Why Japanese Americans in San Francisco Were Forced into Incarceration Camps

Posted on October 7, 2022

View this essay online:
https://academic-master.com/why-japanese-americans-in-san-francisco-were-forced-into-incarceration-camps/

Introduction

Following Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the United States government forcibly removed Japanese Americans from San Francisco and other parts of the West Coast. Families were ordered to leave their homes, businesses, schools, farms, and communities, often with only a few days to prepare. They were permitted to take only what they could carry and were first sent to temporary detention facilities before being transferred to more permanent camps in remote parts of the country.

The government publicly justified this policy as a military security measure. Officials claimed that people of Japanese ancestry living near the Pacific coast might assist a Japanese invasion, commit sabotage, or participate in espionage. However, Japanese Americans were not removed because the government had proved that they posed a collective threat. Individuals were targeted principally because of their ancestry rather than evidence of personal wrongdoing.

Executive Order 9066 did not explicitly mention Japanese Americans by name. Nevertheless, military authorities used it almost exclusively to remove people of Japanese ancestry from designated areas. Nearly 120,000 Japanese Americans and Japanese immigrants were ultimately forced from their homes, and approximately two-thirds of them were United States citizens. No comparable mass incarceration was imposed on all German Americans or Italian Americans, even though the United States was also at war with Germany and Italy.

The government did not move Japanese Americans for their personal protection, and the detainees were not generally pleased to surrender their freedom. They were confined behind barbed wire, watched by armed guards, and denied the ordinary right to leave. Decades later, a federal commission concluded that the policy had not been justified by military necessity. It identified its principal causes as "race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership" (Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians [CWRIC], 1982).

The Importance of Accurate Terminology

The expression *Japanese citizens of San Francisco* can be misleading because the people who were removed did not all share the same citizenship status. Some were first-generation Japanese immigrants known as *Issei*. Federal law prevented many Issei from becoming naturalized American citizens. Their children, known as *Nisei*, had generally been born in the United States and were citizens by birth.

It is therefore more accurate to refer to the affected population as Japanese Americans and Japanese immigrants or as people of Japanese ancestry. Many of those who lost their freedom were American citizens who had never lived in Japan and had committed no crime.

The term *internment* is also incomplete. In international law, internment often refers to the detention of enemy nationals during wartime. Some Japanese nationals were arrested separately by the Department of Justice and held in internment facilities. The much larger program created under Executive Order 9066, however, imprisoned citizens and noncitizens alike on the basis of ancestry.

For this reason, historians, museums, and community organizations increasingly use terms such as *forced removal*, *incarceration*, *mass incarceration*, or *confinement*. These terms more clearly communicate that families did not relocate voluntarily and could not freely leave the camps. The government's official terms, including *evacuation*, *assembly center*, and *relocation center*, made the policy appear more protective and less coercive than it was. The camps were enclosed by fences and guarded by armed military personnel.

Pearl Harbor and the Growth of Wartime Fear

The attack on Pearl Harbor killed thousands of Americans, damaged the Pacific Fleet, and brought the United States directly into the Second World War. The attack created legitimate concerns about further Japanese military action, especially along the Pacific coast. Government officials feared an invasion, attacks on military facilities, and enemy espionage.

These fears soon became directed at Japanese American communities. Within hours of the attack, federal agents began arresting Japanese immigrant leaders, including teachers, religious figures, journalists, and businesspeople. More than 2,000 first-generation community leaders had been detained within approximately one week. Japanese Americans also experienced searches, employment loss, public abuse, and accusations that they were secretly loyal to Japan.

Newspapers and political leaders helped spread rumors that Japanese Americans were transmitting signals to enemy ships or preparing acts of sabotage. Much of this information was unsupported. Ordinary cultural activities, possession of radios, proximity to military installations, and communication with relatives in Japan were sometimes interpreted as suspicious.

The absence of sabotage was itself distorted into supposed evidence of a future conspiracy. Lieutenant General John L. DeWitt, who commanded the Western Defense Command, argued that the fact that no sabotage had yet occurred did not prove loyalty. Instead, he treated it as a possible sign that Japanese Americans were waiting for an appropriate moment to act. This reasoning made it almost impossible for them to establish their innocence. Their behavior could be interpreted as threatening whether they acted or remained peaceful.

Anti-Japanese Prejudice Before the War

The forced removal did not arise solely from the Pearl Harbor attack. It developed against a longer history of anti-Asian discrimination on the West Coast.

Japanese immigrants had faced hostility for decades before the war. They were frequently portrayed as racially incapable of becoming genuine Americans. California laws restricted the ability of immigrants who were ineligible for citizenship to own or lease land. Segregation, employment discrimination, and campaigns against Japanese immigration reinforced the idea that people of Japanese ancestry were permanent outsiders.

The Immigration Act of 1924 effectively ended immigration from Japan, reflecting the racial restrictions embedded in American immigration policy. Japanese Americans were sometimes described as economically threatening because of their success in agriculture and small business. Their productivity was used not as evidence of successful integration but as a reason to demand their exclusion.

These earlier prejudices shaped how wartime fears were interpreted. German and Italian Americans were not collectively assumed to be disloyal simply because the United States was fighting Germany and Italy. By contrast, Japanese ancestry itself became the basis for exclusion. The Library of Congress notes that no other group of American citizens or legal residents experienced a comparable mass incarceration program.

The policy also differed geographically. Japanese Americans in Hawaii, where the Pearl Harbor attack had actually taken place and where people of Japanese ancestry formed a substantial part of the population, were not subjected to the same comprehensive removal. Select individuals were detained, but mass incarceration would have disrupted Hawaii’s economy and war effort. This contrast weakens the argument that every person of Japanese ancestry represented an unavoidable military danger.

Executive Order 9066

President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19, 1942. The order authorized the secretary of war and military commanders to designate military areas from which “any or all persons” could be excluded. It did not explicitly identify Japanese Americans, but it created the

legal and administrative basis for their forced removal.

Congress subsequently passed Public Law 503, which made violations of military exclusion orders a criminal offense. Military authorities then divided the West Coast into restricted areas, imposed curfews, and issued Civilian Exclusion Orders directing Japanese Americans to report for removal.

The exclusion orders were openly ancestry-based. They applied to “all Japanese persons, both alien and non-alien.” The official term *non-alien* was an indirect way of referring to American citizens. Rather than assessing individuals according to evidence, the orders treated ancestry as a sufficient reason for expulsion.

People received numbered family tags and were told where and when to report. Families had to decide what to sell, store, abandon, or entrust to friends. Many sold homes, vehicles, farms, equipment, furniture, and businesses quickly and for far less than their actual value. They did not know where they were going, how long they would remain there, or whether their property would still exist when they returned.

Why San Francisco Was Included

San Francisco was part of a region military authorities considered strategically important. The city had military installations, a major port, shipyards, transportation networks, and access to the Pacific Ocean. These features made officials particularly anxious about invasion and espionage.

However, San Francisco’s Japanese American residents were not individually evaluated to determine whether they had access to sensitive information or presented a genuine danger. Children, older adults, religious leaders, workers, shopkeepers, students, and American-born citizens were all subjected to the same removal policy.

Several exclusion orders affected Japanese Americans living in San Francisco. Under Exclusion Order No. 20, 1,892 people from San Francisco reported through the Bush Street Civil Control Station. Additional residents were removed under orders associated with Buchanan Street and O’Farrell Street. These were not voluntary safety evacuations. People were required by military authority to leave and could face criminal punishment if they refused.

The city’s Japanese American community, including the established Japantown neighborhood, was rapidly emptied. Families lost homes and businesses, while churches, cultural associations, schools, and community organizations were disrupted. The removal damaged not only individual households but also a long-developed social and economic community.

The Claim That Removal Was for Their Protection

The original argument suggests that Japanese Americans were removed because San Francisco was dangerous and the government wanted to protect them from enemy attacks. This interpretation is not supported by the structure or implementation of the policy.

If personal safety had been the primary objective, Japanese Americans could have been offered voluntary transportation, assistance, and a choice of destination. Instead, they were placed under curfews, ordered to report to government stations, transported under military authority, confined behind barbed wire, and prevented from freely returning home.

The camps were guarded from the outside, indicating that the government regarded the residents as people to be contained rather than civilians being sheltered. At temporary detention facilities such as Tanforan, armed guards watched people enter the compound. At the permanent camps, guard towers and fences reinforced their imprisoned status.

The policy also did not remove all residents from potentially vulnerable coastal areas. It selected people according to Japanese ancestry. This selective treatment demonstrates that the government's concern was not simply the physical protection of residents from wartime attack.

Japanese Americans may have complied peacefully for many reasons, including fear of punishment, concern for their children, limited alternatives, and a desire to demonstrate loyalty. Compliance under a compulsory military order should not be interpreted as happiness or free consent.

The Absence of Evidence of a Collective Threat

Government officials had access to information suggesting that mass removal was unnecessary. Intelligence assessments conducted before and after Pearl Harbor did not establish that Japanese Americans as a group were preparing sabotage.

The federal government could have investigated individuals for whom credible evidence existed, as it did with suspected enemy agents from several national backgrounds. Instead, military officials rejected individualized hearings and imposed a collective racial policy.

The Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians later examined official records, interviewed surviving policymakers and former detainees, and heard testimony from more than 750 witnesses. Its report concluded that the government had confined people of Japanese ancestry despite the absence of evidence establishing a collective danger or direct military necessity.

The Library of Congress similarly states that the military was never required to demonstrate that the imprisoned Japanese Americans represented a genuine security threat. No Japanese American was convicted of sabotage on the United States mainland during the war.

National security was therefore the official justification, but it does not fully explain why the government chose mass ancestry-based incarceration. Wartime fear interacted with decades of racial prejudice, economic hostility, political pressure, and the failure of national leaders to protect constitutional rights.

The Removal from San Francisco to Tanforan

Many Japanese Americans from San Francisco and the wider Bay Area were first sent to the Tanforan Assembly Center in San Bruno, approximately 12 miles south of San Francisco. The facility had previously operated as a racetrack.

Tanforan opened as a detention center on April 28, 1942, and operated until October 13 of that year. More than 8,000 Japanese Americans passed through it, and approximately 64 percent were United States citizens. Its population reached a peak of 7,816.

The government transformed the racetrack into a confinement facility surrounded by barbed wire and guarded by armed military police. About half of those detained at Tanforan were housed in former horse stalls. The facilities lacked the privacy, sanitation, and comfort required for family life.

When buses arrived, the detainees walked past armed guards, underwent inspections and basic medical examinations, completed government forms, and received assigned living quarters. Some families had to share small spaces because sufficient housing was unavailable.

The use of a racetrack illustrates the speed and disorder of the program. The government had begun removing families before the permanent camps were ready. Fairgrounds, racetracks, and similar facilities were temporarily converted into what officials called assembly centers. Some detainees lived in spaces where livestock had previously been kept.

Despite these conditions, residents created schools, medical services, religious gatherings, libraries, newspapers, art classes, and recreational activities. These efforts should not be understood as proof that confinement was acceptable. They show how imprisoned communities attempted to preserve dignity and social life under unjust circumstances.

Transfer to Topaz

Almost all Japanese Americans held at Tanforan were later transported to the Central Utah Relocation Center, commonly known as Topaz. The journey took approximately two nights and one day by train. Regular transfers began in September 1942.

Topaz was located in an isolated high-desert area near Delta, Utah. It eventually housed thousands of people, primarily from the San Francisco Bay Area. The environment was marked by dust, extreme

temperatures, limited vegetation, and hastily constructed barracks.

Families lived in simple rooms within barracks that offered little privacy. Meals were served in communal halls, and bathrooms and washing facilities were shared. The physical organization of camp life disrupted ordinary family routines. Parents often lost some of their traditional authority as children ate and socialized with their peers.

The detainees attempted to create functioning communities. They established schools, places of worship, cultural groups, sports teams, newspapers, art programs, and local administrative bodies. Many also worked inside the camps for extremely low wages.

Life in the camps included creativity, friendship, education, and resistance, but these activities occurred under coercive conditions. The ability of a community to survive an injustice does not make the injustice less serious.

Japanese American Loyalty and Military Service

The mass-removal policy assumed that Japanese ancestry made a person potentially disloyal. Yet thousands of Japanese Americans demonstrated extraordinary commitment to the United States.

More than 30,000 Nisei served in the United States military during the war. The 442nd Regimental Combat Team, composed largely of Japanese American soldiers, fought in Europe and became one of the most highly decorated American units relative to its size. Many soldiers fought while their parents and siblings remained imprisoned by their own government.

Other Japanese Americans used their language skills in the Military Intelligence Service, translating documents and questioning prisoners in the Pacific theater. Their work contributed directly to the American war effort against Japan.

Military service did not erase the injustice of incarceration, nor should loyalty have had to be demonstrated through extraordinary sacrifice. American citizens were entitled to constitutional protection regardless of whether they volunteered for military service. Nevertheless, the record of Japanese American soldiers strongly contradicts the claim that ancestry provided a reasonable basis for collective suspicion.

Some detainees resisted the government’s actions through legal challenges, protests, draft resistance, or refusal to provide unconditional answers on controversial loyalty questionnaires. Their resistance did not necessarily indicate support for Japan. In many cases, it reflected anger at being asked to prove loyalty while being denied freedom.

Fred Korematsu and the Legal Challenges

Not every Japanese American complied with the exclusion orders. Fred Korematsu, an American citizen living in the San Francisco Bay Area, refused to leave. He was arrested in 1942 and challenged the constitutionality of the removal order.

In *Korematsu v. United States* in 1944, the Supreme Court upheld his conviction. The majority accepted the government's claim that wartime military necessity justified the exclusion. The ruling later became one of the most heavily criticized decisions in the Court's history.

On the same day, the Court ruled unanimously for Mitsuye Endo, an American citizen whose loyalty the government did not dispute. In *Ex parte Endo*, the Court held that the War Relocation Authority lacked the power to continue detaining a concededly loyal citizen. The ruling helped bring the incarceration program to an end.

These cases reveal the limited protection courts offered during the height of wartime fear. Korematsu's conviction remained in place for decades before a federal court vacated it after evidence showed that the government had withheld or misrepresented important information. The case demonstrates how claims of national emergency can weaken judicial scrutiny of discriminatory policies.

Executive Order 8802 Was Unrelated to the Camps

The original discussion incorrectly states that Executive Order 8802 was issued after Japanese Americans had spent time in the camps and that it reduced discrimination within the military.

President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 on June 25, 1941, several months before the attack on Pearl Harbor and before Executive Order 9066. It prohibited discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin in federal employment and defense industries. It also established the Fair Employment Practice Committee.

Executive Order 8802 did not desegregate the United States armed forces and was not a measure providing freedom or compensation to incarcerated Japanese Americans. President Harry S. Truman later issued Executive Order 9981 in 1948 to promote equality of treatment and opportunity in the military.

Confusing these orders creates a misleading impression that the government quickly corrected the injustice of Japanese American incarceration. In reality, formal acknowledgment and substantial redress did not occur until decades later.

Compensation Was Delayed and Incomplete

The government did not promise each detainee immediate financial compensation in exchange for accepting incarceration. Japanese Americans suffered extensive losses of property, income, businesses, education, professional opportunities, and personal freedom.

Congress passed the Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act in 1948, allowing claims for certain property losses. However, the process was restrictive, required documentation that many families no longer possessed, and provided only limited compensation. It did not adequately address the loss of liberty, emotional suffering, or long-term effects of forced removal.

A major redress movement developed during the 1970s and 1980s. Congress created the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians in 1980 to investigate the policy. The Commission's hearings allowed former detainees to describe their experiences publicly.

Congress passed the Civil Liberties Act in 1988. The law formally acknowledged the injustice, offered an apology, and authorized a payment of $20,000 to each eligible surviving detainee. Payments began in 1990, nearly half a century after the removal.

The Justice Department eventually distributed more than $1.6 billion to over 82,000 eligible people. The payment was an important recognition of governmental wrongdoing, but it could not restore lost years, deceased family members, destroyed communities, or opportunities that had disappeared.

Compensation therefore should not be used to suggest that the original policy was acceptable. Redress was offered because the government eventually recognized that it had committed a serious injustice.

How Camp Newspapers Should Be Interpreted

Newspapers produced inside the camps are valuable historical sources. They reported on schools, employment, food, community events, relocation procedures, military service, and the daily experiences of detainees. The Library of Congress preserves 29 newspaper titles produced in the detention facilities.

However, editorials encouraging cooperation should not automatically be treated as proof that Japanese Americans were happy to be incarcerated. Writers operated within government-controlled institutions and faced practical and political limitations. Many believed that cooperation might protect their families, reduce hostility, or demonstrate American loyalty.

Japanese American communities also contained a wide range of opinions. Some emphasized cooperation and patriotism. Others openly criticized the government, resisted military service, challenged exclusion orders, or expressed anger about the loyalty questionnaire. A single editorial

cannot represent the views of everyone imprisoned.

Statements accepting removal may also reflect survival under coercion rather than genuine agreement. When the government controls a person's movement and threatens punishment for disobedience, apparent cooperation cannot be interpreted as unrestricted consent.

Camp newspapers should therefore be read critically alongside exclusion orders, government records, photographs, court cases, diaries, oral histories, and testimony from survivors.

The Actual Reasons for the Incarceration

The attack on Pearl Harbor created a genuine national emergency, but military danger alone does not explain the incarceration policy. The available evidence points to several interacting causes.

First, wartime fear made extreme measures politically acceptable. Many Americans believed another attack or invasion might occur, and public officials feared being blamed if they failed to act.

Second, long-established anti-Japanese prejudice made Japanese Americans especially vulnerable. They had already been treated as foreigners who could not fully assimilate, even when they were American-born citizens.

Third, economic competition contributed to hostility. Some individuals and organizations viewed Japanese American farmers and business owners as commercial rivals and supported their removal.

Fourth, newspapers and political leaders spread unverified allegations about sabotage and disloyalty. These claims created pressure for broad action despite the absence of evidence against the population as a whole.

Fifth, military leaders favored a collective policy rather than individualized investigation. Ancestry became a substitute for proof.

Finally, elected leaders failed to defend constitutional protections. President Roosevelt authorized the policy, Congress criminalized disobedience, and the Supreme Court initially failed to reject the exclusion orders.

After an extensive investigation, the federal Commission summarized these causes as racial prejudice, wartime hysteria, and failed political leadership. Its conclusion remains the clearest official explanation of why the policy occurred.

The Constitutional and Moral Significance

The forced removal of Japanese Americans demonstrates the vulnerability of civil liberties during

periods of national fear. The government deprived citizens of freedom without criminal charges, individualized evidence, or ordinary hearings.

The policy conflicted with basic principles of due process and equal protection. People were punished not for what they had done but for what officials imagined people sharing their ancestry might do.

National emergencies can require unusual government action. However, the Japanese American experience shows why emergency power must remain subject to evidence, legal limits, and independent review. When fear replaces individual assessment, entire communities can be treated as guilty without proof.

The case also illustrates that citizenship alone does not always protect minorities when prejudice becomes politically powerful. Most of the incarcerated people were citizens, yet their status did not prevent the government from removing them.

Remembering the incarceration is therefore not simply an exercise in condemning people in the past. It offers a warning about collective blame, racial profiling, government secrecy, and the willingness to sacrifice minority rights in the name of security.

Conclusion

The United States did not force Japanese Americans from San Francisco into camps primarily to protect them from enemy attacks. The government removed and imprisoned them because wartime fear, racial prejudice, political pressure, and exaggerated claims about national security combined after Pearl Harbor.

Executive Order 9066 did not mention Japanese Americans directly, but military authorities used it to impose ancestry-based exclusion. Citizens and noncitizens were ordered from their homes, allowed to carry only limited belongings, confined at temporary facilities such as Tanforan, and then transported to permanent camps such as Topaz.

The residents were not given a meaningful choice. Their cooperation often reflected legal compulsion, concern for their families, or an attempt to prove loyalty rather than agreement with the policy. The camps were surrounded by fences and guarded by armed personnel, demonstrating that the program was incarceration rather than a protective relocation.

The government had not established that Japanese Americans as a group presented a military threat. No mass program was imposed on German or Italian Americans, and the government did not require evidence of individual wrongdoing before removing people of Japanese ancestry.

Executive Order 8802 was unrelated to the incarceration program, and compensation was not provided promptly. The Civil Liberties Act of 1988 offered an official apology and monetary redress only after survivors and activists had spent decades demanding recognition.

The most authoritative government investigation concluded that mass incarceration was not justified by military necessity. It resulted from racial prejudice, war hysteria, and failed political leadership. The experience remains a powerful reminder that national security cannot be protected by abandoning constitutional rights and treating ancestry as evidence of guilt.

References

Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. (1982). *Personal justice denied*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Daniels, R. (2004). *Prisoners without trial Japanese Americans in World War II*. Hill and Wang.

Hinnershitz, S. (2021). *Japanese American incarceration The camps and coerced labor during World War II*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Irons, P. (1983). *Justice at war*. Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress. (n.d.). *Behind the wire*. In *Immigration and relocation in U.S. history*.

Library of Congress. (n.d.). *Japanese-American internment camp newspapers 1942 to 1946*.

Muller, E. L. (2001). *Free to die for their country The story of the Japanese American draft resisters in World War II*. University of Chicago Press.

National Archives and Records Administration. (n.d.). *Executive Order 9066 Resulting in Japanese American incarceration*.

National Archives and Records Administration. (2022). *The importance of records Japanese American incarceration during World War II*.

Robinson, G. (2001). *By order of the president FDR and the internment of Japanese Americans*. Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Justice. (1999). *Ten-year program to compensate Japanese Americans interned during World War II closes its doors*.

Weglyn, M. N. (1976). *Years of infamy The untold story of America's concentration camps*. William Morrow.