

International Symposium by Hiroshima Peace Institute

“Terror from the Sky: Indiscriminate Bombing from Hiroshima to Today”

By Yuki Tanaka

“Suddenly

There was a brilliant white-hot flash.
Buildings crumbled,
Fire blazed,
Smoke swirled all around,
Wires dangled everywhere,
And a writhing mass of humanity fled for safety”

This passage from a poem by Hiroshima A-bomb victim, Sadako Kurihara, graphically depicts the horror experienced not only by A-bomb victims, but by all who have suffered air raid attacks. There is little warning of such attacks beyond the sudden appearance of monstrous bombers overhead, emitting ferocious noises, or the sharp, ear-piercing sound of on-coming missiles. The reality of such attacks is all too often a litter of bodies blown to pieces by the blast. Yet, the attackers, hundreds of meters in the air above, have little sense of the horror down below. For the bombardiers and pilots the people on the ground are simply “abstract” targets. By contrast, the experience of their victims is “concrete” reality, reeking of death. This sharp juxtaposition of abstract and concrete within a distance of a few hundred meters is a phenomenon unique to aerial bombing.

The frequent use of aerial bombing in modern warfare surely owes something to the attackers’ complete inability to imagine the terrifying experiences of their victims.

The origin of aerial bombing can be traced to the application of hot-air balloons in warfare in the late 18th century. Initially air balloons were used simply to locate the size and position of enemy forces, but militarists soon realized their potential for dropping grenades and other harmful objects on enemy troops. However, the use of airplanes in the early 20th century led to a drastic change in war strategy. One result was the wide expansion of war zones; another was indiscriminate attacks on civilians.

The indiscriminate bombing of civilians was first conducted by German planes against Parisians in August 1914 — 11 years after the Wright brothers successfully flew the first aircraft in 1903. By the end of 1914, the Allies were also making serial air raids into German territories. Thus, by the time World War I ended in 1918, both sides had engaged in indiscriminate bombing, killing or injuring several thousand civilians.

Shortly after World War I, planes from the British Royal Air Force (RAF) were sent to the Middle East to engage in a new type of operation—the bombing of what an RAF document refers to as “rebels of uncivilized tribes” who refused to submit to British rule. Over several

years from 1920 onward, the RAF attacked rebel groups in Iraq—for which Britain was the trustee nation at the time — by dropping bombs, including incendiary bombs, on remote villages and tent encampments. The same technique of indiscriminate bombing was also used in other territories of the British Empire such as India and South Africa. Yet, the British administrators recommended this use of airpower as “outstandingly effective, extremely economical and undoubtedly humane in the long run.”

In the European theater of World War II, indiscriminate bombing—now termed “strategic bombing” — was increasingly used to terrorize civilians as the war intensified. Civilians in major cities were victimized as both the Axis and Allied sides engaged in such bombing, with mass slaughter as the result. The Germans suffered particularly heavy casualties. By the end of the war, 131 German towns and cities had been bombed, and approximately 600,000 German civilians killed by indiscriminate bombing conducted by British and U.S. forces.

In the Asia Pacific region, the Japanese Imperial Navy first engaged in indiscriminate bombing with a January 1932 attack on civilians in Shanghai during the so-called Shanghai Incident. Thereafter, civilians in cities such as Nanjing, Wuhan, and Chongqing were targeted. In 1940, after repeated Japanese aerial attacks on Chongqing, the U.S. government condemned Japan for these inhumane acts of terror.

Yet, a few years later, when Japan was losing the war in the Pacific, cities on the Japanese mainland became the targets of U.S. air raids. The U.S. engaged in “saturation bombing” in a literal sense until the very end of the war in August 1945, repeatedly attacking cities from Hokkaido to Okinawa, including Tokyo, Kawasaki, Osaka, Kobe, Fukuoka and Naha. In total 64 major cities were destroyed, causing over one million casualties, including half a million deaths, the majority of whom were civilians. Indiscriminate bombing reached its peak, however, with the use of atomic weapons to annihilate Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. Following Japan’s surrender, the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey stated that “the air attack on Japan was directed against the nation as a whole, not only against specific military targets,” thus unashamedly admitting the indiscriminate attacks on civilians by the U.S. Army Air Force.

In the Korean War, U.S. forces bombed and destroyed two large irrigation dams, causing enormous flood damage in North Korea. As a result, North Korea’s agricultural economy was ruined. In the Vietnam War, in addition to a new type of napalm bomb, cluster bombs (with a high failure rate), daisy-cutter bombs (so-called earthquake bombs), and agent orange (a type of chemical defoliant) were widely used. This new bombing strategy with its new types of bombs resulted in long-term damage to the environment and the people, bringing suffering and death to countless civilians well after the actual bombing.

Due to the widespread use of depleted uranium weapons since the Gulf War and the increasing possibility that tactical nuclear arms may be used, as well as the availability of super-large bombs like daisy-cutter bombs and mother bombs, the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons is rapidly disappearing. The number of countries seeking to equip themselves with weapons of mass destruction is increasing as nuclear powers like the U.S. and Britain attempt to subjugate so-called “rogue nations” by the use of military might. Why have we been incapable of preventing this situation, despite the enormous sacrifice of civilian victims to bombing—including those of Hiroshima and Nagasaki— during the last century?

The purpose of our symposium on August 2 was to re-examine the history and the present situation of indiscriminate bombing through the eyes of the A-bomb victims of Hiroshima.

Tanaka is professor at HPI

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| International Symposium Held by Hiroshima Peace Institute | |
| “Terror from the Sky: Indiscriminate Bombing from Hiroshima to Today” | 1~3 |
| Perspectives of Accountability after the U.S.-U.K. Invasion of Iraq by Christian P. Scherrer | 4 |
| New Lecture Series Started at Hiroshima City University: | |
| “Peace Studies I & II” Taught by HPI Staff | 5 |
| Public Meeting | |
| HPI Research Project on Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism | 5 |
| Research Project | |
| Military Violence against Civilians—A Comparative and Historical Analysis | 6 |
| Comparative Research into Genocide and Mass Violence | 6 |
| Confidence-Building Mechanism in East Asia | 7 |
| HPI Research Forum | |
| The Bush Doctrine of Preventive War by Jacques Hymans | 7 |
| Hello from HPI | 8 |
| Diary | 8 |



Indiscriminate Bombing in World War II: Prologue to a Counterfactual Study

Ronald Schaffer is professor emeritus of history at California State University, Northridge. He has a Ph.D. from Princeton University and specializes in the history of strategic bombing.

This presentation sought to identify ways in which the very large number of civilian casualties generated by strategic bombing in the Second World War might have been reduced. It described the origins of strategic bombing theory and its salient ideas, among them the notions that bombing could secure victory by destroying an enemy’s economic infrastructure, that attacks from the air could break an enemy’s will to resist and cause its people to rise up against its government, and that the use of air power against an enemy society would reduce one’s military casualties, providing a desirable trade-off between the lives of enemy civilians and those of one’s own armed forces.

Theorists and practitioners of aerial bombing argued that, by ending wars quickly and efficiently, the bomber would actually prove to be a humane weapon.

At first, the British, the Americans, and the Germans attempted to employ their bombers against what they considered to be essentially military and industrial targets, but all eventually turned to attacking areas inhabited by civilians. Under actual combat conditions, it proved difficult to hit targets with precision and extremely costly to their own forces. All then turned to night attacks, guided by imprecise navigation and aiming systems. They also increasingly employed incendiary weapons, sometimes producing enormous conflagrations. Even when improved methods of locating targets evolved, along with long-range fighter escort to protect them from enemy defenders, the British continued to deliver massive area attacks, and the Americans inflicted very large civilian casualties in raids aimed at military targets within cities.

The American aerial bombing strategy for the war in the Pacific had from the beginning contemplated the incineration of Japanese cities. American military and civilian experts planned incendiary and atomic offensives against those cities so meticulously that it is misleading to describe the bombing that burned down almost all of Japan’s largest urban areas or obliterated them with nuclear weapons as “indiscriminate.”

To indicate possible ways by which the slaughter of civilians might have been diminished, this presentation noted elements of irrationality and emotionalism in the thinking of those who organized the bombing attacks and also ways in which some of the bombing proved counter-productive. It suggested that some loss of civilian lives might have been averted by reversing the trade-off of civilian for military lives implicit in strategic bombing theory (for instance by an increased amount of low-level precision bombing of Japan). The presentation discussed whether or not the practice of bombing in World War II vindicated the prewar theory. It also discussed the proposals for demonstrating the power of the atomic bomb in much less deadly ways. It concluded that strategic bombing failed to bring about an uprising of civilians against their leaders in Europe, but that it may have led Japan’s rulers to feel that such an uprising was possible, thus contributing, along with the entry of the Soviet Union into the Asian war and the imminent threat of an American invasion, to Japan’s decision to surrender.



Sending a Message: the Language of Air Power in Korea and Vietnam

Marilyn Young is professor of history at New York University and director at International Center for Advanced Studies Project on the Cold War as Global Conflict. She earned her Ph.D. at Harvard University and specializes in the Vietnam War.

World War II ended with the biggest bang then possible, administered in what was believed to be a righteous cause, the defeat of Japan. It was the logical conclusion to total war. Then and since, to many in the armed forces, particularly the air force, anything short of the massive use of available force to attain American ends is immoral. Totally secure in the air, able to attack any enemy at will, Air Force generals like Ira Eaker and Curtis LeMay felt a sense of irresistible power. Limited war was an oxymoron. The only problem the advocates of unbridled air power foresaw was the timorousness of a civilian leadership unwilling to use its weapons.

In my paper I explore the ways in which the definition of limited war fought with limited means was, in Korea and in Vietnam, slowly but certainly transformed into total war fought all-out—though short of using nuclear weapons. Starting with Korea and undergoing sophisticated development in Vietnam, air power was understood as a special language addressed to the enemy and to all those who might in the future become the



Inauguration of Indiscriminate Bombing in Asia: Bombing of Chongqing, China, by the Japanese Air Force

Tetsuo Maeda is professor at Tokyo International University. He specializes in military affairs with an emphasis on nuclear weapons.

To my mind, the essence and significance of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima may be summarized as follows:

1. It was an attack targeting a city as such, thus amounting in its degree of inhumanity and cruelty to indiscriminate massacre on a massive scale.
2. It was a mechanical and insensible act in which the murderer did not see the murdered, thus totally devoid of a sense of personal involvement.
3. It represented a combination of the strategy of “terror from the sky” and the 20th-century technology that made that strategy possible, i.e., the marriage of nuclear power and the bomber.

It is for reasons to do with these characteristics that Hiroshima must continue to be talked about and remembered. Furthermore, the fact that the world still remains prisoner to the same kind of threat calls for the universalization of the Hiroshima experience, which should be recalled as an event that could happen again any time just as it once happened. “Hiroshima” is not a tragedy of bygone days. Its ideology continues to haunt mankind in the guise of “strategy of deterrence” and “regional war,” as brought home to peoples around the world from Hanoi to Baghdad.

In order to universalize the significance of “Hiroshima” in the context of these experiences, we must look back to the time before Hiroshima and study the lead-up to Hiroshima. For we can know neither who we are nor where we are going without knowing where we have come from.

My interest in the bombing of Chongqing by the Japanese air force derives from the sense of a problem as sketched above.

Within just a few years of 1938, Japan introduced three new elements into the history of warfare:

1. The politico-military bombing, i.e., massive indiscriminate bombing, of Chongqing in Sichuan Province, then the provisional capital of China.
2. The surprise attack on Pearl Harbor in Hawaii, or the projection of power from the sea to land, launched at the outset of the Japanese-American war.
3. The “special attacks,” i.e., suicide bombing, which in effect turned an airplane into a manned missile and which reached its peak during the Battle of Okinawa.

These “firsts” in the wars of the 20th century, which shared the common characteristic of sudden horror falling from the sky, were all witnessed in the Japanese operations in the Asia-Pacific War. Was not what happened to Hiroshima and Nagasaki nothing but the ultimate form of this new type of violence? Are not both 9/11 and the Iraq War events occurring on the same trajectory?

The bombing of Chongqing lasted for two and a half years and killed 11,885 people in a sequence of 218 air raids, which targeted the city itself, relied on air power alone, and aimed to break the citizens’ will to continue to fight. Little is yet known of what actually happened, however. It is another role of Hiroshima, I believe, to help prevent what happened there from sinking into oblivion.

enemy. It was, at the same time, a language intended to reassure America’s allies. And it was a language that incorporated one very crucial silence: behind all the bombs dropped was the sound of the one that *could* drop but had not... yet.

What was it about bombing that made it so attractive to U.S. policy makers as a mode of communication? The answer begins with a fallacy: WWII ended in a blaze of bombing, *ergo*, bombing ended WWII. Although air power had never fulfilled the promises of its prophets, after WWII the value of strategic bombing was accepted as an article of faith. There were some that doubted the efficacy of strategic bombing for limited warfare, arguing that the goal of such warfare was not the total destruction of the enemy but rather the pursuit of peace through “air persuasion.” Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, with the experience of the Cuban missile crisis behind him, developed this idea, convinced, as H.R. McMaster has written, that “the aim of force was not to impose one’s will on the enemy but to communicate with him. Gradually intensifying military action would convey American resolve and thereby convince an adversary to alter his behavior.” By 1971, it would be difficult to see the difference between total war and the limited war the U.S. claimed to be waging in Indochina: from 1965 to 1971, the U.S. dropped on Indochina three times the total tonnage dropped on Europe, Africa and Asia during WWII.



Hiroshima: Culmination of Strategic Bombing, Beginning of the Threat of Nuclear Omnicide

Eric Markusen is research director at the Danish Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies and professor at Southwest State University. He received his Ph.D. from University of Minnesota and specializes in genocide studies.

This presentation was based on a paper, co-authored with Matthias Bjørnlund, in which we demonstrate that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, while rightfully regarded as a milestone in the history of inhumanity, was at the same time the result of thinking and practices that began years before August 6, 1945, namely, the incendiary bombing of enemy cities. It was also an important point of departure for American nuclear weapons policy at the beginning of the Cold War.

As the final speaker, I had the opportunity of hearing the presentations made by Professors Tanaka, Schaffer, Maeda, and Young, as well as the ensuing discussion. With that in mind, I focused my comments on several points raised in our paper. I noted that Great Britain and the United States

both began World War II with a moral repudiation of bombing cities, but in the course of the war they conducted it at levels far exceeding the Nazis. A key point, echoing Professor Schaffer’s presentation, was the meticulous planning that guided American incendiary and atomic bombing of Japanese cities. In March 1945, such planning resulted in a raid against Tokyo that killed more than 70,000 people in six hours.

By August 1945, the political and military leaders responsible for incendiary attacks embraced the new atomic bombs. Following Japan’s surrender, some of the airmen who had been systematically burning the cities of Japan, e.g., Air Force General Curtis LeMay, played decisive roles in developing U.S. plans to wage nuclear war.

As hydrogen bombs were integrated into the United States and Soviet arsenals, nuclear war plans entailed ever greater levels of destruction. The concept of “nuclear omnicide” was introduced by the philosopher John Sommerville in 1985 in order to convey the likelihood that a “war” fought with nuclear weapons would constitute a categorically new dimension of mass killing, even more destructive and evil than genocide. The American nuclear war plan for 1961 anticipated killing as many as 425 million people in Communist nations, as well as millions downwind from radioactive fallout. In 1962, when the United States discovered that the Soviet Union had managed to sneak nuclear-armed missiles into Cuba, the so-called “Cuban Missile Crisis” brought the world to the brink of actual nuclear war.

The end of the Cold War has not ended the nuclear threat. On the contrary, I mentioned disturbing developments in American nuclear weapons policy following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001: the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan; and the risk of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists and brutal undemocratic regimes.

Despite the depressing accounts of terror from the sky given by the other presenters, and notwithstanding the terrible present dangers mentioned above, I tried to end on a note of hope by briefly surveying several promising international developments: increasing education and research into war and peace, as exemplified by work under way at the Hiroshima Peace Institute; a world-wide surge of concern about genocide; and advances in international law and justice, including the recently-established International Criminal Court.



Summing Up

When we examine the history of wars, we see that no other organizations have committed as much injustice—not only against foreigners, but against their own citizens—as nation-states. As far as genocide and mass killing are concerned, state governments generally carry the greatest responsibility for such crimes against humanity.

Yuki Tanaka is professor at the Hiroshima Peace Institute of Hiroshima City University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Western Australia. He specializes in comparative analysis of Japanese war crimes during World War II.

When nation-states were engaged in total wars such as World War I and II, it was always state governments that perpetrated the most serious crimes against non-combatants, i.e., civilians. This is evident not only from the genocide committed by the German Nazi government against Jews and other socio-ethnic minority groups, or the numerous massacres committed by the armed forces of Imperial Japan against whites as well as Asians. It is also instanced by the thousands of civilians killed by aerial bombardment by the Allied forces in Europe and the Asia Pacific region, and in particular by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

State violence against civilians, in other words, state terrorism, has been repeatedly committed since World War II, in the Korean and Vietnam Wars, the Gulf War, and the conflicts in Bosnia and Kosovo. In more recent aerial attacks conducted by the U.S. and British forces in Afghanistan and Iraq, many civilians were again killed or injured as a result of the bombing of “wrongly identified targets” by “incorrectly programmed smart bombs,” or as “collateral damage.” No matter what military jargon is used to justify attacking civilians, it is clearly indiscriminate bombing in the eyes of the victims. Such bombing also creates huge numbers of refugees, as seen in Afghanistan where thousands of people fled their homes shortly before the onset of U.S. bombing. Eventually about one million Afghan people ended up in refugee camps. Clearly, such aerial bombing, which inflicts enormous hardship on vast numbers of civilians, is nothing short of state terrorism.

“The September 11 Attack” was unquestionably an act of terrorism as it killed thousands of civilians indiscriminately. This act, perpetrated by an al-Qaeda group can be seen as a variation on indiscriminate bombing where civilian planes are used instead of bombers to complete the suicidal mission. One can be certain that al-Qaeda would have used bombers if that had been an option. Whether indiscriminate bombing is carried out by an armed group or by the military forces of a particular nation, it is clearly an act of terrorism from the viewpoint of the civilians who become its targets. Thus it is necessary to re-examine the history of indiscriminate bombing from the viewpoint of its victims to understand its real nature. For this, we need to re-experience, by using our imagination, the terror that the victims went through as well as critically analyze the mentality of the perpetrators.

Comments by Some Participants

Participant A

Looking at aerial bombing from the legal point of view, an important question is on what grounds the policy makers and those who implemented their decisions justified the bombing. Rules banning the bombing of civilians were established in the wake of World War I. So, the question is how the aerial bombing conducted by many states since then has been justified. For example, the Iraq War is seen and justified as a war against terrorism following the September 11 attacks. But can the aerial bombing conducted as part of the war be acceptable and justifiable? If we accept the war against terrorism as a just war, it might become possible to justify even the use of nuclear arms.

Bombing conducted by a state, especially bombing of civilians, raises the problem of state terrorism, which must be considered in the context of the Hague Rules of Air Warfare forbidding bombing as a means to terrorize civilians.

Participant B

As an atomic bomb survivor (Hibakusha), I remembered the horror of 58 years ago while listening to your presentations and was deeply inspired. From a survivor’s viewpoint, nuclear weapons not only kill people, but also destroy humanity, sully man’s history, and blaspheme God. The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki should be tried as a crime against humanity, but it has not been even as we have entered the 21st century. It is the United States, which preaches humanitarianism to the rest of the world, that should be tried first. Only then, will we be able to begin building solid foundations of global order and peace. In reality, however, the United States continues to seek to perpetuate its hegemonic rule by blackmailing the world with nuclear arms in defiance of the wish of the whole world to abolish nuclear weapons. Japan must repeal the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty and get rid of all U.S. military bases on Japanese soil. I believe that only when these goals have been attained, the victims of the atomic bombing may finally rest in peace.

Perspectives of Accountability after the U.S.-U.K. Invasion of Iraq

By *Christian P. Scherrer*

The invasion of Iraq was only the endpoint of a long and intensive campaign of aerial warfare against 22 million Iraqis in Mesopotamia—once the cradle of civilization. When exploring crimes committed against Iraq the time-scale is important. It was from mid-January to March 1991 when the U.S.A., U.K. and other states first began to attack and systematically destroy life and life-support systems in Iraq. Since that time U.S.-U.K. aircraft and missiles continued to attack targets in two arbitrarily declared no-flight-zones.

Most Serious Breaches of Law

The aggressors used cruel weapons such as deadly uranium (DU) munitions. Probably as much as 2,000 tons were employed, leaving behind highly toxic contamination of extensive areas, especially heavily populated city areas. DU remains a threat to health and life for billions of years unless the radioactive materials are quickly collected and destroyed. (For a study that presents preliminary evidence of the most egregious crimes committed in Iraq, see <http://firstpeoplescentury.net/accounta.pdf>). If such serious war crimes were to be overlooked without any form of accountability, then the legal and moral order of the international community would be undermined.

The Occupiers Failed to Establish Any Degree of Security

The U.S. has opened a Pandora's box, and it might harvest utter anarchy in Iraq and instability in the entire Middle Eastern region and beyond, as well as generating increasingly hostile responses throughout the world. Bush's premature "victory" declaration on May 1 was followed by a low-intensity war. The occupiers were unable to establish any degree of security. Indeed, the aggression against Iraq has given a great boost to international terrorism, and irregulars and terrorists started to infiltrate into Iraq, making it a lawless country.

Targeted strikes against U.S.-U.K. occupation forces have killed dozens of soldiers. Since August, deadly bomb blasts have been directed against other targets as well. The massive bomb attack on the U.N. compound in Baghdad on August 19 killed 20 people, among them the U.N. Special Representative for Iraq. It was an assault on an institution that came to help to establish a post-war order. The bombing in the holy city of Najaf, which killed more than 100 people, aimed at a Shiite cleric considered by extremists as a collaborator.

Backlash of Lies and Pretexts for War

Slowly but surely the deceptions and lies of the war leaders have come to light. The U.S. and U.K. governments maintained that Saddam Hussein possessed what U.N. inspectors did not find, yet what the U.S. and U.K. continue to stockpile and used to achieve Iraq's defeat: weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Evidence of Iraq's possession of WMD was simply fabricated or grossly exaggerated. Tony Blair got into trouble and fired Alastair Campbell, his director of communications and strategy, as controversy raged over his own role in misrepresenting the nature of Iraq's threat to the West.

The U.S. media portrayed Saddam as the incarnation of evil, and subsequently made him a scapegoat for 9-11, though meanwhile many U.S. citizens became aware that this was an outright lie from the mouth of their president. (*Read my lips*). Operational links with al-Qaeda were excluded because of their ideological and political incompatibility—as assessed by the CIA. However, public outrage was modest. Americans seem to have shorter memories than the British, but they are now reacting against the high costs of the Iraq campaign.

The World Peace Movements Call for Accountability

The most striking phenomenon that occurred during the run-up to the attack on Iraq was the emergence of a strong peace movement. No other war of aggression in modern times has been so close to universally condemned. Millions of people gathered to protest in Washington, Tokyo, Berlin, Tehran, Paris, Sao Paulo, New York, Cairo, Buenos Aires, London, Barcelona, Gaza, Beijing, Frankfurt, Boston, Brussels, Manama, Jakarta, Seoul, Torrejon, Athens, Canberra, and other cities.

Bush became a "global monster" for outraged citizens worldwide. Never in the history of the peace movement has there been such a worldwide mobilization, not even against the Vietnam War or the nuclear arms race.

The protests also brought about an increasing intertwining of anti-war movements with social justice and anti-globalization movements. Projects such as the People's Tribunal on Iraq, the campaigns against U.S. bases and for the upcoming World Social Forum, the "World Says 'No' to Bush" campaign in the coming 2004 U.S. elections, etc., show the strength of popular movements on a global scale.

Among these projects, one to indict the warmongers in a legitimate way by independent people's tribunals is developing rapidly. It aims at preventing further wars of aggression, genocide, and the use of radiological weapons, and its popularity is growing fast.

The Hands of Mr. Ocampo Are Tied

The International Criminal Court (ICC) was established fairly recently. The Court's first Chief Prosecutor, Luis Moreno-Ocampo, elected in April 2003, must not close his eyes to crimes against humanity, war crimes, breaches of world peace, and violations of a long list of international agreements and norms committed in Iraq. However, in the case of Iraq the legal base of the ICC is narrow. Ocampo stated in a recent interview that "war crimes, crimes against humanity or genocide must have been committed either on the territory of a State Party to the Rome Statute or by a national of a State Party for the ICC to have jurisdiction" (*MoveOn Bulletin*, August 2003, <http://www.moveon.org/>).

ICC does not have universal jurisdiction, as Belgium had until recently. Currently 91 states are parties to the ICC statute; the problem is that neither Iraq nor the U.S.A. is among them. Ocampo's hands are tied. He has already received hundreds of complaints about members of the U.S.-led force in Iraq. In the case of British members of that force, the court could act, but only after determining that the national authorities concerned were unwilling or unable to investigate.

It is intolerable that Blair, Hoon, and others could be indicted, while Bush, Rumsfeld et al would go free. This is one of the many reasons why rights groups and legal experts decided to take action, culminating in an international campaign by attorneys and no-war groups in five countries to have Bush and Blair indicted for crimes against humanity.

Initiatives for People's Tribunals on Iraq

The International People's Tribunal on Iraq was first proposed by Action to Indict Bush-Blair et al based in Japan in March 2003 and the Turkish International Tribunal Initiative. The project was endorsed during the Jakarta peace conference and the Brussels conference of no-war groups and NGOs from Europe and the Middle East in the summer of 2003. The initiator committee, formed in Brussels, subsequently earned support of the Bertrand Russell Foundation. It has since gained the support and cooperation of thousands of individuals, dozens of anti-war movements, and 200 or so organizations in five countries.

The current plans are to hold tribunal sessions and hearings in New York and other cities in the U.S.A., London, Brussels, Hiroshima, Tokyo and other cities in Japan, Istanbul, Heidelberg and other cities in Germany, Copenhagen, Buenos Aires and Monterrey, Mexico, culminating in the final session in a major Arab city.

The Hiroshima tribunal will deal mainly with two issues: the uranium weapons used in Iraq since 1991 and their impact on the Iraqi people and future generations; and the genocidal use of the U.N. sanctions by the U.S. and the U.K. in the 1990-2003 period, which killed an estimated two million people, mainly babies, children and women. The World Uranium Weapons Conference held in October 2003 in Hamburg, Germany, pledged moral and technical support of the proposed international tribunal in general and the Hiroshima tribunal in particular.

Scherrer is professor at HPI

New Lecture Series Started at Hiroshima City University “Peace Studies I & II” Taught by HPI Staff

A new two-semester course titled “Peace Studies I” and “Peace Studies II” taught by all HPI researchers was introduced in the Faculty of International Studies, Hiroshima City University (HCU), in the spring semester of this year. The course aims to teach a variety of peace-related contemporary international issues. At HCU, members of the HPI staff had taught a similar course titled “Contemporary International Peace Studies I & II” from 1999 to 2002. The new course deals with a broader range of issues more comprehensively by involving all the HPI research staff, including President Haruhiro Fukui. Peace Studies I offered in the 2003 spring semester was successfully concluded with the enrollment of approximately 80 students. A member of the faculty assisted the students with, among other things, a new homepage created especially for the course on the university website.

Peace Studies I is designed to teach the basic concepts, framework, and issues of peace studies. Peace Studies II is an extension of Peace Studies I and deals with specific cases of peace-making and conflict resolution based on the HPI researchers’ own work as well as the results of HPI-sponsored research projects.

Peace Studies I in the spring semester of 2003 covered issues such as the basic concepts of peace studies, military conflicts in the contemporary world, ethnic conflicts and genocides in the modern world, war crimes, violence by the military, and disarmament-related problems in the post-World War II period. In addition, more current issues such as the structure of post-Cold War international politics, conflict prevention, human security, and pacifism in Japan were examined.

The issues expected to be covered in Peace Studies II in the fall semester of 2003 include: structural violence and globalization, security structure and confidence-building in Northeast Asia, war responsibility and war crimes, military conflict and genocide, the new U.S. nuclear strategy, state terrorism and indiscriminate bombing, changing U.S. strategy after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, control of information related to the

dropping of the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, etc. The fall semester started with the enrollment of approximately 50 students.

Peace Studies I & II is an elective course primarily for second-year undergraduate students. The teaching staff comprises all the current nine HPI researchers, including the two foreign staff members.

During the 2003 spring semester, a summary of each lecture given by the foreign staff in English was available on the homepage in English and Japanese one week before the lecture date. In the final examination, both Japanese and English questions were given to be answered also in Japanese and English. The final examination of Peace Studies II will be conducted in the same manner.

Intensive Summer Course “Hiroshima and Peace”

HPI research staff members also joined the faculty of the Intensive Summer Course “Hiroshima and Peace” at HCU from July 27 to August 7, 2003. The course was the first intensive summer program offered by HCU and conducted in English for both international and Japanese undergraduate students. Approximately 30 students, including a dozen from the University of Hawaii, Manoa — one of HCU’s sister schools—took the course.

In this summer program, five HPI scholars gave lectures, as follows: Fukui on “War and Peace in the Post-World War II World”; Tanaka on “The Pacific War: Atrocities and War Crimes”; Scherrer on “International Terrorism: Causes, ‘War on Terrorism’ and Arms Race, and the Context of Contemporary Mass Violence”; Huntley on “U.S. Security Policies in Northeast Asia,”; and Mizumoto on “Experience of Atomic Bombing in Hiroshima and Japan’s Nuclear-Related Policies.” The students also had a chance to learn about Hiroshima and Peace by visiting Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park and the Peace Memorial Museum.

By Kazumi Mizumoto, associate professor at HPI

HPI Research Project

Public Meeting on “HPI Research Project on Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism”

HPI’s research project, “The Legitimacy and Rationality of New-interventionism,” held a public meeting to report on the outcome of the project at the Hiroshima City Plaza for Town Development through Citizen Exchange on June 13. The project completed its activities by publishing a book titled “Jindo Kiki to Kokusai Kainyu” (Humanitarian Crisis and International Intervention) in February 2003. The aim of this meeting was to share the outcome of the project and exchange opinions about it with citizens of Hiroshima. The meeting invited three members of the project as speakers: Toshiya Hoshino, professor of Osaka University and the leader of the project; Yukie Osa, Secretary General of the Association for Aid and Relief, Japan (AAR); and Hideaki Shinoda, research fellow at Hiroshima University. It was attended by approximately 40 people, and there was a lively discussion.

Hoshino reported on the research undertaken by project participants, their main findings, and the significance of those findings in the study of contemporary international politics. Osa spoke about how civil society was, and should have been, involved in humanitarian crises such as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Shinoda argued, citing concrete examples, the legitimacy of intervention by international society in humanitarian crises and discussed whether and how such intervention might be institutionalized as a norm of international society. Following these three presentations, Mizumoto and Akiyama, project members from HPI, joined them in a panel discussion with the participation of the audience.

Prior to the meeting, there was some concern that its topic might be too theoretical and that purely conceptual discussions might dominate it. However, the meeting taking place amidst an international crisis brought about by the U.S. attack on Iraq, discussion became heated over such



issues as the legal, political, and ethical justifications for foreign intervention and the implications of “imperialistic” U.S. diplomatic posture for the formation of future international social norms. Considerable interest was also shown in a number of other issues, such as the importance of civil society, NGOs in particular, and the difficulty of effectively providing humanitarian assistance.

The meeting served as a forum for fruitful interaction between HPI and citizens of Hiroshima.

By Nobumasa Akiyama, assistant professor at HPI

Military Violence against Civilians — A Comparative and Historical Analysis

It is widely known that the Japanese Imperial Armed Forces committed various war crimes throughout the Asia Pacific region during the so-called “15 Years War” between the Manchurian Incident in September 1931 and the end of World War II in the Pacific in August 1945. In the last few decades, major war crimes committed by the Japanese—for example, the medical experiments conducted on prisoners by Unit 731, the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in actual combat, the ill-treatment and massacre of prisoners of war (POWs), and the sexual exploitation of Asian women as “comfort women”—have been revealed and studied. However, most of these studies are simply historical accounts of the crimes and scarcely address the fundamental question of why Japanese troops were capable of committing such crimes against humanity. Furthermore, there is a general assumption that Japanese troops before 1931 were well disciplined and their conduct relatively humane, but that a major change in their behavior occurred shortly after the outbreak of World War I, due to the inculcation of a strong nationalism based upon the emperor ideology. However, this assumption contradicts what actually happened in modern Japanese history.

Indeed, Japanese troops were brutal in their conduct even before the first major war involving Japan as a modern state after the Meiji Restoration of 1868. This was the first Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895. During the peasant upheaval (the so-called Tonghak Revolt) in Korea shortly before this war, Japanese troops killed tens of thousands of Korean peasants to crush this peasant movement. In the Sino-Japanese War itself, Japanese soldiers massacred several thousand civilians in Port Arthur in November 1894. Within five months from late May 1895, Japanese Imperial troops also killed well over 15,000 Formosan guerrilla fighters and civilians in order to colonize Taiwan.

It is therefore necessary to re-examine the Japanese military violence from new perspectives to comprehend its distinctive elements and to understand what caused Japanese troops to commit such atrocities from the very beginning of their operations overseas. Yet it is also

important to view these atrocities in a comparative perspective to avoid assuming that they were somehow “peculiar” or “unique.” Rather, it is essential, by documenting and analyzing the historical roots of Japanese war crimes, to illuminate the specific dynamics of modern Japanese culture and society but within the context of a broader analysis of the universal problem of war crimes. By adopting a comparative approach, this project will thus seek to understand Japanese war-time atrocities, not in popular mythical terms of abiding “cultural” legacies, such as “Japanese uniqueness,” but in precise historical, political, and socio-psychological terms. Thus, in the end, the project addresses the fundamental question of how wars dehumanize and brutalize both men and women.

For this purpose, the project adopts the following two aims as its major objectives:

1) To analyze several major cases of massacres and atrocities committed by the Japanese Imperial troops against non-Japanese civilians, and to compare them with similar cases committed in other places at different times by troops of other nationalities.

2) Through such comparative analysis, to determine whether or not the Japanese military atrocities have any distinctive characteristics and also to explore the fundamental elements of military atrocities in general.

Toward these ends, a team of 10 Japanese scholars is currently conducting case studies of several major war crimes committed by the Japanese Imperial forces against civilians between 1894 and 1945. After completing this task, we plan to conduct a comparative study of the Japanese cases and those committed by the military forces of other nations, such as the U.S.

By Yuki Tanaka, professor at HPI

Comparative Research into Genocide and Mass Violence

The twin aims of HPI’s comparative genocide project are ambitious: first, to compare the four total genocides of the 20th century and several other large-scale cases of contemporary genocide and mass murder and, second, to explore a number of critical issues related to those cases, with a view to establishing criteria of comparison and identifying common elements, patterns, and possible remedies. As part of this new project, an international workshop was held in Hiroshima in March this year and another is planned for winter/spring 2004.

Documenting genocide in the modern age is a most delicate and sensitive matter. The 10 participants of the first workshop are documenting modern cases of genocide and mass murder, aware that they are dealing with one of the most important and abhorrent themes of our times. The participants include some of the most prominent scholars in the field. The founder of comparative genocide research, Prof. Vahakn Dadrian (Armenia, U.S.A.), made a masterpiece presentation in comparative research that focused on the Armenian genocide of the 1920s, the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide. The editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Genocide Research*, Prof. Henry Huttenbach (U.S.A.), spoke about perspectives for preventing genocide. Prof. Yuki Tanaka (Japan) offered a revealing account of Japanese crimes against humanity, which focused chiefly on the question of “comfort women.” Beate Ziegls (Germany) explored the contribution made by the father of the genocide convention, Raphael Lemkin, an international lawyer and one of the first genocide scholars. Faustin Kagame (Rwanda, Switzerland) discussed the role of the media in the Rwandan genocide. Prof. Geoffrey Gunn (Japan) presented research on the genocide in East Timor. Patrick Burgess addressed the genocide in East Timor and talked about his work on the Commission for Reception, Truth and Reconciliation in East Timor. Galuh Wandita spoke about the Indonesian genocide of the mid-1960s,

and my own contribution was a comparison of the Rwandan genocide with other total genocides. An additional topic, the reactivation of the Elmau Initiative to Stop Genocide, was discussed on the last day. The participants of the session chaired by Prof. Huttenbach made a number of thoughtful, creative, and constructive proposals about this initiative. In general the workshop was a successful start to a project dealing with an extremely important subject.

The second workshop, to be held at a place yet to be chosen, will discuss studies on a number of other cases and issues. Scholars such as Charny, Cribb, Gunn, Jones, Tatz, and Tanaka are invited to make presentations. A third workshop will concentrate on synthesizing findings and possible remedies. The outcome of the project will be an edited volume, which will be submitted to leading publishing houses for publication in both English and Japanese.

The relevance of this project cannot be underestimated. Unfortunately, genocide is not a thing of the past. Gross human rights violations, atrocities and, in some cases, outright genocide continue to cause havoc in different parts of the world and force whole populations to live in fear and trauma. Violence not only kills but also limits life’s possibilities for those who survive it.

There are, however, some small signs of hope. The latest case, the mass murder in the Eastern Congo, is now being addressed by ICC prosecutor Ocampo, and the U.N. Security Council has sent in peace enforcement troops under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter. The world seems finally to be ready to put a stop to a long and dreadful history of genocide and mass murder.

By Christian P. Scherrer, professor at HPI

HPI Research Forum

May 22, 2003



Title: **The Bush Doctrine of Preventive War: A Case of Foreign Policy Jujitsu**

Speaker: Dr. Jacques Hymans, Assistant Professor of Government at Smith College

Dr. Hymans' presentation addressed a vital topic in today's world: the Bush administration's *National Security Strategy* and its doctrine of "preventive war." Hymans focused on how the administration has successfully implemented a radical shift in U.S. strategic policy by appropriating certain security perceptions and beliefs of the administration's opponents to legitimize that policy shift.

Hymans presented the five basic tenets of the threat perception portrayed by the Bush administration's new *Strategy*:

- * Proliferation as a major and growing national security problem
- * Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, as well as long-range missile technology, lumped together as "weapons of mass destruction" (WMD)
- * The adversary as a set of "rogue states"
- * Increasing skepticism about the future effectiveness of "nonproliferation" diplomacy
- * Increasingly radical doubts about the wisdom of the traditional reliance on "deterrence"

Hymans argued that the Bush administration obtained a quick and wide consensus among Washington elites on this threat articulation because the administration astutely depicted it in terms its critics were already predisposed to hear. Hymans stated that "the absence of significant debate about the nature of the threat neither reflects 'obvious' world realities, nor is it a 'natural' reaction to the events of September 11." Rather, the *National Security Strategy's* mainstream critics have endorsed its threat assessment because, in fact, "they had already independently arrived at the same conclusions."

Hymans explained that none of these tenets is particularly controversial among Washington opinion leaders because each tenet has deep roots in the

thinking of Democratic politicians, arms control advocates, and even some progressive activists. Many individuals in this "loyal opposition" have long argued, for example, that proliferation is a major concern and that long-term reliance on traditional deterrence is untenable. Hence, these individuals could hardly complain when the Bush administration adopted such positions.

Of course, sharing threat perceptions and agreeing on policy prescriptions are very different things. As Hymans noted, the "loyal opposition" generally has *not* accepted the Bush administration's conclusion that a strategy of preventive war is the necessary policy solution to the problems flowing from this threat perception. However, the Bush administration's usurpation of threat perceptions already shared by the "loyal opposition" has limited that opposition's latitude to critique the administration's policy choices. Hymans attributed the "timidity" of the "loyal opposition" not to post-September 11 reticence to challenge a popular president, but to its difficulty in developing different policy prescriptions sharing essentially the same set of threat perceptions.

This final point stimulated a lively discussion following Hymans' presentation. Hymans observed that the Bush administration's claim—that a strategy of preventive war necessarily follows from its threat assessment—is "not entirely baseless," noting that some "arms controllers" have embraced counterproliferation and preventive action strategies. However, he also observed that many arms control advocates and most progressive activists have never supported such policies. Picking up on this, the forum's discussant pointed out that decades-long opposition by arms control and nonproliferation activists to the general thrust of U.S. nuclear weapons policies and global strategies—promulgated by Democratic and Republican administrations alike—has left a powerful legacy of policy prescriptions fundamentally distinct from those the Bush administration has now made the centerpiece of U.S. global strategy. Forum participants discussed how a sturdy link between concerns over proliferation and non-offensive policy strategies already exists, and what it would take for the U.S. "loyal opposition" to embrace such an alternative.

Understanding why a stronger opposition to the Bush administration's global strategies has not yet emerged is a vital prerequisite to successfully generating politically meaningful articulation of an alternative approach. Dr. Hymans' thought-provoking and educational presentation was a positive contribution toward this goal.

By Wade L. Huntley, associate professor at HPI

HPI Research Project

The Second Research Workshop on "Confidence-Building Mechanism in East Asia"

On May 23 and 24, the second workshop for the "Confidence-Building Mechanism in East Asia" project was held at the Toshi Center Hotel in Tokyo.

The workshop was held at a time when the world had been shaken by two major international incidents: the fluidity introduced on the Korean Peninsula by North Korea's announcement that it had secretly kept developing nuclear technology in violation of the U.S.- North Korean Agreed Framework, followed by the outbreak of the Iraq War and its chaotic aftermath. Moreover, the participants from Singapore and Taiwan were unable to attend the workshop due to the ban on travels abroad imposed by their governments in response to the outbreak of SARS.

Following on the first workshop, the participants discussed the interpretations of and policies on confidence building in the different countries. Aware of the diversity of approaches to confidence-building in nations in East Asia and of the fact that these approaches are still in the early stages of development and bound further to deepen and expand, they focused on understanding the differences among the nations and finding common features rather than insisting on adherence to any particular definition of the term "confidence-building."

Throughout the workshop, the participants spent much time discussing the North Korea issue to arrive at a new realization that the issue was a critical and destabilizing factor for East Asian security. Some expressed the view that, overall, the East Asian security situation had deteriorated since the previous workshop because of the North Korea

factor. However, such a pessimistic view was not shared by everybody and, in fact, the wide range of opinions expressed on the subject was more impressive. The Russian participant made a particularly interesting observation that North Korea already possessed three or four nuclear weapons.

Consensus was reached at the workshop on the following three points. First, while the North Korea issue complicates the situation, the fundamental structure of East Asian security has not changed. Second, the broad patterns of cooperative relationships and interests, including those represented by the extant alliances, have not changed, and it is essential that both South Korea and Japan continue to maintain their alliance with the U.S. Third, the roles of the U.S. and China remain critical. Even though the U.S. under the present Bush administration accords a lower priority to East Asia, it must continue to play a critical role, if the fundamental structure of regional politics has not changed, and its cooperative relationship with China must also remain indispensable.

The participants of the workshop confirmed the increasing importance of the institutionalization of confidence-building in East Asia. They also agreed that it is important to incorporate North Korea into the East Asian security system and maintain the dialogue with the regime.

The project is now preparing a final report based on discussions at the second workshop and the document is scheduled for publication in the near future.

By Ikuko Togo, assistant professor at HPI

Hello from HPI



Sung Chull Kim Associate Professor

Sung Chull Kim moved from the Korea Institute for National Unification (KINU) in Seoul to Hiroshima to join HPI in October 2003. He received his doctor's degree from the University of California at Irvine in 1991, and specialized in Korean affairs and comparative socialist systems for 11 years at KINU. In 2002, he taught at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, as a visiting professor. His recent research interests are the North Korea's nuclear

diplomacy and a comparative study of market transition in China, Vietnam, and North Korea.

Kim states: "I am glad to join the Hiroshima Peace Institute. This is a research organization that disseminates the culture and knowledge of peace and promotes the security of human beings. Peace is not a simple matter of military defense, but involves the cultivation of a peaceful mind-set in people and the establishment of law-abiding regimes. From such a perspective, I would like to contribute to peace by researching the creation of a systemic milieu in which a peaceful policy may be nested."

DIARY

July 1, 2003 - October 31, 2003

- ◆ **July 1-4** Yuki Tanaka presents a paper "Crimes Against Humanity: Perspectives Towards Revitalizing the Spirit of Hiroshima" at the Activating Human Rights and Diversity Conference hosted by Southern Cross University in Byron Bay, Australia.
- ◆ **July 1-8** Wade Huntley conducts research on nuclear disarmament and East Asian regional collective security initiatives in Berkeley, U.S.
- ◆ **July 3** Kazumi Mizumoto gives a speech on peace studies for third through sixth graders at Midorii Elementary School in Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **July 3-19** Hiroko Takahashi conducts research on nuclear tests at the National Archives at College Park, Maryland, and at the National Archives and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.
- ◆ **July 4** Mizumoto discusses "The Reality of Peace Research and Its Tasks" at a meeting of the Hiroshima Prefectural Nursing Association.
- ◆ **July 9-11** Huntley visits the Asia Society, San Francisco, the Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute for International Studies, and the Center for International Security and Arms Control, Stanford University.
- ◆ **July 11** Nobumasa Akiyama gives a report on "Support for the Denuclearization of Russia and G8 Global Partnership" at a workshop of the Japan Institute of International Affairs in Tokyo.
- ◆ **July 14** Huntley conducts research on nuclear policy issues at the National Archives, College Park, Maryland.
- ◆ **July 15** Christian Scherrer meets representatives of the Lelio Basso Foundation (LBF) and the Permanent People's Tribunal in Rome.
- ◆ **July 15-17** Huntley visits the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, the Council for a Livable World, the Mansfield Center for Pacific Affairs, the Stimson Center, and the Washington Office of the Monterey Institute of International Studies in Washington, D.C., and the Center for Naval Analysis, Alexandria, Virginia.
- ◆ **July 18** Scherrer visits the Ligue Internationale pour les Droits et la Liberation des Peuples (LIDLIP) and the Secretary General of International Peace Bureau, in Geneva. Mizumoto gives a lecture on "The Atomic Bombing Experience of Hiroshima and Its Tasks for Peace in the 21st Century" at a meeting of the Hiroshima City Women's Peace Group.
- ◆ **July 18-25** Huntley conducts research on nuclear disarmament and Japan's nuclear weapons policies at the University of California, Berkeley.
- ◆ **July 28** Tanaka gives a lecture on "The Pacific War: Atrocities and War Crimes" in the intensive summer course of Hiroshima City University (HCU), "Hiroshima and Peace." Scherrer meets U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food in Geneva.
- ◆ **July 29** Mizumoto gives a lecture on "The Experience of Atomic Bombing in Hiroshima and Japan's Nuclear-Related Policies" in the HCU summer course, and on "Hiroshima and Peace" for a training program for journalists organized by Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **July 31** Huntley gives a lecture on "U.S. Security Policies in Northeast Asia" in the HCU summer course.
- ◆ **July 31-Aug. 1** Mizumoto serves as a commentator at the Senior Journalist Seminar hosted by The Chugoku Shimbum, the U.S. Consulate General Osaka-Kobe, and the Kansai American Center, at the Hiroshima International Conference Center.
- ◆ **Aug. 2** HPI holds an international symposium, "Terror from the Sky: Indiscriminate Bombing from Hiroshima to Today," at the Hiroshima International Conference Center.
- ◆ **Aug. 4** Scherrer gives a lecture on "International Terrorism: Causes, 'War on Terrorism' and Arms Race, and the Context of Contemporary Mass Violence," in the HCU summer course.
- ◆ **Aug. 18-Sept. 12** Tanaka conducts documentary research on World War II at the British Public Records Office in London and the U.S. National Archives.
- ◆ **Aug. 19** Mizumoto discusses peace-related issues at the "International Peace Seminar by Students" hosted by an organization of college students in Hiroshima for international exchange, ISHR.
- ◆ **Aug. 22** Dr. Lawrence Scheinman of the Center for Nonproliferation Studies in Washington, D.C., gives a lecture on "Non-Proliferation, WMD and Terrorism: Do Regimes Matter?" at an HPI Research Forum.
- ◆ **Aug. 28** Huntley chairs the panel on "Futures in Asian Security" at the American Political Science Association 100th Annual Convention in Philadelphia.

- ◆ **Sept. 3** Mizumoto attends the annual meeting of a research group on reference materials at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.
- ◆ **Sept. 15-21** Scherrer meets representatives of governments, the U.N. and NGOs in Kabul, Afghanistan.
- ◆ **Sept. 27** Takahashi receives a doctorate from Doshisha University in Kyoto.
- ◆ **Sept. 28-Oct. 5** Mizumoto visits three cities in Cambodia as the leader of a Hiroshima prefectural mission on reconstruction assistance under the auspices of Hiroshima Prefecture's "Hiroshima Peace Contribution Initiative."
- ◆ **Oct. 1** Tanaka gives a lecture on "History and Thoughts of Indiscriminate Bombing: Europe" in the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima City, at the Hiroshima City Plaza for Town Development through Citizen Exchange.
- ◆ **Oct. 2-16** Akiyama conducts research in Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.
- ◆ **Oct. 5** Scherrer gives a paper on the People's Tribunals and discusses "Genocidal U.S.-engineered Sanctions Against the Iraqi People 1990-2003" at the all-Japan meeting on accountability for the Iraq War, at Waseda University, Japan.
- ◆ **Oct. 8** Fukui, Scherrer, Tanaka, Huntley, and Mizumoto participate in discussions with U.N. Disarmament Fellows at the Hiroshima International Conference Center. Tanaka gives a lecture on "The History and Thoughts of Indiscriminate Bombing: the Asia-Pacific Region" in the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **Oct. 12** Mizumoto serves as a coordinator at "Hiroshima International Peace Forum" hosted by the Hiroshima Peace Contribution Network Council and the 37th School Festival Planning Committee of Hiroshima Prefectural Women's University.
- ◆ **Oct. 15** Professor Masahiro Igarashi of Kanazawa University gives a lecture on "The Development of Ideas of International Humanitarian Law: From the Viewpoint of the Iraq War" in the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **Oct. 15-17** Huntley visits the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and the China Institute for Contemporary International Relations, Qinghua University, Beijing University, the Chinese Institute for International Studies, and meets a senior representative of the Institute for Strategic Studies, National Defense University, Beijing.
- ◆ **Oct. 17** Scherrer discusses "Accountability for War Crimes: Deadly Radiological Warfare in Iraq and Beyond" at the World Uranium Weapons Conference workshop on International Law in Hamburg, Germany.
- ◆ **Oct. 18-19** The fourth workshop of the HPI Research Project on "Military Violence against Civilians - A Comparative and Historical Analysis" is held at HPI.
- ◆ **Oct. 22** Akiyama gives a lecture on "'Victims' of Local Conflict: the Case of East Timor" in the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **Oct. 24-25** Tanaka gives a lecture on "How Should We Conduct Peace Studies in a Time of Globalization? A View from Hiroshima" at Chungnam National University, South Korea.
- ◆ **Oct. 25** Mizumoto gives a lecture on "The Current Situation of Nuclear Weapons" at the 6th session of the Peace Club for Junior High and High School Students at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.
- ◆ **Oct. 25-29** Scherrer gives a talk on "Perspectives of Accountability" at the meeting of the preparatory commission for the Iraq tribunal in Istanbul, Turkey.
- ◆ **Oct. 29** Tanaka gives a lecture on "Contemporary Wars and Indiscriminate Killing: From Vietnam to Iraq" in the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **Oct. 29-30** Huntley makes presentations on "Australasia and South-East Asia" and "Contrasting Approaches of the United States and the European Union" at the United Nations University's select graduate course on Northeast Asian security in Tokyo.
- ◆ **Oct. 31** Huntley makes a presentation on "No Way Out: Bush Administration Dilemmas on the North Korean Nuclear Crisis" at the Peace Research Institute, International Christian University, Tokyo.

— Visitors to HPI —

- ◆ **July 1** Han S. Park and two other professors of international affairs and 13 students from the University of Georgia.
- ◆ **July 11** Essa M. Al Zadjali, editor-in-chief of the Times of Oman.
- ◆ **Aug. 5** Yuji Otabe, professor at Shizuoka College of Welfare and Computer Technology and 27 students of Meiji University.
- ◆ **Aug. 8** Ko Chang Hoon, professor, Department of Public Administration, and two other professors of Cheju National University, South Korea.

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.6, No.2 December, 5, 2003

Copyright 2003 HPI All rights reserved

● Issued by Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University

TEL +81-82-544-7570 FAX +81-82-544-7573

Hiroshima Mitsui Bldg. 12th Floor, 2-7-10 Otomachi, Naka-ku, Hiroshima 730-0051, JAPAN E-mail:office-peace@peace.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp

● Printed by Nishiki Print co., Ltd.