Geopolitical Order, Social Security and Visuality: The National Film Board's Japanese Internment Project

Draft Only-Please do not cite without permission

Rob Aitken
Division of Social Science
York University, Toronto ON
Email: raitken@yorku.ca
Tel: 416.736.2100 x. 30153

Geopolitical Order, Social Security and Visuality: The National Film Board's Japanese Internment Project*

Canadian liberalism, perhaps as much as any variant of liberal government, has been confronted with a vexing puzzle relating to the questions of security and order. How is 'order' to be secured, and with what lexicon can 'order' be enunciated, in a society uniquely conceived as a humane body? Put differently, how are ordering practices to be diagrammed in relation to a national imagination and a liberal rationality which pivot, in a particular kind of way, upon self-images which project the nation as a benign, peaceable and humanitarian form. Reconciling the will to order with and within the broader rationalities of Canadian liberalism requires both the 'erasure' of ordering practices and the constitution of those practices as civilized and humane. For some commentators this has been accomplished by a national narrative which, even as it explains away the violence of imperial episodes, frames the imposition of order (and the violence it often requires) as a civilized response to 'external' sources of pathological disorder. Canadian narratives of geopolitical intervention have, in this frame, often invented a kind of disorderliness as a way to constitute itself as a source of humane practice.[1]

Narratives which constitute the nation as a humane body and the populations which require order as pathological are only one line along which these dilemmas have been addressed. The narratives, tactics and knowledge required to confront this problem of order, especially in the Canadian context, have often formed in a broader and more complex set of ways. In this paper I highlight one particular resolution of the dilemmas

* I would like to thank Tina Monaghan for valuable research assistance and support. I would also like to thank Rick Aitken, Alison Howell, Daniel Pierre-Antoine, and Bernard Lutz, archivist, at the NFB archives in Montreal for assistance, support and for several wondering conversations! The research for this project was supported by a Faculty of Arts Research Grant, York University.

presented by the question of order by retelling parts of a story about a somewhat obscure National Film Board (NFB) project relating to the Japanese Internment. Throughout the fall of 1943 and all of 1944, the National Film Board (NFB) negotiated and managed a complicated documentary film project entitled *Of Japanese Descent*. The project, which suffered strangely protracted bureaucratic negotiations, sought to portray the internment of Japanese citizens in a way that would serve 'as insurance when this is all over'. At one level the project was conceived, in both implicit and explicit ways, an act of erasure. Sponsored by the British Columbia Security Commission (BCSC), the film was conceived as a record, or quite literally as 'evidence', that could be used after the war to portray the internment as a positive and even productive experiment. In these terms, the film project was designed to expunge the violence of the interment and to serve as a document of humane practice. At another level, however, the project invoked a broader range of political technologies designed both to secure and explain order. In attempting to establish a particular narrative of the internment—one that reaffirms the nation and the kind of humane citizenship upon which it rests—the *Descent* project also became connected to a number of other projects and technologies designed, in their own way, to stabilize society and effect a certain kind of order. In these terms the *Descent* project became entangled in a broader diagram of security and order which sketched several lines connecting national security to broader modes of order and stability.

In particular I want to highlight two specific constellations of techniques that were brought into relation to the question of security and detention. First, the *Descent* project articulated the ordering practices of internment within a rationality of cultural governance. In many respects the NFB's *Descent* project was an experiment in the possibilities associated with cultural governance and with 'visuality' as a technique

capable of making the particular rationality of national/social security visible to particular audiences. As it was envisioned throughout various bureaucratic and creative debates, the project was enmeshed within a broader argument which located culture as a surface of intervention. Culture, and filmic visuality in particular, was conceived as a set of technologies capable of intervening directly within various populations related to the Internment and of shaping those populations in particular kinds of ways. In this way, the film was conceived not only as a project of erasure, but as a technique capable of shaping both populations of Japanese-Canadians as well as the working and everyday populations asked to accept those dispersed Japanese-Canadians. It is in these terms that the *Descent* project not only recorded a particular narrative of 'national danger' but also sought to bring into being—to make visible in a literal sense—a broader sense of order by mobilizing a cultural technique of intervention.

A second constellation of techniques that the *Descent* project sought—and a part of the broader terrain of order made visible in the film—relates to the domain of social security. An explicit aim of the producers, experts and bureaucrats connected to the *Descent* project was the promotion of a kind of social government and the assimilation of detainees within a unique conception of a well-integrated social body. Using a language that was shared by both architects of the internment as well as by some of its critics, the film project made visible and was part of a broader rationality which translated the question of internment—the basic 'problem' of the internment and the tactics devised to solve it—from a vocabulary of national danger to a language of social security and social integration. The *Descent* project is one of several heterogeneous attempts to diagram the question of internment as a problem solved by the creation of a well-integrated social body and a 'social' response to risk and danger.

To develop an analysis in these terms, this paper is divided into three main sections. The first section establishes the context for the paper as a whole. This section reviews some of the main ways in which the question of 'security' has come under much closer critical scrutiny over the past fifteen years. Although productive, these critical interventions have not often connected geopolitical security with ordering practices across other scales or locations. Re-threading some of the connections between geopolitical/national security and other registers of order can, this section suggests, contribute to the overall thrust of much of the critical security studies agenda that has developed over the past fifteen years. A second section turns more directly to the NFB *Descent* project as an example of precisely one project that sought a form of order not only in relation to geopolitical security but also to other kinds of rationalities designed to secure a certain form of social order or stability. This section highlights the way in which the *Descent* project attempted to author a connection between security and the broader realm of cultural governance; a realm in which visuality is framed as a pivotal surface of intervention. A third section moves to the issue of social security by foregrounding the ways in which the *Descent* initiative drew upon and helped constitute a rationality which connected the national emergency of the internment with the question of social security and a fully integrated social body. A conclusion extends the discussion of this geopolitical-cultural-social security nexus by teasing out some of the broader implications of this film project. By articulating order in terms of cultural governance and an emergent rationality of social security, this paper underscores the importance of developing critical analyses capable of making security visible as an ensemble of practices connected not only to geopolitical life, but to a heterogeneous range of rationalities of government. This kind of approach, I conclude, can offer a useful critique

in particular of the kinds of liberalism prevalent in Canadian discourses of domestic order and foreign policy not only by connecting them to each other but by more directly placing liberal rationalities concerned with humane practice alongside other discourses and practices—detention, dispersal, imperialism—from which they seek, in such a fundamental manner, to distance themselves.

1 Internment, Security, Order

'Security', although central to both the practice and theoretical landscape of International Relations (IR) and foreign policy analysis, has only recently been subjected to serious critical scrutiny. Over the past fifteen years various critical interrogations have sought, in different ways, to open up the status of 'security' as an unproblematized concept. At one level, some critical interventions have sought to broaden the domain that is normally constituted in relation to security. From a number of different fronts, the territory of 'security'—what counts as a question of 'security', what kinds of pressures and forces are most critically central to the security of human (or ecological) life—has been expanded. Spanning a diverse set of political and theoretical commitments, writers and activists began, over the past decades, to assert a kind of security language and practice related to 'human', 'environmental', 'food' or 'health' security.[2] Although the political and theoretical motives connected to these expansive gestures are diverse, many are animated as attempts to broaden or reclaim the resonances of security or the kinds of ways in which 'security' is mobilized as a way to organize particular sets of social relations beyond the very narrow conception of security as a geopolitical or military practice. 'Human' security is, perhaps, the form of this expansive agenda for security which has become enmeshed within institutional networks at both a national and global level in the most significant manner. Seeking to redefine security in terms of individual

(and not state) agency, and to locate "the individual at the centre of debate, analysis and policy," human security has become a significant policy focus in a range of domestic and multilateral settings.[3]

At another level, there has also been a useful set of critical interventions which have foreground more clearly the political and cultural process associated with the invocation of security. Many critics influenced by a diverse set of perspectives—variants of post-structuralism, contructivism or cultural studies—contest the conception of 'security' as an unproblematic or already-existing kind of category. This unproblematic diagram of security ignores the conditions and knowledge which need to be constituted to deploy or speak security in any particular manner. Moreover, security is conceived not as an unproblematic depiction of some reality which exists prior to outside of any discourse or representation, but, precisely, as a practice which often brings particular forms of reality into being. Various critical approaches—critical geopolitics, the Copenhagen school or critical security studies—have made security visible as a set of practices deeply implicated in the constitution of danger and insecurity. Conceiving security as a discourse, a construction or a speech-act, these various critical approaches have made security visible not as a given or rational response to the given conditions of danger or risk (anarchy) but as a social or cultural practice which constitutes risk and danger in very particular and partial ways. These attempts have ranged from post-structuralist attempts to situate 'security' as a relational category inextricably linked to the constitution of identity, to Bubant's call for modes of analysis capable of locating security "as a socially situated and discursively defined practice."[4]

For the Copenhagen school, for example, security is not a given category, but rather the cultural residue of a process of 'securitization' which ultimately labels social

and political events in ways (often invoking the language of emergency, risk, threat and danger) that elevate those events above the realm of normal political discourse and process, and insulate them from normal rules of political deliberation or contestation. From this perspective security does not, at least in any simple sense, reflect an objective reality, but rather, is a 'speech act' and a process ('securitization') that brings into being a particular kind of political condition and relation.[5]

From a different location, Michael Shaprio, Simon Dalby, Gearoid O'Tuathail and David Campbell, among others, have enunciated the terms of a critical geopolitics which conceives of geopolitical reasoning as a form of knowledge deeply implicated in the constitution of 'danger' in ways that often establish normative grids of 'self' and 'other'; grids deeply implicated in the justification of violence and intervention.[6] David Campbell, for example, drawing upon the work of William Connolly and others, implicates American foreign policy in the constitution and stabilization of American identity. In Campbell's configuration, identity is a fundamental, if highly contested condition of political and social life. No space, body or category has a natural or unproblematic identity. Rather the identity of all bodies is constituted in language, discourse and in complex practices which constantly perform and ennunciate its basic contours.

For Campbell, however, the identity of all bodies is performed not in any completely arbitrary manner, but often in relation to and as a confrontation with difference. American identity marks itself (especially, in a particular way, in the discourses of foreign policy) by demarcating itself against an external space of estranged otherness. "The definition of difference," notes William Connolly, "is a requirement built into the logic of identity, and the construction of otherness is a temptation that readily

insinuates itself into that logic."[7] In this formulation identity and difference form an often unacknowledged yet inextricable dialogue (a domain of identity/difference) in which each (re)constitutes the other. The "constitution of identity," argues Campbell, "is achieved through the inscription of boundaries that serve to demarcate an 'inside' from an 'outside', a 'self' from an 'other', a 'domestic' from a 'foreign'."[8]

The critical geopolitics agenda has, over the past fifteen years, instigated diverse kinds of analyses of the deployment of geopolitical reasoning across a wide range of practices and forms of knowledge: formal state policy domains, discourses relating to state sovereignty, public migration debates, political interventions aimed at immigration, territorial disputes or aboriginal/indigenous struggles as well as geopolitical knowledge constituted in political cartoons, popular culture, travel writing or national cinema.[9] Despite this immense diversity, critical geopolitics has established a common line of analysis which links the constitution of security and insecurity with the formation of identities of both 'self' and 'other'. Treating neither in/security nor identity as self-evident or given, critical geopolitics has opened a useful line of analysis which frames the formation of self and external insecurity as mutually-implicated pactices. "Insecurity," write Weldes et al, "is the product of processes of identity construction in which the self and the other, or multiple others, are constituted."[10] In contrast to conventional approaches to global politics and foreign policy, insecurity and danger are not automatically understood as threats to the internal integrity of the nation, but are discursive materials from which that national body itself gains identity and definition. "The constant articulation of danger through foreign policy," attests Campbell, "is thus not a threat to a state's identity or existence: it is its condition of possibility."[11]

These moves to pry open critical space around the concept of security have been productive in many respects. At one level, these analyses have begun to disturb a concept that, although long central to IR, has often occupied a kind of 'given' or unproblematized status. At another, and perhaps more important level, however, these critical voices have also constituted a timely intervention in a geo/political and cultural context that has become, once again, pressed in, in one or another, by the logic of security. Security increasingly occupies a place that is central to our political present: resonant in networks and islands of 'black sites', in novel modes of detention and 'rendition', and in expansive modes of surveillance. These security practices not only situate violent interventions in spaces beyond the normal domain of political debate, but are beginning to contribute to a re-definition of the 'political' as an 'exceptional' sphere. As Agamben notes, security "becomes the basic principle of state activity" in a way that makes the 'exception' the dominant mode of political deliberation. This increasing resonance of insecurity and the constant "reference to a state of exception", according to Agamben, constitutes a shift in the logic of political life that is fundamentally irreconcilable with democracy.[12]

In this context—a context, Agamben notes, in which the 'camp' exists as a central metaphor for our political present—critical security analyses acquire a certain practical urgency. In our geo/political present, there is a great deal of political urgency associated with the need to open and craft critical devices related to the question of security and to the ways in which its shadow of 'exception' is increasingly becoming routine. Perhaps precisely because of this urgency it is critically necessary, however, to explore ways in which the critique of security can be deepened and probed in different directions. Although these critical interventions have all opened the question of security, they have not as fully interrogated the ways in which projects of 'security' have been attached to or

resonant with other projects of 'social', 'cultural' or 'political' order and stability. Although the critical turn in security studies has allowed us to disturb and problematize appeals to security, they have less frequently been used to explore the dense relations between projects aimed at geopolitical security and broader fields of stability and order. It is precisely within the lines which connect 'national security' with broader projects of order and social stability that many variants of liberal government—including the forms of liberal government associated with Canadian foreign policy—have sought to situate themselves; lines that have often been drawn to resolve a kind of puzzle about how practices imagined as humane can simultaneously secure, order and stabilize.

2 Cultural Governance: Making Order In/Visible

The period just before and during World War II (WWII) was crucial for the formation of liberal government in Canada. Partly in the context of geopolitical turmoil, modes of liberal government were re/framed in this period in ways that begin to sketch out (or at least experiment with) a specific way to resolve the tension between the need to impose order and a form of liberal authority particularly articulated in a humanitarian language. Beginning in the autumn of 1943 the National Film Board developed a project it attempted to insert into this tension in a particular set of ways. The project—*Of Japanese Descent*—quickly became both an important and a complicated project for the NFB. Many of the complications related to the involvement of a web of bureaucratic agencies. Most significant among these entanglements was the British Columbia Security Commission (BCSC) the body that was given formal authority by the federal government to manage wartime security concerns in British Columbia as well as the overall internment. The BCSC officially sponsored the film as a way to dramatize a certain version of the internment in positive tones. The NFB enthusiastically accepted the

sponsorship by signalling a desire to deliver a film consistent with the needs of the commission. The BCSC, writes the first NFB producer of the project, "have their own funds…We would receive payment from the BC Security Commission. We would also keep editorial and technical supervision…and protect the sponsor's interests during production."[13]

At one level the film project, which figured itself as a kind of realism of the internment, can be read as an act of erasure. The earliest correspondence and documentation related to the production clearly mobilize the project as a way of constructing a particular narrative of the internment. The narrative put forward, even from the beginning of the project, was a defensive story designed to erase the violence and exclusion of the internment. "I think," writes NFB producer Dallas Jones in a note to Ottawa, that "there is rather a good film to be made here and a necessary one as an insurance against criticism when this is all over."[14]

As an act of erasure, the film project sought, quite literally, to make visible a very particular dramatization of the internment and, as a consequence, to render invisible—to expunge from the field of vision—much of the violence unleashed during the process of forcible removal, detention and dispersal. In seeking to invent this benign image of the internment, *Descent* attempted to reconfigure the internment into something familiar and legible in terms of the normal parameters of political, legal and social life. For Agamben the 'camp' is emblematic of a process through which human life and political order are reduced to 'bare life'. The camp implies a violation and devaluation of the rule of law and the rendering of the 'exception' as a normal condition.[15] In these terms, the *Descent* project sought to figure the internment precisely not in terms of the exception but within the parameters of the normal political and social order. The project, from its earliest

discussions, sought to make visible the internment in a particular kind of familiar and benign lexicon; a lexicon that rendered the 'exception' invisible. A striking series of correspondence between the on-site NFB producer and Ross Mclean, a key Ottawa NFB executive, foregrounds a desire to make the internment visible in these kinds of ways, and to render any trace of the 'exceptions' invisible. In one exchange, the producer, Dallas Jones, cautions against an early production schedule because filming conditions may make the internment visible as 'a sort of penal colony'; a kind of image (and a kind of 'exception' in Agamben's sense) incompatible with the benign story NFB officials wanted to produce. In this exchange, Jones makes explicit his desire to erase the status of the internment as a camp and as an 'exception':

> I feel I must recommend that production be delayed until April or May of next year. There is snow on the ground now and it will remain until March or April…It covers the natural beauty of the area and makes the little unpainted houses look quite miserable. The little gardens and rock landscaping is covered up leaving only ugly rocks in front of most houses that give the *appearance of a sort of penal colony*…Generally there is something Siberia-like in the community's appearance which will show up in our shooting much worse than it really is. The life looks hard, living looks difficult, and the people will look overburdened...[16]

In this exchange the physical reality of the camp itself proves an obstacle to the kind of imagined account the producers want to envision. The experts—producers, designers and writers—associated with *Descent* sought literally to make visible, and simultaneously, to erase a particular way of seeing the internment.

Although clearly framed, at least in part, as a project of erasure (an erasure made occasionally difficult by the 'bare life' of the camp itself), the *Descent* project was not a project that pivots around a single or monolithic rationality. At another level, the project was oriented around a range of other rationalities and practices. At the center of some of

the broader context in which the project took form is a rationality of cultural governance; a particular way of bringing 'culture' into relation with the 'conduct of conduct'. There are at least two main ways in which the *Descent* project was enmeshed within particular notions of cultural governance. On one hand, the project clearly has resonances with a mode of cultural governance related to national space and the production of national narrative. Throughout the twentieth century 'culture' is used in many locations, in both implicit and explicit ways, across a wide range of genres and practices, to secure the imagined space of the nation and to mark out a sense of national purpose among populations. The development of early state-led cultural policies, the emergence of 'mass' cultural forms (radio, muralism, national film and cinema) and the promotion of national languages and art genres all formed key components of an attempt to fashion a sense of national purpose, space and cohesion. As Michael Shapiro notes:

> …various official and artistic genres, under varying degrees of state control, have been instruments of national culture formation…vehicles of 'national narratives', the temporal frames within which states have sought nation-state status as coherent cultural as well as territorial entities. State-sponsored cultural governance…[seeks] a coherent culture, united on the basis of shared descent or, at least, incorporating a 'people' with a historically stable coherence, and inasmuch as few—if any—states contain coherent historically stable communities of shared descent, the symbolic maintenance of the nation-state requires a contentious management of historical narratives as well as territorial space.[17]

On the other hand, however, the *Descent* project, like much of the NFB over this moment, pursued a second and slightly different form of cultural governance.[18] More broadly, the architects of the *Descent* project conceived of culture—and filmic visuality in particular—as a kind of surface of intervention. For the producers and experts who became connected to the NFB and to this project, 'culture' was conceived as a kind of technology that could be used directly to intervene into the ways in which human conduct

could be governed and shaped. As Bennett notes, the emergence and institutionalization of 'culture' over the nineteenth century in the form of public museums, libraries and other initiatives, was inextricably also an attempt to impose a certain set of 'stabilities of conduct'. Culture, variously figured as the public museum, the lending library, or the repertoire of instructional and classical literature connected to the 'self culture' movement, was constituted as a set of technologies capable of slicing into and shaping conduct within everyday contexts.[19] For Bennett, 'cultural governance' comes to refer, broadly to "the varying ways in which different kinds of cultural knowledge are translated into the varying technical forms through which new realities are produced and sustained, and brought to bear on the regulation of conduct."[20]

Throughout the early moments of the NFB, and certainly predating the *Descent* project, key producers and experts began to conceive of the agency in these terms of the 'regulation of conduct'. John Grierson, the first Director of the NFB and one of the key forces associated with the documentary film movement in the Anglo-American world, consistently articulated the role of film in the specification of new forms of citizenship and conduct. For Grierson, the dramatic and visual components of film, in particular, were useful in establishing and making visible the parameters of new forms of conduct. Film, and its capacity to invoke the 'lively picture' is afforded a privileged location in the technologies required to instrumentalize particular forms of conduct and citizenship:

> For young people and adults alike require a broad and lively picture of their society to stir their imaginations and instil the loyalties necessary if they are to face up to its problems. In short, we felt that the dramatic pattern could convey a sense of growth and movement and opposition…Behind the documentary film from the first was a purpose…to 'bring alive' to the citizen the world in which his citizenship lay, to 'bridge the gap' between the citizen and his community…[21]

In important respects, the *Descent* project itself is a reflection of this attempt to translate the ‘lively picture’ of filmic visuality into new configurations of citizenship and conduct; to make visible, in a literal sense, the requirements of reformed conduct. The production documents related to the project are criss-crossed with an almost urgent need to maximize the efficiency of visual transmission as a technology capable of disseminating a particular rationality of citizenship; both among the interned population as well as the population of ‘average’ citizens beyond the camp borders. The main way in which the film was framed in this way was as a political-cultural technology capable of infinite circulation. Circulation was key to the cultural vision of the NFB throughout the Grierson period. Upon establishing the NFB, Grierson instituted a system of film ‘circuits’ designed to increase dramatically the reach of films among ‘everyday’ populations. Each circuit, often coordinated by volunteers armed with film prints and projectors, screened public-interest films and documentaries, for free, in a range of workplaces, churches, community groups, schools and related settings. By 1944-45, the NFB had established three main circuits; a system of 92 rural circuits across all parts of the country, a dense network of 46 industrial circuits designed ‘to bring films to industrial workers’ and a smaller series of ‘Trade Union Circuits’ coordinated jointly with national labour organizations and focused on specialized labour films. The various circuits combined, by 1945, had cultivated an estimated monthly audience for films which topped 300 000.[22]

It is in this context that the *Descent* project was most primarily conceived as a technology of circulation. Much of the administrative discussion around the project pivots on the ways in which the film can be established in a kind of circuit at the heart of internment project. The film was conceived and managed not only as a record or

particular narrative of the internment, but also, and perhaps most importantly, as a device capable of circulating among and, as a consequence, intervening into the lives of everyday Japanese and non-Japanese citizens. The project is animated by a sense that it will most primarily be *useful* as a way to circulate a certain set of ideas not of the internment but of the conduct necessary among everyday populations to cope with specific aspects of the internment and its aftermath. In a telling note sent to the Department of Labour, an NFB producer signals the desire to place the film in the Industrial circuit program as a way to 'prepare' everyday workers for the inclusion of dispersed Japan workers in the next phase of the internment project. In this configuration the film can make visible what is required of industrial workers as they accept Japanese detainees 'on the bench beside them' after the internment is over:

> The question of timing comes up in considering distribution to industrial audiences to prepare men and women in industry for a Japanese on the bench beside them…We are prepared to place the film on our industrial circuit program…The important thing is that the circuits are available to you and the film should be ready for distribution when the time is right.[23]

The film was also centrally designed to circulate among the interned population itself. In much of the correspondence around the project, the film was urgently situated as a tool that could be used to 'educate' the interned population and, by using a universal language of visuality, to 'prepare' that population for life after internment. This post-interment existence rests on a vision of permanent dispersal of the population across and into other parts of the country. The film was located in the context of this dispersal project as a technology that could help envision this project and help implant it among the interned population. Established in this way, the film was conceived not so much as a document *of* the interment but as a force that could circulate *through* the internment and

its displaced bodies. The film was almost urgently framed as a technique that could circulate among the detained population and, because of its visual properties, could 'arouse' support for the kind of conduct required as the internment became a project centered on 'dispersal':

> The Japanese in BC settlements should be shown the film as soon as it is finished. In this way they can be told more about the opportunities and living conditions available to them in the east and their more favourable interest can be aroused in the prospect of moving east and becoming self-supporting themselves.[24]

Running through the bureaucratic discourse around the project is this particular rationality of cultural governance as well as the role the film could occupy as a technology of circulation designed not only to dramatize the internment but to intervene within populations—both inside and outside of the camp—most deeply effected by the interment and its aftermath. The film served not only as a backward reflection on the internment and its reasons for being, but also as a productive attempt to intervene in the future course of the internment and its populations. As a technology of circulation—and one that relied on what the producers conceived of as a universal language of visuality—the *Descent* project attempted to shape the populations it sought to reach by cultivating a kind of conduct consistent with the objectives of detention and dispersal. In the words of one NFB official, the film could circulate among both the interned and the 'outside' populations and, quite literally, make the populations visible to each other. The film operates as a technology capable of bringing these separated populations 'together first in understanding'. As a consequence, the film itself is conceived as a kind of pre-condition of any 'permanent solution' to the 'Japanese problem':

> For the Future we recognize that probably the first step toward a permanent solution of the Japanese 'problem' will be to relocate the Canadian-born

> Japanese in small groups of families outside their former isolationist colonies in British Columbia. Since by such a plan they would be settled among new white neighbours, people who do not know them and with whom they are unfamiliar, such a fresh start would be made much easier if the two groups—the Japanese and the Eastern Canadians—were brought together first in understanding.[25]

In these terms, the project seeks to create a kind of flimic space in which the dispersal and enounter can be negotiated in advance of but also as a pre-condition of an encounter in 'real' space. The flim becomes a technique capable of enacting the encounter of dispersal (and of establishing a kind of flimic familiarity) in a space that travels before but as part of the dispersal. The flim project, and the flimic space of encounter it creates, becomes a kind of technique of dispersal itself. This formulation pushes in two directions. In one way, this formulation locates the *Descent* project within a particular rationality of cultural governance—a technology of circulation—capable of ensuring that both displaced and privileged populations are 'brought together first in understanding'. In this connection the project architects sought a certain kind of social stability and security not only by specifying the terrain of national/geopolitical security, but also by mobilizing a certain kind of cultural technique. In a related by slightly different direction, however, the language of dispersal, relocation and social integration points to another way in which the film project seeks a certain form of security and stability—the terrain and logic of *social* security.

3 Securing the Social Body: *Descent* and the Translation of Internment

After short stints in the British documentary film movement and with the Empire Marketing Board, John Grierson came to Canada to reorganize government film initiatives, and, after a series of bureaucratic struggles, to establish the NFB. He imported with him a particular form of liberal internationalism, a keenness for the mode of social

science established in Chicago, and an emerging interest in social government and the terrain of social security. For Grierson, the key object of cultural governance—and the key space animated by the work of documentary film—was the 'social' figured as a cohesive and systematic space within which individuals and individual action were to be enmeshed and governed. Grierson sought a new order—an order in which culture would be deeply implicated—which both prefigured an active individual citizenship and, drawing on notions of social security, located those individuals within a broader unified 'social' field. The "problems of a modern highly developed industrial economy," notes Grierson, "involve the creative action of the community operating as a single, integrated and unified force."[26]

The social is a particular form of governmentality in which security of the population is coterminous with the security of society as a self-contained totality. Problems are not conceived in terms of individual pathology or moral weakness but in a language of society as a whole. To establish social government requires the promotion of both individual action and the specification of that action within a social body that is unified and functional. For Grierson, film could occupy a spot central to this world of social security as a form of cultural practice which could both dramatize the world to everyday populations and help those populations make sense of their own role and 'function' within the social body. This new social order requires a new form of culture, and film in particular, that, unlike the superficial culture of feature film, can help instrumenalize the active bonds of the social world. As Grierson attests, documentary film could help picture the world of the social by making visible, not an escape from the world, but the threads that connect individuals—organically—to the social world and the roles they play within that integrated world:

> We do not get the picture of a public bent to the last button on entertainment and escape…[but rather] a people who are hungry for a knowledge of the future, for a chance to understand what is in the making, and how they can best participate in it; not only as to its benefits, but as to its duties….The people as we know them want film materials which will help them in their actual and present citizenship: films about farming and farming research, about housing and community halls, about credit unions and cooperatives, about a world which is organically related to their own interests and their own functions within the nation…[27]

One of the main ways in which this rationality of social security was made visible in the *Descent* project is in terms of the incorporation of the detained population into the functional space of 'society'. Much of the planning for the film, for example, seeks to center the narrative on the ways in which the interned population—often figured as a single body—could be integrated into the fabric of society and economy. There is almost no explicit attempt to constitute the interned population in demonized terms as a degraded, pernicious or dangerous 'other'. Rather, the project architects are keen to depict the body of the interned population as a form that can be easily meshed within the larger body of 'normal' society. The stress, in this formulation, is on the kinds of 'functions' the interned population can occupy within society and the ways in which incorporation into 'society' can maximize the 'usefulness' of the internees. "The film should be a report on a wartime emergency relocation of a minority group," argued producer Dallas Jones, "and its re-establishment in useful work…By discussing…their skills in relation to the Canadian economy, their industry and commercial efficiency…it will indicate their usefulness as Canadian citizens…"[28]

Perhaps the most significant way in which this rationality of social security was articulated in and through the *Descent* project was in terms of relocation and reintegration. Although the project was initially conceived, and commissioned, as a

record of the internment itself, it became primarily focused on the prospect of relocation and dispersal as key to any 'permanent solution'. The narrative figured in the final versions of the film and script equated 'integration' with dispersal. In this configuration, only the dispersal of a racialized group into geographically-dispersed and diluted spaces, could, at the same time, facilitate the integration of that group into the social and national body. The film, by the end of the protracted negotiations that led to its production, became a story most clearly centered on the 'national experiment' of dispersal and reintegration and on the ethic of relocation/re-settlement. As one producer notes, the "film has been broadened to include the whole Japanese concentration and dispersal program including the work in Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec…a record of a national experiment in re-establishing a minority group in useful wartime work."[29]

This attempt to secure society within an integrationist logic was shared by both the proponents and critics of the internment. Not only was this ethic keenly supported by those who were purposely positive of the internment like the *Descent* project, but also by voices critical of the internment and the human rights abuses the internment unleashed. The Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians (CCJC), a progressive coalition of church, labour and social-democratic organizations opposed to the internment, occupied a different vector of this same rationality of relocation. Although the CCJC consistently challenged the government's position regarding its ability to detain and to deport Canadian citizens (and eventually launched a somewhat successful legal challenge) it also established a point of affinity with the government regarding the need for relocation. For the CCJC, the internment was an affront to the rights of both citizens and non-citizens who were detained, stripped of property and subject to unreasonable disruption of most civil rights. The internment also, more importantly, interrupted the ability of detainees—

a population, the CCJC notes, that is characterized by its 'conspicuous energy and enterprise'—to participate in society and to realize their own commercial and social potentials. In this formulation, integrating Japanese-Canadians within the body of the social, and allowing those populations (and society as a whole) to instrumentalize their own enterprise, is conceived as a solution not only to the internment but also to the broader problems of 'racial' and 'occupational' concentration. Geographical and occupational dispersal both remedies some of the excessive abuses associated with the internment—'the abnormal conditions'—and helps integrate the interned population, and their enterprise, into society:

> It is imperatively necessary that…the evacuaees find relatively permanent homes and become economically self-supporting. If lifted from despair by wise and humane treatment, and scattered—a few families here and a few families there—throughout the Dominion, they would soon cease to present Canada with any problem of great magnitude…In the concentration settlements, social and economic conditions are so abnormal as to ensure the progressive deterioration of people formerly conspicuous for energy and enterprise.[30]

In these various ways, the film came to reflect and constitute a kind of shared narrative of internment, displacement, relocation and social security. Relocating and dispersing the interned population—and securing the social body—could all be achieved as part of a broader project of social security/social integration. As it existed both in and outside of the *Descent* project, however, this narrative came to operate as a kind of translation device. By enmeshing internment and relocation within the project of social integration and within the language and practice of social security, the film project (and the broader body of discourse it was situated in) translates the experience of the camp, to use Agamben's term, into a language consistent not only with social cohesion but also with humane practice. The film and the broader discourse of relocation finds a particular

way to 'cleanse' the internment by specifying it in a language and practice oriented around social belonging, solidarity, integration and individual activation. This is not to suggest that the discourse of relocation is somehow 'ideological' in that it only mystifies or falsifies reality by obscuring the basic violence or inequality of social life. Rather, the discourse the film evokes *translates* the experience of internment/relocation by making it legible in a different kind of language and practice; a cleansed language associated with humane and tolerant practice.

The narrative of *Descent* invokes this very act of translation in a number of ways. At one level the film layout and script sought to make visible the internment in this larger context of social governance; to literally make the internment visible as a problem of social governance. The script accomplishes this, in part, by explicitly reframing the internment away from the language of the camp. In the terms enunciated by the narration, the internment is not, in fact, a camp in any meaningful kind of manner. "It should be made clear," the script argues, "that Japanese residents in these towns are NOT living in interment camps…*Guards with bayonets and barbed wire fences have not been necessary*."[31] It is in this way that the script, in a quite literal sense, seeks to translate the experience of the camp into a lexicon of humane treatment.

At another level, however, project architects also, sometimes urgently, sought to translate the question of 'internment' into 'social governance' as a way to constitute and provoke, in a real kind of way, a particular national narrative of humane practice. That is, the project sought not only to interpret the internment in a particular way, but also to use the particular narrative as a way—as a technique—to translate the internment into a practice that could facilitate and help deepen a national commitment to humane and tolerant practice. As an act of translation, the film sought to rework the internment into a

site at which the nation finds and sharpens its self-articulation as a humane body. At stake in the film is not just the need to evoke a particular story of the internment, but also to construct, in a real kind of depth, a sense of tolerance and humanitarianism. For some of those who worked to create the film, the practice of internment and relocation could be used to translate the internment by constituting it as a moment—perhaps even a formative moment—in a national self-image as a source of humane practice:

> In this concept [relocation], I think it will have a purpose beyond mere evidence in case of political or international dispute. It may do something to promote in Canadian thought an attitude of tolerance—careful tolerance if you like but certainly an understanding—for those Japanese-Canadians who have declared loyalty to Canada and who will be the source of much difficulty when the war is finished.[32]

In this formulation, the translation of internment is well framed but also somewhat fragile. On one hand, the film narrates a particular connection between relocation/internment and the broader terrain of humane practice. This nicely punctuates the ways in which the internment itself was figured not only in terms of geopolitical reasoning but also in connection to broader forms of cultural and social security. On the other hand, however, the formulation reveals a certain fragility. The concept, it is argued, can achieve, perhaps, only a 'careful tolerance'; a tolerance that may not be able to overcome the essential difficulty of the moment. It is this fragility and difficulty—the difficulty of social integration, the difficulty of enunciating the claim of integration, the difficulty of maintaining a particularly liberal claim of human practice in the context of displacement and detainment—that provides and makes visible both the urgency of this act of translation but also something of the strategic-critical possibilities inherent in disrupting what, beneath the surface in any case, may be only a partially-resonant or achievable claim.

Conclusion

In March 2006, at a moment which marked the 3rd anniversary of the American invasion of Iraq, a small protest snaked its way through the downtown of Ottawa en route to Parliament Hill. Although it lacked the strange euphoria and power of the protests that opposed the beginning of the war in 2003, the Ottawa rally did nonetheless place into relief some of the complexities and antinomies of the moment. Particularly striking was a reworked anti-war sentiment which targeted not only (or even mainly) the American presence in Iraq but also the Canadian complicity in Afghanistan as well as the broader sympathy of the new Conservative government with the foreign policy goals of the Bush administration. In ways that echo the moment of the Japanese Internment sixty years earlier, the most poignant framings of these strands of sentiment (linking nation and the geopolitics of order) were visual. One quiet visual residue of the protest entailed a reworking of the National Peacekeeping Monument. Occupying a highly charged symbolic space between the National Gallery and the American embassy, the Monument was reclaimed with a small banner which revised an inscription on the back side of the structure's base; rewriting 'In the Service of Peace' to 'In the Service de l'imperialisme'. (See Figure 1) Simple at first glance, the visual gesture is striking in the way in which it immediately destabilizes a mythic diagram of Canadian identity and Canadian work in the world. Literally re-presenting the Monument and the practice most central to Canadian sensibilities of its status in the world—peacekeeping—the *L'Imperialisme* gesture both foregrounds and disrupts a narrative which diagrams the nation as a particularly humane body. This disruptive strategy, simple and striking, dislocates the national narrative of humane practice, by laying a statement of imperial endeavour alongside/across an iconic

representation deeply implicated in our understanding of Canada as a particularly humane and peaceable body.

Figure 1 *In the Service/Au Service De L'Imperialism*

This disruptive gesture emphasizes both the enormous resonance of this national narrative of a humane body as well as the kinds of critical strategies that can be crafted in its wake. In its own particular way, this paper has tried to foreground something of what is at stake in a variant of liberal government particularly reliant on a self-image as a uniquely humane force in the world. As the story of the *Descent* project affirms, the form of humane Canadian liberalism which was forged in and around World War II was confronted with a complicated puzzle. How can humane liberal government be reconciled with order, imperialism and detention? The *Descent* project outlined in this paper both highlights one particular resolution to this puzzle and reveals how much practical work is required to confront and overcome—if in even a haphazard or fleeting

manner—this particular problem. In addressing this puzzle in a particular way, the *Descent* project not only mobilized a familiar story about geopolitical necessity, but also invoked a series of associations to broader forms of social stability and security involving both a particular conception of cultural governance and a rationality of social security/social integration. By invoking these broader associations the film project was able to serve as a technology of translation by reframing the experience of internment/relocation into the practice and language of humanitarian form.

As the *L'Imperliasme* gesture implies, however, the ability to overcome this puzzle, or, put differently, to write in fluent modes of translation, is fragile and uncertain. Just as the architects of the *Descent* project can never fully suppress their anxiety about the quality and durability of their translations, the broader status of a national self-image as uniquely benign and peaceable can never be secured in any final manner. Although, for example, Canadian narratives of liberal government and of its place in the world remain uniquely tied to a discourse of non-imperialism, those narratives can be displaced and overturned by a simple moment of wordplay. [fn here new policy document and non-imperialism]

Perhaps because of the enormous resonance of this discourse of humaneness, and because of the puzzle it creates in terms of reconciling its self-image as a humane body with the need to impose order and ordering practices, the conditions for novel critical strategies is both more daunting and available than normally implied. As the *L'Imperliasme* gesture suggests, laying the images of a humane body alongside those practices it so urgently seeks to displace (order, violence, imperialism) can often be an effective critical strategy; a strategy aimed at disrupting the national narrative not as some unproblematic reflection of geo/political reality, but as an attempt to constitute and

translate that narrative or reality in the first place. This laying alongside—finding ways to situate humane and ordering practices in the same shared field—is an analytical strategy that can open critical spaces in and around the images that are most central to and yet most unquestioned in relation to Canada in the world. This paper has sought to invoke such a critical strategy in a particular way by placing one attempt at humane intervention in a broader field of practices concerned with several different forms of order—social, cultural, geopolitical. This kind of strategy, in turn, can help open some critical space not only around the complexities and puzzles of Canadian liberalism, but also, perhaps around the question of 'security' itself; a concept that has received critical attention but which is still too often conceived in a kind of abstract manner—as national or geopolitical security—somehow outside of and external from other projects designed to secure order and stability. In a moment which once again figures 'security' as a center of our political present, no task, it would seem, occupies or requires greater critical scrutiny and energy than making visible the lines which connect it to and translate it into the broader fabrics of social and cultural life.

[1] See, for example, Sherene Razack, *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004)
[2] See, for example, Simon Dalby, *Environmental Security* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), Ken Conca and Geoffrey D. Dalbelko (eds) *Environmental Peacemaking* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2002), Ronnie D. Lipschutz, *After Authority: War, Peace and Global Politics in the 21st Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), and Ben Fine, *Consumption and the Age of Affluence: The World of Food* (New York: Routledge, 1996). Among participants in the human security debate see Joseph Nye, "Redefining the National Interest," *Foreign Affairs* July/August 1999, Fen Osler Hampson, *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2002), Lloyd Axworthy, "Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership," *International Journal* 53:2 (1997): 183-196,. For other attempts to expand the purview of security see
[3] Ramesh Thakur, "A Political Worldview," *Security Dialogue* 35:3 (2004): 347-348. See also Tara McCormack, "Rethinking Human Security," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, Town & Country Resort and Convention Center, San Diego, California, USA, March 2006, and Caroline Thomas, "A Bridge Between the Interconnected Challenges Confronting the World, *Security Dialogue* 35:3 (2004).
[4] Nils Bubandt, "Vernacular Security: The Politics of Feeling Safe in Global, National and Local Worlds," *Security Dialogue* 36:3 (2005): 275-296.
[5] See Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers-The Structure of International Security.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
[6] Some of the voices involved in the critical politics debate includes Gearoid O'Tuathail, *Critical Geopolitics: The Politics of Writing Global Space,* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), Michael J. Shapiro, "Globalization and the Politics of Discourse," *Social Text* 17:3 (Fall 1999): 111-129, R.B.J. Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), Richard Ashley, "Living on the Border Lines: Man, Postructuralism and War," *International/Intertextual Relations* Eds. James Der Derian and Michael Shapiro (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1989), David Campbell, *Politics Without Principle: Sovereignty, Ethics, and the Narratives of the Gulf War* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1993), and Michael Shapiro and Hayward Alker (Eds.), *Challenging Boundaries: Global Flows, Territorial Identities* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), and the sources reference in the notes below. For a useful review of 'discourse' in International Relations, see Jennifer Milliken, "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods," *European Journal of International Relations* 5:2 (1999): 225-254.
[7] William Connolly, *Identity/Difference: Democratic Negotiations of Political Paradox* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991): 9
[8] David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [Revised Edition] 1998): 9.
[9] See Michael J. Shapiro, *Methods and Nations: Cultural Governance and the Indigenous Subject* (New York: Routledge, 2004), and James Duncan and Derek Gregory, *Writes of Passage: Reading Travel Writing* (New York: Routledge, 1999).
[10] Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson and Raymond Duvall, "Introduction: Constructing Insecurity," *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger* Eds. Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson, and Raymond Duvall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999): 10.
[11] Campbell, *Writing Security*, 13.
[12] Giorgio Agamden, *On Security and Terror* (Frankfurt, 2001).
[13] Correspondence from Dallas Jones on Hotel Vancouver letterhead to Ross dated 17 January 1943. *Of Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada. Correspondence from Collins, the Director of the BC Security Commission to Dallas Jones, Producer at NFB in Ottawa confirms the broader intention of the BCSC to cover the 'all aspects of the Japanaese evacuation' Note, for example, a letter dated 31 January 1944. "All accounts in connection with the cost of producing this film will be paid by the BC Security Commission and I would appreciate if you would accept this as your authority to proceed to have a film produced. Any facilities which the Commission has available will gladly be extended to you for this work." *Of Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[14] Correspondence from Dallas Jones on Hotel Vancouver letterhead to Ross dated 17 January 1943. *Of Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada. See also Correspondence from Dallas Jones to Mr. A. H. Brown, Department of Labour Ottawa dated 25 February 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada: "For the present, and as evidence in possible post-war dispute, the International Red Cross and the Japanese Protecting Power have indicated a need for a film record of Canada's treatment of the Japanese."
[15] See Giorgio Agamben. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. tr. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1998).
[16] Memorandum to Ross Mclean (Assistant to John Grierson) 15th December 1943 from Dallas Jones. *Of Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada. Emphasis added.
[17] Michael J. Shapiro, "Sounds of Nationhood," *Millennium* 30:3 (2001): 583. For the full treatment of Shaprio's argument see Michael J. Shapiro, *Methods and Nations: Cultural Governance and the Indigenous Subject* (New York: Routledge,

2004).
[18] For general discussion of cultural governance, see Kenneth Thompson, "Cultural Studies, Critical Theory and Cultural Governance," *International Sociology* 16:4 (2001): 593-605, and David Campbell, "Cultural Governance and Pictorial Resistance: Reflections on the Imaging of War," *Review of International Studies* 29 (2003): 57-73.
[19] For Bennett, Cultural governance relates to "the operations of those institutions comprising the 'culture complex' within which particular kinds of knowledge and expertise translate and organize cultural resources into ways of acting on the social…with a view to bringing about particular changes, or stabilities, of conduct." See Tony Bennett, "Archaeological Autopsy: Objectifying Time and Cultural Governance," *Cultural Values* 6:1/2 (2002): 30. See also Tony Bennett, "Civic Laboratories: Museums, Cultural Objecthood and the Governance of the Social," *Cultural Studies* 19:5 (2005): in which Bennett describes cultural governmentality in terms of attention to the "differentiated surfaces of government constructed through the application of new forms of description, classification and enumeration in the context of regulatory practices." (page 541-542) For specific reference to my own conception of culture in this regard see Rob Aitken, "'A Direct Personal Stake': Cultural Economy, Mass Investment and the New York Stock Exchange," *Review of International Political Economy* 12:2 (2005): 334-363.
[20] Bennett, "Archaeological Autopsy", 30.
[21] John Grierson, *Propaganda and Education*, Public address, November 1943. Speeches file. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[22] National Film Board of Canada, *Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1944-45* (Ottawa: National Film Board of Canada, 1945).
[23] Correspondence from Dallas Jones to Mr. A. H. Brown, Department of Labour, Ottawa, dated March 3 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[24] Correspondence from Dallas Jones to Mr. A. H. Brown, Department of Labour, Ottawa, dated March 3 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada. See also Correspondence From Dallas Jones to Ross Mclean dated January 31 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.: "By reporting accurately on the life and work of those who have already come East to become self-supporting under the re-settlement plan, it will develop among British Columbia Japanese an understanding of Eastern customs and encourage more of them to migrate Eastward…"
[25] Correspondence from Dallas Jones to Mr. A. H. Brown, Department of Labour Ottawa dated 25 February 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[26] John Grierson, *Propaganda and Education*, Public address, November 1943. Speeches file. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[27] John Grierson *Films and the ILO* Philadelphia, Public address, 26 April 1944. Speeches file. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[28] Correspondence from Dallas Jones to Mr. A. H. Brown, Department of Labour Ottawa dated 25 February 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada. The 'commentary'/script also notes a certain multiple way of understanding the interned population: "some had adopted Canadian ways and lived a healthy life in good surroundings. Others lived, crowded into houses and apartments where health conditions ere below the standards.
A very large proportion lived in buildings entirely unsuitable for human use…" The script also notes, later: "Like people all over the world there are the good, the bad and the indifferent. The problem they represent has been solved only temporarily by the war. The ultimate solution will depend on the measure of careful understanding by all Canadians."
[29] Correspondence From Dallas Jones to Ross Mclean dated January 31 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.
[30] Norman F. Black, *A Challenge to Patriotism and Statesmanship* (Toronto: Christian Social Council of Toronto, July 1944) Ted William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections McMaster University Library, Hamilton Canada. Box: Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians. Folder: Japanese Canadians-miscellaneous publications [17] Black's article was circulated by the CCJC as a statement consistent with their own. See also, Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians, *Combined Report on the Men and Women's Sub-Committees of the CCJC* (Toronto: CCJC, 1 November 1943). Ted William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections McMaster University Library, Hamilton Canada. Box: Cooperative Committee on Japanese Canadians. Folder: Reports [12]: "In the occupational sphere, it is felt that no efforts should be spared to urge a diversification of employments and trades. In the realm of social problems, a wide spread contact with other Canadians must be encouraged. In the realm of political problems, every effort should be made to guard what political rights the Japanese-Canadians still enjoy, and to extend what rights they have lost because of war or other causes. In short, there is need to urge resettlement, not merely relocation."
[31] Project commentary, *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada. Emphasis added.
[32] Correspondence From Dallas Jones to Ross Mclean dated January 31 1944. *Japanese Descent* Production Files Production No. 6053, August 1945. Montreal: Archives, National Film Board of Canada.