

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Hiroshima Peace Institute

Vol.21 No.2 March 2019

Prospects for the Situation on the Korean Peninsula

Hyun Jin Son

The year 2018 saw epoch-making changes regarding the nuclear issue of North Korea. On April 27, a historical inter-Korean summit was held at Panmunjom, where the military border is drawn between North and South Korea. And on June 12, in Singapore, a U.S.-North Korea summit was held for the first time in history.

The Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) signed the Panmunjom Declaration, in which the two Koreas declared that they would put an end to the armistice that had lasted for 65 years since the Korean War, transforming the armistice into a peace treaty. South and North Korea also confirmed the common goal of realizing, through complete denuclearization, a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula. Meanwhile, in the joint statement at the Singapore summit, President Donald J. Trump of the United States of America committed to providing security guarantees to North Korea, and Chairman Kim Jong Un of the State Affairs Commission of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea reaffirmed his firm and unwavering commitment to the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Above all, it is extremely significant that both parties confirmed a mutual goal of realizing a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula, through a process of complete denuclearization.

However, controversy exists as to whether the expression "complete denuclearization" means "complete, verifiable, and irreversible dismantlement (CVID)" of North Korea's nuclear program, as demanded by the international community. What North Korea means by denuclearization is not only to denuclearize North Korea, but also to denuclearize the entire Korean Peninsula by ensuring that the United States does not deploy its nuclear weapons on the peninsula so that no nuclear threat is leveled at the DPRK. While the United States demands that North Korea fulfills CVID regarding its nuclear

weapons and all other nuclear capabilities, North Korea requires the United States to abandon its hostile policy and to take actions to guarantee its regime in a secure and reliable manner. Denuclearization of North Korea and denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula should be implemented based on the principle of reciprocity. To date, the fundamental mutual interests regarding the denuclearization process between the two countries have not yet been coordinated. It will, therefore, require additional time to put the process into practice. North Korea is not likely to carry out complete denuclearization unless it is certain it can obtain maximum benefits from the guarantee for its regime and denuclearization.

It is important to conclude a comprehensive agreement on the complete denuclearization and the building of a lasting and robust peace regime on the Korean Peninsula. What is most important, however, is to restore confidence among the countries concerned, including the United States and the DPRK. Needless to say, the U.S.-North Korea negotiations held in the past resulted in failure: primarily because of strong mutual hostility and distrust. Now South Korea and North Korea have emerged from the existing confrontation and mutual distrust, and are standing at the crossroads of political change toward not only concluding a peace treaty by declaring an end of the Korean War, but also toward establishing a regime for peace on the Korean Peninsula and a multilateral security framework for Northeast Asia. Japan should also continue to sincerely tackle outstanding problems between Japan and North Korea based upon mutual trust, as reaffirmed in the Japan-DPRK Pyongyang Declaration of 2002, until the normalization of their diplomatic relations is realized.

[Accepted 21 December 2018]

(Associate Professor at HPI)

Contents	Prospects for the Situation on the Korean Peninsula	Hyun Jin Son	1
	International Symposium		
	"Opening the Door to Peace: The Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons and Beyond"	Akiko Naono	2-3
	The Rohingya Issue in Myanmar	Narayanan Ganesan	4
	Legal Implications of Adding the Existence of the SDF to the Constitution of Japan	Akihiro Kawakami	5
	Hiroshima Peace Seminar 2018	Hitoshi Nagai	6
	HPI Public Lecture Series 2018		
	"Postwar" Reconsidered: Historical Perspectives"	Makiko Takemoto	6
	Commemorative Lectures Held in October Harkens Opening of the Graduate School of Peace Studies	Takeshi Yuasa	7
	Hello from HPI		7
	Diary		8

“Opening the Door to Peace: The Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons and Beyond”

Akiko Naono

To commemorate both the 20th anniversary of the Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) and the tenth anniversary of the Chugoku Shimbun's Hiroshima Peace Media Center, an international symposium entitled “Opening the Door to Peace: The Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons and Beyond” was held on July 22, 2018. The event was co-hosted by Hiroshima City University, the Chugoku Shimbun, and the Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition (RECNA) at Nagasaki University, and was supported by Hiroshima City and the Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation. In 2017, some progress was made in efforts toward nuclear abolition, as exemplified by the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), and the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN). However, nuclear states have turned their backs on the TPNW. The United States and Russia have promoted the modernization of their nuclear arms, and are even poised to carry out a preemptive strike. Although the U.S.-DPRK summit, the first of its kind in history, was held in June 2018, there has been no specific progress toward the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and the future situation there is impossible to predict. While Japan calls itself the only country in the world to have suffered a nuclear attack, it has increased its dependence on the nuclear deterrent provided by the United States, supporting the U.S. policy that suggests the possible use of small nuclear weapons. Moreover, in its nuclear policy, the Japanese government adheres to promoting the reuse of plutonium that can be used as a component in nuclear weapons, earning the mistrust of the international community. With the Doomsday Clock showing two minutes to midnight warning of a nuclear war crisis, what can we of the civil society do to move toward a “world without nuclear weapons?” The front-line specialists invited to the symposium as panelists talked about the challenges and prospects for the future regarding this issue, while analyzing the situations inside and outside of Japan from various angles.

Keynote lecture

“The Beginning of the End of Nuclear Weapons”

Tim Wright (Treaty Coordinator, International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons [ICAN])

In 2007, when we launched the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, or ICAN, we were determined to amplify the voices of A-bomb survivors, in order to convey the devastating damage wrought by nuclear weapons to people around world, and to promote public awareness that nuclear weapons are arms that jeopardize the existence of humanity. In July 2017, 122 states voted to adopt the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. (TPNW). Among them, 50 states signed the treaty immediately after its adoption. The TPNW will enter into force once a total of 50 states have ratified or acceded to it. As of July 22, 2018, 12 nations have ratified the treaty, indicating progress towards its coming into effect. Comparing with other treaties ten months after the opening for signature, the TPNW had the same number of ratifications as did the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) at the ten-month mark, and one more than the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) each had just four ratifications. Despite these statistics, a number of Japanese media outlets reports that the pace of TPNW's ratification is unusually slow, giving the impression that the arguments of the nuclear-arms states' are more reasonable and gaining greater support, and consequently taking sides with the argument of the nuclear-armed states, which are downplaying the level of support for the nuclear weapons ban treaty.

Although the Japanese government paints itself as a sensible “bridge-builder” between nuclear-armed and nuclear-free nations, by rejecting the ban treaty Japan has actually sided with the group of nuclear states.

The TPNW does not prevent a state party from maintaining an alliance with a nuclear-armed state—Japan could remain an ally of the United States. Of the 17 states designated by the U.S. government as “major non-NATO allies,” 11 cast a vote in favor of the treaty. There is also significant public support for the treaty in four of the NATO countries that host U.S. nuclear weapons on their territory. In my own country, Australia, the main opposition political party, Labor, expressed its commitment to join the nuclear weapons ban treaty when it next forms a government. In Australia, there is a clear disconnect between public opinion and government policy. This disconnect is particularly evident in Japan. However, ultimately, it is not up to politicians but to the Japanese people to decide whether the country will sign and ratify the treaty.

Naysayers told us that we would never succeed in securing a mandate from the UN General Assembly to negotiate this treaty. But we did. Then they told us that the negotiating conference would not result in a treaty being adopted. But it was adopted. Now they tell us that the treaty will never enter into force. But it certainly will. Again, we will prove them wrong. And we will continue proving them wrong until every last nuclear weapon is dismantled.

Panel Discussion

“Two Roads to Abolish Nuclear Weapons’ Reconsidered”

Seiji Endo (Professor, Faculty of Law, Seikei University)

Nuclear abolition can be realized by concurrently taking two pathways—the first is to simply eliminate nuclear weapons, and the second is to create a mechanism for preventing war. The second pathway is needed because, as long as the idea that nuclear weapons are required in case of serious conditions that may occur in the future remains, it is difficult to achieve nuclear abolition. The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) is one of the goals on the first pathway that will advance nuclear elimination. However, the Japanese government did not join the TPNW, and only a small portion of the Japanese public is strongly critical of the government's non-participation in the treaty. This is probably because it is widely thought that Japan can protect itself through its dependence on the U.S nuclear weapons, or that it should firmly maintain nuclear technologies as a potential nuclear deterrent, against the backdrop of

Japan's distrust toward North Korea's nuclear and missile programs and toward China. However, the reason why China and North Korea armed themselves with nuclear weapons was to counter the military threats posed by other countries. An attempt to ensure the security of one's own country based on nuclear deterrence can lead to the proliferation of nuclear arms.

To realize nuclear abolition, in addition to prohibiting nuclear weapons, it is necessary to establish such international relations that eliminate the need to possess or use these arms. International relations in Northeast Asia carry a deep mutual distrust. Nevertheless, countries in the region should make efforts to build a trustful relationship with each other, to create international relations under which nuclear weapons are no longer needed.

“The Road to Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula After the US-North Korea Summit”

Hyun Jin Son (Associate Professor, Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University)

The historic U.S.-DPRK summit was held on June 12, 2018. This summit was an unprecedented event aimed at overcoming 65 years of hostilities between the two countries that has continued since the Korean War, and establishing new U.S.-North Korea relations. In April of the same year, South Korea’s President, Moon Jae-in, and North Korea’s Chairman Kim Jong Un held an Inter-Korean summit for the first time in eleven years. The two leaders confirmed their common goal of realizing a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula, through complete denuclearization. However, it is uncertain whether or not the expression “complete denuclearization” means the so-called “complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization” (CVID), which the international community demands of North Korea. The joint statement signed at the U.S.-DPRK summit reaffirmed North Korea’s commitment to the denuclearization of the Korean

Peninsula, but CVID was not included. As compared with past written agreements concluded regarding North Korea’s nuclear issue, the statement fails to articulate the specific content and implementation period of the measures to be taken, leaving them as matters to be determined at working-level consultations in the future.

The most important challenge to realizing the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is to restore confidence between the United States and North Korea, and to improve their bilateral relationship. The primary reason for the failure of the U.S.-DPRK negotiations held so far has been the strong mutual hostility and distrust. However, the recent U.S.-North Korean summit underlined the establishment of their new relationship, marking the first steps toward confidence building between the two countries.

“Japan’s Nuclear Trilemma: Nuclear Weapons Abolition, Nuclear Deterrence, and the Nuclear Fuel Cycle”

Tatsujiro Suzuki (Director and Professor, Research Center for Nuclear Weapons Abolition [RECNA] at Nagasaki University)

As the only country that suffered an A-bomb attack in the war, Japan has conveyed the inhumanity of atomic weapons to the world. However, the country declared its non-participation in the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons due to the harsh environment surrounding international security. This represents a dilemma faced by Japan’s nuclear policy, which relies on the extended nuclear deterrence of the United States. Japan is also caught in another dilemma—despite upholding nuclear abolition as its national credo, Japan has a potential nuclear deterrent derived from its uranium-enrichment and plutonium reprocessing capabilities, by implementing the nuclear fuel cycle as the pillar of its nuclear policy.

To overcome Japan’s nuclear trilemma, it is vital to establish a security policy that does not rely on nuclear deterrence. If the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula could lead to the creation of

a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the peninsula, then a “Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone” may be created, toward which, Japan can add its support. As proposed in “A Comprehensive Approach to a Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone,” published by RECNA in 2015, one of the most important points involving the Northeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone is that the United States, China, and Russia, which are the nuclear weapon states surrounding South Korea, North Korea, and Japan, would pledge to guarantee that they would not attack or threaten to attack non-nuclear weapon states or North Korea with nuclear weapons. If they promise to do so, South Korea and Japan can withdraw from the nuclear umbrella. To extricate itself from the above-mentioned trilemma, Japan also needs to review the nuclear fuel cycle so as to reduce its plutonium stockpile.

“In a World with the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons: Challenges Lie Ahead for Citizens in Hiroshima”

Yumi Kanazaki (Staff Writer, Hiroshima Peace Media Center, Chugoku Shimbun)

The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is an indispensable step toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. I would like to cite the three challenges that Hiroshima should address now, to have the TPNW take effect and put stronger teeth into the treaty. The first challenge is to close the gap between A-bombed cities and the Japanese government’s nuclear policy. There are many lessons to be learned from ICAN, which has striven to encourage governments to take actions at both the international level and the national level, by establishing clear targets and effective strategies, and by promoting information sharing through SNS and other tools. Second, we must continue to make efforts to convince nuclear states that the possession of nuclear weapons will not be permitted, even though these nations would not gain direct influence if the TPNW comes into effect. We should also protest against these states whenever they take wrong

actions related to the nuclear policies and strategies. Finally, I would like to point out that, after the establishment of the treaty, it is becoming increasingly important to question the folly of some countries trying to protect themselves and their people with these most inhumane weapons, based on the devastating experiences of the *hibakushas*. These A-bomb survivors have not only visited many parts of Japan, but have also traveled around the world, to convey their experiences of the atomic bombings. Their tireless efforts underlie the adoption of the TPNW. Going forward, we have to pass on the experiences of the survivors to future generations and develop more young people in their 20s, 30s and 40s who will work toward the goal of abolishing nuclear arms. We also need to verify whether the actual devastation wrought by the atomic bombings has been sufficiently understood.

At the panel discussion, panelists engaged in lively discussions concerning the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, the prospects for having the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons enter into force, and the roles of A-bombed cities. They also answered questions from the audience. Several of the panelists stressed that it was important that ordinary citizens urge politicians to make stronger efforts to work toward nuclear disarmament, and connect with each other, transcending national borders. These panelists also pointed out that it was essential that Japan broaden the discussion about the elimination of nuclear weapons, without leaving it to experts, that A-bombed cities express their intentions to the Japanese government, and that we all continue raising our voices without giving up, while imaging a world free of nuclear weapons.

In the session “Messages from Hiroshima,” Ms. Emiko Okada, an A-bomb survivor, talked about her experience of the atomic bombing and her sincere wish for nuclear abolition, and Ms. Mayu Seto, a singer-songwriter from Hiroshima, conveyed her desire for peace through performing her song, “Colorful World.” Since the symposium came immediately after the torrential rains that hit western Japan, it was uncertain whether the event could be held as scheduled. Nevertheless, the symposium attracted 260 participants, including many young people. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all presenters and participants of the event.

(Professor at HPI)

The Rohingya Issue in Myanmar

Narayanan Ganesan

The Rohingya issue in Myanmar has deep historical roots and can be traced at least in part to British colonization of the country and its impact on domestic politics. The first major impact came about after the British victory in the First Anglo Burmese War from 1824 to 1826 when Burma lost Arakan (now Rakhine) and Tenasserim states (the former bordering present day Bangladesh) to the British. Annexation of Arakan state meant that there could then be a free flow of peoples from the Indian sub-continent to Burma as a result. This impact would lead to a strong hostility between the local Rakhine (Arakan) Buddhist population that was home to its own Kingdom in the past and the new Muslim settlers who came to be viewed as illegal migrants.

The British would go on to fight another two more wars with Burma before colonizing the entire country by 1889. The long drawn out conflict with the British led to the country being controlled by Britain from 1890. King Thibaw Min and his wife were exiled to Ratnagiri in India. And the British began their rule of Burma from India which lasted until before the outbreak of World War II in 1939 when it was separated from India.

Following their defeat and subjugation the Burmese evolved a deep distrust of foreigners. This included not only the British but also the Indians, Chinese and Thais who were regarded as historical rivals. The rivalry with Thailand was especially exaggerated. In the case of India, the British victory meant that Burma lost control of its borders and large numbers of Indians settled in the country. Given their familiarity with the English language and long dealings with the British they soon dominated the Burmese civil service as well as the economy. The Chettiar (Hindu) money lenders who often took land as collateral for loans were especially loathed. The local hostility against Indians increased tremendously and this would eventually lead to occasional anti-Indian riots up to the 1960s. That and the military junta's nationalization drive in the mid-sixties led in turn to the exodus of Indian businessmen and professionals from the country. In fact until today, Indians are referred to as *kalar* in the country and it is deemed a derogatory word with negative connotative value.

Apart from piecemeal rule over the country, the British colonization of Burma had other serious consequences as well. The first of these was the reification of ethnicity. The British meticulously catalogued all the indigenous ethno-linguistic groups and counted a total of 135 such groups in 1939. Additionally, they also divided the country into ethnic states and used ethnicity for cataloguing as well as political control of the country. Owing to heavy forestation in the highland areas of the country and the threat of malaria, the British only managed to colonize the lowland areas that were then referred to as Ministerial Burma. They then allowed the local highland chieftains to continue ruling under the supervision of the "frontier areas administration".

The reification of ethnicity led in turn to deep divisions within the country especially into the post-colonial period. The Bamar majority that accounts for about two-thirds of the population were primarily lowlanders who also monopolized political power and looked down on the highlanders as less civilized. British

preference for highlanders for soldiering also meant that they were disproportionately represented in the Burmese Army. This preference would later on pit the highlanders against the lowlanders over issues of politics and policy and lead to the establishment of a large number of ethnic insurgent armies that would fight against the government.

The reification of ethnicity meant that the 135 ethno-linguistic groups catalogued by the British came to be regarded as indigenous to the country and those not on the list were regarded as outsiders with attendant negative stereotypes. And since the migrants into Rakhine state were not one of the catalogued groups until today Myanmar authorities do not recognize the term Rohingya and will not use it. This is for fear of inadvertently assigning them official status. Consequently, they are invariably referred to as Bengalis suggesting that they are illegal immigrants from Bangladesh.

On account of this "illegal" status, their rights have always been severely curtailed and they are generally tightly controlled. Such control extends to their freedom of movement and employment, marriage, and land rights. And owing to the fact that they are Muslims and do not blend in with the local Rakhine Buddhists, they have always been periodically persecuted. Such persecution occurs both with the local Rakhines as well as those holding political power and the military. The civil war between East and West Pakistan in 1971 worsened the refugee exodus into Burma and enlarged the Muslim population, much to the chagrin of the locals.

There are a number of other complications to the conflict. Myanmar has a Buddhist majority population and there are elements within this population including the monastic order that are virulently anti-Muslim. Such elements often spew hatred and encourage violence against Muslims. In 2012, as a result of such violence some 200 people, mostly Muslims, were killed and some 140,000 people became internally displaced and continue to live in refugee camps. The military which ruled the country after a 1962 coup is also engaged in violence from time to time like that in 2017 that led to the displacement of some 700,000 Muslims into Bangladesh. That violence was however preceded by a terrorist attack on police stations that killed 10 policemen. Hence the violence that followed was justified as a clearance operation to get rid of extremists.

The borders between Myanmar and Bangladesh are separated by narrow rivers and therefore notoriously difficult to control for population movements. Both countries have poor state and enforcement capacity that worsens the situation. And Rakhine Buddhists also have a deep seated hatred against the majority Bamar ethnic group as well blaming the latter for annexing their kingdom and failing to develop it after independence. High levels of poverty and low levels of development also exaggerate the potential for violence. Given the general hatred against the Rakhine Muslims, it is very difficult for politicians to defend them even when persecuted. Also the military continues to retain tremendous independence and power (accorded by the 2008 Constitution) and its actions are difficult to control.

(Professor at HPI)

Legal Implications of Adding the Existence of the SDF to the Constitution of Japan

Akihiro Kawakami

1. Proposed revisions to the Constitution to add the existence of the SDF

Recent years have seen increasing arguments concerning constitutional revisions. Most noteworthy is the proposal made by Prime Minister Shinzo Abe on May 3, 2017 to add a paragraph (e.g. paragraph 3) or a new article (e.g. Art. 9-2) to the Article 9 of the Constitution concerning the existence of Japan's Self-Defense Forces (SDF), while maintaining the current paragraphs of the Article 9 (paragraph 1: "renunciation of war", paragraph 2: "non-possession of armed force and other war potential" and "denial of right of belligerency"). The ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) has also been poised to submit a four-point constitutional revision draft to the Diet: clarifying the status of the SDF; adding a provision for emergency powers; providing a clause on the elimination of the House of Councilors constituencies comprising multiple prefectures; and development of the educational environment.

The draft revision presented by the LDP March 22, 2018 proposed adding the following clauses to the current Article 9:

Article 9-2: The provisions of the preceding paragraph shall not prohibit Japan from taking necessary measures for self-defense to guarantee the nation's independence and peace as well as the security of the nation and its citizens, and for these purposes, Japan shall maintain the Self-Defense Forces as a national military defense, with the prime minister, who shall be the head of the Cabinet, as its supreme commander, as may be provided by law.

(2) The SDF shall operate pursuant to the approval of the Diet and other such controls, as may be provided by law.

What are the legal implications of these clauses if they are added to the Constitution? I would like to discuss this matter briefly.

2. Legal implications of adding/not adding the existence of the SDF in the Constitution

Fundamentally, it can be said that even if the SDF stays within the confines of the pacifist Constitution, the acknowledgement or official recognition of the SDF's presence could more than "confirm the status quo" in Japan. It would have a significant impact on the civil society and constitutional order of Japan.

What is important here is that the unconstitutionality of the SDF has always been called into question under the current Article 9 and that the burden of proving the constitutionality of the SDF's presence and its activities (including new activities) is on the Japanese government (in the Diet or before the court).

The government always needs to prove the claim that the SDF is not an unconstitutional "war potential"; that the SDF does not constitute "military forces" that a "normal sovereign state" has concerning its belligerent rights; or that the SDF is not a military organization that defends other countries or uses force as a means of settling international disputes. A normal sovereign state conducts activities based on a negative list system, an approach that prohibits activities that do not conform to the law, whereas the SDF, whenever assuming a (new) assignment or engaging in a (new) activity, is required to verify the legitimacy of such an assignment or activity under a positive list approach (because the presence of the SDF is not stipulated in the Constitution and, if anything, the clause advocating that forces and other belligerent rights will never be maintained is included there). Clearly spelling out the existence of the SDF in the supreme law would cause a shift of the SDF's presence from a "positive list approach" to a "negative list approach."

Moreover, the acknowledgement of "military publicness" (the idea that permits a government to provide legitimacy and publicity to military activities to the extent that human rights are limited for the sake of military purposes) under the Constitution would bring crucial legal consequences. Dr. Toshihiro Yamauchi argues that the legal acknowledgement of the SDF's presence might potentially lead to: (1) the validation of Japan's so-called "legislation for peace and security (2015)"; (2) the maintenance of limitless potential for war (e.g. legal approval to possess offensive weapons, such as ICBMs, long-range strategic bombers and offensive aircraft carriers); (3) the legitimization of military conscription; (4) the hollowing-out of the civilian control and democratic control of the authority to use military force; (5) strengthening of discipline for self-defense officials; (6) rampant military secrecy; (7) mandatory land seizures for the SDF's own use; (8) impacts on lawsuits against SDF bases (noise-related lawsuits to demand flight bans and compensatory damages, as well as those claiming the unconstitutionality of SDF bases); (9) increasing military expenditure; and (10) the formation of a military-industrial complex or a military-academic complex (Toshihiro Yamauchi, "Critical Examination of Arguments Concerning Abe's Proposal to Amend Article 9," August and September 2017 Issues of *Law and Democracy*).

One contentious point in particular is that the LDP's draft revision specifies the SDF as "necessary measures for self-defense" rather than "at the minimum necessary level for self-defense." This is open to the interpretation that the exercise of the full-fledged, unlimited, right of collective self-defense can be constitutional. Moreover, the drafted provisions of the Article 9-2 (1) include the phrase "the prime minister, who shall be the head of the Cabinet." Unlike the provision "the prime minister, on behalf of the Cabinet, shall possess the right of the supreme command authority of the SDF" in Article 7 of the Self-Defense Forces Act, this could be read as the prime minister being capable of serving as supreme commander of the SDF without convening a Cabinet meeting to obtain the consent of Cabinet members. The provision "[The SDF shall] operate pursuant to the approval of the Diet and other such controls" of the new paragraph 2 (2) of Article 9 could mean that the SDF may not be subject to the approval of the Diet, depending on the provisions of the law. In other words, the prime minister could use force/belligerent rights on his/her own authority, without obtaining the consent (prior consent, in particular) of the Diet or the Cabinet, which will be another crucial point of discussion. (See Yamauchi's paper mentioned earlier, and Miho Aoi, "The Implications of Stipulating the SDF in the Constitution," *Taking the Constitution Seriously*, edited by Shojiro Sakaguchi, Koji Aikyo and Miho Aoi; Nippon Hyoron-sha, 2018, etc.).

3. How constitutional revisions should be discussed

Specifying the existence of the SDF in the Constitution would have significant legal implications. One important point of discussion surrounding constitutional revision is not how marvelous measures can be implemented if the revised provisions are effectively operated, but whether it is possible or not to ensure that such new provisions can never be abused. A legal system (a Constitution, in particular) must be designed to prevent the person in power, no matter who has political power, from abusing the legal system. In this respect, I am deeply concerned about the lack of any sense of caution concerning the legal abuse of power in recent debates on constitutional amendment.

(Associate Professor at HPI)

In 2018, the Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) marked the 20th anniversary of its establishment at Hiroshima City University in April 1998. The HPI will play a central role in the Graduate School of Peace Studies, which the University will be opening in April 2019. On this commemorative occasion, the Hiroshima Peace Seminar 2018 was held on August 24 and 25, during which trial lectures were delivered by HPI faculty members. Under the overall theme “Perspectives on Peace, Conflict and War,” each faculty member approached a range of subjects from the perspectives and viewpoints of their own specialist fields.

On the first day of the seminar, five faculty members took the rostrum to present lectures on the theme of “History and Society.” Professor Akiko Naono discussed the changes in ways of narrating atomic bombing experiences and their meaning, in her lecture “Experiences of the Atomic Bombing and Postwar Japan.” Professor Robert Jacobs made a presentation (in English) entitled “Beyond Hiroshima and Nagasaki: The History of 2,000 Nuclear Weapon Tests and Global Hibakusha,” in which he talked about the global increase of nuclear victims due to the radiation exposure caused by nuclear accidents as well as nuclear weapon tests after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings. In her speech “History of German Peace Movements and Japan,” Associate Professor Makiko Takemoto traced the history of how German peace movements were formed. The lecture by Professor Hitoshi Nagai, “Reflections on the War and Responsibility: In the Case of the Tokyo Trial,” discussed the context in which the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (Tokyo Trial) were held, along with the characteristics of the trial. At the end of the first day, Associate Professor Xianfen Xu talked in her lecture, “Japan-China Relations for 40 Years after Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship,” about the history of Japan-China relations that celebrated the 40th anniversary of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship concluded between the two countries, as well as the present situation and the future prospects for their relationship.

The second day’s theme was “Law and Politics,” on which five faculty members gave lectures. In his speech “Roadmap toward the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula” Associate Professor Hyun Jin Son analyzed the situation in the Korean Peninsula from the perspectives of the nuclear issue and international relations. Professor Narayanan Ganesan delivered his lecture entitled, “Conflict and Cooperation in Southeast Asia” (in English), in which he discussed the conflicts, cooperation, and mechanisms for easing tension in Southeast Asia. Under the title, “Changing International Order and Sovereign Nations: Regarding Post-Soviet Union Countries,” Professor Takeshi Yuasa analyzed the factors for changing the international order of post-Soviet Union countries, based on Max Weber’s arguments. The lecture “Development of the International Humanitarian Law and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons” given by Associate Professor Yasuhito Fukui discussed the historical and legal status of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons from the aspect of International Humanitarian Law. Professor Tetsuo Sato explained about the legal status of the use of armed force (war), and the mechanisms and issues of regulations under the United Nations system in his lecture, “Considering the United Nations Regulations on the Use of Force in the International Community: The Perspective of International Law.”

The Hiroshima Peace Seminar has been organized annually since 2015, when it was first held as a project commemorating the 70th anniversary of the atomic bombing. In previous years, the seminar’s intended audience was graduate students, public servants, and those in the media. This year’s seminar invited a broader range of participants, including high school students, university students, and ordinary citizens. More than 30 attendees attentively listened to the lectures, and were actively involved in the question-and-answer sessions.

(Professor at HPI)

HPI Public Lecture Series 2018

“Postwar’ Reconsidered: Historical Perspectives”

Makiko Takemoto

The Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) held a public lecture series in fiscal year 2018 at the GOJINSHA Wendy Hito-Machi Plaza. The title of the series was “‘Postwar’ Reconsidered: Historical Perspectives.” Even though more than 70 years have passed since the end of World War II, the word “postwar” is often used in Japan, not only as a simple historical term meaning “after the war,” but also as a term which is combined with Japanese culture and identity. How we understand “postwar” is related to how we discuss and understand the issue of war and peace, and the development and history of Japanese society. The lecturers, titles and contents of each lecture are as follows.

The first lecture (October 19) was “The Narrative of Japanese Postwar History” by Ryuichi Narita, Professor at Japan Women’s University. He looked back to the historiography of the concept of “postwar” and analyzed the changes of the image of “postwar” and perception of Japanese society.

In the second lecture (October 26), Akiko Naono, Professor at HPI, gave a lecture on “Memories of the Atomic Bombings and Responsibility for the Damage.” She analyzed the historical and sociological changes to the debates on the responsibility of the U.S. for the atomic bombing, memories of the survivors, their consciousness and their relationship to the U.S.

The third lecturer was Makiko Takemoto, Associate Professor

at HPI, who talked about “Perceptions of ‘War’ in Postwar Germany” (November 2). She showed the differences of the perceptions of “postwar” and the discussions on war and peace between Japan and (West-) Germany.

The fourth lecture (November 9) was “How did the Japanese View Lt. Onoda?: Narratives about the Japanese Stragglers in the Philippines” by Hitoshi Nagai, Professor at HPI. He analyzed postwar Japanese society through the narratives about stragglers, especially focused on Lt. Hiro Onoda who returned from the Philippines to Japan in 1974.

In the fifth and final lecture (November 16), Akihiro Kawakami (Associate Professor at HPI) talked about “Article 9 of the Constitution as the ‘Symbol of Postwar Japan’.” He explained the discussion on Article 9 and the debates on the “Peace State” focusing on the case of politicians and intellectuals in the 1950s and 1960s.

The number of interested attendees for the audience exceeded the capacity for this lecture series and we had to determine the attendees by ballot. We would like to apologize to the people who were unable to attend as a result and thank them for their interest in our lecture series. The content of each lecture will be published as a HPI booklet in March 2019. The booklet will also be available on our website.

(Associate Professor at HPI)

Commemorative Lectures Held in October Harkens Opening of the Graduate School of Peace Studies

Takeshi Yuasa

On October 27, 2018, Hiroshima City University (HCU) held commemorative lectures for the establishment of the Graduate School of Peace Studies, at the Satellite Campus to introduce the graduate school that will be opening shortly. These lectures were given by two researchers who will join the graduate faculty from academic year 2019.

Dr. Ryo Oshiba (Professor, Aoyama Gakuin University) delivered a lecture entitled “Global Governance and World Order,” and Dr. Tadashi Okimura (Professor, The University of Shimane) presented a lecture entitled “Climate Change Issues: How International Society Is Responding.” Although the lecturers discussed the subjects in line with their specialized fields, unexpectedly, they both focused on how to resolve policy challenges confronting the international community, which is an important issue to be addressed by peace studies in the future. Dr. Oshiba and Dr. Okimura also shared the same opinion that not only national governments but also corporations, nongovernmental organizations, and various other stakeholders should participate in the decision-making process, in order for the international community to promote “governance without government.” They also expressed the same view that the prospects for such global governance is not necessarily bright these days, when we see a widespread trend towards “one’s own country first” policies, driven by U.S. President Donald Trump.

The Hiroshima Peace Seminar was held in August last year, which also shared the objective of promoting the new graduate school. At the seminar, full-time faculty members of the Hiroshima Peace Institute took the podium enabling us to introduce the lineup for the Graduate School of Peace Studies to the general public. Soon, we will welcome the first batch of students and the new graduate school will commence in earnest. We look forward to seeing the new graduate school begin to serve as a venue for productive education and scholarship.

Universities are considered to have entered an age of transformation. In Japan, where the population of young people has been on the decline, there is a glut of universities and graduate schools, and we have already reached the time in which universities cannot achieve

their intake quotas for undergraduate courses. In the future, there will be an accelerating shakeup, with not a few universities falling by the wayside as failed competitors. In parallel with changes in the foundations of learning as an occupation, which is rather familiar to us, I think that the foundations of learning in a more essential sense are also being undermined. U.S. President Trump calls media outlets that are critical of him “fake news.” Meanwhile, information based on flimsy evidence is rampant on social media (including social networking sites), which some think may even have influenced the results of the presidential election. This is the reason why it is said that now we live in the “post-truth” era. On the other hand, in the present age, people believe they can develop their intelligence without attending universities, by obtaining knowledge and information through social networking channels and the Internet.

I believe that in this age, as members of the new graduate school, students and faculty should address this common challenge—that is, to hone their intelligence while pursuing “peace” as the keyword, and fittingly based in Hiroshima. There are plenty of tasks toward making the new graduate school a venue for passionate learning. For example, Mr. Motofumi Asai, the former President of HPI, made a proposal “to elevate Peace Studies even to the position of being the *raison d’être* of HCU” (see *Hiroshima Research News*, Vol. 13 No. 3, March 2011). Although this proposal was advanced before the concept for the new graduate school was established, it is very interesting. He wrote his idea as follows: “On the academic side, Peace Studies should become a fundamental factor which interlinks HCU’s three faculties and graduate schools... On the administrative side, the HPI President should assume a newly created post whose duty it is to oversee Peace Studies on the scale of the entire university.” This idea is ambitious but worth paying attention to. I look forward to the future of the Graduate School of Peace Studies, which will be created based on a sincere reflection of the achievements of the HPI to date over more than two decades—while at the same time remembering to build on the old ways of doing things to develop something new.

(Professor at HPI)

Hello from HPI

Kyung Jin HA

Associate Professor,
Hiroshima Peace Institute



Dr. Ha Kyung Jin was born in 1982 in the Republic of Korea. After graduating from Ewha Womans University in South Korea, and completed her doctoral course at the Graduate School of Interdisciplinary Information Studies, The University of Tokyo. She obtained a PhD in Interdisciplinary Information Studies. She taught at The University of Tokyo Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies as an Assistant Professor etc., before arriving at the HPI to assume her present position in October 2018. She specializes in sociology and media communication. Her single-authored books and papers include: *Public Relations no Rekishi Shakaigaku—America to Ninon ni okeru <Kigyo Jiga> no Kochiku* (Historical Sociology of Public Relations: Construction of “Corporate Identity” in the U.S. and Japan), from Iwanami Shoten, Publishers (2017); *Public Relations no Joken—20 seiki-shoto no America shakai wo tsujite* (Conditions of Public Relations—through the American Society in the Early 20th Century), published in *Shiso “Thought”* magazine, vol. 1070 (2013); “Koho” Aru Public

Relations no Ruikei—1960 nendai Kankoku ni okeru Seifu Communication wo Megutte (A Type of Public Relations—Regarding Governmental Communication in South Korea in the 1960s), published in *Journal of Mass Communication Studies*, vol. 79 (2011).

Greetings

My name is Ha Kyung Jin and I have recently joined the faculty of the Hiroshima Peace Institute. As my area of specialty, I pursue media and communication studies, with particular focus on the theories and history of public relations. In recent years, it has become an important task for the international community to shape public opinion and consensus on a global basis. I will be teaching the Journalism Studies and Global Communication courses, in both of which I would like to discuss the roles of communication that will facilitate dissemination of the significance of peace and encourage the creation of a peaceful world. I also look forward to talking about media literacy, which will help local governments and civic groups to shape public opinion and deepen people’s understanding of political problems, through the public lectures and various activities offered by the HPI.

- ◆ **Jun. 16** Tetsuo Sato delivers a presentation, “How We Could Read ONUMA Yasuaki, *International Law in a Transcivilizational World* (Cambridge University Press, 2017)” at the International Law Colloquium (No. 390), the University of Tokyo (to be published in *Tokyo Review of International Law*, No. 7, 2019).
- ◆ **Jun. 17** Kazumi Mizumoto attends the 2nd meeting on Peace Declaration organized by the City of Hiroshima, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima.
- ◆ **Jun. 28–July 1** Yasuhito Fukui participates in the 3rd UN Review Conference on the Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons (New York, USA).
- ◆ **Jul. 3** Makiko Takemoto presents a lecture, “Hiroshima and Peace Movements in Japan and Germany” at the joint seminar “Themes of the Past in Japan, Germany and Australia” of Chuo University and the University of Western Australia, held at Chuo University in Tokyo.
- ◆ **Jul. 12** Hyun Jin Son presents a lecture, “Japan-Korean Relation after the US-North Korea Summit” at Japan-Korea Friendship Association in Shimane.
- ◆ **Jul. 13** Mizumoto attends the 3rd meeting of the Peace Declaration organized by the City of Hiroshima, held at the City Hall.
- ◆ **Jul. 14** Xianfen Xu delivers a presentation on “China’s Memory of Hiroshima-Nagasaki” at a workshop of KAKENHI (Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research) by Kyoto University of Foreign Studies, held in Kyoto City.
- ◆ **Jul. 27** Hitoshi Nagai presents a lecture, “The Historical Documents of a Japanese War Criminal in the Philippines: Focusing on Former Lieutenant General Shizuo Yokoyama” to the 9th meeting of the Media Material Seminar at the Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Ritsumeikan University.
- ◆ **Jul. 28** Mizumoto presents a lecture, “Hiroshima and Peace” at the training course for domestic journalists organized by the City of Hiroshima, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima.
- ◆ **Jul. 30** Gen Kikkawa presents a lecture, “Is International Peace and Human Security Compatible?” to 30 students of UNESCO IICBA (International Institute for Capacity Building in Africa).
- ◆ **Aug. 2** Fukui participates in the international symposium organized by the Center for Peace of Hiroshima University and speaks on “The Treaty on prohibition of nuclear weapons and its future challenge.”
- ◆ **Aug. 4** Akiko Naono presents a lecture on the memory of the atomic bomb experiences at the “Future Leaders’ Program for Global Peace” seminar series organized by Hiroshima Prefecture.
- ◆ **Aug. 5** Mizumoto presents lectures, “Understanding the Different Cultures: Ethnicity, Culture and Religion” and “The Inhumanity of War and the Inhumanity of Nuclear Weapons” at the “Future Leaders’ Program for Global Peace” seminar series organized by Hiroshima Prefecture.
- ◆ **Aug. 7** H. E. Thulani Dlomo, ambassador of South Africa to Japan visits the HPI, and discusses with Kikkawa on ways to abolish Nuclear Weapons.
- ◆ **Aug. 13–15** Narayanan Ganesan trains the Myanmar civil service on public administration and public policy formulation in Kyaingtung, Shan state, Myanmar.
- ◆ **Aug. 23–25** Fukui participates in the 4th Conference of States Parties (CSP4) to the Arms Trade Treaty, held at Chinzanso, Tokyo.
- ◆ **Sep. 3–5** Ganesan trains the Myanmar civil service on public administration and public policy formulation in Shwebo, Sagaing region, Myanmar.
- ◆ **Sep. 4** Mizumoto presents a special lecture, “The Current State and Tasks of Peace Research” at a training program for Level II Certified Nursing Administrators organized by and held at the Hiroshima Nursing Association.
- ◆ **Sep. 6** Sato attends the annual meeting of the Japanese Society of International Law held in Sapporo.
- ◆ **Sep. 9** Robert Jacobs facilitates a meeting of hibakusha from Hanford and the Nevada Test Site at Southern Utah University in Cedar City, Utah, USA.
- ◆ **Sep. 10** Son joins the discussion and serves as a moderator at the forum, “The Past and Future of Korea-Japan Relations” organized by the Consulate General of the Republic of Korea in Hiroshima and Dongseo University, held at the GOJINSHA Wendy Hito-Machi Plaza, Hiroshima.
- ◆ **Sep. 12–14** Jacobs attends the annual conference of the National Association of Atomic Veterans in Portland, Oregon, USA.
- ◆ **Sep. 15** Naono presents on the politics of the categorization of the war sufferers through legal and institutional arrangements at the 91st Annual Conference of the Japan Sociological Society, held at Konan University.
- ◆ **Sep. 19** Akihiro Kawakami presents a lecture, “Local Self-Government and Argument for Constitutional Amendment in Japan” hosted by the Citizens Policy Research Committee in Tokyo.
- ◆ **Sep. 20–21** Fukui participates in the Stockholm Security Conference 2018 organized by SIPRI and comments in the session on emerging technology and international law. Furthermore he exchanges views about nuclear issues at SIPRI on Sep. 23.
- ◆ **Oct. 4** Jacobs, Son, Takemoto, Xu and Kyung Jin Ha hold a seminar with the trainees of North Korean defectors at the HPI.
- ◆ **Oct. 6** Kawakami presents a lecture, “Peace Power of Citizens and Local Government and Argument for Constitutional Amendment in Japan” at National Conference for Jichiken (Research of Local Self-Government), held in Kochi City.
- ◆ **Oct. 27** Fukui reports on the ‘proliferation financing’ at the international law seminar of Kyoto University.
- ◆ **Nov. 1** Kikkawa presents a lecture on “What is International Peace?” to 28 high school students of Meitou High School, at the HPI.
- ◆ **Nov. 7** Xu presents a lecture, “How Japan Faces Global China” in Asian Community Lecture Series at Nagasaki University.
- ◆ **Nov. 27** Ha serves as a panelist at the panel discussion, “Visioning the Future from the New Past: Thinking about Post 2020 Public Relations” in Japan’s first large-scale conference on public relations, held in Tokyo.
- ◆ **Nov. 28** Ganesan delivers a lecture, “The 2018 Malaysian election and its impact on domestic politics” at the Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Bonn University, Germany.
- ◆ **Nov. 29** Takemoto presents a lecture, “No Euroshima: Hiroshima and Anti-nuclear Movements in Germany” at a meeting of the German-Japanese Society in Bonn, held at Bonn University, Germany.
- ◆ **Nov. 30** Ha presents a lecture, “Electrified Postwar Japan: An Analysis of the Electricity Company’s PR Strategy” to forty-seven trainees of King Prajadhipok’s Institute (KPI), held at the HPI.

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.21 No.2 (March 15, 2019)

- Published by Editorial Committee (Yasuhiro FUKUI, Robert JACOBS, Hitoshi NAGAI, Hyun Jin SON), 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.