

Japanese American Citizens League
125 Weller St., L.A. 90012, (213) 626-4471

SO. CALIF. COMMITTEE TO REPEAL THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT

Dr. Bob Suzuki, Chrmn. - Mr. Ken Yoshikawa, Vice-chrmn.

Los Angeles Times

EQUAL RIGHTS
LIBERTY UNDER THE LAW
TRUE INDUSTRIAL FREEDOM

FRIDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 12, 1969

'Concentration Camps': End of Rumor

ISSUE: Will Congress now quickly end federal "emergency" authority to place Americans in detention camps without due process?

The Administration finally put to rest the ugly rumor that the federal government had emergency plans to place militant dissenters in "concentration camps."

Despite strong official denials, the scare story persisted in ghettos—partly because federal law still permits detention of potential spies or saboteurs during an "internal security emergency."

The dangerously broad power to impose "emergency detention" without due process was included in the Internal Security Act of 1950. Congressional efforts to repeal the provision, however, moved slowly until the Administration last week formally urged that the law be changed.

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, Dep. Atty. Gen. Richard G.

Kleindienst said the law is "extremely offensive to many Americans." He acknowledged that it had led to fears "unfounded as they may be" that protesters and demonstrators might be placed in detention camps.

The law is particularly offensive to Japanese-Americans, 110,000 of whom were moved to "relocation centers" without trials during World War II. It was "one of the sorriest chapters in our American history," said Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.), one of the co-sponsors of the repeal bill introduced by Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii).

That chapter must never be repeated. Approval of the repeal Monday by the Senate Judiciary Committee should be followed by prompt congressional enactment.

The nation will indeed be in danger if we ever again resort to imprisoning Americans without due process on the presumption that they are dangerous.

PACIFIC CITIZEN
Friday, January 30, 1970

Orange County supervisors favor Title II repeal

SANTA ANA — The Orange County board of supervisors, on motion of William Phillips, unanimously passed its resolution for repeal of Title II on Jan. 20.

The resolution, noting that "there are many other adequate laws and governmental powers to deal with emergency situations and threats to our internal security," also directed copies be sent to the President, the two California senators Murphy and Cranston and congressmen from the county area: Charles Wiggins, Craig Hosmer, Richard T. Hanna and James B. Utt.

Appearing before the board to explain Title II were Jim Okazaki, chapter president and former deputy district attorney of Orange County, and Henry Kanegae, national 1st vice president.

EDITORIAL: Chicago Sun-Times (Dec. 8, 1969)

Detention Camp Law Outrageous

The Nixon administration has belatedly moved to erase fears that war protesters, rioters or other dissidents could wind up in concentration camps.

Deputy Atty. Gen. Richard G. Kleindienst has asked repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950—and with that impetus Congress should move with all deliberate speed to pass repealing legislation.

The act—Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950—would permit detention, during an emergency declared by the President, of anyone, considered liable to engage in espionage or sabotage. Passage of the act did in fact lead to establishment of six detention centers which were closed down in the late 1950s only because the appropriation for their maintenance ran out.

Against this background of real barbed wire and barracks, it is not surprising that minority groups have expressed fear the act could be stretched to cover any situation the President or his aides deemed uncomfortable. The fear

was not stilled when Kleindienst himself was quoted last spring as saying demonstrators who interfered with others "should be rounded up and put in a detention camp." Kleindienst denies saying that but the damage was done because there was, in fact, a detention camp law on the books.

It is astounding that the administration took so long to seek a repeal of this obnoxious law, but now that it has so moved, there are bills aplenty upon which Congress could not act. Legislation in the Senate was introduced last spring. In the House, there are bills co-sponsored by more than 100 members. Two bills were submitted by Rep. Abner Mikva (D-Ill.), who has lobbied consistently for camp-law repeal.

There is, really, no reason for Congress to delay. The repeal would cost nothing. It would add immeasurably to America's stature to eschew such totalitarian symbols as concentration camps.

UCLA Asian American Studies Center

TIME

THE WEEKLY NEWSMAGAZINE

December 12, 1969 Vol. 94, No. 24

THE ADMINISTRATION

Request for Repeal

Me and [Stokely] Carmichael can't fill all them camps. They must be planning on taking somebody else.

—H. Rap Brown

For nearly two decades, the President has in fact had at his disposal an ugly antidote to dissent—detention camps. The Internal Security Act of 1950 enables the President to declare an "internal security emergency" and authorize the Attorney General to round up and detain persons believed to be engaged in acts of espionage or sabotage. In 1952, reacting to enormous pressure from the right, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath ordered six detention camps made ready. The camps have never been used as envisioned under the act,* but their very authorization has created among blacks and militant radicals in recent months a paranoia that they might be.

The fear had a number of origins. In May 1968 House Un-American Activities Committee concluded that camps might be used for black militants who espouse "guerrilla warfare." It spread to the antiwar dissenters and campus radicals last spring when Deputy Attorney General Richard G. Kleindienst was quoted in the *Atlantic* magazine as saying: "If people demonstrated in a manner to interfere with others, they should be rounded up and put in a detention camp." Then Vice President Spiro Agnew remarked that "the rotten apples" should be separated from our society.

Something of a Surprise. Last week the Nixon Administration moved to allay these fears and called for repeal of Title II of the Security Act, which provides for the camps. Kleindienst, who has emphatically denied the *Atlantic* quote, was chosen to announce the Administration's proposal. The decision was reached, he said, in hope that it "will allay the fears and suspicions—unfounded as they may be—of many of our citizens."

There has been considerable sympathy on Capitol Hill for doing away with Title II. Hawaii Democratic Senator Daniel K. Inouye, mindful that many Japanese-Americans were shunted off to camps during World War II, has led the attack. Until last week, however, Inouye's cause seemed hopeless. "I was under the impression that Justice was against repeal," he says. Others who directly suggested a repeal of the camp provision to Attorney General John Mitchell in recent weeks came away with the same impression. So the Nixon request was something of a surprise, but one likely to meet with the approval of both houses of Congress.

* They were originally located in Avon Park, Fla., El Reno, Okla., Allenwood, Pa., Florence and Wickenburg, Ariz., and Tulelake, Calif. Three have been sold. Florence and Allenwood are still maintained by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons for short-term convicts. And El Reno is used for cattle grazing.

STATUS OF THE TITLE II REPEAL CAMPAIGN: On December 22, 1969, the U.S. Senate passed Senator Daniel Inouye's bill, which was co-sponsored by 26 other senators including California's Murphy and Cranston, to repeal Title II of the 1950 Internal Security Act. This bill is now pending in the House where other bills to repeal Title II, introduced previously by Congressmen Spark Matsunaga and Chet Holifield, have been co-sponsored by 129 congressmen. We urge you to contact your congressmen asking them for their support. You can also help by urging your state assemblymen and senators to co-sponsor or support Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1, introduced in the California Legislature by Assemblymen Warren, Vasconcellos and Ralph and Senator Short, which calls upon the President and the U.S. Congress to repeal Title II.

Title II Repeal Boxcore

The following governmental bodies, organizations, newspapers, magazines and churches have passed resolutions or favorably commented on repeal of Title II:

GOVERNMENTAL BODIES

- 1—Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations (March)
- 2—Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (March)
- 3—City of Los Angeles Human Relations Commission (June)
- 4—San Francisco Human Rights Commission (April)
- 5—San Francisco Board of Supervisors (May)
- 6—City of Seattle Human Rights Commission (March)
- 7—City of San Jose Human Relations Commission (March)
- 8—City Council of San Jose (April)
- 9—Ventura County Human Rights Commission (June)
- 10—Denver Community Relations Commission (June)
- 11—City Council of Richmond, Calif. (July)
- 12—Alameda County Human Relations Commission (Aug.)
- 13—Alameda County Board of Supervisors (August)
- 14—Hayward (Calif.) Human Relations Commission (Aug.)
- 15—Fremont (Calif.) Human Relations Commission (Aug.)
- 16—Culver City Human Relations Commission (Aug.)
- 17—No. Calif. Assn. of Human Relations Directors (Sept.)
- 18—Pasadena Human Relations Commission (Sept.)
- 19—City Council of Culver City, Calif. (Sept.)
- 20—City Council of Los Angeles (Aug.)
- 21—City Council of Monterey Park, Calif. (Sept.)
- 22—City Council of National City, Calif. (Sept.)
- 23—State of Minnesota, Department of Human Rights (Oct.)
- 24—Palos Verdes Peninsula (Calif.) Human Relations Council (Oct.)
- 25—Concord (Calif.) Human Relations Commission (Oct.)
- 26—City Council of Gardena, Calif. (Oct.)
- 27—Sacramento County Board of Supervisors (Sept.)
- 28—City Council of Berkeley, Calif. (Oct.)
- 29—City Council of Hayward, Calif. (Oct.)
- 30—County Council of King County, Wash. (Oct.)
- 31—City and County Council of Honolulu (Nov.)
- 32—City Council of Santa Monica, Calif. (Dec. 9)
- 33—City Council of Sacramento, Calif. (Nov. 20)
- 34—City Council of Inglewood, Calif. (Dec. 15)
- 35—City Council of Concord, Calif. (Dec. 22)
- 36—City Council of Alhambra, Calif. (Dec. 16)
- 37—Orange County (Calif.) Board of Supervisors (Jan. 20, 1970)
- 38—Long Beach Human Relations Commission (Dec. 11)
- 39—Long Beach City Council (Dec. 16)

PUBLIC MEDIA

- 1—Editorial, Chicago Daily News (April)
- 2—Editorial, San Francisco Chronicle (May)
- 3—Editorial, Los Angeles Times (May)
- 4—Editorial, Fresno-Modesto-Sacramento Bee (May)
- 5—Editorial, Palo Alto Times (May)
- 6—Editorial, San Francisco East-West (May)
- 7—Editorial, The Nation (June)
- 8—Editorial, California Farmer-Consumer Bulletin (June)
- 9—Editorial, KGO-TV, San Francisco (May)
- 10—Columnist (Guy Wright), San Francisco Examiner (April)
- 11—Columnist (Edwin McDowell), The Arizona Republic (May)
- 12—Editorial, Honolulu Advertiser (August)
- 13—Editorial, Monterey Park Progress (Aug.)
- 14—Editorial, The Denver Post (Sept.)
- 15—Editorial, KPIX-TV, San Francisco (Sept.)
- 16—Editorial, Seattle Post-Intelligencer (Sept.)
- 17—Columnist (Herb Robinson), Seattle Times (Oct.)
- 18—Editorial, Seattle Times (Oct.)
- 19—Editorial, Washington Post (Oct.)
- 20—Editorial, Honolulu Star-Bulletin (Oct.)
- 21—Editorial, San Francisco Chronicle (Dec. 5)
- 22—News Comment, Monterey Peninsula Herald (Oct. 23)
- 23—Editorial, Minneapolis Tribune (Dec. 5)
- 24—Editorial, Los Angeles Times (Dec. 12)
- 25—Editorial, Chicago Today (Dec. 5)
- 26—Editorial, Baltimore Sun (Dec. 5)
- 27—Editorial, Washington Post (Dec. 6)
- 28—Editorial, Chicago Sun-Times (Dec. 8)
- 29—Editorial, Chicago Daily News (Dec. 9)
- 30—Columnists (Evans-Novak), Publishers-Hall Syndicate (Dec. 7)
- 31—Columnist (Jack Mabey), Chicago Today (Dec. 10)
- 32—Editorial, Seattle Post-Intelligencer (Dec. 12)
- 33—Editorial, The Arizona Republic (Dec. 15)
- 34—Editorial, Honolulu Star-Bulletin (Dec. 15)
- 35—Editorial, Honolulu Advertiser (Dec. 27)
- 36—Editorial, Dayton Journal Herald (Dec. 5)
- 37—Editorial, San Jose Mercury (Dec. 5)
- 38—Columnist (Walt Woodward), Seattle Times (Dec. 7)
- 39—Editorial, Riverside (Calif.) Press-Enterprise (Dec. 7)
- 40—Columnist (Augustus Hawkins), Los Angeles Sentinel (Dec. 18)
- 41—Editorial, Wisconsin State Journal, Madison (Dec. 31)
- 42—Editorial, Seattle Times (Jan. 4, 1970)
- 43—Columnist (Dick Tracy), San Gabriel Valley Tribune (Jan. 18)

CHURCHES

- 1—Christ United Presbyterian Church, San Francisco (June)
- 2—San Francisco Conference on Religion, Race and Social Concern (June)
- 3—Catholic Archdiocese of San Francisco Commission on Social Justice (June)
- 4—United Methodist Church, California-Nevada Conference (June)
- 5—Council of the Episcopal Diocese of California (June)
- 6—Los Angeles Council of Churches (July)
- 7—Omaha Metropolitan Assn. of Churches, Churchman's Commission on Race and Religion (July)
- 8—North Gardena Methodist Church Commission of Social Concern (June)
- 9—United Methodist Conference, So. Calif.-Ariz. Conference Board of Social Concerns (June)
- 10—Church of Scientology of Hawaii (Sept.)
- 11—Catholic Diocese of St. Paul-Minneapolis, Urban Affairs Commission (Oct.)
- 12—Epworth Methodist Church, Portland, Ore. (Oct.)
- 13—Lake Park Methodist Church, Oakland (Oct.)
- 14—Sturge Presbyterian Church, San Mateo (Oct.)
- 15—Presbytery of Sacramento (Oct.)
- 16—American Baptist Convention (Oct.)
- 17—United Presbyterian Church Synod of the Golden Gate (Oct.)
- 18—Episcopal Diocese of California (Oct.)
- 19—Lutheran Church in America, Pacific Southwest Synod (Nov.)
- 20—El Estero Presbyterian Church, Monterey, Calif. (Nov. 6)
- 21—Unitarian Universalist Assn. PSW Dist. Bd. of Trustees (Dec.)
- 22—Buddhist Churches of America Board of Directors (Dec.)
- 23—Grace Presbyterian Church, Walnut Creek, Calif. (Nov. 26)
- 24—The Presbytery of Omaha Neb. (Dec. 9)
- 25—Western Young Buddhist League, San Francisco (Dec. 27)
- 26—Throop Memorial Church (Unitarian), Pasadena (Nov. 30)

ORGANIZATIONS

- 1—ACLU, Palo Alto Chapter (Sept. 1968)
- 2—ACLU, San Jose Chapter (Sept. 1968)
- 3—Community Relations Conference of Southern Calif. (Jan.)
- 4—American Jewish Congress, So. Calif. Div. (Feb.)
- 5—National Association of Social Workers (April)
- 6—California Democratic Council (April)
- 7—ILWU, San Francisco Local (April)
- 8—ILWU, Northern California District Council (May)
- 9—Chinatown Youth Council, San Francisco (May)
- 10—NAACP, Berkeley Chapter (June)
- 11—San Mateo City School District, Title IV Task Force (June)
- 12—San Francisco Council for Civic Unity (May)
- 13—Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, N.Y. (June)
- 14—ILWU Federated Women's Auxiliaries (June)
- 15—ILWU, San Jose Local (June)
- 16—Contra Costa Citizens United (June)
- 17—Calif. Farmer Consumer Information Committee (June)
- 18—Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce (June)
- 19—Americans for Democratic Action, No. Calif. Chapter (June)
- 20—San Francisco Bay Area Women for Peace
- 21—California Rural Legal Assistance (June)
- 22—Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, N.Y. (June)
- 23—Urban League of Nebraska (July)
- 24—National Urban League (July)
- 25—B'nai B'rith Women in California (July)
- 26—Conejo Valley (Thousand Oaks, Calif.) Human Relations Council (July)
- 27—Chicago Federation of Settlements & Neighborhood Centers
- 28—Omaha Anti-Defamation League (Aug.)
- 29—Omaha Jewish Federation Community Relations Committee
- 30—AFL-CIO Office and Professional Employees Union, Local 29, Oakland (Aug.)
- 31—Illinois/Wisconsin Friends Committee on Legislation (Aug.)
- 32—San Francisco Nikkei Lions Club (Sept.)
- 33—Minneapolis Urban Coalition (Sept.)
- 34—St. Paul (Minn.) Urban Coalition (Sept.)
- 35—VFW, Golden Gate Nisei Post, San Francisco (Oct.)
- 36—Association Conference of Official Human Rights Agencies (Aug.)
- 37—Chinese American Citizens Alliance, Grand Lodge (Aug.)
- 38—The Association of Chinese Teachers, San Francisco (Oct.)
- 39—NAACP, Salt Lake City Branch (Oct.)
- 40—Spanish-Speaking Organization for Community, Integrity, Opportunity, Salt Lake City (Oct.)
- 41—Wasatch Front Young Democrats, Utah (Oct.)
- 42—Utah State Young Democrats (Oct.)
- 43—Volunteers for New Politics, San Francisco (Oct.)
- 44—San Francisco YWCA (Oct.)
- 45—Asian Coalition for Equality, Seattle (Oct.)
- 46—Asian Americans for Action, New York (Sept.)
- 47—Puget Sound (Wash.) Association of Social Workers (Sept.)
- 48—South Bay Chinese Club, Fremont, Calif. (Sept.)
- 49—Classroom Teachers Association of San Francisco (Oct.)
- 50—Dayton (Ohio) Council on Human Rights (Sept.)
- 51—Honolulu Japanese Chamber of Commerce (Oct.)
- 52—Natl. Education Assn. Council on Human Relations (Oct.)
- 53—West Seattle Human Relations Council (Oct.)
- 54—ILWU, Hawaii Local 142, Exec. Comm. (Nov.)
- 55—Women's International League for Peace & Freedom (Nov.)
- 56—Central Seattle Community Council (Nov.)
- 57—VFW, 15th District, San Francisco, Calif. (Nov. 21)
- 58—Intermountain Professional Photographers Assn. (Nov.)
- 59—Inglewood (Calif.) Stabilization Committee (Dec.)
- 60—United Auto Workers, Local 506, San Diego (Dec. 11)
- 61—VFW, Dept. of California Council of Administrative (Nov. 22)
- 62—Nebraska Civil Liberties Union (Dec.)
- 63—Greater Omaha Civil Liberties Union (Dec. 10)
- 64—Harbor Area Welfare Planning Council, Torrance, Calif.
- 65—ACLU, Burbank-Glendale Chapter (Nov. 10)
- 66—Long Beach Chamber of Commerce (Dec. 15)
- 67—VFW, Sacramento Nisei Post 8985 (Dec. 22)

(Not printed at Government expense)

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91ST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

S. 1872—Introduction of a Bill To Repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950

SPEECHES
OF

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE

OF HAWAII

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

April 18, and May 1, 1969

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to repeal title II—the emergency detention provision—of the Internal Security Act of 1950, popularly called the McCarran Act.

Title II of the Internal Security Act gives the President the power to proclaim an "internal security emergency" in the event of any of the following: First, invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions; second, declaration of war by Congress; and third, insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy. Following the declaration of an internal security emergency, title II gives the President or his agent the power to detain persons "if there is reasonable ground to believe that such a person will engage in or probably will with others engage in acts of espionage or sabotage." Following the person's arrest, title II details the procedures for the continued detention of a person. Generally, this course of action is at odds with normal judicial procedure.

As you may remember, the Internal Security Act of 1950, became law over President Truman's veto. In referring to the great majority of the provisions of this act, President Truman declared that they "would strike blows at our own liberties." Title II, I believe, violates a number of our established freedoms and constitutional rights. The procedures detailed in the act are at odds with our established judicial procedures.

In addition, widespread rumors have circulated throughout our Nation that the Federal Government is readying concentration camps to be filled with those who hold unpopular views and beliefs. These rumors are widely circulated and believed in our urban ghettos. Additional credence was added by a House Un-American Activities report of May 1968, which contained a recommendation for the possible use of these detention camps for certain black nationalists and Communists. Many dissidents in our society

fear the use of title II. It stands as a barrier of trust between some people and our Government. As President Truman stated in his veto message:

It is not enough to say that this probably would not be done. The mere fact that it could be done shows clearly how the bill would open a Pandora's box of opportunities for official condemnation of organizations and individuals for perfectly honest opinions . . .

Many would respond to these rumors of concentration camps with the refrain "This couldn't happen in America." However, in times of stress and crisis American justice has not always withstood these pressures. I am naturally reminded that during World War II, 109,650 Americans of Japanese ancestry were arrested, their property confiscated and were detained in various "relocation camps" for most of World War II.

The constitutionality of title II of the McCarran Act, unlike that of title I, has never been tested in the courts. It is believed by most lawyers that someone must be detained under this title before there is just cause for judicial review. Therefore, I propose that it is the Congress' responsibility to repeal title II, and I am introducing this measure to accomplish this purpose.

REPEAL OF TITLE II OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Mike Masaoka, Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League, endorsing the principles of S. 1872, a bill I recently introduced to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Daily I receive hundreds of letters; however, I was deeply impressed by this moving and eloquent statement in support of S. 1872. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Mr. Masaoka letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 23, 1969.

HON. DANIEL K. INOUE,
U.S. Senator from Hawaii, Old Senate Office
Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.
DEAR SENATOR INOUE: On behalf of the
Japanese American Citizens League (JACL),

the only national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry in the United States with chapters and members in 32 states, may we commend you and your 20 cosponsors for introducing last Friday, April 18, 1969, S. 1872, a bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950, which is Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

As you so eloquently explained in introducing this legislation, Title II, which was described by the then Chairman of the Judiciary Committee Pat McCarran as a "concentration camp measure, pure and simple" during floor consideration of this provision almost 20 years ago, "violates a number of our established freedoms and constitutional rights. The procedures detailed in the Act are at odds with our established judicial procedures."

Your introductory remarks to the Senate also emphasized the urgency of repealing this statute, by referring to the May 1968 Report of the House Un-American Activities Committee that included a recommendation "for the possible use of these detention camps for certain black nationalists and Communists." You observed too that "Many dissidents in our society fear use of Title II. It stands as a barrier of trust between some people and our Government."

To refute the argument that Title II would not be put into operation in the United States, you recalled the World War II evacuation and detention of some 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from their West Coast homes and associations, without trial or hearing, at a time when all of our courts were functioning, simply because a Commanding General suspected that there might be some among the evacuees who might engage in sabotage and espionage.

The records, as you know, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Army and Navy Intelligence indicate that there was not a single instance of espionage or sabotage by a resident of Japanese ancestry before, during, and after World War II, in spite of the fact that resident aliens, though lawfully admitted for permanent residence, could not become naturalized citizens because of the racial prohibitions of our national laws of that time.

JACL'S CONCERN

In any event, it is because of our wartime experience that Japanese Americans in general and the JACL in particular feel so strongly about Title II. After all, we of Japanese ancestry are the only Americans in recent times to be arbitrarily deprived of their freedom and of their property and detained in what have euphemistically been described as war relocation centers.

JACL is determined that no other American, or group of Americans, will ever again be subject to detention solely on the grounds

(p.2 not included)



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 115

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 25, 1969

No. 67

Senate

HON. GEORGE MURPHY

REPEAL OF TITLE II, EMERGENCY DETENTION PROVISION, INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as a co-sponsor of S. 1872, I am pleased to support the measure, which would repeal title II, the emergency detention provision, of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Under title II of this act, the President of the United States is given the power to declare an "internal security emergency" when any of the following events occur: First, an invasion of the United States; second, a congressional declaration of war; and, third, an insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy.

After the occurrence of one of these events the President makes the act operational by proclaiming an internal security emergency. Thereafter, the Attorney General may apprehend and detain any person where there are "reasonable grounds to believe that such person will engage in or probably will conspire to engage in acts of espionage or sabotage." While title II, enacted in 1950, obviously was not responsible for, it nevertheless reminds us of one of the sorriest chapters in all of American history. I am, of course, referring to the relocation of 110,000 American residents, 70,000 of whom were U.S. citizens by birth, during World War II. Their sole crime was their Japanese parentage. These Japanese-American residents and citizens were apprehended and moved from their homes to "relocation centers." This action was contrary to America's tradition and its constitutional procedures. Yet, Japan had made its "infamous" attack on Pearl Harbor, the United States was at war and emotions, not reason, were the order of the day. Certainly, both history and hindsight without doubt reveal that the facts did not justify the actions.

Japanese-American residents were loyal citizens. In fact, the record of the all-Nisei famous go-for-broke, 442d regimental combat team in Europe during World War II, in writing one of the outstanding and courageous chapters in our military annals and our Nation's history, stands in marked contrast to the sorry and dark chapter our Government was writing in connection with the go-for-broke combat team's family, friends and relatives in the United States. Similarly, the Japanese-Americans served with distinction in the Pacific Theater. Here, we are told, they did primarily "combat intelligence work"

Reportedly, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said that the Japanese-American's service in the Pacific shortened the war by 2 years and thus prevented the loss of many additional American lives.

Despite this unjust and regrettable treatment, Japanese-American citizens today are not bitter. They still have faith and pride in the American way of life. Senator INOUYE, the author of this amendment, certainly is a good example of the accomplishments of American citizens of Japanese ancestry. After a distinguished war record, he was elected to represent the State of Hawaii in the U.S. Senate. Thus, the accomplishments of Japanese-Americans in all areas of American life show they have won equal treatment and respect that our Government disgracefully denied them in World War II.

So, Mr. President, title II of the Internal Security Act clearly is not needed. It should never have been placed on the books in the first place.

I am most optimistic that we have a good chance of repealing title II this Congress. It is my understanding that the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security has unanimously recommended its repeal to the full Judiciary Committee. This action by the Judiciary Committee, coupled with the interest as evidenced by the measure introduced today, will, in my judgment, result in title II's repeal.

While this experience indicates that government abuse may occur even with a great free government like ours, nevertheless, it also reveals the strength of our system and its ability to correct abuse. California was the home of this controversy. In California today, however, there is no better example of the distance we have come since the wartime discriminating treatment against Japanese-Americans. Japanese-Americans today are among California's most distinguished citizens. They hold public office, they are successful in business, in education, in science, in the health professions, and in all other areas of human endeavor. They are an important part of California and California is an important part of them.

That the suspicion, that the hostility that existed, can be erased in such a short span is encouraging to a nation that has people problems, and to a world that so desperately wants and searches for peace and understanding.