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ON ANONYMITY OF MY INTERLOCUTORS

When I interviewed each of my interlocutors, I explained about benefits and risks of their cooperation to my research and about benefits of anonymity and risks of using their real names, and asked them for permission to use pseudonyms. However, some requested that I use their real names. Like Checker (2005:197), who “ha[s] used people’s real names when they have requested it” in her ethnography about environmental justice activists in Georgia, US, I have used their real names in this thesis when they requested it. For all of the other interlocutors, I have used pseudonyms. I intentionally did not show whose names are real names and whose names are pseudonyms.
ON JAPANESE NAMES AND TERMS

In Japanese, people’s names are presented in the order of family name and given name. However, in this thesis that I wrote in English, in order not to confuse readers, I presented Japanese names in the order of given name and family name. (For example, in order to refer to the person whose family name is Hamai and whose given name is Shinzo, I wrote Shinzo Hamai, not Hamai Shinzo.) In accordance with the custom in Japan, I did not use macrons ( ¯ ) to indicate long vowels in people’s names. (For example, I wrote Shinzo Hamai, not Shinzō Hamai.)

When I wrote Japanese terms and nonhumans’ names, I used the modified Hepburn system for the romanization of Japanese (Shūsei Hebon-shiki Rōmaji). Based on the modified Hepburn, I generally used macrons ( ¯ ) to indicate long vowels. (For example, “pīsu,” “Chūō Park,” and “fukkō.”)
ABSTRACT

This thesis is my exploration of what the landscape of peace, onto which past relevant actors’ discourses and practices of peace and my interlocutors’ present practices of peace are inscribed, represents and silences, and how my interlocutors, who relate their activities to the concept peace, make sense of the concept peace. In the literature in the field of anthropology of peace, peace has been what is defined by the anthropologists, not by their interlocutors. In other words, the anthropologists’ definitions of peace have silenced their interlocutors’ understandings of peace. This whole thesis was written as a critique of how these anthropologists of peace have silenced their interlocutors’ own understandings of peace. I explored how discourses and practices that actors involved related to the concept peace in the past and my interlocutors’ present practices are inscribed onto the landscape. Hiroshima city has been explicitly designed as a “peace (memorial) city.” Reconstruction of ruined Hiroshima as a “peace (memorial) city” enabled the city government to obtain special subsidies, with which the city government constructed many facilities including the Peace Memorial Park, but at the same time, it oppressed and silenced despondent voices and uncomfortable feelings of many citizens, the majority of whom were A-bomb victims. In the Peace Memorial Park, there are many objects such as buildings, monuments, and A-bombed trees, which were erected or have been preserved by a variety of actors who thought these objects symbolize their hope for peace. Many of the objects in the park represent the master narrative of peace in Hiroshima which links the atomic bombing with the concept peace. In my fieldwork, as a guide, I took my guests to a dozen of the objects in the park in my guided tours. My guided tour, which centered on what the objects in the Peace Memorial Park represent, contributed to the hegemonic narrative of peace, which silences many voices. In a Foucauldian sense, I was formed as a subject of the hegemonic discourse of peace in Hiroshima. With this as a backdrop, I inquired how my interlocutors make sense of the concept peace especially in relation to their activities that they relate to the concept peace? Although they clearly relate their activities to the concept peace, their thoughts on peace are rarely made manifest. The foregrounded concept peace silences their understandings of peace, which differs from one another. Many of my interlocutors’ understandings of peace are counterposed to their understandings of what happened in Hiroshima.
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Dear [...] ,

[...]

Born in Hiroshima and growing up as a grandson of a hibakusha1 (who entered the city after the bombing like Yuichi Yokoyama’s grandmother), I have grown up thinking that it is natural and precious for us to call for world peace and abolition of nuclear weapons and take actions toward that goal. If you will, I was a true peace boy

1 The word “hibakusha” (被爆者) consists of three kanjis (kanjis are Chinese letters that are used in Japanese), where “hi” (被) means “receive” or “suffer”, “baku” (爆) means “explode” or “explosion”, and “sha” (者) means “people”. Although the letter “baku” (爆) does not only mean atomic bombs or bombings but also other kinds of explosions, the word “hibakusha” (被爆者) is only used for those who were exposed to (the) atomic bombings. Thus, it can be said that “hibakusha” (被爆者) literally means those who were exposed to (the) atomic bombings. The phonologically same word “hibaku” (被曝), which uses a different kanji for “baku” (爆) (meaning “being exposed to something”), means being exposed to radiation that were not caused by atomic bombings. “Hibaku” in the word “hibakusha” refers to the former one (被爆) meaning being exposed to (the) atomic bombings.

However, the word hibakusha currently means those who were exposed to (the) atomic bombings and/or to the radiation of (the) bombings. For example, my grandmother is hibakusha in this sense – she did not have a direct experience of the Hiroshima atomic bombing, but she went into the city about two weeks after the bombing and got exposed to the radiation. This meaning has been shaped over a long period of history. At first, hibakusha only refereed to those who directly experienced the atomic bombings. However, as victims of the atomic bombs became objects of medical surveys and recipients of the governmental medical compensation, the meaning of the word hibakusha gradually changed to the current meaning – those who were exposed to the radiation of the bombings. For details of this process of formation of the subject hibakusha, see Chapter 1 and 2 of Naono 2015.
(heiwa shōnen), if I say in a parody of militaristic boy (gunkoku shōnen)\(^2\). I took the preciousness of that goal for granted.

However, my thoughts have changed gradually.

The first trigger was an event that happened when I was a first-year high-school student. My friend took me to a certain group’s meeting. There, high school students, with the help of Catholic fathers and leaders who looked like college students, had a meeting to decide a theme of their activities in that year. One student suggested that the theme of the activities this year should be “peace.” Every participant applauded this suggestion, decided unanimously that the theme is “peace,” and started discussing details of their activities. Each attendant suggested what they thought they should do in turn and the discussion proceeded. When it was my turn, I said, “What are you all talking about under the name of peace? What is peace?” At that moment, I had a feeling of strangeness which is caused by something unexplained. At the same time, a feeling of ridiculousness. Thinking back, it might be that I was feeling discomfort because everyone was repeatedly saying self-pleasing things, appealing that “I am a very good student who is thinking deeply about peace!” I did not understand the cause of my sense of strangeness, but because of this feeling, I said something “inappropriate.” What I said froze everyone, who stopped saying anything, and the leader who could not stand the situation dismissed the meeting and the meeting that day was over. Since then I did not participate in their meetings any more, and I know nothing about what they did in that year at all.

Hiroshimans are proud of thinking about peace more than anyone else and bemoan and get indignant at other people who know nothing about August 6\(^{th}\)\(^3\), but what actually is peace which backs them up? In reality, people have their own different

\[^2\text{The word “gunkoku shōnen” (which I translated “militaristic boy”) refers to a boy who was supportive of the militaristic policies of Imperial Japan during the World War Two.}\]

\[^3\text{August 6\(^{th}\) refers to the day of the Hiroshima atomic bombing.}\]
ideas about peace and their ideas are not unified. And I think that is what it should be. However, I am a little bit terrified by people who think that there is a unified idea about peace which functions as everyone’s common recognition.

After I came to Tokyo, the surroundings around me changed, which triggered many thoughts in my mind, but at a certain point, I decided to stop talking about peace or calling for peace. I cannot remember what the trigger was, but I started thinking in this way.

I hope the world is peaceful. I still hope so. However, if I have to sacrifice a lot in order to accomplish this peace… for example, abandon a person whom I love, abandon my own life… if I have to do such things… I rather abandon my hope for the path to peace. I cannot think that I hope the world should be peaceful even if I need to abandon my important stuffs. I cannot give my water to others. I, who have such a heart which wishes for such a halfway peace, am not qualified to talk about or call for peace.

[This unsent e-mail draft that my friend Shinichi wrote ends here.]
In 2005, when I was a 17-year-old, second-year high school student, I participated in a student exchange program that invited 19 high school students from Japan, Israel, and Palestine to Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the atomic bombings. The program aimed to facilitate “dialogues toward peace” between them. After a visit to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and a guided tour of monuments in Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park by Hiroshiman students including me, we had a session to exchange impressions about the Hiroshima atomic bombing and opinions about peace. However, there was a discrepancy between Japanese, Israeli, and Palestinian students’ views about peace. Japanese students talked about elimination of wars or abolishment of nuclear weapons, but some students from Israel saw peace as “security,” while some from Palestine equated peace with “freedom.” As I pointed out in my speech, especially the difference between the Israeli and Palestinian students was very large; while “security” for the Israelis was enhanced by the construction of a wall hundred miles long, “freedom” for the Palestinians meant being able to cross the very border that wall blocked. Though discussing the same word—“peace”—the two groups described two completely different ideas.

In the face of such considerable discrepancy in definitions of peace, how can “dialogues toward peace” be possible? The same concept “peace” could mean completely different ideas to different people and thus the practices that aim to accomplish mutual understandings through using the word “peace” requires us to be sensitive to different meanings that each of discussants assigns to the concept.

How do people make sense of peace? What socio-politico-cultural factors shape their interpretations of peace? In Hiroshima, which is rendered as “a peace memorial city,” the concept peace is prevalent all around the city. You can find the word peace, for example, in names of public facilities such as “Peace Boulevard” and “Hiroshima Peace Boulevard.”

---

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law, which was enacted on August 6, 1949 to reconstruct the city, aimed at “construct[ing] the city of Hiroshima as a peace memorial city to symbolize the human ideal of the sincere pursuit of genuine and lasting peace.”
Peace Memorial Park” as well as names of private facilities such as a church (“Memorial Cathedral for World Peace”) and a blood donation center (“Pīsu”, the Japanese transliteration of the English word peace) and signboards of private facilities such as a local shopping promenade, flowerbeds at a street corner, and a baseball stadium. In this research, I will aim to contextually understand the meaning of this predominantly foregrounded concept peace. How practices that actors relate to the concept peace inscribed into the landscape? What do the landscape and the components of landscape represent? What do they silence? How do those who are involved in activities that they relate to the concept of peace make sense of this concept peace? My research interest in understandings have led me to a qualitative, especially ethnographic, approach, which enabled me to understand the landscape, practices, and discourses of “peace” in the context in which my interlocutors live.

Significance of Research

My anthropological inquiry of the landscape of peace onto which practices that relevant actors relate to the concept peace and the discourses that my interlocutors relate to the concept peace questions the current symbolic domination by academics over conceptualization of peace.

Very little anthropological research has focused on peace. A number of researchers discuss peace as the opposite to concepts like violence, war, conflict, militarism, etc., with the main foci of their research on the latter themes. Anthropological research on peace includes the works of Howell and Wills (1989), Gregor and Sponsel (1994), Gregor (1996), Fry (2006), and Oda and Seki (2014). Although these researchers have attempted to define the concept of peace not as the negation of other concepts but as substantive in its own right, their definitions of peace all fail to give voice to those who are researched, i.e., to the “natives” (Howell and Wills 1989; Gregor and Sponsel 1994; Gregor 1996; Fry 2006) or to the peace “practitioners” (Oda and Seki 2014).

I do not criticize the academic definition of peace, per se. Academics can cast new light on a concept by redefining it as John Rawls did when he presented his definition of justice in A Theory of Justice. I am also not criticizing peace anthropologists’ representation of interlocutors’ lives, per se. Their interpretation and
presentation of these interlocutors’ lives as “peaceful” are their own subjective constructions, which have great value in their subjective interpretation and presentation of the interlocutors’ lives. What I am criticizing here is that anthropologists have not inquired their interlocutors’ definitions of peace in their research of peace. Previous ethnographers gave “to one voice a pervasive authorial function and to others the role of sources, ‘informants’ to be quoted or paraphrased” (Clifford 1986:15).

Through presenting my interlocutors’ understandings of peace, I would like to urge other peace anthropologists and peace scholars to see their interlocutors as definers of peace. In contrast to the previous anthropological research on peace, my research calls for thinking of the interlocutors as subjects who discursively and practically engage with the concept peace. My interlocutors relate their activities to the concept of peace, and therefore analyzing their activities and relevant discourses enabled me to understand how they made sense of the concept of peace.

It is important to understand how my interlocutors at Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace and Asian Network of Trust-Hiroshima make sense of peace because they are playing important roles in communicating, through the concept of peace, with people all over the world who are interested in Hiroshima. The theoretical contribution of my proposed research lies in development of a theory that explains how my interlocutors are making sense of peace.

**Conceptual Framework**

**Existing Literature on Discourses of Peace in Hiroshima**

There is a considerable amount of social research about Hiroshima, but few of them discuss non-academics’ discourses of peace in Hiroshima. For example, Matsuo (1983) conducted survey research on the meaning of the word “heiwa (peace)” by

---

Ishida 1968 classifies several cultural patterns of the notions of peace and compares “shalom” in the ancient Judaism, “eirene” in ancient Greece, “pax” in ancient Rome, “santi” in India, “pinghe (和平)” or “heping (和平)” in China, and “heiwa (平和)” in Japan. He presents the below table to show what meanings each concept of “peace” emphasizes (Ishida 1968:35). (Note: Ishida notes that the table only shows emphases of each of the concept. For example, it is not that the concept of “shalom” means only divine will, justice, and prosperity; the meaning of “shalom” also contains serenity of
using the method of free association. This research asked about 1,000 college students to write down in five minutes as many words as possible which came to their mind when they hear the word “heiwa”. The researcher statistically analyzed the relationship between the stimulus word, “heiwa”, and words that appeared in the students’ responses. Such statistical research is important in terms of linguistically identifying what words people associate with the word “heiwa”, but it is impossible for this kind of survey research to contextually understand how people make sense of peace.

In contrast to the above linguistic research, sociologist Naono (2015), who explores memories of Hiroshima by focusing on hibakushas’ experiences, discusses how “peace” was discussed in relation to “A-Bomb” until around early 1950s. At an early stage of the post-war period, the Hiroshima city government as well as the Japanese government and the Occupation Force argued that the atomic bombings brought “peace” to Japan and the world. The city claimed so in order to inspire the Occupation Force’s cooperation toward the reconstruction of Hiroshima. The 1949 “Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law,” on which reconstruction of Hiroshima was based, has roots in this idea of peace. In the process of rebuilding Hiroshima as a city of peace, traces of Hiroshima’s history both as a military town and as an A-Bombed city started to be erased. In fact, the Japanese government and the mind. It is simply that the emphases of the meaning of “shalom” are on divine will and justice and prosperity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Divine Will; Justice</th>
<th>Prosperity</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Serenity of Mind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Judaism</td>
<td></td>
<td>shalom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eirene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (Japan)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>heping/pinghe (China); heiwa (Japan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>santi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in Japan, in general, the English word “peace” is thought of as interchangeable with the Japanese word “heiwa” and vice versa. In this research, I will translate “heiwa” as “peace”.

7
Occupation Force intended to erase traces of the Japanese invasion of Asia and the American atomic bombing. In contrast, people’s social movements in Japan such as the “No More Hiroshimas” movement that was triggered by a 1946 book “Hiroshima” by an American journalist John Hersey argued for a different kind of “peace”; they argued that peace was harmed by the atomic bomb(s).

Naono 2015 points out that the word peace was not used very often in the experience notes of atomic bomb victims. She also points out that some people wrote in their experience notes that atomic bombings brought peace to the world and argues that the intention behind such claims are different from the intention of the city government. While the city government meant to side up to the Occupation Force to promote reconstruction policies, the victims relied on this logic in order to derive meanings from damages caused by the atomic bombings. In addition, Naono argues, many victims in their experience notes criticized “peace” policies by the city government. Furthermore, she points out that “peace” meaning “No More Hiroshimas” appears rarely in the experience notes of the victims. In addition, Naono warns, atomic bomb victims’ experience was presented and widely perceived as “appeals for peace,” which can silence their other despondent voices such as “It was much better for us all the family members to be killed in Hiroshima,” “I am jealous (of the dead),” and “I wonder why I must live in this world where there is no dream or hope” (Naono 2015:97).

Naono 2015 is a significant study which not only describes historical formation of atomic bomb victims’ interpretations of peace in Hiroshima but also points to that interpretation of hibakushas’ narratives as narratives of “peace” can silence other voices to be heard and meanings that derive from the mainstream hegemonic constructions about peace. However, she analyses the discourses of peace historically, and the present-day discourses of peace by peace activists is out of the scope of her discussion. In this way, how those who engage in activities that they relate to the concept peace in Hiroshima make sense of “peace” remains largely unknown and unexplored.

Concepts

**Landscape (Ingold 1993; Navaro-Yashin 2009; Khayyat 2013).** Ingold (1993) explores the concept of landscape, which might seem to be close to a scene painting in that it reflects “what we see around us” (1993:162). However, he calls for our attention
to the processual (temporal) activities of dwelling (which he calls taskscape), without which its final product (a landscape) could not emerge. It is also important that Ingold does not have a view that in an action of dwelling, agency is enjoyed only by the dwellers and that the world which the dwellers view are just objects. In painting or “in dwelling in the world, we do not act upon it, or do things to it; rather we move along with it” (163). Thus, in his view, the processual activities of humans should be thought of as “nest[ing] within the wider pattern of activity for all animal life, which in turn nests within the pattern of activity for all so-called living things, which nests within the life-process of the world” (164).

I agree with his focus on human actor/viewers’ perspectivity and temporality of the “landscape,” and with his view of the world that human activities are part of the life-process of the world that consists of not only humans but also nonhumans.

In particular, there are two specific conceptual tools that I would like to explicitly put into my theoretical framework: spatial and temporal inscription of practices into the landscape, and nonhumans. Ingold (1993:152) points out, “the landscape is constituted as an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves.” By utilizing this concept landscape, this thesis focuses on the landscape of peace as an ensemble of traces of the past and present actors’ practices that they relate to the concept peace.

Moreover, I find resonance between Ingold’s theory which contextualizes activities of humans in the life-process of the world and Navaro-Yashin’s theoretical focus on nonhumans. Latour (2004) criticizes existing theoretical approach to “actors” which focus only on humans and proposes that we should bring nonhuman “objects back into the normal course of action” (2004:225) with a theoretical interest in how power is exercised through the network of humans and nonhumans. When utilizing the concept of nonhuman in my theoretical framework, however, I am attentive to Navaro-Yashin’s suggestion. While Navaro-Yashin (2009:8) agrees with Latour that “there is a need to attend to the centrality of objects in the making of politics,” she criticizes Latour, pointing out that the network between people and objects need to be studied “in historical contingency and political specificity” (9) and that Latour’s methodology ruins previous theories’ focus on language and discursivity. She suggests that “objects are
discursively qualified as well” (10). Inspired by Navaro-Yashin’s approach, in this thesis, I am attentive not only to who (humans) and what (nonhumans) participates in the course of action of enacting peace and how, but also to how humans discursively engage with nonhumans through enacting peace.

**Silence (Trouillot 1995, Hirsch and Stewart 2005).** I would like to also draw on the literature in the field of historical anthropology, especially Trouillot 1995 and Hirsch and Stewart 2005. I argue that history (which is a Western category), historicism (the Western version of historicity), and the state regime silence people, especially the marginalized, creates the silence of the un-said, and fills the silent discursive space with its official history, its official historicity (historicism), and terror’s talk.

The globally predominant approach to the past—history—, in combination with the power of the regime that promotes such an approach, silences multiple objects in the following three ways. First, historical narratives are created through reducing the intermingled pasts into simplified, linear narratives, which exclude – and thus silence – any other interpretations of the events in the past (Trouillot 1995). Second, historicism is dominantly thought of as the superior form of the production of knowledge about the past. “Facts” in the linear narrative of history are rendered as being already proved by the “evidence.” The calling for “evidence” legitimizes the history as the superior way to narrate the past, and expels other ways to perceive the past. In addition to this, the archive, based on which univocal history is created, functions as the source of legitimacy of its claims on facticity and overwrites the history on those pasts which are not documented. Third, the authorities who disseminate their official history silences people through controlling and terrifying them.

The landscape of Hiroshima is indeed “an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves” (Ingold 1993:152). Then, what have been recorded? What “history” do they represent? What voices do they silence? By utilizing the concept of “silence” in the above literature in the field of historical anthropology, I explore the “landscape of peace” in Hiroshima, by which I mean the landscape which past discourses and practices that the actors related to the concept of peace are inscribed
onto and excluded, oppressed, and silenced by, and which my interlocutors practically engage with.

Genealogy (Foucault 1977[1975]). I also would like to draw on Foucault’s genealogical approach – an approach which focuses on how concepts emerged and how power and knowledge is interrelated to one another in the deployment of these concepts. I would like to apply this genealogical approach to the concept peace. How did the concept peace emerged as a hegemonic concept which swallows every component of the history of Hiroshima atomic bombing? How have I – who grew up in Hiroshima as a school children who received what is called “peace education,” who have identified myself with a grandson of a hibakusha, and who have always been trapped by the concept peace not only as an individual but also as a researcher – been formed as a subject of this hegemonic concept peace? If I use the expression used by my friend Shinichi, who wrote the unsent draft of an e-mail that I presented in the vignette, how have I been formed as a “peace boy (heiwa shōnen)”?

Hiroshima Atomic Bombing/Peace (Yoneyama 1999, Naono 2015). Yoneyama (1999:20) points out, “The commemorative city of Hiroshima was, as it were, designed specifically to demonstrate the interchangeability of ‘the atomic bomb’ and ‘peace’.”

Naono (2015) discusses how “peace” was discussed in relation to “A-Bomb” until around early 1950s. She points to the difference between the city government’s discourse which links the atomic bombing with peace and the A-bomb victims’ narratives. She points out that the word peace was not used very often in the experience notes of atomic bomb victims. She also points out that some people wrote in their experience notes that atomic bombings brought peace to the world, but argues that the victims relied on this logic in order to derive meanings from damages caused by the atomic bombings, which is different from the city government which attempted to side up with the Occupation Force and the national government. In addition, Naono argues, many victims in their experience notes criticized “peace” policies by the city government. Furthermore, she points out that “peace” meaning “No More Hiroshimas” appears rarely in the experience notes of the victims. If atomic bomb victims did not use the concept peace or they used the concept peace very differently from the city
government as Naono (2015) points out, then, how the concept peace came to be predominantly related to the Hiroshima atomic bombing? I explore this question through analyzing the landscape of peace in Hiroshima. Also, how my interlocutors’ understandings of the concept peace related to their understandings of the Hiroshima atomic bombing?

Theoretical Framework

As I already explained, existing literature on how peace activists make sense of “peace” is limited and thus my study is indispensable to understand it. In order to understand how they make sense of peace, my thesis focuses on their discourses and practices that they relate to peace, and the landscape of peace onto which past discourses and practices that relevant actors related to the concept peace are inscribed and with which my interlocutors practically engage (cf. Ingold 1993). In understanding the landscape of peace, I am attentive not only to who (humans) and what (nonhumans) participate in the course of actions of enacting peace and how, but also to how humans discursively engage with nonhumans (cf. Navaro-Yashin 2009). Also, by drawing on the concept of “silence” in the field of historical anthropology, I inquire not only what kind of practices and discourses are inscribed onto the landscape but also what kind of practices and discourses are silenced by the landscape. Furthermore, by leveraging a Foucauldian genealogical approach, I reveal how the concept peace emerged as a hegemonic concept predominantly linked to the Hiroshima atomic bombing, and how I was formed as a subject of the hegemonic narrative which firmly links the concept peace to the atomic bombing, or, if I use my friend Shinichi’s expression, as a “peace boy.” Yoneyama (1999:20) points out “the interchangeability of ‘the atomic bombing’ and ‘peace’,” but Naono (2015) points out that in early post-war years, many A-bomb victims did not naturally link the atomic bombing to the concept peace. How has the concept peace been predominantly related to the Hiroshima atomic bombing?

Methodology

Between November 2016 and January 2017, and in April 2017, I conducted an ethnographic research on those who are involved in activities that they relate to the concept of peace in Hiroshima. I specifically focused on staff and volunteers in the
following two non-profit organizations: Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace (HIP) and Asian Network of Trust Hiroshima (ANT-Hiroshima or ANT). The former organization, HIP, is an organization consisting of about 110 volunteer members. They offer English guided tours of Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park and Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum to international tourists. I chose to study their activities because this organization identifies itself as an organization for “peace.” I have become a volunteer member of the organization since October 2015.

The latter organization, ANT-Hiroshima, is a certified non-profit organization founded to transmit “the message of peace from Hiroshima to the world,” as is indicated on their former website. The organization is involved in a variety of disaster-relief and peace-building projects in Asian countries, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nepal, and the Philippines. The projects include a program in which the organization distributes to the children in, for example, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Nepal the translated picture books about the life of Sadako Sasaki, a girl who died in 1955, ten years after the bombing, at the age of 12 due to acute leukemia induced by the radiation of the A-Bomb. The organization is also involved in a project named “Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative,” in which ANT-Hiroshima, in collaboration with the Hiroshima office of United Nations Initiative for Training and Research (UNITAR), preserves and spreads worldwide the seeds and saplings of A-Bomb survivor trees. I chose to study the activities of this organization because ANT-Hiroshima is committed to transmit “message of peace” to the world.

I chose ethnographic research methods for this research because I intend to contextually examine how the abovementioned interlocutors make sense of “peace.” In particular, I conducted participant observation at the two organizations and conducted semi-structured interviews with ten members (regular members and staff members) of HIP, two staff members of ANT-Hiroshima, and one tree doctor who is involved in

6 The webpage of UNITAR Hiroshima office which explains about Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative states,

It is hoped that many partners will join this initiative and become active ambassadors in their countries of Hiroshima, its peace message and its green legacy. [emphasis added]
ANT-Hiroshima’s project of A-bombed trees. Additionally, in order to research the landscape of peace – what the landscape of peace in Hiroshima and the components of the landscape of peace in Hiroshima represent and silence –, I researched such nonhumans as monuments and A-Bombed trees.

Structure of This Thesis

In Chapter 2, I inquire how discourses and practices that actors involved related to the concept peace in the past are inscribed onto the landscape in which my interlocutors dwell and engage in their activities. How Hiroshimans’ and visitors’ past and discourses and practices that they relate to peace are inscribed onto the landscape? How these discourses and practices of peace shape and are shaped by the landscape? What voices are silenced by the landscape of peace? How do my interlocutors’ practices of peace interact with the landscape and with the discourses and practices of peace by past actors which are inscribed onto the space? These are the key questions that are explored in this chapter. In Chapter 3, I explore how my interlocutors make sense of the concept peace. What kind of activities do they engage in? What is the relationship between my interlocutors’ understandings of peace and my interlocutors’ understandings of the Hiroshima atomic bombing? These are the questions with which I explore my interlocutors’ thoughts on peace. Chapter 4 is a concluding chapter. I re-present my arguments that I presented throughout this thesis, as well as examine what are the loose ends of this thesis, and what further questions this thesis has opened up.
Vignette: My Guided Tour of the Peace Memorial Park

At 1:30 PM on a sunny day in December in 2016, you arrived at the northern side of the Atomic Bomb Dome as one of the college students in a student exchange program. Here in the Peace Memorial Park, volunteer guides at Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace will guide you students, who are divided into several groups, to the monuments in the park until you start listening to a hibakusha’s testimony in Hiroshima National Peace Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims at 2:30 PM.

Hi everyone! I am Yuichi, one of the volunteer guides of Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace, HIP. HIP conducts guided tours of the Peace Memorial Park, and as one of the HIP guides, I will take you to a one-hour tour of the Peace Memorial Park.

We are now standing at the northern edge of the Peace Memorial Park. Before the atomic bombing, this area was a busy downtown. There were many shops, restaurants, and inns around this area. There were about 6,500 people living here. 71 years ago, on August 6, 1945, a US strategic bomber named Enola Gay dropped one atomic bomb, and this single bomb destroyed Hiroshima city. Since this area was very close to the hypocenter, almost all the buildings were completely destroyed and almost all the people were killed instantly. This park was constructed after the war with the hope for peace.

As you see, we are now standing in front of the A-Bomb Dome (Figure V-1). Before the atomic bombing, this building used to be Hiroshima Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall. The hall was designed by a Czech architect and opened in 1915. This hall was used to display local products from Hiroshima prefecture, and since this building was the only Western-style modern building in this area, this place was a touristic spot. I will guide you to the ground zero later, but the hypocenter is very close to this place. The hall was only 160 meters away from it. The bomb exploded about 600 meters above the ground, so the blast of the bomb hit the hall almost directly from above. That’s why the central structure of the building remained standing as it is. In post-war Hiroshima, some people wanted the dome to be gotten rid of because it is too poignant. Others wanted it to be preserved. In 1966, because more and more people called for preservation of the dome, Hiroshima city decided to preserve the dome.
permanently. In 1996, the dome was registered in UNESCO’s World Heritage List. The
dome is one of the two World Heritage sites around Hiroshima. As you might know, the
other site is Miyajima, an island where these is a famous shrine that is located on the
sea.

![Figure V-1. Atomic Bomb Dome. Photo by Kayoko Yokoyama.](image)

Ok, let’s go outside of the park for a short time, because the hypocenter is
located outside of the park. [Two-minute walk to the hypocenter.] 600 meters above this
point (Figure V-2), the atomic bomb exploded. The temperature at the ground level
reached around 3-4,000 degrees Celsius. The steel melts at around 1,500 degrees
Celsius, so the temperature around here was beyond our imagination. This is Shima
Hospital (Figure V-2). There were about 75 people inside the building, and all of them
died. The hospital director was away so he survived, and later rebuilt the hospital here.
Now his grandson is running this hospital as the director.
Then, let’s go back to the park again. This is Motoyasu Bridge. This bridge played an important role when researchers determined the point of the explosion of the bomb. The railings of the both sides of the then bridge were blown into the river, so the scientists could estimate that the hypocenter is on the extension of the straight line from the bridge. The present bridge was reconstructed in 1992.

This river is Motoyasu River. Many people escaped from fires that were caused by the bomb and went into the river, but many of them died. On the night of August 6 every year, people float paper lanterns along the river to pray for the souls of the victims as this photo shows (Figure V-3).

Figure V-2. Hypocenter. Photo by Kayoko Yokoyama.

Figure V-3. Paper lanterns on the Motoyasu River. Photo by author.
This building on our left side (Figure V-4) is now used as a visitors’ information center and called Rest House, but this building is actually an A-bombed building. It was built in 1929 as a Japanese traditional clothes, *kimono* shop. After the war intensified, the Hiroshima Prefectural Fuel Rationing Union bought the building and started using it as the Fuel Hall. At the time of the bombing, 37 people were working here, and almost all of them were killed. Only one person survived at the basement of the building.

I’ll now take you to the place where we can see the A-bomb Dome from the opposite side of the river. If you want, I recommend you take a photo here (Figure V-5).
The next spot I am taking you to is... this spot, Peace Bell (Figure V-6). This was made in 1964 as symbol of Hiroshima’s hope for a peaceful world. Can all of you look at the surface of the bell? What is engraved? (Figure V-7) Yes, the world map. And there are no borders. This hall represents the universe, and this bell represents the world without any borders. This expresses the hope for a united world. Also, please look at the point where the wooden hammer strikes the bell. This is a symbol representing nuclear energy. This expresses the hope for a world where all nuclear weapons are abolished. You can strike the bell, but please strike it softly. Also, can you look at the pond around us? What do you think these plants are? Yes, lotus plants. August is the season of the lotus flowering, and it is said that many people covered their wounds with lotus leaves.

*Figure V-6. Peace Bell. Photo by Kayoko Yokoyama.*
Figure V-7. The surface of the Peace Bell. Photo by Kayoko Yokoyama.

Figure V-8. Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound. Photo by author.
Everyone who wants to strike the bell struck it? Ok, then let’s go in this direction. This is Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound (Figure V-8). It was completed in 1955, at the tenth anniversary of the atomic bombing. There is a crypt under the mound, and in the crypt there are about 70,000 cremains of the people who were killed by the bomb. Almost all of them were unidentified. Among them, about 800 cremains are identified, but have been unclaimed. Can you see the poster over there? The Hiroshima city government is still searching for family members and relatives of these identified people. This place used to be the precincts of the Jisen-ji temple. In the yard of the temple, many dead bodies were gathered and cremated every day. There were many makeshift crematoria all around the Hiroshima city. Actually, my great-grandfather came to Hiroshima several days after the bombing in order to cremate the dead bodies at one or several of those makeshift crematoria. He was 57 years old at the time of the bombing, lived in a village 20 km away from Hiroshima city, and was a volunteer fire fighter in the village. He was of course exposed to the radiation of the bomb when working in Hiroshima. I could not listen to him directly because he passed away before I was born, but my mother listened to his story when she was a child. My mother told me, “What I heard from my grandfather was that he went into the Hiroshima city as a volunteer fire fighter, gathered many dead bodies, soured oil on them, and cremated them. Because there were so many dead bodies. In the hot summer.” She also told me that my great-grandfather could not eat lunch because of the smell of dead bodies being cremated. In this space [an open space in front of the mound], in early morning of every August 6, an interfaith memorial service is held by priests and monks of different religions.
Next, let’s look at this monument (Figure V-9). As is engraved on the surface of the monument, this monument is Monument in Memory of the Korean Victims of the A-bomb. It was erected in 1970 by the Hiroshima local office of the Korean Residents’ Union in Japan outside of the park. In 1999, it was transferred to this location. This is a turtle shaped stone, and at the top of this monument, you can see two dragons engraved. In Korea, it is said that the souls of the dead goes to the heaven on the back of a turtle, and this monument expresses this saying. What do you think this turtle is looking at? Yes, this turtle faces in the direction of Korea. All of these stones were from Korea. In front of the monument, in the ground, the register of the victims is stored. Ok, but can I ask you a very important question? Why Korean victims? Can you guess? Actually, Japan colonized Korea from 1910. Since then, there were many people who came to Japan to search for jobs and who were mobilized to come to Japan against their will and forced to work for example in factories or battlefields. According to one survey, it is said that there were about 50,000 Koreans and about 30,000 of them died because of the A-bomb.
Next to this monument, can you see the place where the ground level is lower than the ground around it? Actually, this is the original ground level at the time of the bombing. Soil was brought into the park and the ground was raised to the present level. As I said, this area used to be the precincts of Jisen-ji temple. Please look at these gravestones scattered around here. The upper parts of the grave were scattered around because of the strong blast of the bomb.

![Children’s Peace Monument](image)

*Figure V-10. Children’s Peace Monument. Photo by author.*

Next, let’s go back to the place near from the Rest House. This is the next monument that I want to explain about (Figure V-10). This is called Children’s Peace Monument. In order to explain about this monument, I need to explain about one A-bombed girl, Sadako Sasaki. She was exposed to the bomb at the age 2 at her house 1.6 km away from the hypocenter. Fortunately, she was not injured by the bomb, and grew up as a healthy and active girl. However, 10 years after the bombing, when she was 12 years old, she suddenly fell ill with acute leukemia because of the radiation of the bomb. It was impossible to save the leukemia patients with the then medical treatment. In a hospital, she believed that folding 1,000 paper cranes would make her wish come true, and continued folding paper cranes. Although she folded more than 1,000 paper cranes, after 8 months from the onset of leukemia, she passed away. You can see Sadako’s
folded paper cranes in the museum. Her classmates were shocked and saddened by her death. Her classmates started a campaign to erect a monument in memory of those children who were killed by the bomb like Sadako. The campaign was supported nationwide and worldwide, and on May 5, Japanese children’s day, in 1958, this monument was erected. Can you see the stone under the monument? The inscription says, “This is our cry, this is our prayer, for building peace in the world.” As you see behind the monument, many paper cranes are dedicated to the monument from all over Japan and the world.

Next, let’s go in this direction. This is the Flame of Peace (Figure V-11). This was first lit in 1964. This flame symbolizes the hope for a world where nuclear weapons are abolished. The pedestal represents two open hands with their palms facing upward, and this fire will be extinguished when all the nuclear weapons are abolished in this world. I hope someday this fire will be extinguished forever.

Figure V-11. Flame of Peace and Pond of Peace. Photo by author.

This pond (Figure V-11) is called the Pond of Peace. Did you notice that there are a lot of water here in this park? Many people died calling for water, and water including this pond is dedicated to the souls of those people.
I want to explain about this monument, so please come to the front side of this monument (Figure V-12). People call this monument Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims. Its official name is Memorial Monument for Hiroshima, City of Peace. The original cenotaph was built by the Hiroshima city on August 6, 1952, but because it was made by concrete and deteriorated as time went by, 33 years later, in 1985, the original one was replaced by this one made of granite. This monument was designed by a Japanese architect Kenzo Tange. He also designed the whole of this park and the Peace Memorial Museum buildings, too. The shape of this monument derives from a roof of a house-shaped Japanese ancient haniwa clay figure. The roof-shaped cenotaph represents the hope that the souls of the victims are sheltered from the elements. Please look at the stone chest under the cenotaph. In the stone chest, the registers of those identified victims who were exposed to the effects of the A-bomb and passed away are placed. So it can be said that this monument is for identified victims, and the mound is for unidentified victims. As of August 6, 2016, 303,195 names have been recorded in the registers. On every August 6, in this open lawn space in front of this cenotaph (Figure V-21), Peace Memorial Ceremony is held by the Hiroshima city government. Before the ceremony, new names are added every year. Actually my grandmother came to Hiroshima city about two weeks after the bombing, got exposed to the radiation which was still remaining, and is registered as a hibakusha, so her name will be recorded in one of the registers after she passes away. Although my great-grandfather was also
exposed to the radiation, his name is not recorded here because he didn’t apply for a Hibakusha Health Book\(^7\) which is given to a registered hibakusha, and my family did not apply to have him included on the registers. The registers contains the names of not only Japanese, but also Koreans, Americans, etc. The inscription on the front side of the stone chest says, “Let all the souls here rest in peace; For we shall not repeat the evil.” In front of this cenotaph, activists and A-bomb survivors hold a sit-in protest every time a nuclear test takes place somewhere in the world. Also, as you might have already noticed, this cenotaph is in a straight line which connects this cenotaph, the Flame of Peace, and the A-bomb Dome (Figure V-13). The museums are built at right angles to this straight line, as you see.

![Figure V-13. Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims, Flame of Peace, and A-bomb Dome. Photo by author.](image)

\(^7\) A Hibakusha Health Book (Hibakusha Kenkō Techō), which is also colloquially called A-bomb (Health) Book (Genbaku Techō) is a book given to hibakushas who applied for one based on Atomic Bomb Survivors’ Assistance Law (Genshi Bakudan Hibakusha ni taisuru Engo ni kansuru Hōritsu). Those who are granted requirements can receive medical expenses by showing the book at clinics and hospitals.
This is the Peace Memorial Museum (Figure V-14). I heard that you would come to this museum after you listen to a survivor’s testimony at a different place in this park. The museum consists of two buildings, the Main Building and the East Building. Since the East Building is now closed, you will just look at the exhibitions in the Main Building. This building exhibits what happened in Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 and effects of the A-bomb. The relics of the victims and A-bombed items are displayed. Also, you can see videos of survivors’ testimonies. You can also see paper cranes folded by Obama when he visited Hiroshima in this May.
Before I take you to the gathering place, let me explain about these trees. Two of the trees here are A-bombed trees (Figure V-15). These trees are Chinese parasol trees, called *aogiri* trees in Japanese. These trees were originally located about 1.3 km away from the hypocenter at the site of the Hiroshima Post and Telecommunications Bureau. As you see, one side of the trunk is hollowed out. This damage is due to the bomb. Although heavily damaged, these trees shot buds in the next spring, and this gave hope to many survivors. A survivor, Ms. Suzuko Numata, is one of them. She lost her left leg due to the atomic bombing. She lost her hope for living, and almost killed herself. But when she saw these *aogiri* trees shooting their buds in the yard of her former workplace, she regained her hope for living. Next to the A-bombed trees, there is a second-generation tree, too. There are 161 A-bombed trees which survived the bomb and still living all over the city of Hiroshima.

Finally, this is your gathering place, Hiroshima National Peace Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims. It was opened in 2002. In this hall, you can see many video testimonies and read a lot of memoirs in English.

Any questions? Thank you so much for your participation in HIP’s guided tour today. I hope you can learn more about the atomic bombing through directly listening to a survivor’s testimony from now and visiting the museum later. I hope your stay in Hiroshima is a fruitful one. Thank you so much for your time today.
Chapter 2. Landscape and Practices of Peace in Hiroshima

In Hiroshima, you can see lots of public and private places which have “peace” in their names: Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, Peace Boulevard, Memorial Cathedral for World Peace, and a blood donation station “Pīsu” (Japanese transliteration of the English word “peace”) (Figure 2-1), to name a few. When you walk on one of the busiest streets in the downtown Hiroshima, Kinzagai street, you can find a golden plate with the word “peace” on the ground (Figure 2-2). When you arrive at Hiroshima station by Shinkansen (bullet train), on the platform you can find a sign board of Hiroshima’s most famous confection, Momiji Manjū, which says “Peace!”\(^8\) (Figure 2-3).

\[\text{Figure 2-1. Sign Board of Blood Donation Stations, “Peace” and “Momiji.”}
\]

\[\text{Photo by author.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{8} In Japan, the word “pīsu” can mean both “peace” and “peace sign (victory sign).” The word “pīsu” in this sign board can be interpreted as both, and since the board reads “Peace! Smile,” it can be understood as a peace sign. However, Nishiki-do (confectionery maker of this sign board) has an in-store advertisement which says that Momiji Manju is a sweet that symbolizes peace. Thus I understand that this word “pīsu” in the sign board needs to be interpreted in the dual sense.}\]
Figure 2-2. Golden plate with the word “peace” on Kinzagai street.  
Photo by author.

Figure 2-3. Sign board of Hiroshima’s famous confection, Momiji Manju, in Hiroshima Station. Photo by author.
When you go into a restaurant of Hiroshima’s local specialty food, *okonomiyaki*, you might find a flyer which says, “Hiroshima Okonomiyaki is a perfect symbol of the ‘Peaceful Household’” (Figure 2-4). A locally famous bakery, Meron-pan, which is based in the nearby Kure city, sells “Heiwa Pan” (translated as “Peace Bread”) (Figure 2-5). In 2015, the 70th anniversary of the bombing, the Hiroshima Prefecture Bus Association sold “Hiroshima Peace Pass,” a one-day ticket for street cars and buses (Figure 2-6). In 2015, the Hiroshima city started the bicycle sharing service, “Peacecle.”

![Figure 2-4. Flyer calling for an event called “Peace-Yaki.”](image)

---

9 I got this flyer at an okonomiyaki restaurant in the downtown in August 2016. A general incorporated foundation, Okonomiyaki Academy has conducted this event named “Peace-yaki,” in which people post photos of their okonomiyaki on which they write “peace” with mayonnaise in order to express their hope for peace through okonomiyaki.
Figure 2-5. Photo of a bread named “Heiwa Pan” (“Peace Bread”). Photo by author.

Figure 2-6. Flyer of “Hiroshima Peace Pass.” Photo by author.
These are just a small number of examples of daily usage of the word “peace” in Hiroshima. In post-bomb Hiroshima, many politicians and the media linked the atomic bombing with peace, and since the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law was enacted in the National Diet in 1949, Hiroshima has been explicitly designed as a “peace memorial city.” This eventually led to this abundance of the concept peace everywhere in Hiroshima.

Then, how Hiroshimans’ and visitors’ discourses and practices that they relate to the concept peace are inscribed onto the space of Hiroshima? How these discourses and practices of peace shape and are shaped by the space of Hiroshima? What do these special inscriptions represent? What do they not represent, or I should say, what do these discourses and practices inscribed onto the space of Hiroshima obscure, exclude, and silence? What is the meaning of conducting a guided tour as I did in the vignette in this space of Hiroshima, specifically in (and around) the Peace Memorial Park? These are the key questions that are explored in this chapter.

i. Concepts: Landscape, Silence, Genealogy, Hiroshima Atomic Bombing/Peace

In order to answer the abovementioned questions, the concept of space is not as helpful as the concept of landscape proposed by Ingold (1993). Ingold (1993:156) defines landscape as “the world as it is known to those who dwell therein, who inhabit its places and journey along the paths connecting them.” He explains that the concept of landscape is different from the concept of space in the following ways. First of all, while the concept of landscape implies a point of observation from which an observer recognizes the place, the concept of space implies independence from any point of observation. Moreover, the concept of landscape enables us to understand the place as is experienced by those who spend time in it without delimiting the place which we would like to inquire, the concept of space denotes the place which those who use the concept of space delimit. Thus, the concept of landscape enables us to explore the place of our inquiry in relation to those who engage in different activities in it.

In addition, Ingold (1993) emphasizes on the “temporality” of the landscape. Here, he uses the term “temporality,” not “history” or “historicity,” to present a view that “each event […] is seen to encompass a pattern of retensions from the past and protentions for the future” (1993:157). In other words, through introducing the concept
of “temporality,” he wants to present a perspective which does not distinguish time (or
temporality) and history (or historicity). The concept of “temporality” thus enables us
understand that “the landscape is constituted as an enduring record of – and testimony
to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing,
have left there something of themselves” (152).

For the purpose of “describe[ing] the practices of work in their concrete particulars” (158), Ingold introduces the concept of “task,” which he defines as “any
practical operation, carried out by a skilled agent in an environment, as part of his or her
normal business of life” (Ibid.). And he further introduces the concept of “taskscape,”
by which he means “the entire ensemble of tasks” (Ibid.). Each of the tasks is
interrelated to one another and embedded in an ensemble of tasks that are performed in
series or in parallel, and those tasks which are interrelated to each other enact the
taskscape as a whole, as each of the sounds produced by the musicians who play
different musical instruments in different ways in an orchestra resonate with each other
and these sounds which are interrelated to one another enact a piece of orchestral music
as a whole.

In his paper, Ingold eventually dissolves the distinction between landscape and
taskscape. If I use a metaphor of a painting, a painting (the landscape) is the product of
the act or performance of painting (the taskscape). The difference between the landscape
and the taskscape lies in that the products of acts/performances (the landscape) endure
to a greater extent than the acts/performances themselves (the taskscape). The landscape
as a whole can be expressed as “the taskscape in its embodied form” (Italic by the
author) (162). In other words, “[t]he landscape is the congealed form of the taskscape”
(Ibid.).

By utilizing this concept, landscape, of Ingold’s, this chapter focuses on the
landscape of peace as an ensemble of traces of the past and present actors’ practices that
they relate to the concept peace. I focus on my interlocutors’ present discourses in
Chapter 3 separately, but when dealing with the past actors’ practices, in order to
understand these practices, I also deal with their past discourses that they relate to their
practices of peace.
I would like to also draw on the following literature in the field of historical anthropology. Based on the literature, I argue that history\textsuperscript{10}, historicism (the Western version of historicity\textsuperscript{11}), and the state regime silence people, especially the marginalized, creates the silence of the un-said, and fills the silent discursive space with its official history, its official historicity (historicism), and terror’s talk.

Presupposed by the disparity of power in the production of knowledge and scholarship and the political, cultural, and economic power relations between the “West” and the “Orient,” Said (1979) argued that, “Orientalism,” an ideological mode of production of knowledge about the “Orient,” could be reproduced on a worldwide scale, and contributed to establishment and legitimization of the Western power to dominate the Orient.

This structure of Orientalism revealed by Said provides us with an important insight in considering the global dominance of the Western notion of history, or, historicism. Through colonization, primary and secondary educational systems influenced by the West, and international interaction at the level of higher education, historicism as the Western notion of history has been disseminated to populations all around the globe (Hirsch and Stewart 2005). Historicism aims at rendering as accurate a picture of the past as possible through available documentary evidence. What is created as a result is a “mythistory” (2005:264), a narrative that holistically explains the past by organizing a distinct class of events in a linear line, based on the illusion that subjects can be explained only through historical development.

This globally predominant approach to the past—history—, in combination with the power of the regime that promotes such an approach, silences multiple objects in the

\textsuperscript{10} The category of “history” – “a factual representation (usually written) of the past, intentionally researched and composed according to rational principles” – is “[a]lmost certainly not” a universal category but a Western one that originated around the period of the French Revolution (Hirsch and Stewart 2005:263).

\textsuperscript{11} Hirsch and Stewart (2005) argue that “history”, which is a Western category, has been largely supported by a position which they call historicism. As I will explain later, this position requires historians to paint as “accurate” a picture of the past as possible through documentary evidence. “Accuracy” here means that the portrayal of the past does not reflect the historian’s present assumptions.
following three, not separate but intertwined, ways. First, historical narratives are created through reducing the intermingled pasts into simplified, linear narratives, which exclude – and thus silence – any other interpretations of the events in the past. Transforming an intertwined messy reality into a linear continuity always entails the reduction of reality. For example, in creating the historical moment of Columbus’ “discovery” of the Americas, the other processes that the actual actors lived get driven away by the linear chronology, in which related occurrences at the time are reduced to “antecedents” or “preparations” of the isolated single moment of “milestone,” i.e. the “discovery” of the Bahamas by Columbus. Naming, commemorations, and numbering contribute to sanitization of the messy past into a clean, singular history (Trouillot 1995).

Second, historicism is dominantly thought of as the superior form of the production of knowledge about the past. “Facts” in the linear narrative of history are rendered as being already proved by the “evidence”—“witnesses and documents, all of which constitute (or fail to constitute) an archive” (Anidjar 2009:142). The calling for “evidence” legitimizes the history as the superior way to narrate the past, and expels other ways to perceive the past. As a result, the “native,” being imbued with the historicism, forgets his own historicity. As Benjamin points out, “One reason why Fascism has a chance is that in the name of progress its opponents treat it as a historical norm” (Benjamin 1968:257). Hence, in internalizing the historical norm of “progress” (historicism), “the powerless,” or “the native does not speak” (2009:157) and “cannot represent himself” (Felman 1999:210; 2009:159). For example, Bilal’s ethnography describes a young Armenian saying, “It can be fear and something else, I mean if I get blocked, and I may get blocked when he says: ‘Show me the sources my brother,’ I mean, ‘not the things that are picked up from here and there, but show me a clear thing,’ then I think I prefer to remain silent” (Bilal 2006: 86). Stories of the Armenian genocide were transmitted not by the “methods of proof for what is considered ‘truth’” (85). In facing the historicization of the Armenian genocide that reduces their grandparents’ stories of the event into truth-lie games, young Armenians including this person in the above quote experience “violence” (87), which violates their own ways of perceiving the event in the past. As the Orient is deprived of the ability to interpret and appreciate itself, and it is the Orientalists who represent the silenced Orient, the perceptions of the
past that do not rely on the historical methods of proof and linear narratives are thought of as just “the things that are picked up here and there,” and thus are deprived of their voices and their historicity, are being silenced. This silence strengthens the dominance of the history: “Historicism is based on a perception of history as victory” (1999:209), and “empathy with the victor invariably benefits the rulers” (Benjamin 1968:256). As a result, “the victor… forever represents the present conquest or the present victory as an improvement in relation to the past” (1999:209).

In addition to this, the archive, based on which univocal history is created, functions as the source of legitimacy of its claims on facticity and overwrites the history on those pasts which are not documented. Well, what are not documented in the archive? The native’s voices. They remain silent, overwhelmed by the jurists, historians, negationists, and murderers’ demands for the “historical fact” proven by the archival records. This is, from the beginning, impossible. Even if the natives utter their voices, they rarely get archived, for they are fragmented and not placed in the linear history and often cannot qualify as “historical facts.” Even if they have the mercy of being archived, they remain inaudible—for, again, they are not narrated in the Western mode of history, and thus rendered just as meaningless. Worse, the documented testimonies can even strengthen the legitimacy and the belief in credibility of the archive by allowing it to claim its inclusiveness. Thus, it can be articulated that the victor’s history deprives us also of “ears” to hear those narratives that are not based on the Western mode of history (1999:210; Anidjar 2009:158). The fate of the archived voice of the native is just to wait for those who can listen to it and “those who will ‘make it talk’” (128).

Third, the victor who disseminates the official history silences people (the “native”) through controlling and terrifying them. Taussig (1989) gives us an example of how people’s fear is reflected in a terror’s talk in the Republic of Colombia. He uses the instance of the editorial of El Espectador paper on February 26th, 1986. It first lists “‘successive acts of terror’ that have ‘shaken the country’,” such as “mounting attacks on journalists, one being killed in Florencia, another in Cali… where eight people were killed, the assassination of ten peasants…, the blowing up of oil pipe lines…, the assassination…in Cauca, the attacking of a police post between Pereira and Armenia… by a guerrilla unit…, massive peasant demonstrations…, the escalation of drug trafficking” (8). In this listing of the atrocities, Taussig points out, “there is this
terrible absence of any mention of the Armed Forces of the State itself” (9), which should certainly be able to benefit from the disorder that the Armed Forces normalizes into people’s daily lives through normal, repeated use of the state of emergency. This absence of mention in the editorial about that which can be critical of the “victor,” in turn, illustrates the presence of that which is not said. Even though it is generally known that the victor is benefiting from their social control of the people, this fact is thought to be critical of the regime and thus, not even mentioned. This is a typical example of what Taussig (1999) calls the “public secret”—“that which is generally known, but cannot be spoken” (1999:51, italic added by the author). As the natives get deprived of their voice and ears through internalizing the norm of facticity, the people get accustomed to the impact of the regime’s social control, silencing over them in face with the fear.

In sum, in reference to the literature in the field of historical anthropology, I argued that the official history as well as the victor that utilizes it silence the marginalized people by (i) barring other interpretations of the past, (ii) depriving them of their own historicity by disseminating the linearity of history that is based on evidence documented in the archive, and (iii) controlling or terrorizing them by way of social control. All three types of silencing similarly show the presence of the un-said—specifically, (i) alternative interpretations of the past occurrences, (ii) other historicities than the Western historicity (historicism), and (iii) public secret.

The landscape of Hiroshima, its central component Peace Memorial Park, and the monuments there are indeed “an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves” (Ingold 1993:152). Then, what have been recorded? What “history” do they represent? What voices do they silence? By utilizing Ingold’s concept of “landscape” and the concept of “silence” in the above literature in the field of historical anthropology, in this chapter, I explore the “landscape of peace” in Hiroshima. By “landscape of peace,” I mean the landscape which past discourses and practices that the actors related to the concept of peace are inscribed onto and excluded, oppressed, and silenced by, and with which my interlocutors discursively and practically engage.

Khayyat (2013) leverages the concept of landscape presented by Ingold (1993) to ethnographically explore the ways in which life and war are entwined in South Lebanon. Through exploration of entanglement of life and war, she succeeds in
presenting how war is lived as a dwelt condition in South Lebanon and in convincingly criticizing the perspective which views war only as violent and destructive. Although the title of this chapter (“Landscape and Practices of Peace in Hiroshima”) is similar to Khayyat’s dissertation (A Landscape of War), please note that my research is not about how “peace” is lived in Hiroshima. The aim of my usage of the concept of “landscape” advocated by Ingold (1993) is to understand how Hiroshimans’ or visitors’ discourses and practices of peace in the past are inscribed into or silenced by the landscape and how my interlocutors who engage with activities that they relate to the concept of peace interact with those discourses and practices of peace through the landscape.

Furthermore, in addition to the concepts of landscape and silence, I would like to draw on Foucault’s genealogical approach – an approach which focuses on how concepts emerged and became obsolete and on how power and knowledge is interrelated to one another in the deployment of these concepts.

In Discipline and Punish, Foucault (1977[1975]) adopted a genealogical approach to analyze transformation of punishment in Europe. His genealogical analysis proceeds this way. Under the absolutist monarchy, criminals were publicly tortured. The aim of such torture was to inflict physical pain on the criminals, which was the price they paid for breaking the monarchical law and thereby injuring the monarch’s sovereignty. As the society transformed from a monarchy into a republic, punishment also changed. Although executions were still publicly displayed, executioners were replaced with a guillotine and a criminal code. The guillotine was designed as a device for punishing criminals with minimal pain and without the executioner touching their bodies. Punishments were based on the law, which associated each crime with a particular punishment based on a calculation of the weight of guilt and the heaviness of the punishment. In this context, a theater of punishment aimed to demonstrate the criminal code to the public. The theater of punishment aimed to control the aggressive and potentially dangerous drives in the souls of the spectators, who were juridical subjects under the legal order. However, punishment gradually became less theatrical and more invisible to the population. Today, the sites of punishment are the prisons. As vividly symbolized in Bentham’s idea of the “Panopticon,” the prisons created, sustained, and automated a power relation with the criminals that automatically functions without the involvement of those who exercise the power. The criminals are
disciplined in order to teach them “correct” habits and desires. This was made possible by the state’s collaboration with knowledge about individuals’ dispositions, and especially about potentially dangerous dispositions. Discipline thus targeted individual subjects. This form of domination spread to the whole society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Europe, and through this the inner lives of individual subjects were controlled in order to develop the economy and spread morality.

I would like to apply this genealogical approach to the concept peace. How did the concept peace emerged as a hegemonic concept which swallows every component of the history of Hiroshima atomic bombing? How power and knowledge is related to one another in deployment of the concept peace? How have I – who grew up in Hiroshima as a school children who received what is called “peace education,” who have identified myself with a grandson (third-generation) of a hibakusha, and who have always been trapped by the concept peace not only as an individual but also as a researcher – been formed as a subject of this hegemonic concept peace?

As Yoneyama (1999:18) points out, “In the years immediately following the end of the war, it was not self-evidently clear that as the site of the world’s first nuclear destruction, Hiroshima would become a universal symbol of peace.” She points out that the concept peace was useful for the city planners who sought for special subsidies from the national government. The concept of peace in the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law signified post-war recovery. She further points out that “[t]he commemorative city of Hiroshima was, as it were, designed specifically to demonstrate the interchangeability of ‘the atomic bomb’ and ‘peace’” (20). This “identification of peace with the bomb […] filled an important gap in the doctrine of U.S. nuclear deterrence” (Ibid.). She says, “[t]he textual production of Hiroshima as the A-bombed city that revived as a mecca of world peace […] helped disseminate the view that the world’s peaceful order was attained and will be maintained not by diplomatic efforts or negotiations, but by sustaining a menacing military force and technological supremacy” (Ibid.).

Furthermore, Naono (2015), who explores memories of Hiroshima by focusing on hibakushas’ experiences, discusses how “peace” was discussed in relation to “A-Bomb” until around early 1950s. At an early stage of the post-war period, the Hiroshima city government, the Japanese government, and the Occupation Force argued that the
atomic bombings brought “peace” to Japan and the world. The city claimed so in order to inspire the Occupation Force’s cooperation toward the reconstruction of Hiroshima. The 1949 “Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law,” on which reconstruction of Hiroshima was based, has roots in this idea of peace. In the process of rebuilding Hiroshima as a city of peace, traces of Hiroshima’s history both as a military town and as an A-Bombed city started to be erased. In fact, the Japanese government and the Occupation Force intended to erase traces of the Japanese invasion of Asia and the American atomic bombing. In contrast, people’s social movements in Japan such as the “No More Hiroshimas” movement that was triggered by a 1946 book “Hiroshima” by an American journalist John Hersey argued for a different kind of “peace”; they argued that peace was harmed by the atomic bomb(s).

Naono 2015 points out that the word peace was not used very often in the experience notes of atomic bomb victims. She also points out that some people wrote in their experience notes that atomic bombings brought peace to the world and argues that the intention behind such claims are different from the intention of the city government. While the city government meant to side up to the Occupation Force to promote reconstruction policies, the victims relied on this logic in order to derive meanings from damages caused by the atomic bombings. In addition, Naono argues, many victims in their experience notes criticized “peace” policies by the city government. Furthermore, she points out that “peace” meaning “No More Hiroshimas” appears rarely in the experience notes of the victims. In addition, Naono warns, atomic bomb victims’ experience was presented and widely perceived as “appeals for peace,” which can silence their other despondent voices such as “It was much better for us all the family members to be killed in Hiroshima,” “I am jealous (of the dead),” and “I wonder why I must live in this world where there is no dream or hope” (Naono 2015:97).

ii. Landscape of Peace in Hiroshima

Landscape of Peace in Hiroshima

Hiroshima city is located at 132.18 to 132.41 degrees east longitude and 34.17 to 34.36 degrees north latitude. Hiroshima’s climate is humid subtropical climate, but since there are chains of mountains on both of the northern and southern sides, there are more sunny days and fewer rainy days, which is typical of the cities located around the
Seto Inland Sea (Hiroshima-shi 1983a). Until the Meiji Restoration (1868), the city of Hiroshima developed as a city which was established with a feudal lord’s castle (Hiroshima castle) in the center from 1589 (Hiroshima-shi 2004). In the Meiji era (1868-1912), Hiroshima started developing as a capital of a new administrative district, Hiroshima prefecture, and as a military city. Commerce and industry flourished, but most of the factories were munitions factories and 40 percent of the urban area was military land. Hiroshima’s resident population around the date of the atomic bombing is estimated at around 280,000 to 290,000. Also, the number of military personnel who were staying in Hiroshima is estimated at around 43,000 and the number of non-resident workers who commuted to the city and conscripted workers is estimated at about 20,000. In total, the physically present population in the city on the day of the bombing is estimated at 340,000 to 350,000 (The Committee for the Compilation of Materials on Damage Caused by the Atomic Bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki 1985[1979]).

At 8:15 a.m. on August 6, 1945, an American strategic bomber named Enola Gay dropped the atomic bomb at an altitude of 9,000 meters. The bomb exploded 43 seconds later at an altitude of about 600 meters. A blast demolished many buildings and heat rays caused fires that completely burned down the buildings located within 2 kilometers of the hypocenter (see Figure 2-7). It is estimated that 90,000 to 120,000 people died during the first two to four months due to burns, external wounds, and serious bodily harm due to radiation (Ibid.).

Peace is not necessarily linked to violence, disasters, or catastrophes even after wars. Actually, as Yoneyama (1999) points out, soon after the bombing, peace was not necessarily related to the immediate, painful memory of the atomic bombing. In post-bomb Hiroshima, however, many politicians and the media started narrating that the atomic bombing brought peace. This narrative served the interests of SCAP (Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, the title of General Douglas MacArthur as the head of the agency of the Allies that implemented occupation policies in Japan. SCAP also referred to the offices of the occupation.), the Japanese government, and the Hiroshima city government. For SCAP, this narrative has an effect of distracting people’s attention from the damages that the American atomic bomb caused. For the Japanese government, this narrative can distract people’s attention from the Emperor’s war responsibility by regarding the A-Bomb deaths not as sacrifices for the Emperor’s sovereignty but as
sacrifices for the future peaceful Japan. The Hiroshima city government emphasized that the A-bomb brought peace for the reason that the atomic bombing put an end to the war and carried an important lesson for the future, and utilized this narrative in order to obtain subsidies for reconstruction from the national government (Nemoto 2013; Naono 2015). This is how this swallowing, hegemonic concept peace emerged in Hiroshima.

I want to show you an example which illustrates the existence of anger toward US (specifically, General MacArthur) and the emperor. The most well-known cartoon about the Hiroshima atomic bombing, “Barefoot Gen” (Nakazawa 2008[1990]), which depicts the life of a fictional character Gen based on the author Nakazawa’s life, illustrates the existence of voices critical about SCAP and the emperor (Figure 2-8 to 2-18). Gen was six years old when the A-bomb was dropped. Several years after the bombing, Gen’s mother passed away leaving Gen behind. Gen starts walking toward Tokyo with his dead mother on his back. His anger is directed toward General
MacArthur and the Japanese Emperor. He says he will make them apologize to his dead mother. His friends stop him and bring Gen and his mother to a crematory, but after the cremation, there are no bones left. (In fact, the bones of the author Nakazawa’s mother were not left after the cremation, which triggered his interest and passion in depicting his experience of the atomic bombing in the form of a cartoon.)

Figure 2-8. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:245)
Figure 2-9. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:246)
Figure 2-10. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:247)
How arrogant can you get? What gives them the right to drop atomic bombs on hundreds of thousands of people, to make them suffer the tortures of hell?

It takes two sides to make a fight. Japan and America both did bad things. Why is Japan the only one being punished? It was America that dropped those horrible bombs!

How would MacArthur feel if his mom or his kids had to suffer and die like that from an A-bomb?

It shouldn't matter whether you're Japanese or American. Even if they won, the Americans ought to take responsibility for what they did.

It's no use, Gen!

I don't believe that. I have to do this!

The Americans don't know the true horrors of the A-bomb.

I have to tell them how Mama suffered and died. I have to make them see how cruel the bomb is.

Figure 2-11. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:248)
Figure 2-12. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:249)
Talk about arrogance! During the war the emperor claimed he was a god, then the minute Japan loses he says he’s only human. As if nothing happened!

And then, after taking all those millions of lives, he gets to stay on as the symbol of Japan.

I won’t be satisfied until I hear him say that he takes responsibility for the war.

Until the top decision-maker takes responsibility, nobody in Japan can really move on. Everything just stays messed up.

If that happens, it’ll mean Mama died in vain.

Don’t be a fool, Gen!

They could shoot you just for going near GHQ, and none of us could raise a peep!

I don’t care! I’ve gotta do this even if they kill me!
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Figure 2-13. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:250)
Figure 2-14. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:251)
Figure 2-15. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:252)
Figure 2-16. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:253)
Figure 2-17. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:254)
Figure 2-18. Excerpts from Barefoot Gen (Nakazawa 2008[1990]:255)
Under the narrative of peace, reconciliation, and the US-Japan political alliance, it is now getting rarer and rarer or more and more difficult to hear hibakushas and other people’s anger toward the US or Japanese politicians such as the emperor. Gen’s anger, however, suggests the existence of such an anger among people, which is not memorialized and is even silenced.

Then, how has this idea of “peace” been incorporated into Hiroshima’s city planning policies? In September 1946, the Special Town Planning Law was enacted in the National Diet and Hiroshima was designated as a city that is entitled to receive subsidy for post-war reconstruction. Based on this law, Hiroshima War Damage Reconstruction Plan was arranged, as Hiroshima-shi (2004) and the webpage of the Hiroshima City webpage which explains about Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law indicates. At around this time, various organizations and individuals proposed, in total, 34 plans for the future Hiroshima city. Some of these plans included the concept of “peace city” or “peace memorial city” and other plans proposed construction of peace-related facilities, but realizing these ideas was too costly for the then Hiroshima city government. Since the city lost many taxable stuffs and many people who are liable to taxation, the city’s reconstruction was delayed. Thus not only for building the proposed peace-related facilities but also for general reconstruction of the city, the Hiroshima city government was in need of more subsidies than the ones that were given based on the Special Town Planning Law. The then mayor Shinzo Hamai (in office from 1947 to 1955 and from 1959 to 1967) lodged a petition to the national government (congressmen and bureaucrats) to receive special subsidies and/or to transfer national properties to the ownership of the city government, but in vain (Ishimaru 2014; Hiroshima-shi 1983b).

Thus Hamai, in consultation with Hiroshiman congressmen and bureaucrats, reached the idea of making a special law under the approval of SCAP. Based on the “atomic bomb brought peace” narrative, they made Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Bill, and showed it to an officer of SCAP, who showed his approval of this proposal. General MacArthur also expressed his approval of this proposal, and as a result, in 1949, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law was enacted in the National Diet. The first article of this law states, “It shall be the object of the present law to construct the city of Hiroshima as a peace memorial city to symbolize the human
ideal of the sincere pursuit of genuine and lasting peace” (Hiroshima-shi 1983b:58-70; Hiroshima-shi 2004:17). Since then, Hiroshima city has been explicitly designed as a “peace memorial city.”

Based on the 1949 Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law, in 1952, the city enacted the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Plan as a new city plan to replace the Hiroshima War Damage Reconstruction Plan. The main points of this plan include (Hiroshima-shi 2004:19):

1. Construction of the Peace Memorial Park near the hypocenter.
2. Construction of the Central Park (Chūō Park) beside the Hiroshima Castle and of cultural and recreational facilities in the park.
3. Construction of the 100-meter-wide road\(^{12}\) that runs from east to west through the center of the city.
4. Construction of various parks and build a network of parks that connects them with the Peace Memorial Park, the Central Park, the 100-meter-wide road.

As hinted in the name of the park (Peace Memorial Park) and the name of the 100-meter-wide road (Peace Boulevard) in these main plans, many objects in Hiroshima came to be named with the word “peace.” For example, Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, which was constructed in the park, Memorial Monument for Hiroshima, City of Peace (colloquially called the Cenotaph (for the A-bomb Victims)), which was erected in the very center of the park, Pond of Peace, on which the cenotaph is located, Children’s Peace Monument (although the Japanese name Genbaku no Ko no Zō (Statue of Children of the A-bomb) does not use the word peace), which was constructed as a result of a social movement by Hiroshiman schoolchildren, Flame of Peace, which was constructed behind the cenotaph by a political organization working for abolishment of nuclear weapons, and Peace Bell, which was constructed by a private organization to express Hiroshima’s hope for a peaceful world. As Trouillot (1995) argues, naming contributes to sanitization of the intermingled, messy past into a

\(^{12}\) This 100-meter-wide road is called “Peace Boulevard.” For the details of the history of this road, see Ishimaru 1998.
linear history. Naming of these objects with the word peace contributes to historicization of the violence that Hiroshima experienced, which can be interpreted in many different ways, into a linear story which utilizes the concept peace – Hiroshima experienced the atomic bombing, and as a result, Hiroshima was rebuilt as a city which makes efforts toward realization of peace.

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law and the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Plan are still playing important roles in the city planning. In 1970 the Hiroshima city government started utilizing a new Hiroshima City general planning scheme which consists of “the Basic Concepts of the City” and “the Hiroshima City Basic Plan.” In 2001, the city government started arranging “the Master Plan for City Planning” based on the abovementioned concepts and plan (see Figure 2-19), and this master plan now includes the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Plan (Hiroshima-shi 1983b; Hiroshima-shi 2004).

![Figure 2-19. The Current Hiroshima City Planning Scheme.](image)

However, as Kiriya (2009) points out, many hibakushas had “uncomfortable feelings (iwakan)” toward reconstruction of Hiroshima proceeded under the name of “peace.” Kiriya (2009:86-87) writes, “It cannot be said that ‘Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law’ is a law for hibakushas. It aimed at ‘reconstruction (fukkō)’ of ‘Hiroshima City’ in terms of construction, and no support was provided to hibakushas.”
Also, Kishi (2009:260) quotes what a hibakusha (the cartoonist Nakazawa) said about implementation of city planning based on the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law (Nakazawa 1987:147-148).

The city government ordered us to get out of our house saying that our house is in the way of the city planning of peace city construction. […] We were made penniless by the A-bomb, wandered through the remains of the bomb like gypsies, found a place for a quiet life after painstaking efforts, and desperately built a shack. We trembled with anger feeling vexed at being dispossessed of our shack. Facing the authorities’ unchanged deed of tormenting citizens who are terribly suffering from the atomic bombing by using the nice-sounding word “peace,” I thought, “What the hell is Peace City Construction! Don’t make a fool of us!”

Kishi (2009:263) further points to “the existence of people who were going through hardships in between the citizens’ hope for preserving the Peace Memorial Park as a memorial of the hypocenter and Hiroshima city government’s city planning which regarded the place of the park as the best location to campaign for the A-bombed city Hiroshima.” Although substitute lots were given to those who were forced to move out of their lands, they needed to relocate to the substitute lots with their own money and only by themselves, which heavily burdened them.


People must not overlook the disparity of the reconstruction of, not “Peace City,” but “Sightseeing City Hiroshima,” which trampled down A-bomb victims. […] About the half of the day laborers who swarm like ants and work on carrying sand or dredging drains are women, and many of them are women who became widows due to the A-bomb or young girls who have keloid scars. As the city planning proceeds and roads get widened, they themselves are being deprived of their own houses. People must not overlook this contradictory reality.
As both Kiriya (2009) and Kishi (2009) point out, reconstruction of Hiroshima as a “peace (memorial) city” entailed oppression and silencing of many citizens, the majority of whom were hibakushas. These voices are, of course, not archivised or memorialized in a form of objects that consist of the landscape of peace in Hiroshima. Rather, the landscape of Hiroshima, which utilizes the concept peace, oppresses, obscures, and silences these voices.

This is a brief overview of the landscape of peace in Hiroshima that has been designed as a “peace memorial city.” Then, with this as a backdrop, how are discourses and practices of peace inscribed onto each of the components of the landscape? What does each of these components of the landscape of peace represent? In other words, what does each of these components of the landscape of peace not represent? What does each of the components silence? The remaining of this chapter tackles with these questions through concretely analyzing the components of the landscape of peace. Since there are numerous components of landscape of peace that utilize the concept of peace and/or symbolize hope for peace, in this thesis, I limit my scope to the facilities, monuments and other objects that appeared in the abovementioned Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Plan (such as Peace Memorial Park) and that my interlocutors engage with through their practices of peace.

*Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park and Facilities and Monuments in the Park*

Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park.

The planning of the current Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park dates back to the Reconstruction Council’s idea of constructing “Nakajima Park” in 1946. At this stage, this park was envisaged as one of the parks planned in the open space planning, and the concept of peace was not yet used. However, because of the limitation of the budget, no measures were taken to construct this Nakajima Park for a full year. In order to bring an end to this situation, the Hiroshima city government under Hamai’s mayorship started planning of legislation of a special law that enabled the city to receive more subsidies and obtain state-owned lands. In order to appeal to the wider public the necessity of allocating more subsidies to the Hiroshima city and transferring the state-owned lands to the city government, the concept of “peace” was introduced. The Hiroshima city
government attempted to side up to the SCAP and the Japanese government through utilizing the “A-Bomb brought peace” narrative (Nemoto 2013; Naono 2015). Accordingly, the name of the park was changed from “Nakajima Park” to “Peace Memorial Park” in December 1947 (Matsuo 2014; Kishi 2009).

Based on the abovementioned Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law that was enacted in 1949, the city government launched a competition for a design of Peace Memorial Park and Peace Memorial Museum and other related facilities. In this competition, an architect Kenzo Tange and his team won the first prize, and his architectural design came to be implemented. Tange designed the park in the following way. First, he drew a straight line to the south by west from the wreckage of the Hiroshima Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall (the current Atomic Bomb Dome), which was located to the north of the premise of the park that he was to design. On this straight line he designed Peace Arch and an open space. At the southern edge of this straight line, he drew another line that crosses with the above straight line at right angles, and designed a series of buildings on this line: Peace Memorial Museum (the current Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum Main Building) in the center, Peace Memorial Hall (the current Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum East Building) in the east, and City Auditorium (the current International Conference Center Hiroshima) in the west (see Figure 2-20) (Toyokawa 2016). Toyokawa (2016:16-17) quotes Tange’s explanation about his intentions of this architectural design:

Peace does not come to us by itself. It is us who need to fight for peace. Peace is not a thing given by nature or by gods, but a thing that people create through their practice. The facilities that memorialize Hiroshima’s peace should not be facilities that ideally memorialize peace given to us, but should have a positive meaning of creating peace. First of all, we thought that the facilities that we are to construct should be a factory that creates peace. When the factory that has this “practical function” is connected to the place of atomic bombing, it is quite natural that it takes on a meaning of a “moral symbol” that memorializes peace. (Tange 1949)
Figure 2-20. Architectural Replica of Peace Memorial Park in Tange’s Design (Toyokawa 2016:15).
Construction of the facilities that Tange envisaged as “a factory that creates peace,” which include the Peace Memorial Museum, Peace Memorial Hall, City Auditorium, the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims (which has been officially called “Memorial Monument for Hiroshima, City of Peace”), and an open space in front of the cenotaph, was completed on August 6, 1955 (Kishi 2009). During this construction process and after completion of the construction, many monuments were constructed in the park under the approval of the city government.

However, in 1967, under the mayorship of Setsuo Yamada (in office from 1967 to 1975), who proposed in the election that the city government should “sanctify” the Peace Memorial Park, the city government decided not to approve any more monuments after the construction of Peace Clock Tower (completed on October 28, 1967) in accordance with the recommendation of an advisory council, Hiroshima City Peace Facilities Management Council (Nishii 2013).

13 Kishi (2009) points out that there were still private houses in the premise of the park at this stage. Private houses were demolished from the premise only after 1959, the year when the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony was first broadcasted on TV in the Hiroshima prefecture.

14 Nishii (2013) writes that there were many requests of constructing monuments in the park, which was located close to the hypocenter.

15 After the completion of Peace Clock Tower on October 28, 1967, the facilities, monuments and other objects that were erected in the premise of the park are limited to:

- Monument of the A-bombed Teachers and Students of National Elementary Schools (completed on August 4, 1971)
- Monument of the Former North Tenjin-machi Area (completed in February 1973)
- Aogiri (Chinese Parasol) Trees Exposed to the A-bomb (transplanted to the park in May 1973)
- Monument in Memory of Dr. Marcel Junod (completed on September 8, 1979)
- Monument Commemorating Pope John Paul II’s Appeal for Peace (completed on February 25, 1983)
- Monument in Memory of the Korean Victims of the A-bomb (transferred to the park from without in July 1999)
- Peace “Watch” Tower (completed on August 6, 2001)
- Hiroshima National Peace Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims (completed on August 1, 2002)
- Monument to Mr. Norman Cousins (completed on August 2, 2003)
- Memorial Monument for Barbara Reynolds (completed on June 12, 2011)
Nishii (2013) analyzes Yamada’s comments on “sanctification” of the park. Yamada thought of the cenotaph and the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound as central components of the park, and, as Nishii (2013:72) quotes, Yamada said, “This [the park] must be clear (kiyoraka), must be clean (seiketsu).” Nishii (2013:72) further quotes Yamada’s following comment on his talk with Tange.

That [the Peace Memorial Park] was designed by Professor Tange at Tokyo University, so […] I asked his intention, and he said, I don’t want messy things (gotagota shita mono) to be placed there. Actually, I want that place to be like Meiji Shrine. I am truly moved by the mayor saying that this [the park] is a “sanctuary.”

As Nishii analyzes, a “sanctuary” means a “clear” and “clean” space without “messy things.” Nishii evaluates this comment and writes that Tange and Yamada did not want any other places for praying except for the cenotaph and the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound in the park. After Yamada made this comment, the city government’s advisory council, Hiroshima City Peace Facilities Management Council submitted a report, saying, as Nishii (2013:69) quotes, “Because there are many monuments and cenotaphs in the Peace Park, we agreed upon not approving construction of any objects in the park after the construction of Peace Clock Tower.” Due to Yamada’s policy of sanctification of the park, the city government states that the criteria for the city government to approve citizens’ usage of the park is more stringent than the criteria for approval of the usage of other municipal parks, as the webpage of Hiroshima City which explains about the present situation and problems of peace memorial facilities written in Policies for Preservation and Development of Peace Memorial Facilities.

Also, the city government conducted maintenance of the park based on the 1969 “Basic Plan for Development of Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park” and the 1988 “Basic Plan for Redevelopment of Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park.” For example, as is indicated in the above webpage of Hiroshima City, the 1988 plan aimed to:

1. Conduct suitable maintenance of the park which is a “sanctuary” and the origin of the international peace city.
2. Enhance the function of the park as a “sightseeing place” which symbolizes the international city of peace and culture.

3. Enhance the function of the park as an “urban park” which receives citizens’ affection.

Presently, the city government conducts maintenance of the park based on the 2006 “Policies for Preservation and Development of Peace Memorial Facilities.” The policies include not only the policy for development of the Peace Memorial Park but also policies for preservation and development of other peace memorial facilities such as the A-bomb Dome and Peace Memorial Museum. In the policies, as is indicated in the Hiroshima City’s webpage on Policies for Preservation and Development of Peace Memorial Facilities which explains about the basic principles of maintenance and utilization of the peace memorial facilities, the basic principles of maintenance of the park state:

- The city government should value the view on the center line that runs from the A-Bomb Dome through the center of the Peace Memorial Park and secure the serenity and atmosphere of the park as a “sanctuary” for commemoration and repose of souls.

- The city government should conduct necessary maintenances of the park in order to promote visitors to surely understand the true reality of the atomic bombing and learn and think about peace.

- The city government should secure a place for people to gather, conduct peace activities, and communicate peace culture, a resting place for visitors, and a place bustling with a variety of people.

- The city government should secure the user-friendliness and safety of the park for visitors.

- The city government should take measures to invite visitors to Peace Memorial Park.

Furthermore, as the same webpage indicates, the basic principles of utilization of the park in the policies state:

- In approval of usage of the Peace Memorial Park including a lawn open space, the city government should pay attention to such factors as seasons
and time periods and consider allowing public access through social experiments.

- In order to tell the real facts of the atomic bombing widely and effectively, the city government should utilize cenotaphs, monuments, and monuments with poems on them in the Peace Memorial Park or on Peace Boulevard.

As is seen above, since Yamada’s mayorship, the city government has deemed the Peace Memorial Park as a “sanctuary.” Although there used to be many meetings and demonstrations conducted in the Peace Memorial Park before Yamada’s mayorship, as I wrote, the present criteria for the city government to approve citizens’ usage of the park is more stringent than the criteria for approval of usage of other municipal parks.

In recent years, the city government’s attitude toward the park as a “sanctuary” has been slightly changing. For example, in August 2005, Peace Concert was conducted in the lawn open space as a “social experiment.” Before that, the usage of the lawn open space was strictly restricted and the space was used only for the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony on the day of the atomic bombing. Additionally, in 2007, the city government invited applications for the opening of a café in the east end of Motoyasu-bashi Bridge as a part of the city government’s activities to realize “Mizu no Miyako Hiroshima (City of Waterways Hiroshima)”, and a café was opened in 2008. Furthermore, in 2015, a boat restaurant which was located elsewhere on the river was transferred to just 200 meters south of the A-bomb Dome on the east side of Motoyasu River.

When I walk around the park, I can see some people who hold a sit-in protest, for example, in front of the cenotaph every time a nuclear-capable state conducts a nuclear test\(^{16}\). When I pass by the A-bomb Dome, I almost always see volunteers who stay at the southern side of the dome and explain to the tourists not only about the dome but also about the damages caused by the atomic bomb. Also, I saw citizens and visitors enjoy using the park through visiting the Peace Memorial Museum, exploring the

\(^{16}\text{Although the city government recognizes these sit-ins, the organizer of the sit-in protests does not ask the city for approval, and the city government has not approved their protests in the park.}\)
monuments, walking or jogging, playing with their children, walking their dogs, taking rest at the benches, or, in the season of cherry blossoms, having cherry viewing picnics (see Figure 2-21).

![Figure 2-21. Cherry Viewing Picnic in the Peace Memorial Park. Photo by author.](image)

The Peace Memorial Park is widely known as a venue of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony\(^\text{17}\). The Hiroshima city government\(^\text{18}\) holds the ceremony every year on the day of the atomic bombing, August 6. Almost every year since 1947, the organizer held the ceremony in the premise of the park\(^\text{19}\). Although the ceremony took

\(^{17}\) For the details of the history of the peace memorial ceremony, see Ubuki 1992.

\(^{18}\) From 1946 to 1954, the ceremony was held by the Hiroshima Peace Festival Association (called Hiroshima Peace Association from 1948). This association had a deep connection to the city government. Its office was located in the Hiroshima City Hall and the mayor of the Hiroshima city was appointed its president. However, this association was independent from the city government and had its independent budget. Since 1955, the Hiroshima city government alone has been organizing the ceremony. Only in 1960, the city government cooperated with the Hiroshima prefectural government to organize the ceremony. (Ubuki 1992)

\(^{19}\) According to Ubuki (1992), in 1946, 1949, and 1950, the ceremony was not held in the Peace Memorial Park. In 1946, the ceremony (then called “Peace and Reconstruction Festival”) was held in the premise of the former Gokoku-Jinja shrine, which used to be located on the north-east side of the T-shaped Aioi bridge (see Figure
place in front of the “Memorial Mound for the Souls Ravaged by the War” (the current “Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound”), which was located at the north-west part of the park, since the cenotaph designed by Tange was completed in 1952, the ceremony has taken place at an open space in front of the cenotaph (Figure 2-22 and Figure 2-23).

![Figure 2-22. The open space in front of the cenotaph. Photo by author.](image)

![Figure 2-23. The open space in front of the cenotaph during the 2016 Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony on August 6, 2016, from the same viewpoint. Photo by author.](image)

2-10). In 1949, the ceremony (then called the “3rd Peace Festival”) was held in the Shimin-Hiroba (Citizen’s Square), which was located in front of the premise of the former Gokoku-Jinja shrine. In 1950, the ceremony (then called the “4th Peace Festival”) was cancelled.
On this day, not only the city and prefectural governments but also many other private and public organizations do hold a variety of events in the Peace Memorial Park. These organizations include Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace (HIP) and Asian Network of Trust Hiroshima (ANT-Hiroshima). HIP, in cooperation with the city government, organizes an event titled “Special A-bomb Testimony” every year. For example, at 10 a.m. on August 6, 2016, right after the Peace Memorial Ceremony, HIP held this three-hour event titled “Special A-bomb Testimony 2016: Three Survivors Testify Their Experiences in English” at one room in the International Conference Center Hiroshima, which is located in the Peace Memorial Park. As a HIP member, I participated in organization of this event. Soon after I participated in a beginning part of the ceremony, I went into the basement of International Conference Center Hiroshima, which is located next to the open lawn space of the park, where the ceremony took place. Since I needed to serve as an emcee of the event, I was preparing for the emceeing of the event in the room, but other members who are in charge of inviting English-speaking foreign visitors to the event went out of the hall with flyers. There were many, probably more than 100 audiences in the room invited or attracted by those HIP members. In the first hour, three hibakushas, two of whom are HIP members (Kazuko and Isamu), shared their A-bomb testimonies with the audience. In the remaining two hours, the audience had discussions with each panel member. During the discussion, the then (and current) Hiroshima Mayor, Kazumi Matsui came to the room and read his peace declaration in English.

Figure 2-24. ANT-Hiroshima’s Movie Screening on August 6, 2016. Photo by author.
In the evening of the same day, ANT-Hiroshima held a movie screening in the park (Figure 2-24). At 7 p.m., one hour after the beginning of floating paper lantern on the Motoyasu River, ANT held a screening of a movie, “White Light, Black Rain: The Destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki” at the opposite side of the river from the A-bomb Dome. This movie was created by a Japanese American director Steven Okazaki in 2007. ANT cooperated with him in the making of this film and has been promoting this movie. There was a long line of people waiting for floating paper lanterns on the river just beside the screen, and many of them paused in front of the screen and watched the movie during their waiting time.

The park is crowded all day long with visitors, volunteers, activists, politicians, diplomats, or journalists on August 6 every year. However, there are many people who do not or have never visited the park on that day. An old lady who lived near my family’s house in Hiroshima is one of them. She is a hibakusha who got exposed to the radiation by coming into the city from the next day of the bombing as a nurse and took care of many injured dying hibakushas. Every August 6, she dedicated water to her household Buddhist altar and stayed at home silently. While the Peace Memorial Ceremony dominates many people’s attention, these hibakushas’ silence is silenced.

Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum

Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum (Figure 2-25 and 2-26) attracts people from all over the world. Many elementary-school, junior-high-school, and high-school students visit the museum in their school trips from all over Japan. Also, the museum attracts many tourists worldwide; as the TripAdvisor webpage about top 30 attractions in Japan by international travelers 2017 indicates, the museum won the third place in the ranking, “Trip Advisor’s Top 30 Attractions in Japan by International Travelers 2017.” According to the Hiroshima City webpage on the outline of the number of visitors at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, in 2016, there were 1,739,986 visitors in total and among them 366,779 were from abroad and 322,529 were students who visited the museum in their school trips. All the international tourists who ask HIP for English guide visit the museum, and ANT-Hiroshima also sometimes takes visitors to the museum.
Figure 2-25. The current Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum Main Building.

Photo by author.

Figure 2-26. The current Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum East Building.

Photo by author.
Presently, the top page of the museum’s English website states,

A single atomic bomb indiscriminately killed tens of thousands of people, profoundly disrupting and altering the lives of the survivors. Through belongings left by the victims, A-bombed artifacts, testimonies of A-bomb survivors and related materials, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum conveys to the world the horrors and the inhumane nature of nuclear weapons and spreads the message of “No More Hiroshimas.”

How has the museum’s mission of “convey[ing] to the world the horrors and the inhumane nature of nuclear weapons and spread[ing] the message of ‘No More Hiroshimas’” been shaped? What kind of peace discourses and practices are inscribed onto and/or excluded by the Peace Memorial Museum? Here, relying on Yang 2013 and the museum’s webpage on the history of the museum, I present a brief history of the museum with the focus on these questions.

The origin of the museum dates back to the A-Bomb Reference Material Display Room in the Chuō Community Hall that was set up in September 1949. Later, The A-bomb Memorial Hall was established independent from the community hall. Materials presented and preserved by the Display Room and the Memorial Hall were collected by individuals including Shogo Nagaoka, who later became the first president of the Peace Memorial Museum in 1955. At this stage, the concept of peace was not used in the Display Room or the Memorial Hall.

In 1949, the year the Display Room was established, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law was enacted in the National Diet. Based on this law, in 1949, the competition for an architectural design of the park was conducted and Tange’s architectural design won the first prize, and in 1951, construction of the Peace Memorial Museum started. Yang (2013:53) quotes Tange’s following statements about the museum.

The A-bomb material room will become a facility which always renews memories of the past and functions as a will toward tomorrow’s peace. I
consider that this is exactly the facility which effectively functions in order to create peace.

This museum which used the concept of peace in its name opened in August 1955. The building designed as the Peace Memorial Museum was used as a space for preserving A-bomb related materials, and the building designed as the Peace Memorial Hall was used as a space of exhibitions. At the first stage, exhibition was quite simple in that the photo panels and showpieces were laid on the floor. However, as many bereaved family members of the atomic bomb victims donated a number of belongings left by them to the museum, the museum expanded the exhibition.

During this period (in 1956), the museum buildings (the Peace Memorial Museum and the Peace Memorial Hall) was used as a venue of the three-week “Atoms for Peace” exhibit in Hiroshima that was organized by the American government in cooperation with the Hiroshima prefectural and city governments (Ubuki 2014). In this exhibition, the concept of peace was utilized to justify the usage of atomic power for the civilian (“peaceful”) purpose. Also in 1958, a part of the museum was used as “Science Museum of Atomic Power,” one of the exhibition pavilions of the Hiroshima Restoration Exposition (Yang 2013).

From 1973 to 1975, the first large-scale renovation was conducted and the exhibitions were redesigned. The museum increased the number of individual A-bomb victims’ relics in the exhibitions. Also, in 1978, hibakushas started participating in the exhibition of the atomic bombing as witnesses who share their testimonies of the atomic bombing with visitors.

In 1991, the second large-scale renovation was conducted. And in 1994, after their renovations, the Peace Memorial Hall reopened as the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum East Building and the Peace Memorial Museum reopened as the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum West Building. The east building was utilized as “a space

20 For the connection between “memories of the atomic bombing” and “dreams for atomic power” in postwar Japan (and Hiroshima) until 1960, see Yamamoto 2012.
21 The name “West Building” was changed to “Main Building” in July 2007. (Yang 2013)
for peace learning” and the west building was utilized as “a space for passing on experiences of the atomic bombing to the next generation” (Yang 2013:60). In the east building, explanations about the pre-bomb Hiroshima as an educational city and a military city were newly added, and an exhibition about the history of invention of atomic bombs and the history of the atomic bombings in Japan were added. In addition, in 1999, newly appointed “Hiroshima Peace Volunteers” started guidance of the museum and the Peace Memorial Park.

Presently, based on the 2007 “Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum Renewal Plan” and the 2010 “Basic Plan for Development of Exhibition at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum,” the museum is under renovation. When I conducted fieldwork in Hiroshima in 2016, the East Building was closed for its renovation and the Main Building exhibited the existing showpieces.

Although there are many objects left by victims and A-bombed artifacts which are exhibited and preserved in the Peace Memorial Museum, there are many voices which are not archived in the museum. For example, the experience of an old lady living near my family’s house who took care of many injured dying hibakushas as a nurse and who never explained about her experience except for me (when I was a 16-year-old high school student, I asked her to allow me to interview her), or the experience of my great-grandfather who did never register himself as a hibakusha to obtain a Hibakusha Health Book and told his story of cremating victims soon after the bombing only personally to his granddaughter, are not archived in the museum.

Moreover, although it is now preserved in the museum, one of my interlocutors, HIP-member hibakusha Isamu’s elder sister’s school uniform was not preserved in the museum for a long time. He was in her mother’s womb at the time of the bombing. Isamu’s mother survived the bombing, but she lost her husband and her eldest daughter. Isamu’s father was working in a post office located in the current Peace Memorial Park (as I explained as a tour guide in the vignette, the place where the

---

22 For the controversy over the renovation in this period, see Naono 2005.
23 In April 2017, the East Building reopened after the renovation. Since then, the Main Building has been closed due to its renovation. The renovation of the Main Building is scheduled to end in July 2018.
current Peace Memorial Park is located was a busy downtown). Isamu’s sister, 13-year-old junior high school student, was mobilized to work on demolition of houses at a town about 1 km away from the hypocenter. Both of them went missing, so Isamu’s mother, who was in her family’s house 3.8 km from the hypocenter at the time of the bombing and was pregnant with Isamu, searched for them for about a month until the end of August, but in vain. In order to take care of the bereaved children, she started working at a nearby post office. One day, she got sick suddenly and hovered around life and death. A few days later, however, she recovered miraculously. Since then until she passed away, she was healthy and always cheerful. She did not apply for a Hibakusha Health Book, and Isamu guesses this was probably because she had not wanted to be labeled as a hibakusha. She never told anything about her experience of the atomic bombing, but after she passed away, Isamu found his eldest sister’s school uniform. Isamu’s mother kept this uniform until she passed away without saying anything about it. Isamu understands that depth of his mother’s sadness was too deep, and thinks that this uniform that his mother kept without saying anything about it shows everything about the A-bomb. Isamu’s mother’s silent, private commemoration of her family expressed by this school uniform show us another way to commemorate the victims, which is different from the way in which the victims are commemorated publicly. As Trouillot (1995) argues, (public) commemorations help sanitize the messy past into a clean, singular historical narrative. Isamu’s mother’s silent, private commemoration was silenced by the public commemoration. Furthermore, this school uniform which was kept silently by Isamu’s mother for a long time suggests that there are many more items left by the victims and stories that these items tell us, which are not preserved and archivised in the museum.

Moreover, the voice of my father who did not know that he was a son of a hibakusha until his mother got a Hibakusha Health Book, and is invited to free medical examinations as one of the children of hibakushas, the voice of my mother who got married to a son of a hibakusha without knowing that until her mother-in-law obtained the health book, or the voice of me myself who is a grandson of a hibakusha and is
worrying about possible future discrimination especially at the time of marriage\textsuperscript{24}, are not archived in the museum. In the case of my mother, for example, she told me this way in my interview with her:

\textsuperscript{24} As the following stories that Nakajo (1986:26-28) says he has heard reveal, it is said that discrimination toward \textit{hibakushas} have existed. The discrimination, which usually is invisible in people’s hearts, comes to the surface especially at the moment of marriages.

For the forty years, \textit{hibakushas}, who have sometimes drawn curious stares, have been disadvantaged at getting married. It is natural that there are people who laugh the matter off, saying “There must not be such a discrimination.” However, I have heard of the following stories:

(1) An unmarried businessman started working with a company which has its headquarter in Osaka and was told to relocate to its Hiroshima branch as his first place of work. His family is a distinguished family who had lived in Nara from generation to generation. His parents and siblings told him, “It is said that the atomic disease of those who got exposed to the atomic bombing run in their blood. Never fall in love with a Hiroshima girl. It is troublesome if a strange child is born.”

(2) The son of a director at a company in Tokyo started telling that he wanted to marry a woman. The director asked his friend to do her background check and it turned out that her father had been doing his military service in Kure city in Hiroshima prefecture. The director is worried, saying “The A-Bomb effect on her father might run in her blood. If so, how can I make my son give up this marriage?” Kure is more than 20km far away from Hiroshima city…

(3) A woman got married without telling her husband that she got exposed to the atomic bombing. Several years later, due to something he came to know that she got exposed to the atomic bombing. Then, the husband questioned her closely. “Why have you concealed it?” When she answered, “Conceal…? Why do I need to tell you? I have never thought of it. Because I have been always healthy,” her husband said, “If I had known it before our marriage, I would not have got married to you…”

With a sigh she says, “When I heard what my husband said to me, I was very shocked. Being exposed to the atomic bombing is that bad thing? Now I am worried whether others might come to know about my exposure even when I go to a hospital for the treatment of a cold.”

(4) A woman, who got married after exposure to the atomic bombing, tried to apply for an A-bomb Health Book just in case because she was
Me: Usually, those who were damaged by the atomic bombing are regarded as “hibakushas,” but in a sense, those who were not exposed to the atomic bombing also got involved. You also got involved completely, in a sense.

Mother: You, too.

Me: Yeah, me too because I am related [to my grandmother] by blood. But those who are not related to hibakushas [by blood] also get involved.

Mother: I see. I did not know about it [your grandma’s exposure to radiation].

going old. This is because if you have this book, the diseases that are thought of as caused by the atomic bombing can be treated for free. However, her husband said to her, “Wait for a while because it might be problematic if you have the book when our sons get married.” Her husband is also a hibakusha, but he does not have the book. There should be many people nationwide who underwent the atomic bombing but have not even applied for the book. It is said that a hibakusha who went to the US after the war and started living there concealed that she was in Hiroshima, saying, “If they know that I was exposed to the atomic bombing, I am not allowed to buy a life insurance.”

(5) When a daughter’s marriage arrangement was almost successful, it coincidentally turned out that her mother is from Hiroshima. The matchmaker advised, “You should change your permanent legal domicile from Hiroshima to anywhere as soon as possible. It is a loss if you are suspected of your exposure to the atomic bombing…”

(6) An elderly woman casually showed her A-Bomb Health Book to the wife of her son who just got married to her, saying, “I experienced the atomic bombing.” Her son got angry, saying with asperity, “You shouldn’t show that kind of thing openly.” Until then she did not conceal it, but she feels lonely thinking that she should feel the same way toward her daughter-in-law as she feels toward the others.
Me: But people do not speak about that kind of thing at all. For example, you were not informed of it and you were shocked.

Mother: I was shocked, but I can’t say that now. About five years after my marriage, I think it was before I gave birth to you two [Note: I am 29 years old as of September, 2017, and I have a brother who is two years younger than me], there was an occasion in which she was going to apply for a Hibakusha Health Book. At that time, I thought, “Oh.” I didn’t know that from the beginning. When we had the arranged marriage meeting, I didn’t hear she was a hibakusha, […]

Me: When you got to know that, what kind of feelings did you have?

Mother: Umm, difficult. Difficult. I thought, what? What? It was like, you were exposed to the bomb?

A-bomb Dome

The A-bomb Dome (Figure 2-27) is a very famous tourist spot in the present Hiroshima, and HIP volunteer English guides are required to include the Dome in their list of the places which they guide the tourists to. Until the city government decided to preserve the Dome permanently in 1966, although Tange designed the Peace Memorial Park based on the Dome (Figure 2-28), the answer to the question of whether the dome should be preserved or not was not decided for more than 20 years after the bombing25.

25 For the details of the controversy about whether to preserve the Dome, see Fuchinoue 2008 and 2011, Hamada 2014, and Fukuma 2015.
In 1915, the Hiroshima Prefectural Commercial Exhibition Hall, which later came to be called the Hiroshima Prefectural Industrial Promotion Hall, opened. This hall was used as a center which promotes sales of the local products of the Hiroshima Prefecture until 1944, when public offices and other public organizations started using the hall as their office (Fuchinoue 2008).
On August 6, 1945, the atomic bomb detonated about 600 meters above the ground and just 160 meters east of the hall. The hall was heavily damaged, but because of its proximity to the hypocenter, the blast of the bomb came to the hall from almost directly above and thus the central part of the building remained standing. The ruin of the hall gradually came to be called “A-bomb Dome” by the citizens in late 1940s and the first half of 1950s (Ibid.).

More than 70 percent of the people in the 1948 public opinion survey conducted by the city and more than 60 percent of the hibakushas in the 1949 public opinion survey conducted by the city answered that the wreckage of the hall should be preserved. Also, in 1949, Tange’s architectural plan which incorporates the dome in the design was determined to be implemented. As Fuchinoue (2008:49) quotes, Tange states,

There was a controversy about this [Note: preservation of the dome]. Some say that the dome should be gotten rid of because it is too poignant in the peaceful time, and others say that the dome should be preserved because of its poignancy. I thought it should be preserved. In order not to forget the horror, atrocity, and inhumane nature of atomic bombs for all time, and in order for the humanity not to use atomic bombs again, I thought this dome should be preserved as a symbol. (Hiroshima-shi 1997)

These public opinion surveys and Tange’s statements, however, clearly illustrate the existence of those who opposed to preservation of the Dome.

At first, the Hiroshima prefectural and city governments were not willing to preserve the dome. For example, in a 1951 round-table talk between the mayor Hamai, the governor of the Hiroshima Prefecture Hiroo Ohara, and the president of Hiroshima

26 In this public opinion survey, those who answered that the dome should be preserved said that the dome can function as “a memorial,” “a warning for future wars,” and “a symbol of peace” (Fuchinoue 2008:49).
University Tatsuo Morito, both Hamai and Ohara (and Morito, too) stated that the dome should not be preserved (Fuchinoue 2008). The city government utilized the dome as a spot which attracts tourists as early as in 1948\(^{27}\), but both the city and prefectural governments did not intend to preserve the dome. In 1953, the ownership of the dome was transferred from the prefectural government to the city government, but the city under Hamai’s mayorship decided to leave the dome as it was until it naturally collapses (Fuchinoue 2008; Hamada 2014).

Despite of the city’s negative attitude toward preservation of the dome, the call for its preservation got louder and louder among the citizens and activists. In 1954, the Hiroshima Prefectural Sightseeing Federation called for setting up an “Association for Preservation of the A-bomb Dome,” saying, “The A-bomb Dome is a symbol of Hiroshima citizens’ desire for peace. It is a historical memorial as well as a valuable tourism resource for the city” (Fuchinoue 2008:51). In 1960, *Orizuru no kai* (Folded Paper Crane Society)\(^{28}\) started a fund-raising campaign and signature campaign after they found a diary left by a girl, Hiroko Tsubakiyama, who wrote in 1959, “After the twentieth century, only the inscription of the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims and the poignant A-bomb Dome will convey the horror of A-bombs to the world” (Fuchinoue 2008:53). In 1964, 11 organizations called the mayor Hamai for permanent preservation of the dome (Fuchinoue 2008). During this period (the first half of 1960s), the significance of Tange’s plan which emphasized on the central line that connects the dome, the cenotaph, and the museum, was reappraised (Fukuma 2015).

As a result, in 1965, the city started a research to know whether it is possible to preserve the dome. And in 1966, the Hiroshima City Assembly unanimously voted to permanently preserve the dome. The “Resolution No.21 (Resolution Calling for Preservation of the A-bomb Dome)” states,

\(^{27}\) In 1948, the Hiroshima City Sightseeing Association designated 13 “A-bomb related sightseeing spots,” which included the dome. (Fuchinoue 2008; Hamada 2014)

\(^{28}\) In 1958, the year when the Children’s Peace Monument (which is explained below in this chapter) was erected in the Peace Memorial Park, *Orizuru no kai* (Folded Paper Crane Society) was founded by Ichiro Kawamoto and school children, as is indicated in the Hiroshima City webpage on how a story of Sadako Sasaki spread to the world.
Hibakushas, all citizens, and all the nationwide people who hope for peace aspire to preserve the dome as well as request prevention of a nuclear war and prohibition of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Preserving the dome and passing it down the generations is our duty toward about 200,000 souls who were killed by the A-bomb and people who hope for world peace. (Hiroshima-shi 1984:99)

The then mayor Hamai, who was at first opposed to preservation of the dome, later wrote in his memoir (Hamai 2011[1967]:290-294),

The A-bomb Dome – it is a memorial monument of the humanity’s permanent aspiration for peace. [...] Humans’ lives are not eternal. Those who experienced the tragedy and learned the lesson will pass away as time goes by. Because of that, we need to preserve the dome and accomplish our mission as witnesses. Preserving the A-bomb Dome is handing down the history of the biggest tragedy in the World War II and the crux for world peace.

In 1996, the A-bomb Dome was registered in UNESCO’s World Heritage List as “a historical testimony which conveys the horror of the first atomic bombing in the human history and as a symbol of abolishment of nuclear weapons and of lasting peace,” according to the Hiroshima city webpage on virtual tour of the A-bomb Dome.

As I already explained above, the current A-bomb Dome attracts many tourists nationwide and worldwide. It attracts volunteers and activists, too. Almost every day, on the south side of the A-bomb Dome, a group of volunteers gather to explain to the tourists about the A-bomb Dome and the atomic bombing. They prepare the self-made folders in multiple languages which consist of photos and explanatory printouts, and teach some of the tourists how to fold paper cranes. Also, on August 6, since no one is allowed to have protests in the central part of the Peace Memorial Park, there are many activists who come to Hiroshima from all around the nation to have protests (Figure 2-
There are also high-school students who call for signature on their petition to the UN for abolition of nuclear weapons.

Figure 2-29. Activists and policemen in front of the A-bomb Dome on August 6, 2015.  
Photo by author.

However, the city government’s (and the prefectural government’s) first negative attitude to preservation of the Dome is not paid attention to at all, and in the linear history of the A-bomb Dome, the existence of those who opposed to preservation of the Dome is regarded just as one piece of a linear, sanitized narrative which progressed eventually to permanent preservation of the Dome.
The Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound (Figure 2-30) is the only monument which has cremains in it in the Peace Memorial Park. Originally, the place where the current mound is located was the precincts of Jisen-ji Temple. Soon after the bombing, innumerable dead bodies were carried to the yard of this temple and cremated, as is indicated in the Hiroshima City webpage on virtual tour of Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound. It is said that many cremains were piled up high in the yard (Horikawa 2015). In May 1946, Hiroshima City Society for Praying for the War Dead, which was organized by the city in cooperation with other public offices in Hiroshima, constructed the Memorial Mound for the Souls Ravaged by the War (Ubuki 1992). Since the mound deteriorated soon, in 1955, the Society for Praying for Peace (a civilian society which was formed after the dissolution of the abovementioned organization, Hiroshima City Society for Praying for the War Dead) reconstructed the mound and renamed it “the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound.” In 1957, the Hiroshima city dug up and transferred many cremains buried in and around the city to this mound (Ubuki 2014). Currently,
cremains stored in the basement room of the mound outnumber 70,000. The majority of them are unidentified. Among them, as the Hiroshima City webpage on their search for the bereaved family members of identified people whose cremains are placed in the mound, 815 cremains are identified but unclaimed as of June 16, 2017.

Inside of the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound, more than 70,000 unidentified cremains are stored, but it is often forgotten – and I have never noticed until I started writing this thesis – that there might well be many people whose dead bodies were not cremated in makeshift crematoria, and thus whose cremains are not stored in the crypt under the mound.

Here, please let me explain about the practice of one of my interlocutors related to this monument. When a HIP guide Junko guides the tourists to this monument (she does so always), she contrasts the mound with the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims, explaining that the Cenotaph commemorates the identified victims, while the mound commemorates the unidentified victims. Through contrasting these two monuments, she attempts to draw her guests’ attention to many victims who have been unidentified.

Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims (Memorial Monument for Hiroshima, City of Peace)

The Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims (Figure 2-31), which is officially called “Memorial Monument for Hiroshima, City of Peace,” is located at the very center of the park on the central north-south straight line from the A-bomb Dome. About this monument, Hamai writes in his memoir, “If this cenotaph does not actually lead to people’s efforts toward peace, it is just a stone for recollection” (Hamai 2011[1967]:209). However, at first, the cenotaph was not planned to be erected as it is now.

In Tange’s 1949 architectural design plan that won the first prize in the architectural design competition, Tange planned to construct Peace Arch over the center of the park. The city government had a plan to construct Irei-dō (Memorial Hall) in addition to the other facilities that the city government required the applicants for the competition to design, but because the city cautioned against the SCAP, it did not write anything about the Memorial Hall in the application guidelines for the competition (Nishii 2015). The plan to construct the Memorial Hall first appeared in 1950 in the
Figure 2-31. The Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims, and the Pond of Peace, which surrounds the cenotaph. Behind the cenotaph, you can see the Flame of Peace and the A-bomb Dome. Photo by author.

Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Design Plan, which was made by the mayor’s office and Tange’s lab. At this stage, they planned the box-shape Memorial Hall to be erected not on the central north-south straight line of the park but at the eastern edge of the park. Also, it was planned to replace the Memorial Mound for the Souls Ravaged by the War, which was erected in the north-west part of the park in 1946. Thus the Memorial Hall was designed to include an underground cinerarium (Ibid.).

Over the planning of the construction of the Memorial Hall, the city’s advisory council, Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Expert Committee exercised considerable influence (Ibid.). Although the committee could not smoothly reach an agreement on the construction plan for the Memorial Hall, Hamai’s idea of constructing a small cenotaph on the ground and a cinerarium under the ground in February 1951 changed the discussion in the committee. At around this period, the Japanese
government (the Construction Ministry) stated that construction of a cinerarium in an urban park like the Peace Memorial Park is prohibited and so the city decided to place a registry of those who died from the atomic bombing. Accordingly, the committee’s discussion started centering on the construction of the cenotaph. Also, in the committee, there appeared a discussion that the location of the Memorial Hall should be changed from the eastern edge of the park to the center of the park. (Ibid.)

After consultation with the mayor Hamai in November 1951, Tange asked an American sculptor, Isamu Noguchi for the design of the cenotaph. Noguchi designed an arch-shaped cenotaph and an underground space for preserving the registry. However, Hideto Kishida, who served as the chairman of the award committee of the competition and a member of the expert committee and who was also Tange’s teacher and boss, opposed to the design by an American. Eventually, Tange scrapped Noguchi’s design and designed the current roof-shaped cenotaph and a stone chest under it in which the registry is placed (Toyokawa 2016). The cenotaph and the stone chest designed by Tange was completed on August 6, 1952 (Hiroshima-shi 1984).

On the front of the stone chest, there is an inscription which reads, “Please rest in peace, / For we shall not repeat the mistake.” As Yoneyama (1999) points out, in the Japanese original inscription, the second line’s subject “we” does not exist. This absence of the subject caused a controversy over the inscription. Those who opposed to this inscription argued that we had made no “mistake.” Although the Hiroshima City official history book, Hiroshima Shinshi says that the controversy gradually calmed (Hiroshima-shi 1984), there still seem to be some people who oppose to this inscription. In 2005, for example, a member of a right-wing private organization damaged the word “ayamachi ha (mistake)” on the stone chest. There are other similar incidents of spraying on the stone chest.

After the construction of the cenotaph, several renovations were made around the cenotaph. In 1957, the city in cooperation with the Junior Chamber International

29 Here, I used Yoneyama’s translation of the Japanese inscription (Yoneyama 1999:16). The city’s official English translation of the inscription is as follows. “Let All the Souls Here Rest in Peace, / For We Shall Not Repeat the Evil.”
30 For the details of this controversy, see Hiroshima-shi 1984 and Yoneyama 1999.
Japan constructed Pond of Peace around the cenotaph. When there was a conference of the Junior Chamber International Japan in Hiroshima in the previous year, the members of the organization decided to erect a memorial of their conference and donated 200,000 Japanese Yen in total. The city decided to construct a pond that surrounds the cenotaph and filled the budget gap. Although the original pond was just around the cenotaph, the pond was expanded to the present size when the Flame of Peace (explained in this chapter below) was constructed in 1964 behind the cenotaph (see Figure 2-32 for the present Pond of Peace). In 1985, due to its deterioration, the then concrete-made cenotaph was renovated to the current granite cenotaph (Ubuki 2014).

As this history of the cenotaph shows, this monument has also a conflicted history. However, in my guided tour, I did not pay attention to the conflicted nature of the cenotaph. For example, I did not know that at first the cenotaph was envisaged as a replacement of the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound and that the people were at first thinking of constructing a cinerarium, but that the Construction Ministry made a statement against construction of a cinerarium in an urban park like the Peace Memorial Park. Also, I did not mention that there have been many people who oppose to the inscription on the stone chest under the cenotaph – “Please rest in peace, / For we shall not repeat the mistake.” – as damage of the stone chest caused by a member of a right-wing private organization or other incidents of spraying on the stone chest illustrates.

Children’s Peace Monument

Children’s Peace Monument31 (Figure 2-32) is one of the monuments in the Peace Memorial Park which was constructed as a result of social movements. Ubuki (2014:233) evaluates these monuments and writes, “Each of these monuments continues to exist as a symbol of significant peace movements in Hiroshima.” HIP’s English guidebook about the monuments in the Peace Memorial Park mentions (and many HIP

31 The official English name of this monument, “Children’s Peace Monument,” is different from the original Japanese (Genbaku no ko no zou), which should be translated, “Statue of Children of the A-bomb.” Since HIP members and ANT members uses the official English name when explaining to the English-speaking international visitors about the monument, I use the official name (Children’s Peace Monument) here.
English volunteer guides who use this book explain to tourists) that the monument is “a symbol of peace” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005:32).

In 1955, a 12 year-old hibakusha girl Sadako Sasaki died of acute leukemia caused by the atomic bombing. After she was admitted to the hospital, high-school students in Nagoya gave her folded paper cranes. She started folding paper cranes, wishing for recovery. In Japan, it is said that folding one thousand paper cranes makes your wish come true. Although she folded more than 1,000 paper cranes, she died after her 8-month battle with the acute leukemia.

Her classmates were shocked by her death, and started calling for establishment of the Statue of Children of the A-bomb in order to pray for the children who were killed by the atomic bomb like Sadako. Several months after the start of their movement for establishment of the statue, the movement spread citywide and 120 representative students from elementary, junior-high, and high schools from all around the city

---

Since Sadako’s classmates called for establishment of the monument in Japanese, I use my translation of the original Japanese name of the monument (Genbaku no ko no zou) instead of the official English name (Children’s Peace Monument) here.
gathered and organized “the Hiroshima Society of School Children for Building World Peace” in 1956. The movement by this organization was supported by many educational organizations, and many people nationwide and worldwide financially contributed to the construction of the monument. As a result, on May 5 (Japanese children’s day), 1958, the Statue of Children of the A-bomb (Children’s Peace Monument) was erected (Ubuki 2014). As HIP guidebook (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005:32) and HIP volunteer English guides explain, “The paper cranes, together with this monument, have become a symbol of peace.” On the stone below the monument, there is a Japanese inscription, which says, “This is our cry. This is our prayer. For building peace in the world.”

Due to its English name (Children’s Peace Monument) and how people perceive this monument together with folded paper cranes (a symbol of peace), the monument is a component of the landscape of peace, which links the concept peace to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

Here, I observed an interesting practice of one of my interlocutors – Tomoko, president of ANT-Hiroshima. During my fieldwork with ANT, together with Tomoko, I guided ANT’s guests, American college students, as an ANT’s intern by using a Japanese picture book, “Orizuru no Tabi: Sadako no Inori o Nosete (Journey of Folded Paper Cranes: Carrying Sadako’s Prayer)” (Umino 2003). ANT has been engaging in a project in which the organization translates this picture book and sends its copies to children in many countries33. When I finished guiding about the monument only by explaining to the visitors about Sadako and her classmates’ efforts to construct the monument, she stopped me, saying, “You shouldn’t skip another important story of this monument,” and started her explanation by using the picture book that I had with me. “After the establishment of the Children’s Peace Monument in Hiroshima, Sadako’s prayer spread all over the world. There are monuments erected all over the world, including the Children’s Peace Statue in New Mexico, US erected by American children, as this book shows.”

33 This project by ANT is detailed in the chapter 3 of this thesis.
As I explain in the Chapter 3, Tomoko learned from her experience in, for example, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Nepal, that Sadako’s prayer and Hiroshiman children’s movements have a power to inspire and motivate many children in the world. For her, my explanation, which lacked an explanation about the worldwide spread of the children’s movements that were inspired by Sadako and children in Hiroshima such as her classmates, was not sufficient because I did not provide an explanation that Sadako’s story and Hiroshiman children’s initiative can inspire and have inspired children all over the world.

Flame of Peace

![Flame of Peace, erected in the Pond of Peace. Photo by author.](image)

The Flame of Peace (see Figure 2-33), which is located north of the cenotaph on the central north-south line of the Peace Memorial Park, is another monument erected as a result of a social movement. In 1961, an organization named KAKKIN (Kakuheiki Haizetsu Heiwa Kensetsu Kokumin Kaigi: National Assembly for
Abolishment of Nuclear Weapons and Construction of Peace) was organized in Tokyo. In this period, a nationwide campaign against A and H-bombs were split into several political groups which had conflicted opinions against one another. KAKKIN is one of them, which was organized by Democratic Socialist Party and Assembly of All Japan Trade Unions in opposition to Gensuikyo (The Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs). In 1962, a Hiroshima prefectural branch of KAKKIN was formed in the Peace Memorial Hall in Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park. In 1963, the Hiroshima Prefectural branch of KAKKIN developed an idea of constructing a flame of peace in the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, and in the same year, the nationwide KAKKIN staff conference determined to construct the flame until August next year. The KAKKIN formed the “Flame of Peace” Construction Committee, which asked Tange to design the flame (Ubuki 2014). The pedestal of the flame Tange designed represents two open hands holding the flame, with their palms facing upward. About his intention of the design, as Ubuki (1992:33) quotes, Tange mentions, “Now, the haniwa-shaped cenotaph which symbolizes consolation (yasuragi) is not enough. The present era requires us to have another dynamic symbol of peace” (Chugoku Shimbun (May 28, 1964)).

The flame’s central presence in the park and what it represents (a hope for a nuclear-free world) dominates people’s attention, and distracts their attention from its political aspect. Many people do not even know that this monument was constructed by an organization affiliated with a political party, and that there were many conflicts between different groups, one of which is KAKKIN. As a subject of hegemonic discourse on peace and on this monument, since when I guided the participants of a student exchange program between Palestine, Israel, and Japan in 2005 as a Hiroshiman participant, I myself regarded this monument as a symbol of Hiroshimans’ hope for nuclear-free world for so long a time.
The Peace Bell (Figure 2-34) is another spot in the Peace Memorial Park to which many HIP volunteer guides take tourists. It was constructed by the A-bomb Survivor Hiroshima Hope Fruition Society, which explains, “This bell/hall is standing at the dearest wish of Hiroshima aiming at the creation of a world of a true peaceful coexistence without any nuclear weapons and wars, and was built as a symbol for this spiritual and cultural movement. We built this bell/hall by crystallizing every people’s wish for peace and their donations,” as is indicated in the Hiroshima City webpage on the virtual tour of Peace Bell. The bell was made by a bell caster Masahiko Katori. On its surface, a world map without any national borders is engraved. At the point where the log hits the bell, the symbol of the atomic energy is engraved in order to express a wish for prohibition of atomic and hydrogen bombs.
The Monument in Memory of the Korean Victims of the A-bomb (Figure 2-35) is another important spot to which many HIP volunteer guides take tourists. It is currently located in the south of the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound in the Peace Memorial Park, but it was first erected outside of the park.

As I already explained above in this chapter, in 1967, under Yamada’s mayorship, the Peace Memorial Park was to be “sanctified” and the city government decided not to approve any more monuments after the construction of the Peace Clock Tower (constructed on October 28, 1967). The Association for Korean Residents in Japan (Zai-Nippon Daikanminkoku Kyoryūminidan) organized the “Construction Committee for Monument in Memory of the Korean Victims of the A-bomb” in April 1967. Although the committee at first thought of constructing the monument in the premise of the Peace Memorial Park, in 1970, it erected the monument at the western end of the Honkawa-bashi Bridge, which is located at the western edge of the park. In
1970, the committee said that they had exchanged a promise with the then mayor Yamada that the city would prepare a space for construction of the monument in the park, but since the “promise” was not recorded in any form, the city declined their request to transfer the monument into the park (Yoneyama 1999; Nishii 2013).

As Yoneyama (1999:155) points out, there have been many “interpretive contestations” about the monument. One of them is about “whether this monument memorializes all souls of the Korean atom bomb dead, or only those survivors affiliated with the Republic of Korea” (156). The organization which erected the monument, Association for Korean Residents in Japan (currently called Zai-Nippon Daikanminkoku Mindan: Korean Residents Union in Japan), is affiliated with South Korea (the Republic of Korea). Against the erection of the monument by this organization, Zai-Nihon Chosenjin Sorengō (the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan), which has close ties to North Korea, argued that they were excluded from the commemorative festival conducted in front of the monument. In 1994, the Korean Residents Union in Japan (affiliated with South Korea) mentioned that this monument is for all the Koreans including both of those affiliated with South Korea and North Korea (Yoneyama 1999).

Another controversy arose in 1980s. It was about the location of the monument.34 Many people including Zainichi Koreans (long-term Korean residents in Japan) started feeling that the location of the monument represents discrimination against Zainichi Koreans. As the call for relocation of the monument into the park got louder and louder, the Hiroshima city government presented a requirement that the monument would need to be suitable for the park, which is a “sanctuary,” and thus the monument would need to be modified to one which commemorates both North and South Koreans (Nishii 2013). Nishii (2013:78-79) explains that the city government, Korean Residents Union in Japan (affiliated with South Korea), and the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan (affiliated with North Korea) almost reached an agreement that they modify the monument so that its representation of religion and

34 For the details and analyses of the controversy over the (re)location of the Monument in Memory of the Korean Victims of the A-bomb and many discourses by various actors involved, see Yoneyama 1999 and Nishii 2013.
nation can be weakened to become suitable for the sanctuary, for example by changing
the inscription which explains about the history of Japanese colonization of Korea and
Japanese transportation of Koreans for forced labor to the one which says “Banko
Ryūhō (萬古流芳),” which means that the deaths of people from Korea are not fruitless
but they remain in people’s heart as a beautiful current, and the one which states, “This
monument was constructed in order to commemorate people from the Korean Peninsula
who fell victims to the atomic bomb dropped in Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 and to
pray for eternal world peace.”. However, Nishii (2013:78) further explains, one of the
construction committee members who erected the monument expressed his opposition
to the “distortion (kaizan)” of the monument. Eventually, the “distortion” was not
accomplished and much later, in 1999, the monument, which was not modified, was
relocated to the current location in the Peace Memorial Park.

The existence of this monument illustrates people’s perception of the necessity
to commemorate non-Japanese population, although the Cenotaph for the A-bomb
Victims is dedicated to all the (identified) A-Bomb victims including non-Japanese.
Although the non-Japanese victims include, for example, Koreans, Chinese, Taiwanese,
South East Asians, and Americans, there is no monument commemorating them except
for this monument commemorating Korean hibakushas (and a memorial plate for
American victims in a building in downtown of Hiroshima (Figure 2-36)). Since the
memorial plate commemorating American victims is not well-known at all even among
Hiroshima residents and of course also among tourists, the tourists who come to the
Peace Memorial Park might have an impression that the people who suffered from the
atomic bombing include only Japanese (and Koreans). It is very difficult to hear voices
of other hibakushas than Japanese (and Korean) hibakushas, whom no monuments
specifically commemorates, since the memory of their existence is not well archivized
as monuments.
I want to draw your attention to the practice of explaining this monument by one of my interlocutors, HIP guide Hiroshi. When Hiroshi guides the tourists as a HIP guide, he always takes them to this monument. He explains that Japan colonized Korea, that it is necessary for Japanese to reflect on Japan’s history of colonization and invasions, and that the former location of the monument represents discrimination against Koreans.

Analysis (or, Self-Reflection)

As I explained with regard to each of the monuments, the Peace Memorial Park itself and many of the monuments erected in the park have political and conflicted histories. The reconstruction of the city as a “peace memorial city” and construction of the park as a central project in the reconstruction policies excluded and even silenced
many Hiroshima citizens who lived in small shacks but were forced to move out of them, as is illustrated by the example of Nakazawa’s family, who were dispossessed of their shack and forced to abandon it because their shack was “in the way of the city planning of peace city construction” (Nakazawa 1987:147), as Kishi (2009:260) quotes. The monuments in the park were constructed under the approval of the city government, and especially since Yamada’s mayorship, as a “sanctuary,” construction of objects in the park and citizens’ usage of the park has been very strictly limited. The park is a venue of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony, which dominates people’s attention, but it does not represent voices of many hibakushas, who have not, do not, or cannot come to the park to attend the ceremony, as is illustrated in the silence of an old lady who lived near my family’s house, stayed at home all day on August 6, and dedicated water to her household Buddhist altar praying for the dead victims she took care of.

There are many objects left by victims and A-bombed artifacts exhibited and preserved in the Peace Memorial Museum, but at the same time, there are many voices which are not archived in the museum. For example, this old lady’s experience as a nurse or my great-grandfather’s experience as a volunteer fire fighter are not archived in the museum. Also, voices of my father, my mother, or me are not archived in the museum. The museum has also a history of exhibition of “peaceful” usage of atomic energy, which is very controversial. However, the political aspects of the museum is not discussed at all, and the museum is thought of a place of inclusive exhibition about the Hiroshima atomic bombing. The Hiroshima city government decided to preserve the A-bomb Dome permanently as a result of many people’s call for preservation, but the history of its first negative attitude toward preservation of the dome is not usually talked about, and at the same time, now that the permanent preservation of the A-bomb Dome – which was even registered in UNESCO’s World Heritage List! – is highly appraised, many people who did not want the dome to be preserved because the dome reminds them of their poignant memory of the atomic bombing were regarded just as one piece of a linear history (or, I should say, progress) which proceeded in the direction of permanent preservation of the dome. Inside of the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound, more than 70,000 unidentified cremains are stored, but it is often forgotten – and I have never heard anyone saying – that there might well be many people whose dead bodies were not cremated in makeshift crematoria, and thus whose cremains are not stored in
the crypt under the mound. The conflicted nature of the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims is also not paid attention to. There have been many people who oppose to the inscription on the stone chest under the cenotaph – “Please rest in peace, / For we shall not repeat the mistake.” – as damage of the stone chest caused by a member of a right-wing private organization or other incidents of spraying on the stone chest clearly illustrates. The Flame of Peace was erected by just one of the many organizations working for abolition of nuclear weapons which have conflictual relationship to each other. However, its central presence in the park dominates people’s attention and distracted their attention from its political aspect, and it is regarded as a representation of Hiroshimans’ hope for nuclear-free world. The Monument in Memory of the Korean Victims of the A-bomb reminds the viewers of the Japanese history of colonization of Korea and forced mobilization of Korean people. The existence of this monument demonstrates people’s perception of the necessity to commemorate non-Japanese population. The non-Japanese victims include Koreans, Chinese, Taiwanese, South East Asians, and Americans, but no monument commemorates them except for this monument commemorating Korean hibakushas. Thus, it is very difficult to hear voices of other hibakushas than Japanese (and Korean) hibakushas, whom no monuments specifically commemorates. The memory of their existence is not well archivized as monuments. Also, the answer to the question whether this monument commemorates North Korean hibakushas is contested.

Then, what is the meaning of my guided tour of this park as is indicated in the vignette? As a guide, I experienced a dilemma. Before working with HIP, I thought it important to convey personal messages, such as “I think of ‘peace’ this way,” or “I think of the atomic bombing this way,” through guiding the monuments in the park, and have dialogues with visitors. However, through many of HIP members, I leaned the importance of telling the “facts” that can be accepted by tourists from different backgrounds. Otherwise, how do I communicate with people who think, for example, that the atomic bombings were definitely necessary in order to end the war between US and Japan or Japanese colonization of many Asian countries as soon as possible? If I start talking about my “opinions,” which cannot possibly be accepted by tourists – for example, an “opinion” (which I think of as a “fact”) that the atomic bombings in Hiroshima and Nagasaki were not as influential on Japanese policy makers’ decision to
surrender as the Soviet’s attack that started on August 9, 1945 against the Soviet-Japanese Neutrality Pact —, then, my guests might well start regarding me as an untrustworthy, partial guide and stop listening to me. Thus, I started learning how to guide the park by memorizing the sentences in the textbook (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005), that I thought are based on “facts” — meaning the stories that can be accepted by my guests.

My guided tours certainly have a positive aspect. Through my guided tours, I could discursively qualify the objects which are otherwise difficult to understand for the tourists. However, my guided tour has a lot of limitations and problems. Since I wanted my tour to be based on “facts” — that can be accepted by my guests from different backgrounds —, I was too fearful to touch on issues that are not represented by the monuments. For example, in my guided tour, I never talked that the reconstruction of Hiroshima as a peace memorial city and the construction of the park excluded and silenced many people who were expelled by the city government under the name of “peace city construction.” At the museum, I never pointed out that there are many people whose voices are not represented in the museum — including me myself! At the A-bomb Dome, in my talk, I regarded people who opposed to preservation of the dome just as one piece of a linear narrative toward permanent preservation of the dome. When explaining about the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound, I never mentioned that there might be more unidentified people whose cremains are not stored in the mound than the people whose cremains are stored there. As a guide, I never mentioned the incidents of damaging or spraying on the inscription. At the flame of peace, I did not mention the political conflicts between different organizations, one of which erected this monument. To be honest, as a subject of hegemonic discourse on peace, I myself regarded this monument as a symbol of Hiroshimans’ hope for nuclear-free world for a very long time! At the Monument in Memory of Korean Victims of the A-bomb, I never mentioned other people who are not well memorialized in a form of monuments, such as Americans, Chinese, Taiwanese, and South East Asians. I reflected this way only through concretely researching each of the monuments in writing this thesis. Furthermore, I presented many historical narratives that linked the atomic bombing with the concept peace. In these ways, I was contributing to a hegemonic narrative of peace
in Hiroshima, which excludes and silences a lot of voices that are not archivised and memorialized.

In other words, through forcing myself to base my explanations on “facts,” I created historical narratives that naturally link the Hiroshima atomic bombing to the concept peace through reducing the intermingled pasts into linear narratives which silence other interpretations of the past, contributed to silencing of other historicities than the Western version of historicity (historicism), and contributed to the authorities who disseminates the official history (that associates the concept peace with the atomic bombing) which fills in the silences.

Even before I learned from my mother that I am a grandson of a *hibakusha* at the age of 15, I learned about the Hiroshima atomic bombing as a part of “peace education” at school. I remember, when I was a 4th-year elementary school student, in a booklet, there was a question about on what day the A-bomb was dropped in Hiroshima, and we students needed to fill in the brackets to answer this question (“Month [8] Day [6] Year [1945]”). Also, when I was a child, my mother read a lot of picture books that are about the atomic bombing to me and my brother. I remember two of them, which are “*Shin-chan no Sanrinsha* (Shin-chan’s Tricycle)” (Kodama 1992) and “*Makkuro na Obentō* (Black Bento)” (Kodama 1995). “Shin-chan’s Tricycle” is a story about a three-year-old boy, Shin-chan. When the A-bomb was dropped, Shin-chan was playing with his tricycle in front of his house. His whole body was burned, and at that night, Shin-chan passed away. His father could not think of cremating his son, so he buried Shin-chan and a girl living in a neighborhood who was playing with Shin-chan in the yard of the house. 40 years later, Shin-chan’s father dug Shin-chan’s bones and had a funeral, and donated Shin-chan’s tricycle to the museum. “Black Bento” is a story of a 13-year-old boy, Shigeru. As a junior-high school student, Shigeru was mobilized to work on demolition of houses. On the day of the atomic bombing, his mother made a deluxe lunch (bento), and Shigeru brought the lunch box (bento box) very happily. After the atomic bombing, Shigeru’s mother searched for him, and finally on August 9th, three days later, she found her son’s dead body, which was embracing the lunch box. The lunch in the box was burned black. Shigeru’s bento box is now exhibited in the museum.
Although I learned about the atomic bombing at home and at school, the atomic bombing had been someone else’s issue until I got to know that my grandmother is a hibakusha. In a report of the student exchange program between Israel, Palestine, and Japan that I participated in as a second-year high school student (I was 16-17 years old) in 2005, I wrote,

In this project, I have another “encounter and dialogue.” I am a grandson of a hibakusha, but I never lived seriously in touch with the atomic bombing or the war. Although I received peace education and visited the Peace Park and the museum many times, in my heart, I was dodging such issues. However, this time, I needed to talk about the atomic bombing as a high-school student who lives in Hiroshima. I went to the museum many times, walked around the Peace Park with a guidebook in my hands, and listened to my grandmother who entered Hiroshima after the bombing, a person who took care of the victims as a nurse from August 7th, and a person who got exposed to the bomb in his mother’s womb. In this way, gradually I encountered with “Hiroshima,” which saw the 60th anniversary of the atomic bombing.

In the process of preparation for a guided tour of the park for other participants from Israel, Palestine, or other parts of Japan, I visited a museum many times and spent many hours taking notes of every panel (I remember that an old man, who was working in the museum as one of “peace volunteers,” volunteers who are recruited by the city and working in the museum, observed me a while and called me to stop, saying to me, “You are very studious.”). I visited the park with the guidebook in my hand in order to remember how to explain about the objects in the park. Actually, this guidebook was HIP’s “Hiroshima Peace Park Guide” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005), which was just published that year. As a high school student who was working on “Hiroshima,” I was also featured in a news program of NHK (Japan Broadcasting Cooperation). In the program, I went to my grandmother’s house to listen to her story. I also clearly remember that in the program, while the TV crew was shooting me, I guided a Canadian family in the park. While explaining about the Flame of Peace, I said
to them, “This monument expresses Hiroshiman people’s hope for nuclear-free world. In order to extinguish this flame, please help us,” to which they answered, “We are Canadians, so we don’t have nuclear weapons.” In this process, I started to identify myself with a grandson of a hibakusha and a Hiroshiman.

Also at the same time, I associated the issue of the atomic bombing with the concept peace, and I never doubted this link. The project in which I participated and at which I started facing the issue of the Hiroshima atomic bombing was titled, “Youth Exchange for Peace.” The program was linked to the concept peace, and the concept peace was (still is) abundant all around the city especially in the Peace Memorial Park, so I naturally associated the atomic bombing with peace. Since I became interested in “peace,” at college, I chose to study politics, which I thought was very important when thinking about peace. I am still studying about “peace” as an anthropology student as you see in this thesis. In a Foucauldian sense, I have been formed as a subject of the hegemonic master narrative of peace in Hiroshima, which links the atomic bombing to the concept peace.

Outside of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park

Figure 2-37. Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park. Photo by author.
Outside of the Peace Memorial Park, it is very difficult for many people to feel that the single atomic bomb completely destroyed the whole area of the two-kilometer radius around the hypocenter. At a first glance, remembrance of the atomic bombing might seem to be confined to the area of the Peace Memorial Park (see Figure 2-37). However, there are actually many monuments, A-bombed trees, A-bombed buildings, A-bombed bridges, A-bombed tram cars, and explanatory boards that convey the damages caused by the bomb (see Figure 2-38) (Tagawa 2016). This disregard of many objects outside of the park is shaped by the enormous presence of the Peace Memorial Park, which dominates residents’ and tourists’ attention.35

---

35 See Gordillo (2014:192-208) for remembrance and oblivion of past events in Argentine.
The hypocenter is located outside the Peace Memorial Park and there is nothing related to the atomic bombing except for an about-one-meter-high explanatory board built by the city (Figure 2-39). However, since it is just about 160 meters from the A-bomb Dome, one of the places where all the HIP volunteer guides are required to take the tourists, many of the HIP members guide the tourists to this spot, explaining that the bomb exploded about 600 meters above this spot. For example, a HIP member Tsutomu have his guests look up the sky when explaining about the hypocenter.
The aunt of Noriko, HIP member, was working as a student nurse in the Shima Hospital, which was (and is) just below the hypocenter. Since her parents did not tell anything about their A-bomb experience, she found that out when she asked about her parents’ and relatives’ experience of the atomic bombing to her parents after she started conducting guided tours at HIP in 2015. She explains to her guests that all the people working in the hospital including her aunt died instantly and that there is a large Buddhist altar in the hospital, because she does not want to waste her aunt’s death.

A-bombed Trees

It was not only humans and animals\(^{36}\) but also plants which were affected and afflicted by the atomic bombing. Currently (as of April 2017), the Hiroshima city registers 161 trees as “hibaku jumoku (A-bombed Trees).”\(^{37}\) Registered A-bombed trees are presently alive trees which existed in the area completely destroyed and burned down by the bomb (within about two kilometers from the hypocenter: see Figure 2-7) before the atomic bombing. The Hiroshima city is located on a delta at the mouth of the Ota River, and if you go beyond two kilometers from the hypocenter, there are many mountains. There must have been many trees in those mountains which were affected

\(^{36}\) The webpage of Atomic Bomb Disease Institute, Nagasaki University, which explains about the effects of A-bomb’s radiation on animals and plans, explains that the effects of heat rays and blast appear on animals as burns and external wounds and the effects of radiation appear as acute sickness and aftereffects. Acute sickness of humans includes radiation burns, loss of hair, and diarrhea and it is thought that mammalian animals such as dogs, cats, mice, horses and cows are affected in the same way. Aftereffects include cancer and genetic damages. It is possible that animals who got exposed to the radiation of the bomb got cancer, although it is very difficult to scientifically determine whether the cancers that animals got are due to the radiation of the bomb or not. Genetic effects of the humans are not scientifically proven, but it has been revealed in experiments that irradiation of mice and fruit flies lead them to have intergenerational effects, so it is possible that there are animals who were genetically damaged by the atomic bomb.

\(^{37}\) Although I put this section about the A-bombed trees in the section about outside of the park, some of the trees are located in the park, as I explained in my guided tour (see the vignette before this chapter). In the northern side of the East Building of the Peace Memorial Museum, there are two A-bombed aogiri (Chinese parasol) trees which are transplanted from a different location.
by the bomb and the radioactive black rain that fell after the bombing, but it is scientifically difficult to know whether the trees were located in the mountains at the time of the bombing. Also, *Genshi-bakudan Saigai Chōsa Hōkoku-shū* (Collection of Reports about Research on Damages Caused by the Atomic Bomb) published by Science Council of Japan in 1953 reports that the effects of the bomb on the trees outside of the two-kilometer radius from the hypocenter are comparatively smaller than its effects on the trees within the two-kilometer radius. Thus, the city government registers the 161 presently alive trees which existed in the area of within about two kilometers from the hypocenter as A-bombed trees.

A-bombed trees have several distinctive features. With regard to the type of the tree, the number of the kinds of the A-bombed trees is 31, and about one third (58) of the 161 registered A-bombed trees are camphor trees. As a distinctive feature of the A-bombed trees, a group of scientists found that the single-stem A-bombed trees which were not transplanted and are still growing at the original locations were inclined toward the hypocenter (Owaki et al. 2014). Moreover, stems of many of the A-bombed trees are curved. Furthermore, there are comparatively many knots in stems or branches of the A-bombed trees. Also, there are relatively many yellow spots (called chimeras) on the leaves of some A-bombed trees such as Japanese camellias.

These A-bombed trees have been protected mainly by a Hiroshima tree doctor Minoru. In 1967, during the summer holidays, Minoru, then an economics-major senior in a college, visited Yakushima Island located south of Kyushu Island and climbed up Miyanoura-dake Mountain. There, he encountered the *Jōmon Sugi* Tree (2700-to-7200-year-old Japanese cedar tree) which was discovered half a year before his visit. He was moved by this tree. Since he was not so interested in economics, he decided to start working with green. After a one-year training in a nursery tree company in Fukuoka, through his teacher’s introduction, in 1969, he started working for a garden designing company in Hiroshima. Although he wanted to work on designing gardens of individual

38 Camphor trees are designated as the city tree of Hiroshima. Tree doctor Minoru said in my interview that there are many A-bombed camphor trees because many camphor trees were planted in schools and military lands in the city. He guesses that camphor trees might be one of the trees most suited to the land of Hiroshima.
private customers, even after three months passed since he started working in this company, his work was all about planting trees in parks and on streets in Hiroshima. Thus he complained to the president of his company. However, the president told him,

The work you’re currently engaged with, planting trees in the parks and on the streets, is the work to protect Hiroshima’s peace. This is a peace industry.

Minoru, who had been thinking of trees only as materials for gardens, changed his mind and started thinking, “The green in Hiroshima represents peace.”

In 1974, at the age of 28, Minoru worked as an assistant to a tree doctor from Osaka who came to Hiroshima to give treatment to trees in Hiroshima Prefecture designated as natural treasures. He said to Minoru, “Hear the trees’ voices,” and, “In Hiroshima there must be many trees which survived the atomic bombing, so why don’t you protect these trees?” This was the first time Minoru got interested in A-bombed trees in Hiroshima. In 1987, he had the first opportunity to work on an A-bombed tree, which is a willow tree at the east end of Tsurumi-bashi Bridge. He transplanted the willow tree so that the bridge could be widened. Four years after that, in 1991, the Forestry Agency of the Japanese government created the certification system for tree doctors, and Minoru became a tree doctor under this system. In 1996, at the age of 50, he retired from the garden designing company in order to focus his efforts on protection of A-bombed trees.

Now, as a tree doctor, Minoru engages in a monitoring study of the A-bombed trees and a project called Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative, which is organized by ANT-Hiroshima and UNITAR Hiroshima Office (see Chapter 3 of this thesis for the details of this project).

Although Minoru considers, “The only thing I can do is to convey peace or Hiroshima’s atomic bombing through trees,” Minoru emphasizes on “freedom” for each person who looks at, touches, and feels something about the A-bombed trees. The executive director of ANT-Hiroshima, Tomoko also points out, “Various thoughts are what humans assign on trees. Trees soar in a grand manner, transcending them.”
As Minoru and Tomoko point out, these A-bombed trees soar transcending the hegemonic narrative in Hiroshima which links the atomic bombing to the concept peace. The trees metaphorically show us other diverse possible ways in which we narrate the atomic bombing.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, by utilizing the concepts of “landscape” and “silence” and drawing on Foucault’s genealogical approach, I explored how past discourses and practices that the actors related to the concept of peace are inscribed onto and/or excluded or silenced by the landscape of peace in Hiroshima, what the components of the landscape of peace represents (and thus silences), and how I was formed as a subject of the master narrative of peace in Hiroshima, which firmly links the Hiroshima atomic bombing to the concept peace.

Especially since the 1949 Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law was enacted, the whole of the Hiroshima city has been designed as a “peace (memorial) city.” Reconstruction of Hiroshima as a “peace (memorial) city” brought many buildings and facilities including the Peace Memorial Park, but at the same time, it oppressed and silenced despondent voices and uncomfortable feelings of many citizens, the majority of whom were hibakushas.

The Peace Memorial Park was constructed based on the law, which has the word peace in its name and enabled the Hiroshima city government to obtain special subsidies for reconstruction of the city. The park was designed by Tange as “a factory that creates peace.” The construction of park entailed excluding and silencing of many citizens, who were forced to move out of their shacks.

In the Peace Memorial Park, there are many objects such as buildings, monuments, and A-bombed trees, which were erected or have been preserved by a variety of actors who thought these objects symbolize their hope for peace. As a HIP guide, I took my guests to a dozen of the objects in the park in my guided tours.

The museum was named “Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum” after the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law was enacted in the National Diet in 1949. Tange, who designed the buildings of the museum, put his thought of the museum as “a facility which always renews memories of the past and functions as a will toward
tomorrow’s peace” into the buildings. The museum was used as a venue of exhibitions that promoted the usage of atomic power for the civilian (“peaceful”) purpose by using the concept of peace. There are many voices which are not archived in the museum. For example, the voices of the old lady living near my family’s house, my great-grandfather, my father, my mother, and me myself are not archived in the museum.

The A-bomb Dome was, at first, not a symbol of peace. The city government (and the prefectural government) at first did not intend to preserve the dome. As the call for its preservation got louder and louder among the citizens and activists, the dome came to be regarded as a symbol of peace, which attracts many tourists and activists. However, at the same time, voices of many people who wanted the dome not to be preserved are silenced.

Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound is also an important constituent of the landscape of peace. This is the only monument in which cremains of the victims are stored. However, it is often forgotten that there might well be many people whose dead bodies were not cremated, and thus whose cremains are not stored in the crypt under the mound.

The Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims was constructed by the city government and was also designed by Tange. This monument is also considered as a symbol of peace as Hamai expresses (“If this cenotaph does not actually lead to people’s efforts toward peace, it is just a stone for recollection”). To this monument, there are people who oppose to its inscription.

Children’s Peace Monument and the Flame of Peace were constructed as a result of social movements (or, as Ubuki (1992) expresses, peace movements). Children’s Peace Monument commemorates the children who were killed by the A-bomb, and the monument together with folded paper cranes are regarded as a symbol of peace. The Flame of Peace represents a hope for nuclear-free world, but its history of political struggles were often not mentioned.

The Peace Bell was also constructed by private actors. It represents Hiroshima’s hope for a world where people live together in peace.

The Monument in Memory of Korean Victims of the A-bomb is another component of the landscape of peace. With regard to this monument there were many interpretive contestations, but these controversies including that about whether this
monument also commemorates North Korean people are not paid attention to. Although this monument illustrates the people’s perception of the necessity to commemorate non-Japanese population, whom the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims actually commemorates, other non-Japanese victims are often forgotten.

My guided tour, which centered on the objects in the Peace Memorial Park, contributed to the hegemonic narrative of peace, which naturally links the Hiroshima atomic bombing to the concept peace and silences many voices. Being fearful of my guests’ reactions, I forced myself to base my explanations on “facts” that are acceptable to my guests, through which I created historical narratives which reduced the intermingled pasts into linear narratives that silence other interpretations of the past, contributed to silencing of other historicities than the Western version of historicity, and contributed to the authorities who disseminate the official history which fills in the silences. In a Foucauldian sense, I was formed as a subject of the hegemonic master narrative of peace in Hiroshima, which links the atomic bombing to the concept peace.

The Peace Memorial Park dominates many people’s attention. However, outside of the Peace Memorial Park, there are many spots silenced. These spots include the hypocenter which many people explore as peace-related spots, and there are many A-bombed trees through which some of my interlocutors communicate peace. The trees transcend the meanings humans assign on them, and thus metaphorically show us other possible ways for us to narrate the atomic bombing.
A locally based group, Coalition for Peace Action, holds an annual commemoration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki Bombings at Princeton, NJ, US. On the day of the atomic bombing (August 5 in Princeton time, which is August 6 in Hiroshima time) in 2012, about 15 minutes before the exact time Hiroshima A-bomb was dropped, when the attendees of the event should have a minute of silence, as an invited speaker, I started giving my speech at the beginning of the ceremony.

I feel really honored and happy to be here with you all. Around several months ago, the organization Coalition for Peace Action offered me this great opportunity to talk to you as a speaker at this commemoration. Since then, I have been always looking forward to meeting you all today.

[…]

Tonight, I want to share just two stories with you. Although the topics are different from each other, I’ll talk about them in the same manner; through talking about myself. I am NOT talking about the survivors’ sentiments on the bombings on behalf of them. NEITHER am I talking about the Japanese opinions as a delegate of Japan. I AM ME. Simply, as I am, I want to share with you what I have had in my own heart through my life.

The first story is about what comes to my heart when I think of “peace.”

When I was fifteen years old, my mother told me my grandmother had been exposed to radiation in Hiroshima after the bombing. Ok, so what? Even after that, I didn’t care the fact that my grandmother is a hibakusha. I thought of it as just a problem of science and technology, medicine, or politics. I also felt it really natural for Hiroshima people like me to have someone affected by the bombing in their families.

However, my feeling toward it gradually changed. Soon after I knew about my grandmother, I fell in love with a girl. She was not from Hiroshima but from other part
of Japan. We were travelling in a big group of students. In the group, there was a guy who was so interested in radiation that he was always measuring radiation intensity everywhere we went. When he was talking about radiation, I said to them by chance, “Actually my grand-ma is a hibakusha.” They, that girl and the radiation guy, got so surprised. Seeing a girl whom I loved so much getting that surprised made me realize for the first time that there was a world where living with a survivor was unnatural. I was so shocked.

I came back home with that shock still in mind. In a bookshelf of my house, I found a novel, “Black Rain.” The story is about a man, Mr. Shigematsu, who is struggling to prove that his niece Yasuko was not in the city at the time of the bombing. Every time Yasuko is proposed a marriage arrangement, every groom family declines to welcome her as a bride when they hear a rumor that Yasuko was A-bomb affected. One day, there proposed a really good arrangement, and Shigematsu makes all his efforts to prove Yasuko’s intactness. But she finally comes down with “A-bomb illness,” and the proposed match becomes broken off accordingly.

I got so frightened after reading the novel. I had never imagined this kind of social intolerance existed, and I feared that the same kind of thing might happen to me in the future. What would I do if the parents of my girlfriend say they don’t want to accept me as their daughter’s groom because I’m a grandson of a survivor? I felt so scary. Since then, I always have had this anxiety nagging in my heart.

Actually, there is an academic paper published in 2007 by a research center in Hiroshima. It says that when multifactorial diseases of the survivors’ children surveyed were combined, there was no evidence observed which statistically suggests increased risk associated with parental radiation exposure. But, I don’t necessarily think this paper easily changes people’s way of seeing hibakushas. Certainly, academic research is really important. It helps us humans search for agreeably objective truth by presenting a reliable hypothesis. However, for example, do smokers stop smoking because it is academically proved that it is bad for health? Do people drop all their prejudices and stop discriminating others because of some academic proof? I doubt that. How we deal with those researches is our own problem.

By thinking in this way through myself, my view on the atomic bombings and nuclear weapons decisively changed. I realized that dealing with the bombings and the
weapons was not only the matter of science and technology, medicine, or politics. It’s not the problem that should be dealt with only by scientists, doctors, or politicians. It’s not the problem of “others.” It is the problem of “us,” the whole humanity. The problem lies in how humanity tackles ALL the challenges that the weapons may pose, such as the social or cultural intolerance against hibakushas.

This is what comes up to me firstly, when I think of “peace.”

My second story is about talking about peace.

Seven years ago, soon after my mother told me about my grandmother, my high school teacher introduced me a student exchange program between Israel, Palestine, and Japan. The project was launched in that year to invite high school students from Israel, Palestine, and Japan to both Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the year of 60th anniversary of the bombings, and let the participants have dialogues toward “peace.” For me, welcoming the students to Hiroshima meant I needed to guide them as a Hiroshima local. I thought of the project as a valuable opportunity to consider how I should think of the fact that I was a grandson of a survivor. I decided to take part in it.

In the project, we talked about peace together while going to the memorial museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, listening to a hibakusha, and participating in the commemoration ceremonies. During the project, discussions on peace left me a strong impression. Some students from Israel thought of the meaning of peace as “security,” while some students from Palestine thought of it as “freedom.” There is a decisive difference between them. “Security” for one group is enhanced by several-hundred-mile-long physical separation walls that prevent “terrorist” suspects from coming into their land. On the other hand, “freedom” of those people who are suspected as “terrorists” is imperiled by the same walls. By using the same word “peace,” they were talking about the opposite things. There arose so furious a quarrel between the participants. Japanese staff couldn’t stop that.

Since then, every time I talk about peace with every person, I’ve got so surprised at how “peace” can be for each individual. Our definitions of “peace” naturally differ. Everyone in this world is a unique individual, and everyone looks through the lens of his/her own personality, background, and experiences. That’s why everyone thinks of the same word “peace” so differently.
If each of us tries to impose each definition of “peace” on others as the right definition, there may well be quarrels or conflicts. But, what if we admit every one of us is all looking at “peace” through the lens of each one’s own heart, and share what consists of those lenses? We would be able to deepen our understanding of “peace” through each other.

I do believe one of the most beautiful things about “peace” is that each individual thinks of “peace” differently. I love talking about “peace.” That’s what I have been looking forward to today. Now I’m speaking here in front of you, but I didn’t come here only to speak to you. Let me listen to you later, after all the speeches by all the presenters. I’m looking forward to knowing you, and your own view on peace.

At the last of my speech, I would like to thank my grandmother, my family, and my friends, all who have been supporting my peace journey in every possible way. And again, I would like to express my deep gratitude to the Coalition for Peace Action for giving me this valuable opportunity to be here as a speaker, and to you all for listening to me.

Thank you all very much.
Chapter 3. Discourses of Peace in Hiroshima

The landscape, Ingold (1993:156) argues, “is the world as it is known to those who dwell therein, who inhabit its places and journey along the paths connecting them.” Through utilizing the concept of “landscape,” as well as “silence” and a Foucauldian genealogical approach, the chapter 2 of this thesis explored how past discourses and practices that various actors related to the concept of peace are inscribed onto and excluded by the landscape of peace which my interlocutors dwell in. This chapter looks at how my interlocutors, who are dwellers and the main characters in their landscape of peace, are discursively engaged in dialogues with these past peace discourses and practices.

i. Concept: Discursive Engagements with Objects

The theory on landscape presented by Ingold (1993) intends to contextualize humans’ activities in the life-process of the world. This world consists not only of humans but also of nonhumans. Here, I find resonance between Ingold’s theory of landscape and Navaro-Yashin’s theoretical focus on nonhumans. Navaro-Yashin (2009) conducted an ethnographic fieldwork in Northern Cyprus, where Turkish-Cypriots refugees have lived with what Greek-Cypriots left after their displacement caused by the 1974 war and the subsequent partition of Cyprus, such as their lands, houses, and belongings. In this context, she explores the interrelationship between these dwellers of the Northern Cyprus, Turkish-Cypriots, and the objects that they appropriated, and/or between the subjectivity of the residents and the affect generated by these appropriated objects. Her materials call for an understanding of the network between people and objects “in historical contingency and political specificity” (2009:9) and an understanding of both the residents’ discursive engagements with the objects and the influences of objects on them.

Navaro-Yashin’s approach suggests that I should pay attention not only to who (humans) and what (nonhumans) participates in the course of my interlocutors’ actions of enacting peace and how, but also to how my interlocutors discursively engage with objects.
ii. Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace

Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace (called HIP; in Japanese, Heiwa no tame no Hiroshima Tsūyakusha Gurūpu) is a group of volunteers. This group is not a group registered or certified as a nonprofit organization based on the Law to Promote Specified Nonprofit Activities. In order to become a HIP member, an applicant only needs to submit an application form and pay annual membership fee (800 Japanese Yen, about 7 US dollars). There is no requirement of English ability. There are about 110 volunteer members\(^39\) registered in the organization.

Mission

Since HIP is not registered as a nonprofit organization, it does not have a clear mission statement. The website of the HIP states,

Regardless of their English fluency, each of the members aims to become a storyteller (kataribe) who passes on facts about Hiroshima.

According to Benjamin (1968:91-92), the storytelling “does not aim to convey the pure essence of the thing, like information or a report. It sinks the thing into the life of the storyteller, in order to bring it out of him again. Thus traces of the storyteller cling to the story the way the handprints of the potter cling to the clay vessel.” HIP members certainly have non-generic relationship with the objects that they explain about in their guided tours.

While HIP’s website expresses its mission in this way, how does each of the staff members and non-staff members recognize HIP’s mission?

\(^{39}\) Although the webpage of the organization which explains about HIP states that there are 110 members registered, the number of active members who attend monthly meetings or guide tourists changes from time to time. For example, Etsuko, a staff member who serves as one of the coordinators of English volunteer guide, tells me that she does not know the exact number of active members, but guesses that currently (as of April 2017) there are about 30 members who can guide tourists to Peace Memorial Park.
Kazuko, who is one of the founders of HIP and has been HIP’s president since the organization was formed in 1984, says, HIP’s mission at the time of the foundation was to “tell facts about Hiroshima to the world.” Sachiko, who has also been involved in the organization since its foundation and is currently a staff member, used the expression, “conveying Hiroshima’s spirit.” She said,

Conveying Hiroshima’s spirit has been the number one mission [of our organization], and it has not changed from the beginning. [...] I want everyone to know that the small bomb in terms of its impact [compared to the present nuclear weapons] caused those huge damages and I hope this leads to abolishment of nuclear weapons.

Other HIP members expressed HIP’s mission in different ways. A staff member Etsuko used the word “peace” and expressed that HIP is “a group which promotes foreign people’s understanding of peace.” One of the non-staff members, Akemi, also used the word “peace” and told me that she thinks that the HIP’s mission is “conveying messages of peace to the people from the world through guided tours.” Another staff member Tsutomu told me, “Simply put, [our mission is] guiding Hiroshima’s A-bomb damages or Hiroshima’s thoughts and, especially monuments for the English-speaking foreign visitors.” He also mentioned, “Simply speaking, by using English, I want to steadily tell English speakers the tragedy of Hiroshima, and the difference between the tragedy of the atomic bombing and peace afterwards. HIP is an organization which gives me such places and opportunities.” Another staff member Hiroshi emphasized on the importance of communicating to the tourists, listening to or knowing about tourists, and knowing about Hiroshima.

The most important thing is to communicate (hasshin suru to iukoto)\(^{40}\). Of course without English it’s impossible to communicate [to the non-

---

\(^{40}\) He used the word “hasshin suru to iukoto,” which I translated “to communicate.” The Japanese word “hasshin suru” is a verb which can be translated “convey” or
Japanese-speaking visitors], so communicating [in English] is very important. Communicating to people who visit Hiroshima, this is the most important activity of HIP. And we need to listen to the visitors as well as to communicate to them. It is a communication [between us and the visitors]. […] Then, when thinking about what we should communicate, we need to know about Hiroshima and, at the same time, about the visitors.

Some members stressed on the important role played by the president of the organization, Kazuko and the HIP’s thought that each member’s motivation is more important than their English ability. Yoshiko explained to me what Kazuko told her when she first became a member of HIP.

I still remember what Kazuko, who is playing an important role internationally, said to me at my first attendance of a regular meeting. “Even if you are not fluent in English, if you have a strong motivation, you can communicate with others.”

Junko explained to me that Kazuko is the core of the organization, which is formed by the members who are highly motivated to “pass on ‘Hiroshima’.” She told me,

There are few volunteer groups which have continued this long. People who gather have a genuine motivation to pass on ‘Hiroshima.’ Members change from time to time. During the 10 years of my membership, there have been ins and outs, but constantly there are this number of members. This is because those who have a genuine motivation to pass on ‘Hiroshima’ come to this organization. I admire Kazuko, who is the core “transmit.” However, there is no object in what he said. Thus I used “communicate” instead of “convey” or “transmit,” both of which are transitive verbs which need objects.
of the organization. She does not speak that much in regular meetings, but Kazuko has a strong motivation to pass on ‘Hiroshima.’ I think HIP is a group which thinks of the members’ motivations or passion as more important than their English abilities.

Junko further explained to me that HIP is an organization which thinks members’ motivation to pass on “Hiroshima” more important than their English fluency.

HIP is not the only organization engaging in communicating the Peace Memorial Park in English. For example, among Peace Volunteers⁴¹ there are some people who do so and there are other individuals who do so. […] Before, we watched a TV program about Kazuko’s husband⁴², and when I saw it, I realized, the origin of HIP is this person’s hope for telling Hiroshima by all means, and President Kazuko followed his hope and this is the core of the organization. Kazuko’s husband continued to transmit Hiroshima to the world by all means when there was nothing. I have never met him, but without him, this group wouldn’t have existed. […] And Kazuko has been engaging in activities with this hope in her mind. The other organizations do not have this hope. So, what we need to tell [to the members] and be faithful to is that fluency in English doesn’t matter and that if you have passion for conveying Hiroshima to the world by all means you can communicate [with the visitors]. Staff members value this very much. But in order to communicate accurately, gaining English fluency is really necessary. […] So the passion is the most

⁴¹ The Peace Memorial Museum recruits Peace Volunteers, who provide visitors to the museum with explanations about the showpieces and guide the tourists to the monuments in the Peace Memorial Park. While many of them provide explanations in Japanese, some of them can communicate in English.

⁴² NHK World, the international broadcasting service of NHK (Japan Broadcasting Corporation), Japan’s national public broadcasting organization, broadcasted in August 6, 2016, a program about how Kazuko’s husband conveyed Hiroshima to the world.
important, and then we need to polish [our English]. But English is not the priority.

History

HIP’s foundation was triggered by Kazuko, who has been the president of the organization. Kazuko’s husband, who worked for the Hiroshima city government and had an experience as the president of Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, died in 1979 at the age of 58. About six months after his death, his friend Robert Jungk, who was an Austrian journalist and writer, visited Hiroshima to talk about his opposition to nuclear power plants and suddenly called Kazuko and told her, “Become my interpreter.” Kazuko, who was working in her family as a housewife, suddenly became an interpreter at the age of 42. Since then, many people who visited Hiroshima started relying on her as their guide, interpreter, and liaison. In this process of being involved in many people’s visits to Hiroshima, Kazuko became interested in this kind of activities. Thus, in 1984, she started calling for founding a group which promotes its members to “study more about Hiroshima and become better guides.” Kazuko’s colleagues and students at the private English school in which she was teaching English agreed on her idea and about 20 people formed a group in November 1984. Kazuko’s friend who was working as a journalist in Chugoku Shimbun Newspaper company gave them an idea of the group’s name in English, “Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace.” Half a year later, the members decided the group’s Japanese name, “Heiwa no tame no Hiroshima Tsūyakusha Gurūpu” based on the English name.

The 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing (August 6, 1985) was approaching. Kazuko, who already had a four-year experience of guiding many people worldwide to Hiroshima, felt that many members did not know many things about Hiroshima. In order to promote the members’ understanding about Hiroshima, the group started making their reference book. In 1985, HIP published Hiroshima Handbook (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 1985). This book had a list of about 800 Japanese and English words related to Hiroshima, explanations of monuments in Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, and reviews of books related to Hiroshima. Since then, HIP has published many books not only for its members but also for other readers.
In 1990s, HIP started English guide of Peace Memorial Park. At first, Sachiko told me, when learning how to guide the park, each of the members studied how they should guide the tourists in each way. For example, some members relied on a book published by Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation, “Hiroshima Peace Reader” (Kosakai 1983). They were in need of a textbook about how to guide tourists to the Peace Memorial Park in English. In 1999, HIP published a small booklet, “A Guide to Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 1999). Even after this booklet was published, HIP continued developing a textbook of English guide of Peace Memorial Park, and in 2005, the year of the 60th anniversary of the atomic bombing, HIP published another book, “Hiroshima Peace Park Guide” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005). This book shows how to guide 21 monuments, buildings and objects around the Peace Memorial Park both in Japanese and in English.

Around 1998, HIP started holding regular meetings monthly. Until then, the group held ad-hoc meetings.

Since there were five hibakusha members in the organization in the past, when HIP members guided English-speaking tourists to Peace Memorial Park, the hibakushas sometimes talked about their experiences of the atomic bombing to the tourists. There are currently only two hibakusha members in the organization, but they sometimes offer English testimonies to HIP’s guests. In mid 1990s, HIP started holding an event of hibakushas’ testimony on the day of the Hiroshima atomic bombing, which has continued until today.

Since 2000, HIP has held another event in November. This event is for Japanese speakers who want to experience English guide of Hiroshima and Peace Memorial Park. HIP members teach attendees how to guide Hiroshima in English.

Activities

HIP’s current activities can be categorized into five categories. The group (1) holds monthly meetings for members, (2) offers guided tours of the Peace Memorial Park in English, (3) publishes books about Hiroshima, (4) holds hibakushas’ English testimony event on every August 6, and (5) holds a yearly event for Japanese speakers who want to learn how to guide Hiroshima in English.
Monthly Regular Meetings

HIP has held monthly regular meetings for members since around 1998. The meetings are also open to non-members. Speakers are invited to some meetings, in other meetings members conduct fieldworks, and in other occasions members hold discussions. Sometimes, members use the time of the meetings to prepare for their yearly events such as an event of hibakushas’ testimony in every August or an event about how to guide Hiroshima in English. For example, the schedule of 2016 monthly events are as follows:

January: Planning of HIP’s activities in 2016
February: “HIP’s Hiroshima Guide” publication party
March: Discussion about “HIP’s Hiroshima Guide”
April: Lecture by a poet, Arthur Binard
May: Lecture by a hibakusha, Mitsuo Kodama
June: Discussion about HIP’s English guide of Peace Memorial Park
July: Preparation for an event in August, hibakushas’ English testimony
August: Hibakushas’ English testimony
September: Showing of a TV program about Kazuko’s husband and Kazuko’s talk
October: Preparation for an event in November, “English Guide of Hiroshima”
December: Fieldwork of Peace Memorial Park

English Guided Tours of the Peace Memorial Park

HIP offers English guided tours of the Peace Memorial Park for the English-speaking tourists. The number of tours in a year varies, but for example, in 2016, HIP offered about 30 guided tours for tourists from all over the world. When applying for
HIP’s English guided tours, applicants need to fill in a Japanese application form on HIP’s website. Although applicants do not need to pay for the tours, HIP requires them to pay 1,000 Japanese yen (about 9 dollars) as a transportation fee for one English guide and another 1,000 Japanese yen as a donation to HIP. When private companies such as travel agencies apply for HIP’s guided tours, they are required to pay 3,000 Japanese yen as a donation to the organization instead of 1,000 yen. One volunteer guide can guide up to 10 tourists at the same time. Thus, for example, when a foreign college wants to ask HIP for an English guide of Peace Memorial Park for its 50 students, the college needs to pay 6,000 yen in total (5,000 yen as five HIP member’s transportation fee and 1,000 yen as a donation to HIP).

When there is an application for HIP’s English guide, three staff members who work as coordinators of guided tours inform HIP’s members of the date and time of the tour. The members who are willing to guide the tourists contact the coordinators, and the coordinators decide whom to ask for conducting the guided tour. The coordinators also ask HIP members to become an assistant to the guide. While a guide can obtain 1,000 yen transportation fee, there is no transportation fee paid for an assistant. HIP members who are still not confident to serve as guides become assistants in order to get trained. A guide decides in what order he or she guides the tourists to the monuments and takes charge of all the tour, and an assistant takes charge of explanation of one or several monuments from the monuments that a guide chooses. There is no qualification for becoming a guide, so whenever a member is confident to be a guide, he or she can volunteer as a guide. It is also possible for two people to become a pair and take charge of one group of guests without an assistant.

Applicants normally ask for a two-or-three-hour guided tour of Peace Memorial Park and Peace Memorial Museum or a one-hour guided tour of Peace Memorial Park. While guides take the tourists to the museum when the tourists ask for

---

Currently there is no English application form. This is because the staff members want a Japanese liaison or coordinator whom HIP’s staff members can contact when in need or when the applicants do not show up. Also, if there is an English application form, it is expected that the number of applicants rises to the extent that HIP cannot handle.
it, they just answer questions of the tourists without offering detailed explanations of the showpieces in the museum since all the panels and showpieces have English explanations. Guides and assistants give detailed explanations of monuments, buildings and other objects in Peace Memorial Park.

Each guide decides how to guide the park. In the stage of training as assistants, a majority of members memorize the explanations of the monuments, buildings, and objects in the park presented in HIP’s “Hiroshima Peace Park Guide” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005). While they explain about the monuments solely based on what they memorized from the textbook at first, in the process of training as assistants, many people start using their own expressions instead of the sentences in the textbook and make a folder of photos and explanations which they show to the tourists. In my case, I worked as an assistant three times and later as a guide three times. At first, I prepared for the tour only by memorizing what is written in the textbook. However, in the second and third time I worked as an assistant, I saw the guides using folders of photos, pictures and maps when they explained about the monuments. Thus I started making my own folder of photos, pictures and maps which help my guests understand my explanations easily (Figure 3-1).

![My folder of photos, pictures, maps and explanations. Photo by author.](image)
Each of the members puts many efforts to learn how to guide their guests. Hiroshi told me that he started preparing for his first guided tour by memorizing the textbook. However, he realized that if he relied too much on what he memorized, sometimes his mind went blank. So he started paraphrasing the sentences in the textbook in his own way.

Akemi, a non-staff member, memorized the textbook by reading the sentences aloud 30 to 40 times every day. Although she is very fluent in English, it took so much time and many efforts for her to master the textbook. Since she felt that many HIP members had difficulty in learning how to guide the park and becoming guides, in cooperation with the staff, she started holding study sessions for those who want to learn how to guide the park after monthly regular meetings. From her experience as a guide (she guided the guests as a guide eight times until January 2017), she advised that everyone should first memorize the textbook by reading the sentences aloud many times. She told me, only through memorizing the textbook completely, guides could be confident and could start paraphrasing the sentences in a way that each of the guides could feel comfortable and adding or reducing information to their explanations.

This difficulty of memorizing the textbook illustrates the difficulty of learning and embodying the sentences that are based on “facts.” As I pointed out in Chapter 2, I experienced a dilemma. Although I have a non-generic, specific relationship with each of the objects in the park, I felt I needed to explain about “facts” that are acceptable for my guests. Otherwise, I felt, my guests would not qualify me as a trustable, impartial guide. However, actually, many experienced guides do not only rely on the sentences in the textbook. Although their explanations are mainly based on the textbook, they sometimes narrate their specific relationship to the objects that they are explaining.

For example, when I took my guests to the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound and explained about the existence of makeshift crematoria all around the city, as I showed in the vignette of my guided tour, I always talked about my great-grandfather, who came to Hiroshima as a volunteer fire fighter to cremate the dead bodies of the A-bomb victims.

Let me take another instance. Tsutomu told me that he is deeply attached to the A-bomb Dome. When I asked how he explains about the dome to his guests, he told me,
In the part of the city which was very prosperous, in the busiest
downtown, the most gorgeous building was damaged and was ruined and
only the current wreckage was left. When people looked [in the direction
of the dome] from afar like the Hiroshima station, this was the only
building remained standing. The building that was ruined remained
standing. I feel this has an impact [on my guests]. I explain in this way.

Also, as I explained in Chapter 2, when Noriko explains about the hypocenter
and Shima Hospital, she talks about her aunt who was working as a student nurse in the
hospital.

Some guides emphasized on the importance of being attentive to guests’
reactions. Junko first began preparing for becoming a guide by completely memorizing
the textbook. However, as she experienced more tours as a guide, she started feeling that
each monument has its story. According to those stories, she started collecting photos,
pictures, etc. which help her guests understand her explanations and put them into a
folder. As she got accustomed, her tours became more participatory and flexible. She
asks questions to the guests while explaining about the monuments, and in accordance
with the guests’ reactions, she changes her explanations.

Etsuko, who showed me how she guided the park as a guide when I served as
her assistant, told me, “It is important to look at the guests’ facial expressions and
reactions [when guiding them].” Noriko, a non-staff member who had experience as a
guide 10 times as of January 2017, emphasized on the importance of listening to the
guests’ questions. “Our guests ask us a variety of questions. Through their questions, we
can know what they want to know. So I incorporate them [the previous questions] into
my explanations.” In my case, when I guided a group of college students as their guide,
the students asked me such questions as the aftereffects of radiation, the size of the area
damaged by the bomb, and why the US chose Hiroshima and Nagasaki as the targets of
its atomic bombings.

Then, why is it important for HIP members to guide the tourists to the
monuments, buildings and other objects in the Peace Memorial Park? A staff member
Sachiko told me that guiding the tourists to the Peace Memorial Park is linked to HIP’s
mission, “conveying Hiroshima’s spirit.” She expects that the tourists can feel
peacefulness of the present era and understand the importance of peace by knowing about Hiroshima through the guided tours. “As an expectation, I hope that they [HIP’s guests] feel peace of the present era.” “I hope that by seeing and hearing the past and present situation of Hiroshima through HIP’s guided tours, the listeners understand the importance of peace.”

Yoshiko, another staff member, explained about the importance of guiding the tourists to the monuments in the following way.

Each of the monuments is based on thoughts of those who passed away, their bereaved families, and those who are still suffering. […] So through the monuments, I want to tell that [to my guests].

She also mentioned,

The guides’ role is to tell what actually happened in Hiroshima to as many people as possible […]. My motivation is to tell how horrible wars are and how important peace is to as many people as possible.

Also, as I already wrote above, another HIP member Akemi told me that through guided tours, HIP members convey “messages of peace to the people from the world.”

However, some members emphasized, HIP guides should not talk about their personal thoughts or feelings about Hiroshima or peace to the tourists. They strongly

44 When I asked what she can personally do for peace, Sachiko explained to me about another activity that she has been engaging in as well as HIP’s activities. She has been volunteering in an activity of recitation of A-bomb memoirs and poems in Japanese. Through listening to the memoirs and poems, she thinks, the listeners feel importance of present peace. This illustrates that through activities that she relates to peace such as HIP’s English guided tours and recitation of A-bomb memoirs and poems in Japanese, she expects that her English-speaking guests of the guided tours and Japanese-speaking listeners of A-bomb memoirs and poems can feel how important the present peaceful situation is.
argued that the guides should inform the guests basically only of “facts” about the Hiroshima atomic bombing. A non-staff member and hibakusha, Isamu told me that guides should only tell the “facts” about the Hiroshima atomic bombing without explaining about their personal feelings or thoughts.

The basic is to tell the facts. [...] Without telling personal feelings. We should guide [tourists] based on the facts. We don’t know whether our personal feelings and personal thoughts are correct or not.

Junko told me that although she sometimes talked about her personal thoughts when guests started talking about various topics, she did not want to impose her personal thoughts on her guests and just explained the “facts” about the damages of the atomic bombing.

Why we guide [tourists] to the monuments is, first of all, because people who want to know [about the monuments] come, so we guide them. This is the simple reason. Many people come here because they are interested in Hiroshima, and they say they want to take part in a monument tour. [...] So when guiding them to the monuments, I don’t include my feelings [in my explanations], I tell facts without attachment. When we start discussing various topics, I start talking about my private things. [...] So when guiding, I tell the facts at all events. So I never want to impose my thoughts onto them. What they think depends on their upbringings. Before, I said I didn’t say this sentence45, but we don’t know whether [the sentence] ‘these words express this thought of ours’ is true or not. So I only tell the words [English translation of the inscription] and what they feel is up to them. [...] I think if they look at it

45 In a study session about how to explain about the cenotaph in January 2017, she told other HIP members including me that in her guided tours, she did not use the sentence, “It is our hope that people everywhere will come to embrace the spirit of these words [note: the inscription on the cenotaph]” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005:22).
[the English translation of the inscription] and it stays with them, that’s enough. I rarely say this is our thought so please bring this message back to our country. But, for example, at the Atomic Bomb Memorial Mound, I sometimes say that though there are many monuments in the Peace Park, if I am asked to guide you to only one monument, I guide you to this monument. I tell some people such a thought, but I think saying we put this hope into these words so please bring it back is too officious, so I don’t want to say that that much. […] The main objective of their visits is not to study about peace. [A monument tour] is just one piece of their travels.

Also, Akemi thinks that guides should tell the “facts” verified officially.

What we need to be careful about is that [our explanations] expand more and more, and some of the facts are not verified by the Hiroshima city government. […] Now that the Internet is very developed, there are many interesting stories that we can find, so many guides put into their explanations what they pick up or what they read casually. You really have to be careful. You have to tell only the facts verified officially.

Another member, Hiroshi, also emphasized on the importance of telling the “facts,” but his meaning of “facts” differs from Isamu’s, Junko’s, and Akemi’s. Hiroshi told me,

We shouldn’t say ‘peace,’ but should tell the facts. How horrible wars are. Wars are like this. […] America is a country which invented nuclear weapons, so there are many hidden hibakushas [in America]. Including soldiers. There are harms of uranium mines. […] If I say things including such a thing [existence of hidden hibakushas], then this somehow leads Americans to realize, the A-bomb is not just an issue in Japan but even in their country there are many victims of radiation. And then [talking about the A-bomb] is also linked to nuclear power plants. A-bombs are related
to nuclear power plants. So talking about the A-bomb is not [talking
about] the things in the past. I give [the tourists] such an explanation [an
explanation that talking about the A-bomb is not talking about the things
in the past], and say that the present power plants that are called peaceful
use of nuclear energy are also based on the same principle, nuclear
energy, and that there are effects of radiation so there needs to be
workers who are exposed to radiation, and that if an accident happens –
you can understand this if you see the accident in Fukushima – it affects
the world. Since it has a global effect, many people become conscious
that it is a global issue. Without our explanations. Those who can
understand. If we tell the facts, then they realize that their countries have
nuclear power plants. […] Telling the facts. I think this is my role.

Telling the “facts” for Hiroshi means explaining not only about the damages of the
Hiroshima atomic bombing but also about global existence of victims of radiation and
the link between the A-bomb and nuclear power plants, which enables tourists to realize
that the issue of the A-bomb is linked to issues in other (especially their own) countries.

On the other hand, a HIP member Noriko told me that guides should tell not
only the “facts” written in the textbook but also “internal things.” She told me, “Just
reading the textbook is not interesting. We should tell internal things.” Then, what are
“internal things”? She answered, “How you are related [to the objects in the park]. For
example, at Shima Hospital46, [I explain about] my family’s history and how my family
is related to this hospital.” As I explained in Chapter 2, Noriko’s aunt was working in
Shima Hospital as a student nurse and was killed by the bomb. Noriko speaks about her
aunt in order not to waste her aunt’s death.

In this way, through taking tourists to each of the objects and providing them
with explanations which they sift through by reading the HIP’s textbook, studying by

46 Shima Hospital is a hospital which was/is located just below the hypocenter.
Noriko’s aunt was working at Shima Hospital as a student nurse at the time of the
bombing.
themselves, and listening to their guests, HIP guides mediate relationship between their
guests and the objects. Although some members emphasize on the importance of telling
“facts,” the meanings of “facts” differ from person to person. Additionally, some of the
guides explain about their specific, non-generic relationship to the objects. Furthermore,
although guides are de facto required take their guests to some of the objects (such as
the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims, A-bomb Dome, and Children’s Peace
Monument), which objects they choose to take their guests to and in which order they
take their guests to the monuments are up to each guide. Also, each guide has their own
folder of materials – maps, pictures, explanations – that they show to their guests when
explaining about the objects in the Peace Memorial Park. Thus, as Benjamin (1968)
points out, traces of each guide (storyteller) cling to their explanations. Some objects
such as the A-bomb Dome powerfully exude affect of the tourists even without guides’
explanations. However, it is difficult for many other abstract objects which are
discursively qualified to a significant extent to evoke tourists’ thoughts and feelings.
Each guide’s explanations discursively qualify these objects. The objects themselves
and guides’ discursive qualification of them represent, for example, the damages of the
atomic bombing, those whom the objects commemorate, those who built the objects, the
reality of global existence of victims of radiation, the issue of nuclear power plants, etc.,
which evoke tourists’ thoughts and feelings. While what each guide explains varies,
through my interviews and participant observation, I found that none of my
interlocutors belonging to HIP thought that their role was to talk directly about “peace.”
I analyze how each of the members think about the concept peace in the below section
which deals with my interviews with them.

Publication of Books

As I already explained, HIP has published many books. Some of them were
first made for the members, but later revised for the wider readership. Also, Kazuko told
me, HIP’s books were at first very academic, but recently HIP has published books for
wider readership who are interested in Hiroshima.

First, in 1985, less than a year after its foundation, HIP published Hiroshima
Handbook (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 1985) for the purpose of promoting
members’ understanding about Hiroshima. This book sold nationwide, and, Kazuko
thinks back, many interpreters at the international conferences about Hiroshima or nuclear weapons relied on this book. Since many readers asked HIP for revising the book, 10 years later, in 1995, HIP published a revised version of Hiroshima Handbook (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 1995[1985]).

HIP has also published books about English guide of Peace Memorial Park and of Hiroshima. In 1999, members made a leaflet, “A Guide to Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park” in order for them to study about how to guide Peace Memorial Park in English (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 1999). This leaflet was revised by members and many cooperators and the revised version was published in 2005 as “Hiroshima Peace Park Guide” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2005). Kazuko explained to me that the members’ hope was to enable the general people to become guides through this book. As I explained in the previous section, almost all of the current HIP members read this revised version as their textbook in order to learn how to guide the English-speaking guests. In 2016, during my fieldwork, HIP published “HIP’s Hiroshima Guide” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2016) for readers who are interested in guiding English speakers to Hiroshima. This book was one of the best sellers in several bookstores in Hiroshima.

Hibakusha’s English Testimonies on August 6

Since mid-1990s, HIP has held an event of hibakushas’ English testimony on the day of the Hiroshima atomic bombing, August 6. Although there are many visitors to Hiroshima on the day of the atomic bombing, no opportunity to listen to hibakushas’ live testimonies in English has been available except for this event. Recently, HIP has held the event in cooperation with the city government in the Peace Memorial Park. The event is usually scheduled soon after the Peace Memorial Ceremony.

Isamu, who is an in-utero hibakusha and a non-staff HIP member, has been giving his testimony in English in this event since 2015. In his testimony, he talked

47 In-utero hibakushas are those who were exposed to the radiation of the bomb in their mothers’ wombs. There are 7155 in-utero hibakushas registered as hibakushas by the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare as of March 2017, according to the ministry’s webpage on the number of hibakushas. Among them, those whose embryonic ages are
about himself and his family members, especially his father and elder sister whose bodies were not found and his mother who was exposed to the bomb 3.8 km away from the hypocenter and went into the city from the next day for about a month to search for her husband and daughter. He told me,

I want them [foreign visitors] to know the facts. Most people don’t know in-utero exposure to the A-bomb. […] Even after more than 70 years have passed, there are in-utero hibakushas. There are people who are still suffering.

He also told me that he wanted to talk about his and his family’s experience only to the foreigners.

If the listeners are not foreigners, I don’t want to talk about my experience. I can talk about my A-bomb experience and the story of my family because the listeners are foreigners. I don’t want to talk about it to my friends and acquaintances in Japan. This is because when I talk about it, they start feeling I am playing the victim though I receive benefits and my medical expenses are free because I have an A-bomb Health Book. I know they think in this way even when they don’t say that. Since I find it unpleasant, I don’t explain about or tell [my and my family’s experience].

When I asked him what he expects the listeners, he answered,

_____________________________________

less than 16 weeks at the time of the bombing were comparatively likely to become ill with microcephaly. Circumference of the microcephaly patients’ heads are less than a half of the circumference of the normal people’s heads. Although Isamu’s embryonic age at the time of the bombing was two months, fortunately, Isamu is not a patient of microcephaly.
I don’t have any expectations. I think it better for them to listen to my poor English and freely feel anything. Since I am not an academic but just an old man who got exposed to the bomb in my mother’s womb. Of course I say that wars are wrong, that [the world] must be peaceful, and that A-bombs are wrong, but I don’t want to say any more thoughts than that.

Kazuko, HIP’s president, is a hibakusha who experienced the bombing in a town in Hiroshima city (2.4 km away from the hypocenter) at the age of 8. In my interview, she emphasized on her role as a “witness” who tells the “facts” about Hiroshima, which motivate the listeners.

To begin with, I am a witness. Soon I will become 80 years old. Since lives are limited, I want to motivate people as much as possible. […] Those who come to Hiroshima get to know the reality, the facts. And those who know the facts have responsibility. When you know [the facts], you cannot be silent. Seeing [Hiroshima] leads you to do something. Knowing [facts about Hiroshima] enables you to do something. When I didn’t know that much I didn’t do anything, but when you know [the facts about Hiroshima], you get involved. You can’t escape from them. I think this is the responsibility. It does not mean that you are forced to take the responsibility, but you are motivated to do something. I want especially American youths to get motivated, because America is a nuclear power. I want them to understand their present situation. I think of Hiroshima as a place where you think about who you are. So anyone including Obama hears their own heart. I think that thinking in Hiroshima means asking yourself who you are, what you have done, and what you can do from now on.

As is pointed out by Agamben (1999[1998]), it is impossible for any witnesses to bear testimony about those who have become nonhumans in Nazi’s concentration camps (the Muselman). Likewise, it is certainly impossible for any witnesses to bear
testimony to, for example, those who were instantly killed by the A-bomb. However, as
the example of Kazuko shows, witnesses of the Hiroshima atomic bombing are not
trying to bear testimony to the others, especially those who were instantly killed by the
bomb or anyone else who suffered from the atomic bombing. They are witnesses to their
own experience of the atomic bombing. In their testimonies, they try to convey “facts” –
their own experience.

Below in this chapter, in analyses of what each of my interlocutors enacts in
their activities in HIP, I analyze how their thoughts on peace is related to their activity
of giving testimonies.

Yearly Event on How to Guide Hiroshima in English

Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation, a public organization which was founded
by the Hiroshima city government and administers and manages the Hiroshima Peace
Memorial Museum and the International Conference Center Hiroshima, has been
organizing a yearly international festival in November since 2000. Since this year, HIP
has been participating in this festival as one of the international organizations in
Hiroshima and holding an event for Japanese speakers who want to learn how to guide
Hiroshima and Peace Memorial Park in English. HIP members teach attendees how to
guide Hiroshima in English based on a special leaflet made for this event. For example,
in November 2015, HIP members taught the attendees how to explain about Hiroshima,
Shukkeien garden, Miyajima, and the Cenotaph for the A-bomb Victims. Based on the
leaflets that HIP had made for this event for more than a decade, in January 2016, HIP
published “HIP’s Hiroshima Guide” (Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace 2016).

Interviews with 10 HIP Members

I conducted one-to-two-hour semi-structured interviews with ten HIP members
(guides and hibakushas) in order to contextually understand their understandings of the
concept peace, which is hidden under the predominantly foregrounded concept peace.

Guides

In my interviews, I asked each of the eight guides (Sachiko, Hiroshi, Junko,
Etsuko, Yoshiko, Tsutomu, Noriko, and Akemi) how they make sense of the concept
peace. Akemi did not give me a clear definition, but all the others answered how they personally define peace. For example, Etsuko thinks peace means a normal life without wars. “Peace… I think [it means] absence of wars. I think ordinary daily lives are peace. Normal life.” In Etsuko’s expression, “normality” of the daily lives without wars is stressed. She thinks of her present-day life as normal and peaceful and the past lives of people in Hiroshima during the war as opposite to normal and peaceful.

On one hand, some of my interlocutors’ understandings of peace are counterposed to their understandings of what happened in Hiroshima. For example, Sachiko associates the present situation of Hiroshima with her personal understanding of peace (the situation in which people are able to live a normal life), and counterposes it to the past situation of A-bombed Hiroshima. She explained to me,

It is said that the antonym of peace is war, but I don’t think it is necessarily so. So, I personally think, without calmness in our minds, we cannot think of creating peace or doing something for peace. […] Being able to eat normally and live, this I personally think is a foundation or a basis on which we can think about peace.

She also mentioned, “I think it can be said that being able to live a normal life is peace. The peaceful state means being able to live a natural life given [to us] as humans.” Furthermore, she explained to me that she expected the tourists to feel peacefulness of the present era and understand the importance of peace by knowing about Hiroshima through guided tours. “As an expectation, I hope that they [HIP’s guests] feel peace of the present era.” “I hope that by seeing and hearing the past and present situation of Hiroshima through HIP’s guided tours, the listeners understand the importance of peace.”

Junko came to understand peace as being able to live normally through his father’s and his uncle’s experiences. During the war, her father’s father (Junko’s grandfather) passed away, so Junko’s father’s family was very poor and always in need of food. He often told Junko about his experience of the US air raids in Kure city, which is a city in which Junko was born and grew up, a city about 20 km south east of Hiroshima city. Also, her uncle, who went into the A-bombed Hiroshima half a day after
the bombing, told her what he experienced in Hiroshima. Junko realized that everyone experienced hardships and that if the war had not happened, they had not need to go through such hardships. This made her interested in doing something for “peace.” For Junko, peace means being able to live normally. “Peace is being able to live normally.” What does “being able to live normally” mean? Junko told me, “Being able to wake up in the morning and sleep at night normally. Because we don’t think we might die today. Being able to naturally think tomorrow is coming. Peace is being able to wake up normally, eat meals, and study.”

Let me take another example. Yoshiko, who moved from eastern part of Japan to a city near from Hiroshima about 30 years ago and thus knew only little about the Hiroshima atomic bombing, told me that participating in HIP’s activities changed her thought on peace.

Probably [through participation in HIP’s activities] I came to think about peace more. Of course there were occasions when I thought about peace in the past, but the biggest change is that I came to feel the importance of peace. […] When I feel the horror of the A-bomb, I came to strongly feel the importance of peace after I participated in HIP.

Yoshiko personally thinks that peace means people’s or humanity’s happiness. “[Peace means] people’s, humanity’s happiness. I hope all the humanity can feel happy without exception. This might be difficult, but I think [peace means that] people feel happy.” Peace in the name of the organization means, for her, HIP’s sense of duty to tell peace.

I think people who want to know about peace and come to Hiroshima have a hope for peace. Hiroshimans’ sense of duty to tell these people peace or the necessity to maintain peace, through the Peace Park and the museum. A sense of duty to have visitors see and feel [what actually happened in Hiroshima] and tell them [peace].
On the other hand, other guides’ definitions of peace were applicable beyond the context of Hiroshima. For example, Tsutomu thinks of peace as absence of conflicts. When I asked him what peace means, he answered,

Absence of conflicts (arasoi)

Absence of conflicts (arasoi)\(^48\). There are many kinds of peace. A family’s peace, Japan’s peace, world peace. But at any level, I think, absence of conflicts is peace.

In the context of Hiroshima, he agrees with what he thinks peace means for Hiroshimans – absence of wars and nuclear weapons. To my question about what peace means for Hiroshimans, he answered,

[Hiroshima] went through the powerful atomic bombing. So [in Hiroshima, peace means] absence of wars. For Hiroshimans, wars are associated with A-bombs and nuclear weapons. So absence of these is peace for Hiroshimans.

Furthermore, answering my question of what he thinks of “Hiroshimans’ idea of peace,” through identifying himself with Hiroshimans, he added,

Hiroshima is the first city on which the A-bomb, the nuclear weapon was used, so this meaning of peace is really important. Because we know about a war that is deeply linked to nuclear weapons, about nuclear weapons, and about their damages, this [the meaning of peace for Hiroshimans that I mentioned] is very important. Hiroshimans have emotional attachment for peace. [If a nuclear weapon is used,] everything disappears in a moment.

\(^48\) The Japanese word arasoi can be translated as conflicts, quarrels, fights, battles, or disputes. Since he uses this word in the contexts of families, Japan, and the world, I translated this word as conflicts here.
Also, as a HIP member, he thinks of peace as opposite of A-bombs and wars.

A-bombs are equal to an evil, so we perceive peace as an opposite of them. Wars are wrong, and an opposite of wars is peace. HIP says peace in this meaning. Peace at HIP is peace confronted with the A-bomb damages.

As the example of Tsutomu illustrates, some of the guides gave me different definitions of peace in different contexts. Let me take another example. Sachiko, who thinks of peace as being able to live a normal life as I already explained above, told me that “P(ace)” in the name of the organization (HIP) means abolishment of nuclear weapons. When I asked about the meaning of “peace” in the name of the organization, she explained to me, “I think HIP has a goal of abolishing nuclear weapons. […] [Monuments and other objects in HIP’s] guided tours and showpieces in the museum convey such messages. We say ‘conveying Hiroshima’s spirit’, but I think this [guiding the tourists to the objects in the park and the showpieces in the museum which call for abolishment of nuclear weapons] is what ‘conveying Hiroshima’s spirit’ means.”

“Through communicating with the foreigners who visit Hiroshima, we call for abolishment of nuclear weapons.”

Also, although she did not give me a clear explanation of how she personally makes sense of the concept peace, when I asked about a meaning of peace in the context of Hiroshima, Akemi told me, “I think [Hiroshima is] a place which knows the reality of A-bombs more than any other places in the world. I think everyone basically thinks that this tragedy of the nuclear weapon should not be repeated.”

Furthermore, on one hand, some guides are sympathetic to how they think Hiroshimans think about peace. For example, as I explained above, Tsutomu identified himself with Hiroshimans and said, “Hiroshimans have emotional attachment for peace.” Also, Yoshiko thinks, “Because Hiroshima is one of the only places on which A-bombs were dropped, so after I joined HIP, I think more strongly that people in Hiroshima hope for a world without wars, or a world without nuclear weapons.” I asked how she thinks of how people in Hiroshima think about peace, and she answered,
I have the same feeling with people in Hiroshima. I feel, oh, everyone might think this way. There might be people who think in different ways, but I think people in Hiroshima think of peace as a world without wars, a world without nuclear weapons. I have the same feeling.

On the other hand, other guides show their opposition to what they think Hiroshimans think of peace. Noriko, for example, told me,

Hiroshima always says a world without nuclear weapons or things related to nuclear weapons, but absence of nuclear weapons is not the only thing that is important. I think [peace is] absence of wars. The world without wars.

Furthremore, Hiroshi fiercely criticized the usage of the word peace in Hiroshima. He thinks that peace means absence of wars. When I asked about the meaning of the word peace, he answered, “Simply, absence of wars. Wars are humans’ killing each other. […] In short, peace is an antonym of war.” He told me that he felt uncomfortable with careless usage of the word peace in Hiroshima, because Hiroshima uses peace as its big draw and a means of business, careless usage of the word peace in Hiroshima lacks understandings of wars in general and especially the was Japan waged, and peace is the word that people usually do not use and thus came down from above.

[In Hiroshima,] the word peace is used as opposition to the Hiroshima atomic bombing. […] I don’t like the word ‘peace city.’ What is ‘peace city’? Hiroshima uses peace as its big draw in a sense. I don’t think it’s good. Because the A-bomb was dropped, [Hiroshima] says peace thinking that A-bombs are wrong. Peace here means the world where no A-bombs are used and there are no hibakushas or nuclear weapons. This is the meaning of peace in Hiroshima. […] I can accept and appreciate people’s hope for peace [that is put into the word peace], but […] before the A-bomb was dropped, Hiroshima was a military city. And we have a
history of colonization. I wonder what peace is – we say peace based only on the fact that the bomb was accidentally dropped – and whether we reflect on our past. […] [In Hiroshima,] peace functions as a kind of brand. […] Hiroshima uses [the word] peace as a means of business. […] If we say peace, do we know about the wars Japan waged? Do we reflect on them? It is necessary [to know about the wars Japan waged and reflect on them]. Peace is the opposite of war. Do we know about wars? Did Japan engage wars? Yes it did. Hiroshima was a strategic foothold. The National Diet was located [in Hiroshima] in the past, and from here, Ujina port, Japan invaded [other countries]. We need to reflect on this. So with regard to peace that is carelessly mentioned, I want to say, what is peace?

Hiroshi further mentioned,

My mother is a hibakusha, but at the time of the war, she felt relieved at the end of the war. […] In short, though the pika⁴⁹ was dropped and they were exposed to the bomb, many people don’t use the word peace. […] So, the word peace is a word that came down from above.

Although Hiroshi uses the concept peace to understand the atomic bombing, he criticizes the hegemonic narrative of peace which links the atomic bombing with the concept peace because the usage of the concept peace – meaning absence of wars for him – requires the users of the concept peace to reflect on the wars that Japan waged.

Although many of my interlocutors counterpose their understandings of peace to the atomic bombing, there are a variety of understandings of peace. The foregrounded concept peace, which is not clearly defined, enables people who have different ideas on

---

⁴⁹ Hiroshi used the word pika to refer to the A-bomb. The A-bomb is also colloquially called pikadon or pika. Pika is a mimetic word that describes the flash of the A-bomb, and don is an onomatopoeia that mimics the sound of the explosion of the A-bomb.
peace to gather in one group, but at the same time, it silences their understandings of the concept peace.

_Hibakushas_

Two of my interlocutors at HIP are _hibakushas_ who share their testimonies with HIP’s guests. Both of Kazuko and Isamu put emphasis on telling the “facts” in their testimonies. Although their hope for, or understanding of, peace lies in a backdrop of each of their testimonies, they do not directly say the word peace or express the way in which they understand peace. Like many of the HIP guides, their understandings of peace is counterposed to their understanding about what happened in Hiroshima.

Kazuko thinks of peace as being alive, and counterposes her understanding of peace to her understanding of wars, which easily cause deaths. Isamu thinks peace means being able to live a daily life calmly, and counterposes peace to A-bombs and wars which can culminate in atomic bombings.

Kazuko talked to me about the meaning of “peace” in the name of the organization. “Peace” in the name “Hiroshima Interpreters for Peace” means getting rid of the “borders in the world,” which necessitates overcoming of language barriers and conveying facts to the people all around the world face to face. She said,

Peace is not accomplished if there are borders (kiwa) in the world. In sum, the idea is that a genuine peace means getting rid of “inter” (sai) of “international” (kokusai)\(^50\). Under the nuclear weapons, there is no distinction between friends and enemies, and everyone is subject to the same fate. Thus we need to think [about the world] on a worldwide scale. When we think [about the world] on a worldwide level, we need to get rid of language barriers. […] I say that when you look up words in a dictionary, you should think studying English is engaging in peace

\(^{50}\) The Japanese word _kokusai_ (international) consists of two _kanjis_ (Chinese characters). _Koku_ means states, nations, or countries, and _sai_ means relationship (or borders, occasions). The _kanji_ for _sai_ is also read “kiwa,” by which she meant borders.
activities, because peace spreads to the world through the words you choose. […] It is also important to convey [facts] face to face. So both of them [getting rid of the language barriers and conveying facts face to face] [are important].

I asked meanings of peace for Kazuko herself.

Peace? That is to be alive. Opposite to death. And wars mercilessly deprive us of the things that we love in front of us. Opposite to being alive. Wars easily cause deaths, and we need to fight with deaths and what causes deaths in order to be alive. So, to begin with, peace is […] to celebrate the difference between each different cultures and to live together based on an idea that all the world is one country.

Isamu thinks of peace as being able to live a daily life calmly. “Peace. I think being able to live a daily life calmly is peace.” He considers that HIP’s peace is inclusive. “I think positively about it [HIP’s peace], it has a global meaning. Inclusive.” “Inclusive means, [HIP’s peace] includes peace in a family, peace in one's heart, peace in the world, peace of the humanity. I think we can conceive it in a broad meaning.” Isamu explained to me that his idea of peace overlaps with HIP’s idea of peace in the following way.

HIP basically thinks that the A-bomb was dropped in Hiroshima, that Hiroshima had such a terrible experience, and that this kind of things should not happen again in the whole world. HIP has the theme of peace in this meaning. So peace at the personal level [being able to live a daily life calmly] [is linked to] wars, basically. If we wage wars, eventually this kind of things happen.

iii. Asian Network of Trust Hiroshima

Asian Network of Trust Hiroshima (called ANT-Hiroshima or ANT) is a certified nonprofit organization based on the Law to Promote Specified Nonprofit
Activities. Based on the articles of organization, the full members who pays the yearly full membership fee are considered as partners (shain) who are entitled to vote in the yearly general meetings. There are currently (as of June 2017) eight executives (yakuin) in the organization, one of whom is an auditor (kanji) and the remaining seven of whom are directors (riji). One of the seven directors (Tomoko) serves as the executive director (rijichō). There are also three staff members and one intern who regularly work in ANT’s office as of June 2017.

Mission

As a certified nonprofit organization, ANT-Hiroshima has a mission statement. The Article 3 of the articles of organization states,

This organization aims at contributing to the world peace through cooperation with people and organizations in all the countries in the world including Asia by utilizing the experience of ‘Hiroshima’ on the basis of ‘friendship’ and ‘trust.’

This article was written when Tomoko and people involved developed the predecessor of the present organization, a private volunteer group named “Group of Hiroshima Citizens Joining Hands with Asian Friends (Ajia no tomo to te o tsunagu Hiroshima shimin no kai),” into the present organization, ANT-Hiroshima in 2004 and when ANT got certified as a nonprofit organization in 2007.

In addition, the present webpage of ANT titled “About Us” says,

The work of ANT-Hiroshima is motivated by Hiroshima's experience and memory as an A-bombed city. Like ants, we may have little power alone, but by working together with other organizations and individuals from across the world, we believe peace in the world can be achieved. With the message and spirit of Hiroshima in our hearts, we move forward in our efforts.
Tomoko told me that the mission of the organization has not changed since she established the predecessor of ANT, Group of Hiroshima Citizens Joining Hands with Asian Friends in 1989 and that as a result of clarification of the unclear mission of Group of Hiroshima Citizens Joining Hands with Asian Friends, the above ANT’s mission statements was formed.

Tomoko told me that what had triggered everything was her encounter with “Hiroshima” at the age of 20. “At the age of 20, I encountered ‘Hiroshima’ and continued thinking about meanings of ‘Hiroshima.’ The basis of this [mission statement] is what I put into my heart in that process. The biggest lesson I learned is what I learned from many hibakushas.” In 1973, when she was 20 years old, her grandfather passed away in front of her. The death of her grandfather made her think of her life and realize for the first time that she was born in Hiroshima and was living in Hiroshima as a daughter of hibakushas. In order to understand meanings of “Hiroshima,” she wrote a senior thesis on “Hiroshima” in 1976. Since then, she encountered many people including hibakushas and the professor who served as Tomoko’s advisor for her senior thesis. Tomoko also mentioned, “I think that [thinking about meanings of ‘Hiroshima’ and learning lessons from hibakushas] is probably the core [of the ANT’s mission]. So it [ANT’s mission] doesn’t shift. Or I should say, it cannot shift.”

Tomoko explained about ANT by using a metaphor of a single-trunk tree.

What is most important is roots. The roots are Hiroshima’s experience and my encounter with hibakushas. Thanks to many people, a small sapling grew up, and there are branches. When we look at branches, we think there are a variety of branches, but the trunk is single. The roots that support the trunk is the fact that I was born in Hiroshima, or I learned many things from Hiroshima, or to put it in another way, there is a word dotoku (土徳; blessing of land), the blessing of a land. This land brought me up. I think that’s it. This land of Hiroshima brought me up, and we have various branches. When I say I was brought up [by the land of Hiroshima], I have a deep sense of being brought up, and when I think back many hibakushas’ lives, A-bombs deprive humans of their dignity.
They don’t only inflict bodily injuries. I think I was born in Hiroshima in the process of them regaining their dignity through enormous efforts and sufferings. I was born at that time. While I was shown that, I learned the powerfulness and sorrow of them regaining their dignity, rather than the importance of dignity. My encounter with it was influential on me. And this is not only what happens in Hiroshima but very universal, in areas of conflicts in Africa or in Yugoslavia, everywhere, there are people who have that kind of feelings, there are some who are trampled on, and there are some who persist in even though they are trampled on. I think I can sympathize with them feeling that that’s the same [with Hiroshima].

Rie, ANT staff member, emphasized on Hiroshima as an engine of ANT’s activities.

I think the engine of ANT’s activities is what people in Hiroshima noticed or thought after going through the war or the atomic bombing. It is about how we should live as a human, or what we should value. It’s very simple, but a real starting point, so it is linked to all the activities [of ANT].

Although ANT’s former webpage titled “What is ANT-Hiroshima” said that their mission was to transmit “the message of peace from Hiroshima to the world,” Tomoko emphasizes that rather than transmitting some message and saying that this is a message from Hiroshima that should be respected, she thinks each person in the world can utilize Hiroshima’s experience.

My thought is that I want people to utilize Hiroshima’s experience, so I help, even a little, them make their efforts in their countries utilizing it. Please make your happier and better world at your land. I never think that this is a wonderful message from Hiroshima so please respect it. I want them to utilize it. Please utilize this and become happy in your countries.
History

When Tomoko’s children went to an elementary school in Hiroshima city, Tomoko was one of the Parent-Teacher Association members. There was a chōsen gakkō nearby, an elementary school that teaches Koreans in Japan being sponsored by North Korea. On the bridge near the both schools, school children from the both schools had a fight. Tomoko, in consultation with a (South) Korean student studying in Hiroshima, proposed to her children’s school that the school should hold an exchange meeting. Through an exchange meeting of both of the schools, children from the both schools became friends and there were no fights on the bridge any more. This incident triggered Tomoko’s interaction with Asian students studying in Hiroshima, and she started supporting these students personally.

One of the Korean students whom Tomoko took care of in Hiroshima contacted her after coming back to South Korea. There were five Korean painters who wanted to have an exhibit in Hiroshima. In order to support the exhibit, Tomoko and her friends founded a private organization, “Group of Hiroshima Citizens Joining Hands with Asian Friends” in 1989. The group welcomed not only these painters but also many visitors to Hiroshima.

In 2004, Group of Hiroshima Citizens Joining Hands with Asian Friends changed its name into Asian Network of Trust Hiroshima (ANT-Hiroshima) in order to express their original thought more symbolically and globally. In June 2007, ANT-Hiroshima became a certified nonprofit organization based on the Law to Promote Specified Nonprofit Activities.

Activities

ANT-Hiroshima and Tomoko think that Hiroshima’s mission consists of five parts: (a) “Conveying detailed information about the damage caused by the atomic bombing to people in Japan and around the world”; (b) “Advancing the goal of abolishing nuclear weapons from the earth”; (c) “Supporting peace-building activities in Japan and around the world”; (d) “Promoting peace culture and peace education”; and (e) “Nurturing peace workers in a range of locations and fields.”
In order to fulfill this five-fold mission, ANT conducts various activities. ANT categorizes their activities into the following four categories: (1) International Peace Activities; (2) International Cooperation Activities; (3) Educational Activities; and (4) Publicity and Educational Activities including Lectures.

International Peace Activities

In the category of “International Peace Activities,” there are seven projects.

(i) **Promotion of Picture books about Sadako Sasaki.** As I already explained in the chapter 2, Sadako Sasaki, at the age of 12, died of acute leukemia induced by her exposure to the A-bomb radiation. Her classmates and many other Hiroshiman school children collaborated to conduct nation-wide fundraising campaign to erect Children’s Peace Monument in the Peace Memorial Park. The book, “Orizuru no Tabi: Sadako no Inori o Nosete (Journey of Folded Paper Cranes: Carrying Sadako’s Prayer)” (Umino 2003) is a picture book about Sadako and Hiroshiman children’s efforts to erect Children’s Peace Monument. ANT has translated this picture book into 22 languages (as of June 2017). In total, 2,500 copies have been sent to 66 countries in the world (as of June 2017). Furthermore, ANT published another picture book, “Sadako’s Prayer” in 2006, which was illustrated by a Pakistani artist. The story was originally written in English, but the book has been translated into 7 languages (as of June 2017). This book is also utilized in peace education activities of ANT in Hiroshima or abroad.

This picture book project began in 2003 when an Afghan girl and an Afghan film director visited Hiroshima.

I realized the power of the picture book [‘Journey of Folded Paper Cranes’] when we read it to an Afghan girl. She changed a lot. In addition, when my friend read the book to an Afghan film director in front of Children’s Peace Monument, this person burst into tears. He burst into tears saying that Sadako is like the children in Afghanistan. He is the person who, for the first time, said that he wanted to publish that book in Afghanistan, he wanted to read the book to Afghan children, so I went to Afghanistan. But, I mean, it is not that we said [we wanted to publish the book], but that the person who lived in a severe condition...
made us an offer. Also, when I read the book in Pakistan [in 2005], Pakistani children changed after reading this book. Curiously, they got energetic. I was surprised. When the children got energetic, their parents changed too. […] Through these two experiences, I realized this story is powerful. […] Based on it [the story of Sadako and Hiroshiman children] we made ‘Sadako’s Prayer’ together with a Pakistani artist. But I think ‘Journey of Folded Paper Cranes’ is very powerful.

(ii) Promotion of films produced by Steven Okazaki. ANT-Hiroshima supported an American film director Steven Okazaki when he shot his two movies, “The Mushroom Club” in 2005 and “White Light, Black Rain: The Destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki” in 2007. ANT conducted the screening of the latter movie in the Peace Memorial Park on August 6 (the day of the atomic bombing), 2016.

(iii) Production of Films of Interviews with Hibakushas. ANT has produced films of interviews with hibakushas. In 2016-2017, ANT made 300 more copies of one of the films and donated them or utilized them in peace education activities.

(iv) Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative. Tomoko and the former director of UNITAR Hiroshima Office co-founded Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative (GLH) in 2011 to “disseminate the universal message of trees that survived the atomic bombing of Hiroshima” according to UNITAR’s webpage on GLH, or “safeguard the survivor trees, hand down their special significance to future generations, and spread their seeds and saplings so they can grow in places around the world and help promote peace” according to ANT’s webpage on legacy of A-bombed trees.

Tomoko explained the significance of GLH in the following way.

For me, sending seeds and saplings is not the main thing. What I think is, I want to safeguard the present trees and pass them down to the future generations, and I also want to tell the deep meanings of the trees to children. When the children are at a loss in their lives, I think the trees can help them. I don’t think sending seeds and saplings is meaningless,
but the way we send seeds and saplings is really important. […] This is not a tree planting activity to increase green, so the number doesn’t matter. Where we plant [seeds or saplings] is very important. I think it necessary for us to plant [seeds or saplings] at places where a message of peace, a message of reconciliation, or a message of anti-nuclear world get stronger. Because these trees are A-bombed trees, of course we have a hope for a nuclear-free world. Also, each person leaves each message, like coexistence, hope, or the power of the tree, to the tree, but what I am also thinking is that if we plant [seeds or saplings] in a really meaningful place, then the people around the tree will assign their own meanings onto the tree. […] It [the meaning of the tree] is not a thing that we senders decide unilaterally, but the people involved in the tree or the people who have received the tree assign their meanings onto the tree based on their country’s history, climate, and various thoughts in the area. […] Various meanings of the trees are what humans attach to the trees. The trees transcend them and soar high in a grand manner. […] Because GLH is co-organized with the former director of UNITAR, she has her own thought and direction. However, what is good about GLH is that the trees exist transcending humans’ small thoughts. This is a big message. Also, the trees make us think deeply about the earth and teach us the importance of paying attention to other living things which live on this planet earth.

(v) **Efforts for Abolition of Nuclear Weapons.** ANT cooperates with organizations in Japan and abroad which hold exhibitions about the atomic bombing(s). ANT is one of the supporters of NGOs leading Hibakusha Appeal, a signature campaign calling for an international treaty to ban and eliminate nuclear weapons. In the fiscal year of 2016-2017, ANT is also making a report of World Nuclear Victims Forum that was held in Hiroshima in 2015.

(vi) **Support for Peace Activities.** ANT supports peace workers from all over the world and forms a network of organizations and individuals involved in ANT’s activities. For
example, on August 8, 2016, ANT supported organization of an event named “28th Hiroshima Citizens’ Gathering for Peace” hosted by another non-profit organization in Hiroshima.

(vii) Peacebuilding Activities in Mindanao, Philippines. Since ANT helped hold the “Youth Exchange for Peace 2005: Israel-Palestine-Japan,” in which I participated as a 2nd year high-school student, ANT has cooperated with individuals and organizations in the world who/which are working for peacebuilding initiatives. In 2012, ANT participated in an exhibition of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings in the Philippines. Since then, ANT has participated in various peacebuilding activities in Mindanao, Philippines.

International Cooperation Activities
The following three projects are included in this category of ANT’s activities.
(i) Pakistan Project. Since 2002, ANT has engaged in support activities of Afghan refugees in Pakistan. In 2004, ANT started a project to build a small medical clinic in the refugee camp, and in 2011, ANT built the clinic which is now run by local people.

Additionally, when a huge earthquake hit the Kashmir region in Pakistan in 2005, ANT provided urgent assistance. As I quoted what Tomoko told me in my interview above in the “Promotion of Picture Books about Sadako Sasaki” section, Tomoko also brought picture books to Pakistan. During the period, about 2,000 copies of the book, “Sadako’s Prayer” were distributed to local schools, which led local people founding a non-governmental organization “Sadako Foundation.” Sadako Foundation built Sadako Primary School with the financial support of Hiroshima citizens. ANT has been supporting the school.

(ii) 2011 Higashi-nihon Daishinsai Reconstruction Support Project. Since there was a huge earthquake in northwestern (Tōhoku) region of Japan on March 11, 2011, ANT has supported reconstruction of the region. On March 11, 2017, ANT held a memorial ceremony in the Peace Memorial Park.
(iii) Support for Nepal. In April 2015, a huge earthquake hit Nepal. ANT has been supporting people in Nepal in cooperation with Nepali students in Hiroshima. ANT also sent 200 copies of the picture book, “Journey of Folded Paper Cranes” from November 2015 to August 2016 to children in Nepal.

Educational Activities

Educational activities are another kind of important activities of ANT. In the fiscal year of May 2016 to April 2017, ANT (i) provided scholarship to students in Hiroshima and a school overseas, (ii) conducted a follow-up survey of hibakushas’ health conditions, (iii) developed educational materials, (iv) conducted educational projects, and (v) accepted interns and volunteers.

(i) ANT Scholarship. In the fiscal year of 2016-2017, ANT provided scholarships to three foreign students. One of them built a school in Rwanda, and ANT made a donation to the school (elementary school and kindergarten).

(ii) Follow-up Survey of Hibakushas’ Health Conditions. In the fiscal year of 2016-2017, ANT conducted a follow-up survey of hibakushas’ health conditions.

(iii) Development of Educational Materials. ANT has developed educational materials including the picture book “Sadako’s Prayer” and DVDs of interviews of hibakushas. Currently, ANT is making picture cards about A-bombed trees.

(iv) Educational Projects. ANT has been supported organization of performance of “The Clouds in Summer Won’t Forget,” a drama in which actresses recite memoirs of Hiroshima/Nagasaki hibakushas. In July 2016, ANT supported two performances of the drama. Furthermore, from April 2017, ANT has been organizing a yearly seminar, “ANT hibaku-taihen keishō juku (ANT A-Bomb Experience Take-over Seminar).” The seminar takes place once a month.
(v) Accepting Interns and Volunteers. ANT accepts interns and volunteers. In the fiscal year of 2016-2017, ANT accepted three interns including me. There are many other volunteers who helped Picture Book project or organization of many events.

Publicity and Educational Activities including Lectures

ANT, especially its executive director Tomoko, has been invited to have a lecture at many schools and local governments. ANT helps coordination of peace education of many individuals and organizations. In the fiscal year of 2016-2017, ANT had 40 opportunities to have lectures or coordinate peace education of individuals or organizations.

Interviews with 2 ANT-Hiroshima Members

I conducted one-to-two-hour semi-structured interviews with two ANT staff members in order to contextually understand their understandings of the concept peace, which is hidden under the predominantly foregrounded concept peace.

In many of the activities that ANT engages in, both of the two staff members (Tomoko and Rie) do not express their thoughts on peace. Their thoughts on peace color how they discursively qualify the objects (for example, A-bombed trees and their seeds and saplings and picture books), but they acknowledge, accept, and encourage other people’s own interpretations of these objects.

Based on her idea that behind Hiroshima’s rebirth were restoration of human dignity, rebuilding of hope, and reconstruction of the city, Tomoko thinks peace as a complex of the following three components: dignity, hope, and social systems.

We say communicating peace, but saying “Peace is important” is not communicating peace. For example, what is necessary for peace is, even when humans […] are able to live human lives with housing, food, and clothing, their dignity (songen) cannot be restored. It is necessary for them to be able to express their feelings or opinions. This enables them to really restore their dignity or live with dignity. Normally people talk about housing, food, and clothing, but I feel it [dignity] is important. Making a society, a world, and an area where it is possible [for people to
live with dignity] leads to making peace. In addition, when humans lose hope and give up, I think, they die. I learned this from Frankl’s “Man’s Search for Meaning.” A story of Auschwitz. Those who despaired and gave up in a concentration camp died, but when we think about how we can do without giving up and endure despair, if we think about the example of Hiroshima, for example, trees shooting out buds are very influential. Also, music, dramas, or festivals. How important it is to feel hopeful. This [encouraging people to have hope] is what we are doing through the picture book project. […] My teacher at college taught me that, there is a German philosopher Simmel, and he says that in the end humans can be consoled only by humans. Simmel says this. I also learned, green leaves can make people hopeful, but people who can make efforts together are necessary. Moreover, the issue of social systems is important. Like the issue of money and the issue of laws. […] So, for me, peace is a complex of these three.

Although Tomoko sometimes talks about her idea of peace with students, visitors, and collaborators, she emphasizes on the importance of relationship with them in thinking about peace.

My professor, who was researching Simmel’s philosophy, used the expression “relationship (aidagara).” Humans’ existence lies in relationship. So even though I have my own idea of peace, another person has his or her own idea of peace. So we talk together about what can be done to better the situation and what dreams we cherish together. In short, I think making peace lies in forging the relationship of talking together about these topics. […] I truly feel so. What my small brain can think is limited.

Then, how is Tomoko’s idea of peace related to the picture book project and Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative (GLH), two of the projects in the category of “International Peace Activities” that ANT engage in?
The picture books about Sadako gives readers, specifically children in conflict-torn lands or disaster-stricken areas, hope, which is the second component of what comprises peace for Tomoko.

Sadako’s death symbolizes Hiroshima’s tragedy. However, children took initiative and erected Children’s Peace Monument three years later. This is revival of hope […]. It is wonderful that this revival of hope inspires various children, and so we have been using this picture book [in our picture-book distribution project].

A-bombed trees and their seeds and saplings can also give hope for humans. However, it is not only senders of seeds and saplings but also receivers who assign meanings on the trees. Furthermore, for Tomoko, trees are not the tools for humans gaining hope or communicating peace. Tomoko thinks, trees also have dignity and inform humans of the importance of paying attention to other living things on the earth. The way in which trees live – trees altruistically gives unconditional love to other living things – shows us the way we should live.

What is important in Green Legacy Hiroshima is trees’ dignity. Trees taught me that humans are not the only living things on this planet earth, and […] the way in which A-bombed trees have lived is non-war (hisen) way of living.[…] Trees are unlimitedly altruistic, or, I should say, they give us unconditional love, like giving us oxygen.

Tomoko also mentioned,

I can refer to trees for my way of living, and trees can give hope to people who are in despair as they gave hope to live to people in Hiroshima. These can be a meaning of trees. It [the meaning of the tree] isn’t a thing that we senders decide unilaterally, but the people involved in the tree or the people who have received the tree assign their meanings
onto the tree based on their country’s history, climate, and various thoughts in the area.

As Tomoko’s daughter, Rie has long been involved in ANT-Hiroshima’s activities personally. Officially, she became a staff member of ANT in October 2016. Rie became interested in “peace” when she went to Cambodia at the age of 22. Seeing and knowing about a wretched environment surrounding children, human trafficking, prostitution, street children, neglected children, an environment surrounding HIV patients, and adults who lost hope for the future, she realized a part of the reality of the world. After coming back to Japan, she experienced a hardship in between the reality that she experienced in Cambodia and the reality of Japan. In the process of going through the hardship, she encountered many hibakushas, who help her overcome the hardship. She thinks back, “If I had not been to Asia, I would not think of peace this deeply. Probably because I actually saw [the reality], I have a strong feeling [about peace].”

I asked what peace means for Rie. She answered,

I think [peace means] the state in which everything in the world is in harmony. But, the clearest image that I have is the society in which things that are deeply related to humans’ dignity are ensured, like the state in which non-violence like Gandhi [prevails] or there are no starving people. This is the basic, and there are many more things that are necessary for peace, but the present situation lacks this state. […] I think for humans peace means water, sky, the earth, trees, and everything. It is difficult. It can be expanded and deepened unlimitedly.

In ANT’s activities that Rie engaged in, she does not usually express her own thought on peace. But she is attached to ANT’s mission of contributing to “peace,” which she interprets as the state in which everything in the world is in harmony, and helps individuals and groups who/which are interested in ANT know about ANT’s activities.
Conclusion

Through participant observation, I found that my interlocutors rarely express their thoughts on peace in their activities that they relate to the concept peace. Under the predominantly foregrounded concept peace, my interlocutors’ understandings of peace are silenced.

In HIP, among the activities that HIP members and staff members engage in, I especially focused on guided tours and hibakushas’ testimonies. In guided tours, my interlocutors take the tourists to almost the same objects in the park, but what differs is in what order they take their guests to each of the objects, how each of them discursively qualifies the objects, and what they chat with their guests when they are not explaining about the objects in the park. Many of my interlocutors’ understandings of peace are counterposed to their understandings of what happened in Hiroshima. In hibakushas’ testimonies, my interlocutors put emphasis on telling the “facts.” Their understandings of peace lie in a backdrop of each of their testimonies, but they do not express their own idea of peace. Like HIP guides, their understandings of peace are counterposed to their understanding about what happened in Hiroshima.

ANT-Hiroshima engages in various activities, but what lies in the basis of these activities is Hiroshima’s experience or what people in Hiroshima have thought through their experience. I especially focused on their picture book project and Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative. In both of the projects, my interlocutors’ thoughts of peace are not manifestly expressed. Their thoughts on peace influence how they discursively qualify the objects (for example, A-bombed trees and their seeds and saplings and picture books), but they acknowledge, accept, and encourage other people’s own interpretations of these objects.
Chapter 4. Conclusion

This thesis is my exploration of what the landscape of peace, onto which past relevant actors’ discourses and practices of peace and my interlocutors’ present practices of peace are inscribed, represents and silences, and how my interlocutors, who relate their activities to the concept peace, make sense of the concept peace.

In order to understand the landscape of peace in Hiroshima and its components, in Chapter 2, I drew on the concept of “landscape” presented by Ingold (1993), the concept of “silence” in the field of historical anthropology, Foucault’s genealogical approach, and the works of Yoneyama (1999) and Naono (2015) who explore the connection between the Hiroshima atomic bombing and the concept peace.

Ingold (1993:152) points out, “the landscape is constituted as an enduring record of – and testimony to – the lives and works of past generations who have dwelt within it, and in so doing, have left there something of themselves.” Then, what discourses and practices are inscribed onto the landscape, and how? On the other hand, the literature in the field of historical anthropology suggests that historical narratives which the landscape of peace represents are created through reducing the intermingled pasts into sanitized linear narratives, which silence any other interpretations of the events in the past (Trouillot 1995). Also, the Western version of historicity, which Hirsch and Stewart (2005) calls historicism, is dominantly thought of as the superior form of the production of knowledge about the past, and expels other ways to perceive the past. There are many personal stories that are not well archivised, memorialized, or represented in/by the landscape of peace, which are silenced. Furthermore, the authorities who disseminate their official history silences people through controlling them. The objects in the Peace Memorial Park were erected under the approval of the Hiroshima city government. What official history do the components of the landscape of peace, which the city government controlled, represent and silence? Yoneyama (1999) points to the interchangeability of the atomic bombing and peace in Hiroshima. Naono (2015) points to the difference between the official (city government’s) usage of the concept peace and atomic bomb victims’ usage of the concept peace in the early post-war period. How has the concept peace become the hegemonic concept that is linked to the atomic bombing in Hiroshima?
I revealed that the Hiroshima city has been explicitly designed as a “peace (memorial) city” especially since the Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law was enacted in 1949, which utilized “the atomic bombing brought peace” narrative to side up with the SCAP and the national government to obtain special subsidies. Reconstruction of ruined Hiroshima as a “peace (memorial) city” brought many buildings and facilities including the Peace Memorial Park, but at the same time, it oppressed and silenced despondent voices and uncomfortable feelings of many citizens, the majority of whom were hibakushas. The Peace Memorial Park was constructed based on the 1949 Hiroshima Peace Memorial City Construction Law. Like reconstruction of ruined Hiroshima as a “peace (memorial) city,” construction of the Peace Memorial Park entailed forced relocation of many citizens from the premise of the park. In the Peace Memorial Park, there are many objects which were erected or have been preserved by a variety of actors who thought these objects symbolize their hope for peace.

As a HIP guide, as I showed in the second vignette between Chapter 1 and Chapter 2, I took my guests to a dozen of the objects in the park in my guided tours. My guided tour, which centered on what the objects in the Peace Memorial Park represent, contributed to the hegemonic narrative of peace, which naturally links the Hiroshima atomic bombing to the concept peace and silences many voices. Being fearful of my guests’ possible reactions, I forced myself to base my explanations on “facts” that are acceptable to my guests, through which I created historical narratives which reduced the intermingled pasts into linear narratives which link the concept peace to the atomic bombing and which silence other interpretations of the past, contributed to silencing of other historicities than the Western version of historicity, and contributed to the authorities who disseminate the official history which fills in the silences. In a Foucauldian sense, I was formed as a subject of the hegemonic master narrative of peace in Hiroshima, which firmly links the atomic bombing to the concept peace.

In Chapter 3, I pointed out that my interlocutors rarely express their thoughts on peace in their activities that they relate to the concept peace. In other words, under the predominantly foregrounded concept peace, my interlocutors’ understandings of peace are silenced. In HIP, I focused on their activities of guides’ tours and hibakushas’ testimonies. In guided tours, my interlocutors take the tourists to almost the same
objects in the park, but in what order they take their guests to each of the objects, how each of them discursively qualifies the objects, and what they chat with their guests when they are not explaining about the objects in the park differed. Many of my interlocutors’ understandings of peace are counterposed to their understandings of what happened in Hiroshima. In hibakushas’ testimonies, my interlocutors put emphasis on telling the “facts.” They did not express their own ideas of peace in their testimonies. Like HIP guides, their understandings of peace are counterposed to their understanding about what happened in Hiroshima. At ANT-Hiroshima, I especially focused on their picture book project and Green Legacy Hiroshima Initiative. In both of the projects, my interlocutors’ thoughts of peace are not manifestly expressed. Their thoughts on peace influence how they discursively qualify the objects (for example, A-bombed trees and their seeds and saplings and picture books).

This research opened up the following three questions, which I could not explore in this thesis. First, how do the other people involved in HIP and ANT, such as HIP’s guests in guided tours or hibakushas’ testimonies and recipients of picture books or seeds and saplings of A-bombed trees at ANT’s projects, perceive the atomic bombing and/or the concept peace? With regard to HIP’s guests, since their time in Hiroshima was very limited, I could not conduct interview with them. With regard to the other people involved in ANT’s projects, such as recipients of the picture books or seeds and saplings of A-bombed trees, because of the limitation of the budget and the time for this research, I could not go to the places where these people live to interview them.

Second, how do people who do not explicitly relate their activities to the concept peace make sense of the concept peace and the hegemonic narrative in Hiroshima which links the atomic bombing to the concept peace? I limited the scope of my research to the organizations which links their activity to the concept peace. However, there are many organizations working on the issue of passing on the Hiroshima atomic bombing to the next generation, abolishment of nuclear weapons, etc. without relying on the concept peace. How do those involved in these organizations make sense of the concept peace? How do they perceive the master narrative of peace in Hiroshima? In what ways do they narrate the atomic bombing?

Third, although I drew on Foucauldian genealogical approach, I relied heavily on the landscape – what the landscape and its components represent and silence, and I
could not explore in detail the question of how the concept peace came to be linked to the atomic bombing predominantly in people’s – hibakushas’, Hiroshima citizens’, activists’, and visitors’ – discourses on the atomic bombing. In order to understand the hegemonic concept peace in Hiroshima genealogically, an inquiry not only into the question of how the concept peace emerged in the discourses and practices of the city government but also into the question of how the concept peace emerged in the discourses and practices of the non-governmental actors is indispensable.
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