Three Views of Exclusion

Use source details to weigh historical evidence.

WG.P.3.1.A "Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, evaluating features such as author, date, and origin of information."

NAME _____ DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK

Read it twice

YOUR JOB Underline the creator and date of each source, then circle one detail from each source that could support a historical claim.

What Can Three Sources Tell Us?

1. In February 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. The order let military commanders create areas from which "any or all persons may be excluded." It did not name Japanese Americans, yet the government later used it to force people of Japanese ancestry from their West Coast homes. The order is a primary source: its author and date help show what federal officials authorized at the time. Its broad wording is evidence of government power, not proof that every person in those areas was removed. To learn what happened to families, a reader needs other sources.

2. In 1946, artist Mine Okubo published *Citizen 13660*, an illustrated account of her forced removal and confinement. Okubo describes living in a former horse stall at the Tanforan detention center in California. Her first-person account is a primary source for conditions she experienced, although it appeared after the war and does not describe every detention site. The detail about a stall supports an analysis of makeshift housing. It cannot by itself establish why military officials issued the order or how all detainees lived. Her position as a detainee gave her access to daily life that the order did not record.

3. The federal Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians issued its report *Personal Justice Denied* in 1982. After reviewing government records and hearing testimony from former detainees, the commission concluded that the exclusion resulted from "race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership." This retrospective report is a secondary source for that conclusion, even though it draws on primary evidence. Its federal origin does not make its conclusion identical to the government's position in 1942. Read beside the order and Okubo's account, it helps explain both official authority and the human impact of exclusion.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE

Use the passage

1. What did Executive Order 9066 authorize? Cite its wording, then explain one thing that wording does not prove.

2. Why is Okubo's book a primary source for housing conditions even though she published it in 1946? Cite a detail from the passage.

3. A reader says the commission report states what the federal government believed in 1942. Use its date and one detail about its research to evaluate that claim.

4. Which source better supports an explanation of why exclusion happened, the 1942 order or the 1982 commission report? Cite a detail from each to defend your choice.

3 YOUR TURN

Your own words

Write five sentences planning a museum display that pairs two sources from the passage. Pose your own question about incarceration, cite one specific detail from each source, and explain what the pair still cannot tell visitors.

ANSWER KEY

Three Views of Exclusion

HIGH SCHOOL · WG.P.3.1.A

PART 1 · READ AND MARK

Underline the creator and date of each source, then circle one detail from each source that could support a historical claim. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 · ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What did Executive Order 9066 authorize? Cite its wording, then explain one thing that wording does not prove.	**It allowed commanders to create areas from which "any or all persons may be excluded." That wording does not prove that every person in those areas was removed.**
2	Why is Okubo's book a primary source for housing conditions even though she published it in 1946? Cite a detail from the passage.	**Okubo wrote about her own confinement and described living in a former horse stall at Tanforan. Her firsthand experience makes the account primary evidence for conditions she experienced.**
3	A reader says the commission report states what the federal government believed in 1942. Use its date and one detail about its research to evaluate that claim.	**The commission issued its report in 1982, not 1942. It reached its conclusion after reviewing records and hearing former detainees' testimony, so its conclusion should not be treated as a statement of the government's position in 1942.**
4	Which source better supports an explanation of why exclusion happened, the 1942 order or the 1982 commission report? Cite a detail from each to defend your choice.	**The commission report better supports an explanation of causes because it attributes exclusion to "race prejudice, war hysteria and a failure of political leadership." The order authorizes exclusion of "any or all persons" but does not state why Japanese Americans were excluded.**

PART 3 · YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

My display asks how a legal order changed people's housing. Executive Order 9066 allowed military commanders to exclude "any or all persons" from designated areas. Mine Okubo described living in a former horse stall at Tanforan. Because Okubo wrote about her own experience in 1946, her account shows one person's conditions rather than every detainee's housing. These two sources do not show how housing differed among detention sites.

Accept other well-supported limits on what a source can establish. For Your Turn, look for an original question, accurate details from two sources, and a limitation that follows from the sources' scope or origin.