

THE JOURNAL OF ETHNIC STUDIES

Volume 10, Number 3

Fall 1982

ARTICLES

TO ASSIMILATE OR REGULATE: FRENCH IMMIGRATION
POLICY IN THE 1920S
By Gary S. Cross 1

WHO SPOKE FOR BOSTON'S IRISH? THE BOSTON PILOT
IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY
By Francis R. Walsh 21

LITERATURE AND THE COLONIZATION OF THE
AMERICAN INDIAN
By Ward Churchill 37

POLITICAL REVITALIZATION AMONG THE TLINGIT
By Kenneth Tollefson 57

NORSE BLOOD AND INDIAN CHARACTER: CONTENT,
CONTEXT AND TRANSFORMATION OF POPULAR
MYTHOLOGY
By Michael G. Michlovic and Michael W. Hughey 79

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS: A COVER-UP
THROUGH EUPHEMISTIC TERMINOLOGY
By Raymond Y. Okamura 95

Asian American Studies
ASIA PACIFIC CENTER
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS:
A COVER-UP THROUGH EUPHEMISTIC TERMINOLOGY

by Raymond Y. Okamura

A large body of literature now exists on the subject of the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. Much of it is flawed by the persistent use of euphemistic terminology. Instead of calling the event an imprisonment, authors have used the terms "evacuation" and "relocation." Since Japanese Americans were in fact confined against their will, the "evacuation-relocation" nomenclature is a distortion. Those writing seem unable to accept the very fact that over 120,000 men, women, children, and babies were expelled from their homes and locked up in American concentration camps.

In this paper,¹ I will examine the use of official language as a cover for either embarrassing or horrible truths. In a sense the government (including the executive, legislative, and judicial branches) circumvented the obvious unconstitutionality of detaining American citizens without evidence, charge, or trial through euphemisms. Thus, although Japanese Americans were herded into barbed wire compounds surrounded by guard towers and armed sentries, the government continually insisted that only an "evacuation" or "relocation" was involved. The linguistic deception fostered by the United States government, and institutionalized by numerous scholars thereafter, bears a striking resemblance to the propaganda techniques of the Third Reich.

The government of the Third Reich (Nazi Germany) utilized an elaborate system of euphemisms to cover up what was actually happening to millions of European Jews, Gypsies, and other groups deemed undesirable. "Emigration," "evacuation," "final solution," "relocation," "resettlement," and "special treatment" were used as code words for the Nazi program of methodical mass murder. The extermination camps in occupied Poland were referred to simply as "the east"; and the various concentration camps where victims were gathered and confined to await "resettlement in the east" were called "assembly centers," "protective custody camps," "reception centers," "relocation centers," and "transit camps." Even more sardonically the prison city of Terezín, which served as a way station to the gas chambers at Auschwitz, was described in official literature as a "health resort," "model ghetto," "paradise ghetto," and "retirement home."²

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA lives in Berkeley, California. He spent three years at the Gila River Concentration Camp in Arizona.

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

Nazi officials were very careful about what they put in writing and masked their intentions with euphemistic language. The actual order, presented here in translation, to annihilate the Jewish people, was cryptically phrased:

Complementing the task which was conferred upon you already on 24 January 1939, to solve the Jewish problem by means of emigration and evacuation in the best possible way according to present conditions, I charge you herewith to make all necessary preparations...for a total solution of the Jewish question within the area of German influence in Europe.³

Later, the Nazi defendants at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials claimed that they knew nothing more than what the written documents stated.⁴ Until the truth emerged, the Nazi terminology deceived not only the general populace, but the victims as well. Many Jews were tricked into turning themselves in for "evacuation" and "resettlement." The euphemistic language made it easier for the vast number of government workers involved in the machinery of death to carry out their tasks.⁵

Nazi Germany was not unique in the use of deceptive terminology for propaganda purposes.⁶ Governments generally do not readily admit wrongdoing nor think badly of themselves; any government in power can be expected to hide, misrepresent, or rationalize its unsavory activities. But once the government changes hands, and facts emerge, the liberated people usually do not perpetuate the distortions of the former government. For example, it would be unthinkable today for anyone to suggest that the events which took place in Nazi-occupied Europe should be called an "evacuation" and "relocation" simply because those were the terms used at the time. Such euphemisms have been relegated to their proper place as historical footnotes, and the main body of literature on the Holocaust uses terms more reflective of the facts.

The United States was no exception to the tendency of governments to characterize their own actions in propagandistic terms. An array of euphemisms—some chillingly identical to the Nazi euphemisms—was developed by the U.S. government for the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans.⁷ That the government promoted euphemistic language at that time is understandable; what puzzles is the continuing and uncritical adherence to the government-coined expressions—even to this date—by

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

nearly everyone concerned. If this practice persists no one will be able to testify to the magnitude of the occurrence, and the United States will have utilized propaganda to maintain an historical image.

In early 1942, federal officials were faced with a perplexing problem: how to satisfy the growing demands from the West Coast that every single person of Japanese ancestry be locked up. There was no problem with respect to adult Japanese nationals against whom there was even the flimsiest bit of evidence. Non-citizens could be classified as "alien enemies deemed dangerous" and summarily interned under individual warrants by the Justice Department.⁸ The question was how to imprison a large number of innocent people—especially American citizens—under the aegis of law. Since there was no evidence whatsoever against the vast majority of Japanese Americans, and since most of the target population consisted of babies, children, and invalids who could not possibly be dangerous, some method had to be found to permit the incarceration of an entire group of people based solely on their ancestry. The solution which emerged after numerous consultations between government and military officials was the extensive use of euphemistic, vague, or misleading terms which could cover the massive violation of constitutional and human rights.⁹

"Evacuation" and "relocation" are the two most commonly used terms to describe the World War II experience of Japanese Americans. A close examination of the definitions of these words, however, reveals the underlying propagandistic intent. "Evacuation" is the process of temporarily moving people away from an immediate and real danger, such as a fire, flood, shoot-out, or bomb threat. Similarly, "relocation" is the process of more permanently moving people away from a long-term hazard, such as an unsafe building, earthquake fault, or contaminated environment. Both terms strongly suggest that the movement is for the protection or safety of the affected people. It was precisely for this reason that the government selected such words. There is no hint in either term that people are to be confined, detained, imprisoned, or restrained in any way. Thus, if these terms are accepted at face value, complaints and lawsuits about false imprisonment or unlawful detention are effectively precluded.

The cryptic language used in Executive Order 9066 is reminiscent of that used in Nazi orders. Franklin D. Roosevelt's order never mentioned detention or imprisonment. Instead, the true intent of the order was disguised as follows:

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

I hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of War, and the Military Commanders whom he may from time to time designate...to prescribe military areas...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 restriction 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.¹⁰

The United States government and military officials knew exactly what those seemingly innocuous phrases meant, and they promptly set about building concentration camps. "Any or all persons" meant only persons of Japanese ancestry; "may be excluded" meant being evicted from one's home and locked up; "the right to leave shall be subject to whatever restriction" meant being shot if one tried to escape; and "shelter and other accommodations" meant tar paper barracks surrounded by barbed wire fences and guard towers.

A follow-up directive from Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to the designated Military Commander General John L. DeWitt was even more Hitlerian in tone:

In order to permit the War Department to make plans for the proper disposition of individuals whom you contemplate moving outside your jurisdiction, it is desired that you make known to me your detailed plans for evacuation. Individuals will not be entrained until such plans are furnished and you are informed that accommodations have been prepared at the point of detaining.¹¹

The subsequent public proclamation by General DeWitt puts the Nazi propagandists to shame:

Whereas, it is necessary, in order to provide for the welfare and to ensure the orderly evacuation and resettlement of Japanese voluntarily migrating from Military Area No. 1, to restrict and regulate such migration...all alien Japanese and

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

persons of Japanese ancestry who are within the limits of Military Area No. 1, be and they are hereby prohibited from leaving that area for any purpose until and to the extent that a future proclamation or order of this headquarters shall so permit or direct.¹²

The "future proclamation or order" turned out to be a proscription condemning Japanese Americans to imprisonment. The entire process of incarceration was couched in euphemistic terminology. The detention orders were called "civilian exclusion orders." The accompanying "instructions" stated that they were merely to be "evacuated" at a certain time and date. The temporary detention camps where they were initially confined were named "assembly centers" or "reception centers." The permanent concentration camps where they were ultimately incarcerated were called "relocation centers." All written orders contained the curious phrase "non-alien," which turns out to be a code word for a citizen of the United States of America.¹³

Government and military officials took great pains to assure that everyone within their control used this language. For example, General DeWitt gave this instruction to his subordinate military commanders:

The Evacuation Center has been established for the purpose of caring for Japanese who have been moved from certain military areas. They have been moved from their homes and placed in camps under guard as a matter of military necessity. The camps are not "concentration camps" and the use of this term is considered objectionable. Evacuation Centers are not internment camps. Internment camps are established for another purpose and are not related to the evacuation program.¹⁴

Dillon S. Myer, director of the so-called "War Relocation Authority," issued similar instructions to the civilian staff:

The term "camp" when used to refer to a relocation center is likewise objectionable. It leads people to confuse the relocation centers administered by the War Relocation Authority with the detention camps and internment camps administered by other agencies. The evacuees are not

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

"internees." They have not been "interned."...employees of the War Relocation Authority should refer to persons who have been evacuated from the West Coast as evacuees, and the projects as relocation centers. Some people have been referring to the evacuees as "colonists." This term is not objectionable, but the term "evacuee" seems preferable. Where the context makes the meaning clear, the term "resident" is, of course, also acceptable.¹⁵

No matter what the government called them, the facilities were in reality concentration camps and the inmates were prisoners. General DeWitt left no doubt that the Japanese Americans were to be confined:

It is hereby ordered that all persons of Japanese ancestry, both alien and non-alien, who now or shall hereafter reside, pursuant to Exclusion Orders and Instructions from this Headquarters, within the bounds of established Assembly Centers, Reception Centers or Relocation Centers...are required to remain within the bounds of Assembly Centers, Reception Centers or Relocation Centers at all times unless specifically authorized to leave.¹⁶

For the concentration camps located outside of the Western Defense Command jurisdiction, Secretary of War Stimson issued similar orders.

All persons of Japanese ancestry, and all members of their families, both alien and non-alien, who now or shall hereafter be or reside, pursuant to orders and instructions of the Secretary of War, or pursuant to the orders and instructions of the Commanding General, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, or otherwise, within the bounds of any of said War Relocation Project Areas are required to remain within the bounds of said War Relocation Project Areas at all times unless specifically authorized to leave.¹⁷

The written orders were enforced with barbed wire fences, guard towers, search lights, and machine guns. It was clearly understood by both guards and prisoners that the restrictions would be maintained with physical violence, if necessary. General DeWitt set forth the following policy:

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

The military police on duty at relocation centers and areas shall perform the following functions...They will maintain periodic motor patrols around the boundaries of the center or area in order to guard against attempts by evacuees to leave the center without permission...They shall apprehend and arrest evacuees who do leave the center or area without authority, using such force as is necessary to make the arrest.¹⁸

The euphemistic language accomplished a number of important objectives for the government: (1) it sidetracked legal and constitutional challenges; (2) it allowed the government to maintain a decent public image; (3) it helped lead the victims into willing cooperation; (4) it permitted the White civilian employees to work without self-reproach; and (5) it kept the historical record in the government's favor.

Appeals to the judicial system failed miserably. The government had laid the legal foundation well, and the courts became part of the semantic conspiracy. The majority of the U.S. Supreme Court accepted the euphemistic terminology without examination, refused to consider the real facts of the case, and rendered decisions upholding the government's actions. The language of the court majority in the Fred T. Korematsu case is a classic example:

Had petitioner here left the prohibited area and gone to an assembly center we cannot say either as a matter of fact or law, that his presence in that center would have resulted in his detention in a relocation center....Korematsu was under compulsion to leave the area not as he would choose, but via an Assembly Center. The Assembly Center was conceived as a part of the machinery for group evacuation. The power to exclude includes the power to do it by force if necessary. And any forcible measure must necessarily entail some degree of detention or restraint....Regardless of the true nature of the assembly and relocation centers—and we deem it unjustifiable to call them concentration camps with all the ugly connotation that term implies—we are dealing specifically with nothing but an exclusion order.¹⁹

Justice Owen J. Roberts, however, did not subscribe to such escapist nonsense, and stated in dissent:

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

An Assembly Center was a euphemism for a prison. No person within such a center was permitted to leave except by Military Order...We further know that...so-called Relocation Centers, a euphemism for concentration camps, were established....But the facts above recited...show that the exclusion was but part of an over-all plan for forcible detention....The two conflicting orders, one which commanded him to stay and the other which commanded him to go, were nothing but a cleverly devised trap to accomplish the real purpose of the military authority, which was to lock him up in a concentration camp.²⁰

The general American public knew little about the concentration camps in its midst. Most White Americans wanted Japanese Americans out of the way; they were not particular about how it was to be accomplished; once it was done, they did not care to know what the camps were like.²¹ The newspapers, then the main source of information for the public, worked closely with military authorities. Most newspapers printed army press releases verbatim, and many city rooms became an extension of the army public relations office. In prose that only a government press agent could have authored, the lead paragraph in a Central California newspaper article announced:

Free to come and go as they wish within the limits of their new abodes provided for them by a considerate nation, more than 500 evacuated Japanese were in assembly centers near Pinedale and at the Fresno District Fairground today.²²

Not only did the newspapers adopt the government euphemisms, they added distortions of their own. The press consistently ignored the fact that American citizens were involved in the lockup. The detainees were invariably identified as "Japs," "Nips," "aliens," "enemy aliens," "dangerous aliens," or, if the editor was charitable, as "Japanese" or "Nipponese." Whenever it became necessary to refer to American citizens, code terms like "non-aliens" or "other persons of Japanese ancestry" were substituted. The barbed wire enclosures were variously labeled "alien assembly center," "alien reception center," "enemy alien camp," "Japanese alien camp," "Japanese relocation center," or just "Jap Camp."²³ Unless one took a great deal of trouble to find out, a general newspaper reader would not

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

have known that native-born Americans were being held prisoner in these camps. Not surprisingly, there are still some Whites who insist that only "dangerous aliens" were detained and that other people were free to leave the "relocation centers" whenever they pleased.

A few noteworthy exceptions to the press whitewash, however, deserve mention. A Tacoma News-Tribune editorial stated:

In this war we are seeing more euphemistic terms than in previous conflicts. Consequently, the concentration camp which the government is starting to build at Puyallup is termed an "assembly center." But it is a concentration camp, even though temporary.²⁴

The Washington Post editorialized:

The government of the United States—sometimes referred to as a symbol of democracy—now holds some 70,000 American citizens in places euphemistically called "relocation centers"....No violation of law has been charged against them. No court of law has sentenced them. They have been found guilty of nothing save the peculiar pigmentation of their skins.²⁵

There was almost total cooperation by Japanese Americans in their own incarceration. Attempts to evade the round-up were rare, and nearly everyone appeared at the designated time to the declared place. Certainly the fear of consequences was an important factor; but a large number of Japanese Americans accepted—or wanted to believe—the government's assurances that they were only to be "evacuated" to a "resettlement center." Those who had faith in the government were in for a rude shock when they arrived at the detention camp site. One anonymous detainee wrote to a friend on the outside:

This evacuation did not seem too unfair until we got right to the camp and were met by soldiers with guns and bayonets. Then I almost started screaming.²⁶

Estelle Ishigo observed as she entered the Pomona Detention Camp:

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

The first sight of the barbed wire enclosure with armed soldiers standing guard as our bus slowly turned in through the gate stunned us with the reality of this ordered evacuation.²⁷

The Puyallup Detention Camp was described in the following way by Ted Nakashima:

The resettlement center is actually a penitentiary—armed guards in towers with spotlights and deadly tommy guns, fifteen feet of barbed-wire fences, everyone confined to quarters at nine, lights out at ten o'clock. The guards are ordered to shoot anyone who approaches within twenty feet of the fences. No one is allowed to take the two-block hike to the latrines after nine, under any circumstances.²⁸

Given the grim daily existence, the inmates adopted much of the government euphemisms as a psychological shield against the stark reality of the barbed wire and guard towers. Life perhaps seemed more bearable if they pretended that they were "evacuees" instead of prisoners, and that they were living in a "relocation center" and not a concentration camp. One indication of the emotional scars left by the incarceration is the continued use of the government euphemisms by the former prisoners. The terms "evacuation" and "relocation" are still used within the Japanese American community (usually with a capital "E" and "R") as a kind of in-group code and safety-valve to prevent the outpouring of emotion. The truth is stored in the mind's eye of the victim, but it is rarely expressed openly. Sociologist Stanford Lyman observed: "Nisei employ euphemisms whenever the simple and more direct form might indicate a state of emotional involvement or evoke an undesirable emotional response from others."²⁹

For the civilian employees who ran the concentration camps, the euphemisms made their jobs more agreeable. The White staff members could think of themselves, not as concentration camp wardens, but more as friends, teachers, and social workers who were there to care for the "evacuees" or "colonists." It would have been devastating to staff morale if they ever admitted to themselves that they were, in fact, part of the oppressive machinery to keep the Japanese Americans behind barbed wire. They diligently created a mountain of red-tape, replete with endless questionnaires, reports, regulations, and procedures, all of which made it

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

extremely difficult for anyone to be released on parole. Perhaps the White employees deluded themselves; but a recent study shows that many of the staff members were engaged in repression and thought control.³⁰

The historic record of the incarceration has been distorted by the pervasive influence of official terminology. All of the primary documents were controlled by the government; and nearly all of the contemporaneous publications were written from the point of view of the government. Inmate newspapers, circulars, and letters were subjected to censorship; all camp records and reports were written by government employees and scholars; outside reporters and scholars had to submit to strict government regulations in order to gain access to the camps. Books published during, or shortly after the episode, invariably used the government euphemisms without qualification or explanation. Since most of these early books were written by camp administrators and government employed or affiliated scholars, it is no wonder that the "evacuation-relocation" nomenclature saturates these works. A survey of books published before the mid-1960s reveals the consistent use of euphemistic terms in the titles, such as "Evacuation of Japanese Americans," "Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement," "Japanese Americans in the Relocation Centers," "Japanese American Relocation Center," "Japanese Evacuation," and "Japanese Relocation Camp."³¹

Beginning with the ethnic awareness movements in the late 1960s, the terms concentration camp and internment have frequently appeared in book titles. Although many authors have used titles like "America's Concentration Camps," "Concentration Camps USA," and "The Internment Years," none has systematically replaced euphemistic terminology in their text. An incongruous situation presently exists wherein authors provocatively use internment or concentration camp in their titles, but revert to the old "evacuation-relocation" nomenclature in their text, tables, and illustrations.³² The record needs rewriting.

The words used to depict an event are crucial to one's perception and understanding of the occurrence. Henry Stuart Hughes, in commenting about Ludwig Wittgenstein's philosophy, once wrote.

(Earlier) he had maintained that language proceeded from reality—that the structure of the real world determined the structure of speech. Now he had come to believe that the reverse was the case: language, as the vehicle for understanding reality, determined the way in which people saw it.³³

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

NOTES

¹This paper is a modified version of a written statement submitted to the "Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians" at the public hearing in Seattle, Washington on September 11, 1981. The commission was established by Public Law 96-317 (94 Stat 964) on July 31, 1980 to "review the facts and circumstances surrounding Executive Order Numbered 9066, issued on February 19, 1942, and the impact of such Executive order on American citizens and permanent resident aliens...(and to) recommend appropriate remedies." Hearings were also held in Anchorage, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, St. Paul (Pribilof Islands), San Francisco, Unalaska (Aleutian Islands), and Washington, D.C. during the latter half of 1981. The report is expected in 1983.

²Walter and Michi Weglyn provided valuable research assistance for this section. For a discussion on the Nazi euphemisms, see Lucy S. Dawidowicz, The War Against the Jews 1933-1945 (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975), pp. xiii, 130, 134, 136, 139; Gerald Green, The Artists of Terezin (Schocken Books, 1978), pp. 20-21; Walter Laqueur, The Terrible Secret (Little, Brown, 1980), pp. 17-18; John Toland, Adolf Hitler (Doubleday, 1976), Vol. II, pp. 861-862.

³Document 710-PS, Exhibit USA-509, Reichmarshall Hermann Goring to SS Gruppenfuhrer Reinhard Heydrich, July 1941; Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal (Nuremberg: International Military Tribunal, 1947-1948), IX: 518-519, XXVI: 266-267.

⁴See, for example, the testimony of Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Trial of the Major War Criminals, XVI: 19. Also, according to Gordon K. Hirabayashi, Robert H. Jackson (Supreme Court justice and chief U.S. prosecutor) complained to Frank L. Walters (a member of the prosecution staff who coincidentally was Hirabayashi's lawyer) that the Nazi defendants cited the U.S. Supreme Court decisions on the Japanese American cases as a defense. Unfortunately, such a citation could not be found in the official text of proceedings. But in all likelihood, if such a claim was made, it would have been erased from the transcript. Tu quo que arguments were prohibited under the rules of the Tribunal, and any mention of similar misdeeds by the victorious nations was stricken from the record. See Bradley F. Smith, Reaching Judgement at Nuremberg (Basic Books, 1977), pp. 81, 102.

⁵George M. Kren and Leon Rappoport, The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior (Holmes and Meier, 1980), pp. 7, 87, 138.

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

⁶Canada also used euphemistic terms to describe the incarceration of Japanese Canadians in prison camps. See Ken Adachi, The Enemy That Never Was (McClelland and Stewart, 1976), pp. 218, 251-252.

⁷Although the United States did not engage in wholesale murder, there is an analogue in the group incarceration of a nation's own citizens and residents based solely on ancestry.

⁸Presidential Proclamation 2525, December 7, 1941 (6 Fed Reg 6321); based on 50 USC 21-23 (1940), 1 Stat 577 (1798). The Justice Department was more comfortable about its actions, and used straightforward terms like internment, internee, and internment camp. Internees held by the Justice Department were entitled to individual hearings, were granted protections of the Geneva Prisoners of War Convention of 1929, and were given the right to appeal to a neutral consul (Spain). American citizens held in the regular concentration camps had far fewer rights in comparison.

⁹The individual who devised this semantic solution has not been positively identified, but Colonel Karl R. Bendetsen is the most likely candidate. Bendetsen was a lawyer by profession, a representative of the Provost Marshall General during the crucial discussion phase, and eventually head of the "Wartime Civil Control Administration," the military-civilian agency responsible for implementing the detention orders. See Roger Daniels, Concentration Camps USA (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972), pp. 44-70; Michi Weglyn, Years of Infamy (William Morrow, 1976), pp. 69, 94.

¹⁰Executive Order 9066, February 19, 1942 (7 Fed Reg 1407).

¹¹U.S. War Department, Final Report: Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast 1942 (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943), p. 26.

¹²Public Proclamation No. 4, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, March 27, 1942 (7 Fed Reg 2601).

¹³Final Report: Japanese Evacuation, pp. 45, 96-100, 513-515.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 216.

¹⁵Memorandum to all staff members, War Relocation Authority, Tule Lake Project, Newell, California, October 2, 1942.

¹⁶Civilian Restrictive Order No. 1, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, May 19, 1942 (8 Fed Reg 982).

¹⁷Public Proclamation No. WD-1, War Department, August 13, 1942 (7 Fed Reg 6593).

¹⁸Circular No. 19, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, September 17, 1942, Final Report: Japanese Evacuation, p. 527.

RAYMOND Y. OKAMURA

¹⁹Korematsu v. U.S., December 18, 1944 (323 US 214, at 221-223).

²⁰Ibid., at 230-232.

²¹For example, the White residents of Owens Valley, California were appallingly ignorant about the massive Manzanar Concentration Camp right in their backyards. See Isami Arifuku Waugh and Raymond Okamura, "Book Review/Camp and Community," Amerasia Journal, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1978), 133-136.

²²"First Japanese Enter Fresno Assembly Centers," The Fresno Bee, May 11, 1942.

²³See newspaper articles listed in Raymond Okamura, "Pilgrimage Guide to the Temporary Detention Camps," Pacific Citizen, Holiday Issue, December 19-26, 1980, pp. 56-59. Also check other newspapers in the area printed on the same dates: competing newspapers frequently published near-identical articles, obviously taken from army press releases.

²⁴"Camp at Puyallup," The Tacoma News-Tribune, March 31, 1942.

²⁵"General DeWitt's Statement," The Washington Post, April 15, 1943.

²⁶Audrie Girdner and Anne Loftis, The Great Betrayal (Macmillan, 1969), p. 147.

²⁷Estelle Ishigo, Lone Heart Mountain (Anderson, Ritchie and Simon, 1972), p. 9.

²⁸Ted Nakashima, "Concentration Camp: U.S. Style," The New Republic, Vol. 106, No. 24 (June 15, 1942), 822.

²⁹Stanford M. Lyman, "Generation and Character: The Case of the Japanese American," East Across the Pacific (Clio Press, 1972), p. 286.

³⁰"Prof. Says WRA 'Spied' on JAs in WW2," Pacific Citizen, April 24, 1981. See article by Peter T. Suzuki, "Anthropologists in Wartime Camps for Japanese Americans: A Documentary Study," Dialectical Anthropology Vol. 6, No. 1 (1981), 23-60.

³¹Raymond Okamura, "The Concentration Camp Experience from a Japanese American Perspective," Counterpoint: Perspectives on Asian America (Los Angeles: University of California Asian American Studies Center, 1976), pp. 27-30.

³²Ibid., p. 29. Also see pamphlet by Edison Uno, "Concentration Camps, American-style" (reprint from Pacific Citizen, Special Holiday Edition, December 1974), wherein the author strongly argues for the use of the term concentration camp, yet captions his charts as "relocation camps" and "assembly centers."

THE AMERICAN CONCENTRATION CAMPS

³³Holocaust and Crisis of Human Behavior, p. 137. Quotation from H. Stuart Hughes, The Sea Change: Migration of Social Thought, 1930-1965 (Harper and Row, 1975), p. 53.

IMR

International Migration Review - the foremost source in current critical research and theory development...

FOR ALMOST 25 YEARS NOW:

The International Migration Review has provided contemporary analyses and critical examinations of human migratory movements and ethnic group relations. Through an interdisciplinary approach and an international perspective, IMR also offers a topical and comprehensive review of international policy formation and legislative developments concerning population movements in the areas of both emigration and reception, representative of scholarly and institutional advances in migration studies throughout the world.

EACH ISSUE OF IMR:

presents original articles on the demographic and sociological trends in migration, research documentation notes, reports on key legislative developments, both nationally and internationally, an extensive bibliographic and abstracting service, the International Newsletter on Migration (Research Committee on Migration, International Sociological Association), plus a scholarly review of new books in the field.

Highlights of the Spring Issue

Volume 16, No. 1

- "The Relationship of U.S. Aid, Trade and Investment to Migration Pressures in Major Sending Countries" by T.K. Morrison
- "The Political Impact of Foreign Labor: A Re-evaluation of the Western European Experience" by M. Miller
- "Farm Labor Migrations in the Awash Valley of Ethiopia" by H. Kloos
- "West Indian Migration to the United States Virgin Islands: Demographic Impacts and Socio-Economic Consequences" by K. De Albuquerque and J.L. McElroy
- "Lebanese Migration and Settlement in Sydney, Australia" by I. H. Burnley
- "Migrant-Nonmigrant Differentials in Socioeconomic Status, Fertility and Family Planning in Nepal" by J.M. Tuladhar and I. Stockel
- "Real Earnings and Human Migration in the United States" by R.J. Cebula
- "Political Integration of Mexican American Children: A Generational Analysis" by J.W. Lamare
- "Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1981" by A.T. Fragomen, Jr.

Forthcoming

- New Directives in Theory and Methods and Ethnicity Research, edited by Alejandro Portes and Charles Hirschman.
- Migration and Development edited by Roger Bohning.

Also in preparation, two special issues:
Mental Health Problems of Migrants
Undocumented/Illegal Migrants

INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION REVIEW
209 Flagg Place, Staten Island, N.Y. 10304

Please enter my subscription for the period checked below:

	1 year	2 years	3 years
Individuals	<input type="checkbox"/> \$22.50	<input type="checkbox"/> \$44.00	<input type="checkbox"/> \$67.50
Institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> 29.50	<input type="checkbox"/> 58.00	<input type="checkbox"/> 86.50

Outside the continental U.S.A. add \$5.00 per year.
Single issues are \$8.00 each + \$1.50 postage and handling.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP _____