Sample A

☑ Scoring Guideline
☑ Student Samples
☑ Scoring Commentary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score of 1</th>
<th>Score of 2</th>
<th>Score of 3</th>
<th>Score of 4</th>
<th>Score of 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Presents an overly broad topic of inquiry.</td>
<td>• Presents a topic of inquiry with narrowing scope or focus, that is NOT carried through either in the method or in the overall line of reasoning.</td>
<td>• Carries the focus or scope of a topic of inquiry through the method AND overall line of reasoning, even though the focus or scope might still be narrowing.</td>
<td>• Focuses a topic of inquiry with clear and narrow parameters, which are addressed through the method and the conclusion.</td>
<td>• Focuses a topic of inquiry with clear and narrow parameters, which are addressed through the method and the conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Situates a topic of inquiry within a single perspective derived from scholarly works OR through a variety of perspectives derived from mostly non-scholarly works.</td>
<td>• Situates a topic of inquiry within a single perspective derived from scholarly works OR through a variety of perspectives derived from mostly non-scholarly works.</td>
<td>• Situates a topic of inquiry within relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives, although connections to some works may be unclear.</td>
<td>• Explicitly connects a topic of inquiry to relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives AND logically explains how the topic of inquiry addresses a gap.</td>
<td>• Explicitly connects a topic of inquiry to relevant scholarly works of varying perspectives AND logically explains how the topic of inquiry addresses a gap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Describes a search and report process.</td>
<td>• Describes a nonreplicable research method OR provides an oversimplified description of a method, with questionable alignment to the purpose of the inquiry.</td>
<td>• Describes a reasonably replicable research method, with questionable alignment to the purpose of the inquiry.</td>
<td>• Logically defends the alignment of a detailed, replicable research method to the purpose of the inquiry.</td>
<td>• Logically defends the alignment of a detailed, replicable research method to the purpose of the inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Summarizes or reports existing knowledge in the field of understanding pertaining to the topic of inquiry.</td>
<td>• Summarizes or reports existing knowledge in the field of understanding pertaining to the topic of inquiry.</td>
<td>• Conveys a new understanding or conclusion, with an underdeveloped line of reasoning OR insufficient evidence.</td>
<td>• Supports a new understanding or conclusion through a logically organized line of reasoning AND sufficient evidence. The limitations and/or implications, if present, of the new understanding or conclusion are oversimplified.</td>
<td>• Justifies a new understanding or conclusion through a logical progression of inquiry choices, sufficient evidence, explanation of the limitations of the conclusion, and an explanation of the implications to the community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally communicates the student’s ideas, although errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization distract or confuse the reader.</td>
<td>• Generally communicates the student’s ideas, although errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization distract or confuse the reader.</td>
<td>• Competently communicates the student’s ideas, although there may be some errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization.</td>
<td>• Competently communicates the student’s ideas, although there may be some errors in grammar, discipline-specific style, and organization.</td>
<td>• Enhances the communication of the student’s ideas through organization, use of design elements, conventions of grammar, style, mechanics, and word precision, with few to no errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cites AND/OR attributes sources (in bibliography/works cited and/or in-text), with multiple errors and/or an inconsistent use of a discipline-specific style.</td>
<td>• Cites AND/OR attributes sources (in bibliography/works cited and/or in-text), with multiple errors and/or an inconsistent use of a discipline-specific style.</td>
<td>• Cites AND attributes sources, using a discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND in-text), with few errors or inconsistencies.</td>
<td>• Cites AND attributes sources, with a consistent use of an appropriate discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND in-text), with few to no errors.</td>
<td>• Cites AND attributes sources, with a consistent use of an appropriate discipline-specific style (in both bibliography/works cited AND in-text), with few to no errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview

This performance task was intended to assess students’ ability to conduct scholarly and responsible research and articulate an evidence-based argument that clearly communicates the conclusion, solution, or answer to their stated research question. More specifically, this performance task was intended to assess students’ ability to:

- Generate a focused research question that is situated within or connected to a larger scholarly context or community;
- Explore relationships between and among multiple works representing multiple perspectives within the scholarly literature related to the topic of inquiry;
- Articulate what approach, method, or process they have chosen to use to address their research question, why they have chosen that approach to answering their question, and how they employed it;
- Develop and present their own argument, conclusion, or new understanding while acknowledging its limitations and discussing implications;
- Support their conclusion through the compilation, use, and synthesis of relevant and significant evidence generated by their research;
- Use organizational and design elements to effectively convey the paper’s message;
- Consistently and accurately cite, attribute, and integrate the knowledge and work of others, while distinguishing between the student’s voice and that of others;
- Generate a paper in which word choice and syntax enhance communication by adhering to established conventions of grammar, usage, and mechanics.
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This could be the land
where everything grows.
Bulldozers had sifted up
large piece of parched woods and
worthless rocks.
Bilateral builds to be are not yet.

Meanwhile on this dust
I counted seven shapes
of sturdy grey and greens
some small and slender
vertical parallels.
No one planted them here with squared T's.
Some weblike tentacles reaching out
Toward rounded rotundas.

Molded by no one.

Here
starshaped with tiny speckles,
are these the intruder in my garden
of new seedlings?
My garden carefully fed and fettered?
Of course.
I pronounced their execution
with a pinch of my fingers.

But here
among a myriad of friends
they flourished in weedly wilderness,
boldly gracing several acres
of untended land.
Tomorrow they shall be banished from their home.

And watered by many droplets
of human sweat
will sprout another college where
disciplined minds finely honed
will grow
in carefully
planted rows.

No room for random weeds.

Abstract

Following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, US President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066, authorizing the incarceration of 110,000 Japanese Americans into internment camps. By 1943, agriculture dominated camp life, especially at the Manzanar Internment Camp in Owens Valley, California. During their internment, the Japanese Americans, unbeknownst to each other, raised a variety of gardens, including traditional Japanese ornamental gardens. The ornamental gardens ranged greatly in size and consisted of raked gravel dry gardens, cactus gardens, showy flower gardens, and ornate rock gardens. In an effort to preserve the history of the near-extinct generation of Japanese Americans, this study seeks to understand the purposes and implications of the ornamental gardens, with a focus on the Manzanar camp. In this qualitative retrospective ethnographic case study, I examine the overarching themes arising from ten interviews with WWII internees who lived at the Manzanar internment camp using the thematic analysis approach. This study found that the Japanese Americans initially raised the ornamental gardens to resist and combat their desolate, harsh environment, but these gardens had unforeseen consequences for the Manzanar community. While the gardens functioned as a pastime, a means to preserve and revive Japanese culture, and, paradoxically, an avenue to strengthen relationships with the War Relocation Authority officials, they also ultimately helped the inmates to conceptualize their highly complex experiences during WWII. This study’s findings, with a deep examination of the Manzanar camp, are aligned with broader environmental studies on the Japanese Americans during WWII, specifically with regard to the gardens functioning as acts of resistance. Looking towards the future, I recommend that further research should examine how defiant gardens throughout history compare with one another and drive the narratives of those involved.
Historical Context

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, catalyzing mass fear and mistrust of Japanese American citizens across the United States.\(^2\) Thus, on February 19th, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 which authorized the removal and incarceration of 110,000 Japanese Americans (two-thirds of whom were American citizens) living on the West Coast into temporary internment camps.\(^3\) The executive order also called for the establishment of the War Relocation Authority (WRA), the federal government agency responsible for the relocation of all Japanese people and the creation and regulation of relocation centers (internment camps).\(^4\) Beginning in August 1942, the Japanese Americans were moved into the internment camps and deprived of their civil liberties. On March 20, 1946, nearly six months after the official end of WWII, all internment camps were retired and the Japanese Americans were left to rebuild their American lives.\(^5\)

As Japanese Americans relocated into the internment camps, they were forced to leave their homes and occupations behind. In contrast to their pre-WII lives, the Japanese Americans in the camps were assigned occupations designed to aid the war effort, such as teaching, cooking, and farming.\(^6\) From the perspective of the WRA, the conditions in the internment camps generally provided the “the bare subsistence level”.\(^7\) In camp, the Japanese Americans were relegated to “simple construction barracks,” in the place of homes and provided with a few facilities and

\(^3\) Ibid, 135.
\(^5\) Ibid, 240
\(^6\) Oguzhan, 150.
services including food courts, minimal medical care, and education for their children. Despite their job assignments and their access to meager resources, the Japanese Americans found themselves with an abundance of time. After living in the camps for a few months, the internees longed to enrich camp life. They began organizing activities such as painting, pottery, baseball, fishing, farming, and gardening. Prior to WWII, Japanese Americans dominated agricultural businesses in the US. Ten years before the war, one-third of Japanese Americans in Los Angeles were gardeners. By 1940, on the West Coast more than forty-six percent of Japanese Americans were employed in agriculture, with an additional twenty-six percent employed in “agriculture-related activities such as produce businesses.” However, these pursuits had to be suspended at the start of WWII.

By 1943, agriculture came to dominate camp life. Camp community groups, led by former farmers and gardeners, and schools typically maintained the gardens and crops. Most of the internment camps had victory gardens — gardens initiated by the US government to aid the war effort. The victory gardens enriched the inmates’ government-issued diet with an increased
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variety of produce; the internees took this opportunity to plant Japanese vegetables. The Japanese Americans also constructed thousands of ornamental gardens, ranging in size from parks for all inmates to enjoy, block gardens (a set of barracks were called a block), to small personal gardens. Among these ornamental gardens were traditional raked gravel dry gardens, cactus gardens, showy flower gardens, and ornate rock gardens. The Manzanar internment camp in Owens Valley, CA became famous for the creation of Merritt Park, the most elaborate and sophisticated garden in all in of the camps. The project, featuring ponds, boulders, tea houses, and a waterfall, illustrated the complexity and magnitude of a wartime garden.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Literature Review}

In this literature review, four major works consider the environmental conditions and agriculture across Japanese internment camps during WWII. Bowdoin College Professor Connie Chiang sets the framework for the current literature on the topic. Chiang not only provides an overview of environmental theory and history, but also examines how agriculture influenced the interactions between WRA officials and inmates. Examining specifically environmental injustice theories, Chiang claims that, “WRA officials tried to use nature as an instrument for social

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid.
control by locating the camps in places where they could isolate Japanese Americans and procure their labor in the name of assimilation and patriotism.”14 As she explores both the perspectives of the WRA and of Japanese Americans, she asserts that in an effort, “to resist and endure their incarceration, Japanese Americans both established intimate connections to nature and sometimes refused to work when demanded.”15 In short, Chiang argues that, “the natural world” became a platform that upset “power relations” between the WRA and Japanese Americans, “ensuring that WRA control over the detainees was not absolute.”16

Kenneth Helphand finds a similar theme in his book on defiant gardens. According to Helphand, defiant gardens are, “gardens created in extreme or difficult environmental, social, political, economic, or cultural conditions”.17 In his chapter on Japanese internment, Helphand claims that, “At the relocation camps, garden-making was literally the domestication of an inhospitable environment, creating a cultural setting which was a semblance of normalcy.”18 He further adds that the gardens were mechanisms to maintain “cultural integrity” and “self-respect”; they were “an enterprise of survival, a defense of sanity and a demonstration of psychological, and here political, defiance.”19 Helphand’s book claims that the gardens served as acts of resistance, a tool to defy the WRA and their living conditions, and a means to emotionally survive the wartime experience. Ultimately, Helphand and Chiang’s analyses demonstrate how the Japanese Americans’ relationship with nature across the camps became a tool for defiance against their incarceration and the WRA.

15 Ibid, 236.
16 Ibid, 236.
18 Ibid, 117.
19 Ibid, 117.
Anna Tamura offers a similar perspective as she focuses on agriculture at two internment camps: Manzanar and Minidoka. Similar to Helphand and Chiang, she reports that the gardens functioned as acts of resistance — “political symbols of sedition and non-compliance as well as loyalty and patriotism.” Arguing that the gardens were “restorative agents that fostered communal healing, and [were] the results of cultural cohesion and community competition,” she too highlights how these gardens served as techniques of daily survival. Monica Embrey’s dissertation speaks to Tamura’s claims. In her case study on the environmental justice history of the Manzanar internment camp, Embrey examines the Japanese Americans’ relationship with the Owens Valley land, with a focus on their use and conservation of water. When addressing gardening and farming in the camp, she brings two important Japanese concepts into the literature discussion: "Gaman" and "Shikata ga nai". In her book The Art of Gaman, Delphine Hirasuna defines gaman as, “enduring what seems unbearable with dignity and grace” while Professor Jane Iwamura defines Shikata ga nai as the belief that, “one should not concentrate on the things one cannot change.” With these two concepts in mind, Embrey argues that they are fundamental in understanding the motives of Japanese Americans’ relationships with the land surrounding them. With sources such as Tamura and Embrey, the Japanese Americans’ quest to ease routine adversity shines through; it is apparent that agriculture in the camps fostered emotional survival.

---

21 Ibid, 1.
While Helphand, Chiang, Tamura, and Embrey’s analyses contextualize the Japanese Americans’ relationships with the environment and agriculture, no study focuses solely on the Japanese ornamental gardens. Furthermore, with the exception of Embrey, this literature lacks comprehensive research on one particular internment camp. While these articles analyze the importance and implications of these gardens, the current gap in research allows for generalizations when understanding the Japanese American experience and their relationship with ornamental gardens. A qualitative ethnographic case study examining the purposes of the gardens in the Manzanar internment camp may shed light on this gap. Furthermore, it will provide deeper insight into the everyday acts of resistance and the grit that enhanced camp life.

Method

The method of my study addresses the question: Through a qualitative retrospective ethnographic case study, what purposes did the Japanese ornamental gardens in the Manzanar internment camp serve for the Japanese Americans during World War II? I hypothesized that the Japanese Americans built the gardens as a pastime, a means to resist the WRA, and a method of healing as a community. It is important to recognize that I made a significant assumption within the research question. Asking, “what purposes did the... gardens... serve” implies that I believe that there is/are purpose(s) behind these gardens. But gardens do not, in general, spring out of deserts without good cause.

Qualitative Retrospective Ethnographic Case Study

With these questions in mind, it is important to break down and define the different components of the method. Qualitative methods “rely on text and image data, have unique steps
in data analysis, and draw on diverse designs.” In a qualitative retrospective ethnographic case study, “retrospective” implies that outcome of the event has already occurred by the time the study is initiated. Hence, this study analyzed the purposes of the gardens during WWII, rather than the purpose of the gardens today. An ethnographic case study is a sociological method that explores how a select group of people live and make sense of their lives with one another in a particular place. In the context of this study, the selected cohort consists of ten Japanese Americans who lived at the Manzanar internment camp. Each individual in the cohort developed a relationship with the gardens, whether it was through a parent working in the gardens or their own direct contact with and memory of the gardens. This method was chosen to not only fill the current gap in the literature, but also to avoid generalizations when describing the internees’ relationships with the ornamental gardens. I chose to focus on the Manzanar internment camp as it was the largest internment camp in the nation and was home to Merritt Park, and thus has the most primary sources documented.

**Thematic Analysis**

At the beginning of the study, I thematically analyzed interviews of the ten internees. In thematic analysis, qualitative researchers determine the relationship between overarching themes in a data set; they build their patterns, categories, and themes from the bottom up by organizing the data into increasingly more abstract units of information. This method of
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analysis was chosen to link the individual experiences of the internees to common themes that can be applied to the Manzanar narrative as a whole. The ten interviews were found on the Densho Encyclopedia Digital Repository by using the search words, “Manzanar camp gardens”, “Manzanar”, “camp gardens”, “parks”, and “camp activities”. The interviews were pre-recorded on the site and range from one to five minutes. Densho Encyclopedia is a nonprofit organization with the “initial goal of documenting oral histories from Japanese Americans who were incarcerated during World War II.” Today it serves as a database of primary sources from Japanese Americans during WWII.

The thematic analysis was conducted in three steps. Firstly, I watched and transcribed each of the ten interviews. I watched the interviews multiple times in effort to familiarize myself with the testimonies of the interviewees. Then, I identified similar experiences among the Japanese Americans in an attempt to understand what types of events contributed to the raising of the gardens. Once I identified similar experiences, the narratives were analyzed to discover the purpose of raising ornamental gardens. Then the overlapping experiences were sorted into groups and further labeled with an overarching theme.

After I conducted a pilot study in December 2017, I realized I lacked a robust and clear argument based solely on using these interviews. Therefore, a second qualitative step was added to my method: a mixed media primary source thematic analysis. I expanded my data set by adding other primary sources such as official documents from the WRA, poems, diary entries, and camp newsletters to flesh out my argument. These sources were found on various platforms
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including Densho Encyclopedia, museum collections, and other literature on the gardens. The primary sources underwent the same process of thematic analysis as the interviews.

Limitations

Before moving on to the findings discussion of the study, it is important to address the limitations in my research process and findings. The first and most significant limitation lies within my cohort. Because most of my desired cohort is over 80+ years old or already deceased, conducting the interviews myself was unfeasible. Owing to the nature of historical retrospective inquiry, I chose instead to use the ten pre-recorded interviews found on Densho. Therefore, I was unable to write the questions myself. Perhaps if I was able to conduct the interviews in person, my findings would have been free of the innate subjectivity of some of the questions asked. Another limitation regarding my cohort was the sample size. Considering the number of interviews and the average length of each segment directly speaking to the ornamental gardens (two minutes), the amount of data I was able to analyze was not lengthy. Given this limitation, I may have missed opportunities for a wider analysis. However, since very few individuals who lived in the Manzanar Camp and were connected to the gardens are still alive today, the perspectives in the interviews still offer crucial insight into the purposes of the Manzanar gardens. Lastly, there was room for human error from both the interviewees and researcher. Because the interviewees were looking back on their experiences, it is possible that they did not accurately depict camp life in the gardens. Similarly, it is possible that I transcribed part of an interview incorrectly or misinterpreted the meaning in these testimonies which could have potentially skewed my data.
Findings

After I applied the thematic analysis to the interviews and primary sources, seven different themes emerged regarding the purposes of Japanese ornamental gardens in the Manzanar internment camp; however, five themes were repeated consistently. These five themes are: (1) Community Building and Enrichment, (2) Defiance of Environment, (3) Gaman, (4) Shikata ga nai, and (5) Boredom. Below, these five themes are defined.

Table 1: Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Number of interviews with this theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Building and Enrichment</td>
<td>The effort to improve or enhance the quality of life through communal activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance of Environment</td>
<td>The attempt to beautify the camp in contrast to the barren environment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaman</td>
<td>Enduring what seems unbearable with dignity and grace</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikata ga nai</td>
<td>One should not concentrate on the things one cannot change</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>The abundance of unstructured time leaving the inmates to feel restless and in need of a pastime</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

For the purposes of a robust, clear analysis and line of reasoning, these themes will not be discussed in isolation and will rather be analyzed in the context of the larger narrative of the Manzanar internment camp during WWII.

**Discussion**

When the Japanese Americans were relocated to the internment camps, the community immediately faced a problem: the hazardous and poor environmental conditions. Located in the Owens Valley, California, the Manzanar land was notorious for its extreme temperatures, ruthless sun, and strong winds. When the WRA built the camps, they erased any trace of vegetation and leveled the land, “to build roads, prepare building sites, and establish agricultural fields.”

This excavation exacerbated the conditions of Manzanar as the newly churned dust coated the lives of the internees, including their skin, food and barracks. Henry Fukuhara remembered, the “wind would come and, and it would be so bad that you could hardly walk outside, and then... the sand would come up through the cracks in the floor and would come in through the sills of the window, and it was terrible.”

Hikoji Takeuchi added, “let’s face it, Manzanar was a barren

---


In fact, four internees used the word “barren” to describe the initial conditions of Manzanar, emphasizing the harsh conditions they endured in their desolate, dust-coated camp.

In effort to resolve the environmental issues of the camp, the WRA launched a camp landscaping program. This advancement set the framework for all future agricultural projects to be developed over the next four years, including victory gardens, cattle ranches, block gardens, and ornamental gardens. While the WRA facilitated many of these landscaping projects, the Japanese Americans initiated the construction of ornamental gardens as a defense against the environment. Sue Kunitomi recalled that internee Henry Uenu raised a little ornamental garden outside of the mess hall, “because everybody lined up for their meals outside the mess hall and there was no shade and no place to sit, so he talked to the mess hall people... and the men in the block ....” including Uenu and his friends, “decided they would build ...this garden.” Uenu’s project ultimately sought to mitigate the hot, uncomfortable conditions near the mess hall. His story, along with others, sparked a grander purpose in raising the gardens: beautifying the camp. Henry Fukuhara recalled that before the Japanese Americans began to build these gardens, “everything was just barren because there

were no trees there at all because, with the exception of an apple tree ... [the WRA] bulldozed everything... [the gardens] made the appearance [of the camp] more appealing and more comfortable."\(^{38}\) Willie Ito added, “They tried to make it look homey. Rather than seeing nothing but sand, it [was] so nice to see greenery.”\(^{39}\) Most of the youth, however, had become accustomed to the barren environment. Eiichi Sakauye remembered that, “Because of the gardens [the] bumble bees and butterflies came in.” He further added that he would have to explain to the kids, “Watch out, there’s a bumblebee, it’ll sting you. And then they wondered why I said that to them. And the butterfly comes along, the butterfly comes to suck the sugar from this pollen and so forth. We [told] them how the butterfly lays its egg and it pupates to a worm, and from the worm, it comes to a butterfly. And these kids were quite interested. So the kids come from all parts of the camp and come to see us... I don’t think they’d been exposed to nature.”\(^{40}\) Essentially, Fukuhara, Ito, and Sakauye’s testimonies describe the stark contrast in environment after the Japanese began building the gardens: with the garden came comfort, beauty and biodiversity. With this juxtaposition, the ornamental gardens defied the barren setup of the Manzanar internment camp.

The small but highly significant changes to the landscape altered the Japanese
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\(^{38}\) Fukuhara, Henry, interview by John Allen, Densho Digital Repository, November 6, 2002.


Americans perceptions toward their internment experience; they came to see beauty can be nurtured even in dust.

Even with this environmental enrichment, Japanese Americans faced an internal struggle. In the camps, the inmates sought to preserve their Japanese culture and identity, yet needed to pledge their allegiance to the WRA and, more broadly, the US. When the Japanese Americans initially settled into the internment camps, their relationships with the WRA were tense and formal. The WRA was responsible for logging the inmates’ daily interactions ranging from meal plans to medical examinations. They also regulated the internees’ activities and prohibited them from displaying and teaching Japanese culture (including speaking and writing in Japanese and celebrating Japanese cultural events and recreation). Despite these rules, the Japanese Americans silently protested their confinement through the ornamental gardens.

In advancing their agricultural projects, the inmates defied camp regulations but unexpectedly strengthened relationships with the WRA. The nature of these formal interactions with the WRA changed as Pleasure Park, also known as Merritt Park, was built. Brothers Kuichiro and Akira Nishi along with Henry Uenu initiated the project, gathering their fellow inmates to raise the sophisticated, beautiful Japanese ornamental garden. As they embarked on their project however, they faced a problem in the planning of the garden: they did not have the resources.

---

needed to grow the garden, including machinery, plants, and shrubs. And so the debates and deliberation with the WRA began. Eventually, the Nishi brothers convinced the WRA to not only move forward with the project, but also fund supplies and further loosen camp rules. Henry Nishi, son of Kuichiro, recalled that when his father needed locust trees for Pleasure Park, “[the WRA] must have been given permission to go out of camp... to get locust trees because there [were] no locusts... on the property.” Similarly, Arthur Ogami remembered his father, “...had a crew and [the WRA] provided [a] truck for him. And he’d go out to the foothills of the mountain to pick up rocks and trees, shrubs to use in the garden”.

As the Japanese Americans pushed the limits of their incarceration to build gardens, they found themselves rewarded with opportunities to venture out of the camp, allowing them short reprieves from their highly regulated lives. Eventually, the brothers renamed Pleasure Park to Merritt Park after WRA project director Ralph Merritt in gratitude for his help. Though the WRA still recorded and charted every aspect of the inmates lives (including the gardens), the innate nature of the interactions between the two groups changed course. As the two parties worked together, the WRA learned to trust the Japanese Americans and came to empathize with the Japanese American perspective. Though the gardens initially symbolized defiance, they ultimately functioned as an agent to soften the interactions between the WRA and internees.

While the gardens became a pathway for communication between the WRA and internees, they also forged closer relationships among the Japanese Americans. In Manzanar, sixty-percent of the Issei generation (the first generation of Japanese Americans) had worked in agriculture and landscaping businesses prior to WWII. By raising the gardens, the Japanese Americans were
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able to reconnect with their lives before WWII as a community. Madelon Arai Yamamoto remembered that as her father dug a large ornamental pond in 1943, “he had many friends that helped, that were interested in building the pond... before I knew it they were in front of the house digging it out. And then before I knew it they arrived with the concrete, and then before I knew it there was boulders all around there.”\textsuperscript{45} Yamamoto’s testimony demonstrates how the initiative of one person had a multiplier effect on the participation of those around him. George Izumi further described how the gardens were a mechanism for Japanese Americans to collectively reunite with their heritage. He recalled, “there was a fellow named... Mr. Kato, who was a rock garden specialist. He built that garden. He brought all the stone, big rocks down there, and they built a beautiful rock garden up near the hospital.”\textsuperscript{46} Similarity, Henry Fukuhara added that, “there were gardeners that knew how to make the real Japanese gardens,” and taught the younger generations the practices of the Issei.\textsuperscript{47} Henry Nishi added, “none of us had too much experience [with ornamental gardens]. We were pretty.... young. But most of our... dads were not around either because they were interned elsewhere... [we were] exposed to a lot of agriculture, ornamental agriculture.”\textsuperscript{48} Perhaps the gardens acted as a liaison between the generations so the Issei were able to pass down their expertise in traditional Japanese gardening. Yamamoto

\textsuperscript{46} Izumi, George, interview by John Allen, Densho Digital Repository, November 6, 2002.
\textsuperscript{47} Fukuhara, Henry, interview by John Allen, Densho Digital Repository, November 6, 2002.
added, “it was a way to develop a little community.”

The efforts to beautify the Manzanar environment, build community, and pass down Japanese gardening techniques, however, would not have been possible without the abundance of unstructured time. In the majority of the interviews, the Japanese Americans recalled how bored they were in the camps. Madeline Yamamoto also remembered, “...even though all adults had some sort of responsibility or, quote, job, in camp, they had lots of time. No one had cars, no one could go to the movies... We had a lot of time on our hands.” Perhaps this is to say that without the free time in the camps, the gardens would never have been raised. Jun Ogimachi added, “Well... the people within the block were just doing them. They just... need[ed] something to do.”

Yamamoto and Ogimachi’s testimonies bring to light two important Japanese beliefs: ganan (enduring what seems unbearable with dignity and grace) and shikata ga nai (not concentrating on the things one cannot change). Perhaps the gardens allowed the internees to focus on an aspect of their life which they could change, rather than dwelling on the ways their lives were regulated. George Izumi added, “So, you know, it goes to show you that if... any individual... set[s] their mind to do what they want to do, they can do it. It doesn't matter ... what it is in life.” Looking back on his father’s garden next to the camp hospital, Arthur Ogami added, “I think the gardens expressed that just because we’re here, we have to do something to refresh our feelings. I think that the gardens... express[ed] that there is hope for peace and
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54 Izumi, George, interview by John Allen, Densho Digital Repository, November 6, 2002.
freedom. And you can go to these gardens and feel it.” Izumi’s and Ogami’s reflections on their experiences suggest these gardens functioned as a mechanism of endurance for the people of the Manzanar internment camp. As the Japanese Americans crafted intricate yet bold gardens, they reflected their heritage and peacefully channeled their feelings. Through organizing and nurturing these gardens, the Japanese Americans found their strength, voice, and hope in a time seeded with alienation and adversity.

**Conclusion**

These interviews summarize the purposes of the ornamental gardens for the Japanese Americans in the Manzanar internment camp. The cohorts’ reflections on their WWII experiences make apparent that the gardens served to defy environmental conditions, improve relationships with the WRA, reconnect generations, and offer creative expression of their feelings. When comparing the results of this study to the body of literature, certain key differences emerge. The first difference is that while this study does recognise that the gardens were defiant against the environmental conditions, the results did not find that they were used to resist the WRA as Chiang claimed in her study. Rather, I found that the gardens eased the tense relationships between the two. This proves my earlier claim that the gap in

---


literature must be addressed to avoid generalizations when describing the internees’ relationships with the ornamental gardens. Furthermore, while the literature focuses on the gardens acting as political statements, my findings suggested that rather than resistance, the significance in the gardens lay in their emotional grounding for the internees of Manzanar.

In contrast to many reactions to unjust historical turning points, the Japanese American response to alienation and incarceration is stunning. While this study is significant in that it preserves the history of this near-extinct generation of Japanese Americans, the narrative of the Manzanar ornamental gardens, arguably more significantly, is a exemplar template for peaceful protest and communal healing. Looking towards the future, I recommend that further research should examine how defiant gardens throughout history compare with one another and drive the narratives of those involved — for example, Guantanamo Bay prisoners scavenged seeds from their meals which flourished as secret gardens, an endeavor later known as “Seeds of Hope”.\textsuperscript{57} Or, ironically, the British serving in Afghanistan built their own oasis, the Helmand Peace Garden, surrounding their military headquarters. Today, an English Rose grows there in defiance of its barren environment.\textsuperscript{58} These stories and many others bring to light the complexity at the intersection of cultivation, resistance, and beauty. Ultimately, the ornamental gardens and their implications serve as the perfect symbol of graceful endurance. Like the gardens, the Japanese Americans were assimilated, organized, and parented. However, despite the obstacles of their barren and toxic environment, they too found a way to thrive.

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid, 117.
Bibliography


Manzanar Relocation Center.


Manzanar Relocation Center.


Embrey, Sue Kunitomi, interview by John Allen, Densho Digital Repository, November 6, 2002.


Izumi, George, interview by John Allen, Densho Digital Repository, November 6, 2002.


Sample: A
Score: 5

The paper earned a score of 5 because it establishes a focused topic of inquiry, clearly providing background information on its topic (pages 4–9). The paper indicates the relevance of its uncovered gap and resulting research question (page 9, paragraph 1: “A qualitative ethnographic case study examining the purposes ...”). The paper speaks to the limitations of its replicable method and discusses implications (page 22) of an analysis like this for other contexts such as Guantanamo. In addition, the paper is well organized and uses its interpretation of evidence to construct a persuasive and sophisticated argument leading to a new understanding. The student is also able to connect this understanding and the research process back to the scholarly literature (see page 21), placing the new understanding in conversation with past studies. While the visuals (for examples, see pages 5, 6, and 14) were not analyzed directly as the student implied they might be, if they are considered as visuals accompanying a presented lecture, they do not detract or confuse the main argument.

The paper did not score a 4 because the writing and citation attribution style are clear and compelling and provide a strong sense of the student’s unique voice as a credible researcher. It is the establishment of this voice and the paper’s superior understanding of the context in which the research is being conducted that caused the paper to merit more than a score of 4.