CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: Will the next panel, the focus of which will be the impact on the family, primarily survey/experiences, as I understand it, come forward and be seated, please.

Mr. Ishiyama, or is it Dr. Ishiyama?

MR. ISHIYAMA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: As I understand it, you are something of a Chair of this panel, is that correct?

MR. ISHIYAMA: No, I am not a Chair.

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: You are not a Chair?

MR. ISHIYAMA: Absolutely not.

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: Then I cannot endow you with that title.

MR. ISHIYAMA: Right.

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: You do have survey results to present to the Commission, do you not?

MR. ISHIYAMA: Not really.

It is in my report, but I will not give an oral report on it.

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: All right. Well then would you proceed.

MR. ISHIYAMA: I will.
TOARU ISHIYAMA,
PARRA, 0HIO

MR. ISHIYAMA: Before I start, I would like to point out that Justice Goldberg really ruined my day today when he said, "You all look too good".

I would like to point out that generally I am pretty grubby but for this occasion I bought a suit and I got--

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN (interrupting): That was a mistake. Honestly, that was a mistake. You should just come in looking scruffy.

MR. ISHIYAMA: Commission members--

CHAIRMAN GOLDBERG: May I interrupt you for a moment.

This is very serious business, but when I represented the labor movement, we wanted to get the minimum wage improved.

At that time, it was 75 cents an hour. I had the bright idea of bringing in a textile worker from South Carolina, and finally one of the representatives of the union said, we have got the ideal woman; she is trying to raise six children on 75 cents an hour.
I said, that is who we want, much better than lobbyists. So the day came, she comes to Washington, and lo and behold, she has her hair done, she has a mink jacket.

I was flabbergasted and, of course, what developed was this. She was going to testify as you are before a Congressional Committee and the whole town got together, her neighbors pitched in, got her hairdo and someone gave her a mink jacket, which didn't help my testimony very much, but that was the truth.

MR. ISHIYAMA: My name is Toaru Ishiyama. Parma, Ohio, is my home.

I was living in Alameda, California, with my mother and two younger sisters when we were evacuated first to one assembly center and then to Topaz, Utah, eventually.

When it became clear that this Commission was going to be formed, I resolved early to testify about the psychological impact of the relocation.

So, consequently, I began a rather intensive search for the scientific literature. I started with the year 1981, went back 39 years to the year 1942, looking
for something that had something to do with the psychological impact of the American concentration camp experience.

To my amazement, my search produced absolutely very little, absolutely nothing, as a matter of fact. A very interesting question is raised, why, why this vacuum? How come the Japanese American social scientists, and there are many, and their colleagues did not flood the literature with psychological studies and analyses or analyses?

What is it in the American concentration camp experience that has taken it out of the psychological field of both of its victims and the scientific community?

By the way I am a psychologist. I begin to talk like a "shrink" and I hope that you will forgive me.

Generally four factors are seen as common to the concentration camp, prisoner of war, and hostage experiences. These are, one, life endangering factors; two, prolonged helplessness; three, recurrent terrifying episodes and; finally, assaults on self-esteem and self-image.
When they argue the relative rank of the American concentration camp on the first three variables, it is my conviction that what really characterizes the American concentration camp was the assault on the self-esteem and self-image.

From a formal psychological perspective, I add a greater assault. I call this the assault of abandonment by one's own country which like the dripping water torture may be the most pernicious, pervasive and debilitating onslaught on one's identity.

It was this assault, in my opinion, which launched the Japanese Americans on a 40 year journey to gain the external validation of respect.

They lost an internal validation, but we had to go out and get the external validation of respect in terms of success.

The focus on external validation, therefore, negated self-analysis and introspection.

Hence, there is the self-imposed knowledge gap, but what about the Japanese colleagues? Now they wrote about the social economic, political, constitution issue, but they did not write about the psychological
issue.

It is my opinion, again, that maybe psychological issues are too personal, too close. To get close is to begin to feel, to understand on a very human basis.

This may then lead to an uncomfortable feeling of guilt, or perhaps we Japanese Americans played our stoic, untouchable role too well and fooled everybody, including ourselves.

What we have then now our thousands of psychological studies locked up in each of the victims.

In order to change that I would like to present a brief psychological analysis of my personal experience. I need to point out that nothing dramatic happened to me. I am just one of these average Joe Blow, no Taro Blow, Japanese Americans, but I think that it is interesting because I do think that I am kind of average and, therefore, may be representative.

I would like to present my personal history in terms of both the personal and a professional perspective.

I will attempt to do so in terms of a simply,
clear-cut or series of a simple, clear-cut explanatory concepts.

The first concept is the greater the dissonance, the greater the effort required to achieve consonance.

O.K. The bonds of loyalty and trustworthiness were at the core of what my parents tried to instill in me. When you combine this with an almost religious acceptance of the constitution or the principles underlying the Constitution of the United States, you get a super patriot.

I was a super patriot. When I was a kid, I remember when the National Anthem was sung, I would get kind of tearful, all choked up and shivers went up my spine and, boy, I was ready to fight anybody.

In my senior year, for example, I entered a number of oratorical contests, the title of which was, "Why I am Proud to Be an American", and I really really was proud to be an American at that time.

Two, Principle Two, when dissonance occurs, that is, when one's perception or expectation and reality is not congruent, then consonance or congruence is pursued
in terms of a variety of ego-defense mechanisms that distort reality.

When it became clear that the military was going to move the Japanese out, I insisted, I was convinced that I was not going to be moved, because I was a citizen and my citizenship would protect me. That was my defense.

Obviously, my citizenship did not save me. I was ejected from my company and detained in the middle of a vast, barren and unwelcoming desert.

In the middle of that desert, a crazy psychological process was set in motion. I could deal with a lot of things. I could deal with hardships. I could deal with the physical discomfort, but I could not deal with the psychological assault of being in a prison without being guilty of any crime.

Something in me said, hey, don't be aware of the fence; if the fence ain't there, you are not in jail. In the two years, that I was in Topaz, I never went near the fence.

I did not see the fence, until I left. Now, the avoidance and denial works well, but it worked well
until the loyalty questionnaire. The demand for a statement, a written statement of loyalty was the assault that broke the denial's back.

I could not avoid the issue anymore. If my country was, indeed, just, if it respected me, what in the hell was I doing here and why was I being subjected to this?

It is almost as if my mother had said, hey, I will acknowledge you as my son, if after I defile you and debase you and eject you, you will swear that you will fight for me.

When denial fails, obviously, anxiety and despair is heightened.

Principal Three, psychological assault eventually produces hostility. Hostility, in turn, can be handled in a number of ways. One is direct action and, therefore, we saw the riots, the expression of disloyalty.

If disloyalty cannot be aimed at the assailter, it can be repressed or avoided. So we have lots of people that say, let's forget about it, it is all behind us, let's forget it ever happened.

Or, one can identify with the aggressor. Bette-
heim pointed this out in the study of the German death camps.

So we now have the spectacle of some Japanese Americans having, quote, nothing to do with Japanese and only having Caucasian friends, unquote.

Or in another but I think bizarre identification with the rationale of the aggressor, and I am paraphrasing a well known Japanese politician, "It was a great opportunity for us to have a vacation, to get in touch with our culture, to get in the mainstream of American society. It was the best thing that could have happened to us."

I say, that is an identification with the aggressor.

Or one can interject the hostility, and experience guilt and shame, as, most of you know, victims of rape often do.

When I left Topaz to go out to Cleveland, I can remember the feeling that everybody knew that I had been found wanting; the feeling of utter nakedness, I will never forget, and that is why I can understand why some Japanese Americans have never shared this episode with their offspring. One does not share a shameful
experience very easily.

Or one can scapegoat, so we have some people who scapegoat the Japanese American Citizens League, for example, as if the United States Government and the Western Defense Command and the bigots and everybody else had nothing to do with the whole sorry mess.

I, in fact, scapegoated. It is a funny, crazy thing and you may think that I am kind of psychotic and neurotic at times, but this is what happened. I could not hate the United States, so I focused my non-interjected hate on California.

I got to dislike anybody from California. I disliked Japanese Americans who were moving back to California, because I figured they were betraying me and they were identifying with the aggressor.

I used other four letter words but I won't use them here.

In fact, it took me 15 years before I could visit the only relatives that I have simply because they lived in California.

Now, obviously, that has not persisted. With time, my anger has kind of diminished, but it still remains.
The fourth principle is the thing that saved me personally, and the principle is behind every anger there is often a tear. Now, the question came to me many times, how come I stay mad, how come it is insatiable? I would talk about it. I expressed the anger, but it is still there, how come?

Well, I learned some years ago an interesting thing. I learned that with the gentleman's agreement in 1924, the Issei had felt abandoned by the Japanese government. What they felt was a sense "sted ateta" which means to be cast aside.

Now, remember one of the most cohesive socialization threats, and I think many Issei's will remember this, was the threat of being away. If you are not good, we are going to give you away, because that practice was not very uncommon in the old culture.

It is a devastating threat. I finally realized that my country in 1942 had abandoned me, much as my father's country had abandoned him, but an infinitely more direct hostile way.

Now, when a child feels abandoned, he cries. Only later, this anger comes, but we did not cry in 1942.
I think this is why when Japanese Americans go on pilgrimages to the camps, they cry and cry and cry. We cry because of what we lost.

To paraphrase a statement made regarding the Iranian hostage situation, "Let no one be deceived. Some part of each of us will remain in those camps forever."

Principal Five, the consequences of psychological assault can be multi-generational. Studies have indicated that first and second generation offsprings of the holocaust survivors are being still affected by that experience, by the experience of their grandparents.

In the same way, I am convinced that the impact of my experience has been reflected in the way that I have reared my children and the way that I served as a role model and the way that I both consciously and unconsciously shaped my kids.

The pervasive fear, and I still have that, the fear that it might happen again has been transmitted to my progeny, for their question is, what will it take to make it happen again?

In probably more subtle ways, the guilt which results from the interjection of hostility is also trans-
mitted. The fact that Japanese Americans have not shown up in psychiatrists' offices in great numbers does not indicate an absence of pain. I think that it simply indicates or provides testimony to the tremendous strength of the Japanese American who refused to be victimized.

I am saying all of this not simply to make a statement nor to bare my soul, nor to bring my soul under psychological scrutiny.

I am saying this because I really want this country never again to abandon its children, never again to turn on its own, and that it be true to the principles which I thought and still think make it great.

I have a number of recommendations based upon what I think ought to be the underlying principle. I know there have been issues about, Japanese Americans may be fairly affluent, they don't need the money.

I would like to place the emphasis not so much on compensation but on deterrents and the only way that you are going to deter, there are a number of ways to do that, one way is to make it painful; make it expensive; so if you would ask me what I think the redress amount ought to be, I am saying that it ought to be big
enough to be painful.

It, if it is a reasonable payment, it ain't painful. If it is reasonably and not painful, then it is not a deterrent. I think that ought to be the principal thing.

I have a number of other things, but I think I have gone over my time, so you can read it in my recommendations.

Thank you,

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: Thank you very much.

Mr. Komatsu.

IKUO KOMATSU,

SHAKER HEIGHTS, OHIO

MR. KOMATSU: The first thing that I would like to say is that I think that I am on the wrong panel, especially after following Toaru.

CHAIRMAN BERNSTEIN: Would you like to change?

MR. KOMATSU: Yes, the one next month.

Members of the Committee, my name is Ikuo, Ikie, Komatsu.

I live in Shaker Heights, Ohio. I am vice president and chief engineer of a consumer products manu-