



Not to Be Forgotten:
Legal Lessons of the Japanese Internment



**2017 NINTH CIRCUIT
CIVICS CONTEST**

THE ORGANIZERS THANK THE FOLLOWING FOR THEIR
GENEROUS SUPPORT*:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

U.S. DISTRICT AND BANKRUPTCY COURTS
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF GUAM

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN
DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN
DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

*PRIZE MONEY AND OTHER CONTEST COSTS ARE FUNDED THROUGH ATTORNEY
ADMISSION FEES COLLECTED BY THE COURTS TO FUND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS
FOR THE BAR AND COMMUNITY.

A Word About the Contest

Civics education helps ensure that young people become knowledgeable citizens who understand and participate in our democracy. We are very pleased to have contributed to this effort through the 2017 Ninth Circuit Civics Contest, which is organized by the Ninth Circuit Courts and Community Committee in collaboration with all of the federal courts of the circuit.

This year's theme was "Not to Be Forgotten: Legal Lessons of the Japanese Internment." Students were challenged to write an essay or produce a brief video focusing on the constitutional conflicts arising out of the unwarranted incarceration of Japanese-Americans at the beginning of World War II.

The contest was open to high school students in the nine western states, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands. More than 1,000 entries were received. Preliminary judging was done at the district level, which narrowed the field down to 45 essays and 36 videos. The top three finishers in each competition (6 total) were chosen by the Courts and Community Committee.

We would like to thank all of the federal courts of the Ninth Circuit for their support. We could not have succeeded without the help of the many judges, attorneys, court staff and educators from throughout the western states and Pacific islands who contributed their time and efforts.

July 2017



*District Judge
Janis L. Sammartino,
chair of the Ninth
Circuit Courts
and Community
Committee*

WINNING ESSAY CONTEST ENTRIES

1st
place

OLIVIA TAFS
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

THE UGLY ABYSS OF RACISM: LESSONS OF JAPANESE INTERNMENT

“No one should ever be locked away simply because they share the same race, ethnicity, or religion as a spy or terrorist. If that principle was not learned from the internment of Japanese Americans, then these are very dangerous times for our democracy.”

-Fred Korematsu

On February 19, 1942, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 into law.¹ The order led to the internment of 120,000 Japanese Americans in what was later called an act of “wartime hysteria.”² It was challenged in a series of Supreme Court cases, including *Hirabayashi v. United States*,³ *Korematsu v. United States*,⁴ and *Ex parte Mitsuye Endo*.⁵ Remembering the social and legal lessons of Japanese internment has become increasingly important as the United States combats terrorism in the 21st century.

Japanese internment in the United States began after the attack on Pearl Harbor, and lasted until 1946. Executive Order 9066 allowed the removal



Olivia Tafs, 15, is an incoming sophomore at West Anchorage High School in Anchorage, Alaska. Her favorite school subjects are science and orchestra. She enjoys playing cello and tennis, as well as reading and competing in debates. Right now, she hopes to go into a career in space exploration.

of any persons from military areas “as deemed necessary or desirable.” Under the order the entire West Coast was deemed a “military area,” and by June 1942, over 100,000 Japanese Americans were detained in camps.⁶ The act was fueled by racial prejudice, as rumors spread of a Japanese spy ring plotting to undermine the American war effort. Japanese Americans, mostly American citizens without Japanese loyalty, were ripped from their lives on the West Coast, imprisoned in camps far from home, and suffered property losses and disruption of cultural norms.⁷ Japanese internment was upheld in courts, but, after an influx of lawsuits and backlash from the public, the last camp closed in 1946.⁸

Several prominent Supreme Court cases were brought against the United States in response to Japanese internment. Gordon Hirabayashi violated the mandatory curfew, and then challenged the United States’ treatment of Japanese Americans as a violation of 5th Amendment rights.⁹ The Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the discrimination was a military necessity, presuming Japanese Americans felt a dangerous sense of “solidarity” with the Japanese, unlike Americans of other ethnicities.¹⁰

The Court ruled similarly in *Korematsu v. United States*.¹¹ Fred Korematsu refused to leave his home, resulting in his arrest and imprisonment.¹² The Court ruled in a 6-3 majority that as a matter of national security, it was necessary that Japanese Americans be detained.¹³ While the legality and necessity of the internment camps were determined by the government to be questionable at best after they were shut down, the ruling in *Korematsu* has never been overturned, and remains a part of United States caselaw.¹⁴

While these challenges to the internment camps themselves were met with claims of “military necessity,” the same cannot be said of *Ex parte Mitsuye Endo*.¹⁵ Endo argued that it was unlawful for her to be detained without a trial, as the courts were accessible. The Supreme Court agreed that Endo should be released, because of her proven loyalty to the United States; she was a Christian American citizen who had never been to Japan and didn’t speak Japanese. This precedent allowed Japanese Americans who were “proven” to have loyalty to the United States to be freed and return to their homes, but it did not end Japanese internment.¹⁶ People who still had ties to their cultural heritage remained imprisoned, against the principles of freedom and diversity upon which America was founded.

These three cases decided and defended the principle that in times of war or national emergency, discrimination against people of a certain race or ethnicity could be a “necessity.” As Justice Jackson wrote in his dissenting opinion in *Korematsu*, “The principle...lies about like a loaded weapon, ready for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need. Every repetition imbeds that principle more deeply in our law and thinking and expands it to new purposes.”¹⁷ Japanese internment is the most extreme example of a dangerous principle that governs the national mentality of countries caught in conflict; in times of war, safety comes before civil rights.

These legal precedents remain a legacy of Japanese internment, and in recent years they have become even more relevant. The treatment and perception of Muslim and Middle Eastern individuals after 9/11 have paralleled the perception of Japanese Americans after Pearl Harbor. A ‘Special Registration’ program which sought to fingerprint, photograph, and monitor immigrants from 25 countries after 9/11 was criticized as being ineffective and harmful; out of the 25 countries affected, all but North Korea were majority Muslim.¹⁸ Additionally, the Supreme Court is set to hear a case against the United States for long-term and reportedly unnecessary detention and mistreatment of hundreds of Arab Muslims in the investigation following 9/11.¹⁹

Profiling of ethnic groups is also seen in later policy decisions; in one of the first executive acts of his term, President Trump blocked immigration and refugees from seven countries in the name of protecting the nation from foreign extremists, citing the events of 9/11.²⁰ In reality, none of the perpetrators of the 9/11 terrorist attacks came from countries listed in the order; in fact, no one from those countries has been responsible for a terror attack since 1975. They all, however, have a population that is mostly Muslim.²¹

The lessons learned from the internment of Japanese Americans have only become more relevant. The ability to discriminate against racial or ethnic groups in times of war remains a legal precedent and a part of America’s national consciousness, and in the fight against terrorism we’ve seen how the instinct to profile and mistreat groups deemed “the enemy” returns in times of conflict. Remembering the lessons we learned after Japanese internment is essential today, as America struggles to find a

balance between the safety of the masses and the standards of liberty and civil rights our country was built upon. By learning from past mistakes and working to end fear-based discrimination, America can prove and uphold the idea that while history can repeat itself, it doesn't have to.

- 1 "Roosevelt Signs Executive Order 9066." *History.com*. A&E Television Networks, n.d. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.
- 2 McGrath, Jane. "Did the United States Put Its Own Citizens in Concentration Camps during WWII?" *HowStuffWorks*. N.p., 07 May 2009. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.
- 3 320 U.S. 81 (1943).
- 4 323 U.S. 214 (1944).
- 5 323 U.S. 283 (1944).
- 6 "Roosevelt Signs Executive Order 9066." *History.com*. A&E Television Networks, n.d. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.
- 7 "Japanese-American Relocation." *History.com*. A&E Television Networks, 2009. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.
- 8 "Hirabayashi v. United States." Oyez, <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1940-1955/320us81>. Accessed 20 Apr. 2017.
- 9 *Hirabayashi*, 320 U.S. at 83-85, 100.
- 10 *Id.* at 96-97, 104-105.
- 11 323 U.S. 214 (1944).
- 12 *Id.* at 215.
- 13 *Id.* at 223-24.
- 14 Konkoly, Tony. "Korematsu v. United States (1944)." PBS. Public Broadcasting Service, n.d. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.
- 15 323 U.S. 283 (1944).
- 16 Niiye, Brian. "Ex Parte Endo." *Densho Encyclopedia*. N.p., n.d. Web. 20 Apr. 2017.
- 17 *Korematsu v. United States*. Cornell University Law School. Supreme Court. 18 Dec. 1944. Print.
- 18 Jachimowicz, Maia, and Ramah McKay. "'Special Registration' Program." *MPI*. Migration Policy Institute, 011 Apr. 2003. Web. 22 Apr. 2017.
- 19 "Supreme Court Hears Case of Muslims Detained after 9/11." *Al Jazeera*. Al Jazeera, 19 Jan. 2017. Web. 22 Apr. 2017.
- 20 Exec. Order No. 13769, 3 C.F.R. (2017). Print.
- 21 Greene, Alan. "Trump's Travel Ban Is Nothing to Do with National Security." *IOL*. IOL, 03 Feb. 2017. Web. 22 Apr. 2017.

2nd
place

ANDREW STAHL BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASHINGTON

PRESERVING INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN WARTIME

The United States is a nation of laws. These laws stem from the document that is the soul of this country and the legacy of those who fought to create it: the Constitution. This document lays out the duties and functions of the government, and the powers delegated to each branch. Perhaps the most explicit section, the Bill of Rights, is devoted entirely to what the government can not do, enumerating the most fundamental rights and liberties of citizens. At times the Constitution is inconvenient for both government and its citizens, but this is a signal that it is functioning as it should. There is no greater test of this document than when the government seeks to impose upon individual rights in the interest of national security.

On February 19, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066, allowing for subsequent Order 9102 and providing for the removal of all Japanese citizens and resident aliens alike from the western United States. This order came just ten weeks after Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, killing 2,400 Americans and wounding over 1,100 more. The



Andrew Stahl, 18, just completed his senior year at Bainbridge High School on Bainbridge Island, Washington, and will be attending the University of Washington this fall. While he has not yet decided on a major or a career path, the fields of law and political science have captured his interest. Outside of class, Andrew enjoys participating in Model United Nations club and volunteering at his local Rotary Auction. He enjoys salmon fishing and hiking. He also pursues wood and metalworking and has begun crafting

custom kitchen knives. Andrew says the contest was especially significant in his community as Japanese-American citizens from Bainbridge Island were among the first to be removed from Washington. He believes strongly in the importance of the lessons learned from our nation's history.

executive order seemed to show little regard for the Bill of Rights, specifically its 5th Amendment. This amendment guarantees basic rights that compose the backbone of society, as set forth by John Locke in 1689. It states, “nor shall any person... be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law”. It is this language that formed the constitutional claims of several Japanese Americans in their subsequent legal battles against the government.

One such American, Fred Korematsu, refused to leave his home for an internment camp. As a result, he was tried and convicted, and the case was appealed until it reached the Supreme Court.¹ Korematsu’s claim was that the President had acted beyond the powers granted to him in times of war as Commander in Chief, and in detaining Japanese citizens had violated their 5th Amendment rights guaranteeing due process and equal protection under the law. Since there had been no suspension of habeas corpus (as President Lincoln had done during the Civil War), Korematsu argued there was no legal justification for his removal and detainment. The court rejected Mr. Korematsu’s argument and upheld his conviction, holding that in times of war “pressing public necessity” justified the infringement of Japanese Americans’ 5th Amendment rights. The court acknowledged that due to the discriminatory nature of the executive order, it should be viewed as “suspect” and subject to strict scrutiny. However, the court then summarily disposed of the issue by deferring to the judgment of the military, which asserted that the exclusion of Japanese Americans from the West Coast was essential for national security.

In a similar case, Gordon Hirabayashi was convicted of violating a curfew and the subsequent exclusion order.² In his appeal to the Supreme Court, Hirabayashi argued that his 5th Amendment rights had been violated because the executive orders targeted only those of Japanese descent. The Supreme Court again maintained the constitutionality of the orders³, holding that there was no equal protection clause in the 5th Amendment, and stating that: “in time of war residents having ethnic affiliations with an invading enemy may be a greater source of danger than those of a different ancestry.” Again, the Supreme Court placed national security before individual rights.

After spending more than two years in internment camps, Japanese Americans realized a small victory in 1944, when the Supreme Court issued a decision in favor of a woman named Mitsuye Endo.⁴ Ms. Endo had filed a writ of habeas corpus challenging the government’s justification for the exclusion. The Supreme Court decided that the government must release

those whom they could not prove to be disloyal to the country. Shortly before the ruling was issued, President Roosevelt rescinded the exclusion orders and allowed the Japanese to return to their homes.

Today, the *Korematsu* and *Hirabayashi* cases are widely regarded in the legal community to have been wrongly decided. The late Justice Antonin Scalia ranked the *Korematsu* case alongside *Dred Scott* as one of the court's most shameful decisions (Liptak). The *Korematsu* case was never overturned, but Congress issued a formal apology in the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 and stated that it was "overruled in the court of history". The Civil Liberties Act⁵ granted monetary reparations to those interned, and served as an apology by the U.S. government and an admission of wrongdoing, citing the executive orders as a product of "race prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership".

This war hysteria resurfaced after the horrific attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. This marked the beginning of what is known today as the War on Terror. This post 9/11 paranoia gave rise to legislation such as the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act⁶ and the Patriot Act⁷, which like the executive orders of Roosevelt, threaten individual liberties in the name of national security. This is not a war that has a foreseeable end. This is not a war that can be won with sheer military might. Although the War on Terror is fought on a worldwide scale, there is again a growing concern that the enemy may walk among us. This is why it is crucial that neither the American people nor their government let the fear in their hearts or the hate in their minds infringe upon the rights of their fellow man. The lessons learned during the Japanese internment have shown us the actions of a fearful country. A fearful country that when threatened, denied its people the very rights it was simultaneously fighting to protect. As America endeavors to put an end to terrorism, it must not do so in a manner that vilifies a race or religion. It must do so in a manner that upholds the individual rights and liberties set forth in the Constitution.

1 *Korematsu v. United States*, 323 U.S. 214 (1944).

2 *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U.S. 81 (1943).

3 This conviction was later overturned in 1987, when it was discovered that the office of the U.S. Solicitor General had given false testimony in the trial.

4 *Ex Parte Endo*, 323 U.S. 283 (1944).

5 Pub. L. 100-383.

6 Pub. L. 95-511.

7 Pub. L. 107-56.

3rd
place

BRANDON SHI SAN RAMON, CALIFORNIA

NOT TO BE FORGOTTEN: LEGAL LESSONS OF THE JAPANESE INTERNMENT

In times of war, our courts' interpretations of the Constitution often relegate a cherished safeguard of liberty to an ineffective paper shield, easily subverted to the detriment of our founding principles. While not desirable, this occurs by design — the Constitution itself, combined with legal precedent, delegates the power of interpreting laws to the courts. Consequently, our courts are trusted with immense responsibility. Like our nation's court system during the Japanese internment of the 1940s, American courts today are trusted with the responsibility of weighing the exalted ideals of civil liberties against the hard realities of national security — all the while remaining immune to the irrational passions of the public. As terrorist attacks eradicate Americans' sense of security, and as President Donald Trump promises to strip away the rights of Muslim Americans, the connections between the Japanese internment's legal history and current government policies regarding terrorism become increasingly clear.

In 1941, while war raged across Europe and Asia, the Empire of Japan carried out a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, an American naval base — killing thousands of Americans, including civilians. The catastrophe shocked the American public; paranoia and suspicion ensued.¹ While deep-



Brandon Shi, 16, is an incoming senior at Dougherty Valley High School in San Ramon, California. His favorite subjects in school include history, English and Spanish. Brandon writes for his school newspaper, the "Wildcat Tribune," and has been a competitive swimmer for over 10 years. He is an art lover and is passionate about social justice. In his free time, Brandon enjoys going to art museums, watching movies, reading, and traveling. After high school, he hopes to attend Columbia University and eventually go to law school.

seated racism and xenophobia had always made life difficult for Japanese Americans, it was the Pearl Harbor attack and fears of Japanese-American fifth column activity that provided a direct catalyst for internment. Calling Pearl Harbor “a date which will live in infamy”, President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066, authorizing the forced relocation of more than a hundred thousand Japanese Americans — many of them United States citizens — and provoking the classic debate between maintaining national security and preserving civil liberties.²

The judiciary sided with national security, justifying the constitutionality of forced relocation. In *Hirabayashi v. United States* (1943), the Supreme Court ruled that a curfew targeted solely against Japanese Americans did not violate the Fifth Amendment’s guarantee of due process, upholding Gordon Hirabayashi’s conviction for violating the curfew (deemed a “protective measure”).³ In *Korematsu v. United States* (1944) the Court upheld Executive Order 9066, stating that “military urgency” justified the internment.⁴ Even in *Ex parte Endo* (1944), which acknowledged the right of citizens who were “concededly loyal” to be free from wartime detention, the Supreme Court refused to rule on the constitutionality of internment itself.⁵ Thus, all of these decisions gave either explicit or tacit consent to government policies.

Sixty years after Pearl Harbor, on September 11, 2001, another shocking tragedy seared itself into the American psyche. The 9/11 attacks would come to define a generation and an era. Overseas, the U.S. prepared to fight terrorism; at home, civilians prepared for increased surveillance and security screenings. Due to a multitude of later events such as the Arab Spring, the rise of ISIS and the Syrian refugee crisis, terrorism and concerns over terrorism continue to this day — shaping our institutions, our politics, and our common law heritage. Without a doubt, fear and prejudice have taken root, as they did after Pearl Harbor. This time, however, it is Muslims and their civil liberties who are most affected due to national security concerns.⁶ Directly citing a need for security and referring to 9/11 as an example, President Donald Trump signed Executive Order 13769 in January 2017 — banning the admittance of foreign nationals from seven Muslim-majority countries by ordering a halt to the “entry into the United States ... of such persons for 90 days from the date of this order.”⁷ The order drew many comparisons to the Japanese internment.⁸

This comparison is not baseless. In both periods of history, public sentiment and policy have been tainted by popular paranoia and false information. During the internment, the Court's assessments of "military urgency" relied on tampered evidence and baseless fears fueled by the larger public's hysteria — in retrospect, undermining the legitimacy of *Hirabayashi* and *Korematsu*. In the DeWitt report, the government itself acknowledged that Japanese Americans were not a threat to national security; however, these findings were suppressed during *Hirabayashi* and internment continued,⁹ reflecting the pervasive wartime atmosphere of suspicion. Looking back, the fact that the Supreme Court's decisions were influenced by the public's fear of Japanese espionage marks a failure of the courts to remove themselves from public opinion, going against the Constitution's vision of a judiciary independent from the passions of the masses — after all, justices and judges are appointed, and not elected, for precisely this reason.

Unfortunately, the redress and reparations provided in the 1980s have not prevented the continuation of the American public's paranoia and the American government's use of faulty evidence in conversations about national security. Whether this manifests itself in Trump's support for a Muslim ban and registry or state legislatures' specious insinuations that Sharia law is penetrating American common law¹⁰, the connections between current government policies and the Japanese internment are obvious. Like Japanese Americans during World War II, Muslims as a whole do not pose a systematic threat against American security¹¹ — so inevitably, the government's justifications for their policies have no origin in reality. This is evident in the Trump administration's creation of nonexistent terrorist attacks such as the so-called "Bowling Green Massacre"¹² — a lie, whether intentional or instinctive, created to vilify Muslims. Ultimately, these efforts mirror the government's false evidence during the Japanese internment — evidence that ultimately had real consequences in the lives of thousands of people.

In the end, many parallels exist between the legal history of the Japanese internment and the current realities of our ongoing struggle against terrorism. The persecuted group has changed, but the presence of irrational paranoia and false information in the debate between civil liberties and national security remain constant — most recently manifesting itself in the Trump administration. Recent rulings stalling the

implementation of the Muslim ban give reassurance in an otherwise bleak time; however, they have not completely halted the resurgence in fear and suspicion that once again threatens to cause another civil liberties disaster. Unfortunately, those birds may have already flown.

1 Henretta, James A., Eric Hinderaker, Rebecca Edwards, and Robert O. Self. "The Attack on Pearl Harbor." *America's History*. 8th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2014. 772-773. Print.

2 Henretta, James A., Eric Hinderaker, Rebecca Edwards, and Robert O. Self. "Japanese Removal." *America's History*. 8th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2014. 787-788. Print.

3 Hall, Kermit L., Paul Finkelman, and James W. Ely. "Hirabayashi v. United States 320 U.S. 81 (1943)." *American Legal History: Cases and Materials*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. 438-440. Print.

4 Hall, Kermit L., Paul Finkelman, and James W. Ely. "Korematsu v. United States 323 U.S.214 (1944)." *American Legal History: Cases and Materials*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. 440-445. Print.

5 Hall, Kermit L., Paul Finkelman, and James W. Ely. "Note: Ex parte Endo , 323 U.S. 273 (1944)." *American Legal History: Cases and Materials*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. 446. Print.

6 Friedersdorf, Conor. "Civil Liberties Keep Americans Safe." *The Atlantic*, Atlantic Media Company, 15 June 2016, www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/06/terror-civil-liberties/487115/. Accessed 23 Apr. 2017.

7 Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States, Exec. Order 13769, 82 FR 8977 (Feb. 1, 2017). *Federal Register: The Daily Journal of the United States*. Web. 21 April 2016.

8 "Trump Ban: US Sports Figures Criticise Ban on Immigrants - BBC Sport." *BBC News*, BBC, 31 Jan. 2017. Web. Accessed 23 Apr. 2017.

9 Hall, Kermit L., Paul Finkelman, and James W. Ely. "Note: The Internment Cases a Generation Later." *American Legal History: Cases and Materials*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. 446. Print.

10 Hardy, Benjamin. "Committee Approves Bill Targeting Sharia Law." *Arkansas Times*, Arkansas Times, 2 Feb. 2017, www.arktimes.com/ArkansasBlog/archives/2017/02/02/committee-approves-bill-targeting-sharia-law-andother-foreign-jurisprudence. Accessed 23 Apr. 2017.

11 Shane, Scott. "Immigration Ban Is Unlikely to Reduce Terrorist Threat, Experts Say." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 28 Jan. 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/01/28/us/politics/a-sweeping-order-unlikely-to-reduce-terrorist-threat.html. Accessed 23 Apr. 2017.

12 Blake, Aaron. "Kellyanne Conway's 'Bowling Green Massacre' Wasn't a Slip of the Tongue. She Has Said It before." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 6 Feb. 2017, www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2017/02/06/kellyanne-conways-bowling-green-massacre-wasnt-a-slip-of-the-tongue-shes-said-it-before/?utm_term=.9414699e678b. Accessed 23 Apr. 2017.

WINNING VIDEO CONTEST ENTRIES

Winning video entries can be viewed by visiting the 2017 Civics Contest website: <http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/civicscontest>



JOSHUA RIEL
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA



Joshua Riel, 18, recently graduated from Las Vegas Academy of the Arts as an orchestra major. His instrument is the double bass. In addition to many honors at his school, Joshua has been selected to the All-State Orchestra for the past four years, sitting as first chair for the past three years. Joshua has also been the All-State Solo Command Winner for the past two years. At school, his favorite subjects included government and he enjoyed participating in discussions and debates on current events. On his free time, Joshua loves composing music and producing new videos. He will be attending the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, in the fall and plans to major in business and minor in music."



TAMARA SATO & EMILY WU HONOLULU, HAWAII



Tamara Sato, 16, is an incoming senior at Punahou School in Honolulu, Hawaii. The daughter of Japanese and Chinese parents, she lives on the island of Oahu. Her favorite subjects are English, Japanese and economics. In her spare time, she likes to bake desserts such as cupcakes, cakes, cookies and Danish pastries. In the future, she hopes to major in business, and baking and pastry arts before coming home to live in Hawaii.



Emily Wu, 17, is an incoming senior at Punahou School in Honolulu this fall. Her favorite courses this past year have been English and Advanced Placement U.S. history. In her free time, Emily enjoys doing art with oil paint and color pencils. She also likes to go hiking and shopping with friends. She intends to major in business or international relations in college, with a minor in graphic design. Ultimately, Emily hopes that her job will take her to different countries and allow her to experience new cultures.



BRIANNA CHAPMAN
ARCATA, CALIFORNIA



Brianna Chapman, 16, is an incoming junior at Northcoast Preparatory Academy in Arcata, California. She enjoys studying film and has been creating video productions since she was 8 years old. In her free time, she likes to explore the possibilities of film and be creative. After graduating high school, she hopes to continue pursuing her passion of filmmaking wherever it may lead her.



NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WINNERS

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California. Winners of the essay and video competition received \$100.

ESSAY WINNERS

1st Place

Iris Wu

Senior at Miramonte High School, Orinda

2nd place

Brandon Shi

Junior at Dougherty Valley High School, San Ramon

3rd Place

Lori Sarsfield

Junior at New Technology High School, Napa

VIDEO WINNERS

1st Place

Brianna Chapman

Sophomore at Northcoast Preparatory Academy, Arcata

2nd Place

Brandon Shi, Amisha Kambath and Maddie Taylor

Juniors at Dougherty Valley High School, San Ramon

3rd Place

Nicholas Dillon, Hari Ambu, and Savanna Harwood

Juniors at New Technology High School, Napa

OTHER ESSAY & VIDEO CONTEST FINALISTS

District of Alaska

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska, which awarded prizes of \$500, \$300 and \$200 to the top three finishers.

The Alaska winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Olivia Tafis, freshman; 2nd, Anessa Feero, senior; and 3rd, Sarah Chen, sophomore, all from West Anchorage High School in Anchorage.

Video winners are: 1st, the team of Brynn Morse, sophomore, and Sarah Chen, junior, at East Anchorage High School and West Anchorage High School, respectively. There are no 2nd or 3rd place winners.

District of Arizona

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, which offered prizes of \$500, \$300 and \$200 to the top three finishers in both the essay and video competitions.

The Arizona winners of the essay competition are: 1st place, Maya Bose, a senior at Corona del Sol High School in Tempe; 2nd place, Jennifer Smetanick, a junior at Basis Phoenix, a charter school in Phoenix; and 3rd place, Mindy Long, a sophomore at Hamilton High School in Chandler.

Video winners are: 1st place, the team of Allison Gooch, a senior, and Jacob Staudenmaier, a junior, at Arcadia High School in Phoenix; 2nd place, the team of Aida Farrally, Caitlyn Hartman and Sydney Hartman, seniors at the Arizona School for the Arts in Phoenix; and 3rd place, the team of Anthony Jaber, Frederick Lewis and Joshua Crest, seniors at Walden Grove High School in Sahuarita.

Central District of California

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court and U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Central District of California. The district offered prizes of \$1,000, \$750 and \$500 to the top finishers in the competition and a trip to San Francisco for the first place winners accompanied by a parent or guardian, to attend the opening session of the circuit conference.

Central District of Calif. winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Ian Xu, a senior at Arcadia High School in Arcadia; 2nd, Zachary Finkelstein a junior at Dana Hills High School in Laguna Niguel; and 3rd, Danielle LaCorte a senior at Agoura High School in Agoura Hills.

Video winners are: 1st, the team of Ian Xu, Cathleen Huang, and Jason Wang, seniors, at Arcadia High School in Arcadia; 2nd, the team of Jennifer Ramirez, Alexandra Castillo and Kimberly Barraza, seniors at Pacific High School in San Bernardino; and 3rd, Sophia Eberlein, a senior at Palisades Charter High School in Pacific Palisades.

Eastern District of California

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California.

Eastern District of Calif. winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Kou-Lai Chang, a junior at Florin High School in Sacramento; 2nd, Kiyomi Sun, a senior at Laguna Creek High School in Elk Grove; and 3rd, Gemma Ylaria Goebel, a senior at Granite Bay High School in Granite Bay.

Video winners are: 1st, Hazel Ford, a freshman at Good Measure Academy, a homeschool and collaborative program in Auburn; 2nd, Kinsey Mason, a sophomore at Clovis West High School in Fresno; and 3rd, Roman Hernandez, a junior at Merced High School in Merced.

Southern District of California

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California. The district offered prizes of \$1,000, \$500 and \$250 to the top finishers in the competition.

Southern District of Calif. winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Lauren Mikuriya, a junior at La Jolla Country Day School in La Jolla; 2nd, Jordan Furtak, a junior at Patrick Henry High School in San Diego; and 3rd, Sonia Gu, a junior at Canyon Crest Academy in San Diego.

Video winners are: 1st, the team of Angelina Felipe, Andres Rodriguez and Shaun Tayaba, juniors at Morse High School in San Diego; 2nd, the team of Ana Little-Sana, Mia Rollins, and Alexandra Heath, seniors, at E3 Civics Charter High School in San Diego; and 3rd, the team of Anthony Alcaraz and Jorge Borquez, juniors at Eastlake High School in Chula Vista.

District of Guam

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Guam. The district offered prizes of \$150, \$100 and \$50 to the top finishers in the competition.

Guam winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Lela Yang, a sophomore at St. John's School in Tumon; a tie at 2nd, Heera Kodiyamplakkal, a freshman, and Maylene Yeh, a sophomore, both from Harvest Christian Academy in Barrigada. There is no 3rd place winner.

Video winners are: 1st, the team of Raizel Yu and Anne Wen, juniors at St. John's School in Tumon; 2nd Julian Villegas, a senior at Guam High School in Agana; and Travis Aguon, a senior at Guam High School.

District of Hawaii

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii. The district offered prizes of \$1,000, \$500 and \$250 to the top finishers in the competition.

Hawaii winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Isabelle Rhee, a junior at Punahou School in Honolulu; 2nd, Elise Kuwaye, a sophomore at Kaimuki Christian School in Honolulu; and 3rd, Allison Ching, a junior at Punahou School.

Video winners are: 1st, Allie Marshall, a junior at Kahuku High and Intermediate School in Kahuku; 2nd, the team of Tamara Sato and Emily Wu, juniors at Punahou School; and 3rd, Stephanie Fujita, a junior at Punahou School.

District of Idaho

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho. The district offered prizes of \$1,000, \$500 and \$250 to the top finishers in the competition.

Idaho winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Ben Moody, a senior, homeschooled in Kuna; 2nd, Isaac Reitz, a sophomore at Fruitland High School in Fruitland; and 3rd, Teresa Fong, a sophomore at Meridian Technical Charter High School in Meridian.

Video winners are: 1st, Braxton Smith, a junior at Meridian Technical Charter High School; 2nd, Georgette Cardiel, a senior at Blackfoot High School in Blackfoot; and 3rd, Carter Spencer, a junior at Meridian Technical Charter High School.

District of Montana

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Montana. The district offered prizes of \$2,000, \$1,000 and \$500 to the top finishers in the competition.

Montana winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Trinity Holden, a freshman at Great Falls Central Catholic High School in Great Falls; 2nd, John Davies, a sophomore at Billings West High School in Billings; and 3rd, Heidi Froelich a senior at Park City High School in Park City.

Video winners are: 1st, Alexis Giles; 2nd, Coya Nack; and 3rd, Kaitlyn Bird, all seniors at Fort Benton High School in Fort Benton.

District of Nevada

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Nevada winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Annasophia Laurent; 2nd, Liara Marie Santos; and 3rd, Winona Jane Caro, all seniors from Las Vegas Academy of the Arts in Las Vegas.

Video winners are: 1st, Joshua Riel, a senior at Las Vegas Academy of the Arts; 2nd, the team of Gregory Salsman, Andrew Hurtado and Justin Lee, juniors at West Career and Technical Academy in Las Vegas; and 3rd, the team of Zane Mechem, Anali Macias, and Ashanti Jake, seniors at Las Vegas Academy of the Arts.

District of Northern Mariana Islands

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Northern Mariana Islands.

Northern Mariana Islands winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Olivia Hirsh, a senior at Marianas High School in Saipan; 2nd, Stephen Carino, a junior at Saipan Southern High School in Saipan; and 3rd, Giu Hur, a senior at Marianas High School.

The 1st place video winner is the team of Jae Yeon Lee, Stephen Carino, and Guillermo Faller, juniors at Saipan Southern High School. There are no 2nd and 3rd place winners.

District of Oregon

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon. Cash prizes were offered to the top finishers, who were invited to an award presentation at the Federal Bar Association Oregon Chapter's Annual Dinner.

Oregon winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Danny Luo, a sophomore at Lincoln High School in Portland; 2nd, Allison Kirkpatrick, a junior at Cleveland High School in Portland; and 3rd, Kevin Sy, a junior at International High School of Beaverton in Aloha.

Video winners are: 1st, the team of Razan Husein and Maisha Hoque, freshmen, and Zaynab Ibrahim, a sophomore, all from Oregon Islamic Academy in Tigard; 2nd, the team of Sarah Fattom, Sofia Al-Bawani, and Maymuna Muktar, juniors from Oregon Islamic Academy.

Eastern District of Washington

Finalists are the winners of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Washington.

Eastern District of Wash. winners of the essay competition are: 1st, Ben Read, a senior at Lewis & Clark High School in Spokane; 2nd, Daniel Beeson, a senior at Mead High School in Spokane; and 3rd, Fatimah Albaqshi, a junior at Pullman High School in Pullman.

The 1st place video winners are the team of Fatimah Albaqshi and Julia Ulziisaikhan, juniors at Pullman High School. There are no 2nd or 3rd place winners.

Western District of Washington

Finalists of a local contest sponsored by the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington essay competition are: Benjamin Gessner, a sophomore at Emerald Ridge High School in Puyallup; Mardy Harding, a senior at Nathan Hale High School in Seattle; and Andrew Stahl, a senior at Bainbridge High School on Bainbridge Island.

The 1st place video winners are the team of David Bernado, a sophomore, and Keisuke Sano, a freshman, both from Gibson Elk High School in Issaquah.

2017 CIVICS CONTEST JUDGES

Essay Winner Selection:

Chief Magistrate Judge Ronald Bush, District of Idaho
Bankruptcy Court Clerk Kathy Campbell, Central District of California
District Judge William H. Orrick, III, Northern District of California
Attorney Martha Sheehy, District of Montana
Circuit Executive Elizabeth A. “Libby” Smith, Ninth Circuit

Video Winner Selection:

Clerk of Court Molly Dwyer, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
District Judge John A. Kronstadt, Central District of California
Assistant Circuit Executive David Madden, Ninth Circuit
District Judge Janis L. Sammartino, Southern District of California
Circuit Librarian Eric Wade, Ninth Circuit

Preliminary Judging (Essay & Video)

Sandy Andrews, Denise Asper, Judge Bridget Bade, Noah Baron, Kathleen Butterfield, Alex Clausen, Erica Craven-Green, Rollins Emerson, Eve Fisher, Nancy Fisher, Lisa Fitzgerald, Kristine Fox, Dustin Glazer, Paul Keller, Kari Kelso, Debora Kristensen, David Madden, Stephanie McMahon, Emily Newman, Judge Michael Seng, Allison Taylor, Chandan Toor, Ruth Tronnes, Katherine Rodriguez, Katherine Warren

SPECIAL THANKS to all of the judges, attorneys, court staff and educators from across the Ninth Circuit who contributed to the success of the contest.



Office of the Circuit Executive

Elizabeth A. Smith, Circuit Executive

P.O. Box 193939, San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Ph: (415) 355-8900, Fax: (415) 355-8901

<http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov>