

August 14, 1990

Office of the Editor
Pacific Citizen
941 East 3rd Street, Room 200
Los Angeles, California 90013

Dear Sir:

I am writing regarding several articles that have appeared in the Pacific Citizen over the last year or so.

As one who is not eligible for redress due to a technicality - my mother left camp when she was 5 months pregnant because she did not want her child born in a concentration camp (see enclosed documentation), I would like to comment on the statement in the June 1, 1990 issue of the Pacific Citizen.

Maybe my mother's leaving camp and thus making her child ineligible for redress is something that can be chuckled at 46 years later, but at the time, it was a very serious issue, something to which she gave a lot of thought and a very brave thing to do. Time should not diminish nor make light of this act.

As for myself, to be very honest and a little ashamed for my lack of faith, even though I supported redress, wrote letters and contributed money, I NEVER thought it would pass and never expected to see either an apology or money from the United States government. After it passed, knowing the circumstances of my particular case, I felt the same. I wrote a couple of letters regarding my situation and made a couple of phone calls to find out the official reason I was being denied redress, but then just let the matter go with the attitude I'm not going to miss something I never expected in the first place.

Now, I have just read the July 20-27, 1990 article about the life of Estelle Peck Ishigo and simply put, it breaks my heart. This woman is not eligible for redress? That cannot be. I feel like shouting from the rooftops for the world to know that there are legitimate cases out there with special circumstances - those non-Japanese Americans who went to camp with their Japanese-American spouses, those who voluntarily relocated, those with circumstance similar to mine and on and on, I am sure. Unfortunately, unless something is done to make the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 a reality for this group, these people are not eligible for an apology or monetary compensation - not because they are not deserving of redress, but simply (and sadly) because of a technicality in the circumstances of their cases. There is something terribly wrong in this - maybe it's no longer a case of justice denied, but it is not yet justice for all.

Now comes the part where the person criticizing should offer a solution. Unfortunately, I hardly know where to turn, much less

Office of the Editor
Page 2

August 14, 1990

have the answer to this problem. Having read and saved your editorial of June 23, 1989 regarding redress issues still to be solved (it was a ray of hope for me - even though it didn't change anything, just seeing support for those in my situation validated by belief), I am writing to see if there is any current information on what is being done or can be done to remedy this situation. Are the right people in the right places aware of the problem? Is anyone aware of the problem? Does anyone care? What can I do? If you cannot help me, can you direct me to someone who can? I would appreciate any insight or information you can give me regarding this matter.

In closing, I cannot tell you how valuable the Pacific Citizen has been in keeping me informed about the progress of redress over the years, not only as a source of information, but also as a ray of hope that maybe, just maybe, redress would become a reality. My sincere thanks, and keep up the good work!

Yours truly,

Sharon M. Tanihara
11025 Sherman Avenue
Garden Grove, California 92643
(714) 530-1715