

1.

EUPHEMISTIC AND ACCURATE TERMINOLOGY

Statement By

Raymond Y. Okamura  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Statement submitted to the "Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians" established by Public Law 96-317 on September 11, 1981 at Seattle, Washington.

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 Terezin, 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."<sup>1</sup>

Nazi officials were very careful about what they put in writing and always masked their evil intentions with euphemistic language. The actual order to annihilate the Jewish people, for example, was camouflaged with cryptic phraseology:<sup>2</sup>

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.

Later, the Nazi defendants at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials claimed that they knew nothing more than what the written documents

stated.<sup>3</sup> Until the truth finally leaked out, 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." Also, the euphemistic language made it easier for the vast number of government workers involved in the machinery of death to carry out their tasks without remorse.<sup>4</sup>

Nazi Germany was not unique in the use of deceptive terminology for propaganda purposes.<sup>5</sup> Governments--like people--generally do not like to admit wrongdoing or think badly of themselves; and any government in power can be expected to hide, misrepresent, or rationalize its unsavory activities. But once the government changes hands, and the truth becomes widely known, 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 ingenious array of euphemisms--some chillingly identical to the Nazi euphemisms--were used by the U. S. government to describe the mass incarceration of Japanese Americans.<sup>6</sup> The fact that the government at the time promoted euphemistic language

is understandable: the puzzling phenomenon is the continued uncritical adherence to the government-coined expressions-- even to this date--by nearly everyone concerned. If this practice persists much longer, there will be no one left alive who can testify to the truth, and the United States will score one of the biggest propaganda feats in recent history.

In early 1942, federal officials were faced with a perplexing problem: how to satisfy the growing demands from the West Coast to lock up every single person of Japanese ancestry. There was no problem with respect to adult Japanese nationals against whom there was even the flimsiest bit of evidence, no matter how farfetched. Non-citizens could be classified as "alien enemies deemed dangerous" and summarily interned under individual warrants by the Justice Department.<sup>7</sup> The question was how to imprison a large number of innocent people--especially American citizens--under color 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 device 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 double-talk.<sup>8</sup> Euphemistic, vague, or misleading terms were formulated to cover up the massive violation of constitutional and human rights.

"Evacuation" and "relocation" are the two most commonly used terms to describe the World War II experience of Japanese Americans.

5.

A close examination of the definitions of these words, however, reveals the underlying propaganda 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; and 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 the Nazi orders. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's order never mentioned detention or imprisonment. Instead, the true intent of the order was cunningly disguised as follows:<sup>9</sup>

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.

U. S. government and military officials knew exactly what those innocuous sounding phrases meant, and they promptly set

6.

about building concentration camps. "Any or all persons" meant only persons of Japanese ancestry; "may be excluded" meant being kicked out of 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:<sup>10</sup>

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 detraining.

And, the resultant public proclamation by General DeWitt puts the Nazi propagandists to shame:<sup>11</sup>

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

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;" and the permanent concentration camps where they were ultimately incarcerated were called "relocation centers." All written orders contained the curious phrase "non-alien," which turned out to be a code word for a citizen of the United States of America.<sup>12</sup>

Government and military officials took great pains to assure that everyone within their control followed the linguistic party-line. In a remarkable bit of gibberish, General DeWitt instructed his subordinate military commanders:<sup>13</sup>

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.

Dillon S. Myer, director of the so-called "War Relocation Authority," issued similar instructions to the civilian staff:<sup>14</sup>

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 '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.

But 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:<sup>15</sup>

8.

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.

For the concentration camps located outside of the Western Defense Command jurisdiction, Secretary of War Stimson issued similar orders:<sup>16</sup>

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.

The written orders were backed up 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 enforced with physical violence if necessary. General DeWitt set forth the following policy:<sup>17</sup>

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.

The use of euphemistic language accomplished a number of important goals for the government: (1) it sidetracked legal and constitutional challenges; (2) it allowed the government to have a good public image; (3) it deceived the victims into

willing cooperation; (4) it permitted the white civilian employees to work without self-reproach; and (5) it kept the historic record in the government's favor.

1. 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 of legal gobbledygook:<sup>18</sup>

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.

Justice Owen J. Roberts, however, did not subscribe to such escapist nonsense, and stated in dissent:<sup>19</sup>

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.

2. The general American public knew little about the concentration camps in its midst. Most white Americans wanted Japanese Americans out of the way; were not particular about how it was accomplished; and once it was done, did not care to know what the camps were like.<sup>20</sup> The newspapers, then the main source of information for the public, worked hand in hand 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:<sup>21</sup>

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.

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."<sup>22</sup> Unless one took a great deal of trouble to

11.

find out, a general newspaper reader would not have known that native-born Americans, women, children, and babies were being held prisoner in these camps. As a matter of fact, there are some white people today 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:<sup>23</sup>

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.

Likewise, the Washington Post editorialized:<sup>24</sup>

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.

3. There was almost total cooperation by Japanese Americans in their own incarceration. Attempts to evade the round-up were rare, and nearly everyone affected dutifully turned themselves in at the designated time and place. Certainly the fear of worse consequences was an important factor; but also a great number of Japanese Americans believed--or desperately 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:<sup>25</sup>

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.

Estelle Ishigo observed as she entered the Pomona Detention  
Camp: 26

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.

The Puyallup Detention Camp was described by Ted Nakashima: 27

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.

Given such a 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. Otherwise, they would have gone stir-crazy. Life seemed more bearable if they pretended that they were "evacuees" instead of prisoners, and that they were living in a "relocation center" instead of concentration camps. The American-educated could not accept the fact that their own government had judged them untrustworthy and imprisoned them like common criminals. The experience contradicted everything they had learned in their school years, and their value system was shattered. One indication of the deep emotional scars left by the incarceration is the continued use of the same 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."<sup>28</sup>

4. For the civilian employees who ran the concentration camps, the euphemisms made their jobs more agreeable. The stigma of being concentration camp wardens was avoided; and the white staff members could think of themselves 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. Yet, instead of declaring the whole program a mistake and freeing the prisoners forthwith, they diligently created a mountain of red-tape, replete with endless questionnaires, reports, regulations, and procedures, which made it 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 intimately engaged in repression and thought control.<sup>29</sup>

5. Thus far, 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; and 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 use 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-1960's reveals a 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."<sup>30</sup>

Beginning with the ethnic awareness movements in the late 1960's, 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 have systematically replaced euphemistic terminology in their text. An incongruous hybrid situation presently exists where authors provocatively use internment or concentration camp in their titles, but revert to the old "evacuation-relocation" nomenclature in their text, tables, and illustrations.<sup>31</sup>

Perhaps the unremitting use of euphemisms is due to carelessness or the inertia of tradition. But before the people who experienced the American concentration camps are gone, the historic record must be corrected. Images of the incarceration are recorded in the memories of the victims, but have not been fully transformed into writing. Future historians may well wonder what the so-called "evacuation-relocation" was all about since some of the details of the event hint at something much more drastic. The time has come to clearly identify the government terms as euphemisms and consign such terms to the footnotes of history. This is not to suggest that the euphemisms should be completely obliterated because there is an important lesson to be remembered regarding the propagandistic nature of official terminology. But the euphemisms should be set apart from the main text with quotation marks or parentheses. Literature on the Holocaust will surely provide a good guide on how to shed the albatross of euphemisms.

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, wrote:<sup>32</sup>

(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.

Writers should scrutinize each word they plan to use for proper definition, implication, and nuance; and any official or

traditional term should be viewed with great suspicion. Words found to misrepresent or distort the fact of incarceration must be replaced with accurate and honest terms. For example, "evacuation" should be superseded by terms like banishment, eviction, exile, expulsion, forced removal, or ouster; "relocation" with detention, imprisonment, incarceration, internment, or lockup; "assembly or reception center" with interim or temporary detention camp; "relocation center" with concentration, detention, internment, or prison camp; "evacuee" with inmate, internee, detainee, or prisoner.

The report of the "Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians" undoubtedly will become the new standard upon which all future works will be based. Furthermore, the report of the Commission will have a profound influence on how the general American people will judge the World War II incarceration of Japanese Americans. Thus, it is of utmost importance that the report of the Commission be impeccable in its use of terminology. Indeed, it will be beneficial if the word "relocation" is dropped from the name of the Commission. The Commission has a duty, through the language of its report, to make sure that the written record is accurate, factual, and truthful.

NOTES

1. Walter 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 (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975), pp. xiii, 130, 134, 136, 139; Gerald Green, The Artists of Terezin (New York: Schocken Books, 1978), pp. 20-21; Walter Laqueur, The Terrible Secret (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), pp. 17-18; John Toland, Adolf Hitler (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), Vol. II, pp. 861-862.
2. Document 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.
3. See, for example, the testimony of Arthur Seyss-Inquart, Trial of the Major War Criminals, op. cit., 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 (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 81, 102.
4. George M. Kren and Leon Rappoport, The Holocaust and the Crisis of Human Behavior (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980), pp. 7, 87, 138.
5. Canada also used euphemistic terms to describe the incarceration of Japanese Canadians in prison camps. See Ken Adachi, The Enemy That Never Was (Toronto: McClland and Stewart, 1976), pp. 218, 251-252.

6. Although 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.
7. Presidential 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 straight-forward 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.
8. The 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 (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972), pp. 44-70; Michi Weglyn, Years of Infamy (New York: William Morrow, 1976), pp. 69, 94.
9. Executive Order 9066, February 19, 1942 (7 Fed Reg 1407).
10. U. S. War Department, Final Report: Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast 1942 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1943), p. 26.
11. Public Proclamation No. 4, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, March 27, 1942 (7 Fed Reg 2601).
12. Final Report: Japanese Evacuation, op. cit., pp. 45, 96-100, 513-515.
13. Ibid., p. 216.
14. Memorandum to all staff members, War Relocation Authority, Tule Lake Project, Newell, California, October 2, 1942.

19.

15. Civilian Restrictive Order No. 1, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, May 19, 1942 (8 Fed Reg 982).
16. Public Proclamation No. WD-1, War Department, August 13, 1942 (7 Fed Reg 6593).
17. Circular No. 19, Western Defense Command and Fourth Army, September 17, 1942, Final Report: Japanese Evacuation, op. cit., p. 527.
18. Korematsu v. U. S., December 18, 1944 (323 US 214, at 221-223).
19. Ibid., at 230-232.
20. For 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, pp. 133-136 (1978).
21. "First Japanese Enter Fresno Assembly Centers," The Fresno Bee, May 11, 1942.
22. See 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.
23. "Camp at Puyallup," The Tacoma News-Tribune, March 31, 1942.
24. "General DeWitt's Statement," The Washington Post, April 15, 1943.
25. Audrie Girdner and Anne Loftis, The Great Betrayal (New York: Macmillan, 1969), p. 147.

20.

26. Estelle Ishigo, Lone Heart Mountain, (Los Angeles: Anderson, Ritchie and Simon, 1972), p. 9.
27. Ted Nakashima, "Concentration Camp: U. S. Style," The New Republic, Vol. 106, No. 24, p. 822, June 15, 1942.
28. Stanford M. Lyman, "Generation and Character: The Case of the Japanese American," East Across the Pacific (Santa Barbara: Clio Press, 1972), p. 286.
29. "Prof. Says WRA 'Spied' on JAs in WW2," Pacific Citizen, April 24, 1981. See forthcoming article by Peter T. Suzuki, "A Documentary Study of Anthropologists and the Wartime Camps for Japanese Americans," Dialectical Anthropology (New York: Elsevier Press, in-press).
30. Raymond 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.
31. Ibid., 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."
32. Holocaust and Crisis of Human Behavior, op. cit., p. 137. Quotation from H. Stuart Hughes, The Sea Change: Migration of Social Thought, 1930-1965 (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 53.