TEACHER GUIDE

MEDIA LITERACY AND JAPANESE AMERICAN
WORLD WAR II INCARCERATION

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 9066
Special thanks to Ron Ritchhart and Harvard Project Zero’s Visible Thinking Project for the use of thinking routines. To learn more, www.pz.harvard.edu or Making Thinking Visible: How to Promote Engagement, Understanding and Independence for All Learners by Ron Ritchhart, Karin Morrison and Mark Church, published by Jossey-Bass, 2011.

The artist Roger Shimomura is represented by the Greg Kucera Gallery, Seattle

**INSPIRING FUTURE GENERATIONS**

Densho (a Japanese term meaning ‘to pass stories to the next generation’) is a Seattle-based nonprofit that shares stories of Japanese American World War II incarceration to promote equity, address racism and bigotry, and encourage the preservation of our democratic principles in times of fear. Founded in 1996, Densho hosts a free online archive of over 1,000 video interviews and 50,000 photos, documents and newspapers, as well as an online encyclopedia on Japanese American history.

In addition to these historical materials, Densho provides lesson plans and online teacher training workshops for educators. An online course connecting Japanese American incarceration to similar histories of racial exclusion during World War II will be available Fall, 2017.

For more information on Densho and Japanese American incarceration, including links to oral histories and teacher resources, please visit www.Densho.org or find us on Facebook or Twitter @DenshoProject.

**PARTNERING ORGANIZATIONS**

This teacher’s guide complements the February 19, 2017 Seattle Times’ educational supplement, of the same name. These publications commemorate the 75th anniversary of Executive Order 9066 authorizing the removal of Japanese Americans during World War II. It was created in the spirit of promoting a strong and vibrant democracy—built on ideals of a diversity of ideas, ongoing questioning/deliberation of issues and ideas, and the importance of an active and participatory citizenry. This teacher guide is presented by The Seattle Times Newspapers In Education Program and Densho, with funding from 4Culture and Seattle Office of Arts & Culture, and sponsorship from ACLU of Washington.
INTRODUCTION
“To be a citizen of the United States requires developing a democratic mind—the intellectual ability to entertain contradictory or opposing ideas, hold tentative judgments, and make decisions based on facts supported by evidence.”

“Restoring Civic Purpose in Schools”
James E. Davis, H. Michael Hartoonian, Richard D. Van Scotter and William E. White

This guide highlights the seldom told story of the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II to provide students with the opportunity to learn from a challenging time in our country’s history – and to apply lessons learned to issues of today. We explore this content first by introducing thinking routines, which can then be used to analyze the included primary source materials. The aim is to help students develop a “democratic mind” by learning how to engage with multiple perspectives on an issue, support thinking with evidence, and to discuss issues with an open heart and mind.

USING THIS TEACHER’S GUIDE
This teacher’s guide was designed to complement the 8-page education supplement, “Media Literacy and Japanese American World War II Incarceration” published on February 19, 2017, in The Seattle Times. The guide is framed into four sections that will help teachers share the story of the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II:

1. Introducing the Story
2. Deepening Understanding of the Story
3. Exploring Complex Issues and Dilemmas of the Story
4. Applying Lessons from the Story to Issues of Today

Each section begins with an example of practice to give a picture of what learning might look like in the classroom, as well as quick facts and guiding questions. Next, you will find directions for thinking routines particularly suited to using the primary source materials with students. These thinking routines are developed by Harvard Project Zero’s Visible Thinking research project, www.pz.harvard.edu. Following the thinking routines in each section, is a suggested collection of primary source materials from the Densho archives to help to share the story.

The elements a teacher needs to provide powerful learning opportunities for students are included in this guide; however, not in the form of lesson plans. For complete curriculum units and lesson plans, see The Learning Center on the Densho website, www.densho.org. Please contact Densho, info@densho.org with your questions, feedback and stories.
THINKING ROUTINES: AN OVERVIEW

Densho: The Japanese American Legacy Project worked with Ron Ritchhart, director of Harvard’s Visible Thinking Project in 2011, to figure out how to engage teachers and their students in thinking about the story of the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II. The result of this inquiry is contained in this teacher’s guide. At its essence, it provides students with primary source materials from the Densho archives, and then engages them in “thinking routines” to promote analysis of this seldom told story in American history, and how it informs thinking about social justice issues of today.

What are thinking routines and how do they work?

Good teachers know how to get their students to think. Researchers at Harvard’s Visible Thinking Project wanted to know just how good teachers go about doing this. They observed these teachers at work in the classroom and found that they take a very systematic approach to getting their students to think, then repeat it again and again with all kinds of content. The researchers took these practices and developed them into “thinking routines;” simple recipes for getting students to think.

Just how do thinking routines promote student learning? Ron Ritchhart comments, “Well, one of the things I like to say is a quote from David Perkins, ‘Learning is a consequence of thinking’”. He goes on to note, “If we’re more aware of the kind of thinking we want students to do, then that thinking is going to lead to developing understanding and developing the kind of learning outcomes we’re after.”

The researchers found that the kind of thinking routine that a teacher uses depends on the kind of thinking that they want their students to develop. So, one thinking routine is used to get students to observe carefully, while another emphasizes metaphorical thinking, and yet another develops thinking about multiple viewpoints on an issue.

To date, the Visible Thinking Project has developed around 30 different thinking routines. They are simple to use in the classroom because they have very few steps, which makes them easy to remember. They are goal oriented, targeting specific thinking skills. Ritchhart points out that another way to think about thinking routines is that each is a pattern. “It’s a pattern that you develop. Are there questions you routinely ask over and over again as your kids are exploring that content? Is there a way you structure the exploration of ideas?” Ritchhart notes that the real power of these instructional patterns is to make them explicit, which extends their use beyond the classroom, “And by making them (thinking routines) explicit, we turn them from a teaching strategy into a strategy for learning that students can then use as tools in their own learning.”


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTINE</th>
<th>KEY THINKING MOVES</th>
<th>HISTORICAL THINKING</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Introducing and Exploring Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See-Think-Wonder</td>
<td>• Description</td>
<td>• Describe what’s there</td>
<td>Good with ambiguous or complex visual stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretation</td>
<td>• Wonder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wondering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoom In</td>
<td>• Description</td>
<td>• Describe what’s there</td>
<td>A variation of See-Think-Wonder involving using only portions of an image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inference</td>
<td>• Build explanations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretation</td>
<td>• Reason with evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Points</td>
<td>• Decision making and planning</td>
<td>• Wonder</td>
<td>Solicits ideas and reactions to a proposal, plan or possible decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uncovers personal reactions</td>
<td>• Make connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Synthesizing &amp; Organizing Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI: Color-Symbol-Image</td>
<td>• Capturing the heart through metaphors</td>
<td>• Capture the heart and form conclusions</td>
<td>A non-verbal routine that forces visual connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: Making Thinking Visible by Ritchhart, Morrison & Church, Jossey-Bass, 2011; “Thinking Like a Historian” by Sam Wineburg, Teaching with Primary Sources Quarterly, Winter 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROUTINE</th>
<th>KEY THINKING MOVES</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>PAGE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| See-Think-Wonder     | * Description  
• Interpretation  
• Wondering            | Good with ambiguous or complex visual stimuli                        | page 3 for see-think-wonder |
| Zoom In              | • Description  
• Inference  
• Interpretation        | A variation of See-Think-Wonder involving using only portions of an image |             |
| Compass Points       | • Decision making and planning  
• Uncovers personal reactions | Solicits ideas and reactions to a proposal, plan or possible decision |             |
| CSI: Color-Symbol-Image | • Capturing the heart through metaphors   | A non-verbal routine that forces visual connections                   |             |
| I Used to Think...   | • Reflection  
• Metacognition                        | Used to help learners reflect on how their thinking has shifted and changed |             |
| Tug of War           | • Perspective taking  
• Reasoning  
• Identifying complexities | Identifying and building both sides of an argument of tension/dilemma |             |
| Word-Phrase-Sentence | • Summarizing  
• Distilling                           | Text-based protocol aimed at eliciting what a reader found important or worthwhile. Used with discussion to look at themes and implications |             |
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PART 1: INTRODUCING THE STORY

Powerful practice #1: Ignite student curiosity by teaching with your mouth closed.

A guest speaker walks into a middle school classroom, and before beginning a lecture, he has students actively discussing a historical event that they previously knew little to nothing about. How did this happen? First he handed out different photos documenting the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II, and asked three questions: What do you see? What do you think is going on? What do you wonder? Then, he kept his mouth closed, and let the students in their small groups do all the talking. After about 20 minutes, each group described for the class, the image they were examining - telling what they saw, what they thought about it and what questions it raised for them. The guest speaker connected the thoughts of all the groups, answered a few key questions, and then, the class was over. Everyone - the classroom teacher, the guest speaker and the students were all amazed at how much they learned by taking the time to look carefully and to think about what they were seeing.
Introduce the story of the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II by using the See-Think-Wonder or Zoom-In (which is a variation of See-Think-Wonder) thinking routine. Primary source images to use with either of these follows the directions for the routines.

“QUICK FACTS”
After Executive Order 9066 was signed by President Roosevelt on February 19, 1942:

Military necessity allowed for the mass removal of Japanese Americans living on the West Coast

Japanese Americans were usually given one to two weeks to close businesses and homes prior their removal

No hearings or trials prior to incarceration

“Camps” in isolated areas – surrounded by armed guards and barbed wire

Those with as little as 1/16 Japanese “blood,” including men, women, and children, were subject to incarceration

- Although the U.S. was at war with Germany and Italy, and despite the fact that there were known German American spy rings in the U.S., there was no mass removal or incarceration of German Americans or Italian Americans.

Guiding Questions
- Is it ever right to deny citizens their constitutional rights?
- What happens to our democratic ideals when our country is at war?
- How can fear threaten a democracy?
- How far should public opinion influence public policy?

THINKING ROUTINE
SEE—THINK—WONDER
A routine for exploring works of art and other interesting things

Purpose: What kind of thinking does this routine encourage?
This routine encourages students to make careful observations and thoughtful interpretations. It helps stimulate curiosity and sets the stage for inquiry.

Application: When and where can it be used?
Use this routine when you want students to think carefully about why something looks the way it does or is the way it is. Use the routine at the beginning of a new unit to motivate student interest or try it with an object that connects to a topic during the unit of study. Consider using the routine with an interesting object near the end of a unit to encourage students to further apply their new knowledge and ideas.

Launch: What are some tips for starting and using this routine?
Ask students to make an observation about an object—it could be an artwork, image, artifact or topic – and follow up with what they think might be going on or what they think this observation might be. Encourage students to backup their interpretation with reasons. Ask students to think about what this makes them wonder about the object or topic. The routine works best when a student responds by using the three stems together at the same time, i.e., “I see..., I think..., I wonder....” However, you may find that students begin by using one stem at a time, and that you need to scaffold each response with a follow up question for the next stem.

The routine works well in a group discussion but in some cases you may want to ask students to try the routine individually on paper or in their heads before sharing out as a class. Student responses to the routine can be written down and recorded so that a class chart of observations, interpretations and wonderings are listed for all to see and return to during the course of study.

- What do you see?
- What do you think about that?
- What does it make you wonder?
Dorothea Lange (1895–1965) was one of the 20th century’s most prominent documentary photographers. She is perhaps best known for her work documenting the Great Depression. Based in California when World War II broke out, she was one of the first photographers to work for the federal government beginning in March 1942 documenting the mass removal of Japanese Americans and their temporary incarceration in temporary “assembly centers.” Many of Lange’s photographs from this period were censored because the U.S. government wanted to control how the mass removal and incarceration were portrayed. The following photos are courtesy of the National Archives and Records Administration.

May 2, 1942  Turlock Assembly Center, California
Original War Relocation Authority (WRA) caption: Turlock, California. These young evacuees of Japanese ancestry are awaiting their turn for baggage inspection at this Assembly center.

April 29, 1942  Tanforan Assembly Center, California
Original WRA caption: Tanforan Assembly center, San Bruno, California. Barracks for family living quarters. Each door enters into a family unit of two small rooms. Tanforan assembly center was opened two days before the photograph was made. On the first day there had been a heavy rain. When a family has arrived here, first step of evacuation is complete.

March 13, 1942  Oakland, California
Original WRA caption: Oakland, California. Following evacuation orders, this store, at 13th and Franklin streets, was closed. The owner, a University of California graduate of Japanese descent, placed the “I AM AMERICAN” sign on the storefront on Dec. 8, the day after Pearl Harbor. Evacuees of Japanese ancestry will be housed in War Relocation Authority centers for the duration.

April 20, 1942  San Francisco, California
Original WRA caption: San Francisco, California. Flag of allegiance pledge at Raphael Weill Public School, Geary and Buchanan Streets. Children in families of Japanese ancestry were evacuated with their parents and will be housed for the duration in War Relocation Authority centers where facilities will be provided for them to continue their education.

April 25, 1942  San Francisco, California
**PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS: PHOTOGRAPHS**

*Ansel Adams* (1902–1984) was perhaps the most important landscape photographer of the 20th century known for his work documenting the untouched wilderness, especially in national parks and other areas of the American West. In the summer of 1943, Adams was invited by his friend, newly appointed director of the Manzanar War Relocation Authority Center, Ralph Merritt, to photograph life at the camp. Adams’s goal was to stress the good American citizenship of the inmates and to show their ability to cope with the situation. Photos are courtesy of the Library of Congress.

| 1943  Manzanar incarceration camp, California | Original Ansel Adams caption: Roy Takeno (Editor) and group reading Manzanar paper in front of office, Yuichi Harata, Nabuo Samamura, Manzanar Relocation Center, California. |
| 1943  Manzanar incarceration camp, California | Original Ansel Adams caption: Manzanar from Guard Tower, view west, (Sierra Nevada in Background) Manzanar Relocation Center, California. |
| 1943  Manzanar incarceration camp, California | Original Ansel Adams caption: Relocation departure, Manzanar Relocation Center |
### PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS: PAINTINGS

Roger Shimomura is an art professor at the University of Kansas. He was born in 1939 in Seattle and spent two years away from his home while incarcerated in Minidoka, Idaho, one of 10 concentration camps for Japanese Americans during World War II. Shimomura's work often focuses on the experiences of Asian Americans and the challenges of being “different” in America. These paintings appear courtesy of the artist and are available digitally in the following slideshow: [http://densho.org/learning/shadow/module/index.html](http://densho.org/learning/shadow/module/index.html).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting Description</th>
<th>Artist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>American Infantry #5</em>, Roger Shimomura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Classmates</em>, Roger Shimomura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>From the series, An American Diary</em>, Roger Shimomura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting depicts the order for Japanese Americans to leave Seattle next to the Seattle skyline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A painting from the series An American Diary</em>, Roger Shimomura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting depicts Roger Shimomura when he was a young boy in the Minidoka camp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Not Pearl Harbor</em>, Roger Shimomura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a painting created by the artist after September 11, 2001.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 2: DEEPENING UNDERSTANDING OF THE STORY

Powerful Practice #2: Let students learn more about the story from those who lived it.

Listening to others tell stories is an age-old way of learning. Densho’s collection of over 1,000 oral histories brings the voices of ordinary people telling their experiences during World War II to students so that they can deepen their understanding of this period of history. How does a teacher know if students understand what they hear in a presentation? One teacher selected a segment from a visual interview from the Densho archive and showed it to her students. Then she asked them to think about the core ideas, what they found to be most interesting, or important. Developing these ideas further, the teacher asked students to note a color, a symbol (a sign that stands for something else), and an image that represents the core ideas from the oral history. The students recorded the color, symbol and image on paper, then wrote a short explanation of how these connect to the story. Students paired up and shared their thinking with one another. Finally, the entire class discussed what makes a particular color, symbol, or image particularly insightful.

Have students use metaphors using the Color-Symbol-Image thinking routine to make their thinking visible. Through their selections and explanations, a teacher can assess just how much a student understands. Transcripts of selected video interviews are provided, and teachers can choose to read these to a class. However, there is power to hear and see the person telling their story. To access the recordings go to [www.densho.org](http://www.densho.org).

“QUICK FACTS”

- Anti-Asian immigration policies included stopping all immigration from Japan in 1924.
- 120,000 people were incarcerated, 66% are American-born citizens, 33% are under 18 years.
- Orphaned Japanese American children were taken from institutions on the West Coast and placed in a special orphanage at the Manzanar, CA camp because of “military necessity.”
- A coalition of church groups and educational leaders helped some 5,000 Japanese Americans to leave the camps early to attend college.
- In 1942, interracial marriages were rare, and even illegal in most states. A few non-Japanese Americans “voluntarily” joined their Japanese American spouses in the camps.

Guiding questions

- What does it mean to be a patriot?
- What is loyalty?
- Is there a price that’s too high to pay for democracy?
- What happens when you look like the enemy?
THINKING ROUTINE

CSI: COLOR, SYMBOL, IMAGE
*A routine for distilling the essence of ideas non-verbally*

**Purpose: What kind of thinking does this routine encourage?**
This routine asks students to identify and distill the essence of ideas from reading, watching or listening in non-verbal ways by using a color, symbol, or image to represent the ideas.

**Application: When and where can it be used?**
This routine can be used to enhance comprehension of reading, watching, or listening. It can also be used as a reflection on previous events or learnings. It is helpful if students have had some previous experience with highlighting texts for important ideas, connections, or events.

The synthesis happens as students select a color, symbol, and image to represent three important ideas. This routine also facilitates the discussion of a text or event as students share their colors, symbols, and images.

**Launch? What are some tips for starting and using this routine?**
After the class has read a text, you might ask the class to identify some of the interesting, important, or insightful ideas from the text and list these on the board. Write “CSI: Color, Symbol, Image” on the board. Select one of the ideas the class has identified. Ask students what color might they use to represent the essence of that idea? What color captures something about that idea, maybe it is the mood or tone. Select another idea and ask the class what symbol they could use to represent that idea. You might define a symbol as a simple line representation or uncomplicated drawing, such as two crossed lines to denote an intersection of ideas, or a circle to represent wholeness or completeness. Then pick another idea from the list and ask students what image they might use to represent that idea. You might define an image as a visual image or metaphor that is more complex and fully developed than just a symbol.

**Script: What should I say during this routine?**
As you are reading/listening/watching, make note of things that you find interesting, important, or insightful. When you finish, choose 3 of these items that most stand out for you.

- For one of these, choose a color that you feel best represents or captures the essence of that idea.
- For another one, choose a symbol that you feel best represents or captures the essence of that idea.
- For the other one, choose an image that you feel best represents or captures the essence of that idea.

With a partner or group, first share your color and then share the item from your reading that it represents. Tell why you choose that color as a representation of that idea. Repeat the sharing process until every member of the group has shared his or her Color, Symbol, and Image.

Visible Thinking
THINKING ROUTINE

I USED TO THINK..., BUT NOW I THINK...
A routine for reflecting on how and why our thinking has changed

Purpose: What kind of thinking does this routine encourage?
This routine helps students to reflect on their thinking about a topic or issue and explore how and why that thinking has changed. It can be useful in consolidating new learning as students identify their new understandings, opinions, and beliefs. By examining and explaining how and why their thinking has changed, students are developing their reasoning abilities and recognizing cause and effect relationships.

Application: When and where can it be used?
This routine can be used whenever students’ initial thoughts, opinions, or beliefs are likely to have changed as a result of instruction or experience. For instance, after reading new information, watching a film, listening to a speaker, experiencing something new, having a class discussion, at the end of a unit of study, and so on.

Launch: What are some tips for starting and using this routine?
Explain to students that the purpose of this activity is to help them reflect on their thinking about the topic and to identify how their ideas have changed over time. For instance:

When we began this study of ________________________, you all had some initial ideas about it and what it was all about. In just a few sentences, I want to write what it is that you used to think about ________________________. Take a minute to think back and then write down your response to “I used to think...”

Now, I want you to think about how your ideas about ________________________ have changed as a result of what we’ve been studying/doing/discussing. Again in just a few sentences write down what you now think about _______________________. Start your sentences with, “But now, I think...”

Have students share and explain their shifts in thinking. Initially it is good to do this as a whole group so that you can probe students’ thinking and push them to explain. Once students become accustomed to explaining their thinking, students can share with one another in small groups or pairs.

Remind students of the topic you want them to consider. It could be the ideal itself—fairness, truth, understanding, or creativity—or it could be the unit you are studying. Have students write a response using each of the sentence stems:

• I used to think...
• But now, I think.
### PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIALS: ORAL HISTORY TRANSCRIPTS

Go to www.Densho.org/Times to view these oral history interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW INFORMATION</th>
<th>NARRATOR BACKGROUND</th>
<th>SEGMENT OVERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akiko Kurose</strong></td>
<td>Kurose, Japanese American female, born 1925, Seattle, Washington. In 1942, she and her family were incarcerated at the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months and then taken to the Minidoka, Idaho concentration camp.</td>
<td>Kurose remembers the attack on Pearl Harbor, and how, as a teenage girl in Seattle, she suddenly realized her “Japanese-ness”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 1997</td>
<td>Location: Seattle, Washington Interviewer: Matt Emery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kara Kondo</strong></td>
<td>Kondo, Japanese American female, born 1916, Yakima Valley, Washington. Following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, she and her family were removed to the Portland, Oregon “Assembly Center” and then to the Heart Mountain, Wyoming concentration camp.</td>
<td>Kondo recalls the day she left her home and entered the Portland “Assembly Center.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7 &amp; 8, 2002</td>
<td>Location: Seattle, Washington Interviewer(s): Alice Ito, Gail Nomura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joseph Frisino</strong></td>
<td>Frisino, male, Italian and Irish descent, born 1919 in Baltimore, Maryland. He grew up outside of Baltimore and began working for the Baltimore News Post in 1937 until he was drafted into the Army in 1940.</td>
<td>Frisino talks about some of the feelings U.S. soldiers had towards Japanese Americans while they guarded them during the mass removal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 20, 2000</td>
<td>Location: Seattle, Washington Interviewer(s): Jenna Brostrom, Stephen Fugita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masao Watanabe</strong></td>
<td>Watanabe, Japanese American male, born 1923, Seattle, Washington. He and his family were removed to the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months and then incarcerated at the Minidoka, Idaho concentration camp. In 1943, he joined the 442nd Regimental Combat Team and served in Europe.</td>
<td>Watanabe shares his feelings about being confined at the Puyallup “Assembly Center,” also known as “Camp Harmony.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 1998</td>
<td>Location: Seattle, Washington Interviewer(s): Tom Ikeda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helen Amerman Manning</strong></td>
<td>Manning, Caucasian female, born 1916, Bloomfield, New Jersey. She was a high school teacher at the Minidoka, Idaho concentration camp.</td>
<td>Manning talks about teaching at the Minidoka camp and her thoughts about the incarceration of Japanese Americans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: August 2, 2003</td>
<td>Location: SeaTac, Washington Interviewer(s): Alice Ito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aya Uenishi Medrud</strong></td>
<td>Medrud is a Nisei (second generation Japanese American) female who was born 1925, in Malden, Washington. She grew up in Seattle, Washington, before being removed with her family to the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months. She and her family were then moved to the Minidoka, Idaho incarceration camp.</td>
<td>Medrud is a Nisei (second generation Japanese American) female who was born 1925, in Malden, Washington. She grew up in Seattle, Washington, before being removed with her family to the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months. She and her family were then moved to the Minidoka, Idaho incarceration camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: May 13, 2008</td>
<td>Location: Denver, Colorado Interviewer: Daryl Maeda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Akiko Kurose Interview
Date of Interview: July 17, 1997
Location: Seattle, Washington
Interviewer: Matt Emery
Length of Interview: 2 hours 5 minutes

Kurose was a Nisei (second generation Japanese American) female who was born 1925 in Seattle, Washington. In 1942 she and her family were removed from Seattle and incarcerated at the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months and then taken to the Minidoka, Idaho incarceration camp. After the war, Kurose was an educator in the Seattle Public Schools.

Below is an interview excerpt in which Kurose, as a teenage girl in Seattle, tells how she suddenly felt her “Japaneseness” after the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Interview Excerpt

ME: Let’s move ahead, to the time of Pearl Harbor. Where were you, what were you doing?

AK: Well, I had just come home from church. And then we kept hearing, “Pearl Harbor was bombed, Pearl Harbor was bombed.” I had no idea where Pearl Harbor was. My geography was not that sophisticated. I had no idea, and my father said, “Uh-oh, there is going to be trouble.” And I said, “Well, how come?” He said, “Well, Japan just bombed Pearl Harbor.” And he says, “We’re at war with Japan.” But, I thought, “Why should it bother me?” You know, “I’m an American.” And then he said, “You know, we are aliens.” My parents... “We don’t have the citizenship, so they’re gonna do something, we’ll probably get taken away.” But at that time, my parents had no feeling that we would be removed because – so they were saying my brother would have to take on the responsibility to keep the family together, because they may be removed or put into camp or whatever. And, then when I went back to school that following morning, December 8th, one of the teachers said, “You people bombed Pearl Harbor.” And I’m going, “My people?” All of a sudden my Japaneseness became very aware to me. And then that I was no longer, I no longer felt I’m an equal American, that I felt kind of threatened and nervous about it. And then the whole time we were now getting the orders, and getting prepared to go to camp and whatever.

ME: You mentioned your teacher said, “Your people bombed Pearl Harbor.” Was there any other signs, any other discrimination?

AK: Yeah, and some of the students would just be very unfriendly. Because it was a very emotional time and some of their families, members probably went to war or were involved. And so it became a very emotional time, and my Japaneseness became very, very prominent to me. It was that I became very much aware of my Japaneseness. Not in a real positive way, but kind of a scary way, or, and almost like... “Why?”

ME: What did you think was going to happen to your parents?

AK: I had no idea. I just felt like, “Why are they saying this, and where are they gonna go?” I really had no idea what a camp would be like. And I really didn’t know what to expect.

ME: What, what did they think was going to happen to them? Did they have any idea?

AK: They just said, “Uh-oh.” And they didn’t really clarify, or possibly they didn’t know, probably they didn’t know exactly what was going to happen. The FBI was, came to the apartment, and they were watching the man across the street, Mr. Kimura, because he worked for the Japanese Consulate or whatever. And so, all this became a very, kind of a fearful kind of thing for us. You know, saying, “Wow, this could actually happen.”
Kara Kondo Interview
Date of Interview: December 7 & 8, 2002
Location: Seattle, Washington
Interviewer(s): Alice Ito, Gail Nomura
Interview Length: 5 hours 30 minutes

Kondo was a Nisei (second generation Japanese American) female born 1916 in the Yakima Valley, Washington, and spent her childhood in Wapato, Washington. Following the bombing of Pearl Harbor, she and her family were removed to the Portland, Oregon “Assembly Center” and then to the Heart Mountain, Wyoming incarceration camp. Kondo was on the staff of the camp newspaper, the Heart Mountain Sentinel. She left camp for Chicago, Illinois, and lived in Pennsylvania, Kentucky and Missouri before returning to Yakima, Washington. She became involved in political organizations such as the League of Women Voters and became actively involved in groups addressing environmental issues.

Below is an interview excerpt where Kondo recalls the day she left her home and entered the Portland “Assembly Center.”

Interview Excerpt

AI:  Well, I think you had mentioned that it was early June when you and your family were finally actually physically going to leave. Could you tell us about those last days?

KK:  Yes. It, it had such a feeling of unreality. The contingent of the military that came from, from Fort Lewis to evacuate us, to get our final papers in order and to actually put us on the train, were very kind. They were helpful, and we worked with them for about, close to a week. And they’re the ones that had to see that we got on the train. There were two, we had two trains. One left on, I think it was June the fourth, and the other, the fifth. But I think I went on the first one. And to accompany us from Wapato to Portland was another group that stayed on the — came to escort us to Portland. And I remember that I was, when we approached there I was helping, I helped with name interpretation and pronunciation and with the, with the GIs that were helping us move. And so I was outside helping them with the names of people, who were supposed to get on the train, and I heard a scuffle and pretty soon someone was being kicked off, one of the soldiers that were to accompany us was being thrown off the train. And it was very frightening to think, “Oh my goodness. What’s going to happen to us?” And those who had been there said, “Don’t worry. Nothing is going to happen to you. They had a little leave time in between and they got drunk. And so they were, but we told them that, gave them explicit instructions that nothing was going to happen to you.”

So these are the kinds of things that occurred, but I can never, I can always picture the sun was setting and the crowd was gathering where the people ...some of your friends... and there were hundreds of people there. Some were there to say goodbye, others came just for the curiosity. And it just had sort of a circus feeling about it. And people were looking for their friends to say goodbye to, and, but finally we got on the train. I remember the last name and I got help going up the train. And I said, “Thank you for your help.” He said, “Forget it. Thank you.” And it was such an odd feeling, it just... as we pulled out I can remember my father holding onto the arm of the seat, hard seat. The blinds had been drawn, but you could, before they did that you could see the shadow of Mt. Adams and the sun behind it. And looking at his face I could just feel that he was saying goodbye to the place that he’d known so well. Pictures like that just really, when you think about it, were very sad. But it was... such a... it’s hard to explain the kind of feeling, the atmosphere of that time.

But... and we went, traveled through the night with the shades drawn and got to Portland livestock center, our evacuation center about, really about dawn. And I stayed until the last person got in the, into the compound and heard the gate clang behind me. And I think — when people ask what my memory was about evacuation — I think I’ll always remember the sound of the gate clanging behind you and knowing that you were finally under, you had barbed wires around you, and you were really being interned.
Joseph Frisino Interview
Date: June 20, 2000
Location: Seattle, Washington
Interviewer(s): Jenna Brostrom, Stephen Fugita
Length of Interview: 3 hours 56 minutes

Frisino was a male of Italian and Irish descent who was born 1919 in Baltimore, Maryland. He grew up in the countryside outside of Baltimore and began working for the Baltimore News Post in 1937 until he was drafted into the Army in 1940. Frisino went through Officer Candidate School before being shipped overseas to fight for two years in the jungles of Burma as a communications supply officer.

Below is an interview excerpt where Frisino talks about some of the feelings U.S. soldiers had towards Japanese Americans while they guarded them during the mass removal.

Interview Excerpt

SF: I think you, you told a story earlier about one of your soldier friends who had guarded or overseen the, some of the Japanese Americans being interned. Could you tell us that, about that?

JF: Well, we were at Camp Cook, and we, it seemed to me that we were deployed along the, along the coast from Santa Barbara north when the submarine business, when a part of our battalion, in fact, part of our company, including my friend Sergeant Couch, who was with me on Pearl Harbor Day going to have his picture taken, he was by this time a platoon sergeant, staff sergeant, and he was one of those who was -- I don't know how they selected them—but called out from this 85th Armored Reconnaissance Battalion to usher these, the Japanese Americans to a camp somewhere. I'm not quite sure just where, but somewhere in California. And they were gone, I guess four or five days. I'm not quite sure.

But everybody envied him because here was a chance to maybe get into some action against some of these rotten people who have done this. But nothing really untoward happened. It was simply a matter of escorting these people in, but this one, one fellow was saying that he was, he was manning a machine gun on the, on the armored scout car, and he was saying, “I was just watching these people like a hawk, just hoping somebody would do something 'cause I could fire.” And I mean, he was really gung-ho to fire into these people. And, when he said this, I had no feeling whatsoever of, “Why would you want to do that,” or anything. It just seemed, “Okay, that’s a, that’s a natural way to go, that, you want to hate somebody, if you want to have some revenge, why, this is the way to do it.” But it never, fortunately never happened.

But I never, I never realized then that, the background of these, of these people who were in these trucks. I mean, the Japanese Americans who were in the trucks. So that was, that was my only encounter with, with that transportation situation. I’m, I’m certain that there wasn’t a man in the outfit who didn’t feel exactly like that fellow who was manning the machine gun, that given a chance, they’re gonna fire.
Masao Watanabe Interview
Date: June 19, 1998
Location: Seattle, Washington
Interviewer(s): Tom Ikeda
Interview Length: 2 hours 56 minutes

Watanabe was a Nisei (second generation Japanese American) male born 1923 in Seattle, Washington. He and his family were removed from their homes and incarcerated at the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months and then moved to the Minidoka, Idaho incarceration camp. In 1943, he volunteered for the army while in camp and served in Europe with the 442nd Regimental Combat Team. Watanabe returned to Seattle after the war and worked for the U.S. Customs Service.

Below is an interview excerpt where Watanabe shares his feelings about being confined at the Puyallup “Assembly Center,” also known as “Camp Harmony.”

Interview Excerpt

TI: Let’s jump now to the Puyallup Assembly Center, or what was called “Camp Harmony.”

MW: That was a hell of a good name.

TI: Do you remember going to Puyallup and what it was like?

MW: Hey, I was a high school graduate. I sure remember.

TI: And what was it like?

MW: I had been to Puyallup a few times when it was the fairgrounds of Western Washington. Little did I know that I would replace the pigs and the cows and that type of stuff, you know, ‘cause they, they restructured the fairgrounds and the parking lots into these temporary hovels. And they had a hell of a lot of nerve calling it “Camp Harmony.” But, anyway, it was... boy, it was a real traumatic type of living, where you’re in the former stalls where the pigs and the cows and everything else were. Temporary shacks, just the walls were so many feet off the ground, and families of six and seven were crowded into one little spot. I think intentionally, I forgot a lot of “Camp Harmony.” I hate to use the word “harmony,” but it was just not a very good experience.

TI: How were you, what were you thinking? I mean, you were a high school graduate and so you had learned a lot in your civics courses and history courses about the United States Constitution and all those things. What was going through your mind as this was happening to you, a United States citizen?

MW: Well, in retrospect I can say a lot about that, but I just... I just felt that all this liberty and crap was all crap. You know, it just, you read so much about democracy and all this and it was a real eye-opener to see what could happen to citizens and what does citizenship mean. ‘Cause it just bothered the heck out of me to think that I tried to be a good citizen and, man, they are tossing me into joints like this. I didn’t like it. I can’t imagine anybody liking it or having positive images of being locked up.
Helen Amerman Manning Interview
Date: August 2, 2003
Location: SeaTac, Washington
Interviewer(s): Alice Ito
1 hour 54 minutes

Manning was a Caucasian female who was born 1916 in Bloomfield, New Jersey. She attended Michigan State College and then Stanford University for graduate courses, before becoming a high school teacher at the Minidoka, Idaho incarceration camp. After World War II, Manning worked for various organizations in the field of race relations, including the San Francisco Council for Civic Unity, and the Oakland Redevelopment Agency.

Below is an interview excerpt where Manning talks about teaching at the Minidoka camp and her thoughts about the incarceration of Japanese Americans.

Interview Excerpt

AI: Well, I'd like to go back a little ways and -- to the point before you actually started classes. And I'm wondering what your own thinking was on the justification of this relocation issue.

HM: Well, it was very interesting... I guess I hadn't really thought it through that much. My aunt, who was the social worker, was living in Carmel at the time, and she was a social worker, and had a colleague who was in the assembly center down in Monterey County, and she had been to visit her, and she knew more about the relocation program than I did. So she clued me in a lot, so I don't think I'd ever confronted the issue head-on. But when we started the workshop of the faculty and the cadet teachers, the Nisei, who were to be assistant teachers, was the day they started blasting for the foundations of the watchtowers. Well, those dynamite blasts just reverberated through the building, and of course, it just underscored the humiliation of the cadet teachers. And we could see they were quite upset. Finally they asked us, “Well, what do you think about relocation, the evacuation?” And when the teachers said, “Well, we don't think they should have taken the American citizens,” the tension was broken, and we could turn then to discussing education. So that was my first real confrontation of it.

AI: That must have been quite a moment, to really be confronting the idea that the government had taken this action against American citizens, and that as a group of teachers, you were stating that in your opinion, that had been mistaken on the part of the government.

HM: Right, right. But I have to say, we were confronted with such an adjustment, new things happening all our waking hours, so that there was almost more than we could reflect on. And it sort of grew on me, and as I learned more about the experiences prior to the actual evacuation, and, for instance, I knew a young college student and his sister who relocated very early, and through them, and through their conversations with my parents whom they visited in New Jersey, I learned how, after the evacuation orders, people would come up to their home and, “Well, I’ll give you five dollars for your refrigerator,” and they just seemed to feel that a Japanese family was fair picking. And then I learned about how people had to dispose of their goods, could only bring what they could carry in a suitcase, and the whole picture began to unfold. But it didn't come all at once. And I'm still learning.
Aya Uenishi Medrud Interview
Date: May 13, 2008
Location: Denver, Colorado
Interviewer: Daryl Maeda
2 hours

Medrud is a Nisei (second generation Japanese American) female who was born 1925, in Malden, Washington. She grew up in Seattle, Washington, before being removed with her family to the Puyallup, Washington “Assembly Center” for several months. She and her family were then moved to the Minidoka, Idaho incarceration camp. From Minidoka, she relocated with family to Utica, New York. Medrud also worked in Japan for the U.S. Army of Occupation and for the Tokyo General Army Hospital during the Korean War. She married a U.S. Air Force officer and eventually moved to Boulder, Colorado.

Below is an interview excerpt where Medrud talks about visiting wounded Japanese American soldiers in Utica and then being confronted by an angry woman.

Interview Excerpt

AM: There was a Utica General Army Hospital, which was installed in one of their, one of the hospitals as a military hospital. And what they did was take the soldiers wounded from combat from Europe, European Theatre, in transit from the European Theatre to where they would be going to live in hospitals near where their homes were. And so Utica was a transit (point). The chaplain there found out about the Japanese family, so my dad was called on the phone and asked if my sister and I would go visit some of the GIs who were wounded from the 442 and 100th battalion. So this must have been spring of ‘45, sometime in early ‘45. And I remember we were asked to come and visit, and I had no preparation of what it meant to come and visit something like that. We were brought to a ward, and there were all these GIs from the 442, 100th Battalion, mostly Hawaiian. But they were guys just like us, I mean, we were Asians. And that was my first experience with what war really meant. I mean, you can talk about “raise the flag” and rah-rah-rah and stuff like that, but the human cost was something that I had never known. Nobody prepared me for this.

The chaplain didn’t prepare me, all he did was say, “There are some people you should say hello to.” So my sister and I—and she's always behind me, of course, I'm leading the way and she's behind me -- walking up, and then for the first time encountering people with faces blown away, missing limbs. And the thing that -- and bandages. And you could see that they were Asians and you could see, and they would say something in Hawaii, if they could speak, they would say something, and say hello. But can you imagine what it was like to be at that point, I suppose I was nineteen, probably my nineteenth birthday, to encounter something like that without knowing what to expect. And I don’t know what I said, I probably said something stupid like, “How are you?” and then walked along.

Well, when I walked through, and left that place, my sister and I had to catch a bus to go back home, but we had to transfer to a bus in downtown Utica. And while my sister -- Hope was all over the place, she was looking at the windows and stuff like that -- but I was standing there sort of in a, still in shock from what I had observed and that experience, and I was standing of the corner of the street waiting for my bus to come, and this woman came up to me and stuck her face right in my face like this and screamed at me, “You goddamn Jap, you have no right to be here. Get out of here or I’ll kill you.” And I was, having had that experience in the hospital, I had, you can imagine this frustration because I didn’t know how to respond to her. I was angry, but at the same time, I was just terrified of what that meant, and I couldn’t wait to get home.
PART 3: EXPLORING THE COMPLEXITIES AND DILEMMAS OF THE STORY

Powerful practice #3: Develop appreciation for complexity and learning multiple perspectives of an issue.

A teacher wants her students to know that public issues are rarely black and white. To get them to better understand the complexity involved, she tells the students about a time in U.S. history when Americans were denied their civil liberties and incarcerated because of their ancestry. The year was 1942, and the Japanese had just bombed Pearl Harbor, killing thousands of Americans. President Roosevelt was faced with how to keep the country safe and secure as the U.S. entered World War II. Should Japanese Americans be incarcerated?

Instead of getting her students to answer the question, the teacher has students focus on understanding the abundance of nuance that surrounded the issue at the time. She asks students to read a variety of primary source documents that represent a spectrum of perspectives. Then, in small groups, students identify reasons (from the readings) that Japanese Americans should or should not be incarcerated. Next, they organize the reasons for or against incarceration along a continuum from strongest to weakest. While doing this, they are deliberating – sharing their thinking, and in the process, are developing their understanding of many different perspectives on the issue. The whole class debriefs their learning together, and then discusses how this lesson from history can inform their thinking about issues today.

The impulse today is to look back at World War II and wonder how the government could have incarcerated over 110,000 innocent Japanese Americans. By examining this issue through the Tug-of-War thinking routine, students can begin to see the complexity involved in historic events. To learn the breadth of the issue, be sure to select primary source documents that reflect a wide range of perspectives. The Word-Phrase-Sentence thinking routine can be used to review the primary source documents prior to using the Tug-of-War thinking routine.

“QUICK FACTS”

• Not a single Japanese American living in the United States, Hawaii, or Alaska was ever charged or convicted of espionage or sabotage. The few Americans who were found guilty of spying for Japan were all of European descent.

• Military commanders in Hawaii resisted demands to incarcerate 160,000 people of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii on the basis that Japanese American labor was needed for the military effort.

• Some 33,000 Japanese Americans (out of a total population of around 300,000) served in the U.S. armed forces during World War II, despite the fact that many of their families were incarcerated.

• Dozens of terrorist attacks—including shots fired into homes at night—greeted Japanese Americans returning to the West Coast in 1945.

• When the camps closed in the fall of 1945, those left living there were given $25 and sent back by bus and train to where they had been picked up three years earlier.

Guiding questions

• Is it ever right to sacrifice individual rights for the common good?

• Can you have a democracy without struggle?

• Can the news be reported without bias?

• How does the media shape public opinion?
THINKING ROUTINE

TUG OF WAR
A routine for exploring the complexity of fairness dilemmas

Purpose: What kind of thinking does this routine encourage?
This routine builds on children’s familiarity with the game of tug of war to help them understand the complex forces that “tug” at either side of a fairness dilemma. It encourages students to reason carefully about the “pull” of various factors that are relevant to a dilemma of fairness. It also helps them appreciate the deeper complexity of fairness situations that can appear black and white on the surface.

Application: When and where can it be used?
This routine can be used in any situation where the fairness dilemma seems to have two obvious and contrasting ways of being resolved. Dilemmas can come from school subjects or everyday life: testing of medicine on animals, adding people to a game once it has started, censoring a book in a library, and so on.

Launch: What are some tips for starting and using this routine?
The routine works well as a whole class activity. Present the dilemma to the class. Draw or place a rope with the two ends representing the opposing sides of the dilemma and ask students to think about what side of the dilemma they would be on and why. Students can write their justifications on post-it notes. Encourage students to think of other reasons or “tugs” for both sides of the dilemma, and then have students add their post-it notes to the rope. Stand back and ask students to generate “What if’s:” questions, issues, factors or concerns that might need to be explored further to resolve the issue. Write and post these above the rope. Finish the lesson by asking students to reflect on the activity. What new ideas do they have about the dilemma? Do they still feel the same way about it? Have they made up their minds or changed their minds? The display of the tugs and What if’s? on the rope helps to make students’ thinking visible. Most importantly, their ideas are displayed in a way that shows their interconnectedness. The collaborative thinking process of the group as a whole is represented through the “action” of the tug of war. This is a key point about making thinking visible: It shows the dynamic interaction of people’s thoughts in a context of a shared inquiry. Documenting thinking and making it visible in the classroom can facilitate this interaction in order to make the inquiry richer.

1. Present a fairness dilemma.
2. Identify the factors that “pull” at each side of the dilemma. These are the two sides of the tug of war.
3. Ask students to think of “tugs”, or reasons why they support a certain side of the dilemma. Ask them to try to think of reasons on the other side of the dilemma as well.
4. Generate “what if?” questions to explore the topic further.
THINKING ROUTINE

WORD-PHRASE-SENTENCE
A routine for “essence capturing” and exploring the meaning of text from a variety of personal viewpoints

Review the text that you have read and select: (5 minutes)
a. A word that captured your attention or struck you as powerful.
b. A phrase that moved, engaged, provoked, or was in some way meaningful to you.
c. A sentence that was meaningful to you and helped you to gain a deeper understanding of the text.

1. In your group, have each member share his/her word selection and discuss why he/she selected it. Have a recorder write each person's response (see model format). After everyone has shared and discussed their word selection, repeat for the phrase and sentence. Discussing the choices and making connections to other’s choices is the heart of this routine. (15-30 Minutes)

2. Look at the group's responses. (15 minutes). Consider:
a. What common themes emerge in the groups’ responses?
b. What implications, interpretations, or predictions (your choice here will depend on the type of text being read) surrounding the text emerge from the groups' responses?
c. What aspects/points from the text were missing from the groups' discussion? Why do you think this is?

3. Have each group member reflect briefly on his or her current understanding of the text and how the protocol process contributed to his or her understanding. (5 Minutes)
## Primary Source Materials: Newspaper Articles and Editorials

Record your Word-Sentence-Phrase reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article/Editorial</th>
<th>Word-Sentence-Phrase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *This is War! Stop Worrying About Hurting Jap Feelings*  
by Henry McLemore  
Seattle Times  
January 30, 1942 |  |
| *More Plain Talk*  
by Walt Woodward  
Bainbridge Island Review  
February 5, 1942 |  |
| *FBI Ousts Nipponese in Island Raid*  
The Seattle Times  
February 2, 1942 |  |
| Today and Tomorrow  
*The Fifth Column on the Coast*  
By Walter Lippmann  
New York Tribune  
February 12, 1942 |  |
| *War's End May Find Change In Sentiment Toward Japs*  
The Seattle Times  
December 30, 1942 |  |
| *Loyal Japanese Returning ‘Home’*  
The Seattle Times  
September 1945 |  |
PART 4: APPLYING LESSONS FOR THE STORY TO ISSUES TODAY

Powerful Practice #4: The study of history is most powerful/impactful when it informs thinking and actions today.

Japanese American WWII incarceration is a clear example of a group of U.S. citizens being denied their civil liberties. In the case of the incarceration of Japanese Americans during World War II, the government, after 40 years, apologized and admitted wrongdoing. What can students learn from this and apply to issues today? One teacher starts with three key lessons from the Japanese American experience:

1. A national crisis can cause mass hysteria in which a group of people becomes the unfair target.
2. Political leadership determines public policy – good or bad.
3. Ordinary people can do extraordinary things.

After sharing these with students, he facilitates a class discussion connecting the key lessons with any similar patterns or events today. Then, in small groups, students develop proposals for what they can do to address the issue. Students take notes while each group presents their action proposal to the entire class. The teacher asks each student to select one of the action proposals to investigate further. To shape their investigation, he has students think about then write independently on these questions:

- What excites you about this proposal?
- What do you find worrisome about this proposal?
- What additional information would help you to evaluate this proposal?
- What is your current opinion of this proposal? How might you move forward?

This sequence of learning allows students to apply their learning of history to a current issue, then provide them with a structure to evaluate a course of civic action. Use the “Compass Points” thinking routine to help students assess proposals for civic action.

“QUICK FACTS”
- In 1983, a U.S. congressional commission uncovered evidence from the 1940s showing there was no military necessity for the incarceration of Japanese Americans during WWII. The commission reported that the causes of the incarceration were rooted in “race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership.”
- In a 6 to 3 decision in Korematsu v. United States, the U.S. Supreme Court sided with the President and Congress, arguing, “the military authorities considered that the need for action was great, and the time was short.” In Justice Murphy’s dissent, he stated that the order goes over “the very brink of constitutional power and falls into the ugly abyss of racism.”

Guiding questions
- How do you right a wrong?
- What do you stand for?
- What would you do if the government took away your constitutional rights?
- What would you do if you saw someone being treated unfairly?
- What are the responsibilities of being a citizen?
THINKING ROUTINE

COMPASS POINTS
A routine for examining propositions

1. **E = Excited**
   What excites you about this idea or proposition? What’s the upside?

2. **W = Worrisome**
   What do you find worrisome about this idea or proposition? What’s the downside?

3. **N = Need to Know**
   What else do you need to know or find out about this idea or proposition? What additional information would help you to evaluate things?

4. **S = Stance or Suggestion for Moving Forward**
   What is your current stance or opinion on the idea or proposition? How might you move forward in your evaluation of this idea or proposition?

Purpose: Why use this routine?
To help students flesh out an idea or proposition and eventually evaluate it.

Application: When and where can I use this routine?
This routine works well to explore various sides and facets of a proposition or idea prior to taking a stand or expressing an opinion on it. For instance, the school may be considering the idea of a dress code, a teacher might present the class with idea of altering the room arrangement, a character in a book might be confronted with making a choice, a politician might be putting forth a new way of structuring taxes, and so on.

Launch: What are some tips for starting and using this routine?
The routine needs to be modeled with the whole group initially with responses recorded for the entire class to see. This enables students to build on each other’s ideas. You might record responses using the directions of a compass to provide a visual anchor. That is, draw a compass in the center of the board and then record responses corresponding the appropriate direction: E, W, N, or S. It is generally easiest for students to begin with what is exciting or positive about the idea or proposition and then move to worrisome and need to know. Students might be asked to write down their individual stance or suggestion for moving forward after the initial group discussion. You can also ask students to make an initial judgment or evaluation of the idea or proposition before doing the compass points and then ask them how their thinking has changed after discussion using the compass points routine.
Read the following historical and current primary source materials: record your thoughts before and after the class discussion. Did your opinions change or stay the same? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>PRE-DISCUSSION THOUGHTS</th>
<th>POST-DISCUSSION THOUGHTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General DeWitt’s Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 1943</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naval Intelligence memo by Lt. Commander Ringle, Office of Naval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview of James Rowe in the Justice Department, October 15, 1942</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Order: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find your own:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL DEWITT'S FINAL REPORT

General John DeWitt was the military commander on the West Coast at the onset of World War II. Excerpts from his Final Report justifying and documenting the removal of Japanese Americans from the West Coast — July 19, 1943.

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 and 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.

Whether by design or accident, virtually always their communities were adjacent to very vital shore installations, war plants, etc. While it is believed that some were loyal, it was known that many were not. It was impossible to establish the identity of the loyal and the disloyal with any degree of safety. It was not there was insufficient time in which to make such a determination; it was simply a matter of facing the realities that a positive determination could not be made, that an exact separation of the “sheep from the goats” was unfeasible.
Naval Intelligence Memo

This is from the first two pages of a top-secret memo written in February 1942 by Lt. Commander Ringle of the Office of Naval Intelligence. Ringle was in charge of surveillance of the Japanese on the West Coast. This document was not made available to the U.S. Supreme Court when it heard arguments challenging Executive Order 9066.

I. OPINIONS

(a) That within the last eight or ten years the entire “Japanese question” in the United States has reversed itself. The alien menace is no longer paramount, and is becoming of less importance almost daily, as the original alien immigrants grow older and die, and as more and more of their American-born children reach maturity. The primary present and future problem is that of dealing with those American-born United States citizens of Japanese ancestry, of whom it is considered that least seventy-five per cent are loyal to the United States. The ratio of those American citizens of Japanese ancestry to alien-born Japanese in the United States is at present almost 3 to 1, and rapidly increasing.

(b) That of the Japanese-born alien residents, the large majority are at least passively loyal to the United States. That is, they would knowingly do nothing whatever to the injury of the United States, but at the same time would not do anything to the injury of Japan. Also, most of the remainder would not engage in active sabotage or insurrection, but might well do surreptitious observation work for Japanese interests if given a convenient opportunity.

(c) That, however, there are among the Japanese both alien and United States citizens, certain individuals, either deliberately placed by the Japanese government or actuated by a fanatical loyalty to that country, who would act as saboteurs or agents. This number is estimated to be less than three per cent of the total, or about 3500 in the entire United States.

(d) That of the persons mentioned in (c) above, the most dangerous are either already in custodial detention or are members or such organizations as the Black Dragon Society, the Kaigan Kyokai (Navy League), or the Hoimusha Kai (Military Service Men’s League), or affiliated groups. The membership of these groups is already fairly well known to the Naval Intelligence service or the Federal Bureau of Investigation and should immediately be placed in custodial detention, irrespective of whether they are alien or citizen. (See references (c) and (f).

(e) That, as a basic policy tending toward the permanent solution of this problem, the American citizens of Japanese ancestry should be officially encouraged in their efforts toward loyalty and acceptance as bona fide citizens; that they be accorded a place in the national effort through such agencies as the Red Cross, U.S.O. civilian defense production activities, even though subject to greater investigative checks as to background and loyalty, etc., than Caucasian Americans.

(f) That in spite of paragraph (e) above, the most potentially dangerous element of all are these American citizens of Japanese ancestry who have spent the formative years of their lives, from 10 to 20, in Japan and have returned to the United States to claim their American citizenship within the last few years. These people are essentially and inherently Japanese and may have been deliberately sent back to the United States by the Japanese government to act as agents. In spite of their legal citizenship and the protection afforded them by the Bill of Rights, they should be looked upon as enemy aliens and many of them placed in custodial detention. This group numbers between 600 and 700 in the Los Angeles metropolitan area and at least that many in other parts of Southern California.

(g) That the writer heartily agrees with the reports submitted by Mr. Munson, (reference (b) of this report.)

(h) That, in short, the entire “Japanese Problem” has been magnified out of its true proportion, largely because of the physical characteristics of the people; that it is no more serious than the problems of the German, Italian, and Communist portions of the United States population, and, finally that it should be handled on the basis of the individual, regardless of citizenship, and not on a racial basis.

(i) That the above opinions are and will continue to be true just so long as these people, Issei and Nisei, are given an opportunity to be self-supporting, but that if conditions continue in the trend they appear to be taking as of this date; i.e., loss of employment and income due to anti-Japanese agitation by and among Caucasian Americans, continued personal attacks by Filipinos and other racial groups, denial of relief funds to desperately needy cases, cancellation of licenses for markets, produce houses, stores, etc., by California State authorities, discharges from jobs by the wholesale, unnecessarily harsh restrictions on travel, including discriminatory regulations against all Nisei preventing them from engaging in commercial fishing--there will most certainly be outbreaks of sabotage, riots, and other civil strife in the not too distant future.
Interview of a Lawyer in the Justice Department

James Rowe worked in the Justice Department as Assistant to the Attorney General during World War II. Prior to the signing of Executive Order 9066 the Justice Department argued that U.S. Citizens could not be removed without trials, and that the military exclusion zones for non-citizens should be restricted to small areas around potential military targets. Below is from an Oct 15, 1942 interview in which he describes the last couple of days before EO9066 was signed.

I am convinced that the whole story lies in the single fact that the Army folded under pressure. When I was in San Francisco the first week of January, General DeWitt told me, in referring to the demand already made by Los Angeles group, that he ‘thinks mass evacuation is damned nonsense!’ and I agreed with him and still argue with his original statement. Mass evacuation is damned nonsense and there was no good military reason for it.

Proclamation 9066 was actually put through in less than two days. The Justice Department had no idea that the Army was considering the evacuation of citizens and aliens from large territories until an evening meeting at Attorney General Biddle’s home which can now be definitely dated on February 17. Before this evening meeting, there had been discussion of evacuation of aliens and citizens from all strategic areas. And the Justice Department previously had refused to evacuate citizens from Bainbridge Island. The January 17th meeting was called to adjust the differences between the Justice Department and the War Department in regard to the huge areas in Oregon and Washington that the Army had set forth from which it wanted all aliens excluded. But the question of citizens being evacuated was not being considered.

The argument waxed hot and though the Attorney General did not back Ennis or me with much force, he at least did not argue against us, and we had refused every Army demand successfully. Suddenly General Gullian reached in his pocket and pulled out a slip of paper which contained an order giving the War Department power to remove citizens and aliens. I laughed at him. The old buzzard got mad. I told him he was crazy, and immediately perceived that he was pulling the Army tactic of attacking when on the defense. But in another minute I thought that I was crazy. Because the Attorney General immediately wanted to get to work polishing up the order. His attitude amazed me. Ennis almost wept. I was so mad that I could not speak at all myself and the meeting soon broke up.

The next morning we met in Mr. Stimson’s office and I arrived about three minutes late. Ennis was there when I arrived, arguing with Stimson and Biddle and getting absolutely nowhere because his own boss was against him. Now Biddle was wholeheartedly in favor of the resolution. Ennis and I might have combated Biddle’s passive acceptance of 9066, but it was impossible for us to oppose his energetic approval.

So Ennis and I helped draw up the resolution that very morning, and on the way home in the cab I had to convince Ennis that it was not important enough to make him quit his job.” Rowe pushed 9066 through the budget and had it [illegible] by the evening of the 19th, just two days after it was suggested for the first time.
Everyday is history, be a historian...

**HISTORICAL THINKING**

What do historians do?
- See themselves as detectives searching for evidence among primary sources
- Argue about the past’s meaning and what it has to tell us in the present
- Take a historical approach to primary sources

**Historians . . .**

1. **Describe what's there** — make careful observations — look, read, and listen carefully, note the author, and the use of language.

2. **Wonder** — be curious, ask lots of questions. Who created this? When? For what purpose? How trustworthy might this be? Ask questions about important details across multiple sources to determine points of agreement and disagreement.

3. **Make connections** — determine how this fits with what you already know. Situate the source and its event, issue or topic to a specific time and place. Consider what else you know that might connect to this. Reference other source documents to build a story.

4. **Uncover complexity** - identify what lies beneath the surface, and also note what has been left out or is missing. What is the author not saying? Are there hidden stories to uncover?

5. **Consider different viewpoints** — identify different perspectives and viewpoints on the event, issue or topic. Whom does the issue affect? Who influences it and shapes the debate? Whose voices aren’t heard? What is the “other side”?

6. **Build explanations** — interpret findings, share and deliberate theories with others about the past’s meaning and what it has to tell us in the present.

7. **Reason with evidence** — make assertions and support them with evidence. Why do you think so?

8. **Capture the heart and form conclusions** — identify the big questions, main ideas, and central themes.

Adapted from material by:

A Note on Terminology

**WORDS SHAPE OUR UNDERSTANDING OF HISTORY**

In the 1940s, officials of the federal government and U.S. military used euphemisms—words that made things sound better than they were—to describe their actions against people of Japanese ancestry in the United States. The deceptiveness of the language can now be judged according to evidence from many sources, notably the government’s own investigation, as documented in Personal Justice Denied (1982–83), the report of the U.S. Congressional Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians (CWRIC).

Should euphemistic language from an earlier era be used today? This is an important question for students, teachers, and all people concerned with historical accuracy. Many use the terminology of the past, which they believe is true to that era and unlikely to invite controversy. In contrast, many Japanese Americans, historians, educators, and others use terminology that they feel more accurately represents the historical events. Densho encourages individuals to think critically about the language used during the 1940s by the U.S. government in its punitive treatment of Japanese American citizens and legal resident immigrants based on their ancestry.

In early 1942, Japanese Americans were forcibly removed from the West Coast and forbidden to return. The government called this an “evacuation,” which implies the forced move was done as a precaution for Japanese Americans’ own safety, as in a natural disaster. In fact the CWRIC found that the true motivations were “race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership.” An additional factor was a desire for economic gain. “Exclusion” and “mass removal” are more apt terms, because Japanese Americans were expelled from the West Coast and subject to arrest if they returned.

The commonly used term “internment” is misleading when describing the detention camps that held 120,000 people of Japanese descent during the war. “Internment” refers to the legally permissible detention of enemy aliens in time of war. The word is correctly used to describe the confinement of Japanese, German, and Italian immigrants without U.S. citizenship after war was declared in 1942. The word is incorrect when applied to American citizens; yet two-thirds of the Japanese Americans incarcerated were U.S. citizens. Although “internment” is a recognized and generally used term, Densho prefers “incarceration,” a more accurate term except in the specific case of aliens. “Detention” is used interchangeably, although some scholars argue that the word denotes a shorter time of confinement than the nearly four years the Japanese American camps were in operation.

The Nisei (“second generation”) were U.S. citizens born to Japanese immigrant parents in the United States. The accurate term for them is “Japanese American,” rather than “Japanese.” In public documents, the government referred to the Nisei as “non-aliens” rather than “citizens.” Their parents, the Issei (“first generation”), were forbidden by discriminatory law from becoming naturalized American citizens. By the 1940s, most Issei had lived in the United States for decades and raised their families here. Many had no plans for returning to Japan, and would have become naturalized citizens if allowed. (They remained aliens until 1952, when immigration law was changed.) To reflect this condition, Densho uses the term “Japanese American” to refer to the Issei as well as the Nisei.

At first, Japanese Americans were held in temporary camps that the government called “Assembly Centers,” facilities surrounded by fences and guarded by military sentries. For purposes of identification, Densho uses this euphemistic term as part of a proper noun, for example, “Puyallup Assembly Center,” and in quotation marks when referring to this type of confinement facility.

Japanese Americans were later confined within permanent camps that the government called “Relocation Centers.” In fact, they were a type of prison—compounds of barracks surrounded by barbed wire fences and patrolled by armed guards—which Japanese Americans could not leave without permission. “Relocation center” inadequately describes the harsh conditions and forced confinement of the camps. These camps more aptly fit the dictionary definition of “concentration camps” and were referred to that way by many people at the time, including President Franklin Roosevelt. Use of this term with Japanese Americans is not meant to compare with what happened in Europe, where the term “concentration camp” might itself be considered euphemistic.

The debate over the appropriate terminology to describe the federal government’s treatment of people of Japanese descent during World War II will likely continue into the near future. Until consensus is reached, Densho encourages teachers and students to choose their words thoughtfully and carefully.

Densho’s terminology conforms with the “Resolution on Terminology” adopted by the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund (see http://www.momomedia.com/CLPEF/backgrnd.html).

For examples of these linguistic questions found in the Densho Digital Archive, see: http://www.densho.org/terminology/

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

"Aliens ineligible to citizenship" A phrase used in the wording of alien land law legislation. This phrase was a way to make sure the legislation applied to people of Asian ancestry without specifically mentioning them as the targeted group. Until 1952, existing federal naturalization laws discriminated on the basis of ancestry. The right to become a naturalized U.S. citizen was given only to “free white persons and to aliens of African nativity, and to persons of African descent.”

Assembly centers Temporary incarceration camps that imprisoned Japanese Americans who had been forcibly removed from the West Coast in the early months of World War II. By mid-1942, Japanese Americans were transferred to more permanent “relocation centers,” also known as concentration camps. The terms “temporary incarceration camps” or “temporary prison camps” better convey the nature of these facilities. Densho’s policy, however, is to still use the term “assembly center” as part of a proper noun, e.g. “Puyallup Assembly Center,” and in quotation marks: “assembly center” when referring to the facilities. The reason for this is to avoid confusion, since many people would not associate “temporary incarceration camps” with “assembly centers.”

Civil rights The freedoms and rights that a person has as a member of a given state or country.

Concentration camps Euphemistically called “relocation centers” by the War Relocation Authority (WRA), the concentration camps were hastily constructed facilities that housed Japanese Americans who had been forcibly removed from their homes and businesses on the West Coast during World War II. This term was also used to refer to the Justice Department internment camps where enemy aliens were detained. See internment camps at densho.org/assets/sharedpages/glossary.asp?section=home#Internment%20camps for definition.

Evacuation Forced removal of Japanese Americans in early 1942 from the West Coast. They were forbidden to return. The government called this an “evacuation,” a euphemism that implies it was done as a precaution for Japanese Americans’ own safety, when in fact, it was motivated by economic greed and racial prejudice. “Mass removal” and “exclusion” are better terms for the event, because Japanese Americans were expelled from the West Coast and forbidden to return.

Executive Order 9066 This order, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on February 19, 1942, authorized the War Department to prescribe military areas from which “any and all persons may be excluded.” This provided the basis for the exclusion and mass incarceration (or “internment”) of all Japanese Americans from the West Coast.

Hate Crime A crime motivated by racial, sexual or other prejudice—typically one involving violence.

Incarceration The state of being in prison, or being confined.

Internment camps Camps administered by the Justice Department for the detention of enemy aliens (not U.S. citizens) deemed dangerous during World War II. Most of the several thousand people in these camps were Issei and Kibei who had been rounded up after the attack on Pearl Harbor because they were perceived as “dangerous.” Japanese Latin Americans were also placed in these camps. “Internment camp” is used by some to describe the “incarceration camps.” The term “internment” is problematic when applied to U.S. citizens. Technically, internment refers to the detention of enemy aliens during time of war, and two-thirds of the Japanese Americans incarcerated were U.S. citizens. Although it is a recognized and generally used term even today, we prefer “incarceration” as more accurate, except in the specific case of aliens.

Immigration Act Federal law limiting or prohibiting certain group from immigrating. For example, the Immigration Act of 1924 ended further immigration from Japan, while restricting the number of immigrants to the U.S. from southern and eastern Europe. Echoing the phrase, “aliens ineligible for citizenship,” from the Alien Land Law of 1913 and the 1922 Supreme Court decision in Ozawa v. United States, a special anti-Japanese provision was inserted to exclude the Japanese who were barred from naturalization.

Issei The first generation of immigrant Japanese Americans, most of who came to the United States between 1885 and 1924. The Issei were ineligible for U.S. citizenship and considered “enemy aliens” during World War II.

Jap A derogatory, hostile term used to refer to Japanese and Japanese Americans.
Japanese American Two-thirds of those imprisoned during World War II were Nisei born in the United States and thus U.S. citizens. The proper term for them is “Japanese American,” rather than “Japanese.” Their parents, the Issei, were immigrants who were legally forbidden from becoming naturalized citizens. While they were technically aliens, the Issei had lived in the U.S. for decades by the time of World War II and raised their children in this country. Many of them considered themselves to be culturally Japanese, but were committed to the United States as their home. Calling the Issei “Japanese American” as opposed to “Japanese” is a way to recognize that fact.

Land Laws Alien land laws are most often associated with western states’ attempts to limit the presence and permanence of Japanese immigrants from 1913 through the end of World War II by forbidding “aliens ineligible for citizenship” from purchasing, and later from leasing property in the states in which these laws were passed.

“Loyalty questions” Two questions on questionnaires distributed to Japanese Americans in incarceration camps. Despite serious problems with the wording and meaning of the questions, government officials and others generally considered those who answered “no” to the two questions to be “disloyal” to the United States. “Yes” answers to these questions made internees eligible for service in the U.S. Army, and some became eligible for release and resettlement in areas outside of the West Coast exclusion zones.

Media Communication outlets, such as radio, Television, newspapers, and the internet, that reach people widely to convey messages or information. Whether we realize it or not, the media shapes how we look at the world around us. Our beliefs about history and current events are based on information we get from the news, pop culture, social media and public figures. If this information is biased, our worldview can become biased as well. When our media sources fail to raise questions about unjust actions, in words or with “feel good” photos taken out of context, they help to justify those actions—and we risk missing out on vital facts that could change our opinions or push us to get involved.

Model Minority A minority group whose members are perceived to achieve a higher rate of socioeconomic success than the population average. The model minority myth of Japanese Americans, built on a distorted and exaggerated concept of Japanese American success, was used by some to denigrate other communities of color for their purported failure to pick themselves up by their bootstraps.

Nisei American-born children of Japanese immigrants, second generation Japanese Americans. Most mainland Nisei were born between 1915 and 1935; in Hawaii, large numbers were born about a decade earlier. Many Nisei share a common background. Many grew up in a rural setting; were part of a large family; attended both a regular public school and private Japanese language schools; and had their lives dramatically changed by events stemming from World War II (which nearly all see as a key turning point in their lives).

Non-alien The government sometimes referred to Nisei as “non-aliens,” a way of evading the fact that they are American citizens.

Redress and reparations Two terms used to refer to Japanese American efforts to get compensation from the U.S. government for being wrongfully detained in incarceration camps during World War II. While often used as synonyms, “redress” can imply an apology; “reparations” specifically refers to monetary compensation.

“Relocation centers” A term used by the U.S. War Relocation Authority to refer to the camps in which most Japanese Americans were detained during World War II. These were prisons surrounded by barbed wire fences and patrolled by armed guards, which inmates could not leave without permission. Because “relocation center” inadequately describes the harsh conditions and forced confinement of the camps, terms such as “incarceration camp” or “prison camp” are more accurate. As prison camps outside the normal criminal justice system, designed to confine civilians for military or political purposes on the basis of race and ethnicity, they fit the definition of “concentration camps.”

War Relocation Authority (WRA) The U.S. government agency charged with administering the incarceration camps in which Japanese Americans from the West Coast were imprisoned during World War II.

Yellow peril A term used by anti-Japanese agitators in the early 1900s to describe the “threat” of Japanese immigration as a precursor to a Japanese invasion.
RELATED CONTENT STANDARDS

Standards that align with the study of the Japanese American experience during World War II, and the use of primary source materials have been identified to support teacher planning. Please note the numbering of the standards is sometimes out of sequence as only the most relevant standards have been selected.

For more information, link directly to the following:

**Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs)**
for Social Studies, Reading and Communication (grades 6 – 12)
http://standards.ospi.k12.wa.us/

**Common Core State Standards Initiative**

**Washington State's Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs)**

**Social Studies**

**EALR 1 Civics**
1.1 Understands key ideals and principles of the United States, including those in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and other fundamental documents.

**EALR 4 History**
4.2 Understands and analyzes causal factors that have shaped major events in history.
4.3 Understands that there are multiple perspectives and interpretations of historical events.
4.4 Uses history to understand the present and plan for the future.

**EALR 5 Social Studies Skills**
5.1 Uses critical reasoning skills to analyze and evaluate positions.
5.2 Uses inquiry-based research.
5.3 Deliberates public issues.
### COMMON CORE STANDARDS — GRADES 6–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth Grade</strong></td>
<td>7. Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources.</td>
<td>6. Identify aspects of a text that reveal an author’s point of view or purpose (e.g., loaded language, inclusion or avoidance of particular facts).</td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Integrate information (presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words to develop a coherent understanding of a topic or issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of the source distinct from prior knowledge or opinions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Compare and contrast one author’s presentation of events with that of another (e.g., a memoir written by and a biography on the same person).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seventh Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Compare and contrast a text to an audio, video, or multimedia version of the text, analyzing each medium’s portrayal of the subject (e.g., how the delivery of a speech affects the impact of the words).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Analyze how two or more authors writing about the same topic shape their presentations of key information by emphasizing different evidence or advancing different interpretations of facts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMMON CORE STANDARDS — GRADES 6–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Integration of Knowledge and Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eighth Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of using different mediums (e.g., print or digital text, video, multimedia) to present a particular topic or idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ninth Grade, Tenth Grade</strong></td>
<td>5. Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.</td>
<td>6. Compare the point of view of two or more authors for how they treat the same or similar topics, including which details they include and emphasize in their respective accounts.</td>
<td>9. Analyze a case in which two or more texts provide conflicting information on the same topic and identify where the texts disagree on matters of fact or interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text.</td>
<td>1. Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eleventh Grade, Twelfth Grade</strong></td>
<td>1. Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, connecting insights gained from specific details to an understanding of the text as a whole.</td>
<td>6. Evaluate authors’ differing points of view on the same historical event or issue by assessing the authors’ claims, reasoning, and evidence.</td>
<td>1. Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary that makes clear the relationships among the key details and ideas.</td>
<td>7. Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words in order to address a question or solve a problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>