

International Symposium (July 31, 2004)

“Reflections of the Enola Gay: Symbolic Representations of War and Destruction, 1945-2004”

What Can We Learn from the Enola Gay Exhibition? By Yuki Tanaka

Since December 2003, the “Enola Gay,” the B-29 bomber which dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima, has been on permanent display in the new wing of the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C. This exhibition is seen by American World War II veterans and politicians as evidence of the military might as well as the technological supremacy of the United States, but it makes no reference to the nuclear holocaust that resulted in horrific mass killing and the total destruction of Hiroshima city, as well as long-term damage done to survivors and the environment by the bomb’s radiation.

Yet, it was a common practice already during World War II to regard aerial bombing campaigns as proof of a nation’s (military) strength or as a way to demonstrate a nation’s ascendancy over the enemy to its own people by exploiting images of aerial bombings. In Britain, for example, there is a wartime propaganda poster in which a large number of Lancaster bombers, looking like a huge swarm of dragonflies, are pictured showering bombs on a German city. Similarly, immediately after the bombing of Hiroshima, a popular American magazine, *Life*, published a special edition, with a large imaginary picture of the bombing of Hiroshima by the Enola Gay spread across its cover page. The irony of an illustration depicting the instant killing of 70,000 people splashed across the cover page of a magazine entitled *Life* cannot be ignored. Interestingly, however, the picture itself was not that of a gigantic mushroom cloud, as we know the detonation of the Hiroshima A-bomb actually produced, but simply an enlarged version of an explosion typically caused by a conventional bomb or an incendiary bomb. This implies that the common understanding of an atomic bomb by those on the attacking side was that it was simply a mammoth conventional bomb. Indeed, this view is still held by most American veterans who do not clearly perceive the difference between atomic bombs and conventional bombs.

According to Professor Lawrence Wittner, while the majority of Americans are now against the development of nuclear arms and the conduct of nuclear wars, they still regard the use of atomic bombs against Hiroshima and Nagasaki as justifiable acts. It seems that their anti-nuclear sentiment derives from a wish not to become themselves the victims of a nuclear attack. In other words, the fundamental point of American anti-nuclear sentiment lies in the desire to defend the lives of American citizens, with little concern for the lives of people of other nations. Clearly, this problematic attitude stems from the fact that the memories of the A-bomb victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are not widely and deeply shared with the American people.

In any war, it is almost inevitable that the “enemy’s faces” are dehumanized. This leads to the dehumanization of the civilian population of the enemy nation as well, even though these civilians’ faces are similar to those of one’s own people. If one wishes to prevent the dehumanization of citizens of any country and thus to reduce acts of violence and terrorism throughout the world, it is most important for each of us to examine such acts from the viewpoint of the victims. To comprehend the problems of violence as seen in the eyes of the victims

means that one must listen to the individual stories of the victims, to re-experience their psychological pain, and to internalize such pain as one’s own. As Professor Takashi Kawamoto claims, “sharing memories” in the true sense becomes possible only through this process of re-living and internalizing the pain of others. The intense desire of American parents to protect their own children against air raids was vividly expressed in a propaganda poster produced in the U.S. during World War II, using a picture of an innocent girl’s face looking apprehensively up at the sky. A recent photograph of an Iraqi father carrying his severely wounded daughter strikes us by conveying the indescribable sorrow of this man. Both of these images capture the essence of “individual stories” of victims. By focusing attention on these individual stories, the scope for “sharing memories” begins to widen, as they force one to think about the fundamental question of universal humanity.

How can we, the citizens of Hiroshima, help American citizens share the memories of the A-bomb victims? What changes are needed to make the present exhibition of the Enola Gay a symbol of “sharing memories” between the Japanese and Americans? It is impossible to achieve this goal of sharing memories simply by criticizing the Americans’ one-sided way of maintaining their memories of the bombing of Hiroshima. We must also change our own way of storing our memories, so that they can be shared with many people throughout the world. To this end, it is necessary, for example, to design and restructure the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum so that it may provide a venue where all people can share common memories of Hiroshima, regardless of nationality, race, religion, and political ideology. Such a change should be the result of extensive discussions from a wide range of viewpoints and perspectives. In addition, as Professor Laura Hein lucidly argues, there seems to be much that can be learnt from the recent changes at some American museums, which have occurred since the first Enola Gay Exhibition controversy in 1996.

It is indeed indisputable that the central message of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum must be opposition to nuclear weapons. Yet, we also need to find our own unique way to continually deliver to the entire world a powerful message of rejecting any type of violence anywhere in the world.

The core philosophy of this message must include the conviction emphasized by Professor Tony Coody, that any form of indiscriminate killing of civilians amounts to an act of terrorism, whatever the motivation and whoever the perpetrator. Seen from this point of view, it is clear that indiscriminate mass killing is a crime against humanity, common both to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Moreover, “sharing memories” becomes possible between the Japanese and the Americans if we listen carefully to the individual stories of the victims in both cases.

No matter what the reason, killing civilians — including those of enemy nations — is one of the most serious violations of fundamental human rights. One inevitably brutalizes oneself by violating those rights, and such an act eventually leads to the disintegration of one’s own humanity. Similarly, by violating the fundamental human rights of citizens of other nations, the perpetrating nation corrupts its own democracy and contributes to its own eventual destruction. We Japanese learnt this important lesson from our own experiences in the 15-year Asia-Pacific War, although it seems that Japanese politicians are now forgetting this lesson. Today the U.S. seems to be embarking upon a path similar to that which we commenced more than 70 years ago. In the eyes of the citizens of Hiroshima, the body of the plane, the Enola Gay, displayed simply to symbolize the supremacy of American military power and technology, is seen as a warning sign against the danger that American democracy faces.

Tanaka is professor at HPI

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| HPI International Symposium on July 31, 2004 | |
| “Reflections of the Enola Gay: Symbolic Representations of War and Destruction, 1945-2004” | 1~3 |
| Genocide in Darfur, Sudan? by Christian P. Scherrer | 4 |
| HPI Research Forum | |
| What Does “Peace” Mean in a Post-Civil War Society? by Midori Iijima | 4~5 |
| Iraq after the “Anti-terrorism War” by Shintaro Yoshimura | 5 |
| New Tasks for the Peace Movement in Hiroshima by Kazumi Mizumoto | 6~7 |
| HPI Public Meeting | |
| Research in Progress on Damage Due to Bikini Atoll H-Bomb Tests | 7 |
| Diary | 8 |



The Enola Gay and the World of Terror

By Tony Coady

Tony Coady is Professor of Applied Philosophy at the Center for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics, University of Melbourne. He specializes in applied philosophy.

The symbolism of the hijacked airliners exploding into the World Trade Center in New York needs to be juxtaposed with the image of the Enola Gay above the mushroom cloud rising from Hiroshima. It is important today to view the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki against the background of the current war on terror and concern with the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Both the atomic bombings of Japan and the September 11th attacks in the United States were acts of terrorism if we define terrorism, as I think we should, as "the organized use of violence to attack the innocent (or their property) for political purposes." These were qualitatively similar crimes, although the scale of destruction in Hiroshima and Nagasaki was much greater.

Both attacks constitute moral crimes because they employed a tactic that violates a deep principle of just war theory: that which prohibits direct attacks upon non-combatants (the "innocent" in the special sense of the word meaning those not engaged in executing harmful acts that might justify a violent response). In my definition of terrorism, both states and non-state agents can perpetrate terrorist acts.

Some have argued that there is no moral point in distinguishing between non-combatants and combatants, but these arguments are flawed. In particular, the idea that modern warfare or insurgency cannot distinguish between combatants and non-combatants is unsustainable in light of the fact that in any war there remain millions of people who cannot plausibly be seen as being involved in the enemy's lethal chain of agency. There are, for instance, infants, young children, the elderly and infirm, large numbers of tradespeople and workers, not to mention dissidents and conscientious objectors. It is simply obscene to claim that there is no moral difference between shooting a soldier who is shooting at you and gunning down a defenseless child who is a member of the same nation as the soldier.

Terrorism is often justified by both state and non-state actors as a necessary means of achieving critical goals. The United States claimed its terrorism was required to bring the war to an end more quickly and with lower loss of life; other terrorists claim their deeds are justified by their contribution to the end of foreign occupation or to the exposure of vulnerabilities of an imperialist power. Not only is this sort of explanation often weak in its own terms, but more significantly, it ignores the inherent wrong in terrorism.

The legitimate campaign against the spread of weapons of mass destruction is hampered by the fact that its principal promoter, the United States, has itself used such weapons against Hiroshima and Nagasaki and continues to possess huge stockpiles of them. The legitimate campaign against terrorism also needs to acknowledge the existence of state terrorism, especially the readiness of major powers to use nuclear weapons.



The Enola Gay Exhibits and the Peace Movement in the United States

By Lawrence S. Wittner

Lawrence Wittner is Professor of History at the University at Albany, State University of New York. He has a Ph.D. from Columbia University and specializes in American diplomatic history.

In 1995 and again in 2003, the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, a very large U.S. government museum complex, opened exhibits featuring the Enola Gay, the plane that dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Both of these exhibits stirred up substantial public controversies centered on the atomic bombing of Japan.

In the first controversy, hawkish forces — veterans groups, military lobbyists and conservative politicians — succeeded in using nationalism to browbeat Smithsonian officials into eliminating pictures and portions of the museum script highlighting Japanese suffering and the nuclear arms race, and had them replace these items with new sections emphasizing Japanese wartime villainy. However, these changes deeply disturbed two key constituencies: historians and peace movement leaders. As a result, these groups protested against the reduction of the exhibit to little more than nationalist propaganda and secured a few small concessions from the Smithsonian staff. Outraged, the hawkish groups succeeded in forcing the museum director to resign and stripping down the exhibit to merely a plaque identifying the B-29, an upbeat film about the crew, and a cardboard cutout showing the crew members.

The issue resurfaced in 2003, as the Smithsonian was making plans for another Enola Gay exhibit. By this time, the Smithsonian leadership and staff had been thoroughly purged or tamed, and the new museum director promised that the Enola Gay would be displayed "in all its glory as a magnificent technological achievement."

Peace activists and anti-nuclear academics once again responded. Under the banner of the Committee for a National Discussion of Nuclear History and Current Policy, they demanded that the exhibit also discuss the effects of the atomic bombing. They petitioned, staged a public protest meeting at American University and held a demonstration at the opening of the exhibit.

Despite these efforts, the 2003 protests did not generate broad popular backing. The public meeting and the demonstration were both rather small-scale events, and once again there was a strong expression of support for the atomic bombings.

This failure to mobilize substantial criticism of the Enola Gay exhibits reflected the strength of nationalism in American life. Polls show that over the years most Americans have continued to support the atomic bombing of Japan. This support is not based upon a fondness for nuclear weapons, for, since World War II, peace groups have managed to turn a majority of Americans against them. However, most Americans cling to the notion that they are the citizens of a uniquely virtuous nation and therefore dislike exhibits that undermine this belief.

Q & A

Question: I believe that comparing the bombing of Hiroshima with the attack on the Twin Towers would be hardly acceptable in the United States. Considering the strong nationalistic sentiments currently prevalent in the U.S., I believe that there should be changes both in the way the American government perceives its own actions and in the way the American people perceive their own actions. How can we face this difficulty and appeal to ordinary Americans at the same time?

Answer (Prof. T. Coady): There are several American intellectuals, outstanding intellectuals like Michael Walzer and John Rawls, who regard the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as immoral acts on the same grounds that I have been arguing. Walzer gets very close to calling it terrorism and he certainly calls the bombing of German cities terrorism. That is getting as close as you can to saying that it is on a par with September 11th. He probably does not say that publicly at the moment, but certainly in the United States there are a lot of philosophers who take a somewhat similar line to mine about terrorism. I think that the only thing one can do is to keep repeating these views and writing

about them, and being as brave as possible about confronting people with them.

Question: I understand that thanks to American multi-culturalism, American museums have also become more open-minded towards a variety of differing views that exist within their own nation. However, it is often pointed out that while this growing tolerance brought about through multi-culturalism accepts and appreciates differences within domestic culture, it fails to extend such an outlook to foreign culture. Does there exist any trend that seeks to make American multi-culturalism more truly universal?

Answer (Prof. L. Hein): American multi-culturalism is a new phenomenon. When I was a child and in school, there was no mention of the internment of Japanese Americans in our textbooks. I didn't learn about it until I went to college. I have looked at this closely and all the textbooks that are used widely in the United States now discuss this event and take the view that it was a terrible wrong that harmed not just



American Museums and Their Audiences since the Enola Gay Controversy

By Laura Hein

Laura Hein is Professor of History at Northwestern University. She has a Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin and specializes in Japan's international relations in the 20th century.

In December 2003, the National Air and Space Museum opened a permanent exhibit featuring the Enola Gay. Like the 1995 exhibit, it celebrates the technical details of the plane without acknowledging the human suffering that it caused. The exhibit is chilling evidence of the militarization of American culture. Similarly, much of the U.S. government's motivation for going to war since 1945 seems to have been aimed at making Americans feel good about using military power again. For example, the 1983 war on Grenada was staged largely for the effect it would have on domestic audiences, and glorification of American wars was the real goal of the conflict.

This is the reason why it is so disturbing to see that one effect of the controversy over the 1995 Enola Gay exhibit has been to make museum curators more willing to censor themselves. Nonetheless, wider trends in curatorial practice over the last two decades still offer opportunities for museum professionals who wish to question the costs of wars. Museums have worked hard to overcome the impression that they are irrelevant to the lives of most Americans. Curators now believe that museum exhibits should be open-ended and also should reflect a multiplicity of views about a given subject. Therefore war exhibits everywhere now feature foot soldiers and civilians at least as much as generals. The main museum strategy is to evoke a variety of memories among museum-goers without trying to integrate them completely — collecting memories rather than collectivizing them. Far more challenging for museums is representing the larger social categories that shape peacetime lives as well: nationality, of course, but also race, gender, region, class, religion, etc. Nonetheless, simply by collecting a variety of individual experiences about an individual conflict, it has become impossible to choose one white soldier to stand in for everyone involved in it.

While growing increasingly sensitive to the feelings and sensibilities of all Americans, however, it seems that most Americans, including those working in museums, are still relatively uninterested in representing the experiences of foreigners. Yet, many Americans have never been comfortable with the official A-bomb narrative because it seems not to support the idea that the United States fights only for the right reasons and only when it must. Indeed, people come to look at the Enola Gay airplane at the National Air and Space Museum because they *already see it* as a complex symbol of many things. If, as museum professionals now emphasize, visitors are bringing their own meanings to exhibits, display of the Enola Gay will forever provide an invitation to debate the moral and strategic legitimacy of the use of the atomic bomb in August 1945.

Q & A

Japanese Americans but everyone else. It harmed the Constitution; therefore everyone's rights were affected. And Japanese Americans should be praised for insisting that their views be incorporated into the national point of view; that represents something that has changed in my lifetime. In the city of Chicago where I live now, about a third of the children speak a language other than English in their homes. These are mostly American citizens, and even among those who currently are not, the majority will ultimately become citizens. The line between American and foreigner for many people has become blurred also because children who were born in the United States automatically become American citizens. There are many families that include both citizens and non-citizens. Therefore, when I am feeling optimistic, the situation I see is one of an expanding community of people whose perspective is considered legitimate. However, at the moment, we are at the point where the imagination of many Americans gets stuck and I spend a lot of my time trying to get it unstuck.



Caring for Memories and Sharing of Memories : A Critical Note on the Smithsonian Enola Gay Controversy

By Takashi Kawamoto

Takashi Kawamoto is Professor at the Graduate School of Education, University of Tokyo. He entered the doctoral program in the Graduate School of Humanities at the University of Tokyo, earning a Litt. D. He specializes in social ethics.

Introduction : The Aim and Scope of Presentation

At the time when the first controversy over the display of the Enola Gay had reached its final stage in 1995, John Rawls, an American moral philosopher, explicitly stated that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been morally wrong. I translated into Japanese this courageous and cogently argued article, "Fifty Years after Hiroshima," (*Dissent*, Summer 1995) and had it published in the February 1996 issue of the liberal Japanese magazine *Sekai* (World). Subsequently, I gave a talk on A-bomb survivors' memories jointly with Etsuko Nakatani, a member of the Association of Second-Generation Atomic Bomb Victim Teachers (*Hibaku Nisei Kyoshi no Kai*). Our talk was televised under the title of "Caring for Memories." In the program, Nakatani and I attempted to loosen the fixed ideas, i.e. myths, held by both Americans and Japanese about the meaning of the atomic bombings and correct distortions in their memories. As the permanent exhibit of the Enola Gay in the Smithsonian Museum shows, however, it is difficult to say that Japanese and Americans have succeeded in sharing their memories of the atomic bombings.

The First Enola Gay Controversy (1994-1995) and Diverse Memories

Differences between the Japanese and American "myths of the atomic bombs" surfaced during the first controversy over the exhibition of the Enola Gay. Simply put, there remains a strong myth in the U.S. that the use of the atomic bombs brought about an early conclusion to World War II and saved the lives of a great number of American soldiers. In Japan, on the other hand, the atomic bombings were accepted as a kind of terrible "natural disaster," which finally ended World War II. Japanese also tend to forget their responsibility for the war of aggression they had launched against other Asian countries. Although both Americans and Japanese hold on to their own myths that underscore their national and cultural backgrounds, memories relating to the atomic bombs are not monolithic in either country. For instance, there is a movement within Japan that rejects the characterization of Japan simply as "the only nation in the world that has ever been subjected to atomic bombing" and insists on incorporating in its collective memory the record of its own aggression against Asian countries. Similarly in the U.S., some citizens and scholars dispute the prevailing "A-bomb myth."

"Stories of Individual Victims," "The Dialectics of Memory," and "Overlapping Consensus"

Considering these diverse memories, I would like to explore a path towards "sharing of memories" by way of "caring for memories." In my opinion, there are three possible ways to follow such a path.

First, we can start from a consideration of the person: an individual with his/her proper name and body, and relationships between him/her and others. My thought in this regard has been prompted by the article entitled "Commemoration and Silence: Fifty Years of Remembering the Bomb in America and Japan" by Laura Hein and Mark Selden published as a chapter in *Living with Bomb: American and Japanese Cultural Conflicts in the Nuclear Age* in 1997. This article focuses attention on "the story of individual *hibakusha* (atomic bomb survivors)," which might be used to challenge or even undermine "the official stories."

Second, there is an approach that Risa Yoneyama calls "the dialectics of memory." Yoneyama has conducted research into A-bomb survivors' involvement in testimony-giving activities based on their personal experiences. She describes, for example, the process of transformation experienced by the testifier (*shogensha*) such as Suzuko Numata, whose self as well as memories changed as a result of speaking of her experiences as an A-bomb survivor while carrying out research into other survivors' experiences.

Third, we can attempt to find "overlapping consensus," to borrow John Rawls' technical terminology, between our differing views, even between multiple conflicting and competing memories, and generate partial and overlapping agreements step by step. I believe that this approach has much in common with the proposals put forth in the "Hague Appeal for Peace 1999" by Tadatosh Akiba, Mayor of Hiroshima. For example, in order to condense the messages of *hibakusha* into the highest moral principle and to make it the overwhelming rallying point of world public opinion, Akiba proposed as a possible first step adherence to the straightforward principle: "One should not kill non-combatants in war or similar conflicts."

Genocide in Darfur, Sudan?

By Christian P. Scherrer

The Sudan is one of the world's deadliest places. The largest country in Africa has suffered horrific mass violence ever since it gained independence from Britain in 1956. In the past 50 years more than 3.5 million people have been either slaughtered or starved to death. The Sudan has been a particularly deadly place for minority peoples and rebels ever since civil war broke out in the south of the country in 1955 with the rise of the Anyanya separatist movement among the Southern Sudanese. This conflict continued from 1955 to 1972, with some violence continuing up until 1979. Major bloodshed was halted at that time by the dictator Numeiri's promise of autonomy for the Southern Sudanese, only to resume in a more devastating fashion in 1983, this time with the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) becoming the principal foe of a succession of Khartoum regimes. The SPLA, led by Dr. John Garang, is strong among the pastoralists, Dinka, Nuba and some Nuer.

Failed State — Criminal Governance

Ninety percent of this horrendous death toll can be attributed to nefarious government forces and their allies among Arab tribes. The victims were mainly unarmed civilians among the African peoples of the Dinka, Nuer, Shilluk and Equatorians in southern Sudan and the Nuba of central Sudan. Only recently has violence spread to Darfur in western Sudan.

The same brutal tactics were applied in this region as earlier in southern Sudan: the predominantly civilian victims from among the non-Arabic (African) peoples invariably suffered indiscriminate genocidal attacks by Arab militias and were subjected to the deliberate premeditated use of famine as a weapon by successive governmental regimes, be they either "democratically" elected or military in nature.

Divide and Rule Tactics and Terror — Now Also Against Muslims

The only differences in this case in comparison to previous assaults are that, firstly, the Darfur rebels of the Sudan Liberation Movement (SLM) and Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) are much younger and weaker than the 21-year-old SPLA, which became a formidable opponent of the northern Arabized clique regimes, hence they are much less able to protect the very people they claim to be fighting for.

Secondly, for the first time the victims are almost entirely fellow Muslims, a surprising fact for a government that has imposed draconian Sharia law throughout the country, and is known to be composed of hard-line "good Muslims" — offshoots from the 1989 coup by the fundamentalist National Islamic Front (NIF) and its sympathizers in the army.

Genocidal Pattern of Violence

In relation to Darfur, the mass media has referred to "ethnic cleansing," a term that implies the use of various policies designed to remove forcibly members of a particular ethnic group or several groups by a particular attacker — usually a state or a state-sponsored armed group. This constitutes a gross violation of human rights, as are forced emigration and state-ordered population transfers. In extreme cases, if the international community chooses to look the other way, it becomes a prelude to genocide.

This seems to be what has happened in Darfur since the fall of 2003, despite some engagement by the international community, and after the crisis was described as the world's "worst human disaster" by U.N. sources. Violence has increased and displayed a genocidal pattern, and has been accompanied by organized mass rapes of girls and women, systematic killings of men among the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa peoples and destruction of their villages, food storages, and mosques.

The World's Worst Humanitarian Crisis

The Darfur crisis of 2003-2004 clearly came about as the result of criminal policies pursued by the military junta in Khartoum. As happened earlier in southern Sudan, the regime incited nomadic Arab *Baggara* tribes — more precisely, members of the Bani-Helwa, Bani-Hussein, Rizegat, and Misiyria tribes — to assault and terrorize the indigenous, sedentary African Muslim peoples of Darfur in order to punish them for their alleged support of local rebels.

The regime provided militiamen with modern weapons and mobile phones, and granted them full impunity to carry out killings and the raping and kidnapping of girls and women from among the Fur, Masalit, and Zaghawa peoples. The assaults of armed gangs called Janjaweed on the defenseless population caused widespread panic and a mass flight to safer areas and into Chad since the fall of 2003.

The Miserable Non-response of the International Community

U.N. organizations and international NGOs warned of a major disaster in Darfur as early as November 2003 but no effective action took place. Despite international efforts to put a stop to the killings and widely reported atrocities committed by Arab militiamen in conjunction with Sudanese army and police forces, the mass violence continued.

The militias were not disarmed and it is estimated that by May 2004 they had killed up to 50,000 people and driven one million into "internally displaced people" (IDP) camps in Darfur and an additional 200,000 into refugee camps in Chad. Janjaweed militiamen have clashed with Chadian government forces along the border.

Peace Process in Southern Sudan Gave Rise to More Violence in Darfur

The peace process initiated between the Sudanese government and the SPLA in the 50-year-old conflict in southern Sudan unfortunately provided the regime with the opportunity to redeploy as many as 20,000 of its soldiers and as many policemen into the Darfur region.

Allegedly they came to stop the militia terror being waged against the civilian population, but in reality it was to combat the rebels. The murderous attacks of the Janjaweed have not stopped. Despite the passing of strongly worded U.N. resolutions, no international intervention has taken place. A few hundred observers have been sent by the African Union (AU). One hundred fifty Rwandan soldiers were sent in August to protect them and a force of 3,500 AU peacekeepers will be deployed — depending on funds and facilities provided by EU and the U.S. Several hundred already arrived.

Plight of the Refugees Worsens

Meanwhile, as predicted by the U.N. and humanitarian NGOs, the scale of the humanitarian disaster increased dramatically with the arrival of the rainy season in July. Lines of communication were interrupted and food could not be delivered to the neediest people. Currently there are almost two million IDPs and refugees in the Darfur region, and up to 100,000 civilians are believed to have been slaughtered. More may die from famine in the coming months.

The scale of the Janjaweed campaign of terror has led to comparisons with the Rwandan genocide. For many observers, the tactics used in Darfur are more akin to the ethnic cleansing campaigns carried out in former Yugoslavia, although in Darfur a genocidal pattern has become clearly visible. So far, however, neither the United Nations nor the African Union considers that the Darfur conflict constitutes genocide. This could hamper the planned AU peacekeeping operation.

Scherrer is professor at HPI

HPI Research Forum

May 6, 2004



Title: What Does "Peace" Mean in a Post-Civil War Society?: The Case of Guatemala

Speaker: Midori Iijima, Associate Professor of Latin American Studies, Rikkyo University

"Civil War" is the phrase that accurately describes a certain "Latin Americanness." The term refers to a bitter confrontation between a regime and an anti-regime force, especially between military governments and their opposition. "Civil War" often takes the form of an "unbalanced war" in which the regime side has overwhelming power to mobilize all resources against the anti-regime forces. Now, does the end of such a conflict immediately bring peace to the society? In this presentation, the speaker analyzes this important question, through a typical case of Guatemala.

In Guatemala an internal war was fought between left-wing guerrillas

and government forces for over 30 years ending in 1996. It is believed that this war left more than 200,000 dead and displaced more than 150,000 civilians, turning them into refugees. In the worst period (1978-1983), the army carried out ruthless counterinsurgency (and even civilian-targeted) operations in the central-western highlands of the country where 440 villages were burned to the ground. Most of the victims of these assaults were rural Mayan civilians who lived in departments with predominantly indigenous population, such as Quiche.

The complexity of this prolonged war stems from the fact that racial discrimination in this society has compounded and intensified a political/ideological confrontation. The army drafted members of the indigenous population and had them organized into groups called the Civil Self-Defense Patrols (PAC) in rural communities. Members of the PACs, assigned the task of persecuting the guerrillas and sympathizers, killed even their own neighbors in order to survive and overcome their own inferiority complex. They were thus in charge of executing human rights violations planned by the army. As a result, it is not unusual to find members of the same family on both sides of the conflict in Guatemala.

At the end of 1996, the Peace Accords were concluded between the Guatemalan government and the guerrilla organization under U.N. auspices,

Iraq after the “Anti-terrorism War”

By Shintaro Yoshimura

The situation in Iraq continues to worsen long after U.S. President George W. Bush declared an end to major combat operations in Iraq on May 1, 2003. One year after the alleged “end” of the war, the death toll of American soldiers had reached at least 900 (with American wounded numbering at least 5,800), surpassing by far the 140 deaths recorded during the period of “actual wartime” (40 days). Worse still, since the beginning of the Iraq War, the death toll of Iraqi civilians has reached at least 11,000. It is a notable characteristic of this war that the death toll has been far greater following the “end” of the war than during the large-scale military engagements, and that the victims include many more non-combatants than combatants.

One cannot dismiss these facts simply by saying that no war is free from miscalculations due to the fact that these miscalculations are integrally linked to the contradictions that have dogged the war from the very beginning. With regard to the reasons used to justify the launching of the attack against Iraq, the Bush administration drew attention to: 1) Iraq’s development of weapons of mass destruction; 2) its relationship with al-Qaeda; and 3) the dictatorship of the Hussein regime, under which human rights were being severely and systematically abused. Of these three reasons, the first two have already been proven to be largely unfounded. Even the third and last reason appears dubious when one considers recent highly questionable U.S. military activities, including the brutal arrest and imprisonment of suspected “terrorists,” assaults without warning on and accidental bombings of houses and mosques condemned as “terrorist-connected,” the killing and wounding of innocent civilians, and the prisoner abuses at Abu Ghraib. These acts committed by coalition forces are more than equal to those committed under the Hussein regime in their degree of disregard for human life and human rights.

It is true that following the fall of the regime, many Iraqi people celebrated their liberation from Hussein’s dictatorship. It is also true, however, that increasing numbers of Iraqi people have begun to believe that the liberation has subsequently turned into occupation and dominance by a foreign power, wherein the U.S. occupation force goes about single-mindedly “terrorist-hunting” and the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) and U.S.-based corporations go about profiteering through the appropriation of oil interests and reconstruction funds. Not surprisingly, many Iraqis have come to hear the cliché “for the sake of the Iraqi people” — so often repeated by leaders of the occupation, as just another foreign lie.

Many of the suicide bombings and kidnappings that occurred in various parts of Iraq immediately following the overthrow of the Hussein government were committed by Sunni Muslim groups, including supporters of the previous regime, such as members of the *Fedayeen Saddam* and al-Qaeda members who entered Iraq during the war and the post-war turmoil (including *al-Tawhid wal-Jihad*). Since March 2004, however, resistance from Shi’i Muslims, who make up 60% of Iraq’s population, has intensified. As dissatisfaction with the occupation grows among the urban population around the country, members of the coalition forces have started to become paranoid. At the same time as espousing “peace and justice” as their slogan, they have become increasingly belligerent and have begun to treat all opponents of occupation policies

as “terrorists.”

Afghanistan’s case differs somewhat from that of Iraq. During and after the conflict, the U.S. and U.K. leaders made use of the Northern Alliance as a political and military counterforce to the Taliban regime, and, as a result, the transition to a provisional government has been relatively smooth. As long as the traditional tribal decision-making system represented by the *Loya Jirga* (great assembly) and Islamic values and institutions are being respected, and as long as there is no drastic change in the balance of power among the tribal groupings and warlords, Afghanistan may not experience so serious political turmoil, at least for the time being.

Iraq, on the other hand, was created by the U.K. in the aftermath of World War I in the same way that a house can be built on a vacant plot of land. There exist neither an easily identifiable “Iraqi people,” nor specific institutions through which relationships can be coordinated between the ethnic, religious, and sectarian groups on one hand, and the tribal groups on the other. While the search for a new social and political order is under way, various political groups are at present coming and going, each seeking to promote its own interests. In this general climate, it now looks to be almost impossible for the Iraqi Interim Government (inaugurated in June 2004), or Ali al-Sistani, the authoritative leader of the Shi’i sect, or Muqtada al-Sadr, the leader of the Mahdi Army, or the leaders of Kurdish organizations, or for that matter any other politician or leader to succeed in the challenge of rebuilding a peaceful Iraq.

The Bush administration and the political leaders of its so-called “Coalition of the Willing,” who have embarked upon what appears now to be a reckless adventure in the name of an “anti-terrorism war,” in order to gain control of oil resources and even to redesign the 80-year-old “Middle Eastern States System,” seem to lack the wit to understand that the fact is that war is terrorism writ large. Nor do they seem to understand that the reason why their enormous barrage against the specter of “terrorism” has not managed to eliminate it is because this same terrorism is, in fact, the creation of the aggressive policies of the U.S. No matter how the situation in Iraq pans out in the future, the political situation in the Middle East will continue to grow more and more volatile, and as a result it may lead to another 9/11.

The destructive interventions by external, i.e. European and U.S., forces, coupled with the enforced restructuring of the regional system, all couched in some kind of euphemism or another, have succeeded in producing a perennially conflict-ridden Middle East, which is tragically symbolized by the intractable Palestinian problem. The whole world is currently pervaded today by an “anti-terrorist” mood and is in effect sitting on another powder keg. Confronted by this grim situation is not only the United Nations’ political leadership but also the authenticity of Japan’s commitment to peace — the commitment of a nation that during World War II went through the dual tragedy of, on one hand, committing cruel aggression against its Asian neighbors and, on the other, suffering the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

*Yoshimura is associate professor,
Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University*

bringing the war to an end. The Peace Accords stipulate, among other things: 1) a thorough investigation be carried out about alleged human rights violations and massacres committed during the conflict, 2) recommendations be formulated for national reconciliation, and 3) an investigation report be published. Based on these stipulations, the Historical Clarification Commission (CEH) began operations in cooperation with the U.N. in July 1997. Victims of the conflict were, however, far from hopeful about the results, predicting that the military would exercise considerable influence over the Commission’s work.

In consideration of the feelings of this nature held by many victims, the Recovery of Historical Memory project (REMHI) released a report based on the findings of its own investigations one year earlier than the CEH did, so as to prevent the latter from publishing a hollow and meaningless “report.” REMHI was led by the Catholic Church who had played an active role in the negotiations of the peace process. During the course of the investigations, which proceeded in a “climate of terror,” those who shared similar experiences of suffering under similar circumstances gave their testimonies to each other.

The REMHI report was released in April 1998. Two days later, Bishop Juan Gerardi, the representative of the project, was brutally assassinated, in spite of the passage of a dozen months or so after the signing of the Peace Accords. The murder frightened the fragile civil society of the country and although “perpetrators” of the crime were subsequently arrested, the truth

about who was really responsible for the crime remains unknown. The incident proved that peace-building efforts in Guatemala have not led to significant improvements in the judiciary, legislature or executive of the country. Furthermore, it has highlighted the persistence of a “structural impunity,” which impedes investigations and the attribution of responsibility for injustices and political crimes.

Two competing views exist about the priority action that post-civil war society like Guatemala should take: one view holds that it is better to concentrate first on establishing democracy, which would in effect grant impunity to human rights violators, rather than raking up past wrongs, while the other holds that it is essential to uncover the truth about the past wrongs not to repeat the same mistakes. This confrontation over the better way to deal with the past continues to split Guatemalan society as much as the war itself. This shows how difficult it is to rebuild a society torn apart by civil war and to achieve genuine peace even after “peace” has been signed on paper.

Following Professor Iijima’s presentation, Mr. Daniel Hernández-Salazar, a photographer and former Associated Press correspondent who observed many excavations of civil war victims’ remains in Guatemala, presented photos and film that depict the reality of the horrors that continue to dominate Guatemalan society today.

By Hitoshi Nagai, research associate at HPI

New Tasks for the Peace Movement in Hiroshima: Sixty Years after the Atomic Bombing

By Kazumi Mizumoto

In 2005 it will be 60 years since the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. It is often said that throughout the postwar era, Hiroshima has been continually appealing to the world for the abolition of nuclear weapons. However, the path of the peace movement in Hiroshima has not been so simple. In reality, it has been influenced by the surrounding international and domestic political contexts at each stage of its development. At the present time, at the beginning of the 21st century, the movement continues to be affected by the changing international conditions of the post-Cold War era, and especially so since the September 11th terrorist attacks.

The peace movement in Hiroshima is deeply rooted in issues relating to the atomic bombing and nuclear weapons. As the international situation becomes increasingly complex, however, it is necessary that its goals and methods become better adapted to the changing dynamics of the political sphere.

In this article I will review the developments and achievements of the peace movement in Hiroshima over the last 60 years and also explore the mission and role that Hiroshima is expected to play at the dawn of this century.

Atomic and Nuclear Issues

At the outset, I would like to ask the question "What are the real issues posed by atomic and nuclear weapons to today's world?" Although the phrases "atomic issues" and "nuclear issues" are commonly used, the issues implied by these phrases are actually quite diverse and are not simple to address. Some of them are listed below.

- Why did the U.S. develop and drop the atomic bombs on the Japanese cities?
- What is the true extent of the damage caused by the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?
- What are the real dangers associated with the development and testing of nuclear weapons?

Additionally, there are issues relating to:

- Relief and compensation for the atomic bomb victims and survivors
- International law on the use of nuclear weapons
- Justification for the American use of the atomic bombs and the control of information related to that action
- How to implement measures aimed at bringing about the eradication of nuclear weapons and the safe disposal of nuclear materials
- Legal control over the development, testing, storage, deployment, and transport of nuclear weapons
- Legal control over nuclear disarmament and the process of banning and eradicating nuclear weapons
- The conditions for the denuclearization of nuclear-weapon states, with special reference to the experiences of South Africa, the Ukraine, etc.
- The dangers of military doctrines based on nuclear deterrence

The topics listed above are just a few examples of the real issues relating to nuclear weapons that the world is currently facing. If we seriously intend to pursue the goal of banning and eradicating these weapons from the Earth, it is vital for us to tackle these problems in a consistent and comprehensive manner.

A Brief History of the Peace Movement in Hiroshima and Its Achievements

The history of the peace movement in Hiroshima can be divided into several distinct periods.

<From the End of World War II to the Bikini Atoll Incident>

The peace movement in early postwar Japan, which was widely supported by a strong anti-war sentiment held by the public, focused on several specific issues, such as the peace treaty concluded in 1951 with the Allied nations, the presence of U.S. military bases in Japan and the country's postwar rearmament. The movement had strong links with left-wing political parties and the labor movement.

In Hiroshima and Nagasaki, there were some small-scale movements seeking the banning of atomic weapons, but survivors of the atomic bombings were not fully re-integrated into local postwar society and many suffered from discrimination in terms of employment opportunity and choice of marriage partner. One reason for this was that until April 1952, Japan was under occupation by the Allied nations, during which time strict controls were enforced upon the dissemination of information relating to the atomic bombings.

It was the Bikini Atoll Incident of March 1954 — the incident in which a Japanese fishing boat, the Lucky Dragon, was exposed to fallout and radiation from a U.S. thermonuclear test in the Pacific Ocean, causing the subsequent death of one crew member — that changed the attitude of the Japanese public towards the wartime atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and their survivors. A nationwide movement collecting signatures to support an appeal for the banning of atomic and thermonuclear weapons began and, as a result, the first World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (*Gensuikin*) was convened in Hiroshima on August 6, 1955, exactly 10 years after the atomic bombing of the city. It was practically the first time that the peace movement in Japan had defined "the rescue of atomic survivors" to be its central mission as well as one of the central goals of the 1955 Conference.

<From the First Conference to the Division of *Gensuikin*>

After 1955, the World Conference was held once every year, mainly in Hiroshima and Tokyo. However, the opinion of the organizers soon became divided over issues such as the attitude that should be taken towards the U.S. and the Soviet Union and the pros and cons of the revision and renewal of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, among others. In 1959, the pro-Liberal Democratic Party group left *Gensuikin*. In 1961, the pro-Democratic Socialist Party group organized a rival anti-nuclear weapon conference. The pro-Socialist Party group, too, left *Gensuikin* in 1963 and inaugurated its own conference and campaign against atomic and hydrogen bombs. Following these defections, the original *Gensuikin* World Conference became an event organized mainly by pro-Communist Party groups. The split of the World Conference had a significant effect on the peace movement in Hiroshima and brought about corresponding divisions within it.

<The Development of a Diverse Movement in Hiroshima>

The split of the *Gensuikin* movement, mainly caused by ideological rivalries, had a negative effect on the peace movement in Japan as a whole. However, in Hiroshima, new groups were formed in the period from the mid-1960s to the 1980s that were not bound to the doctrine and ideology of any particular political party. Citizens' groups focused on specific targets which could act as unifying goals for the city and called for broad cooperation among the people. Among these goals were the publication of a white book on the damage caused by the atomic bombs, the re-creation on a map of the original layout of the area around the hypocenter, the protection and reinforcement of the Atomic Bomb Dome, exhibitions of the bombs' damage inflicted upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki in cities around the country, and the recovery of films collected by the U.S. authorities in Hiroshima and Nagasaki immediately after the bombing, a campaign that was to become known as the Ten Feet Movement.

The local media in Hiroshima provided impetus to the movement by publishing a variety of reports and articles or broadcasting documentary programs about the atomic bombings and their survivors. In recent years, it has become customary in Japan for the media to publish or broadcast every summer reports and commentaries on the atomic bombings. In order to produce reports of high quality, the media find it necessary to work with citizens' movements. In so doing, the media help energize the peace movement in Hiroshima. The municipal governments of both Hiroshima and Nagasaki and members of academic circles have also contributed significantly to the movement by supporting its goals.

<The Internationalization of the Movement>

In 1977, after more than 10 years had passed since the split of the *Gensuikin* movement, a joint World Conference was held by the original *Gensuikin*'s two successor groups where "the total ban on nuclear weapons" and "support for atomic bomb survivors" were declared as the movement's major goals. The latter was a goal addressed to the Japanese government, which eventually bore fruit in the Atomic Bomb Victims Relief Law promulgated in 1995. The former was an appeal to international society. In pursuit of this goal, the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki sent a delegation of atomic bomb survivors to the U.N. General Assembly's Special Session on Disarmament in New York in 1978 and 1982, together with the signatures of hundreds of thousands of Japanese who supported the abolition of nuclear weapons. Since then, the peace movement in Hiroshima has become more and more

Research in Progress on Damage Due to Bikini Atoll H-Bomb Tests

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the Bikini Incident, the tragedy caused by the U.S. hydrogen bomb tests conducted at Bikini Atoll. Among the victims of the tests were the crewmembers of a Japanese fishing boat called the *Daigo Fukuryumaru* (5th Lucky Dragon), who were exposed to the radioactive fallout of the H-bomb test. On September 17, 2004, a meeting was held by HPI to discuss the incident and its continuing aftereffects on the *hibakusha*, or the people who were exposed to the radiation, over half a century later. The meeting, held at Hiroshima City Plaza for Town Development through Citizen Exchange, heard a lively discussion among some 40 citizens who attended.

The first session began with an explanation of the general purpose of the meeting by MC Hitoshi Nagai, a Research Associate at Hiroshima Peace Institute. Next, Professor Tetsuo Maeda of Tokyo International University gave the keynote lecture entitled "The Meaning of the Human Suffering Caused by the Bikini Atoll H-bomb Test in Today's Context." In the second session, Hiroko Takahashi, also a Research Associate at Hiroshima Peace Institute, gave a presentation entitled "The *Daigo Fukuryumaru* Incident and the U.S. Government's Responses." Following her presentation, Mr. Seiichiro Takemine, a student of Waseda University Graduate School, gave a presentation entitled "U.S. Government Approaches to the Treatment of the Marshall Islanders Exposed to Radiation," based upon his recent survey of the current conditions in the Marshall Islands and their inhabitants.

Professor Maeda emphasized the fact that the total damage inflicted by the series of H-bomb tests at Bikini Atoll has yet to be accurately assessed since the tests affected so many people: not only the crewmembers of the *Daigo Fukuryumaru* but also those of over 900 other Japanese fishing boats. He also stressed that by no means was Bikini Atoll the only location where nuclear tests have been conducted in the post-1945 world. This suggests that there may be countless other victims of nuclear tests living in various parts of the world. Furthermore, we are as yet unaware of the precise impact of depleted uranium bombs used during the recent conflict in Iraq and elsewhere. "Prior to the A-bombing of Hiroshima, numerous civilians died in the indiscriminate bombing of Chongqing (China) and many other cities," Maeda continued. "After Hiroshima, Marshall Islanders were exposed to radiation from the H-bomb tests. Because these incidents are all interconnected, it is extremely important and meaningful to discuss the Bikini Incident here in Hiroshima."

Takahashi reported that the U.S. government has yet to accept its responsibility for the death of Mr. Aikichi Kuboyama, the chief radio operator of the *Daigo Fukuryumaru*, who died after exposure to radiation from the H-bomb test. Instead, the government continues to maintain that Kuboyama died of hepatitis caused by a blood transfusion. She further stated that the U.S. government has had the *Daigo Fukuryumaru* case declared closed, rejecting any

further contact with the victims on the ground that the compensation problem had reached a "full settlement" when the Japanese and U.S. governments signed an agreement on the issue in January 1955. Takahashi maintained, however, that scholars have begun to discover much new information relating to the *Daigo Fukuryumaru* case in official documents recently declassified by the U.S. government.

Mr. Takemine pointed out that, half a century after the H-bomb test at Bikini Atoll, the local people are still suffering from the lasting and serious aftereffects of those 67 tests. He stated: "The effects of the nuclear tests have not been limited to the deterioration of the natural environment or the residents' health conditions. Worse than either of such effects, the aftermath of the tests continues to erode the fundamentals of local life such as the economic, psychological and social bedrock upon which the people have built their lives in their own land." Takemine also brought up the compensation issue in the Marshall Islands and stated that "the U.S. government provided 150 million US dollars to the people in 1986 not as a sign of an admission of their fault for conducting nuclear tests but as a way to bring the issue to a 'full settlement' and thus to ensure that the U.S. would not be officially charged later with responsibility for the damage done to the people."

Finally, Nagai gave a brief summary of the presentations made by Takahashi and Mr. Takemine and made the following comment: "The U.S. government's responses to the Bikini Incident have been characterized by a clever maneuver to justify both its nuclear tests and its possession of nuclear weapons."

The presentations were followed by an open-ended discussion between the speakers and the audience. Some members of the audience pointed out the similarity between the Japanese government's aid to *hibakusha* in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the U.S. government's compensation to American soldiers exposed to radiation at nuclear test sites. The audience demonstrated a keen interest in, and deep empathy for, the experience of the Marshall Islanders. The meeting effectively fostered a shared awareness among the speakers and members of the audience of a variety of facts relating to the Bikini Incident, as well as generating a common recognition that problems pertaining to it are yet to reach a "full settlement."

By Hiroko Takahashi, research associate at HPI



internationalized, and interchange between NGOs in Hiroshima and abroad has become more extensive.

Examples of more recent international activities include support for: victims of nuclear tests and nuclear power plants outside Japan; campaigns against the deployment of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles in Europe; the nuclear-free cities movement; the World Court Movement; and assistance to atomic bomb survivors living overseas. A delegation was sent to India and Pakistan after both countries conducted nuclear tests in 1998 to appeal against the atrocity of the use of atomic bombs.

<Tasks for the Peace Movement 60 Years after the Atomic Bombing>

As stated above, in spite of the split of the *Gensuikin* movement, there are many clearly visible achievements of the peace movement in Hiroshima. However, many challenges also remain. As mentioned above, although many problems can be included under the heading of so-called "atomic bomb issues" and "nuclear issues," only a handful of them have been addressed so far. Furthermore, whereas the linkages between the movement, on one hand, and the media and local governments, on the other, have been strengthened, the movement still lacks an effective channel through which it can influence the nation's lawmakers in Tokyo.

The negative legacy of the split of *Gensuikin* is still found in Hiroshima.

The difficulty of conveying the A-bomb experiences of the survivors to the younger generation represents another important issue; even now many citizens and the media are equally dependent upon the atomic bomb survivors for finding "answers" to many of the problems they are facing. Although the importance of sending messages from Hiroshima to the rest of Japan and beyond is constantly re-emphasized, it seems that some in the city are not as interested in receiving messages from the world in exchange, and are indifferent to how people abroad look at Hiroshima and its experiences.

Clearly atomic bomb and nuclear issues will be and should be at the heart of the peace movement in Hiroshima in the years to come. But, at the same time, more recognition is needed of the fact that nuclear weapons represent only one of the many issues relating to peace in today's world. The peace movement of Hiroshima should free itself from local and parochial interests and adopt "human" and "humanitarian" perspectives transcending nationalities and national borders.

Mizumoto is associate professor at HPI

D I A R Y

July 1, 2004 - October 31, 2004

◆**July 4-9** Sung Chull Kim delivers paper entitled "Peace-Prone Foreign Policy: Systems Analysis of Domestic-Regional Linkages," at 48th annual conference of International Society for Systems Sciences, in Asilomar, California.

◆**July 10** Kazumi Mizumoto reports on "Nuclear Holocaust—How Should We Perceive the Atomic Bombing of Hiroshima?" at joint study meeting of the 1st and 3rd sectors of Hiroshima Institute for Peace Education, at Hiroshima Institute for Peace Education.

◆**July 17** Mizumoto gives lecture on "The Inhumanity of Depleted Uranium Bombs" at meeting for peace held at Sakura City Museum of Art, Chiba Prefecture.

◆**July 19-29** Christian Scherrer participates in Working Group for Indigenous Peoples 22nd session and Sub 2 meeting of United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva and speaks on "Indigenous Peoples and Conflict Resolution," presenting recommendations to the Office of High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR).

◆**July 27** HPI President Haruhiro Fukui attends and chairs Hiroshima meeting of Peace Memorial Facilities Utilization Council convened by Hiroshima City at Hiroshima City Hall.

◆**July 28** Mizumoto attends as committee member 1st conference of core members of Hiroshima International Peace Forum, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture and held at Hiroshima Prefectural Government Tokyo Office.

◆**July 29** Fukui attends and chairs Tokyo meeting of Peace Memorial Facilities Utilization Council convened by Hiroshima City at Tokai University Members-Club.
Mizumoto gives lecture on "Hiroshima and Peace" in training program for journalists organized by Hiroshima City.

◆**July 31** HPI holds international symposium, "Reflections of the Enola Gay: Symbolic Representations of War and Destruction, 1945-2004," at Hiroshima International Conference Center.

◆**Aug. 5** Scherrer visits Cambodian film director Panh in Locarno, Switzerland, to discuss his film "S21: The Khmer Rouge Killing Machine," in which killers and victims of the Cambodian genocide confront each other for the first time.
Mizumoto gives lecture on "Review of the Relationship between Peace and A-bomb Experiences" at 18th meeting for peace for high school teachers and staff in large cities, organized by Hiroshima City High School Teachers and Staff Union, held at Hiroshima Garden Palace Hotel.
Hiroko Takahashi chairs 2nd workshop on Global Hibakusha at HPI.

◆**Aug. 13** Scherrer interviews Chief Prosecutor of the U.N. Tribunal on Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) at The Hague, about questions relating to criminal justice and the Milosevic case.

◆**Aug. 14** Scherrer interviews Secretary General of Amnesty International on the organization's work related to the Rwandan genocide, its aftermath and genocide alerts in general.

◆**Sep. 7** Mizumoto and Takahashi attend annual meeting of research group on reference materials at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.

◆**Sep. 7-13** Fukui attends Fifth Pan-European International Relations Conference held at Netherlands Congress Centre, The Hague. He chairs Panel on "Case Studies on Security Threats and Institutional Response: North America" at Section 8: "Global and Regional Security Governance" and reports on "Case of Japan" at Panel on "Case Studies on Security Threats and Institutional Response: China, Japan, and Russia."

◆**Sep. 10** Mizumoto attends as committee member 2nd conference of core members of Hiroshima International Peace Forum, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture, at Hiroshima Prefectural Government.

◆**Sep. 11** Mizumoto gives lecture on "The Current Situation of Nuclear Weapons" at 5th session of the Peace Club for Junior High and High School Students at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.

◆**Sep. 12-19** Mizumoto visits Phnom Penh and Siem Reap in Cambodia as member of Consulting Team for Reconstruction Support Project in Cambodia, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture.

◆**Sep. 16-19** Yuki Tanaka presents paper entitled "A History of Indiscriminate Bombing: What Can We Learn From It?" at the 16th World Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War held in Beijing.

◆**Sep. 16-23** Narayanan Ganesan visits Bangkok to conduct research and interview academics at Chulalongkorn and Thammasat Universities for his ongoing work on Thai domestic politics and foreign policy.

◆**Sep. 17** HPI holds meeting for presentation of the results of research by its staff on 50th Anniversary of the Bikini H-bomb Test at Hiroshima City Plaza for Town Development through Citizen Exchange. Hitoshi Nagai chairs the meeting and Professor Tetsuo Maeda of Tokyo International University gives keynote lecture on "The Meaning of the Human Suffering Caused by the Bikini Atoll H-bomb Test in Today's Context." Mr. Seiichiro Takemine, student of Waseda University Graduate School, gives presentation on "U.S. Government Approaches to the Treatment of the Marshall Islanders Exposed to Radiation" and Takahashi gives presentation on "The *Daigo Fukuryūmaru* Incident and the U.S. Government's Responses."

◆**Sep. 19** Takahashi gives presentation on "The Atomic Bomb Information Control during the Japanese Occupation Period" at Symposium on "U.S. Occupation and Complicated Circumstances of Anti- and Pro-American Feelings" at 1st Conference of Japanese Association for American History held at Hitotsubashi University.

◆**Sep. 25** Takahashi gives presentation in session on "The Reality of the Bikini H-bomb: Damages and Victims" at "Peace as a Global Language Conference 2004" organized by PGL III Organizing Committee at Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritumeikan University.

◆**Oct. 3-13** Mizumoto visits Phnom Penh and Siem Reap in Cambodia as member of Consulting Team for Reconstruction Support Project in Cambodia, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture.

◆**Oct. 5** Scherrer, Tanaka, and Kim meet and hold discussions with U.N. Disarmament Fellows at HPI.

◆**Oct. 12** Fukui and Takahashi attend Exploratory Committee for Renewal Plan of Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.

◆**Oct. 14** Mizumoto gives lecture on "Peace-building Efforts Starting from Local Governments—The Atomic Bombing Experience of Hiroshima and Its Tasks for Peace in the 21st Century" for 16th training program of National Association of City Audit Commissioners at Hiroshima Koseinenkin Kaikan.

◆**Oct. 14-16** Scherrer participates in 2nd International Conference on Genocide at California State University in Sacramento and gives keynote speech on "The 1994 Rwandan *Genocide-in-Whole* in Comparative Perspective."

◆**Oct. 15** Fukui gives lecture on "New Approaches to the Study of War and Peace" in the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima.

◆**Oct. 18** Fukui attends and chairs Tokyo meeting of Peace Memorial Facilities Utilization Council convened by Hiroshima City at Tokai University Members-Club.
Mizumoto gives lecture on "Activities for Peace Contribution from Hiroshima" at training program for teachers from Bosnia and Herzegovina organized by Hiroshima International Center and Japan International Cooperation Agency at Hiroshima Prefectural government.

◆**Oct. 27** At a meeting of the HPI lecture series for citizens of Hiroshima, Professor Masaki Uno of Hiroshima City University gives lecture on "The Idea of War and Peace in Islam."

◆**Oct. 28** Fukui attends and chairs Hiroshima meeting of Peace Memorial Facilities Utilization Council convened by Hiroshima City at Hiroshima City Hall.
Mizumoto attends as committee member 3rd conference of core members of Hiroshima International Peace Forum, organized by Hiroshima Prefecture, at Tokyo.

◆**Oct. 29** Tanaka gives lecture on "'Humane Bombing' and 'Precision Bombing' in Iraq: A Comparative Analysis of Aerial Bombing by the RAF in the 1920s and by the U.S. Forces in 2003-2004" at HPI Research Forum.

- Visitors to HPI -

◆**Aug. 2** Wen Desheng, section chief (Asia, Africa and Oceania) at Chinese Association for International Understanding. Niu Qiang, secretary general of Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament.

◆**Aug. 3** His Excellency Judge C.G. Weeramantry, former vice president of International Court of Justice.

◆**Aug. 5** Masaki Takahashi, member of executive committee of Peace Boat, Hsi-Chieh Chien, executive director and 3 other members of PEACETIME Foundation of Taiwan.

◆**Oct. 7** Eugen Eichhorn, professor of Mathematics, and 3 other professors of TFW University of Applied Sciences, Germany.

◆**Oct. 15** Dr. Victor Dionisio Montejo Esteban, peace secretary, Guatemala.

HIROSHIMA RESEARCH NEWS

Vol.7, No.2 November 26, 2004

Copyright 2004 HPI All rights reserved

●Publisher: Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University; Editor : Ayako Yoshida

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

Ote-machi Heiwa Bldg. 9F/10F 4-1-1 Ote-machi, Naka-ku, Hiroshima 730-0051, Japan. E-mail:office-peace@peace.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp

●Printed by Nishiki Print co., Ltd.