

INTERMENT OF JAPANESE-AMERICANS

Performance Standard 16BUS.J

Create a chart summarizing Supreme Court cases involving the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II and write an essay addressing two issues accordingly:

- *Knowledge*: Identify the key elements (e.g., facts, legal issues, decision and reasoning) of three Supreme Court cases involving the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II.
- *Reasoning*: Analyze two issues associated with the court cases; assess the significance of the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II in political history.
- *Communication*: Produce a “case summation chart” and a 500-word essay that are well-focused, well-organized and well-detailed; express all ideas in a way that provides evidence of knowledge and reasoning processes.

Procedures

1. *In order to understand the development of significant political events (16B)*, students should experience sufficient learning opportunities to develop the following skills:
 - Assess the significance of a watershed event in United States political history.
 - Identify events and issues associated with the internment of Japanese-Americans as a result of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Note: Have students complete a unit that addresses domestic issues faced by the United States during World War II.
2. Have students review and discuss the assessment task and how the rubric will be used to evaluate their work.
3. Have students read about three court cases (i.e., Hirabayashi, Korematsu, and Endo) and *Constitutional Rights in a Time of Crisis, 1941-45*.
4. Ask each student to complete a “Case Summation Chart.” The chart should present the following information about each of the cases:
 - Facts about the case,
 - Legal issues presented in the case, and
 - Decision of the court and reasoning.
5. Ask each student to write an essay analyzing two issues associated with the court cases. Students must make a clear argument for or against each of the following and must support their statements with factual information from the readings:
 - Was the U. S. government justified in its actions toward Japanese-Americans?
 - Should the U. S. government make total repayment (plus interest) to any survivors and/or their families to compensate them for their losses?
6. Evaluate each student’s work using the Social Science Rubric as follows and add the scores to determine the performance level:
 - *Knowledge*: The identification of the key elements (e.g., facts, legal issues, decision and reasoning) of three Supreme Court cases involving the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II , was complete and correct.
 - *Reasoning*: The analysis and the argument for or against the two issues was thorough and correct.
 - *Communication*: The “case comparison chart” and the positions on the two issues were well-focused, well-organized, and well-detailed; the knowledge and reasoning were completely and effectively communicated.

Examples of Student Work follow

Time Requirements

- Two class periods

Resources

- Copies of “*Constitutional Rights in a Time of Crisis*” and articles on the 3 Supreme Court Cases (i.e., Hirabayashi, Korematsu, and Endo)
- Copies of the “Case Comparison Chart”
- Social Science Rubric

The Hirabayashi Case

Gordon Hirabayashi was an American citizen of Japanese ancestry. Born in the United States, he had never seen Japan. He had done nothing to suggest disloyalty to the United States.

Background to the Case: Hirabayashi was arrested and convicted for violating General DeWitt's curfew order and for failing to register at a control station in preparation for transportation to a relocation camp. At the time Hirabayashi was studying at the University of Washington. He was a model citizen and well-liked student, active in the local YMCA and church organizations. Hirabayashi refused to report to a control center or obey the curfew order because he believed both orders were discriminatory edicts contrary to the very spirit of the United States. He later told a court, "I must maintain the democratic standards for which this nation lives...I am objecting to the principle of this order which denied the rights of human beings, including citizens."

The Decision: The Court unanimously upheld the curfew law for "Japanese-Americans: living in Military Area #1." The Court said the President and Congress had appropriately used the war powers provided in the Constitution. The Court also held that the curfew order did not violate the Fifth Amendment.

Speaking for the court, Chief Justice Stone said discrimination based only upon race was "odious to a free people whose institutions are founded upon the doctrine of equality." However, in this case, Stone said, the need to protect national security in time of war necessitated consideration of race.

The Court ruled only on the legality of the curfew order. It avoided the larger issue of the legality of holding American citizens in detention centers and later in large, barbed-wire enclosures, which the government called "relocations camps".

Hirabayashi eventually spent more than three years in county jails and federal prisons for his refusal to go along with a law that made him a criminal simply because of his ancestry.

The Korematsu Case

Fred Korematsu was born and raised in Oakland, California. He could read and write only English. He had never visited Japan and knew little or nothing about the Japanese way of life.

Background to the Case: In June 1941, before America's official entry into World War II, Fred Korematsu tried to enlist in the Navy. Although the Navy was actively recruiting men in anticipation of entering the war, the service did not allow Korematsu, an American citizen of Japanese ancestry, to enlist. He then went to work in a shipyard as a welder. When the war began, he lost his job because of his Japanese heritage. Korematsu found part-time work as a welder. Hoping to move to Nevada with his fiancée, who was not a Japanese-American, Korematsu, ignored the evacuation orders when they came. As an American citizen he felt the orders should not apply to him in any event. The FBI arrested Korematsu, who was convicted of violating orders of the commanders of Military Area #1.

The Decision: By a 6-3 vote, the Court upheld the exclusion of Japanese-Americans from the Pacific coastal region. The needs of national security in a time of crisis justified the "exclusion orders." The war power of the President and Congress, provided by the Constitution, provided the legal basis for the majority decision.

Justice Black admitted that the "exclusion orders" forced citizens of Japanese ancestry to endure severe hardships. "But hardships are a part of war," said Black, "and war is an aggregation of hardships."

Justice Black maintained that the orders had not "excluded" Korematsu primarily for reasons of race, but for reasons of military security. The majority ruling did not say whether or not the relocation of Japanese-Americans was constitutional. Rather, the Court sidestepped that touchy issue, emphasizing instead the nation crisis caused by the war.

Dissenting Opinions: Three justices – Murphy, Jackson, and Roberts – disagreed with the majority. Justice Roberts thought it a plain "case of convicting a citizen as punishment for not submitting to imprisonment in a concentration camp solely because of his ancestry," without evidence concerning his loyalty to the United States.

Justice Murphy said that the "exclusion orders" violated the right of citizens to "due process of law." Furthermore, Murphy claimed that the decision of the Court's majority amounted to the "legalization of racism." Racial discrimination in any form and in any degree has no justifiable part whatever in our democratic way of life."

Murphy admitted that the argument citing military necessity carried weight, but he insisted that the military necessity claim must "subject itself to the judicial process: to determine "whether the deprivation is reasonably related to a public danger that is so immediate, imminent, and impending"...

Finally, Murphy concluded that "individuals must not be left impoverished in their constitutional rights on a plea of military necessity that has neither substance nor support."

The Endo Case

In 1942, the government dismissed Mitsuye Endo from her civil service job in California and the military ordered her to a relocation center. She had never attended a Japanese language school and could neither read nor write Japanese. She was a United States citizen with a brother serving in the U.S. Army. Her family did not even subscribe to a Japanese language newspaper.

Background to the Case: Miss Endo's attorney filed a writ of *habeas corpus* on her behalf, contending that the War Relocation Authority had no right to detain a loyal American citizen who was innocent of all the various allegations that the army had used to justify evacuation.

The Decision: The Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Mitsuye Endo "should be given her liberty." The government should release the Japanese-American woman from custody whose loyalty to the United States had been clearly established.

Justice Douglas said, "Loyalty is a matter of the heart and mind, not of race, creed or color..."

Justice Murphy added, "I am of the view that detention in Relocation Centers of persons of Japanese ancestry regardless of loyalty is not only unauthorized by Congress or the Executive, but is another example of the unconstitutional resort to racism inherent in the entire evacuation program... Radical discrimination of this nature bears no reasonable relation to military necessity and is utterly foreign to the ideals and traditions of the American people."

Shortly after the court's decision in the Endo case, Major General Pratt, commander of Military Area #1 at that time, ordered a suspension of the "exclusion orders" that had resulted in the detention of people such as Korematsu and Endo. Most of the detained "Japanese-Americans" were free to return home.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN A TIME OF CRISIS, 1941-1945

On December 7, 1941, Japanese aircraft attacked Pearl Harbor in Hawaii. The surprised defenders suffered a crushing defeat. The Japanese disabled or destroyed five American battleships and three cruisers, killing 2,355 members of the American armed services. The attack left another 1,178 military personnel wounded.

President Roosevelt denounced the “sneak attack” and Congress declared war on Japan. A few days later Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. Thus, Americans entered World War II.

Within three months, the Japanese overran most of Southeast Asia and the American territories of Guam and the Philippine Islands. Americans feared a Japanese invasion of Hawaii, or even of California.

General J.L. DeWitt, responsible for defending the Pacific Coast against enemy attack, feared that the 112,000 persons of Japanese ancestry who lived in the West Coast states might be a threat to national security. General DeWitt recommended that these people be sent away from the region.

Suspension of Constitutional Rights

More than 75,000 American citizens of Japanese ancestry lived on the West Coast of the United States. With a few exceptions, all of these citizens had been born and raised in the United States. The overwhelming majority of them had never seen Japan. Virtually all of them spoke English. These Japanese-Americans considered themselves loyal American citizens.

Over thirty-five thousand Japanese immigrants also lived on the West Coast. These men and women had come to the United States before 1924. Although legally citizens of Japan, most considered themselves loyal to their adopted country.

In the weeks after the bombing at Pearl Harbor, some people pointed out that these older Japanese were not United States citizens, but Japanese citizens, even though they had lived in the U.S. for many years. However, few Americans understood that at the time it was illegal for Japanese nationals to become naturalized citizens. In 1922, in the case of *Ozawa v. United States*, the Supreme Court held that certain Asians (such as Japanese, Chinese, and Koreans) could not become naturalized citizens. Thus, although many of the Japanese immigrants living in the United States had wanted to become citizens, the Court had denied them that right. The government only made exceptions for Japanese immigrants who had fought in World War I.

Further examples of discrimination against the Japanese came in 1924, when the Congress prohibited all Japanese immigration to the United States.

Thus, the government did not allow Japanese immigrants to become citizens and prohibited their relatives from joining them in the United States. Nevertheless, these Japanese were loyal to their adopted country. Born in the United States, the children of these immigrants had, of course, become citizens at birth. They also considered themselves patriotic and loyal. Yet, many American politicians and leaders thought otherwise. Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson urged President Roosevelt to take action to remove all American citizens of Japanese ancestry, as well as all Japanese immigrants, from the West Coast.

On February 19, 1942, the President issued Executive Order #9066 giving authority to military commanders to establish special zones in territory threatened by enemy attack. The order invested the military commanders with power to decide who could come, go, or remain in the special military areas. The President issued this executive order on his own authority, under the Constitution, as commander-in-chief of the nation’s armed forces.

On March 2, General DeWitt established Military Areas #1 and #2 in the western part of the United States.

On March 21, Congress passed a law in support of the President’s Executive Order and of the subsequent actions of General DeWitt.

On March 24, General DeWitt proclaimed a curfew between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. for all persons of Japanese ancestry living within Military Area #1, which comprised the entire Pacific coastal region.

On May 9, General DeWitt ordered the exclusion from Military Area #1 of all persons of Japanese background. The vast majority of these people were U.S. citizens born on American soil. These people had thoroughly American attitudes, beliefs, and behavior. Most of them would have felt out of place in Japan.

The military sent the Japanese-Americans to the relocation centers far from the coastal region. In effect, this action placed more than 75,000 American citizens who had broken no laws in jail without trials. The government did not charge any of these people with crimes.

They could take with them only what they could carry. A government order dated December 8, 1941, froze their bank accounts leaving them without funds. To raise cash, they had to sell any possessions they could. Other Americans and local governments took advantage of their plight, offering to buy

possessions and property at low prices that rarely reflected the value of the goods. These Japanese-Americans could never regain most possessions and property lost in this way.

Constitutional Issues

Military commanders, acting under authority granted by the President and Congress, had denied more than 75,000 American citizens their constitutional rights of “due process.” The Fifth Amendment says, “No person shall be...deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...” Article I, Section 9, of the Constitution grants the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, a written court order issued to inquire whether or not a person is lawfully imprisoned or detained. The writ demands that the persons holding the prisoner either justify his or her detention or release the person.

Had the government taken away the constitutional rights of Japanese-Americans? The Supreme Court finally had to rule on the legality of holding thousands of American citizens in detention camps solely because of their ancestry. Would the court overturn military actions sanctioned by the President and Congress?

Three notable cases involving the constitutional rights of Japanese-Americans came before the Supreme Court.

They were:

1. Hirabayashi v. United States (1943)
2. Korematsu v. United States (1944)
3. Ex parte Endo (1944)

Constitutional Significance

The Court had not used the Constitution to protect Japanese-Americans from abusive treatment during World War II. There was military interference with civil liberties in the name of a wartime emergency. The Supreme Court allowed the executive and legislative branches of government to engage in behavior that it surely would have found unconstitutional in peacetime.

The Court avoided answering a significant constitutional question in reaching verdicts in the cases of Hirabayashi, Korematsu, and Endo. Can military authorities, even if supported by acts of the President and Congress, detain citizens outside of a combat zone without charging them with any crime, merely on grounds of defending the nation during wartime.

By avoiding this question, the Court allowed the executive and legislative actions that sanctioned the Relocation Centers during World War II to set a dangerous precedent. The Court established a precedent supporting the evacuation and detention of unpopular minorities during time of war. Will others

use this precedent to deny constitutional rights to certain groups of citizens during a national crisis in the future?

Afterward

A government commission formed to investigate wartime espionage reported that no evidence existed of disloyal behavior among the Japanese-Americans on the West Coast. The government did not find a single Japanese-American guilty of spying for Japan during World War II, even though it jailed many as suspected spies. In addition, one of the best fighting units of the U.S. Army in Europe, the Nisei Brigade, was made up of Japanese-Americans. This brigade became the most decorated unit in the history of the U.S. Army. Its soldiers proved their loyalty by fighting for their country even though their families had been jailed without “due process of law.”

After release from the detention camps, most Japanese-Americans returned to the Pacific Coast. They began again, resettling in cities and starting new farms. Many initiated legal actions to regain their lost property. In 1948, Congress agreed to pay for some of that property, giving the Japanese-Americans less than ten cents for each dollar they had lost. This action was to prove the only admission Congress made that it had done anything wrong to the Japanese-Americans during the war. This minor recompense was a small way of saying, “We’re sorry.”

The U.S. Government justified the internment two ways. The government claimed that American citizens of Japanese ancestry, more loyal to Japan than to their own country, would spy for Japan. Second, the U.S. Government claimed that because Japan had attacked the U.S., those Americans of Japanese ancestry might have helped Japan. Yet, many have always questioned the validity of these fears.

No evidence justified fears that American citizens of Japanese descent or Japanese immigrants living in the U.S. supported Japan in any substantial fashion. The few supporters of Japan, mostly old men who posed no danger to the U.S., quickly suffered arrest long before the planning of any mass deportation of Japanese-Americans. No Japanese-Americans or Japanese immigrants committed acts of sabotage during the war.

John J. McCloy, a key advisor to Secretary of War Stimson, was the civilian in the War Department most responsible for the removal. Many years after the war he admitted that the purpose of the internment was “in the way of retribution for the attack that was made on Pearl Harbor.” In other words, their own government forced American citizens to leave their homes and property and to

spend four years behind barbed wire guarded by armed soldiers, because a foreign country (which most of these citizens had never visited) had attacked the United States.

In 1980, Congress re-opened investigations into the treatment of Japanese-Americans during World War II and created the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. After nearly three years of careful examination of the evidence, which included testimony from 750 witnesses, the Commission issued a report on February 25, 1983. The report concluded: "A grave injustice was done to American citizens and resident aliens of Japanese ancestry who, without individual review or any probative evidence against them, were excluded, removed, and detained by the United States during World War II."

Reprinted with permission

Lessons On the Constitution Project 87

American History Association and American
Political Science Association, 1986

CASE COMPARISON CHART

THE HIRABAYASHI CASE	THE KOREMATSU CASE	THE ENDO CASE
<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <p>What Is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <p>Decision and Reasoning:</p>	<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <p>What Is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <p>Decision and Reasoning:</p>	<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <p>What Is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <p>Decision and Reasoning:</p>

The Case:	The Case:	The Case:
<p><u>The Hirabayashi Case</u></p>	<p><u>The Korematsu Case</u></p>	<p><u>The Endo Case</u></p>
<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon Hirabayashi was born in US, never even saw Japan. • Never did anything to suggest disloyalty to US. • naturalized citizen, active in NAACP and in church. • arrested & convicted for violating curfew & refusing to register for relocation. <p>Decision and Reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The court unanimously upheld the curfew for Japanese-Americans living in West Coast. • Hirabayashi eventually spent 3 years in jail for his refusal to comply in laws against Japanese-Americans. 	<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could read/write English only. • Tried to enlist in US Navy, but was denied because of his ancestry. • Fined due to Japanese heritage. • Ignored evacuation orders because he was an American citizen. • convicted of violating orders of commanders of military area #1. <p>Decision and Reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By a 6-3 vote, the court upheld the exclusion of Japanese-Americans from the Pacific coastal region. 	<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1942, Mitsuye Endo was fired from her civil service job & ordered to relocate. • couldn't read/write Japanese. • US citizen w/ a brother serving in the army. • Filed a writ of habeas corpus on her behalf. <p>Decision and Reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unanimous decision that Endo should be given her liberty. She was released from the relocation camp.
<p>What is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Powers due to war in Constitution. • need to protect national security & essential creation of race. • legality of the curfew order. 	<p>What is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • war power in Constitution • excluded from Navy for military security • didn't focus on relocation issue • violated citizens due process • legalized racism 	<p>What is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unconstitutional resort to racism with no reasonable relation to military necessity. • ordered suspension of the exclusion orders.

Japanese Americans in World War Two

On May ninth, General DeWitt ordered the relocation of seventy five thousand Japanese Americans from Military Area One. He froze their bank accounts, robbed them of their possessions and property, and stripped them of their rights. These three famous cases were brought to the Supreme Court: *Hirabayashi v. United States*, *Korematsu v. United States*, and *Ex parte Endo*. In the first case, Gordon Hirabayashi, a natural born citizen of the United States, was arrested and convicted for violating curfew and failure to register for relocation. Though he had never shown disloyalty to the United States, he was put in jail. The Supreme Court unanimously upheld the constitutionality of the curfew set upon Japanese Americans in Military Area One due the war powers granted to the President and Congress in the constitution. It was also decided that the curfew was not in violation of the Fifth Amendment. Gordon eventually spent more than three years in prison. Less than a year later, Fred Korematsu, also a natural born citizen, was also convicted of violating orders of Military Area One. Fred not remained loyal to the US, he had previously tried to enlist in the US Navy, and was rejected because of his race. By a 6-3 vote, the exclusion of Japanese Americans from this area was upheld by the Supreme Court. This was also based on the extended powers during wartime. In the same year, Mitsuye Endo, also a natural born citizen, was relocated, and filed a writ of

habeas corpus. Miss Endo had shown no aggression or opposition towards America. Her brother was even in the US Army. This time, the Court unanimously decided that Mitsuye should not have been held, and should now be set free. Shortly after this ruling, it was ordered that the exclusion orders would be terminated, and that the Japanese Americans would be set free. This brings up two obvious questions: was the US justified in its actions, and, if not, should payment be made to the Japanese Americans? In my opinion, the answers are just as obvious.

It is my belief that the US acted hastily and out of fear, and that their actions were not justified. It is true that many people feared a Japanese invasion of California, but it seems that the government rushed into relocation, not fully weighing the consequences. As Supreme Court Justice Douglas said, "Loyalty is a matter of the heart and mind, not of race, creed or color." The vast majority of the Japanese Americans held showed absolutely no signs of disloyalty to the US or loyalty to Japan. It was plain racial discrimination, which "...in any form and in any degree has no justifiable part whatever in our democratic way of life," adds Justice Murphy. Never before had we taken action to detain Americans due to their heritage or beliefs. It is true that the constitution gives extended powers to the executive and legislative branch in time of war, but just as Supreme Court Justice Murphy states, "...individuals must not be left impoverished in their constitutional rights on a plea of military necessity that has neither substance nor support." The right to a trial by jury was nowhere to be found in most of these seventy five thousand cases, which violates the Sixth Amendment. They were stripped of their property, which is insured in both the Fifth Amendment of the constitution and the declaration of independence. The Fourteenth Amendment also says that nothing can

abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. It is true that Congress does have the power to do this under the necessary and proper clause. But the necessity of this action is a very debatable issue. Also, the fact that the courts completely reversed their decision in the span of a year and a half shows the irrationality of their first action. Perhaps Roosevelt was correct in saying our only fear is fear, itself. We feared the Japanese, so we unjustly held innocent people to calm ourselves. The relocation of Japanese Americans was completely prejudiced and undemocratic.

Because I believe that the government was unfair in their actions, I also think that they should have issued payment to the Japanese Americans that were imprisoned. Because of the war and the newly stable economy, it would have been unreasonable for the government to completely repay each person in full. We should have designed a program, much like those of the new deal, to help the Japanese Americans get back on their feet. Perhaps there could have been an employment program or soup and food lines as there were during the Great Depression. Basically, if the government had pumped federal money into programs to aide and re-establish the Japanese race in the US, the situation would have been much better. America was in the wrong. It was not enough to simply change the law. All of those people's lives were completely ruined. We were so eager to step in and rebuild Japan after the atomic bomb destroyed it, but we could not even aide our fellow countrymen. Even if it wasn't the direct giving of money to each person, there was need for government intervention and financial assistance, and none was provided. The government should have financially aided the Japanese Americans after the racist treatment they endured in World War two.

In conclusion, it is my opinion that the American government handled this situation very poorly. Their unjust imprisonment and lack of reimbursement displays the weakness in our democracy at that time. The Japanese American citizens suffered through legalized racism. In the land of freedom, their own representatives held them hostage. And they did not deserve it. In my eyes, this incident is a black spot in American history.

The Case: The Hirabayashi Case	The Case: The Korematsu Case	The Case: The Endo Case
<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hirabayashi violated the curfew order - He failed to register with a central station in preparation for transportation to a relocation camp - He thought that both of these orders were discriminatory - The court ruled against him and he spent 5 years in jail. 	<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Korematsu could read & write only English - Never visited Japan - Korematsu tried to enlist in the Navy - Navy wouldn't allow people of Japanese ancestry to enlist - Korematsu wouldn't denounce Pacific Coast Army - was arrested for violating the orders of commanders in military area #1. 	<p>Facts (4-5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Endo had never attended a Japanese language school - Couldn't read or write Japanese - Her attorney filed a writ of habeas corpus on her behalf. - Was a loyal American citizen
<p>Decision and Reasoning:</p> <p>The court upheld the curfew law. Said that the war powers provided in the constitution were used appropriately.</p>	<p>Decision and Reasoning:</p> <p>The court upheld the exclusion of Japanese-Americans from the Pacific-Island region. A 6-3 majority vote decided this. They based it on national security in a time of war not as racial discrimination.</p>	<p>Decision and Reasoning:</p> <p>The court unanimously ruled that Endo should be given her liberty. She should be released from custody. It was racism to put Japanese-Americans into relocation centers.</p>
<p>What is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <p>The court only ruled on the legality of the curfew order avoiding the larger issue of the legality of holding American citizens in detention centers, and relocation camps.</p>	<p>What is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <p>The court ruled on the legality of the exclusion order, in turn avoiding the "legality" of racism issue. But by making the decision they did, they brought this idea to the floor for many people to see.</p>	<p>What is The Legal Issue Presented Here?</p> <p>The court ruled on the legality of detaining Japanese-Americans in Relocation Centers. They said it was discrimination and shoving actors, the exclusion orders were suspended.</p>

December 7, 1941. A day that America will remember for as long as the sky is blue. A day that will live in the hearts of all Americans forever. On December 7, 1941, Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, beginning the intense hostility between the Japanese and the Americans, which would last for many years to come. After this date, the U.S. government began to evacuate Japanese-Americans into relocation centers. But these relocation centers were really just prison built to hold Japanese-Americans, even if they did nothing wrong. ~~And not~~ until the decisions of the Hirabayashi, Korematsu, and Endo court cases did the Japanese-Americans finally regain their freedom in the United States. Questions that come to mind when pondering this dark time in history are: Was the United States justified in its actions? And, should there be a total repayment made to the families of the Japanese who were interned? Both of which are questions that have many possible answers. Which answers are correct? That is the real question.

Was the United States justified in its actions? This question can be looked at in many different ways. First of all, you can take the views and perspectives of the United States government. Japan had just bombed Pearl Harbor, really taking things to the next level. The U.S. needed to feel safe from any possible attacks that Japan may have been planning. By evacuating the Japanese-Americans, they took out a lot of possible "attacks from the inside" that Japan may have had planned, and they took out any spies that Japan

"Exceeds" (page 3)

may have had living in the west coast of the United States. The Supreme Court had to make many rulings in favor of the evacuations. Two of the biggest cases are those of Hirabayashi and Korematsu. Both of these Japanese-American men were convicted of crimes that may have been discriminatory towards them. Each case was ruled on by the Supreme Court, and both times, the laws were upheld, and the men were each sentenced to terms in jail. The Supreme Court made these decisions based only on the security of the nation, and not on the legality of racism or any other possibility of discrimination. Secondly, you can look on the side of the Japanese-Americans that got kicked out of their homes. Many of these people had never been to Japan. Many of them couldn't read or write Japanese. And most of them were very loyal United States citizens. They felt as if they were being discriminated against. They knew that they had nothing to do with Japan, and they knew that the U.S. was wrongful in their doings. It wasn't until the Endo court case that the U.S. Supreme Court realized that maybe what they were doing was wrong. They ruled that it was racism to put Japanese-Americans in relocation centers. This was the beginning of the Japanese-Americans' newfound freedom in America. So was the United States justified in its actions? My opinion is that they were right in defending and protecting the country, but so many people were hurt in the process that it makes the topic very tough to have a clear opinion on.

Should there be a total repayment made to the families of the Japanese who were interned? This is another tough question to answer. You can also look at this question from different points. First you need to look on the side of the United States. The U.S. felt as if they really didn't do anything that any other country wouldn't have done. So therefore they didn't feel as if it was necessary to repay in total all of the money and other

"Exceeds" (page 4)
possessions that they owed the Japanese-American families that they harmed. Plus, there would have been too much to repay. The United States was in a war, and most of their funds were going towards the war effort. This meant that there wasn't very much to give to the Japanese-Americans that they hurt. In the eyes of the Japanese, the United States government owed them full repayment of everything that was lost. They had a right to feel that way because of all the hardships they went through. In my opinion, there was no way for the U.S. to repay the Japanese in total, nor do I feel that it was necessary. But as was the case with the first question, there are very many opinions on how each instance was handled, and nobody will ever know what the true answers are.

Due to the bombing of Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on December 7, 1941, the United States made laws restricting Japanese-Americans, and later evacuated these people from their homes into relocation centers. The Japanese-Americans didn't like these actions very much, but the U.S. defended themselves by saying that it was in defense for the country. Two questions that come to mind while thinking about this horrible time in history are: Was the United States justified in its actions? And, should there be a total repayment made to the families of the Japanese who were interned? Both questions can be taken in different ways, and every person will have a different opinion, but the real answers will remain wrapped in the mystery that is the history of World War II.