

# HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Hiroshima Peace Institute

Vol.16 No.1 July 2013

## Message from the New President of the Hiroshima Peace Institute

Gen Kikkawa

The United Nations charges its Security Council with the primary responsibility for the “maintenance of international peace and security.” After nearly 70 years since the establishment of the UN, has this mission been achieved? Has war been abolished? Why have nuclear weapons not been abolished?

More than 100 million people lost their precious lives in war from the 20<sup>th</sup> century up until today. The international society has worked to prevent war, utilizing its wisdom. The measures for peace conceived and taken so far can be summarized as the applications of following peace theories. Firstly, peace theory that seeks to outlaw war. Resulting first in the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, the theory continues to be passed down in the forms of the 1945 UN charter that prohibits threat or the use of force, and the current movement to outlaw nuclear weapons. Secondly, peace theory that seeks peace through arms control and disarmament. Resulting first in the Washington Naval Treaty of 1922, this theory has been applied to various arms control and disarmament treaties and agreements of today. There is, thirdly, peace theory that seeks to prevent war and conflicts through economic internationalism, by making resources and food available through free trade or collective management. That the European Community (EC), established for the joint management of natural resources, was developed into the European Union (EU) as a “no-war” security alliance, and the creations of free trade systems from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) to the World Trade Organization (WTO), are the examples of such an attempt. Fourthly, peace theory of mutual understanding that seeks to realize peace through the promotion of mutual understanding and trust. Based on the philosophy of the League of Nations International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation, this theory was passed on to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), through which it has been practiced in the activities of various international friendship groups and study abroad programs. And lastly, there is a system of collective security alliance that is designed to prevent wars and conflicts through an international framework.

The number of wars and conflicts did decrease as a result of these multiple efforts. As far as wars of aggression go, no war of aggression has been waged since 1976 except for the aborted Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. But that does not mean we now have world peace, with people in the world enjoying prosperity. On the contrary, human security is not necessarily guaranteed even in times of peace. During the Cold War, for example, nuclear weapons in a “balance of power” threatened the very survival of human beings. Also in the background of peace, freedom, or even the lives of many people were being threatened under undemocratic governments. The peace and security the international society tried to protect lie in states’ political independence and territorial integrity. While the Cold War was an ideological confrontation between East and West fought over which is more superior a sovereign, security meant that of a regime. The doctrine of Peaceful Coexistence was the middle ground for the two superpowers in the fierce clash between the confrontation and maintenance of international peace. How many people, especially of Eastern and developing countries, lost their lives behind the scenes when the international society had tried to maintain peace and security of their regimes? According to a recent study, “democide,” or the murder of people by a government,

passed war as the leading cause of death in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

What was peace then? Behind the name of peace and under the banner of friendship and cooperation, how many people have been sacrificed? We have to learn from this lesson that international peace, while it may contribute to national security, may not necessarily serve as the foundation of human security. In addition, we have to find answers to the following questions: Why is human security not guaranteed in times of peace? How can we achieve both peace and human security at the same time?

Yet, we have to note that peace has been maintained, though between developed countries, in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and the number of wars has decreased. And this peace was the result of the comprehensive efforts already mentioned. On the other hand, a large stockpile of nuclear weapons, ethnic confrontations and failed states were left behind after the end of the Cold War. And little progress has been made toward the abolition of nuclear weapons. What is even worse is that India, Pakistan, North Korea and Iran are now arming themselves with nuclear weapons. We cannot help but be surprised to find East Asia, of which Japan is a part, one of the most dangerous areas in the world. In fact, with territorial disputes creating international tension, and nuclear and missile tests posing threats, there are a lot of concerns over the possibility of military confrontation. The international environment surrounding Japan has become an area most delayed in terms of building a framework for international peace and security. Who would have imagined that East Asia, where peace-oriented Japan is located, would be at the center of international politics in the raw, contrary to its will?

Nuclear programs are often motivated by the desire to be armed with a tool that can help maintain the regime. Countries in Asia that are developing nuclear weapons are those long engaged in conflicts, either within their territory or between each other, many of which being undemocratic nations that oppress their people. In the backdrop of the nuclear program lies the growing sense, from the international society, of isolation, which is closely connected with the way of governance of the regime seeking nuclear weapons. What is urgently needed for the international society to maintain peace in Asia and to pursue nuclear abolition is its effort to democratize oppressive regimes of countries that tend to be obsessed with nuclear development, to protect human security of the people under the regime who have nowhere to go, and to construct a security community that would eliminate the need for arms.

Nuclear weapons must be abolished for world peace. They must be abolished also for the sake of the human security of the people of the nuclear armed countries. And there is no high road towards nuclear abolition. What is currently needed are multifaceted efforts to eliminate all the factors that demand nuclear programs. It may look roundabout but will be a steady step. How can we realize human security and a security community in Asia? I believe it is the mission of the Hiroshima Peace Institute to present comprehensive measures for nuclear abolition from multifaceted points of view and to make an academic contribution to the creation of a security community in Asia. I will perform the duties of the HPI president toward this end to the best of my ability.

*Kikkawa assumed the presidency at HPI on April 1, 2013.*



## Peace through the Concept of “Open” One Asia

Kim Tae Wook

Various problems have recently emerged in Asia including territorial disputes in the South China and East China Seas, as well as tensions on the Korean Peninsula. In these circumstances, however, many scholars have called for the establishment of a huge collective body in Asia.

Since last year I have hosted a special omnibus lecture series by top-flight scholars in and outside Hiroshima City University, where I work, under the theme of “An Open Collective Body in Asia.” Along with the lecture series I have been devoted to the issue of the possible construction of an Asian consortium with the publication of *Hitotsu-no-Asia-Kyodotai-o-Mezashite (toward a one Asia consortium)*, a collection of papers written on the issue by the lecturers and other scholars. This academic work has been done out of my belief that a regional community should not only be realized by the establishment of trade zones but also discussed based on the full understanding of the relationship of economic mutual reliance and of the need for security cooperation, as well as of the cultural and historical contexts.

Here I would ask readers to remember that this community in Asia that we are talking about should be “open.” The concept of “an open collective body,” unlike merely “a collective body,” refers to a state with an active traffic of people and goods with few obstacles restraining them. Mutual traffic and access should not be limited in a community. In an exclusively natural community a hierarchy will be created and the country at the top will have control over other countries. The Great East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere proposed by Japanese Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka in 1940 is one such example.

Also, the open nature of the community must be flexible. The Asia we are talking about is not Asia in a precise geographical term, but includes countries that are not usually perceived as belonging to Asia. In fact, the discussion over regionalism and community in Asia is gradually extending from the west to the east; starting with ASEAN countries extending to Japan, China and Korea, and further extending east to the Pacific region. While economics might have been the core of the flow at first, there is also a growing need for cooperation in the areas of politics and security.

Additionally, the open community has its own obstacles to this openness.

In examining the Asian consortium, I would ask readers to remember the three points just mentioned. In the following, I would like to examine the roles a regional community should play.

As for the need for a regional community to construct peace in Asia, the importance of regional cooperation in security matters must be firstly noted. North Korea’s nuclear program not only remains a matter of concern for proliferation, but has also heightened tensions in the region, especially on the Korean Peninsula.

Six countries, the Republic of Korea (ROK) and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), the United States, Japan, China and Russia, began talks in 2003 to stop the DPRK’s nuclear tests. Though currently suspended, the talks have created expectations for the six-party process to play the role of a future regional security mechanism. Also because of the newly intensified military activities due to territorial disputes, establishment of more effective bilateral or multilateral security cooperation mechanisms are urgently called for.

Especially in Asia, there are many areas where cooperative alliances between countries are deemed necessary, including the environment, energy and disaster prevention. It will take a tremendous amount of time for the negotiation and establishment of a cooperative structure if countries are to cope with these issues on a global scale. It would be easier to solve, however, if it was an issue of environmental cooperation within limited areas such as the Asian Consortium. The issue of large-scale earthquakes and subsequent tsunamis in Japan, China, and Indonesia, above all, requires, not a temporary relationship in the wake of a disaster, but a system of regional cooperation in such areas as information gathering, joint research and the construction of an emergency relief system.

The importance of regional cooperation in Asia applies not only to security but also to economics. The rapid economic growth in China and the ripple effects of the financial crisis in the US and Europe are causing an adverse effect on economies the world over. The ripple is approaching Asia and some measures are needed to contain it on a regional basis at the Asian front.

Historically there were cases in which crisis acted as a catalyst for regional cooperation — an Asian consortium like we are currently discussing. The Asian financial crisis in 1997

led to the organization of the ASEAN+3 later in that year through which countries began to seek ways to strengthen regional cooperation in East Asia. And now they are discussing the possible establishment of an East Asian Community. The Chiang Mai Initiative in 2000 triggered countries in East Asia to contribute to the construction of crisis prevention mechanisms via the currency swap agreements, in a hope that realized an East Asian Community in 2005.

As we have seen, establishments of regional communities based on cooperative relationships between countries in the areas of peacekeeping and economic cooperation is an important matter. What then does the relationship of economic reliance have to do with political cooperation? I would like to discuss this in the following essay.

For Asian countries, the rising tide of militarism in China and the DPRK is a menace. The United States is also interested in this, warning against military threats by strengthening ties with Japan and the ROK, as well as with other Asian countries including Vietnam, the Philippines and Australia. However, at the same time the unified US-Japan military strength, which combines Japan’s latest technology with the US system that dominates half of the military spending in the world, as well as the expansion of China’s military strength pose unstable elements in the security of East Asia. In this regard, the region serves as the largest point of military competition in East Asia. At a time when a cooperating system for security is most needed in the region, East Asian countries, especially the three countries of Japan, China and the ROK, are having difficulty reaching agreements on the issue of a possible regional community due to diplomatic frictions over history and territorial disputes, as well as over nationalistic public sentiments.

As I have already mentioned, mutual economic reliance in the Asia-Pacific region has increased despite the intensified tensions over security and complicated public sentiments in East Asian countries. When we further discuss the issue with a focus on Japan, China and the ROK, we find the following two points notable. Firstly, each of the three countries has trade volume with the other two countries that exceeds, when combined, that with outside countries, including the US and EU. This proves the strong mutual economic reliance among the three countries. Secondly, the United States is still an important trade partner for each of the three countries. Summing up, the three countries are mutually indispensable in economic terms despite their political conflicts with each other.

Table. 1: Trade Volume of Japan, China and ROK (As of Dec. 31, 2010, in million USD)

	Partner	Total trade volume	Export (%)	Import (%)
Japan	China	301,886	149,086 (19.4)	152,800 (22.1)
	US	185,369	118,199 (15.4)	67,170 (9.7)
	RK	90,594	62,053 (8.1)	28,541 (4.1)
	China + ROK	392,480	211,139 (27.5)	181,341 (26.2)
China	EU	479,712	311,235 (19.7)	168,477 (12.1)
	US	385,342	283,304 (18.0)	102,038 (7.3)
	Japan	297,768	121,061 (7.7)	176,707 (12.7)
	RK	207,170	68,771 (4.4)	138,399 (9.9)
	Japan + ROK	504,938	189,832 (12.1)	315,106 (22.6)
Republic of Korea (ROK)	China	188,412	116,838 (25.1)	71,574 (16.8)
	Japan	92,472	28,176 (6.0)	64,296 (15.1)
	US	90,219	49,816 (10.7)	40,403 (9.5)
	China + Japan	280,884	145,014 (31.1)	135,870 (31.9)

Source: Japan External Trade Organization (<http://www.jetro.go.jp/>)

Now, can we offset the political conflicts with mutual economic reliance? This is a question that has been pursued by many scholars over the last decades. Opinion is largely divided in two — while realistic scholars argue that the more possibilities of conflicts the more expanded the trade between the countries, scholars of liberal leaning, by contrast, claim that trade and other economic activities have nothing to do with political issues. They believe powers inside each country would work to alleviate the possible tensions between countries since it is something the business communities desperately want to avoid.

Our conclusion is based on the latter’s theory — that economic activities have nothing to do with political issues, and that mutual economic reliance would promote cooperation rather than political conflicts between countries. The degree of economic reliance is difficult to measure since capital movements among countries have become increasingly rapid, not only with trade but also with capital investments and stock investments. Since various individuals and organizations promote economic reliance in pursuit of profits, they do not desire political or military conflicts that would deter their activities.

How then could we build the regional community based on economic cooperation that we just discussed that would help promote peace?

Firstly, all the individuals and countries need to try to remove barriers between themselves and others. All the individuals are different, e.g. their nationalities and languages in collective terms, and their thoughts and opinions in individual terms. I assume these differences have stood as barriers for mutual understanding, ultimately working as an obstacle for peace to come to the world. Japan, for example, is often said to have an inward-looking perspective compared with her neighboring countries of China and the ROK. It is true that Japan with a population of more than 100 million people has power that is comparable to the US and Europe, and that her people’s acquisition of foreign languages did not really matter until recently. We are now entering a global age that changes so rapidly that it is time for Japanese people to stop resting on their earlier fame as an economic power and make efforts to remove these barriers, e.g. by studying abroad.

There are many problems to be solved before building a community, including the issues of public sentiment over history, territorial disputes and suspicious nuclear programs. In fact, the Korean Peninsula is now full of tension caused by the DPRK’s military threats. There is a mountain of issues as just mentioned in the Asian region, however, I hope peace will come when we overcome these problems and are able to build a community.

Finally, for the countries to realize peace is to overcome their conflicts, build an open community to construct a multilateral cooperative structure that places a high value on security and economy. Building a community does not necessarily directly lead to peace; however, it will certainly shorten the way. My specialty is economics and not politics or peace studies, and thus I have explored ways towards peace from an economic point of view. But there is no doubt that cooperation is a more important element than conflicts between countries in their activities, whether economic or political.

Excerpt from “Introduction” in Kim Tae Wook and Kim Sung Chull, eds., *Hitotsu-no-Asia-Kyodotai-o-Mezashite (toward an one Asia consortium)*, Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobo, 2012. Partially revised and expanded by the author.

Professor, Faculty of International Studies, Hiroshima City University

Message from the New President of the Hiroshima Peace Institute	Gen Kikkawa	1
My Approach to Peace Studies Vol. 5 “Peace through the Concept of “Open” One Asia”	Kim Tae Wook	2-3
Peace Education for a Sustainable Society – A New Program at Hiroshima City Schools –	Masashi Urabe	4-5
A War of Memories “Dissecting the Takeshima/Dokdo Dispute”	Mikyong Kim	6-7
Diary		8



# Peace Education for a Sustainable Society

## — A New Program at Hiroshima City Schools —

Masashi Urabe

Peace education in Hiroshima is undergoing a gradual change. A new program for peace education was introduced from this academic year at all the municipal elementary, middle and high schools in Hiroshima. In traditional peace education various programs have been conducted based on the local or school experiences and histories, such as peace assemblies, school operas, visiting peace museums and monuments (field work), as well as listening to a-bomb survivors telling their experiences. In these programs, children learned the horrors of war and effects of the atomic bombing as well as the importance of peace, through local memories. However, peace education now faces a need to respond to changing circumstances and modern issues as it has become increasingly difficult to directly come into contact with a-bomb survivors as they are rapidly aging, and new types of conflicts emerge in an era of expanding globalization.

Hiroshima City, in an effort to meet with these new challenges, declared to start building a sustainable society on a global scale in its basic plans for the promotion of education formulated in 2010. It aims to promote school education that could nurture children who would cherish life and would be capable of creating a peaceful and sustainable society, who would bear the future responsibility for building this sustainable society. The new program for peace education was introduced based on the principle of this education plan. What is innovative about this program is that it systematized peace education into a 12-year program to be adopted from elementary through high school education.

Let's take a look at this program for peace education. It is comprised of four programs; Program 1: Come to see the real

horror of the effects of the atomic bombing and to realize the preciousness of life and humanity (for 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> graders); Program 2: Come to understand the real horror of the effects of the atomic bombing and the efforts of reconstruction (4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> graders); Program 3: Come to examine the issue of world peace (7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> graders); Program 4: Come to have a view for realization of a peaceful and sustainable society (10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> graders). It stipulates schools to allot three hours in an academic year for the program. The contents of each program are as follows (Tables 1-4). Hiroshima Peace Notebook, a 4-volume textbook/workbook (each volume is designed to suit each program), was specially edited for the program.



Photo Caption: Hiroshima Peace Notebook

Table 1 : Peace Education <Program 1> for 1<sup>st</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> graders

[1 <sup>st</sup> graders] Unit Title: What we treasure		
Goal of this unit : Through drawing pictures of one's own treasures, Students will come to realize that everyone—he/she and all the friends around him/her live surrounded by precious things, to understand that the atomic bomb had destroyed everything in a moment, and to think about the preciousness of life and peace.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Let's draw what we treasure	Art class
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Let's talk about what we treasure	Art class
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Goldfish is gone	Moral education
[2 <sup>nd</sup> graders] Unit Title : We are all alive		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to feel the life of plants through the five senses, to respect all living creatures and appreciate peace through viewing the event of atomic bombing from the perspective of plants.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Let's become friends with trees and flowers	Life education
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Chinese parasol trees	Moral education
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Letters to Chinese parasol trees	Japanese
[3 <sup>rd</sup> graders] Unit Title : Hiroshima at the time of war		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to know the importance of family in a hard life through the ways of life of children when the war intensified, to realize how inhumane things war and atomic bombs are as they could deprive people of their lives and destroy family ties in a moment, and to appreciate peace.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Way of life of children: in the past and now	Social studies
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Family ties	Moral education
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Separation of families	Moral education

Table 2 : Peace Education <Program 2> for 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> graders

[4 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Hiroshima's a-bomb experiences and what we would like to tell		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to know the horror of the effects of the atomic bombing as well as the way of life of children during the war, to feel the spirit of the people who tried to do their best in the difficult time, to learn how determined survivors are to tell their experiences in a hope not to repeat the tragedies, and to respect their feeling and appreciate peace.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	History and mission of the Flower Festival	Social studies
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Hiroshima's experience and people's way of life	Social studies
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	What to pass on and our messages	Moral education
[5 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Reconstruction of Hiroshima and its citizens' wish		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to learn the way of life in the wake of atomic bombing and the spirit of people who were involved in the reconstruction of the city, to respect the people who contributed to the reconstruction of the city, to explore his/her own way of life and deepen their understanding of what contribution they can make for peace.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	What war and the bomb deprived people of?: Survivors speak	Moral education
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Reconstruction of the city and people's wish	Moral education
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Those who contributed to the city's reconstruction and development	Japanese
[6 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Hiroshima from now on		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to understand various activities of citizens of Hiroshima in the pursuit of peace, including the reconstruction of the city, to appreciate the peace at hand, and to be interested in voluntarily participating in making a peaceful society as a member of the community.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Making a peaceful city	Social studies
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Peace in life	Social studies
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Making a more peaceful city	Japanese

Table 3 : Peace Education <Program 3> for 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> graders

[7 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : People's desire for peace		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to learn the history of and stories behind Okonomiyaki (a local specialty food in Hiroshima), to know behind-the-scene stories of the city's reconstruction, to understand the people's desire for peace, and to think about peace at his/her own school and community as well as about what they can do for peace.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Stories behind Okonomiyaki	Moral education
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Stories behind reconstruction of the city	Social studies
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Peace at our own school and community	Japanese
[8 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Connection of Hiroshima and the world		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to understand the achievement of the children in Hiroshima who contributed to the establishment of the Children's Peace Monument in the Peace Park and Dr. Marcel Junod, a Swiss doctor and delegate of the International Committee of the Red Cross, who came to the city following the end of war. Students will come to think about the connection between Hiroshima and the rest of the world and to be encouraged to contribute to peace.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	About the world-famous story of Sadako and her paper cranes	Moral education
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Love and courage that transcended the border	Social studies
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	Recipe for peace	Japanese
[9 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Making a sustainable society come true		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to understand current problems in the world through studying international efforts to abolish nuclear weapons, and to become aware that they are the ones to lead the community in the future for the realization of a sustainable society as they explore ways to solve the problems.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Status quo of the world over the issue of nuclear weapons	Social studies
Lesson 2 (thinking)	Efforts being made for international peace	Social studies
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	To make a peaceful, sustainable society come true	Japanese

The new program for peace education is innovative even from a global point of view. The program has a perspective of sustainable development. Its concept is based on the principle of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD).

Sustainable development refers to a mode of development in which resources are used in a sustainable way so that human needs can be met not only in the present, but also for generations to come. To ensure everyone a healthy and cultured living we have to, for example, overcome poverty, secure good hygiene standards and preserve the environment. To achieve this, we have to take such measures as to abolish discrimination by gender and race, promote effective use of resources, and construct a society in which people of future generations will be able to live without fear. The realization of a peaceful society is an important agenda for sustainable development since wars and conflicts generate refugees and cause extensive damage to the environment. And we need to nurture citizens, who can contribute to achieve an intergenerational and interregional equity, equality between men and women, social generosity, poverty reduction, environmental conservation and restoration, and preservation of natural resources, as well as a fair and peaceful society. And ESD is the type of education to serve for such purposes. ESD is a learning mechanism to realize a sustainable society, a place for people of various standing and diverse backgrounds to exchange ideas and use their talents, in an attempt to achieve a sustainable future through trial and error.

Japan has been a global forerunner of ESD since it has become a global movement after the United Nations General Assembly adopted on Japan's initiative a resolution to designate the 10 years from 2005 as the UN Decade of ESD.

In these circumstances, Hiroshima's program for peace education could be highly appraised as a model of ESD. The city has organized the program in a future looking style, providing children with an opportunity to learn about modern issues of nuclear weapons and regional conflicts, and think for themselves about what they can do for the future, while it has maintained the traditional program of learning the local memory, e.g. listening to the stories of a-bomb survivors. For example, in the program for

Table 4 : Peace Education <Program 4> for 10<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> graders

[10 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Hiroshima		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to deepen their thoughts on peace based on their past studies. They will also come to learn what happened to the city when the atomic bomb was dropped, its effects from the scientific point of view. They will come to understand survivors' wish and their ways of life.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	What is peace?	LHR
Lesson 2 (thinking)	The real horror of atomic bomb and its effects	LHR
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	A-bomb survivors' messages	LHR
[11 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : About a peaceful, sustainable society		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to study the problems the international society faces from multilateral points of view, and to examine further the role of Hiroshima in the international society from the viewpoint of making a sustainable society.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	Let's talk about nuclear weapons	LHR
Lesson 2 (thinking)	People's thoughts on Hiroshima	LHR
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	From Hiroshima to the international society	LHR
[12 <sup>th</sup> graders] Unit Title : Our peace project		
Goal of this unit : Students will come to think about what they can do to create a peaceful world through their work of "Our peace project." They will be encouraged to get voluntarily involved in realizing a peaceful world. Also, they will come to have an overview of their future life as they attempt to identify it with the issue of peace that they have learned so far.		
Lesson 1 (awakening)	What we can do to make peace come true	LHR
Lesson 2 (thinking)	My peace project	LHR
Lesson 3 (disseminating)	My future course and "peace"	LHR

6<sup>th</sup> graders, children will learn about various activities for peaceful environments and will be encouraged to get involved in such activities. In the programs for 9<sup>th</sup> graders and up, they will learn about international efforts to abolish nuclear weapons, examine ways to solve current global problems, and explore what they can do for a sustainable society.

And here I, in the capacity of a member of Hiroshima City University, would like to ask teachers in the municipal schools to make every effort to improve the program. Perhaps while implementing the program in the classroom, you will find some kind of defects in the textbook or other teaching materials for each unit, e.g. awkward flow of the story. Or the materials may not stimulate children to act voluntarily as expected. There should still be room for improvement. But I also understand that frontline teachers are too busy, unfortunately, to examine the textbook and other teaching materials to propose improvements.

So here I ask teachers of Hiroshima municipal schools to make use of the graduate school at the Hiroshima City University to develop better teaching materials for the program for peace education. To be more specific, I recommend that you study in our two-year Master's course of peace studies at the Faculty of International Studies at the Hiroshima City University and obtain a Master's degree in peace studies by writing a thesis on the program for peace education. The university's Faculty of International Studies now has a Peace Studies program in addition to the International Studies program. The Peace Studies program offers a high quality research environment for peace studies with the professoriate of Hiroshima Peace Institute in addition to the regular faculty.

Frontline teachers are expected to improve the city's internationally progressive program for peace education and make it more advanced. And for members of the Graduate School and Peace Institute of Hiroshima City University, it would be our pleasure to be of service to such an effort. We, on the university's part, will continue to improve the research environment to welcome you here.

Associate Professor, Faculty of International Studies,  
Hiroshima City University



# A War of Memories

## Dissecting the Takeshima/Dokdo Dispute

Mikyong Kim

**SUMMARY BOX:** The disputed islets known by Japanese as Takeshima and by Koreans as Dokdo continue to plague bilateral relations between the two countries, and each side approaches the issue from a different perspective. Koreans regard the dispute as a history problem, while the Japanese perceive it as a territorial issue. This essay argues that the dispute should be approached as a “memory problem” in order to open up a venue for mutually sympathetic discourse.

While much of the world’s attention was focused on the maritime disputes in the South China Sea between China and several members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, South Korean President Lee Myung Bak paid a surprise visit on Aug. 10 in 2012 to the disputed Takeshima/Dokdo islets, provoking Japan to recall its ambassador to Seoul and reigniting bitter feelings in both countries that have long hampered efforts to overcome historical grievances between the two nations.

Compounding the problems are lingering legacies of the San Francisco Peace Treaty of 1951, which officially ended World War II, because the treaty added ambivalent legal stipulations to a murky “memory” problem. After the war, Japan, the colonial perpetrator, was transformed into a strategic ally of the United States in the emerging Cold War architecture. The US, in effect, rewarded the former aggressor at the cost of Korea’s grievances. The current clash over the islets is on a continuum of unresolved memory problems where resentments, lack of convincing repentance and territorial ambition co-exist. In the eyes of Koreans, an unrepentant Japan continues its aggressive posture by making impudent territorial claims, while the Japanese believe the Koreans are confusing territorial issues with peripheral historical sentiments. In short, the two sides keep talking past each other in what is essentially a memory war.

### Lingering Legacies of the Asia-Pacific War

The Asia-Pacific War (1931-1945) was a pivotal moment in history partly because its violence awakened dormant feelings about earlier humiliations. Japan’s atrocities precipitated memories of 19<sup>th</sup> century colonial invasions, collaboration with the West and earlier aggression against Asia. Japan modernized rapidly in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and became a colonial power; Korea, meanwhile, vanished into what proved to be the beginning of a 36-year-long Japanese Empire. Japan, thus, chose not to resist the Western powers but to emulate them. The elites of the Meiji era in Japan held Asia in contempt, and adopted an attitude of even sterner superiority as its colonial conquests continued.

For Koreans, the memory of dehumanization under Japanese fascism defines the *felt past*. From their standpoint, Japan not only violated the entitlements of citizens but also offended their national honor, shamed and demeaned them, and refused to repent by humbling itself, as it had humbled them, through a

convincing apology. Only the clearest expressions of remorse could have begun to mitigate these resentments, but instead of genuine remorse, Japan extended formal apologies. Remorse is a sentiment that accompanies the realization of wrongdoing; apology is the communicative format through which remorse is conveyed. Even today, Korea under the influence of Confucian formalities remains all too aware of the separate realms occupied by ritual, true feeling and the telltale signs of inauthentic performance. Repeated insults and denials by Japanese politicians of past wrongdoings raise suspicions of broader Japanese indifference and intensify demands for authentic remorse. Herein lies a perceptual dilemma that worsens the memory problem and alienates Japan from its former victims.

Historians, political scientists and Asian studies scholars often sample regional memory content, but they leave important questions unanswered. How bitter are the memory wars between Korea and Japan? At what level of concreteness or abstraction are events selected for analysis? Which aspects of these events are taken as a given and which remain in dispute? What causes and functions are attributed to them? In what social locations (for example, state, class, community, generation, institution and interest group) are the accounts of historical events produced and perpetuated? Which cultural forces (values, climate of opinion, cultural mentality) inspire them? Is the relation between memories and their social contexts causal? Semiotic? Functional? Hegemonic?

### The Korea-Japan Memory Problem

Japan is the antagonist in Northeast Asia’s memory wars. Spatially isolated and economically superior to its former victims, Japan took its time in addressing its past. Postwar Japan deemed demands for apology and compensation less urgent than its own citizens’ sense of victimhood, but as former victim-nations became economic competitors during the last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Japan mellowed. If this point stands alone, however, we are left with the conclusion that generations change their minds about the past when it becomes good for business, and that Korea presses its claims because the country now is strong enough to rub Japan’s nose in its own sins. Resentment grows, it is true, as economic and political circumstances change, but with no conception of national culture and its symbols, we are inclined

to dismiss memory changes as epiphenomena “reflecting,” “expressing” or “articulating” power differences, thus denying the very existence of a memory problem.

Koreans take great interest in the way their Japanese neighbors remember the Asia-Pacific War. They get their information from Japan’s textbooks, mass media, official statements, historical monuments and ritual observances. The main point of contention is Japan’s alleged whitewashing of its colonial past and wartime atrocities, where Dokdo stands as a powerful symbol of Japanese unequivocal impudence. Japanese politicians paying their respects at the controversial Yasukuni Shrine, where Japanese war criminals are entombed along with other war dead, have continually reinforced this mindset.

Modern Japan, therefore, is important for the value it adds to the “presentist” models of collective memory, in which the social, psychological, cultural, economic or political demands of the present shape views of the past. When Japanese prime ministers have visited Yasukuni, they were more concerned with their present political problems than with the sacredness of the past. The same observation can be extended to the three LDP politicians who attempted to visit South Korea’s Ullneung Island in August 2011, despite stern protests from Seoul. The parliamentarians were staging a political show as a means of distracting cynical constituents back home.

The “presentist” mode of collective memory is stronger in Japan than in Korea. A residual culture of communitarianism and honor, and an emergent culture of individualism and dignity coexist. That explains the pendulum swings in public sentiment between dismissive indifference to charged self-vigilance. Conservatives prefer pure nationalism, uncontaminated by memories of atrocity, and they justify Japan’s past actions. To this end, they tell their story in television programs, comic strips and films, which young people avidly consume and discuss. By the same token, newly approved textbooks describe Korea’s Dokdo as Japan’s Takeshima, igniting another round of memory war between the two neighbors. In Japan, facing a difficult past is not a matter of coming to terms with wrongdoing alone but also of seeking to salvage oneself from a sense of shame. Every defense of past wrongdoing is thus rooted in cultural, economic and political contexts that promote official and private expressions.

This is particularly so when we consider the limited economic advantage that Japan can get from the surroundings of Takeshima/Dokdo. It is the very desire to redeem its past in the collective memory that makes the territorial issues so critical. For Japan, winning international recognition that the islands unquestionably belong to Japan is one of the key tasks in rectifying the misdeeds and injustices committed in the process of relinquishing its territories “which she has taken by violence and greed,” as stated in the Cairo Declaration of Dec. 1, 1943. By implication, Takeshima/Dokdo should not have been part of the territories that Japan would have to relinquish.

Japanese honor, which takes the form of particularism—a refusal to submit its “soul” to foreign ideas—energizes and sustains its modernity. Without transcendental reference points to critique wrongdoing, however, Japanese recollection of their country’s atrocities leads more to silence than to remedial protest. They also expect silence from their former victims. When Koreans protest the exploitation of their forbears by Japan, many Japanese hear what they describe as *urusa* (or “noisiness”), which refers not to acoustics but to contempt and annoyance with insincere

complaints. To conceive these different outlooks as a memory war is reasonable but does not get to the core of the problem, for it is ultimately a matter of one nation misreading another’s cultural codes, not its memories.

For South Korea, Dokdo is a reminder of its suffering under Japanese occupation. Koreans consider any contest about its sovereign control over the islands to be tantamount to denying their historical memory as victims of imperialism. For Koreans, Japan’s persistent claims to Dokdo are unmistakable evidence that the former colonizers do not repent their past sins and have every intention of reviving their violent greed.

### A Perfect Symbol

Korea’s use of the past to reinforce itself in the present draws from Japanese preoccupation in other ways. The Takeshima/Dokdo controversy exemplifies the memory problem because it concerns a group of uninhabited and rocky islets claimed by both Japan and Korea. The fact that the islets are practically useless makes it a perfect symbol of the memory wars. In this context, the Korean “presentism” entails a change in the appearance of an object, event or issue resulting from a change in the position of the viewer. In this case, the viewer is the United States, and its post-war preoccupation with communist rather than fascist expansion as demonstrated by the San Francisco Peace Treaty. New threats cause even powerful states to see the world—and the past—differently. The Treaty, which was drawn up during the Korean War, when the US was concerned with maximizing Japanese support against the communist threat to Asia, means a great deal to Japan, for it constitutes proof that it is an ally of the democracies, a respectable nation that has compensated for its historical crimes. In crafting the treaty, the US, over the objection of its European allies, left the legal status of the islands ambiguous enough for Japan to claim ownership. The Korean claim to the islets, in contrast, is based on remembrances of past suffering and disgrace—intensified on the anniversaries of Japan’s occupation of Korea, the end of the Asia-Pacific War and the normalization of diplomatic relations with Japan.

The “recovery of honor” (*myonggyehobok*) is the overriding mnemonic task in contemporary South Korea. Amid political democratization and rising national affluence, those “wronged and defamed” under Japanese hegemony are reclaiming “historical justice” (*yoksajok junguei*); collaborators are identified and punished. Relative to the continuing resentment against Japan, some Koreans see their memory war as a manifestation of rising nationalism despite, or because of, globalization. Others see Korean honor manifesting a unique version of the norm of reciprocity, linked as it is to a sense of justice so strong that, to Japanese critics, Koreans seem “dogmatic,” i.e., morally self-indulgent, and unforgiving as a matter of principle. In turn, Koreans see “opportunism” in the empty apologies of Japanese officials.

The conjunction of the Cold War’s lingering threats and the memory of Japanese colonialism thus combine to make Takeshima/Dokdo, rather than some other geographical site, the source of the continuing dispute between the two countries. Because very little is materially at stake, the islets become “good to think with,” symbols of national integrity and pride and of humiliation and suffering both for Korea and Japan.

Associate Professor at HPI

- ◆ **March 7** Mizumoto & Nagai attend a working group meeting of the editorial committee of the “research project of reconstruction and peacebuilding of Hiroshima” organized by Hiroshima Prefecture, held at the Hiroshima Prefectural Office.
- ◆ **March 9** Takemoto, Takahashi, Kawakami, and Kiriya organize a film show of the Movie “Hiroshima” (1953) at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum as part of research project “Peace museum studies on relationship of the idea of ‘peace’ and presentation of the information of radiation disaster in local governments,” funded by the peace-related grants of Hiroshima City University. ▽Takemoto organizes a web-meeting with author Peter Stephan Jungk at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.
- ◆ **March 9-10** Takemoto organizes a two-day research meeting in Hiroshima as part of research project “Toward the peace studies as global history: memories of Auschwitz and Hiroshima” (*Jungk Kaken*) funded by *Kaken-hi* (Grant-in Aid for Scientific Research).
- ◆ **March 12** Nagai gives lecture, “Hiroshima Seen from Abroad: The Case of the Philippines” at Hiroshima Jogakuin Senior High School.
- ◆ **March 18-20** Ganesan organizes a workshop and presents a paper on The Role of Civil Society in Democracies in Southeast Asia in Istanbul Turkey.
- ◆ **March 19** Mizumoto serves as the Vice-Chair at the 14th meeting of the Exhibition Review Committee of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, held at the museum.
- ◆ **March 22** Mizumoto attends the 5th meeting of the Drafting Committee of the Peace Education Program organized by the Hiroshima Municipal Board of Education, held in Hiroshima City.
- ◆ **March 24** Mizumoto gives lecture “Further Learning from the Study Tour to Cambodia: A New Perspective” at a review session of the Study Tour to Cambodia organized by the Hiroshima International Center (HIC), held at HIC.
- ◆ **March 25** Mizumoto & Takahashi attend the annual meeting of the Advisory Research Group of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, held at the museum.
- ◆ **March 27-April 4** Ganesan conducts German-funded training workshops for NGOs and political parties in Yangon and Mawlamyaing in Myanmar.
- ◆ **April 3** Kim serves as chair and discussant of a panel “Korean Peninsula in the Past, Present, and Future,” and presents a paper, “Historical Memory, Human Rights and Reconciliation: Korea-Japan Relations,” at the “Korea, Japan and Africa in the Midst of Conflict” panel at the 2013 Annual Convention of International Studies Association in San Francisco, CA, USA.
- ◆ **April 8** Mizumoto attends the 1st & founding meeting of the executive committee of the 2013 Hiroshima International Youth Conference for Peace in the Future, organized by the Hiroshima Municipal Board of Education, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima.
- ◆ **April 19** Kiriya presents paper “Lessons from the process of reconstruction in Hiroshima and Nagasaki” at the research meeting organized by and held at the Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition (RECNA), Nagasaki University.
- ◆ **April 20** Kim organizes a workshop on Japan’s Korean War in Hiroshima.
- ◆ **April 27** Kawakami gives lecture “The Position of Peace Constitution in the Global Nuclear Age” at the University of California Program organized by Meiji Gakuin University, held in Hiroshima. ▽Kawakami gives lecture “Origin and Current Status of the Peace Constitution” at a symposium organized by the Hiroshima Branch of Japan Congress of Journalists, held in Hiroshima.
- ◆ **May 4** Mizumoto gives presentation “Vision and Practice of Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Northeast Asia: Model of Security Cooperation” at a symposium “Toward an Open Asia Community,” co-organized by the Academy of Korean Studies (AKS) and Hiroshima City University, held at AKS in Seongnam City, South Korea.
- ◆ **May 10** Ganesan delivers the Distinguished Guest Lecture on Recent Developments in Myanmar at Ewha Womans University, Seoul.
- ◆ **May 13** Mizumoto participates in a meeting of the Promotion Committee of “A Hiroshima for Global Peace” Plan, related to the “Hiroshima Round Table” for nuclear disarmament in East Asia, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture, held at the Tokyo Office of Hiroshima Prefecture Government.
- ◆ **May 20** Mizumoto attends the 1st regular meeting of the Hiroshima Network of Peace Research & Education Organizations, organized by and held at Hiroshima Prefecture.
- ◆ **May 20-21** Takemoto organizes a research meeting of Jungk Kaken Group in Hiroshima.
- ◆ **May 24-25** Ganesan attends a workshop on Human Security in Asia and chaired a panel on Southeast Asia at Ewha Womans University, Seoul.
- ◆ **May 26** Jacobs presents lecture “Hiroshima as seen and defined in America, and the development of modern nuclear weaponry” to the seminar “To learn how to deliver the A-bomb damage in English” at the Hiroshima Memorial Peace Museum.
- ◆ **May 28** Kikkawa attends the second meeting of the board of trustees of the Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation, held at Hiroshima International Conference Center.
- ◆ **May 31** Kikkawa attends the joint social gathering for peace-related organizations in Hiroshima, organized by the seven groups of atomic-bomb survivors in Hiroshima, held at Hiroshima City Cultural Exchange Hall. ▽Mizumoto gives lecture “Hiroshima & Peace: the Danger of Nuclear Weapon” at the Peace Seminar 2013 for the students of Saint Elizabeth College and Hiroshima Jogakuin University (HJU), organized by and held at HJU.
- ◆ **June 1** Nagai serves as chair at the 1st Open Session of the 89th Conference of Japan Society for Southeast Asian Studies, held at Kagoshima University.
- ◆ **June 3** Jacobs gives lecture “Nuclear Weapons in Hiroshima and America” at the HJU Peace Seminar 2013.
- ◆ **June 6** Kawakami gives lecture “The Idea and Challenge of Peace Constitution” at a meeting organized by the Shinshu (Shin-Buddhism) War-Bereaved Families Association, held at Hiroshima Branch Temple of Hongan-ji.
- ◆ **June 10-22** Ganesan coordinates and trains on International Relations and Public Policy Formulation at the Egress Summer School in Yangon, Myanmar.
- ◆ **June 12** Mizumoto gives special lecture “The Current State and Tasks of Peace Research” at a training program for Level II Certified Nursing Administrators organized by the Hiroshima Nursing Association, held at the association.
- ◆ **June 13** Kim serves as discussant of a panel, “Human Rights in Post-Conflict and Transitional Societies,” at the International Conference “Protection of Human Rights: Institutes and Practices,” in Saint-Petersburg, Pushkin, Russia.
- ◆ **June 14** Kim serves as chair of a panel, “The Arab Spring and Human Rights,” at the International Conference “Protection of Human Rights: Institutes and Practices,” in Saint-Petersburg, Pushkin, Russia.
- ◆ **June 15-16** Takemoto and her Jungk Kaken Group hold a centennial exhibition of Robert Jungk “The man who told the world about Hiroshima: For a nuclear-free future” at the Japan Peace Society’s annual meeting, held at Osaka University.
- ◆ **June 20** Mizumoto gives presentation “Japanese Perspectives” at the second International Workshop “Envisioning Northeast Asia Peace and Security: Developing a Comprehensive Approach to a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone,” organized by the Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Nagasaki University, and Hanshin University, held in Seoul.
- ◆ **June 28** Jacobs gives lecture titled, “Hibakusha Communities Around the World,” as an invited speaker at Seijo University in Tokyo.

## HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.16 No.1 (July 27, 2013)

- Published by Editing Committee, Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University  
3-4-1, Ozuka-higashi, Asaminami-ku, Hiroshima 731-3194 Japan  
Phone: +81 (0)82 830 1811 Fax: +81 (0)82 830 1812 E-mail: office-peace@peace.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp
- Printed by Letterpress Co., Ltd.