Bendetsen relative to General DeWitt's Final Report, which had just been received by the War Department in Washington, D.C. Colonel Bendetsen was at the time in charge of the Wartime Civil Control Administration of the Western Defense Command. The typed transcript (Ex. 66) of that conversation reveals that Mr. McCloy was more than a little exercised because the Final Report had been printed in final form and distributed without any prior consultation by the Western Defense Command with the War Department about its contents. Mr. McCloy was particularly disturbed that General DeWitt had stated in his report that the security of the West Coast would continue to require the exclusion of the Japanese for the duration of the war.

Thereafter, on April 26, 1943, Brigadier General James W. Barnett sent a message (Ex. 67) to General DeWitt which in pertinent part was as follows:

"Bendetsen informs me he conferred on final report in Washington today. He was given oral directive to revise the report with the assistance of Capt. Hall. He made the point that he was in no position to do this since it was your report. Bendetsen told me that he could recommend the acceptance of some parts of the suggested revision but that two points went to the fundamental concept of evacuation. The principal one of these was that

MEMORANDUM DECISION - 11

loyalty could not be determined and for that reason mass evacuation was ordered. He requested instructions. I told him it was your report and that the War Department could not tell you what to say. He had made that point and said that the instructions he received were to make a draft of the proposed revision for presentation to you for acceptance or revision. If you have additional instructions I will transmit them to Bendetsen by telephone."

On April 27, 1943, General DeWitt responded to the message from Brigadier General Barnett with the following message (Ex. 68):

"My report as signed and submitted to Chief of Staff will not be changed in any respect whatsoever either in substance or form and I will not repeat not consent to any repeat any revision made over my signature. Higher authority may of course prepare and release whatsoever they so desire as views of that authority but statements in my signed report of evacuation are mine and so submitted. Submission of prepared revisions for presentation to me for acceptance or revision will accomplish nothing as final word on subject so far as I repeat I am concerned has been said."

MEMOD ANDIR

On May 3, 1943, Colonel Bendetsen sent the following message (Ex. 70) to General DeWitt relative to conferences between himself and Assistant Secretary of War McCloy:

"Mr. McCloy stated that he strongly desired to avoid creating the impression that he had any wish to prescribe what the Commanding General should say or not say in the final report. He did say, however, that he thought it could be improved upon.

Following this vein, he expressed an earnest desire to have transmitted to the CG the nature of his specific suggestions with an explanation of why he felt the making of revisions conforming to these suggestions would result in improvement."

"In brief, Mr. McCloy's suggestions cover three points:

"a. In paragraph 2 of the letter of transmittal the statement appeared that the necessity for exclusion of all Japanese from the Pacific coast 'will continue for the duration of the present war.' He said he could see no objection to a statement to the effect that exclusion will be essential so long as any military necessity exists therefor, but he said

no one could foresee what the situation would be a year or two hence, and therefore he felt it stultified the report to make such a statement. He drew a parallel to the fact that in the last war a formal state of war continued in existence until 1921, although hostilities had ceased on November 11, 1918.

- b. "The second objection was to that portion of Chapter II which said in effect that it is absolutely impossible to determine the loyalty of Japanese no matter how much time was taken in the process. He said that he had no objection to saying that time was of the essence and that in view of the military situation and the fact that there was no known means of making such a determination with any degree of safety the evacuation was necessary."

 (Emphasis in the original.)
- c. His other comments related to certain changes in style and tone, which were orally described as designed to eliminate redundancy. These were indicated by him with blue pencil. In a number of cases he made comments on changes in tone which he

3

5

4

6

8

10

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

MEMORANDUM DECISION - 15

believed were calculated to eliminate unnecessary pointedness with regard to certain sins of omission on the part of the Department of Justice. He said he felt this could be accomplished without in any way departing from an accurate factual account.

On May 5, 1943 General DeWitt sent the following message (Ex. 71) to Brigadier General Barnett:

"Have no desire to compromise in any way govt case in Supreme Court and do not understand how substance and form of report as submitted can have this effect. Both you and Bendetsen know my crews [views] and my attitude. Do not understand McCloy's proposal. Report is now factual and I solemnly see my views and actions determined as necessary at time of evacuation weakened or undermined if report changes. I cannot conscientiously change or put into separate document proposals for future disposition of evacuees without by my own act invalidating my assigned mission and responsibilities thereunder. If time permits send Bendetsen by air to Anchorage reporting to me from there so he will know where to meet me and I can be fully informed and settle the matter." (Emphasis in the original)

On May 9, 1943, Colonel Bendetsen sent the following message (Ex. 72) to Brigadier General Barnett:

"General DeWitt directs that final report of evacuation be revised as indicated by Colonel Bendetsen to Major Moffitt in Major Moffitts copy of report together with style changes given to Major Moffitt orally... You are prohibited from submitting to Assistant Secretary of War any drafts of amended report. Further the revised report will not be given to anyone until DeWitt finally approves. All copies heretofore sent to the War Department (not including inclosures) will be called in by you and you will have War Department records of receiving report destroyed inasmuch as such revision as is finally sent to War Department will have a later dated transmittal letter. ..."

Exhibits 73 and 74 relate to the changes in the Final Report suggested by the War Department. Fifty-five changes were listed. The proposed changes most relevant to this proceeding were these:

Page iii, paragraph 2, second sentence: Eliminate the words "and will continue for the duration of the present war."

Page iii, paragraph 2, end of the second sentence: Insert "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 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry resided in colonies adjacent to many highly sensitive installations. Their loyalties were unknown, and time was of the essence."

Page 9. Strike the following: "It was impossible to establish the identity of the loyal and the disloyal with any degree of safety. It was not that 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."

And replace with the following: "To complicate the situation, no ready means existed for determining the loyal and the disloyal with any degree of safety. It was necessary to face the realities - a positive determination could not have been made."

On June 5, 1943, General Dewitt issued a revised version (Ex.

MEMORANDUM DECISION - 17

1 2 3

85) of his final report on the Japanese evacuation. In that version of the report the underlined portions of the following statements were either deleted from or added to the original version of the Final Report:

Page iii, paragraph 2: "The security of the Pacific Coast continues to require the exclusion of Japanese from the area now prohibited to them and will continue for the duration of the

(Deleted from the original version.)

present war."

Page iii, paragraph 2: "More than 120,000

persons of Japanese ancestry resided in colonies

adjacent to many highly sensitive installations.

Their loyalties were unknown, and time was of

the essence." (Added to the original version.)

Page 9. "It was impossible to establish the identity of the loyal and the disloyal with any degree of safety. It was not that 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."

(Deleted from the original version and replaced by the following sentence.)

Page 9: "To complicate the situation, no ready means existed for determining the loyal and the disloyal with any degree of safety. It was necessary to face the realities - a positive determination could not have been made."

(Added to the original version.)

On June 21, 1943, the Supreme Court handed down its decision, affirming the conviction of petitioner on the count charging curfew violation.

That General DeWitt did in fact believe that it was impossible to separate the loyal Japanese from the disloyal ones, is borne out by the transcripts of two telephone conversations which took place a few months before the publication of the initial version of the Final Report.

The first was a conversation between General DeWitt and Major General A. W. Gullion, the Provost Marshal General, on January 14, 1943. The subject matter of the conversation was the possibility that the Western Defense Command might be called upon to make thirty thousand or more loyalty investigations of individuals in the relocation centers. In the transcript (Ex. 63) of that telephone

MEMORANDUM DECISION - 19

conversation the following appears:

DeWitt: I don't see how they can determine the loyalty of a Jap by interrogation...or investigation.

Gullion: They've got a questionnaire that the

Navy -- some psychologist over there in

the Navy sold to them.

DeWitt: There isn't such a thing as a loyal

Japanese and it is just impossible to

determine their loyalty by investigation -
it just can't be done...

The other was a conversation just four days later between General DeWitt and Assistant Secretary of War McCloy. General DeWitt was disturbed that he had been instructed to prepare for about 30,000 loyalty investigations. In the transcript (Ex. A-84) of that conversation the following appears:

DeWitt: Because I feel that I wouldn't be loyal to you or honest to you if I didn't say that it is a sign of weakness and an admission of an original mistake.

Otherwise -- we wouldn't have evacuated these people at all if we could determine their loyalty.

McCloy: I don't know whether we are at one on

MEMORANDUM DECISION - 20

1 2

7.2

that --

DeWitt: I know we are not one on it --

McCloy: We evacuated them from the West Coast

because we thought the front was

immediate. We couldn't sort them out

immediately.

It is further borne out by his statement in the original version of the Final Report that the security of the Pacific Coast required the exclusion of the Japanese from that area for the duration of the war. This can only be interpreted to mean that in his opinion the loyalty of a person of Japanese extraction could not be determined no matter how long the war might last.

In its brief to the Supreme Court in petitioner's appeal the government did not take the position that it was impossible to separate the loyal Japanese residents from those who were not.

Rather, it was a lack of time that prevented that separation.

On page 35 of its brief the government stated:
"The classification was not based upon invidious race discrimination. Rather, it was founded upon the fact that the group as a whole contained an unknown number of persons who could not readily be singled out and who were a threat to the security of the nation and in order to impose effective restraints upon them it was

necessary not only to deal with the entire group, but to deal with it at once." (Emphasis added)

On page 61 it stated:

"The grave emergency called for prompt and decisive action."

On page 62 it stated:

"What was needed was a method of removing at once the unknown number of Japanese persons who might assist a Japanese invasion, and not a program for sifting out such persons in the indefinite future." (Emphasis added)

On page 63 it stated:

"The operative fact on which the classification was made was the danger arising from the existence of a group of over 100,000 persons of Japanese descent on the West Coast and the virtually impossible task of promptly segregating the potentially disloyal from the loyal." (Emphasis added)

The opinion of the Supreme Court in <u>Hirabayashi vs. United</u>

<u>States</u>, reflected the court's acceptance of the government argument that the lack of time to separate the loyal from the disloyal justified action directed toward all individuals of Japanese