

14 August

Mr. Harry Honda
Editor, Pacific Citizen (PC)

Dear Sir,

The letters in recent issues of PC demonstrate the wide spectrum of opinions on the Redress issue and it is obvious that it is riven by deep differences. Although committed to the Redress program, many including myself have great doubts with the current commission and "Seattle" plans. Realizing there are many uncommitted outside of the JACL as well as JACL dissenters, I would have to conclude that the major thrust of the program may be either misdirected, untimely, threatening ~~and shortsided~~ ^{OR SIGHTED}. Also for many, reparation feature is grubbing, embarrassing and even "unAmerican".

Perhaps it is because the current Redress campaign will not correct the real injustice of Evacuation---the abuse of constitutional powers and rights. Despite the repeal of Title II proviso of the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Government can still detain or incarcerate any one or groups by suspending constitutional rights under the war powers of the President and Congress---in other words, Evacuation can be repeated. Why?---because detention and incarceration phases of Evacuation were never adjudicated! (If PC would print KOREMATUS vs UNITED STATES in its entirety it will be apparent to anyone able to read the English language that the Court itself makes this very point. Surely if PC can print so many pages of YANKEE SAMURAI it could devote part of one issue to the complete text of this pivotal decision. Many, including Sen. Hayakawa, still believe that Evacuation was "constitutional which is partially correct, or shall I say, wrong?)

There was a time not so long ago that the unresolved constitutional issue of incarceration was "our problem" as the present Redress campaign would suggest. Clearly that time is long past. Such is the diversity of the population (witness

the flow of Asians among the "coloured races" since the passage of the McCarran-Walter bill followed by the liberalization of the immigration laws in 1965---and now the "boat people") that the issue (Redress in the fullest context) can no longer be parochial---we must transcend our racial clastrophobia and doctrinal quarrels. The issue is now a socially desirable, constitutional and even moral matter. We should take the issue to Federal courts and if necessary to the Supreme Court. If victorious what greater legacy could we leave for our parents and future generations? Of even greater impact and importance is that it would serve warning to the Government that any racial or ethnic groups will never be subjected to "Evacuation" again.

A more immediate benefit would be the establishment of legitimacy of the Redress process and Congress would have no recourse except to resolve the matter. Of course, there will be great legal obstacles and it will be costly. There is no reason, however, that the two approaches could not be pushed concurrently. This is the time for the gathering of the committed and uncommitted, JACL members and non-members and all we have to gain is freedom.

(A rape! a rape! Yes you have ravish'd justice. John
Wester 1580-1625)

Respectfully yours,

Eji Suyama
Eji Suyama, M.D.

cc: John Tateishi - *chairman of redress committee.*
Ron Ikejiri
Daniel Inouye, *Sen*
Spark Matsunaga, *Sen.*