



Research Forum

Russian Invasion of Ukraine: Russia, Humanitarian Crisis, International Law

Gen Kikkawa

On February 24, 2022, immediately after the close of the Beijing Winter Olympics, Russian forces began to invade Ukraine. Concerning the reason for this military attack, President Putin of Russia said, “Since Russia’s security was threatened, this (special military operation) was the only option available to us.” What did President Putin mean by citing a threat to Russia’s security? Why does he regard Ukraine’s membership in North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as a threat to Russia? Above all, why did he resort to such an act of violence?

On March 29, 2022, the Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) held an emergency online research forum titled, “The Invasion of Ukraine: Russia, Humanitarian Crisis, International Law.” At this forum three speakers discussed Russia’s invasion of Ukraine from various viewpoints. Toshiya Umehara (Ph.D. student at the Graduate School of Peace Studies, Hiroshima City University; former London Bureau Chief Correspondent, European Editor and member of the editorial board of the Asahi Shimbun) discussed it from the viewpoint of nuclear issues and as a humanitarian crisis, Mihoko Kato (lecturer at HPI) gave a presentation from the standpoint of Russian foreign relations, and Tetsuo Sato (specially appointed professor at HPI) discussed the issue from the framework of international law. The following synopses were submitted by the speakers:

1. Umehara: From the Viewpoint of Nuclear Issues and as a Humanitarian Crisis

Russia’s invasion of Ukraine comprises a multi-layer crisis. First of all, the humanitarian crisis that is taking place on the front lines is extremely challenging. At the time of this forum, one in four Ukrainians have been displaced and are living within or outside the country as either an internally displaced person or a refugee. The crisis is exceptional in terms of both the scale and exacerbating speed.

An even more structural crisis is taking place along multiple layers. Russia tries to justify its invasion by delivering a completely illusory message that Ukraine has been “Nazified,” and continues to deny its responsibility for inhumane acts. Such remarks are eroding our belief in fact and truth. Moreover, we can never overlook the risks involved in acts that violate established international norms, such as the norm that prohibits changes of national borders by means of force. There is also a mid- to long-

term risk of the collapse of the international order, which can lead to the instability of international society.

Russia insisted that Russian Ukrainians, who comprise a minority group, were being oppressed by the Ukrainian government and that it was necessary to intervene in order to protect these people. This assertion, however, is completely untrue. Even though there are many Russian-speaking people in Ukraine, they regard themselves as European citizens, and the majority of them do not desire the integration of their country with Russia.

After the end of the Cold War, due to political corruption, Ukraine was on the verge of becoming a failed state, at least in terms of governance. In the Euro-Maidan Revolution, which took place in 2014, a popular uprising culminated in the overthrow of the Ukrainian government at the time. Fearing the influence the incident might have on Russia, President Putin commenced the first military intervention, which began with the annexation of Crimea.

In the current invasion, to secure Russia’s advantage in military operations, President Putin threatens international society by implying the possible use of nuclear weapons. This can erode the norms or traditions that have prevented the use of nuclear weapons for more than 76 years. The so-called “nuclear peace theory” that is based on nuclear deterrence is no longer valid in the present crisis in Ukraine. As part of its efforts to justify the intervention, Russia even suggested that Ukraine was developing weapons of mass destruction, with no basis in fact. Under the present circumstances of the war, which are not favorable for Russia, it is hard to deny the possibility that Russia will adopt the so-called “escalate to de-escalate” strategy and launch a limited nuclear attack as a “gamechanger.”

After the end of the Cold War, Ukraine made the decision to abandon its nuclear weapons and acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Even though Russia provided security assurances to Ukraine at that time, the nuclear power one-sidedly canceled this agreement and threatened Ukraine by implying the possible use of nuclear weapons. This in turn has impacted the global norm of nuclear non-proliferation. Before discussing this issue, I would like to remind you of the fact that the nuclear arsenals that remained in Ukraine at that time were kept at bases of the former Soviet Union and that they were constantly under Russian control. Although a few Japanese people believe

Contents	Research Forum	
	Russian Invasion of Ukraine: Russia, Humanitarian Crisis, International Law Symposium	Gen Kikkawa 1-2
	East Asia on the Move	Tadashi Okimura 3
	Public Lecture Series	
	A Hiroshima Approach to Peace Studies	Makiko Takemoto 4
	What Is the “Peace Memorial City”?	Shota Moriue 5
	Hello from HPI	Yasuhiro Yamada 6
	“Genbakugo no 75 nen—Nagasaki no Kioku to Kiroku wo Tadoru”	Chie Shijo 6
	Hello from GSPS	
	Going My Way to Study	Masayo Eguchi 7
	The First Online Briefing Session on Admission to the Graduate School of Peace Studies 2022	Makiko Takemoto 7
	The Forthcoming Online Briefing Session on Admission to the Graduate School of Peace Studies 7
	Diary 8

that if Ukraine had not abandoned its nuclear arsenal, it would not have been invaded by Russia, this view is not based on fact.

While the non-nuclear theory upheld by Hiroshima and Nagasaki faces a serious challenge, it is still valid. In addition to overcoming the humanitarian crisis happening right now on the front lines as quickly as possible, we must also work to restore the norms of the non-nuclear theory based on fact.

2. Kato: From the Viewpoint of Studies on Russian Foreign Relations

To describe the background to the current full-scale war, I explained about the Euro-Maidan Revolution (February 2014), which was triggered by Russia's attempt to prevent Ukraine from signing the Association Agreement with the European Union (EU), the annexation of Crimea by Russia (March 2014), and subsequent armed conflict between pro-Russia separatists and the Ukrainian government in Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts (Donbas region) in eastern Ukraine. During the period between 2015 and 2019, the Ukrainian Poroshenko administration promoted a shift away from Russia. The Zelensky administration, which was inaugurated in April 2019, continued the anti-Russian policies of the former president and sought membership in the EU and NATO. Throughout the year prior to the Russian invasion, tension was rising in the Donbas region, and the conflict was intensifying between the Zelensky administration and the Putin administration, the latter one-sidedly insisting that Ukraine could obtain true sovereignty only under its partnership with Russia.

Next, from a broader perspective, I explained the international situation that contributed to the Russia's intervention. After the inauguration of the Biden administration in January 2021, the U.S. and Russia agreed to extend the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and to continue negotiations. The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Afghanistan in August 2021, however, clearly showed that the presence of the U.S. as a global power was diminishing. This likely made the Putin administration believe that the U.S. would not intervene in conflicts within the regions of the former Soviet Union. In addition, the Putin administration committed a serious misjudgment, having been misled by its string of successful military operations, including the second Chechen war, the Russo-Georgian war, the annexation of Crimea, and the intervention in Syria, along with the enhanced presence of Russia in a broad region from the Middle East to South Asia. Based on the misconception of Russian power, the Putin administration might have predicted that Russia would be able to recover its sphere of influence through a short-term operation.

Finally, it is worth noting that responses to the Russian invasion differed from country to country. While Western countries, led by the U.S., demonstrated unprecedented solidarity in imposing sanctions against Russia and aiding Ukraine, some countries (Turkey and Saudi Arabia) blamed Russia but did not impose sanctions, other countries (China, India, member states of the Collective Security Treaty Organization, Vietnam, Iran, Iraq, etc.) adopted a neutral position and did not impose sanctions, and still others (Belarus, Syria, North Korea, etc.) supported Russia. It



cannot be denied that the war was caused partly by the obsession and distorted view of history personally held by President Putin. The difference in responses to the war, however, possibly reveals the fact that there is another aspect of the war. For some people, the war might represent an explosion of negative energy derived from the frictions and discontinuity between nations of democratic, dictatorial, and authoritarian systems, as well as by frustrations of people against the security orders built in Europe, the Middle East, Eurasia, and East Asia after the end of the Cold War. Needless to say, the utmost priority should be placed on stopping the Russian military operation right now. However, if Western countries further isolate Russia, the country is likely to reinforce its relations with the so-called failed states and countries under conflict. We must understand that this in turn could lead to the instability of the international order and inflict a negative impact on the West.

3. Sato: From the Viewpoint of International Law

In the reports on Russia's invasion of Ukraine, we often see many terms and concepts of international law. In my presentation, I tried to offer systematic, brief, and easy-to-understand explanations about major issues and points of dispute related to the Russia's invasion of Ukraine from the viewpoint of international law. At the same time, I also lectured on basic knowledge of international law to lay citizens.

To understand international relations in the light of international law, it is important to distinguish the following three levels or types of relations: first, bilateral relations between Russia and Ukraine; second, the responses of third parties, such as Western countries, Japan, and China; and third, the responses of international organizations and institutions, such as the United Nations (UN). I discussed various issues related to international law by sorting them into these three categories.

First, regarding bilateral relations, Russia's invasion of Ukraine is a military attack, which violates the principle of refraining from the use of force. Russia cannot justify its actions by stating that it exercises the right of self-defense. The military operations undertaken by Russia comprise a typical case of invasion as it is defined. Moreover, indiscriminate attacks by Russia are considered to be war crimes.

Next, on the level related to third parties, including Western countries and Japan, international law permits the third parties to exercise the right of collective self-defense on the request of Ukraine, which is the victim of the military attack. However, these countries have refrained from exercising this right in fear of the risk of escalation into a full-scale war with Russia. Meanwhile, the third parties have imposed broad economic sanctions against Russia. Surprisingly, the grounds for such sanctions are not clearly stipulated by law. Concerning Belarus's support of Russia's invasion, judging from the content of its support, we can say that Belarus is also participating in the invasion.

On the third level, while the UN Security Council is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, because of the veto power of Russia, one of its permanent members, the council does not function properly. This leads to a question: "Why is the right of veto granted to permanent members?" Next to the Security Council, the UN General Assembly should be responsible for maintaining international peace and security. Accordingly, the content of its resolutions should have great significance.

At present, multiple international courts are concurrently involved in providing responses to the incident. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) rendered its provisional measures order in an application brought by Ukraine, demanding that Russia suspend its military operations immediately. Russia, however, refused to obey the order. Meanwhile, many state parties, including Japan, referred the invasion of Ukraine to the International Criminal Court (ICC), and ICC prosecutors are investigating the matter.

Given the decentralized structure of international society today, it is difficult to control the illegal acts of superpowers. Even amid this environment, it is essential that countries around the world work together and continue to cooperate with one another in order to uphold the rule of law.

(Specially Appointed Professor at HPI)

East Asia on the Move

Tadashi Okimura

On December 4, 2021, the Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) co-organized an online symposium titled, “East Asia on the Move,” together with the Hiroshima Peace Media Center of the Chugoku Shimbun and the Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Nagasaki University (RECNA). Approximately 170 people participated in the event. On behalf of the co-organizers, greetings were delivered by Director Ryo Oshiba of HPI, Chief Editor Katsuhiko Shimoyama of the Chugoku Shimbun, and Director Fumihiko Yoshida of RECNA. Following their greetings, Professor Gen Kikkawa of HPI explained the purpose of the symposium as follows: “To share recognition of the changing state of East Asia, as seen in the U.S.-China conflict and North Korea’s nuclear development, and to discuss the role that Japan can play to build peace in East Asia.” Subsequently, keynote speeches were delivered by Professor Takuya Sasaki of Rikkyo University, Professor Akio Takahara of the University of Tokyo, and Professor Lee Jong Won of Waseda University. After the panel discussion, the three keynote speakers expressed their views concerning the comments given by panelists and inquiries from audience members who had asked questions in advance. An outline of the keynote speeches and the panel discussion are as follows.

Professor Sasaki, who specializes in U.S. politics and foreign relations, evaluated the Biden administration’s policy in the East Asia and Pacific region since the policy was established in order to keep China contained. According to the professor, the difference between the Biden administration and the Trump administration is that the former prioritizes partnerships with its allies and friends. Specifically, the Biden administration seeks to reinforce the U.S. partnership with Japan and South Korea, and seeks the effective use of multilateral frameworks such as the Quadilateral Security Dialogue (Quad) between Japan, the U.S., Australia, and India; the trilateral security partnership between Australia, the U.K., and the U.S. (AUKUS); G7, and NATO. The administration has also decided to rejoin the Paris Agreement. While these policies differ from those of the Trump administration, the Biden administration maintains the previous administration’s trade and investment policies for China based on the so-called China threat theory and cautiousness against China’s military power. Meanwhile, inside the U.S., many citizens are not satisfied with the current administration’s economic and employment policies, measures against price hikes, and those against the COVID-19 pandemic. The professor considers that such public dissatisfaction can possibly erode the stability of the administration. Based on this analysis, he concluded that although the Biden administration has revived the diplomacy that is in line with the principle of international cooperation and is promoting its China policies through partnership with U.S. allies and friends, because of the mountain of domestic challenges, it is difficult to foresee how much attention and resources the administration can continue to allocate towards realizing the Free and Open Indo-Pacific vision and maintaining the U.S.-led international order in the Asia-Pacific region.

The second keynote speaker was Professor Takahara, a specialist in contemporary Chinese politics. His lecture was about the confidence and anxiety of the Xi Jinping administration. According to the professor, due to the outbreak of COVID-19 in Wuhan, Xi Jinping’s authority was briefly on the verge of crisis, but before long, the Chinese leader recovered his authority by controlling the epidemic with state power. After revitalizing China’s economy quicker than that of other major countries, China celebrated the centennial of the founding of the Chinese Communist Party. Moreover, in November 2021, the party adopted its third “historical resolution,” which, the professor believes, was effective in reinforcing Xi Jinping’s political power. He notes, however, that this resolution reveals the lack of confidence of the Xi Jinping administration since the resolution only emphasizes the party’s successful achievements and virtually ignores its failures. Based on this view, the professor considers that the lack of legitimacy in governance is the Achilles’ heel of the Chinese Communist Party and its leaders. Moreover, noting that China is faced with various domestic challenges, including the need to

secure ongoing job opportunities, a declining birthrate and an aging population, the professor asserted that China needs to accelerate its modernization to gain people’s support. On the other hand, he believes that while it is essential to build a democratic, law-abiding, and market-oriented society with appropriate systems and sufficient transparency in order to modernize the country, this does not comply with the supreme priority of the Chinese Communist Party, i.e., to firmly uphold its leadership and governance over the public. Based on this view, the professor considers that China is becoming increasingly dependent on its people’s nationalism. To enhance its influence on international society, China is endeavoring to give the impression that it is an open and confident nation, while at the same time being a modest and peaceful country. In actuality, however, the professor believes that China will maintain its “wolf warrior” diplomacy.

Finally, Professor Lee of Waseda University, a specialist in studies on the contemporary Korean Peninsula, provided a lecture about the intersection and interlocking of the old and new ‘Cold Wars.’ In this lecture, he discussed the emergence of a new Cold War (between the U.S. and China) in East Asia coupled with an exit from East-West Cold War on the Korean Peninsula. Concerning North Korea’s nuclear programs, although the Biden administration continues to uphold the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula as its ultimate goal, the professor considers that the administration is likely to adopt a-step-by-step approach, comprising of the process of nuclear disarmament and arms control. Concerning the background to this change in approach, he described the difficulty in immediately achieving denuclearization due to the progress of North Korea’s nuclear programs, recognition of the limits of hardline policies by the Trump administration, and a decline in the priority attached to North Korean issues associated with a shift towards prioritizing measures against China’s threat. Based on this view, the professor considers that the U.S. has changed its policy toward North Korea to so-called “management mode.” As regards North Korea, on the other hand, the professor believes that the country is accelerating the development of tactical weapons rather than strategic arms while maintaining the self-reliance policy within the nation. Towards the U.S., he believes that North Korea is unlikely to agree to hold negotiations, but will continue to demand that the U.S. abandon its hostile policy toward the country. In other words, the professor regards the current North Korean policy as its own version of “strategic patience.”

In the panel discussion, Professor Yoshida of RECNA, discussed the risks of nuclear proliferation, the shift of priorities in security policies to disarmament, and views on the world order sought by the U.S. and China. Ms. Hiromi Morita, an editorial writer of the Chugoku Shimbun, focused on the viewpoint of victims of the atomic bombing, stressing the importance of imagination in order to share the human misery experienced by real people in the affected areas. Finally, Lecturer Mihoko Kato of HPI discussed possible responses of the U.S. in a case where two armed conflicts take place simultaneously, one between Russia and Ukraine and the other between China and Taiwan. There was also a question from an audience member about the possibility of China using force against Taiwan. In response, the keynote speakers expressed their views on various related topics, including the uncertainty over the types of world order being sought, the vital importance of stabilizing political and diplomatic relations, the importance of China’s role in shifting arms escalation to disarmament, and the need for Japan’s wise stewardship in the fluid situation of the East Asian region, particularly around the Taiwan Strait.

This symposium, held two and a half months prior to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, featured lively discussions on the changing situation in East Asia. At the time of writing this article, we see turmoil in Europe, in addition to East Asia, which indicates that international society has entered a turbulent era. The Hiroshima Peace Institute plans to organize more symposia on topics involving changing trends both around the world and in Japan. We would very much appreciate your continued support and participation.

(Professor at HPI)

The Hiroshima Peace Institute held a public lecture series for the academic year 2021, from January to February in 2022. Usually, the public lecture series is held face-to-face with an audience, however due to the COVID-19 it was not possible to organize the lectures in AY2020. In AY2021, the lecture series was offered in the form of online lectures for the first time. Since the English public lecture series, which has been held at the Satellite Campus of Hiroshima City University annually since 2015, could not be offered either, the two-lecture series were integrated and offered as one course of lectures.

The AY2021 lecture series was designed to present an approach to peace studies that HPI compiled in the book *A Hiroshima Approach to Peace Studies: 13 Lectures on War and Peace* (edited by the Hiroshima Peace Institute, Kyoto: Horitsu Bunka Sha, July 2021). Five HPI researchers gave lectures based on their own research topics and provided the latest information about war and peace in the world.

Brief outlines of each lecture are as follows. All of the lectures were delivered on demand on YouTube for a week each, from Friday to Thursday.

“Atomic Bomb Damage and Newspaper Coverage” (Jan. 7 - Jan. 13, 2022, in Japanese)

Chie Shijo, Associate Professor at HPI

In the first lecture, Associate Professor Chie Shijo gave a lecture on the atomic bombing and contemporary newspaper coverage. During the 76 years since the atomic attacks in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the attitude of newspaper coverage was shaped the most in the first month after the attacks. In her lecture, Professor Shijo carefully followed newspaper coverage related to the atomic bombing from the case of a local newspaper in Nagasaki, the Nagasaki Shimbun. She analyzed the influence of censorship on the newspaper articles under the U.S.-led Allied Occupation and examined the relationship between censorship and freedom of speech today.

“Nuclear Weapons and the Constitution of Japan, Article 9” (Jan. 14 - Jan. 20, 2022, in Japanese)

Akihiro Kawakami, Associate Professor at HPI

The second lecture was given by Associate Professor Akihiro Kawakami. First, he pointed out that the experiences in Hiroshima and Nagasaki became a background to establish Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. Then, he explained the Japanese government’s interpretation and logic regarding the possession and use of nuclear weapons and the use of force. Finally, he analyzed the discussion of these in the Diet as well as the discussion on the security-related legislation (2015), and reexamined the problems of possession and use of nuclear weapons.

“Hiroshima & Peace Studies: To Review the Stereotypical Relationship” (Jan. 21 - Jan. 27, 2022, in Japanese)

Kazumi Mizumoto, Professor at HPI

In the third lecture, Professor Kazumi Mizumoto gave a lecture in a dialogue with Professor Chie Shijo. He presented an overview of the historical background of Hiroshima’s recognition as a “city of peace” and examined the role of the former military city “Hiroshima” during the Pacific War, and the problem of Japan’s war responsibility. “Hiroshima” and “peace” are often taken for granted as being tied together, but he reminded the audience that we must learn about different perspectives and that we need to discuss peace not only in relation to nuclear weapons but also to the inhumanity of war.

Professor Mizumoto retired from the Hiroshima Peace Institute in March 2022 and became an emeritus professor at Hiroshima City University in April. This lecture was his last public lecture as a member of the Hiroshima Peace Institute.

“The February 2022 Military Coup in Myanmar: Its Impact on Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy” (Jan. 28 - Feb. 3, 2022, in English)

Narayanan Ganesan, Professor at HPI

In the fourth lecture, Professor Narayanan Ganesan analyzed the latest situation in Myanmar. After giving an overview of Myanmar’s history and the democratization process as a background, he examined the process of the 2021 military coup and the regime change as well as the intentions of the military. He also explained the major problems caused by the military coup and provided us with different perspectives to consider on the Myanmar coup and its impact on domestic and international politics.

“The History of the Global Hibakusha” (Feb. 4 - Feb. 10, 2022, in English)

Robert Jacobs, Professor at HPI

The fifth and final lecture was on the history of Global Hibakusha by Professor Robert Jacobs. He gave a summary of how hibakusha were produced in many ways such as nuclear weapons, nuclear tests, nuclear production, nuclear accidents, and radiation exposure from nuclear waste. He also explained the problems which global hibakusha face, radiation-related health problems after the Cold War, as well as the negative legacies in society and the environment caused by radiation.

More than 340 people applied for the lecture series, including students and academic researchers. The comments of the participants show a high level of interest in the research at HPI. In this sense, the advantages of online formats were fully utilized by having participants not only from Hiroshima but also from different regions in Japan and overseas.

The contents of this lecture series were published in a booklet which was issued in July 2022. Separately from this booklet, an English booklet was also published for the two lectures conducted in English. PDF files of the Japanese and English booklets are available on the website of HPI. If you are interested in reading them, please visit our website.

(Associate Professor at HPI)

What Is the “Peace Memorial City”?

Shota Morieue

Three Legal Aspects of Hiroshima City

Hiroshima City, home to the Hiroshima Peace Institute, has a variety of attractive culture such as culinary culture represented by *okonomiyaki* savory pancakes and oyster dishes; sports culture highlighted by the professional baseball and soccer teams based in the city, and historic culture with such tourist destinations as Hiroshima Castle and the Atomic Bomb Dome.

In this article, I would like to diverge from these cultural aspects and view Hiroshima City from a legal viewpoint, which brings about three major aspects that characterize this city.

First, Hiroshima City is one of more than 1,700 municipalities (cities, towns, and villages) in Japan. As one of 792 cities, it provides a variety of administrative services to residents to support their daily lives (e.g. collecting garbage every morning and providing COVID-19 vaccinations).

Second, Hiroshima City is one of 20 ordinance-designated cities (major cities granted special rights by government ordinance). It was the 10th to be designated as such in 1980. Ever since, the city government of Hiroshima has offered a broad range of administrative services on virtually the same level as prefectural governments (e.g. granting licenses to restaurants and operating children’s welfare centers).

Third, Hiroshima City is known as the Peace Memorial City. On August 6, 1949, exactly four years after the atomic bombing, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Act (hereinafter referred to as “the Act”) was enacted with the aim of reviving Hiroshima City as the Peace Memorial City. This feature is unique to Hiroshima and forms part of its identity. After preparation of the Basic Plan of Hiroshima City in 1970, however, the city set “International Peace Culture City” as the ultimate goal of its development plans. Consequently, the term “Peace Memorial City” is rarely used today. This is probably because the Act is regarded merely as a tool to promote post-war reconstruction. Regardless of the validity of such recognition, the Act is still in effect, which means that Hiroshima remains the Peace Memorial City at least in legal context.

In the Act, which comprises seven articles, there is no article that stipulates the concept of Peace Memorial City. To clarify the meaning of Peace Memorial City, it is therefore necessary to search for views on the Peace Memorial City embraced by people at the time of the enactment 73 years ago.

Two Types of Views on the Peace Memorial City

With this view in mind, I have been studying the law-making process of the Act at the Doctoral Program of the Graduate School of Peace Studies (GSPS) at Hiroshima City University. After devoting myself to this study for a year, I have reached a provisional conclusion that people at the time did not have a common recognition of the Peace Memorial City.

Even so, their views on the Peace Memorial City could be roughly classified into the following two categories: first, the view that the atomic bombing over Hiroshima City led to the end of World War II and consequently peace in the world. (This view has been criticized as one of the myths related to the atomic

bombing.) People holding this view tried to *reconstruct* Hiroshima City as a memorial city of the end of the war. For example, Tsuneo Kusunose, who became the governor of Hiroshima Prefecture in October 1945, contributed an article to *Chugoku Shimbun* newspaper. In this article, published on December 19, 1945, he described his vision of reviving Hiroshima as follows: “I want to raise reconstruction funds and materials from people around the world to make Hiroshima a peace memorial city to commemorate the termination of the war.” (Underlined by the author.)

Second, irrespective of the effect of the atomic bombing on ending the war, some others sought to reconstruct Hiroshima as a city that would symbolize the vision and ideal of the pacifism stipulated in the Constitution of Japan. For example, Tadashi Teramitsu, then the Director General of the Proceedings Department of the House of Councillors, who is said to be the drafter of the Act, wrote in his book *The Hiroshima Peace City Act* that the spirit of the Act was completely unrelated to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima on August 6, and that the essence of the Act was to build a new city on this planet, a “city to symbolize the human ideal of sincere pursuit of genuine and lasting peace.”

As I have described thus far, there are two types of views about the Peace Memorial City: one as a city that commemorates the end of the war, and the other as a city representing genuine and lasting peace.

Is There a Mirror that Reflects the Image of the Peace Memorial City?

Having said that, the question is what concrete images of the city these two types of view would present.

From the first view (i.e. the Peace Memorial City should commemorate the termination of the war), the fact that the atomic bombing terminated the war ought to be emphasized, therefore the Peace Memorial City should at least clarify and pass on to future generations the actual state of Hiroshima after the bombing as well as the historical impact of the incident.

Concerning the second view (i.e. the Peace Memorial City should symbolize genuine and lasting peace), Teramitsu, the advocator of this view, wrote in his book as follows:

Once you step into Hiroshima City, you will see every tree and every blade of grass symbolizing permanent peace. Even pebbles on the ground represent world peace. And the aroma of international peace fills the air all over this city of peace. This is the vision of Hiroshima that it should realize someday, a city that represents peace both spiritually and physically.

Furthermore, in a commemorative lecture held soon after the enactment of the Act, Teramitsu encouraged all citizens of Hiroshima to become idealists (*Chugoku Shimbun*, published on May 14, 1949).

In any case, there is no mirror that reflects the image of the Peace Memorial City. Hiroshima City therefore must seek to create its own image itself.

(Ph.D. Student at GSPS)

Hello from HPI

Yasuhiro YAMADA


Professor

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Yasuhiro Yamada. I became a faculty member of the Hiroshima Peace Institute on April 1, 2022. I specialize in the contemporary history of U.S. foreign relations, focusing on the history of U.S. foreign relations concerning nuclear weapons. My research topics include the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 and changes in U.S. diplomacy and security policies driven by the development of hydrogen bombs and long-range ballistic missiles. In the autumn of 2018, I began an investigation at the National Archives (United Kingdom) in London in search of clues to clarifying what type of relationship the U.S. and U.K. had built around the time when the former dropped atomic bombs over Japanese cities and why the two nations had built such a relationship. Unfortunately, however, I was obliged to suspend my research activities in London in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

I was raised in a small town located 40 km east of Sapporo at the eastern margin of the Ishikari Plain. In 1982, I entered Hiroshima University and lived in Hiroshima for eight years as an undergraduate and later as a graduate student. I spent most of my time in districts south of National Highway Route 2, particularly in Ujina where I

lived, Higashisenda-machi where the university was located, and around Takanobashi, home to the movie theater “Salon Cinema.” During the 1980s, Tenmaya Department Store was still in Hacchobori. I also remember well that Koji Yamamoto and Sachio Kinugasa (baseball players belonging to the Hiroshima Toyo Carp) hit homeruns when I went to see a Carp game for the first time at the former Hiroshima Municipal Baseball Stadium. At that time, Hiroshima City University was yet to be founded, as was the Astram Line (a rubber-tired transit system). Instead, street-cars were in service with the fare amounting to 110 or 120 yen for travel within the city. As I have begun to live in Hiroshima again after so many years, I am surprised to see many bicycles traveling along sidewalks downtown. It used to be much safer to walk in the downtown area.

As I have assumed a new post here in Hiroshima, which has radically changed, I truly hope that I will be able to fulfill my new missions here.



New Publications



“Genbakugo no 75 nen — Nagasaki no Kioku to Kiroku wo Tadoru”

(Seventy-five Years after the Atomic Bombing: Tracing Records and Memories of Nagasaki) by the Association to Document the Postwar Histories of the Nagasaki Atomic Bombing, co-edited by Takeshi Shinki, Katsuya Kinaga, Yusuke Kusano, Chie Shijo, Maika Nakao, and Hibiki Yamaguchi, published by Shoshi Tsukumo in 2021.

Chie Shijo

When we hear the phrase “atomic bomb damage,” we often think of the damage that took place at the moment of the bombing and immediately after the event. While many books on atomic bomb damage have been written and published in Nagasaki, this book sheds light on such damage over the longer span of the postwar era. Part 1 of the book records the results of a personal interview survey of 28 people, including both *hibakusha* (atomic bomb survivors) and other activists engaged in various related campaigns. For these people, interviews were conducted on various themes, including the *hibakusha* movement, the peace movement, peace administration, programs to collect testimonies and documents, *hibakusha* surveys, and peace education campaigns. Being the first such publication to record interviews given by five organizations of *hibakusha*, the book sheds light on the commitment of the individuals who have been engaged in the survey of *hibakusha* and who have gathered their testimonies and related documents. The interviews, given by a broad range of people, are complemented by heartfelt explanations provided by Takeshi Shinki on the background to the interview survey.

Part 2 comprises reports on documents regarding atomic bomb damage. In Nagasaki, neither the prefectural/municipal governments nor universities have archives of such documents. Because of the lack of public organizations to collect, preserve, and seek effective use of related documents, it is difficult to collect adequate information about them. In this context, even though this book does not completely cover all the necessary information, it works as a valuable guide for researchers since it introduces major collections of documents on the issue, in addition to the results of a questionnaire survey given to 146 groups and organizations in Nagasaki Prefecture regarding their collections of documents on atomic bomb damage.

Many of those involved in the postwar reconstruction and *hibakusha* movement in Nagasaki are now elderly. Unfortunately, a few people who gave interviews in the survey project passed away before the book’s publication. Amid this environment, the book was compiled by a team of authors who were born after the end of World War II. They, including the author of this article, conducted interviews and surveyed related materials to clarify the 75-year history from the atomic bombing. The book is the outcome of their activities, representing their efforts to document the experience of *hibakusha* and compile a postwar history of Nagasaki. To readers who are interested in atomic bomb damage and the present situation of Nagasaki in relation to the bombing, I would like to recommend this book together with its companion volume: *Genbakugo no 70 nen—Nagasaki no Kioku to Kiroku wo Horiokosu* (Seventy Years after the Atomic Bombing: Uncovering Records and Memories of Nagasaki).

(Associate Professor at HPI)

Hello from GSPS

Going My Way to Study

Masayo Eguchi

I was an elementary school student when the Iran-Iraq War broke out in 1980. It shocked me to realize that war was not a past or a declining phenomenon like the Vietnam War, but one of the global issues in the real world. Looking up at the starlight beyond the cosmos, I asked myself: Why do human beings fight and kill each other on this planet? That might be the origin of my current research questions.

When I was a high school student, I wondered which career might be better, to study International Relations or to study to become a practitioner working in the field of international cooperation. Hmm, can anything change in the world under this Cold War? Therefore, I chose the latter. Then suddenly, the Berlin Wall collapsed. What is going on? Maybe the world is drastically changing... And my dream plan for international cooperation never came true because I got sick due to overwork. Finally, I came back to the alternative of studying International Relations, after a quarter of a century, at the Open University Japan as a graduate student. In a special lecture there, I came across “peacebuilding,” which became my research subject.

Academic approaches provide us with diverse perspectives and enrich our lives. This helps us to interpret not only distant conflicts but also our own experiences. In my case, for example, the concept of “structural violence” helps me to understand the toll that overworking had taken on me. To give another example, after writing on social

enterprises in my first Master’s thesis, I was able to apply this framework when building a business model for my occupational health consultant’s office.

After graduating from the Open University Japan, I studied peacebuilding at a certain national university as a graduate student and enjoyed good connections with classmates and researchers. Ironically, what I learned there guided me to withdraw from this academic program. When I endured harassment, the lack of support by the supervisor and the university administration so alarmed me that I decided to leave to protest the human rights violation against me, and to caution to prevent such harm for the next generation. How fortuitous that it was just at this time that HPI established the doctoral program at the Graduate School of Peace Studies (GSPS), I felt as if it was personally opening a door to facilitate my path forward!

It is encouraging that we can take academic approaches to grapple with the reality of protracted conflicts, or of a Japanese society full of structural violence. However, I still lacked an academic discipline. I now endeavor to master a specific discipline with the aim of contributing to a peaceful future for children all over the world. Thus, my long, long journey will continue.

(Ph.D. Student at GSPS)

The First Online Briefing Session on Admission to the Graduate School of Peace Studies 2022

Makiko Takemoto

The Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) held the first online briefing session of AY2022 on admission to the Graduate School of Peace Studies (GSPS) via Zoom on June 3, 2022.

We had participants not only from Japan, but also from Rwanda. In the first half of the session, an outline of the GSPS, and the entrance examination system were introduced. Possible career paths of graduates and the procedures for the acceptance of international students were also explained. In addition, three current graduate students in the master’s program at GSPS shared their experiences about student life.

In the second half of the session, participants were divided into ten breakout rooms where they could talk with the faculty members of HPI, master’s and doctoral graduate students at GSPS, and administrative staff members. There were lively sessions with many questions, for example about how to prepare for the entrance exam as well as about the life as a student in Hiroshima.

(Associate Professor/Admission Committee at HPI)

The Forthcoming Online Briefing Session on Admission to the Graduate School of Peace Studies

The second online briefing session on admission to the GSPS for AY2022 will be held on October 7, 2022. Everyone is welcome, for example, those who would like to study at the GSPS, or those who would like to get information about the entrance exam. Those who would like to enroll on the Master’s or Doctoral Program from April 2023 are especially encouraged to participate. If you could send your questions when applying, the faculty members of HPI, our current students in the Master’s and Doctor’s courses and the administrative staff members will be better able to answer them during the session. You can talk personally with the professors

whom you might like to consult. The students will also talk about their studies at GSPS. Please do not miss this opportunity.

Date and time: October 7, 2022 (Friday), 6:30–8:00 p.m.

How to hold the event: Online (Zoom meeting)

Fee for the participation: Free

Deadline of the application: September 30, 2022 (Friday), 5 p.m.

Contact: office-peace@m.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp

For further information, please visit the HPI website.



2022

- ◆ **Feb. 16** Robert Jacobs presents a Keynote lecture, “Nuclear Fieldwork in the Global Hibakusha Project,” as part of the “Ethics & Ethnography in Nuclear History” workshop, University of South Wales, UK, via Zoom.
- ◆ **Mar. 3** Gen Kikkawa presents an online lecture entitled, “Ethnic Politics and Military Aggression,” at the Webinar for Institute of International Relations and Area Studies at Ritsumeikan University.
- ◆ **Mar. 6** Mihoko Kato’s interview appears in the article, “Russia’s Attack on the Nuclear Power Plant is a Blackmail, Protest from the Atomic Bombed City Hiroshima,” published in the *Asahi Shimbun*.
- ◆ **Mar. 7** Akihiro Kawakami gives a lecture titled, “The Constitution of Japan and Our Lives,” hosted by the Article 9 Society Hiroshima for Childcare Workers, via Zoom.
- ◆ **Mar. 11** Kikkawa publishes an essay entitled, “Putin’s Perception of Security Crisis and Ukraine War,” for the Column and Commentary of International Relations and Area Studies at Ritsumeikan University.
- ◆ **Mar. 16** Jacobs participates in a round-table discussion on the topic, “Cities of Peace,” as part of the Global Media Festival 2022 hosted by Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta, USA, via Zoom. ▽Makiko Takemoto translates into Japanese the article “Remembering War, Forgetting Hiroshima: ‘Euroshima’ and the West German Anti-Nuclear Weapons Movements in the Cold War” by Holger Nehring in *Kokusai Heiwa Kenkyu Hiroshima no Jidai*, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2022, translation supervised by Kiichi Fujiwara and Wakana Mukai (Original Title is *The Age of Hiroshima*, edited by Michael D. Gordin and G. John Ikenberry, Princeton University Press, 2020).
- ◆ **Mar. 25** Chie Shijo presents a lecture titled, “‘Inheritance of the Atomic Bomb Experience’ from Documentary Materials: Issues in Hiroshima and Nagasaki,” at the meeting for jointly reviewing *Seventy-five Years after the Atomic Bombing: Tracing Records and Memories of Nagasaki* at Hiroshima University.
- ◆ **Mar. 28** Takemoto gives a Zoom lecture on German and Japanese peace movements to Nagasaki Youth Delegation.
- ◆ **Mar. 29** Toshiya Umehara presents a lecture titled, “From the Viewpoint of Nuclear Issues and as a Humanitarian Crisis,” Kato “From the Viewpoint of Studies on Russian Foreign Relations,” and Tetsuo Sato “From the Viewpoint of International Law,” in a research forum titled, “Russian Invasion of Ukraine: Russia, Humanitarian Crisis, International Law” organized by the Hiroshima Peace Institute, held online.
- ◆ **Mar. 30** Ryo Oshiba publishes an article entitled, “Approaches to Global Governance,” *Political and Legal Studies of Japan*, no.4, March 2022, pp. 77–92.
- ◆ **Apr. 15** Kato participates in a round-table talk on, “Where Does This War Come from and Where Does It Go?” published in a special edition of journal *Sekai*.
- ◆ **Apr. 17** Sato attends the Board of Councilors of the Japanese Society of International Law, held online.
- ◆ **Apr. 19** Hitoshi Nagai attends the 690th NHK International Broadcast Programs Council, held online.
- ◆ **Apr. 23** Kawakami gives a lecture titled, “The Meaning of the Constitution of Japan in World History,” at the Niho Community Center.
- ◆ **May 5** Jacobs presents a lecture titled, “Nuclear Bodies: The Global Hibakusha,” to the Science & Global Security Seminar at Princeton University, via Zoom.
- ◆ **May 10** Nagai publishes *The War Crimes Trials and Japan-Philippines Relations, 1945–1953* (on demand) from Iwanami Shoten.
- ◆ **May 12** Oshiba and Tadashi Okimura welcome H.E. Mr. Stefán Haukur Jóhannesson, Ambassador of Iceland to Japan, and introduce the work of the HPI.
- ◆ **May 17** Nagai attends the 691st NHK International Broadcast Programs Council, held online.
- ◆ **May 18** Takemoto attends a meeting of the International Youth Conference for Peace in the Future Committee, organized by the Youth Support Department of Hiroshima City Board of Education, via Zoom.
- ◆ **Jun. 1** Oshiba contributes an article based on an interview, “G7 Summit in Hiroshima,” to the *Chugoku Shimbun*.
- ◆ **Jun. 2** Kikkawa presents an online lecture entitled, “Current Situation and Issues of Security in East Asian Countries,” at the Webinar for Peace and Resilience Building in Education from Educational Policies and Course Perspectives: Experience from Japan, by UNESCO International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa.
- ◆ **Jun. 6–21** Narayanan Ganesan conducts an online course on public policy formulation for 55 Myanmar students of the Centre for Diversity and National Harmony, Myanmar coordinated by a faculty at Cornell University in New York.
- ◆ **Jun. 18** Xianfen Xu presents a paper titled, “Chinese Peninsula Policy and Six-Party Talks,” at a meeting hosted by the research project of the East Asian Armistice Regime, via Zoom.
- ◆ **Jun. 20** Shijo contributes a book review entitled, “Creating and Passing Down War Experiences,” in *Journal for Sociology of Warfare*, Vol. 6 (June 2022): pp. 275–278.
- ◆ **Jun. 23** Kato gives a presentation titled, “War in Ukraine and the Security in East Asia,” in the Special Roundtable, “War in Ukraine and Its Impact on Asia,” at the Seventh Annual Conference of the Asian Borderlands Research Network (ABRN) at Chung-Ang University (Seoul, Korea), via Zoom.
- ◆ **Jun. 26** Sato attends the Board of Councilors of the Japanese Society of International Law, held online.
- ◆ **Jun. 27–29** Ganesan conducts an online course on Thai politics and foreign policy for 55 Myanmar students of the Centre for Diversity and National Harmony, Myanmar coordinated by a faculty at Cornell University in New York.

※For other entries of the DIARY,
please visit our website.



HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.25 No.1 (September 30, 2022)

- Published by Editorial Committee (Robert Jacobs, Xianfen Xu, Mihoko Kato), 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@m.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp
- Printed by Letterpress Co., Ltd.