"Between two cultures and two separate times": *here*, *home*, and identity in the writing of the Japanese American Internment.

Sophie L. Joshua

A thesis submitted for the degree of PhD in Literature

Department of Literature, Film & Theatre Studies

University of Essex

30th October 2024

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the dedication and support I have received throughout the research and writing process.

I dedicate this work to the memory of my beloved grandparents, whose strength and love continue to guide me. I hope they would be proud of how far I have come.

I am deeply grateful to Dr Owen Robinson, who has been my PhD supervisor, mentor, teacher, confidant, and source of constant encouragement throughout both my Master's and PhD. The work I have produced and the academic I have become would not exist without his unwavering support, commitment to his students, and unfathomable intellect. It has been an honour to learn from him, to receive his thoughtful and generous feedback, and to engage in the critical discussions that have shaped this project. His emotional and academic support has been immeasurable, and he continues to inspire the kind of lecturer I hope to become.

I would also like to extend sincere thanks to Dr Annecy Lax and Dr Jak Peake, who sat on my panel and reviewed my work and submissions throughout this project. Your insights, challenges, and guidance pushed me beyond what I thought I was capable of, and your advice and feedback have been instrumental in my growth as a researcher and writer.

To my parents, Hayley Joshua and Michael Joshua, thank you for being enduring examples of work ethic, strength, and commitment, and for your unwavering emotional and financial support across what must have felt like a lifetime of university degrees and deadlines. I also want to thank Nicky Joshua for your consistent interest in my work and for always taking the time to support and discuss my progress with me.

To my brilliant and loving friends-Megan Sharman, Kieran Lynn-Pocock, Brendan Lynn-Pocock, Lloyd Shankley, Nial Peters, Naomi Nash, Emma Stuckey, Charlie-Jane Herbert,

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Ashley Hill, and Faith Reader-thank you for being my academic and emotional sounding boards, my study partners, my champions, and the steady, reassuring voices that drowned out the doubt when I questioned whether I could see this through.

I would also like to thank my wonderful partner, Lewis Harvey. From the beginning of our friendship to our relationship now, you have been one of my greatest supporters. Thank you for your patience with my absences, for reminding me to take breaks and step into the sunlight, for listening to endless streams of research and ideas, and for helping to ease my anxieties. You have helped me learn not to carry the weight of other people's opinions, to stand more confidently in who I am, and to hold onto what truly matters to me. Your presence has made all the difference.

Finally, I wish to dedicate this work to the countless victims of war across history-those who perished, those who endured, and those whose voices live on in testimonies, letters, and fragments of memory. Over the past six years, as I have studied war and immersed myself in these accounts, I have been continually humbled by the weight of their suffering and the clarity of their witness. Their stories shape this thesis. It is not written in their name, but in recognition of their experiences, and with a deep commitment to not letting them be forgotten. Their pain, resilience, and humanity remain with me.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Abstract

This thesis introduces the original concept of *here*, developed as a critical lens to examine literature written in response to the Japanese American internment during World War II. *Here* refers to a metaphysical location in which individuals feel displaced and unwelcome due to perceived foreignness, fractured identity, and social exclusion. This state arises when an expected sense of belonging or *home* is not met. *Here* exists in contrast to *home*, which represents an individual's imagined or idealised place of comfort and acceptance. Using specific literature that covers a comprehensive timeline of the Japanese American experience throughout World War II and the Japanese Internment in the United States of America, this study explores how experiences of relocation, racism, and cultural dislocation shaped individuals' understandings of identity and belonging. The primary texts examined include *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* by Julie Otsuka, *Midnight in Broad Daylight* by Pamela Rotner Sakamoto, *Only What We Could Carry* edited by Lawson Fusao Inada, Patricia Wakida, and William Hohri, and *No-No Boy* by John Okada. These texts span genres such as biography, memoir, poetry, and anthology. Through close reading and comparative analysis, the thesis applies *here* as a conceptual lens to examine how these forms represent psychological and cultural dislocation. Drawing on interdisciplinary frameworks from diaspora studies, sociology, geography, and literary theory, including narrative form, memory studies, and theories of collective voice and testimonial literature, the thesis argues that *here* provides a new critical vocabulary for analysing the intersections of trauma, identity, and belonging. The formal structures, voices, and stylistic strategies of each work are integral to understanding how *here* is constructed and expressed. This thesis offers *here* as a valuable tool for interpreting displacement shaped by historical injustice.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Table of Contents

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Introduction

This thesis will define and explore the concept of *here*. *Here* is a concept I have developed and created to use as a scope through which we can examine narratives in literature and other creative works. *Here* is the metaphysical location in a narrative where an individual feels out of place and unwelcome in a geographical or social setting, due to their perceived foreignness, lack of identity, and feelings of displacement. It exists in the presence of an individual and is created when an expected idea of feeling welcome and at *home* is not met.

This thesis aims to introduce the critical lens of *here*, using Japanese-American internment literature as a case study. It focuses on works produced by writers and editors of Japanese descent, including Japanese citizens, members of the Japanese American community, and immigrants with Japanese citizenship, written in response to the Japanese internment and World War II. The texts examined are: *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* by Julie Otsuka, *Midnight in Broad Daylight* by Pamela Rotner Sakamoto, *Only What We Could Carry* edited by Lawson Fusao Inada, Patricia Wakida, and William Hohri, and *No-No Boy* by John Okada. Each chapter of this thesis will analyse one of these texts, except for Chapter 1, which will cover both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*. In each chapter, I will outline the plot and historical context of the selected text(s), then discuss their style and form, emphasizing relevant theory and the influence and significance this has for our understanding. I will then conduct a close reading of specific passages, events, and characters, exploring themes of home and identity. Next, I will examine how *here* applies to and reflects the ideas of home and identity presented and discussed. Based on this analysis, I will draw additional conclusions and insights about the texts and demonstrate how *here* can be used to deepen our understanding of them through this lens.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

On 7th December 1941, Japan attacked Pearl Harbour, which led the U.S. to enter World War II.[1] On 19th February, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, authorising the removal of all those who were deemed a threat to national security to 'relocation centres', also known as internment camps (xi-xii). On 2nd March 1942, the head of the Western Defence Command, General John L. DeWitt, divided parts of the West Coast into 'Military Area 1' and 'Military Area 2' (xii). The War Relocation Authority (WRA) was established on 18th March 1942, and its purpose was to command the relocation of Japanese-Americans to the internment camps (xii). The first Civilian Exclusion Order was issued by the United States Armed Forces on 24th March 1942, which gave Japanese American families one week to prepare for a mandatory and complete removal from their homes (xii). In February 1943, the WRA distributed what they named the **'Application for Leave Clearance'.** This form, which was distributed amongst all interned who were seventeen years of age and older, was informally known as the 'loyalty questionnaire' because it tested the perceived 'loyalty' of those interned to the United States, and also enabled the U.S government to register all male citizens of Japanese heritage who were of draft age to volunteer for combat (200-202). Segregation hearings began as a result of this form on 10th July 1943 (202). The most impactful questions, which determined the fate of those interned, were questions 27 and 28:

27. Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty wherever ordered?

28: Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces,

---

[1] Gary Y. Okihiro ed. *Encyclopaedia of Japanese American Internment* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2013), xi. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor, to any other foreign government, power, or organization?[2]

The results of the form deemed 18,000 Japanese 'disloyal' and most were relocated to the Tule Lake internment camp in California (Okihiro, 202). Eventually, Tule Lake became the largest internment camp and was renowned for the violent treatment of its prisoners and the renunciation of many citizenships (203). The leader of Japan, Emperor Hirohito, announced surrender on 15th August 1945, and the official Instrument of Surrender was formally signed on 2nd September the same year (xiv-xv). The relocation orders were finally revoked, and the last internment camp was closed in 1946 (xv). The internment led to the incarceration of over 120,000 Japanese Americans. Approximately two-thirds of those interned were citizens of the United States, and around 1,800 victims tragically and unfairly died whilst interned (xiii); due to inadequate medical care and lax oversight of living and working conditions.[3]

A wide range of texts have been published, and in some cases translated, in response to the Japanese and Japanese American experience during World War II and the internment. These responses are diverse in form and publication, as well as intended readership. The earliest forms of these documented experiences were written during the internment itself; for example, the work of Muin Ozaki, an internee who recorded poetry about his experience on rice paper between his relocation to internment camps. The internment is still documented and explored in the 21st Century, such as Julie Tamiko Manning and Matt Miwa's verbatim play *The Tashme Project: The Living Archives*. There are novels written to encapsulate the internment experience, which include *Journey to Topaz* by Yoshiko Uchida, *Within These Lines* by Stephanie Morrill, *This Light Between Us: A Novel of World War II* by Andrew

---

[2] Jonathan Lee, *Japanese Americans: The History and Culture of a People* (California: ABC-CLIO, 2017), 88. Subsequent page references in text.

[3] Stephanie D. Hinnershitz. *Japanese American Incarceration* (Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021) 139.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Fukuda, *Beneath the Wide Silk Sky* by Emily Inouye Huey Among and *Hotel on the Corner of Bitter and Sweet* by Jamie Ford. Some graphic novels have also received wide reception, such as *They Called Us Enemy* by George Takei, Justin Eisinger and Steven Scott, *Displacement* by Kiku Hughes, *We Hereby Refuse: Japanese American Resistance to Wartime Incarceration* by Frank Abe and Tamiko Nimura, *Those Who Helped Us* by Ken Mochizuki and Kiku Hughes and *My Nest of Silence* by Matt Faulkneras. There are even children's picture books dedicated to the internment: *Ruth Asawa: A Sculpting Life* by Joan Schoettler, *It Began with a Page: How Gyo Fujikawa Drew the Way* by Kyo Maclear, *A Life Made by Hand: The Story of Ruth Asawa* by Andrea D'Aquino, *Shapes, Lines and Light: My Grandfather's American Journey* by Katie Yamasaki being some examples. Anthology is also a dominant form in presenting the internment and the Japanese American experience, one of the most famous being *Poets Behind Barbed Wire*: a collection of tanka poems edited and translated from Japanese by Jiro Nakano and Kay Nakano.

In the final part of this introduction, there are subchapters which will discuss and analyse existing scholarship and theory regarding the key terms which comprise the concept of *here:* place, identity, diaspora, othering, and home. There is other literature and scholarship that focuses on theory and critical commentary regarding Asian American Literature and the internment. Scholarship that gives an overview and contextual insight of these texts includes *Asian American Literature: An Encyclopaedia for Students,* which is a compilation of twelve contextual essays introducing fundamental elements and subcategories of Asian American literature. The compilation expands on social and literary concerns, tensions, and context, which are relevant to the exploration and commentary of Asian American literature. More internment-based works include Jeanne Sokolowski's 'Internment and Post-War Japanese American Literature: Toward a Theory of Divine Citizenship', which explores socially constructed ideologies of gender and citizenship in Japanese American internment literature.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Anthony Sze-Fai Shiu's 'Exception(al): Apprehending the Unexpected in Japanese American Internment Literature' discusses how we can reassess Japanese American literature by interrogating state power, and recognising the influence this has on concepts such as belonging and citizenship. Close reading of Japanese American internment literature and the study and impact of form and text includes 'Lives Interrupted: A Brief Look at Eight Novels Based on the Japanese-American Internment Experience' by Bruce Degi, which, through the comparison of eight novels, constructs a discussion of the complex relationship between fact and fiction. There is also scholarship regarding similar themes I am exploring in this thesis, such as 'Figures of Identity: Rereading Asian American Literature' by EE Tsou. Comparative studies discussing my chosen texts are also established in this field of study, for example, 'A History of Silence: Representations and Aesthetics in John Okada's *No-No Boy* and Julie Otsuka's *When the Emperor Was Divine'* by MO Friis. This thesis contributes to such discussions as it combines analysis of multiple text forms, close-reading, and comparative literary discussion into one research project, with the chosen texts creating a timeline of the internment experience and the pre-existing social, political, and historical constructs, contexts, and ideals which lead to it, as well as the devastating aftermath. Upon this, this thesis applies a new lens through which we can examine the aforementioned to conclude and insight into ideas such as home and identity in Japanese American writing.

In considering the significance of *The Buddha in the Attic*, published in 2011, and *When the Emperor Was Divine*, published in 2002, by Julie Otsuka, *Midnight in Broad Daylight* by Pamela Rotner Sakamoto, which appeared in 2016, *Only What We Could Carry*, edited by Lawson Fusao Inada, Patricia Wakida, and William Hohri and released in 2000, and *No-No Boy* by John Okada, originally published in 1957, it becomes clear that these texts contribute importantly to the development of Japanese American literature addressing the internment and its aftermath. Each work represents a distinct literary approach to the internment experience,

Sophie Joshua
1405142

from fiction and biography to documentary anthology and poetry, while collectively constructing a nuanced intergenerational narrative of cultural identity, state violence, and historical memory.

Julie Otsuka's texts offer formally innovative contributions to this body of literature. *When the Emperor Was Divine* presents the internment of a Japanese American family through a restrained and fragmented narrative, employing multiple perspectives to emphasize the psychological dislocation of incarceration. In *The Buddha in the Attic*, Otsuka shifts focus to the early twentieth-century lives of Japanese picture brides, using collective first-person narration to evoke shared struggle and erasure. Her use of minimalist prose and repetition mirrors the silencing of Japanese American voices within official history, while amplifying a communal experience that resists disappearance. These thematic concerns find resonance in Canadian Japanese internment literature, particularly in Joy Kogawa's *Obasan*, which similarly explores silence, memory, and identity through fractured narrative and restrained expression.

Although Canadian texts such as *Obasan* offer valuable comparative perspectives and share many thematic and aesthetic concerns with Japanese American literature, this thesis focuses specifically on the Japanese American context. The decision not to include Canadian internment literature arises from my choice to maintain a clearly defined national and historical scope. By concentrating exclusively on Japanese American writing, this study aims to engage more deeply with the particularities of U.S state policy, cultural history, and literary production surrounding the internment, and to avoid conflating the distinct legal, social, and political frameworks that shaped the internment experiences in Canada and the United States.

Pamela Rotner Sakamoto's *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, though a historical biography published in 2016, contributes meaningfully to the literary and cultural understanding of Japanese American identity during and after World War II. Focusing on the divided Fukuhara

Sophie Joshua
1405142

family, the narrative offers a transnational portrait of loyalty, belonging, and dislocation that complements the fictional explorations of identity in Otsuka's and Okada's works. By situating individual experience within broader geopolitical contexts, the biography expands the scope of Japanese American literature to encompass diasporic and global dimensions.

Only What We Could Carry, published in 2000 and edited by Lawson Fusao Inada, is an anthology that collects a wide array of literary, artistic, and documentary material produced during and after the internment. Its inclusion of poetry, letters, photographs, official documents, and personal testimonies constructs a polyphonic record of incarceration and resistance. Many of the poems and selections within this volume also appear in earlier anthologies such as *Aiiieeeee!* first published in 1974, and *The Big Aiiieeeee!* published in 1991, both co-edited by Inada. These anthologies were foundational in establishing Asian American literature as a field and legitimizing the voices of previously marginalized writers. The recurrence of key texts across these collections reflects both editorial continuity and a sustained commitment to building a literary memory of internment that crosses genres and generations.

John Okada's *No-No Boy*, originally published in 1957, remains a foundational text in Japanese American literature. First published to little notice and rediscovered during the Asian American literary recovery movement in the 1970s, the novel explores the psychological and communal fallout of internment through its protagonist Ichiro, who is ostracized for refusing to swear unqualified allegiance to the United States. The novel critiques both state violence and intra-community judgment, offering a complex portrait of fractured identity and moral ambiguity. The continuing relevance of Okada's work is underscored by its adaptation into a stage play by Ken Narasaki in 2010, which brought the narrative to a new medium and generation of audiences.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Together, these texts represent a diverse and evolving archive of Japanese American internment literature, encompassing fiction, biography, anthology, and poetry. While intertextual connections exist between Japanese American texts and other literary works by Japanese diasporic individuals with binational or transnational citizenship writing, this thesis chooses to focus solely on the Japanese American tradition to engage more precisely with the historical and cultural specificities of that experience. This narrowed scope allows for a deeper literary analysis that foregrounds Japanese American voices and their particular articulations of home and identity.

While this thesis focuses specifically on Japanese American literature to maintain a coherent national, historical, and cultural framework, the chapter on *Only What We Could Carry* includes an extract of a select text that reflects the experiences of Latin Americans of Japanese descent: *Adios to Tears* by Seiichi Higashide. The inclusion of this work is not intended to broaden the overall scope of the thesis beyond the Japanese American context but rather to acknowledge that the internment and forced relocation policies during World War II extended beyond the borders of the United States. Latin Americans of Japanese descent, particularly those residing in Peru, were forcibly removed, interned, and in some cases rendered stateless or deported. *Adios to Tears*, which recounts the personal narrative of a Peruvian Japanese internee who was forcibly brought to the United States, serves to highlight the global dimensions of wartime racial persecution. Its inclusion reinforces the broader argument that while Japanese American voices form the core of internment literature, they were not the only ones to document, resist, and memorialise these injustices through literary and testimonial forms. Recognising this wider transnational dimension allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how Japanese diasporic writers across the Americas responded to shared histories of racialised state violence.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Terminology and the phrasing of certain identifying words are key to this research. Firstly, *here* will be italicised in order to specify and highlight when I am discussing my constructed theory and applying it to the texts. If the word 'here' is used in this thesis and is not italicised, this does not refer to my theory. Furthermore, the word *home* will be italicised when referring to the *home,* which is specifically the counterpart to *here*. The italicised *home* is a constructed idea the individual has of what their *home* is or should be. If 'home' is used in this thesis and is not italicised, it will either be used about a description or definition of home outlined in a secondary source, or in a quotation from one of my chosen texts or sources, which I am studying.

Secondly, I will be referring to both Japanese individuals and Japanese American individuals, and will be using the phrase 'Japanese' to refer to both groups unless specification is appropriate and required. If specification between the two groups is required, they will be referred to as such, for example, 'first-generation Japanese in America', 'Japanese American', or 'those of Japanese heritage'.

The chosen literature I have used for this study varies in form and style, as well as the context in which they were written. Because of this, the subjects of these texts are about also vary. *Here* can be used as a lens to examine a multitude of literary and creative forms and a multitude of people whose narratives and stories these forms focus on. For example, though the characters in *No-No Boy* are fictional, the events that happen to them are based on the treatment of the "No-No boys," which John Okada witnessed. The Fukuharas in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, however, are a real family whom Pamela Rotner Sakamoto interviewed. *Only What We Could Carry* plays host to a variety of speakers, poets, and authors. Due to this melange of narrative voices and subjects, I will use the term 'individual' and 'individuals' regarding the people in my chosen literature, as well as those who are being discussed regarding my theory *here*. This will be the terminology used throughout this thesis, unless it is explicitly

Sophie Joshua
1405142

relevant and clear that the aforementioned are fictional characters, such as those in *No-No Boy*, whom I will refer to as 'characters'.

Issei is a Japanese-language term that is used to specify the first generation of Japanese to immigrate to the United States. *Nisei* refers to the second-generation Japanese immigrants who were born and educated in the United States. *Kibei* was a term often used to describe Japanese Americans born in the United States who had been sent to Japan to receive their education in Japan and then returned to the United States.

The chapters of the thesis are ordered chronologically based on when each text is set rather than when they were published. *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor was Divine* both begin before the internment, the narrative of *The Buddha in the Attic* beginning in 1907. As they are both authored by Julie Otsuka, they will be examined comparatively, both for close reading analysis, as well as their writing styles and the context in which they were written. The narrative of *Midnight in Broad Daylight* begins on the day of the Pearl Harbour attack. Through the varying extracts and contributions, *Only What We Could Carry* depicts the experience during the Japanese and Japanese Americans' incarceration in the internment camp, and *No-No Boy* is set after the internment and the surrender of Japan in World War II. The chapter chronology has been chosen so as to present a timeline for the research, as well as the evolution of *here* during the significant events that happen to the individuals in the texts.

'Chapter One: *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* by Julie Otsuka' examines two novels by Julie Otsuka that frame the Japanese American experience before and during internment through distinctive narrative techniques. *The Buddha in the Attic* uses a collective first-person voice to trace the lives of Japanese picture brides from their journey to America in 1907 through their marriages, labour, motherhood, and eventual removal to internment camps. *When the Emperor Was Divine* follows a Japanese American family through their forced relocation, internment, and return, using shifting third-person perspectives

Sophie Joshua
1405142

to convey the psychological fragmentation caused by incarceration. The chapter explores how Otsuka's use of minimalism, repetition, and archival sourcing constructs a sense of collective erasure and marginalised memory. Through comparative analysis, the chapter identifies how generational tensions, gendered displacement, and the inability to communicate across states of emotional dislocation contribute to the formation of *here*, a metaphysical state of estrangement that emerges when belonging is denied. Particular attention is given to the differing experiences of *Issei* mothers and *Nisei* children, and how their respective understandings of *home* and identity come into conflict.

Much existing scholarship surrounding *The Buddha in the Attic* is focused on the issues of gender, feminism, and motherhood, as well as the specific collective narrative writing style and where the text stands in the discussion of U.S history. Ulfa Rimadini's 'Utilizing Women in *The Buddha in The Attic*' (2011) by Julie Otsuka explores the contribution of fictional devices such as character, plot, and setting in revealing the issues of utilizing women by using *The Buddha in the Attic*. Hala Alma'aqbeh and Mahmoud Zidan's 'Studies of the Face(less): Picture Brides and Facial Recognition in Julie Otsuka's *The Buddha in the Attic'* discusses how the text resists racializing surveillance through making use of unidentifiable characterization. Soyeon Kim's 'Reclaiming a Space in American History with the Collective Voices of the Japanese Picture Brides in Julie Otsuka's *The Buddha in the Attic*' argues that the collective voice is as a tool with which Otsuka uses to create a subversive alternative to mainstream versions of American history and further their idea that it can be a means of occupying a narrative space in the novel. Jianying Deng also contributes to the discussion of Otsuka's novel with their article 'Collective Memory, Living History: We-Narrative in Julia Otsuka's *The Buddha in the Attic*'. Deng argues that the narrative style in *The Buddha in the Attic* is an effective technique to express the collective minds of the marginalized and subdued Japanese "picture brides", giving them long-overdue voices to articulate their hidden and forgotten life stories.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The narrative of *The Buddha in the Attic,* beginning in 1907, is beneficial to my research because it provides context for the growing tensions and prejudices against the Japanese people in the United States, which predated Pearl Harbour, World War II, and the Japanese internment. Context is given to what preceding mindsets and attitudes catalysed the internment, therefore highlighting the injustice of it. The picture brides are also a valuable demographic to discuss because they are an example of a group of individuals who emigrated from their homes in Japan to the United States, and attempted to find a new home there. They undertake crucial milestones in their lives, such as marriage and motherhood, raising children who will be westernised and have no memory or nostalgia toward a country for which their mothers do. The novel shows these brides attempting to forge a *home* as well as their understanding of what *home* is to them, and this, in turn, means *here* can be examined when these expectations are not met.

When the Emperor was Divine was first published in 2002, and the narrative follows a Japanese American family from the day before they leave for an internment camp, to their imprisonment, and then the events following their release. The father in the novel has been arrested under suspicion of treason, and the final chapters depict his homecoming. *When the Emperor was Divine* was inspired by events that happened to Otsuka's own family. Otsuka's grandfather was arrested and imprisoned for being a suspected Japanese spy in 1941 following the tragedy of Pearl Harbour, and her grandmother, mother, and uncle were interned in Utah. The characters of the father, the mother, the girl, and the boy represent Otsuka's grandparents, mother, and uncle.

S. Weaver's 'From Sea to Waterless Sea: Archipelagic Thought and Reorientation in *When the Emperor Was Divine*' provides a sea-oriented analysis of the internment, and by calling upon theory from trauma scholars, Weaver has reoriented understandings of islands, continents, and the concept of home. They use *When the Emperor Was Divine* to advance a model for understanding the ocean as a symbol through which traumatic experiences can be

acted out and refracted. Pei-chen Liao's 'Life Writing, Cultural Memory, and Historical Mediation in Julie Otsuka's *When the Emperor was Divine*' focuses on the limits of ethnic minority groups' self-representation, and how the semi-biographical narrative meets the ethical demand to keep marginalised memories of past violence alive and collective. I intend to discuss ideas of the limits upon minority groups as well as the traumas suffered, specifically regarding World War II, and the influence these factors have on our ideas of home and identity.

When the Emperor was Divine follows the same characters throughout the internment and then their experience upon their return to wider American society. The evolution of what they perceive to be their *home* is presented throughout this narrative, as well as presenting how *here* also evolves due to the individual's circumstances. Furthermore, the reader sees the perspective and impact the internment had upon those whose relatives were falsely accused and imprisoned, as well as the accused themselves. The adolescence of the children in *When the Emperor was Divine* is also significant to this study because the novel provides their perspective. Too young to comprehend the events of the internment, as well as the changing in attitudes of their peers and the rest of wider American society toward them, the boy and the girl give a very reactive, emotive and also candid version of events and their ideas of home and identity which could not be given from an adult's perspective. Though children are featured in *The Buddha in the Attic*, their perspective is not provided, so this text allows for a different perception and avenue of study, and these differing perspectives also create a discussion for the two texts comparatively.

How Japanese and Chinese individuals are treated by wider American society, and the significance of this society being too ignorant to know the differences between the two races, is another focus of this chapter. The second-generation *Nisei* suffer differently from their parents, as their struggles for identity and feelings of displacement occur in the country where they were born due to the perceived connection they have with a country most have few or no

ties with. Both these experiences are presented in *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor was Divine*, and in this chapter, the differences between the generational struggles are compared and contrasted. Life for the characters in *When the Emperor was Divine* post-internment is also explored in the first chapter, firstly by discussing the experiences of the mother and children, and then finally with an analysis of the final chapter of *When the Emperor was Divine*, which depicts the character of the father confessing to war crimes which he did not commit.

'Chapter 2' discusses the 2016 biographical text *Midnight in Broad Daylight* written by Pamela Rotner Sakamoto. Harry, Frank, Mary, Victor, and Pierce Fukuhara were born and raised in the Pacific Northwest with their father, Katsuji, and their mother, Kinu. The Fukuharas move to their mother's childhood home in Hiroshima following the death of Katsuji, but find themselves divided between their differing loyalties and views toward America and Japan. Harry eventually relocates back to the United States, but is interned not long after. During his internment, Harry volunteers as a Japanese translator in the United States' Allied Translator and Interpreter Section. Back in Japan, Frank and Pierce become soldiers in the Japanese Imperial Army. The catastrophic events of World War II and the travels of both the American and Japanese armies result in the Fukuhara brothers traveling closer toward each other, and there is an ominous possibility they will have to fight; however, before this happens, the U.S. detonates the atomic bomb over Hiroshima, resulting in innumerable losses of life and injury.

Midnight in Broad Daylight explores the interfamilial struggles and conflicts that World War II caused, especially as the biography presents the perspectives from Japanese Americans who lived in Japan and Japanese Americans who lived in the United States. Upon this, the Fukuhara siblings differ on which countries they feel more accepted in, and this influences how they are treated as well as what ideas of *home* are presented. The contrast

between the siblings in these ways is why this text has been chosen for this research, as the Fukuharas best present the divided national loyalty which World War II caused, and how *here* can be experienced simultaneously, yet differently between individuals even when in the same location.

There is little scholarship specifically regarding *Midnight in Broad Daylight* and its contributions to literary discussion of the internment as well as the Japanese American experience. However, there is research that focuses on similar themes and experiences interlaced in the text. Emily Hiramatsu Morishima's 'Remembering the Internment in Post-World War II Japanese American Fiction', for example, gives insight into how narrative storytelling is crucial to remembering traumatic events and the way communal memories can challenge dominant historical narratives. 'Citizens, Immigrants, and the Stateless: A Japanese American Diaspora in the Pacific Asian America' by Michael R. Jin analyzes and discusses the *Kibei* experience during the internment.

In this chapter, I will discuss the sources this text was derived from and how the bibliographical form influences our study of it. By examining the structure of the text, it will also be presented how Sakamoto's role in *Midnight in Broad Daylight* is to combine and structure the information and stories she has accumulated to fulfill her intentions for the biographical novel. Using close reading, I will also examine identity, home, and *here* during World War II in Japan compared to America. Furthermore, the different terms for the schooling and birthplace of the Japanese Americans and how these identifying labels and prejudices against them influenced Fukuhara's sense of identity will be identified in this chapter. I will focus on how the contrasting education, personality traits, association with different countries, customs, and stereotypes have contributed to the Fukuharas' differing experiences, and therefore the different countries they identify with, and the different states of *here* they are in throughout their narrative.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

'Chapter 3' will explore the anthology *Only What We Could Carry*. It is compiled of varying poems, essays, short stories, plays, prose, and other literature written about the internment and the Japanese and Japanese American experience between the bombing of Pearl Harbour in 1941 to the liberation of Dachau in 1945. Due to the enormity of the anthology, I have chosen specific extracts from it for this study.

Scholarship specific to the literature compiled by the editors of *Only What We Could Carry*, and the way the anthology and the repeated use of work across different anthologies are discussed in texts such as *Interning America's Colonial History: The Anthologies and Poetry of Lawson Fusao Inada* by Ryan Burt. Burt comparatively examines the anthologies Lawson Fusao Inada has edited and the impact he has had in the field of Asian American studies. Fu-jen Chen and Su-lin Yu's 'Reclaiming the Southwest: A Traumatic Space in the Japanese American Internment Narrative' discusses similar topics, which I will be confronting in my exploration of *Only What We Could Carry*. Their study examines how the internment created not only a physical but a figurative reality, and the way it contributed toward the clash of political and cultural ideologies between the Japanese people and wider American society.

Only What We Could Carry differs the most in form compared to the other texts chosen for this research, as it is an anthology. *Here* is a scope through which we can examine literature to draw conclusions and understanding regarding *home* and identity, and its application to the anthology form showcases the various literature types *here* can be applied to. This is why each extract I have chosen from the anthology to discuss is different.

The first extract I will examine is the 'Preface of *No-No Boy*'. The extract outlines what the loyalty questionnaire was and the way it divided the Japanese who were interned, as well as those who fought in the war. The 'preface' also provides examples of prejudice and incidents spurred by the demonising of the Japanese Americans in the lead-up to, and during the internment. This extract will be explored regarding its significance to this study and the study

of anthologies surrounding the internment. The next part of *Only What We Could Carry* which will be examined is extracts from the diary of a young man named Stanley Hayami living in an internment camp. The diary form will be examined, as it is a very personal and intimate account that needs recognition for the study of it. How the tense in which the diary is written is important to the study and understanding of *here* will then be discussed. *Here* exists in the present of an individual, and the diary form is written in this individual's present, which requires recognition before the next part of this exploration, where close reading will be applied.

The next part of the chapter will focus on five poems and extracts of poems from various monuments, exhibitions, and anthologies: 'I', 'II', 'III', 'IV', and 'V'. Each poem has been renamed by the editors in ascending roman numerals, and they are dispersed throughout the anthology. The structure and renaming of these poems in the anthology create a micro-anthology when they are discussed comparatively. My interpretation of this structure is that a timeline is also created, outlining key points of the internment journey, which would have been experienced by many. The way this structure demonstrates the power of anthology, as well as contributes to our understanding of the Japanese internment experience in this form, and meets the intentions of the editors, is evaluated and discussed. I will then go on to apply close reading and analysis of each poem in turn, discussing their historical context as well as their significance in the anthology and how they are presented in each. I will also compare these poems, as well as highlight which point of the internment journey each represents, why this has been included, and how each poem can be used to further demonstrate the internment experience and the understanding of *home*, *here,* and identity.

The final extract discussed in this chapter is a passage from the memoir *Adios to Tears: The Memoirs of a Japanese-Peruvian Internee in U.S. Concentration Camps*. Written by Peruvian Japanese author Seiichi Higashide, 'Adios to Tears' begins with Higashide's name being published in a Peruvian newspaper naming those who are deemed dangerous by the U.S government. Higashide recalls hiding from the authorities and evading arrest, but eventually

Sophie Joshua
1405142

being imprisoned and deported alongside other detainees. 'Adios to Tears' represents the victims of the internment residing in Peru and wider Latin America, and highlights how Latin Americans of Japanese descent were also persecuted. The enormity of the internment and the wide scope of its victims are highlighted in this chapter. Following this discussion, certain passages from this memoir in the anthology will be identified, specifically regarding the idea of identification. It will also be discussed how wider American society's need to identify minority and ostracised groups is significant in the first instance, but then, once this identification has occurred, there is no further understanding of identity or individuality, and how this is used as a tool to discriminatorily justify prejudice and ostracization.

The final chapter focuses on *No-No Boy* by John Okada, which follows the character Ichiro Yamada. Ichiro answered "no" twice in the national government 'loyalty questionnaire' as to whether he will serve in the U.S Armed Forces, abandon any association with Japan, and swear loyalty to the United States of America. Like many others, Ichiro is sentenced to a two-year prison sentence, and the novel focuses on Ichiro's return to his family home in Seattle. Ichiro represents those who, like himself, answered no to this questionnaire and were labelled 'No-No Boys'. Due to this label, Ichiro faces conflict with his family, Japanese Americans, and wider American society, as well as his feelings about his identity and sense of belonging.

No-No Boy has been discussed and analysed in many literary critical works, such as 'Race, Power, and Cultural Politics in John Okada's *No-No Boy'*, where Jinqi Ling highlights specific forms of engagement which the novel allows. Thematically specific scholarship has also been published, Jeffrey T. Ya Mashita's 'Contesting Japanese American Identity: A Literature Review of *No-No Boy*', for example, celebrates and explores the novel's portrayal of the psychological, material, and political consequences of incarceration. The historical context of the No-No Boys as well as the representation of this group in Japanese American writing is also available in studies such as Tara Fickle's 'No-No Boy's Dilemma: Game Theory and

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Japanese American Internment Literature', whereby Fickle discusses the model minority myth and how game theory fundamentally shaped representations of racial and national identity in the lead up to, and during the internment.

No-No Boy was chosen to explore and demonstrate *here* due to two factors. Firstly, the novel focuses on American society post-World War II and internment, and does not depict the characters' experiences during the internment. By including *No-No Boy* as my final text, I am also providing a post-war exploration of *here, identity,* and *home*. Secondly, those who each member of the Yamada family represents and those they interact with and have relationships with embody how, within the Japanese American community, there were conflicting views, opinions, and ideals due to World War II and the internment. Each significant character in *No-No Boy* embodies and represents one of these different views. Because of this, each character is also in a different state of *here*. This wide range of key terms being explored in this singular text is why it has been chosen as the final text in this thesis.

The chapter begins with an exploration of the Yamada family unit, and how *here* can be perceived in various ways between characters in the same location and present. *Here* is constructed from individual perception and experience, often isolating the individual from their family unit, and the Yamadas all experience *here* in different ways because it is perceived differently, yet simultaneously. Following this discussion, the chapter will be structured by character. Each mindset embodied by their retrospective character in *No-No Boy* also presents a corresponding idea of *home*.

Mrs Yamada will be examined first. She represents those Japanese who supported the No-No Boys' decision not to join the United States armed forces. She represents those who believed Japan was victorious in the war and that corrupt propaganda has the citizens of the United States convinced otherwise. Furthermore, Mrs Yamada represents those in the Japanese

community who longed to return to Japan and did not want to affiliate any part of themselves with the United States. In regard to Mrs Yamada, there will be two ideas of *home* discussed: *Japan-home* and *America-home*. Theory regarding gender and motherhood will also be applied to the discussion of Mrs Yamada, and how this theory and these ideals influence her character, how she is perceived, and her state of *here*. Mrs Yamada commits suicide in *No-No Boy*, and part of the final chapter is dedicated to this significant event. Mrs Yamada's suicide is crucial to this chapter because she is an example of the devastation *here* can cause if one is unable to leave it. Through the study of Mrs Yamada's suicide and the events leading up to it, I will explain how her idea of her *Japan-home,* for which she longed, did not exist in the living world, and so she found it in death.

The next character to be discussed in this chapter will be Ichiro, the protagonist. Ichiro represents the "No-No Boys": a group of Japanese American men who divided the Japanese and Japanese American community with their answer to the loyalty questionnaire. Ichiro's state of *here* will be explained and explored due to how he feels torn between a Japanese and American identity, and how the Japanese community, wider American society, and the conflict in his family home influences and distorts his view of *home* and his identity. Ichiro's internal monologue is the main point of discussion, as the novel is written from his perspective, and his struggles and confusion over whether he is Japanese or American present a question of national loyalty and identity. Ichiro's internal monologue allows us to draw wider conclusions regarding the *here* of the individual, as well as how the other characters in the text are in the state of *here* because of how they are perceived.

Taro, Ichiro's younger brother, will also be examined. How Taro signifies the second generation of Japanese living in the United States who rejected affiliation with their Japanese heritage, and who wanted to fight in the armed forces in order to prove their loyalty to the

United States, will be the focus of this part of the chapter. The exploration of Taro's state of *here* will be defined and exemplified through his alienation from his parents and his family.

The character of Mr Yamada portrays those Japanese people who did not reject the United States nor Japan, but rather were willing to embrace their new lives in post-World War II and internment society, yet were berated and hindered from doing so due to the unwavering loyalty of other members of his community to America and Japan. Mr Yamada is not identified as Japanese or American in the way that his family members identify these terms, and this is at the core of what is explored in his section of the chapter, as well as the significance this has to the *here* that he is in. Mr Yamada's *here* is the most influenced by his family and their decisions, and we see his *here* and *home* evolve as the narrative unfolds. This is why the exploration of this character follows the discussion regarding his wife's suicide. The ideals of fatherhood and masculinity are also discussed in this chapter, corresponding with the previous discussion of motherhood and femininity in Mrs Yamada.

Ichiro's friend Kenji is an ex-Japanese American soldier who did fight for the Armed Forces. Kenji represents those who did the same, and the prices they paid for this. Though Kenji is not in the state of *here,* comparisons between himself and other characters, such as Ichiro, create an understanding of what creates a perception of *home* and identity for them.

I will conclude the thesis by compiling and comparing the conclusions made throughout my chapters. Furthermore, I will discuss my findings and the literature used comparatively in order to support and explain the presence of *here* in my chosen texts, as well as its contribution to our understanding of *home* and identity in Japanese American writing and literature surrounding the internment.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The development of the concept of *here* in this thesis is grounded in an interdisciplinary framework shaped by theorists from fields including geography, sociology, philosophy, political theory, diaspora studies, and psychoanalysis. The definition of *here* outlined in this thesis depends upon identifying when an individual feels displaced or unwelcome in a location or social setting due to perceived foreignness or unfulfilled expectations of belonging. Not all theoretical frameworks meet the criteria for this specific definition. The theorists included each offer essential elements: temporality, emotional affect, identity disruption, and spatial perception. The criteria for inclusion, then, are theoretical approaches that focus on lived experience, internal conflict, displacement, and the socio-political structuring of place. Theories that define space only in physical or strictly empirical terms, or that treat identity as fixed and resolved, are excluded, as they do not account for the complexity of *here* as an emotional and socially constructed metaphysical condition.

Glenn Albrecht's notion of "solastalgia", the distress caused by environmental change in one's home environment, is included because it identifies a state in which home has become uninhabitable, despite physical stasis. His theory highlights the emotional response to environmental and social degradation, which parallels how *here* is experienced as a betrayal of the expected safety or identity of home. His concept supports the emotional destabilisation central to *here*, but it is not central due to its focus on ecological disruption rather than identity, diaspora, or social alienation.

Julia Kristeva's exploration of melancholia in *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia* is essential in accounting for the psychological interiority of *here*. Her discussion of loss without clear mourning, of grief internalised and tied to an unattainable object, articulates how *here* often exists in the space of the lost or impossible home. Kristeva is included because she offers a model of psychic experience that explains the lingering pain of exclusion, even in the

absence of obvious trauma. Her contribution is especially valuable in understanding how *here* can be self-sustaining and effectively powerful.

Salman Rushdie's *Imaginary Homelands* is central to this thesis because he conceptualises home as an imaginative construct shaped by exile, memory, and partial perception. He recognises that identity is fractured and that belonging is always mediated by the stories we tell about ourselves and our past. His notion that exiled individuals create imaginary homelands resonates deeply with *here* as a condition created when the imagined home does not align with lived experience. He is included not only for his theoretical insights but also because his literary prose exemplifies the hybrid positionality that is generated *here*.

Paul Gilroy is key in this discussion for his analysis of identity in post-imperial societies. His argument in *Postcolonial Melancholia* that national narratives suppress the traumatic legacies of empire speaks directly to the sociopolitical backdrop that creates *here*. Gilroy's idea of postcolonial melancholia describes a condition in which societies, and by extension individuals within them, remain haunted by histories of exclusion and dominance. This melancholy aligns with the internal state of *here*, where belonging is perpetually deferred by an unacknowledged or repressed past. Gilroy's work is therefore foundational in articulating how national ideologies contribute to the individual's displacement.

Milford Jeremiah is included for his nuanced definition of place in literature, which distinguishes between the physical environment and the emotionally or socially constructed setting. His understanding of place as relational and temporally variable allows *here* to be defined in literary terms, particularly through remembered or removed environments. Regarding place; the work of Roberto Dainotto is also used because he critiques the hegemonic function of place in literature. His idea that literary depictions of place can mask power dynamics supports the notion that *here* is often constructed through imposed social hierarchies.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Peter Brown and Michael Irwin are also essential for their analysis of how literary place functions as both symbolic and constructed. Their differentiation between the writer's place and the reader's interpretation justifies the subjective, multilayered structure of *here*, where perception varies even within shared physical space.

Gabriel Sheffer, Thomas Faist, Rogers Brubaker, and Yossi Shain are included for their theories on diaspora, which frame *here* as a condition emerging from the friction between connection to origin and rejection by the host society. Their work is used to delineate how transnational belonging can produce a psychic state of dislocation. Avtar Brah, Jean Phinney, and Anthony Ong also contribute to understanding *here* regarding the fluidity and instability of diasporic identity. Their arguments help identify how identities evolve or are resisted, and how this dynamic relationship creates or resolves *here*. Lajos Brons and Jean-François Staszak are essential for their work on othering. Their definitions clarify how imposed difference and exclusion from the dominant group impose a relational sense of *here* through alienation, marginalisation, and surveillance.

Edward Said's theory of Orientalism is foundational in demonstrating how systems of cultural dominance rely on the construction of foreignness. His work is particularly useful for understanding how space and belonging are ideologically policed dynamics that directly inform the concept of *here* as explored in this thesis. While Said's primary focus is the Middle East, this study extends his framework to examine East Asian contexts and the experiences of diaspora, where similar mechanisms of othering and spatial control are at work.

Sara Ahmed and Shelley Mallet are included for their work on home, both emphasising the emotional, relational, and performative aspects of what constitutes a home space. Their arguments support the idea that *here* arises when these expectations are not met. The exploration and definition of home in this thesis is also founded in the work of Aviezer Tucker,

Peter Saunders and Peter Williams, Tim Ingold, and Peter Somerville. Each contribute key insights into home as a psychological, temporal, and constructed idea. Their work supports the claim that *here* exists in a gap exists between expectation and experience of home, and that this gap is socially, politically, and emotionally produced.

These aforementioned theorists have been selected for their relevance to the affective, spatial, social, and narrative dimensions of *here*. They are incorporated where their concepts expand or sharpen the framework, and excluded when their models presume fixed identity, static place, or an unproblematic notion of home. This critical evaluation provides the scaffolding for the readings that follow.

Here is a metaphysical state of being and mindset experienced by the individual in a narrative or creative work, which is created when the individual feels abjectly displaced due to their perceived foreignness, lack of identity, and feelings of isolation from society. This understanding of *here* as a metaphysical state of displacement is closely aligned with Glenn Albrecht's concept of solastalgia, which he defines as "the pain or distress caused by the loss of, or inability to derive, solace connected to the negatively perceived state of one's home environment".[4] The individual remains physically present in their home, yet experiences emotional estrangement when their relationship to place is disrupted.

In *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*, Julia Kristeva defines melancholia as a psychic condition marked by a loss so profound that it cannot be represented or spoken. Unlike mourning, which involves conscious recognition of loss, melancholia is a silent, internal

---

[4] Glenn Albrecht et al., "Solastalgia: The Distress Caused by Environmental Change," *Australasian Psychiatry* 15, no. S1 (2007): S96, https://doi.org/10.1080/10398560701701288. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

suffering that creates a "hole in being" where the self is torn apart with the lost "Thing."[5]. This emotional void offers a powerful framework for understanding psychological displacement and fractured identity, linking to the idea of *here* as a state of disconnection from belonging and selfhood. *Here* aligns with Kristeva's concept of "the Thing" (13) as a pre-symbolic loss at the core of melancholia, which, like *here*, is experienced not as a tangible absence but as an unnamed metaphysical displacement.

Salman Rushdie's *Imaginary Homelands* examines exile, memory, and identity in postcolonial literature. He argues that displaced writers reconstruct lost homelands through fragmented memory and imagination. Language becomes a tool of transformation that allows writers to challenge dominant histories. Rushdie observes, "We will… create fictions, not actual cities or villages, but invisible ones, imaginary homelands, Indias of the mind".[6] This formulation of the homeland as an imaginative construct directly corresponds with the relational definition of *here*, which is generated in opposition to the denied or unreachable idea of *home*. The imagined nature of home, as described by Rushdie, takes on a more painful quality in the theory of *here*, where home is not merely distant or lost, but denied by the surrounding society. The symbiosis between *here* and home exists because *here* only arises when the individual's imagined or hoped-for *home* is disrupted by external forces such as racism, displacement, or state violence. While Rushdie situates the imaginative act of reclaiming home as a creative and necessary response to exile, the theory of *here* identifies the failure of this act as a source of existential instability and psychological estrangement.

---

[5] Julia Kristeva, *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989) 13. Subsequent page references in text.

[6] Salman Rushdie, *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991* (London: Granta in association with Penguin Books, 1991), 12. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua

1405142

Paul Gilroy in *Postcolonial Melancholia* similarly identifies that "those who thought they were at home discovered that they had been living in a foreign country all along".[7] This reflects the core of *here* as a state of psychic and social dislocation that emerges not from literal migration alone, but from the societal rejection of belonging. In both cases, identity becomes fragmented as the individual is denied recognition by the society that they assumed was home. Gilroy's account of sudden unbelonging echoes this metaphysical rupture, supporting the claim that *here* is not only emotional but structured by national myths and racialised exclusions. Regarding the symbiotic relationship between *here* and *home*, Gilroy discusses when a subject is made to feel "like an alien in the place they had regarded as home" (48). This alienation does not emerge in isolation but is relationally dependent on the idea of a prior or possible *home*. The symbiosis between *here* and home is also mirrored in Gilroy's assertion that "the racial state was thus enabled to define what 'home' might be and who might be legitimately permitted to dwell within it" (48). *Here*, then, becomes the emotional counterpart to state-controlled definitions of national space and citizenship.

Here is a lens that does not need to be isolated to Japanese and Japanese Americans living in America. Albrecht introduces the term "psychoterratic illness" to describe a condition where "people's mental wellbeing is threatened by the severing of healthy links between themselves and their home or territory" (95). Albrecht does not use this term specifically regarding the Japanese and Japanese Americans; however, this concept supports that the application of *here* can be used beyond a single ethnic or national context, affirming its relevance in broader literary and social analysis. Nevertheless, texts which depict the Japanese and Japanese Americans' experience will be used as the subject in which to demonstrate the way we can apply this lens to literary academic discussion. The way *here* is experienced and

---

[7] Paul Gilroy. *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005. 47. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

perceived through examination of the treatment of the Japanese and Japanese Americans who are caught between these cultures, and the influence World War II and the Japanese Internment had on these experiences is the aim of this thesis.

Here is always present and has a nowness to it. It is a counterpart to one's present perception of *home*, but this present perception, whether deemed good or bad, can be influenced by memories of the past or an idealised version of home created through nostalgia or, in some cases, a romanticism of a location not available to the individual. Even though *here* can only ever exist in the present of a character, the factors that influence its creation and perception are often rooted in historical prejudices and events. World War II was not the beginning of anti-Asian racism, but rather it was the catalyst for a more prominent demonstration of pre-existing xenophobia and racial hatred toward those of Asian descent. Kristeva's melancholic subject finds resonance in the experience of racialised individuals whose understanding of home is shattered by historical trauma. In the context of Japanese American internment, the rupture between national identity and belonging creates a melancholic crisis. Kristeva articulates this condition through the metaphor of a metaphysical abyss: "I owe a supreme metaphysical lucidity to my depression… I have the arrogant feeling of being witness to the meaninglessness of Being" (24). Kristeva reveals not only sorrow but a stark clarity about one's alienation from the symbolic structures of society. For many Japanese Americans, the betrayal by the nation they considered *home* did not merely disrupt external realities but also fractured the internal coherence of selfhood, intensifying that *here* can be a place where the subject is stripped of political and existential legibility.

Gilroy's view of postcolonial melancholia frames the *nowness* of *here* in terms of national time. He writes that contemporary racism is "the product of a postimperial melancholia that is fixated on the past but projected into the present" (90). This retrojection of empire into the 'now' constructs a temporality of exclusion that defines *here*. *Here* is shaped by memories

of the past or an idealised version of home, and Gilroy reinforces this with his critique of imperial nostalgia, showing how *here* is manufactured through a repressed yet persistent racial history. Gilroy stresses that "racism remains an integral and inner constituent of modernity and not its anachronistic survival" (55). This underscores that *here* is always contemporary but shaped by deep historical conflict. *Here* does not merely emerge from contemporary alienation but from the sedimentation of history in the present, which is the cumulative impact of structural exclusion that spans generations.

Here is present when *home* is compromised, and this can occur when the individual is identified as an alien and as the enemy by the wider society in which they are living. The existence of *here* is dependent upon a conceived idea of its counterpart *home*, so as an individual's locations and experiences change, does that individual's perception of home, and therefore, so does *here*. *Here* is created when an expected idea of feeling welcome and at *home* is not met. It exists only in relation to *home*. If a *home* is attempted to be made through varying structures outlined by the critical theory which will be discussed in the subchapters of this introduction, yet these attempts of a creation of a *home* are hindered by laws, social hierarchies and prejudice-fuelled abuse, then the individual in question will remain in a state of *here* as they cannot reach their desired *home*. This dynamic is echoed in the psychological burden described in Albrecht's work, where individuals facing environmental change "experienced negative affect that is exacerbated by a sense of powerlessness or lack of control over the unfolding change process" (95). Threat to one's ability to influence one's condition is central to the formation of *here*. An example of this is Japanese American children who change their family names to more westernised names to try and fit in with their fellow students, but are still shunned by their peers and interned by the United States government.

This aligns directly with Gilroy's discussion of integration as a conditional and often unreachable promise. He notes that an individual's "belonging is conditional and reversible. It

Sophie Joshua
1405142

is contingent on exceptional conduct" (40). The failure to achieve the *home* is not due to a lack of effort, but because the criteria for inclusion are racially coded and constantly shifting. *Here,* emphasis is placed on the failure to reach *home* because of external, structural forces, and this is echoed in Gilroy's assertion that minorities are "constantly being made into aliens" (40), even when they attempt to integrate.

Here can also be created due to confusion and lack of knowledge about the differences between certain ostracised groups, which leads to both prejudice and discrimination, but also serves as protection from the prejudice and discrimination these individuals are threatened with. In my chosen literature, both Japanese people and Chinese people are ignorantly misidentified by wider society, who make attempts to put an identity upon them to determine the level of prejudice they should put upon them. Gilroy reflects on how racial categorisation operates in colonial and postcolonial societies: "These acts of identification allowed colonial power to be renewed at home through the racialisation of minorities" (9). This process of misnaming racial others is not simply ignorance-it is a strategic tool of power. The heedless conflation of Japanese and Chinese identities portrayed in *The Buddha in the Attic* fits within Gilroy's larger argument that race functions as a flexible yet violent ordering mechanism. *Here* is produced through this reduction of identity to threat level.

In the Japanese community, the first wave of Japanese immigrants is referred to as *Issei,* and their second-generation children are referred to as *Nisei.*[8] The *Nisei* in both texts struggle between their American and Japanese identity, and ultimately are struggling to find acceptance in either. Simultaneously, their struggle to be American and to be identified as such results in their parents, the *Issei*, ultimately feeling isolated, too. An example is in Otsuka's *The Buddha in the Attic,* when the *Issei* mothers lament their children "spent their days now living in the

---

[8] A. Leong. *Roots of the Issei: Exploring Early Japanese Newspapers*. (United States: Hoover Institution Press, 2018) 4. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

new language, whose twenty-six letters still eluded us even though we had been in America for years. *All I learned was the letter x so I could sign my name at the bank".*[9]   This is another example of *here* being experienced in different ways, but simultaneously by two individuals. Kristeva's understanding of melancholia offers a lens through which to comprehend the fragmented and unshared experience of *here* between individuals occupying the same physical and emotional spaces. Melancholia isolates the subject not only from others but also from language itself. Kristeva writes, "The speech of the depressed is to them like an alien skin; melancholy persons are foreigners in their maternal tongue. They have lost the meaning-the value-of their mother-tongue for want of losing the mother" (43). This estrangement from language mirrors the estrangement between individuals who occupy *here* in different ways and with different perceptions of home and identity. Even while physically together, the failure to communicate or empathise across different expressions of *here* reinforces the psychic and interpersonal isolation that both Kristeva and this thesis aim to address. Each individual is unable to experience *here* in the same way that their counterpart does, which further heightens their isolation from one another. This is true for its presence between the *Issei* and *Nisei*.

Paul Gilroy's claim that "the immigrants' children are constantly being made into aliens. Their belonging is conditional and reversible" (40) reinforces the structural vulnerability faced by the *Nisei*. Their efforts to be seen as American are undermined by a system withholding full citizenship and cultural legitimacy. Though the *Nisei* may attempt to assimilate into American society, their subjectivity remains suspended in *here*, constantly redirected back into foreignness. Gilroy's observation is that the racial state "defines what 'home' might be and who might be legitimately permitted to dwell within it" (48). The *Issei* in

---

[9] Julie Otsuka*, The Buddha in the Attic*. (London: Penguin Books, 2013), 73. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

my chosen texts experience an even more explicit exclusion due to their accent, appearance, and legal status. While the *Nisei* face the burden of conditional inclusion, the *Issei* encounter structural silence: they are seen as unassimilable and socially irrelevant. The generational tension is less a conflict than a shared alienation: *here* is present for both generations, but in different forms.

If *here* exists in this way, it is because the individuals are either fully or partially excluded from one another's ideas of *home*, creating *here*. Gilroy reflects that "the conviction that civilization was somehow the exclusive property of the English or Anglo-Saxons... ensured that colonial power could be renewed at home through the racialization of minorities" (9). This premise underpins the structural fragmentation of identity that is produced *here*. When individuals and groups are forced to compete for recognition within a system that defines belonging through exclusion, they fracture into separate ideals of *home*. The division of understanding between *Issei*, *Nisei*, and the dominant culture produces a parallel but unshared *here*.

Home, here, and identity are different for each individual; though a shared event and experience can alter what these are, the outcomes will still, at times, be different. This can be due to factors such as the age, gender, and race of the individual, but can also be influenced by the unique personality and perspective of that individual. As Albrecht and his co-authors note, "Environmental change can create distressed environments inhabited by distressed people" (96). This interplay between external transformation and internal identity disruption mirrors the relational nature of *here* as contingent upon the shifting dynamics of one's surroundings, and the different tensions each individual feels can cause this distressing environment. The difference between the individuals in the same environment, such as age or political opinions, can mean the aforementioned tensions of each individual go unnoticed by those in their company and vice versa. This is not to say, however, that because every individual is different

Sophie Joshua
1405142

that the state of *here* will be present and inescapable for everyone, but rather it is how these differences are responded to and to what extent they are embraced by the individual and wider society that determines whether an individual is in the state of *here*. If a unity and understanding can be forged between two individuals in two states of *here*, there is the possibility of finding *home*.

The theory of *here* is a valuable lens through which to examine literature, as it can be used to examine identity in regard to the individual and their perception of their own identity, as well as how others identify them and the identity they perceive that individual to have. Kristeva emphasises the redemptive potential of art and language as a response to melancholia. She argues that creativity allows the subject to transform internalised loss into a shared human experience and writes, "Sublimation alone withstands death. The beautiful object that can bewitch us into its world seems to us more of an adoption than any loved or hated cause for wound or sorrow" (96). Through this process, literature becomes a terrain in which the metaphysical state of *here* is given form and visibility. When authors and narrators articulate their emotional and cultural dislocation, they perform a sublimatory act that makes visible what would otherwise remain hidden. This supports the use of *here* as a methodological lens in literary analysis, allowing scholars to read beyond plot and character into the affective ruptures that shape subjectivity. The social, political, historical, and transnational context of the individual's location can also be examined. This thesis will identify that the concepts of home and identity can vary between the personal and individual sector compared to the social groups and wider society of the country in which that individual is living, or they can correlate. The individuals' community can have a different perception of what these factors are and what applies to the individual, and furthermore, the wider society and government of the country in which they are living can also have a conflicting view of these concepts compared to the individual and their community. The co-existence of these diverse perceptions between the

Sophie Joshua
1405142

sectors of individual, community, and wider society creates doubt in the individual about their understanding of home and identity. This, therefore, leads to the individual being in the state of *here*, as they believe themselves to have a certain identity and home, but their understanding is isolated only to them.

I will use an example to demonstrate these co-existing different identities and ideas of *home*, and further in this thesis, aspects of this example are present in the narrative and testimonies of the individuals in my chosen texts. A Japanese American born in the United States who has never even visited Japan could see their home as the United States, and could identify themselves as American. Following the attacks on Pearl Harbour however, the individual in question would see the United States government use prejudice propaganda leading to wider American society identifying anyone of Japanese heritage to be dangerous, despite nationality or birth place, and therefore refusing to see these individuals as American, even if the individual's affiliation with Japan was distant and separated by multiple generations. This would mean the home and identity the individual recognises differ from that of wider American society. The individual could therefore look for a form of social acceptance and a home in the Japanese American community, but this community itself is divided between those who are striving to be seen as 'loyal' to the United States and therefore submitting to the internment and abuses committed by wider society, and those who were outraged by the mistreatment of the Japanese and Japanese Americans and wished to reject and rebel against the bigoted practices and political sanctions of the United States government and wider American society. These two subgroups, therefore, each have a differing view of the identity and home of the individual in question and a different criterion for the individual if they wish to be accepted into that group, and co-existence between these two groups is impossible.

Rushdie writes that "sometimes we feel we straddle two cultures; at other times, that we fall between two stools" (15) underscores the unstable positionality of hybrid or diasporic

identity, a key concern of the theory of *here*. Regarding the Japanese American identity during and after World War II, the subject is not only displaced but actively misread by the dominant culture. This mirrors Rushdie's concern with in-betweenness but with an important distinction: while Rushdie frames cultural hybridity as a sometimes productive, if precarious, position, *here* insists that the forced and misinterpreted hybridity of the Japanese American subject leads to emotional and social dismemberment rather than synthesis. The individual in the state of *here* is not balancing cultural influences on their terms, but instead is situated in a no-man's land by societal misrecognition and prejudice.

The individual and social groups they are associated with being othered, segregated, and penalised in a location they perceive to be their home will lead to the continuation of conflict, injury, and in many cases, death. These threats lead to an individual being in the metaphysical state of *here* if that individual has previously identified the location of these atrocities happening to them as their *home*, or otherwise is attempting to create a *home* in this environment. The aforementioned outcomes of prejudice-fuelled ostracization lead the individual to be in a state of mortal peril due to the dangers they face from prejudice, biased laws, and practices such as imprisonment, internment, conscription, or abuse. An individual trying to escape these practices and outcomes may attempt to seem more 'loyal' to the country in which they hope to be socially and politically accepted, but this can also lead to emotional and physical suffering as well as injury and death. The individual joining the army of the country they are residing in and being injured or killed, or the individual being shunned by their families and communities who are also persecuted by the country they are residing in, are two examples of this, and will be exemplified in the narratives of some of my chosen texts.

The abuse and mistreatment of an individual, in many instances, can lead to the individual not only being treated as an outsider, but also as inhuman. *Here* being the state that an individual is in has been previously discussed regarding the location of that individual not

Sophie Joshua
1405142

feeling like *home*, and that individual feeling out of place and not welcome. This feeling of being out of place, however, is at its worst when that individual no longer feels as if they are being treated with humanity. Gilroy makes clear that "the dehumanization of racial others continues to disfigure the political culture of ostensibly democratic states" (78). When individuals are treated not as citizens but as threats or abstractions, they are stripped of their humanity. This is the most challenging form of *here*, where not only *is home* denied, but even the right to feel pain or claim dignity is eroded.

Albrecht's work uses a testimony which reflects the effect this lack of humanity causes: "In Dora's testimony from Albrecht's field research, this emotional toll becomes painfully vivid: 'I'd wake up in the middle of the night with my stomach like that... what do I do? I can't sell to anybody; nobody wants to buy it because it's right next to the mine.' Such testimony illustrates the psychological disintegration that parallels the physical transformation of place, a phenomenon that literature on internment frequently represents." (96). This quotation from Dora exemplifies how external degradation of place triggers internal collapse, mirroring the internment experience where Japanese Americans, though physically in their country of birth, were rendered inhuman by government action and public sentiment. Dora's distress and helplessness illustrate the kind of embodied, affective suffering that emerges when one's sense of place is forcibly altered, aligning with the emotional dimensions the framework of *here* discusses.

Every ostracised and repudiated individual is not necessarily in the state of *here;* it is through a comparison of these individuals to others in a chosen text who are in the state of *here* that an understanding can be formed as to what creates a perception of *home* and identity. If an individual is ostracised and unwelcome due to their perceived foreignness and their heritage, but does not have an expected idea of *home* or identity, which they have forged from the view of others and the misguided perceptions of an idealised version of these concepts, then they are

not in the state of *here*. This distinction aligns with Gilroy's emphasis that "melancholia is not uniformly distributed. It is not universally shared" (90). Not all who are marginalised *here* resist through collective identity, activism, or even apathy. The specificity of *here* lies in its construction and in how historical forces rupture an individual's sense of self. The lens of *here* and Gilroy's work both reject the flattening of experience and instead insist on nuanced, context-sensitive interpretation.

Here can be present for more than one individual simultaneously, in the same location, but with different causes and effects. This often contributes to the state of *here* being present, as one does not recognise the other's state of *here*, isolating them from one another further. This is what leads to different members of a family unit or in cohabitation each being in an individual state of *here*. *Here* is not necessarily created due to physical location, but the social relationships that are experienced in that location. This is why it is created when an individual feels out of place and unwelcome in a geographical or social setting, due to their perceived foreignness, lack of identity, and feelings of displacement. It is created when an expected idea of feeling welcome and at *home* is not met, and this is heavily influenced by the social interactions of the place in question.

Rushdie's insight that "exiles or emigrants or expatriates are haunted by some sense of loss, some urge to reclaim, to look back" illustrates how exile operates as a social and emotional condition as much as a geographical one (10). *Here* builds on this by proposing that even in familiar or ancestral locations, the absence of social acceptance can produce the experience of displacement. *Here* can manifest in one's country of birth just as vividly as in a land of forced migration. The critical distinction in *here* is the emphasis on social relationships: the rejection or categorization by surrounding individuals, communities, and institutions is what ultimately renders a place uninhabitable as home. While Rushdie sees the pain of exile as a product of distance and nostalgia, *here* presents it as something activated by social friction in the present.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

This difference highlights the political immediacy of *here*, where belonging is denied not by geography, but by societal refusal.

The expectations put upon the individual to fulfil a certain role or meet an expectation associated with this role, such as mother, father, husband, wife, etc., can also lead to the feeling of displacement from one's family or household. One person's idea of *home* may include someone who meets the expectations of certain roles within a family or social group, and therefore, that person may directly or indirectly ostracise the individual who is not fulfilling the expectations. In contrast, the isolation one feels when they do not meet the expectation of the role that they are given emphasises the interpersonal empathy gap that is created through a simultaneous yet different sense of *here* between individuals. Often, the criterion for these roles is varied depending on the country the individuals are in, and also the country they most affiliate themselves with. In the case of the generational gap between first- and second-generation immigrants, this is therefore heightened. Gilroy's critique of "universalist claims of national identity" (106) explains how roles like mother, father, or citizen are racialised and culturally encoded. These expectations can impose conflicting demands that fracture familial unity. *Here* splinters individuals even within the *home*, because their performances of expected roles fail to align with cultural or national ideals. The result is further estrangement.

There may be instances where the individual relocates to the country that the wider society in their current location associates them with; however, this does not guarantee the absence of *here*, but rather highlights how here can evolve with one's surroundings. Relocating from one country to another, for example, from America to Japan, can still lead to the isolation and categorisation of that individual from groups due to their associations or minor traits, which reference the country they moved from. It is the way humanity categorises and isolates individuals that leads to them being in the state of *here*, as they are perceived as too foreign in the host country where they are living. This is influenced by previous locations they have lived

in, and too close an association with Japan or America in the opposing country influences how that individual is treated, which is what inaugurates a struggle for identity. Gilroy notes: "Even when minorities 'return' to their supposed homeland, they are received as impostors" (64). Migration does not resolve *here*-it reconfigures it. Instead of homecoming, individuals experience renewed exclusion for not being Japanese enough in Japan or too American. Identity is relational, and past geographies continue to shape present perceptions. *Here* travels with the subject, and it is not left behind at a border.

The phrases and idiomatic words that are used to establish or create an identity often also contribute to the individual being in the state of *here*, as the different understandings and ideas of characteristics and traits associated with these words often are opposing between individuals. For example, in the time frame in which my chosen texts are set, the identity of 'Japanese' had diverse definitions depending on who was using the term, who was identifying it, who was afraid of it, and who embraced it. This, in turn, created an identity that was compromised and ever-changing. Being influenced by the expectations and connotation of certain identifying words and the present a character person is in creates feelings of displacement and an unsureness of one's own identity in a country once viewed as *home*, leaving many of the subjects of the term 'Japanese' in the state of *here.*

Here is a useful scope for the analysis and understanding of literature as it embraces the displacement between the reader and the individual. The reader accepts that we can never experience the individual's present, but rather can look at it from a position so displaced that it provides us with an understanding of the social commentary in a text, and a wider understanding of events that lead to its creation. This is why *here* is present when the expectation of *home* cannot be met due to social, political, and historical influences, because in identifying when an individual is in the state of *here*, we are able to pinpoint social, historical, and political contexts and issues that have contributed toward it. This supports Gilroy's broader

Sophie Joshua
1405142

argument that "cultural analysis becomes a way of confronting the failures of political structures" (104). *Here* is not only a concept but a methodology. It permits a reading of literature that is responsive to affect, social trauma, and identity as fractured rather than fixed. Through the lens of *here*, literature becomes a record of emotional dislocation and a means of accessing what history and politics erase.

When *here* is identified through academic exploration of a text, it is identified by the researcher, but will never be experienced themselves. *Here* is isolated to the individual and their present; it would be impossible for anyone else to do so. This in itself is why *here* is so prevalent, yet so unique and difficult for the individual to escape from. It is heavily influenced by wider society, as well as the social, political, and historical context of the individual's present. It is the individual's perception of these events that is their present in *here*. Whether the source examined is fiction or non-fiction, *here* is examined in literature and the creative form. That is where the *here* is explained to the reader, or to someone else trying to perceive and recognise *here* for someone other than themself. Gilroy concludes that postcolonial criticism must "resist the comforting illusions of universalism" and instead "reinsert those who have been disqualified from full humanity" (111). This aligns with the concept of *here*. Recognising *here* in literature does not replicate the experience, but it portrays, dignifies, and reanimates it. The methodology of *here* repositions marginalised stories not as peripheral, but as structurally central to understanding the cost of displacement.

The present *here* of a speaker, narrator, author, or any other individual voice in a text will always be a *here* that exists in that text and in that text's present where the individual resides. Kristeva frames the analytical process of naming melancholia as a symbolic mourning. While the melancholic may be mute in their suffering, the theorist, reader, or analyst performs an act of witnessing by giving the suffering a name. Kristeva writes, "Naming suffering, exalting it, dissecting it into its smallest components-that is doubtless a way to curb mourning"

Sophie Joshua
1405142

(95-96). This provides an ethical and theoretical justification for the work undertaken in the study of *here*. Though *here* cannot be experienced directly by the researcher, its presence can be articulated, theorised, and examined in literary form. In doing so, the isolated suffering of the subject becomes part of a shared intellectual and emotional discourse. Studying and identifying *here*, therefore, becomes an act of recognition, enabling marginalised narratives to re-enter a field from which they were excluded.

Rushdie's contributions are fundamental to the concept of *here*, particularly regarding the isolation of *here* to the individual and their present. Rushdie's observation that "human beings do not perceive things whole; we are … wounded creatures, cracked lenses, capable only of fractured perceptions" (12) provides a useful philosophical underpinning for the concept of *here* as it is theorised in this chapter. The metaphysical space of *here* is defined by the impossibility of external comprehension: the researcher may observe or attempt to interpret, but the present-tense experience of *here* remains fundamentally inaccessible. In both Rushdie's account of diasporic identity and the theory of *here*, the individual's internal world is fragmented by historical, cultural, and personal loss. However, the concept of *here* expands on Rushdie by locating this fragmentation not just in memory and imagination, but in an epistemic solitude that is imposed by both personal isolation and the limits of academic engagement. The cracked lens Rushdie describes mirrors the fractured self-perception of the individuals in the state of *here*, whose experience can only be represented through narrative or research frameworks.

. The following section of this introductory chapter is organised into several sub-sections, each dedicated to examining distinct theoretical articulations of key concepts central to my analysis of *here*. These terms include place, identity, diaspora, and othering, and are explored through a variety of theoretical perspectives. By mapping how these concepts have been constructed and explored, I aim to establish a nuanced framework for understanding *here*

Sophie Joshua
1405142

as a complex, shifting site shaped by movement, memory, and power. This multiplicity is necessary not only because each term carries layered histories and implications, but also because the idea of *here* itself is fluid and shifting. Establishing these varied definitions is essential to clarify the conceptual ground of my argument and to reflect the multiplicity that *here* inherently carries.

Place

Dolores Hayden suggests that "Place is one of the trickiest words in English. It carries resonances of homestead, location, and position in social hierarchy."[10], and it is therefore open to a variety of definitions and understandings. Identifying what is meant by an individual feeling "out of place" is integral to our understanding of *here*, as well as understanding what is meant when an individual is feeling unwelcome in a certain place and setting.

> Milford Jeremiah writes:
>
> Place, in its literary sense, can be defined in several ways. For one thing, we may define place as the physical aspect of the environment at hand. In another sense, we may define place as the environment removed from the speaker or writer. In some instances, place is the term used to describe the setting in which issues of writing and other language-related skills are housed and discussed. In the literary world, place is usually combined with time and events to establish what is known as the social setting or the social context of a literary work.[11]

The physicality of place identified by Jeremiah is important in my definition of *here*. I suggest that 'place' will always have some form of connection to the physical. For example, if the place in question is imagined, it will have been created from similarities to or contrasts with physical places the individual has in their mind's eye. Alternatively, if the place is a memory, it was once a physical location that is being recalled. Because of this, *here* is always created about a

---

[10] Dolores Hayden, *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997) 15.

[11] Milford Jeremiah, 'The Use of Place in Writing and Literature', *Language Arts Journal of Michigan* v. 16, no .7 (2000) 23. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

physical place created, as well as in contrast to an individual's idea of *home*. Furthermore, the reason that *here* is created for an individual is often because their idea of *home* is not fulfilled by a physical location in a way that is expected.

Jeremiah continues, "In another sense, we may define place as the environment removed from the speaker or writer" (23). This idea of place, regarding my definition of *here,* is a contributing factor to its understanding, because a notion of a place that is removed from the individual can also create a state of *here*. An example of this is in *No-No Boy*, when Ichiro reminisces about a time in his childhood when "we were Japanese with Japanese feelings and Japanese pride and Japanese thoughts because we lived in America".[12] Ichiro using the past tense suggests that this is no longer how he feels or thinks, or that he is Japanese, in the way the word "Japanese" is being used. Ichiro's opinion of the part of himself which is Japanese to an extent reflects that of American society: it is something which once was "all right," but it is no longer. The place "removed from the speaker" (23) is an environment where Ichiro felt he was allowed to be Japanese. Ichiro is in a state of *here* because his present self is too foreign for his circumstances, a circumstance which has changed due to America being at war with Japan. "It was all right then to be Japanese and feel and think all things that Japanese do even if [he] lived in America" (16): Ichiro's *here* has been created in his present through his perception of his past, a place which, by Jeremiah's description, is removed and no longer exists.

Jeremiah writes, "In the literary world, place is usually combined with time and events to establish what is known as the social setting or the social context of a literary work" (23), and this is significant when understanding *here* also. Social setting and context have a momentous influence on the individuals in the chosen literature, as it is social interactions,

---

[12] John Okada*, No-No Boy* (Washington: University of Washington Press, 2014), 16. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

constructs, and historical contexts of time and events that create the feeling of displacement and therefore the creation of *here.* In *When the Emperor was Divine,* each Japanese family is given twenty-five dollars upon leaving the internment camps and returning to the towns that they had left. The speaker in this chapter, the mother, says, "Why even bother at all? Twenty-five dollars, we later learned, was the same amount given to criminals on the day they were released from prison."[13] The Japanese are treated with the same regard as the American government treated criminals, their supposed 'crime' being Japanese in a post-war American society. This is an example of combining "time and events to establish what is known as the social setting or the social context of a literary work" (23). The place that the family is in in *When the Emperor was Divine* has become *here*, because they are made to feel like criminals and outcasts in a place in which they once did not.

Later in his essay, Jeremiah identifies that "Place serves a function in that it puts the reader where the writer intends him or her to be mentally, and this information gives the reader some insight into the history, the terrain, the people, the customs of a community, and so forth" (25). I have previously highlighted that *here* exists in the present of an individual, and it has a characteristic of "nowness" to it, whereby it exists in relation to a past perspective or present expectation which it now does not, or possibly never will meet. The experiences of the individuals in my chosen texts are based on true events, and the "nowness" of *here* and its existence in the present of the individual is why Jeremiah's identification of place is significant. The reader can identify *here* because they are in a place that is the specific individual's perspective, to evoke understanding from the reader.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' *Communist Manifesto* was originally published in London in response to and in support of the Revolutions of 1848. It has been recognised as

---

[13] Julie Otsuka, *When the Emperor was Divine* (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 118. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

one of the world's most influential political documents and addresses both historical and present insight into class struggle and the heresy of capitalism and the capitalist mode of production. Though not specific to a place's impact in literature, Marx and Engels' approach places a "tool" used to create social hierarchy.[14] Roberto Dainotto uses the manifesto in his discussion of place in literature. He discusses the impact of place and how it is used rather than a specific definition, like Jeremiah:

> The theoretical compulsion to put all cultures, so to speak, in their place seems to serve the multicultural utopia of a coexistence of different cultures. What this contiguous arrangement of cultures in space does, instead, is to bracket away the very question of hegemony- the historical process whereby one culture acquires authority over all.[15]

Place is discussed in regards to its function as an ideal in literature, rather than a defined concept. The idea of one's place in the world and in society is a way to enforce inequality by making it appear as though this hierarchy is integral to the function and wellbeing of society. Place is a multipurpose term, and therefore it is important that when defining it to construct and define *here*, we understand that the ideas of place in literature are as significant as their definitions. The "out of place" feeling which contributes to the state of *here* is in regards to the physical location which the individual is in, as well as their standing and place in society.

I argue that place is a constructed idea: be it physical location or an ideal or perception, it is multifunctional because its perception varies between each individual. This does not make it any less real, it just means that we must approach place and how we use it in an interactionalist manner. Much like Jeremiah's suggestion that place can be removed from the speaker or writer, it is still a construct created through perception, memory and experience. Lynne C. Manzo and Patrick Devine-Wright describe place as "space that has been given meaning through personal, group, or cultural processes .... [p]laces may vary in several ways-

---

[14] F. Engels and K. Marx, *The Communist Manifesto (*London: Penguin Classics, 2004), 255.

[15] Roberto Dainotto, *Place in Literature: Religions, Cultures* (New York: Cornell University, 1999), 3.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

scale or size and scope, tangible versus symbolic, known and experienced versus unknown or not experienced".[16] It is this perspective on place which is reflected in the construct and recognition of *here*, as *here* is also varying in its perception through personal, group or cultural processes. Other scholars also support the identification of place as being constructed by circumstance and personal processes. Peter Brown and Michael Irwin recognise that "literary place insists on being something other than itself, and gestures towards an importance beyond what is immediately obvious. Part of that importance is its position as a confluence of personal, historical and political currents".[17] Much like the way the same location can hold a different meaning between two individuals experiencing it simultaneously, *here* has the same ability to be perceived in multivarious ways even in the same location and present, as it is constructed from each individual perception and experience. I take the nature of *here* further and argue that because it is perceived differently yet simultaneously, this often solidifies its presence. Through these differing perceptions, miscommunication and misunderstanding will occur between two individuals, who as a result will feel alienated from one another.

Perception being a key factor in both place and its contribution to *here* is not just something which must be recognised between individuals, however. As this is a study of *here* in literature, the writer's perception must also be taken into account. Peter Brown and Michael Irwin write:

> 'Literature and place' is a portmanteau term with several specific applications which, for the sake of convenience, may be grouped into two types: the 'outside' (literary places) and the 'inside' (places in literature). The 'outside' approach is empirical and quasi-antiquarian, dedicated to amassing data and establishing connections between writers and real places. The 'inside' approach is more speculative and theoretical in tendency. Its main field of enquiry is the literary work and its economy of meaning, in

---

[16] C. Lynne Manzo and Patrick Devine-Wright, *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications (*Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2020) 5.

[17] Peter Brown and Michael Irwin, *Literature and Place 1800-2000* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2008), 21. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

which the idea of place is more important than the identification of topographical correlatives (13).

The concept of 'inside' and 'outside' approaches is recognised in my research, as this contribution to our idea of place is significant to the discussion. Regarding my *here,* the place in question is the 'inside approach', in Brown and Irwin's terms, "places in literature" (13). Okada wrote *No-No Boy* in response to the treatment of the No-No Boys he witnessed; the text is in part based on real events, but some parts are also fiction. Though I recognise and acknowledge the 'outside' approach, the place which constructs *here* is through the 'inside approach', as it is what has been created that is to be examined.

Brown and Irwin continue that "the representation of place in fictional mode also puts in play a series of possible practical interchanges between the real and the written world" (16). They continue by discussing how a place in literature, even a place based on a real location, is always that place which has been created by the writer. They give examples of locations in literature and state that they are the locations, but from the perception of the author: "not 'nineteenth-century London' but 'Dickens's London', not 'the Great Plains' but Washington Irving's Great Plains" (16). This is taken into account when creating my concept of *here*, as it is my understanding that the places written about are from the perception of the writer, with an intent to convey their message. However, I do recognise that all readers are free to interpret and construct a place for themselves. We are shown Ichiro's *here* in Okada's America, for example, which is why, as readers, we understand, yet are less sympathetic toward Ichiro's mother's refusal to accept the outcome of the war. This is further supported by Brown and Irwin, who continue: "places work by association with particular ideas. Writers might reinforce or elaborate those ideas, challenge them, or indeed be influential in initiating them" (21). This is true in regards to analysing the chosen literature through the scope of *here,* as we must remember that the writers are providing the reader with reinforced perceptions in a society, which are being challenged, influenced, and/or elaborated upon.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Ichiro's mother is an example of *here* being dependent upon perception and created by different experiences. Mrs Yamada's *here* is created from her refusal to accept the present place as her home, due to her fantasies about Japan. Ichiro's *here* is created through the reader's understanding of him in his present place as a "No-No Boy", and Okada's elaboration of this. However, Ichiro's mother's *here* is created through Okada challenging her present place which she is in. Brown and Irwin write "Descriptions of place do not exist merely for the sake of enabling the reader to compare imitation with reality; rather, they are there to embody certain ideas which the writer wishes to convey" (16). How the writer conveys place has an impact on whether *here* is present to the individual. No matter the inspiration or basis of the place that exists in the text, it has been created by the writer, and sometimes that place does not meet the expectation that the individual needs to convey a message or social commentary to the reader.

It is these aforementioned ideologies and understandings of place that amalgamate into the place that defines *here*. When place is used in this thesis, it will be in reference to one or more of these descriptions which has been identified, as well as being referenced and demonstrated throughout.

Identity and Place

Identity is another key term relevant in the construction and identification of *here*. There are important links between diaspora, an individual's identity, and place (both perceived by themselves and by others), interlacing throughout the chosen material and the definition of *here*. *Here* is also created for an individual when they are struggling with their own identity, be it because of a perception or action of another person toward them, or an internal turmoil with their own identity. Place and a sense of belonging have a significant impact upon identity, as Brown and Irwin discuss:

Sophie Joshua
1405142

> Place in literature performs an important function in the exploration of various aspects of identity, whether personal, social, or national. The individual's process of self-discovery is often enacted in place and through the attempts of an individual to understand it. Place influences the development of character just as much as places are given character by the people who inhabit them…Also at issue here is the problem of striking a balance between person and place, between having roots and being rootless. Too close an identification with a particular place can produce an aggressive and defiant parochialism, complete deracination a loss of identity. Emotional attachment to a particular kind of place can contribute to the formation of a group identity (22).

It is this link that Brown and Irwin make between identity and place that forms *here*, as I am arguing that displacement has a direct impact on one's identity, and this is why diasporas who feel displaced are an example of being in *here.* Much like *home* and *here,* place and identity live in a symbiotic relationship to one another, where place influences individuals and individuals influence place, and these influences form identity. In agreement with Brown and Irwin, "personal, social, or national" (22) aspects of identity are influenced by place, and this is true *here*. It is my argument that a state of *here* can be created by the following occurrences: firstly, by national dislocation, such as moving to a new place. Secondly, *here* can also be created through social dynamics, for example, how the individuals in my chosen texts are treated by society due to prejudice and hysteria surrounding the war, which is happening at the time. Thirdly, *here* can be created through personal disapproval, such as how the individual views themselves as a product of feeling displaced. This development was created in part by the influence of place and identity, which Brown and Irwin present.

The self-discovery which Brown and Irwin discuss is another reason that their exploration of identity and place is key when defining *here*: "The individual's process of self-discovery is often enacted in relation to place, and through the attempts of an individual to understand it" (22). The narratives of the texts I have chosen all include a form of self-discovery; some successful and intended, and others in contradistinction to this. I argue that the process of self-discovery is a result of being *here*, and the journey an individual takes through *here,* and this has been enacted by place and identity.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Another aspect of *here* which has been described is how it is created through an individual expecting to feel at *home*, or welcome in a place, but is not. Brown and Irwin write: "Also at issue here is the problem of striking a balance between person and place, between having roots, and being rootless. Too close an identification with a particular place can produce an aggressive and defiant parochialism, complete deracination a loss of identity" (22). The parochialism that is created from the fierce identification that individuals in my chosen texts show to their country of origin is just as responsible for the creation of *here*. This also creates the aforementioned "formation of a group identity" (22) of the second-generation diaspora in my chosen texts, who are of Japanese origin but have grown up in America, and are never fully a part of the group identity and place to which their older generation of family is rooted.

Milford Jeremiah defines place as "the environment removed from the speaker or writer" (23), and this can be married with Brown and Irwin's analysis. The place removed in Jeremiah's definition is the "particular place" (22) in Brown and Irwin's. In terms of *here,* this is the country of origin with which individuals in the chosen literature identify. It is important to understand that those who identify with their country of origin to the point that it creates *here* for other individuals are not inherently wrong or cruel for doing so. An example of this is Mrs Yamada in *No-No Boy*. Mrs Yamada shows a fierce loyalty and attachment to Japan, despite not having been there in over thirty-five years, and refusing to respond to the letters that her relatives write to her. Despite the resentment Ichiro shows his mother, he does question "was it she who was wrong and crazy not to have found in herself the capacity to accept a country which repeatedly refused to accept her or her sons unquestioningly" (95). Ichiro then goes on to describe Mrs Yamada as having a "soul that was Japanese once and forever [which is] beginning to destroy her mind" (95). It is examples like these that shall be examined, and in this thesis, I will argue that the way these individuals are made to feel displaced and in a state

Sophie Joshua
1405142

of *here* by the society in which they are living causes them to identify with their country of origin so fiercely and with "emotional attachment" (22).

Diaspora

The term diaspora was originally used to refer to the Jewish community and other groups exiled from Israel, who then dispersed.[18] Gabriel Sheffer describes diaspora as a community whose "members (or their ancestors) emigrated or were dispersed from their original homeland but remain oriented to it and preserve a group identity".[19] What creates a diaspora, and what can be used to identify a diaspora from other groups, such as those in exile, is debated and discussed by many scholars. Discussion surrounding this also goes further, with the question of what diaspora means in regard to literature. The term diaspora is to be identified in the description of *here,* because the literature involved in my study focuses on the Japanese diaspora of World War II. An individual being diasporic contributes to the creation of *here*, as the dispersal across a landscape contributes to the struggles with identity and place that the individuals face.

Thomas Faist discusses diasporas being "transnational", whereby they maintain connections and ties to their country of origin and also take an interest and investment in the politics, society, history, culture, and economy of the country in which they are currently living. He also goes on to write that this often extends to relationships with other group members who are in other locations.[20] This relationship that diaspora have with their host country and their country of origin is relevant when discussing *here,* as this investment in the host country and

---

[18] Martin Baumann, "Diaspora: Genealogies or Semantics and Transcultural Comparison", *Religions in the Disenchanted World* v 47, no 3 (2000): 313–337.

[19] Gabriel Sheffer, *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 4. Subsequent page references in text.

[20] Thomas Faist, 'Trans nationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* v. 23, no. 2 (2000): 189.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

connection to the country of origin creates a position for identity and place to be in between the two. *Here* can be identified as an interim between an individual's idea of *home* and their current location. This is not necessarily directly caused by being diasporic, but it is a contributing factor because of the relationship dynamics the diaspora has with both countries.

Diaspora is not always followed by ideas of displacement and negativity, however, and this is something which needs to be recognised. Gabrielle Sheffer argues that diaspora, over time will form a sense of unity and community amongst themselves within the host society (4). This unity and community, which has been created, is present in the chosen texts, and the concept of *here* is not something that is present or can be identified in every individual in the chosen literature, nor is it present in all diasporas. This thesis is not suggesting that every immigrant or diasporic narrative will present every individual in a state of *here*. *Here* is not always created, and circumstances such as finding unity and community help to prevent or eradicate it. Faist also addresses the community that diaspora find amongst themselves, arguing that diaspora membership is not always eternal or irrevocable, going on to compare it to exile. Faist argues that groups of political exiles, for example, often determinedly resist creating a connection and forming an interest with their host country (189). In this sense, diaspora can also be identified as a way to prevent an individual from feeling *here*, but only to the extent that the diaspora finds membership within their community and takes a direct interest in the society of their host country.

Rogers Brubaker argues that, as a definition, there should be an aspect of understanding and acceptance from the individual who is being labelled diasporic. Brubaker writes that in order for a group to be a diaspora, the members must knowingly identify themselves as a diaspora, not just with their homeland or as an ethnic minority. Individuals who are regarded as diasporic by members of wider society may not identify themselves as such, and as a result,

they are not part of it. Though they are groups bound together, individuals do not necessarily have to be inescapably bound to them.[21] Roger Waldinger also considers the individual's rejection of the diaspora label and discusses how it is not unheard of for an individual to cut their ties and connection to their homeland altogether, and as a result, disassociate themselves from the diaspora term.[22] Identity and diaspora are to be discussed further in this chapter, and Brubaker's theory on diaspora is a relevant and helpful one when defining *here*. It illustrates that in regard to diaspora, the identification of the individual intrinsically may differ from the external one put upon them by society. The term diaspora is then both attached to and rejected by an individual and vice versa, so it is a state of *here* in which their identity resides as it is not truly accepted by either.

Identity and Diaspora

Milton J. Esman writes that "both the migrants and their descendants constitute the diaspora as long as they maintain their diasporic identity and practices".[23] The timeline of when an individual becomes diasporic is very important; therefore, it is not accurate to determine that an individual becomes diasporic as soon as they migrate. Sheffer, too, argues that it is not the timeline that makes one diasporic, but the decision of individuals within the migrated group and the limitations imposed upon the group by the host country affect when the individual becomes diasporic. These factors make it possible that a group can become a diaspora long after their original dispersal (4).

---

[21] Rogers Brubaker, "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* v. 28 no.1 (2005): 1–19.

[22] Roger Waldinger *The Cross-Border Connection: Immigrants, Emigrants, and Their Homelands* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015), 349. Subsequent page references in text.

[23] Milton J. Esman, *Diasporas in the Contemporary World* (Malden: Polity, 2009), 9.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Much like the argument that diaspora is not just created as soon as an individual arrives in the new host country, there is also no determined amount of time that the country of origin has to be lived in for it to be established as the diasporas' homeland. Yossi Shain and Aharon Barth argue that as long as the diaspora views the place they identify as their homeland as the place of origin, it matters not if they or their family have ever been to the location in question.[24] The individual's perception of the homeland will determine their present and their association or disassociation with both their homeland and the host country. This is similarly true in regard to the host country's perceptions of the diaspora in question and their treatment of them. Both of these instances influence one another, and both affect the perception of *here*.

An example in *No-No Boy* is when Ichiro contemplates that he is half American and half Japanese, but during the war, it is only the part that is Japanese that matters:

> I was thereby still half Japanese, and when the war came and they told me to fight for America, I was not strong enough to fight you, and I was not strong enough to fight the bitterness which made the half of me which was you bigger than the half of me which was America (16).

To other members of society, all that matters is that Ichiro is Japanese; he has never visited Japan and saw himself as American until the war. "The half of me which was you" refers to the Japanese family he is descended from. *Here* is created through an individual feeling displaced where they are living, and a contributing factor is the perceived links with members of their community, and the outside community's makes with their country of origin.

Alternatively, there is no definitive standard where a diaspora must stay a diaspora or maintain their connection to their country of origin. Jean S. Phinney and Anthony D. Ong discuss this in regard to identity and state that identities are neither static nor exclusive. They

---

[24] Yossi Shain and Aharon Barth, 'Diasporas and International Relations Theory' *International Organization* v. 57 no.3 (2003): 451.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

explain the idea that one can develop, change, or abandon different identities at different stages of one's life. [25] As Avtar Brah writes: "at the heart of the notion of diaspora is the image of a journey. Yet not every journey can be understood as diaspora".[26] When the host country and society reject the attempts to be integrated into their community, and simultaneously the community whose membership is created by diasporic identity and a connection to the homeland decide to exclude those making attempts to do the former, this is when an individual is both too foreign for *home*, too foreign for their present location, and therefore is in a state of *here.* James Clifford discusses the ability of diasporic identities to change: "at different times in their history, societies may wax and wane in diasporism, depending on changing possibilities – obstacles, openings, antagonisms, and connections – in their host countries and transnationally".[27] Diasporic identity can change and evolve, labelling the connection and emotional attachment to the homeland as their diasporic identity, which prevents this evolution if it is not met with a similar desire to have this in their host country. This connection is neither inherently good nor bad, right or wrong; however, the attempt to hold onto both of these connections will therefore leave the individual with no genuine connection to either and a displacement from both.

Othering

Othering is a phenomenon in which an individual or group is isolated from the rest of society due to a label that they are different and dissimilar. Othering influences how people perceive and treat those individuals who are 'othered, ' and this often leads to that individual or group

---

[25] Jean S Phinney and Anthony D. Ong, 'Conceptualization and Measurement of Ethnic Identity: Current Status and Future Directions' *Journal of Counselling Psychology* (2007): 54. Subsequent page references in text.

[26] Avtar Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. (London: Routledge, 1996), 179. Subsequent page references in text.

[27] James Clifford, 'Diasporas' *Cultural Anthropology* (1994): 306. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

believing it also, and even embracing the stereotype set upon them. This creates an identity which meets the stereotype put upon the individual, and this is partly formed by whether they are in the state of *here*. Othering is an influential part of the definition of *here,* and the act of othering itself causes *here* to be. Lajos Brons describes othering:

> Othering is the construction and identification of the self or in-group and the other or out-group in mutual, unequal opposition by attributing relative inferiority and/or radical alienness to the other/out-group. The notion of othering spread from feminist theory and post-colonial studies to other areas of the humanities and social sciences, but is originally rooted in Hegel's dialectic of identification and distanciation in the encounter of the self with some other in his Master-Slave dialectic.[28]

Brons' definition of othering is one that I am using to structure *here*. *Here* is a state in which the individuals live due to the "mutual, unequal opposition by attributing relative inferiority and/or radical alienness to the other/out-group" (6). The individuals being studied are alienated due to physical, cultural, and personal attributes, which are highlighted and used to differentiate them from the rest of American society. The root of this alienation and the prejudice put upon them is that the country of origin they are from is at war with America- this is the radical alienness (6). I have discussed above how the identity of diaspora can appear and disappear due to corresponding social factors, and this is also true with othering. I refer to the extract from *No-No Boy* when Ichiro reminisces about the time before World War II, "because it was all right then to be Japanese" (16). Ichiro feels othered after the war begins, and when the Japanese are being persecuted, such as with the internment and the 'loyalty questionnaire'.

The Master-Slave dialectic Brons identifies is Georg Hegel's theory from *The Phenomenology of Spirit*. It is the idea of master-slave relationship dynamics that are formed through self-consciousness when meeting another person. The master in the interaction is who obtains recognition from the other, in the sense that they impose themselves as the slave's value.

---

[28] Lajos Brons, 'Othering, An Analysis. Transience' *Journal of Global Studies* (2015): 6. Subsequent page references in text.

The slave, on the other hand, is the one who supposedly sees their true self in the master.[29]

What is being described, therefore, is a fragile relationship between slave and master, and between a dominant and a submissive. This theory, being used in my definition of *here,* allows it to be applied to the relationships between the Japanese and the wider American society in the time in which the chosen texts are set. *Here* is not created by the physical location, but the emotions in the physical location, and an individual's emotions will always, in part, be reflected, conformed, and changed according to interactions and social relationships. This idea of master and slave, and the relationship between the two, which ultimately dictates who is who therefore influences how much power and independence an individual feels they have, and if this feeling underlies that of slavery and submission, then it calls into question how much influence and power the master group has over dictating how welcome the submissive group is in a physical location. The feelings and attitudes toward the Japanese before, during, and after World War II and internment will, therefore, to an extent, dictate the Japanese individual's ideas of *home*, and also what wider American society also believes this to be.

Jean-François Staszak discusses otherness and the different ways it is imposed:

Otherness is due less to the difference of the Other than to the point of view and the discourse of the person who perceives the Other as such. The Other is to choose a criterion that allows humanity to be divided into two groups: one that embodies the norm and whose identity is valued, and another that is defined by its faults, devalued, and susceptible to discrimination. Only dominant groups (such as Westerners in the time of colonization) are in a position to impose their categories in the matter. By stigmatizing them as Others, Barbarians, Savages, or People of Colour, they relegate the peoples that they could dominate or exterminate to the margin of humanity. The otherness of these peoples has notably been based on their supposed spatial marginality.[30]

---

[29] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Hegel's Phenomenology of Self-consciousness: Text and Commentary* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1999) 177. Subsequent page references in text.

[30] Jean-François Staszak, 'Other/Otherness' *International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography:* v. A no. 12. (Oxford: Elsevier Science, 2009): 1. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Staszak argues a point comparable to the earlier statement that othering is a product of prejudice and a criterion 'us and them' mindset. It suggests there is an intrinsic human need for categorisation and division to understand it, and to furthermore create and enforce a hierarchy to live by. The way this is established is to create inferiority and superiority; to measure this by differences, and justify it by deciding which groups pose more of a threat to others. In the case of the chosen material, this is rooted in America being at war, or having a history of war with the country that the other is from. The criteria by which the diaspora is held to and discriminated against is what creates the *here* for them; their country of origin is their perceived "fault", and they are stigmatised for this. The "dominant groups" in this instance feel threatened by the othered group due to the war: "they could dominate or exterminate [them] to the margin of humanity" and therefore stigmatize them as "Barbarians", "Savages", etc. It is labels such as this that contribute to the feeling of *here*, as the labels imposed upon the diasporic unjustly imply danger and barbarity, resulting in othering.

Edward Said discusses the legacy of the colonizer and argues that its existence is used as a tool for civil wars, corruption, and labor exploitation. He writes: "Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between 'the Orient' and (most of the time) 'the Occident'".[31] In Said's view, the West creates a wrong image about the Orient and considers it as the "Other" in contrast to the ideal West. The perceived threat to the ideal West, which is to say, a West that is dominated by White citizens, is the basis on which the anti-Japanese hatred has been formed. Therefore, the way to tackle a threat to a White-dominated and White-looking society was to suggest that anything other poses a threat to the life and safety of that society, and the events of World War II allowed a misguided association between the Japanese living in America and the Japanese at war with America.

---

[31] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 2.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

In her foreword to *No-No Boy*, Ruth Ozeki discusses the rapid change in attitude toward the Japanese during World War II: "Japanese in the United States became, by virtue of their ineradicable brownness and the slant eyes which, upon close inspection, will seldom appear slanty, animals of a different breed" (13). The Japanese were identified by physical features which were different from those of White Americans; however, rather than these differences being merely acknowledged and accepted, they were used to identify a comparison with citizens of another country with which the United States was at war. This was the warped justification used to discriminate against them. Much like how *here* is not a physical location, but rather the emotion an individual has in that location, the physical location and social ties that the Japanese had to the United States were irrelevant compared to their appearance, and this appearance differed from, and therefore was focused upon by, wider American society. Ozeki emphasises the frailty and falseness of this means to identify and categorise the Japanese, by highlighting that "upon close inspection" the eyes of the Japanese "will seldom appear slanty" (13), yet many examples of the anti-Japanese propaganda circulated during World War II focused on the eyes and hyperbolised the shape of the eyes of the Japanese.

Staszak goes on to write that:

> The creation of otherness (also called *othering*) consists of applying a principle that allows individuals to be classified into two hierarchical groups: them and us. The out-group is only coherent as a group as a result of its opposition to the in-group and its lack of identity. This lack is based upon stereotypes that are largely stigmatizing and obviously simplistic…Otherness and identity are two inseparable sides of the same coin. The Other only exists relative to the Self, and vice versa. The asymmetry in power relationships is central to the construction of otherness. Only the dominant group is in a position to impose the value of its particularity (its identity) and to devalue the particularity of others (their otherness) while imposing corresponding discriminatory measures…. The power at stake is discursive: it depends on the ability of a discourse to impose its categories. But this ability does not depend solely upon the logical power of the discourse, but also upon the (political, social and economic) power of those who speak it (2)

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The two hierarchal groups Staszak discusses in his description of otherness can be likened to the group of individuals who are *here*. The "them and us" mindset created by the simplistic and stigmatising stereotypes contributes to *here* because it creates the alienation felt by the individuals. By labelling individuals "them and us", it also creates an imagined border between the them and the us, where neither can live without conflict with the other. The "stigmatising and simplistic" (2) stereotype put upon the othered individual in this case is that they are not to be trusted, and are too different to integrate into society. Keeping the othered group just on the outside of societal acceptance would therefore reinforce a means by which to dominate them, as the need for acceptance will increase the submission of the othered group, with the hope that submission will lead to acceptance. Furthermore, the fear of further exile or punishment as a repercussion for lack of submission will also reinforce it. The father in *When the Emperor Was Divine* presents this ethos when he says, "*And remember, it's better to bend than to break"* (78).

Othering and Identity

Othering and its impact on one's identity is also an important relationship to examine. Staszak continues:

> Otherness and identity are two inseparable sides of the same coin. The Other only exists relative to the Self, and vice versa. The asymmetry in power relationships is central to the construction of otherness. Only the dominant group is in a position to impose the value of its particularity (its identity) and to devalue the particularity of others (their otherness) while imposing corresponding discriminatory measures (2).

The asymmetry in power relationships is similar to the asymmetric relationship between *home* and *here*. They too, are both inseparable sides of the same coin, and one cannot exist without the other, as they are part of each other's construction. Identity and otherness in Staszak's terms are the two sides of the coin, and this is why identity is also a corresponding factor in the understanding of *here*. The struggle for the individual's identity signifies they are *here*, and

Sophie Joshua
1405142

this is caused by othering. The dominant group in the case of my chosen literature is American society, which is othering the Japanese diaspora, and the discriminatory measures, such as the internment, are what cause the othered to be in a state of *here*.

There are examples in the texts where the group or individual who is being othered also discriminates against other minority groups, however, and this is not to be ignored. An example is in *No-No Boy*, when Ichiro comments "friggin' niggers" (7) in response to a group of African Americans outside of a bar he is walking past, who have just shouted "go back to Tokyo, boy" (7) at him. Being othered and discriminated against does not automatically create unity between minority groups, as demonstrated in *No-No Boy*. *Here* is diverse, and can be experienced by different individuals in the same setting and circumstance, but with different perspectives, much like a place. It is this diverse and adaptable manner, dependent on individual experience, which also creates *here*, as alienation is created when each individual does not understand or know of the other's circumstances. From Staszak's description of othering, the attempts of a group to "devalue the particularity of others" (2) is why even the othered groups themselves try to other minority groups who are not viewed as one of their own. It is a way of trying to regain the identity they feel they have lost, in an attempt to impose the value of their particularity (2). From Staszak's description, *here* also has a domino effect, whereby in the attempt to regain their identity and release themselves from a state of *here*, we see individuals trying to impose it upon others.

A state of *here* can be developed further with Staszak's definition, as it is my argument that the othered groups attempting to create another othered will never fully succeed. This is because they are still othered, and even through attempting to find their identity by burdening another group with discrimination, they are still othered by the dominant group. They do not have the identity that they are desiring. *Here* has a deep-rooted origin sprung from mistrust and discrimination, which has then created a state in which the individuals live. Staszak writes that

Sophie Joshua
1405142

"the power at stake is discursive: it depends on the ability of a discourse to impose its categories. But this ability does not depend solely upon the logical power of the discourse, but also upon the (political, social and economic) power of those who speak it" (3). The state of *here* is created by the political, social and economic factors which influence the dominant groups. The American government confined and imprisoned the Japanese population, including children and others who had never been to Japan, under the prejudice-fuelled justification that it was within the country's best interest to do so. The Japanese internment is proof of the power which Staszak describes, whereby the power of those who speak the discourse of discrimination (in this case, the American government) create the othering of certain groups which devalues the particularity of others through corresponding discriminatory measures. The influence of othering, married with 'justified' discriminatory measures at the hands of those in power, creates a place where any group not approved of are deemed 'too foreign'.

Western perception of Otherness

Otherness is cross-national, and not exclusive to White American society vs. the Japanese living in America. In regards to the chosen texts which I am using to discuss *here*, the dominant and submissive groups have this status in the confines of World War II and internment. Which is to say, that in my chosen texts, any group who is not Japanese is able to assert themselves over the Japanese. There is still hierarchy, where White American members are overriding, but in regard to the texts which I am studying, it would not be accurate to isolate the dominant group who other the Japanese to just White Americans.

Staszak comments that historically:

the Renaissance and the discovery of new civilizations, especially in America, brought the issue back to the forefront, paving the way for Westerners to search for the means

> to classify societies… thinking of civilisations as different like Others justifies the supremacy of Ours and legitimizes its propensity to dominate them (4).

This justification of supremacy and the legitimising of this hierarchy is at the core of discrimination which ultimately leads to othering and vice versa. It is also my argument that the way in which discriminatory acts are justified is what contributes to the creation of *here*, through the process of othering. If an individual feels there is a justified reason behind their othering, then they will never feel at *home* or accepted in their society, as they will believe that they do not belong there. The boy in *When the Emperor was Divine* is an example of this, as once he is interned, he starts to worry he was "there because he'd done something horribly, terribly wrong" (57).

Staszak discusses the idea of the 'Savage', and how this contributes to othering. The idea of the 'Savage' is the "man of the Forest, opposed with man from cities and fields…the Savage imposes itself as the descriptor of those who would constitute a lesser form of humanity" (4). Staszak's example of the "man of the forest" and "man from cities" is comparable to a phrase from *The Buddha in the Attic*, where the mothers of the picture brides advise their daughters "*walk like the city, not like the farm!*" (6). The reader is presented with a similar notion; that there is a link between the rural and the unwanted citizens that may come from there. By identifying a person or a group as less than human, we see a warped prejudice causing othering to happen. There are many examples of the 'savage' label being put upon individuals, and in the case of the social, political historical contexts of the material, this is illogically justified with the notion that the Japanese individuals are the enemy because of the atrocities of World War II.

Staszak writes "Carving humanity into races and the world into continents is…[a] template that Europe has used to create a spatial form of otherness" (4), and the identifying of races is what alienates the Japanese in the chosen material. The previously discussed label of

the 'savage' being related to the war with America is this spatial form of otherness, because it is the continent which the individuals are from which is the factor that justifies the discrimination. Feeling as if they are *here* is to be expected when the Japanese feel they are in the wrong continent.

The othering of another continent is relevant in the discussion of othering being a part of *here*. Examples in the chosen texts not only demonstrate this continental othering but also highlight the artificial and invalid nature of its justification. In *When the Emperor was Divine*, the boy details a moment when he is walking through his town and a stranger asks him, "Chink or Jap?" (76). To correctly identify if this child should be stigmatised for his heritage or not by the standards which American society has deemed acceptable through othering and racism, the stranger asks the boy to tell him if he is Japanese or Chinese because he himself cannot tell. The carving of continents that Staszak describes is emphasised in this interaction. Knowledge of this continent, its citizens and descendants is not needed, as the 'savage' label applied to the continent is an identification in itself. Discussion of appearance, and the impact it has on the isolation of Japanese and how this contributes to *here* will be explored in this thesis. This example presents Staszak's theory regarding how geographical borders have helped to create the 'other'. Staszak writes "the anthropological fiction of races and the geographical fiction of continents allow these categories to be reified and naturalized by giving them a supposedly geographical legitimacy and a false sense of evidence" (4), and there are multiple instances in the chosen literature where individuals are only identified as Asian, with no further specification to their country of origin.

Previously, the notion that identity, or lack thereof, is influenced by the dominant group in society has been presented, and this works in correspondence with the geographical legitimacy and false evidence put upon the othered. The othered individuals are not made to feel welcome in America, but are not identified as belonging to a country, just a continent. By

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Staszak's standards of given identity, it stands to reason, therefore, that this displacement and non-identification with a non-existent country, simultaneously used to stigmatise an individual, leaves them in a state of *here*, whereby they feel they belong to neither.

This identification with Asia is influenced by Orientalism, a concept that emerged from a period of colonial expansion into the Orient. Edward Said highlights that, by the time of World War II, a shift had occurred from European to American hegemony: "The two greatest colonial systems in modern history, the British and the French, have left their legacy to the United States" (4). Said's description of Orientalism applies to my chosen texts, which depict Japanese individuals internalising the 'us and them' binary. As Said explains, "there is nothing mysterious or natural about authority. It is formed, irradiated, disseminated, instrumental… it is always involved in a complex hegemony" (19). The characters' internalisation of racial hierarchies reflects this process. Orientalism's dominance is not only external but internalised by those it subjugates. Rather than resisting this imposed worldview, some individuals adopt it-even against other Japanese people-in order to survive within the world Said describes as the 'familiar': in this case, American society. In this context, "familiarity" is not synonymous with acceptance but with dominance. Said writes, "the Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of Europe's greatest and richest and oldest colonies…" (1), suggesting that the familiar is manufactured by long-standing narratives of superiority and control. Said further argues that "as much as the West itself, the Orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West" (5). This highlights how the ideological 'legacy' transferred to the U.S. also involved a cultural and intellectual concept of control that resonates with how American media portrayed Japanese Americans during and after the war.

A sense of unworthiness emerges in this present-tense experience of *here*, as illustrated in *No-No Boy* when a man says to the judge: "Maybe I look Japanese and my father and mother

and brothers and sisters look Japanese, but we're better Americans than the regular ones because that's the way it has to be when one looks Japanese but is really a good American" (32). In this statement, the speaker first acknowledges his perceived inferiority-suggesting he must exceed expectations to prove belonging-and then situates himself within the 'them' of the 'us and them' divide. Prejudices against the Orient have fostered a system of discrimination based on appearance, serving to further other those deemed outside the dominant social group.

As previously discussed, those who are other than the Japanese in my exploration *here* are not isolated to the White American community; however, it is my argument that the less white an individual looks contributes to the wider American society's creation of otherness. Furthermore, the "superior" phase of humanity being identified as White Man produces an intrinsic sense of othering derived from a criticism of one's appearance. The children in *When the Emperor was Divine* say, "we looked at ourselves in the mirror and did not like what we saw; black hair, yellow skin, slanted eyes. The cruel face of the enemy" (120). Much like the unnamed gentleman in *No-No Boy*, the children are compliant with the othering and prejudiced views that the dominant groups in society have put upon them. Othered people are in a state of *here*, as *here* manifests all of the attributes and ideologies that create othering. The labels that the dominant group in society imposes onto those whom they see as different and lesser are often accepted by the othered in an attempt to survive. Despite these attempts, however, the Internment proves that, despite even adopting the identity put upon them, they are not accepted or identified as belonging, and are in a state of *here*.

Home

Home, much like its counterpart *here*, is a multifaceted concept, with many different theorists discussing its definitions and dynamics. *Here* and *home* live in a symbiotic relationship, which is why *home* will be italicised when it is being discussed as a counterpart to *here*. *Here* is

created through an expectation of *home* upon a place which, for the individual, is not met or does not exist. Place in this instance is the theorised idea of place previously discussed.

Shelley Mallet discusses the diverse nature of home: "we need to develop a complex view of home that takes into account the interaction between place and social relationships".[32] I have previously described *here* as being experienced simultaneously by different individuals, yet from different perspectives and situations. Mallet's point corresponds with *here* in this way, as we must also take "into account the interaction between place and social relationships" (69) when examining it. The way *here* and *home* are created through an assortment of social experiences, places, and relationships is what makes their descriptions equally complex.

Mallet describes home in relation to the outside world, writing that "it is a confined space...[the] outside is perceived as an imposing, if not threatening or dangerous space. It is more diffuse, less defined. Different performative expectations exist for people in this outside space. There are different rules of engagement with people, places and things" (69). This concept of home being a safe haven from the outside world, which is viewed as dangerous, contributes to why *here* exists.

This is applicable specifically within literature, as discussed by Barrington Moore, who argues that home in literature is identified as a haven or refuge that people can retreat to and relax in.[33] If an individual views the society to which they have moved as their expected confined space of safety, then any threat to their life or wellbeing will compromise how they view that space, and they will feel in a state of *here* when it is threatened. *Home* does not always need to refer to a building; it can be applied to a location, for example, when the children in

---

[32] Shelley Mallet. 2004. 'Understanding home: a critical review of the literature' *Editorial Board of The Sociological Review* v.15, no 1 (2004): 69. Subsequent page references in text.

[33] B. Moore, *Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History.* (New York: Sharpe, 1984) 82.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

When the Emperor was Divine discuss what their lives will be like when they return, and exclaim, "yes, the world would be ours once again" (126). The conceived idea of *home* that the children expect to return to focuses on independence and ownership of their location, and the acceptance and comfort they once felt. This is not met, however. The discrimination and otherness that is experienced through "engagement with people, places and things" (69) in their present is imposed upon them due to societal prejudices (previously discussed in the form of otherness) and poses this threat. This creates one version of *here* in response to Mallet's ideals of home, as the individuals feel they are at risk and in danger in the place they once perceived as *home*.

Rapport and Dawson examine the values of home regarding diaspora, and how transnational the concept of home is, focusing specifically on migration. Similar to the concepts of identity, the perception of home will differ depending on one's origins. Rapport and Dawson describe home as a place where space and time are controlled and structured functionally, economically, aesthetically, and morally, and where domestic 'communitarian practices' are realized.[34] This depiction of the function of home is an explanation as to why the diasporic feel in a state of *here*. If *home* is where the aforementioned structure resides, and these structures differ between Japanese and other practices in other American homes, then *here* can be created. Firstly, as an individual develops and experiences other members of society's homes, the expectation of their *home* is highlighted as being different. A *home* where the community is considered a minority will seem out of place, intrinsically for the diaspora, and upon external inspection and criticism from other, more powerful social groups. Secondly, factors which create Rapport and Dawson's construction of home will contribute to the creation of *here*, as controlled and structured functions, economics, aesthetics, and morals, as well as

---

[34] N. Rapport and A. Dawson, *Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement* (Oxford: Berg, 1998), 6.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

'communitarian practices' which are realized, will also only be considered norms within the community, and not with the rest of society. This creates the sense of marginality previously discussed with regard to othering, and is met with discriminatory measures to create *here*.

Home theory is not restricted to the physical location, as Aviezer Tucker discusses: "most people spend their lives in search of home, at the gap between the *natural home* [conceived as the home environment conducive to human existence, i.e., dry land] and the particular *ideal home* where they would be fully fulfilled".[35] Shelley Mallet elaborates on this concept, stating "this may be a confused search, [or] a sentimental and nostalgic journey for a lost time and space" (16). Much like the concept of a remembered place, Tucker highlights that the idea of home can be a metaphysical location where the individual can be "fully fulfilled" (184). It is my argument that this fulfilment is married with a sense of identity that has been stripped from the diaspora in the chosen material through othering.

This "confused search" and a "sentimental and nostalgic journey for a lost time and space" (16) is also present within the chosen material. In *No-No Boy,* this is presented through Ichiro's mother's longing to return to Japan and her belief that Japan was victorious in World War II. In her present, Mrs Yamada presents the yearning for a "lost time and space" in two senses; firstly, she wants to return to a memory of Japan, which is influenced by her nostalgia for the country she knew over a decade previously. The letter Mrs Yamada receives from her sister, depicting the poverty and struggles of Japan since losing the war, suggests that it has changed since Mrs Yamada left, and that the Japan she remembers no longer exists. Secondly, Mrs Yamada is yearning for a Japan that does not exist because the Japan she wants to go to is one she believes to have been victorious in World War II. Mrs Yamada's particular ideal *home,*

---

[35] A. Tucker, 'In Search of Home', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, v. 11 no. 2 (1994): 184. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

where she would be fully fulfilled, does not exist, as it is formed from memory, belief, and misconception. By the standards of Tucker and Mallet's theories, Mrs Yamada is an example of how *here* is formed in response to an idea of *home*.

Other scholars also support the idea of home being a more utopian haven and a romanticised ideal that can never match reality. The idea of *home* can be influenced by the past and a perceived notion, which is fuelled by nostalgia, that *home* can be seen as a permeable concept. Doreen Massey suggests that memories and remembering of what one deems traditional are significant as they "illuminate[s] and transforms the present".[36] Time and tense are significant to the understanding of *here* and its presence, because though the *here* is always in the present, its counterpart, *home,* which it is being compared to, can be a present *home*, a *home* of the past, or an expectation of a future *home*. Time is just as significant to the feeling of *here* as well as place, because it is often the time in which the perceived idea of *home* exists, which means the *home* is, in fact, unachievable. Mrs Yamada is an example of this, as in her present society, she does not feel at *home*, yet she is also unable to return to the *home* she believes will fulfill her, and it will never meet her expectations because the Japan she imagines exists in the present is a Japan of the past. The children in *When the Emperor was Divine* however, imagine a future *home* they believe is achievable because they were interned. They ponder their return and say, "We would never be mistaken for the enemy again!" (114). Throughout the narrative, the children give the impression that they believe their internment proved they were not the enemy, and that the *home* they will return to is one where they are accepted back into society because its members will believe this also. Whether they will be in

---

Sophie Joshua
1405142

here or *home* upon their return, therefore, depends on whether the future *home* they created in their minds meets these expectations.

Sociologist Julia Wardaugh argues that for certain groups, in her example, women and children, home is far from a haven, as it is where sexual, physical, and emotional abuse most occurs.[37] Rather than a sense of home, Wardaugh argues that for the victims of abuse, within the home, there is a "creation of homelessness" (93). Wardaugh argues that, much like the relationship dynamic of *home* and *here*, home does not exist without the concept of homelessness. Wardaugh argues that home and homelessness live in a dialectical relationship, however, rather than being opposites. She describes the relationship between home and homelessness as being constructed of "complex and shifting experiences and identities" (93). Wardaugh's perception of homelessness is not dissimilar to my concept of *here*; however, the theory stands more isolated in relation to *home* itself, whereas *here* refers to *home* as well as to greater societal constructs and the diasporic.

Home is a concept experienced by the individual, and with this occurs an assemblage of experiences and actions. This is presented through the differing theories that surround the concept of home. In the description of *here* presented at the beginning of this thesis, it was explained that *here* exists in the present of an individual and is created when an expected idea or feeling of *home* is not met. In many of the theories of home which are presented, safety and haven are significant factors, so when examples such as the abuse which Wardaugh writes of occur, *here* is created. The expectation of safety and haven, which theorists such as Tucker and

---

[37] J. Wardhaugh, 'The Unaccommodated Woman: Home, Homelessness and Identity' *Sociological Review* v. 47 no.1 (1999): 93. Subsequent page references in text.

Mallet present, is not met when theories such as Wardaugh's are applied; this creates *here* in regards regarding *home*.

Peter Saunders and Peter Williams argue that home is viewed as a distinct private sphere, and the understanding of this is formed by three related concepts: privacy, privatism, and privatization.[38] In the context of Saunders and Williams, privacy at home means that the individual is free from surveillance and societal expectations that exist outside of the home. Privatism is described as the increasing habit where individuals withdraw from communal life and instead have begun orienting their activities around their home sphere. Privatisation refers to a change in attitude, where privatised home ownership is favoured over public or state-owned housing (81).

Saunders and Williams discuss the factors that create a home in terms of privacy for the individual. I have used these factors in the exploration of *home,* which then corresponds to the idea of *here*, because it is a theory that focuses on the individual's private sphere, and is a more interactionist perspective of home. The individual being free from surveillance and able to withdraw from society into their private sphere is a luxury that many of the diasporic individuals are not able to have. Because Japanese people are viewed as the enemy, there is a sense of constant surveillance around them. Being unable to retreat into a private sphere in the fear of seeming dangerous or foreign creates the place of *here*, as by Saunders and Williams' definition, this is a trait that creates the home.

---

[38] P. Saunders and P. Williams, 'The Constitution of the Home: Towards a Research Agenda' *Housing Studies* v. 3 no.2 (1988): 81. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Sara Ahmed describes home as not necessarily being a location, such as a country or town, but rather that it can be where a person's family resides, or where they are from. [39] Ahmed goes further to say that close personal relationships also can constitute a home as they hold symbolic meaning. The crux of Ahmed's argument is that relationships and emotional ties build an idea of home, rather than a specific location or household. Ahmed's contribution *here* concentrates on the interpersonal relationships that build a home, and the emotional and social ties leading to this. Ahmed's work contributes to *here* as it focuses on aspects of the individual's journey where their familial relationships, close social dynamics, or lack thereof, influence whether *here* is present. The Japanese diaspora is a community, and social relationships both within this community and between other communities in American society are at the core of *here*. This is because the other key terms being examined in regard to *here* are reliant and created by social and relationship constructs and dynamics. It is important, therefore, that our ideals of *home* reflect this, which is why Ahmed's work is crucial.

In response to Ahmed's discussion of home, *here* can be caused by a lack of close family relationships. This is why *here* was created for the diaspora in my chosen texts, as many of them are separated from their families in their narratives. An example is the Japanese picture brides in *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka*,* who come to America and do not see their families in Japan again. However, in regard to the texts I have chosen and my development of *here*, I argue that a family unit around an individual is not the only structure that creates a *home*.

In the chosen material, there are examples of the family being responsible for the creation of *here*. An example is the aforementioned Japanese picture brides in *The Buddha in*

---

[39] Sara Ahmed, 'Home and away Narratives of Migration and Estrangement'*: International Journal of cultural studies* v.2 no.3 (1999): 289. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

the Attic; by taking Ahmed's discussion about family and applying it to the idea of *home* and *here*, in theory, once the brides had children, they would feel at *home* and not in a state of *here* any longer. This is not the case, however. Being surrounded by familial or personal relationships will only create the *home* ideal if those relationships are functional and unstrained, unaffected, and uninfluenced by the other terms used to create the idea of *here*. This is why the children of the brides in *The Buddha in the Attic* alienate their mothers in an attempt to fit in with the rest of American society. The mothers in *The Buddha in the Attic* comment on a similar issue, when they recall their children "gave themselves new names we had not chosen for them and could barely pronounce. One called herself Doris. One called herself Peggy. Many called themselves George" (73). By rejecting the names given to them and choosing names their mothers struggle to pronounce, the children are creating *here* for their mothers. By Ahmed's standards of familial relationships, arguably, the brides would have been in a state of *here* when coming to America from Japan, as they were leaving their families behind. *Here* would have then ceased with the creation of their own family in the form of their children. However, in an attempt to reclaim their own identities and become more American and ultimately leave their own state of *here (*the *here* created by the aforementioned ideas of place and othering), the children alienate their mothers and create *here* for them. This demonstrates how *here* can exist in contrasting duality between individuals and be experienced from different perspectives. *Here* lives in response to *home*, and the duality referred to in *here* is presented in *home* also, as the children attempt to create a *home* for themselves in America through reforming their identities, whilst unknowingly alienating their mothers. *Here* is created when a perception and idea of *home* is not met, and this happens when the second generation rejects their heritage.

Peter Somerville argues that "home is not just a matter of feelings and lived experience but also of cognition and intellectual construction: people may have a sense of home even though they have no experience or memory of it. … We cannot know what home 'really' is

Sophie Joshua
1405142

outside of these ideological structures".[40] This point from Somerville is included in my exploration of *home* and the development of *here* because it represents a similar concept to *here* in the sense that it can be metaphysical, being created by a feeling and impression rather than a physical ideal. *Here* only exists in relation to *home*, and the expectation of *home,* which is not met. The feeling of safety and comfort, which has been discussed in the previous theories surrounding home, is significant, and this is not always due to a certain perceived memory or experience but rather a sense and feeling, derived from a primal and internal sense.

Tucker provides another perspective of home, similar to that of Somerville, where it is suggested that the concept of home is dependent upon a person's subjectivity. He argues that the idea of home does not necessarily have to be anchored to a physical location, such as a house, but rather it is a space where individuals feel at ease and can fully feel as if they are in control of their own identity. Tucker argues that home can be a multitude of factors, including emotional environment, culture, geographical location, political system, historical time and place, etc., which either create a home for an individual independently or combined (184). The different ways in which *home* can be experienced and created through the amalgamation of the aforementioned terms, which are open to subjectivity, are at the heart of *here*. There is no one shared and communal experience of *here* that can apply to all situations within the chosen texts, as the subjectivity, experience, and circumstance of the individual will always shape how *here* is being formed.

Tim Ingold writes: "how we function as persons is linked to how we make ourselves at home. We need time to make our dwelling into a home. … Our residence is where we live, but

---

[40] P. Somerville. 'Home Sweet Home: A critical Comment on Saunders and Williams', *Housing Studies*, v.4 no 2 (1989): 113. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

our home is how we live.[41] *Here* is something which is experienced, it is a metaphysical location and therefore must be examined as such through theorists such as Ingold. The way in which an individual functions in the place which they perceive should be their *home* is how we are able to see the presence of *here* rather than them entering a physical location or social situation and having *here* put upon them. *Here* can be caused by external individuals upon an individual, such as those who other the diasporic, but ultimately it is how the individual lives with these factors that best portrays *here*.

The theory behind the key terms explored have been used to develop *here*; the research undertaken and conclusions presented are a result of my examination of *here*, created through the key terms and theory behind them. This thesis will now explore the presence and identification of *here*, as well as its relation to the Japanese experience, and the effect that *here* has upon the individuals within the narratives of the chosen texts.

---

[41] T. Ingold, *Shifting contexts: Transformations in Anthropological Knowledge* [1955] ed. M. Strathern (London: Routledge, 2000), 18. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Chapter 1: The Buddha in the Attic and When the Emperor Was Divine by Julie Otsuka

The Buddha in the Attic and *When the Emperor Was Divine* are both novels written by author and artist Julie Otsuka. *The Buddha in the Attic* was published nine years after *When the Emperor Was Divine*; however, the discussion of these texts will refer to *The Buddha in the Attic* as a predecessor of *When the Emperor Was Divine*. The narrative of *The Buddha in the Attic* begins thirty years before the latter, and though I recognise *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* as individual texts with non- identical characters, they will be explored as a successive narrative of events; chronologically with regards to when they were set as opposed to when they were published.

In this chapter, *here* is conceptualized not as a physical location but as a state of being marked by displacement, exclusion, and unfulfilled belonging. It exists only in relation to *home*, emerging when the expected sense of comfort, identity, and safety associated with *home* is denied. Drawing from Julie Otsuka's *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*, this chapter explores how Japanese immigrants and their American-born children inhabit this state of *here* across different historical moments. For the *Issei* (first-generation immigrants), *here* arises from the failure to establish a secure and accepted *home* in America due to racial prejudice and social exclusion. For the *Nisei* (second-generation), *here* is produced through cultural dislocation, identity confusion, and the internalization of otherness, especially during and after the internment.

The present chapter considers that *here* is often enforced by dominant societal discourses, such as media propaganda, racialized stereotypes, and political policies that cast the Japanese as enemies. Even after returning from internment, the Japanese are not fully reintegrated into American society, and their efforts to adapt through changing names and behaviour do not guarantee acceptance. The term *"Model Minority"* is discussed as a

Sophie Joshua
1405142

contemporary counterpart to this experience, reinforcing that only conditional and performative forms of belonging are permitted. Ultimately, *here* is shown to be a liminal, continuous experience, shaped by shifting power dynamics, social relationships, and the evolving but persistent impact of racism.

First published in 2011, *The Buddha in the Attic* is a novel following the journeys of the Japanese picture brides, who were sent from Japan to America to marry Japanese men between 1907 and 1924. The marriages were arranged by showing the prospective bride and groom photographs of each other. This is how the women came to be known as the picture brides.[42] The novel follows these women for three decades, from their boat journey to America and the first night with their husbands, to becoming mothers and their departure for the internment camps in 1942.

Otsuka created the narrative of this novel by combining a plethora of sources and verbatim material. In her acknowledgments for *The Buddha in the Attic*, Otsuka names some of the sources used to compile the narrative, but states, "I have drawn upon a large number of historical sources, and… there is not room here to mention them all" (130). Some of the texts she attributes to her work are Kazuo Ito's *Issei: A History of Japanese Immigrants in North America*, Eileen Sunada Sarasohn's *The Issei and Issei Women East Bay Japanese for Action Presents "Our Recollections",* Sayo Masuda's *Autobiography of a Geisha,* and Won Kil Yoon's *The Passage of a Picture Bride*. She references over twenty texts, and they range from autobiographies, biographies, compilations of maps, photos, poetry, oral histories, and many more resources, some of them being translations.

---

[42] T. Makabe, *Picture Brides: Japanese Women in Canada* (Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1995): 24.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The nature of the narrative and how this text can be categorised, therefore, is complex. Fredrik Brøgger writes about:

> The concept of history as an 'imaginative reconstruction'[43] of the past, with the idea of history as a linguistic means of expression - hence history, like literature, becomes not a reflection of some 'objective truth', but rather a production of the subjective vision of the writer himself.[44]

The speakers in the text act as a communal, narrative voice that tells varying stories of a shared experience. They remain unnamed and unidentified. This ultimately creates a diverse but united narrative voice through which their story is told. An example of the picture brides' experience and how Otsuka presents their narrative is in the chapter depicting the brides' first nights with their husbands: "They took us flat on our backs on the bare floor of the Minute Motel. They took us downtown, in second-rate rooms at the Kumamoto Inn. They took us in the best hotels in San Francisco that a yellow man could set foot in at the time" (19). Chapters such as this present the "subjective vision" (90) Brøgger discusses; multiple first nights are being described in unison, but they are told through one voice. The *Buddha in the Attic* is inspired by testimonies and sources used to describe a part of history, and was created through an individual's truth. In this example, it is that of the picture brides through the retelling of their own experiences. Otsuka has then used these truths to form an "imaginative reconstruction" (90) of the history of the picture brides and a representation of the picture bride experience.

Carl Hecker, too, discusses how the retelling of history will always be just that. He writes, "In truth the actual past is gone; and the world of history is an intangible world, re-

---

[43] In this passage Brøgger refers to theory from Carl Becker regarding the 'imaginative reconstruction' of history.

[44] Fredrik Brøgger. 'History vs. Literature: Facts vs. Fictions? Or Factual Fictions vs. Fictional Facts? Or, Help, I Want to Get off.' *American Studies in Scandinavia* v. 16, no. 2 (1984): 90. Subsequent page references in text.

created imaginatively, and present in our minds."[45] It is important we recognise that even the sources acknowledged and used to comprise *The Buddha in The Attic* are in themselves a version and a re-telling of events. The same can be said for *When the Emperor was Divine*, which is set as the evacuation of the Japanese for the internment camps is beginning. The novel follows a Japanese family who are interned and imprisoned, as well as the events following their release. First published in 2002, this text was inspired by Otsuka's family history. The day after the events at Pearl Harbour in 1941, Otsuka's grandfather was arrested and imprisoned for being a suspected Japanese spy. Shortly after, her grandmother, mother, and uncle were imprisoned in an internment camp in Utah. These are who the father, the mother, the girl, and the boy represent in the narrative. This text is Otsuka's recreation of an already retold story of the family's experience. She was not present for the events in the narrative, and even if she was, her testimony would be a retelling of her own experience, just like that of the picture brides. Both narratives are based on events of the past, but they are not the past.

The retelling and producing of a reconstructed state of events is a perception of history created by the author or editor. The way this retelling is edited and composed will ultimately be a key device in portraying social commentary, which fulfils the author's and/or editors' intentions. As well as their own stories, characters in both texts also discuss events which happened to people they knew, told to them by a third party or people the events. The events in both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor was Divine* are therefore products of Otsuka's reimagined world, inspired by source material and a retold story compiled and restructured. The conclusions formed and the arguments made regarding both texts, therefore, should be viewed as such; they, too, are formed regarding these reimagined and retold narratives. The research undertaken regarding the literature serves as a tool to respond to the

---

[45] Carl Hecker. 'What Are Historical Facts?' *Western Political Quarterly* v 8, no. 3. (1955): 333.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

events of the internment and the picture bride experience, and this has allowed Otsuka to create a representation of the Japanese internment experience through combined and reconstructed narratives and stories.

Patricia Wakida, a fourth-generation Japanese American author, historian, and poet, comments on the underlying prejudice and racism against Japanese and Japanese Americans before World War II. She argues the internment of the Japanese was "rooted in decades of anti-Japanese and anti-Asian prejudice" [46] and "the devastation at Pearl Harbor inflamed an already pronounced resentment toward Japanese immigrant communities" (xi). This chapter will explore *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* comparatively to demonstrate this. The correlating experiences between first-generation Japanese in America and Japanese Americans living over three decades apart indicate the deep-rooted prejudices toward the Japanese that pre-dated World War II. Furthermore, the examples of racism and racial hatred presented in these texts demonstrate how the tragedies of World War II were used to justify this behaviour. By comparing *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine, here* is present when *home* is compromised, this occurs when the character is identified as alien and as the enemy. Though both texts are based upon true testimony, they are not historical textbooks, and in this exploration of both texts, there are comparisons made between historical events and evidence, as well as events in the texts. Brown and Irwin write that "the representation of place in fictional mode also puts in play a series of possible practical interchanges between the real and the written world" (16), and this is the intention of these comparisons. Historical examples and material surrounding the events leading up to, during,

---

[46] Patricia Wakida 'Preface' in *Only What We Could Carry: The Japanese American Internment Experience*. (Berkeley: Heyday 1955), xi. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

and after the internment also contributed toward the conclusions I have made from the comparison of *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*.

Pre-World War II prejudice toward the Japanese occurred through both social interactions and government sanctions. Part of this was due to pre-constructed prejudices and views of other Asian immigrants, such as Chinese immigrants and their second generation. Lin Wu writes that Asian immigrants were viewed as posing "an existential threat to Western civilization".[47] She goes on to suggest that those anti-Asian ideologies "became popular in the United States as many Chinese male labourers arrived on the West Coast in the mid-19th century. Their lifestyles and work ethics challenged working-class Whites' financial security and the idea of 'White purity'" (2). There are also multiple examples in *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine,* which highlight how Chinese and Japanese members of society are often confused for one another, and also treated with the same racial hatred.

In *The Buddha in the Attic*, many of the picture brides move to farms and fields to help their husbands with agricultural labour. According to K. Cheung, "the Japanese in the United States were the only Asian American community in the early twentieth century to develop families. Federal laws prevented the immigration of Chinese and Filipino women, but Japanese women were allowed into the country".[48] The brides sent to work for the farming industry in *The Buddha in the Attic* recall:

> THEY DID NOT want us as neighbours in their valleys. They did not want us as friends. We lived in unsightly shacks and could not speak plain English. We cared only about money. Our farming methods were poor. We used too much water. We did not plow deeply enough. Our husbands worked us like slaves. *They import those girls from Japan as free labor*: We worked in the fields all day long without stopping for supper. We worked

---

[47] Lin Wu 2022. *From Yellow Peril to Model Minority and Back to Yellow Peril.* v. 8, No. 1, (Western Oregon University: Western Oregon University Press): 2. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211067796.

[48] King-Kok Cheung (1997). *An Interethnic Companion to Asian American Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres)*: 126. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

> in the fields late at night by the light of our kerosene lamps. We never took a single day off. A clock and a bed are two things a Japanese farmer never used in his life. We were taking over their cauliflower industry. We had taken over their spinach industry. We had a monopoly on their strawberry industry and had cornered their market on beans. We were an unbeatable, unstoppable economic machine, and if our progress was not checked the entire western United States would soon become the next Asiatic outpost and colony (35)

The agricultural industry in America, up until the picture brides' arrival, had been male-dominated, including those workers who had immigrated from Asia. Due to preconceived and misguided prejudice, many in White American society felt threatened by the arrival of the brides and the eventual reproduction of second-generation Japanese American children. Anti-East Asian racial hatred surged, with pre-existing antipathy for Chinese immigrants feeding this. Staszak discusses the idea of Orientalism and how this ideology created the prejudices and stereotypes toward the Japanese, as well as other immigrants from Asia:

> The Oriental is characterised by his barbarity, his savageness and his race. The Orient is the geographical fiction that gives him geographical basis, Orientalism is the discourse through which the West constructs the otherness of the Turks, Moroccans, Persians, Indians, Japanese etc., all reduced to the same stigmatising stereotypes, and this gives itself an identity in opposition to them. The West thereby gains the right, if not the duty, to dominate the Orient, to save it from despotism, superstition, misery, vice, slavery, decadence, etc (4-5)

There are multiple examples in *The Buddha in the Attic* where prejudice and stereotype-induced statements about the brides and other Japanese people are quoted. For example: "*They import those girls from Japan as free labor*" (35). Staszak also discusses othering, and explains that it "allows individuals to be classified into two hierarchal groups: them and us. The out-group is only coherent as a group as a result of its opposition to the in-group and its lack of identity. This lack is based upon stereotypes that are largely stigmatizing and obviously simplistic" (2). Stereotype-fuelled statements such as the previous example from *The Buddha in the Attic* contributed to the dehumanising and othering of the Japanese. They were seen as dangerous and barbaric. To White American society, this also justified the exclusion and segregation of the Japanese who relocated around America to follow the agricultural work: "We settled on the edge of their towns, when they would let us. And when they would not- *Do not let sundown*

Sophie Joshua
1405142

find you in this country, their signs sometimes said- we travelled on." (23). The treatment of the Chinese immigrants paved the way for the treatment of the Japanese. Firstly, the Japanese were seen as similar to the Chinese due to the homogenising assumptions made about the continent from which they moved. Secondly, it was believed they posed a threat to White American agricultural communities, as more Japanese were able to work because the men's spouses could, and they were also able to reproduce. As noted previously in Staszak's work, this could be identified as Westerners searching for the means to classify societies to sanctimoniously justify the supremacy of white American society over groups of those who are othered from society (4).

Rapport and Dawson describe home as a place where space and time are controlled and structured functionally, economically, aesthetically, and morally, and where domestic 'communitarian practices' are realized (6). Aviezer Tucker writes "most people spend their lives in search of home", and then goes on to discuss "the natural home as the home environment conducive to human existence" (184), meaning it needs to have the basics of survival, such as dry land and water. In the realms of the narrative, picture brides and their husbands live where they work; they refer to sleeping in sheds on the farms and go on to say "Home was wherever the crops were ripe and ready for picking. Home was wherever our husbands were. Home was by the side of a man who had been shovelling up weeds for the boss for years" (24). Their natural home's existence is dependent upon their financial stability and their work, yet they are continuously harassed for this. In the aforementioned examples, the Japanese picture brides and their families attempt to control their *home* economically by working and contributing to the agricultural sector, however their attempts are met with hate crimes fuelled by stereotypes and prejudices which were caused by a pre-determined fear of the Orient, as well as a "propensity to dominate them" (4).

Sophie Joshua
1405142

In *The Buddha in the Attic*, some quotations are italicised. The italicised phrases can be identified into two categories: they are either spoken or thought by a picture bride, for example, *"I was thirteen years old and had never looked a man in the eye"* (20), or as speech someone else has said, for example "*They import those girls from Japan as free labor"* (35). In both instances, the speaker remains unnamed. The text is spoken through a communal narrative voice; the italicised phrases are specific to the individual, whereas the non-italicised text presents a communal voice. For example, when relating the birthing of the brides' children, Otsuka writes, "We gave birth even though we had drunk the medicine the midwife had given us to prevent us from giving birth one more time. *My husband was ill with pneumonia and my work was needed outside in the field*" (59). The use of these italics always conveys an individual experience, either to emphasise a social issue, or to highlight a certain mindset or event which underlines the overall intention of different chapters. The aforementioned italics regarding the woman whose husband has pneumonia, for example, present how integral the field work was for the livelihood of the picture brides' families and how the birth of the second generation was unavoidable and often detrimental to them. There is previous discussion regarding the rural farmwork that the Japanese undertook upon immigration into America, and it is italicised phrases such as these that highlight social and economic issues surrounding this work.

Even when it is clear the italicised phrases have been spoken by a picture bride, for example, "They took us even though we insulted them – *you are worth less than the little finger of your mother"* (20), there are still no speech marks indented. The italicisation highlights individuality but does not isolate the speaker from the overall communal narrative voice, which Otsuka presents. The italics emphasise the importance of the context and subject of the individual experience in the phrase itself: *"I was thirteen years old and had never looked a man in the eye"* (20) is an example of this. It gives insight to the reader how young some of

the girls were and therefore evokes shock, but their individual experience works in duality with the overall experience of the other speakers, also, and highlights the injustices that occurred.

Details of the violence that often ensued due to the prejudices of White Americans are also presented in *The Buddha in the Attic*. The brides recount:

> sometimes they burned down our fields just as they were beginning to ripen and we lost our entire earnings for that year. And even though we found footsteps in the dirt the following morning, and many scattered matchsticks, when we called the sheriff to come out and take a look he told us there were no clues worth following (36).

Their attempts to create a *home* by the definitions used in this thesis, therefore, are met with a price. Barrington Moore argues that home in literature is identified as a haven or refuge that people can retreat to and relax in (82). If the idea and feeling of *home* is attributed to this refuge and feeling safe, then this too is unattainable to the picture brides and their families. Julia Wardaugh argues that for the victims of abuse within the home, there is a "creation of homelessness" (93), and that the idea of home is compromised when an individual's safety is compromised. In *The Buddha in the Attic*, the *home* of the brides and the safety within their *home* is compromised due to the threat they are perceived to pose to the white workers in the agricultural sector. *Here* is created when an expected idea of feeling welcome and at *home* is not met. It exists only in relation to *home*. If a *home* is attempted to be made through economic structures such as their work, yet this creation of a *home* is met with abuse, then the Japanese in the previous examples will remain in a state of *here* as they cannot reach their desired *home*.

In both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*, Japanese and Chinese characters are often confused for one another. This confusion and lack of knowledge about the differences between these groups leads to both prejudice and discrimination, but also serves as protection from the prejudice and discrimination they are threatened with. This ultimately leads to confusion and a struggle for identity, and the presence of *here*. Following the events of Pearl Harbour, the children in *When the Emperor Was Divine*, who are named

"the boy" and "the girl", explain *"on the street we tried to avoid our reflections wherever we could. We turned away from shiny surfaces and storefront windows. We ignored the passing glances of strangers. What kind of "ese" are you, Japanese or Chinese?"* (120). In *The Buddha in the Attic*, the brides say that a "Chinese laundryman was found unconscious and bleeding on the waterfront and left behind for dead" (89), and then go on to explain, *"They mistook him for one of us"* (89). The Chinese businessman in *The Buddha in the Attic* was attacked because he was believed to be Japanese, and the children in *When the Emperor Was Divine* experience other members of society trying to identify if they are Japanese or Chinese, and by extension, how to treat them. It is in these examples that this evolution of the treatment of Japanese is provided, and how the pre-World War II prejudices toward these groups were heightened by the war.

Sheffer argues that the decisions of an individual within the migrant group and the limitations imposed upon the group by the host country affect when the individual becomes diasporic. These factors make it possible for a group to become a diaspora long after their original dispersal (4). The second-generation Japanese American children, such as the boy and the girl, become diasporic after the events at Pearl Harbour, because this is when they are abused by the host country. This is when they turn towards their Japanese identity and communities. They are unable to be identified as Japanese and Chinese, and by association, whether they are safe or dangerous. The struggle for an understanding of identity is presented by an experience of the boy, who is stopped by a man in the street, and is asked, "Chink or Jap?" the boy answers "Chink" and runs away. Only when he gets to the corner of the street does he turn around and shout, "Jap! Jap! I'm a Jap!" (76). The boy, knowing what he should answer, followed by his sudden change of mind, shows a confusion of his identity, and his desperation to show that he is Japanese. He is torn between how others perceive him, how he perceives himself, and who he should be to keep himself safe. Brown and Irwin recognise that

"too close an identification with a particular place can produce an aggressive and defiant parochialism, complete deracination a loss of identity" (22). It is this defiance that is shown through the boy's actions and his shouting that he is Japanese. Though it is not "aggressive" (22), we can see an emotional outburst caused by the confusion of not being able to be "Japanese". Peter Somerville writes, "home is not just a matter of feelings and lived experience but also of cognition and intellectual construction: people may have a sense of home even though they have no experience or memory of it. … We cannot know what home 'really' is outside of these ideological structures" (113). The boy has never visited Japan, but he has a sense of loyalty and an identity relating to this. In regard to Somerville's theory, the sense of *home* the boy feels can be directly linked to Japan, even if he has no experience there geographically, and this *home* has now been compromised, resulting in the state of *here*. Furthermore, we are not sure what "Japanese" means in regard to the boy, and we are not sure if he even knows. However, there is a loyalty to this identity, which is shown.

In *The Buddha in the Attic*, the brides' sons begin "wearing *I am Chinese* buttons pinned to the collars of their shirts" (92). This example, as well as the dialogue between the boy and the man on the street in *When the Emperor Was Divine,* shows how racism and ignorance lead to the grouping together and confusion between these groups, with no efforts being made to distinguish between the two. Yet this confusion also served as a form of protection due to the ignorance of the rest of American society, not being able to tell them apart. The boys in *The Buddha in the Attic* and the boy in *When the Emperor Was Divine* both use a Chinese identity as protection, compromising their own identities. Brown and Irwin discuss the effects of not being able to understand one's identity, and how this is influenced by location; "the individual's process of self-discovery is often enacted in relation to place, and through the attempts of an individual to understand it" (22). The place in which the Japanese are living post-Pearl Harbour is no longer that of safety, nor is it a place where they can recognise and identify themselves

Sophie Joshua
1405142

as Japanese. This causes an internal struggle for identity, as they are not sure who they are safe to be.

The second generation of the Japanese suffer differently from their parents, as they have not come from Japan to America, and have no preconceived ideas about whether they are foreign, nor as to why their identity and *home,* which they have always had, have changed. In the barracks of the internment camp, the boy "Sometimes…worried he was there because he'd done something wrong" (57). The boy is too young to understand why the internment has happened, highlighting how guiltless he is and the unjust manner in which he has been imprisoned. This not knowing is "the problem of striking a balance between person and place, between having roots, and being rootless," which Brown and Irwin discuss (22). Through the boy's attempts to understand his identity and why he is in the present place of the internment camp, a fear of an unknown wrong he has committed has arisen. Who he believes he is as a person has been influenced by the place he is in, which in turn creates feelings of displacement and an uncertainty of his own identity in a country he once saw as his *home*; this is why he is in the state of *here.*

The children in *When the Emperor was Divine* see the internment camp as a form of punishment for something they have done wrong, which reflects the emotional texture of the children's lives within the camp. This exemplifies Glenn Albrecht's concept of *solastalgia.* Although their physical location has changed, what they mourn is not solely geographic displacement, but the erosion of meaningful connection to their environment. Their loss of hope, vibrancy, and affective rootedness illustrates a grief that persists within place rather than away from it. This internal dislocation is a response to forced assimilation into an unfamiliar and hostile environment, and this aligns with Albrecht's definition of *solastalgia* as a lived experience of desolation caused by environmental change.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The children of the first generation of Japanese to move to America in both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* are torn between their *home* in America and their ties to Japan. This is prominent when examining the relationship between them and their parents, as well as how they are perceived by the wider American society in which they grew up. Cheung writes:

> The internment during World War II of over 110,000 Japanese Americans in concentration camps affected the *Issei* but perhaps had its most profound impact on the *Nisei*, most of whom were born between 1910 and 1940 and were adolescents or young adults during the war years. Simultaneously influenced by their parents' Japanese values and the 'American' ideas of their peers, *Nisei* negotiated between two cultures, but ultimately considered themselves American (126).

This is true for before World War II and post-internment, as there are examples of this in both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*, which are set individually in these two time frames.

The Buddha in the Attic presents the isolation the *Issei* feel from their children, and this is because it is written from the perspective of the picture brides who are the first generation. The bride's first focus is on how their children are learning a new language and how they can conform to wider American society more easily than they can themselves. Their children "spent their days now living in the new language, whose twenty-six letters still eluded us even though we had been in America for years. *All I learned was the letter x so I could sign my name at the bank"* (73). Through the actions of the second generation, the difference between them and their parents is further presented: "they refused to use chopsticks. They drank gallons of milk. They poured ketchup all over their rice" (75). This is an example of the *Nisei* being "simultaneously influenced by their parents' Japanese values and the 'American' ideas of their peers" (126) and the *Nisei* negotiated between two cultures. Doreen Massey writes those memories and remembering of what one deems traditional is significant as it "illuminate[s] and

Sophie Joshua
1405142

transforms the present" (182). The "traditional" customs of the *Issei*'s past are transforming

their expectations of the present, and the present in which their children are living. The *home*

the *Issei* are striving to create from their past is foreign to their family of the present because

of the way this past is foreign to the *Nisei*.

Tucker argues that home can be a multitude of factors: emotional environment, culture,

geographical location, political system, historical time and place, etc., which either create a

home for an individual independently or combined (184). Testsuden Kashima discusses social,

political, and historical factors that influenced the *Issei's* sense of belonging. He writes:

> There was a sustaining pride in the Japanese people and its culture, which honoured
> traditional social values and cohesive group relationships, with particular deference to
> those in positions of authority and status within the family and the community. There
> were also the obvious differences in language and religion. These factors promoted
> internal solidarity within the Japanese community and, combined with the hostile
> nativism… placed the *Issei* in comparative isolation in the public and economic life.[49]

The solidarity and isolation that the *Issei* felt from the "emotional environment, culture,

geographical location, political system" (184) was then heightened by the westernisation of

their children. The *Issei* and *Nisei* have grown up in different geographical locations and

cultures; therefore, their language and their capabilities in American society are different.

Though the brides have been living in the country for years, the language their children speak

is still referred to as "new", signifying how removed they feel from it. The brides then go on

to say that "soon we could barely recognise them" (73), and that "MOSTLY, they were

ashamed of us" (75). In this instance, the factors which Tucker outlines have created *home*

individually for the first and second generations of Japanese. The individual *homes* of the first

generation are foreign to the second, and vice versa. *Home,* having different and individual

---

[49] Testsuden Kashima 'Part I: Nisei and Issei' in *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.* (United States: The Commission, 1983) 31. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

meanings for different people, does not prove the existence of *here*; however, it does present that these individual *homes* cannot meet the other definitions of *home,* which have been used to create the counterpart of *here.* Sara Ahmed describes home as not necessarily being a location, such as a country or town, but rather that it can be where a person's family resides, or where they are from (289). *Home* is constructed in multifarious ways; however, the *Nisei* and *Issei* growing up in different locations means that neither can be recognised or welcomed in the other's *home*.

Though the *Nisei* are separated from their parents in pursuit of the "American ideas of their peers" (126), they are not fully accepted into wider American society in many instances. Arguably, it is for this reason that the *Issei* were striving for the *Nisei* to embrace their Japanese traditions over the American ones. The brides in *The Buddha in the Attic* worry about their children's expectations of the future: "One wanted to become a doctor…One wanted to become a star. And even though we saw the darkness coming we said nothing and let them dream on" (79). Japanese and American values co-exist for the *Nisei*; however, the family that holds the Japanese values believes that those who hold the American ones will not be fully accepted into wider American society. This is again an example of the way *here* is presented. By definition, it exists in the present of a character and is created when an expected idea of feeling welcome and at *home* is not met. The *Issei* recognise the false hope that the *Nisei* have about their futures, but allow their children to strive for them anyway. The ideas the children have for their future are unattainable; what is real, however, is their present, where they are not accepted by wider American society.

Jean S. Phinney and Anthony D. Ong state that identities are neither static nor exclusive. They explain the idea that one can develop, change, or abandon different identities at different stages of one's life (54). Their essay is critical when understanding identity in regards to the characters in the chosen texts, as well as the definition of *here* because there are

Sophie Joshua
1405142

continuous examples of the *Issei* and *Nisei* (though, it is mostly the *Nisei*) trying to change their identities from expectations and values put upon them by their Japanese family and wider American society. There are examples in *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* where the *Nisei* try to adapt and change to fit into wider American society. In *The Buddha in the Attic*, the children "gave themselves new names we had not chosen for them and could barely pronounce. One called herself Doris. One called herself Peggy. Many called themselves George" (73), and in *When the Emperor Was Divine*, the children return from the internment and say; "we would change our names to sound more like theirs" (14). These quotations are from before and after the internment, yet they both depict the *Nisei* using the same tactics in an attempt to seem more American than Japanese. The children in *The Buddha in the Attic* are unsuccessful, however, as they are still interned at the end of the text. Wardaugh argues that home and homelessness live in a dialectical relationship, rather than being opposites. She describes the relationship between home and homelessness as being constructed of "complex and shifting experiences and identities" (93). There is a sense of homelessness amongst the *Nisei* because they are shifting their own identities through their names, in an attempt to distance themselves from their Japanese identity. This is ultimately unsuccessful. Brown and Irwin's theory that "the individual's process of self-discovery is often enacted in relation to place, and through the attempts of an individual to understand it" (22) is presented here. In an attempt to understand the place that they are in as well as discover their own identities, the *Nisei* are caught between two worlds. They are "influenced by their parents' Japanese values and the 'American' ideas of their peers", negotiating "between two cultures" (126). They are seen as becoming American by the Japanese community but not by wider American society; it is an example of them feeling too foreign for either, as the identity they are trying to forge for themselves varies due to the perceptions of other people.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The *Nisei* being ostracised by other children in wider American society is a prominent occurrence in *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*. The boy in *When the Emperor Was Divine* has "A MEMORY FROM BEFORE: his sister arriving home from school with her new jump rope trailing behind on the sidewalk. 'They let me turn the handle…but they wouldn't let me jump'" (70). This is an example of the "already pronounced resentment toward Japanese immigrant communities" (xi) which Wakida writes about, and indicates how, even from a young age, there are experiences of anti-Japanese prejudice. Similar to the experience of the girl in *When the Emperor Was Divine,* in *The Buddha in the Attic*, the *Nisei* are excluded by the other children: "at recess they huddled together in a corner of the school yard and whispered among themselves in their secret, shameful language" (72). The reason that the *Nisei* are negotiating "between two cultures" (126) is that they are excluding their Japanese culture and striving to be accepted into the American one. However, the varying time differences between the parallel examples of anti-Japanese prejudices suggest that this is unattainable. The false hope and unattainable identity are arguably "the darkness" (9) that the *Issei* in *The Buddha in the Attic* foresee.

Historical examples date back to the 1800s of anti-Japanese and anti-Asian activity. Prejudice was part and parcel of American society decades before the arrival of the subjects of both texts. Kashima writes, "following early incidents in the 1890s, anti-Japanese activity commenced in earnest in 1900. On May 7, 1900, local labor groups called a major anti-Japanese protest in San Francisco. Political, economic, and social arguments were made" (32). They then go on to quote Mayor James Duval Phelan of San Francisco: "The Chinese and Japanese are not bona fide citizens. They are not the stuff of which American citizens can be made…Personally we have nothing against Japanese, but as they will not assimilate with us and their social life is so different from ours, let them keep at a respectful distance" (32). Historical examples such as the aforementioned and "The interaction between place and social

Sophie Joshua
1405142

relationships" (69), which Mallet discusses, highlight how difficult it is for the *Nisei* to obtain the *home* they are striving for. This is not to suggest it is unobtainable, but the place they are in deems them too foreign for the social relationships which, by Mallet's theory, create an individual's sense of *home*.

Once released from the internment camps, the children in *When the Emperor Was Divine* make plans on how to successfully integrate themselves back into American society, and to ensure they will not be ostracised from it. They say, "we would join their clubs, after school, if they let us. We would listen to their music. We would dress just like they did. We would change our names to sound more like theirs. And if our mother called out to us on the street by our real names we would turn away pretend not to know her. We would never be mistaken for the enemy again!" (114). The *Nisei* are willing to do whatever it takes, and change multiple aspects of their lives to fit in. Phinney and Ong's idea that one can develop, change, or abandon different identities at different stages of one's life (54) is encompassed here. In the previous example, where the picture brides say the children "refused to use chopsticks… drank gallons of milk…[and] poured ketchup all over their rice" (75), the children are enjoying and embracing foods and customs identified as American. However, in this example from *When the Emperor Was Divine*, the children are willing to change their tastes, interests, and names to fit in. Their stage of life, in which they are changing their identities, is different between pre-World War II and post-World War II. In one instance, they are changing previous Japanese customs and traditions due to preference and new experiences, whereas in the other instance, they are willing to change again, this time to meet the preferences of wider American society. The provision of "if they let us" (114) shows that though they are willing to make these changes, it is still wider American society that decides if the *Nisei* can be integrated into it, and if the changes constitute a new identity. Staszak discusses otherness and the different ways it is imposed:

Sophie Joshua
1405142

> Otherness is due less to the difference of the Other than to the point of view and the discourse of the person who perceives the Other as such. The Other is to choose a criterion that allows humanity to be divided into two groups: one that embodies the norm and whose identity is valued and another that is defined by its faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination. Only dominant groups (such as Westerners in the time of colonization) are in a position to impose their categories in the matter (1).

The dominant group in this instance is wider American society, in particular, White American society. It is they who embody the norm and whose identity is valued and it is the Japanese who are defined by their faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination. The faults in this instance being created by a misconceived and blanket association that wider American society has drawn between the Japanese and the attacks on Pearl Harbour. The *Issei* being othered by wider American society threatens their attempts to create an American identity and their *home* in America. The *Nisei* are born into a society that ostracises them under the guise of their association with the *Issei*. Furthermore, the *Nisei* are ostracised in part by the *Issei* for their association with wider American society. The two groups differ in this way. The perception of *home,* which is not met by the *Issei,* is one of a *home* they are striving to create after knowing a previous *home* in a new physical location, but for the *Nisei,* it is a *home* in which they are born, in which they are trying to evolve, and find acceptance.

Though they look for the acceptance of their new identities from wider American society, the children in *When the Emperor Was Divine* do not see the truth in its accusations. After listing the changes they will make, the children go on to say, "we would never be mistaken for the enemy again!" (114). The children do not believe they are the enemy, nor do they believe that wider American society is certain they are the enemy; they believe it has been a mistake. This is due to childhood innocence and naivety, much like the children in *The Buddha in the Attic* who have hopes of being doctors and stars. The younger *Nisei* are unable to understand that their situation has been "rooted in decades of anti-Japanese and anti-Asian prejudice" (xi), and that conforming to after-school clubs and music tastes cannot change this. According to Brown and Irwin, "the individual's process of self-discovery is often enacted in

relation to place, and through the attempts of an individual to understand it" (22), and in their present they are understanding the identity put upon them to be a mistake.

This will change as they grow up, and the childhood naivety diminishes. Phinney and Ong's idea that an individual can develop, change, or abandon different identities at different stages of one's life (54) is applicable here, because as the children get older, they will understand the identity put upon them is indeed 'mistaken', but it is a mistake founded in generational prejudice, and not a misunderstanding in the present which can be easily resolved. This again is the "darkness" (79) which the mothers in *The Buddha in the Attic* foresee.

The chapter narrated by parents of the children in wider American society is much like the voices of the picture brides; it is a communal speaker, and we do not know how many parents are sharing this experience. They begin by saying, "IT IS OUR CHILDREN who seem to have taken the disappearance of the Japanese most to heart…Where can I go to find them?" (118). This signifies another kind of childhood naivety, where the children in wider American society also do not understand why the internment has taken place and why the Japanese have left. Further on in the chapter, the parents speak of the new wave of immigrants who move in: "NEW PEOPLE BEGIN to move into their houses. Okies and Arkies…Dirt-poor Negroes…Vagrants and squatters. Country folk. Not our kind. Some of them can't even spell" (126). They lament that "we begin to long for our old neighbors, the quiet Japanese" (127). There is a sense of Japanese exclusivism, potentially shading into racism here, and the parents and children missing the Japanese signifies the nowness of *here*, and how it occurs in the present of a character. The actions of wider American society have supported the events that led to the internment, yet when faced with a new group of minorities, it is the Japanese they miss. Lajos Brons writes, "Othering is the construction and identification of the self or in-group and the other or out-group in mutual, unequal opposition by attributing relative inferiority and/or radical alienness to the other/out-group" (6). Before the internment, it was the Japanese

Sophie Joshua
1405142

who were identified as having relative inferiority and radical alienness; however, after their departure, groups with what was seen as greater inferiority and radical alienness were then ostracised, and the Japanese were missed. *Here* is a state in which the characters live due to the "mutual, unequal opposition by attributing relative inferiority and/or radical alienness to the other/out-group" (6). *Here* will always be present as long as the prejudices of the past are influencing the present. In this instance, the identity of the other, which was put upon the Japanese by wider American society, contributed to their being in this state of *here*. These prejudices formed about them have also influenced the present of their children. The *here* where the parents are in and the displacement that they feel in many instances influence how the *Issei* view wider American society, which in turn has influenced the *home* that they have created for their children. The elements of wider American society, the *Nisei,* act as a constant reminder to the *Issei* of the society that ostracises both groups.

It is only hindsight, memories of the past, and the Japanese leaving that caused wider American society to miss them. This change of heart would not have occurred if the internment had not happened, and if the Japanese had stayed in the present of the wider American society, they would still be in the state of *here*. The interned Japanese were compared to new groups of people deemed inferior by a new set of criterions, and this is the reason why they are missed. The dominant group that puts the identity of the other upon the inferior group, and in this instance, the dominant group is White American society. When new groups with what are perceived to be more relative inferiority and radical alienness appear, it is only then that the Japanese are seen as less like the other, and this is because they now share more attributes with White American society than the new inferior group.

Gabriel Sheffer defines diaspora as "members (or their ancestors) [who] emigrated or were dispersed from their original homeland but remain oriented to it and preserve a group identity" (4). In *When the Emperor Was Divine* and *The Buddha in the Attic*, it is the *Issei* who

Sophie Joshua
1405142

mostly try to preserve their group identity; however, the *Nisei* reject it. Roger Waldinger discusses an individual's rejection of the diaspora label and explains that it is not unheard of for an individual to cut their ties and connection to their homeland altogether, and as a result, disassociate themselves from the diaspora (64). The group in question was dispersed twice, once by migrating to America, and then when they were evacuated due to the internment. The internment caused a divide amongst the Japanese community living in America, and this is discussed further in the chapter examining *No-No Boy*. The identity put upon the individual by the dominant group and the identity that the individual is striving for or embracing often conflict with one another, and the treatment of the Japanese returning from the internment demonstrates this.

When the Emperor Was Divine depicts the experience of the mother and the children after the internment. Upon release from the camps, the family's return to a vandalised home this underscores the persistence of solastalgic trauma. Though the physical structure of their house remains, it has become uninhabitable as a site of belonging. Albrecht's theory reveals how emotional bonds to place are severed not only by absence but by the transformation of that place into a symbol of social abandonment. The return is not restorative; instead, it reinforces the dislocation endured in the camps, extending psychic damage into what should be the space of recovery.

The children recall:

> AT SCHOOL our new teachers were kind to us, and the students in our classes polite, but at lunchtime they would not sit with us, or invite us to join in their games, and not a single one of our old friends from before-friends who had once shouted out to us, *Your house or mine*? Every afternoon, after school, and in whose back-yards we had dug huts and built forts, friends whose mothers (tall, slender women in sparkling white kitchens) had invited us to stay for supper ('We'll call your mother') and whose fathers, on clear nights, had shown us the stars ('Now stand still and look up!') (120)

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The *Nisei* are still ostracised at school and by the other children in wider American society, even upon their return. As previously discussed, they were missed when they were a past and a memory, but now in the present of wider American society, they are once again othered. The Japanese are still in a state of *here* because of the way they are being identified in the present. The other American children, however, are also seen as different upon the return of the Japanese. The boy and the girl describe their friends as "our old friends from before-friends who had once shouted out to us" (120). The children show they do not identify their friends in the same way either. They believe:

> Perhaps they were embarrassed-we had written to them (*hello, how are you. It's very hot here in the desert*) … Or maybe they were afraid. (Later, we would learn that the postman, Mr. DeNardo, had told them that anyone who wrote to us was guilty of helping the enemy. "Those people bombed Pearl Harbour! They deserved what they got.") … Perhaps they had never expected us to come back and had put us out of their minds once and for all long ago (121)

Sheffer argues that the decision of individuals within the migrant group and the limitations imposed upon the group by the host country affect when the individual becomes diasporic. These factors make it possible that a group can become a diaspora long after their original dispersal (4). It is the limitations put upon the Japanese by the host country that are preventing them from being integrated into society. Even though there were instances of anti-Japanese prejudice before they left, the children are now prevented from events and interactions with children in wider American society, once available to them before the internment. Much like the immigration of new minority groups, causing wider American society to miss the Japanese, the *Nisei* are filled with a saudade for their interactions and relationships with wider American society before the internment.

Here can be present for more than one individual simultaneously, in the same location, but with different causes and effects. This is true of the *Nisei* and the children in wider American society, as they have had new identities placed upon them. Like its counterpart of

home, *here* is presented in multifarious ways, which needs to be examined with a complex view. Tucker's theory of the *ideal home* being where an individual would be fully fulfilled (184) is relevant here, as Mallet elaborates on this concept and states, "this may be a confused search, [or] a sentimental and nostalgic journey for a lost time and space" (16). The difference between *here* and *home* is that *here* is always in the present of a character; however, *home* and the idea of h*ome* can be in the past. *Here* occurs when the idea of *home* is not met, and if a nostalgia for *home* exists because that *home* is in a lost time or space, then the individual is in a state of *here*. The nostalgia for a lost time and space is present in both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*, and it is because of this that the state of *here* is present for the *Nisei* upon returning from the internment camps.

The examples of racism and anti-Asian prejudice presented in *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine* demonstrate how the tragedies of World War II were used to falsely justify pre-existing prejudices. Following Pearl Harbour, the mainstream media used these pre-existing prejudices to further manipulate and influence wider American society. "Yellow peril," is a maligning ideology constructed in the nineteenth century by European imperialists. The ideology pathologises Asian people as an existential threat to Western civilization, and to the corrupt and racist mind, justifies the colonisation of Asian nations.[50] According to Wu, this ideology was "popular in the United States as many Chinese male labourers arrived on the West Coast in the mid-19th century. Their lifestyles and work ethics challenged working-class Whites' financial security and the idea of 'White purity'" (2). By dehumanising the Japanese, the media were able to further bastardise an already corrupt view that wider American society had of them. The effect newspaper articles had upon the war hysteria is also presented in both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*.

---

[50] J.K.W Tchen and D. Yeats *Yellow peril! An archive of anti-Asian fear.* (New York Verso, 2014) 15.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The picture brides begin to recount the changes in how they were treated, and reason, "IT WAS ALL, of course, because of the stories in the papers. They said that thousands of our men had sprung into action, with clockwork precision, the moment the attack on the island had begun. They said we had flooded the roads with our run-down trucks and jalopies…" (85). The use of "we" magnifies the association that the media was drawing between the Japanese Imperial Army and the Japanese living in America at the time. After the internment, the family in *When the Emperor Was Divine* recalls:

> ...we kept up with the stories in the papers. *More Rescued Prisoners Tell of Japan's Torture Camps. Some Forced to Wear Metal Bits, Others Starved to Death. Trapped Yanks Doused with Gasoline and Turned into Human Torches.* We listened to the interviews on the radio. *Tell me, soldier, has it made a big difference to you, losing your leg?*" (119)

After this is the following extract:

> *Just put it behind you.*
> No good
> *Let it go.*
> A dangerous people.
> *You're free now.*
> Who could never be trusted again.
> *All you have to do is* behave (120)

The Japanese who were released from the internment camps are still struggling with the labels put upon them. It is unclear if there are two speakers or one, and this indicates that the identity of the members of the family in *When the Emperor Was Divine,* believe they have, and the one put upon them by wider American society is becoming blurred. The quotation from *The Buddha in the Attic* portrays the newspapers before the war, and the quotation from *When the Emperor Was Divine* is from after the war had finished. Both present the influence the American newspapers had on the way the Japanese were viewed in the eyes of mainstream media and

Sophie Joshua
1405142

how they viewed themselves because of it. Much like the factors which make it possible for a group to become a diaspora long after their original dispersal (4), the state of *here* and the lingering threat of the identity of 'enemy' are present even when returning from the internment. This is firstly due to the media's refusal to differentiate between the Japanese Imperial Army and the Japanese living in America. Secondly, this is because of the lasting impact the trauma of the internment has on the victims of it; they believe they are still demonised upon release. In the thirty years following Franklin Roosevelt's signing of Executive Order 9066, authorising the incarceration of the Japanese, the U.S. military had conflict with Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. These wars emphasised the idea of the 'yellow peril', which it was believed needed to be controlled and subdued.[51] The prejudice and anti-Japanese hatred outlined before and during World War II are still present after it ceased, presenting the lasting damages of prejudice, and the difficulty of feeling at *home* once an individual has been in a state of *here*.

E.D Wu discusses the phrase "Model Minority", which is the counterpart to the 'yellow peril. It is a prejudicial term theorised by American sociologists in the 1960s, which, according to Wu, exoticizes Asian Americans' ability to transcend historical racial prejudice, overcome systemic barriers, and achieve mainstream success if they take certain steps to conduct themselves in a way that seems non-threatening. [52] Though this term was coined twenty years after the internment ended, there are shadows of this ethos in *When the Emperor Was Divine*. Before leaving the internment camp, the family must attend a mess hall lecture on "How to Behave in the Outside World" (122). Some of the advice they are given is "Speak only English. *Do not walk down the street in groups of more than three, or gather in the restaurants in groups*

---

[51] D.Y Hamamoto *Monitored peril: Asian Americans and the politics of TV representation*. (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1994) 255.

[52] E.D Wu (2013). *The colour of success: Asian Americans and the origins of the model minority* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2013) v. 8, no. 1. 150-180. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

of more than five. Do not draw attention to yourselves in any way" (122). The idea that one must conform to certain practices demanded by another group in society to be integrated back into it presents the difficulty of the Japanese being able to do so. The rules set before them of how to behave suggest they are expected to meet the idea of a "Model Minority" in society, yet other groups do not have to meet these criteria. If one set of rules applies to a group of individuals, but these rules are not applicable to others, then there is still segregation in that society. The way othering is used as a way in which Westerners search for the means to classify societies and discriminatorily justify the domination of other groups is exemplified here (4). The Japanese's only attainable goal is to be identified as the least threatening type of enemy, yet other members in wider American society do not have to meet the criterion of the 'Model'. It is the rules for and expectations of the Japanese that keep them in a state of *here* even after the internment. The best they can hope to be is a 'Model Minority', and it is the only identity they can have that will contribute toward, but not guarantee, a life free from prejudice and discrimination. These rules enforce upon the Japanese an inferiority which justifies the supremacy of wider American society and legitimizes its propensity to dominate them. The Japanese person's life in America is now dependent upon conformity to rules that reassure the wider American society of their safety, from a perceived threat that was catalysed by their prejudices.

The speaker in the final chapter of *When the Emperor Was Divine* is the father, who is confessing to an unknown and unnamed character his guilt. However, the crimes he is "guilty" of are acts for which the Japanese Imperial Army is responsible, and what the newspapers and members of wider American society have blamed guiltless Japanese for. The father confesses, "All right, I said. I admit it. I lied. You were right. You were always right. It was me. I did it. I poisoned your reservoirs. I sprinkled your food with insecticide…I spied on your neighbours.

I spied on you" (140). He then goes on to say, "Who am I? You know who I am. Or you think you do." (140) and the final words of the chapter and text read:

> I'm sorry.
>
> There. That's it. I've said it. Now can I go? (144).

The confession can be examined through two points of discussion: Firstly, if the confession is seen as sincere, then because of his confession, the father will forever be othered by wider American society, as he has met the criterion that legitimises their supremacy over him. His previous ethos of "*And remember, it's better to bend than to break*" (78) resonates in this confession. He is admitting to accusations made about him and the rest of the Japanese. The father will forever be in a state of *here* because the *home* which he will return to has been obtained by fulfilling a belief derived from the years of prejudice and ideals of white supremacy, catalysed by war and anti-Asian propaganda. The identity of the Japanese being one imposed upon them by wider American society has led to the father submitting to the accusations made. Wherever the father wants to go, whichever definition of *home* it is compared to, it is one made on the premise of false guilt.

However, there is also irony in the father's words, and overall, it is apparent that this confession is insincere. He is using this confession as a tool with which to criticise his captors and the systematic prejudices which have led to the imprisonment of himself and others. The use of the plural, such as "reservoirs" and "neighbours" (140), is him making generalisations. Even if the father were guilty of some of the crimes for which he was accused, he couldn't have been the perpetrator of every reservoir poisoning or spying on every neighbour. The irony of the father admitting to a list of war crimes and treason, but then asking afterwards if he can go, implies the confession is all that is required for his release. The insinuation is that the system imprisoning him is corrupted, and serves to accuse to ostracise the minority and justify

prejudice, rather than to protect the country or those who live in it. The internment of children, the elderly, as well as all those of Japanese heritage, some of whom had never even visited Japan, is a testament to this. The process of the internment itself is also reflected in his confession. It was all Japanese who were interned, imprisoned, or forced to serve in the Armed Forces; they too were generalised into one group, which was the 'enemy'. This confession and the father's final question reinforce how Otsuka's edited and retold version of history is crucial in portraying the social commentary and statement she wishes to make regarding the internment experience.

Staszak discusses the power which a dominant group has over the group who is being othered: "the power at stake is discursive: it depends on the ability of a discourse to impose its categories. But this ability does not depend solely upon the logical power of the discourse, but also upon the (political, social and economic) power of those who speak it" (3). There are many examples of American media promoting anti-Japanese propaganda, which evoked war hysteria and anti-Japanese hatred during World War II. A few examples of these are the 'How To Spot A Jap!' pamphlet illustrated by Milton Caniff and distributed by the United States Army, *Life* magazine's December 22 1941 article titled 'How To Tell Japs From The Chinese', Disney's 1945 anti-Japanese animated Donald Duck film 'Commando Duck', and several propaganda posters produced by Theodor Seuss Geisel, most commonly known as the famous Dr Seuss. There was also a widely distributed poster illustrated by Phil Von Phul, who was trying to encourage the population to save silk that could be used to make parachutes for the U.S Army. The poster was titled 'SALVAGE SCRAP TO BLAST THE JAP' and depicted an American eagle fighting a snake. The snake had slanted eyes, overgrown front teeth, and a red hat- features commonly used to describe the appearance of the Japanese in the aforementioned pamphlets and articles distributed during World War II.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

In his study of othering, Staszak states that the misconceptions which lead to othering are "based upon stereotypes that are largely stigmatizing and obviously simplistic" (2). It is this simplistic and stigmatising material that leads to simplistic and stigmatising actions from wider American society towards the Japanese. Staszak discusses how this contributes to othering and prejudice. The idea of the 'Savage' is the "man of the Forest, opposed with man from cities and fields…the Savage imposes itself as the descriptor of those who would constitute a lesser form of humanity during the Renaissance and the great explorations of Africa and especially, America" (3-4). In dehumanising the Japanese, the treatments of them were justified by wider American society. Staszak also argues "by stigmatizing them as Others, Barbarians, Savages or People of Colour, they [the dominant group] relegate the peoples that they could dominate or exterminate to the margin of humanity" (1). The representation of the Japanese published by the American media did just this, and in turn, this belief was adopted to an extent by some of the Japanese also. At the beginning of *When the Emperor Was Divine*, the children recognise that their appearance is being scrutinised by members of wider American society, and ask, "Is there anything wrong with my face?" (15) because "People were staring" (15). Toward the end of *When the Emperor Was Divine*, the children then begin to recognise their features, which, now associated as a stigma and something not human, as this also is. They say, "we looked at ourselves in the mirror and did not like what we saw: black hair, yellow skin, slanted eyes. The cruel face of the enemy" (120). The children begin to adopt the mindset that the representation of themselves and their features is true, and that, much like the pamphlets, it is these features that identify them as the enemy. Not only this, but the boy uses these features to identify other Japanese, as when he is struggling to look for his father, he justifies "they all looked alike. Black hair. Slanted eyes. High cheekbones. Thick glasses. Thin lips. Bad teeth. Unknowable. Inscrutable." (49). "The limitations imposed upon the group by the host country" (4), which Sheffer discusses, are now being imposed upon the Japanese by

Sophie Joshua
1405142

themselves, as they have been influenced by the propaganda and war hysteria circulating in wider American society.

There are, however, examples of a change in attitude toward the Japanese in *When the Emperor Was Divine*. It is unclear how long after the return of the Japanese this was, but the children recount "in the school yard. At the park. On the street. They were calling out to us now. Not many of them. Just a few." (138). They go on to say, "At first we pretended not to hear them, but after a while we could no longer resist. We turned around and nodded, we smiled, then continued on our way" (138). The change in attitude of "Just a few" (138) members of wider American society is a sign of hope for the Japanese, and their reluctance to respond at first suggests the uncertainty the Japanese feel toward wider American society's treatment of them. These exchanges need to be examined through two different perspectives: that of the Japanese and the perspective of wider American society. In the texts used to examine the state of *here*, identities placed upon a character and an individual's struggle to find an identity encumber one another. *Here* can be present for more than one individual simultaneously, in the same location, but with different causes and effects. This often contributes to the state of *here* being present, as one does not recognise the other's state of *here*, isolating them from one another further. Like its counterpart of *home*, it needs to be examined with a complex view that can change and adapt, and this adaptation happens through interaction with wider American society post-internment.

James Clifford discusses the ability of diaspora identities to change: "at different times in their history, societies may wax and wane in diasporism, depending on changing possibilities – obstacles, openings, antagonisms, and connections – in their host countries and transnationally" (306). In the aforementioned exchange, the host country in which the Japanese are living has now changed. World War II changed the state of the world and the societies within it, so the identities in those societies also changed. The events leading up to and during

Sophie Joshua
1405142

the Japanese internment were fuelled by pre-existing prejudices; however, the identity placed upon the Japanese. Sheffer argues that a group can become a diaspora long after their original dispersal (4); and World War II was responsible for this in regard to the Japanese. Some members of wider American society in *When the Emperor Was Divine* no longer see the Japanese as the enemy, and this is shown by their calling out to them. The social, political, and historical factors surrounding World War II affected their identity and how foreign the Japanese were, both of which were decided and put upon them by wider American society.

The Japanese are hesitant at first to respond to those who call out to them. They pretend not to hear them, and this suggests a fear of them rather than an abhorrence. It is the decisions and prejudices of wider American society that caused the internment, and their capability of being able to decide who the enemy at any unspecified moment or period is a threat to the Japanese. As Staszak writes, it is "only dominant groups [who] are in a position to impose their categories in the matter (1). *Here* is not so much based on location, but the social relationships in that location, which is why the children ultimately accept their classmates reaching out to them once more.

Tim Ingold writes, "how we function as persons is linked to how we make ourselves at home. We need time to make our dwelling into a home. … Our residence is where we live, but our home is how we live" (18). It is in time that the Japanese, in this instance, interact with wider American society, as it is wider American society who have decided how [they] live (19). They do not fully feel accepted back into society at first, and are in constant fear of the circumstances changing. They are in the same location, but their present and their social relationships are different. The location is the same, but the circumstances and how they live have proved to be ever-changing. The need for human interaction and social relationships leads the Japanese to interact with wider American society. "Interaction between place and social relationships" (69), previously discussed by Mallet, is key here. It is through these social

relationships and new interactions that the Japanese begin to adjust to their new present, and attempt to find an identity and a home in this.

The Buddha in the Attic reveals how Japanese internment was rooted in long-standing anti-Asian prejudice, enacted both socially and institutionally. Attempts by Japanese communities to integrate economically, as seen in both *The Buddha in the Attic* and *When the Emperor Was Divine*, were met with violence and exclusion. These texts show how the meaning of being "Japanese" shifted under pressure, producing identities that were unstable and compromised. The space once considered home became a site of uncertainty and fear, leaving characters suspended in a state of *here*, where identity is questioned and belonging denied.

In *The Buddha in the Attic*, the *Issei's* attachment to traditional Japanese values sets them apart not only from American society but also from their Nisei children, whose Americanisation distances them further from their parents' understanding of home. This generational divide foreshadows the outcome in *When the Emperor Was Divine*, where the children, upon returning from internment, begin to adopt more overtly American behaviours, creating an emotional and cultural distance from their mother. These divided homes cohabited yet were emotionally and ideologically separate, not fulfilling shared notions of home, thus reinforcing the conditions of *here*.

Here emerges when home is inaccessible, lost to memory, or rendered unattainable by external forces. The return from internment did not dissolve the Japanese American community's alienation; prejudice persisted, and the trauma of internment lingered. Even after the war, the Japanese continued to exist in a state of *here*, shaped by suspicion and exclusion. The societal pressures to conform to the image of the "Model Minority" further entrenched this

Sophie Joshua
1405142

marginalisation, positioning assimilation as the only path to provisional acceptance while reinforcing the dominance of white American norms.

Media-fuelled hysteria during the war contributed to the vilification of Japanese Americans, and these narratives were internalised by wider society. As public perceptions shifted, so too did the identities that were forced upon the Japanese. The transformation of these social, political, and historical forces-beyond the control of those affected-underscores the temporality of *here*: it exists in the present, shaped by the conditions of the moment. It is not geography that defines *here*, but the social relationships within it. When belonging is denied and identity rendered foreign, *here* becomes a persistent condition of displacement forged by failed expectations of home and enduring systems of exclusion.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Chapter 2: *Midnight in Broad Daylight* by Pamela Rotner Sakamoto

First published in 2016, *Midnight in Broad Daylight* follows a Japanese American family who find themselves serving opposing countries during World War II. Katsuji, the Fukuhara family's father, emigrated to the United States from Japan in 1900; his wife, Kinu, was a Japanese "picture bride" whom he married. She also emigrated to America from Japan. Harry, Frank, Mary, Victor, and Pierce Fukuhara were born and raised in the Pacific Northwest; however, following the death of Katsuji, they were moved to their mother's childhood home in Hiroshima. Harry is continually intent on moving back to America, where he deems his home to be; however, the Pearl Harbour attack follows not long after his move back, and he is interned. Despite this, Harry still feels a loyalty toward America, and during his internment, he volunteers as a Japanese translator to assist the Allied Translator and Interpreter Section. Frank and Pierce are enrolled as soldiers in the Japanese Imperial Army, and as the war continues, the relocation of the American and Japanese armies results in Harry and his brothers traveling closer toward each other. Before the Fukuharas would have to meet and presumably fight, however, the U.S. detonated the atomic bomb over Hiroshima, resulting in a large volume of fatalities and injuring thousands of civilians. Members of the Fukuharas' extended family are victims of this.

In this chapter, *here* is conceptualized as a metaphysical state of alienation, experienced when an individual's expectations of acceptance, belonging, or identity are not fulfilled in their present context. Unlike other chapters in this thesis focused on Japanese American experiences solely within the United States, this chapter expands the scope to examine the Fukuhara family's transnational experiences across both Japan and America during World War II. Through Sakamoto's biographical account, this chapter shows how the Fukuharas are repeatedly marked as "foreign" in both nations. They are ostracized in America for being Japanese, and in Japan for being American.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Here emerges for each family member in different but overlapping ways, shaped by gender, culture, politics, and upbringing. For Mary, her American-associated assertiveness contradicts Japanese gender norms, resulting in her othering. For Frank, stereotypes about *Nisei* men undermine his masculinity and loyalty. Victor, who assimilates successfully in Japan, and Harry, who maintains loyalty to America despite appearances, demonstrate how identity is often judged by outward conformity rather than inner truth. *Here* is not bound to a specific location, but rather constructed through social perception, exclusion, and the persistent need for conformity. It critiques the parallel of marginalization in both Japanese and American societies, suggesting that despite being enemies, they mirror each other in their treatment of those perceived as foreign. Thus, the Fukuharas, who are caught between two national identities-exist in a continual state of *here*, unable to fully belong in either country or even fully to one another as a family. Their fragmented identities and the shifting expectations placed on them create overlapping but distinct experiences of dislocation and estrangement.

Midnight in Broad Daylight is a biography. Author Pamela Rotner Sakamoto met Harry Fukuhara at a press conference for former Jewish refugees in 1994. After hearing his story, Sakamoto travelled internationally to meet with Harry and his brothers, and began compiling their story for the best part of a decade. In her author's note, Sakamoto writes, "as amazing as many of the events may seem, please note that this is a work of nonfiction. No names have been altered, characters created, or events distorted. If a comment appears in quotation marks, it is verbatim from an interview, oral history, letter, or other primary source."[53] Depending on how it is examined and the theories that are applied, Sakamoto's text could be examined as historical writing, literary non-fiction, or several other forms of writing. Sakamoto engages with her historical sources by explaining and structuring them to fulfil her intention of creating

---

[53] Pamela Rotner Sakamoto. *Midnight in Broad Daylight: A Japanese American Family Caught Between Two Worlds*, (New York: HarpPeren, 2017) xii. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

"a book as a legacy of U.S. Japan relations, the Japanese experience in America, and the Nisei second-generation Japanese American story" (xii). Eric Heyne writes: "I think it is important to frame our discussion of literary nonfiction in terms that recognise its potential success as both a useful model of reality and an aesthetically pleasing verbal pattern of human meanings".[54] Sakamoto's text provides both of these successes, as she uses aspects of verbatim connected by narrative. An example of this is in the Prologue 'SHOCKWAVE', where the following interaction between Harry and his employer is depicted:

> "Harry," she said, "Japan has attacked Pearl Harbor."
>
> "Oh, is that so?" The news meant little to him. He nodded and the woman returned inside.
>
> When she reappeared a short time later, he was puzzled. She said, Japan has invaded Pearl Harbour."
>
> That's terrible". Harry didn't know what else to say. He had never heard of Pearl Harbor (1).[55]

From Sakamoto's author's note, we know this extract contains verbatim from Harry's interviews when quotation marks are used: "if a comment appears in quotation marks, it is verbatim from an interview, oral history, letter, or other primary source" (xiii). However, Sakamoto's own words and chosen phrasing are still in this extract, which are not verbatim from Harry. Harry responds to his employer's news about Pearl Harbour with a speech which has been derived from an interview, but then Sakamoto writes context for the reader to help them understand the thought process behind this speech; "Harry didn't know what else to say. He had never heard of Pearl Harbor" (1). Harry gives a short response to his employer of "That's terrible" (1). Sakamoto includes extra information so as to effectively portray her intention and the purpose of including the interchange between Harry and his employer. If the reader were not given the information that Harry had never heard of Pearl Harbour, then they

---

[54] Eric Heyne. 'Toward a Theory of Literary Nonfiction' *Modern Fiction Studies* v. 33, no. 3 (1987): 490. Subsequent page references in text.

[55] This line spacing is how this passage is printed in the text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

may make an incorrect assumption that Harry does know what it is, which, to some, would make his response rather cold and cruel, which is not the case. This extract highlights that incorrect associations have been made by wider American society between some Japanese Americans and the war atrocities occurring, which, in many instances, is not the case. This observation is only apparent to the reader when Harry's verbatim speech is coupled with Sakamoto's context and explanation.

Heyne describes that the status of a text "is either/or, a binary matter determined by the author's intention", and describes this as "the illocutionary intentions of the author" (481). Because Sakamoto has sourced testimony from the Fukuhara siblings regarding their different experiences at the same point in time, she has structured the text in a way that allows the reader to consider the similarities and differences between their experiences in different countries. An example of this is at the end of the chapter 'Panic in Los Angeles', when Harry is on the train on his way to an internment camp. Sakamoto writes, "Harry began the slow count to twenty, dreading wherever they were ending up tomorrow" (136), and this is the final line of the chapter. The next chapter, 'Silence from Glendale to Hiroshima', opens with "Frank knew the necessity of counting to twenty. This skill was called *gaman* (self-restraint). In Japan, where it was essential for a pressed population living in limited space, *gaman* had been elevated to an art" (137). How the end of 'Panic in Los Angeles' and the beginning of 'Silence from Glendale to Hiroshima' are structured in the text next to each other reflects the echoes of a once shared experience between the two men who are now living separate lives. We do not know in what order Sakamoto was given these accounts, and there is no guarantee these two events happened in unison; however, Sakamoto has used historical sources and testimony and placed them in chapters next to each other to fulfill her intention.

Milford Jeremiah discusses the significance that place has in literature to fulfil an author's intention: "place serves a function in that it puts the reader where the writer intends

him or her to be mentally, and this information gives the reader some insight into the history, the terrain, the people, the customs of a community, and so forth" (25). The chapters in *Midnight in Broad Daylight* alternate between Japan and America, and it is through the similarities and differences of the experiences in these places that Sakamoto's intentions are apparent. The subtitle of *Midnight in Broad Daylight* is *A Japanese American Family Caught Between Two Worlds*, and by structuring the text in the way she has, Sakamoto has placed her readers in between the two worlds also. Jeremiah also writes that "in the literary world, place is usually combined with time and events to establish what is known as the social setting or the social context of a literary work" (23), and the alternating structure of *Midnight in Broad Daylight* allows the social context of being caught between two worlds to be further appreciated. The sources which Sakamoto has used also provide this social setting and context, and this has been achieved by ensuring that "no names have been altered, characters created, or events distorted (xiii).

Japan and America, which have been created, are from "an interview, oral history, letter, or other primary source" (xiii). Brown and Irwin discuss the balance between the real world and the written world, and give examples of famous locations in literature, explaining that they are not locations of the real world, but rather locations from the perception of the author: "not 'nineteenth-century London' but 'Dickens's London', not 'the Great Plains' but Washington Irving's Great Plains" (16). They go on to write "the representation of place in fictional mode also puts in play a series of possible practical interchanges between the real and the written world" (16). Sakamoto conveys the "legacy of U.S-Japan relations, the Japanese experience in America, and the Nisei second-generation Japanese American story" (xii) by structuring and constructing the experiences Fukuharas have shared with her. The "real world" is the interviews, oral history, letters, and other sources, and this is interchanged into the written world, which is Japan and America in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*. When Japan and America

Sophie Joshua
1405142

are discussed in this chapter, it is the Japan and America created from Sakamoto's sources to which I am referring. For Sakamoto to convey her intention, we must enter her Japan and America. Equivalently, for us to understand *here*, we must look through the lens of the subject in Sakamoto's Japan and America, as it is in their present where it exists.

Sakamoto's role in *Midnight in Broad Daylight* is to combine and structure the information and stories she has accumulated to fulfil her intention of creating "a book as a legacy of U.S-Japan relations, the Japanese experience in America, and the Nisei second-generation Japanese American story" (xii). Sakamoto's Japan and America have been created by Fukuhara's memories of Japan and America, and we are reminded of this with the use of verbatim speech throughout. This is not to say that verbatim accounts shouldn't be trusted as truth, nor is it definite that verbatim accounts are inherently true. The account given was experienced in the same way by everyone involved in that particular event, and there are many instances where verbatim accounts can contradict one another. But this idea of perspective and differing experiences is an essential component of human experience. World War II affected millions of individuals in differing ways through one multinational crisis. In texts such as *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, it is the responsibility of an author to take the verbatim and the personal experience which is not their own, and transform it so it can be explained and understood for their intentions, which in this case, is to present a shared experience through individual narratives.

Other texts examined in this thesis have the same responsibility; *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka is told in the first-person plural, but there are no individualised characters named or identified. In her acknowledgements, Otsuka writes "This novel was inspired by the life stories of Japanese immigrants who came to America in the early 1900's. I have drawn upon a large number of historical sources" (130), and goes on to say she is "particularly indebted to Kazuo Ito's *Issei: A History of Japanese Immigrants in North America* and Eileen

Sunada Sarasohn's *The Issei* and *Issei Women*" (130) and also goes on to name many other texts of many different forms, such as historical texts, compilations of short stories, written personal accounts and news briefings. Otsuka's text is structured so that each chapter presents a different key event in the brides' lives; for example, the chapter 'Whites' is about the brides' experiences working for wider American society, and the chapter 'Babies' describes the brides' experiences in childbirth and raising *Nisei* children. In these chapters is a multitude of similar and differing experiences that are told consecutively, but it is never identified whose experience is whose. The chapter 'First Night' describes the brides' first sexual experiences with their new husbands:

> They took us by lamplight. They took us by moonlight. They took us in darkness, and we could not see a thing. They took us in six seconds and then collapsed on our shoulders with small shuddering sighs, and we thought to ourselves, *That's it?* They took forever, and we knew we would be sore for weeks. They took us on our knees, while we clung to the bedpost and wept. They took us while concentrating fiercely on some mysterious spot on the wall that only they could see. They took us while murmuring "Thankyou" over and over again in a familiar Tohoku dialect that immediately set us at ease. *He sounded just like my father*. They took us while shouting out in rough Hiroshima dialects we could barely understand and we knew we were about to spend the rest of our lives with a fisherman. (21)

Midnight in Broad Daylight and *The Buddha in the Attic* differ in a multitude of ways; for example, *Midnight in Broad Daylight* is written in the third person and *The Buddha in the Attic* in the first-person plural. Secondly, *Midnight in Broad Daylight* identifies whose story is whose, whereas *The Buddha in the Attic* never specifies how many characters' stories are being shared, nor does Otsuka advise us of which woman each experience belongs to. Where they are similar, however, is that the nature of each text is to highlight the different experiences in a shared event. Much like Sakamoto, Otsuka combines and structures a melange of narratives, which creates one story for her reader to follow. This story, the places in it, and the experiences depicted are therefore a construct based on true events in order to represent an experience. Just like *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, the events in 'First Night' did not happen at the same time, on the same date, or even in the same state, but the characters in the text are where the author

Sophie Joshua
1405142

needs them to be. To an extent, Otsuka even highlights the contradicting experiences of the "picture brides", by structuring the accounts in this chapter in a way so that the events are presented oxymoronically, for example "They took us by lamplight. They took us by moonlight. They took us in darkness, and we could not see a thing" (21). It is the isolated experiences specific to the individual that are taken and compiled to present a shared experience of a particular group. Indeed, this is one of the aspects of *here*, as it can be present for more than one individual simultaneously, even in the same location, but with different causes and effects. The melange of ways in which *here* is perceived does not mean it is fictitious; moreover, it presents itself in multifarious ways that, like its counterpart of home, needs to be examined with a complex view.

Midnight in Broad Daylight is an appropriate source in which to examine *here* and its presence. Both Brown and Irwin's and Jeremiah's work have been used to outline the definition of *here*, and how Sakamoto's text and the places in it engage with this work allow us to examine *here* throughout its narrative. The "interchanges between the real and the written world" (16) create a forum in which we can examine *here*. The world of the text has been created to highlight the events and interactions that have contributed to the presence of *here* for the individual. Sakamoto has created her Japan and America, and has placed the reader in a position alternating between the two, because in doing so "the reader [is] where the writer intends him or her to be mentally" (25).

Here is a lens through which we can examine this intention. The place in which *here* exists is metaphysical; it is formed in one's present state and psyche rather than a physical setting. *Here* is often catalysed by the relation of a physical location to the individual's present experience; a simplified example is the Japanese Americans who were raised in America, who were suddenly identified as an enemy. In the aforementioned example, the physical location is America, and the expectation of America being the individual's home and the displacement

Sophie Joshua
1405142

that the individual feels are experienced in the psyche. We cannot perceive the existence of *here* when it is created through a perception of home, which is incorrect or does not exist for an individual, because *here* exists only in relation to home, and the individual's perception and expectation of it. *Here* can be present for more than one individual simultaneously, in the same location, but with different causes and effects. Its ability to be experienced this way often leads to the isolation of an individual, as its existence is derived from that individual's ideas and perceptions of home.

The texts in this thesis thus far have been discussed regarding the Japanese and Japanese American subjects living in America before, after, and during World War II. The presence of *here,* therefore, has also been discussed regarding these Japanese and Japanese American individuals having the echoes of Japanese traditions, customs, expectations, and characteristics affecting and influencing their lives in America. These echoes are either through a desire to preserve their lives and memories of Japan, or through the determination of other members of their family and the Japanese and Japanese American community to preserve this in the aforementioned individual. The individuals being discussed are also the victims of prejudice and racial hatred from the wider American society. This is caused by an amalgamation of pre-existing prejudices, underlying racism, and World War II, catalysing the hysteria surrounding those perceived as foreign. Harry, Frank, Mary, and Pierce, in *Midnight in Broad* Daylight, however, move from America back to Japan in part of the narrative. Therefore, unlike previous examples in this thesis, there will be a discussion regarding the echoes of American traditions, customs, expectations, and characteristics that affect and influence the Fukuharas' life in Japan. It is the parts of the Fukuharas that are a bi-product of their life in America, which are deemed as "foreign", rather than the other way round.

The expectation of Japanese women, and the passive servitude in which they were expected to conduct themselves, is one that Mary struggles with following her return to Japan.

Mary often defended Victor in school: "people would pick on him, and I used to fight for him" (29). Regarding this, Sakamoto writes that "Mary chose to confront situations that she should have let pass. After all, a girl raised in Japan was supposed to be reserved and submissive…Her outspokenness extended to school, where she gained a reputation as a brash "Yankee" and a "bully" (29-30). The confrontational and outspoken aspects of Mary's personality have resonated negatively in wider Japanese society. If a girl raised in Japan should not act the way Mary is depicted, then, to an extent, it makes sense that Mary does not act this way, as she was not raised in Japan. Mary was born and raised in Auburn, California. Mary is expected to act in a way that correlates to an upbringing not available to her. The wider Japanese society recognises the correlation between upbringing and culture, as it is highlighted that a girl raised in Japanese culture is to act in a certain way, yet the same wider Japanese society enforcing this ideal is opposed to the way Mary acts because of the culture in which she was raised. If one's identity must evolve and transition depending upon the society one is living in, and what's more, the personality traits and impulses which in part construct this identity are formed from an individual's upbringing in that society, then that individual may never be able to meet the criterion set before them by the society in which they are living. The improbable remedy to this conflict would be to never leave the society in which they were raised.

Furthermore, there is a prejudice being presented in this extract regarding immigrants moving to Japan. Not only are the personality traits Mary displays seen as negative, but they have also been associated with American attributes, as the reputation she acquired consisted of the label "Yankee", an informal and often derogatory way of referring to someone who is American. The term "Yankee" in this example serves as a tool to segregate Mary. One interpretation is that the way Mary is viewed by wider Japanese society and the negative connotations surrounding the way she is being described are influenced by a prejudice against

Sophie Joshua
1405142

her lack of perceived Japanese attributes, rather than perceived American attributes. This interpretation correlates with the concept of othering and the standards set by it.

The foundation of the issue that wider society has with those who do not display customs correlating to an upbringing in the society in which one lives is a lack of conformity and a fear of this lack of conformity. Jean-François Staszak, in his article 'Other/Otherness' in the *International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography,* discusses otherness and the ideas of conformism that influence it. Staszak writes, "the Other is to choose a criterion that allows humanity to be divided into two groups: one that embodies the norm and whose identity is valued and another that is defined by its faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination" (1). An individual showing attributes that resonate with a foreign upbringing is one of the factors that threaten the conformity of the society, and this is why Mary is perceived by wider Japanese society in the way she is. The fact that Mary has been raised in America is significant, which is why she is referred to as a "Yankee" and a "bully" (29-30); however, the displays of this upbringing in her current location of Japan are also significant. In the same way, *here* only exists in relation to home; the presence of Mary in this group "defined by its faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination" (1) only exists because of the existence of the group, which is "valued" (1) in the society reprimanding her. If Mary were to have stayed in America, displaying these mannerisms, then she would not be in the group defined by its faults by Japanese standards. She may be in a group "defined by its faults" (1) in America, but that would be due to other reasons and mannerisms; the prejudice of which is not derived from an association with America. By applying Staszak's theory, it could be argued that the label forced upon Mary, which excludes her from wider Japanese society, is only able to exist because wider Japanese society exists.

Doreen Massey suggests that what one deems traditional is significant as it "illuminate[s] and transforms the present" (182). *Here* has an aspect of "nowness" to it, and it

Sophie Joshua
1405142

is only created in the present tense of a character or an individual. Ideas of "home", whilst it is possible to be referring to the present, can be used in regards to the past or the future, as well as locations which exist as such; however, *here* is present, and exists in contrast to the past, present, or future uses of "home". Mary is in the state of *here* in this part of her narrative because it is her upbringing and her past which is being judged in her present by wider Japanese society. Her upbringing in America threatens what wider Japanese society deems traditional, and it is this that is transforming her present. This is true for a lot of the individuals in the texts being discussed in this thesis, as a home from the past can always influence an individual's present and future. One example from this thesis is Mrs Yamada in *No-No Boy* by John Okada, whose obsession with and adoration of the Japan that existed over three decades previous to her present results in her suicide.

Being recalcitrant to the norms of a society will always provide a struggle for an individual, and identifying themselves as a part of that society without conforming will always be a challenge. This is arguably because more often than not, the conformity set in place in a society benefits those who run it. Staszak also discusses the power dynamic in othering, and writes that "the power at stake is discursive: it depends on the ability of a discourse to impose its categories. But this ability does not depend solely upon the logical power of the discourse, but also upon the (political, social and economic) power of those who speak it" (3). In the example of Mary, it is the patriarchal values of Japanese society that hold this power. This is why Mary is stigmatised. Mary challenges the patriarchy in wider Japanese society and rejects the expected servility of Japanese women.

Lajos Brons, in his article 'Othering, An Analysis', comments that the notion of othering spread partly from feminist theory (6). Othering is key to the construction of my definition of *here*, so applying a feminist reading which discusses gender roles and the role sexism plays in *Midnight in Broad Daylight* and the effect it has on the individual's identities

Sophie Joshua
1405142

and ideas of home is appropriate. There is much research that discusses the role of women in Japan and how the westernisation of Japanese and Japanese American women has influenced this, often to some form of detriment to the women's lives. Ivy D. Arai writes: "Traditional Japanese culture expected the woman to 'walk two steps behind a man'. This popular saying depicts the woman's status in Japanese society".[56] Arai then goes on to say:

> In the prewar years, Japanese-American women experienced a double exclusion…As Japanese women came into greater contact in the United States with Western values, Japanese-American women confronted a dilemma. Some Japanese-American women endured an inner conflict concerning their role in society as a result of the greater opportunity available in the United States. Some women were attracted to the new possibilities open to American women, but their ambitions or dreams for themselves remained contained by their traditional culture (215)

Though it is a different text form and was written at a different point in time; pertinent to Arai's discussion is a passage from the *Bulletin of the Japan Society*: "Of the westernised woman, many of the returnees [to Japan] have been out of the marriageable class or have been less desirable by certain Japanese standards".[57] By challenging the patriarchy in wider Japanese society and rejecting the conformity and passivism expected of Japanese women, Mary is othered by the society in which she is living. She is defined by perceived "faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination" (1).

Phinney and Ong discuss that the host country and a perceived homeland influence identity, but do not define it. They state that identities are neither static nor exclusive. It explains the idea that one can develop, change, or abandon different identities at different stages of one's life (54). By Phinney and Ong's standard, Mary would be able to change her identity and adapt to her new host country Japan, should she want to, however it is my argument that an identity which meets the criterion of what a Japanese girl should be will be difficult for

---

[56] Nicole Dombrowski. (Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis, 2004) *Women and War in the Twentieth Century: Enlisted with Or Without Consent*. 158.

[57] *Bulletin of the Japan Society* (London: The Society, 1950) 14.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Mary to achieve, and that it would also be a continuous struggle for her into womanhood. The expectation of Japanese women is also very prominent, with regulations and roles that seem to have evolved from those put upon them in adolescence. The servitude expected of Japanese girls seems to be preparing them for roles as mothers and wives in adulthood. Jenifer Robertson refers to this ethos and writes about how Japanese philosophers such as Yamaga Soko and texts such as *Shingaku dowa shu* were fundamental in creating the same ethos of "good wife, wise mother" and "reliable mothering".[58] Japanese women in the role of wife and mother benefit the patriarchy and are integral to its success; they serve their husbands, and by association, the next generation of sons. This same ethos is then passed to their daughters. There are echoes of this ethos in *Midnight in Broad Daylight,* when it is said that Kinu, Mary's mother, "would lead a gratifying life as a *yoki tsuma, tsuyoi haha,* or good wife and wise mother" (16-17).

Should Mary want to "develop, change, or abandon" (54) her perceived American identity to pursue a more Japanese identity in "different stages of [her] life" (54), it would be difficult for her to do so. This can be suggested from sources such as the aforementioned *Bulletin of the Japan Society,* which states that "the westernised woman… [has] been out of the marriageable class or [has] been less desirable by certain Japanese standards" (14). This examination of Mary and how wider Japanese society perceives her suggests that the traditional Japanese customs "illuminate and transforms the present" (182). To this effect, Mary may always be defined by her perceived "faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination" (1) in wider Japanese society, unless she can find a way to be unwesternised, and ignore desires which drive her to be outspoken, brash, and to fight on behalf of her brother.

---

[58] Jenifer Robertson, *Recreating Japanese Women 1600-1945* ed. Gail Lee Bernstein (Oakland: University of California Press, 1991), 95.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Other individuals in *Midnight in Broad Daylight,* such as Victor, however, do not seem to struggle in Japanese society in regards to fitting in and adopting what is perceived to be a Japanese identity. Mary is described as "so different from Victor, who seemed to have lost his English, turned Japanese, and fled from his American past" (30). There is a focus on Victor losing what are perceived to be American characteristics, rather than his adopting Japanese ones. It seems that in order for an individual who presents dual nationality or heritage to be truly accepted into one society, they must lose the reminisces of the other, foreign country. Like Mary, Victor too was defined more by his American-isms than his Japanese ones, as it is his shedding of these perceived American qualities, losing his English, and fleeing his past, which has seemingly turned him Japanese. This, however, highlights the fragility and modifiable nature of identity, specifically when that identity is constructed of ideals heavily influenced by national identity. It is an example of the "complex and shifting experiences and identities" (93) associated with home and homelessness. Victor, shedding his American identity and adopting one that is perceived as wholly Japanese, isolates himself from his American past, and if he is content with this, then it may not be an issue for him, nor would it influence his happiness. However, if Victor is to live in a world that expects him to adopt a new identity every time he moves to a new country and, in the process, forget his past in previous countries, then his present identity in Japanese society is as mercurial as Mary's is.

When Mary and Victor return to America and the rest of their siblings, the fragile nature of identity and the influence that dual nationality has on it is highlighted: "the siblings were strangers…Mary and Victor were now *Kibei-Nisei,* meaning they were educated in Japan and had returned to America. *Kibei* often seemed, by dint of their years abroad, more Japanese than American. So different in mien and perspective, the two sets of siblings appeared to have little in common" (36). Mary and Victor need to be examined separately here, as their Japanese and American identities differ in America, just as they did in Japan. Mary, who has shown too much

of an association with America in Japan, now shows too much of an association with Japan in America. The siblings in her new host country recognise her as being Japanese, as it is her differences from them that they identify with. Mary is too foreign for both of the countries she has attempted to live in, due to her perceived association with the other. Victor, who was able to adopt a Japanese identity and reject his American one in Japan, also faces isolation; however, it is different from Mary's. He, too, is perceived as foreign and as a stranger due to his association with Japan; however, his isolation is formed from an identity with Japan, which he has embraced, and has its origins in a Japanese society that has accepted him. The differences between all of the Fukuhara siblings' appearances and personalities do not necessarily lead to this isolation, as people can be different from one another and still forge relationships. However, it is the aspects of mien and perspective that have been forged in Japan that Mary and Victor's siblings identify with. It is the association with the foreign that is the cause of the isolation.

Humanity's need to isolate and categorise individuals allows them to "choose a criterion that allows humanity to be divided" (1). The Fukuhara children are identified as *Nisei*- the second generation of Japanese Americans. Mary and Victor then have another label, *Kibei,* which means they are *Nisei,* educated in Japan, who had returned to America. The label of *Nisei* isolates the second-generation Japanese Americans, and then the added label of *Kibei* isolates members of this group further by identifying and categorising a group who have already been identified and categorised. Isolation itself is not always negative- the intention of this observation is not to disparage the categorisation of humanity; however, it does influence one's identity and how one is viewed by the society in which one is living. When the categorised groups the Japanese Americans have been split into are then further divided, it gives an almost Russian Doll effect, whereby every group gets smaller and more divided as the persistence to label and identify groups continues. If this nature does continue, then eventually,

Sophie Joshua
1405142

we will only be left with the individual, but there will be no unity or sense of community. Though Mary and Victor are *Nisei* like their brothers, they are "now *kibei*" (36) also, and this label is what associates them with being more Japanese than American.

When Mary and Victor were *Nisei* in Japan, they were still divided, as Mary was seen as showing more American qualities and Victor was seen as displaying more Japanese ones. Furthermore, when the Fukuhara children moved back to Japan together, it is said that the "moment they descended the stairs, the Fukuharas were officially *Amerika-gaeri* (returnees from America) who were often perceived, correctly or not, as wealthy and ostentatious. What was certain was that *Amerika-gaeri* were ethnically Japanese, but different in mien, style, habits, and thinking" (69). The subtitle of *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, as previously noted, is 'A Japanese American family caught between two worlds,' and in instances such as these, we see that in many ways the two worlds are not very different from one another. In Japan, we see a need to categorise groups of people, and this categorisation is primarily regarding identifying the differences between the host country and the society from which the individual came, and what aspects of them differ from the host country.

A contribution to the Fukuharas' being caught between worlds is that both of the worlds are so similar in the way in which they identify and ostracise the foreign, often associating negative attributes of one's personality and a difference in social convention with it. It does not come down to one country ostracising the other, but rather that both Japan and America take the same approach toward immigrants. Arguably, it would be easier for the Fukuharas to travel between America and Japan if one ostracised the other, whilst the latter did not. One country's acceptance of the foreign aspects of the Fukuharas but continuing to integrate them into their society with acceptance, without labels and without categories, would solidify that country as their home. They could also forge a national identity with this country, and see the other country, which perceives them as foreign to be foreign also.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Victor thrives in Japan, as he takes the approach of fully embracing a Japanese identity and rejecting any associations he may have with an American identity. However, Japan and America, so alike in their isolation and categorisation of groups, both ostracise the Fukuharas due to their associations with the other country, and this is why they will always be in the state of *here*, and perceived as too foreign in the host country where they are living. Unless they completely shed the aspects of their personalities and mien which remind the Japanese and American societies of one another, they will always struggle to find an identity which is accepted in either country, or a place in that country they can call home.

The similarities between Japan and America in *Midnight in Broad Daylight* can be used to critique how humanity and society approach those who are deemed different. The irony is that both Japan and America are ostracising groups in their societies for being like their rival country, but in doing so, are mirroring one another. Harry recalls being punished for speaking English with his friends on a bus in Japan and says "the antagonist was the United States and we represented America" (80), and then later recalls an article from the *Los Angeles Times* which read "A viper is nonetheless a viper wherever the egg is hatched – so a Japanese American, born of Japanese parents- grows up to be Japanese, not American" (125). The idea of the foreign and nationality, and citizenship, are tools used by both countries to segregate. In the text, both countries oppress those who have an association with the other country, and both are responsible for how the Fukuharas' identities and ideas of home are suspended between the two worlds. The refusal of Japan and America, when playing host country, to accept one who is deemed foreign due to their differences results in that individual having a radical alienness in both countries. This makes the contrast that the individual has with both countries become even more paramount, and their chances of being accepted and finding an identity in either society become increasingly impossible, as the cyclical nature of this continues.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Labelling and categorising a group of people does provide a level of understanding and identification; for example, the terms *Issei* and *Nisei* identify first and second-generation Japanese Americans. However, it is when this labelling and categorisation are used to justify segregation and racism, or cause a perceived alienness surrounding a particular group, that issues and a struggle for identity and acceptance can be found. For example, in "1922, the Supreme Court, in Ozawa v. U.S., stated that *Issei* were 'aliens ineligible for citizenship" (14). Sakamoto writes, "America was changing rapidly, xenophobia flared, and the issue of citizenship turned to color. It always had" (14). It is from these xenophobic and racist intentions that the labelling and categorisation of certain groups can be corrupted and used against a group of individuals. We can see this when Sakamoto writes, "Racial discrimination toward Americans of Japanese descent was so pervasive that even a *Nisei* who graduated summa cum laude from a university could not find a job" (14). In this example, the *Nisei* who progress in America and even adhere to their education system, succeeding in it and showing an interest in employment, cannot find a place in America. Individuals have been categorised into those who are of Japanese descent and those who are not, regardless of citizenship. I refer again to the aforementioned analogy of "A viper is nonetheless a viper wherever the egg is hatched – so a Japanese American, born of Japanese parents- grows up to be Japanese, not American" (125). It is this segregation that leads to marginalisation and leaves the Japanese Americans the victims who are "susceptible to discrimination" (1). It is marginalisation such as this that was a contributing factor toward the Japanese and Japanese Americans. Labelling a group in a certain way justifies this kind of ostracization.

In the chapter 'Silence from Glendale to Hiroshima', Frank recalls how the *Nisei* occupants of Hiroshima felt excluded by wider Japanese society as the conflicts with America grew. Sakamoto writes, "DESPITE JAPANESE PROPAGANDA ABOUT UNITY – '100

MILLION HEARTS[59] beating as one' – the *Nisei* in their midst were isolated" (138), and Frank recounts how all *Nisei* residents were required to register themselves with the Japanese government. Sakamoto goes on to say that Frank "wondered what more the prefectural government needed to know about this group of people" (138) and "The idea that the government was separating dual nationals from the general Japanese population scared him" (138). The separation between the *Nisei* and the wider Japanese society shows how the categorising and labelling of individuals can lead to marginalisation. The inference of the registration was that the *Nisei* needed to be monitored, as if an association with America was a threat to wider Japanese society. The propaganda about "100 MILLION HEARTS beating as one" (138) is ironic, as these one hundred million in question must see themselves as united in support of Japan, yet the Japanese government has divided the one hundred million by nationality. It seems that to the institutions that run the country, the identity that a person has can only be accepted if it is beneficial for that country.

The citizens of Japan are fed propaganda that promotes loyalty, and in multiple instances, we have seen examples of the expectation of Japanese *Nisei* to conform to the norms, values, and behaviours of Japanese society and to integrate themselves into it. Despite this, however, the registration of the *Nisei* suggests that the Japanese government sees them as separate from wider Japanese society, even though the *Nisei* are expected to identify themselves as a part of it. A group can never be truly united when systems in place have divided them. Those who put these divisions in place seem to be using loyalty and submission as synonyms for one another. The Japanese government and Japanese society are promoting propaganda and values of what it is to be Japanese by endorsing a false ideal of unity and belonging. Under this guise, however, is stigmatisation and segregation to eradicate any

---

[59] This capitalisation is printed in the text, and is not due to publisher style.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

perceived threats, and conformity and submission are the preferred outcomes of this. If the *Nisei* are expected to embrace a Japanese identity that conforms with the society in which they are living, but feel divided from that Japanese society, then a struggle for identity and misplacement will occur.

Sakamoto writes: "The idea that the government was separating dual nationals from the general Japanese population scared [Frank]" (138); he recognises the separation from wider Japanese society and comments that "the *Nisei*…were isolated" (138). Individuals such as Frank and the other *Nisei* in Japan at this time will inevitably feel displaced from wider Japanese society and even from their own identity. Fulfilling the expectations set upon them by wider Japanese society and meeting the criterion of being Japanese by the standards set is still met with the *Nisei* having to register themselves as a people different from the general Japanese population. Their expectation of acceptance and home, created by the propaganda, does not come to pass. *Here* exists when an expected idea of feeling welcome and at home is not met, and this is what happens to Frank and many of the *Nisei* who are made to register. Frank's loyalty to his host country is demanded, but he is not granted true acceptance in it. Frank has to show traits of what it is to have a Japanese identity, but will not be viewed as having one by wider Japanese society.

Frank's isolation from wider Japanese society, which is forged from his dual nationality and association with America, extends to more than a perceived threat he may pose to Japan during the war. There are also presumptions about the personality and character traits surrounding those of dual nationality, which deem *Nisei* men to be inferior to other Japanese men. As the Imperial Army begins recruiting for war with America, "Frank had heard a joke that Japanese men departed for military training carrying a stack of towels; a single toothbrush; one bar of soap; some cash; their *Senjjinkun* (Field Service Code) manual exhorting 'death before dishonor'; and a *sennibari* (thousand stitch stomach warmer) that was an amulet for

battlefield success. More concerned with grooming than combat, *Nisei* soldiers, people sneered, packed a Dopp kit with aftershave. Frank bristled at the implication. '*Nisei* were sissies, sort of'" (138-139). Similarly, when the Fukuharas move back to Japan, it is said that the *Amerika-gaeri*, a label put upon them, were "perceived, correctly or not, as wealthy and ostentatious" (69). The word *sissy* used in this context, much like the word *Yankee* being applied to Mary, holds negative connotations, and in both instances, these negative connotations have been associated with ideals and values which American society is perceived to have held.

Amerika-gaeri being associated with wealth and ostentatiousness, and the *Nisei* soldiers being referred to as needing aftershave and a Dopp kit (a travel bag used for toiletries), suggests that the perception by wider Japanese society of those who have an association with America is that they are reliant upon luxury and comfort. The word *sissy* is a pejorative term associated with men who do not demonstrate what are perceived as masculine traits, but rather show signs of fragility and weakness, which, unfortunately, are associated specifically with women. Lajos Brons describes Othering as "the construction and identification of the self or in-group and the other or out-group in mutual, unequal opposition by attributing relative inferiority and/or radical alienness to the other/out-group (6). The joke Frank recalls about the *Nisei* soldiers being *sissies* is derived from a direct comparison to other Japanese men without a *Nisei* status, suggesting there is an inferiority associated with *Nisei* soldiers that is not applied to men in wider Japanese society. Frank must serve in the Japanese Imperial Army, which has been advertised as a way to prove he is Japanese and loyal to his country, yet isolation in the group of men willing to serve still occurs.

Both Mary and Frank are ridiculed for personality traits that have been associated with America, and in both instances, this ridicule associates that individual with their opposite gender. In the joke that is made; Japanese men who are deemed as what Brons would call the "in-group" (6) have packed items reflective of being ready for combat: "their *Senjjinkun* (Field

1405142

Service Code) manual exhorting 'death before dishonor'; and a *sennibari* (thousand stitch stomach warmer) that was an amulet for battlefield success" (138-139). In defending her brother Victor, Mary says, "people would pick on him, and I used to fight for him" (29). Mary shows similar qualities, which the Japanese men use as a criterion to assert themselves as the "in-group": a willingness to fight and defend honour. However, when Mary does this, she shows what are deemed to be qualities opposing those of what is expected of Japanese women. This display of 'masculine' qualities, so adored in Japanese men, is ridiculed. To assert the negative connotations of these qualities upon Mary, she is labelled as a *Yankee*, as if the 'masculine' qualities she displays are equivalent to American personality traits. The criticism Frank receives alludes to him having feminine qualities, as he is perceived as an individual who seeks an excess of pampering, toiletries, and hygiene products. His critics use a word associated with displaying stereotypical feminine qualities, and, in this instance, the label of *sissy* has been created from a preconceived idea about what American men value and their lifestyle.

By comparing both examples, an issue is raised regarding how gender norms and the qualities Japanese men and women are supposed to have are viewed and measured. If the realms in which certain qualities are associated with each sex were confined to Japanese society, and the ridicule which Mary and Frank both faced was regarding their opposition to their expected gender roles, then the reasons for which they were ridiculed would be clearly outlined, though still incredibly wrong. However, in both instances, these qualities have been associated with America. If masculine qualities are viewed as negative American qualities, but feminine qualities are viewed as negative American qualities also, then there are not any qualities associated with sex that either individual can display without having wider Japanese society attribute what Brons calls "relative inferiority and/or radical alienness" (6) to them. Arguably, if Mary were to display the feminine qualities associated with Frank and vice versa,

neither would be ridiculed; they would be fulfilling the roles expected of Japanese men and women. It is only when these qualities, which have been assigned to the two sexes, are displayed in the opposite sex to what is expected, that they become American qualities.

Much like the discussion regarding Mrs Yamada in *No-No Boy*, and the concept of *Japan-home* and *America-home*, whereby there are two homes which have different meanings to Mrs Yamada, one being positive and one being negative; the impossible situation Mary and Frank are in could be analysed if we look at the idea of 'Japanese masculine' and 'Japanese feminine' vs. 'American masculine' and 'American feminine'. This would be the idea that to wider Japanese society; 'Japanese masculine' and 'Japanese feminine' have positive connotations and 'American masculine' and 'American feminine' have negative ones. For example, the 'Japanese masculine' would be associated with valour and bravery, presented by what the Japanese men are said to pack for war, whereas the 'American masculine' would be associated with aggression and antagonism, such as how Mary's defence of Victor is viewed. The same principle could be applied to the 'Japanese feminine' which would hold qualities of passivity and obedience, such as what Mary is expected to show in Japanese society, and 'American feminine', which would portray the timid and the indulged, reflected in what the *Nisei* men were said to pack for war. I have chosen these words as an example of what can be associated with the 'Japanese masculine', 'Japanese feminine' and 'American masculine', 'American feminine' terms, as they can be used to describe what inferences are made through the ridicule of Mary and Frank.

If Mary and Frank's experiences are examined in this way, then it would explain why the preconceptions of masculinity and femininity are weaponised in a pursuit to segregate them from wider Japanese society. In the examination of wider Japanese society in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, the fear of those who contrast with the norm presents an alienness which, to wider Japanese society, can only be understood if it is viewed as being from America. Applying

1405142

this theory could provide an understanding of the Fukuharas' feeling of displacement, which comes from ridicule that draws upon their gender, and is associated with nationality and dual nationality. What *Midnight in Broad Daylight* then presents is that international conflict, and the xenophobic mentalities which come from this can transition onto other forms of prejudice, such as sexism, and, to an extent, misogyny and misandry. Mary and Frank's dual nationalities and identities would then also have an association with dual gender specific characteristics, qualities, and roles, which come with negative connotations, and a perception of radical alienness that is used to identify and persecute them.

In *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, Harry Fukuhara identifies himself as American; he is certain of his American identity and continually refers to himself as American throughout the text, for example, when he describes himself as "a young American boy on the cusp of adolescence" (52) and a "patriotic American" (123). Even when he and Pierce are being schooled in Japan and are being educated and prepared for service in the Japanese Imperial Army, Harry describes himself as "being an American in the arms of Japan" (78). What is ironic in this example is that Harry is being integrated into an education system whose goal is to create soldiers willing to show loyalty to and serve Japan, but Harry's loyalty, though hidden, remains to America. Sakamoto quotes Harry's diary entries from being in school in Japan: "'Got pretty tired carrying guns all day' he wrote. On Saturdays when school attendance was compulsory, he had four periods of class 'and then marched around'. The mindless drills, he figured, were simply 'part of the curriculum.'" (79). What is viewed by wider Japanese society as training for the Imperial Army is described as menial tasks by Harry; the drills do not prepare him to fight in the Japanese Imperial Army, nor do they cause his loyalty to America to waver. It seems the faith that Japanese society has in the systems put in place to condition the next generation of Japanese soldiers is misguided.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Harry being able to do this shows that, to Japanese society, national identity and loyalty are measured by submission and conformity to the systematic institutions that run the country, rather than the individual's identity. Even the reason that Harry did not have to register his *Nisei* status with the Japanese government like Frank did was due to a systematic flaw, and not because he had proved himself not to be American. "In a paperwork oversight, his parents hadn't edited their family register upon Harry's 1920 birth in Seattle. Because he had never attended a Hiroshima public school and had left before rationing was introduced, Harry had slipped through a crack in Japan's cement bureaucracy" (138). The emphasis on conformity and the institutionalisation of adolescent boys in Japan does not completely metamorphose them into recognising a Japanese identity, and Harry is an example of this.

From this examination of Harry, three arguments can be established; firstly, the previous arguments I have made regarding society's need for conformity and fear of those who do not adhere to the social norm are confirmed. Harry pretends to adhere to the institutionalisation and similarity of the schooling system in place, yet his American identity goes undetected due to his perceived conformity to society. Secondly, this example of Harry also supports the previous arguments made about Victor's acceptance in Japan being due to his conformity. Harry and Victor differ; Victor rejects his American identity and conforms to Japanese society's expectations and values, one of which is having no association with America, and Harry puts on a façade to do this, but never actually does. Neither outwardly presents a difference or contrast to the social norm, and therefore both are recognised as having Japanese identities. Lastly, this observation of Harry highlights why a struggle for identity and a sense of home is apparent in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*. A society or community of people is still constructed of individuals, and even those who are similar are never the same. To the wider societies exemplified in this text, there is a disapproval of the individual identity in the fear that it is related to a different national identity. This is why there is a struggle for identity

in the subjects we are presented with in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, because the individual is only esteemed if they portray an identity associated with their host country. There is an uncertainty of who the individuals are, and who they are allowed to be outside of these parameters, even those of dual nationality.

Sara Ahmed describes home as not necessarily being a location, such as a country or town, but rather that it can be where a person's family resides, or where they are from (289). If Ahmed's theory is used to examine the Fukuhara siblings and their family, then the sense of belonging and of *home* is unreachable for the Fukuharas as a family unit. The Fukuhara siblings are continuously separated between Japan and America throughout their lives. In childhood, this is due to the wishes of their family, and in adulthood, this is by choice. This choice in adulthood was probably contributed to by the separation in childhood, as the identities they began to forge were in different countries and were separate from a number of their siblings. Throughout their lives, the Fukuharas never stay in one residence, as they continuously move between America and Japan, and where they are 'from' is different because the continuous back and forth between Japan and America means that at different points in their lives they are 'from' America, and in others they are 'from' Japan. This is highlighted by the fact that, depending on which country they are coming from at the time, a different label is attached to them; for example, *Amerika-gaeri* is applied to them when they come from America to Japan, and *Kibei* when they come from Japan to America.

In the few instances where the Fukuhara siblings are all reunited, the differences between them are quickly identified, for example when Mary and Victor return to Auburn, Sakamoto writes "If the two sets of siblings had been able to communicate, they might have bonded at their shared experience. But the teenage pair spoke mostly Japanese and the younger of the trio largely English" (36). In the case of the Fukuhara siblings, where their family resides and where their family is from is forever changing. The siblings are often separated between

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Japan and America, which means not only are these two countries continuously interchanging between being the Fukuharas' host country, but they are also not the host country for all of the Fukuhara siblings simultaneously. If we use Ahmed's theory to interrogate where and what home is for the Fukuhara siblings as a unit, then arguably, they would find a home when they are reunited; however, this is not possible for them. The perceived foreignness, which wider society and the Fukuharas use to isolate and distinguish themselves from one another, prevents them from this, and they appear as "strangers" to one another.

In *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, the Fukuhara family exemplifies the fragmented nature of *here* as experienced by individuals of dual nationality. Though siblings, they understand where they are "from" differently. Harry identifies as American, while Victor aligns with Japan. When apart, each sees the other's national identity as separate from their own, and even when reunited, they remain disconnected by divergent allegiances. While dual nationality might seem a unifying factor, both men live in societies that pressure them to adopt a singular national identity, rejecting the hybridity they represent. As Ahmed's theory suggests, a unified home cannot be formed when competing national identities occupy the same space, especially when those identities are in opposition.

Both American and Japanese societies during World War II project assumptions onto the Fukuharas based on the nationality of the country they are currently residing. The family's personal experiences are used by Sakamoto to reflect a broader Japanese American reality, conveyed through personal testimony, historical context, and carefully structured narrative. Sakamoto states her intention to create "a book as a legacy of U.S.–Japan relations, the Japanese experience in America, and the Nisei second-generation Japanese American story" (xii).

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The Fukuharas are consistently marked as foreign, regardless of which country they are in. Their sense of *here* is shaped by societal rejection on both sides of the Pacific, and by the pressures to conform to one national identity at the expense of another. To do so, however, often means rejecting one's own childhood or cultural background. Their struggles reflect the broader consequences of being caught between nations at war, where any perceived closeness to the opposing country brings suspicion and alienation. National identity becomes a means of categorisation-a reflection of society's impulse to isolate what is perceived as different.

The novel highlights how both Japan and the United States demand loyalty and submission to a dominant national narrative. This loyalty is weaponised, erasing individual identity in favour of social conformity. The pressure to choose one side over the other reveals the impossibility of fully inhabiting a dual identity when both countries reject that hybridity. For the Fukuharas, this results in ongoing dislocation. They are separated by time, geography, and ideology, and wherever they go, they are labelled according to their perceived foreignness. When reunited, they carry different versions of *here*, shaped by the places they have lived and the nations that have judged them.

The Fukuharas exist in a liminal state between two worlds, where a unified sense of *home* is continually deferred. Their identities are shaped not only by personal history but by the external demand to conform to singular categories. Sakamoto presents *here* as a fractured, simultaneous condition, shared by the family but experienced differently by each member. This fragmented *here* encapsulates the isolation and conflict that arise when dual identity is treated as a threat rather than a complexity.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Chapter 3: *Only What We Could Carry* edited by Lawson Fusao Inada, Patricia Wakida, and William Hohri

Only What We Could Carry is an anthology of varying poems, essays, short stories, plays, prose, and extracts of literature written about and during the period from the bombing of Pearl Harbour in 1941 to the liberation of Dachau in 1945. The anthology was compiled and edited by Lawson Fusao Inada, Patricia Wakida, and William Hohri, and was first published in 2014. In this chapter, I intend to discuss specific extracts and entries, and examine them through the scope of *here*, and how these entries depict identity and *home*. I will firstly provide a brief outline of and discuss the anthology and the effect this form has on the chosen extracts and this thesis. The first extract from *Only What We Could Carry,* which I will examine, is the 'Preface of *No-No Boy*'. This will be followed by the entry from a diary of a young man living in an internment camp, titled 'A Young Nisei's Diary'. The next part of this study will focus on five poems: 'I', 'II', 'III', 'IV', and 'V'. These are a variety of poems and extracts of poems from various monuments, exhibitions, and anthologies. They have been renamed by the editors to ascend in Roman numerals, and are spread throughout the anthology. The final extract to be discussed is a passage from *Adios to Tears*, which is a memoir written by Seiichi Higashide, a Latin American Japanese person who was born in Hokkaido, emigrated to Peru, and was deported to the United States and into an internment camp along with other Latin American Japanese.

In this chapter, *here* is examined through the layered, fragmented narratives within the anthology *Only What We Could Carry* are examined, demonstrating it as a metaphysical state produced by exclusion, emotional and physical displacement, and disrupted belonging. Through varied forms such as poetry, memoir, and diary, the anthology presents *here* as a deeply personal yet socially and politically constructed condition that emerges when individuals are denied the stability, identity, and protection traditionally associated with *home*.

The anthology form inherently involves both inclusion and exclusion, shaping not only the texts presented but the meanings derived from them. In *Only What We Could Carry*, this editorial process transforms *here* into a relational and fragmented construct shaped by loss, memory, and intention. Texts like Stanley Hayami's diary and *Adios to Tears* reveal *here* as a shifting, present-tense experience shaped by both internal turmoil and historical trauma. Through poetic fragments-particularly the sequence of Roman-numeraled poems-this chapter explores how *here* evolves across the internment experience, from arrest to generational aftermath.

The anthology's limitations-what it includes and necessarily omits-mirrors the structure of *home* itself: a bounded, defined space shaped in part by what is excluded. As Mallett notes, home is often "confined," while the outside is "diffuse" and governed by "different rules of engagement" (69). Likewise, the creation of *here* is contingent on the denial or absence of *home*, and this condition differs even among individuals in the same place. The anthology thus offers multiple perspectives on shared events, reinforcing how identity and belonging are destabilized under systemic erasure.

The editors of *Only What We Could Carry* openly acknowledge these editorial boundaries in their foreword, recognizing that much material was inaccessible or lost. Yet it is through this acknowledged incompleteness that the anthology gains critical power: by embracing the reality of exclusion, it highlights the constructed nature of literary memory. Anthologies, then, are not total archives but curated spaces of intention, shaped by what is both present and absent. Repetition of texts across anthologies, as seen in Lawson Inada's editorial work, forges intertextual and political connections—such as the linking of Japanese American internment with Indigenous resistance—demonstrating how inclusion can reframe historical narrative.

Ultimately, *Only What We Could Carry* becomes both a record and a warning. Its editors offer readers "landmarks" rather than fixed paths, encouraging individual interpretations while

Sophie Joshua
1405142

advancing a clear moral vision: to confront the enduring harms of racial prejudice and resist its future iterations. The anthology's diversity of voices across age, race, gender, and genre forms a literary microcosm of wartime society. In doing so, it constructs a version of *here* that is not fixed in geography, but shaped by loss, resistance, and the urgent need for remembrance.

Preface to *No-No Boy* by John Okada

John Okada's 1957 novel *No-No Boy* is a text that will be explored in the last chapter of this thesis: it depicts Ichiro, a young Japanese American who returns to his family home after being imprisoned for answering "no" twice on The Loyalty Questionnaire. This questionnaire was distributed amongst the Japanese American men living in America during World War II, whereby they were asked if they were willing to surrender their ties to any Japanese citizenship, swear loyalty to the United States of America, and enlist in the army. The 'Preface' to *No-No Boy* is one of the selections in *Only What We Could Carry*. It outlines what the loyalty questionnaire was, the conflict it caused amongst the Japanese who were interned, and provides small anecdotes about Japanese men and women living in America in the lead up to, and during the internment. Though published in 1957, the novel was "all but forgotten" (287) until five years after Okada's death, when the Combined Asian Resources Project reprinted it in 1971. Ryan Burt discusses Inada's use of *No-No Boy* in *Only What We Could Carry*, and writes:

> [One of the] texts excerpted in all the major anthologies Inada edited, including those coedited with Chin, is John Okada's novel *No-No Boy*…. The inclusion of sections from *No-No Boy* in the original *Aiiieeeee!, The Big Aiiieeeee!* and *Only What We Could Carry* signals an effort to recast the internment and post-war experiences of Japanese Americans by underscoring challenges to the JACL [The Japanese American Citizens League's] version of history (112)

The inclusion of *No-No Boy* in all anthologies that Inada compiled and contributed to suggests how significant a text he feels it is to our understanding and remembrance of the internment experience.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The use of the 'Preface' to *No-No Boy* is significant to this study and the study of anthologies surrounding the internment for a number of factors; firstly, the text itself, much like the internment, represents an often-forgotten part of history. The editors of *Only What We Could Carry* in their 'Note to the Reader' highlight that an intention of their anthology is for readers to "understand more deeply the consequence of racial prejudice, to confront more fully the harm that it does and the strengths that it calls forth, and by increasing intellectual and emotional awareness" (iv). Including the 'Preface' of *No-No Boy* in *Only What We Could Carry* helps to do this because it is a text set after World War II. One of the ways to confront and expose the harm anti-Japanese prejudices cause is to present how there were still consequences of the internment even after it ended. Minot describes an editor's choice of texts in their anthology to be the editor giving their reader "subliminally a set of value judgments with which we can test and shape our own" (67), and this is what the inclusion of the 'Preface' of *No-No Boy* does.

It is crucial to recognise that Inada and the editors of *Only What We Could Carry* have used the 'Preface' rather than an excerpt of the narrative of *No-No Boy*. What the text represents, and the reasons it was written, are what the editors wished to convey through this specific inclusion. A preface is a piece of writing at the beginning of a text that is written by the author, advising the readers how and why it came into being. Every submission in the anthology is a response to the internment experience. The speaker, narrator, author, or creator of each has responded to their experience; however, not to the events that led to it. Okada himself wrote this 'Preface' and therefore the reader is given an example of not only the experience which has resulted in the literature, but the social, political, and historical factors which led to the experience. This 'Preface', therefore, within the confines of the anthology, could be seen as a representation of why all of the texts and sources included in it came into creation. Rather than the content of the text itself, we are given insight as to why it, like so

Sophie Joshua
1405142

many others, was created. The inclusion of the 'Preface' serves to remind the readers that what they are reading is the response to the atrocities of the internment, but also the wider factors contributing to this experience in the first instance.

Okada wrote *No-No Boy* as a response to the treatment he witnessed of the No-No Boys upon their return to American society, and there was minimal public interest in the text until much later after publication. We can view the 'Preface' as a telling of the events and experiences which lead to the writing of the novel, and also the importance of its resurrection in publication, and reintroducing efforts "to recast the internment and post-war experiences of Japanese Americans by underscoring challenges to the JACL version of history" (112). *No-No Boy* serves as a reminder of the lasting damage the editors wished to convey, and the 'Preface', being used in the anthology, presents the factors that lead to the lasting damage.

The editors of *Only What We Could Carry,* remembering the internment and preserving the memories of what the world became, remind us of the fragility of *home* and how, even though it is created by the perception of the individual, it can often be tarnished and reformed by the prejudices and corruption of wider society. Its counterpart *here,* therefore, is also easily changed and can evolve just as one's idea of *home* can. The state of *here* which the individuals are in changed pre-and post-internment. The *here* state was formed by the perception of the Japanese and Japanese Americans being unjustly viewed as the enemy pre-internment, and the *here* state post-internment was formed for the Japanese and Japanese Americans via two perceptions of them by wider American society. The first being how that individual was treated by wider society's measurement of how 'loyal' that individual was to the United States, and this was determined by their answer to the loyalty questionnaire; and the second, by an even more misconceived and blinded perception wider American society had of the Japanese and Japanese Americans, which was that those of Japanese and Japanese American citizenship and relation were still the enemy. The delicateness of *home* is highlighted then, because living in a

Sophie Joshua
1405142

world where *home* can be easily taken away, and experiencing just how easily it can be taken away, will then bring with it a sense that one is never secure and one's *home* is never in stasis. The constant threat of an individual's *home* being taken due to factors outside of their control and the perception of wider society outside of the *home* will reinforce the presence of *here*.

Okada discusses how, in the eyes of wider American society, "everything Japanese and everyone Japanese became despicable" (288) following the news spreading of the events of Pearl Harbour, and there has been much discussion regarding informal and social interactions between the Japanese community and wider American society as fallout in the previous texts examined. The children at school and in the streets of their town, in *When the Emperor was Divine,* are one of the many examples of this. However, the fallout Okada witnessed and describes in the 'Preface' is not only a change in attitudes demonstrated by personal interactions with the Japanese, but rather the more institutionalised and government-sanctioned, and regulated practices which saw a change also. One instance Okada describes is a man in a tavern who, in his "patriotic tremor with alcoholic tones" (288), wanted to "let it be known to the world that he never thought much about the sneaky Japs and that this proved he was right. It did not matter that he owed his Japanese landlord three weeks' rent, nor that that industrious Japanese had often picked him off of the sidewalk and put him into bed" (288). The man in question is using the events of Pearl Harbour to manipulate the justification of his own rent arrears and to ignore his own anti-social behaviour. The actions of this man are falsely justified due to war crimes not even committed by the Japanese landlord. By the standards of the social protocols and laws sanctioned by the United States government regarding rent, and social protocol regarding anti-social behaviour and substance abuse, this man in the tavern is more of a criminal and displays more immorality than the landlord.

There are many examples of hate crimes against Japanese in the material discussed, yet rarely are we shown repercussions for the perpetrators of these crimes. We see then a biased

measurement of what makes one 'savage', 'barbarian', 'criminal', or whichever label is used to persecute an individual or group. It is this bias that can be seen like the internment itself; therefore, the mistreatment and imprisonment of the Japanese during the internment can be seen as a war crime. Those committing these crimes corruptly justify this behaviour by masking it as a response to crimes committed by other individuals in another country.

The "patriotic tremor with alcoholic tones" (288) could be viewed as a wider metaphor for the voices of those who were prejudiced against the Japanese after Pearl Harbour. The patriotism having a tremor would then be an inference to the fragile and frangible justifications used to persecute the Japanese in America under the guise of devotion to the safety of the United States and its citizens. As well as signifying the man's intoxication, the "alcoholic tones" (288) could be a reference to the way war hysteria had a nature similar to that of intoxication, and led to lapses in judgment and aggression just as alcohol can cause in some instances. Though the hypocrisy and invalidity of the accusations and prejudices are highlighted, however, it nevertheless poses a threat to the Japanese community in the United States, and the other literature in the anthology is a representation of just how devastating the patriotic tremors of the accusers could be.

The statement of "everything Japanese and everyone Japanese became despicable" (288) suggests the label of Japanese was to become a generalised term, and that those of Japanese descent were only identified in this way. The internment itself presents this ideology, as everyone of Japanese descent were interned or imprisoned despite age, gender, citizenship, education, or any other factor humanity has used to categorise civilisation into groups. This blanket term of "Japanese" is used to identify the marginalised group; however, different sub-categories are identified. Okada briefly discusses the order in which the Japanese were imprisoned and interned:

Sophie Joshua
1405142

> First, the real Japanese Japanese[60] were rounded up. These real Japanese Japanese were Japanese nationals who had the misfortune to be diplomats and businessmen…Then the alien Japanese, the ones who had been in America for two, three, or even four decades (289)

The Japanese and Japanese Americans had names for certain groups within their community, which they used to identify the upbringing, parentage, and education of their fellow Japanese, such as *Issei*, *Nisei,* and *Kibei*. Okada uses terms such as "real Japanese Japanese" and "alien Japanese" (289) rather than *Issei* and *Nisei,* but is referring to these various groups to highlight wider American society's limited understanding of the differences between members of the Japanese community. They understand there is a difference, and that not all Japanese and Japanese Americans are the same, and even recognise that some have few ties to Japan, yet this is still not enough to protect the Japanese from persecution. This is why Okada has used terms that both explicitly have the word "Japanese" in them.

The internment and World War II highlighted differences between those of Japanese heritage and wider American society, yet obfuscated the differences between those of Japanese heritage within that community. Humanity being carved and categorised to identify differences can be used as a means to alienate and persecute if this persecution is being enforced by a dominant and racially prejudiced society. One's identity as an individual and as part of a community is created by recognising differences, but when these differences are used to oppress the individual, then this will alter their sense of self and belonging. The 'Preface' is an example of this, and overall stands as an accurate representation of the mentality, events, and prejudices which led to the internment, and the pieces describing it in *Only What We Could Carry*.

A Young Nisei's Diary

---

[60] This duplicate word is how this sentence is presented in the text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The next extract from *Only What We Could Carry* is 'A Young Nisei's Diary'. The excerpt is pages of diary entries and drawings by Stanley Hayami, a *Nisei* from Los Angeles who was attending high school in the Heart Mountain internment camp in Wyoming. The diary is written from 1942 to 1944. Rather than transcribing the diary, the editors have scanned pictures of the page entries. There are also illustrations sketched by Hayami on these inserts. In a paragraph written by the editors at the beginning of the extract, we are told Hayami joined the U.S Army in 1944 and was killed in 1945 in Northern Italy whilst coming to the aid of another soldier. He was eighteen years old when he died.

The editors advise that their "editorial hand was light" (xv), and the way this diary is presented in this anthology is an example of that. By not transcribing the pages into text format, the reader can see aspects of this entry which would only be available to the reader if they were to see it in its original form- Hayami's handwriting, for example. The punctuation, or lack of punctuation, certain phrases, spelling, etc., has been left, and this extract is one of the most personal and intimate pieces in the anthology because of this.

'A Young Nisei's Diary' is not a novel, nor any kind of literature written with the intention of publication. Hayami's use of the diary form conveys a sense of intimacy and vulnerability, offering the reader a private, unfiltered view of her experience. Unlike autobiography, which is typically written with a reader in mind, the diary-barring intentional publication-assumes no reader. This absence of intended readership heightens the immediacy and emotional resonance of Hayami's reflections.

Though we are close to it, the reader can never fully experience Hayami's present. Even with a light editorial hand, the diary has still been mediated: it appears as part of an anthology, not as an isolated document, and is presented only in extract rather than in full. Moreover, the inclusion of a foreword shapes the reader's emotional reception by offering background on

Hayami's life and death. While the diary captures an intimate and immediate perspective, its framing within the anthology reminds us that this experience is still curated and contextualised. The details given in this introductory paragraph will influence the reader's emotive response to 'A Young Nisei's Diary'. If this extract is the reader's first experience with this particular source, then the conclusions and ideas they form from it will be influenced by the information and context given by the editors. An example of this is in the introductory paragraph, where the editors explain that Hayami lost his life fighting in the U.S Army. By including this information, the tragedy of Hayami's situation is emphasised, as the reader will explore this extract with the foresight of his death. This editorial choice is one of the "landmarks" to which the editors refer in the introduction, the landmark being knowledge given to the reader which provides a certain perspective in which to read this source through, one which they would not have likely had were it not for this editorial choice.

This diary is an echo of Hayami's feelings and thoughts, as he wrote and felt them in his present. From the moment he wrote this, however, what we, the readers, perceive is a reflection of that. This diary, in its form, presents the existence of *here* in the present of an individual. *Here* exists in the present of an individual, and it is present when an individual's idea and perception of *home* is not met. The diary is not a memoir written with the hindsight of age and reflection, but rather as a response to the current circumstance of its writer. For example, the diary extracts are dated by Hayami, and written in the present tense; the first entry is dated "November 29, 1942" and the first line is "Today I am writing my first entry in this journal. It is no special day, but I have to start someplace" (138). Aspects of Hayami's writings such as this, present a first-person narration of his thoughts and reflections, and the conclusions and insights the reader will draw from this narration and its influence in the anthology overall is formed from the writing of Hayami's present, rather than other extracts in the anthology, which are reflections of an experience.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Some entries are written in the past tense, such as the December 13, 1942 note on a football match: "Well UCLA finally beat USC" (140). Yet even these reflect Hayami's present, as they capture his immediate thoughts and reactions: "My mind reminds me that" (138)- underscoring the diary's temporal intimacy. The illustrations included in the diary demonstrate the in-between, yet present nature of *here*, and how Hayami's reflections of his previous and current location seem to overlap and cause uncertainty in his present. The first illustration of the house he lived in pre-internment is titled "MY HOUSE 1931to 1942", and the second illustration of the barracks during the internment is titled "MY HOUSE 1942-1943". *Here* is formed due to feelings of displacement, and is an emotional response which exists in the present of an individual, but the factors which create it are due to social, political and historical events occurring and which have occurred, the diary form reflecting aspects of this nature also is why it is a key text in our exploration and understanding of *here*. This diary can be viewed as a reflection of the existence of a metaphysical world, which exists as a response to the physical one, just as *here* exists as a response to the perceived idea of *home,* which is not met in the physical world.

In an entry on page 140, Hayami writes about a televised game where "U.C.L.A plays U.S.C" and writes "Gosh I wish I were home so I could see that game" (140). He recognises in this entry that he does not perceive the place where he is living as his *home*, and is referring back to where he was before he was interned. The illustrations on page 141 depict three pictures, one underneath the other: the first picture is of a single-story house; it has a front porch which is supported by beams, and eight windows span across the front and to the side of the house. Above this picture, he has written "MY HOUSE 1931-1942" (141). The picture underneath is of a darker, one-story building with no porch, but three doors, each with small steps leading up to it. Windows are separating each door, and the roof has the figures "8-2-B" written across it. Above this is written "MY HOUSE 1942-1943". The last drawing at the

bottom of the page is of a large, black question mark, and this is titled "MY HOUSE 1943 -" (141). This diary entry represents the displacement and uncertainty that Hayami feels, as he reflects and documents his living situation of the past, and is unclear about where he will be in the future. I refer back to the previous argument of how delicate and variable the idea of *home* was for many Japanese and Japanese Americans during the internment, and it is in this awareness of the unknown that the displacement Hayami feels is presented.

The illustration of a question mark in Hayami's diary captures the fragility of home and the uncertainty of return. In another entry, he reflects on his post-internment future and writes: "My heart says that if I believe, I will go far. My mind reminds me that I can indeed go far, but only so far as my IQ and race handicap will allow me to go" (138). This entry reflects both hope and deep anxiety about re-entering American society as a Japanese American. Hayami does not doubt his potential but recognises that prejudice may limit his opportunities. He is displaced not only in the present but fears continued exclusion in the future: a future where even the idea of home remains uncertain.

Some of the extracts the editors have chosen focus on significant social events, such as the American football game where the University of California, Los Angeles played the USC Trojans. This game is occurring in the world outside of the internment camps, but is still being followed and watched by those interned, like Hayami. Those interned are imprisoned by laws and political decisions made by the American government, whose premise for doing so is founded in prejudice and emphasizes the perceived differences and alienness of the Japanese compared to the rest of the wider American society. Hayami is a challenge to these differences. He and the other Japanese are imprisoned by laws and political decisions separating them from the rest of society, yet interest in the football game and his passion for a national sport represent a part of human nature and of society. This challenges the premise on which the internment

was created, because it is bodiless attributes of humanity which defy the limitations put upon its members due to physical appearance and birthplace.

Despite physical location and government-sanctioned alienation, Hayami has forged a tie to the rest of society through love of the national sport. The nature of *home* as discussed in relation to *here* is reflected in this. A connection to the place Hayami still refers to as his *home* is through his feelings of admiration for something rather than his physical circumstances. It is a connection he has with his social ties in wider American society. The feeling of *home* being present or not present is what conduces *here*, and for Hayami, his idea of *home* is alive, and he believes it to be achievable. This is in part preserved by the aforementioned connection. What puts him in the state of *here*, however, is that due to social, political, and historical factors, he is separated from this *home*.

There can be a difference between the *here* an individual feels and the *here* the reader perceives that individual to be in. *Here* exists only in the literary and creative form, and that is how it is to be examined. The reader of this extract knows Hayami will fight in the war and will lose his life due to the introductory description written by the editors. Despite the connection made between himself and the outside world, Hayami will be removed from it, not fully accepted back into it, and not able to return to the *home* which he discusses in his diary. This *home* not being achievable shows how he is in the state of *here*, yet tragically, it is the reader who can see this, rather than Hayami himself. The isolating nature of *here* is that it can be experienced simultaneously, yet differently between individuals, and the same is for how it is perceived also. Its nature of only existing and being able to be perceived in literature isolates those individuals being examined further, as the reader can observe, but not experience the individual's *here*, and is often able to understand and view the tragedy of the individual's circumstance in a way that the individual cannot. We must accept that this diary entry gives us

an insight into Hayami's experience, but we will never truly experience it, just as we will never truly experience his *here*, or his idea of *home*.

Poetry

There is a collection of five poems in *Only What We Could Carry* which each holds the title of a different roman numeral between I-V. They are ordered numerically in the anthology, but do not consecutively follow one another. For this discussion, I will refer to these as either "extract" or "poem", and both of these terms will refer to the same source, but with different meanings. "Extract" will be used to discuss the specified poem in its edited and reduced form within the anthology, such as when the poem is taken from a longer one. "Poem" will be used when discussing the material with close reading, and as an individual source outside of the anthology.

The poems can be seen as a journey through the internment: 'I' discusses the arrest of an unnamed individual in their home, 'II' depicts an unnamed individual standing in a yard waiting to be sent to an internment camp, 'III' portrays the dawn rising during the internment experience, 'IV' depicts an individual having their papers stamped and being relocated, and finally 'V' presents the worry of *Issei* parents regarding their *Nisei* children fighting in the armed forces. The narrative created is arguably why the editorial decisions were made regarding how the extracts are ordered, and also why they are titled numerically. The numerically named poems could be viewed as a micro-anthology within the anthology. This micro-anthology has been edited and ordered in a certain way so that the extracts can be presented in comparison and alongside one another in order to demonstrate a social issue, and the journey many would have taken during their internment. This form reflects Rushdie's idea that exile and trauma are narrated through fragments rather than a single voice. The anthology's polyvocal structure becomes a method of restoring fragmented identity through memory. By ordering them to create a narrative, *Only What We Could Carry* connects the different poems

Sophie Joshua
1405142

in a way that exceeds the thematic and topical aspects of the poems individually, transforming these into motifs that correlate between poems.

The editors' choice to title the extracts as numerals could be a nod to the lack of humanity during the internment, and how the generalisation of the Japanese and those with Japanese heritage stripped them of any individuality. A lot of the internment and the governmental decisions regarding it were reliant upon numbers and statistics: documentation of those who had immigrated or had relatives who did, questionnaires being distributed under the guise of measuring loyalty, and lists being distributed amongst towns of those being interned. The use of Roman numerals to title such personal accounts and experiences depicting suffering and imprisonment, therefore, could be a representation of this ignorant and dehumanising attitude toward the Japanese during the internment.

The poems are not directly following one another, but rather being distributed throughout the anthology with other material in between represents the different experiences had by those interned and just how vast the internment was. Many lives were affected in different ways, and the material in between the poems reminds the reader of the vast experiences and events that occurred in different locations to different people between the events depicted in the poems. The reader following this singular journey, yet being exposed to other events in the internment, amplifies the significance and enormity of it. The theory used to discuss anthology in this thesis has, in part, been regarding condensing material, yet this condensing for the anthology has created a world which represents the internment and the experience of it in a broad and multifaceted way. This was only possible through refining the aforementioned material.

The first poem, titled 'I' in *Only What We Could Carry,* is as follows:

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Arrest[61]
The time has come
For my arrest
This rainy night.
I calm myself and listen
To the sound of shoes. (1)

This is the first entry in the entirety of the anthology following the introductory chapters. This positioning further presents the idea that the poems as a collection can be read as a journey. The anthology presents the internment experience, and this poem regarding the arrest of an individual to be taken to an internment camp represents the beginning of this experience, which would have been the reality for many. 'I' was originally written by Sojin Takei and was published in *Poets Behind Barbed Wire*[62]; a poetry anthology published in 1983. The anthology offers an account of the inner lives of four internees whose poems were originally published in camp magazines. All poems in the anthology were edited and translated from Japanese by Jiro Nakano and Kay Nakano, and it is written in the traditional poetry form of tanka, which is a short poem compiled of thirty-one syllables.

The speaker of the poem, saying "The time has come" (1), suggests an inevitability of the arrest. This could be a reference to the multiple arrests in the homes of those Japanese falsely accused of treason and war crimes, and how the speaker was expecting it to happen to them. The term "My arrest" (1) is direct, and the use of the first person places the reader closer to the perspective of the speaker. This familiarity evokes fear for the reader and foreshadows the terror of the journey about to happen as the reader follows the poems. As well as being a reference to the multiple arrests of different Japanese and Japanese American citizens in their homes, the use of the word "arrest" itself and its association with criminals is fitting, as the Japanese were treated as such. Furthermore, the word "Arrest" (1) being in bold also suggests

---

[61] This format in bold is how it is printed and presented in the text.

[62] This is the text the editor's reference in their bibliography.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

this is a title; however, the editors have titled this extract 'I'. The bold print gives an abrupt and harsh beginning to the anthology and micro-anthology in *Only What We Could Carry*. The word "arrest" can also be seen as a reference to the system that has put this injustice into place. An arrest is the practice of taking someone into legal custody to uphold the law, and the arrest of innocent Japanese and Japanese and Americans, such as the speaker, was government-sanctioned.

The rain and the nighttime setting of 'I' are symbols for sadness, as well as fear and a sense of the unknown. If we examine this poem in comparison to the others in the micro-anthology, then there is also a foreshadowing of the dark events about to happen in the upcoming poetry. The speaker saying "I calm myself" (1) regarding the ominous footsteps approaching emphasises the sense of dread, and their attempts to keep it at bay. So begins their journey of survival. The lack of humanity in the events of the internment that the reader is about to see portrays the need for survival against the internment, as well as against the government and society in which the Japanese had once tried to find a *home* in.

This poem serves as a reminder that the Japanese and Japanese Americans unfairly and unjustly became the enemy when the U.S government decided they were. Unfortunately, many societies are riddled with prejudices and racist views, which pose a threat to many minority groups, and the internment followed decades of anti-Asian prejudices and underlying racial tension and fascism. However, the internment represented the government overall endorsing and permitting these tensions and mindsets to be wrongly justified at the expense of countless Japanese lives. Humanity's desire to carve one another into groups and categories, and to pose dominance over minority groups, will always be present; however, what is also present are laws and judicial systems put in place to protect members of society from harm. These systems, however, use their power to imprison and stigmatise certain groups under the guise of protecting others, and these imprisoned groups, such as the Japanese and Japanese Americans,

Sophie Joshua
1405142

are forced to live in a world and society where systems that serve to protect choose not to protect them due to factors outside of their control.

'II' is the second poem in the anthology, and was originally written by Shizue Iwatsuki. Shizue Iwatsuki and her husband immigrated to the U.S. in 1916. Iwatsuki and her husband were incarcerated in Pinedale Assembly Centre, sent to the Tule Lake Prison Camp in California, and then Minidoka Prison Camp in Idaho. This poem is written in the Standing Stones of the Japanese American Historical Plaza in Portland, Oregon. The extract in the anthology is taken from the last stanza of the original poem:

> Rounded up
> In the sweltering yard.
> Unable to endure any longer
> Standing in line
> Some collapse (67)

In the micro-anthology, this poem is the second part of the journey, where the victims of the internment are waiting to be sent to different camps and prisons. The use of the word "endure" (67) correlates with the already presented idea of survival in 'I'. The influence an anthology can have on the study of literature is that certain ideas can be emphasised through the inclusion of certain extracts and the exclusion of others. The editors have chosen certain extracts from the original poems and isolated them for the anthology in order to create and enhance interlacing themes and similarities between them.

This poem is the most graphic of the five regarding the physical suffering endured by the Japanese during the internment. The imagery of the heat and discomfort elevates this. "Rounded up" and "yard" (67) give imagery of the Japanese being treated like animals, and highlight the lack of humanity with which they are being treated. This inhumanity in which the victims of the internment were treated resulted in those individuals no longer feeling human,

and therefore stripped away any remaining association they may have felt with the rest of the world.

Being ostracised from the dominant group is a contributing factor to *here*, but instances like the one being discussed in 'II' show the dominant group exiling the Japanese from humanity altogether. They have been exiled to a place where their safety and basic human rights have been stripped from them, and through corruption and prejudiced views, they are deemed unworthy to be seen as individuals any longer. They have been "Rounded up" in a "yard" (67) like animals, and what is presented therefore is an exclusion not only from society, but from humanity itself. Staszak discusses the western perception of otherness and writes about the idea of the 'savage', and the view of those othered to be the "man of the Forest, opposed with man from cities and fields…the Savage imposes itself as the descriptor of those who would constitute a lesser form of humanity" (4). 'II' exposes that the Japanese were incorrectly viewed as savage and as a dangerous group, yet the U.S government's attempt to rectify this and supposedly ensure the safety of the United States was to enforce sanctions and legislation that led to the Japanese being treated as a lesser form of humanity. Prejudice and racial hatred have led to individuals being in circumstances where they are treated as lesser forms of humanity, but not due to their own doing. The dominant group enforces acts that depict a lack of humanity upon other groups, often justifying this by associating them with lesser forms of humanity in the first instance. I use the term humanity here regarding the state of being human physically, not in the moral sense. The dominant group seems to be able to decide who is worthy and unworthy of being treated as human, yet when the dominant group itself undertakes savage acts such as the internment, this happens unopposed and seemingly without guilt. Furthermore, the safety of other groups in society is compromised in the name of ensuring safety for the dominant group.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Home is associated with safety; it means more than shelter. I would go as far as to say that *home* and the idea of *home* can only be found amongst humans; we seem to be the only creatures who see *home* and what Tucker describes as the "natural home" (184) as different. We look for comfort that lies beyond water, shelter, and heat, and in part, this idea of *home* is created through humanity and social interaction. War and events such as the internment have stripped this from certain groups. This is the *here* which can be found in 'II'.

'III' is part of a longer poem by Neiji Ozawa, a poet interned at Gila River. Originally, the poem was published in *May Sky: There Is Always Tomorrow*, an anthology compiled by Violet Kazue de Cristoforo. In *Only What We Could Carry,* the poem reads:

> At daybreak
> Stars disappear
> Where do I discard my
> dreams? (151)

If we continue to view these poems in the anthology as a journey with the speaker's internment experience being documented throughout, then this extract takes place either in an internment camp or on the way to one. The speaker asking where to discard their dreams could suggest that they have lost hope, and this is why they wish to discard them. Alternatively, the speaker could be so isolated and displaced from their life and home pre-internment that it is only in the isolation of nighttime that they dare to have them. The harsh reality of daybreak is where they are faced with internment life, such as the communal meal times and interacting with the other Japanese who are suffering alongside them. The stars would therefore be a metaphor for their dreams at nightfall and their disappearance at daybreak.

The speakers in 'II' and 'III' use atmospheric conditions to emphasise the oppression and cruelty they face. There is a comparison to be made between the daytime, such as the sun and heat in the previous poem, presenting the physical struggles and suffering of the Japanese,

Sophie Joshua
1405142

and the isolation of the nighttime presents the speaker's internal struggles and the personal suffering of the individual.

Home and *here* are the internal elements in this comparison. Both exist due to the feeling the individual has, and their ideas and dreams of what their *home* and identity could and should be. The location of the individual, the society surrounding them, and the treatment they receive are the physical elements, and overall, this is what affects the internal state of the individual. This is also why nighttime represents the internal and the daytime the external, because it is in the day where the events happen and when the location is recognised, but it is nighttime where the individual has their dreams and hopes, which will ultimately be stripped away by daylight.

The fourth poem, titled 'IV' in the anthology, was written by Muin Ozaki. Ozaki was also an internee, and throughout his incarceration authored over two hundred tanka poems that recorded different aspects of each internment camp he was imprisoned in. To preserve his poetry, Ozaki wrote his poems on rice paper. This particular poem appeared in many anthologies, including anthologies that feature some of the other poems in *Only What We Could Carry*.

'IV' reads as follows:

> "Disloyal"
> With papers so stamped
> I am relocated to Tule Lake.
> But for myself,
> A clear conscience. (262)

The poem references the relocation of the already imprisoned Japanese and Japanese Americans due to the 'loyalty questionnaire'. Segregation hearings began as a response to how these questionnaires were answered, and those deemed 'disloyal' were relocated to the Tule

Lake internment camp, which was prominently known for the violent treatment of its prisoners and the renunciation of many citizenships.

The word "disloyal" being in quotation marks suggests a lack of validity in the phrase, and the mention of the papers being stamped emphasises the institutionalised and official government sanctions and prejudices because of this untrue allegation. The use of the word "But" in "But for myself/a clear conscience" (262) further presents the resistance of the speaker toward the internment and their disagreement with it. They are not accepting the identity put upon them. 'IV' gives another example of the internal feelings of the individual conflicting with the physical setting they are in. "Clear conscience" (262), being the final line in this extract, contrasts with the first line of "Disloyal" (262); the last line is what the speaker knows about themself, but the first line is the label put upon the speaker by the government and wider American society. As Paul Gilroy argues, the legacy of empire sustains racial hierarchies that undermine legal belonging. The experience presented in this poem exposes the fragility of citizenship for racialised individuals.

This poem, being the fourth step in the journey presented through the micro-anthology in *Only What We Could Carry,* shows the reader the uncertainty and fluctuating nature of the relocation process for some of the internees, especially after the distribution of the 'loyalty questionnaire'. The inclusion of this poem portrays the uncertainty of the journey that many internees had to undertake despite their innocence, as well as the continuing mistrust toward those who were interned. The relocation serves as a reminder that even if the speaker were to attempt to forge familiarity, social relationships, or some form of comfort in the internment camp, this too could be taken away. Furthermore, even when submitting to the restrictions and sanctions of the internment, the Japanese were further tested and persecuted. No *home* or idea of *home* is possible for the speaker to maintain because of the uncertainty and unreliability of both due to their oppressors.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The final poem is 'V':

> The cream of the crop-
> Nisei soldiers- raised
> By wrinkles on the parents' brow (339)

Though an anonymous writer writes the poem, the extract used in *Only What We Could Carry*

is once again taken from a longer poem:

> Trembling hands,
> As the mother opens
> The V-Mail.
>
> The cream of the crop—
> Nisei soldiers—raised
> By wrinkles on the parents' brow.
>
> Endlessly,
> Japanophobes
> List of their grievances.
>
> Relocation—
> To the east, to the west?
> Folded arms.
>
> Standing
> On the wide desert,
> Before the silent wind,
> My body sank
> Into nothingness.
>
> The lights have been turned off.
> Here at the Relocation Center,
> And I'll sleep this evening
> With the voices of the migrating wild ducks
> Passing through my heart.[63]

It could be interpreted that the name of the poem in *Only What We Could Carry* is inspired by

the first stanza in the original poem. V-mail was an abbreviation for Victory Mail, which was

a hybrid mail process used by the United States during World War II in order to contact soldiers

who were stationed abroad. The poem signifies more injustices that surrounded the internment,

---

[63] Marvin K. Opler et al., *Impounded People: Japanese-Americans in the Relocation Centers* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2021) 221.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

where members of the Japanese community were pressured by the United States government to sign the loyalty questionnaire and enlist in the armed forces.

This is the final part in the timeline created through the poems in the anthology. The poem, focusing on the next generation of Japanese and Japanese Americans who either felt forced to enter the armed forces or who did so to try and prove their loyalty to the United States, signifies the generational suffering and traumas that the internment and World War II caused. The editors describe the anthology and the story of the internment as "disturbingly relevant" (xiv), and that the purpose "is not just to explore history, but to use that exploration to understand more deeply the consequence of racial prejudice, to confront more fully the harm that it does and the strengths that it calls forth, and… to help ensure that such events cannot occur again" (xiv). By including a poem that looks to the future generations of Japanese in America, they can emphasise how the effects of the internment were not just isolated to the years it was occurring. The poem can be seen to represent the fears the editors have for the future, and emphasise their desire to "ensure that such events cannot occur again" (xiv).

The metaphor "cream of the crop" (339) to describe those Japanese who joined the armed forces suggests that they were seen as somewhat elite by those in wider American society who did not trust those of Japanese descent, and the members of the Japanese community who wanted to comply with the government sanctions and prove themselves to be loyal. The individuals in question must put themselves in danger and risk death if they wish to be accepted into a society that rejected them due to crimes they did not commit. The value put upon the *Nisei* who chose to fight enforces the corrupt idea that submission to the government's sanctions and regulations, even when these infringe upon human rights and exploit prejudice, is how an individual's worth is measured.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Despite being described as "cream of the crop" (339), however, it could be argued that the *Nisei* soldiers are still separated from the rest of American society. The name used to refer to them is still *Nisei*, presenting how the soldiers are still seen as having connections to Japan, despite signing a questionnaire declaring that they reject any ties they feel they have to it. *Nisei* is a term used specifically to describe the second-generation Japanese Americans born in America, and the use of this term, as well as the mention of their parents, highlights the horrific truth of how young some of these soldiers were, Stanley Hayami, for example.

The "wrinkles on the parents' brow" (339) can be interpreted to have a double meaning. Firstly, this could represent the worry the parents of the soldiers have for their children going to war, as they may lose their lives or possibly take the lives of Japanese soldiers to whom they have a social or familial connection. Another interpretation could be that it expresses the concern the parents have for their children's future in the United States after the internment. The description that the *Nisei* were "raised" on "wrinkles on the parents' brow" (339) emphasises this, as it also implies that, as their children grew up in the United States, *Issei* parents were worried about the treatment their children did and would receive. This worry is reflected in other texts examined in this thesis, such as in *No-No Boy* by John Okada and *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka. Mrs Yamada believed that neither of her sons could ever find a *home* in America because wider American society would never accept them due to their Japanese heritage. Ichiro even laments, "was it she who was wrong and crazy not to have found in herself the capacity to accept a country which repeatedly refused to accept her or her sons unquestioningly" (95). The mothers in *The Buddha in the Attic* also fear for their children's future. When talking about their children's future hopes, they say, "One wanted to become a doctor…One wanted to become a star. And even though we saw the darkness coming we said nothing and let them dream on." (79). The darkness they see coming could be interpreted to be the way wider American society will ostracise their children and therefore hinder their future

careers, a worry which Hayami in 'A Young Nisei's Diary' also has. 'V' encapsulates a worry regarding the future generations of Japanese Americans post-internment, and this correlating worry between the chosen texts in this study exemplifies how it is a fitting representation of why it is beneficial to this anthology, and it is a representation of the attitudes and experiences during the internment.

The language used in 'V' criticises how many Japanese were forced into the armed forces. The prejudices that society puts upon certain groups, and the lengths this society outlines that those groups have to to be a part of it, are therefore futile. The loyalty questionnaire is documented proof that the ostracised group is only given a supposed opportunity for acceptance if those lengths serve and benefit society's needs at the time. The Japanese being unjustly seen as too dangerous and untrustworthy to live amongst other Americans, but still trustworthy enough to fight for the United States Armed Forces, presents this.

Here could be used to discuss the structure and layout of these poems in the anthology regarding its nowness, and also the way it can be experienced simultaneously, yet differently, between individuals. Its continuing existence in the individual's present is due to the ongoing internment experience and the narrative created through the compilation of the poetry. It has an evolution, just as the narrative evolves, and the anthology that connects these poems creates this. Though the poems present different experiences for the individual, the same or similar feelings of hopelessness and displacement are present due to the social, political, and historical factors that have created and influenced the internment.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

<u>Adios to Tears</u>

The next excerpt to be discussed is 'Adios to Tears', an extract from the memoir *Adios to Tears: The Memoirs of a Japanese-Peruvian Internee in U.S. Concentration Camps*. The memoir follows the story of the author, Seiichi Higashide, a Peruvian Japanese business owner living in Peru with his wife. Higashide was one of the 2,200 Latin American citizens of Japanese descent who, during World War II, were deported to American internment camps. To view *Only What We Could Carry* as a microcosm of society during World War II is a way in which we can understand the place of 'Adios to Tears' in this anthology. This extract represents the victims of the internment residing in Peru and wider Latin America, and highlights how Latin Americans of Japanese descent were also persecuted. The enormity of the internment and its devastation are prevalent here, as the reader can see how the internment was not confined to the United States of America. To include this text in this anthology is to recognise the breadth of the devastation the internment caused, and to allow these voices to be heard also.

The excerpt itself does not include the internment of Higashide; instead, the excerpt in *Only What We Could Carry* begins with the subheading "THE BLACKLIST", whereby Higashide sees his name on a list published in a Peruvian newspaper, naming apparent "dangerous Axis nationals" (204) residing in Peru. It then depicts his hiding from the authorities, and how he and his wife evaded his arrest by feigning that he had fled and gone missing, though clever loopholes in the bureaucratic system, such as changing the business into her name. The final part of this extract is sub-headed 'TEMPORARY DETAINMENT BY THE U.S MILITARY' whereby Higashide is arrested, detained, and deported alongside other detainees.

There are countless examples in *Only What We Could Carry* where 'foreign' has been incorrectly used as a synonym for 'enemy', and therefore weaponised politically to reinforce

xenophobia. When Higashide found himself on the list, he says, "I could not think of other reasons. I had not committed any crimes. I had not participated in any propaganda activities for the Japanese government and, of course, had not engaged in espionage or underground activities. I could not understand what criteria had been used to compile the list" (205). The atrocities of the internment and the hypocrisy of those who governed it are presented comparatively in both 'V' and 'Adios to Tears', as both present the manipulated justifications of the xenophobia toward those of Japanese descent. This rhetoric reflects Said's Orientalism. Those of Japanese heritage are unjustly marginalised as racially foreign and inherently suspicious, regardless of citizenship or loyalty.

How this manipulation has been used is for the victimised group to serve a purpose for the benefit of the race and social groups that are dominant and govern society. In their introductory information to the extract from 'Adios to Tears', the editors write that:

> *The primary issue behind the seizure of the Latin American Japanese was not security, but the use of hostages that could be traded for Americans trapped in Axis countries. More than 800 Latin American Japanese eventually served the government's purpose and were exchanged for U.S civilian prisoners by deportation to Japan* (204) [64]

Higashide also writes that the arrest and deportation of those citizens who had Japanese heritage often happened without identification and notification, and that it was merely "where heads were counted…to go out to arrest any persons simply to meet quotas once the ship was anchored was simply without reason or justice" (209). This practice further presents how those of Japanese heritage were stripped of all identity, and were seen as numbers and figures rather than citizens, and furthermore, as human beings.

The idea of identifying an individual has been a key factor in the internment and also a catalyst for the prejudiced actions against the Japanese, for example the character of the boy in *When the Emperor was Divine* being asked if he was Chinese or Japanese, and the *Nisei* in *The*

---

[64] This is italicised in the printed text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Buddha in the Attic wearing badges to say they were Chinese, in the hopes they could distance themselves from the unjust stigma of being Japanese. The list identifying deemed "dangerous Axis nationals" (204) is also an example of this.

Wider American society's need to identify minority and ostracised groups seems to be significant in the first instance, but then, once this identification has occurred, no further understanding of their identity or individuality is sought. Once they are identified, all other identifying factors are stripped from them, and they are categorised and dehumanised to eradicate them. Higashide describes that "whether it was relocation or deportation, the methods used to carry them out grew completely undisciplined" (209). The vast extent of the groups of people who were victims of the internment was not due to them being Japanese American, Latin American, or any multi-heritage individual associated with Japan, but rather that these individuals were not White American. Higashide, describing the methods used as growing and "undisciplined" (209), presents how the biases, which echoed remnants of white supremacy and racial hatred, escalated to the events that occurred during the internment. Individuals were stripped of their lives and *homes* due to their differences, and other lives were prioritised over their own.

The inclusion vs. exclusion discussion regarding the anthology and its content is prevalent in the discussion of the Japanese Latin Americans during the internment. If this anthology aims to shed light on an often-lost part of history and unheard testimony, then the inclusion of a narrative that represents an even smaller minority group amongst those interned is crucial to the study. An argument could be made, then, that this intention is not executed in full, as surely, there are other minority groups amongst the interned who do not fall under the categories of Japanese, Japanese American, or Latin American, and this, to an extent, is a very valid criticism. However, I reiterate how we must embrace and lean into the exclusion of certain texts in the anthology to embrace the inclusion. The inclusion of this memoir in *Only What We*

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Could Carry does not isolate the other minority groups of Japanese descent affected by the internment, but rather it represents that the internment and the stigmatisation of those of Japanese heritage were not limited to the confines of the United States. The awareness of this social issue is identified and publicised through the use of 'Adios to Tears'.

Higashide's memoir is written in the first–person perspective just as Hayami's diary is, but stylistically it is clear this was intended for publication. Examining 'Adios to Tears' regarding its presentation, publication, and inclusion in this anthology presents how even narratives based on events that occurred from testimony and memories are still given to a reader in an edited and compressed form. An example of this is that in his memoir, Higashide has divided the chapters by subheadings. The layout of his memoir is a narrative in stages, outlining his overall experience. The subheadings just serve as a reminder of this editing process and how an author's intentions must be remembered when examining a text, especially one that is personal to the author, such as a memoir or an autobiography.

The memoir was originally written in Japanese and translated into English, so there is a possibility that phrasing, meanings, and expressions are in some way lost in the translation. Due to varying dialects and grammatical differences, as well as other linguistic factors, it can be assumed that the translation will always differ from the original writing in some form. This translation reemphasises the argument that all narratives based on true events will in some way be altered to fulfil the intention of an author, and to do this, there will always be variances in their form as well as exclusions from the narrative itself. 'Adios to Tears' is not published in its entirety in *Only What We Could Carry*. Like many texts in this anthology, the editors have only included a part of it. Barbara M. Benedict describes how one benefit of an anthology is "to entertain and, eventually, to educate a broad audience relatively inexpensively" (35), and through this examination of 'Adios to Tears', it is apparent that the texts in the anthology in question contribute to this through their editorial evolution.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

***

To study the anthology is to acknowledge exclusion as essential to understanding inclusion, since the editorial intention is revealed as much by what is left out as by what is chosen. Just as *home* and *here* exist in a symbiotic relationship, so too do inclusion and exclusion. The act of compilation transforms individual sources into parts of a broader framework, and once situated within an anthology, these texts must be read about one another. Their repetition and repurposing across anthologies generate intertextual dialogues, inviting new readings of political, social, and historical contexts. In *Only What We Could Carry*, the editors bring together diverse voices, and although each extract reflects a distinct experience, the reader is encouraged to draw personal connections, interpretations, and conclusions. This multiplicity of form and voice is unique to the anthology format, allowing for engagement across genres and perspectives within a single text.

All literature, even autobiographical or documentary in nature, involves interpretation and reframing. As Churchman observes, engaging with an anthology is not to engage directly with a historical moment, but to "select an occasional work here and there and imagine we have an idea of the period" (150). The point Churchman raises reinforces this thesis's argument that what we are shown is always a version of the event, shaped by authorial and editorial choices. This insight underscores the constructed nature of representation. Experiences of *home*, *here*, and *identity* are never uniform, even when shaped by a shared event such as internment. The anthology format captures this complexity by presenting varied and often conflicting perspectives on a single historical trauma.

Readers must therefore approach *Only What We Could Carry* with the understanding that they are encountering the internment experience as mediated through the perspectives of its contributors and shaped by editorial framing. The conclusions they draw emerge not from the historical event itself, but from the version of reality constructed by the anthology's texts

Sophie Joshua
1405142

and the socio-political ideologies they reflect. As one scholar puts it, the "empirical realities… [and] socio-political ideologies and identities" (237) expressed by authors create a scope that guides interpretation. The anthology becomes a microcosm of wartime American society, with each text representing a group affected by internment. It foregrounds the fragility of *home*, revealing how easily it can be dismantled by prejudice and bureaucracy. In turn, *here* emerges as a consequence of this loss-mutable and contingent, defined by the very destruction of *home*.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Chapter 4: *No-No Boy* by John Okada

This chapter will examine the presence of *here* in the novel *No-No Boy* by John Okada. *Here* is examined as a complex, personal, and unstable state of being that arises from fractured identity, othering, and the collapse of expected ideas of *home*. This chapter argues that *here* is not defined by physical geography but by a metaphysical and emotional dislocation rooted in social rejection, political betrayal, and generational conflict. Through the lens of John Okada's *No-No Boy*, this chapter explores how the characters Ichiro, Taro, Mr Yamada, and Mrs Yamada each occupy distinct but interrelated states of *here*, shaped by their responses to the war, their cultural loyalties, and their place within both Japanese and American communities.

The following analysis presents *here* as a condition that exists in the present moment when *home*, identity, and belonging are disrupted. For Ichiro, *here* is created by his internal conflict and rejection from all communities. Branded a "No-No Boy," he is ostracised by both American society and fellow Japanese Americans. This chapter explores how his perceived disloyalty results in his feeling like an intruder in his own country, trapped between cultural heritages and unable to find a meaningful place to belong. Ichiro's *here* is intensified by his belief that he does not deserve happiness or reintegration.

I will also explore Mrs Yamada's *here* as a product of her refusal to accept postwar reality. She is emotionally anchored to a delusional version of Japan that no longer exists, creating a deep state of estrangement from her surroundings, family, and ultimately herself. Her suicide becomes the result of her inability to reconcile her constructed *Japan-home* with the disillusionment of the present. Mr Yamada's *here*, by contrast, is marked by passivity and silence. He is unable to assert himself either as a father or husband and thus exists in a suspended identity between loyalty, shame, and emotional withdrawal. His *here* dissolves only after his wife's death, when he begins to carve out a home of his own in America.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

What follows is an examination of *here* as not being experienced in isolation but often formed and shaped by familial and communal relationships. Each character's state of *here* influences and exacerbates another's. Taro, for example, tries to escape his perceived foreignness by embracing American identity and enlisting in the military. His *here* is formed through rejection of his family and heritage, yet he remains caught in a space where full acceptance by society is uncertain. Even Kenji, a war veteran seemingly embraced by society, questions the value of the symbolic rewards he has received. He too exists in a fragile place where mortality, memory, and identity blur, and his desire for a future without racial identity reflects his disillusionment with the categories that have governed his life.

Ultimately, this chapter shows that *here* in *No-No Boy* is a shared but individually shaped condition. It is experienced in different forms by all characters, yet rooted in the same instability between *home* and nation, perception and reality, and identity and expectation. The idea of *here* becomes central to the novel's critique of assimilation, loyalty, and the consequences of systemic exclusion on the personal and collective psyche.

Each discussion of the characters in *No-No Boy* will begin with a short description of who the character is in the novel. The events, actions, and relationships of these characters will then be examined and evaluated regarding the theory behind the key terms. The presence of *here* will also be identified and examined, in response to the character exploration and the theories applied. The concluding section will summarise the conclusions made from the exploration of each character, as well as the contribution this makes to the research as a whole.

John Okada was born in 1923 in Seattle, and served in the U.S Armed Forces during World War II. First published in 1957, *No-No Boy* is Okada's only published work. *No-No Boy* follows the character Ichiro Yamada, a fictional representation of the "No-No boys", a real and greatly ostracised group of Japanese American men during and post-World War II. Before the

novel begins, Ichiro has answered "no" twice in a national government questionnaire as to whether he will serve in the U.S Armed Forces, relinquish any affiliation with Japan, and swear loyalty to the United States of America. Like many others who answered the same, Ichiro is sentenced to a two-year prison sentence, and the novel begins when he returns to Seattle. Ichiro faces internal and familial conflict, as well as a struggle for identity in a world in which he now feels a stranger. The novel follows his story as well as the fractured and vituperated community of Japanese Americans living in a post-war American society.

The Yamadas are a Japanese American family living in Seattle, who live behind a grocery store which is run by Mr. and Mrs. Yamada, who moved to the United States from Japan thirty-five years previously. Their sons Ichiro and Taro were, however, born in America. Mrs Yamada believes that Japan was victorious in World War II and that it is "propaganda of the radio and newspapers which endeavour to convince the people" otherwise (15). Mr Yamada, the father, suffers from alcoholism, and though he does not believe the advertised outcome of World War II to be false, he does not try to convince his wife otherwise. Ichiro, the eldest of the Yamada sons, is the protagonist of the novel, and the narrative follows his perception of events. Ichiro has been labelled a "No-No boy", a colloquial term used to refer to the Japanese American men who answered 'no' twice to questions 27 and 28 on the Loyalty Questionnaire, which was distributed after the attacks on Pearl Harbour. The questionnaire read:

> 27. Are you willing to serve in the armed forces of the United States on combat duty wherever ordered?
> 28: Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces, and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese emperor, to any other foreign government, power, or organization? (88)

The men who answered no to these questions and refused to serve in the U.S Army were imprisoned until after the war ended, and were stigmatised by both the wider American and

Japanese American societies. Taro, the youngest Yamada boy, holds resentment toward both his parents and his brother. He continually attempts to dissociate himself from his Japanese heritage and announces to his family his intentions to join the U.S. Army. Taro also helps to initiate a physical assault upon Ichiro by a group of his friends.

The Yamada family, as individuals, are all in a state of *here*; however, *here* is experienced differently and individually by each member. Furthermore, the actions and feelings caused by a state of *here that* each member of the Yamada family is experiencing contribute to the feeling of *here* of another member.

Here has the ability to be perceived in various ways between characters in the same location and present. It is constructed from individual perception and experience. The Yamadas all experience *here* in different ways because it is perceived differently yet simultaneously, and this often solidifies its presence amongst them. The differing perceptions and understanding of Ichiro becoming a "No-No boy" cause miscommunication, misunderstanding, and conflict between the Yamadas, who, as a result, feel alienated from one another.

In the upcoming discussion of Mrs Yamada, there will be two ideas of *home* discussed: *Japan-home* and *America-home*. The *Japan-home* is Mrs Yamada's idea of her *home* in Japan, which is constructed from her memories of the Japan of the past, current pro-Japanese propaganda, and her interpretation and alteration of events during World War II. Though part of her *Japan-home* is manifested through memory, the *Japan-home* referred to is one Mrs Yamada believes exists in the present. *America-home* is Mrs Yamada's current *home* in the United States, and though this idea is constructed of her current surroundings and experiences, it is still influenced by the *Japan-home*, and it is this which causes her to disassociate from *America-home*.

Ichiro describes his mother as "a Japanese who breathed the air of America and yet had never lifted a foot from the land that was Japan" (12). Shain and Barth argue that as long as the

Sophie Joshua
1405142

diaspora views the place they identify as their homeland as the place of origin, it matters not if they or their lineages have ever been to the location in question (451). By this standard, Mrs Yamada (even though she was born in Japan) would not even need to have lived there to identify with Japan in the way she does. She is caught between her nostalgia and longing for Japan, but in reality, this is a memory of Japan that no longer exists post-World War II. The reader is told that conditions in Japan have changed when the letter from Mrs Yamada's sister arrives, in which she details the poverty and suffering in Japan and begs her sister for money. The nowness which I discuss the state of *here* having is what leads to Mrs Yamada's suicide, as she is caught between Japan and America, to the point where I argue the memory of Japan haunts her present. Her identity is always "a Japanese" (12), and she is never willing to associate herself with America. Her location is America, yet her mentality still lives in Japan, and this creates her state of *here.*

It is a question, however, of whether Mrs Yamada is merely unwilling to associate herself with America, or whether she is unable to due to the social, political, and historical context of the place in which she is living, or perhaps both. Brown and Irwin write that "personal, social, or national" aspects of identity are influenced by place (22). The treatment of and prejudice toward the Japanese pre- and post-World War II is an influential factor in why Mrs Yamada cannot associate herself with America. Racism toward them is continuous and apparent in *No-No Boy*, and the continual verbal and physical abuse presented to the reader is an indication of how constant this was in the day-to-day lives of many Japanese. If "otherness and identity are two inseparable sides of the same coin" (2) as Staszak writes, then the *here* which exists is also due to the identity struggles Mrs Yamada is having with her otherness.

When we examine Shelley Mallett's definition of home being a safe haven from the perceived danger of the outside world, it is understandable that Mrs Yamada and other members of the Japanese community are longing for Japan. It is a place where they feel safe

and accepted, and therefore, they see it as their *home*. This is also an indication of why they are so firm in their beliefs that the Japan they remember has not fallen. Mallett goes on to write that the idea of home can be a "sentimental and nostalgic journey for a lost time and space" (16). This is an appropriate description of the nostalgia Mrs Yamada has for the memory of Japan, which existed thirty-five years previously. Mrs Yamada finds sanctuary in her delusion. If the perceived home and safety that Japanese and Japanese Americans imagine no longer exists, then they have no *home*. Doreen Massey suggests that memories "illuminate and transform the present" (182.). Mrs Yamada's present is transformed by her memory to the extent that she no longer has a place in it where she can exist. Mrs Yamada's state of *here* is because her Japan no longer exists, which is why she is holding onto the fantasy of Japan being victorious in World War II. The place her family perceives as her home is America; the place she expects to be her *home* no longer exists, placing her in a state of *here*.

However, Mrs Yamada's rejection of America becoming her *home* began before World War II, and the state of *here* in which she lives is partially due to her view of America and Japan. Ichiro states his parents "had lived in America for thirty-five years without becoming less Japanese and could speak only a few broken words of English and write it not at all" (19). Mrs Yamada's not learning to speak or write English furthers our perception of her fierce loyalty and infatuation with Japan. It is this which also keeps her in a state of *here* because she will always feel dissociated from America. Mrs Yamada is not alone in this; the Kumasakas, a family who are friends with the Yamadas, also present an unwillingness to accept America as their *home*. When sitting in their house, Ichiro says "they continued to maintain their dreams by refusing to learn how to speak or write the language of America" (25), and he also comments that they insisted on only renting, rather than making a commitment to buying a property. It is revealed by Ichiro that the Kumasakas eventually bought a house, and that they "had exchanged hope for reality" (25).

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Characters such as Mrs Yamada and the Kumasakas represent the Japanese who are unwilling to identify with or make a *home* in America. They do this by not making any commitments to America, as it would threaten their likelihood of returning to Japan. They are emotionally between Japan and America, physically in one place but emotionally tied to another. The in-between place that characters are in due to their present situation is *here*, it exists because it is formed in a character's present. The difference is, however, that the Kumasakas have succumbed to planting roots in America, even though this is not by choice, but by accepting the reality of their situation. Japan is the hope, yet America is the reality, and the previous statement by Ichiro suggests the reluctant tone behind this decision. In this instance, Japan is in the past; there is a disinclination to accept America as their future, and their presence is *here*.

Mrs Yamada's loyalty to Japan influences her identity to such an extent that it engulfs it. She is described as "the woman who was only a rock of hate and fanatic stubbornness and was, therefore, neither woman nor mother" (21). Mrs Yamada's Japanese identity surpasses her other roles and identifying factors, such as being a mother. Sara Ahmed's description of home refers not to a location such as a country or town, but rather where a person's family resides, or where they are from (289). If Mrs Yamada's *home* is Japan, where she is from, and she is not fully Ichiro's mother because of this, then her state of *here* also contributes to creating Ichiro and Taro's state of *here*. They are unable to have a mother as she is possessed by her hatred and fanatic stubbornness, and therefore do not have a *home* as their family does not reside there. Ichiro is stereotyping motherhood and women as if these roles are only fulfilled if one is not stubborn or fanatic. Even if someone is not perceived as a 'good' mother, or if they do not meet the expectations of a stereotypical woman, they are still these things. Mothers and women are capable of being hateful and stubborn because they are human, yet Mrs Yamada is not able to be these things if she wishes Ichiro to identify her as a mother and a woman. If these

Sophie Joshua
1405142

qualities of hate and fanatic stubbornness create Mrs Yamada's Japanese identity, a conflicting differentiation is created between her Japanese identity and her identity as a mother and womanhood. She can be either, but not both. To be a mother and a woman in Ichiro's eyes is to compromise the Japanese identity to which she holds so dear. The stereotypical qualities that create the standard Ichrio holds his mother to create a state of *here* for Mrs Yamada as she is caught between identities.

Jenifer Robertson explores the expectations Japanese women were held to once they became mothers. She writes about how Japanese philosophers such as Yamaga Soko and texts such as *Shingaku dowa shu* were fundamental in creating this expectation. Pre-World War II, the ethos of "good wife, wise mother" and "reliable mothering" (95) was prominent in Japanese households. Robertson goes on to explain that the role of a mother was so passive and nurturing that it was only the fathers who were expected to execute discipline on their children. There was also concern that the mother's love would interfere with a father's discipline (95) if given the opportunity. Mrs Yamada's unwavering loyalty to Japan and her childhood in Japan would suggest that Japanese customs and gender roles were also transferred to the Yamada household in Seattle. The expectation Ichiro has of his mother could be from the behaviour he witnessed as a child. This integrated expectation of what makes a "good mother" and "reliable mothering" (95) is also an indication of why, in the present, she is viewed as "neither woman nor mother" (21). If Mrs Yamada's identity metamorphosed from woman to mother (in the sense that the two could not co-exist, and this new role took precedent over the individual self) once she gave birth, then we can assume this role was expected to take precedent over her identity as Japanese, also.

The way in which Mrs Yamada views her own identity also questions her identity as a mother by the standards of Japanese culture. Mrs Yamada continuously uses the phrase "Japanese" as an identity throughout the novel, for example, when she speaks about Mrs

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Kumasaka. Mrs Kumasaka's son died fighting in the U.S Armed Forces, and Mrs Yamada believes his mother should have prevented his enrollment. Regarding this, Mr Yamada says to Ichiro, "she did not conduct herself as a Japanese, and no longer being Japanese, she is dead" (39). She then refers to Ichiro as "my son who is…Japanese" (40). If the expected passive and nurturing role of women is a Japanese custom, and Mrs Yamada labels her identity as Japanese, then by the "good mother" and "reliable mothering" (95) standard, Ichiro and the Japanese society of the past set, she is not a mother by their standard. Mrs Yamada and Ichiro have both made decisions resulting in expectations and a new identity put upon them; when they are unable or unwilling to meet these, they both suffer internally and in their day-to-day life. It is when identities are expected by a third party and forced upon the self that a struggle occurs, and when internal turmoil can ensue.

Mrs Yamada, however, is surrounded by her family: she has Taro, her husband, and Ichiro, who has returned home. Furthermore, she claims Ichiro is her son because he went to prison rather than serving in the armed forces. So, by the standard set by Ahmed, Mrs Yamada's family should contribute to her feeling at *home*, but it doesn't. This is because Mrs Yamada's sister and other family members are still living in Japan, and she views them as having a Japanese identity. In her eyes, this identity is what creates the members of her family, and it is therefore not complete until they are united. When Mrs Yamada's sister writes to her, begging for financial aid due to the disastrous state of post-war Japan, she refuses to believe it is the truth, exclaiming, "how [the American soldiers in Japan] must have tortured her" (100) into writing the letter. She does not believe her sister to be accepting of Japan's victory and can only presume she is being tortured into presenting this idea. Mrs Yamada tells Ichiro, "You are my son who is also Japanese" (40), and also says Ichiro will not go into the army "for you are my son" (40). Mrs Yamada's perceptions of her sister and Ichiro present how she makes a direct connection between her family members and their Japanese identity. Even though she is

Sophie Joshua
1405142

surrounded by her biological family, Ichiro and Taro fail to meet Mrs Yamada's expectations of the Japanese identity which she has set for them, and because of this, they are no longer her family, which leads to her feeling of *here*. Ichiro also states how he and Taro are never truly accepted by their mother, due to their perceived lack of Japanese identity. After her suicide, Ichiro perceives her body and addresses his mother: "You who gave life to me and Taro and tried to make us conform to a mold which never existed for us because we never knew of it" (165).

Ichiro is the protagonist of *No-No Boy*. He is unsure of his identity, his place in the world, and where his *home* is after being imprisoned for two years as punishment for not fighting in the U.S Armed Forces. He is persecuted by the Japanese and Japanese Americans who want to identify with America, as he reflects badly upon them and represents the traitorous Japanese stereotype formed by war hysteria in America. He is also persecuted by other members of wider American society due to their prejudices against the Japanese as a result of World War II. Those Japanese and Japanese Americans who agree with Ichiro's decision give Ichiro praise and approval, which he does not want. He expresses "I wish with all my heart that I were Japanese or that I were American" (17). Ichiro is in a state of *here* throughout the novel as he struggles to find a place in the world, and returns to a supposed *home* that is forever changed by the war. Ichiro being unable to identify as Japanese or American reflects the linguistic aspects of Kristeva's melancholia. It suggests not indecision but rather erosion of selfhood. This loss of identity is so profound that it escapes articulation. Ichiro's inability to decisively identify a nationality reflects a paralysis rooted in disillusionment and betrayal, which is reflected in Kristeva's work.

Ichiro's *here* is created by his present, and his present experience of *home* in contrast to how he remembers it. He has returned to a place he once saw as his *home,* which has now labelled him as an outcast. When he first arrives at his family's grocery store, Okada gives

great detail of his journey there, and then simply writes "then he was home" (7). I use this example as in theory, the building where the Yamadas live should be his *home*, and it is labelled as such, but this is not the case. Ichiro's expected idea of feeling welcome and at *home* is not met upon his return from prison:

> When one is born in America and learning to love it more and more every day without thinking about it, it is not an easy thing to discover suddenly that being American is a terribly incomplete thing if one's face is not white and one's parents are Japanese of the country Japan, which attacked America (49).

Ichiro's present has been completely changed by World War II; he is now seen as the enemy by a lot of society. He looks Japanese and is associated with the attacks on America, and this change in his present is an example of how the nowness of a state of *here* occurs in a character's present. Ichiro's identity is now incomplete because of his association with Japan, and this is true of all of the Japanese characters in my chosen texts.

To the Japanese Americans, such as Taro, who want to identify as American, and to the Japanese, and to those who did enrol, Ichiro is a traitor and is shunned. This is because, in his defiance, he poses a threat to their desire to be accepted into wider American society. We see examples of this even in the opening chapter of the novel, which sets a tone regarding how Ichiro is shunned by different groups of Japanese American society and wider American society. Upon getting off the bus in Seattle, Ichiro meets an old friend named Eto, who has served in the armed forces and has returned home. Upon finding out that Ichiro is a No-No boy, he calls him a "rotten, no-good bastard" (5) and spits on his neck. Later on in the novel, Ichiro and his friend Kenji are in a bar, and a Japanese man named Bull brushes past Ichiro and exclaims to his peers, "brand new suit. Damn near got it all cruddy" (69). I refer back to Brons' definition of 'Othering': "Othering is the construction and identification of the self or in-group and the other or out-group in mutual, unequal opposition by attributing relative inferiority and/or radical alienness to the other/out-group" (6). To people such as Taro, Eto, and Bull, the

Sophie Joshua
1405142

No-No boys are the out-group. Ichiro is othered by members of the Japanese and Japanese American community as well as the rest of the wider American society; he cannot find a true refuge or safe haven to escape the prejudices against him, and this is why he is in a state of *here*.

Ichiro is also in a state of *here,* however, due to his own beliefs and judgment of the decision he made. The reader is presented with this idea through Ichiro's view of his friend Kenji, a war veteran who lost a leg fighting in World War II. To Ichiro, Kenji is a "veteran of the army of America and had every right to laugh and love and hope, because one could do that even if one of his legs was gone" (58). In his own opinion, Ichiro has no right to feel happiness, due to his refusal to enlist in the U.S Army: he is not worthy of the things he craves- yet Kenji is. Kenji lost his leg in battle and has an infection in the stump of his leg that he has been told will lead to his death, yet in Ichiro's eyes, the reward Kenji has received for this is worth the price he is paying. Ichiro believes he will never leave the situation he is in because he believes it is a price he must pay for his decision. He is in a state of *here* because he believes he should be.

However, I argue that by fighting in the war, Ichiro would not be free from all prejudice and still would not be able to truly find a *home* of acceptance in the new world where he is now living, and would still be in a state of *here*. When he is walking to his family's grocery store upon his return home, a group of men shout "go back to Tokyo, boy" (7) at him. These men do not know whether Ichiro is an army veteran or not; they are merely shouting at him because he looks Japanese. Ruth Ozeki, in the foreword of *No-No Boy,* also highlights the way Japanese appearance was demonised as a result of World War II: "Japanese in the United States became, by virtue of their ineradicable brownness and the slant eyes which, upon close inspection, will seldom appear slanty, animals of a different breed" (XXII). Whether he fought in the war or not, Ichiro has returned to an America he no longer recognises and is identified as the enemy.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Ichiro is othered by wider American society, and through this, will struggle to find a place he can call *home.*

In the narrative of *No-No Boy*, the decision whether to enrol in the U.S armed forces is presented as an identifying factor whether you are Japanese or American. For the time in which the novel is set, these words could be substituted for enemy or ally and would hold the same meaning, though being 'American' and looking Japanese is still a risk for *any* Japanese living at this time, as argued above. The way these two ideas contradict yet are both present in *No-No Boy* suggests the precarious situation the Japanese and Japanese Americans were in. Wanting to identify as American is a contributing factor to why Taro is insistent upon enlisting on his eighteenth birthday. A conversation between Ichiro and his mother presents this mentality, as she directly associates his decision with being Japanese. Mrs Yamada says that the Kumasakas' son Bob, who died fighting in World War II, is no longer Japanese. Ichiro asks her if he is Japanese, and she says he is. He then asks her, "what happens when I'm no longer Japanese?" (40) to which she responds, "I will be dead when you *decide* to go into the army of the Americans. I will be dead when you begin to cease to be Japanese" (40). To his mother, rebelling against America is showing loyalty to Japan, and therefore makes you Japanese. Being Japanese (refusing to fight) is something to be proud of, and her life is dependent on this; she goes as far to say that it was her loyalty to Japan is what led to his decision: "my strength which was vast enough to be your strength" (40).

Ichiro sees his Japanese heritage as the reason he is unable to now fit into the new post-World War II America, and also the reason that he chose to not to fight. He believes his mother's fierce loyalty to Japan was something passed on to him, and that it is what makes him Japanese:

> The thing in him which made him say no to the judge and go to prison for two years was
> the growth of a seed planted by the mother tree and that she was the mother who had put

> this thing in her son and that everything that had been done and said was exactly as it should have been and that that was what made him her son because no other would have made her feel the pride that was in her breast (12)

The resentment Ichiro feels toward his mother is caused by his belief that it is she who influenced him not to fight, and therefore it is she and the Japanese side of him that are to blame for his ongoing displacement in the world. Ichiro's identity is not his own, and is allied to his mother's, yet he is living in a society where being Japanese is infelicitous. As soon as the loyalty questionnaire was published, Ichiro was unable to be a Japanese American. He had to be Japanese or American, and both have labels and expectations upon them, which will lead to some form of persecution:

> I was thereby still half Japanese and when the war came and they told me to fight for America, I was not strong enough to fight you and I was not strong enough to fight the bitterness which made the half of me which was you bigger than the half of me which was America and the whole of me that I could not see or feel (16)

Ichiro's sense of *home* is ambivalent because his identity is ambivalent, and he does not want to identify as Japanese in the way his mother identifies it. He asks, "Why is it that, in my freedom, I feel more imprisoned in the wrongness of myself and the thing I did than when I was in prison? Am I never to know again what it is to be American?" (76). Ichiro was Japanese American in the pre-World War II world he remembers, and now feels he must be either Japanese or American, and both words have criteria which he does not meet. It is understandable then that Ichiro is in a state of *here*: he is "an intruder in a world to which he had no claim" (3) because the world he had a claim to no longer exists. Despite fulfilling the expectation put upon him by his mother by refusing to join the armed forces, Ichiro has a detachment from his mother, which is not only cultural but emotional, and this is a reflection of his fractured self-concept. Kristeva's theory offers a framework to understand this rupture, as melancholia inhibits relational connection by consuming the subject in unresolved grief.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Taro, Ichiro's younger brother, represents the Japanese Americans who are trying to reject their Japanese heritage and are attempting to identify as American. He is also one of the Japanese Americans who stigmatise the "No-No Boys", and therefore holds resentment and hatred toward Ichiro. In the Foreword of the 2014 edition of *No-No Boy*, Ozeki discusses how following their internment, the "Japanese Americans were busy keeping their heads down, assimilating, and working on becoming the model minority of 1950's America" (VIII). This attitude is very much reflected in Taro, and he decides to join the U.S Armed Forces following Ichiro's return from prison.

Much like Mrs Yamada, Taro does not identify with his family. This, and Taro's attempts at identifying as American, are reflected on by Ichiro in the novel:

> [T]he reason why Taro was not a son and not a brother was because he was young and American and alien to his parents, who had lived in America for thirty-five years without becoming less Japanese and could speak only a few broken words of English and write it not at all, and because Taro hated that thing in his elder brother which had prevented him from thinking for himself. And in his hate for that thing, he hated his brother and also his parents because they had created the thing with their eyes and hands and minds, which had seen and felt and thought as Japanese for thirty-five years in an America which they rejected (19)

Taro identifies as American, or at least he is trying to. He holds resentment toward his brother and his parents because, in different ways, they have rejected America in his eyes, and therefore pose a threat to his American identity. His parents have done this by not learning English, and not fitting in with American Society. Ichiro has done this by refusing to join the army, and as a result, is viewed as a traitor to America. The hatred in Taro leads to the complete rejection of his family; he is no longer Mr and Mrs Yamada's son and is no longer Ichiro's brother. The *here* for the members of Taro's family is created by his rejection of it, yet he is also in a state of *here*. It is an example of how *here* is multifarious and can be present simultaneously between multiple individuals, yet in different ways.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Taro's state of *here* is created through his alienation from his parents and his family. He does not want to be identified with Japan and represents the second-generation Japanese Americans who are viewed as Japanese by association, despite never having even visited the country. He also represents the Japanese Americans who do not agree with Ichiro's choosing two years of imprisonment over joining the U.S Armed Forces. Ichiro, in his internal monologue to Taro, blames himself for this and says it was "frighteningly urgent for you to get into uniform to prove that you are not a part of me" (75). In doing this, Taro is alienating himself from his family home, and attempts to prove himself to be American by joining the army and assisting with a physical assault on his brother. I am not arguing, however, that Taro will not find a *home* in the wider American society, which he longs to be a part of. After the assault on Ichiro, the reader is not shown the rest of Taro's journey, so a conclusion cannot be drawn about whether he stays in a state of *here* and can find his desired ideal *home*. Taro's *here* is more of a quest, where he is attempting to find a *home* by fleeing the perceived place, which is labelled his home. Brah writes, "at the heart of the notion of diaspora is the image of a journey" (179), and Taro's journey begins when he physically leaves his family in an attempt to leave his state of *here*. Taro sees himself as too foreign to be a part of his Japanese family. However, Taro will not truly find his identity in the wider American society, which he is longing for, because of the prejudices and racism catalysed by World War II. Though there are no examples in *No-No Boy* that involve Taro specifically receiving these kinds of prejudices himself, the continuous and casual manner in which Ichiro receives racial abuse and Taro's desperation to dissociate himself from anything and anyone Japanese present this idea.

***

Mrs Yamada's suicide is the tragic ending to her narrative. It is the result of what devastation a state of *here* can cause if one is left in it. Mrs Yamada's death is not the only possible outcome of a state of *here*, but for her state, it was inevitable, and this is demonstrated in the events

Sophie Joshua
1405142

leading up to her suicide. Mrs Yamada's manifestation of Japan is constructed of two different delusions: that the Japan of the present is the same Japan she remembers from thirty-five years previous, and that Japan did not lose the war. Events and characters in the novel pose a threat to this manifestation, and once it is destroyed, so is Mrs Yamada's will to live. Following his mother's suicide, Ichiro says it is because "the soul that was Japanese once and forever was beginning to destroy her mind" (95). Mrs Yamada's mind becomes destroyed when her idealised version of Japan is destroyed, and this is because her mind is the only place where it exists.

In the previously discussed dialogue between Ichiro and his mother, when Ichiro asks her what would happen if he ceased to be Japanese, which, by her definition, is to show loyalty to America. Mrs Yamada's response is "Then I will be dead too" (40). Shortly after Taro joins the U.S Army, Mrs Yamada takes her own life in the bath. Mrs Yamada's fierce loyalty to the Japan she remembers is why Taro's leaving affects her so severely. This is apparent to Ichiro also, who asks Taro, "You realise Ma won't get over it, don't you?" (61) when hearing the announcement of his enrolment. Both of these instances are foreshadowings of Mrs Yamada's death. Taro packing his bag and leaving the Yamada household is described as "the departure of the son who was not a son but a stranger, and, perhaps more rightly, an enemy" (62). Mrs Yamada's definition of family is directly influenced by an individual's perceived loyalty to Japan, and Taro does not show this. Not only does he lose his status as her son, but he also gains the label of the enemy in his departure. Mrs Yamada's state of *here* is solidified, and this in turn detaches her one step further from the Japan she longs for. Mrs Yamada views loyalty to Japan as a strength, and it is a quality she believes instigated Ichiro's refusal to join the U.S Armed Forces. She believes this is a quality passed down from herself: "my strength which was vast enough to be your strength" (40). Taro's joining the army is another catalyst for Mrs Yamada's suicide, as "the strength that was the strength of Japan had failed" (63) in Taro. The

Sophie Joshua
1405142

strength of Japan failing also threatens the strength of Japan, Mrs Yamada believes to be true. The part of Taro Mrs Yamada perceived to be Japanese contributed to the idealised perception she had of her *home* in Japan, as her son was a creation of her and therefore a by-product of her Japanese loyalty. Taro's leaving to fight in the U.S Armed Forces destroys this idea of Mrs Yamada's *home,* and she is left in a deeper state of *here* than before.

The Kumasakas' decision to make their new house in America their *home* causes Mrs Yamada to disassociate herself from them, and she leaves "the house which was a part of America" (29). Her long-standing friends creating a *home* in America and celebrating their son who died fighting for America suggests they no longer see it as a temporary location, and do not intend to return to the utopian Japan Mrs Yamada believes exists. The Kumasakas' decision threatens Mrs Yamada's idea of Japan being the place it once was, as if it were the Japan of the past, the Kumasakas would want to return there. Mrs Yamada is plunged further into a state of *here* because the Japanese who she felt shared her ideas of *home* have now changed.

The letter from Mrs Yamada's sister depicts a deprived and suffering country who were not victorious in the war, and this is the penultimate cause of Mrs Yamada's suicide. Before she attempts to revert to her delusion by saying the letter was written under duress, Mrs Yamada sits in what is described as "dumb confusion that raged through her mind, fighting off the truth which threatened no longer to be untrue" (100). When the letter from her sister arrives, it is another threat to Mrs Yamada's manifestation of Japan, and slowly she begins to see the delusion keeping her alive break down.

Ichiro going to Portland with Kenji is the final and conclusive event destroying Mrs Yamada's fantasy of Japan and ultimately, her mind and her will to live. Mrs Yamada asks Ichiro not to be friends with Kenji, as he fought for the U.S Armed Forces during the war. Mrs Yamada says, "he is not Japanese. He fought against us" (94). When Ichiro refuses and tells

Sophie Joshua
1405142

her he and Kenji are going to Portland, Mrs Yamada's face turns "into a hard mess of dark hatred" (95). Ichiro's association with Kenji and rejection of his mother's wishes further destroy the perception of the strength of Japan, as in her eyes, he is associating himself with the enemy who betrayed Japan. Ichiro and Taro have both now ceased to be Japanese in the eyes of their mother, and in doing this have destroyed her hope of returning to her idealised version of Japan. The strength of the Japanese Mrs Yamada saw in her sons reflected that of herself and her beliefs. Ichiro poses the question "was it she who was wrong and crazy not to have found in herself the capacity to accept a country which repeatedly refused to accept her or her sons unquestioningly" (95), and this reflects Mrs Yamada's state of *here*. Mrs Yamada believed that neither of her sons felt at *home* in America, and therefore associated her idea of *home* in Japan with their identities. Ichiro goes on to say it was a "mistake to think that you could keep us completely Japanese in a country such as America" (165). Mrs Yamada was able to see the prejudicial treatment and rejection of her family by the wider American society and therefore willed the Yamada sons to reject the wider American society in turn. Their failure to do this and their attempted evolution into American society, however, isolated Mrs Yamada in her state of *here*. Furthermore, the Yamada sons destroyed her idea of their Japanese identity and the theoretical *home* she had created from the Japan of the past.

Ichiro's leaving catalyses Mrs Yamada's spiral into madness, and she soon becomes mute, refusing to eat or even move off her bed. Mr Yamada observes, "Mama had not eaten for two days, not since Ichiro had gone to Portland" (155). Her tragic suicide is her last attempt to return to the perceived Japan that she had created for herself through delusion and willpower. Mrs Yamada associates not being Japanese with death early on in the novel. After hearing of Bob Kumasaka's death fighting in the armed forces, she says to Ichiro that it is Mrs Kumasaka, his mother, who is to blame as she allowed it to happen. She says, "It is she who is dead because she did not conduct herself as a Japanese and, no longer being Japanese, she is dead" (39).

Sophie Joshua
1405142

According to Mrs Yamada, not showing loyalty to Japan means you are no longer Japanese, and therefore should be dead. However, the Japan she wants people like the Kumasakas to be loyal to does not exist, and therefore, she cannot be this either. When the manifested Japan ceases to be true, then Mrs Yamada ceases to be Japanese, and by her standard, is dead.

Mrs Yamada's suicide is her response to realising the *Japan-home* is completely unattainable. Even if Japan were to have won the war and even if she and the Yamadas returned there, it would never have been the *home* she imagined. Mrs Yamada constructed the *Japan-home* from a memory of thirty-five years ago, and shaped this memory through a sentimentalised vision which was romanticised by her disdain for the American society in which she was living. The only way to return to her perceived *Japan-home* is through death, as everything in the living world disproves it. Once her delusion is broken, Mrs Yamada finds herself without a *home*, and therefore, due to its symbiotic relation to *home*, her state of *here* is broken also. Mrs Yamada was in a state of *here* because her perceived *home* in Japan was ultimately unattainable. Leaving a state of *here* then is not always a solution, nor does it promise a positive conclusion. Brown and Irwin's discussion of place is relevant here. They argue that too close an identification with a particular place produces an aggressive and defiant parochialism, complete deracination, and a loss of identity. Furthermore, the emotional attachment to a particular kind of place can contribute to the formation of a group identity to which Brown and Irwin refer (22). There is an emotional attachment to Mrs Yamada's manifested Japan, and the close ties she has created between this and her family's Japanese identity. This, coupled with the parochialism and defiance against wider American society, is why Mrs Yamada could only find a place in death once the place of *here* and *home* were gone.

Mrs Yamada's *home* and identity were dependent upon her delusion, and once this was broken, a state of *here* and *home* were places she could no longer inhabit. Mrs Yamada packing suitcases before running the bath in which she drowns herself is a metaphor for her preparing

Sophie Joshua
1405142

her journey *home*, and her departure from *here*. Ichiro believes that in her death, his mother has been able to truly be at *home* in the Japan she created from memory and loyalty, and desperation. He bids her, "so now you are free. Go back quickly. Go to the Japan that you so long remembered and loved, and be happy" (166), and this represents that Mrs Yamada has left her state of *here*. The *Japan-home* she longed for did not exist in the living world, so she found it in death.

<div align="center">***</div>

Throughout most of the novel, Mr Yamada is passive and forgiving towards the consecutive outbursts and confrontations that occur in the Yamada household. He has an obvious addiction to alcohol and uses this as a coping mechanism throughout most of the novel. When Ichiro returns *home*, he asks his father why he is drinking, and Mr Yamada says he is celebrating life: "One celebrates Christmas and New Year's and Fourth of July, that is all right, but life I can celebrate any time." (34). Mr Yamada lists traditional Western holidays, but uses "life" as an excuse to drink. Mr Yamada is unable to identify or integrate into America because of Mrs Yamada's attachment to Japan. He is not even allowed to send his family in Japan money and provisions when they write to him and ask, as in the eyes of Mrs Yamada, this would be admitting Japan was not victorious in the war. Mrs Yamada seeks refuge in her delusion, and Mr Yamada seeks refuge in his alcoholism to cope with Mrs Yamada's delusions. He is drinking to escape life rather than to celebrate it, and in this comes his passivity to a state of *here* created by the conflicting identities and loyalties in the household.

Ichiro asks his father why he does not argue with his wife's beliefs, and why he does not attempt to reason with her, to which he responds:

> Your mama is sick, Ichiro, and she has made you sick and I am sick because I cannot do anything for her and maybe it is I that is somehow responsible for her sickness in the first place. These letters are from my brothers and cousins and nephews and people I

hardly knew in Japan thirty-five years ago, and they are from your mama's brother and two sisters and cousins and friends and uncles and people she does not remember at all. They all beg for help, for money and sugar and clothes and rice and tobacco candy and anything at all. I read these letters and drink and cry and drink some more because my own people are suffering so much and there is nothing I can do…She won't let me send money or food or clothing because she says it's all a trick of the Americans and that they will take them (35)

Mr Yamada is most accepting of the present situation that the Yamadas are in. Mrs Yamada is fighting for her *Japan-home*, Taro endeavours to be integrated into and identified as a member of wider American society, and Ichiro endeavours to find his identity between the two. The sickness which he refers to is these internal struggles which his family members have, as well as the struggles of the letter-writers in Japan. It is his acceptance of, and passivity towards, this sickness that he now believes could have caused it. Sociologist Julia Wardaugh writes that for certain groups, one's home is not the haven it appears to be due to conflicts and abuse that can happen within. Rather than a sense of home, Wardaugh argues that these instances cause a "creation of homelessness" within the home (93). There is conflict and discomfort in the Yamada household created by the Yamadas' individual needs and an ignorance, and sometimes unwillingness to recognise those needs of their other family members. This in turn creates a state of *here* for Mr Yamada- he is "sick" also. Mr Yamada feels loyalty and affection toward his family and friends in Japan, and this is coupled with the understanding that they are suffering as their country has been devastated by war. Mrs Yamada's loyalty and affection for her manifested *Japan-home* has ultimately led to more destruction in her family in Japan's lives. Sending them provisions would be admitting Japan did not win the war, so she won't. The Japanese letter-writers suffer as a repercussion of their adherence to a mythical version of Japan. Mr Yamada calls them "my own people" (35), suggesting that he does associate himself with Japan still.

On Ichiro's first night back in the Yamada household, Mr Yamada apologises and says "I am sorry that you went to prison for us" (36). An inclusive term is used when describing

Japanese, and this is the effect of living with Mrs Yamada. Mr Yamada believes Ichiro went to prison for the Japanese which Mrs Yamada speaks of; the ones like her who have "the strength of Japan" (40). Mrs Yamada believes both herself and her husband to be this type of Japanese. When telling Ichiro that the Kumasakas are no longer Japanese, she says "We are Japanese as always" (35) when referring to herself and Mr Yamada. Unlike his wife however, Mr Yamada feels sorrow that Ichiro had to be imprisoned for them, and this suggests he is not fully Japanese in the way his wife expects him to be. Mr Yamada says he could send the provisions in secret but does not because "It is not for me to say that she is wrong even if I know so" (35). He is stuck between his expected roles as a member of the Yamada family, whether to be a father and husband, or a loyal brother and cousin, and uncle.

Ichiro describes his father as "the man who was neither husband nor father nor Japanese nor American but a diluted mixture of all" (105). Ichiro holds a similar view regarding both his parents; similarly, he described his mother as "the woman who was only a rock of hate and fanatic stubbornness and was, therefore, neither woman nor mother" (21). Ichiro's standard of parental roles has created his sense of *here,* if we define *home* in Sarah Ahmed's terms that it is where a person's family resides (289). This is another example of how *here* can be experienced simultaneously yet differently. Ichiro feels in a state of *here* partly due to his mother's actions and Japanese identity and he blames his father for not contradicting Mrs Yamada. He accuses him of not being a father, but in fulfilling Ichiro's wishes, Mr Yamada would not be showing loyalty to his wife, and would not be fulfilling his duties as her husband. He is unable to be a husband or a father because of his wife and sons' states of *here* and expectations of him.

Mr Yamada is being held to a standard that deems him not to be a father, as if fathers who are passive to confrontation are not fathers. Again, we see a romanticised view of parenthood set by Ichiro, who questions his parents' identities. Kohsuke Yamazaki writes:

Sophie Joshua
1405142

> An ancient Japanese proverb says that one should fear 'Earthquakes, Lightning, Fire, and Father', in that order. As this proverb points out, the Japanese people have considered the father a symbol of power and authority. Looking back historically, with the Second World War as a turning point, the father's role has begun to be devalued, and among the rapid social changes, it has assumed a less meaningful existence.[65]

Much like the role of motherhood, the role of a father in Japanese culture is one that transformed following World War II. Whether he meets Ichiro's expectations of what the word means, Mr Yamada is Ichiro's father, yet by Ichiro's standard, his passivity deems him not to be. Jenifer Robertson's research depicting the role of the father in a Japanese family to be in charge of discipline (95) presents a more rigid and authoritarian expectation of the father, which Mr Yamada does not portray. If Mr Yamada ever showed these qualities, they seem to have been debilitated to accommodate Mrs Yamada's beliefs and behaviour following World War II and the fall of Japan. Fundamental roles integral to family life, such as motherhood and fatherhood, were seen to alter with World War II. Roles such as these had been outlined and adhered to, helping to shape and recognise one's identity. The space of the home, when defined in Barrington Moore's terms as a "haven or refuge" (82), or where a person's family resides (289) such as Ahmed suggests, is transformed when the roles within the home are. The devastation of the war, seeing mothers and fathers taking on responsibilities, roles, and personas deemed anomalous to the accustomed day-to-day life of their children and themselves, is therefore an indication of why feelings of displacement are at the core of the Yamada family conflict.

Mr Yamada is not identified as Japanese or American in the way that his family members identify these terms. In a temper, Ichiro says:

> You're a Jap. How can you understand? No. I'm wrong. You're nothing. You don't understand a damn thing. You don't understand about me and about Ma and you'll

---

[65] Kohsuke Yamazaki, 'Transition of the Father's role in Japanese family and culture' *Annual Report of The Clinical Centre for Infant Development* no. 2 (1980): 43. Subsequent page references in text.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

never know why it is that Taro had to go into the army. Goddamn fool, that's what you are, pa, a goddamn fool" (105).

Mr Yamada does not easily connect or relate to those members of his family who try to identify as Japanese and those who try to identify as American. Ichiro says his father is not "Japanese nor American but a diluted mixture of all" (105), and this is Mr Yamada's state of *here*. Unlike the other members of his family, he does not constantly attempt to grasp onto an identity of Japanese or American, and his passivity is a coping mechanism. He has to be this way because he is silenced by the aggressive and passionate nature of the other members of his family. Mr Yamada's passivity is the dilution which Ichiro speaks of, and this is his *here*. He cannot choose a *home* between Japan and America because, in doing so, he will always be isolating himself from certain members of his family.

Mrs Yamada's suicide leads to a revival of Mr Yamada. At the funeral and the wake, he seems to be a new man and enjoys the presence and attention of the bereaved friends who come to visit. His wife's death also leads to the immediate cessation of his drinking. At the funeral, Ichiro says, "his father had been flushed without touching a drop, drunk with the renewal of countless friendships and elated by the endless offerings of sympathetic phrases" (171). Mr Yamada's excessive drinking was a coping mechanism that helped to dilute him into submission and passivity toward his wife and the conflict in his family. Mrs Yamada's manifestation of Japan died with her, and therefore, the struggle between her *Japan-home* and *America-home* stopped, alongside Mr Yamada's drinking.

Mr Yamada is no longer caught between maintaining his wife's manifestation of Japan and his present desires-this includes his desire to help those who have written to him from Japan. After the funeral, Ichiro finds his father putting parcels together to send to Japan, saying to his son, "I'll send tomorrow" (188). When writing on the packages to Japan, Mr Yamada "scratched in the names and addresses in both English and Japanese" (188). The merger of the

Sophie Joshua
1405142

languages is a symbol of Mr Yamada finding a balance between America and Japan, and represents how he intends to live in the future. Taro held a desire to become American, and Mrs Yamada held a desire to stay Japanese; both had radical and perceived identities attached to them, which ultimately caused their state of *here*. The American and Japanese identities perceived by Taro and Mrs Yamada dictated that one must pick between the two, and they both leave the Yamada household in pursuit of these. Through their absence, Mr Yamada has found his own identity where both Japan and America can co-exist. Ichiro says, "the packages were the symbol of his freedom in this way" (188), and this freedom has come from the co-existence in which Mr Yamada has begun to live.

Ichiro claims his parents "had lived in America for thirty-five years without becoming less Japanese and could speak only a few broken words of English and write it not at all" (19). Mr Yamada has either begun to learn to write English, or he knew how to previously and concealed it from his wife; either way, it is a symbol of him creating a *home* in America, as he is embracing the language. Mr Yamada also chose to embrace and build a *home* in America with the development of his shop. He determines he will not be fulfilling his wife's plans to move back to Japan, and says he will use the money she had saved for this to develop it: "Ya, it is just right for me. Maybe I fix up a little bit. Paint the shelves, a better cash register, maybe I think I buy a nice, white showcase for the lunch meat and eggs and things" (188). Aviezer Tucker discusses how home theory is not restricted to the physical location. He writes that "most people spend their lives in search of home, at the gap between the *natural home* [conceived as the home environment conducive to human existence, i.e., dry land] and the particular *ideal home* where they would be fully fulfilled" (2). In *No-No Boy*, the home environment conducive to human existence is the Yamadas' grocery store, where he lived with his wife and sons, but it was not Mr Yamada's ideal *home* where he was fully fulfilled. This is due to the conflicts within it, and Mrs Yamada never allows his ideal *home* to be created, as it

Sophie Joshua
1405142

threatens her ideal *home* in her manifested Japan. He makes a decision similar to that of the Kumasakas, where he intends to make a *home* in America, and this is symbolised by the refurbishment of the grocery store. This will be his ideal *home* because he has created it from his desires, and also because Mrs Yamada is no longer there to hinder it with her infatuation with the manifested Japan. Mr Yamada's state of *here* is ended with Mrs Yamada's death and Taro leaving home as he is not caught between being a husband to her and a father to his sons in the way they expect him to be; furthermore, he can find an identity and *home* for himself.

Following his wife's death, Mr Yamada not only attempts to create a *home* for himself, but he also attempts to allow Ichiro to make one of his own. He says, "you take time, Ichiro. There is no hurry. I do not understand everything that is troubling you. I know-I feel only that it is very big. You give it time. It will work out. After a while, maybe you go to work or go to school if you wish. It can be done. You have a bed. There is always plenty to eat. I give you money to spend. Take time, ya?" (189). Mr Yamada is providing the basics of what makes a shelter, such as food and somewhere to sleep. In Tucker's terms, he is offering him the natural *home*. Mr Yamada then, however, tells Ichiro he will give him the time he needs to deal with the things bothering him, and also says he will allow him to make the decision himself if he wishes to go back to school or not (a previous cause for argument between Ichiro and his parents). Mr Yamada gives Ichiro the chance to make his ideal *home*, and much like his writing in English, Mr Yamada shows an ability and capability he previously didn't whilst his wife was alive.

Tim Ingold writes, "how we function as persons is linked to how we make ourselves at home. We need time to make our dwelling into a home. … Our residence is where we live, but our home is how we live" (18). Mr Yamada attempts to give Ichiro the time he needs to make the dwelling of the Yamada house into a home, and gives him the options of how he can live. Though he cannot "understand everything that is troubling" Ichiro, Mr Yamada perceives that

Ichiro is troubled, and he is troubled by his state of *here*. Mr Yamada is creating his ideal *home* and is hoping Ichiro can do the same. *Here* can be experienced simultaneously yet in different ways, and Mr Yamada is attempting to create a *home* for himself and Ichiro somewhere in the middle between the two identities and lives created by Mrs Yamada and Taro. If "our home is how we live" (18), then Mr Yamada is giving Ichiro the chance to create a *home* in the same way he is doing himself, allowing him to live how he wants to. This *home*, therefore, will be a *home* shared by the two of them.

It is never confirmed if Ichiro is able to meet the ends that his father hopes, and Ichiro believes he never will because of the passive position Mr Yamada took for so long. After Mr Yamada says he will give Ichiro time, "his lips trembled a little and Ichiro felt that it was because the old man was finally doing and saying what he should have long ago and knew that it was too late" (189). Maybe Ichiro will never be able to find a *home* in the exact way Mr Yamada wants him to; however, Mr Yamada is trying to allow both their ideals of *home* to co-exist together. *Here* exists in relation to *home*; therefore, Mr Yamada is also attempting to marry the two states of *here* that he and Ichiro are feeling, and in this unity, there is the potential to find *home*.

Kenji was one of the Japanese Americans who fought in the U.S Armed Forces when required to do so. He lost his leg in combat, and the remaining eleven and a half inches of leg left is infected. This infection is terminal, and when he and Ichiro reunite following Ichiro's release from prison and Kenji's discharge, Kenji has been told he has less than two years to live. By the conclusion of the novel, Kenji has died, and Ichiro has inherited his Oldsmobile.

Kenji's return to Seattle was vastly different from Ichiro's. He tells Ichiro with "no trace of the braggart" (55) that he received "A medal, a car, a pension, even an education. Just for packing a rifle" (55) and then proceeds to ask him, "Is that good?" (55). Cars, pensions,

Sophie Joshua
1405142

and education are the foundations of what could be a good life for Kenji, yet the question is still asked. The question devalues the rewards he has received for serving; furthermore, Kenji is reducing his service in the U.S Armed Forces by describing it as "Just…packing a rifle" (55). Aviezer Tucker writes that "most people spend their lives in search of home, at the gap between the *natural home* [conceived as the home environment conducive to human existence, i.e., dry land] and the particular *ideal home* where they would be fully fulfilled" (184). Kenji has been given commodities to create himself a *home* in America; he has a car for transport, a pension to support him financially, and an education that could lead to further opportunities. Barrington Moore writes that "home in literature is identified as a haven or refuge where people can retreat to and relax in" (82). The commodities rewarded to Kenji are not the basics of primal human existence, such as water or shelter, yet they do provide a more secure refuge in which Kenji can live.

What the medal represents is also conducive to the creation of a *home* and of a refuge where Kenji could retreat when examined through Ichiro's perception of what it means to be at *home* in America. The medal is proof of Kenji's service to the U.S Army. Ichiro perceives this service to be Kenji's right to put "one good foot in the dirt of America and know that the wet coolness of it is yours beyond a single doubt" (59), whereas he, Ichiro, feels "like an intruder in a world to which he had no claim" (3). Kenji asks, "Is that good?" (55) regarding the things given to him, suggesting a refusal to accept these would create his *home* in America. From the standards of home outlined by Tucker and Moore, Ichiro sees Kenji as having the tools to create a *home*, and because he will never be given these, Ichiro feels as though he will never achieve them. Ichiro's *here* is created through his perception of Kenji. However, Kenji's questioning and devaluing the tools he was given presents how he does not associate these with an idea of *home*.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Ichiro's jealousy of Kenji is repeatedly voiced in *No-No Boy*, yet he does not use this jealousy to begrudge or mistreat him. Kenji himself does not seem to hold any pride or illusion of superiority over Ichiro due to his status as a veteran and Ichiro's as a No-No boy. In the opening of the novel, Ichiro meets a Japanese American veteran named Eto Minato, a man he knew before World War II. Upon learning that Ichiro is a No-No boy, Eto spits on him and calls him a "Rotten bastard" (5). The attitude of some Japanese Americans toward "No-No boys" is presented here, yet Kenji is one of the exceptions to this. Whilst driving with Kenji, Ichiro admits, "I wasn't in the army, Ken. I was in jail. I'm a No-No boy", and following this, "There was a silence, but it wasn't uncomfortable. Ichiro could tell instantly that it did not matter to Kenji" (57).

During their drive, Ichiro says:

> [he] had been envying Kenji with his new Oldsmobile, which was fixed to be driven with a right leg that wasn't there any more, because the leg that wasn't there had been amputated in a field hospital, which meant that Kenji was a veteran of the army of America and had every right to laugh and love and hope, because one could do that even if one of his legs was gone (58)

Brown and Irwin's identity theory that "personal, social, or national" aspects of identity are influenced by place (22) is reflected in how Ichiro perceives Kenji's place in America. Regarding Kenji, Ichiro thinks:

> you were man enough to wish the thing which destroyed your leg and, perhaps, you with it but, at the same time, made it so that you can put your one good foot in the dirt of America and know that the wet coolness of it is yours beyond a single doubt (59)

 The place in which Ichiro believes Kenji belongs is created from Kenji's social identity as a veteran of the U.S. Army; equally, Ichiro's identity is a No-No boy, and he believes he does not belong in the same place as Kenji. Much like Mrs Yamada's delusional creation of her perceived *Japan-home*, Ichiro has created an idea of *home* in American society that he believes Kenji is entitled to. This place is unknown even for Kenji, however, as it is not a *home* that he recognises, nor is it one he attempts to integrate himself into.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Ichiro and Kenji hypothetically swapping places is a recurring topic in their interactions with one another. Ichiro asks Kenji, "Would you trade places with me? I said I would with you" (57), and he goes on to wish, "give me the stump which gives you the right to hold your head high" (58). Brown and Irwin go on to write, "The individual's process of self-discovery is often enacted in relation to place, and through the attempts of an individual to understand it" (22). Rather than understanding Kenji, Ichiro wishes to swap places with him. Ichiro's struggle for identity is therefore formed in his inability for self-discovery, as he believes his "No-No boy" status hinders him from ever having his ideal identity in his ideal *home*, something he believes Kenji has. Both Kenji and Ichiro have something to learn about themselves by hypothetically switching places; Kenji's realisation of his mortality and how he should be living his life is what he would use were he in Ichiro's place with years ahead of him. If Ichiro were able to swap places with Kenji, he would realise that he has romanticised the place in which Kenji is in, and this is why Kenji ultimately does not brag or show pride in his perceived status over Ichiro's.

J. Wardhaugh describes the relationship between home and homelessness as being constructed of "complex and shifting experiences and identities" (93). Ichiro and Kenji have different experiences upon returning, but both experienced a shift in identity. They are described as:

> One already dead but still alive and contemplating fifty or sixty years more of dead aliveness, and the other, living and dying slowly. They were two extremes, the Japanese who was more American than most Americans because he had crept to the brink of death for America, and the other who was neither Japanese nor American because they had failed to recognize the gift of his birthright when recognition meant everything. (68)

Ichiro believes Kenji has an American identity because he fought in the armed forces. Kenji is dying, and the perceived *home* that Ichiro imagines him to have, he will leave when he dies. Ichiro perceives himself as homeless because of his inability to identify with America or Japan.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Because of this, he feels as though he is dead already. Through a comparison with Kenji, there is an ever-growing similarity formed between Ichiro and his mother. Both feel dead whilst being alive, and mourn for a *home* not accessible to them. Kenji's death and Mrs. Yamada's death contrast, however: Ichiro believes that in her death, his mother will be returning to "the Japan that [she] so long remembered and loved" (166). The foundations of Ichiro's ideas of *home* are acceptance and a secure identity-this is why he believes Kenji to have a *home* in life and his mother to have a *home* in death.

Ichiro has not lived with Kenji nor grown up with him like he has with the rest of the Yamadas. Ichiro has a better understanding and therefore perception of his family's identities than he does of Kenji's, because he can relate to their present situations more. He empathizes with his father's struggle to make Mrs. Yamada understand that Japan did not win the war, and he has longed to fit in with White American society, just as he perceives Taro to do now. Though he deemed it an impossible feat, he even understood his mother's wishes: "All she had wanted from America for her sons was an education, learning, and knowledge which would make them better men in Japan" (182). The perspective is Ichiro's for the majority of the text. It is often from his stream of consciousness and his perceptions that the reader is given details about a character's thoughts, rather than through their speech. However, Kenji's emotions and thoughts are expressed mostly through his dialogue. Kenji's place in the world as a Japanese American soldier is so displaced from the present Ichiro has created, his perceptions of his own *home* and identity are often not presented by Ichiro, because he does not know. Ichiro's stream of consciousness, being a focal way in which the *here* for a character is expressed, however, does not disprove its existence for that character, but rather further demonstrates that between characters, *here* can simultaneously be present and can be perceived in multivarious ways.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

In their final interaction before his death, Kenji and Ichiro discuss his No-No boy status and how the other Japanese Americans treat him. Kenji also advises him on how he should handle the turmoil he feels and the treatment he receives:

> Go back. Later on you might want to come to Portland to stay, but go back for now. It'll turn out for the best in the long run. The kind of trouble you've got, you can't run from it. Stick it through. Let them call you names. They don't mean it. What I mean is, they don't know what they're doing. The way I see it, they pick on you because they're vulnerable. They think just because they went and packed a rifle they're different but they aren't, and they know it. They're still Japs. You weren't here when they first started moving back to the coast. There was a great deal of opposition –name-calling, busted windows, dirty words painted on houses. People haven't changed a helluva lot. The guys who make it tough on you probably do so out of a misbegotten idea that maybe you're to blame because the good that they thought they were doing by getting killed and shot up doesn't amount to a pot of beans. They just need a little time to get cut down to their size. Then they'll be the same as you, a bunch of Japs (146)

Kenji explains to Ichiro that those Japanese Americans who ostracise the No-No boys do so as they, too, are mistreated, feel ostracised, and need to blame another group to cope with this. Kenji also describes to Ichiro a time before Ichiro was released, when the Japanese Americans who fought in the armed forces also suffered due to the prejudices of other groups in society. Kenji's account of the returning soldiers' experience begins to destroy Ichiro's idealised view of a *home* where he is a Japanese American veteran of the U.S Armed Forces. Ichiro and his mother both had their idealised visions of an unobtainable *home* destroyed; however, Ichiro knew his was unobtainable. His vision of a place where he had a *home* in America was built upon fanaticism and jealousy, whereas his mother believed her *Japan-home* to be tangible and attainable to her. This could be the reason why Mrs Yamada's ideal *home* led to her suicide and Ichiro's does not.

Kenji tells Ichiro that eventually the Japanese Americans mistreating him will realise they are "the same as you, a bunch of Japs" (146), thus explaining to him that they are all ostracised due to racial prejudice in American Society. Said's framework clarifies this: no matter his birthplace or armed service, Ichiro's body will be read as foreign. Though the

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Japanese American veterans and the Japanese Americans were "busy keeping their heads down, assimilating, and working on becoming the model minority of 1950's America" (VIII), it is not enough. General John L. DeWitt, famous for his unwavering support of the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II, famously used the phrase "A Jap's a Jap"[66] when justifying the internment that began in 1942. This phrase reflects Kenji's advice to Ichiro; just as being an American citizen did not eradicate one's association with Japan, army enrolment will not *ameliorate* the prejudices Japanese Americans are facing post-World War II. Jean-François Staszak writes that Othering requires "a criterion that allows humanity to be divided into two groups: one that embodies the norm and whose identity is valued and another that is defined by its faults, devalued and susceptible to discrimination" (1). The othering of the No-No boys is created through this. Their supposed fault is that they didn't serve in the armed forces, and are being blamed for the discrimination the Japanese Americans face. The Japanese American veterans Kenji speaks of are those like Eto, who view the No-No boys as traitors; othering them from their community. Staszak goes on to say:

> Otherness and identity are two inseparable sides of the same coin. The Other only exists relative to the Self, and vice versa. The asymmetry in power relationships is central to the construction of otherness. Only the dominant group is in a position to impose the value of its particularity (its identity) and to devalue the particularity of others (their otherness) while imposing corresponding discriminatory measures" (2).

This is at the core of the discrimination that is projected onto the No-No boys by other members of the Japanese American Community. Ichiro's identity is formed around this otherness he feels from the Japanese American veterans, which is why he continuously compares himself and Kenji. He views Kenji and Eto as belonging to the dominant group. This is also why he feels relief when Eto spits on him- he believes that Eto is in a position to do so. The asymmetry in power relationships is central to the construction of otherness but also to the construction of

---

[66] Keith Robar, *Intelligence, Internment, and Relocation. Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066: How Top Secret "MAGIC" Intelligence Led to Evacuation* (Seattle: Kikar Publication, 2000), 198.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

the identities Ichiro has formed for himself and characters such as Kenji and Eto. Kenji eradicates this by saying that the veterans and the No-No boys are the same, and are all "a bunch of Japs" (146).

Kenji's death serves as a symbol of the hapless situation the Japanese and Japanese Americans were in. Even when he served in the U.S Armed Forces and was doing the thing believed by so many to be proof that you were loyal to America, he still suffered. Kenji was rewarded with material objects but still lost his life, and he and so many others were all still viewed as "a bunch of Japs" (146) by the wider American society. Kenji understood this and therefore did not create for himself a perception or an imagined *home* in which to retreat.

When talking about his death and the prospect of an afterlife, Kenji says:

> 'Have a drink for me. Drink to wherever it is I'm headed, and don't let there be any Japs or Chinks or Jews or Poles or Niggers or Frenchies, but only people. I think about that too. I think about that most of all. You know why?'

> He shook his head and Kenji seemed to know he would even though he was still staring out the window. 'He was up on the roof of the barn and I shot him, killed him. He wasn't the only German I killed, but I remember him. I see him rolling down the roof. I see him all the time now and that's why I want this other place to have only people because if I'm still a Jap there and this guy's still a German, I'll have to shoot him again and I don't want to have to do that. Then maybe there is no someplace else. Maybe dying is it. The finish. The end. Nothing. I'd like that too. Better an absolute nothing than half a meaning. The living have it tough. It's like a coat rack without pegs, only you think there are. Hang it up, drop, pick it up, hang it again, drop again …. Tell my dad I'll miss him like mad. (48)

Kenji, too, seems to find a freedom in death- but he only believes this freedom will come if there is no race in his afterlife. By using racial slurs to describe different races, religions and ethnicities such as "Japs or Chinks or Jews or Poles or Niggers or Frenchies" (148), Kenji is expressing how the racial hatred and prejudices put upon these people is what identify them and consume their identities. This is what he hopes is absent from the afterlife. By wishing for "only people" (148), Kenji is desiring a place without identity, as he suggests it is identities that ultimately lead to all the problems of inclusion and exclusion. It is these problems that

Sophie Joshua
1405142

have created othering, whereby an identity is placed upon an individual, such as Ichiro, which they believe not to be their own. Even the nickname of "No-No boy" has attached to it a history and an action that, unjustly, is to be shunned, and Ichiro himself suffers because of this identity placed upon him, which he ultimately but unwillingly embraces. Kenji displays this ethos of trying to see others as "only people" (148), which is why he does not care about Ichiro's status as a No-No boy. Kenji does not base his perceptions of identity and *home* upon the foundations assumed to create them by other characters and wider American society. However, he recognises the aforementioned factors as what influence the status and identity of many minority groups in wider American society.

Kenji is not in the state of *here* because he refuses to be. *Here* can be used to examine the effect the individual's mindset, their private sphere and their public sphere have upon their idea and perception of home and their identity. Unlike Ichiro and Mrs Yamada, Kenji does not allow the external environment to dictate his perception of his identity or *home*. The social, political, and historical context of his present influences his external circumstances, but not his internal beliefs.

Kenji also comments on the devastating consequences the discriminatory measures of Othering have on war and death: "because if I'm still a Jap there and this guy's still a German, I'll have to shoot him again and I don't want to have to do that" (148). In the aforementioned scenario, what determines life or death is the country where an individual perceives you to be from. The effects of Othering, segregation, and group penalizations lead to war and ultimately death, a cycle Kenji hopes to break free from. Kenji himself is dying due to an injury he sustained fighting for the U.S. Army, an act many believed would ensure safety.

Though Kenji is not in the state of *here,* it is through a comparison between himself and other characters, such as Ichiro an understanding can be formed as to what creates a perception of *home* and identity for them. Though his life is the object of envy for some, Kenji is still

ostracised and unwelcome due to his perceived foreignness and his heritage. He, however, does not have an expected idea of *home* or identity formed by the view of others or the misguided perceptions of an idealised version of these concepts.

By examining the narratives of each character in *No-No Boy*, the way *here* can be experienced simultaneously yet differently is presented. The differing opinions on Ichiro being a No-No boy stem from the different ideals of *home* and identity each individual has. It is these divergent perceptions and ideas of *home* and identity that create conflict between the Yamadas, who, as a result, feel alienated from one another. Kenji does not place his own identity or value upon a specific location or national identity, which is why he does not experience this conflict. World War II was a cause of the struggle for identity and *home*, both recurring themes in *No-No Boy*, and this is because it destroyed and changed a world that the characters were accustomed to. The post-war society was a new present that could no longer inhabit identities and *homes* from the past.

Mrs Yamada's *home* and identity were dependent upon her delusion of her *Japan-home*. Ultimately, it was unobtainable, as its foundations were a memory of thirty-five years previous, and a present which never existed (Japan winning the war). This was so intrinsic to her identity and a *home* she believed obtainable that once this illusion was broken, the *Japan-home* she longed for did not exist in the living world, and therefore neither did she. Mrs Yamada's ideas about her own identity dominated any other identities available and expected of her.

For Ichiro, being Japanese American was possible pre-World War II; however, upon his release from prison, he feels he must be either Japanese or American, and both words have criteria and responsibilities which he does not wish to fulfil. He is "an intruder in a world to which he had no claim" (3) because the world he had a claim no longer exists, and he believes identity and belonging to be co-dependent. Choosing an identity, innately Japanese or innately American, would also be the same as choosing between family members, such as his mother

and Taro, and therefore, this struggle for identity he has is a cause for turbulence in the family unit.

Second-generation Japanese Americans are represented by Taro and Ichiro. Taro's state of *here* is created through alienation from his family, and by association, his Japanese heritage also. He does not want to be identified with Japan, and longs to be integrated into American society and an American identity. Ichiro represents the pressures of the second-generation Japanese Americans who are expected to show loyalty and maintain an identity that belongs to Japan, and how this results in being Othered, and without a feeling of belonging.

Much like how the ideas of one's *home* were altered by World War II, so was the family unit and the gender roles that were seen as the norm. Fundamental roles integral to family life, such as motherhood and fatherhood, were seen to alter with World War II. The wedge between first- and second-generation Japanese Americans became greater as a result. Just as characters such as Taro and Ichiro were expected to be Japanese or American, parents were held to a standard where expectations of motherhood and fatherhood left no opportunity for change or the individual self. This resulted in their alienation from their children.

It is the perception of others and the concern for this that also causes a struggle for an identity and to find a *home*. When an expectation of an identity is not met, this is a cause for stigma and criticism, and it is when one no longer feels accepted that displacement occurs. Characters such as Kenji do not have an expected idea of *home* and identity dependent upon the expectations of others or the misguided perceptions of an idealised version of an individual, and this is why he does not struggle in the same way. Mr Yamada, too, once being free from the expectations of being Japanese, which his wife sets, shows a change in character and identity that up until that moment was not possible for him.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Loyalty to a singular country, and that ultimately gives a character belonging, is integral to one's identity in *No-No Boy*. Country and identity being closely linked in this way is in part what led to the Japanese internment. This constructed, prejudiced sense of national loyalty to one country was the cause for suspicion and othering toward the Japanese Americans.

The presence of *here* in Japanese American literature during and after World War II is embodied in the Yamada family of *No-No Boy*, though it manifests differently for each member. All four Yamadas experience displacement and alienation, shaped by societal pressures, familial expectations, and their own conflicted identities. These expectations, whether from family, community, or self, remain unfulfilled. For characters like Ichiro and Mrs. Yamada, *here* is further complicated by a longing for a lost or unreachable past. The novel's contribution lies in its portrayal of *here* as a fractured and multifaceted condition that reveals how identity and home are perceived and contested across generational and ideological divides.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

<u>Conclusion</u>

This thesis has introduced the concept of *here* as a critical and interpretive lens that deepens our understanding of *home* and identity in the context of Japanese American internment literature. Unlike fixed geographical or historical interpretations of displacement, *here* has been theorised as a fluid, subjective, and affective state-one shaped by social rejection, fractured identity, historical and racial conflict, and personal estrangement. To reinforce the originality and necessity of this lens, this conclusion summarises each chapter's contribution and situates *here* within broader critical discourses. By drawing on the ideas of key theorists and integrating them with close readings of the texts *The Buddha in the Attic, When the Emperor Was Divine*, *Only What We Could Carry*, *Midnight in Broad Daylight,* and *No-No Boy*, the thesis builds a multifaceted picture of how *here* can interrogate complex cultural experiences of unbelonging in literature.

These chapters collectively demonstrate that *here* is not reducible to a specific identity category or historical moment. It is a condition that arises whenever an individual's sense of self is at odds with social or political expectations. The concept is shown to be intersectional, encompassing issues of race, gender, language, generational conflict, and national loyalty. *Here* also provides a powerful counter-narrative to dominant American ideologies of patriotism and assimilation, especially during wartime. Instead of framing the internment as an exception, *here* reveals it as symptomatic of broader patterns of exclusion and state-sanctioned identity regulation.

The Buddha in the Attic and *Midnight in Broad Daylight* reveal further dimensions of *here*-especially through their exploration of collective identity and cultural alienation. In *The Buddha in the Attic*, the plural first-person narrative immerses the reader in the collective voice of the Issei women who emigrated from Japan to the United States. Their shared experiences of work, motherhood, language barriers, and social invisibility establish *here* as both a

Sophie Joshua
1405142

gendered and racialised position of unbelonging. Their *homes* in America become sites of both longing and loss-marked by failed assimilation and the impossibility of full acceptance. Meanwhile, in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, the story of the Fukuhara family, divided by war and geography, intensifies the emotional and ideological fractures caused by internment. Frank's struggle with his Japanese and American identities reveals how *here* can transcend location and instead manifest as a state of moral and cultural paralysis. For Frank, belonging to either side requires disavowing a part of himself. These texts demonstrate that *here* is forged not just by physical displacement but by the conflicting demands of nationhood, family loyalty, and individual belief.

In *Only What We Could Carry*, the anthology form itself creates a mosaic of *here* experiences. By including voices from across the Japanese American community-diary entries, poems, essays, and photographs-the text reflects the multidimensional and intersectional nature of *here*. This collection resists closure and singular narrative authority, privileging instead a plurality of perspectives that speak to the heterogeneity of internment and its aftermath. In this polyphonic structure, *here* becomes a chorus of simultaneous alienations emerges, with each contributor capturing a different facet of dislocation. The editorial decision to juxtapose bureaucratic documents with personal testimony accentuates the dehumanising processes of state control and the resilience of the human voice in the face of it.

The critical contribution of this thesis lies in articulating *here* as a transitory, yet powerful, interpretive tool. It enables a reading of literature that foregrounds emotional and psychological estrangement over spatial dislocation alone. By refusing to define *here* in fixed terms, the thesis has shown its adaptability across texts, genres, and identities. This fluidity allows *here* to challenge binary understandings of *home* versus exile, loyalty versus resistance, belonging versus unbelonging. It exposes the false dichotomies imposed by state and society, revealing instead a continuum of negotiated, shifting, and contested identities. The texts

Sophie Joshua
1405142

suggest that belonging is always conditional, and *here* exposes the fault lines that run beneath those conditions.

Furthermore, *here* proves to be a valuable framework for examining how race, gender, and generational differences intersect. The pressure to conform to the "model minority" ideal is frequently critiqued in the literature examined. Kenji, in *No-No Boy*, represents the futility of such compliance-despite fulfilling societal expectations, he faces death and abandonment. His quiet dignity contrasts with Ichiro's existential anguish, and both represent differing but coexistent forms of *here*. Similarly, gendered expectations are upended in *Midnight in Broad Daylight*, where Frank and Mary are judged for their perceived deviation from cultural norms. These deviations are not merely personal traits but social transgressions that locate them within *here*. Frank's bilingual identity and gender nonconformity provoke suspicion in both Japan and the U.S., revealing that *here* can exist simultaneously across national contexts.

The multi-layered tensions between national, familial, and personal identity recur throughout the selected texts. Loyalty questionnaires, racialised suspicion, family discord, and cultural alienation are explored not only as political consequences but as emotional burdens. These burdens create internal conflicts that are as damaging as the external ones, and literature becomes the means through which these tensions are examined and expressed. *Here*, as this thesis has argued, it captures this emotional weight and transforms it into a site of critical inquiry. In many ways, the Japanese American experience represents a microcosm of larger diasporic conditions-negotiating dual loyalties, navigating competing histories, and contending with cultural invisibility.

Here also invites us to consider the role of language and silence in the formation of identity. Silence, whether imposed by surveillance or chosen as survival, becomes a defining feature of the internment narrative. In *When the Emperor Was Divine*, the silence of the individuals mirrors the silencing of an entire community. Words become dangerous, memories

are repressed, and stories are interrupted. The absence of speech is itself a form of *here*-a space where articulation is either withheld or impossible. In contrast, the anthology's preservation of personal testimony in *Only What We Could Carry* represents a reclamation of voice and agency. In this way, literature not only records *here* but resists it.

The concept of *here,* therefore, extends beyond mere location. It encompasses temporal disjuncture, identity ambiguity, and emotional exile. It explains how one can feel out of place even in familiar surroundings, and how *home* can become alien when societal perception diverges from personal identification. For many of the individuals studied, America was *home* in name but not in experience. Their physical presence in the United States was contradicted by the denial of citizenship, rights, and belonging. *Here* is thus a means of understanding this paradox.

Ultimately, the presence of *here* in Japanese American literature demonstrates that identity is not a static construct but a dynamic negotiation shaped by memory, perception, and power. This thesis has proposed *here* as a lens capable of capturing this dynamism and foregrounding the silenced, the marginalised, and the displaced. In doing so, it contributes to a broader understanding of how literature functions not only as a record of experience but as a space for the articulation of complex, unresolved, and evolving identities.

The critical lens of *here* enables an interrogation of exclusionary national narratives and a rethinking of what it means to belong. It gives voice to the individual's struggle against monolithic definitions of identity and highlights the emotional terrain of those living in the shadow of collective trauma. By situating Japanese American internment literature at the centre of this exploration, the thesis underscores the importance of narrative as resistance, memory as reconstruction, and literature as a means of making *here* visible. *Here* becomes both a condition and a method-at once what is experienced and how we come to understand that experience through literary study.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The presence of *here* contributes to our understanding of *home* and identity because it gives us a focus and a scope in which to examine a notion and an expression of a feeling that goes beyond displacement. By applying *here* to the Japanese American literature in this thesis, it is presented how catastrophic events such as World War II and the internment can be used as a social weapon to justify misguided prejudices of society and governments toward marginalised groups. When an individual is struggling with their identity and sense of *home* and belonging due to social, political, and historical factors, a critique can be made toward the government and society that influence these factors. Humanity's need to categorise and identify certain groups and what this identification is used for influences the state of those who are being identified. Pre-existing hatred toward the Japanese, which was rooted in wider American society, catalysed the events of the internment. It is the dominant group in society that governs and dictates how these identifiable factors are used or ignored in order to exploit a marginalised group.

The different literary forms that encapsulated the internment experience are the expressions and responses from those individuals who have experienced *here*. The way these experiences can be structured and edited into anthologies, bibliographies, and narratives allows the reader to perceive and understand a time and account that otherwise would not be accessible to them. Furthermore, the way these texts can be restructured and compared to one another allows this understanding to be continuously challenged and dissected to example new practices and accounts of the internment and the Japanese and Japanese American experience during World War II. When applying *here* to the study of literary work, we must embrace what is excluded to appreciate what is included, as that is where the editors', authors', and poets' intentions are displayed. Inclusion and exclusion live in a symbiotic relationship just like *home* and *here* do. Stories, accounts, experiences, and literary work can be compiled so they are no longer just individual sources, but can also contribute to the framework of our understanding

of key themes and events that are interlaced between the individual texts. It is through comparative literary study that we can then identify how these texts depict social issues and injustices.

These texts, being used in multiplicity, create intertextuality between them. The themes, as well as the social, political, and historical discussions about the events depicted, can then be explored. The conclusions reached will vary depending on the experience and knowledge of the reader themselves, but part of the aim of this thesis is for the reader to form their conclusions across different styles of text regarding the internment experience through the lens of *here* in one format.

Every form of literature requires some interpretation. To understand and be able to discuss the issues and arguments the texts raise is to recognise that even verbatim work, autobiography, and other forms of literature based on events that have occurred have been interpreted in some form. Engagement with these texts is not engaging with the time period or the internment itself, but rather engaging with an imagined reconstruction and reflection of that period and the internment experience in it. *Home, here,* and identity will always be different between each individual; however, a shared event such as the internment alters what these are. Even when the specific events are different, often the same emotion or response is expressed and evoked. This, however, does not always cause unity between the individuals who have the same emotion, which is why *here* can be experienced simultaneously, yet differently. The explorations and discussions in this thesis portray different events that are thematically and ideologically reflective of one another.

Here refers to a time, situation, or location happening in an individual's present, where one is perceived to be, or feels displaced or unwelcome. *Here* is metaphysical, but it can only exist in response to a setting or place. In the scope of *here*, place has different definitions and

levels that work in conflict with one another and influence how the individual feels about each of them. There is the place which the individual being studied is physically in, but there is also, in some instances, an idea of a place which they feel an association with, have memories of, or have even romanticised, which affects the present place and how they view it. This is often the idea of *home* that the individual longs to obtain or return to. When this *home* is unattainable to them due to social, political, and historical factors, or when they are physically removed from it against their wishes, this is when *here* is also created.

When one's *home* and identity are dependent upon memory or romanticisation of a *home,* it is ultimately unobtainable, especially if the foundations of this *home* are built on a memory or a present that never existed. There is sometimes a danger when the individual holds memory of the past or a deluded present as too intrinsic to their identity and a *home* they believe to be obtainable. Once this illusion is broken, the *home* the individual longs for is broken also, leaving them forever in the state of *here* if they are unwilling to forge a new *home* in the present. There is an aspect of "nowness" to *here*, created in the present tense of a character or an individual. The *home* for which the individual in the text yearns can be a *home* of the past or the future, as well as locations that exist in the present. The *home* can also be imagined or sentimentalised. The contrast *here* has with this idea of *home* is sometimes therefore due to it not being in the present of the individual. *Here* is always in the present, but can exist due to a contrast with the past, present, or future uses of *home*.

The association with a certain country, nationality, and place that the dominant group in society and wider society places upon the individual also influences the aforementioned places, as this association is often accompanied by unjust stereotypes and warped justifications of discrimination, often unable to be circumvented by the individual. The volume of those who believe the stereotypes and labels to be true, therefore, also contributes to whether the individuals in the state of *here* are discriminated against. There is then a correlation between

how wider society negatively perceives the individual and how that individual is treated. This correlation is when an individual's struggle for identity occurs as their social relationship with wider society changes. Many Japanese Americans did not feel an affiliation with Japan and felt the United States was their *home,* and this was where they felt an attachment. What the chosen literature presents, therefore, is that when their American identity is not recognised by wider American society, and another identity is put upon them which they do not recognise, not only is there a struggle for identity, but also with an idea of belonging and where their *home* is and should be.

The labelling and categorisation that individuals experience in the narratives presented in this thesis reflect humanity's need to isolate and categorise individuals. This classification and categorisation are, in the most part, used to identify the differences between how native one is to the host country in which they are living, the origin of that individual's family, and what aspects of them differ from the rest of society in their host country. This is presented in the texts chosen in this thesis as a means to create an ethnically and racially homogeneous society, which is why race and association with other countries that are not the host country are a primary contributor to how individuals are categorised.

The idea of loyalty and national pride is weaponised to ensure submission into conformity; however, the fixation society has upon this conformity to the norm does not recognise individual identity. Metamorphosing what the reader, and often the pre-World War II individual, perceives to be dual national identity and the condemnation of individual identity into a singular, national identity results in that individual's identity and their understanding of it being in turmoil.

The differences an individual has to wider society are seen as a fault, which is not a reflection upon national differences, but upon humanity's apparent need to create a minority in which to oppress and ostracise. How these differences are viewed and the consequences of

these differences are dependent upon the standards of the dominant groups in society. The differences between individuals in society and what is expected of them sometimes surpass race and nationality, and can be extended to ideas of gender also. There are many instances in the narratives where an individual shows personality traits associated with the opposite gender, and therefore are victims of persecution for not meeting the criterion set by a dominant group, which does not want to integrate with them, but still expects them to conform to a standard that they set. The way Mary and Frank in *Midnight in Broad Daylight* are perceived by their peers in Japan, and the way the Americans attribute to them, show are associated with non-conformity to gender stereotypes presents this.

Here is not forged just by location, but by the social relationships and experiences in that location. The second-generation Japanese Americans are an example of this, as their idea of belonging and the *home* they knew changed and transformed following the events of Pearl Harbour. Their parents and the first-generation Japanese immigrants do remember prejudices and racial hatred pre-dating this; however, this is not the reality for their children, as their perception is different, and therefore so are their ideas of *home* and their state of *here*.

Loyalty to a singular country, and this loyalty ultimately giving the individual a sense of belonging to a group, is integral to one's identity in my chosen literature. One's affiliation and association with a country and their own identity being closely associated in this way is in part what led to the Japanese internment. Many of the individuals in the texts discussed accepted their national duality; however, they had a close association with one of the countries in this duality, but it was the constructed and prejudiced views of wider American society that led to national duality being the cause for suspicion and othering toward the Japanese Americans.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

The individual identities and national identities of the subjects of the texts are continually shifting and being held to question or criticism by the United States government and wider American society. Due to the catastrophes and tragedies of World War II, the societies where each individual has forged, or attempted to forge, an identity reject the other country to which that individual has or is perceived to have an association. This also occurs between family members in the same location, depending on where each individual feels they identify. The individuals of this family unit, and those who feel their host country rejects their dual national identity, are in a state of *here* which occurs simultaneously, but differently. The texts examined present how identity and belonging are co-dependent. For many, choosing an identity innately 'Japanese' or innately 'American' would be akin to choosing between family members. Due to individual prejudices and the prejudices of wider American society, communal identity and *home* between one another cannot be formed, as there will always be labels put upon the identity chosen. This ultimately causes contrast and conflict between an individual's identity, familial belonging, and perceived national loyalty.

Home is not just a matter of lived experience, however. An individual may have a sense of *home* even though they have no experience or memory of the *home* they have in mind. The same can be said regarding national identity. Characters such as Ichiro in *No-No Boy* and the boy in *When the Emperor was Divine* have never visited Japan, but still have a sense of loyalty and an identity toward it. They do not want to vilify their Japanese or American identities, but rather live in a society where both can exist and be embraced symbiotically without persecution. In many instances in the texts, we do not know what "Japanese" or "American" means specifically to the individual. These texts are a product and expression of the Japanese American experience, and often the speaker is the individual or individuals whom the texts are regarding. However, in many instances, the reader is presented with what the term 'Japanese' and 'American' means to those in wider American society who wish to eradicate one of these

Sophie Joshua
1405142

identities in the individual. This represents the confusion of identity and self, which occurs when the dual nationalities of the individual are put into conflict.

For many individuals in the texts, being Japanese and American was possible pre-World War II; however, the internment and post-war society influenced many to feel they had to be either Japanese or American. Both words had criteria and responsibility which many did not wish to fulfil or commit to, and the 'loyalty questionnaire' was an example of these kinds of expectations put upon individuals.

Ideas and perceptions of one's *home* were altered by World War II, and so was the family unit and the gender roles that were seen as the norm. Fundamental roles integral to family life, such as motherhood and fatherhood, were seen to alter with World War II because of how the family needed to adapt, as well as losing their understanding of their place in a society that imprisoned them. The *Issei* were held to a standard where expectations of motherhood and fatherhood left no opportunity for change or the individual self. This standard was derived from the *Nisei,* requiring emotional support as they became aware of the changing attitudes toward them from wider American society. Whether it was 'American' or 'Japanese', the *Nisei* felt they had to choose between two identities, and expected the same from their parents. If the *Issei* wanted to preserve their already established association with Japan, but the *Nisei* wanted to adopt and embrace that part of their identity which was American, then in part their parents were seen as failing the *Nisei's* expectation of what a parent should be by not following suit and helping their children to obtain these identities. This is mostly presented in how Taro and Ichiro view Mr and Mrs Yamada in *No-No Boy*.

The *Nisei* are represented by second-generation characters and individuals in the texts. Characters such as Taro in *No-No Boy* had their state of *here* formed through alienation from their family, whom they associated with their Japanese heritage. He and the children in *The*

Buddha in the Attic want no identification or association with Japan, and long to be integrated into American society and forge an American identity. Individuals such as Stanley Hayami and Ichiro, however, represent the pressures some of the *Nisei* felt, as they are Japanese Americans in a society that expected them to be one or the other.

Simultaneously, the *Issei* felt rejected by the *Nisei* for not wanting to associate themselves with that nationality, which was so intrinsic to their parents' identity. This feeling is expressed by the mothers in *The Buddha in the Attic*. This complex dynamic between the *Issei's* identity as parents, the *Issei* and the *Nisei's* own identity as individuals, and their national identity resulted in alienation between the groups. The social and political turmoil that World War II and the internment heightened made it so these identities could not co-exist without at least one being eradicated. World War II and the internment increased the already established cultural divide between *Nisei* and *Issei*. When national identity and race are used to establish belonging and acceptance in society and demand loyalty from the individual, their social and familial ties are also conflicted.

When an expectation of an identity is not met, this is a cause for stigma and criticism, and it is when one no longer feels accepted in their location due to this stigma and criticism that displacement occurs. Characters such as Kenji, whose identity and expected idea of *home* are not dependent upon the way others treat him, are why he alone continuously does not seem to be in the state of *here*. However, it could be argued that this is because he is faced with his mortality, and therefore is more subconsciously introverted and self-aware as he grapples with this. His terminal diagnosis is a tragedy he must face alone, and in this state, he is isolated. The tragedy of Kenji's narrative is that he conformed to what the United States government wanted of him and fought in the armed forces, but is paying a higher price. Rejecting the opportunity to become what was perceived as a 'model minority' and conform to the systems, government sanctions, and expectations of wider American society, which imprisoned and persecuted

Sophie Joshua
1405142

oneself, results in a present where the individual is in a state of *here,* which is difficult, yet not impossible to leave. However, fulfilling the requirements that would present the individual as 'loyal' will often result in a loss of self, the family, and even life. This comparison of Kenji to other characters and individuals in the chosen texts highlights the tragic ultimatum that the devastation of World War II, the 'loyalty questionnaire', and the internment caused.

The presence of *here* in Japanese American literature before, during, and after World War II and the Japanese internment is in the present of the individuals followed in my chosen texts. Though the presence of *here* is different between each individual, each person experiencing *here* feels out of place and unwelcome due to their perceived foreignness, lack of identity, and feelings of displacement. These feelings are caused by expectations from fellow Japanese and Japanese Americans, the wider American society, and their ideas of identity and *home*. Whatever this expectation is, the inability to meet it causes their *here*. It is important to note here that, in regard to the expectation of wider American society, I am referring to the warped concept of model minority, and the submission they deem must be shown by ostracised and marginalised groups. *Here* exists only in relation to *home*, so when these ideas and perceptions are not met, that is when *here* is present. The contribution of the chosen literature for this study to the exploration of *here* in Japanese American literature is that through the contrasting views and ideals of vastly different characters and individuals, the multivarious nature of *here*, as well as perceptions of identity and *home,* are presented.

By examining the narratives of each character in the same text, the way *here* is experienced simultaneously yet differently is presented. The differing opinions and ideals of each stem from the different ideals of *home* and identity each individual has. These divergent perceptions and ideas of *home* and identity can often create conflict between individuals; however, as a result, they feel alienated from one another. It is the individuals who do not place their identity or value upon a specific location or national identity who do not experience this

Sophie Joshua
1405142

conflict. World War II emphasised the struggle for identity and *home,* which already existed for many Japanese because it destroyed and changed the world and the *home* that they knew. This change, which continued into post-war society, could no longer inhabit identities and *homes* from the past, yet through social and political limitations would not allow them to create a new *home* or identity in their present. This is how the presence of *here* was prevalent before, during, and after World War II and the Japanese internment, and why it can be used to study the literature that was created in response to these events.

In conclusion, this study of *here* affirms literature's capacity to witness, to question, and to heal. Japanese American internment literature is not simply testimony to injustice, but a site of theoretical innovation. By proposing *here* as a critical lens and tracing its presence across diverse texts, this thesis has offered a new way of reading marginalised narratives-one that prioritises emotional resonance, internal contradiction, and the struggle to articulate belonging in an often-hostile world. In doing so, it opens a space for continued engagement with how literature can help us see and feel what it means to be displaced, and what it means to survive.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Bibliography

Abe, Frank, and Tamiko Nimura. *We Hereby Refuse: Japanese American Resistance to Wartime Incarceration*. Seattle: Chin Music Press Inc, 2021.

Abe, Frank, Greg Robison, and Floyd Cheung, ed. *John Okada: The Life and Rediscovered Work of the Author of No-No Boy*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2018.

Ahmed, Sarah. '*Home and Away: Narratives of Migration and Estrangement.' International Journal of Cultural Studies Vol*. 2, No. 3 (1999): 329-347.

Akyeampong, Emmanuel. *'Africans in the Diaspora: The Diaspora and Africa.' African Affairs Vol*. 99, No. 395 (200): 183–215.

Albrecht, Glenn, Sartore, Gina-Maree, and Pollard, Georgia. *'Solastalgia: The Distress Caused by Environmental Change'*. Australasian Psychiatry vol. 15, no. 1 (2007): S95-S98. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed March 12, 2025).

Alma'aqbeh, Hala, and Mahmoud Zidan. *'Studies of the Face (less): Picture Brides and Facial Recognition in Julie Otsuka's The Buddha in the Attic.' International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (2022): Vol*. 22, No. 2.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.

Barth, Aharon. *'Diasporas and International Relations Theory'*. International Organization vol. 57, no. 3 (2003): 449–479. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Baumann, Martin. *'Diaspora: Genealogies Or Semantics and Transcultural Comparison.' Vol*. 3, no. 47 (200): 313–337.

Benedict, Barbara. *'Choice Reading: Anthologies, Reading Practices and the Canon, 1680–1800'*. The Yearbook of English Studies. 35-55.

Bokser Liwerant, Judit. *'Being National, Being Transnational: Snapshots of Belonging and Citizenship.' Shifting Frontiers of Citizenship: The Latin American Vol*. 29 (2013): 343-365.

Brah, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Brons, Lajos. *'Othering, An Analysis'*. Transience: a Journal of Global Studies vol. 6, no. 1 (2015): 69-90. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Brown, Peter, and Michael Irwin. *Literature and Place 1800-2000*. Lausanne: Peter Lang Publishing, 2008.

Brubaker, Rogers. *'The 'diaspora' Diaspora.' Ethnic and Racial Studies Vol*. 28, No. 1 (2005): 1–19.

Brøgger, Fredrik Chr. *'History Vs*. Literature: Facts vs. Fictions? Or Factual Fictions vs. Fictional Facts? Or, Help, I Want to Get off.' American Studies in Scandinavia vol. 16, no. 2 (1984): 85-97. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Burt, Ryan. *'Interning America's Colonial History: The Anthologies and Poetry of Lawson Fusao Inada.' Melus Vol*. 35, no. 3 (2010): 105-130.

Butler, Kim D *'Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse.' Diaspora: A journal of transnational studies vol*. 10, no. 2 (2001): 189–219.

Cahill, Edward, and Edward Larkin. *'Aesthetics, Feeling, and Form in Early American Literary Studies.' Early American Literature Vol*. 51, no. 2 (2016): 235-254.

Chan, Jeffrey Paul. *Chin, Frank*. Inada, Lawson Fusao, and Wong, Shaun. Eds. *Aiiieeeee!: An Anthology of Asian American Writers*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2019.

Chan, Jeffrey Paul. *Chin, Frank*. Inada, Lawson Fusao, and Wong, Shaun. Eds. *The Big Aiiieeeee!* London: Penguin Random House UK, 1991.

Chapman T. *and J*. Hockley. *Ideal homes? Social change and domestic life*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Chen, Fu-jen, and Yu Su-lin. 'Reclaiming the Southwest: A traumatic space in the Japanese American internment narrative.' Journal of the Southwest (2005): 551-570.

Cheung, King-Kok. *An Interethnic Companion to Asian American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Churchman, Philip. H. 'The Use of Anthologies in the Study of Literature'. Vol. 7, no. 3 (1922): 149-154 https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed January 22, 2024).

Clifford, James. *'Diasporas.' Cultural Anthropology Vol*. 9, No. 3 (1994): 302–338

Collective, Anon, ed. *Book of Anonymity*. Goleta: Punctum Books, 2020.

Crow, Graham, and Graham Allan, ed. *Home and Family: Creating the Domestic Sphere*. London: Macmillan, 1989.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

D'Aquino, Andrea. *A Life Made by Hand: The Story of Ruth Asawa*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2019.

Dainotto, Roberto M. *Place in Literature: Religions, Cultures and Communities*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Decelle, Timothy. *W and Abram Van Engen*. 'Exploring Early American Literature Anthologies.' Early American Literature, vol. 56, no. 3, (2021): 845-862. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Degi, Bruce. *'Lives Interrupted: A Brief Look at Eight Novels Based on the Japanese-American Internment Experience.' Cea Critic Vol*. 70, No. 3 (2008): 56–66.

Deng, Jianying. *'Collective Memory, Living History: We-narrative in Julia Otsuka's The Buddha in the Attic.' European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, Vol*. 10, No. 6 (2022): 23-34.

Dinneen, M. *The Portuguese-speaking Diaspora in Great Britain and Ireland*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2010.

Dombrowski, Nicole. *Women and War in the Twentieth Century: Enlisted With Or Without Consent*. Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis, 2004.

Dupuis A., *and D.c Thorns*. 'Home, Home Ownership and the Search for Ontological Security.' Sociological Review, vol. 46, no. 1 (1998): 24-47. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Engels, F. *& K Marx*. *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin Classics, 2015.

Esman, Milton J. *Diasporas in the Contemporary World*. Cambridge: Polity. 2009.

Faist, Thomas. *'Trans Nationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture'*. Ethnic and Racial Studies vol. 23, no. 2 (2000): 189–222. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Faulkner, Matt. *My Nest of Silence*. New York: Atheneum Books for Young Readers, 2022.

Fickle, Tara. *'No-no Boy's Dilemma: Game Theory and Japanese American Internment Literature.' Modern Fiction Studies Vol*. 60, no. 4 (2014): 740–66.

Ford, Jamie. *Hotel on the Corner of Bitter and Sweet*. London: Allison and Busby, 2012.

Friis, Matias Orseth. *A History of Silence: Representations and Aesthetics in John Okada's No-No Boy and Julie Otsuka's When the Emperor Was Divine*. Bergen: The University of Bergen, 2018.

Fukuda, Andrew. *This Light Between Us: A Novel of World War II*. New York: Tor Teen TR, 2021.

Gilroy, Paul. *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Hall, S. *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, 1997.

Hayden, Dolores. *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes As Public History*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1997.

Hecker, Carl. *'What Are Historical Facts?' Western Political Quarterly Vol*. 8, No. 3 (1955), 327-340.

Hegel, Georg and Friedrich Wilhelm et al. *Hegel's Phenomenology of Self-consciousness: Text and Commentary*. New York: University of New York Press, 1999.

Hendin, Josephine. *A Concise Companion to Post-war American Literature and Culture*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

Heyne, Eric. *'Toward a Theory of Literary Nonfiction.'* Modern Fiction Studies Vol. 33, No. 3 (1987): 470-490.

Hinnershitz, Stephanie D. *Japanese American Incarceration*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021.

Horst, Heather A.. *'Reclaiming Place: The Architecture of Home, Family and Migration.' Anthropological Vol*. 53, no. 1, (2011): 29-39.

Hughes, Kiku. *Displacement*. New York: First Second Publishing, 2020.

Inada, Lawson Fusao, Patricia Wakida, William Hohri. *Only What We Could Carry: The Japanese American Internment Experience*. Berkeley: Heyday, 2014.

Inouye Huey, Emily. *Beneath the Wide Silk Sky*. New York: Scholastic Press, 2022.

Japan Society of London. *Bulletin of the Japan Society, London*. London: The Society, 1950.

Jeremiah, Milford A. *The Use of Place in Writing and Literature.' Language Arts Journal of Michigan: Vol.* 16, No. 7 (2000): 23-27.

Jin, Michael R. *Citizens, Immigrants, and the Stateless: A Japanese American Diaspora in the Pacific*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2021.

Jones, G. *Leaving Home*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.

Jones, G. *Experimenting with Households and Inventing Home.' International Social Science Journal Vol.* 52, No. 2 (2000): 183-194.

Kato, A. *The Japanese Family System: Change, Continuity, and Regionality in the Long Twentieth Century*. Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2021.

Kessler, Lauren. *Stubborn Twig: Three Generations in the Life of a Japanese American Family*. Oregon: Oregon Reads, 2008.

Kim, Jinah. *Postcolonial Grief: The Afterlives of the Pacific Wars in the Americas*. Durham: Duke University Press Books, 2018.

Kim, Soyeon. *'Reclaiming a Space in American History with the Collective Voices of the Japanese Picture Brides in Julie Otsuka's The Buddha in the Attic.' Feminist Encounters: A Journal of Critical Studies in Culture and Politics Vol.* 6, No. 2 (2022): 29.

Klekowski von Koppenfels, Amanda. *'The Disinterested State: Negative Diasporic Policy As an Expression of State Inclusion and National Exclusion.' Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies Vol.* 45, No. 4 (2017): 595-612.

Kristeva, Julia. *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.

Lange, Dorothea. *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the Censored Images of Japanese American Internment*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2008.

LaRossa, R. *Of War and Men: World War II in the Lives of Fathers and Their Families*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Lawrence, Keith, ed. *Asian American Literature: An Encyclopaedia for Students*. ABC-CLIO, 2021.

Lee, Erika. *The Making of Asian America: A History*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2014.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Lee, Jonathan. *Japanese Americans: The History and Culture of a People*. New York: ABC-CLIO, 2017.

Lee, Robert G., and Wanni W. *Anderson*. Displacements and Diasporas: Asians in the Americas. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2005.

Leong, A. *Roots of the Issei: Exploring Early Japanese Newspapers*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2018.

Liao, Pei-chen. *'Life Writing, Cultural Memory, and Historical Mediation in Julie Otsuka's When the Emperor Was Divine.' Life Writing Vol*. 15, no. 4 (2018): 505-521.

Ling, Jinqi. *'Race, Power, and Cultural Politics in John Okada's No-No Boy.' American Literature Vol*. 67, no. 2 (1995): 359-381.

Littrup, Lisbeth. *Identity in Asian Literature*. London: Curzon Press, 1996.

Ma, Sheng-mei. *Diaspora Literature and Visual Culture: Asia in Flight*. N.p., Taylor & Francis, Abingdon: 2010.

Maclear, Kyo. *It Began With a Page: How Gyo Fujikawa Drew the Way*. New York: Harper Collins, 2019.

Mailer, Norman. *The Naked and the Dead*. New York: Harper Perennial, 2006.

Makabe, T. *Picture Brides: Japanese Women in Canada*. Ontario: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1995.

Mallet, Shelley. *'Understanding Home: a Critical Review of the Literature.' The Sociological Review Vol*. 52, No. 1 (2004): 62-89.

Malos. *E*. (ed.) The Politics of Housework. London: Allison and Busby, 1980.

Manzo, Lynne C. *and Patrick Devine-Wright*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2020.

Massey, Doreen. *'Places and Their Pasts.' History Workshop Journal Vol*. 39, No. 1 (1995): 182-192.

Mochizuki, Ken, and Kiku Hughes. *Those Who Helped Us: Assisting Japanese Americans During the War*. Seattle: Chin Music Press Inc, 2022.

Mohrem, Boubaker. *'Examining the Concept of the Other According to Edward W*. Said.' International Journal of Humanities vol. 6, no. 10 (2020): 1-14. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Moore, B. *Privacy: Studies in Social and Cultural History*. New York: Sharpe, 1984.

Morishima, Emily Hiramatsu. *Remembering the Internment in Post-World War II Japanese American Fiction*. Oakland: University of California, 2010.

Morrill, Stephanie. *Within These Lines*. London: Blink, 2019.

Nelson, Cary. *'Multiculturalism Without Guarantees: From Anthologies to Social Text.' The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association Vol*. 26, No. 1 (1993): 47-57.

Nguyen, Viet Thanh. *The Displaced: Refugee Writers on Refugee Lives*. New York: Abrams, 2018.

Nguyen, Viet Thanh. New York: Grove Press, 2017.

Oh, Seiwoong. *Encyclopaedia of Asian-American Literature*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2010.

Okada, John. *No-no Boy*. Washington: University of Washington Press, 2014.

Okihiro. *Gary Y., Ed*. Encyclopaedia of Japanese American Internment. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2013.

Opler, Marvin K, and Katherine Luomala et al. *Impounded People: Japanese-Americans in the Relocation Centers*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2021.

Otsuka, Julie. *The Buddha in the Attic*. London: Penguin Books, 2013.

Otsuka, Julie. *When the Emperor Was Divine*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. Washington: University of Washington Press, 1997.

Phinney, Jean S. *and Anthony D*. Ong. 'Conceptualization and Measurement of Ethnic Identity: Current Status and Future Directions.' Journal of Counselling Psychology. Vol. 54, no. 3 (2007): 271-281. https://doi.org/placeholder (accessed February 12, 2023).

Rapport, N. *and A*. Dawson. Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement. Oxford: Berg, 1998.

Robar, Keith. *Intelligence, Internment, and Relocation*. Roosevelt's Executive Order 9066: How Top Secret "MAGIC" Intelligence Led to Evacuation. Seattle: Kikar Publication, 2000.

Robertson, Jenifer. *Recreating Japanese Women, 1600-1945*. Oakland: University of California Press, 1991.

Robinson, Greg. *The Unsung Great Stories of Extraordinary Japanese Americans*. Washington: University of Washington Press, 2020.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta Publications, 1992.

Rutherford, Jonathan. *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990.

Rybczynski, W. *Home: A Short History of an Idea*. New York: Penguin Books, 1986.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Sakamoto, Pamela Rotner. *Midnight in Broad Daylight: A Japanese American Family Caught Between Two Worlds*. New York: Harper's, 2017.

Saunders, P. A Nation of Home Owners, London: Unwin-Hyman, 1990.

Saunders, P. Social Class and Stratification, London: Routledge, 1990.

Saunders, P. *' The Meaning of Home in Contemporary English Culture.* 'Housing Studies Vol. 4, No. 1 (1989): 177-192.

Saunders, P. *and P*. Williams. 'The Constitution of the Home: Towards a Research Agenda.' Housing Studies vol. 3, no. 2 (1988): 81-93.

Schoettler, Joan. *Ruth Asawa: A Sculpting Life*. Gretna: Pelican Publishing Co., 2018.

Searle, John. *R*. 'On Narrative and Narratives.' New Literary History vol. 6, no. 2 (1975): 319-332.

Shain, Yossi, and Aharon Barth. *'Diasporas and International Relations Theory.' International Organization Vol*. 57, No. 3 (2003): 449–479

Sheffer, Gabriel. *Diaspora Politics: At Home Abroad*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Shiraev, Eric B. *Cross-cultural Psychology: Critical Thinking and Contemporary Applications*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 2004.

Shiu, Anthony Sze-Fai. *'Exception(al): Apprehending the Unexpected in Japanese American Internment Literature.' Cr: The New Centennial Review Vol*. 19, no. 2 (2019): 203-230.

Smith, Z. *Age of Fear: Othering and American Identity During World War I*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019.

Soga, Keiho. Et al. *Poets Behind Barbed Wire*. Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press,1983.

Sokolowski, Jeanne. *'Internment and Post-war Japanese American Literature: Toward a Theory of Divine Citizenship' Melus Vol*. 34, no. 1 (2009): 69–93.

Somerville, P. *'Home Sweet Home: A Critical Comment on Saunders and Williams.' Housing Studies, Vol*. 4, No. 2 (1989): 113–118.

Staszak, Jean-François. *'Other/Otherness.' International Encyclopaedia of Human Geography Vol*. 8 (2009): 43-47.

Strathern, Marilyn, ed. *Shifting Contexts: Transformations in Anthropological Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Takei, George. *They Called Us Enemy*. Georgia: Top Shelf Productions, 2019.

Takei, George, Justin Eisinger, and Steven Scott. *They Called Us Enemy*. San Diego: IDW Publishing, 2019.

Tsou, Elda E. *Figures of Identity: Rereading Asian American Literature*. Columbia: Columbia University, 2008.

Tsukamoto, Tetsuz. *Shingaku Dowa Shu*. Tokyo: Yuhodo, 1914.

Tucker, A. *'In Search of Home.' Journal of Applied Philosophy, Vol*. 11, No. 2 (1994): 181-187.

Uchida, Yoshiko. *Journey to Topaz*. New York: Scribner, 1971.

Umebinyuo, Ijeoma. *Questions for Ada*. California: self-published, 2016.

Van Hear, Nicholas, and Robin Cohen. *'Diasporas and Conflict: Distance, Contiguity and Spheres of Engagement.' Oxford Development Studies Vol*. 45, No. 2 (2017): 171–184.

Wagner, D. *Checkerboard Square: Culture and Resistance in a Homeless Community*. Kansas City: West Press, 1993.

Sophie Joshua
1405142

Waldinger, Roger. *The Cross-border Connection: Immigrants, Emigrants, and Their Homelands*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Wardhaugh, J. *'The Unaccommodated Woman: Home, Homelessness and Identity.' Sociological Review Vol*. 47, No. 1(1999): 91–109.

Wu, K.M. *'The Other Is My Hell; The Other Is My Home' Human Studies Vol*. 16, No. 1-2 (1993): 193-202.

Wu, Lin. *'From Yellow Peril to Model Minority and Back to Yellow Peril'*. AERA vol. 8, no. 1 (2022): https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211067796.

Yamasaki, Katie. *Shapes, Lines and Light: My Grandfather's American Journey*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2022.

Yamazaki, Kohsuke. *'Transition of the Father's Role in Japanese Family and Culture.' Annual Report of The Clinical Centre for Infant Development, No*. 2 (1980): 43-55.

Zeleza, Paul Tiyambe. *'Rewriting the African Diaspora: Beyond the Black Atlantic.' African Affairs Vol*. 104, No. 414 (2005): 35-68.