



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Pieris, A

Title:

Intersecting sovereignties: Border camps and border villages in wartime North America

Date:

2019

Citation:

Pieris, A. (2019). Intersecting sovereignties: Border camps and border villages in wartime North America. Pieris, A (Ed.). *Architecture on the Borderline: Boundary politics and built space*, Architecture on the Borderline: Boundary politics and built space, (1), pp.36-56. Routledge.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/313800>

*This is an Accepted Manuscript of Book Chapter in Architecture on the Borderline: Boundary Politics and Built Space (Routledge Architext Series 2019) available at <https://www.routledge.com/Architecture-on-the-Borderline-Boundary-Politics-and-Built-Space/Pieris/p/book/9781138102828>*

## Intersecting Sovereignties: Border camps and border villages in wartime North America

Anoma Pieris

### **Abstract**

The forced removal of civilians of Japanese ancestry from homes along the sensitive West Coast of North America, and their incarceration in detention centres and remote concentration camps, remains a particularly troubling episode within Second World War histories. State sovereignty, imposed in this manner, created an internal border condition where a group of minority citizens was disenfranchised. The denial of civil liberties was further spatialised in the camp facilities erected for their accommodation; barrack cities in the US and repurposed or rebuilt work camps in Canada. This chapter compares the facilities at Manzanar, California, with those at New Denver, British Columbia, examining how social oppression was conveyed through two very different types of camp architecture, and how incarcerated populations responded to them. The chapter's additional focus on an orphanage and a sanatorium uncovers internal generational vulnerabilities.

<Chapter begins here>

Following the Japanese navy's surprise aerial attack on Pearl Harbour in December 1941, both the US and Canadian governments issued exclusion orders: Executive Order 9066 (February 19, 1942) and the order-in-council PC1486 (January 16, 1942), respectively,<sup>1</sup> authorising the forced removal of people of Japanese ancestry, including birthright citizens, from the sensitive West Coast areas of North America. These orders created an artificial coastal border zone on one side of North America while dispersing fragmented spaces designed for civilian exclusion in remote parts of the interior geography. In the USA, some 118,110 civilians (Kashima 2003, 136) were removed to 17, so-called 'Assembly' or 'Reception Centers' (in fairgrounds, race tracks and stadia) and from there to 10 hastily, purpose-built 'Relocation Centers'; places of illegal detention and incarceration (Daniels 1981; Robinson 2001). These facilities were distributed in the West Coast military areas 1 and 2, demarcated by the Western Defense Command and Fourth Army as exclusion zones (Burton et al. 2000, 34-44). Two separate agencies: the (military) Wartime Civilian Control Administration and the government's War Relocation Authority (WRA), appointed to oversee the forced removal, administered their incarceration (Fig. 2.1).

<Figure 2.1 near here>

Across the 49th parallel, the 'mass uprooting' of a smaller population of 21,460 Japanese Canadians, some 75 per cent of whom were naturalised or Canadian born citizens, was overseen by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police under the British Columbia Security Commission (BCSC) (Miki and Kobayashi 1991, 16, 31; Robinson 2009, 98-101 and 132-3; see also Adachi 1976; La Violette 1948; Broadfoot 1977). A further 3000 persons, forcibly removed from islands and areas outside Vancouver, were detained in the former Pacific

National Exhibition buildings in Hastings Park. Able-bodied men were sent to roadwork camps and dependent females, children, elderly persons and invalids were incarcerated one hundred miles (approximately 160.9 kilometres) eastward in the mountainous interior of British Columbia. Many community leaders were arrested and detained in both the USA and Canada.

Comparisons between the US and Canadian facilities indicate how sovereignty was re-interpreted and applied in the wartime context. In the USA, the incarcerated civilians were confined to purpose-built barrack environments; in Canada, to repurposed or purpose-built rural settlements. The conversion of these frontier architectures into borderland spaces of deprivation and their easy transformation to carceral environments suggests disturbing correlations between incarceration and citizenship made evident in built form. A further comparison of two of these camps: the 10,000 person concentration camp at Manzanar in California and a cluster of 'internment' camps for some 1500 persons at New Denver, a village in the mountainous Kootenays region in British Columbia is instructive. The liberal values and opportunities projected in these settler architectures were subverted by incarceration, under the terms of wartime sovereignty.

Using these camps as its starting point, this chapter investigates how these over-determined spaces of exclusion were encountered and altered through domicile. Incarcerated civilians were subjected to programmes of assimilation and to administrative and military control. They were denied the opportunities, freedoms and security afforded by liberal democracy and being defended by American and Canadian troops overseas. But despite these forbidding

conditions and continued surveillance, they displayed remarkable resilience in surviving the camps. This chapter uses a spatial lens to uncover that history.

Some notes on terminology. The US and Canadian governments, at that time, used numerous euphemisms such as ‘evacuation’, ‘detention’ or ‘relocation’, to veil the violence of the mass incarceration, enabling control of the incarcerated population under national rather than international law (Miki and Kobayashi 1991, 24). Manzanar was called a War Relocation Center and the camps in Canada – ‘internment camps’. Although typically used for enemy aliens (foreign nationals of a hostile power), the term ‘internment’, pervaded the literature. ‘American concentration camps’ is the more current term (see Daniels 2005).

The peculiar intersection of wartime sovereignty with the racist legacies of these two settler societies produced a ‘state of exception’, a term used by Giorgio Agamben (1998) with reference to the suspension of rights afforded under state sovereignty in Nazi concentration camps. In North America, ‘Japanese’ ancestry became a reductive category for those targeted for forced removal, negating their other achievements and identities, and suspending their civil liberties. Nevertheless, given the inter-generational complexity of the community, diverse political or cultural relations to sovereignty persisted in the camps. Forms of individual agency, multiple place histories and the everyday and relational permeations of power produced attributes of what Avery Gordon describes as ‘complex personhood’ (Gordon 1997). This complexity remained integral to the incarcerated population’s socio-

political consciousness and irreducible to the narrow determinations of normative sovereignty.

One way of understanding this social complexity is through intersectional theory (Crenshaw 1989; Grzanka 2014), an approach which argues that specific acts and policies create burdens that flow along intersecting axes of identity (such as gender, class, sexual orientation and race). Innocent men, women and children, including elderly persons, were inadvertently implicated in the political persecution of cultural and or racial groups. In the case of the forced removal of people of Japanese ancestry, Japan's hostile actions cast undue suspicion on a natal or communal identity category that had been historically discriminated against in racist immigration policies. Their exclusion continued earlier forms of racialised violence through which White settlers expropriated land from Native American communities (Veracini 2010, 97; Bateman and Pilkington 2011, 206). However, Japanese immigrants who arrived in America during the late nineteenth century were also part of the settler influx, in competition for these expropriated resources and lands (see Fujikane and Okamura 2008 for Hawaii). Both racist policies and settler dynamics interlaced in their reception.

Wartime exclusion orders compounded discriminatory legislations, including anti-miscegenation laws, that had denied Asian immigrants naturalisation, suffrage, land ownership and access to professions in late nineteenth and early twentieth century North America, restricting their sociospatial mobility (Daniels 1981, 174-80; Robinson 2009, 14-15, 24; CWRIC 2000, 290-292).<sup>2</sup> Transcontinental migrations between Canada, the USA and Hawaii were also restricted at times. Such policies were fuelled by racist lobbies and were

countered by second generation Japanese American (Nisei)/ Japanese Canadian (Nikkei) organisations who sought to prove their patriotism. When compared with other Asian communities whose former governments sided with the Allies, or the many European immigrants who could be similarly linked to the Axis partnership, people of Japanese ancestry were singled out en masse for segregation in 1942.

### **Material deprivation**

Following the exclusion orders, West coast minorities of Japanese ancestry lost their properties in distressed sales or had them confiscated in processes shepherded by government agencies. In the USA, the Farm Security Administration (FSA), acting as a sub-agency under the WRA, redistributed their agricultural lands to alternative operators, offered them compensation and later managed farm labour camps where young Japanese American men and women would be employed (Hewes 1942; Robinson 2009, 83). The Canadian government seized and sold 'evacuee' land and property paying out small allowances from which the incarcerated population paid for housing and provisions, or in the case of self-supporting 'evacuees' was used to pay for alternative placements in the interior (Daniels 1981, 187). These losses of land and livelihood occurred at a time when West coast cities, placed on a war-footing, would expand and prosper through military industry (Hise 1997). The racial tensions, generational divisions and conflicted loyalties of the preceding era intensified after the Pearl Harbour attack (Robinson 2009, 36-9).

Although sharing common cultural roots, the political processes that regulated citizenship divided the community: Japan born immigrants (*issei*) in the USA could not be naturalised or

own agricultural property, unlike their America born progeny (*nisei* and *sansei*— some sixty-two per cent of that population) (Robinson 2009, 14-15, 24). Naturalisation remained open to immigrants to Canada (Robinson 2009, 274; Miki and Kobayashi 1991, 16-18). A third category of *kibei*, were US-born but educated in Japan. Consequently, immigrants and citizens of Japanese ancestry in North America had complex relationships with US or Canadian sovereignty. Immigrants who retained their Japanese nationality, due to legal restrictions, became vulnerable once war broke out. Hostile encounters with Japanese Imperial troops in the Pacific theatre of war, where many American or Canadian servicemen were captured, aggravated latent prejudices in the West coast populations where Asian immigrants were a fast-growing minority (CWRIC 2000, 67). Operational racist stereotypes activated by the military and media masked more complex social realities (80).

### **Physical dislocation**

When compared with the repurposed settlements in Canada, US facilities occupied the square mile grid apportioned to Western territories by Thomas Jefferson, in a pattern synonymous with city planning. Remote sites in the desert landscape, Mississippi flood plains and two Native American reservations were converted into camps. Granada, Colorado; Heart Mountain, Wyoming; Jerome and Rohwer, Arkansas; Manzanar and Tule Lake in California; Topaz, Utah; and Gila River and Poston in Arizona retained the rigidity of the grid iron while Minidoka, Idaho scattered several grid blocks (Burton et al, 2011, 2, Figure 1.1; Bancroft Library, JAER Records, Final Reports, vols. I-V, 1946, reel 148; National Archives, Washington DC, Records Group 210). Military-style barracks were constructed for each

facility to accommodate large numbers ranging from 8000 persons at Granada to 20,000 at Poston, both camps in Colorado (De Witt 1942, 256). Tule Lake in California was used by the administration to segregate those identified as dissenters, or unwilling to comply. The camps were built to the minimum requirements of health and sanitation at USD 56 million at that time (Burton et al. 2000, 40).

The camp settings in British Columbia were distinctive from the USA, as the mountainous terrain of the Kootenays region obviated the need for surrounding walls or fences in many camps. Ghost towns of the former silver-mining industry – built on traditional lands of the region’s Sinixt Nation, who had been depopulated by disease and dispersed during the previous two centuries, were repurposed for ‘internment camps’ at Slocan City, Greenwood, Sandon, Kaslo, New Denver and Rosebery (Daniels 1978, 5-7). New towns were built at Tashme and Lemon Creek (Slocan extension was a composite of Slocan City, Bay Farm, Popoff and Lemon Creek) (Miki and Kobayashi 1991, 30). Apart from these housing centres, there were road work camps for males over eighteen years of age, sugar beet fields, and self-supporting projects in the interior (Smith 2000, 106; Robinson 2009, 171-5). Tashme was the only camp inside the hundred-mile zone modelled after the American grid plan (Karizumai 2016, 27). As with Tule Lake, dissenters were sent to the Prisoner of War camps at Angler, and later at Petawawa, both in Ontario (Robinson 2009, 196; Daniels 1981, 185).

In the Owens Valley, California, 220 miles north of Los Angeles, the military and later the WRA leased 5,415 acres including an extant but depopulated town grid from the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power under EO 9066 (Burton et al. 2001, 163). This land,

expropriated from the Indigenous Paiute during the mid-nineteenth century, had been used for the Manzanar irrigation colony with a nominal underlay of roads and services useful for the camp layout. The Owens Valley Reception Center was built on the site in March 1942, using some 1000 workers hired by Griffith and Co. of Los Angeles, a firm employed in other prestigious military projects. The facility was converted into a War Relocation Center operating from June 1942 to November 1945 with a peak population of 10,046 persons (Kitayama, 2018). The majority of those incarcerated at Manzanar came from the Los Angeles area while smaller numbers came from Stockton, California and Bainbridge Island, Washington (Burton et al. 2001, 163).

Three generations of culturally ‘Japanese’ civilians arrived at Manzanar in late March 1942 to a city of 34 residential blocks separated by five fire breaks, more reminiscent of a military cantonment than a place of even temporary domicile (Unrau 1996, 220–225, 281–292, 470–476; maps and plans, 835–848) (Fig. 2.2). They saw it through a cloud of dust raised by bulldozers auguring the dust storms that would sweep across the site and seep through the tar paper insulation of their barrack walls (Unrau 1996, vol. 1, 189, based on The Silverman Report 174-5 and interviews 206). Residential blocks each contained 19 green lumber, gable roofed 6 x 30.5 metre (20x100 foot) barracks: 14 for accommodation, 2 latrines, a laundry, recreation (community) hall and mess hall (Fig. 2.3) (Unrau, 1996, vol. 1, 227-280, 261). Standard barracks were divided into 4-6 living units or doubled up across the width to form the mess hall, still adhering to the rigid military grid. The anonymity of and lack of privacy in these structures, qualities desirable for disciplining troops, reduced the incarcerated population into an undignified collective (see site plans in NARA, WRA Records, Manzanar, Record Group 210). Military police lived on the camp perimeter, while timber framed staff

housing for 250 WRA administrative staff at the so-called 'Beverley Hills' area in the southwest section of the camp, purpose-designed in September 1943, asserted their relative entitlements (Unrau, 1996, vol. 1, 247). As noted by Lynne Horiuchi (2015, 108-109), when renowned FSA architects Vernon de Mars and Garrett Eckbo proposed designs for civic recreation areas at Manzanar (in plans that were never implemented) their designs for staff housing included landscaped gardens and community structures absent in proposals for the rest of the camp. These same FSA architects were reputed for many enlightened community planning schemes in designs for depression era (1930s) labour camps built for drought stricken white share-croppers from the Midwestern states and southern plains (Imbert 1997, 122).

<Figs 2.2 and 2.3 near here>

Conversely, the Canadian camps were so-called residential 'shacks' shared by two families each, except for Popoff which had multi-unit barrack structures. New Denver on Slocan Lake was the centre of operations for all of the camps in the Slocan Valley. Here, the Selkirks, the Purcells and the Eastern Monashee mountains acted as natural barriers and, apart from guard posts at points in the Slocan Valley, freedom of movement was permitted between camps. In total, there were five camps in New Denver's immediate vicinity with three associated with the village. The Orchard Camp (Fig. 2.4) was located on a parcel of land, south of Carpenter Creek, adjacent to the municipality's boundaries while other neighbouring camps included the sixty-acre Harris Ranch and two acre Nelson Ranch found to the north and south of the town and leased to the Security Commission. Cole Harris, the grandson of JC Harris, the owner of Harris Ranch (at that time) remarks that camps created beside well-established populations such as Harris Ranch, New Denver, Kaslo and Greenwood were different to

camps without that proximity (Harris 2015, 1). As with the remote towns in the US asked to accommodate large Asian populations, the region's long term residents approached the prospect with misgivings, opposition and gradual adaptation (3).

<Fig 2.4 near here>

There were two variations of camp housing in New Denver: buildings repurposed for accommodating the incarcerated population and houses built from scratch. As detailed by his grandson, Cole, J.C. Harris leased his land and ranch house to the Security Commission for USD 50 per month (Harris 2015, 6, 9, 10). At the peak of the occupation 50 men and 2 cooks were accommodated in the Harris ranch house (Fig. 2.5) with around 150-200 men, women and children in the houses on the Far Field (around 6 persons per house) (13). In the houses purpose-built for their accommodation, two families shared a common hearth.

<Fig 2.5 near here>

In some communities, like Sandon, Kaslo or Slocan, Japanese Canadian carpenters, supervised by white foremen, repaired unused buildings, but in other sites like New Denver, shacks were purpose built for the families (Harris 2015, 11) (Fig. 2.6). The Commission converted the covered skating rink to offer temporary accommodation (in addition to tents) and set up a carpenter shop for making prefabricated components. JC Harris wrote that the winter of 1942-3 was exceedingly harsh, 'the huts were wet and draughty, and with wartime scarcities there was no material to fix them' (14).

<Fig 2.6 near here>

## **Life in the border camps**

The loss of civil liberties at Manzanar was conveyed through spatially congested, basic and temporary facilities and disciplinary and labour regimes. The regimented numbering pattern that purportedly democratised US urban form anonymised the incarcerated population, an indignity famously conveyed by Miné Okubo in her 1946 graphic book *Citizen 13660*.

WRA/WCCA regulation forbade certain forms of public gathering. Quite apart from these systemic deprivations, the incarcerated population lived in barbed wire enclosures with guard towers and inward focused search lights (Burton et al. 2000, 45), turning these environments into 'Prison Cities' (Horiuchi 2005). Movement in or out of the camp, if permitted, was under escort by military police garrisoned at the site.

Other aspects of the physical plan impacted family cohesion. The military or work camp model was adapted in the common washing and messing facilities while rigid linear arrangements restricted views of the surrounding panorama. There were few civic amenities, excepting the community barrack building in each block and an auditorium purpose built in 1944. The incarcerated population adapted utility spaces and community halls for their various activities. They created recreational spaces in the firebreaks. They struggled to domesticate the hostile expanse.

The New Denver camps appeared comparatively humane. The plan for the orchard camp was a loose domestic arrangement of 8.5 x 4 metre shiplap timber shacks, built by some of the incarcerated men under boat builder Phillip Matsumoto. This plan was later reconfigured as a

loose suburban grid.<sup>3</sup> Shizuye Takeshima (1991, 16) describes their house as a ‘summer bungalow’ of two rooms, flanking a kitchen – shared by two families (four adults and three children). The central hearth and chimney enabled family cohesion – unlike the communal messes in the US camps. But, consequently, families had to provision themselves and women were consumed by domestic labour.

Everyday tedium, long lines outside the mess hall, lack of privacy in the sleeping compartments and lavatories were among the main complaints of the US camps (see Houston and Houston 1973, 23). There were disruptions to the community caused by influxes or depletion of camp population, particularly once younger men and women were recruited via the FSA as seasonal workers. Problems related to provisioning, including the equitable distribution of food, poor health, depression, poor insulation from bad weather were also symptoms of their impoverishment and disorientation. Depictions of Manzanar by photographers like Ansel Adams (1944) (see previous Fig. 2.3) convey the stark regimented conditions. Toyo Miyatake (Adams and Miyatake 1978), an incarcerated photographer from Los Angeles, who brought a contraband camera inside the camp and later operated a photo studio there at Block 30, individualised his subjects, at a time when, as noted by Jasmine Alinder (2009, 101), the racist discourse was obsessively rendering people of Japanese descent as an indistinguishable, homogeneous mass.

The population incarcerated at Manzanar were not passive recipients of these environments as many photographs of the camp reveals. At the earliest opportunity they adapted their barrack quarters to simulate some semblance of their former lives. Culturally familiar food,

religious practices and various forms of recreation were organised. When compared to the nearby townships of Lone Pine and Independence, Manzanar was a carceral boom town with chapels or temples of various dominations, sports fields and golf course, picnic areas and parks, and judo and kendo dojos. The cooperative enterprise ran two gift shops, a beauty parlour, a barber shop, a dressmaking shop, a shoe repair shop, a watch repair shop, a mail order counter, a sporting goods store, a laundry, a flower shop; held outdoor movies and ran the *Manzanar Free Press* (Burton 1996, 92-3). The camp population raised its own livestock, and farmed food-crops, herbs, and guayale (93, 95) countering their civic deprivation through collective efforts.

By August 1942, the camp was planted with Victory gardens; a pleasure garden, Merritt Park, gradually took shape during 1943; a golf course and several parks and picnic areas, an outdoor theatre and several sports fields provided various options for recreation (82). Picnic areas often included walkways, bridges and fire pits. Individual barracks were softened by borders of planting and rustic fencing (see Burton 2015). Prized among these were the linear block gardens located in the common areas alongside some of the mess halls (Fig. 2.7). They provided aesthetic relief for the long lines queuing outside at mealtimes and individualised each segment of the grid.

<Figure 2.7 near here>

Similar transformations occurred at New Denver. There was some limited interaction between the Japanese Canadian residents and the townspeople (Harris 2015, 20-21): they met at the Bosun Hall in New Denver and in theatrical events, dances, sporting competitions,

school productions and church activities (Shimizu 2008, 14, 20, 30, 32). They highlighted their needs during visits by Red Cross representatives. Takashima (1991) writes of multiple appeals to the BCSC by her father and others for plumbing, lamps, a bath house, all of which would be given incrementally over the three-year period. Wood sheds were added to keep the poorly insulated homes warm in sub zero temperatures. A communal bath house constructed by them in 1943 was converted into a community Kyowakai Hall with an *Otera* (Buddhist temple/shrine) at one end (NIMC pamphlet). In the spring and summer months, the residents at the orchard camp transformed the spaces around their shacks into vegetable plots and ornamental gardens (Shimizu 2008, 16, 34) (Fig. 2.8). Takashima (1991, 39-40) writes how the men of the two families who shared their shack cleared, turned and hoed the ground that first spring – created flowerbeds in the front and vegetable plots at the back, and planted a row of fir trees to separate their two gardens. Meanwhile the gardens around the ranch house benefited from an elderly resident population with time on their hands. Returning from a visit to her former home in July 1943, Mrs Harris wrote of the flower garden and vegetable garden declaring, ‘I have never seen it [the ranch house] look more beautiful than it does now’(Harris 2015, 16).<sup>4</sup> Her grandson describes a mosaic of ornamental gardens with small waterwheels that turned in the creek and bridges, one of which was big enough to walk across (17-18).

<Fig 2.8 near here>

Whereas racial covenants and expectations of assimilation had constrained similar forms of cultural expression in pre-war American cities, like for example, the Japanese garden tradition, in the camps they found new purpose and reciprocity. Tenacious signs of defiance or resilience (Helphand 2006, 155-200), they were powerful means for humanising

incarceration; all the more potent in the Canadian case with its metaphor of uprooting. However, the aesthetics of the camp gardens drew on multiple intersectional cultural practices, of Japanese-style ornamental garden creation, of immigrant gardeners' knowledge of local flora and the hybrid forms of place identification through cultivation for consumption or pleasure that invariably mark settler landscapes (Hirahara 2000). By offering a means of identity construction in the face of social oppression, the immanent complexity of the carceral space was unveiled.

### **Intersectional environments**

While intersectional theory, as developed in critical race theory and feminist sociology, exposed patriarchal or racial discrimination, it also sensitised us to these intra group complexities. However, the approach paid less attention to minority embodiment of diasporic political or transnational sensibilities. Within the population incarcerated under the exclusion orders multiple and intersecting intergenerational political relations produced competing axes of identity. Family groups splintered along these lines. When wartime sovereignty introduced new forms of racial discrimination, individualised forms of social mobility based on class, education or professionalisation were suppressed. In the scenarios described here, denial of civil liberties created an artificial social boundary between those with Japanese ancestry and other citizens and immigrants across North America.

For example, at Manzanar, while everyday social divisions occurred along inter-state, place-based groupings, between residents of Bainbridge Island in Washington and those from Los Angeles or elsewhere in California; group division around issues of national loyalty

factionalised the camp. Those aggrieved by incarceration were affronted by US-patriots; such as the members of the Japanese American Citizens League who cooperated with the administration. A so-called 'riot' at Manzanar in December 1942 brought these internal tensions to light. A compulsory loyalty questionnaire, distributed two months after this incident in 1943 (CWRIC 2000, 203), further polarised these positions by posing two questions: number 27 – regarding willingness to serve in the US-military forces, or for women in the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps (later the Women's Army Corps); and number 28 – asking Nisei to renounce loyalty to the Japanese Emperor and swear allegiance to the United States. The US military began drafting men from within the camps from January 1944. Education programs at the Manzanar high school modelled assimilatory American values.

While the push and pull of sovereign power deepened national and generational differences based on language, cultural practices and politics, communal subjectivities were further differentiated by gender, age, sexuality, cultural practices, language, religion (whether Buddhist, Catholic or Protestant or other religions, sects or denominations) and class. Incarceration was experienced differently across these identity categories. Biographical accounts remind us of the irreducibility of any cultural group to either racial or national characteristics, and alert us to how human vulnerabilities vary. Meanwhile the many external pressures aimed at humiliating this population made outward expressions of Japanese culture politically sensitive.

Their material dispossession, racial segregation and further differentiation by gender and by productivity; their removal into assembly centres in stalls meant for livestock, quarantine and subsequent incarceration, denied and subverted the spatial freedoms that Japanese migrants to the US or their US-born children and grandchildren associated with civil liberties. These processes also degraded camp populations as subordinate dependents and compliant manual workers. This perception was deepened through forms of civic deprivation in the barrack cities. Other stand alone facilities for particularly vulnerable groups such as orphaned children on elderly persons, further exposed individual frailties.

Manzanar was the only US war relocation centre to include an orphanage, a separate self sufficient 'Children's Village' located in the fire-break south of Block 29, near the camp hospital (Fig. 2.9). Its barrack buildings were larger and better insulated with porches at either-end and internal shower and toilet facilities. There were three separate barracks each for staff, boys and girls (Unrau 1996, vol. 1, 233, based on Project Report No. 3, Manzanar Project Reports and vol. 2., 607-9). Writing on the experiences of some of its 101 occupants, Catherine Irwin (2008) describes the children as 'twice-orphaned'; the majority of them came from three California orphanages, Shonien (Children's Garden) and Maryknoll Catholic Home in Los Angeles and the Japanese Salvation Army Home, San Francisco. The number also included children whose parents had been detained, who were from broken families, whose mothers were hospitalised, or who had been born out of wedlock to women in the camps. Although a mixed marriage non-exclusion policy came into force from September 1942, the incarceration of some 19 mixed-race children as well as children of Japanese ancestry from non-Japanese foster families shows how rigidly the military had enforced the exclusion order. Referring to HE Whitney's (1948) study of homeless children of Japanese

ancestry, Wilber Sato observes that WRA statistics revealed that 209 ‘homeless or otherwise’ exempted children were left behind in sanatoria, mental and penal institutions, hospitals and orphanages (Burton 1996, 91) with equally troubling consequences.

<Figure 2.9 near here>

There was a strong sense of group cohesion under Superintendent Lillian Matsumoto who had accompanied the orphans from Shonien. The micro-community lasted for the duration of the camp, amplified due to a dedicated staff, strict routine and religious rituals. The village was further emplaced through a garden setting, with gazebo and rustic fencing and 10,600 square feet of lawn (Burton 2015, 61). With the closure of the camps after the war, the government dispersed the children to institutions, kin, or to foster parents and the facilities were dismantled.

In the Canadian case, segregation by gender, and removal of productive males to road works camps or able families to self-supporting camps heightened perception of the interior camps as dependencies. But government policy made exceptions for Eurasians and Japanese married to other ethnic groups (Daniels 1981, 185) so that only 15 Japanese girls were removed from the Oriental Home in Victoria to Assiniboia, Saskatchewan, both facilities in this case operated by the Women’s Missionary Society of the United Church (Oikawa 2012, 204-205). As outlined by Mona Oikawa, the church was thus implicated in the displacement process (34). Her more strident critique is reserved, however, for the Hastings Park hospital or the five hospitals associated with the interior camps, which by segregating spaces of contagion amplified socially embedded racialised pathologies (210). Hospitals were also

integral to the US camps, essential given the numbers incarcerated, but also indicative of their total social segregation.

At New Denver, a 100-bed Tuberculosis Sanatorium (the 'San') was built to receive patients from Hastings Park and other camps on the lake shore adjacent to the camp (Fig 2.10). Some 212 patients were treated between 1942-47 (Hastings Park 1942, online). The 'San' is described as a modern facility with doctors and dental offices, x-ray and other spaces, a kitchen, two dining rooms, men's and women's wards, two sun porches, staff quarters, a library and a pavilion built in 1944 for patients awaiting discharge. Japanese gardeners cared for the vegetable plots and lawns and at least one of the doctors, Dr Uchida, was culturally Japanese (Hastings Park 1942, online). By January 1943, the Japanese Canadian population in the village had risen to 1500 persons, due to the presence of this facility. Young Japanese Canadian girls were trained as nurses, and once they relocated, family members of patients took over carer's duties (*Hastings Park 1942*, online).

<Figure 2.10 near here>

Barriers to post war social reintegration were far greater in Canada than in the USA. Despite the lack of any evidence of their disloyalty, Prime Minister McKenzie King advocated forced repatriation of Japanese Canadians in 1944. A survey was conducted on whether they chose voluntary relocation further East within Canada or repatriation to Japan (Kage 2012, 12). Unsure of their prospects in Canada and intimidated by these pronouncements some 4000 persons left in March 1946 (18). By January 1947, the remaining population had reduced to 6,776 persons; they were not allowed back to their places of origin until April 1949

(Karizumai 2016, 47; Miki and Kobayashi 1991, 51). In fact, New Denver's sanatorium continued to treat invalid Japanese Canadians after the war and some families with family members undergoing treatment there remained in the Orchard long after other camps in the valley had been salvaged. The village also gathered other aged and invalid former-camp residents unable to travel east of the mountains once restrictions were lifted in January 1946. The provincial administration awarded deeds to those residents who had occupied their homes for more than ten years, several of which were modified from shacks. The Sanatorium was later converted to a residential school for 104 culturally Russian 'Sons of Freedom' Doukhobor children removed from Perry Siding under British Columbia's Protection of Children Act between 1953 and 1959 (Righting the Wrong 1999, 17; Sunahara 91). The building was fenced in and members of the RCMP patrolled the grounds (50). As with Japanese Canadians, forced removal was a radical intervention in the family lives of these communities.

### **The Afterlives of Camps**

This chapter has offered insights into two prominent wartime camp environments in North America outlining the very different responses they elicited in those incarcerated there. One challenge in uncovering their physical history has been the almost complete demolition of the facilities in the post war years. These processes followed the revocation of the exclusion orders and return of many from among the camp populations to their former cities after the war. There, impoverished and confronted by lingering hostility they began rebuilding their shattered lives. Political changes, when they occurred several decades later, were formulated around the cause of civil liberties, which in turn positioned the Japanese American or Japanese Canadian communities as a vocal minority. However, their battles were internal to

their respective political geographies. The Japanese American Citizens League prompted the US Congressional Commission hearings in 1980 forging pathways to redress and culminating in the August 1988 Civil Liberties Act (Miki and Kobayashi 1991, 64-5). The National Association of Japanese Canadians, inspired by successes south of the border likewise reached a settlement in September 1988.<sup>5</sup>

Physical traces have proved important for acts of reparation, recognition or commemoration. Four years after the 1988 national apology to Japanese Americans, the abandoned camp site at Manzanar was declared a National Historic Site, managed by the National Parks Service. Certain remains, such as the ‘soul consoling tower’, cemetery and former auditorium, would become central features of this commemorative landscape. Similarly, at New Denver, a Nikkei Internment Memorial Centre was established on the former orchard site during the 1990s, by a group of those who had been incarcerated there during the war (McAllister 2010). At both these sites the National Park Service assisted by members of the Japanese community have repurposed or simulated architectural and landscape for interpretive strategies. At Manzanar three new barrack buildings and one rehabilitated 1942 mess hall convey aspects of incarceration to visitors, while the abandoned gardens are being uncovered from under layers of dust and scrub. At New Denver, the site includes the community hall with the original Otera (shrine), and three former residential ‘shacks’. These are tied together by a Heiwa Teien (peace garden) designed by the renowned landscape designer Roy (Tomomichi) Sumi, who was incarcerated successively at the Tashme, Rosebery, New Denver Camps and Blue River Road Camp (Sumi and Shimokura 2015, 16-18). The messages of tolerance expressed through these new facilities call for empathetic co-curation between government agencies, town councils, people of Japanese ancestry and other local

communities. Their lessons appear manifested in minority struggles for and achievement of related civil liberties in North America.

The exclusion orders were troubling responses to a global border conflict that eventually brought down both German and Japanese imperialism, ended protracted international warfare, and initiated decolonisation across Asia. These changes hardened aspects of national sovereignty and shifted emphasis to nation building. The alienation of supposedly 'subversive' minority citizens during times of national emergency and the erosion of transnational links by insular patriotism are part of its negative legacy. Such practices raise 'statelessness' as a border condition and an intersecting axis of identity.

## REFERENCES

- Adachi, K 1976, *The Enemy That Never Was: A History of the Japanese Canadians*  
McClelland and Stewart, Toronto.
- Adams, A and Miyatake T 1978, *Two Views of Manzanar: An Exhibition of Photographs*,  
Frederick S. Wight Art Gallery, University of California Los Angeles, CA.
- Adams, A 1944, *Born Free and Equal*, US Camera, New York.
- Agamben, G 1998, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford University Press,  
Stanford, CA.
- Alinder, J 2009, *Moving Images: Photography and the Japanese American Incarceration*,  
University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Bateman F and Pilkington, L 2011, *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and  
Culture*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

- Bancroft Library, Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Records 1930-1974, Final Reports, vols. I-V, 1946, reel 148.
- Broadfoot, B 1977, *Years of Sorrow, Years of Shame: The Story of Japanese Canadians in World War II* Doubleday, Toronto.
- Burton, J ed. 1996, *Three Farewells to Manzanar*, National Parks Service Publications in Anthropology, Tucson, Arizona.
- 2015, *Garden Management Plan: Gardens and Gardeners at Manzanar*, National Park Service, Manzanar National Historic Site, CA.
- Burton, J, Farrell, MM, Lord, FB and Lord, RW (eds.), [1999] 2001, *Confinement and Ethnicity: An overview of World War II Japanese American Relocation Sites*, Arizona: National Parks Service Publications in Anthropology, Tucson.
- Crenshaw, K 1989, 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics', *The University of Chicago Legal Forum*, vol. 140, 139-67.
- CWRIC [1997] 2000, *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians*, University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Daniels, R [1971] 1981, *Concentration Camps USA: Japanese Americans and World War II* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.
- Daniels, R 2005 'Words Do Matter: A Note on Inappropriate Terminology and the Incarceration of the Japanese Americans', in L Fiset and G Nomura (eds.) *Nikkei in the Pacific Northwest: Japanese Americans and Japanese Canadians in the Twentieth Century*, University of Washington Press, Seattle, 83-207.
- ed., 1978, Department of Labour, Canada, Report on the Administration of Japanese Affairs in Canada, 1942-1944[origin. pub. 1944], Arno Press, New York.

- De Witt, JL 1943, *Final Report of the Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast, 1942*,  
Government Printing Office, Washington.
- Fujikane, C and Okamura, J 2008, *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the  
Habits of Everyday Life in Hawaii*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.
- Gordon, A 1997, *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*, University of  
Minnesota Press, MN.
- Grzanka, PR (ed.) 2014, *Intersectionality: a foundations and frontiers reader*, Westview  
Press, Boulder, Colorado.
- Harris, C 2015, *Mist and Green Leaves: Japanese Canadians on Harris Ranch*, Chameleon  
Fire Editions, New Denver, B.C.
- Hastings Park 1942: New Denver Sanatorium* n.d., Japanese Canadian Hastings Park  
Commemoration and Education Project, viewed 18 January 2019,  
<<http://hastingspark1942.ca/history/new-denver-sanatorium/>>
- Helphand, K 2006, *Defiant Gardens: making gardens in wartime*, Trinity University Press,  
San Antonio, Texas.
- Hewes, LI 1942, *Final Report of the Participation of the Farm Security Administration in the  
Evacuation Program of the Wartime Civil Control Administration Civil Affairs  
Division Western Defense Command and Fourth Army*, Farm Security  
Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, San Francisco, CA.
- Hinohara, N (ed). 2000, *Greenmakers: Japanese American Gardeners in Southern California*  
Southern California Gardners' Federation, Los Angeles.
- Hise, G 1997, *Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth-Century Metropolis*, The Johns  
Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

- Horiuchi, L 2005, 'Dislocations and Relocations: The Built Environments of Japanese American Internment', PhD Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA.
- 2015, 'Architects at War: Designing Prison Cities for Japanese American Communities', in B Tauke, K Smith, and C Davis, *Diversity and Design: Understanding Hidden Consequences*, Routledge, New York, 101–120.
- Houston, JW and Houston JD 1973, *Farewell to Manzanar*, Houghton Mifflin Company, New York.
- Imbert, D 1997, 'The Art of Social Landscape Design', in M Treib and D Imbert (eds.), *Garrett Eckbo: Modern Landscapes for Living*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 106–177.
- Irwin, C 2008, 'Twice orphaned: voices from the Children's Village of Manzanar' PhD thesis, Calif: Center for Oral and Public History, California State University. *Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Records, 1930–1974*, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
- Kage, T 2012, *Uprooted Again: Japanese Canadians move to Japan after World War II*, trans., C Merken, Ti-Jean Press, Victoria, British Columbia.
- Karizumai 2016, *A Guide to Japanese Canadian Internment Sites*, Nikkei National Museum and Cultural Centre, Burnaby, BC.
- Kashima, T 2003, *Judgement Without Trial: Japanese American Internment during World War II*, University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Kitayama, G 2018, *Manzanar*, Densho Encyclopedia, viewed 19 January 2019, <<https://encyclopedia.densho.org/Manzanar/>>.
- La Violette, FE 1948, *The Canadian Japanese in World War II*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

- McAllister, E 2010, *Terrain of Memory: A Japanese Canadian Memorial Project*, UBC Press, Vancouver.
- Miki, R and Kobayashi, C 1991, *Justice in Our Time: The Japanese Canadian Redress Settlement*, Talonbooks, Vancouver with National Association of Japanese Canadians, Winnipeg.
- National Archives, USA (NARA), Records of the War Relocation Authority, 1941–1989, Record Group 210.
- Nikkei Internment Memorial Center*, visitor pamphlet, Village of New Denver.
- Oikawa, M 2012, *Cartographies of Violence: Japanese Canadian Women, Memory and the Subjects of Internment*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.
- Okubo M 1946, *Citizen 13660*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Righting the Wrong: The Confinement of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobor Children*, Public Report No.38. 1999, Ombudsman, Province of British Columbia.
- Robinson, G 2001, *By Order of the President: FDR and the Internment of Japanese Americans*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- 2009, *A Tragedy of Democracy: Japanese Confinement in North America*, Columbia University Press, New York.
- Shimizu, H 2008, *Images of Internment: Life in the New Denver Internment Camp, 1942-46*, Ti-Jean Press, Victoria, BC.
- Silverman, ME, 1946, Appendix 25 in RL Brown and R Merritt, 'Final Report, Manzanar', vol.1, pp. A 174-5, RG 210, Entry 4b, Box 71.
- Smith, GS 2000, 'The Japanese Canadians in World War II', in K Saunders and R Daniels, *Alien Justice: wartime internment in Australia and North America*, Queensland University Press, Brisbane, QdLD, 93-113

Sumi E and Shimokura, H 2015, 'Roy Tomomichi Sumi: Renowned Designer and Architect of Japanese Gardens', *Nikkei Images* 20, no. 3, 16-18, Nikkei National Museum and Cultural Centre, Burnaby, BC.

Sunahara, AG 1981, *The Politics of Racism: The Uprooting of Japanese Canadians During the Second World War*, James Lorimer Ltd., Toronto, Canada

Takeshima, S 1991, *A Child in Prison Camp*, Scholastic Library Publishing, Toronto.

Unrau, HD 1996, *The Evacuation and Relocation of Persons of Japanese Ancestry During World War II: A Historical Study of the Manzanar War Relocation Center*, US Department of the Interior, National Parks Service, Denver, Colorado.

Veracini, L 2010, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Whitney, HE 1948, 'Care of the homeless children of Japanese ancestry during evacuation and relocation', Thesis, University of California, Berkeley.

---

<sup>1</sup> Funding for this research was provided by the Australian Research Council, Future Fellowship FT140100190, *Temporal Cities, Provisional Citizens: Architectures of Internment 2015-2018*. My particular thanks to Ross Cole, Amanda Murphy (Recreation and Cultural Services Coordinator for the Village of New Denver) and Paul Gibbons at New Denver and to Jeff Burton and, in particular, Rosemary Masters at Manzanar for their comments on material presented here. Thanks also to Lynne Horiuchi, a partner on the related research project, who commented on early drafts of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> In the USA, the Alien Land Law of 1913 prohibited the ownership of agricultural land by aliens ineligible for citizenship, and the Alien Land Act of 1920 prohibited leasing and sharecropping. The Immigration Act of 1924 imposed restrictive quotas, where Japan had a zero quota. Under a Gentleman's agreement of 1907-08 between Japan and the US, emigrant numbers were controlled. In Canada, the Chinese Immigration Act excluded Chinese in 1923.

---

<sup>3</sup> The camp was reconfigured in approximately 1942/43 and again between 1957-1960 when title was deeded to occupants by the BCSC.

<sup>4</sup> Granny to Ellen, Bosun Ranch, July 5, 1943, family files.

<sup>5</sup> Redress was led at that time by the National Japanese Canadian Citizens Association.