

263 16th Avenue
San Francisco, CA. 94118
September 28, 1984

Congressman Sam B. Hall, Jr.
Chairman, Subcommittee on Administrative Law
and Governmental Relations
Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Attn: Janet Potts, Staff Counsel
Re: HR 4110 Hearing, September 12, 1984

Dear Congressman Hall:

I am Kiku Funabiki, a non-affiliate, and one of the two ex-detainees who testified before the Subcommittee on September 12, 1984.

Since I was assured that this addendum to my testimony would be accepted for the records of the HR 4110 hearing, I assume this will be forwarded along with the transcripts to each Subcommittee member.

May I state that I was not in a position to reply effectively or thoroughly to the questioning for the following reasons:

For one who tends to shy away from public exposure it is traumatic to address a formidable group such as yours, even with a prepared text.

My testimony conveyed that remembering the experience of the unjust seizure and incarceration of my father opened up the most hurtful part of my past. After the reading I was emotionally drained and psychologically unprepared to field questions ^{especially these} which were intimidating to me. I might add that I thought it most insensitive of Congressman Kindness then to exacerbate my pain by referring to my father as "enemy alien" and implying possible espionage activity by him. This was not a court trial where I would at least have had the protection of a counsel, judge, and jury.

*because he dealt
with white clients
in his business*

The following are clarifications and refutations to questions directed at me after my testimony, with the exception of Item I. I have stated their sources and have attached some exhibits for their substantiation:

- I. Regarding the matter of barbed wire fences, watch towers and armed guards:

Page two/Funabiki

Mr. Bendetsen's forceful denial of their existence when there are thousands of photographs and documented accounts by ex-detainees compels me to question his reliability.

II. To the matter of our freedom to go in and out of camps as alleged by Mr. Bendetsen again:

On file with the Justice Department is a memo dated October 1, 1942 from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to Edward Ennis of the Enemy Alien Control Unit asking "which agency is responsible for locating any person who might ESCAPE from these centers" and what procedure would be instituted against such "ESCAPEES".

Hoover had to consider these facilities prison like to employ the terms "escape" and "escapees". Since the FBI under the Justice Department considered this so, so must have all governmental agencies.

Ennis' reply should lay this matter to rest. "No person of Japanese ancestry could leave established Relocation Centers without permission from the headquarters of the Western Defense Command. etc."

See attached exhibits 1 and 2

III. Questions regarding guards who gunned down detainees:

Seven of the people shot and killed by guards are listed in Years of Infamy by Michi Weglyn, page 312, footnote 3; details of deaths are in The Spoilage, by Dorothy Thomas, pages 249-260; The Price of Prejudice by Leonard Arrington; Those Other Camps by Paul Clark; "The Manzanar Riot", Amerasia Journal, Vol. 2, No. 2, pages 113-142.

There is even a case where a guard inflicted a gunshot wound on a child.
Years of Infamy by Michi Weglyn, pages 90-91.

IV. The question regarding the relationship between whites and the Japanese before Pearl Harbor:

There was legalized racism. The Prohibition of Naturalization is a federal law which did not allow my father, a fifty year resident of the United States to become a citizen. Out of this law stemmed several repressive California state laws: Anti-Miscegenation Law; Alien Land Law; restrictions on fishing and certain business.

Page three/ Funabiki

licenses.

Bamboo People by Frank Chuman

- V. The question whether the camps could have been built for our protection given the animosity; concrete evidence of subversive Japanese American activity after Pearl Harbor which could have been a menace to the United States.

To Mr. Kindness' question which states, if I recall correctly, "If someone was in the same situation as your family, was it not good that the government took them out of this situation where they needed protection and where they needed help to subsist?"

First, why were our funds frozen so that we could not subsist?

If Mr. Kindness was of German ancestry and had the Exclusion Order applied to German residences in the United States would he have allowed himself to be uprooted and placed in a barbed wire compound for "protection"? Would he not have demanded equal protection under the law and taken his chances? And what of the unnecessary drain the entire detention placed on the taxpayers?

If the "concrete evidence" of our questionable loyalty refers to "Magic Cables", Col. John Herzig's documented testimony clearly indicates that these cables fail to support Mr. Lowman's interpretation that Japanese Americans engaged in any acts of espionage.

The secret Munson Report ordered by President Roosevelt two months before Pearl Harbor for thorough intelligence gathering of espionage activity by residents of Japanese ancestry confirmed that not one had committed acts of sabotage. "Yet for reasons that still remain obscured this highest level intelligence consensus was to become one of the war's best kept secrets".

Years of Infamy, Michi Weglyn, Chapter I, page 34.

See attached exhibits 3 and 4.

- VI. To Mr. Kindness' reference to the definition of the words "evacuation", "relocation", and "internment".

See exhibit 5

The American system of justice states that one is innocent until proven guilty. My father and thousands of issei like him when seized by the FBI were labeled "enemy alien" and thus assumed guilty. Why is there a double

Page four/Funabiki

standard whereby only we, not German or Italian residents, must prove ourselves with leave clearances, a Loyalty Oath, Combat Teams, etc.?

Forty two years later when the facts confirming our indisputable loyalty are all recorded we sit before you and must still prove our innocence by having to refute false charges over and over again. None of this has to do with our civil rights as guaranteed by our Constitution, our most sacred protection.

Mr. Chairman, may I close by imploring you to have the Subcommittee place more emphasis on the constitutionality of our detainment at future hearings.

Thank you.

Most respectfully,

Kiku Funabiki

(Mrs.) Kiku Funabiki

Encls: 5 exhibits