights of Japanese Canadians...but rather the basic concept of democracy...”.

Following the list of past headlines presented by Aunt Emily’s old scrapbook, is another short list presented by Naomi. This is a list of Aunt Emily’s justice-making effort that is personal and particular: “Aunt Emily with her billions of letters and articles and speeches, her tears and her rage, her friends and her committees...” (42). Had the list of headlines retrieved from Aunt Emily’s scrapbook not been supplemented by Naomi’s view of her Aunt, the reader would be left with a detached sense of injustices beyond the context of Japanese Canadian experience. However, through Naomi describing the memories she had of her aunt’s political activity, we can begin to know the subjective and affective elements of Primary Redress Public justice-making.

This list is a mishmash of actions, interactions and sentiments - a representation of the overwhelming piling-up of the past that has taken place since the years of internment. This mountainous pile of remnants of the past was also vital to redress discourse in this second moment that especially required listing. How better to manage, sort, prioritize, recall and divvy disparate and fragmented multitudes of information and experience than by the practice of listing?

Whereas the particularity of Japanese Canadian firsthand accounts were omitted from the “brown and brittle clippings”, the “thin wafers of paper [that were] fragile with old angers”, Naomi’s listing of Aunt Emily’s efforts is rich with personality, emotion and action that represents, in particular, the hard justice-making work of Japanese Canadians themselves. The use of stark adjectives describing the newspaper clippings reinforces the ‘spirit’ that is missing in the rationalist presentation of injustices of the past.

This ‘spiritless’ form of writing is part of a language ideology that “enables the public sphere”, and causes the “poetic or creative function of public address [to] disappear from view”, says Warner (146). He moreover points out that the common assumption for public language is that “clear style results in a popular audience and that political engagement requires having the most extensive audience possible” (137). Thus appealing to rationality is assumed to be a discourse’s political necessity. However, Kurasawa (2008) asserts that firsthand accounts of a particular injustice must describe the socio-historical specificity of its causes and consequences, while at the same time gesturing to its universal significance and impact” (39). This double-sided approach is a key difference between the first and second moments. Whereas the first moment focused almost entirely on the ‘universal significance and impact’, this second moment brings in the voice of firsthand account. *Obasan* asserts and attests to the importance of tempering and balancing rationalist justice-making discourse, used to gain an extensive audience, with the subjective and affective discourse of experience.

The form language takes will inspire different ways of imagining a public (Warner 2006:142). Through *Obasan* (1981), and the analysis that follows, a different imagining of a public is being called into view; one which simultaneously mobilizes

rationalism and subjectivism¹⁰. Whereas listing in redress discourse appealed to rationality in the first moment, listing in the second moment appealed to both rationality and empathy. Lists appealing to rationality employed clear and concise points to render information accessible by most and to control interpretive possibilities on the receiving end. Lists appealing to both rationality and empathy however, served to manage maintained a control over the reception of that discourse on two levels, not only managing the interpretive possibilities, but also appealing to the emotional responses of the dominant public in order to personalize redress enabling the possibility of fostering “empathy against indifference” (Kurasawa 2008:25).

“Interpretive peril”, as Kurasawa (2008) calls it, threatens particularly through “Western news media’s tendency to oversimplify [injustice] in order to gain an audience and keep its attention” (37). To circumvent the interpretive peril of news media’s tendency towards oversimplification, it is in the best interests of redress discourse to abbreviate itself; better that the information become oversimplified by those it concerns than by reporters, in other words. Warner points out that “the more punctual and abbreviated the circulation and the more discourse indexes the punctuality of its own

¹⁰ I recall the 1946 Memorandum from *Obasan*, introduced in the previous chapter here as an added example. Although I included the memorandum in the previous chapter for its relevance to the first moment, it is equally as relevant to this chapter. The memorandum, as originally circulated in the first moment, employed rationalist discourse in justice-making effort. What the memorandum presents is a list of factually stated injustices, written in rationalist discourse that abstracts Japanese Canadian particularity to a level of universal concern. In the second moment however, this list is repurposed as the final pages of a novel. Whereas the memorandum of the first moment anticipates a very specific audience (members of the House and Senate), the memorandum in this second moment now anticipates a much wider and more generalized readership – the realization of a greater redress public. The novel envelops the non-particular discourse of the list with the particularity of Japanese Canadian subjectivity; a succinctly presented, rationalist listing of Japanese Canadian injustice written in the words of members of a dominant public (adding to the air of objectivity), embedded within a deeply intimate and personal account of sufferings in the words of a Japanese Canadian, as an epilogue. As an epilogue, and in light of the justice-making effort highlighted in the personal accounts of the book, I find that the story concludes with a strong underscoring of the length of time and amount of effort that both Primary and Secondary Redress Publics had invested in justice-making.

circulation, the closer a public stands to politics” (96). He notes the difference in punctuality between the headline and the archive as examples. The process of listing and the resultant lists thus assists, enables and encourages redress discourse to operate within the temporality of the headline, thereby fostering media saliency, a sense of urgency and rooting it in currently unfolding social relevance.

4.2 Analysis: “Dear Mr. Mulroney”

(Archival material, Miki 1987)

The Injustice

With the injustices of the forties so long in the past, the injustice of the early to mid-eighties was the government’s refusal to negotiate with the NAJC in developing a redress settlement. Before the Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement was signed in September 1988, the NAJC, chosen to represent Japanese Canadians in redress (JCA 2005a), would attempt negotiations with five consecutive ministers (Miki 2004: 320). One of the key points of contention was the government’s insistence in offering a group payment as settlement, rather than recognizing the rights of individual Japanese Canadians (Miki 2004:296). For example, Jack Murta, the Conservative Minister in the Multiculturalism Directorate, would stand firmly by an offer to fund a “national, government-controlled foundation ‘in the name of Japanese Canadians’ to combat racism in Canada” and would deny the opportunity to negotiate the recognition of individuals (Miki 2004: 153).

Personalizing Redress for this Injustice

This section examines a letter written to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney as redress material (see Appendix H). It was written by NAJC president Arthur Miki and is dated 12 July 1987, just over one year before the settlement would be reached. The letter appears in a Fonds collection of Roger Obata who was a long time activist for the civil rights of Japanese Canadians, from the forties through the eighties (JCA 2005b). Relevant to this section, he provided guidance and informed opinion to President Arthur Miki during the redress campaign, as evidenced by letters to Miki written in response to statements from the Prime Minister's office (Obata Fonds 1942-2000).

This is a two-page letter written directly to the Prime Minister, with the Minister of State for Multiculturalism, Hon. David Crombie, copied. Attached to this two page letter are two newspaper articles. The first is titled "Compensate internees for unfair treatment, Mulroney urges PM" (Cleroux 1984 – see Appendix I) and the second is titled "Still hurting after all these years" (French 1987 – see Appendix J). This section will proceed by first analyzing the letter. Analysis of the letter will highlight the shift in authority that took place between the first and second moments examined; in this second moment, Primary Redress Publics were published and publicized as authorities on the matter of their injustice. Analysis will also demonstrate how redress publics continued to address assimilation discourse, though by this moment the address has changed. The article "Still hurting after all these years" attached to the letter will then be examined with particular emphasis placed on how mainstream news media was reporting on deeply personal aspects of injustice and redress efforts during this time.

The Letter

This letter to Prime Minister Mulroney lists information in numbered paragraph form (i.e. the beginning of each paragraph begins with the numeration “first”, “second” and so on). In the previous letter examined from 1945, the actions of government were downplayed in favour of enumerating the ways that Japanese Canadians were able to assimilate and were in fact, good citizens. In contrast, the actions of government are called to account in this second letter, by placing their shortcomings, failures and refusals at the forefront. Moreover, this letter maintains the earlier rationalist approach to justice-making by listing violations of rights common to all Canadian citizens. Miki lists, for example, “important issues regarding the War Measures Act, the Constitution and measures to prevent a recurrence”, in point #1. In point #2 he references loss of civil liberties. Finally, in the last paragraph of the letter, Miki calls on Prime Minister Mulroney to exhibit “international leadership” by linking redress to the “advancement of human rights” (p.2).

The letter’s rationalist points and presentation are, however, different from the letter of 1945 by way of both the authority that the letter exhibits and the subjectivist discourse included. In terms of authority, the letter exhibits the emergence of the NAJC as the authority on Japanese Canadian redress issues, part of a Primary Redress Public. The 1945 letter analyzed in the previous chapter and written by members of a Secondary Redress Public in the voice of “Canadian-born and naturalized citizens of Japanese origin”, is apparently passive, respectful and humble. One could hardly call the tone of that early letter authoritative. This letter, in contrast, has a tone of authority, confidence and strength that I noted especially through the use of action words contained within the

letter such as, “we continue to insist”, “we must question”, “we have stated publicly”, “we wish to point out”, “we now ask you”, and “we call upon you”.

The repeated use of “we” in this letter also calls attention to the new inclusion of subjectivist discourse in this moment; the “we” (meaning a Primary Redress Public) referred to in the 1940s is different than the “we” in the 1980s. I argue, by way of the analysis presented in the previous chapter, that rationalist and assimilationist discourse shaped the “we” referred to in the redress discourse of the first moment. It is the “we” of a generalized and impersonalized mass whose citizenship and identity were assumed firstly by the marks of their embodiment. In this second moment the “we” is paradoxically an individualized, particular and personal “we”, developed by Primary Redress Publics who were assembled for justice over (now historical) violations of citizenship rights.

I noted the introduction of subjectivist discourse into justice-making effort through Miki’s use of personalizing and individualizing emphases in this letter. Firstly, Miki personalizes the letter by addressing it to “Mr. Mulroney” rather than to “Prime Minister Mulroney” or by the use of some other honorific. This use of “Mr.” appeals to Mulroney as an individual, rather than to his political station. Miki moreover, requests that Mulroney “intervene personally, to meet directly with [them] as soon as possible for frank discussion of ways and means of breaking this deadlock” (p.2). This request for personal intervention is another testament to the personalizing of redress, or the minimization of distance between Japanese Canadians and the federal government. Next, in contrast to the 1945 letter to Prime Minister King, this letter is written by an individual holding a prominent title within his community. I point this out because an

individual is addressing the Prime Minister – a far more personal request than that made by “the Canadian-born and naturalized citizens of Japanese origin” in the previous letter. Finally, Miki personalizes certain list points (more detail to follow) by appending a Globe and Mail article that features the personal experiences of some Japanese Canadians. In other words, Miki is introducing subjectivist discourse to rationalist redress discourse through personalizing elements such as these.

I noted the individualizing angle of this letter in a couple of ways. Firstly, this letter to Prime Minister Mulroney introduces a new facet of justice-making that emphasizes communication among individuals. The letter requests discussions and negotiations directly between the Prime Minister and individual citizens such as Arthur Miki, as part of a Primary Redress Public. I further observed the individualizing aspect introduced to redress discourse through the statement made in point #3: “we continue to insist that the individual Canadian citizens whose rights were abrogated should be treated as individuals, rather than simply as members of an ethnic group and that such recognition should take the form of per capita compensation” (p.1). This point evinces the federal stance on compensation for Japanese Canadians as one that would only recognize an ethnic group, rather than individuals.

These subjectivist elements of redress discourse, evinced in this letter by the personalizing and individualizing points mentioned, are significant because they address and challenge assimilation discourse. The Redress Publics of this second moment continue to challenge assimilation discourse in their justice-making effort, but differently than in the first moment. In the 1940s, Secondary Redress Publics challenged assimilation discourse by minimizing Japanese Canadian particularity. They did so in

order to divert attention away from “racial” and ethnic markers that might distract publics from the issues at hand and towards the rights of citizenship being violated by government. Furthermore, I argued in the previous chapter that Secondary Redress Publics failed to critically assess assimilation discourse, leaving it intact and in circulation within redress discourse and its constituted publics.

Conversely, this letter written in the second moment challenges the goal of a national homogeneity that lies at the core of assimilation, with subjectivist heterogeneity. In other words, the subjectivist discourse introduced into redress discourse in the 1980s appears to directly oppose the massifying trend typical of assimilation mentality. This mentality generalizes people into (racial) categories and encourages them to work towards fitting within an idealistically homogeneous fold¹¹, thereby erasing or diluting the specificity of their ethnic embodiment. The emphasis placed in this letter on the particularity of Japanese Canadian experience challenges and attests to the lingering, if not active, assimilation discourse of the 1940s, still circulating in 1987. In contrast to the previous moment, redress discourse observed in this letter challenges the foundation of assimilation discourse, rather than the assumption of the unassimilability of Japanese Canadians. I argue that in this moment, subjectivist and pluralist discourse shaped the “we” referred to in the redress discourse. It is the “we” of a particularized and personalized culture redefined by the justice-making work of Primary Redress Publics and a “we” that counters the erasing effects of assimilation discourse.

Public Support

¹¹ I drew from Foucault’s articulation of massifying powers, as explained in *Society Must Be Defended* (2003) in considering this statement. In this light, I understand assimilation to be part of a biopolitical tendency to normalize and to generalize a population.

The emphasis placed in this letter on “overwhelming editorial and public support...”, made known through news articles and references to television news broadcasts, gives the reader a sense of public support Japanese Canadian redress held at this time. Public support is another area of remarkable shift between these two moments. While we are able to see support for Japanese Canadians in the 1940s such as the justice-making efforts of Secondary Redress Publics examined in the previous chapter, the support demonstrated in the 1980s is greater and wider-ranging. The materials examined in the first moment, demonstrate that racist and assimilation discourses circulated through dominant publics at this time. Redress discourse would therefore try to grow public support through the circulation of materials focused on correcting these discourses. In contrast, redress discourse in the second moment would try to grow public support through disseminating the experiences of Japanese Canadians. Interestingly, redress discourse no longer directly addresses racist discourse in this second moment. In other words, the imagined audience of the first moment was assumed to be racist whereas the imagined audience of the second moment is assumed to be unaware or ignorant of the experiences of Japanese Canadians.

The attachments to the letter serve to emphasize the importance and predominance of publicity in this moment. There is, in effect, no longer a dominant ‘silence’ on the issue. In the first letter from 1945, an attachment of signatures would presumably have been present. The strength of this attachment would have rested both in the number of names listed and the identities of those who signed. For example, a list of signatories who were solely Japanese Canadian would not hold as much meaningful weight as one that listed a range of identities, including prominent figures or members of

dominant publics. In the second letter, newspaper articles are attached. This attachment implies the existence of many more and varied supporters and therefore a less knowable 'public' of witnesses to the injustices suffered by Japanese Canadians than that of the first letter. The attachments to this letter serve to demonstrate that redress discourse was now indexed within dominant discourse and the testimony represented by these articles forces government recognition – a dialogical process of address and response was created by this and other list(s) of reasons and supporters for redress between the NAJC and the federal government.

Specifically, the article entitled "Still hurting after all these years" (French 1987) reinforces and publicizes point #8 in the list that references public support and awareness. There is little doubt that Miki would have chosen this article based on its highly sympathetic and supportive tone, artistic presentation and Saturday issue full-page feature length. The other article, "Compensate internees for unfair treatment, Mulroney urges PM" (Cleroux 1984) publicizes both the first and final points listed in the letter that highlight that the Prime Minister had publicly stated he was in favour of compensating Japanese Canadians. Kurasawa (2008) observes that "the world is consumed by a more generalized witnessing fever whereby public spaces have been transformed into veritable machines for the production of testimonial narratives and evidence (of a visual, oral or textual variety)" (24). By drawing the Prime Minister's attention to the public space created by publicity such as these news articles, demonstrating evidence that 'the public' has witnessed this Primary Public's call for redress, the letter makes the other points listed appear more urgent.

The emphasis this letter places on publicity is salient on several levels. It draws attention to multiple publics generated by and circulating redress discourse. For example, through the NAJC, as representative of the Japanese Canadian community, the Prime Minister would be aware of a Primary Redress Public. The letter also demonstrates Secondary Redress Publics by the tone and style of writing in Carey French's (1987) article published in Vancouver (more on this article to follow). French represented a redress supporter and a member of a Secondary Public in that location. Next, point number six of the letter brings the existence of Redress Publics on an international scale to light by referencing Japanese American redress legislation before the House at that time. Importantly, this letter situates the Prime Minister himself within a Secondary Redress Public, having circulated redress discourse within dominant fields of politics. The article, entitled "Compensate internees for unfair treatment, Mulroney urges PM" quotes Brian Mulroney as saying, Japanese Canadians: "[are] looking for symbolism and reassurance... I feel very strongly that Canadian citizens whose rights were abused and violated and trampled upon indeed should be compensated" (Cleroux 1984: 3rd par). He states further, "the fact of the matter is, it was 30 years ago and Canadian citizens were arbitrarily deprived of their rights and this should not happen. If there was a Conservative government I can assure you we would be compensating Japanese Canadians" (5th par).

"Still Hurting After All These Years" (French 1987)

This Globe and Mail article, attached to the letter to Prime Minister Mulroney, is a piece of redress material of this second moment that is entirely subjectivist. Dated July

11th, 1987, this article is a full page composition written on Japanese Canadian suffering. This article portrays suffering, the hurt that continues “after all these years”, through sharing the stories of several Japanese Canadians with respect to their treatment during the 1940s. French takes the stories of injustice and justice-making effort and circulates it in her own words, through her own channels; these are all integral parts of bearing witness (Kurasawa 2008: 34).

She lists each person by name, gives a description of their appearance and character and a few sentences or short paragraphs that tell the most poignant memories and experience. She describes Tom Oikawa, for example: “sitting watery-eyed in his living room in Richmond, close to the North Arm of the Fraser River where he moored his boat for so many years, the retired fisherman is momentarily choked by the anger, which never really goes away”. Personal accounts such as these added a dimension of affect to circulating redress discourse.

I noted the incredibly poetic-expressive language of this article. It interlaces personal stories with the description of scenes from a dance performance choreographed by Japanese Canadian dancer-choreographer Jay Hirabayashi. The article is extremely emotive. The beginning sentence of the article reads: “It takes an age for the ashen form to rise from the newspaper opened on the floor like a prayer mat. Muscles and tendons almost in spasm, lips flattened over teeth bared in a rictus of fear and fury, the bald head rotates in a search of the breathy sounds of the Japanese flute”. This is not the language of the earlier moment. Redress discourse circulated in the 1940s period as a reaction to various injustices in a language that erased Japanese Canadians almost completely from the discourse, except to attest to how they might be assimilated. Redress discourse

circulating in this latter period, by Primary and Secondary Redress Publics alike, is intimately specific both personally (in terms of individual experiences, feelings and stories) and culturally (as is noted for example with the inclusion of the Japanese flute and the characteristically unique sound it emits).

Personal stories infuse redress discourse with particularity and subjective meaning to transform the rationalist and assimilationist discourses of the past. Redress discourse was transformative in the 1980s in a number of ways. This letter demonstrated that Redress Publics generated discourse that sought to transform the unawareness dominant publics had of the post-war experience of Japanese Canadians. It sought to transform understanding of the rights of citizens living in democracies. It sought to transform the unwillingness of government to negotiate with redress publics. It sought to transform the discourse of assimilation that continued to consider Japanese Canadians only as an ethnic group, rather than as individual citizens. The transformative agenda of Redress Publics in this second moment, attests to the circulation of more characteristically *counterpublic* discourse.

4.3 Analysis: Justice In Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians

(NAJC n.d.)

The Injustice

As this redress brief was circulated circa 1987, the injustice which this redress material addressed is the same as addressed in the previous section. This section will therefore move directly on to personalizing redress.

Personalizing Redress

Justice In Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians (NAJC n.d.) is a sixteen page redress brief printed by the NAJC. The cover features a black and white photo image of woman and two children, well-dressed, with serious faces, standing with suitcases and blankets. A large mass of people are lined up the background of the image. This brief provides an overview of the NAJC redress campaign. It provides both a past and a present account of Japanese Canadians; the past is presented to lay the foundation of injustices to be redressed and the present offers insight into the current status of the redress campaign, including the NAJC Redress Proposal (see Appendix 11), efforts to date (see Appendix 12) and a list of notable supporters (see Appendix 13). The document ends resourcefully with “what you can do” and “sources for further reading” (pp. 14-15).

Much like the letter to the Prime Minister by NAJC President Arthur Miki in the previous section and in contrast to the 1945 pamphlet presented in the previous chapter entitled “What About the Japanese Canadians”, the tone of this document is one of authority. It anticipates questions and provides answers. Questions such as “Why Redress?” (1), “Who Stands With Us” (12-13), and ‘What Can I Do?’ (14) are given answers upfront. Facts such as “seventy-five percent [of internees] were naturalized or Canadian-born citizens” (1) and a national coalition of “Canadians of different ethnic origins, professions, religious affiliations, associations and political interests exists to provide visible and vocal support” (12) are written in response to these questions.

Though the tone of this communication brief is one of authority on the subject of Japanese Canadian redress, it was not written in strictly rationalist discourse. Rather, it

lists both factual and experiential or subjective aspects of injustices suffered¹², especially through the quotations that appear in the margins of almost every page. One such point listed Doug Oike as stating, “so much was denied to us, but what hurt more than anything was seeing our parents, who came as poor immigrants and couldn’t speak English, lose everything” (5). Another page listed the voice of Tom Tagami:

Father and mother were taken to a so-called sick bay, a
partitioned six by eight foot horse stall with twin beds for each
couple. The stench from years of horse urine soaked in the floors
was enough to make a healthy person ill (2)

The point in providing these quotations is to note the emotive quality of this redress material, as spoken by Japanese Canadians, notably the *nisei*, or second generation, in these quotations.

Whereas in the previous moment, the material analyzed contained no direct Japanese Canadian voice for redress, rather the representative voice of Secondary Redress Publics, this material was written, printed and circulated mainly by Primary Redress Publics. Moreover, as with the scrapbook reference in *Obasan* and the characteristics of the letter to the Prime Minister, this communication brief features the interlacing of facts and feelings, particular and non-particular, experience and memory. For example, page 5 lists a summary of losses in 1986 dollars compiled by Price

¹² At the beginning of this chapter I noted that lists examined in this second moment of redress no longer necessarily fit the rationalist list form where, for example, points are listed numerically or in some logical sequence. Rather, I stated that rationalist form of listing emerges in this moment’s redress materials as a piece, among others, in a collage of particular, personal and affective details that use not only words but images. As such, when I employ the term “listing” in this analysis, I refer to the presence of a number of the same type of information presented in a consistent format throughout the material.

Waterhouse totalling \$443,139,000. To the left of this summary list is a quotation from David Suzuki: “As an adult, I ended up in psychoanalysis and was shocked to discover that virtually every problem I had traced right back to the evacuation” (see Appendix 14).

Added to the tone of authority then, noted in the analysis of the letter in the previous section, was one of confidence. It seems it would take confidence in one’s position and strength to move out of the strict realm of the objective, the factual and the “realist” (McAllister 1999a) and into the vulnerable and more ambiguous space of displaying experience and emotion. At the beginning of *Obasan* Naomi expresses the sentiment that she “can only see a dark field with Aunt Emily beaming her flashlight to where the rest of us crouch and hide, our eyes downcast as we seek the safety of invisibility” (32). The communication brief exposes like the flashlight and transforms invisibility. It uses a more complex layering of lists portraying this confidence. Not only facts, figures and numbers are included but personally identifying elements such as full names of individual people are exposed as well as images of families, men, women and children alike. Layered within these lists are also details that are markers of social success or standing. Within the voices listed by quotation are Japanese Canadian published authors (Muriel Kitagawa and Joy Kogawa) and academics (Roy Miki and David Suzuki), for example.

4.4 Conclusions of this Analysis

This chapter explored the ways in which the personal and affective elements of injustice and justice-making emerged as a relevant and acceptable addition to the grounds of appeal. In this second moment, redress discourse juxtaposed rationalist and subjectivist

elements of the past, by representing Canadian human rights injustices on the one hand and the particular suffering of Japanese Canadians on the other.

Redress Publics mobilized this dual rationalist/subjectivist representation through the use of publicity to break through dominant public indifference or unawareness. Publicity would be a key enabler of introducing the affective realm to redress discourse in this moment. I also noted that redress discourse largely circulated within the punctuality of the headline, characterized by abbreviated statements ready for quick consumption. The temporality of this discourse thus enabled and encouraged the politicizing of Japanese Canadian justice-making effort and sustained redress discourse as a conversation continually unfolding in the public realm.

Listing, in this moment, proved a simple, highly productive and effective way of indexing particularity and subjectivity into redress discourse. The simple, abbreviated and organized form of listing would facilitate the easy integration of redress discourse into streams of publicity. Moreover, once publicized, the interpretation of redress discourse presented repeatedly as a compilation of listed injustices, voices, reasons for redress (and so on) could be better managed through the rationalist, brief, synthesized and factual presentation inherent to lists.

I noted the passage chosen from *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981), “Dear Mr. Mulroney” (NAJC 1987) and “Still Hurting After All These Years” (French 1987) for their effort to personalize and individualize redress; these materials infused the “brown and brittle clippings” with soul, so to speak. I argued that the subjectivism introduced into redress discourse in the 1980s via these personalizing and individualizing elements in redress material worked to counter effects of the assimilation discourse of the 1940s still in

circulation. I highlighted moreover, that these lists presented a shift in authority from the first to the second moment. Conversely to the first moment, Primary Redress Publics demonstrate authority in the creation and circulation of redress discourse. The lists of this moment also demonstrated a change in public support. In this second moment, public support was greater and wider-ranging. Racist discourse was no longer a prime target of redress discourse, rather Redress Publics would try to grow public support by addressing the unawareness of Canadians on the experiences of Japanese Canadians.

I perceived a new confidence in redress discourse at this time, noted especially through the risky move of moving from a rational fact-based use of language to an affective, poetic-expressive one. I equally remarked on this confidence through the transformative character of redress discourse at this time. It is this transformative language that I noted as being a key marker distinguishing Redress Publics of this time circulating counterpublic discourse.

In the first moment I argued that redress publics were not counterpublics in Warner's understanding. Rather, I argued the Secondary Redress Publics examined in the first moment were publics. One of the important factors contributing to that conclusion was that these publics continued to circulate dominant discourses of assimilation. In this chapter however, I argue that redress discourse was inherently transformative. It inspired a different way of viewing things such as the past and our responsibility to injustices historically located, assimilation, rights of citizenship and interactions between the state and its citizenry.

Redress discourse circulating in this second moment affirms who Japanese Canadians were as a wronged-people, but also as justice-makers, activists, and redress

seekers. Redress publics employed both rationalist and subjectivist language to communicate these messages. In an ideal world, if 'race' were not a marker of identity or a means of dividing and categorizing a population, Japanese Canadians would not have been "Japanese", "Japs", "Canadian-born and Naturalized Citizens of Japanese Origin" or "Japanese Canadians". They would simply have been people. This ability to be a person, plain and simple, is the privilege of being unmarked, part of the 'majority' or disembodied. This 'majority' is the premise by which Habermas (1991) characterized the public sphere. The identity of those allowed voice in the public sphere was formed in the privacy of the family home.

However, for Japanese Canadians or any other person marked in some way by way of race, class, sexuality, gender, age, ability and so on, identity is something that is strongly mediated by external factors, inspirations and pressures. Japanese Canadian identity exists in this second moment "by virtue of the world they elaborate[d] together and [that identity] is always fundamentally inflected by the nature of that world" (58). Moreover, Warner states that "when people engage publics, they engage in struggles over the conditions that bring them together as a public" (12). In this second moment, Redress Publics were engaged in discursive struggle over not only the attainment of redress as a justice-form, but over redress as the justice-making of a Japanese Canadian identity. Redress discourse generated and circulated especially by Primary Redress Publics, transformed Japanese Canadian identity in this second moment as one sovereign to governmental discourse of assimilation.

Conclusion

Analyzing redress as justice-making offered the opportunity to develop fruitfully subtle and nuanced understandings of redress. While some may analyze a particular justice-form of redress and the actions and actors involved in its attainment, the results of my analysis offer a new way of looking at and understanding redress. This genealogy of redress discourse is an examination of how redress discourse, as generated and circulated by Redress Publics, struggled for dominant voice over the discourse of assimilation. Further, analyzing the publics constituted by redress discourse enhances discourse analysis by considering the circulators and audiences of that discourse, as well as the changes they undergo over time.

Redress discourse in both the 1940s moment and the 1980s moment attests to the circulation of assimilation discourse in Canada. Each of the 1940s redress materials examined evinces Secondary Redress Publics addressing assimilation discourse by affirming the ability of Japanese Canadians to assimilate. None of these materials challenge or question the basis of assimilation itself. Instead, Secondary Redress Publics struggled to be the dominant voice or authority on the assimilability of Japanese Canadians. Therefore, these publics during the 1940s maintained the circulation of assimilation discourse within its channels of redress discourse.

Secondary Redress Publics representing Japanese Canadians engaged in justice-making by attesting to the assimilability of Japanese Canadians and by minimizing attention to their differences and emphasizing their actual likeness to 'white' Canadians. In other words, the redress discourse of the 1940s, as generated by Secondary Redress Publics, anticipated the imagined audiences of that discourse to be too caught up in the

racial identity of Japanese Canadians to be able to recognize the real issues that pertained to rights of citizenship. They would therefore, through the rationalist presentation and language of lists that enumerate violations of citizenship rights, largely erase the specificity of Japanese Canadians in redress discourse. These lists are rationalist insofar as they simplify and synthesize complex ideas into easily remembered terms. There is little ambiguity in these lists and affect is non-existent or highly contained.

Though the material of the 1980s does not directly address assimilation discourse by name, this discourse is present. The redress materials I examined in this moment address assimilation discourse by countering its erasing effects. In contrast to the non-particular approach to redress discourse of the 1940s, redress materials circulated by Primary Redress Publics in the 1980s voice the particularity of Japanese Canadian history and identity. They showcase this particularity through the inclusion of individual family names in the materials; a ‘public’ affirmation of Japanese ancestry. *Obasan* (Kogawa 1981) not only included the particularity associated with a deeply personal and intimate account of the effects the internment years had on Japanese Canadians, but the particularity of Japanese culture through the use of Japanese language (as with the titular use of the word “Obasan” rather than Aunt) and references to the customs of the *Issei*.

Redress Publics engaged in justice-making in the 1980s by challenging the foundation of assimilation discourse itself. They publicized the particularity of Japanese Canadians, introducing personalizing and individualizing elements into redress discourse. Instead of working to emphasize their likeness to the ‘general public’, they drew attention to the differences of their experiences to other Canadians. Redress Publics declared the specificity of Japanese Canadians in redress discourse through a subjectivist presentation

and language that lists first-hand accounts, includes photographs and is open to affect and interpretation. Importantly, the original rationalist listing of the 1940s is also included in this material, however always supplemented by the subjective accounts of individual Japanese Canadians. The content of the lists of the 1980s are predominantly subjectivist insofar as they encourage the reader to empathize with what is presented.

How Are Publics Involved in Redress?

This genealogy of redress discourse demonstrated that Primary and Secondary Redress Publics were involved in a collaborative justice-making effort in the 1940s to the 1980s through the creation, circulation and maintenance of redress discourse in both public and counterpublic ways. To enable the creation, circulation and maintenance of redress discourse, redress publics generated and publicized lists that would synthesize losses, damages, suffering and supporters into a logical and coherent presentation. The importance of rendering information accessible to an imagined general public cannot be underestimated. Not only would the information need to be easily understandable and relatable, it must be able to be indexed into channels of dominant discourse, as well as in the punctuality of currently unfolding politics.

Redress Publics served a vital role in redress, as each uniquely navigated the socio-political contexts of their time in justice-making effort. As such, I stress that it is inadequate to only consider the justice-making efforts of Primary Redress Publics. It is highly productive to equally emphasize the work of Secondary Redress Publics involved in justice-making as more than an afterthought or expression of gratitude for support. Doing so enables a further blurring of the racial divide which risks being reproduced in

redress discourse that particularizes and limits redress to an understanding of a justice-form achieved by the efforts of the Primary Redress Public concerned.

What my analysis is unable to address within the scope of this project that would be fruitful for further analysis, is if and how redress publics continue to exist once a redress settlement has been achieved. The continued circulation of redress discourse today implies the continued existence of redress publics. This analysis could ask what is the context of redress publics today? Do the Japanese Canadian community centres, cultural groups and the Canadian Race Relations Foundation, born out of the 1988 Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement, circulate redress discourse and if so, have the discursive forms mobilized by this discourse changed? How are they engaging with redress discourse in contemporary contexts and in what ways is this practice productive? Such an analysis would enhance understandings of publics involved in redress developed in this thesis.

Appendices

Appendix A

Kogawa, Joy. 1981. "Excerpt from the memorandum sent by the Co-Operative Committee on Japanese Canadians to the House and the Senate of Canada, April 1946." *Obasan* (248-250). Vancouver: Penguin Books.

EXCERPT FROM THE MEMORANDUM SENT BY THE CO-OPERATIVE
Committee on Japanese Canadians to the House and the Senate of
Canada, April 1946

It is urgently submitted that the Orders-in-Council [for the deportation of Canadians of Japanese racial origin] are wrong and indefensible and constitute a grave threat to the rights and liberties of Canadian citizens, and that Parliament as guardian of these rights and the representative of the people should assert its powers and require the Governor-in-Council to withdraw the Orders, for the following reasons:

1. The Orders-in-Council provide for the exile of Canadian citizens.

The power of exile has not been employed by civilized countries since the days of the Stuarts in England. So seriously was it then viewed that the Habeas Corpus Act makes it a serious offense for any official to exile a British subject.

2. The Orders and the proposed exile of Canadian citizens constitute a violation of International Law and as Mr. Justice Kellock and Rand have stated, involves invasion of another's territory, and the violation of sovereign rights.

The Congress of the United States has no power to exile citizens, and the British Parliament has not,

OBASAN

even in the gravest emergencies, found it necessary to assume such a power.

3. The Orders-in-Council put the value of Canadian citizenship into contempt. They cancel naturalization in a wholesale manner, and without any reason.

At this time when the Parliament of Canada will be considering legislation designed to enhance the value and dignity of Canadian citizenship, these Orders will have precisely the opposite effect.

4. The Orders-in-Council are based upon racial discrimination. Deportation on racial grounds has been defined as a crime against humanity, and the war criminals of Germany and Japan are being tried for precisely this offense, amongst others.

5. The proposed deportations are in no way related to any war emergency.

The necessity of removing persons of Japanese origin from the coastal regions during the war, was referable to the emergency, but now that hostilities have ceased for some time, it cannot possibly be suggested that the safety of Canada requires the injustice of treating Canadian citizens in the manner proposed.

The Prime Minister has himself made it clear that no instances of sabotage can be laid at the door of Japanese Canadians.

If any of those concerned have been disloyal, there is ample power under the Immigration and Naturalization Acts for their deportation after proper inquiry into individual cases.

Many Japanese Canadians have already settled in the Prairie Provinces and in Eastern Canada and have no desire to return to B.C. There is therefore no need for fear of concentration on the Pacific Coast as in the past.

6. The Orders for deportation purport to be based on alleged requests to be sent to Japan. It is suggested that the signing of these requests indicated disloyalty. This is far from the truth. The signing of the forms was encouraged as an act of co-operation with the Government of Canada. The very form used, implied that the Government approved and sought the signing of these forms. Those who refused to sign were described as uncooperative, and denied privileges accorded to those who did sign. For the Government, which through its agents obtained and sought the signing of these forms, to claim now that they indicated disloyalty, would be to implicate the Government itself in the encouragement of a disloyal attitude.

7. The Orders constitute a threat to the security of every minority in Canada

8. The Orders cannot be enforced without grave injustice and inhumanity to innocent persons.

9. The effect of these Orders will be to cause lasting hostility to Canada throughout the Orient where racial discrimination is deeply resented. The future of Canada's international relationship may depend upon the revocation of these Orders

10. The Orders are directly in contradiction of the language and spirit of the United Nations Charter, subscribed to by Canada as well as the other nations of the world and are an adoption of the methods of Nazism.

Respectfully submitted,
James M. Finlay, Chairman
Andrew Brewin
Hugh MacMillan

Appendix B

Norman, Howard. 1945. "9. The 'Japanese' cannot be assimilated." *What About the Japanese Canadians?*(page 11). Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Consultative Council printers.

Page Eleven

ASSIMILATION AND DUAL CITIZENSHIP

9. "The 'Japanese' cannot be assimilated."

This question is based on a misunderstanding of the word "assimilation," which does not necessitate intermarriage. An oriental can be perfectly assimilated without marrying a white. The physical differences of the oriental—skin, features, hair, stature—are superficial. "Japanese" blood when taken from a donor is indistinguishable from "English" blood; it falls into the same four types. The chief organs of assimilation are social, spiritual and intellectual—commerce and industry, schools, churches, clubs. The chief vehicle of assimilation is language, which conveys ideas and ideals, songs, poetry, religion, law. First generation Japanese as a rule do not become perfectly assimilated for this reason; neither do first generation central Europeans. Second generation Japanese-Canadians are usually well assimilated because they have been educated in our schools and speak English easily. Read "The New Canadian", a newspaper published by Japanese-Canadians, and note that their ideals are Canadian. They write, feel, argue and persuade as Canadians.

It should be remembered, however, that assimilation is a two-fold process. There is the person who is assimilated and the community which assimilates him. If some of our oriental Canadians are imperfectly assimilated, the fault is frequently ours. We hold them at arm's length.

10. "But the difference in colour between oriental and white is insuperable."

Here we are up against the inveterate racial prejudice of the white, evidenced, for example, in prejudice against the negro in the southern United States. Prejudice of this sort cannot be justified on any Christian, scientific, humanist, rationalist, liberal, socialist or Marxist basis.

11. "Marriage between white and oriental is impossible."

The facts are that successful marriages do occur. Though they are not common, they occur often enough to prove they can be successful. I think of a naturalized Japanese, at present in Canada, who has been happily married to a white woman for thirty years.

Appendix C

Norman, Howard. 1945. "25. We housed them well, built hospitals for them, paid their dependents relief, and educated their children." *What About the Japanese Canadians?*(page 19). Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Consultative Council printers.

Page Nineteen

They must have police permits to travel certain distances—not unlike the yellow passports that Jews had to carry in Tsarist Russia. None of these restrictions has applied to other enemy aliens, much less their children born in Canada. Yet most of the Orders-in-Council specify "persons of the Japanese race," making no distinction between Japanese nationals and second or third generation Canadians of Japanese stock.

24. "The greatest pains have been taken to see that they received a fair price for their property."

Farms and houses deteriorate very rapidly if left untended, and Japanese-Canadian property was left untended. In many cases the houses were broken into and robbed. Then—except for a block of farms in Fraser Valley that was bought by the Veterans' Board—the property was bought up by speculators. But when whites have to hand over their property for government purposes, it is expropriated and the owners are paid the full assessed value by the government.

25. "We housed them well, built hospitals for them, paid their dependents relief, and educated their children."

If housing two families that did not know each other before, in tarpaper houses, eighteen feet by twenty-four, is good housing, we did. (This has happened in many cases.) Making dependents of our most industrious racial minority is not a praiseworthy performance.

The children have been the greatest sufferers. The segregation of the relocation centres has meant a maximum of Japanese family influence, and a minimum of contacts with white, especially white children. For three years these children, born in Canada, have been denied chances that other Canadian children have enjoyed. Educational facilities have been inadequate and in some cases unbearably expensive. In Grand Forks, for instance, the Japanese children were at first denied admittance to the local school. Later they were admitted on the payment of fees. From 1944 the financial assistance lent by the British Columbia Security Commission was withdrawn, and the fee has been \$5 per child per month. If the fee were overdue, the child was not allowed back. One father had four children, and had to pay \$20 monthly. On December 22nd the School Board presented a bill for \$185 for 37 public school

Appendix D

Norman, Howard. 1945. "18. If the 'Japanese' are all right, why are they the objects of hatred in British Columbia?" *What About the Japanese Canadians?* (pp.15-16).

Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Consultative Council printers.

Page Fifteen

labour, and not more than 5 per cent of the capital required in the industry."

A good many people in British Columbia, consciously or unconsciously, attribute their sufferings during the depression to Japanese and other oriental Canadians. These hardships, however, were largely due to the functioning of our society. The fishermen of Newfoundland and the farmers of Ontario, where there were no Japanese, also suffered.

18. "If the 'Japanese' are all right, why are they the objects of hatred in British Columbia?"

Quotations could be offered in support of the statement that many white citizens of British Columbia regard the Japanese-Canadians as good neighbors. One will be sufficient. After three years' experience of a large number of Japanese-Canadians in their midst, Greenwood Council declared: "We have watched them and may say that their record has been very good. They have been law-abiding under very difficult conditions. Their homes and property were taken from them, many of them lost the savings of a lifetime, and they were herded around more or less like cattle. In spite of this they have been cheerfully waiting for the end of the war . . . and we feel that, given an opportunity, they would be loyal citizens of Canada."

"The sentiment of the people of Greenwood is common to those of Kaslo, New Denver and Slocan City, other centres which have sheltered the Japanese since their expulsion from the coast."¹¹ In the fall of 1944, when the British Columbia Security Commission planned to close Kaslo as a relocation centre, the white citizens petitioned that the Japanese-Canadians **be allowed to stay there.**

The dislike of many people in British Columbia for the Japanese-Canadians has been cultivated for the past fifty years, and includes, to a lesser degree, other orientals. For instance, the British Columbia Legislature defeated in its 1945 session, against the protest of its more enlightened members, a proposal to enfranchise 1200 East Indians—British citizens—that are thinly scattered through six large white communities in the province. Many of these East Indian Canadians, like other orientals, were born and educated in British Columbia.

→ Much of the dislike of orientals in British Columbia is synthetic: it is whipped up by political rabble-rousers or less reput-

Appendix E

Norman, Howard. 1945. "STAND FOR JUSTICE" *What About the Japanese Canadians?* (p. 27). Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Consultative Council printers.

Page Twenty-seven

STUDY THE PROBLEM. Get the facts; don't believe rumours. The Consultative Council will be glad to send further material to speakers and study groups.

STAND FOR JUSTICE. Let the candidates in your riding or your Member of Parliament know that you want a square deal for all Canadian citizens, Japanese-Canadians included. When the subject of the Japanese-Canadians is raised, speak a good word for a helpless minority. If your friends are stubborn, don't argue; give them this pamphlet.

STAY WITH IT. We are building a new world, and we cannot build it in a day.

A SUGGESTED POLICY FOR THE JAPANESE-CANADIANS

1. The Declaration of Loyalty. Since the R.C.M.P. have a file on every person of Japanese race in Canada, it is not necessary that each one should appear before the Loyalty Tribunal. Only nationals and those whose loyalty may be in question should be obliged to do this, and in each case the person should have a lawyer or interpreter if he so desires. For most Japanese-Canadians a form to be sworn before a J.P. would be sufficient. The disaffected and those who wish to go, of course, will be sent to Japan.

2. Removal of Restrictions. With the declaration of loyalty to Canada, restrictions should be lifted and disabilities removed. The Dominion and provincial franchise in all provinces should be granted to all oriental Canadian citizens now deprived of it, subject to the customary formalities.

3. Rehabilitation. The Japanese-Canadians are social casualties of the war, and in some cases need rehabilitation. Where necessary financial assistance should be given until self-support is attained. Many of them, like white dependents, will require social assistance till their death.

To rehabilitate Japanese-Canadians who are capable of self-support but in need of temporary assistance is good economy. At present the taxpayer is footing the bill for the administration of Japanese-Canadian affairs.

There is little danger of the Japanese forming "little Tokyos" again if the rehabilitation is administered wisely. If two or three families are convinced that they will be given rehabilitation if necessary, a fair job, and the chance to establish a home in a certain locality, they will go there. That confidence is lacking at present.

Appendix F

1987. "Starting Over: Japanese Canadian Experience in Montreal, 1942-1952." *Tribune Juive Magazine d'actualité culturelle*. Juillet-Août 1987 5(1), p. 40-41.

Starting Over

Japanese Canadian Experience in Montreal, 1942-1952

Note:

This collage consists of quotations selected and compiled from about forty interviews conducted by the History Project of the Japanese Canadian Cultural Center of Montreal. Interviewees are mostly over sixty-five years old. Interviews were conducted in both English and Japanese and focussed on the first decade after the Japanese relocation to Montreal.

There was no reason [to come here] The government sent us. We had no idea where the hell Farnham and Quebec were.

I didn't feel anything

I was kind of worried about the language — the language is entirely different and the customs must be different and I wondered how I was going to get along. but when I got to Montreal I found it was quite bilingual.

There were roaches, oh yes!... if you didn't buy furniture you couldn't rent. Bed and stuff all dirty and old. They ask me, "you buy or not?" So I said yes because we couldn't stand living in one room anymore

This place we found on St. Dominique, we payed \$1,000 [key money] for junk furniture. It was just stuff we didn't need at all, old stuff.

I decided to come here because my old man was here. I didn't know that it was such a cold place. If I had known...

When we arrived at de Bullion Street I thought, "Shit, we ended up in a horrible place again." I felt depressed just like when I arrived at the sugar beet farm in Alberta

When I arrived, I stayed in a rooming house for about four months. There were no jobs although I went to places where they find you jobs. The business people of Montreal, they don't know Japanese. They say we cannot hire you because we don't know what kind of people you are. There's nothing but washing dishes, so I took it.

I didn't like it. It was old. Everything was old, dreary, and drab. And it was raining. What a change. And I missed the mountains and B.C.

There were many Japanese living in that area [Prince Arthur, Huichison]. Landlord was the same guy. As long as money was coming in, this French man didn't care who the tenant was. So the Japanese took these apartments. In other areas it was not that easy. Once they know that you are Japanese... well, there was discrimination.

First of all these eastern Canadians, they had never seen Japanese before — they had no idea of what we were like. French people I worked with would ask me if I was Chinese — I said no. Then they asked where I was from. I said British Columbia. I don't know if they knew where B.C. was, but anyway, they asked me why. So I told them what happened during the war. They couldn't believe it. They simply couldn't understand.

If we stick together the government wouldn't like it. Isn't it terrible? So we scattered. When you think about the future of Japanese people it's no good. We will disappear. But what can you do? It's the government.

[About Quebec and B.C.] Well, the weather is better there, but people are better here. [Unlike B.C.] here we are treated as equals.

In Montreal there are so many kinds of people, so they don't discriminate against us especially. Probably more than 60% I think are from outside. Many blacks, many Greeks. Around Park Avenue you can say all of them are either Greek or Jewish, Japanese so few and scattered

The first house we lived in was on de Bullion Street near Prince Arthur. When I think back I realize it was a dirty place. Shopping on St. Lawrence. Butcher, fruit store, grocery, clothing — nothing was missing.

We lived on Coloniale near Prince Arthur. Neighbors were European — Hungarians, Germans, Ukrainians, etc. We had nice neighbors. We had "balcony communications". Germans said we were "Allies". I went shopping every weekend with Jewish friends. Everybody was nice except landlords.

[Rosemount district] Japanese families were not around there. [Garnier Street] so some neighbor thought I was a spy or something and called the RCMP. So the RCMP came to check me up, you know. It was a French and Italian neighborhood. They turned out to be very nice to us.

Around St. Antoine there were a few Japanese. Many kinds of people — French speaking, blacks, all kinds, even English. It was a dirty place, kids used to have to change clothes many times. It was soot from the CPR.

[Verdun] There were some Japanese but it was nothing in the sea of all kinds of people. My children were always the only Japanese kids in their class.

[Farnham, where there was a temporary hostel for new arrivals to Quebec] The majority of Quebec are French, you know, they had never seen Japanese. So when I used to walk in the evening with my kids they all looked at us from their porches. But as people, I got good vibrations

To find a job it had to be a Jewish firm. They knew the Japanese work hard and are honest. . They say that during the war the Japanese took care of the Jews. So I still think that even white people have a [Japanese] sense of "on" [debt of gratitude].

During the war, Italians were very good to me because Mussolini was Japan's partner. It was very helpful for my business. They gave me lots of business.

I was impressed by French Canadians. They want to know you. Plain, ordinary [people]... it's a friendly kind of curiosity.

English — each person is not bad... But as a group you have to be careful.

It was easier to tolerate Japanese than Jews because we were less of a threat and because of the Catholic bias against the Jews. We were so few, we were quaint and adorable. The Japanese never make waves so we weren't looked on with great disfavour.

In Montreal there are many people "mixed up" [people of mixed marriages]. So I don't feel so shy about my being married to a black woman. I understand that people feel funny to see a couple of two colours. It's natural but I don't feel that way anymore. Once you begin talking to them, [different ethnic group] it's unexpectedly easy to come across. Only food and language are different, but humans, they are not so different after all.

Appendix G

Kogawa, Joy. 1981. *Obasan*. (pp. 41-42) Markham, ON: Penguin Books.

said, "Why not leave the dead to bury the dead?"

"Dead?" she asked. "I'm not dead. You're not dead. Who's dead?"

"But you can't fight the whole country," I said.

"We are the country," she answered.

Obasan was not taking part in the conversation. When pressed, finally she said that she was grateful for life "Arigatai. Gratitude only."

Uncle, who had been listening tensely up to this point, relaxed his jaws and slapped his lap with both hands. "In the world, there is no better place," he said. "This country is the best. There is food. There is medicine. There is pension money. Gratitude. Gratitude."

He was right, I thought. If Aunt Emily with her billions of letters and articles and speeches, her tears and her rage, her friends and her committees — if all that couldn't bring contentment, what was the point?

"What energy," Uncle said good-humouredly and yawned aloud. "Genki ga ii ne."

"Have to keep trying," Aunt Emily said.

Uncle shuffled off to bed leaving us in the kitchen. "A time to work. A time to talk. Now time to sleep," he said.

"Goodnight, Uncle," I said. I would have gone to bed as well, but Aunt Emily was not sleepy.

"Life is so short," I said sighing, "the past so long. Shouldn't we turn the page and move on?"

"The past is the future," Aunt Emily shot back.

Appendix H

Miki, Art. 1987. Letter to the Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. Roger Obata Fonds.

National Archives, Archival Reference No.: R9332-0-7-E, Box 6, File 21.

Page 2/...

Fourthly, we are shocked that Mr. Crombie's only offer of compensation was presented before we had had the opportunity to discuss with him the rationale behind the figures in our proposal. The Government has steadfastly refused to modify this take-it-or-leave-it proposition. We must question the political will of a Government that would tell us that if we do not accept a unilateral offer the discussions are over.

It has always been our position that a meaningful solution can be achieved only through a negotiated settlement. We have stated publicly that our position is flexible, but Mr. Crombie's position leaves no room for the process of negotiation.

We wish also to point out that the NAJC has received overwhelming editorial and public support, and Redress is widely viewed as an issue of fundamental justice. In addition, I am sure you are aware that in the United States there is legislation before both Houses that would provide the sum of \$20,000 U.S. to all surviving Japanese Americans who were incarcerated, plus a community fund of \$50 million. We can only remind you that Japanese Americans did not suffer the enormity of the losses of Japanese Canadians.

We now ask you to intervene personally, to meet directly with us as soon as possible for frank discussion of ways and means of breaking this deadlock, and to give Mr. Crombie the mandate to carry on meaningful negotiations toward a just and honourable settlement.

On May 15, 1984 you stated, "I feel very strongly that Canadian citizens whose rights were abused and violated and trampled upon indeed should be compensated." We call upon you to honour your commitment and to show international leadership in the advancement of human rights by redressing the wrongs against Japanese Canadians. We sincerely believe that with the political will we can achieve a settlement of which the all Canadians can be proud.

With respect,

Yours truly,

Arthur Miki, President

cc: Hon. David Crombie,
Minister of State for Multiculturalism

Appendix I

Cleroux, Richard. 1984. "Compensate internees for unfair treatment, Mulroney urges PM." *Globe and Mail*, May 16, 1984.

Compensate internees for unfair treatment, Mulroney urges PM

By RICHARD CLEROUX

Conservative Leader Brian Mulroney says he is in favor of compensation for Japanese Canadians who were unfairly interned during the Second World War.

Mr. Mulroney said in an interview yesterday that the Japanese Canadians "are not looking for overwhelming compensation."

"They're looking for symbolism and reassurance," he said. "I feel very strongly that Canadian citizens whose rights were abused and violated and trampled upon indeed should be compensated," he said.

Mr. Mulroney said he disagrees with Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau's stand that to compensate Japanese Canadians would mean the Government would have to compensate other groups.

"I don't swallow Mr. Trudeau's line about going back to the Acadians and Indians and all that nonsense," he said. "The fact of the matter is, it was 30 years ago and Canadian citizens were arbitrarily deprived of their rights and this should not happen. If there was a Conservative government I can assure you we would be compensating Japanese Canadians."

Mr. Mulroney did not say what he had in mind by way of compensation.

Mr. Mulroney and his wife Milla were in Toronto yesterday campaigning for the ethnic vote in a schedule that included four separate interviews at MTV, a multicultural television channel in the city, a reception for the ethnic press and

a big evening reception in a north end hotel for about 1,000 party fund raisers from the various ethnic communities.

Mr. Mulroney repeated the commitment to fight for minority rights that he had made in Winnipeg March 29. He said there is no greater vocation for a politician in this country than to fight for the preservation of minority language and ethnic rights.

In Winnipeg he was booed and hissed and told to go back East when he made that commitment; in Toronto last night they applauded heartily. They even applauded when he spoke a few words of French, which was a marked contrast to the insults and catcalls he provoked when he spoke a few words of French in Winnipeg.

Mr. Mulroney poked fun at Liberal Leadership candidate John Turner's stand on the minority language rights issue.

"We've got that great pillar of consistency, Mr. Turner," Mr. Mulroney said sarcastically. "Now there's a guy who knows his mind ... both of them."

He began by opposing bilingualism in Manitoba, then he wound up supporting Bill 101 in Quebec.

"It's hard to figure him out, except that I'm told that tomorrow he's going to announce that he's in favor of full and total bilingualism ... in Rochester, Detroit and Gary, Ind."

Earlier in the day, Mr. Mulroney and his wife toured the Toronto Sun and met the publisher and the editorial board at The Globe and Mail.

"...Canadian citizens whose rights were abused and violated and trampled upon indeed should be compensated..." - BRIAN MULRONEY

The Globe and Mail May 16, 1984

Appendix J

French, Carey. 1987. "Still hurting after all these years." *Globe and Mail*, p. D5, July 11, 1987.

FEATURES PAGE

Still hurting

Japanese Canadians and Ottawa sit down again today in an attempt to heal old wounds from the war

BY CAREY FRENCH
The Globe and Mail

IF TAKEN all together, the Japanese Canadian community in Canada today is probably the largest and most diverse of any ethnic group in the country. It is a group that has been hurt by the war, and it is a group that is still hurting.

The Japanese Canadian community in Canada today is probably the largest and most diverse of any ethnic group in the country. It is a group that has been hurt by the war, and it is a group that is still hurting.

The Japanese Canadian community in Canada today is probably the largest and most diverse of any ethnic group in the country. It is a group that has been hurt by the war, and it is a group that is still hurting.

Model of a Japanese Canadian community center in 1941, built by the Japanese Canadian community in Vancouver. The center was destroyed by fire in 1942.

Model of a Japanese Canadian community center in 1941, built by the Japanese Canadian community in Vancouver. The center was destroyed by fire in 1942.

after all these years

Mr. Kiyomasa, a Japanese Canadian, is seen in a portrait. He is a man with glasses, wearing a light-colored shirt. He is looking directly at the camera with a slight smile.

Left behind and lonely

THE PICTURE of the Japanese Canadian community in Canada today is probably the largest and most diverse of any ethnic group in the country. It is a group that has been hurt by the war, and it is a group that is still hurting.

The Japanese Canadian community in Canada today is probably the largest and most diverse of any ethnic group in the country. It is a group that has been hurt by the war, and it is a group that is still hurting.

The Japanese Canadian community in Canada today is probably the largest and most diverse of any ethnic group in the country. It is a group that has been hurt by the war, and it is a group that is still hurting.

Appendix K

NAJC. 1986. "NAJC Redress Proposal." *Justice In Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians*. (p.9).

NAJC REDRESS PROPOSAL

Submitted to the Federal Government May 20, 1986

RECOMMENDATION 1 That an official acknowledgement of the injustices inflicted on Canadians of Japanese ancestry during and after World War II be issued by the Parliament of Canada

RECOMMENDATION 2 That citizenship be restored to Japanese Canadians who were expelled from Canada through the government's 'repatriation policy,' and that the offer of citizenship should also be extended to their children

RECOMMENDATION 3. That the records of those Japanese Canadians who were convicted under the War Measures Act be cleared

RECOMMENDATION 4 That each living Japanese Canadian who was affected by the injustices during and after World War II be compensated \$25,000

RECOMMENDATION 5. That the Japanese Canadian community be awarded \$50 million to establish a community controlled fund to undertake projects and activities that strengthen its social and cultural well-being

RECOMMENDATION 6 That the War Measures Act be amended in such a manner as to ensure that similar injustices will not recur, and further that a serious commitment be made to initiate a review and amendment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to guarantee that the rights of individuals will never again be abrogated on the basis of ancestry

RECOMMENDATION 7 That a Japanese Canadian Human Rights Foundation be established to foster human rights. Such a foundation could provide

- assistance to groups who are targets of racism and whose rights have been violated
- grants for research against racism and prejudice
- development of educational materials on the experience of Japanese Canadians
- organizing national and international conferences, seminars and workshops on human rights issues
- participation in multicultural activities and projects
- scholarships to further intercultural understanding

Appendix L

NAJC. N.d. "Redress Efforts to Date." *Justice In Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians*. (pp. 10-11).

REDRESS EFFORTS TO DATE

March 1984 An all parliamentary committee issues *Equality Now*, a report on visible minorities in Canada, and recommends redress for Japanese Canadians

November 21, 1984 The National Association of Japanese Canadians releases *Democracy Betrayed: The Case for Redress*, the first official call on the Government of Canada to redress the violation of rights and freedoms of Japanese Canadians during the 1940s

December 15, 1984 The NAJC Council meets with representatives of the Honourable Jack Murta, the Minister of Multiculturalism. An agreement is reached that a Redress settlement will be negotiated with the NAJC. A joint press release announces that negotiations will deal with the wording of an acknowledgement, civil rights protective legislation and compensation to the Japanese Canadians interned

January 1985 Jack Murta reneges on his commitment to negotiate with the NAJC and refuses compensation to Japanese Canadians. Instead, he offers a token \$6 million fund to memorialize the mistreatment of Japanese Canadians. When the NAJC refuses his offer, he threatens to act without the NAJC's approval, but backs down when there is strong public opposition to his plan

At the release of the NAJC brief, *Democracy Betrayed* in Vancouver, B.C., on November 21, 1984

February to June 1985. Intermittent talks are held between Jack Murta's staff and the NAJC, but the negotiation process is denied. Talks reach an impasse

August 1985 to May 1986 The Honourable Otto Jelinek replaces Jack Murta as the Minister of Multiculturalism. Once again the NAJC attempts to establish a negotiation process as outlined in the joint press release of December 15 1984. Jelinek holds firm on the offer made by Jack Murta. In January, he threatens to act unilaterally, but backs down because of strong opposition from the NAJC, the media and other concerned Canadians

May 9, 1986 Price Waterhouse Associates assesses income and property losses at not less than \$443 million in 1986 dollars

"We're a very small group in numbers. And so the policy of dispersing Japanese Canadians across this country, even after the defeat of Japan, worked beyond the wildest dreams of politicians. And forty years later, most of the people of my generation are still hiding in the woodwork and not wanting to speak. As Aunt Emily says in *Obasan*, our tongues were cut off. It takes a while for the nerves to grow back."

Joy Kogawa

In conversation

with Robert Fultord

The Case for Redress Information

November 1984

“I feel very strongly that Canadian citizens whose rights were abused and violated and trampled upon indeed should be compensated. . . . If there was a Conservative government, I can assure you we would be compensating Japanese Canadians.”
 Prime Minister Brian Mulroney during his 1984 campaign

May 20, 1986: The NAJC submits to the Federal Government a comprehensive Redress proposal calling for the repeal of the War Measures Act, amendments to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, an official acknowledgement of the injustices, the creation of a human rights foundation and compensation to Japanese Canadians who suffered the internment and are still living. Otto Jelinek refuses to consider the Redress proposal and rules out negotiations with the NAJC.

August 1986 to February 1987: The Honourable David Crombie replaces Otto Jelinek as Minister of Multiculturalism. Crombie studies the Redress issue for eight months, meeting intermittently with the NAJC.

March to June 1987: David Crombie sends a letter to the NAJC offering a \$12 million community fund. He rules out direct compensation to Japanese Canadians affected by the injustices. He refuses to negotiate with the NAJC.

July 11, 1987: The NAJC meets with David Crombie and appeals to him for more flexibility and for legitimate negotiations to achieve a just and honourable settlement. David Crombie calls off further meetings with the NAJC because the NAJC will not accept his “take it or leave it” Redress offer. Talks reach an impasse.

July 12, 1987: The NAJC appeals to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney to intervene personally to resolve the Redress issue.

September 17, 1987: The U.S. House of Representatives passes the Civil Liberties Act of 1987, offering an acknowledgment and \$1.37 billion in Redress to Japanese Americans interned during World War II — \$20,000 to each of the estimated 66,000 survivors and a \$50 million fund to educate the American public about the uprooting.

October 1987: Public support for the NAJC is mobilized in the birth of the National Coalition for Japanese Canadian Redress. The Coalition consists of a broad cross-section of individuals, ethnic organizations, unions, professional associations and cultural groups. Writers Margaret Atwood, June Callwood and Pierre Berton and former Justice of the B.C. Supreme Court Thomas Berger are among the first individuals to join the Coalition.

October 29, 1987: At a rally in Toronto, 16 leaders of national ethnic organizations show their support for Japanese Canadians by signing a resolution urging the Prime Minister to negotiate a meaningful settlement with the NAJC. Two days later, George Corn, president of the Canadian Ethnocultural Council, which represents thirty-five national ethnic organizations, adopts the same resolution.

Appendix M

NAJC. N.d. "Who Stands With Us." *Justice in Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians*. (pp. 12-13).

WHO STANDS WITH US

THE NATIONAL COALITION

In recognition that Redress for Japanese Canadians is a civil rights issue for all Canadians, the National Coalition for Japanese Canadian Redress was founded in October 1987. This coalition of Canadians of different ethnic origins, professions, religious affiliations, associations and political interests exists to provide visible and vocal support for the NAJC's Redress objectives. Members of the Coalition include:

Irving Abella, Historian	Edith Bowke, Folklorist
Howard Adelman, Philosopher	Northrop Frye, Author
Ied Allan, Author	Robert Fulford, Journalist
Dennis Arland, film maker	Mas Funo, Artist
Marjaret Atwood, Author	Ken George, Labour Leader
Dave Barrett, former B.C. premier	Graeme Gibson, Author
Gregory Baum, Theologian	Dr. William Gibson, Physician
Daryl I. Bean, Labour leader	William Gilbey, Regina representative, Canadian Civil Liberties Association
Edward Belobaba, Lawyer	Harry Glasbeek, Lawyer
Thomas Berger, Lawyer	Charles Gray, Musician
Pierre Berton, Author	Paul Guenette, Camera operator
Ernie Best, Educator	Gus Harris, Mayor of Scarborough
Marie Claire Blas, Writer	Beata Hasznik, Artist
Deanne Bogdan, Professor	James Hathaway, Professor
Arthur Buchfeld, Rabbi	Debra Henderson, Film executive
George Bowering, Writer	Philip Hewitt, Clergy
Marilyn Bown, Clergy	Arthur Hies, Director, Canadian Institute of Minority Rights
Dwight Boyd, Professor	Wendy Hunt, Educator
Irene Callwood, Journalist	Mel Hurtig, Publisher
Shirley G.E. Carr, Labour leader	George Ignatieff, Author
Peter Chimbos, Greek Canadian community leader	Barbara Jackman, Lawyer
Lovell Clark, Historian	David Kar, Clergy
Austin Clarke, Author	Kulmen Kaplansky, Human rights advocate
Adrienne Clarkson, Publisher	Joseph Katz, Educator
Bruce Cockburn, Musician	Anthony Keith, Lawyer
Marjorie Cohen, Economist	Geoff Kelly, Communications director
Ramsay Cook, Historian	Bill Kilbourn, Writer
Donald Corbett, Educator	Iroy Kogawa, Author
Irwin Cotler, Law professor	Judith Kucharsky, Minority rights advocate
Alan Davies, Professor	Robert Kroetsch, Writer
Graeme DeCarie, Historian	Angele Lacalamita, Retired
Fascial Delgado, Director, Ethnic Minorities Dossier, Montreal YMCA	Ross Lambertson, Human rights advocate
Remi De Roo, Roman Catholic Bishop, Victoria	Michele Landsberg, Columnist, <i>Globe and Mail</i>
Louis Dudek, Retired professor	Mary Jo Leddy, Journalist
Wayne Easter, Farm leader	Dennis Lee, Author
Margrit Fuchler, Educator	
Clifford Elliott, Clergy	
Kathryn Emslie, Film executive	
George Erasmus, National Chief, Assembly of First Nations	
Timothy Findlay, Author	
James Finlay, Clergy	

“Injustices to Canadians on the basis of race are the saddest part of the history of Canada. We must seek to acknowledge and settle this issue in a manner satisfactory to the community that suffered. The government has an opportunity to resolve the matter now.”
Dr. Lilian Ma
Canadian Ethnocultural Council

Bruce McLeod Columnist
Toronto Star
Elsie McMurphy Union
president
David Mirmorek Environ-
mental scientist
Dow Maimur Rabbi
Michael Marrus Historian
Dick Martin Labour leader
IS Midanik Past president
Canadian Civil Liberties
Association
Raymond Moriyama Architect
Khaleel Mouammar Systems
analyst
J J Munro Union president
Roxana Ng Professor
bpNichol Poet
John (Jack) Nichol Union
president
Michael Ondaatje Author
Tom Onley Artist
Erna Paris Historian
Jean Claude Parrot Union
president
Nicole Parson Journalist
Jordin Pearlson Rabbi
Michael Peers Primate Anglican
Church of Canada
Rick Phillips Teacher
Ruth Reich Person Historian
Gunter Plaut Rabbi Holy
Blossom Temple
James Porter Professor
Cyril Powles Historian
Alison Prentice Historian
Borden Purcell Human rights
advocate
B Ragula President Byelorussian
Canadian coordinating
committee
Leyla Raphael President World
Conference on Religion and
Peace (Canada)
Bill Reid Haida artist
Mordecai Richler Author
Bruce Rogers Broadcaster
R Roman Professor
Jeff Rose Union president
Abraham Rotstein Professor
Clayton Ruby Lawyer
Stanley Ryerson Historian
Sybil Shack President Canadian
Civil Liberties Association
(Manitoba)
Donald Sjoberg Bishop Evan-
gelical Lutheran Churches in
Canada

Anne Squire Moderator United
Church of Canada
Howard Stitt Professor
Wayne Sumner Professor
David Suzuki Scientist
Ruth Syme Clergy
Takao Tanabe Artist
Catherine Taylor Insurance agent
John Thompson Historian
Setsuko Thurlow Educator
Rhea Tregebov Writer
Cerald Vanduzande Public affairs
director
Patrick Watson Broadcaster
Key Whitaker Professor
Joyce Wieland Artist
Gordon Wilson Labour leader
Lois Wilson President World
Council of Churches
Friedrick Zemms Professor

Affiliation of Multicultural
Societies and Service Agencies
of B.C.
Byelorussian Canadian
Coordinating Committee
Canadian Arab Federation
Canadian Federation of
Multicultural Council
Canadian Hispanic Congress
Canadian Lithuanian Community
Chinese Benevolent Association
Chinese Canadian National
Council
Council of Muslim Communities
of Canada
Federation of Sikh Societies of
Canada
First Portuguese Canadian Club
German Canadian Congress
Hellenic Canadian Congress
Intercultural Association of
Greater Victoria
The Korean Canadian Cultural
Association of the Metro-
politan Toronto
Lithuanian National Federation in
Canada
Manitoba Intercultural Council
Multicultural Council of
Saskatchewan
National Council of Jamaicans
and Supportive Organizations
in Canada
Richmond Multicultural Concerns
Society
United Council of Filipino
Associations in Canada

B.C. Association of Social
Workers
B.C. Human Rights Coalition
B.C. Organization to Fight
Racism
B.C. Teachers Federation—
Program Against Racism
Canadian Civil Liberties
Association (Manitoba)
Canadian Institute on Minority
Rights Montreal
Canadian High School Librarians
Federation
Committee for Racial Justice
Independent Pictures Inc.
Writers Union of Canada
Vancouver Island Human Rights
Coalition
York University Faculty
Association

The Anglican Church of Canada
Human Rights Committee of
Canadian Council of Catholic
Bishops
The United Church of Canada

B.C. Federation of Labour
Canadian Union of Postal
Workers
International Woodworkers of
America (Canada)
National Farmers Union
Prince Rupert Amalgamated
Shoreworkers and Clerks
Union
Public Service Alliance of
Canada
United Fishermen and Allied
Workers Union

Hon Ed Broadbent M.P. Leader
New Democratic Party of
Canada
Hon Ernie Epp M.P.
Hon Dan Heap M.P.
Hon Pauline Jewett M.P.
Hon Svend Robinson M.P.
Hon David Croll Senator
Hon Jerry Grubstein Senator
Hon Michael Harrington M.P.
Leader New Democratic Party
of B.C.
Hon Robert Williams M.P.A.
(B.C.)
Communist Party of Canada

Appendix N

NAJC. N.d. "Economic Losses." *Justice in Our Time: Redress For Japanese Canadians*. (pp. 12-13).

ECONOMIC LOSSES

The Price Waterhouse Study

Some months ago Price Waterhouse Associates undertook a study of economic losses using documents and files in the Custodian's archives in Ottawa. In their 1986 report they concluded that from 1941 until 1949 Japanese Canadians lost not less than \$333 million (1986 dollars) in income and \$110 million in property and suggested that the community's potential for economic growth had also been damaged.

"So much was denied to us, but what hurt more than anything was seeing our parents, who came as poor immigrants and couldn't speak English, lose everything."

Doug Oike,
retired sawmill worker
"The wound that hasn't healed"
by Tim Harper, *Toronto Star*,
February 22, 1987

Summary of Losses in 1986 dollars (from the study by Price Waterhouse *Economic Losses of Japanese Canadians after 1941*)

Income loss	\$333 040 000
Fraser Valley farmland	19,314,000
Other real property	10 986 000
Fishing assets	10 350 000
Businesses	7 627,000
Other property	10 341 000
Education fees paid	1,280 000
Other losses	1 141 000
Less Awards made by Bird Commission	(11 040 000)

TOTAL = \$113 139 000

The Inadequacy of the Bird Commission

A federal commission headed by Mr. Justice Henry Bird was set up after the war to provide compensation for the property losses suffered by Japanese Canadians during the years of uprooting. The Commission's terms of reference were kept narrow by the federal Government to avoid embarrassment. Only losses resulting from the sale of property by the Custodian of Enemy Alien Property at less than fair market value were considered.

The Commission had no right to question the policies responsible for the dispossession. Loss of income and opportunity were not considered, nor were the emotional suffering caused by the uprooting, the betrayal of citizenship rights and the government's broken promises regarding the safekeeping of properties entrusted to the Custodian.

The Bird Commission awarded a total of only \$12 million to Japanese Canadians. In contrast, the U.S. government, which did not liquidate the property of interned Japanese-Americans, awarded \$37 million in postwar claims.

The Immeasurable Losses

Of course, the intangible losses are incalculable. It is extremely difficult to assess in economic terms the damage to an unjustly shattered community. Thousands of citizens and their descendants lost opportunities for employment and education and have suffered immeasurable shame and grief at having their families torn apart, their citizenship denied, and their dignity undermined.

"As an adult, I ended up in psychoanalysis and was shocked to discover that virtually every psychological problem I had traced right back to the evacuation."

David Suzuki
"Redress for Japanese Canadians
A Community Forum,"
Vancouver, B.C., August 1984

References

1987. "Starting Over: Japanese Canadian Experience in Montreal, 1942-1952." *Tribune Juive Magazine d'actualité culturelle*. Juillet-Août 1987 5(1), p. 40-41.
- Adachi, Ken. 1976. *The Enemy that Never Was: A history of the Japanese Canadians*. Toronto, ON: Mclelland and Stewart.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1998. "The Public and the Private Realm." Pp. 22-78 in *The Human Condition*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, Thomas. *Fragile Freedoms: Human Rights and Descent in Canada*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company.
- Bird, Henry Irvine. 1950. *Royal Commission to Investigate Claims of Canadian Citizens of Japanese Origin Evacuated from Coast Areas of British Columbia in 1942*. Sessional Paper No. 185A, Ottawa, ON, retrieved February 16, 2011 (<http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca/index.asp?lang=eng&page=information&sub=commissions&doc=archives/topic-sujet-eng.htm>).
- Blatz, Craig, Schumann, Karina and Michael Ross. 2009. "Government Apologies for Historical Injustices" *Political Psychology* 30(2): 219-241.
- Brodie, Janine. 1998. "Restructuring and the Politics of Marginalization." in *Women and Political Representation in Canada*, edited by Manon Tremblay and Caroline Andrew. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.

- 1996. "New State Forms, New Political Spaces." in *States Against Markets: The Limits of Globalization*, edited by Robert Boyer and Daniel Drache. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brooks, Roy L. 1999. *When Sorry Isn't Enough: The Controversy over Apologies and Reparations for Human Injustice*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Canadian Race Relations Foundation (CRRF). 2004. "From Racism to Redress: The Japanese Canadian Experience." Retrieved January 17, 2011 (<http://www.crr.ca/divers-files/en/pub/faSh/ePubFaShRacRedJap.pdf>).
- CCNC (Chinese Canadian National Council). N.d. "Head Tax Redress Campaign". Retrieved <http://www.ccnc.ca/sectionEntry.php?entryID=10&type=Advocacy>.
- CCJC fonds. 1943-1951a. "Racial Discrimination and Internment: The Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians." Retrieved February 2, 2011 (<http://digitalcollections.mcmaster.ca/case-study/racial-discrimination-and-internment-cooperative-committee-japanese-canadians>).
- CCJC fonds. 1943-1951b. "Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians, Leaflet [194-]". Retrieved January 21, 2011 (<http://digitalcollections.mcmaster.ca/cooperative-committee-japanese-canadians-leaflet-194>).
- CIC (Citizenship and Immigration Canada). 2011. "Multiculturalism." Retrieved July 15, 2011 <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/index.asp>.
- CIC (Citizenship and Immigration Canada). 2010a. "Community Historical Recognition Program." Retrieved May 20, 2011 <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/programs/community.asp>.

- CIC (Citizenship and Immigration Canada). 2010b. "Community Historical Recognition Program: Applicant's Guide 2010-2011." Retrieved May 20, 2011
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/English/resources/publications/multi-chrp-guide/section-01.asp>.
- CIC (Citizenship and Immigration Canada). 2009. "Chinese Head Tax Redress." Retrieved May 20, 2011
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/multiculturalism/programs/redress.asp>.
- CIC (Citizenship and Immigration Canada). 2009. "What is Multiculturalism." Retrieved July 15, 2011
<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/information/faq/multiculturalism/multi-faq01.asp>.
- Clark, Warren and Grant Schellenberg. 2002. "Who's Religious?" in *Canadian Social Trends* by Statistics Canada, Retrieved March 29, 2011
(<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/11-008-x/2006001/9181-eng.htm>).
- Class Action Services. N.d.. "The Indian Residential Schools Settlement Has Been Approved." Retrieved November 14, 2010
(http://www.residentialschoolsettlement.ca/detailed_notice.pdf).
- Cleroux, Richard. 1984. "Compensate internees for unfair treatment, Mulroney urges PM." *Globe and Mail*, May 16, 1984.
- Cunningham, Michael. 1999. "Saying Sorry: The Politics of Apology." *The Political Quarterly* 70(3): 285-293.
- Davidson, Arnold E. 1993. *Writing Against the Silence: Joy Kogawa's Obasan*. ECW Press.

- Dewing, Michael. 2009. *Canadian Multiculturalism*. Parliamentary Information and Research Service Research Paper. PRB 09-20E. Ottawa, ON: Library of Parliament.
- Diener, Betty D. and Greyser, Stephen A. 1978. "Consumer Views of Redress Needs." In *The Journal of Marketing*, 42(4), retrieved April 1, 2011 (<http://www.jstor.org/pss/1250081>).
- Dahmoon, Rita and Yasmeen Abu-Laban. 2009. "Dangerous (Internal) Foreigners and Nation-Building: The Case of Canada." *International Political Science Review* 30: 163.
- Ewing, John M. 1944. "The Case Against the Enemy Aliens." Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Retrieved on October 21, 2009 (http://archives.cbc.ca/war_conflict/second_world_war/dossier/568/).
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. *The Foucault Effect*
-----1977. *Nietzsche, Genealogy, History*.
-----1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Toronto, ON: Penguin Books.
-----2003. "Society Must be Defended." In *Lectures at the College de France, 1975-1976*. pp. 239-263. New York, NY: Picador.
- Fowke, Edith. 1954. *They Made Democracy Work: The Story of the Cooperative Committee On Japanese Canadians*. Toronto, ON: CCJC.
- Freeman, Michael. 2008. "Historical Injustice and Liberal Political Theory". In Gibney, Mark, Howard-Hassman, Rhoda, Coicaud, J-M and Niklaus Steiner. Eds., *The*

- Age of Apology Facing Up To the Past*. Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- French, Carey. 1987. "Still hurting after all these years." *Globe and Mail*, p. D5, July 11, 1987.
- Gibney, Mark, Howard-Hassman, Rhoda, Coicaud, J-M. and Niklaus Steiner., Eds. 2008. *The Age of Apology: Facing Up to the Past*. Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gomer-Sunahara, Ann. 2000. *The Politics of Racism*. Retrieved September 26, 2009 (<http://www.japanesecanadianhistory.ca/>).
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1991. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere, An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. First MIT Press.
- Hall, Gerald. 2004. "Human Rights Legislation and Redress for Past Wrongs." Conference Paper, Race Policy Dialogue Conference; Ontario Human Rights Commission.
- Harris, Mason. 1990. "Broken Generations in Obasan: Inner Conflict and the Destruction of Community." *Canadian Literature*, 127:41-57.
- Henderson, Jennifer and Wakeham, Pauline. Eds. Forthcoming. "Introduction." *Reconciling Canada: Critical Perspectives on the Culture of Redress*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- James, Matt. 2008. "Wrestling With the Past: Apologies, Quasi-Apologies and Non-Apologies in Canada." Pp. 137-153 in *The Age of Apology Facing Up to the Past*, edited by M. Gibney, R.E. Howard-Hassmann, J.M. Coicaud and N Steiner. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- 2004. "Recognition, Redistribution and Redress: The Case of the 'Chinese Head Tax'." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 37(4): 883-902.
- Japanese Canadian Association (JCA). 2005a. *Renewal Call for Redress*. Retrieved May 15, 2010 (<http://www.najc.ca/thenandnow/renewal2.php>).
- 2005b. *Renewal – Roger Obata (1915-2002)*. Retrieved February 20, 2011 (<http://www.najc.ca/thenandnow/renewal1b.php>).
- 2005c. *WWII Experience: Bird Commission*. Retrieved March 18, 2011 (<http://www.najc.ca/thenandnow/experience2d.php>).
- Kitagawa, Muriel and Miki, Roy. 1985. *This is My Own: Letters to Wes and Other Writings on Japanese Canadians 1941-1948*. Vancouver, BC: Talonbooks.
- Kurasawa, Fuyuki. 2007. *The Work of Global Justice: Human Rights as Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kogawa, Joy. 1981. *Obasan*. Markham, ON: Penguin Books.
- Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Law, John and Singleton, Vicky. 2005. "Object Lessons." *Organization* 12(3): 331-355.
- Leslie, Christopher R. 2007. "The Significance of Silence: Collective Action Problems and Class Action Settlements." In *Florida Law Review* 71, retrieved April 2, 2011 (<https://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&doctype=cite&docid=59+Fla.+L.+Rev.+71&srctype=smi&srcid=3B15&key=1801191f525102ef60006a05c8cc6014>).

Maple Leaf Foods. 2008. "Message From Maple Leaf Foods Regarding Listeria Recall."

Retrieved December 21, 2010

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cgk3o3AJM2U&feature=related>).

McAlister, Kirsten Emiko. 1999a. "Narrating Japanese Canadians In and Out of the Canadian Nation: A Critique of Realist Forms of Representation." *Canadian*

Journal of Communication 24(1). Retrieved November 4, 2010 (<http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewArticle/1083/989>).

-----1999b. "Remembering Political Violence: The Nikkei Internment Memorial Centre." PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.

McHoul, Alec and Wendy Grace. 1997. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, power and the subject*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Miers, David. 2001. "An International Review of Restorative Justice." *Crime Reduction Research Series Paper* (10). Policing and Reducing Crime Unit. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, London: Home Office.

Miki, Art. 1987. Letter to the Prime Minister Brian Mulroney. Roger Obata Fonds. National Archives, Archival Reference No.: R9332-0-7-E, Box 6, File 21.

Miki, Roy. 1998. *Broken Entries: Race, Subjectivity, Writing*. Toronto, ON: Mercury.

-----2004. *Redress: Inside the Japanese Canadian Call for Justice*. Vancouver, BC: Raincoast Books.

-----2009. "After Redress: A conversation with Roy Miki." *Canadian Literature* 201: 71-88.

- Miki, Roy and Cassandra Kobayashi. 1991. *Justice In Our Time: The Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement*. Vancouver, BC: Talonbooks.
- Miki, Roy and Cassandra Kobayashi. 1989. *Spirit of Redress: Japanese Canadians in Conference*. Vancouver: JC Publications.
- NAJC. N.d. *Justice in Our Time: Redress for Japanese Canadians*. Redress Brief.
- Nobles, Melissa. 2008. *The Politics of Official Apologies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Norman, Howard and VCC (Vancouver Consultative Council). 1945. *What About the Japanese Canadians?*. Vancouver, BC: Vancouver Consultative Council printers.
- Northern News Service. 2008. "Harper Apologizes for Residential Schools." in *Northern News Service Online* (http://nns1.com/northern-news-services/stories/papers/jun13_08apo-nun.html).
- Obata, Roger – Fonds. 1942-2000. National Archives. Archival Reference No.: R9332-0-7-E.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2001. "Memorandum". Retrieved June 13, 2011
<http://www.oed.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/view/Entry/116345?rskey=ibkgEW&result=2&isAdvanced=false#eid>.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2011. "Redress". Retrieved May 25, 2011
<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/160456>.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online. 2008. "Scrapbook." Retrieved July 20, 2011
<http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.library.carleton.ca/views/ENTRY.html?entry=t140.e0743250&srn=1&ssid=703755710#FIRSTHIT>.

- Picard, Andre. 2008. "Handling of Listeriosis Outbreak is a Disgrace." in *The Globe and Mail*, Retrieved April 4, 2011
(<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/health/article51735.ece>).
- Saar, Robert. 2002. "Genealogy and Subjectivity." Pp.231-245 in *European Journal of Philosophy*, 10(2) Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Sevy, Rosa and John Torpey. 2004. "Commemoration, Redress and Reconciliation in the Integration of Immigrant Communities: The Cases of Japanese-Canadians and Japanese Americans." Working Paper No. 04-01, Vancouver Centre of Excellence, Vancouver, BC.
- Sugiman, Pamela. 2004. "Memories of Internment: Narrating Japanese Canadian Women's Life Stories." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 29(3): 359-388.
- Tavuchis, Nicholas. 1991. *Mea Culpa: The Sociology of Apology and Reconciliation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Thompson, Grace Collection. 1945-1948a. Letters to the Prime Minister of Canada. National Archives, Archival Reference No.: R6953-0-5-E.
- , 1945-1948b. "Orders-In-Council Threaten Your Citizenship!". National Archives, Archival Reference No.: R6953-0-5-E.
- Thompson, Janna. 2009. "Apology, historical obligations and the ethics of memory." *Memory Studies* 2: 195.
- , 2008. "Apology, Justice and Respect: A Critical Defense of Political Apology." In Gibney, M., Howard-Hassman, R., Coicaud, J-M. and Niklaus Steiner., Eds. *The Age of Apology: Facing Up to the Past*. Pennsylvania, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Torpey, John. 2006. *Making Whole What has Been Smashed: On Reparations Politics*.
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Urban Walker, Margaret. 2006. "Restorative Justice and Reparations." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 37(3): 377-395.
- Walters, William. Forthcoming. "Governmentality and (Three Styles of) Genealogy."
Chapter 4 in *Governmentality: Encountering Global Politics*, Routledge.
- Warner, Michael. 2002. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York, NY: Zone Books.
- Weitekamp, Elmar. 1993. "Reparative Justice: Toward a Victim Oriented System."
European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research 1(1): 70-93.
- Wethey, Emma. 2002. *The Politics of Apology: Issues arising from state apologies to indigenous peoples for historical injustice in Australia and North America*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.