Security and Freedom

Weigh wartime decisions against civil liberties

9-12.US2.21 "Evaluate Supreme Court and executive decisions to limit civil liberties and to relocate Japanese Americans and others to internment camps."

NAME _____ DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK

Read it twice

YOUR JOB Underline the stated security reason for removal, circle two restrictions on freedom, and number the Supreme Court's two rulings so you can compare them.

Wartime Power and Its Limits

1. In February 1942, after Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. It allowed military commanders to exclude people from designated areas. The Army used that power to remove roughly 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry from the West Coast; most were U.S. citizens. Families had little time to leave and were sent to guarded camps. Officials argued that removal prevented espionage, but they offered no proof that each person removed posed a threat.

2. Fred Korematsu refused an exclusion order and challenged his conviction. In 1944, the Supreme Court upheld the exclusion order in Korematsu v. United States, accepting the military's claim of wartime necessity. The ruling addressed exclusion, not whether confinement in camps was lawful. That same day, in Ex parte Endo, the Court ruled that the government could not continue to detain a citizen it acknowledged was loyal. Together, the rulings left the mass removal largely intact while placing a limit on detention.

3. The government also detained some German and Italian nationals as enemy aliens, but it did not remove entire communities of German or Italian ancestry from the West Coast. Japanese Americans faced a much broader policy based on ancestry rather than individual evidence. Wartime security was a real concern, yet these different treatments raise a question: when officials claim an emergency, what evidence should they need before taking away a person's freedom? Congress later apologized for the Japanese American incarceration and authorized payments to survivors.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE

Use the passage

1. How did Executive Order 9066 allow officials to restrict freedom without proving individual danger?

2. What security claim did the Court accept in Korematsu, and what question did its ruling leave open?

3. How did Endo limit detention without undoing the mass removal?

4. How does the treatment of German and Italian nationals challenge the claim that broad removal of Japanese Americans was necessary?

3 YOUR TURN

Your own words

Imagine advising officials facing a future security crisis. In three sentences, propose a safeguard against unfair removal, use one detail from the passage to justify it, and explain how officials could still address a real threat.

ANSWER KEY

Security and Freedom

HIGH SCHOOL · 9-12.US2.21

PART 1 · READ AND MARK

Underline the stated security reason for removal, circle two restrictions on freedom, and number the Supreme Court's two rulings so you can compare them. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 · ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	How did Executive Order 9066 allow officials to restrict freedom without proving individual danger?	**It let military commanders exclude people from designated areas, leading to mass removal without proof that each person posed a threat.**
2	What security claim did the Court accept in Korematsu, and what question did its ruling leave open?	**The Court accepted the claim of wartime necessity for exclusion but did not decide whether confinement in camps was lawful.**
3	How did Endo limit detention without undoing the mass removal?	**It barred continued detention of a citizen the government acknowledged was loyal, while the exclusion ruling remained in place.**
4	How does the treatment of German and Italian nationals challenge the claim that broad removal of Japanese Americans was necessary?	**Some German and Italian nationals were detained, but entire communities were not removed. The difference calls into question removal based on ancestry instead of individual evidence.**

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

Before ordering removal, officials should require evidence that each person poses a specific threat and allow a prompt hearing. Executive Order 9066 led to the removal of roughly 120,000 people of Japanese ancestry without proof that each posed a threat. Officials could still investigate credible leads and restrict a person when evidence supports that action.

Accept safeguards other than hearings if students connect them to passage evidence and explain a way to respond to a genuine threat. Distinguish the Korematsu ruling on exclusion from the Endo ruling on continued detention.