
Peace Studies Bulletin

No. 25 (November 2006)

Peace Studies Association of Japan

日本平和学会

Special Issue: Rising Pacifism in Japan

Toward a Peace Studies Association That Takes Action for Peace	
	UTSUMI Aiko 2
A Rising Tide of Pacifism or Raising the Tide of Pacifism	
	ENDO Seiji 3
A Belated Message from Japan	
	TSURUMI Shunsuke 5
Peace Studies in Japan: Some musings about where we are, and where we are going	
	Ronni Alexander 6
Preserving the Memory of Wartime Sexual Violence	
	IKEDA Eriko 9
Agriculture and Peace in East Asia	
	KATSUMATA Makoto 12

Reports from NGOs Working for Peace

Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and a Citizen-led Democracy	
	UEMURA Hideaki 15
Development Education Association and Resource Center (DEAR)	
	KAMIJO Naomi 16

Announcement

First Annual PSAJ Peace Prize and Peace Studies Prize for Young Researchers	
	YOKOYAMA Masaki 18

Toward a Peace Studies Association That Takes Action for Peace

UTSUMI Aiko

17th President, Peace Studies Association of Japan
Keisen University, Tokyo

The Peace Studies Association of Japan was founded in September 1973. The prospectus states that it “will develop the scientific and objective peace studies based upon the value that Japan should never wage war again in the future.” I would like to clarify the founding philosophy of the Association during a time when the discourse of xenophobic nationalism is gathering momentum.

The draft for a new constitution presented by the Liberal Democratic Party in 2005, which includes a clause establishing a military for self-defense, also includes in the preamble the statement that all people “shall jointly have the obligation to support and defend with affection, responsibility, and spirit the nation and society to which they belong.” Patriotism is thus written into the preamble.

Since August 9, 1999, the government has intensified its efforts to make sure that the Japanese flag is flown and the National Anthem is sung in public schools. In considering this issue, we should not overlook the “Kokoro Notebooks” (“kokoro” can be loosely translated as “heart” or “mind”) distributed in elementary and secondary schools. Its aim is to encourage children’s affection for family and hometown, and this is intended to lead to patriotic sentiments.

The association needs to adapt our efforts for the creation of peace to the needs of the time, by critically revisiting and identifying the thoughts and practices for the creation and settlement of peace that we have accumulated thus far. The main theme of the 2006 spring research conference is “Rising Pacifism.” For the past two years, we have been trying to determine “what meaning pacifism . . . can have in the

transborder power structures currently being formed,” and demonstrate both movements to oppose those structures and the possibility of alternatives. In order to promote those attempts more intensively, this conference will focus on the issue of “pacifism.”

With both peace studies and peace practices facing severe challenges, the main difference from the situation thirty years ago when the Association was founded is the transformation of the international situation, particularly in Asia. South Korea is stepping up efforts to probe into human rights abuses both at the time of Japanese imperialism and during its own military regime. Post-war compensation movements, a powerful transborder force since the 1990s, have urged the Japanese people to reexamine their understanding of history and have revealed problems in the post-war peace movements. There have been frequent intellectual personnel exchanges between Japan and other Asian countries in the realms of area studies and international politics. NGOs and citizen movements have continued to make efforts for the creation of peace by confronting state and non-state violence as well as the development of the globalized market economy.

In 2006, the Peace Studies Association is facing new trials with respect to the reason for our very existence. I hope that we will be able to work together to build an association that will be more active in creating peace; that can “facilitate and develop genuinely scientific, objective studies on war and peace,” as is stated in its prospectus; that will stimulate active researches and discussions; and that will enrich thoughts and movements for peace.

A Rising Tide of Pacifism or Raising the Tide of Pacifism

ENDO Seiji

Vice President, Peace Studies Association of Japan
Seikei University, Tokyo

Today's world is full of violence of various kinds and patterns, particularly since 9/11. Though there were some positive, although mixed and lagging, signs of the institutionalization of peace, disarmament, and more egalitarian development toward the end of the 1990s, 9/11 shattered them, and the militant and ideologically motivated reactions of the US administration opened up a path towards more violence and turbulence. Seizing the hysteria and sense of insecurity following 9/11 as a good opportunity, it pursued the military option to smash, first, the Taliban regime of the already devastated Afghanistan and then cast away the highly enfeebled autocratic regime of Iraq. All these military actions were meant to make the world and the US safer, but it turned out to be a tragically counter-productive exercise. Afghanistan is gradually falling into grave instability; Iraq is now virtually in a chaotic state of civil war where previously unknown forces of terror and brutal violence prevail.

These US policies, which are devastating for the stability of the world, have made heavily military options thinkable and, in a sense, pursuable and preferable for a variety of actors from Israel and Russia to the so called terrorist groups of various persuasions. The world has since been experiencing a wave of killings and destruction in Palestine and Lebanon, Iraq Chechen, Darfur and so forth. Under these circumstances, those political forces that call for peaceful solutions for many of the world's problems have faced a terribly difficult situation.

In addition, global market forces have been making the lives of ordinary working people harder and harder since the late 1970s. Economic globalization has seriously weakened existing social ties; the ideological offensive of

neo-liberalism looks formidable, and alternative forms of political economy are not easy to formulate. Thus prevalence of military power and the dominance of neo-liberal economic globalization constitute a very tough combination of forces for pacifism and egalitarian social movements. It is under these precise circumstances, however, that the forces of pacifism have to rise up and show their significance.

We organized a panel entitled "Rising Pacifism" at the annual research convention of the Peace Studies Association of Japan in June 2005, inviting distinguished scholars and activists. At that forum, we discussed the possibility and significance of pacifism under today's difficult situation. The panel was a memorable one and was successful in provoking critical thought on the current US policies and dominant way of thinking about peace and security. Mr. Nakamura Tetsu's speech, in particular, was powerful and persuasive in showing that peace cannot be built upon military means and the destruction caused by them. He has been struggling to build a solid infrastructure to allow people to live peacefully in Afghanistan for more than twenty years and told us that the safest way to help people lead peaceful lives is to use no weapons and to provide them with water to grow a variety of agricultural products.

Based on Mr. Nakamura's persuasive account of peace-building under a very difficult situation, we decided to organize the whole annual conference of Peace Studies Association of Japan in 2006 under the general theme of "Rising Pacifism." We certainly cannot claim that pacifism is rising all over the world; violence continues to dominate in many parts of the world. However, if we try hard to find new

trends in the world, we do see that the tides of pacific activities are not just vanishing away. To the contrary, we find many symptoms of a rising pacifist orientation. Opposition to Bush is making headway in the US; Blair is facing severe criticism in the UK; the World Social Forum has established a firm foundation in the global political calendar; a variety of social forums are being established almost all over the world to find alternative ways of political economy; and a variety of center-left governments have won elections in many parts of the world. We cannot be optimistic about those trends, since they are just beginning to emerge, and considering that the forces against that pacifistic orientation are very strong.

At this juncture, however, as peace researchers we need to critically analyze the cause, reason, strength, significance, and meaning of these embryonic trends in order to raise and strengthen pacifism. Thus, the general theme of this annual conference, "Rising Pacifism," is, on one hand, descriptive of the rising current of peace-oriented activities and critical social movements. On the other hand, it is normative or formative in that critical analysis will further strengthen the burgeoning trends of pacifism. This is why we organized our annual conference under the general theme of "Rising Pacifism."

In order for pacifism to rise and for us to raise pacifism, we first need to critically reexamine our methodology of research on peace and identify the problems inherent in them.

Given the rise of self-centered xenophobic nationalism in Japan, the Japanese tradition of pacifism has been on the defensive and the agenda of peace research has leaned toward so-called realism. Thus we must first look back and reflect on the distinctive identities of peace research as an academic discipline. We also need to expand our field of research. We have a very strong tradition of art forms in which the value of peace is firmly ingrained. This important treasure has not been earnestly scrutinized in our academic discipline of peace research. In addition, we have a new academic/activist trend in the research of public philosophy, which places a high value on the importance of peace. This academic movement should be introduced into peace studies and we should search for a positive synergy between the two streams. All these trends are set against the strong conservative and reactionary currents in Japan, which call for the transformation of the Japanese polity into an ordinary military power. The strength of Japanese pacifism is now being critically being tested under the offensive of those forces. It is under these circumstances that the four panels have been organized at the 2006 annual convention.

We are still very far from a situation where we can safely state that pacifism is rising. We still have to struggle hard to raise the tide of pacifism and strengthen its philosophical and theoretical foundation through a critical reexamination of our way of peace research and pacifism.

A Belated Message from Japan

TSURUMI Shunsuke

Philosopher

The United States dropped two atomic bombs on Japan, though this was unnecessary from a military point of view. It behooves Japan, however late, as a state and also as a nation, to respond to this fact.

The cold war benumbed the minds of Japanese intellectuals regardless of whether they were on the right or the left. The post-war peace movement was split into two, the left claiming that the atom bombs under the auspices of the Soviet Union were clean bombs, and the right tacitly supporting the U. S. stand.

The emergence of the atomic bomb in human history, in my view, necessitates a reconsideration of the system of state sovereignty. We need to go back beyond Meiji, to the Edo Era when we did not wage war for 200 years and further back to ancient geography Fudoki, where mystical heroes like Urashima Taro were champions.

Taro was sensitive to the torture of animals, giving a sum of money from his meager

earnings as a fisherman to the children and set the animal free. In return, the mother of the child tortoise came up to the shore and gave Taro a free ride to the palace under the sea. For a time, Taro enjoyed his stay under the sea, but after a while, stricken by homesickness, he asked for leave. The mistress of the palace gave him a present as a token of her affection but warned him never to open it unless in extreme circumstances. Taro came back to his old home country, where he could no longer find his old friends. When he opened the box, smoke arose and he became an old man, senility having come to his rescue.

This fable, retold in the light of today's international politics, is endowed with hard realism. We should no longer be duped by the myth of progress that served as a propelling force of Western civilization. The time has come to resurrect an ideal hidden in our own ancient geography.



Left: the author ©TAKEUCHI Kazuharu

Peace Studies in Japan: Some musings about where we are, and where we are going

Ronni Alexander

PSAJ Member
Kobe University, Kobe

Recently I came to the rather startling realization that I have been a member of the Peace Studies Association of Japan (PSAJ) for more than twenty years. In that time the world, the field of peace studies, and the PSAJ have all changed. Hopefully I have, too. It was, I believe, partially the recognition of these changes that prompted the Program Committee for the 2006 Spring PSAJ Conference to include a Round Table on directions for Peace Studies. I had the honor of participating in that Round Table, and the following essay is based on some of my comments there.

I shall begin with positioning myself as a peace researcher, clarifying my understanding of, and expectations for, peace studies as a field. For me, both personally and professionally, these lie in the possibilities for connecting the personal and political. My personal journey to peace studies began in junior high school, when I first discovered to my shock and disappointment that what I had been learning in school about the commitment of the United States to peace and human rights was totally belied by the Vietnam War. Around the same time, I became aware of environmental destruction, particularly the dangers of chemicals such as DDT and the herbicides being used in Vietnam.

Another important step on my journey occurred in 1977 when I first came to Japan and was shocked to learn what lay beneath the mushroom clouds in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This shock gradually turned into commitment when I traveled in Asia about a year later and learned that the problems in developing countries were fundamentally related to the ways we in developed countries were using and

abusing the world's natural, economic and human resources. Hiroshima, Nagasaki and opposition to all things nuclear remain a fundamental part of my commitment, something I share with many other peace researchers in Japan. At the same time, I find the persisting tendency to portray Japan as an innocent victim of nuclear attack extremely troubling.

My work since has focused on how living things can find safety and security. I am grateful to the PSAJ for giving me the space to grow as a peace researcher and as a critical thinker, to challenge the tenets of the field of international relations as I understood it, and to explore new areas such as gender, sexuality and the links between 'inner peace' and 'peace of the world.'

As a field, peace studies was born out of the desire to find a way to end war, and, perhaps later, to give a voice to the powerless. It has been from the start a normative field, and my understanding, at least personally but also I think more fundamentally, is that it is based on values of social justice and non-violence.

Keeping this positioning in mind, I would like in this essay to address two sets of issues. The first is the problem of how the values held to be 'universal' in peace studies are constructed, and who is involved, or not involved, in that process. This is not merely a question of universal versus particular values, but of how we frame and situate our discussions. When we 'give voice to the powerless,' how do we decide who is powerless and who is not? In giving the powerless a 'voice,' are we not also running the risk that our discourse will at the same time define them as 'powerless?' Moreover, if we are seeking one unified 'peace,' then does the voice

we find for the powerless become their one and only voice? If so, then will it not lead to a new disenfranchisement and marginalization of those not determined to be 'powerless,' or those entirely overlooked in the first place? This questioning refers not only to the values we bring to our work, but to the ways in which we establish those values in the first place.

One of the most fundamental tenets of peace studies today is the division of peace into positive and negative peace and of violence into direct, structural and cultural violence. These important ideas, first posited by Johan Galtung, have made a tremendous difference in the ways we imagine and discuss peace. They are both essential and problematic; essential in that they give us a tool to look beyond the realities of war to the structures and elements of our societies that create and/or support 'non-peace,' and problematic because 'non-peace' is often hard to see and define, and because it is not nearly as exciting or immediately horrendous as war. I am of the position that it is only by looking beyond, under and around war that we can find an end to it. In other words, I support the pursuit of positive peace in peace studies, although I understand that those working on negative peace are certainly more likely to be successful, at least in the short term. I do question, however, the use of dichotomies to explain something that is much more complex and inter-related. Even given that Galtung's work has been much simplified and misinterpreted, the divisions of peace and violence into seemingly logical pairs may in fact be leading us away from actually contributing to peace-making by allowing us (perhaps inadvertently) to believe that they are actually two different things.

This also applies to the definition of peace itself. I agree with Johan Galtung that peace is the absence of violence and the opportunity for what I would call self-realization of the full extent of each individual's abilities. However, we do need to consider whether this emphasis on peace-as-lack-of-violence does not also mean that we become limited in our abilities to see peace without violence. Can we describe peace in any other way? Elise Bolding wrote in reference to cultures of peace that "we cannot achieve what we cannot imagine." I believe one

of the ideas of cultures of peace is to imagine peace without imagining violence. Do we have the imagination, creativity and courage to do this?

If we reject violence as a way of discussing peace, we run the risk of ignoring many of the real and very pressing situations around the globe that require immediate action. How are we to respond to massacre and rape, rampant killing and terrorism? My response is that it remains the job of peace studies to explore non-violent and alternative ways of dealing with direct violence. This requires not only an understanding of the ways in which structural and direct violence are entwined, but also being open to alternative discourses.

It is my impression that there is great concern, particularly perhaps in Japan, that peace studies/peace research becomes acknowledged as a 'legitimate' academic field. This search for legitimacy further compromises peace studies as an alternative field, because it encourages the use of a model of academia which privileges the researcher over the researched and more traditional forms of research over new and truly trans-disciplinary approaches which involve not only intellectual efforts but also other forms of expression. Needless to say, it also makes it particularly difficult for young and alternative voices to be heard.

In Japan today, we are confronted by not only conflicting views of justice, but by conflicting views within peace studies about violence. Of particular concern to me is what I see as an increasingly strong assertion that it is appropriate to use violence to create peace. Related to this is the issue of the relationship between peace studies and the military, addressed in the last issue of the Peace Studies Bulletin. I fear we are running the risk of obscuring the difference between peace studies and security studies. Perhaps this, too, comes in part from the desire for 'legitimacy' and to not only engage in, but become part of, the mainstream security discourse.

This brings me to the second set of issues. The strength, and perhaps in some ways also a weakness of peace studies is its transdisciplinary nature and its close relationship with peace movements. In Japan, I see peace studies as

being heavily dominated by such disciplines as political science, international relations and perhaps peace education, with a wide range of thinking about the ways peace studies and peace movements should or should not be involved with each other. I find it encouraging that many young peace researchers have joined the PSAJ in recent years, and that, for example, a Peace and Arts Commission was established in PSAJ last year. I hope that these developments will give new energy to peace studies, and allow for the exploration of new modes of expression, perhaps even a conference devoted to performing or designing peace.

Personally, my commitment as a peace researcher is also a commitment as a peace activist. I recognize that not all peace researchers are activists, and that activism is also a diverse concept; peace movements are made successful and strong through their diversity. While our work as researchers and as activists are not one

and the same, as researchers I believe we must ground our work in activism, our own and that of others, and at the same time contribute to the work of activists and others through our research. We need to establish a true, equitable and trusting partnership with peace movements.

How do we create such partnerships? Perhaps it begins with recognizing that both our voice and our silence are powerful. Our voice must be expressed in a way that is accessible, and that shows at least our 'united diversity,' if not our 'diverse unity.' In using our differences as a reason for silence, we are not only refusing to recognize differences among ourselves, but are refusing to acknowledge our role as a positive force for peace. If as peace researchers in a normative peace studies community we are unable to give voice to, and live with, our own differences, how can hope to make a positive contribution to the creation of peace in the world beyond our small, ivory borders?

Preserving the Memory of Wartime Sexual Violence

IKEDA Eriko

TV Director

Chair of the Steering Committee of Women's Active Museum on War Peace (WAM)

In this report, I would like to discuss the progress of the movement to record and preserve information concerning wartime sexual violence, from within and outside of the mass media, with special reference to my own personal experiences.

More than ten years have passed since I began listening to and filming the stories of victims of Japan's military sexual slavery (the "comfort woman" system). I started out as a director of documentaries about issues concerning the war, but later became a "video activist" in the movement to support the former "comfort women." This is my present position. Interviews with survivors of sexual slavery cannot take place unless there is mutual trust between the speaker and the listener. Both must have the same sense of urgency, and share a common purpose. The women I interview regard their victimization as something to be ashamed of. Blaming themselves for what happened to them, they had kept their silence for half a century. Some had even been branded traitors. Those of us who listen are from the perpetrating country. At first, the tension in the air is palpable. But we keep going to see them, and as we get to know each other, they gradually begin to come to terms with their experience of sexual violence, and accept themselves as human beings. They establish relationships with other survivors. Their voices become stronger; they begin to look people in the eye; their facial expressions become brighter. The change in them affects their families and communities, and us, the interviewers, as well. Along with their testimonies, these subtle changes, both in the women themselves and in the atmosphere surrounding them, are all recorded in the films we make.

There is very little documentation concerning the victims of wartime sexual

violence. Because many of the survivors are illiterate, visual and audio records are an important means of communicating their stories. It was their voices, heard on television or the radio, that gave survivors of Japan's military sexual slavery throughout Asia the courage to come forward.

Having abandoned its responsibility to research the "comfort woman" system, and provide the survivors with a sincere apology and individual compensation, the Japanese government is now proceeding to turn Japan back into a country that can make war. Now that more than sixty years have passed since the war ended, with survivors dying one by one, it is a matter of great urgency for the Japanese people to record the effects of wartime sexual violence, from the points of view both of the victims and the perpetrators, and use this shared memory to keep this from happening again. For as Milan Kundera once observed, when those in power force us to forget, memory becomes the people's sole means of resistance, and most effective weapon.

Experiences of the Asia-Pacific War have been recorded and handed down through a number of media, but television documentaries have played a particularly important role in preserving these wartime memories. The current vast accumulation of documentaries began immediately after the war, when the stories of returning veterans or surviving family members were often recorded. During the 1970s and 1980s, the field expanded to include the experiences of the women who stayed at home to work "behind the guns," hibakusha (A-bomb survivors), war orphans left behind in China, and Japanese Americans forced to spend the war years in relocation centers. After the death of Emperor Hirohito, with the end of the Cold War

and increasing democratization in Asia, during the 1990s attention began to be focused on the role of the Japanese military and the emperor, and the voices of victims from throughout Asia began to be heard. In 1991, the first Korean survivor of the “comfort woman” system spoke out, providing the impetus for survivors from other Asian countries to come forward. These women became the subject of a number of documentaries. The courage of former “comfort women” influenced victims of rape in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, giving rise to an international women’s movement. But by the late 1990s, as Japan moved farther to the right, a backlash against this movement emerged, and the “comfort woman” issue began to disappear from both the mass media and school textbooks. At a certain Japanese television network, “three great taboos” are said to be feminism, “comfort women,” and the emperor’s war responsibility.

Fortunately, however, visual records no longer belong solely to television stations or movie studios. A movement that might be called “the democratization of visual images” has been gathering strength since the time of the first Gulf War, when ordinary citizens began to establish their own independent media to disseminate information in opposition to the mass media. Having learned from its failure to control information during the Vietnam War (in other words, from having allowed reporters on location to send graphic images of war into American living rooms, thus fueling the anti-war movement), the American government kept rigid

controls on war reporting. Video journalists and public access TV stations resisted by covering the anti-war movement, and broadcasting their reports on cable TV. This was made possible first of all by the availability of cheap, compact video cameras, which allowed individuals to record and edit their own films. In addition, with the development of communication technology brought on by the IT revolution, these individuals can now easily distribute their films, or broadcast them on the Internet. A second important factor is the “fall” of the mass media. By this I mean that the mass media has basically been reduced to doing PR work for the government. This tendency became more pronounced after 9/11, with the bombing of Afghanistan and the invasion of Iraq. The four major networks sent out a constant stream of statements released by the government and the military, but failed to broadcast images of or information about either Iraqi citizen casualties, or the worldwide anti-war movement. In this vacuum, on-location reports from independent video journalists and activists played an important role in keeping the public informed.

In Japan, in addition to independent journalists who report current wars, there are groups that collect testimonies and uncover documentation concerning war crimes committed during the Asia-Pacific War. Video Juku, which conducts interviews with former “comfort women,” is one of these groups. We make our own videos, which we distribute through circulation systems for private media. A



Former “comfort women” gathered at the Women’s International War Crimes Tribunal held in Tokyo in 2000, (c)VAWW-NET Japan

“grassroots” movement helps us to hold showings at community centers and other public facilities. We also keep in contact with citizens’ media groups from abroad. At present, the Japanese mass media has forgotten the original mission of journalism, which is “to keep a watchful eye on those in power, to prevent them from making war,” and media that fuel popular pro-war sentiments are given free rein. Although on a very small scale, we might say that citizens’ media groups are now actually fulfilling the true role of journalism.

A truly symbolic event concerning the recording of the victimization of the former “comfort women” occurred in 2000, when the Women’s International War Crimes Tribunal was held in Tokyo. Originally proposed by Japanese women involved in the movement to support the “comfort women,” this was a people’s tribunal, organized with the help of people from the victimized countries, as well as activists from all over the world, with the purpose of adjudicating criminal responsibility for the “comfort women” system. A verdict of guilty was handed down to ten military officials, including Emperor Hirohito. While the Japanese media largely ignored the Tribunal, nearly one hundred networks came to

cover it from abroad. A documentary on NHK’s educational station that covered the Tribunal was broadcast in a heavily censored form, due to pressure from rightwing politicians and activists. VAWW-NET Japan (Violence Against Women in War Network, Japan), one of the sponsoring organizations, then sued NHK. Legal proceedings are still in progress. Yet although the major Japanese media responded to the Tribunal with neglect, contempt, and sabotage, Video Juku recorded the entire proceedings on a number of video cameras, and broadcast them on the Internet while the Tribunal was in progress. When it was over, VAWW-NET Japan and other organizations established the Women’s Active Museum on War and Peace (WAM), where testimonies and documentation concerning both the perpetrators and victims of wartime sexual violence are preserved and made available to the public. WAM opened in August 2005. Visitors to the museum have access to a complete record of the Tribunal and documents used in it, and can watch videos of survivors’ testimonies. Thus, with the emergence of concerned citizens who have taken upon themselves the task of collecting and preserving information about war, the people’s movement for peace has entered a new stage.



At the entrance of the Women’s Active Museum on War and Peace (WAM)
There are pictures of former “comfort women.” ©WAM

Agriculture and Peace in East Asia

KATSUMATA Makoto

PSAJ Member

Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo

Ivan is still living and people crowd to his kingdom. His own brothers have come to live with him, and he feeds them, too. To every one who comes and says, "Give me food!" Ivan says, "All right. You can stay with us; we have plenty of everything"

Only there is one special custom in his kingdom; whoever has horny hands comes to table, but whoever has not, must eat what the others leave.

(Leo Tolstoy, Short Stories, Volume 2, The Modern Library, New York, 1965, p. 167.)

There is no doubt that agriculture, even in our contemporary world, remains an activity which is sustaining our lives and human reproduction. Agriculture feeds us as it clothes and shelters us against the sun and the cold. Agriculture is one of the important pillars of life.

Nevertheless it should be pointed out that agriculture per se has not always been carried out in a peaceful manner. The ecological and socio-political dimensions of contemporary agriculture should be analyzed from the view of peace studies.

This first dimension, the ecological dimension, refers, in terms of natural sciences, to the complex relationships between humans and nature. Introduction of the concept of entropy allows us a better understanding of the question of what kind of agricultural system is more ecologically sustainable¹. There are agricultural systems which are based on high entropy, involving the destruction of the material cycle and the diversity of nature.

This ecological constraint of agriculture

leads us to remind ourselves of the importance of the socio-political dimension of agriculture. We can not avoid public and in-depth discussions of a sustainable agricultural system, concerning which societal and political decisions should be made. The general picture of East Asian agriculture shows us that despite the large number of people still living by small-scale family farming, their future is seriously undermined by the global agro-business strategy, which consists of prioritizing immediate market benefits at the expense of the long-term sustainability of agriculture, and the undemocratic decisions of their governments, which hasten forward the liberalization of the national agricultural sector. Therefore the question of how to avoid dominant and unsustainable agriculture and promote a sustainable one based on democratic and local initiatives should be part of an urgent agenda for public debate.

The case of South Korea is illustrative in this regard. The "green revolution" promoted by successive Korean governments is based on the massive use of chemical inputs for mass production, mass marketing, and mass consumption. This type of agricultural system, as we can confirm in the evolution of farm trade under the World Trade Organization regime, provokes within producer countries depletion of nature such as soil erosion due to exploitation of nature without consideration for the local material cycle. Furthermore, in consumer

¹ Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1975:359) "Energy and economic Myths," Southern Economic Journal XLI:347-81, "To suggest further that man can construct at a cost a new environment tailored to his desires is to ignore completely that cost consists in essence of low entropy, not of money, and is subject to the limitation imposed by the natural laws." This quotation comes from an illuminating book written by Kozo Mayumi: The Origins of Ecological Economics, The bioeconomics of Georgescu-Roegen, Routledge, 2001, p. 45.

countries, massive imports of farm products cause serious issues of waste and food risk as well as national food insecurity. It should be concluded from what has been mentioned that the “green revolution,” which destroys the material cycle is an anti-life system.

From this point of view, on-going negotiations on the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) between South Korea and the United States have become an urgent issue for the future of South Korean sustainable agriculture. As matter of fact, the FTA that the Korean government is negotiating with the USA represents a serious obstacle to the progress of a more life-oriented agriculture. One of the most important aspects of the Korea-USA agreement resides in discarding the law on administrative procedure, for the FTA prescribes the organization of public hearings before starting ministerial meetings on foreign affairs.

Furthermore the Korean government has authorized the import of dubious American beef before the FTA negotiations. These facts are undemocratic and contrary to the livelihood security of farmers², food safety, and ecological and health conservation. Farm products should not be merely commodities which are traded throughout in the world³.

From the presentation and discussion and

² A report authored by the Korean University professor Han Doo-bong in the *The Korea Times* says that South Korea's agriculture sector could lose up to 8.8 trillion won (9.39 billion US dollars) if a US-South Korea free trade agreement goes through. He says also that the trade pact with the US would help boost productivity, “But not bring any great benefits to the agricultural sector. There are no major export items, and the US tariff rates for farm goods are already low,” forecasting that agricultural exports to the US would not increase sharply. *AgraFood Asia*, June 2006, p. 15.

³ The World Bank, which is a devotee of the virtues of market globalization with her sister financial organization IMF and the World Trade Organization, continues to advocate a free trade utopia through her writings. For instance, the Bank's most comprehensive trade model estimates that if trade in industrial and farm products were fully freed, the one-off gains from reallocating resources more efficiently could boost income in developing countries by 86 billion dollars by 2015 and pull an extra 30 million people out of extreme poverty. Two thirds of these would be in Africa. *The Economist*, December 10th, 2005, p. 79.

questions which followed, three concluding remarks can be suggested in order to further reflect on a perspective of a sustainable and more just society, two conditions inseparably connected to the promotion of peace.

The experiences of South Korean farmers' movements suggest to us that the current globalised capitalist system could not achieve a sustainable livelihood for all and that only a cooperative social system could secure a living system by practicing a local material circulation. Nevertheless, the realization of a cooperative society is not likely to be on the immediate agenda in the area. The importance of thinking power for a sustainable social system needs to be understood by a much larger number of social movements and to be prepared step by step through organic farming and the transition of the currently dominant agriculture to one based on local material circulation.

The second remark to be suggested consists in highlighting how solidarity actions are essential in terms of region-wide social movements, since East Asian agriculture has been facing worldwide commodification of nature. In order to protect the local living system in East Asia from destruction of the agricultural environment, peasants movements need to find fora for broader exchanges of their experiences and dialogues among themselves which go beyond nationalistic discourses based on narrowly defined national interest and big agro-business oriented agricultural policies..

The third point concerns the need for understanding and the formulation of a new analytical framework for increasing the number of young people returning to rural areas to take up new organic farming. As we can currently observe, the latest Japanese statistics show that the rate in which the number of people are becoming new farmers is increasing remarkably⁴. Peace studies should ascribe a more profound and radical meaning to this phenomenon, which may appear at first glance to be a cultural or merely week-end hobby activity. This movement

⁴ The number of new young farmers, which was only 4300 in 1988, reached 11,900 in 2003. The definition of young farmer is a full time farmer less than 39 years old. *White Paper on Food, Agriculture and Rural Areas: 2004*, Ministry of Agriculture, June 2005.

of settlement from cities to rural areas may suggest to us a tendency for the young generation to practice in rural areas a new form of resistance against the excessive commodity relations of contemporary societies (the mega-city is a symbol of alienation of people from nature) and a deliberate attempt to enlarge the autonomous space of livelihood by the practice of self-sufficiency in food without market transactions.

The quotation I made from Tolstoy's short story at the beginning of this essay provides a strong insight into the nature of sustainable agriculture and the meaning of farm work; convivial activities we can do without money and weapons.

Notice: This paper is primarily based on the discussion during the special session: Agriculture and Peace by the main speaker Dr. Kwon Young geun, Director of the Korean Institute of Research on Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing, the two panelists, Rural Journalist Mr. OHNO Kazuoki and Editor OOE Tadaaki and questions from the floor. The author is deeply grateful to these participants and particularly Dr. Kwon who came especially to participate in the bi-annual symposium of the Japan Society of Peace held on June 18th at Meijigakuin University, and Mr. Maruyama Shigeki, member of our Society, who greatly contributed to the preparation of this session. Nevertheless, the responsibility for errors, misinterpretation, and oversimplification which may have been made in the editing of this resume is exclusively assumed by the author.



From left: the author, Dr. Kwon Young geun and his interpreter, Mr. OHNO Kazuoki, and Mr. OOE Tadaaki

Report from NGOs Working for Peace (I)

Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and a Citizen-led Democracy

Reported by UEMURA Hideaki

PSAJ Member

Shimin Gaikou Centre (SGC), Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

A Brief History: Becoming a Grassroots ECOSOC NGO

Shimin Gaikou Centre has supported human rights movements of indigenous peoples and nations in Japan and all over the world since 1982, when it was established by a group of citizens in Japan. In other words, the Centre has struggled to build democracy and resolve social issues involving peace, the environment, development, education and culture from the perspective of indigenous peoples and nations. The Centre has consistently focused on communicating with and supporting the Ainu people since 1986 and the Okinawan people since 1996, respectively, in Japan and some indigenous peoples' organizations and governments in Asia and the South Pacific. In appreciation of these activities as a non-indigenous NGO in Asia, the United Nations designated the Centre as the first Japanese grassroots NGO with Special Consultative Status at the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) in 1999.

Main Activities for the Ainu, Okinawans and South Pacific Islanders

In Japanese society, unfortunately there is a lack of concern among citizens about the human rights of indigenous peoples. Many people have no recognition of the issues themselves. Therefore the Centre's budget is always limited, while the Peace Tax system was introduced in 1986. For example, the whole budget in 2004 was about 2,000,000 Japanese yen, an insufficient sum to hire full-time and paid staff for the office. In spite of the limited financial and human resources, however, the Centre has developed its main activities as follows; (1) Every year it sends a delegation to the regular sessions of the UN human rights bodies on the rights of indigenous peoples and nations, such as the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the Working Group on the Draft Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous People, and the Permanent Forum on the Indigenous Issues, together with Ainu and the Okinawan groups, supporting them financially and technically. (2)



An informal meeting between Asian governments and IPs in Asia, held by SGC in Geneva, December 2004

©Shimin Gaikou Centre

Every year the Centre makes a major contribution to a scholarship programme for two indigenous South Pacific students from their entrance to graduation in Vanuatu. This programme essentially started in 1990 in cooperation with the Vanuatu government and as a Japanese response to its active declaration as a nuclear-free nation in 1981 and the historical South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty of 1985. As a result, it was named the Peace Scholarship.

Promoting Citizen-led Democracy in the Age of Globalization

In addition, the Centre has actively worked to establish and develop NGO networks in order to promote a “citizen-led democracy” in Japan. It became one of the founding members of the International Human Rights NGO Network in 1990. In 2005, it organized a Japan NGO Network on UN Reform along with Peace Boat and Japan International Volunteer Center, and sent a Joint Proposal by NGOs on UN Reform to the UN headquarters in New York and to the Japanese government with the endorsement of other NGOs and NGO activists.

The International Human Rights NGO Network worked as the core group among participants from Japan in the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna, Austria in 1993, and in the World Conference against Racism,

Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance held in Durban, South Africa in 2001. In 2005, the Japan NGO Network on UN Reform organized the first Public Forum on UN Reform. Co-sponsored by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, it was aimed to comprehensively, constructively, and critically discuss the entire foreign policy of Japan including peace & security, disarmament, development and human rights between the government and civil society organizations. An effort to periodically hold the Forum, a unique mechanism in the world, has been aggressively and successfully made by the Network.

Other activities and the system of the Centre, including the Peace Tax, can be found on the following website:

<http://www005.upp.so-net.ne.jp/peacetax/>

The Centre welcomes new members to support its activities.

Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Centre for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples)

3-35-13-204 Higashi-komatsugawa, Edogawa-ku, Tokyo 132-0033 JAPAN

Tel & Fax: +81-3-5662-0906

Email: peacetax@js2.so-net.ne.jp

URL: <http://www005.upp.so-net.ne.jp/peacetax/>

Report from NGOs Working for Peace (II)

Development Education Association and Resource Center (DEAR)

Reported by KAMIJO Naomi

PSAJ Member

International Peace Research Institute, Meiji Gakuin University

Global Perspectives in Education in the 1970s

Education concerning globalization first appeared in the late 1960s and 1970s. This included

development education, international education and global education. Development education was promoted by developmental NGOs of northern European countries and Canada in the 1960s. They

focused on the problems of underdevelopment which prevailed among Third World countries.

Development Education in Japan

The first symposium on development education was held in 1979 in Tokyo, under the sponsorship of UNICEF and UN University. After this symposium developmental NGOs, youth organizations and UN related associations organized monthly meeting to study development education. They supported symposiums on development education at Yokohama in 1980, Osaka in 1981 and Nagoya in 1982. Under the initiative of this group, The Development Education Council of Japan (DECJ¹) was established in 1982. DECJ defined development education as follows:

Development Education is the education and learning in school and community to understand the structure and causes of under-development, the inter-relatedness of the global community, efforts and projects of development. It also seeks change of attitudes and morale to participate in the process of solving developmental issues.

Redefinition of Development Education

After the UN and International Conferences on global issues in the 1990s, such as the World Conference on Education for All (Jomtien, 1990), the UN Conference on Environment and Development (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), the World Human Rights Conference (Vienna, 1993), the Intergovernmental Conference on Population and Development (Cairo, 1994), the World Summit for Social Development (Copenhagen, 1995), the Fourth UN Women's World Conference (Peking, 1995), and the UN Conference on Human Dwellings (Istanbul, 1996), DECJ redefined Development Education as follows in 1997:

Development Education aims to understand various developmental issues, think of better development for the future and to participate in a fairer global community in which everyone can live together.

Under this definition, development education seeks fairness and justice among members of the global community, and the co-existence of races and nations. From this definition, there is a close similarity with ESD (Education for Sustainable Development).

Participatory Learning Method

Not only the themes but also the learning methods

¹ DECJ's name was changed to DEAR (Development Education Association and Resource Center) in 2002 when it was registered as an NPO corporation.



23rd Annual National Conference
at Waseda University, 2006

are important factors in Development Education. Participatory learning was adopted from the start, and many learning methods such as debate, photo language, simulations and workshops were introduced. This is because the goal of global education is not only to give knowledge and skills on global issues but to promote a change of attitudes to participate in the process of solving these issues. Old methods of teaching were insufficient to attain these goals.

DEAR's Activities

To promote Development Education in Japan, DEAR organizes various programs such as the Annual National Conference on Development Education, Regional Seminar on Development Education, workshops/seminars, Information Center, Publications (Journal, Newsletter, Handbook, Booklet series, teaching materials, directory, catalogue and website), sends facilitators to communities and schools, organizes research groups on Development Education, participates in international conferences, and acts as a consultant for the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Education.

DEAR has a membership system and has about 800 individual and organizational members. Half of the members are schoolteachers, and the others include adult educators, NGO/NPO workers, and corporate persons.

The mission of Development Education is to change the global society into a fairer and more sustainable world, which is a faraway goal, but a possible one.

DEAR (Development Education Association
and Resource Center)

2-17-41-3F Koishikawa Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 112-0002
JAPAN

Tel +81-3-5844-3630

Fax +81-3-3818-5940

Email: main@dear.or.jp

URL: <http://www.dear.or.jp/english/english.html>

Announcement

First Annual PSAJ Peace Prize and Peace Studies Prize for Young Researchers

YOKOYAMA Masaki

Chair, Selection Committee

Ferris University, Tokyo

The Peace Studies Association of Japan established the PSAJ Peace Prize and Peace Studies Prize for Young Researchers, which are awarded to individuals or organizations that have made significant contributions to peace studies or the peace movement in Japan, as a means to vitalize the peace movement and peace studies.

The PSAJ Peace Prize is given to one individual or organization, with a base of activities in Japan, who is deemed to have made a major contribution through peace studies or peace activities. The Peace Studies Prize for Young Researchers is given to two young researchers who have made a major contribution to the field of peace studies.

The recipients of the first PSAJ Peace Prize and Peace Studies Prize for Young Researchers are as follows.

First PSAJ Peace Prize

ARASAKI Moriteru, for four decades of research activities centered around Okinawa, as a member of PSAJ, and to celebrate the completion of his work, *Okinawa Dojidai Shi, Bekkan, 1962-1972, Mikan no Okinawa Senso* (Contemporary history of Okinawa, appendix, 1962-1972, the unfinished Battle of Okinawa), Gaifusha, 2005, the final in his work, *Okinawa Dojidai Shi Shirizu* (Contemporary History of Okinawa), 10 volumes + appendix.

Unfinished Pacifism

Starting from the mid 1960s, Mr. Arasaki has carried out research and writing activities on peace issues, focusing on Okinawa. The publication of the full work, completed with the publication of the 11th volume last year, marks a watershed for Japanese peace studies. The author's concrete philosophy, in particular regarding the struggle of the farmers of Ie Jima, is filled with the conviction in support of the autonomy of people, that people themselves make history, and the author describes himself as a "follower of the Okinawan people's movement." He also grasps the "pacifism" of the postwar Japanese mainland as being made possible by the military victimization of Okinawa, and sees peace and autonomy for Okinawa as the realization of true pacifism on the mainland. He consistently insists that there can be no peace on the mainland without peace on Okinawa. In the same way, it can be said that the "unfinished Battle of Okinawa," whose frontline is now the coast of Henoko, is equivalent to the "unfinished pacifism" of Japan. We present the first PSAJ Peace Prize to ARASAKI Moriteru, confident that nobody has done greater work, with the hope also that this will contribute to reflection on the past and future development in Japan's peace studies.

First PSAJ Peace Studies Prize for Young Researchers

KAWASAKI Akira, for *Kakukakusan: Gunshuku no Kaze wa Okoseruka?* (Nuclear proliferation: will we be able to create a wave of disarmament?), Iwanami Shoten, 2003.

This is an excellent explanatory work on the issue of nuclear weapons, that comprehensively examines the current state of nuclear arms and movements toward disarmament. The strength of this book is that KAWASAKI, a member of PSAJ, makes use of the knowledge and experiences accumulated during his work at an NGO working on disarmament. Concretely, he analyzes the problems with U.S. anti-proliferation policy and trends in the disarmament movement, using a wealth of data, and makes fascinating proposals regarding the verification system under the NPT. This is an epochal work in the Japanese peace movement and peace studies, as it is a difficult fusion of movement and high-level specialist knowledge.

SAEKI Natsuko, for *Ache no Koe: Sensu, Nichijo, Tsunami* (Voices of Aceh: war, everyday life, and the tsunami), Commons, 2005.

This book addresses the multifaceted situation in Aceh, on the northern tip of Sumatra Island, since the 1990s, under human rights violations by the Indonesian military, through the live voices of victims, mainly women. In form, it is close to a war chronicle. Ms. Saeki, a member of PSAJ, does not give in to abstract peace studies, which is all too common, but puts her own body into the line of fire as she examines the “violence” that victims see from their precious “everyday life.” This is a very significant work, as it comes as a shock to people who thought they understood peace studies.



PSAJ Peace Prize Recipients ©TAKEUCHI Kazuharu
From left: Ms. SAEKI Natsuko, Mr. KAWASAKI Akira, and Mr. ARASAKI Moriteru

Peace Studies Association of Japan (Nihon Heiwa Gakkai)

(January 2006 – December 2007)

President: UTSUMI Aiko

Vice Presidents: ENDO Seiji, OGASHIWA Yoko

Secretary General: HORI Yoshie

Auditors: USUI Hisakazu, SHUTO Motoko

Council Members:

ALEXANDER Ronni	KIMURA Akira	OGASHIWA Yoko
ARASAKI Moriteru	KITAZAWA Yoko	OHASHI Masaaki
ENDO Seiji	KOBAYASHI Koji	OKAMOTO Mitsuo
FUJIWARA Osamu	KODAMA Katsuya	OTA Kazuo
FUNAKOE Kouichi	KOSHIDA Kiyokazu	SAEKI Natsuko
HORI Yoshie	KOUKETSU Atsushi	SASAKI Hiroshi
ISHIDA Atsushi	MOGAMI Toshiki	SATAKE Masaaki
ISHIHARA Masaie	MORI Reiko	SHOJI Mariko
ISHII Mayako	MURAI Yoshinori	SO Sun
ISHIKAWA Shoji	MUSHAKOJI Kinhide	TAKAHARA Takao
KATSUMATA Makoto	MUWANGI Gordon Cyrus	TOSA Hiroyuki
KIKKAWA Gen	NAKAMURA Hisashi	UTSUMI Aiko
KIMIJIMA Akihiko	NISHIKAWA Jun	YOKOYAMA Masaki

Chairpersons of Committees:

Program Committee: SASAKI Hiroshi

Editorial Committee: SHOJI Mariko

Overseas Committee: OHASHI Masaaki

Newsletter Committee: KIMURA Akira

Homepage Committee: SAEKI Natsuko

PSAJ is a member of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA).

Peace Studies Bulletin No. 25 was compiled and edited by the Overseas Committee and its members.

Chairperson: OHASHI Masaaki

Members: KAMIJO Naomi, KAYANO Tomoatsu, URUSHIBATA Tomoyasu

PSAJ Secretariat (January 2006 – December 2007)

Peace Studies Association of Japan (PSAJ)

C/O Ms. HORI Yoshie

Keisen University

2-10-1 Minamino Tamashi Tokyo, 206-8586, Japan

Email: PSAJ@keisen.ac.jp

Fax: +81-42-376-8247