

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Hiroshima Peace Institute

Vol.14 No.3 March 2012

Examining the Dangers of the Civilian Use of Nuclear Energy International Symposium “Exploring the Roles of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Japan”

Kazumi Mizumoto

The Hiroshima Peace Institute (HPI) and the Chugoku Shimbun co-hosted an international symposium entitled “Exploring the Roles of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Japan: In the Wake of the 3/11 Nuclear Power Plant Disaster” on November 19, 2011, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima. It was aimed at re-considering the future roles of Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Japan following the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant in March 2011, which revealed the potential dangers of civilian in addition to military use of nuclear energy. Attended by an engaged audience of approximately 280 people, experts from Germany, the US and Japan, and also A-bomb survivors exchanged their insightful knowledge and perspectives.

The first session entitled “Reflecting on the Development of Nuclear Energy in Japan” opened with a report from Mr. Seiji Shitakubo, a correspondent for *The Chugoku Shimbun*. Under the title “From the Series of Articles ‘Fukushima and Hiroshima,’” he spoke about the present situation in Fukushima together with photographs. Secondly, Hitoshi Yoshioka, vice-president and professor of Kyushu University who is an expert in Japan’s atomic energy policy, gave a speech entitled “The Impact of the Fukushima Nuclear Accident on Japanese Nuclear Policy.” Comparing the accidents in Fukushima and Chernobyl, Yoshioka highlighted the deficiencies of safety management at the plant in Fukushima which led to the recent disaster.

In the following session entitled “How Does the International Community See Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Weapons?”, Frank

Uekötter, fellow at the Rachel Carson Center in Germany who conducts research on environmental problems caused by nuclear power plants, gave a speech entitled “How to Abandon Nuclear Energy: The German Case.” Uekötter examined Germany’s experience up until its recent decision to instigate a gradual shut-down of all nuclear power plants in the country, by means of consideration of their costs and risks. This was followed by a speech by Marylia Kelley, executive director of Tri-Valley CAREs, an anti-nuclear NGO based in California. In her speech entitled “US Nuclear Policy in the Age of Obama and Fukushima,” Kelley underlined the increase in budget for nuclear weapons that has occurred even under the Obama administration, and the recent merger of movements against nuclear weapons and nuclear power plants, following the Fukushima accident.

In the last session entitled “What is the Future Role of Hiroshima and Nagasaki?”, Osamu Saito, a medical doctor at Watari Hospital in Fukushima City who has rich experience of providing medical care for *hibakusha* in Hiroshima, gave a speech entitled “Ongoing Radiation Impact and Hibakusha.” In this speech he stated that Japanese policy towards *hibakusha* has actually been largely to abandon them, and that we should not allow the government to repeat such negligence again. The session concluded with a final speech entitled “The A-bomb Experience and Fukushima.” The speaker, Toshiko Tanaka who is a *hibakusha* and an enamel mural artist, appealed that there must never be any more new *hibakusha* in Japan.

Vice-President of HPI

Part 1 Reflecting on the Development of Nuclear Energy in Japan

From the Series of Articles “Fukushima and Hiroshima”

Seiji Shitakubo

Correspondent for *The Chugoku Shimbun*

The Chugoku Shimbun is currently running a series of reports about Fukushima, dispatching three correspondents equipped with radiation dosimeters and wearing radiation protection suits. As the leader of the three, today I will talk about what we saw there and whether the experience of Hiroshima can be of any help in handling the post-accident situation in Fukushima. While the cleanup of radioactive soil is continuing at parks and schools in Fukushima City, some local residents are opposing the plan for temporary storage sites for the contaminated soil. It seems that this is partly due to the insufficient explanation provided by the central and local governments.

I am repeatedly asked in Fukushima how nuclear power plants have been perceived in Hiroshima. In 1956, an exhibition to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy was held at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum. It glorified the power source as “the energy of dreams,” and the media supported the promotion. Based on this bitter experience, this time we selected 50 local residents from the Hamadori area in Fukushima Prefecture so that we could report how the local people are provided with information about the

accident, and how their needs and psychological states are changing over the long term.

The mayor of Okuma Town, a town in the vicinity of the Fukushima power plant, was informed of the evacuation order issued by the central government only via a police officer who happened to be at the town hall. Actually, the local residents had been skeptical even prior to the 3/11 accident about the transparency of TEPCO, the operator of the power plant, regarding information releases about past accidents. Similarly, interviews held in September, six months after the accident, revealed the worry and fear among mothers and female high school students concerning their babies’ health or having children in the future.

Just as *hibakusha* in Hiroshima and Nagasaki have suffered prejudice, the affected people in Fukushima Prefecture are similarly suffering from groundless rumors. I saw farmers in Date City bury peaches, one of the local specialties, in the earth with their eyes full of tears. Fireworks produced in the prefecture were being boycotted in other prefectures. As a company based in the atomic-bombed city of Hiroshima, we will continue producing our reports so that readers in Hiroshima can communicate their sympathy to the people in Fukushima.



Contents

Examining the Dangers of the Civilian Use of Nuclear Energy: International Symposium “Exploring the Roles of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Japan”	Kazumi Mizumoto	1-3
My Approach to Peace Studies Vol. 1 “Rethinking Peace from Hiroshima”	Nobuyuki Kakigi	4-5
Keys to Understanding the Arab Spring	Masaki Uno	6
HPI Lecture Series for Citizens of Hiroshima (Second Term 2011) “Nuclear Energy and Japanese Society: Historical Analysis and Prospects”		7
Diary		8

The Impact of the Fukushima Nuclear Accident on Japanese Nuclear Policy

Hitoshi Yoshioka

Vice-President and Professor of Kyushu University

When comparing the nuclear accident in Fukushima with that of Chernobyl as well as the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, several important characteristics of the former case come to light. The first characteristic is the fact that a great number of people were exposed to radiation. While there haven't been any victims suffering from acute radiation disease, a fair number of people are expected to suffer from late onset radiation disease. The second is that hundreds of thousands of people had to evacuate and most of them are unlikely to be able to return home due to the excessively high levels of radiation in their hometowns. The third is that a large number of workers who were engaged in the restoration of the damaged nuclear power plant were also exposed to radiation. The fourth is that full restoration of the pre-accident environment will be impossible in some contaminated areas. For instance, the damaged reactor buildings are too dangerous to be dismantled or removed, therefore they will probably need to be sealed within concrete sarcophaguses. The fifth is that the situation in Fukushima is much worse than that in Chernobyl since four of the reactors at the Fukushima plant are in a hazardous condition. The sixth is that it is likely to take at least several years before all of the reactors are safely shut down. The seventh is that a significant amount of contaminated water has drained into the sea.

The cause of a nuclear disaster on such a grave scale can be analyzed in terms of the reactors themselves and of crisis

management. Regarding the former, there are four factors which it can be argued aggravated the accident: firstly, the disproportionate number of 54 nuclear reactors were constructed within a small country where the occurrence of earthquakes and tsunamis is by no means rare; secondly, as many as six reactors were constructed at the Fukushima plant; thirdly, old and fragile reactors were left in operation at the plant; fourthly, the risk of tsunamis was disregarded. In fact, the site of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant was originally 30 meters above sea level, but it was lowered by 20 meters for the convenience of pumping in seawater to cool the reactors. As a result, it was hit by a tsunami with a height of 14 meters. It should also be noted that the long power outage was not predicted at the plant.

With regard to crisis management, this was carried out not by the disaster management headquarters set up at the Prime Minister's Office, but by TEPCO's headquarters from which the former was only informed of decisions and provided with information. At the same time, however, despite its huge size, TEPCO proved incapable of handling such a national crisis. Nevertheless, the actual and disproportionate responsibility for restoration work was placed upon the shoulders of TEPCO.

Henceforth a realistic approach for Japan could be to live with nuclear power plants for the next 20 years or so, while gradually moving towards the complete abandonment of all nuclear power plants.



Part 2 How Does the International Community See Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Weapons?

How to Abandon Nuclear Energy: The German Case

Frank Uekötter

Fellow at the Rachel Carson Center, Germany

The recent German decision to gradually shut down all nuclear power plants in the country was the last step in a long process of de-nuclearization. The first step towards the decision was the strong, persistent protest of local people who had learnt the dangers of nuclear energy. The second step was the support for the anti-nuclear movement by the Green Party and the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD). The third step was that electricity companies realized that power plants running on gas or oil are cheaper than nuclear power plants. The fourth step was that by the late 1980s, the German government had abandoned the utopian narrative of the 1950s which regarded nuclear energy as "the technology of the future." The fifth step came with German reunification, following which all nuclear reactors in East Germany were shut down and construction of new reactors cancelled. Consequently, it was clear in 1990 that no more new nuclear power plant would be constructed in Germany in the future. The sixth step was the decision taken by the coalition government that was formed between the SPD and the Green Party in 1998: this was to limit the lifetime of the then existing reactors to 32 years on average. The incumbent

center-right government which won the general election in 2009 enacted a new law to extend the lifespan by 12 years on average. Nevertheless, the overall stance towards nuclear energy of the government can be said to be far from enthusiastic as it had been during the 1950s. Only after all these steps came the seventh step, that is the recent decision to abandon nuclear energy, made by Chancellor Merkel following the nuclear accident in Fukushima.

What we should learn from the path of German nuclear power policy since the 1950s is to "prepare for the unexpected." Formerly, engineers and physicists dreamed of nuclear power plants, the Social Democrats were enthusiastic towards them, and the center-right coalition government supported nuclear power policy. Nevertheless, none of these groups of people were able to maintain their support for nuclear power plants. The process of de-nuclearization should be established on a middle ground — a path between the extremes. In 2010, nuclear power supplied 22 percent of all electricity consumed in Germany, and it will not be easy to replace this share with other energy sources. The shift towards renewable sources will need to be gradual. Other European countries may follow the path that Germany has taken.



US Nuclear Policy in the Age of Obama and Fukushima

Marylia Kelley

Executive Director of Tri-Valley CAREs, the US

President Obama called for "a world without nuclear weapons" in the famous speech that he delivered in Prague in 2009. However, his administration is actually engaged in the modification and modernization of nuclear weapons for the purpose of "maintaining" them, and also under the name of the "Life Extension Program." Moreover, when the US and Russia signed the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, President Obama promised the nuclear "hawks" in the Senate a significant increase in the budget for nuclear weapons programs in order to obtain the votes necessary for the ratification of the treaty. In fact, the budget is projected to amount to 700 billion dollars in total for the coming ten years. The National Nuclear Security Administration of the US Department of Energy runs eight major nuclear weapons facilities, and the US is planning to produce nuclear weapons for the next 40 years or more at those facilities in Los Alamos, Oak Ridge, Kansas City, Livermore and others.

At Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California near where I live, out of its budget for the next year of 1.2 billion dollars, 89 percent will be spent on nuclear weapons programs. The air, land

and groundwater aquifer beneath our homes have all been contaminated as a result of nuclear testing, and the laboratory is on a special government list of the most contaminated locations in the country. The cleanup is expected to take 70 more years, and government officials have admitted that the area can never be completely cleaned up.

There are 7 million people living within 50 miles of Livermore Laboratory, and all of them are potential victims of radiation exposure. Past accidents at the laboratory have so far released 1 million curies of radiation into the air.

The accident in Fukushima has exerted a significant influence on US citizens, and in fact movements against nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons are moving closer to each other. Hiroshima and Nagasaki have played the role of catalyst to accelerate action for the abolition of nuclear weapons. For all the roles that you have played, I thank you. As a citizen of the United States, I repeatedly remind myself that it was my country that dropped two nuclear weapons on Japan. In this context, my group organizes anti-nuclear demonstrations at the gates of Livermore Laboratory on the anniversaries of Hiroshima and Nagasaki every year.



Part 3 What is the Future Role of Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

Ongoing Radiation Impact and Hibakusha

Osamu Saito

Medical Doctor at Watari Hospital, Fukushima City

The level of radioactive contamination caused by the accident in Fukushima is as grave as that of the accident in Chernobyl, and the radiation level of land reached 5 millisieverts per year in 13 percent of the whole area of Fukushima Prefecture. Contaminated water is continuously draining into the sea. It is still an incomplete and urgent task to establish a system to check the safety of food in order to prevent the internal exposure of local people. While it is difficult to measure the radiation dose of external exposure accurately, some measurement results which were taken in Fukushima City in September were far lower than expected; this was a great relief. Although the probability of late onset radiation disease may not be so high, the uneasiness in their daily lives and mental stress that the people of the prefecture are suffering are serious enough. Secondary damage attributed to evacuation, such as excessive mental strain, decrease in income and separation of families, should also not be overlooked. Living in shelters can also be a cause of mental illness. Concern is particularly great for the mental and physical conditions of elderly people who have to live on their own, especially during the winter.

The people of Fukushima Prefecture are also experiencing difficulties regarding their jobs since most of the key industries of the prefecture, such as dairy farming, agriculture, fishing and tourism, have been suspended due to the widespread contamination of land and sea. At the same time, compensation claims brought against TEPCO are not proceeding without difficulty due to the complicated procedures, underestimated compensation amounts and inaccurate evaluations of the damage caused by groundless rumors. Therefore, full compensation is highly unlikely.



The recent nuclear accident in Fukushima is one of the most serious incidents in the history of postwar Japan, both politically, economically and internationally. However, the Japanese government has so far shown insufficient leadership in its efforts to come to terms with the situation. Clarification of the state's responsibility is essential in order to restore industrial infrastructure. Previous Japanese administrations largely abandoned *hibakusha*, in response to which *hibakusha* themselves have been calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons and state compensation. It is an absolute necessity for the victims of the nuclear accident in Fukushima to not tolerate such a policy of "abandonment" on the part of the government, and to demand the abolition of all nuclear power plants and a drastic shift in energy policy.

The A-bomb Experience and Fukushima

Toshiko Tanaka

Hibakusha and Enamel Mural Artist

At the time of the atomic bombing, I was a first-year student at elementary school. On my way to school, I looked up at the sky. At that moment there was a great flash of light and everything around me went white. I must have covered my face with my right arm because I received burns on my head, right arm and the left side of the back of my neck. In later years I lived a happy married life and had a son and a daughter. However, my second child developed a disease caused by inherited radiation damage. A-bombed parents feel guilty for having been atomic-bombed themselves, and they live with that sense of guilt for their children and thus with a psychological burden for the rest of their lives. Nevertheless, due to the difficulties of proving causal relationships between exposure to radiation and specific diseases, claims for public support usually have to be withdrawn.

Japan hasn't learnt any lessons from the atomic bombings or

from the nuclear accidents of the Lucky Dragon, Three Mile Island and Chernobyl. On the contrary, it has allowed the recent nuclear disaster to happen, which caused the spread of radiation and deprived people of fresh air, water, food and even places to live. When I recently visited New York for 62 days to speak about my atomic bombing experience, wherever I went I was asked why Japan has built so many nuclear power plants despite all of its terrible experience of the atomic bombings and nuclear accidents. I was always at a loss for words. It is true that the myth of "peaceful use" of nuclear energy was accepted in Japanese society due to a lack of knowledge and indifference among people, which I, as a *hibakusha*, am truly ashamed of. I cannot tolerate the fact that Japan is creating more *hibakusha* now. As a *hibakusha* myself, I strongly believe that I must continue to relate my own experiences.



Q & A Session

Q: How is Germany moving towards alternative energy sources?

Uekötter: Solar energy, wind energy and biofuel are being introduced. However, biofuel may cause some side effects on the soil. Renewable energy is not a panacea; it has its own weak points.

Q: Why can't nuclear power plants be abolished immediately?

Yoshioka: The cost of building and dismantling a nuclear power plant is enormous, whereas the cost of maintenance and nuclear fuel is cheap. Therefore dismantling and replacing nuclear power plants with thermal power plants will require a huge amount of money. One to two trillion yen will be required to dismantle 30 to 40 nuclear reactors. The central problem is this high cost.

Uekötter: Dismantling a nuclear reactor safely requires a long period of time. In fact, Germany has begun searching for a place for the permanently safe storage of a huge amount of radioactive waste. It takes a long time to dispose of the radioactive waste that is produced following the dismantling of a nuclear reactor.

Q: What is the situation in Japan regarding the ultimate disposal of high-level radioactive waste?

Yoshioka: A law was enacted in 2000 which requires all radioactive waste to be reprocessed, formed into glass, and then stored in geological depository sites. The newly-established Nuclear Waste Management Organization of Japan (NUMO) called on municipalities to offer candidate sites for this. However, so far no candidate municipality has come forward. Having witnessed the Fukushima accident, no municipality is likely to be interested in the near future.

Q: Doesn't the most powerful nuclear weapon state the US have any desire to move towards the abolition of nuclear weapons, and lead the world in efforts to that effect?

Kelley: In the US there are indeed citizens calling for nuclear abolition in various cities and towns. However, it is still difficult to change US nuclear policy. In order to achieve this, it is necessary to educate the general public so that they will understand what their government is actually doing and then take action themselves. I've been devoting myself to that effort, but it is a long process.

Q: What is the reality of the environmental damage caused by nuclear weapons production facilities in the US?

Kelley: People engaged in the US nuclear weapons industry say that environmental pollution was caused or nuclear accidents occurred "only by

accident." In reality, however, the environment surrounding any nuclear weapons production facility is contaminated with radioactivity. It was as late as 2000 that the US government introduced a compensation system for the workers who developed illnesses or lost their lives as a result of radiation exposure at nuclear facilities. In fact, from Livermore Laboratory, family members of approximately 3,000 workers who became ill or died have applied for compensation for their suffering.

Q: Is the damage caused by the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki taught in the US and Germany?

Kelley: Many children in the US do not know the names of the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, or the fact that the US dropped atomic bombs on these cities. It is very dangerous not to know these historical facts. I want to correct this deficiency in US education through citizens' NGO activities.

Uekötter: In Germany, teaching about Hiroshima has waned over the last 20 years. During the Cold War period, people in Europe associated any confrontation with the experience of Hiroshima, that is the danger of nuclear weapons. Since the end of the Cold War, however, people in Germany assume that no nuclear weapons will ever be used against them. This is by no means a positive tendency. In Germany, as in anywhere else, we should not forget the experiences of the *hibakusha*.

Q: Can the people in Fukushima have any hopes for the future?

Yoshioka: I can talk about what we, the independent Investigation Commission, were told by the mayors and civil servants of Okuma and Futaba Towns in which all the residents had to evacuate. According to them, most of the young people of these towns have no intention of returning there; however, middle-aged and elderly people still hold strong affection for their hometowns and wish to return someday. Nevertheless, as long as a roadmap for the cleanup remains unclear, they may not be able to keep hold of their hopes, nor to actually return home. The principle reason for their anxiety is the fact that they cannot see a clear picture for the future.

Saito: It was reported in *The Chugoku Shimbun* that 25 percent of the people who evacuated from the contaminated areas do not wish to return to their hometowns, which in turn means that 75 percent of them wish to do so. However, this will not be possible until the government develops a comprehensive plan for conducting the cleanup and ensuring food safety. There are large numbers of people who have been compelled to return to their hometowns as they have been unable to find a job in a new location, or they could not endure the separation of their families. These people are strongly determined to live their lives positively. It is the government which bears the clear responsibility to support these people.

(Summarized by Kazumi Mizumoto)

The present issue marks the start of a new series entitled “My Approach to Peace Studies” in which a specialist from a variety of fields writes about “peace” or “peace studies” as seen from the perspective of that particular field. The first article presented here is written by Associate Professor Nobuyuki Kakigi of the Faculty of International Studies, Hiroshima City University. Under the theme of “philosophy and peace,” he discusses how the concept of “peace” should be understood in relation to each individual’s life, making reference to issues unique to Hiroshima.

Rethinking Peace from Hiroshima: From Memory Inheritance to Peace Lying between Selves and Others

Nobuyuki Kakigi

To affirm one's life with profundity

“Life is survival.”—These words of the philosopher Jacques Derrida which he expressed just prior to his death may pose an important question in relation to the meaning of life in this world. This question has become ever more pertinent in the aftermath of the nuclear disaster in Fukushima since the accident has caused a significant amount of radiation to be emitted into the surrounding area, which has further devastated the lives of the residents in the vicinity and has also threatened their lives as well as those of others who have yet to be born. Furthermore, the potential effects of invisible radiation still remain largely unforeseeable. In such circumstances, one may naturally think that one’s own survival is indeed a fragile condition.

When regarding oneself as a survivor, one inevitably recalls those who were not able to survive. Thinking of such people does not only lead to an idea that life and death are inseparable. It also leads to an idea, as is often observed in the cases of *hibakusha* in Hiroshima, of why it was that one did not perish along with the deceased; and this thought manifests itself more strongly among those to whom the deceased were close. For Derrida, clinging to life despite having such a sense of guilt, which for him was an affirmation of life, was not simply a matter of praising survival. Suffering from cancer, he equated this affirmation of life to the utmost degree with his own philosophy. For him, philosophy may have meant becoming closer to life which even resonated with the dead; and then affirming that life which has such overwhelming power that it could even drive one into death. If this is the case, it can be argued that within Derrida’s thinking may be found a possible way to affirm survival with profundity without leaving the dead behind.

This profound thinking may also offer a means through which peace that originates from Hiroshima can be considered. “To consider peace originating from Hiroshima” can be interpreted as “to pursue peace as an opportunity to live on as a survivor.” In this case, peace is no longer an abstract concept: it should be revisited as an embodied concept and, moreover, an opportunity for individuals to actually survive. What should be

sought in Hiroshima, therefore, is a means by which this embodied concept of peace can be integrated with an idea of creating peace in relationship with others. A first step towards this would be an attempt to take on board the individual experiences of the people of Hiroshima, be they experiences of those who were lost or those who survived with deep psychological and physical scars, without beautifying them and reducing them to a cliché or a stereotyped image. This could provide an opportunity to learn about past events which have preceded one’s own life, uncover past violence which those people have actually gone through, and also strive to prevent any similar cases happening again in the future. (It should be noted that violence has been repeated in the form of exposing people to radiation and through legislation under which government authorities have been able to select who can be counted as a “victim” at their discretion.) In such a process of endeavor, the act of passing on the memories of *hibakusha* and of pursuing peace as an opportunity to survive can be consolidated together.

A more open way of passing on memories of the atomic bombing

A further discussion of the issue of passing on the memories of *hibakusha* should emphasize the need to address the difficulty of achieving this successfully. The need to pass on the memories of *hibakusha* has always been advocated in Hiroshima. However, what this can actually convey to non-*hibakusha* should be carefully considered, while consulting other cases such as the issue of the limits of representation in relation to the Holocaust. An enquiry of this nature may serve to clarify the difficulty of such an endeavor. In spite of the considerable difficulty however, it still remains necessary to attempt to comprehend *hibakusha*’s unique experiences of the atomic bombing in detail by means of examining their records and testimonies. This clearly includes the great difficulty of bridging the gap between *hibakusha* and non-*hibakusha*. Nevertheless, this very gap can be conceived as actually inducing comprehension. Otherwise, not only will the unique memories of each individual be lost forever, but Japan will also likely have the memories of the atomic bombings utilized for

the justification of its self-contradiction, which is the fact that despite its claims that it is “the only atomic-bombed country” and has a constitution which strictly prohibits acts of war, for many years Japan has been actively engaged in the development of nuclear energy which could be diverted towards the production of nuclear weapons.

If, in contrast, one addresses the memories of *hibakusha* without reducing them to a cliché such as “the woefulness of the atomic bombing,” such an attempt can potentially go beyond the “myth” that Japan is “the only atomic-bombed country.” (Here it should be noted that the victims of the atomic bombings were by no means only Japanese people.) This can increase the possibility that within each memory an entanglement of various forms of violence can be discerned, such as an indiscriminate massacre caused by nuclear weapons, all-out war, colonization, and the postwar Japanese legal system which has discriminated against *hibakusha*. In this context, it is unavoidable to accept the fact that Hiroshima was a military hub for the Japanese invasion of Asian countries. Attempting to comprehend *hibakusha*’s memories by putting oneself into their shoes may require addressing various related issues: taking into account the fact that Hiroshima was formerly a military hub; admitting Japan’s ultimate responsibility for its invasion of Asia during WWII, together with its colonialist policy; questioning Japan’s responsibility for continuing the war which ultimately led to the atomic bombings; and also confronting the Japanese government’s stance which has demanded that the whole nation endure the damage caused by the war, and which at the same time overlooked the war responsibility of the government itself.

In the process of associating others’ past experiences with ongoing problems that exist today, while addressing the cases of violence that have been experienced by each individual who was in many respects a victim but also in some others an aggressor, what is essential is to contrast the atomic bombing of Hiroshima with other cases of violence that have occurred in other places. The literary theorist Edward Said, who consistently maintained his criticism of the imperialism of the West, stated that remembering an experience of suffering is not enough unless it is associated with the sufferings of others. Otherwise, that particular memory will be confined to a limited scope and will be forgotten in other places, which will then cause other people to endure the same suffering. In fact, since the atomic bombing of Hiroshima there have been large numbers of people who have suffered similar cases of violence, such as through indiscriminate massacres or the use of radioactive weapons such as ammunition which contains depleted uranium. Consequently, passing on the memories of the atomic bombing may mean not only communicating them to those outside Hiroshima, but moreover contrasting them with other cases of suffering, and attempting at all cost to prevent similar cases of violence from occurring in the future. In so doing, will it at last become possible to link memory transmission and the pursuit of peace. Moreover, it may also become possible for the concept of peace to be reinterpreted so as to mean surviving together with others.

Revisiting the concept of peace

As discussed above, there is a necessity for the word “peace,” which has become so ubiquitous in Hiroshima that it is almost a cliché today, to be reinterpreted in order that it is no longer a mere abstract ideal. Peace should be understood as representing an

opportunity to survive in this world in which the history of violence is still ongoing. In other words, the pursuit of peace is not to view it as an imposed objective, but to seek it in close relation to oneself who continually interacts with others in daily life. This process requires that the concept of “peace” be clearly distinguished from that of “security” which is today frequently pursued by violent means. This situation is due to the fact that the concept of “security” fuels an ungrounded sense of terror of others who are different from oneself—the word “terrorist” functions to project “terror” on others and exclude them—and consequently provokes a new form of war, as represented by a “war against terrorism.” In fact, for the sake of “security,” currently the lives of the people of Okinawa are once again on the verge of victimization, at the same time as the so-called “Apartheid Wall” built in the West Bank “for security” stands as nothing more than a structurization of both racist and colonial violence which tramples on the human dignity of Palestinians. It is crucial to clearly distinguish between the concepts of “peace” and “security” in order not to wage war for the sake of “peace” which is understood as “security,” nor to allow violence to repeat itself causing the exclusion of others, and nor to deprive people of an opportunity to survive.

In this case, therefore, how can peace be interpreted as an opportunity to survive? Immanuel Kant who advocated “perpetual peace” stated that peace among world citizens, upon which he placed more importance than peace among states, should be built with universal hospitality as its guiding principle. Similarly, Emmanuel Lévinas, who went beyond the theory of war to address issues of ethics, conceived a “first philosophy” of peace as receiving the other into one’s space without unconditionally perceiving the other as familiar. Adopting these perspectives may lead to a view that peace gains real meaning only through the acceptance of others with whom one lives. Kant advocated that peace must be established by means of law. However, if peace is discussed only within the field of law, this may overlook the potential violent nature of politics which is carried out on the basis of law. In this respect, the theory of Lévinas may have more validity since it argues that fundamental peace can be found in encounters with others who do not stand on the same ground as oneself. Therefore peace should be reinterpreted to mean living with unfamiliar others in peace. Nevertheless, according to Derrida, peace understood only in the domain of ethics has the potential to block the path of actually achieving peace between oneself and others. In an attempt to question the fundamentals of politics, he therefore sought a way to achieve a “first philosophy” of peace through encountering others with whom one lives in peace.

By means of this approach the concept of peace can be successfully redefined. Peace can be constructed within life with others through accepting them and standing against a history of violence; and this may represent what we are actually seeing in the contemporary global political arena. In the present world which poses a serious threat to peoples’ lives through violence and radiation, comprehending *hibakusha*’s experiences in an open manner in order to associate them with other experiences may lead to a pursuit of peace that originates from Hiroshima, which is understood as an opportunity to survive together with others and without disregarding the dead.

*Associate Professor at the Faculty of International Studies,
Hiroshima City University*

Keys to Understanding the Arab Spring

Masaki Uno

The protests in Tunisia which broke out towards the end of 2010 rapidly developed into an anti-regime movement. On January 14, 2011, Tunisia's dictatorial regime collapsed following the exiling of Tunisian President Ben Ali, and 11 days later on January 25, the revolution in Tunisia triggered anti-regime protests in Egypt against President Mubarak and also in other Arab countries. The spillover effects of the Tunisian revolution have yet to come to an end, and democratization movements are still ongoing in countries such as Syria and Yemen. The chain of these democratization movements has been termed the Arab Spring. This article discusses key issues relating to this historic event.

The first point that should be emphasized is the fact that all of the individual cases that make up the Arab Spring represent resistance against dictatorial regimes. On the surface, these regimes may seem to have had little or no association with the Western world. However, history reveals the existence of deep relations between these regimes and Western countries. The former were previously under the control of the latter, either directly or indirectly, in the form of British or French colonies, protectorates or UN trust territories. Against such a historical background, some Arab monarchies such as Morocco, Jordan and some Gulf countries have actually come into existence as a result of their installation and patronage by the imperial powers. Similarly, republican regimes such as Egypt (since the 1952 revolution), Algeria, Libya, Syria and Iraq also have significant links to the regimes installed by their former masters. In fact, these regimes even utilized socialism and communism, political ideologies which originated in the West, to sustain their respective power. This explains how the dictatorial regimes of the Arab world are in reality historically inseparable from the Western world. It should also be remembered that it is partly due to the Western world that these regimes have been able to stay in power until now.

The second key point is the fact that anti-American (anti-Western) sentiment is quite common within Arab countries, especially at the grassroots level. The reason for this can be found in the common understanding among the people of the region that their countries were formerly under the control of Western countries. Particularly important in this context is the Israeli-Palestinian issue. It is a common perception in the Arab world that this conflict came about as a result of European imperialism, and that the creation and continued existence of Israel has been essentially supported by the US. Hence, the Arab world regards Israel as a "puppet state of European and American imperialism."

The final point which should be recognized is the fact that Islamism is gaining influence and beginning to assume control in the political vacuum that has been created by the recent collapse of dictatorial regimes. Political movements calling for changes to bring about a more Islamic political system does not represent a new phenomenon, as demonstrated by the establishment of the Muslim Brotherhood in 1928. However, hitherto these movements have been unable to make a significant impact due to constant suppression orchestrated by the former regimes. Nevertheless, the 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran triggered a rapid increase in the number of young people devoting themselves to Islamism. This trend was accelerated by the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1990. In the Arab world, socialism and communism had previously exerted

significant influence on both anti- and pro-regime forces. However, those historic events weakened support for these ideologies and, as a consequence, encouraged support for Islamism among the people of the Arab world, despite its religious and sectarian nature, which would ostensibly seem rather irreconcilable with socialism and communism. The recent election victories of Islamist forces in Tunisia and Egypt may confirm this trend of the rise of Islamism. In the West as well as in Japan, democracy which developed in the West is quite often viewed as an absolute ideology which should ultimately replace all other political systems. However, other ideologies are actually being adopted in the developing world. In fact, in the Islamic world, to which the Arab world belongs, Islamic democracy is becoming widely developed and accepted. It is important for this reality to be acknowledged.

These key points may lead to a conclusion that the Arab Spring stands as a consequence of the interactions between the Western world, including Japan, and the Arab world. This understanding may stimulate further questions regarding our possible subconscious tendencies when examining the Arab Spring: for example, imposing Western values on the Arab world as an absolute; disregarding the political system of the Arab world and regarding Islam as a threatening religion in order to justify the imposition of Western values; and effectively fueling such perceptions through the media. In the case of Japan, the media appears to discuss the Arab Spring only within the context of assessing its influence on Japan's national interests, which can be rephrased as the national interests of the US since the diplomatic policy of the two countries largely resonates with each other. In fact, most of the country's media reports seem to view the dictatorial regimes as an absolute "evil," while disregarding the fact that it was the Western world, again including Japan, which supported this "evil" and benefitted from it. Following the election victories of Islamist forces in some Arab countries, the Japanese media was largely in line with that of the US in the way that it expressed great concerns over the future of the Middle East and also a strong desire for the Islamic forces to be moderate should they gain political influence. Similarly, with regard to the Israeli-Palestinian issue, the media reveals a strong tendency towards overlooking the inhumane occupation of Palestine by Israel, and instead emphasizes the perceived danger of Hamas, the Islamist organization based in Palestine, to an unnecessary degree. It is this one-sided standpoint prevalent in Japan that has not only blocked the path towards mutual understanding between Japan and Arab countries, but has rather made its achievement more difficult.

Although its further development is unforeseeable, it is likely that the democratization movements in the Arab world will lead to a greater call for a resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian issue which is based on justice. Above all, the current situation has been caused by past negligence in terms of addressing the issue in a truly just manner. Israel and the US maintain that pressure on Israel has stalled the Middle East peace talks, and Japan has followed this assertion. However, it is clear that the greatest hindrance to peace in the Middle East has been the ongoing Israeli occupation of Palestine. The Arab Spring urges us to decide whether to cling on to traditional Western values or to champion diverse values.

*Professor at the Faculty of International Studies,
Hiroshima City University*

Nuclear Energy and Japanese Society: Historical Analysis and Prospects

The Great East Japan Earthquake on March 11, 2011, and the subsequent disaster at the nuclear power plant in Fukushima reminded us of the great potential dangers of nuclear energy. This event triggered a wide-ranging debate over how Japanese society can and should handle this energy resource, and also posed a question regarding Hiroshima's previous attitude towards Japanese nuclear policy. Reflecting on this situation, the Hiroshima Peace Institute organized the latest Lecture Series for Citizens on the theme of nuclear energy and Japanese society. Emanating from various research fields such as media studies, history, medical sciences and physics, five lecturers examined the present situation and problems surrounding nuclear energy. Particular focus was placed upon the following issues: the controversial handling of the Fukushima disaster by the Japanese government; the similarities and differences between the radiation-caused damage in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and that in Fukushima; the problems and tasks imposed upon Japan which is heavily dependent on nuclear energy; and the recent anti-nuclear decision taken by Germany and the future path that Japan should take. The summaries of each lecture are as follows.

Lecture 1 From HIROSHIMA to FUKUSHIMA, from FUKUSHIMA to...?

(October 7) Toru Takeda, Journalist / Critic / Professor at Keisen University

The first lecturer was Toru Takeda who is a specialist in media studies and also a journalist. Based upon his previous research on Manchukuo, patients with Hansen's disease in Japanese society and nuclear power plants, he identified linkages between these three issues. In both cases of city planning in Manchukuo, a puppet state established by the Japanese Empire in 1932, and regarding nuclear power plants within Japan, priority was given to technological development over people's lives. At the same time, discrimination against sufferers in society was observed in both the cases of Hansen's disease and that of the Fukushima disaster. Through historical analysis of Japanese nuclear policy, he questioned the actual feasibility of both a society with nuclear power plants and the immediate abolition of all nuclear power plants. He also identified the creation of certain communities that are vulnerable to radiation as a result of the imposition of nuclear power plants on those peripheral communities. He then emphasized the importance of people becoming aware that holding an absolute expectation with regard to renewable energy is a naïve hope.



such as the absence of a registration system for patients suffering from cancer, inefficiencies in epidemiological research, and a lack of social and medical support for all victims of internal and external exposure to radiation.

Lecture 4 The Nuclear Power Phase-out in Germany

(October 28) Makoto Nishida, Lecturer at Kobe University

Following the Fukushima disaster, the German government led by Chancellor Angela Merkel carried out a radical shift in its policy on nuclear energy through deciding to instigate a gradual shutdown of all its nuclear power plants by 2022. Despite the growing interest in this policy change amongst the Japanese public, the long path leading up to this decision is not well known. Nishida first examined the historical and political background of Merkel's recent decision, the response of German society, and the future challenges facing the country. He then focused on the Green Party and the influence that it has had in German politics and society, especially regarding previous moves towards the phasing-out of nuclear power plants. Reflecting on the case of Germany, he discussed the prospects for the abolition of nuclear power plants in Japan, and emphasized the need to examine nuclear power plants in relation not only to natural disasters but also to national security. He also emphasized the need for cross-factional discussions on issues such as the abolition of nuclear power plants, alternative energy sources and ecology.



Lecture 2 Global Hibakusha and Japanese Society

(October 14) Hiroko Takahashi, Assistant Professor at HPI

As a scholar of US history, Takahashi has been conducting research into the information control relating to radiation issues imposed by both the US government and its military. She has brought to light the actual situation regarding "Global Hibakusha" such as atomic soldiers (soldiers who were mobilized for nuclear tests) and workers at nuclear power plants who have suffered health problems as a result of exposure to radiation. In the lecture she first explained the historical background of the US information control on radiation effects in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and revealed the similarities between these cases and the handling of the Fukushima disaster by the Japanese government. According to Takahashi, the Japanese government still disregards the dangers of residual radioactivity and internal exposure to radiation. She emphasized the need to protect people from radiation, especially workers at nuclear power plants, infants, children and expectant mothers.



Lecture 5 Nuclear Energy and Peace

(November 4) Michiji Konuma, Professor Emeritus at Keio University

Physicist Michiji Konuma has long been involved in efforts campaigning for nuclear abolition as a member of the Pugwash Conferences and also of World Peace 7, a group of intellectuals who are calling for world peace. In this lecture, he first demonstrated that in order to achieve peace, there is no alternative but to bring about nuclear abolition and the non-military resolution of conflicts. He then examined the characteristics and problems which are unique to the Fukushima disaster in comparison to other accidents such as that which took place in Chernobyl, and presented a detailed examination of the problems of the Japanese government's handling of the disaster. He further stressed that both nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons ultimately violate fundamental human rights, and as a consequence, efforts need to be made to achieve the following: the cancellation of plans for and the construction of new nuclear power plants; the immediate abandonment of old and decrepit nuclear power plants; promotion of the development and use of renewable energy resources; and the reduced and efficient use of electricity. He also opined that if the nuclear power plants currently in operation are to remain so in the immediate future, it is absolutely necessary to acknowledge the risk of nuclear accidents, develop thorough safety measures, and keep the plants in operation for the shortest possible period, and only after having secured the agreement by all the people who could potentially be affected in the case of a nuclear accident. He concluded the lecture by emphasizing that every individual as well as society as a whole should make continued efforts towards a world without nuclear energy.



Lecture 3 The Physical and Psychological Effects of Nuclear Energy

(October 21) Nanao Kamada, Chairman of the Hiroshima A-bomb Survivors Relief Foundation

Based upon his own extensive experience of treating and supporting *hibakusha* in Hiroshima, physician Nanao Kamada examined the characteristics of radiation effects in the cases of Hiroshima, Chernobyl and Fukushima. This examination included the differences between internal and external exposure, and the possible effects that nuclear energy can have on the human body such as damages to chromosomes and the development of cancer. Kamada emphasized the need to measure the levels of both internal and external radiation exposure of the evacuees from Fukushima, to examine their evacuation routes and dietary records, and to conduct medical checks over a long period of time. He also identified insufficiencies which exist in terms of social infrastructure



Makiko Takemoto, Assistant Professor at HPI

- ◆ **Nov. 3** Robert Jacobs presents paper “Ignoring a Research Cohort: American Atomic Soldiers and Radiation Exposure” at the annual meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science, held in Cleveland, OH, US.
- ◆ **Nov. 5** HPI Vice-President Kazumi Mizumoto gives lecture “Hiroshima and Peace: The Atomic Bombing Experience and Contributions towards Peace” to a group of teachers from the Takéo Provincial Teachers Training College as part of the Cambodia Reconstruction Support Project, co-organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and JICA, held at the Hiroshima Prefectural Office.
- ◆ **Nov. 8** Mizumoto serves as the Vice-Chair at the 8th meeting of the Exhibition Review Committee of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima.
- ◆ **Nov. 10** Mizumoto and Jacobs give lectures on the reconstruction of Hiroshima and the atomic bombings and nuclear weapons as perceived in the US respectively, to a group of students from the Lower Secondary School affiliated with the School of Education, Nagoya University, held at HPI.
- ◆ **Nov. 13-14** Mikyoung Kim presents paper “*Ganbarism: The Dilemmas of Fukushima Victims*” at the Asan Japan Conference “Japan in Crisis: What Will It Take for Japan to Rise Again?”, organized by and held at the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, Seoul, South Korea.
- ◆ **Nov. 18** Mikyoung Kim presents paper “The Dokdo/Takeshima Debates: A Memory Problem” at the Second International Forum for Peace and Prosperity in Northeast Asia entitled “Sixty Years after the San Francisco Peace Treaty: Peace, Conflict, and Historical Reconciliation in the Asia-Pacific,” held at Columbia University, New York, NY, US.
- ◆ **Nov. 24** Mikyoung Kim presents paper “North Korea and East Asian Community Debates,” at the international conference “G20 Era and Regional Cooperation of Asia: A Search for a Directivity,” held at Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Seoul, South Korea.
- ◆ **Nov. 25** Narayanan Ganesan presents paper “East Asian Regionalism: Positions and Priorities” at the 5th APISA Congress “Regional Integration in Asia and Europe in the 21st Century,” held at Overseas Chinese University, Taichung, Taiwan.
- ◆ **Nov. 26** Mizumoto gives keynote speech “The Roles of Local Governments and NGOs” at the workshop on the internationalization of local community entitled “From Regional Societies!—Support for Reconstruction and Contribution towards Peace by Local Governments and NGOs,” organized by the Council of Local Authorities for International Relations (CLAIR) and other organizations, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima. ▽ Mizumoto presents paper “An Analysis of Recent Trends and Debates on Nuclear Weapons” at a workshop organized by the Advisory Research Committee of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, held at the museum.
- ◆ **Nov. 28** Mizumoto gives lecture “Hiroshima and the Danger of Nuclear Weapons” to a group of Rotary Peace Fellows from the ICU Rotary Peace Center during their Hiroshima Field Trip, held at HPI.
- ◆ **Nov. 30** Jacobs gives report on his research project “Global Hibakusha Project” and discusses films at the symposium “Rethinking Nuclear Development” during the 2011 Hiroshima Peace Film Festival, held at HPI.
- ◆ **Dec. 6** Mizumoto gives lecture “Contribution towards Peace from Hiroshima: Support for Reconstruction and the Tasks for UNITAR” at a meeting of the League of Hiroshima Prefectural Councilors for the Support of UNITAR (the United Nations Institute for Training and Research), held at the Hiroshima Prefectural Council.
- ◆ **Dec. 19** Mizumoto presents paper “The Meaning of Peace Studies in Hiroshima” at the 2nd workshop of the Research Project on Peace and Conflict Studies, organized by and held at the Institute of International Relations and Area Studies, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto.
- ◆ **Dec. 20** Ganesan co-hosts with the Jeju Peace Institute and chairs the joint conference “Peace and Cooperation in East Asia,” held at HPI. ▽ Mizumoto presents paper “A Nuclear-free Zone in Northeast Asia: Its Prospects and Challenges” at the same joint conference.
- ◆ **Dec. 21** Mizumoto serves as the Vice-Chair at the 9th meeting of the Exhibition Review Committee of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, held at the International Conference Center Hiroshima.
- ◆ **Dec. 22** Hitoshi Nagai gives lecture “The Institute for American Studies of Rikkyo University during the Second World War” at Rikkyo University, Tokyo.
- ◆ **Dec. 24, 2011-Jan. 16, 2012** Ganesan conducts field research in Myanmar.
- ◆ **Jan. 16** Mizumoto attends the Task Force Meeting of “A Hiroshima for Global Peace” Plan, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture, held at the Hiroshima Prefectural Office.
- ◆ **Jan. 22** Mizumoto gives lecture “Cambodia: History, Civil War and Rehabilitation” at a preparatory training course for the Study Tour to Cambodia, organized by the Hiroshima International Center (HIC) and JICA Chugoku, held at HIC.
- ◆ **Feb. 7** Mizumoto serves as the Vice-Chair at the 10th meeting of the Exhibition Review Committee of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, held at the museum.
- ◆ **Feb. 29-Mar. 7** Mizumoto conducts visit to Cambodia for several projects including the Cambodia Reconstruction Support Project, co-organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and JICA.

—Visitors—

- ◆ **Nov. 10** Students from the Lower Secondary School affiliated with the School of Education, Nagoya University.
- ◆ **Nov. 28** Rotary Peace Fellows from the ICU Rotary Peace Center.
- ◆ **Dec. 20** President Tae Kyu Han and six other members of the Jeju Peace Institute.
- ◆ **Jan. 31** Prof. Akihisa Matsuno from the Osaka School of International Public Policy, Osaka University, and three researchers from Southeast Asia.

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.14 No.3 (March 26, 2012)

- Published by Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University (Editor: Yuko Takahashi)
Ote-machi Heiwa Bldg. F9/10, 4-1-1 Ote-machi, Naka-ku, Hiroshima 730-0051, Japan
Phone: +81 (0)82 544 7570 Fax: +81 (0)82 544 7573 E-mail: office-peace@peace.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp
- Printed by Letterpress Co., Ltd.