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### Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 30, 1919</td>
<td>Fred Toyosaburo Korematsu is born in Oakland, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>The Selective Service Act of 1940 is passed, establishing America’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first peacetime draft. In the draft’s first year, 3,500 Nisei --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second-generation Japanese-Americans born in the United States --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are drafted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 1941</td>
<td>Japan attacks Pearl Harbor. The United States is drawn into World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War II. The FBI arrests 1,300 Issei -- first-generation Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immigrants -- leaders identified purportedly as potentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dangerous enemy aliens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, 1942</td>
<td>Nisei are reclassified as aliens ineligible for the draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 1942</td>
<td>President Roosevelt signs Executive Order 9066, authorizing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forced exclusion of all persons of Japanese ancestry from the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 1942</td>
<td>Congress passes legislation making violation of military orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>issued pursuant to E.O. 9066 a crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March to August,</td>
<td>All persons of Japanese ancestry on the West Coast of the United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>States are forced to leave their homes and businesses and move to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>temporary detention centers -- and eventually to concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>camps. More than 110,000 Japanese-Americans are expelled from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Coast; they lose approximately $6-10 billion in property and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1942</td>
<td>Civilian Exclusion Order No. 34 is issued ordering exclusion of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>persons of Japanese ancestry from the area where the Korematsu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family resided. Fred’s family reports as ordered five days later,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without Fred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 30, 1942</td>
<td>Fred is arrested in San Leandro, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1942</td>
<td>Formal charges are filed against Fred for remaining in the area in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>violation of Civilian Exclusion Order No. 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 1942</td>
<td>Fred is tried and found guilty as charged in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Court for the Northern District of California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28, 1943</td>
<td>Nisei are permitted to volunteer for military service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 19, 1943</td>
<td>Ninth Circuit hears oral argument from counsel for Fred (on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>government's motion to dismiss the appeal), Minoru Yasui, and Gordon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hirabayashi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 1, 1943  Supreme Court determines that Fred’s conviction can be appealed.

June 21, 1943  Supreme Court decides Hirabayashi and Yasui.

December 2, 1943  Ninth Circuit affirms Fred’s conviction.

January 20, 1944  The draft is reinstituted for all Nisei, including those imprisoned in camps.

February 2, 1944  Fred’s petition for certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court.

March 27, 1944  Certiorari is granted in Fred’s case.

June 6, 1944  D-Day -- The Allied Forces land at Normandy.

October 11-12, 1944  Oral argument is held before the Supreme Court in Fred’s case.

December 17, 1944  The War Department announces that Japanese Americans who have passed loyalty screening are free to leave camps after January 2, 1945.

December 18, 1944  The Supreme Court issues Korematsu, upholding Executive Order 9066 and the Army’s exclusion of Japanese-Americans.

May 28, 1945  Fred’s parents return to Oakland from Topaz.

August 11, 1945  V-J Day -- Japan surrenders.

September 2, 1945  World War II formally ends.

October 12, 1946  Fred marries Kathryn.

December 24, 1947  President Harry S. Truman pardons all wartime draft resisters, including the Nisei resisters from Heart Mountain and other camps.

1952  Congress enacts the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which includes allowances for Issei naturalization.

February 17, 1954  Fred’s father becomes a U.S. citizen.

February 19, 1976  President Gerald R. Ford issues Proclamation 4417 repealing Executive Order 9066.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 1980</td>
<td>President Jimmy Carter signs legislation establishing the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (the “Commission”) to investigate incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1982</td>
<td>Fred meets Professor Peter Irons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 1983</td>
<td>Fred’s legal team files his petition for a writ of error coram nobis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 1983</td>
<td>The Commission publishes report entitled “Personal Justice Denied.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 1983</td>
<td>The Commission issues formal recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 1983</td>
<td>Judge Marilyn Hall Patel conducts hearing on Fred's petition and rules from the bench.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 1984</td>
<td>Judge Patel issues her formal written opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10, 1988</td>
<td>President Ronald Reagan signs the Civil Liberties Act, providing a formal apology from the government and redress of $20,000 to each survivor incarcerated under Executive Order 9066.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 1998</td>
<td>Fred receives the Presidential Medal of Freedom from President Bill Clinton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 2005</td>
<td>Fred dies at the age of 86.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23, 2010</td>
<td>Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signs legislation recognizing Fred’s birthday as “Fred Korematsu Day of Civil Liberties and the Constitution” in California. It is the first time in U.S. history that a day has been named for an Asian American.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE ORDER

- - - - - -

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF WAR TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY AREAS

WHEREAS the successful prosecution of the war requires every possible protection against espionage and against sabotage to national-defense material, national-defense premises, and national-defense utilities as defined in Section 4, Act of April 20, 1918, 40 Stat. 533, as amended by the Act of November 30, 1940, 54 Stat. 1220, and the Act of August 21, 1941, 55 Stat. 655 (U. S. C., Title 50, Sec. 104):

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of War, and the Military Commanders whom he may from time to time designate, whenever he or any designated Commander deems such action necessary or desirable, to prescribe military areas in such places and of such extent as he or the appropriate Military Commander may determine, from which any or all persons may be excluded, and with respect to which, the right of any person to enter, remain in, or leave shall be subject to whatever restrictions the Secretary of War or the appropriate Military
Commander may impose in his discretion. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to provide for residents of any such area who are excluded therefrom, such transportation, food, shelter, and other accommodations as may be necessary, in the judgment of the Secretary of War or the said Military Commander, and until other arrangements are made, to accomplish the purpose of this order. The designation of military areas in any region or locality shall supersede designations of prohibited and restricted areas by the Attorney General under the Proclamations of December 7 and 8, 1941, and shall supersede the responsibility and authority of the Attorney General under the said Proclamations in respect of such prohibited and restricted areas.

I hereby further authorize and direct the Secretary of War and the said Military Commanders to take such other steps as he or the appropriate Military Commander may deem advisable to enforce compliance with the restrictions applicable to each Military area hereinabove authorized to be designated, including the use of Federal troops and other Federal Agencies, with authority to accept assistance of state and local agencies.
I hereby further authorize and direct all Executive Departments, independent establishments and other Federal Agencies, to assist the Secretary of War or the said Military Commanders in carrying out this Executive Order, including the furnishing of medical aid, hospitalization, food, clothing, transportation, use of land, shelter, and other supplies, equipment, utilities, facilities, and services.

This order shall not be construed as modifying or limiting in any way the authority heretofore granted under Executive Order No. 8972, dated December 12, 1941, nor shall it be construed as limiting or modifying the duty and responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with respect to the investigation of alleged acts of sabotage or the duty and responsibility of the Attorney General and the Department of Justice under the Proclamations of December 7 and 8, 1941, prescribing regulations for the conduct and control of alien enemies, except as such duty and responsibility is superseded by the designation of military areas hereunder.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

February 4, 1942.

[Signature]
HEADQUARTERS WESTERN DEFENSE COMMAND
AND FOURTH ARMY
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL
PRESIDIO OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

June 5, 1943


TO: Chief of Staff, United States Army, War Department, Washington, D. C.

1. I transmit herewith my final report on the evacuation of Japanese from the Pacific Coast.

2. The evacuation was impelled by military necessity. The security of the Pacific Coast continues to require the exclusion of Japanese from the area now prohibited to them and will so continue as long as that military necessity exists. The surprise attack at Pearl Harbor by the enemy crippled a major portion of the Pacific Fleet and exposed the West Coast to an attack which could not have been substantially impeded by defensive fleet operations. More than 115,000 persons of Japanese ancestry resided along the coast and were significantly concentrated near many highly sensitive installations essential to the war effort. Intelligence services records reflected the existence of hundreds of Japanese organizations in California, Washington, Oregon and Arizona which, prior to December 7, 1941, were actively engaged in advancing Japanese war aims. These records also disclosed that thousands of American-born Japanese had gone to Japan to receive their education and indoctrination there and had become rabidly pro-Japanese and then had returned to the United States. Emperor worshipping ceremonies were commonly held and millions of dollars had flowed into the Japanese imperial war chest from the contributions freely made by Japanese here. The continued presence of a large, unassimilated, tightly knit racial group, bound to an enemy nation by strong ties of race, culture, custom and religion along a frontier vulnerable to attack constituted a menace which had to be dealt with. Their loyalties were unknown and time was of the essence. The evident aspirations of the enemy emboldened by his recent successes made it worse than folly to have left any stone unturned in the building up of our defenses. It is better to have had this protection and not to have needed it than to have needed it and not to have had it—as we have learned to our sorrow.

3. On February 14, 1942, I recommended to the War Department that the military security of the Pacific Coast required the establishment of broad civil control, anti-sabotage and counter-espionage measures, including the evacuation therefrom of all persons of Japanese ancestry. In recognition of this situatio-
tion, the President issued Executive Order No. 9066 on February 19, 1942, authorizing the accomplishment of these and any other necessary security measures. By letter dated February 20, 1942, the Secretary of War authorized me to effectuate my recommendations and to exercise all of the powers which the Executive Order conferred upon him and upon any military commander designated by him. A number of separate and distinct security measures have been instituted under the broad authority thus delegated, and future events may demand the initiation of others. Among the steps taken was the evacuation of Japanese from western Washington and Oregon, California, and southern Arizona. Transmitted herewith is the final report of that evacuation.

4. The report comprises nine Parts and reference matter. Its twenty-eight chapters are supplemented by a pictorial summary. In Part I, I have traced the developments which led to the issuance by the President of Executive Order No. 9066, establishing military control over the Pacific Coast. The military necessity for the specific action reported is outlined in Chapter II. Part II, Chapters IV to VI, inclusive, presents a résumé of the evacuation method. In these chapters the means provided to protect the persons, the property and the health of evacuees are described. In succeeding Parts a more detailed account of each phase of the operation is found. Part III describes the military organization established to accomplish the evacuation. Part IV, Chapters VIII to XII cover evacuation operations. Part V comprises Chapters XIII to XIX. These offer a narrative of Assembly Center Operations—the selection, construction and administration by the Army of the temporary residences provided evacuees pending their transfer to Relocation Centers in the interior. Part VI includes Chapters XX to XXII. This section reports the Army’s participation in preparing semi-permanent facilities for the relocation of evacuees and the methods pursued in their transfer to these accommodations. In Part VII is found Chapters XXIII to XXVI, in which collateral aspects of the program are discussed, such as curfew and travel control, public relations, inspection and repatriation activities. Part VIII, consisting of Chapter XXVII and XXVIII, presents a fiscal and statistical summary. Part IX concludes the report with a series of photographs pictorializing the entire operation. Only those data essential to an understanding of the subject are included in the appendices.

5. There was neither pattern nor precedent for an undertaking of this magnitude and character; and yet over a period of less than ninety operating days, 110,442 persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from the West Coast. This compulsory organized mass migration was conducted under complete military supervision. It was effected without major incident in a time of extreme pressure and severe national stress, consummated at a time when the energies of the military were directed primarily toward the organization and training of an Army of sufficient size and equipment to fight a global war. The task was, nevertheless, completed without any appreciable divergence of military personnel. Comparatively few were used, and there was no interruption in a training program.

6. In the orderly accomplishment of the program, emphasis was placed upon
the making of due provision against social and economic dislocation. Agricultural production was not reduced by the evacuation. Over ninety-nine per cent of all agricultural acreage in the affected area owned or operated by evacuees was successfully kept in production. Purchasers, lessees, or substitute operators were found who took over the acreage subject to relinquishment. The Los Angeles Herald and Express and the San Diego Union, on February 23, 1943, and the Tacoma News-Tribune, on February 25, 1943, reported increases not only in the value but also in the quantity of farm production in their respective areas.

7. So far as could be foreseen, everything essential was provided to minimize the impact of evacuation upon evacuees, as well as upon economy. Notwithstanding, exclusive of the costs of construction of facilities, the purchase of evacuee motor vehicles, the aggregate of agricultural crop loans made and the purchase of office equipment now in use for other government purposes, the entire cost was $1.46 per evacuee day for the period of evacuation, Assembly Center residence and transfer operations. This cost includes financial assistance to evacuees who voluntarily migrated from the area before the controlled evacuation phase of the program. It also covers registration and processing costs; storage of evacuee property and all other aspects of the evacuee property protection program. It includes hospitalization and medical care of all evacuees from the date of evacuation; transportation of evacuees and their personal effects from their homes to Assembly Centers; complete care in Assembly Centers, including all subsistence, medical care and nominal compensation for work performed. It also reflects the cost of family allowances and clothing as well as transportation and meals during the transfer from Assembly to Relocation Centers.

8. Accomplishment of the program in the manner selected would have been impossible without the participation of the Federal civilian agencies so ably assisting throughout. Under my continuous direction, the associated agencies of the Federal Security Agency, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture, and the Work Projects Administration of the Federal Works Agency accepted major responsibilities. The War Relocation Authority; the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, Justice, Commerce and Interior; the Division of Central Administrative Services of the Office for Emergency Management performed an important service from the beginning, and various state and local agencies effectively cooperated. The participating Army Agencies, particularly the Division Engineers of the United States Engineer Corps who supervised the construction of Assembly and Relocation Centers, discharged their responsibilities in a superior manner. The agencies of my command, military and civilian personnel alike, responded to the difficult assignment devolving upon them with unselfish devotion to duty. To the Japanese themselves great credit is due for the manner in which they, under Army supervision and direction, responded to and complied with the orders of exclusion.
9. A large quantity of primary source materials not found in the Appendix has been selected and bound together. These have been made available in triplicate. It is proposed that one set be retained at this Headquarters. Two sets are forwarded with this report. It is requested that one set be retained in the office of the Adjutant General, War Department, and the other forwarded to the Library of Congress for future reference. The great volume of secondary source materials will remain on file at this Headquarters. All of these data will be available for research purposes whenever the Secretary of War so directs.

J. L. DeWitt,
Lieutenant General, U. S. Army,
Commanding.
Department of Justice
Alien Enemy Control Unit
Washington
April 30, 1943

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Res: Japanese Brief

Last week with our draft of the Hirabayshi brief I transmitted to Mr. Raus an annotation which I thought he would find helpful in obtaining a background view of the context of this case. In particular, I sent him a copy of Harper's Magazine for October 1942, which contains an article entitled 'The Japanese in America. The Problem and Solution,' which is said to be by 'An Intelligence Officer.' Without attempting to summarize this article, it stated among other things that:

1. The number of Japanese aliens and citizens who would act as saboteurs and enemy agents was less than 3,500 throughout the entire United States.

2. Of the Japanese aliens, "the large majority are at least passively loyal to the United States".


4. With the exception of a few identified persons who were prominent in pro-Japanese organizations the only important group of dangerous Japanese were the Kibei (American-born Japanese predominately educated in Japan).

5. "The identity of Kibei can be readily ascertained from United States Government records."

6. "And this war not come along at this time, in another ten or fifteen years there would have been no Japanese problem, for the Issei would have passed on, and the Nisei taken their place naturally in American communities and national life."

This article concludes: "To sum up: the Japanese Problem has been magnified out of its true proportions largely because of the physical characteristics of the Japanese people. It should be handled on the basis of the individual, regardless of citizenship and not on a racial basis." (Emphasis in original.)

I thought this article interesting even though it was substantially anonymous. I now attach much more significance to it because a memorandum prepared by Lt. Com. K. D. Ringle, who has until very recently been assis-
tant District Intelligence Officer, 11th Naval District, in charge of
naval intelligence in that district (which includes Los Angeles), and
who was formerly Assistant District Intelligence Officer in Hawaii,
has come to my attention. A comparison of this memorandum with the
article leaves no doubt that the author of the Harpers article is
Lt. Com. K. D. Ringle. There are many long passages in the first person
relating to personal experiences which are identical in the two writings.

In addition, I am informed entirely unofficially by the persons
in the Office of Naval Intelligence that Lt. Com. Ringle in fact was lent
to War Relocation Authority to prepare a manual on the background of the
Japanese who were being evacuated from an Intelligence or security view-
point, for the use of the WRA personnel. After this memorandum was pre-
pared permission was obtained to abstract it and publish it anonymously
in Harpers. Thus the Harpers article, which clearly indicates that the
method of evacuation was wrong and that it would have been sufficient
to evacuate not more than 10,000 known Japanese and that it would now
be safe to release all but not more than 10,000 presently identified
Japanese, was written by a Naval Intelligence officer who was on duty
from 1940 until very recently in the Los Angeles area, from which ap-
proximately one-third of the evacuation came.

I have furthermore been most informally, but altogether reliably,
advised that both the article and the WRA memorandum prepared by
Lt. Com. Ringle represent the views, if not of the Navy, at least of
those Naval Intelligence officers in charge of Japanese counter-intelligence
work. It has been suggested to me quite clearly that it is the view of
those officers that the whole evacuation scheme was carried on very badly
and that it would have been sufficient to evacuate the following three
groups:

1. The kibei.
2. The parents of kibei.
3. A known group of aliens and citizens who were
   active members of pro-Japanese societies such as
   the Japanese Navy League, the Military Virt-
   euse Society, etc.

Since the naval officers believe that it was necessary to evacuate only
about 10,000 people, they could have identified by name, they did not
feel that it was necessary to evacuate all of the Japanese. Presumably,
they did not make this view known fourteen months ago for the reason
that Secretary Knox was at that time greatly exercised about the Japa-
nese Fifth Column and that, since it was the Army’s problem, it was safer
to keep quiet than to brave the political storm then raging.

In retrospect it appears that this Department made a mistake four-
ten months ago in not bringing the Office of Naval Intelligence into the
controversy. I suppose that the reason that it did not occur to any of us to do this was the extreme position then taken by the Secretary of the Navy.

To have done so would have been wholly reasonable, since by the terms of the so-called delimitation agreement it was agreed that Naval Intelligence should specialize on the Japanese, while Army Intelligence occupied other fields. I have not seen the document, but I have repeatedly been told that Army, before the war, agreed in writing to permit the Navy to conduct its Japanese intelligence work for it. I think it follows, therefore, that to a very considerable extent the Army, in acting upon the opinion of Intelligence officers, is bound by the opinion of the Naval officers in Japanese matters. Thus, had we known that the Navy thought that 90% of the evacuation was unnecessary, we could strongly have urged upon Gen. DeWitt that he could not base a military judgment to the contrary upon Intelligence reports, as he now claims to do.

Lt. Com. Ringle's full memorandums is somewhat more complete than the version published in Harper's and I think you will be interested in reading it. In the past year I have looked at great numbers of reports, memoranda, and articles on the Japanese, and it is my opinion that this is the most reasonable and objective discussion of the security problem presented by the presence of the Japanese minority. In view of the inherent reasonableness of this memorandum and in view of the fact that we now know that it represents the view of the Intelligence agency having the most direct responsibility for investigating the Japanese from the security viewpoint, I feel that we should be extremely careful in taking any position on the facts more hostile to the Japanese than the position of Lt. Com. Ringle. I attach the Department's only copy of this memorandum.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that the Department of Justice is now representing the Army in the Supreme Court of the United States and is arguing that a partial, selective evacuation was impracticable, we must consider most carefully what our obligation to the Court is in view of the fact that the responsible Intelligence agency regarded a selective evacuation as not only sufficient but preferable. It is my opinion that certainly one of the most difficult questions in the whole case is raised by the fact that the Army did not evacuate people after any hearing or on any individual determination of dangerousness, but evacuated the entire racial group. The briefs filed by appellants in the Ninth Circuit particularly pressed the point that no individual consideration was given, and I regard it as certain that this point will be pressed even more, assuming that competent counsel represent appellants, in the Supreme Court. Thus, in one of the crucial points of the case the Government is forced to argue that individual, selective evacuation would have been impractical and insufficient when we have positive knowledge that the only Intelligence agency responsible for advising Gen. DeWitt gave him advice directly to the contrary.
In view of this fact, I think we should consider very carefully whether we do not have a duty to advise the Court of the existence of the Ringle memorandum and of the fact that this represents the view of the Office of Naval Intelligence. It occurs to me that any other course of conduct might approximate the suppression of evidence.

As I have said, my information that the Ringle memorandum represents the view of the Office of Naval Intelligence has come to me informally. I feel, therefore, that we have an obligation to verify my informal information. I believe that we should address an inquiry to the Secretary of the Navy, making reference to the Ringle memorandum, and stating that we have been advised that this represents the Navy's view and asking the Secretary if in fact the views of ONI, at the time of the evacuation, coincided with Com. Ringle's.

The Ringle memorandum originally came into my possession from WHI and we noticed the parallel between the memorandum and the article in this office. Attorneys for WHI furthermore are among the persons who have advised us that the Ringle memorandum represents the official Navy view. In view of the fact that any other information which I have obtained is highly confidential, I would prefer to refer in a letter to Secretary Knox only to WHI.

I have prepared for your consideration a draft of a letter which you might wish to send to Mr. Knox.

Edward J. Denis
Director, Alien Enemy Control Unit

Attachment
Office Memorandum

TO: The Attorney General

FROM: J. Edgar Hoover - Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation

DATE: February 7, 1944

SUBJECT: Reported Bombing and Shelling of the West Coast

There is attached a memorandum relative to Lieutenant General DeWitt's final report on the Japanese evacuation of the West Coast.

Certain statements were made in the report indicating that immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor there was a possible connection between the sinking of United States ships by Japanese submarines and alleged Japanese espionage activity on the West Coast. It was also indicated that there had been shore-to-ship signaling, either by radio or lights, at this time.

As indicated in the attached memorandum, there is no information in the possession of this Bureau as the result of investigations conducted relative to submarine activities and espionage activity on the West Coast which would indicate that the attacks made on ships or shores in the area immediately after Pearl Harbor have been associated with any espionage activity ashore or that there has been any illicit shore-to-ship signaling, either by radio or lights.

Attachment
When Lies Overruled Rights

By KAREN KOREMATSU
Feb. 17, 2017

When President Trump signed an executive order temporarily banning travel from seven majority Muslim countries, he hurled us back to one of the darkest and most shameful chapters of American history. Executive orders that go after specific groups under the guise of protecting the American people are not only unconstitutional, but morally wrong. My father, and so many other Americans of Japanese descent, were targets of just such an order during World War II.

Seventy-five years ago on Sunday, under President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s Executive Order 9066, all people of Japanese ancestry living on the West Coast were forced to leave their homes and report to incarceration camps. Two-thirds were American citizens. Fred Korematsu, my father, then 23, refused to go. A proud and loyal citizen, he had tried to enlist in the National Guard but was rejected and was wrongly fired from his job as a welder in an Oakland, Calif., shipyard. He was arrested and tried for defying the executive order. Upon conviction, he was held in a horse stall at a hastily converted racetrack until he and his family were moved to a desolate camp in Topaz, Utah. My father told me later that jail was better than the camp.

He appealed his conviction to the Supreme Court. In his case, and in cases brought by Minoru Yasui and Gordon Hirabayashi — among the most infamous cases in American legal history —
the court in 1944 upheld the executive order. Justice Frank Murphy vehemently opposed the majority decision, writing in a dissenting opinion, “Racial discrimination in any form and in any degree has no justifiable part whatever in our democratic way of life.” In the hysteria of war and racialized propaganda, my father’s citizenship did not protect him. For him and the 120,000 other Japanese-Americans incarcerated during World War II, there was no attempt to sort the loyal from the disloyal.

In 1982, almost 40 years after my father’s conviction, evidence was discovered proving that the wartime government suppressed, altered and destroyed material evidence while arguing my father’s, Yasui’s and Hirabayashi’s cases before the Supreme Court. The government’s claims that people of Japanese descent had engaged in espionage and that mass incarceration was necessary to protect the country were not only false, but had even been refuted by the government’s own agencies, including the Office of Naval Intelligence, the F.B.I. and the Federal Communications Commission.

With that evidence, my father reopened his case. In November 1983, he stood before a Federal District Court judge, Marilyn Hall Patel, and said, “As long as my record stands in federal court, any American citizen can be held in prison or concentration camps without a trial or a hearing.” Judge Patel overturned my father’s conviction, declaring that his case “stands as a caution that in times of distress the shield of military necessity and national security must not be used to protect governmental actions from close scrutiny and

Although his conviction was vacated, my father was keenly aware that his case was never formally overturned, even though it was widely discredited by scholars and even the courts. He was a quiet, soft-spoken man, but he spent the rest of his life speaking around the country about the government misconduct that led to incarceration, in hopes of preventing it from occurring again. In 1998, President Bill Clinton awarded him the Presidential Medal of Freedom for the brave stand he took against an unjust government action.

In 1991, President George H. W. Bush declared, “The internment of Americans of Japanese ancestry was a great injustice, and it will never be repeated.” But it can happen again. Since my father’s death in 2005, I have taken on his work to remind Americans what happens when our Constitution is ignored in the name of national security. We need to scrutinize Mr. Trump’s executive orders and any other attempts to single out groups for repression. Let us come together to reject discrimination based on religion, race or national origin, and to oppose the mass deportation of people who look or pray differently from the majority of Americans.

“Stand up for what is right,” my father said. “Protest, but not with violence. Don’t be afraid to speak up. One person can make a difference, even if it takes 40 years.”

Karen Korematsu is the founder and executive director of the Fred T. Korematsu Institute.

Included with permission of the author.
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