

7:9

CORRESPONDENCE

BY SUBJECT

LUNDBERG-WARREN

CORRESPONDENCE

JULY-SEPT 1943

C-A  
171



July 13, 1943

Personal

Honorable Earl Warren  
Governor of California  
Sacramento, California

Dear Earl:

I presume upon my friendship with you to write you regarding a matter over which I am much concerned. I am convinced that we must deal fairly with the loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry who have been evacuated from our state.

You have recently been quoted in the press as believing not only that these people should not be returned to California during the war but that you also oppose the plan of the Federal Government to relocate loyal persons in non-military zones where they might aid in meeting the manpower shortage. The July 5th issue of Life Magazine states that you oppose any release from the Relocation Centers with the words "No one will be able to tell a saboteur from any other Jap...We don't want to have a second Pearl Harbor in California .... This isn't an appeal to race hatred."

Unfortunately there are already evidences that your words are being exploited by vigilante-minded individuals. Some with whom I have talked believe that you have been misquoted. Some think that you were referring to the disloyal persons who are now confined in internment camps and that you did not have reference to the many loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry who are living in the Relocation Centers.

The Committee on whose letterhead this is written and of which I am an active member, does not suggest that even loyal evacuees should be returned to the West Coast at the present time. But it does strongly support the position that Americans of Japanese ancestry who are found to be loyal should be permitted to find their places in industry and agriculture outside the military areas. Our opinion is backed up by authoritative testimonies by J. Edgar Hoover, Colonel K. J. Fielder of Army Intelligence and others. I enclose some of these supporting statements.

Frankly, Earl, I feel it would be sound for you to take a long view and a nation-wide view of this question, which is so clouded by war-time emotions here at home in California, with doubtless a considerable element of emotions that have their root in economic jealousies. As far as I have been able to learn, people in the Middle West and East are more sensitive to the preservation of the liberties of American citizens including those so unfortunate as to look like our present enemies. The fundamentals of the Bill of Rights have weathered many an emotional storm in our Nation's history, and I feel sure you believe as I do that it will weather this one. You have already helped it weather local attempts at embezzlement by domestic enemies of various Caucasian ancestries; I am one of those who hope it may please God to permit you to do so on a nation-wide scale.

So if you have been misquoted, will you not take steps to set the matter right?

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Alfred J. Lundberg

AJL:MFS



STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Governor's Office  
Sacramento

July 16, 1943

Mr. Alfred J. Lundberg  
1106 Broadway  
Oakland (4), California

Dear Al:

I have your letter of July 13 concerning the Japanese who have been evacuated from our State and calling attention to my statements on the subject at the recent Governors' Conference. In it you say, "Unfortunately there are already evidences that your words are being exploited by vigilante-minded individuals." If this is the fact, I sincerely regret it because nothing is more destructive than vigilante spirit and action, and I have consistently opposed both throughout my public career.

I am very happy to discuss the subject with you because I believe that both of us speak the same language and are motivated by the same interest. I have been intimately acquainted with your humanitarian instincts ever since we both joined with others in Oakland to form the Religious Fellowship some fifteen years ago. However, I cannot make any apology for the things that I said concerning the evacuation and relocation of Japanese, because I believe them to be true and in the interest of safety of our State and Nation.

I believe these views are not colored by race hatred or by "war time emotions here at home in California with doubtless a considerable element of emotions that have their root in economic jealousies," stated by you to be prevalent. It is my opinion that the Japanese, whether born in Japan or in this country, were rightfully evacuated from this area and placed in Relocation Centers under the authority conferred by Congressional Act, signed by the President and acted under by the Commanding General charged with the military safety of this section of our country. At that time everyone from the President down acquiesced in the procedure. I heard of no objection being raised by governmental agencies or citizen groups, although they had ample time to do so. I am persuaded that the reason there was no such objection was that the public feared the activities of these people, as did the Commanding General. At that time the affair at Pearl Harbor was still ringing in our ears. Now that the details of that incident have been somewhat dimmed by passing of time, there is a movement to undo that which was then done in the interest of safety. Personally, I am of the opinion that little has happened since Pearl Harbor to justify us in abandoning protective measures. Certainly our victories do not add up to any such total.

On the other hand, I am of the opinion that if the European War should be terminated successfully in a reasonably short time we will still have a terrific war on our hands with the Japanese and that it will take the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys to win it. In short, I believe that the same smugness that brought about the laxity ending in the disaster at Pearl Harbor is beginning to permeate our country again, and that unless we do keep uppermost in our minds the formidable military establishment of Japan, the degree of her preparation, and the imperial designs, we may have another Pearl Harbor. I pray that it may not be so, but that if it should be, California, through an appreciation of the dangers involved, may have protected herself against the blow falling here.

I cannot help believing that you and your committee share this belief with me: otherwise you would not have said in your letter "The Committee on whose letterhead



July 16, 1943

this is written, and of which I am an active member, does not suggest that even loyal evacuees should be returned to the West Coast at the present time, but it does strongly support the position that Americans of Japanese ancestry who are found to be loyal should be permitted to find their places in industry and agriculture outside the military areas." That statement indicates to me that you believe exactly as I do; that regardless of the place of their birth they cannot, under existing war conditions, be trusted in this vital war area. The only difference, apparently, in our thinking is that you are of the opinion that they can safely be released from sequestration in other parts of the country, while I am of the opinion that under our way of life a potential saboteur is a menace to our war effort, regardless of where he may be released.

In this country of ours where people are free to come and go as they please without any system of espionage, there is no limit to the dangers involved in setting a potential saboteur loose in any part of the country. The destruction of an airplane factory in Kansas City is just as much a disaster as the destruction of one at Burbank, California. The destruction of bridges and tunnels in the Rocky Mountains would be just as great a disaster as similar sabotage in the Sierra Nevadas. The destruction of Boulder Dam, which is outside the combat area but which furnishes a major portion of the water and power for war industry in Southern California, would be just as serious as the destruction of the Pitt River Dam and others in the combat area serving war industry in northern California. It is on this theory I believe that if the evacuees cannot safely be returned to California they cannot safely be released anywhere.

As I view the situation, your position, giving full credit for the humanitarian motives prompting it, is not one based upon principles but upon expediency for the safety of our country, as is mine. If it were otherwise, and your conclusion was based upon the Bill of Rights which was referred to in your letter you would contend that every person born in this country of Japanese parentage would, under present conditions, be entitled to every right of citizenship; that is, the right to come and go and assemble, not in some parts of the country, but in every part of the country, including this combat zone where you and I and others have the same privilege. For obvious reasons you and your committee do not rely upon this principle in arriving at your conclusion.

There is an old saying that one cannot eat his cake and keep it, and it seems that that is the situation in which we find ourselves now. Either we take the protective measures that we know in our hearts are necessary to insure safety of our country or we abandon them as being in conflict with some principle of law. We cannot do both in this situation, and our Supreme Court unanimously recognized this fact recently in sustaining the curfew regulations on those of Japanese ancestry. It arrived at its conclusion reluctantly, as we all do in such situations. Nevertheless it was firm and unanimous in its conclusion that because of the peculiar situation of those of Japanese extraction, a distinction could, under the Constitution, be made. How far they will go in sustaining these procedures I do not profess to know, but I am of the opinion that it will go as far as it believes the necessities of the situation justify.

Lieutenant General DeWitt, the Commanding General of this area, has expressed the firm belief that in order to insure the safety of the area none of the evacuees should be returned. Inasmuch as the original evacuation was made under his direction, I see no reason why we should doubt the wisdom of his present opinion on the subject.



July 16, 1943

Reduced to simplest terms, our difference of opinion on the subject, if we are in disagreement, would seem to depend upon whose judgment we are going to accept as to the action required to protect us against fifth-column activities, which are part and parcel of Axis warfare. I personally choose to take the opinion of the Commanding General who is charged with our safety, rather than the views of experimenters who sometimes fall into the error of supporting their theories to the extent of disregarding very obvious precautions that should be taken against the dangers of modern warfare. I think there can be no doubt that the evidence which has recently come to light in some of the Relocation Centers shows a shocking indifference to the safety factor. I suppose you are aware that for a long time there have been thousands of people in California including army, navy, coast guard, local law enforcement and civilian patrols, guarding our coast line against possible landings of Japanese saboteurs from submarines. We have been warned by the government time after time of the probability of attempted landings. Should the evacuees be returned to California and given the right of unrestricted travel, who, I ask you, could tell the difference between a loyal Japanese on our coast line and a saboteur?

Some months ago the country was in a turmoil over the secret landing of six Germans who had been trained in the techniques of sabotage in Germany and sent to this country with that knowledge and the necessary funds to disrupt our war effort. Fortunately they were apprehended by the F.B.I. They were promptly and properly tried, convicted, and executed, and those who assisted them were likewise punished. It was a serious situation, but compared with the potentialities involved in releasing all those whom the social workers in Japanese Relocation Centers put the stamp of loyalty upon, it is but a drop in the bucket. We know how Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire and of their efforts to achieve them.

As a matter of plain, simple fact, Al, it seems to me that we could not expect the average Japanese born in this country to give his loyalty to America in this war of survival. Again I hope that in saying this I am not giving vent to any feeling of race prejudice or hatred but rather to a recognition of loyalties that are born of home, family, race and religion. I would expect to be so judged if I were in Japan. Suppose that as young men, you and I had gone to Japan to live; that we had brought our American wives with us and had there brought our children into the world. Suppose, further, that they had lived in our American homes, more or less isolated from the Japanese society and culture, prohibited from acquiring citizenship or land, and perhaps never even learning the Japanese language. Suppose they had never known any other environment prior to the outbreak of this present war, where do you believe their sentiments would now be? Would they be for Japan or would they be for the United States of America; and given the opportunity to help one or the other, which do you believe they would help? I believe I know what both your children and mine would do under the circumstances; and I believe that Japanese, so born and reared, would react even more strongly because their government is their religion as well, and their Emperor is their God.

I have no doubt that there are many Japanese who came to this country because they would rather live here than live their lives under conditions as they are in Japan. I am also certain that there are many of their children born in this country who would have the same loyal sentiments that you and I have. For them this is a tragedy. War is a tragedy to millions of people. If there were any reasonable way of determining the loyalty of these individuals, I would be the first to insist upon their having the right to all the freedoms that we have. Unfortunately, I believe there is no way of determining this fact, or if there is, it has not been tried.



July 16, 1943

Frankly, as a citizen and public official I am not willing to adopt the theories or the practices indulged in by the Relocation Authorities to determine this fact. If, on the other hand, General DeWitt who is charged with the military security of the area and who has been intimately connected with the situation since before Pearl Harbor, or Director J. Edgar Hoover of the F.B.I., were to pass favorably upon the release of any of these individuals, I would accept the decision cheerfully and without question.

In conclusion let me say again that I appreciate the humanitarian sentiments which impelled you to write--the sentiments that have brought your committee together. Also that fundamentally there is no real difference of opinion between us and that we are both guided by a desire to do for these people those things which are consistent with the security of our nation. The only difference between us, as I view the situation, is that you do not believe the elements of danger in this group are as serious as I do, and that you base your opinion, as to the danger involved, upon the opinions of the workers in the War Relocation Authority. While I base mine upon army and navy officials and the members of the F.B.I. and other law enforcement officers as well as upon the opinion of the Commanding General for this area.

You may be sure that so far as is consistent with this belief on my part, I will do everything possible to protect the lives and property of these people as I would all other citizens of our country. It was in this spirit that I said at Columbus, Ohio, that I was not making an appeal to race hatred, but rather an appeal for national security.

Trusting that you will convey these views to the members of your Committee; and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

(signed) Earl Warren

EW:ccp



*(Part of exchange of letters bet. A. J. Lundberg, (Pres. of Key System Railway & active in Fair Play Committee) & Governor Warren, after Warren had written expressing distrust of the Japanese & opposing their return to Calif.)*

September 2, 1943

Honorable Earl Warren  
Governor of California  
Sacramento, California

Dear Earl:

I am very grateful for your letter of July 16; it was good of you to take the time to set forth your views so fully and I am happy to have been able to convey them to some of the members of this Committee. The multiplicity of demands upon my time is responsible for my delay in replying, which I hope you will forgive.

*omit*  
I hope also, that you will give the whole subject further thought and study, for while - as you say in your letter - we are both earnestly desirous of serving our Country's best interests, there is a very fundamental difference in our respective approaches to this problem.

*(Fair Play Com)*

At the outset I should say that while I am interested, as you are, in movements primarily humanitarian, my interest in this Committee does not spring from that motive at all, nor even from a personal interest in persons of Japanese ancestry, tho I have many friends among them. It springs from a lively interest in a *concern with* fundamental principle I regard as the most important of all American principles, the protection of minority groups. It is probable that my interest in that principle is primarily selfish, since I myself belong to minority groups in respect of ancestry, economic station, religious denomination, and (for the present only, I hope!) political party. I am persuaded that this Committee is thoroughly sound when it says: "Attacks upon the rights of any minority tend to undermine the rights of the majority."

At the moment, as an American, I am particularly interested in the question of minorities discriminated against on the basis of ancestry, since that was the basis of Hitler's rise to power. Upon the hypothesis that



"superior" and "inferior" qualities in human beings are determined by inheritance alone, without regard to environmental factors, rests the whole structure of Nazi justification for ruling the world and rationalizing the enslavement of all non-"Aryan" persons. Scientific men appear to agree that inheritance of certain mental and physical "characters" is a condition precedent to the development, through environment, of various attainments, but they admit no selection of these "characters" on the basis of "blood" or "race", or even that such a thing as "race" exists in the world in a sufficiently pure form to justify any sub-classification for biological purposes of the genus "homo sapiens" (which latter, as to many individuals, is doubtless a misnomer).

*Some fellow-Californians*

*the attitude* Here, then, is a fundamental difference of point of view in the Japanese question. You believe that persons of Japanese ancestry are, for that reason, "potential saboteurs"; that "they cannot safely be released anywhere"; and that "Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire." *They applaud* You express confidence in the judgment of General De Witt, who, as you undoubtedly know, was reported by the Associated Press as having testified before the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee: "It makes no difference whether the Japanese is theoretically a citizen - he is still a Japanese. Giving him a scrap of paper won't change him. I don't care what they do with the Japs as long as they don't send them back here. A Jap is a Jap."

I, on the other hand, believe that a person is either loyal to our country or not, as the case may be, entirely regardless of the blood or the mixture of bloods that flows in his veins. It may be, as you say, that "social workers" and "experimenters" think so too, but in this matter they have not influenced my judgment at all. When I cannot know all the facts of my own knowledge, I prefer to depend on those whose experience leads me to believe that they are qualified to express an informed opinion. In this matter, I would disqualify General De Witt because of his obvious race prejudice as revealed in the testimony above quoted. But I would be guided by such as the following:

Col. Kendall J. Fielder, Chief of Military Intelligence, Hawaiian Dept.: "How differently a Himmler or a Rosenberg would have handled this delicate situation. Does any one for a moment believe that any of the axis crowd would give one of enemy race a fair chance to prove himself? Yet that's what was done in Hawaii - and so far it has proved militarily sound. That the situation is working out well is a tribute not only to wise administration, but to tolerance on the part of the rest of our good Americans here. \* \* \* For the information of all who might be misled, there is none among us who has been



led into this policy out of a mawkish sentimentality or gullibility. To us, Japan and her people are a race of stubborn, hardy, despicable warrior zealots, who would stop at nothing to snuff out our lives and our way of life. Her army and navy must definitely be crushed. The question of Americans of Japanese blood is far different. They are Americans - and until they prove (or show themselves dangerously capable of proving) traitorous, they should be treated as Americans." (Address, March 1943 - underscoring mine.)

J. Edgar Hoover, Director, F. B. I.: "We have had practically no trouble with the Japanese in Hawaii. I made the statement before, that there has been no sabotage or espionage committed in Hawaii, subsequent to Pearl Harbor. There was espionage committed prior to Pearl Harbor, but not by the Japanese population as such, but by espionage agents and consular agents of the Japanese Government \* \* \* The action taken and the prompt manner in which it was taken, took out of circulation those individuals who might have been the nucleus of any espionage or sabotage rings of either Japanese, Germans, or Italians in the United States." (Testimony before House Appropriations Committee)

Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War: "It is the inherent right of every faithful citizen, regardless of ancestry, to bear arms in the Nation's battle. When obstacles to the free expression of that right are imposed by emergency considerations, those barriers should be removed as soon as humanly possible." (Statement announcing formation of a combat unit of Americans of Japanese descent, January 31, 1943)

Hon. Joseph C. Grew, former ambassador to Japan: "There are among Americans of Japanese race as fine people individually as you can find anywhere, and many of them are peculiarly anxious to repay Americans for freedom by making especially arduous efforts in the prosecution of the war. I welcome the policies of our government, which are designed to relieve the Nisei of discriminatory restrictions as rapidly and fairly as possible, and I applaud the action of the Army in setting up facilities whereby these Americans will be able to show the world what they are able to do." (Address, April 26, 1943)

Col. W. P. Scobey, Executive Officer, Office of Assistant Secretary of War: "The War Department has faith in the loyal Japanese Americans."

Lt. General Delos C. Emmons, Commander Hawaiian Dept.: "Enough Hawaiians of Japanese Ancestry have responded to the call for volunteers to form a combat team of approximately 4,000 men. \* \* The response to the call was highly gratifying. \* \* I believe they will make a splendid record."



Mr. Justice Murphy, U. S. Supreme Court: "Except under conditions of great emergency a regulation of this kind (the curfew), applicable solely to citizens of a particular racial extraction, would not be regarded as in accord with the requirement of due process \* \* It by no means follows, however, that there may not be discrimination of such an injurious character in the application of laws as to amount to a denial of due process of law, as that term is used in the Fifth Amendment. I think that point is dangerously approached when we have one law for the majority of our citizens and another for a particular racial heritage." (Concurring opinion in Curfew case - underscoring mine)

*indoctrination*

In addition to the foregoing, I have considerable information of my own on the Japanese question, due to the long residence of my wife in Hawaii where her family lives, my many friends there in every social station whom I have often talked with here on the mainland during the last thirty years, as well as my two visits to the island of Oahu during 1940 and 1941 (I was in Pearl Harbor on December 4, 1941, and left Honolulu on the 5th). One could not live in California one's whole life as I have, and have many friends among persons of Japanese ancestry in every social station, without coming to know how at variance with the fact is ~~our~~ *the assumption* expressed belief that "Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire." It is indeed comforting for the future of America to know how futile were the efforts of the Japanese Government (and of many other foreign governments as well, particularly the German) to claim as citizens those of that "race" born on our soil, and to inculcate in them admiration and zeal for the land, customs, or social order of their ancestors. Even in Hawaii, so much closer to Japan than we are, and where children of Japanese ancestry nearly all went to privately maintained Japanese language schools every school day after attending American school, I know of my own knowledge that it just hasn't "taken" at all. *4* As an investment, whatever money has been furnished by the Japanese Government all these years for these long-continued attempts at indoctrination has been a complete loss. With 37 per cent of the population of the Hawaiian Islands of Japanese ancestry, there was not one single instance of sabotage at the time of Pearl Harbor (lurid accounts in our local press to the contrary notwithstanding). There were no "arrows cut in the cane fields"; there were no "Japanese owned trucks blocking the roads"; on the contrary, Americans of Japanese ancestry in Honolulu were as surprised as were my friends in the "Big Five" at the dastardly sneak attack and equally anxious to avenge it, as the volunteering records for both military and civilian services amply indicate. The "laxity at Pearl Harbor" ~~to which you refer in your letter~~, had nothing to do with persons of Japanese ancestry; the laxity, if any, was on



9/2/43, p. 5

*warlord*  
# the part of Caucasian officers of our own armed forces, and on the part of Caucasian civilians in important positions who had "race prejudice in reverse," by which I mean that their lifetime contact with persons of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii had blinded them to the distinction between these Americans and the Japanese people of the homeland. They just didn't think the Japanese Government would be capable of such a deed as Pearl Harbor. # I came back on SS "Lurline" with a friend of thirty years standing, a vice president of one of the leading banks in Honolulu, who didn't believe it even when we got the news from the lips of the ship's captain that Sunday morning (having sailed at noon the Friday before). He maintained absolutely that "there must be some mistake - it just isn't possible." As the radio was immediately closed down, he arrived at San Francisco still unconvinced until after landing. He had "race prejudice in reverse" - he attributed to the Japanese Government the good qualities of the Americans of Japanese ancestry he knew so well - just as your good self and General De Witt, in the reverse direction, attribute to the Americans of Japanese ancestry you apparently don't know so well, the bad qualities of the Japanese Government.

*Blood  
+ skulls  
German  
vs.  
Jap-*  
The prejudice is wrong in either direction, simply because the "blood" has nothing to do with it at all. If it did, and if ~~you~~<sup>we</sup> were consistent, ~~you~~<sup>we</sup> would certainly strongly advocate the isolation for the duration of all persons of German ancestry. They are German citizens, according to the home government. They have been subjected to attempts at indoctrination ever since Bismarck's time; ~~you~~<sup>one</sup> need only know what has gone on in Milwaukee, Cincinnati, etc., to know this. Bad tho it is, there is nothing in Japan's record to equal Germany's. Japan has only become an aggressor and a violator of accepted standards of conduct in the last half-century; whereas Germany has been at it since Roman times or earlier. Pearl Harbor hurts because it happened to us; how about Poland, Russia (attacked in the face of a treaty of friendship and mutual protection); Czecho-Slovakia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and the rest? The execution of some American fliers hurts; how about the execution of the innocent population of the entire village of Lidice in Czecho-Slovakia? Since Bismarck's day the German national anthem was "Deutschland Uber Alles" (Germany over all the World). If blood tells, persons of German ancestry are far more dangerous than those of Japanese ancestry. You can "spot" the latter, not the former. Indoctrination, and sympathy with the ideals of the land of their ancestors, is shown by the record to have been much more effective with those of German blood than those of Japanese. Not one attempt at sabotage has so far been charged to any American of Japanese ancestry; but there have been many charges, and convictions, in the case of Americans of German ancestry. This in spite of the fact



9/2/43, p. 6

that Hawaii has 37 per cent of its population of Japanese ancestry; and that 20,000 here on the continent outside of the Western Defense Command area were never sequestered, as well as the many thousands subsequently released from sequestration and scattered over the continent.

~~And now I wish to answer a few specific points in your letter:~~

It is not true that there was no protest at the inept and unAmerican handling of this situation by General De Witt. A predecessor of this committee objected; I was among those present when a sub-committee called on the General pursuant to appointment but he being busy on other matters, we spent an hour with Col. W. L. Magill, Provost Marshal. Col. Magill told us in substance that "the General had made up his mind." Many other protests are recorded in the Tolan Committee Report (see pp. 147/156). It should also be borne in mind that at that time, the falsity of the Pearl Harbor sabotage stories had not been effectively proven (if it has to this day among Californians); nor had the intelligent, American and effective method of dealing with this problem in Hawaii been made generally known. Also, in time of national emergency, many citizens are reluctant to question the judgment of the General in command, especially not having the proof, which we have later had from his own testimony, of the personal bias that may be influencing his judgment.

But the harm has been done. It cannot be promptly undone. However, ~~we assured that~~ our Committee is not at all departing from principle in not urging immediate return of loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry to this area now. That is not because we fear what they would do; tho it is true that the treatment they received may in some instances serve to destroy the admiration they had for our American institutions. It is because we fear what our prejudiced fellow citizens would do to them. We think it would be injurious to the war effort to make it necessary to devote the time of civil and military authorities to the maintenance of law and order and the protection of the rights of these unfortunate citizens, who were singled out by the General on the basis of blood to be branded as "dangerous" for that reason alone, while those of other enemy descents were not thus branded as racial groups.

*Indiscriminately  
as a racial  
group,*

The details of what happened at Pearl Harbor have not been "somewhat dimmed by the passing of time" in our minds, certainly not in my own; I'll never forget that trip home on a blacked-out ship whose owners heard nothing from her from Sunday noon until inside the bar, so that on Monday



they took out special high rate insurance against her loss with all on board. But as above pointed out, Pearl Harbor and other crimes of the Japanese Government do not in our minds make Americans "potential saboteurs" because they are of Japanese ancestry, any more than the attack on Poland makes Americans disloyal because they have German blood. We just don't think that the acts of the various governments of the world can be attributed in any degree whatever (be they good or bad acts) to Americans who happen to have that particular ancestry; we think all Americans should be judged on what they are as human beings and not as persons of a given ancestry (since all Americans except Indians are of "foreign" extraction).

We agree ~~with you~~ that we will probably have a "terrific war" on our hands to lick Japan, and that it will take thousands of lives to win it. It has already taken thousands of lives as far as we have gone in the German and Italian phase of the war; but in neither case do we feel that that has the slightest bearing on the loyal or disloyal attitudes of Americans, regardless of their racial extraction. Either that proposition is so or it isn't; if it's so, it is equally applicable to persons of German ancestry as to Japanese.

We agree ~~with you~~ that the danger from potential saboteurs is very great in any part of the country, considering how complex modern life has become and how dependent upon bridges, tunnels, power lines, etc., etc. Hence the need for the utmost vigilance all over the country on the part of F. B. I., Army Intelligence, and law-enforcement authorities of every kind. But we do not agree at all on the proposition that a person is any more of a "potential saboteur" because he is of Japanese descent, or German or any other for that matter. His "potentialities" are at least less if he is as readily recognizable hanging around a dam or a power line even in a stolen uniform, as one of Japanese descent would be.

~~We agree with you that "one cannot eat his cake and have it too."~~ We cannot preserve the fundamentals of American principles but use Nazi methods just because they are "more efficient," unless we must do so temporarily to save our very existence, as we are doing in the regimentation of our free-enterprise economy in order to coordinate the production of the machinery of war. That is a deliberate (we hope temporary) surrender of rights and liberties of all citizens in which we all concur (in principle if not in administration). But to imprison whole minority groups for the duration on no other ground than their racial extraction is indeed the Nazi theory of "protective custody" 100%, and so complete a departure from fundamental American principles that it could only be justified if the necessity were as self-evident as the necessity for making guns instead of automobiles. It can



certainly not be justified merely because the General happening to be in command in one area has a personal race prejudice, when a General nearer the front faces an even worse situation by reason of numbers and successfully handles the matter otherwise.

*omit* [ This brings me to the paragraph commencing at the top of your page 4. Whose judgment shall we accept? That of a General who has himself admitted that he believes "a Jap is a Jap," or that of a General who has successfully dealt with an even keener problem along American lines; that of the Intelligence Officer of his department; and that of the facts themselves, i. e. the total absence of sabotage or attempted sabotage on the part of any American of Japanese ancestry or even alien of Japanese ancestry except the direct agents of the Japanese Government to which Mr. Hoover referred in the statement I quoted above.

*The* ~~Your~~ analogy of the persons of American ancestry born in Japan with the persons of Japanese ancestry born in America omits an important fundamental fact. Everything depends on purpose and attitude. Immigrants from other countries of the world come to America to make it their homes; to enjoy its freedoms and its institutions; and to give their children opportunities they know from experience they would not have at home. It is their purpose to become Americans, and it is their attitude to cut the cord that binds them to their homeland. This, they recognize, is the land of opportunity; here is their future and their children's future. My own parents left Denmark for exactly that purpose and with exactly that attitude; and I personally know many, many Japanese whose parents left Japan for exactly that purpose and with exactly that attitude. I do not happen, despite a wide acquaintance, to know a single one whose parents came here "as agents of Japan," etc. Doubtless there were some; as there are some who have come here as "agents of Germany." The reason behind emigration from overcrowded "have-not" countries of low standards of living to America where "everyone is rich" (as they say in Denmark for instance) are not so complicated and so insidious as the suspicious would have us believe. They are the same reasons that induced our ancestors to come to the colonies; they wanted freedom and opportunity; they had the guts to pack up and leave the homeland; and when they got here they wanted to stay and to enjoy the "blessings of freedom for ourselves and our posterity." Indeed, the high percentage of older Japanese who planned to stay here for life is surprising in face of the fact that we deny them naturalization and discriminate socially against them.

Americans, on the other hand, seldom leave America (even under the New Deal) to find better opportunity



9/2/43, p. 9

elsewhere; they seldom "feel at home" anywhere else; and you are probably right in most cases, they are Americans still. What a splendid tribute to the superiority of our country and our institutions! It's a one way street; it doesn't go both ways.

11  
No, I am not under the influence of humanitarians, social workers or experimenters." But I am not gullible enough to believe biased testimony; not swayed by emotion enough to lose sight of fundamentals; and not willing to approve a wrong act just because it's irreversible for the present.

omit  
It is exceedingly difficult to cover so complex a subject by correspondence. The members of the Committee feel that the attitude of the Chief Executive of our State on this fundamental question will have an important bearing on the future solution of the problem that has been created by the indiscriminate evacuation. Many of us are convinced that there lies for you in the future an opportunity to serve our country on a much wider plane, in which case your attitude may have an important bearing on such proposals as that of depriving persons of Japanese ancestry of citizenship; deporting them; etc., etc., which in turn of course will be followed by like proposals to deport persons of other racial descents at future times when we happen to be at war with their ancestral countries. Once the Nazi principle that "blood counts" is admitted, there can be no logical end to the deportation of persons of differing racial stocks until all except the Indians shall have gone. In the evolution of time we shall probably be at war with many other nations, just as we are now at war with Italy and Japan which were our Allies only 25 years ago. If we exclude Caucasians from our future deportations, we still have the Chinese, Negroes, Filipinos, Malays, East Indians, Esquimaux, and many other so-called "non-assimilable" persons to deal with. It is an endless problem.

ent  
Therefore, some time at your convenience, we would like very much to have an opportunity to sit down with you and talk this whole question over. It cannot be but that a frank discussion of this important question would be helpful. If our point of view is wrong we certainly want to know it; and I know you well enough to know that if we can convince you that your point of view may in some respects be wrong, you will be the first to admit it. Will you be good



9/2/43, p. 10

out { enough to let me know when such a conference in the San  
Francisco Bay area would be convenient to you? I will under-  
take to make the arrangements.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Alfred J. Lundberg,  
P. O. Box 58,  
Oakland 4, California.

AJL:WPS



September 2, 1943

Honorable Earl Warren  
Governor of California  
Sacramento, California

Dear Earl:

I am very grateful for your letter of July 16; it was good of you to take the time to set forth your views so fully and I am happy to have been able to convey them to some of the members of this Committee. The multiplicity of demands upon my time is responsible for my delay in replying, which I hope you will forgive.

I hope also, that you will give the whole subject further thought and study, for while - as you say in your letter - we are both earnestly desirous of serving our Country's best interests, there is a very fundamental difference in our respective approaches to this problem.

At the outset I should say that while I am interested, as you are, in movements primarily humanitarian, my interest in this Committee does not spring from that motive at all, nor even from a personal interest in persons of Japanese ancestry, tho I have many friends among them. It springs from a lively interest in a fundamental principle I regard as the most important of all American principles, the protection of minority groups. It is probable that my interest in that principle is primarily selfish, since I myself belong to minority groups in respect of ancestry, economic station, religious denomination, and (for the present only, I hope!) political party. I am persuaded that this Committee is thoroughly sound when it says: "Attacks upon the rights of any minority tend to undermine the rights of the majority."

At the moment, as an American, I am particularly interested in the question of minorities discriminated against on the basis of ancestry, since that was the basis of Hitler's rise to power. Upon the hypothesis that



"superior" and "inferior" qualities in human beings are determined by inheritance alone, without regard to environmental factors, rests the whole structure of Nazi justification for ruling the world and rationalizing the enslavement of all non-"Aryan" persons. Scientific men appear to agree that inheritance of certain mental and physical "characters" is a condition precedent to the development, through environment, of various attainments, but they admit no selection of these "characters" on the basis of "blood" or "race", or even that such a thing as "race" exists in the world in a sufficiently pure form to justify any sub-classification for biological purposes of the genus "homo sapiens" (which latter, as to many individuals, is doubtless a misnomer).

Here, then, is a fundamental difference of point of view in the Japanese question. You believe that persons of Japanese ancestry are, for that reason, "potential saboteurs"; that "they cannot safely be released anywhere"; and that "Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire." You express confidence in the judgment of General De Witt, who, as you undoubtedly know, was reported by the Associated Press as having testified before the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee: "It makes no difference whether the Japanese is theoretically a citizen - he is still a Japanese. Giving him a scrap of paper won't change him. I don't care what they do with the Japs as long as they don't send them back here. A Jap is a Jap."

I, on the other hand, believe that a person is either loyal to our country or not, as the case may be, entirely regardless of the blood or the mixture of bloods that flows in his veins. It may be, as you say, that "social workers" and "experimenters" think so too, but in this matter they have not influenced my judgment at all. When I cannot know all the facts of my own knowledge, I prefer to depend on those whose experience leads me to believe that they are qualified to express an informed opinion. In this matter, I would disqualify General De Witt because of his obvious race prejudice as revealed in the testimony above quoted. But I would be guided by such as the following:

Col. Kendall J. Fielder, Chief of Military Intelligence, Hawaiian Dept.: "How differently a Himmler or a Rosenberg would have handled this delicate situation. Does any one for a moment believe that any of the axis crowd would give one of enemy race a fair chance to prove himself? Yet that's what was done in Hawaii - and so far it has proved militarily sound. That the situation is working out well is a tribute not only to wise administration, but to tolerance on the part of the rest of our good Americans here. \* \* \* For the information of all who might be misled, there is none among us who has been



led into this policy out of a mawkish sentimentality or gullibility. To us, Japan and her people are a race of stubborn, hardy, despicable warrior zealots, who would stop at nothing to snuff out our lives and our way of life. Her army and navy must definitely be crushed. The question of Americans of Japanese blood is far different. They are Americans - and until they prove (or show themselves dangerously capable of proving) traitorous, they should be treated as Americans." (Address, March 1943 - underscoring mine.)

J. Edgar Hoover, Director, F. B. I.: "We have had practically no trouble with the Japanese in Hawaii. I made the statement before, that there has been no sabotage or espionage committed in Hawaii, subsequent to Pearl Harbor. There was espionage committed prior to Pearl Harbor, but not by the Japanese population as such, but by espionage agents and consular agents of the Japanese Government \* \* \* The action taken and the prompt manner in which it was taken, took out of circulation those individuals who might have been the nucleus of any espionage or sabotage rings of either Japanese, Germans, or Italians in the United States." (Testimony before House Appropriations Committee)

Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War: "It is the inherent right of every faithful citizen, regardless of ancestry, to bear arms in the Nation's battle. When obstacles to the free expression of that right are imposed by emergency considerations, those barriers should be removed as soon as humanly possible." (Statement announcing formation of a combat unit of Americans of Japanese descent, January 31, 1943)

Hon. Joseph C. Grew, former ambassador to Japan: "There are among Americans of Japanese race as fine people individually as you can find anywhere, and many of them are peculiarly anxious to repay Americans for freedom by making especially arduous efforts in the prosecution of the war. I welcome the policies of our government, which are designed to relieve the Nisei of discriminatory restrictions as rapidly and fairly as possible, and I applaud the action of the Army in setting up facilities whereby these Americans will be able to show the world what they are able to do." (Address, April 26, 1943)

Col. W. P. Scobey, Executive Officer, Office of Assistant Secretary of War: "The War Department has faith in the loyal Japanese Americans."

Lt. General Delos C. Emmons, Commander Hawaiian Dept.: "Enough Hawaiians of Japanese Ancestry have responded to the call for volunteers to form a combat team of approximately 4,000 men. \* \* The response to the call was highly gratifying. \* \* I believe they will make a splendid record."



9/2/43, p. 4

Mr. Justice Murphy, U. S. Supreme Court: "Except under conditions of great emergency a regulation of this kind (the curfew), applicable solely to citizens of a particular racial extraction, would not be regarded as in accord with the requirement of due process \* \* It by no means follows, however, that there may not be discrimination of such an injurious character in the application of laws as to amount to a denial of due process of law, as that term is used in the Fifth Amendment. I think that point is dangerously approached when we have one law for the majority of our citizens and another for a particular racial heritage." (Concurring opinion in Curfew case - underscoring mine)

In addition to the foregoing, I have considerable information of my own on the Japanese question, due to the long residence of my wife in Hawaii where her family lives, my many friends there in every social station whom I have often talked with here on the mainland during the last thirty years, as well as my two visits to the island of Oahu during 1940 and 1941 (I was in Pearl Harbor on December 4, 1941, and left Honolulu on the 5th). One could not live in California one's whole life as I have, and have many friends among persons of Japanese ancestry in every social station, without coming to know how at variance with the fact is your expressed belief that "Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire." It is indeed comforting for the future of America to know how futile were the efforts of the Japanese Government (and of many other foreign governments as well, particularly the German) to claim as citizens those of that "race" born on our soil, and to inculcate in them admiration and zeal for the land, customs, or social order of their ancestors. Even in Hawaii, so much closer to Japan than we are, and where children of Japanese ancestry nearly all went to privately maintained Japanese language schools every school day after attending American school, I know of my own knowledge that it just hasn't "taken" at all. As an investment, whatever money has been furnished by the Japanese Government all these years for these long-continued attempts at indoctrination has been a complete loss. With 37 per cent of the population of the Hawaiian Islands of Japanese ancestry, there was not one single instance of sabotage at the time of Pearl Harbor (lurid accounts in our local press to the contrary notwithstanding). There were no "arrows cut in the cane fields"; there were no "Japanese owned trucks blocking the roads"; on the contrary, Americans of Japanese ancestry in Honolulu were as surprised as were my friends in the "Big Five" at the dastardly sneak attack and equally anxious to avenge it, as the volunteering records for both military and civilian services amply indicate. The "laxity at Pearl Harbor" to which you refer in your letter, had nothing to do with persons of Japanese ancestry; the laxity, if any, was on



the part of Caucasian officers of our own armed forces, and on the part of Caucasian civilians in important positions who had "race prejudice in reverse," by which I mean that their lifetime contact with persons of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii had blinded them to the distinction between these Americans and the Japanese people of the homeland. They just didn't think the Japanese Government would be capable of such a deed as Pearl Harbor. I came back on SS "Lurline" with a friend of thirty years standing, a vice president of one of the leading banks in Honolulu, who didn't believe it even when we got the news from the lips of the ship's captain that Sunday morning (having sailed at noon the Friday before). He maintained absolutely that "there must be some mistake - it just isn't possible." As the radio was immediately closed down, he arrived at San Francisco still unconvinced until after landing. He had "race prejudice in reverse" - he attributed to the Japanese Government the good qualities of the Americans of Japanese ancestry he knew so well - just as your good self and General De Witt, in the reverse direction, attribute to the Americans of Japanese ancestry you apparently don't know so well, the bad qualities of the Japanese Government.

The prejudice is wrong in either direction, simply because the "blood" has nothing to do with it at all. If it did, and if you were consistent, you would certainly strongly advocate the isolation for the duration of all persons of German ancestry. They are German citizens, according to the home government. They have been subjected to attempts at indoctrination ever since Bismarck's time; you need only know what has gone on in Milwaukee, Cincinnati, etc., to know this. Bad tho it is, there is nothing in Japan's record to equal Germany's. Japan has only become an aggressor and a violator of accepted standards of conduct in the last half-century; whereas Germany has been at it since Roman times or earlier. Pearl Harbor hurts because it happened to us; how about Poland, Russia (attacked in the face of a treaty of friendship and mutual protection); Czecho-Slovakia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and the rest? The execution of some American fliers hurts; how about the execution of the innocent population of the entire village of Lidice in Czecho-Slovakia? Since Bismarck's day the German national anthem was "Deutschland Uber Alles" (Germany over all the World). If blood tells, persons of German ancestry are far more dangerous than those of Japanese ancestry. You can "spot" the latter, not the former. Indoctrination, and sympathy with the ideals of the land of their ancestors, is shown by the record to have been much more effective with those of German blood than those of Japanese. Not one attempt at sabotage has so far been charged to any American of Japanese ancestry; but there have been many charges, and convictions, in the case of Americans of German ancestry. This in spite of the fact



9/2/43, p. 6

that Hawaii has 37 per cent of its population of Japanese ancestry; and that 20,000 here on the continent outside of the Western Defense Command area were never sequestered, as well as the many thousands subsequently released from sequestration and scattered over the continent.

And now I wish to answer a few specific points in your letter:

It is not true that there was no protest at the inept and unAmerican handling of this situation by General De Witt. A predecessor of this committee objected; I was among those present when a sub-committee called on the General pursuant to appointment but he being busy on other matters, we spent an hour with Col. W. L. Magill, Provost Marshal. Col. Magill told us in substance that "the General had made up his mind." Many other protests are recorded in the Tolan Committee Report (see pp. 147/156). It should also be borne in mind that at that time, the falsity of the Pearl Harbor sabotage stories had not been effectively proven (if it has to this day among Californians); nor had the intelligent, American and effective method of dealing with this problem in Hawaii been made generally known. Also, in time of national emergency, many citizens are reluctant to question the judgment of the General in command, especially not having the proof, which we have later had from his own testimony, of the personal bias that may be influencing his judgment.

But the harm has been done. It cannot be promptly undone. However, be assured that our Committee is not at all departing from principle in not urging immediate return of loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry to this area now. That is not because we fear what they would do; tho it is true that the treatment they received may in some instances serve to destroy the admiration they had for our American institutions. It is because we fear what our prejudiced fellow citizens would do to them. We think it would be injurious to the war effort to make it necessary to devote the time of civil and military authorities to the maintenance of law and order and the protection of the rights of these unfortunate citizens, who were singled out by the General on the basis of blood to be branded as "dangerous" for that reason alone, while those of other enemy descents were not thus branded as racial groups.

The details of what happened at Pearl Harbor have not been "somewhat dimmed by the passing of time" in our minds, certainly not in my own; I'll never forget that trip home on a blacked-out ship whose owners heard nothing from her from Sunday noon until inside the bar, so that on Monday



they took out special high rate insurance against her loss with all on board. But as above pointed out, Pearl Harbor and other crimes of the Japanese Government do not in our minds make Americans "potential saboteurs" because they are of Japanese ancestry, any more than the attack on Poland makes Americans disloyal because they have German blood. We just don't think that the acts of the various governments of the world can be attributed in any degree whatever (be they good or bad acts) to Americans who happen to have that particular ancestry; we think all Americans should be judged on what they are as human beings and not as persons of a given ancestry (since all Americans except Indians are of "foreign" extraction).

We agree with you that we will probably have a "terrific war" on our hands to lick Japan, and that it will take thousands of lives to win it. It has already taken thousands of lives as far as we have gone in the German and Italian phase of the war; but in neither case do we feel that that has the slightest bearing on the loyal or disloyal attitudes of Americans, regardless of their racial extraction. Either that proposition is so or it isn't; if it's so, it is equally applicable to persons of German ancestry as to Japanese.

We agree with you that the danger from potential saboteurs is very great in any part of the country, considering how complex modern life has become and how dependent upon bridges, tunnels, power lines, etc., etc. Hence the need for the utmost vigilance all over the country on the part of F. B. I., Army Intelligence, and law-enforcement authorities of every kind. But we do not agree at all on the proposition that a person is any more of a "potential saboteur" because he is of Japanese descent, or German or any other for that matter. His "potentialities" are at least less if he is as readily recognizable hanging around a dam or a power line even in a stolen uniform, as one of Japanese descent would be.

We agree with you that "one cannot eat his cake and have it too." We cannot preserve the fundamentals of American principles but use Nazi methods just because they are "more efficient," unless we must do so temporarily to save our very existence, as we are doing in the regimentation of our free-enterprise economy in order to coordinate the production of the machinery of war. That is a deliberate (we hope temporary) surrender of rights and liberties of all citizens in which we all concur (in principle if not in administration). But to imprison whole minority groups for the duration on no other ground than their racial extraction is indeed the Nazi theory of "protective custody" 100%, and so complete a departure from fundamental American principles that it could only be justified if the necessity were as self-evident as the necessity for making guns instead of automobiles. It can



certainly not be justified merely because the General happening to be in command in one area has a personal race prejudice, when a General nearer the front faces an even worse situation by reason of numbers and successfully handles the matter otherwise.

This brings me to the paragraph commencing at the top of your page 4. Whose judgment shall we accept? That of a General who has himself admitted that he believes "a Jap is a Jap," or that of a General who has successfully dealt with an even keener problem along American lines; that of the Intelligence Officer of his department; and that of the facts themselves, i. e. the total absence of sabotage or attempted sabotage on the part of any American of Japanese ancestry or even alien of Japanese ancestry except the direct agents of the Japanese Government to which Mr. Hoover referred in the statement I quoted above.

Your analogy of the persons of American ancestry born in Japan with the persons of Japanese ancestry born in America omits an important fundamental fact. Everything depends on purpose and attitude. Immigrants from other countries of the world come to America to make it their homes; to enjoy its freedoms and its institutions; and to give their children opportunities they know from experience they would not have at home. It is their purpose to become Americans, and it is their attitude to cut the cord that binds them to their homeland. This, they recognize, is the land of opportunity; here is their future and their children's future. My own parents left Denmark for exactly that purpose and with exactly that attitude; and I personally know many, many Japanese whose parents left Japan for exactly that purpose and with exactly that attitude. I do not happen, despite a wide acquaintance, to know a single one whose parents came here "as agents of Japan," etc. Doubtless there were some; as there are some who have come here as "agents of Germany." The reason behind emigration from overcrowded "have-not" countries of low standards of living to America where "everyone is rich" (as they say in Denmark for instance) are not so complicated and so insidious as the suspicious would have us believe. They are the same reasons that induced our ancestors to come to the colonies; they wanted freedom and opportunity; they had the guts to pack up and leave the homeland; and when they got here they wanted to stay and to enjoy the "blessings of freedom for ourselves and our posterity." Indeed, the high percentage of older Japanese who planned to stay here for life is surprising in face of the fact that we deny them naturalization and discriminate socially against them.

Americans, on the other hand, seldom leave America (even under the New Deal) to find better opportunity



9/2/43, p. 9

elsewhere; they seldom "feel at home" anywhere else; and you are probably right in most cases, they are Americans still. What a splendid tribute to the superiority of our country and our institutions! It's a one way street; it doesn't go both ways.

No, I am not under the influence of humanitarians, social workers or experimenters. But I am not gullible enough to believe biased testimony; not swayed by emotion enough to lose sight of fundamentals; and not willing to approve a wrong act just because it's irreversible for the present.

It is exceedingly difficult to cover so complex a subject by correspondence. The members of the Committee feel that the attitude of the Chief Executive of our State on this fundamental question will have an important bearing on the future solution of the problem that has been created by the indiscriminate evacuation. Many of us are convinced that there lies for you in the future an opportunity to serve our country on a much wider plane, in which case your attitude may have an important bearing on such proposals as that of depriving persons of Japanese ancestry of citizenship; deporting them; etc., etc., which in turn of course will be followed by like proposals to deport persons of other racial descents at future times when we happen to be at war with their ancestral countries. Once the Nazi principle that "blood counts" is admitted, there can be no logical end to the deportation of persons of differing racial stocks until all except the Indians shall have gone. In the evolution of time we shall probably be at war with many other nations, just as we are now at war with Italy and Japan which were our Allies only 25 years ago. If we exclude Caucasians from our future deportations, we still have the Chinese, Negroes, Filipinos, Malays, East Indians, Esquimaux, and many other so-called "non-assimilable" persons to deal with. It is an endless problem.

Therefore, some time at your convenience, we would like very much to have an opportunity to sit down with you and talk this whole question over. It cannot be but that a frank discussion of this important question would be helpful. If our point of view is wrong we certainly want to know it; and I know you well enough to know that if we can convince you that your point of view may in some respects be wrong, you will be the first to admit it. Will you be good



9/2/43, p. 10

enough to let me know when such a conference in the San Francisco Bay area would be convenient to you? I will undertake to make the arrangements.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Alfred J. Lundberg,  
P. O. Box 58,  
Oakland 4, California.

AJL:MFS



July 13, 1943

EXHIBIT D(a)

Personal

Honorable Earl Warren  
Governor of California  
Sacramento, California

Dear Earl:

I presume upon my friendship with you to write you regarding a matter over which I am much concerned. I am convinced that we must deal fairly with the loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry who have been evacuated from our state.

You have recently been quoted in the press as believing not only that these people should not be returned to California during the war but that you also oppose the plan of the Federal Government to relocate loyal persons in non-military zones where they might aid in meeting the manpower shortage. The July 5th issue of Life Magazine states that you oppose any release from the Relocation Centers with the words "No one will be able to tell a saboteur from any other Jap...We don't want to have a second Pearl Harbor in California .... This isn't an appeal to race hatred."

Unfortunately there are already evidences that your words are being exploited by vigilante-minded individuals. Some with whom I have talked believe that you have been misquoted. Some think that you were referring to the disloyal persons who are now confined in internment camps and that you did not have reference to the many loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry who are living in the Relocation Centers.

The Committee on whose letterhead this is written and of which I am an active member, does not suggest that even loyal evacuees should be returned to the West Coast at the present time. But it does strongly support the position that Americans of Japanese ancestry who are found to be loyal should be permitted to find their places in industry and agriculture outside the military areas. Our opinion is backed up by authoritative testimonies by J. Edgar Hoover, Colonel K. J. Fielder of Army Intelligence and others. I enclose some of these supporting statements.

Frankly, Earl, I feel it would be sound for you to take a long view and a nation-wide view of this question, which is so clouded by war-time emotions here at home in California, with doubtless a considerable element of emotions that have their root in economic jealousies. As far as I have been able to learn, people in the Middle West and East are more sensitive to the preservation of the liberties of American citizens including those so unfortunate as to look like our present enemies. The fundamentals of the Bill of Rights have weathered many an emotional storm in our Nation's history, and I feel sure you believe as I do that it will weather this one. You have already helped it weather local attempts at embezzlement by domestic enemies of various Caucasian ancestries; I am one of those who hope it may please God to permit you to do so on a nation-wide scale.

So if you have been misquoted, will you not take steps to set the matter right?

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Alfred J. Lundberg

AJL:MFS



STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Governor's Office  
Sacramento

July 16, 1943

Mr. Alfred J. Lundberg  
1106 Broadway  
Oakland (4), California

Dear Al:

I have your letter of July 13 concerning the Japanese who have been evacuated from our State and calling attention to my statements on the subject at the recent Governors' Conference. In it you say, "Unfortunately there are already evidences that your words are being exploited by vigilante-minded individuals." If this is the fact, I sincerely regret it because nothing is more destructive than vigilante spirit and action, and I have consistently opposed both throughout my public career.

I am very happy to discuss the subject with you because I believe that both of us speak the same language and are motivated by the same interest. I have been intimately acquainted with your humanitarian instincts ever since we both joined with others in Oakland to form the Religious Fellowship some fifteen years ago. However, I cannot make any apology for the things that I said concerning the evacuation and relocation of Japanese, because I believe them to be true and in the interest of safety of our State and Nation.

I believe these views are not colored by race hatred or by "war time emotions here at home in California with doubtless a considerable element of emotions that have their root in economic jealousies," stated by you to be prevalent. It is my opinion that the Japanese, whether born in Japan or in this country, were rightfully evacuated from this area and placed in Relocation Centers under the authority conferred by Congressional Act, signed by the President and acted under by the Commanding General charged with the military safety of this section of our country. At that time everyone from the President down acquiesced in the procedure. I heard of no objection being raised by governmental agencies or citizen groups, although they had ample time to do so. I am persuaded that the reason there was no such objection was that the public feared the activities of these people, as did the Commanding General. At that time the affair at Pearl Harbor was still ringing in our ears. Now that the details of that incident have been somewhat dimmed by passing of time, there is a movement to undo that which was then done in the interest of safety. Personally, I am of the opinion that little has happened since Pearl Harbor to justify us in abandoning protective measures. Certainly our victories do not add up to any such total.

On the other hand, I am of the opinion that if the European War should be terminated successfully in a reasonably short time we will still have a terrific war on our hands with the Japanese and that it will take the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys to win it. In short, I believe that the same smugness that brought about the laxity ending in the disaster at Pearl Harbor is beginning to permeate our country again, and that unless we do keep uppermost in our minds the formidable military establishment of Japan, the degree of her preparation, and the imperial designs, we may have another Pearl Harbor. I pray that it may not be so, but that if it should be, California, through an appreciation of the dangers involved, may have protected herself against the blow falling here.

I cannot help believing that you and your committee share this belief with me: otherwise you would not have said in your letter "The Committee on whose letterhead



July 16, 1943

this is written, and of which I am an active member, does not suggest that even loyal evacuees should be returned to the West Coast at the present time, but it does strongly support the position that Americans of Japanese ancestry who are found to be loyal should be permitted to find their places in industry and agriculture outside the military areas." That statement indicates to me that you believe exactly as I do; that regardless of the place of their birth they cannot, under existing war conditions, be trusted in this vital war area. The only difference, apparently, in our thinking is that you are of the opinion that they can safely be released from sequestration in other parts of the country, while I am of the opinion that under our way of life a potential saboteur is a menace to our war effort, regardless of where he may be released.

In this country of ours where people are free to come and go as they please without any system of espionage, there is no limit to the dangers involved in setting a potential saboteur loose in any part of the country. The destruction of an airplane factory in Kansas City is just as much a disaster as the destruction of one at Burbank, California. The destruction of bridges and tunnels in the Rocky Mountains would be just as great a disaster as similar sabotage in the Sierra Nevadas. The destruction of Boulder Dam, which is outside the combat area but which furnishes a major portion of the water and power for war industry in Southern California, would be just as serious as the destruction of the Pitt River Dam and others in the combat area serving war industry in northern California. It is on this theory I believe that if the evacuees cannot safely be returned to California they cannot safely be released anywhere.

As I view the situation, your position, giving full credit for the humanitarian motives prompting it, is not one based upon principles but upon expediency for the safety of our country, as is mine. If it were otherwise, and your conclusion was based upon the Bill of Rights which was referred to in your letter you would contend that every person born in this country of Japanese parentage would, under present conditions, be entitled to every right of citizenship; that is, the right to come and go and assemble, not in some parts of the country, but in every part of the country, including this combat zone where you and I and others have the same privilege. For obvious reasons you and your committee do not rely upon this principle in arriving at your conclusion.

There is an old saying that one cannot eat his cake and keep it, and it seems that that is the situation in which we find ourselves now. Either we take the protective measures that we know in our hearts are necessary to insure safety of our country or we abandon them as being in conflict with some principle of law. We cannot do both in this situation, and our Supreme Court unanimously recognized this fact recently in sustaining the curfew regulations on those of Japanese ancestry. It arrived at its conclusion reluctantly, as we all do in such situations. Nevertheless it was firm and unanimous in its conclusion that because of the peculiar situation of those of Japanese extraction, a distinction could, under the Constitution, be made. How far they will go in sustaining these procedures I do not profess to know, but I am of the opinion that it will go as far as it believes the necessities of the situation justify.

Lieutenant General DeWitt, the Commanding General of this area, has expressed the firm belief that in order to insure the safety of the area none of the evacuees should be returned. Inasmuch as the original evacuation was made under his direction, I see no reason why we should doubt the wisdom of his present opinion on the subject.



July 16, 1943

Reduced to simplest terms, our difference of opinion on the subject, if we are in disagreement, would seem to depend upon whose judgment we are going to accept as to the action required to protect us against fifth-column activities, which are part and parcel of Axis warfare. I personally choose to take the opinion of the Commanding General who is charged with our safety, rather than the views of experimenters who sometimes fall into the error of supporting their theories to the extent of disregarding very obvious precautions that should be taken against the dangers of modern warfare. I think there can be no doubt that the evidence which has recently come to light in some of the Relocation Centers shows a shocking indifference to the safety factor. I suppose you are aware that for a long time there have been thousands of people in California including army, navy, coast guard, local law enforcement and civilian patrols, guarding our coast line against possible landings of Japanese saboteurs from submarines. We have been warned by the government time after time of the probability of attempted landings. Should the evacuees be returned to California and given the right of unrestricted travel, who, I ask you, could tell the difference between a loyal Japanese on our coast line and a saboteur?

Some months ago the country was in a turmoil over the secret landing of six Germans who had been trained in the techniques of sabotage in Germany and sent to this country with that knowledge and the necessary funds to disrupt our war effort. Fortunately they were apprehended by the F.B.I. They were promptly and properly tried, convicted, and executed, and those who assisted them were likewise punished. It was a serious situation, but compared with the potentialities involved in releasing all those whom the social workers in Japanese Relocation Centers put the stamp of loyalty upon, it is but a drop in the bucket. We know how Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire and of their efforts to achieve them.

As a matter of plain, simple fact, Al, it seems to me that we could not expect the average Japanese born in this country to give his loyalty to America in this war of survival. Again I hope that in saying this I am not giving vent to any feeling of race prejudice or hatred but rather to a recognition of loyalties that are born of home, family, race and religion. I would expect to be so judged if I were in Japan. Suppose that as young men, you and I had gone to Japan to live; that we had brought our American wives with us and had there brought our children into the world. Suppose, further, that they had lived in our American homes, more or less isolated from the Japanese society and culture, prohibited from acquiring citizenship or land, and perhaps never even learning the Japanese language. Suppose they had never known any other environment prior to the outbreak of this present war, where do you believe their sentiments would now be? Would they be for Japan or would they be for the United States of America; and given the opportunity to help one or the other, which do you believe they would help? I believe I know what both your children and mine would do under the circumstances; and I believe that Japanese, so born and reared, would react even more strongly because their government is their religion as well, and their Emperor is their God.

I have no doubt that there are many Japanese who came to this country because they would rather live here than live their lives under conditions as they are in Japan. I am also certain that there are many of their children born in this country who would have the same loyal sentiments that you and I have. For them this is a tragedy. War is a tragedy to millions of people. If there were any reasonable way of determining the loyalty of these individuals, I would be the first to insist upon their having the right to all the freedoms that we have. Unfortunately, I believe there is no way of determining this fact, or if there is, it has not been tried.



July 16, 1943

Frankly, as a citizen and public official I am not willing to adopt the theories or the practices indulged in by the Relocation Authorities to determine this fact. If, on the other hand, General DeWitt who is charged with the military security of the area and who has been intimately connected with the situation since before Pearl Harbor, or Director J. Edgar Hoover of the F.B.I., were to pass favorably upon the release of any of these individuals, I would accept the decision cheerfully and without question.

In conclusion let me say again that I appreciate the humanitarian sentiments which impelled you to write--the sentiments that have brought your committee together. Also that fundamentally there is no real difference of opinion between us and that we are both guided by a desire to do for these people those things which are consistent with the security of our nation. The only difference between us, as I view the situation, is that you do not believe the elements of danger in this group are as serious as I do, and that you base your opinion, as to the danger involved, upon the opinions of the workers in the War Relocation Authority. While I base mine upon army and navy officials and the members of the F.B.I. and other law enforcement officers as well as upon the opinion of the Commanding General for this area.

You may be sure that so far as is consistent with this belief on my part, I will do everything possible to protect the lives and property of these people as I would all other citizens of our country. It was in this spirit that I said at Columbus, Ohio, that I was not making an appeal to race hatred, but rather an appeal for national security.

Trusting that you will convey these views to the members of your Committee; and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

(signed) Earl Warren

EW:ecp



C O P Y

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Governor's Office

Sacramento

July 16, 1943

Mr. Alfred J. Lundberg  
1106 Broadway  
Oakland (4), California

Dear Al:

I have your letter of July 13 concerning the Japanese who have been evacuated from our State and calling attention to my statements on the subject at the recent Governors' Conference. In it you say "Unfortunately there are already evidences that your words are being exploited by vigilante-minded individuals." If this is the ~~fact~~ fact, I sincerely regret it because nothing is more destructive than vigilante spirit and action, and I have consistently opposed both throughout my public career.

I am very happy to discuss the subject with you because I believe that both of us speak the same language and are motivated by the same interest. I have been intimately acquainted with your humanitarian instincts ever since we both joined with others in Oakland to form the Religious Fellowship some fifteen years ago. However, I cannot make any apology for the things that I said concerning the evacuation and relocation of Japanese, because I believe them to be true and in the interest of safety of our State and Nation.

I believe these views are not colored by race hatred or by "war time emotions here at home in California with doubtless a considerable element of emotions that have their root in economic jealousies," stated by you to be prevalent. It is my opinion that the Japanese, whether born in Japan or in this country, were rightfully evacuated from this area and placed in Relocation Centers under the authority conferred by Congressional Act, signed by the President and acted under by the Commanding General charged with the military safety of this section of our country. At that time everyone from the President down acquiesced in the procedure. I heard of no objection being raised by governmental agencies or citizen groups, although they had ample time to do so. I am persuaded that the reason there was no such objection was that the public feared the activities of these people, as did the Commanding General. At that time the affair at Pearl Harbor was still ringing in



July 16, 1943

our ears. Now that the details of that incident have been somewhat dimmed by passing of time, there is a movement ~~of~~ to undo that which was then done in the interest of safety. Personally, I am of the opinion that little has happened since Pearl Harbor to justify us in abandoning protective measures. Certainly our victories do not add up to any such total.

On the other hand, I am of the opinion that if the European War should be terminated successfully in a reasonably short time we will still have a terrific war on our hands with the Japanese and that it will take the lives of hundreds of thousands of our boys to win it. In short, I believe that the same smugness that brought about the laxity ending in the disaster at Pearl Harbor is beginning to permeate our country again, and that unless we do keep uppermost in our minds the formidable military establishment of Japan, the degree of her preparation, and the imperial designs, we may have another Pearl Harbor. I pray that it may not be so, but that if it should be, California, through an appreciation of the dangers involved, may have protected herself against the blow falling here.

I cannot help believing that you and your committee share this belief with me: otherwise you would not have said in your letter "The committee on whose letterhead this is written, and of which I am an active member, does not suggest that even loyal evacuees should be returned to the West Coast at the present time, but it does strongly support the position that Americans of Japanese ancestry who are found to be loyal should be permitted to find their places in industry and agriculture outside the military areas." That statement indicates to me that you believe exactly as I do; that regardless of the place of their birth they cannot, under existing war conditions, be trusted in this vital war area. The only difference, apparently, in our thinking is that you are of the opinion that they can safely be released from sequestration in other parts of the country, while I am of the opinion that under our way of life a potential saboteur is a menace to our war effort, regardless of where he may be released.

In this country of ours where people are free to come and go as they please without any system of espionage, there is no limit to the dangers involved in setting a potential saboteur loose in any part of the country. The destruction of an aeroplane factory in Kansas City is just as much a disaster as the destruction of one at Burbank, California.



July 16, 1943

The destruction of bridges and tunnels in the Rocky Mountains would be just as great a disaster as similar sabotage in the Sierra Nevadas. The destruction of Boulder Dam, which is outside the combat area but which furnishes a major portion of the water and power for war industry in Southern California, would be just as serious as the destruction of the Pitt River Dam and others in the combat area serving war industry in northern California. It is on this theory I believe that if the evacuees cannot safely be returned to California they cannot safely be released anywhere.

As I view the situation, your position, giving full credit for the humanitarian motives prompting it, is not one based upon principles but upon expediency for the safety of our country, as is mine. If it were otherwise, and your conclusion was based upon the Bill of Rights which was referred to in your letter, you would contend that every person born in this country of Japanese parentage would, under present conditions, be entitled to every right of citizenship; that is, the right to come and go and assemble, not in some parts of the country, but in every part of the country, including this combat zone where you and I and others have the same privilege. For obvious reasons you and your committee do not rely upon this principle in arriving at your conclusion.

There is an old saying that one cannot eat his cake and keep it, and it seems that that is the situation in which we find ourselves now. Either we take the protective measures that we know in our hearts are necessary to insure safety of our country or we abandon them as being in conflict with some principle of law. We cannot do both in this situation, and our Supreme Court unanimously recognized this fact recently in sustaining the curfew regulations on those of Japanese ancestry. It arrived at its conclusion reluctantly, as we all do in such situations. Nevertheless it was firm and unanimous in its conclusion that because of the peculiar situation of those of Japanese extraction, a distinction could, under the Constitution, be made. How far they will go in sustaining these procedures I do not profess to know, but I am of the opinion that it will go as far as it believes the necessities of the situation justify.

Lieutenant General DeWitt, the Commanding General of this area, has expressed the firm belief that in order to insure the safety of the area none of the evacuees should be returned. Inasmuch as the original evacuation was made under his direction, I see no reason why we should doubt the wisdom of his present opinion on the subject.



July 16, 1943

Reduced to simplest terms, our difference of opinion on the subject, if ~~we~~ we are in disagreement, would seem to depend upon whose judgment we are going to accept as to the action required to protect us against Fifth-column activities, which are part and parcel of Axis warfare. I personally choose to take the opinion of the Commanding General who is charged with our safety, rather than the views of experimenters who sometimes fall into the error of supporting their theories to the extent of disregarding very obvious precautions that should be taken against the dangers of modern warfare. I think there can be no doubt that the evidence which has recently come to light in some of the Relocation Centers shows a shocking indifference to the safety factor. I suppose you are aware that for a long time there have been thousands of people in California including army, navy, coast guard, local law enforcement and civilian patrols, guarding our coast line against possible landings of Japanese saboteurs from submarines. We have been warned by the government time after time of the probability of attempted landings. Should the evacuees be returned to California and given the right of unrestricted travel, who, I ask you, could tell the difference between a loyal Japanese on our coast line and a saboteur?

Some months ago the country was in a turmoil over the secret landing of six Germans who had been trained in the techniques of sabotage in Germany and sent to this country with that knowledge and the necessary funds to disrupt our war effort. Fortunately they were apprehended by the F.B.I. They were promptly and properly tried, convicted, and executed, and those who assisted them were likewise punished. It was a serious situation, but compared with the potentialities involved in releasing all those whom the social workers in Japanese Relocation Centers put the stamp of loyalty upon, it is but a drop in the bucket. We know how Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire and of their efforts to achieve them.

As a matter of plain, simple fact, Al, it seems to me that we could not expect the average Japanese born in this country to give his loyalty to America in this war of survival. Again I hope that in saying this I am not giving vent to any feeling of race prejudice or hatred but rather to a recognition of loyalties that are born of home, family, race and religion. I would expect to be so judged if I were in Japan. Suppose that as young men, you and I had gone to Japan to live; that we had brought our American wives with us and had there brought our children into the world. Suppose, further, that they had



July 16, 1943

lived in our American homes, more or less isolated from the Japanese society and culture, prohibited from acquiring citizenship or land, and perhaps never even learning the Japanese language. Suppose they had never known any other environment prior to the outbreak of this present war, where do you believe their sentiments would now be? Would they be for Japan or would they be for the United States of America; and given the opportunity to help one or the other, which do you believe they would help? I believe I know what both your children and mine would do under the circumstances; and I believe that Japanese, so born and reared, would react even more strongly because their government is their religion as well, and their Emperor is their God.

I have no doubt that there are many Japanese who came to this country because they would rather live here than live their lives under conditions as they are in Japan. I am also certain that there are many of their children born in this country who would have the same loyal sentiments that you and I have. For them this is a tragedy. War is a tragedy to millions of people. If there were any reasonable way of determining the loyalty of these individuals, I would be the first to insist upon their having the right to all the freedoms that we have. Unfortunately, I believe there is no way of determining this fact, or if there is, it has not been tried.

Frankly, as a citizen and public official I am not willing to adopt the theories or the practices indulged in by the Relocation Authorities to determine this fact. If, on the other hand, General DeWitt who is charged with the military security of the area and who has been intimately connected with the situation since before Pearl Harbor, or Director J. Edgar Hoover of the F.B.I., were to pass favorably upon the release of any of these individuals, I would accept the decision cheerfully and without question.

In conclusion let me say again that I appreciate the humanitarian sentiments which impelled you to write -- the sentiments that have brought your committee together. Also that fundamentally there is no real difference of opinion between us and that we are both guided by a desire to do for these people those things which are consistent with the security of our nation. The only difference between us, as I view the situation, is that you do not believe the elements of danger in this group are as serious as I do, and that you base your opinion, as to the danger involved, upon the opinions of the workers in the War Relocation Authority. While I base mine upon army and navy officials, members of the F.B.I. and other law enforcement officers as well as upon the opinion of the Commanding General for this area.



July 16, 1943

You may be sure that so far as is consistent with this belief on my part, I will do everything possible to protect the lives and property of ~~these~~ these people as I would all other citizens of our country. It was in this spirit that I said at Columbus, Ohio that I was not making an appeal to race hatred, but rather an appeal for national security.

Trusting that you will convey these views to the members of your Committee; and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

(signed) Earl Warren

EW: ecp



Comments on July 16 letter

3  
Copy  
Para. 3 which begins "I believe these views..."

Objections to the procedure were voiced in the same forum in which Mr. W. expressed his views, viz. the Tolan Committee of the House of Representatives. They were published in the same series of Hearings. Among notable objectors see representatives of National Security and Fair Play Committee and Congress of Industrial Organizations. See especially pages 11183 ff., 11199, 11240 et al.

Some of "the Details" of Pearl Harbor have been "dimmed by the passing of time." Others have been clarified, even reversed completely as to our notions of significant fact. These have been published in official statements, and carried in national magazines. The report on the Naval Intelligence Officer in Harpers last October, and the experience of the Army in Hawaii seem worth review.

Para. which begins "On the other hand..."

Not clear what "the same smugness that brought about the laxity ending in the disaster at Pearl Harbor" has to do, logically, with the conclusion of this paragraph. Did the American-born Japanese take advantage of "smugness" to bring about Pearl Harbor? Of course no one wants to change a Pearl Harbor here, but the argument seems to have substantial elements of irrelevance.

Para. 4 which begins "I cannot help believing..."

Mr. W. needs some clarification of the position of the Committee, evidently.

Para. 5. ~~Of course~~ which begins "In this country..."

Of course damage by a potential saboteur to an airplane factory in Kansas City is as destructive and as "great a disaster as similar sabotage" in Burbank. But what supports the conclusion of the sentence in the final paragraph? Doesn't this paragraph beg the question?

Para. 6 which begins "As I view the situation..."

This paragraph contains a conclusion arrived at by Mr. W. concerning the position of the Committee on A.P. & F.P. that is based on a complete non sequitur fallacy.

Para. 7 which begins "There is an old saying..."

The failure of analogy between the saying about the cake and "the situation in which we find ourselves now" seems clear enough. The issue is stated as one of black and white, of "safety of our country" vs. "principle of law." Does the Supreme Court so view it? Is not it more likely that the Court sees the issue as a balance between the rights of citizenship to protection from interference, and the right of the community to interfere in proportion to the jeopardy of the "safety of the country?" From which it seems to follow, and press accounts of the Supreme Court decision suggest this, that the balance between the safety of the country and the rights of citizenship ~~for~~ to freedom from interference is one to be reassessed on the basis of new knowledge and changing situations, frequently if not continually. I am not a lawyer and may have misinterpreted, but I doubt it.



Para. 8. which begins "Lieutenant General DeWitt..."

There is not the slightest criticism of General DeWitt in pointing out that Mr. W's conclusion is completely unsupported by his premise, and his argument is what is known as a non sequitur.

Para. 9 which begins "Reduced to simplest terms..."

Why should not Mr. W. have asked, at conclusion of his paragraph, "Who, I ask you, could tell the difference between a loyal German-American (Italian-American, Chinese American, et al. not forgetting British if recent newspaper reports are to be believed) on our coast line and a saboteur?" Mr. W's argument seems to prove too much.

Para. 10. which begins "Some months ago..."

There seems to be a convenient slurring of some facts here, and ignoring of some others, as well as the slurring of a profession.

Para. 11 which begins "As a matter of plain, simple fact..."

This argument is based upon introspection. That method of arriving at conclusions is not without value, but wouldn't it be safer to use more objective methods of arriving at them? The Naval Intelligence Officer who made the study published in Harpers used observation, and arrived at a different conclusion from the one Mr. W. arrives at by use of introspection.

Para 12 which begins "In conclusion let me say..."

Of course there is a real difference of opinion between the Committee and Mr. W., and the opinion of the Committee has been incorrectly perceived and stated by Mr. W. Furthermore Mr. W's alignment of authorities on one side and the other contains some elements that to say the least are of doubtful validity. Is Mr. W. really well-informed on this subject?

Para. 13, which begins "You may be sure..."

Without altering Mr. W's position as quoted, it might be pointed out to him that he could give force to the assertion in the first sentence of his paragraph if he would state publicly, for example, that upon conclusion of hostilities he will "do everything possible to protect the lives and property of these people" within the jurisdiction of his authority in California.

NB Error made in numbering of paragraphs above. 12 & 13 above should be 14 & 15

Para. 12 corrected, which begins "I have no doubt..."

Before the Toian Committee religious persons expressed confidence that they could "tell who are loyal and who are disloyal in many cases; most cases, I believe." p. 11210. The Department of Justice has regular procedures for doing this very thing, for Japanese as well as others, and has acted upon hundreds, perhaps thousands of cases. The Army seems able to make this distinction, also. The last sentence of Mr. W's paragraph seems plainly in accord with well-known facts.

Para. 3 which begins "Frankly, as a citizen..."

Of course Mr. W. must choose his position. Irrespective of its wisdom or unwisdom, it is interesting to note that he is willing to accept "cheerfully and without question" the decision of the Commanding General or the F.B.I. Well, too many things might be said in comment on that to set them down here.



September 2, 1943

Honorable Earl Warren  
Governor of California  
Sacramento, California

Dear Earl:

I am very grateful for your letter of July 16; it was good of you to take the time to set forth your views so fully and I am happy to have been able to convey them to some of the members of this Committee. The multiplicity of demands upon my time is responsible for my delay in replying, which I hope you will forgive.

I hope also, that you will give the whole subject further thought and study, for while - as you say in your letter - we are both earnestly desirous of serving our Country's best interests, there is a very fundamental difference in our respective approaches to this problem.

At the outset I should say that while I am interested, as you are, in movements primarily humanitarian, my interest in this Committee does not spring from that motive at all, nor even from a personal interest in persons of Japanese ancestry, tho I have many friends among them. It springs from a lively interest in a fundamental principle I regard as the most important of all American principles, the protection of minority groups. It is probable that my interest in that principle is primarily selfish, since I myself belong to minority groups in respect of ancestry, economic station, religious denomination, and (for the present only, I hope!) political party. I am persuaded that this Committee is thoroughly sound when it says: "Attacks upon the rights of any minority tend to undermine the rights of the majority."

At the moment, as an American, I am particularly interested in the question of minorities discriminated against on the basis of ancestry, since that was the basis of Hitler's rise to power. Upon the hypothesis that



"superior" and "inferior" qualities in human beings are determined by inheritance alone, without regard to environmental factors, rests the whole structure of Nazi justification for ruling the world and rationalizing the enslavement of all non-"Aryan" persons. Scientific men appear to agree that inheritance of certain mental and physical "characters" is a condition precedent to the development, through environment, of various attainments, but they admit no selection of these "characters" on the basis of "blood" or "race", or even that such a thing as "race" exists in the world in a sufficiently pure form to justify any sub-classification for biological purposes of the genus "homo sapiens" (which latter, as to many individuals, is doubtless a misnomer).

Here, then, is a fundamental difference of point of view in the Japanese question. You believe that persons of Japanese ancestry are, for that reason, "potential saboteurs"; that "they cannot safely be released anywhere"; and that "Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire." You express confidence in the judgment of General De Witt, who, as you undoubtedly know, was reported by the Associated Press as having testified before the House Naval Affairs Subcommittee: "It makes no difference whether the Japanese is theoretically a citizen - he is still a Japanese. Giving him a scrap of paper won't change him. I don't care what they do with the Japs as long as they don't send them back here. A Jap is a Jap."

I, on the other hand, believe that a person is either loyal to our country or not, as the case may be, entirely regardless of the blood or the mixture of bloods that flows in his veins. It may be, as you say, that "social workers" and "experimenters" think so too, but in this matter they have not influenced my judgment at all. When I cannot know all the facts of my own knowledge, I prefer to depend on those whose experience leads me to believe that they are qualified to express an informed opinion. In this matter, I would disqualify General De Witt because of his obvious race prejudice as revealed in the testimony above quoted. But I would be guided by such as the following:

Col. Kendall J. Fielder, Chief of Military Intelligence, Hawaiian Dept.: "How differently a Himmler or a Rosenberg would have handled this delicate situation. Does any one for a moment believe that any of the axis crowd would give one of enemy race a fair chance to prove himself? Yet that's what was done in Hawaii - and so far it has proved militarily sound. That the situation is working out well is a tribute not only to wise administration, but to tolerance on the part of the rest of our good Americans here. \* \* \* For the information of all who might be misled, there is none among us who has been



led into this policy out of a mawkish sentimentality or gullibility. To us, Japan and her people are a race of stubborn, hardy, despicable warrior zealots, who would stop at nothing to snuff out our lives and our way of life. Her army and navy must definitely be crushed. The question of Americans of Japanese blood is far different. They are Americans - and until they prove (or show themselves dangerously capable of proving) traitorous, they should be treated as Americans." (Address, March 1943 - underscoring mine.)

J. Edgar Hoover, Director, F. B. I.: "We have had practically no trouble with the Japanese in Hawaii. I made the statement before, that there has been no sabotage or espionage committed in Hawaii, subsequent to Pearl Harbor. There was espionage committed prior to Pearl Harbor, but not by the Japanese population as such, but by espionage agents and consular agents of the Japanese Government \* \* \* The action taken and the prompt manner in which it was taken, took out of circulation those individuals who might have been the nucleus of any espionage or sabotage rings of either Japanese, Germans, or Italians in the United States." (Testimony before House Appropriations Committee)

Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War: "It is the inherent right of every faithful citizen, regardless of ancestry, to bear arms in the Nation's battle. When obstacles to the free expression of that right are imposed by emergency considerations, those barriers should be removed as soon as humanly possible." (Statement announcing formation of a combat unit of Americans of Japanese descent, January 31, 1943)

Hon. Joseph C. Grew, former ambassador to Japan: "There are among Americans of Japanese race as fine people individually as you can find anywhere, and many of them are peculiarly anxious to repay Americans for freedom by making especially arduous efforts in the prosecution of the war. I welcome the policies of our government, which are designed to relieve the Nisei of discriminatory restrictions as rapidly and fairly as possible, and I applaud the action of the Army in setting up facilities whereby these Americans will be able to show the world what they are able to do." (Address, April 26, 1943)

Col. W. P. Scohey, Executive Officer, Office of Assistant Secretary of War: "The War Department has faith in the loyal Japanese Americans."

Lt. General Delos C. Emmons, Commander Hawaiian Dept.: "Enough Hawaiians of Japanese Ancestry have responded to the call for volunteers to form a combat team of approximately 4,000 men. \* \* The response to the call was highly gratifying. \* \* I believe they will make a splendid record."



Mr. Justice Murphy, U. S. Supreme Court: "Except under conditions of great emergency a regulation of this kind (the curfew), applicable solely to citizens of a particular racial extraction, would not be regarded as in accord with the requirement of due process \* \* It by no means follows, however, that there may not be discrimination of such an injurious character in the application of laws as to amount to a denial of due process of law, as that term is used in the Fifth Amendment. I think that point is dangerously approached when we have one law for the majority of our citizens and another for a particular racial heritage." (Concurring opinion in Curfew case - underscoring mine)

In addition to the foregoing, I have considerable information of my own on the Japanese question, due to the long residence of my wife in Hawaii where her family lives, my many friends there in every social station whom I have often talked with here on the mainland during the last thirty years, as well as my two visits to the island of Oahu during 1940 and 1941 (I was in Pearl Harbor on December 4, 1941, and left Honolulu on the 5th). One could not live in California one's whole life as I have, and have many friends among persons of Japanese ancestry in every social station, without coming to know how at variance with the fact is your expressed belief that "Japanese, wherever born, are indoctrinated with the ambitions of the Japanese Empire." It is indeed comforting for the future of America to know how futile were the efforts of the Japanese Government (and of many other foreign governments as well, particularly the German) to claim as citizens those of that "race" born on our soil, and to inculcate in them admiration and zeal for the land, customs, or social order of their ancestors. Even in Hawaii, so much closer to Japan than we are, and where children of Japanese ancestry nearly all went to privately maintained Japanese language schools every school day after attending American school, I know of my own knowledge that it just hasn't "taken" at all. As an investment, whatever money has been furnished by the Japanese Government all these years for these long-continued attempts at indoctrination has been a complete loss. With 37 per cent of the population of the Hawaiian Islands of Japanese ancestry, there was not one single instance of sabotage at the time of Pearl Harbor (lurid accounts in our local press to the contrary notwithstanding). There were no "arrows cut in the cane fields"; there were no "Japanese owned trucks blocking the roads"; on the contrary, Americans of Japanese ancestry in Honolulu were as surprised as were my friends in the "Big Five" at the dastardly sneak attack and equally anxious to avenge it, as the volunteering records for both military and civilian services amply indicate. The "laxity at Pearl Harbor" to which you refer in your letter, had nothing to do with persons of Japanese ancestry; the laxity, if any, was on



the part of Caucasian officers of our own armed forces, and on the part of Caucasian civilians in important positions who had "race prejudice in reverse," by which I mean that their lifetime contact with persons of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii had blinded them to the distinction between these Americans and the Japanese people of the homeland. They just didn't think the Japanese Government would be capable of such a deed as Pearl Harbor. I came back on SS "Lurline" with a friend of thirty years standing, a vice president of one of the leading banks in Honolulu, who didn't believe it even when we got the news from the lips of the ship's captain that Sunday morning (having sailed at noon the Friday before). He maintained absolutely that "there must be some mistake - it just isn't possible." As the radio was immediately closed down, he arrived at San Francisco still unconvinced until after landing. He had "race prejudice in reverse" - he attributed to the Japanese Government the good qualities of the Americans of Japanese ancestry he knew so well - just as your good self and General De Witt, in the reverse direction, attribute to the Americans of Japanese ancestry you apparently don't know so well, the bad qualities of the Japanese Government.

The prejudice is wrong in either direction, simply because the "blood" has nothing to do with it at all. If it did, and if you were consistent, you would certainly strongly advocate the isolation for the duration of all persons of German ancestry. They are German citizens, according to the home government. They have been subjected to attempts at indoctrination ever since Bismarck's time; you need only know what has gone on in Milwaukee, Cincinnati, etc., to know this. Had the it is, there is nothing in Japan's record to equal Germany's. Japan has only become an aggressor and a violator of accepted standards of conduct in the last half-century; whereas Germany has been at it since Roman times or earlier. Pearl Harbor hurts because it happened to us; how about Poland, Russia (attacked in the face of a treaty of friendship and mutual protection); Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and the rest? The execution of some American fliers hurts; how about the execution of the innocent population of the entire village of Lidice in Czechoslovakia? Since Bismarck's day the German national anthem was "Deutschland Uber Alles" (Germany over all the world). If blood tells, persons of German ancestry are far more dangerous than those of Japanese ancestry. You can "spot" the latter, not the former. Indoctrination, and sympathy with the ideals of the land of their ancestors, is shown by the record to have been much more effective with those of German blood than those of Japanese. Not one attempt at sabotage has so far been charged to any American of Japanese ancestry; but there have been many charges, and convictions, in the case of Americans of German ancestry. This in spite of the fact



that Hawaii has 37 per cent of its population of Japanese ancestry; and that 20,000 here on the continent outside of the Western Defense Command area were never sequestered, as well as the many thousands subsequently released from sequestration and scattered over the continent.

And now I wish to answer a few specific points in your letter:

It is not true that there was no protest at the inept and unAmerican handling of this situation by General De Witt. A predecessor of this committee objected; I was among those present when a sub-committee called on the General pursuant to appointment but he being busy on other matters, we spent an hour with Col. W. L. Magill, Provost Marshal. Col. Magill told us in substance that "the General had made up his mind." Many other protests are recorded in the Tolan Committee Report (see pp. 147/158). It should also be borne in mind that at that time, the falsity of the Pearl Harbor sabotage stories had not been effectively proven (if it has to this day among Californians); nor had the intelligent, American and effective method of dealing with this problem in Hawaii been made generally known. Also, in time of national emergency, many citizens are reluctant to question the judgment of the General in command, especially not having the proof, which we have later had from his own testimony, of the personal bias that may be influencing his judgment.

But the harm has been done. It cannot be promptly undone. However, be assured that our Committee is not at all departing from principle in not urging immediate return of loyal Americans of Japanese ancestry to this area now. That is not because we fear what they would do; tho it is true that the treatment they received may in some instances serve to destroy the admiration they had for our American institutions. It is because we fear what our prejudiced fellow citizens would do to them. We think it would be injurious to the war effort to make it necessary to devote the time of civil and military authorities to the maintenance of law and order and the protection of the rights of these unfortunate citizens, who were singled out by the General on the basis of blood to be branded as "dangerous" for that reason alone, while those of other enemy descents were not thus branded as racial groups.

The details of what happened at Pearl Harbor have not been "somewhat dimmed by the passing of time" in our minds, certainly not in my own; I'll never forget that trip home on a blacked-out ship whose owners heard nothing from her from Sunday noon until inside the bar, so that on Monday



they took out special high rate insurance against her loss with all on board. But as above pointed out, Pearl Harbor and other crimes of the Japanese Government do not in our minds make Americans "potential saboteurs" because they are of Japanese ancestry, any more than the attack on Poland makes Americans disloyal because they have German blood. We just don't think that the acts of the various governments of the world can be attributed in any degree whatever (be they good or bad acts) to Americans who happen to have that particular ancestry; we think all Americans should be judged on what they are as human beings and not as persons of a given ancestry (since all Americans except Indians are of "foreign" extraction).

We agree with you that we will probably have a "terrific war" on our hands to lick Japan, and that it will take thousands of lives to win it. It has already taken thousands of lives as far as we have gone in the German and Italian phase of the war; but in neither case do we feel that that has the slightest bearing on the loyal or disloyal attitudes of Americans, regardless of their racial extraction. Either that proposition is so or it isn't; if it's so, it is equally applicable to persons of German ancestry as to Japanese.

We agree with you that the danger from potential saboteurs is very great in any part of the country, considering how complex modern life has become and how dependent upon bridges, tunnels, power lines, etc., etc. Hence the need for the utmost vigilance all over the country on the part of F. B. I., Army Intelligence, and law-enforcement authorities of every kind. But we do not agree at all on the proposition that a person is any more of a "potential saboteur" because he is of Japanese descent, or German or any other for that matter. His "potentialities" are at least less if he is as readily recognizable hanging around a dam or a power line even in a stolen uniform, as one of Japanese descent would be.

We agree with you that "one cannot eat his cake and have it too." We cannot preserve the fundamentals of American principles but use Nazi methods just because they are "more efficient," unless we must do so temporarily to save our very existence, as we are doing in the regimentation of our free-enterprise economy in order to coordinate the production of the machinery of war. That is a deliberate (we hope temporary) surrender of rights and liberties of all citizens in which we all concur (in principle if not in administration). But to imprison whole minority groups for the duration on no other ground than their racial extraction is indeed the Nazi theory of "protective custody" 100%, and so complete a departure from fundamental American principles that it could only be justified if the necessity were as self-evident as the necessity for making guns instead of automobiles. It can



certainly not be justified merely because the General happening to be in command in one area has a personal race prejudice, when a General nearer the front faces an even worse situation by reason of numbers and successfully handles the matter otherwise.

This brings me to the paragraph commencing at the top of your page 4. Whose judgment shall we accept? That of a General who has himself admitted that he believes "a Jap is a Jap," or that of a General who has successfully dealt with an even keener problem along American lines; that of the Intelligence Officer of his department; and that of the facts themselves, i. e. the total absence of sabotage or attempted sabotage on the part of any American of Japanese ancestry or even alien of Japanese ancestry except the direct agents of the Japanese Government to which Mr. Hoover referred in the statement I quoted above.

Your analogy of the persons of American ancestry born in Japan with the persons of Japanese ancestry born in America omits an important fundamental fact. Everything depends on purpose and attitude. Immigrants from other countries of the world come to America to make it their homes; to enjoy its freedoms and its institutions; and to give their children opportunities they know from experience they would not have at home. It is their purpose to become Americans, and it is their attitude to cut the cord that binds them to their homeland. This, they recognize, is the land of opportunity; here is their future and their children's future. My own parents left Denmark for exactly that purpose and with exactly that attitude; and I personally know many, many Japanese whose parents left Japan for exactly that purpose and with exactly that attitude. I do not happen, despite a wide acquaintance, to know a single one whose parents came here "as agents of Japan," etc. Doubtless there were some; as there are some who have come here as "agents of Germany." The reason behind emigration from overcrowded "have-not" countries of low standards of living to America where "everyone is rich" (as they say in Denmark for instance) are not so complicated and so insidious as the suspicious would have us believe. They are the same reasons that induced our ancestors to come to the colonies; they wanted freedom and opportunity; they had the guts to pack up and leave the homeland; and when they got here they wanted to stay and to enjoy the "blessings of freedom for ourselves and our posterity." Indeed, the high percentage of older Japanese who planned to stay here for life is surprising in face of the fact that we deny them naturalization and discriminate socially against them.

Americans, on the other hand, seldom leave America (even under the New Deal) to find better opportunity



elsewhere; they seldom "feel at home" anywhere else; and you are probably right in most cases, they are Americans still. What a splendid tribute to the superiority of our country and our institutions! It's a one way street; it doesn't go both ways.

No, I am not under the influence of humanitarians, social workers or experimenters. But I am not gullible enough to believe biased testimony; not swayed by emotion enough to lose sight of fundamentals; and not willing to approve a wrong act just because it's irreversible for the present.

It is exceedingly difficult to cover so complex a subject by correspondence. The members of the Committee feel that the attitude of the Chief Executive of our State on this fundamental question will have an important bearing on the future solution of the problem that has been created by the indiscriminate evacuation. Many of us are convinced that there lies for you in the future an opportunity to serve our country on a much wider plane, in which case your attitude may have an important bearing on such proposals as that of depriving persons of Japanese ancestry of citizenship; deporting them; etc., etc., which in turn of course will be followed by like proposals to deport persons of other racial descents at future times when we happen to be at war with their ancestral countries. Once the Nazi principle that "blood counts" is admitted, there can be no logical end to the deportation of persons of differing racial stocks until all except the Indians shall have gone. In the evolution of time we shall probably be at war with many other nations, just as we are now at war with Italy and Japan which were our Allies only 25 years ago. If we exclude Caucasians from our future deportations, we still have the Chinese, Negroes, Filipinos, Malays, East Indians, Esquimaux, and many other so-called "non-assimilable" persons to deal with. It is an endless problem.

Therefore, some time at your convenience, we would like very much to have an opportunity to sit down with you and talk this whole question over. It cannot be but that a frank discussion of this important question would be helpful. If our point of view is wrong we certainly want to know it; and I know you well enough to know that if we can convince you that your point of view may in some respects be wrong, you will be the first to admit it. Will you be good



9/2/43, p. 10

enough to let me know when such a conference in the San Francisco Bay area would be convenient to you? I will undertake to make the arrangements.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

Alfred J. Lundberg,  
P. O. Box 58,  
Oakland 4, California.

AJD:MPS