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This article presents a language specialist’s content analysis of four topics related to the memory of World War II. The purpose of the analysis is to develop critical content-based instruction (CBI) in an advanced Japanese language course that will be implemented at a Canadian university. These specific topics are: Atomic bombs (A-bombs) in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Canada’s involvement in the development of the A-bombs, the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, and representations of peace and war in language arts and history textbooks used in Japan. I identify higai and kagai [suffering from harm vs. causing harm] relations in various materials including articles, literature, textbooks, and films, while demonstrating how these victim-offender relations reflect complex international and domestic relations of power rather than a simple binary. Such intellectual engagement will enable learners to gain multiple perspectives for ethical understandings of historical events in the target and in their own societies. Some examples of materials and activities are presented.

INTRODUCTION

Shanghai, China, May 2011

1938年4月17日，原在虹桥路的日本同文书院亦相继侵占我校校舍，摘下“交通大学”校牌，改挂“东亚同文书院”布招。日方对交大内部房屋任意拆卸改造，器用杂物均被运走，或被烧毁。

On April 17, 1938, Riben Tongwen Shuyuan (Japan Common Culture Academy), originally located at Hong Qiao Road, occupied buildings on our university campus, took down the gate sign of Jiaotong University, and changed it to the sign of Dongya Tongwen Shuyuan (Tòa Dôbun Shoin: East Asia Common Culture Academy). The Japanese randomly modified and demolished buildings on Jiatong University campus; equipments and loose items were all moved away or burned. (Translation)

The caption is printed at the bottom of an old black-and-white photo of a campus gate standing before an administration building in the background. A sign on the gate says “Tòa Dôbun Shoin (Dongya tongwen shuyuan: East Asia Common Culture Academy),” the Japanese college in Shanghai that my grandfather attended.
and where he later taught. The photo is displayed in the institutional history museum of Shanghai Jiaotong University, China. I unfortunately don’t speak Mandarin, but as a native speaker of Japanese, I recognize the main point by looking at the Chinese characters, namely that the Japanese college had occupied Shanghai Jiaotong University’s campus and replaced the gate sign. Occupied was not part of my memory—not at least from what I heard from my mother who was adopted at the age of 23 in 1950 by her aunt and uncle who were childless.

My grandfather, or my mother’s adoptive father, whom I didn’t know since he passed away before I turned one, lived in Shanghai, China between 1916 and 1944. He was there first as a student at Tōa Dōbun Shoin, a Japanese college\(^1\) that provided Japanese young men an education with a mission to develop practical knowledge and skills to conduct business and trade in China and beyond (Reynolds, 1986). Shortly after the Marco Polo Bridge Incident in 1937, which marked the beginning of the 8-year Sino-Japanese War, the original Hong Qiao campus building burned down. I had understood that the Academy borrowed another campus.

My understanding of Tōa Dōbun Shoin as a benign and even benevolent institution was clearly one-sided. I must have been unconsciously influenced by the Japanese mainstream national discourse that downplayed Japan’s role as a perpetrator during the war.

**Hawaii, USA, August 1986**

“…We should never repeat this tragic history. In order to prevent another calamity, we must strengthen our military power.”

I walked out of a theater in the USS Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harbor in astonishment. The short video about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor left me with horrific images of violent destruction. But what horrified me more were the final words of the video—that in order to prevent another tragedy, the nation must strengthen its military capacities. I was in Honolulu taking a course at TESOL Summer Institute, which I decided to do before launching my Master’s study in the U.S. mainland. As a 29-year-old novice international student, this logic was incompatible with the discourse of peace I grew up with in the 1960s and 70s in Japan. In my familiar narrative, the words “In order to avoid another tragedy” should be followed by: “we must seek peace” or “we must not allow another war to break out.” This does not imply that Japan is without armed forces\(^2\); rather, the familiar narrative reflects the current Constitution of Japan (implemented in 1947), which renounces war. Article 9 stipulates:

> Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.  
> In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding clause, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. …

According to my familiar narrative shaped through school learning, mass media,
and popular culture, any discussion of Japanese involvement of war ought to end with an emphasis on peacekeeping without war or nuclear weapons. Peacekeeping is certainly part of the American mainstream narrative but the means to the end is completely different—peace is to be achieved based on the might of prevailing armed forces. Significantly, the Japanese Peace Constitution would not have been created if Japan had not lost World War II (WWII). The interpretation of peace is vastly different between the winner and the loser. For the first time, I realized a fundamental difference in perspectives produced by an unequal relation of power.

**SCOPE OF THIS ARTICLE**

These two stories indicate that our knowledge, interpretations, and feelings about a historical event can be drastically different across national borders. Such conflicting historical narratives are predicated on the victim vs. victimizer or, in Japanese terms, *higai* vs. *kagai* [suffering from harm vs. causing harm] duality as well as historically constructed relations of power between the economically, politically, racially, and culturally dominant group and subordinate ones.

These stories also show how one’s political and historical perspectives are constructed by national discourses. Through international travel and study, I came to know the other story. How can our students in schools and universities in North America understand unfamiliar narratives that they have never been exposed to? While not all students can afford to travel like I did, foreign language classrooms can offer perfect opportunities to learn alternative perspectives that transcend national borders and familiar boundaries in general.

Focusing on the past-present continuum of the memory of WWII in Japan, this article discusses the contents of selected topics that could be used for content-based instruction (CBI) to teach advanced Japanese in North America, especially in Canada where I teach. In presenting both factual information and interpretive critiques, I explore critical understandings of historical events that could help learners expand their understanding of not only the target culture but also their own. As such, this paper is not about how to teach history in CBI; rather it aims to explore critical interpretations of historical events in course development. By focusing on *higai* and *kagai* aspects of historical incidents, I examine the dual role of *higai* and *kagai* agents, which produces, sustains, and reflects certain power relations, in order to achieve ethical understandings of unjust and irrational events of war in history.

The educational vision sought in this article is consistent with the development of intercultural understanding and intercultural competence (e.g., Byram, Nichols, & Stevens, 2001). Yet it moves beyond a neutral sense of the intercultural in everyday communication and confronts difficult issues of brutality, atrocity, and exploitation in order to search for moral responsibilities for teachers and learners as citizens of the local and global communities. Such exploration cannot simply view language and culture as objects of instruction—it requires teachers and students to develop symbolic competence to understand that historical memories and subjectivities are not unitary and to envision “alternative ways of remembering an event, of telling a story, of participating in a discussion, of empathizing with others, of imagining their
future and ours, and ultimately of defining and measuring success and failure” (Kramsch, 2009, p. 201). This perspective is consistent with critical foreign language teaching that problematizes and politicizes taken-for-granted cultural norms and transcends the instrumental purpose of learning a language (Kubota, 2003, 2008; Reagan & Osborn, 2002). In teaching about memories of war with this pedagogical vision, a teacher naturally engages in critical CBI.

In what follows, I shall first provide conceptual discussions of higai-kagai duality in relation to understanding historical events, which is followed by a brief discussion of critical approaches to CBI. I shall then present four examples of pedagogical content: A-bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Canada’s role in the production of A-bombs, the recent accident at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant, and representations of peace and war in language arts and history textbooks used in Japan. This paper represents work-in-progress since I am in the process of planning and implementing a new advanced Japanese language course. I deliberately chose citations (e.g., online and print articles, children’s literature, textbooks, films) that could serve as classroom teaching materials or supplemental readings. The arguments, interpretations, and materials presented here are not meant to be exhaustive or theoretical; rather, they highlight what I, as a content non-specialist, am able to engage in within a critical CBI framework.

**HIGAI-KAGAI RELATIONSHIP**

The opposing views and interpretations in my Shanghai and Hawaii experiences manifest higai-kagai positions that are intertwined with historically constructed relations of power. In the first experience, a colonizer’s understanding of borrowing Jiaotong University campus erased a victim’s perspective of having it occupied. Similar cases are commonly found elsewhere. As discussed later, the interpretation of Imperial Japan’s military invasions in Asia with little recognition of kagai responsibility mitigates or erases the memory of higai experienced by local people and instead glorifies its action as liberating them from European colonial powers. Likewise, a U.S. perspective as a conquering nation in the war views the Hiroshima/Nagasaki bombing as necessary to end the war and thus beneficial. A Japanese perspective conversely views bombing as totally inhumane and intolerable.

Even when a group has a kagai role in a series of events, they often emphasize their own higai position as an implicit strategy to evade kagai responsibility. For example, the video shown in Pearl Harbor was predicated on a higai position of being attacked. The same is true for the logic behind the events of 9/11 and subsequent military attacks against Iraq and Afghanistan. The dominant narrative of war memories in Japan as represented in the discourse of “No more Hiroshima” is from a higai perspective, escaping Japan’s kagai responsibility of war, although addressing kagai responsibility of the Self raises complex emotional reactions among direct victims of A-bombs (Fujiwara, 2006). This indicates the complexity of the higai-kagai relationship as discussed below. A mono-vision of victimhood directly or indirectly accentuates the Other as a kagai agent while downplaying the kagai responsibility of the Self.
Furthermore, the *higai-kagai* relationship exists not only in inter-country events but also within-nation narratives, signifying local structures of power. As shown below, when victimhood is romanticized and elevated to a patriotic narrative of reconstruction, victims are homogenized and diverse forms of suffering are excluded and forgotten. For example, victims of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings are homogenized as Japanese civilians only, as symbolized by the exclusion of the monument for Korean A-bomb victims in Hiroshima, which was finally moved inside the Peace Park in 1999. The fact that over 1 million Koreans were forced to work as Imperial subjects in Japan is not usually in the Japanese mainstream *higai* narrative. Prior to Hiroshima bombing, a *higai-kagai* power relationship had also been established between ordinary citizens and the Imperial Army as seen in *tatemono sokai* [building evacuations], whereby private homes were demolished to create buffer zones in order to prevent fire caused by bombing from spreading (Fujiwara, 2006).

Furthermore, such intra-national unequal relations of power demonstrate both synchronic and diachronic continuities. That is, power struggles between dominant and subordinate groups in terms of ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic status continue to exist to this date and similar patterns of domination and subordination can be observed across nations.

Such complex interplay of power indicates that in order to engage foreign language learners in critical reflections on multiplicity of perspectives and to help them develop symbolic competence (Kramsch, 2009), simply juxtaposing the dominant discourse of the Other (e.g., suffering in Hiroshima) vis-à-vis the popular position of the Self (e.g., justification of A-bomb) is not enough since it may run the risk of essentializing historical memory only from the *higai* position while overlooking *kagai* responsibilities and the past-present continuity of the complex relations of power. This paper addresses a web of complexities that underlie *higai/kagai* relations.

**CBI IN JAPANESE: CRITICAL POSSIBILITIES**

Teaching about memories of war in an advanced Japanese language course is an example of CBI as it is theme-focused. Aiming to integrate academic content learning and language development, CBI has become a valuable approach in foreign language instruction (Stryker & Leaver, 1997). In advanced foreign language courses, CBI typically involves the use of authentic materials to enable learners to explore multiple perspectives in the target society and to enhance critical reflections and understanding of the topic and the target culture in general. In the field of Japanese language teaching, various efforts to integrate language and content have been reported (Chikamatsu, 2008, 2009, 2011; Chikamatsu & Matsugu, 2009). In these reports, contents address topics in history, performing arts, literature, popular culture, area studies, politics, economics, and so on.

Of several types of CBI, Chikamatsu (2009) comments that the following two models are considered to be ideal: the sheltered model, which is geared toward nonnative-speaking learners of the target language and taught by a content specialist, and the adjunct model, which is targeted to both native and nonnative speakers and
taught by a content specialist with additional instruction offered by a language specialist. However, implementing these models can be challenging due to the fact that learning the Japanese language is time-consuming, especially for native English speakers. In order to narrow the gap between students’ language proficiency and authentic instructional materials, Chikamatsu (2009) proposes a hybrid model in which both language and content are taught by a language specialist to target language learners. Using this model, Chikamatsu implemented CBI in advanced Japanese courses at DePaul University.

Most relevant to this paper is a content-based course on “War and the Japanese” developed and taught by Chikamatsu (2008, 2011). Focusing on the Asia-Pacific War that Japan fought during WWII, this course mainly aims to guide students to understand historical perspectives represented in school textbooks and other media produced in Japan and to develop the linguistic skills necessary to express one’s opinion (e.g., a statement of peace) effectively. To accommodate the aforementioned language-content gap, relatively simple authentic reading materials used in Japanese schools as well as anime and manga were utilized. One class project focused on comparing/contrasting multiple online customer reviews of a film, watching a film individually, and writing a review of a film. Another was conducting a questionnaire survey in Japanese related to issues of war and peace, analyzing responses, and writing one’s proposal for peace. Students also interacted with a guest speaker and participated in community events. Through these activities, students critically engaged in materials to understand and interpret authors’ intentions and to read between the lines.

These topics, teaching materials, and activities presented by Chikamatsu (2008) can be integrated as critical CBI. The unique teaching materials and activities certainly evoke feelings and perspectives that are different from the mainstream American discourse with which the students are familiar. The materials and activities enable learners to question established knowledge, to scrutinize power relations that construct different memories of war, and to explore their own discourse of peace. In the process, the learners critically reflect on the mainstream discourse about war that they have been familiar with and construct alternative narratives not only on the topic in question but also on related issues.

In applying critical CBI to classroom instruction, what Kramsch observed in a German class (Kramsch, 2011) provides an insight. In reading a text on the U.S. Bombing of Dresden during WWII, the class refrained from discussing why the pacifist German author did not blame the U.S. for the bombing. Kramsch argues that what is unsaid and may be unsayable can become a point of departure for critical discussions to foster deeper cultural understanding.

The advanced Japanese course that I am developing and implementing aims to address the complexity and ambiguity of historical memories that may be difficult to confront especially because not only is the higai position exposed but the kagai position is also scrutinized. The discussions of historical topics in the next several sections draw on books, online and print articles, and films that could be used in the classroom. Following common practice in East Asia, I use the order of “family name given name” for Japanese names.
A-BOMBS AND KAGAI

Yûnagi no machi, sakura no kuni [Town of evening calm, country of cherry blossoms] is originally a work of manga written by Kôno Fumiyo (2004), later adapted as a live-action film. Two stories about one extended family over three generations after the bombing of Hiroshima highlight the long-term health and psychological effects of radiation exposure. The story begins in 1955 in Hiroshima. Minami, a young woman living with her mother in a so-called genbaku [A-bomb] slum not too far from where the Genbaku Dome [Hiroshima Peace Memorial] stands, is depicted as a cheerful office worker. Nonetheless, she is agonized by horrifying thoughts:

What we know is that someone thought we should die. But we’ve lived. And the scariest thing is I’ve come to notice I’ve become someone who deserves that fate.

In this ambiguous monologue, Minami does not identify who imposed kagai; neither does she blame them. Instead, she expresses grave fear and anxiety. Minami is unable to accept her colleague’s affections for her because she feels she does not deserve to live. The horrific memory of her father, sisters, and thousands of people perishing in scorching heat reminds her, “You have no business living here.” Minami dies at the age of 23 of the effects of radiation exposure. Yet the damage does not end with Minami’s death; the consequences of radiation exposure, as both fear and reality, linger on to the next generation.

Survivor’s guilt or their sense of “ikite ite moshivake nai [Forgive me for surviving],” that is, a sense of owing something to those who perished is a recurring theme in other works such as Chichi to kuraseba [The face of jizo], a play written by Inoue Hisashi and later produced as a film (see Norimatsu, 2010). This two-hander mainly consists of a dialogue between Mitsue, a young librarian and genbaku survivor, and the ghost of her father Takezô, who was killed by the bomb. Like Minami, Mitsue resists seeking happiness. In this play, the pacifist author speaks through Takezô:

Takezô (Father): Listen to me, will ya! When you were next to me then, didn’t you just cry and tell me how inhuman it all was, how horrible, that we had to part like that? Remember? Didn’t I say to you, “A parting like this should never happen again, till the end of time. It’s not human.” Were you able to hear my last words, Mitsue? “Live. Live my life for me too!” So, you see, you will go on living because of me.

Mitsue (Daughter): Because of you?

Takezô: Yes. Go on living so that the world will remember that tens of thousands of people have had to say goodbye like that and it’s inhuman...”

(cited from Norimatsu, 2010)

Here, Takezô’s encouragement of his daughter to replace the guilt with a will to live is overlaid with a pacifist condemnation of the A-bomb’s brutality and belief in the pursuit of enduring peace—the same discourse that influenced me as surfaced in
Pearl Harbor. Survivors are victims themselves and yet they feel guilty for not sharing the same victimhood with those who perished. This indicates the paradox of victimhood as felt on the individual level.

It is also worth noting that so-called genbaku films, including *Kuroi ama* [Black rain] (1989) based on Ibuse Masujii’s novel, tend to give the leading role to a dutiful pretty unmarried hibakusha woman who dies young due to a radiation-related disease. This romanticizes femininity, endurance, and innocence, while constructing an ideal womanhood that pursues marriage and bearing children (Todeschini, 1993; see also Yoneyama, 1999). The exploitation of women hibakusha’s sufferings to arouse sympathy further works to oppress women in general. Here, the representation of victimhood is intertwined with gender politics.

What is absent in the above examples is anger toward the direct kagai agent. The feelings of survivor guilt rather than expressions of anger as a victim may not be unrelated to the power relation between the occupier and the occupied. During the U.S. occupation, criticisms of U.S. actions were censored and suppressed. Hibakusha [surviving A-bomb victims] were kept silent. Moreover, their bodies were examined but not medically treated either by the United States or the Japanese government. In 1946, one year after the bombing, the American government established *Genbaku shôgai chôsa iinkai* [Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission: ABCC] and conducted research on the health effects of radiation among hibakusha without providing them with medical treatment. The U.S. government evaded its kagai responsibility and instead took advantage of it. Surprisingly (or not), the Japanese government was complicit in this activity. Sasamoto (1997) reveals that Japan established its own commission but its mission was to cooperate with ABCC, not to provide survivors with support. A film produced as part of this research was used by the United States to prepare for anticipated nuclear war. Sasamoto (1997) condemns Japan as being complicit with the United States in supporting the rhetoric and policy of nuclear deterrence. Instead of supporting hibakusha with treatment for their physical and psychological trauma or demanding that the United States take responsibility for the cruelty of its actions, the Japanese government supported the occupying authority. While this action might have been inevitable under occupation, what is disturbing is the fact that a similar pattern has pervaded post-war Japanese policies.

Given what the Japanese government did or did not do, it is not surprising that survivors were socially marginalized. Discrimination against hibakusha was quite common. Nakazawa Keiji, a manga/anime author of *Hadashi no Gen* [Barefoot Gen], which graphically depicts the cruelty of genbaku, recounts his own experience of being a hibakusha, moving to Tokyo, and receiving strange looks when he told his friends about his Hiroshima experience (Nakazawa, 2008). For hibakusha women, the novel, *Kuroi ama* [Black rain] (Ibuse, 1970) actually exacerbated marriage discrimination against them (Chûjô, 1986). Discrimination is unfortunately recurring in the aftermath of the Fukushima nuclear disaster.

The criticism of Sasamoto (1997) clearly demonstrates that the kagai-bigai dynamic does not indicate a fixed duality between them but a complicated struggle of politics. This allows us to move away from a simple binary of bigai vs. kagai to investigate how bigai position could also include kagai complicity. This leads to us to
investigate discrimination more closely. In fact, the category *hibakusha* included many Koreans who had been brought to Japan for forced labor under the Japanese colonial rule (1910-1945). An estimated total of 70,000 Koreans were affected by A-bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and 40,000 of them perished (Norimatsu, 2010). Nevertheless, Korean and other non-Japanese *hibakusha* were long denied access to the Japanese government’s relief support. Only recently did the government remove the requirement to enable them to come to Japan for medical treatment; but North Korean *hibakusha* are still neglected due to the lack of diplomatic relations between the two nations.

Many of the narratives of *genbaku* and other war tragedies found in literature, performing arts, and films, as well as language arts reading materials as discussed later, position Japan as a victim. Instead of directly condemning the United States, they underscore the tragic aftermaths of the inhumane acts while remaining silent about Japan’s *kagai* responsibility.

There are, however, some works that remind us of Japan’s *kagai* role. For example, the aforementioned *Hadashi no Gen* [*Barefoot Gen*] (Nakazawa, 1975/1980) includes a Korean character, Mr. Park, who lives next to Gen’s family in Hiroshima. He befriends Gen’s father, who is a defiant anti-war and anti-discrimination activist and thus imprisoned by the Japanese authority. Mr. Park supports Gen’s family by supplying food. After the bombing, however, Mr. Park is depicted as an angry man whose severely injured father is turned away by makeshift clinics one after another simply because they are Korean. The author also shows Japanese complicity with the ABCC in an episode in which Gen’s sick mother is referred to the ABCC by his Japanese doctor. Although she is examined, she is not provided with any treatment and is even given the label “specimen.” It turns out that Japanese doctors refer their patients to ABCC for free new drugs which they sell to their patients. *Hadashi no Gen* is filled with outrage at such a multilayered *kagai* system.

As a writer of adolescent literature, Wada Noboru wrote *Kanashimi no toride* [Fortress of sorrow] (Wada, 1980), *Kimu no jūjika* [Kim’s cross] (Wada, 2004), and *Omoide no An: Aoi me no seiza* [Ann in my memory: A constellation of blue eyes] (Wada, 1984). The first two feature Koreans forced to labor for the construction of an underground Imperial General Headquarters toward the end of the Asia-Pacific War. After conducting research on the construction of the (unfinished) Matsushiro Imperial General Headquarters located in Nagano Prefecture, Wada wrote the first piece from a Japanese perspective and the second from a Korean perspective. The third story was later adapted as a live-action film entitled *Omoide no Anne* [Anne in memory] (1984). It depicts how the militarism and suppression of religious freedom during the 1930s and the outbreak of the Asia-Pacific War in 1941 caused a tragic separation between a Japanese boy, a son of a Christian priest, and a Canadian girl, a daughter of a missionary medical doctor. The overall theme focuses on the unreasonable injustices perpetrated against Japanese and non-Japanese people by the Imperial Japan. A unique feature of this story/film is that the characters include a Korean doctor working for the hospital and a Korean fugitive, which balances the *bijai-kagai* dynamics. This type of creative work unfortunately seems to be in the minority.
CANADA’S KAGAI A-BOMB RESPONSIBILITY

It appears that kagai-bigai issues of genbaku only apply to the United States and Japan. But is it relevant to Canada as well? In a nutshell, Canada was deeply implicated in the production of A-bombs. Yet, discussion of its role is completely absent from mainstream Canadian discourse. A recent book, The Highway of the Atom by van Wyck (2010) and two documentary films, Village of widows (1999) and Somba ke: The money place (2009) offer important insights.

During the 1940s, Canada, along with the Belgium Congo, was a major supplier of uranium to America’s Manhattan Project. Uranium ore was mined in Port Radium on Great Bear Lake in Canada’s Northwest Territories and transported to Port Hope in Ontario for refining. Mining at Port Radium began in 1930 after the discovery of pitchblende by Gilbert LaBine, who owned Eldorado Gold Mining Limited. In the 1930s, however, the demand for uranium was much smaller than radium, which was used for luminous paint, cancer treatment, and other medical purposes. As the world market for radium became saturated, Eldorado Mine at Port Radium was closed in 1940. However, with the rise of American demand for uranium, it was reopened in 1942 and became the Crown Corporation in 1944.

Thus, Canada was indeed complicit with the United States in the development of A-bombs. The racist undertone behind the atomic bombing was also shared. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister at that time, wrote in his diary on August 6, 1945, “We now see what might have come to the British race had German scientists won the race. It is fortunate that the use of the bomb should have been upon the Japanese rather than upon the white races of Europe” (see Jones, 2010, p. 21). What is particularly disturbing as well as remarkable is a hikai-kagai relation of power within Canada involving indigenous people.

Délina is a First Nations community of the Sahtu Dene, located by Great Bear Lake, which is about 250 km west of Port Radium. Elders’ testimonies suggest that during Eldorado mining, the Dene worked to transport sacks of uranium by hand and performed various supporting roles such as providing miners with food, timbers, bedding, clothing, and so on. Neither European nor Dene workers were told about the danger of radioactive materials.

It was around 1960, the year that the mine was closed, when the Dene of Délina began to see cancer deaths. In 1998, the Dene requested that the Canadian government investigate the health and environmental hazards related to uranium mining. In 2005, the government released Canada-Délina Uranium Table Final Report, which can be summarized as follows:

It is a tragic piece of work that chronicles the disappointments suffered upon a community. Its main reported finding was that there was insufficient evidence to link the Dene’s work for the mining company Eldorado, to the cancers experienced in the community. Sorry. (van Wyck, 2010, pp. 182-183)

Délina is a small community with approximately 500 people. Residents witnessed
many who died of radiation-related illness. Yet, according to the Report, the sample size was too small to yield any significant results using an epidemiological frame. This clearly shows how aboriginal people who have been colonized for centuries in Canada continue to be oppressed and abandoned. They are actually indirect victims of the war. It is easy to identify a *higai-kagai* relationship of WWII as an inter-country conflict. However, this relationship also exists within a nation border, threatening the lives of the powerless.

Yet, what is remarkable about the Dene was their capacity to view themselves as an accomplice, a *kagai* agent, despite their suffering. *Village of widows* (Blow, 1999)—titled as such because many women lost their husbands to cancer—recounts a story about a Dene delegation visiting Japan in 1998 to attend the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony. They felt responsible for the uranium that was produced from their own land that had contributed to the deaths of tens of thousands of civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In the film, one Dene woman comments:

> To us, the land and resources are sacred because of the fact that we rely on them to continue to live. And that very resource is what actually caused damage to other people; it’s very hard to comprehend. People here, I think, basically want to make amends.

The delegates paid their respects to the victims and also visited a hospital where Korean *hibakusha* were treated. At the hospital, George Blondin, a Dene elder states: “We as Indians share your sorrow. Everybody is your brother and sister.” The film juxtaposes these dignified thoughts and deeds of the Dene with the Canadian government’s reluctance to accept its responsibility for the radiation-related deaths and the radiation hazards of the tailings of the abandoned mine.

Another documentary, *Somba ke: The money place* (2009), which came out 10 years later in 2009, contrasts Canada and the United States in terms of the government’s responses to indigenous communities suffering from uranium contaminations. Whereas the United States banned uranium mining on Navajo land in 2005 and paid compensation to Navajo miners and transport workers based on the 1990 Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, Canada has taken neither of these measures. Nonetheless, the Dene, the victim, visited Hiroshima to make redress; a deed that neither the American nor Canadian head of state has done.

The American and Canadian response parallels the Japanese government’s irresponsible stance not to compensate individual war victims of Asian neighbors.

Dene’s visit to Hiroshima teaches us how it is possible not to let our *higai* position blind us from our *kagai* responsibility. As in the dominant discourse of peace in Japan, staying in the *higai* position and telling victim narratives is easier than recognizing one’s complicity with the *kagai* position. Dene’s spiritual conviction that all humans and natural being are sacred and connected with each other allows us to see the seamless *higai* and *kagai* cycle and the importance of actively accepting our responsibilities.

However, the Dene could not pass up economic opportunities. Less than 10 years after the visit to Hiroshima, the Déline community agreed to issue drilling
licenses to a mining developer at the uranium ore deposits near Port Radium. As 
Somba ke: The money place shows, the Nuclear Renaissance or the global revival of nuclear energy since the early 2000s boosted the prices of uranium, making Canada’s uranium mining industry keen to expand their production. For the community of Deline, this is also an opportunity for jobs just like in the past.

Today Canada is the second largest exporter of uranium after Kazakhstan. Current uranium mines are located in the Province of Saskatchewan. Japan is one of the largest consumers of uranium for nuclear power. Over 30% of Japan’s imported uranium comes from Canada. Perhaps Canadian uranium (and plutonium produced from Canadian uranium) is now contaminating the environment of Japan and the world after the nuclear disaster in Fukushima. I wonder what the Dene would think about the potential risk of this deadly, natural resource.

Critical reflections on the memories of A-bombs have revealed the multidimensional nature of bigai-kagai relationship. The relation cannot be understood just from a simplistic binary of “who is the victim; who is the offender?” Rather, it is embedded in power hierarchies between and within nations. Acknowledging our bigai-kagai dual position requires a critical self-reflection of our role in local and global communities. The recent nuclear disaster of Fukushima once again challenges us to recognize the complexity of bigai-kagai relations. Although the accident is unrelated to war, the level of destruction as well as the response of the government and the media reminds many people of the war years.

FUKUSHIMA NUCLEAR DISASTER

It is ironic that the world’s only victim nation of nuclear bombs has been suffering from a catastrophic nuclear accident. It appears that Japan is a victim of natural disasters this time—a major earthquake followed by a gigantic tsunami. However, one might also wonder why the only victim nation of nuclear weapons has developed as many as 54 nuclear reactors at 17 nuclear power plants. Why hadn’t Mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki or organizations such as Nihon Hidankyô (Japan Confederation of A- and H-Bomb Suffers Organization) protested against nuclear energy to prevent the Fukushima nuclear accident? In reality, Japan’s policy for using nuclear power for peaceful purposes was initiated by the United States during the Cold War and subsequently promoted by Japan’s political and business establishment. Thus, although the accident was triggered by natural disasters, the real kagai agent was the national and international establishments that promoted nuclear energy. Scholars such as McCormack (2010, 2011) and Tanaka and Kuznick (2011a, 2011b) provide a historical overview.

The idea of the peaceful use of nuclear power dates back to President Eisenhower’s “Atoms for peace” speech at the United Nations General Assembly in 1953. At the height of the Cold War, developing nuclear weapons and winning support from anti-communist allies became essential. However, it was necessary to first dissipate the public fear of nuclear power. The strategy used by the United States was to promote nuclear energy for non-military beneficial purposes. Massive energy generated in a nuclear reactor, which was originally built to produce
plutonium for Nagasaki-type bombs, was used to produce electricity. In 1954, the Bravo hydrogen bomb test in Bikini Atoll prompted a major anti-nuclear movement in Japan (and this initiated the formation of Nihon Hidankyô). However, this did not keep the U.S. and Japanese establishments from promoting the peaceful use of atomic energy. In 1955, both countries signed an agreement to collaborate on the research and development of nuclear energy. Shōriki Matsutarō, a media entrepreneur and later a politician (and an unindicted A-class war criminal), played a major role in launching a campaign to promote nuclear energy. The campaign was extremely successful. Prior to the Fukushima accident, few Japanese feared that nuclear reactors in Japan would ever melt down (or melt through) or even that they knew that so many nuclear reactors existed in the first place, producing almost 30% of the electric power consumed. The idea of nuclear energy for peaceful uses had seeped into people’s minds as common sense.

Other players that the establishment needed to persuade were the people in rural communities where nuclear facilities were built. Economic incentives were offered to economically depressed communities far away from densely populated areas with a high demand for electricity. A huge sum of money was offered to build luxurious public facilities. Just like the Dene who sought new economic chances, people in such communities viewed nuclear power plants as opportunities for jobs and economic prosperity even though they bring only a short-term promise.

The prosperity of the nuclear industry has been built on short-term promises, corruption, falsification of data, cover-ups of accidents, and other deceptive practices. These problematic maneuvers actually continue today in containing the ongoing trouble at the Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant as well as in handling problems at other plants.

How do we understand bigai-kagai relationships in this case? Historically and internationally, the United States has definitely played a major role as an instigator. However, the more immediate kagai agent has been the Japanese establishment including the government, lawmakers, power companies, nuclear industry, businesses, media, and scientists—groups that continue to promote nuclear energy even today. Obviously, the most immediate victims are local people of Fukushima and surrounding prefectures and the restoration workers at Fukushima Daiichi Power Plant.

There is a disturbing overlap among what has happened in Fukushima, Port Radium, and numerous other places like Okinawa, a southern island of Japan that has a long history of oppression. What is shared is the fact that economically and/or ethnically marginalized local residents and working-class people become victims of the establishment of their own country. With regard to the restoration workers at Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant for instance, The Mainichi Shimbun newspaper reported on July 13, 2011 that of the several thousands of workers who were outsourced by approximately 600 firms, 422 did not have contact information. Tokyo Electric Power Company and affiliated firms failed to keep employees’ records, leaving no means to monitor and to ensure these workers’ health. This echoes the situation of the Dene. No employment records of Dene workers at Port Radium are available from mining companies or from the Canadian government; in
fact, some information does exist but after it was transformed from a quasi-government classification to a private one, access has become almost impossible (van Wyck, 2010).

The case of Okinawa is also instructive in this discussion on a nation’s victimization of its own citizens. In Okinawa, tens of thousands of civilians died during the fierce battle near the end of WWII. Many were actually victims of the Japanese Imperial Army; they were forced out of shelters, ordered to commit suicide, or arrested on trumped-up charges of espionage, killed, and robbed of food (Arashiro, 2001). In an illustrated children’s book called Mabuni no Anmā [A mother of Okinawa] (Akaza, 2005), a mother learns about the death of her son and laments: “No matter what, nuchi du takara [life is a treasure], life is precious—but you were not allowed to express it or even think of it.” Even today, Okinawa is forced to host approximately 75% of the U.S. military bases located in Japan. In all these cases, the establishment manipulates, exploits, and abandons the marginalized.

Historically situating the Fukushima accident in political and economic interests allows us to see how vulnerable citizens are manipulated by means of various tactics including economic incentives, propaganda, and appeals to patriotism. Education is often complicit in such manipulation. It is indeed a site of struggle for (re)producing memories of war and peace. In what follows, I focus on two facets of school textbooks: so-called peace materials in language arts and descriptions of the Asia-Pacific War in history education.

WAR AND PEACE IN TEXTBOOKS

Peace materials in Japanese language arts textbooks are reading materials, mostly short stories, about war. Chikamatsu (2008) uses in her “War and the Japanese” course “Chii chan no kage okuri” [Chii-chan’s shadowsending] by Aman Kimiko, which appears in a 3rd grade textbook. It is a story about a young girl living during the war. The story begins on the day before her father is sent to the front. He teaches his children a game of imagining their own shadows in the blue sky. An air raid eventually takes the lives of the young girl and her family. “Otona ni narenakatta otôto tachi ni” [To brothers who couldn’t grow up] by Yonekura Masakane appears in the 7th grade textbook. The author recounts his own experience of losing his baby brother to malnutrition while taking refuge from air raids in an unfamiliar remote village. The story echoes a popular animation film, Hotaru no haka [Grave of the fireflies], which is based on a novel by the same title written by Nosaka Akiyuki. It is a story of a boy and his younger sister who try to survive as orphans but eventually die of hunger. “Hiroshima no uta” [A ballad of Hiroshima] by Imanishi Sukeyuki appears in a 6th grade textbook. It is the story told by a Japanese naval officer who was sent to Hiroshima to rescue genbaku victims. He rescued a baby girl from the arms of her dying mother and left her with a civilian couple who came by. The story ends with a miraculous reunion years later between the author and the girl and an emotional revelation of her identity. An expository essay also for the 6th grade, “Heiwa no toride o kizuku [Building a fortress of peace]” by Oomuta Minoru is about the designation of Hiroshima Genbaku Dome as a UNESCO World Heritage
site. The essay concludes that the building sends a symbolic message of peace and
the renunciation of nuclear weapons.

These stories highlight the brutality and tragedy of bombs and hunger that took
people’s lives, arousing empathy with the victims and expressing condemnation of
war of any kind. This reflects the spirit of the Constitution of Japan as well as the
prevalent discourse of peace as evident in my expectations for the video in Pearl
Harbor. Similar to the discussion of the Bombing of Dresden in a German class
(Kramsch, 2011), nowhere do these texts mention who dropped the bombs.
Furthermore, while these readings emphasize Japan’s victimhood, they mention
nothing about Japan as a kagai agent during the war—there is no mention of Japan’s
aggression in Asia and the Pacific, the oppression of Koreans, Taiwanese, Chinese,
and others, or the atrocities during the Battle of Okinawa. These facts perhaps
reflect a combination of various factors: a legacy of the U.S. occupation, the current
U.S.–Japan military alliance, the relative lack of public discourse on Japan’s war
responsibility, and the politically contested nature of education, which is even more
apparent in history textbooks discussed below.

History textbooks in Japan are always contested. The Ministry of Education requires publishers to pass content screening before they publish their textbooks.
Since textbook publishing is under state control, it is heavily influenced by both
domestic and international politics. Descriptions of certain incidents during the Asia
Pacific War especially raise controversies in conjunction with international demands
to mention Japan’s kagai responsibility. One such example is the issue of comfort
women (ianfu), sexual slaves for Japanese soldiers during WWII. It is estimated that
at least 80,000 to 100,000 women mainly from Korea (80%) and other places such as
Taiwan, China, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Malaysia were mobilized (Tanaka,
2002). Facts about this institutionalized rape and slavery were long hidden, surfacing
only in the late 1980s due to the brave testimony of survivors. In 1991, for example,
Kim Hak-soon, a victim from South Korea testified at a press conference about her
experience. Following a series of lawsuits against the Japanese government filed by
victims and the revelation of official records, the Japanese government finally
acknowledged in 1993 the Japanese Imperial Army’s involvement in the
administration of comfort facilities and made a commitment to remember the facts
through history education. This prompted the references to comfort women in
junior and senior high school textbooks. By 1997, almost all junior and senior high
school history textbooks included a brief reference to comfort women (McCormack,
textbooks that passed the government’s screening in 1992 and 1996, the change in
the later version is clear. However, a reference to comfort women disappears in the
2001 version.

In the 1990s, rightwing conservative groups demanded a reversal of the trend of
recognizing Japan’s war responsibility in history textbooks, which had begun in the
1980s in response to strong criticisms from neighboring countries and Okinawa and
resulted in references to Nanjing Massacre and the Battle of Okinawa. A rightwing
conservative group called Jiyudogi Shikan Kenkyukai [Liberal-View-of-History Study
Group] was established in 1995 by Fujioka Nobukatsu, a scholar of social studies
education, to promote a right-wing revisionist historical view while criticizing the
existing history textbooks that included references to Japan’s wartime crimes as “masochistic.” In 1996, a group of revisionists formed Atarashii Rekishi Kyokusho o Tsukuru Kai [The Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform] and published their first history textbook in 2001. In the midst of this conservative turn, references to comfort women were removed almost completely from textbooks through the publishers’ self-censorship (Nozaki, 2008).

To see what content is included or excluded and how the same incident is described differently, one can compare just two pages on Asian neighbors during the war in two of the most recently published Japanese junior high school textbooks—one authored by Fujioka Nobukatsu et al. (published by Jiyûsha) and another non-revisionist one (e.g., published by Teikoku Shoin). The former downplays Japan’s kagai responsibility and promotes the view that what Japan did to its Asian neighbors is justifiable and even appreciated by Asian people (e.g., those in British Malaya) because it liberated them from European colonial power. Conversely, the latter includes a more detailed account of cultural and linguistic assimilation and forced labor as well as an excerpt from an Indonesian textbook critical of Japanese rule.

As evident, an examination of school textbooks reveals the political construction of the memory of war and peace with in contested discourses. The political construction of war memory is apparent in history textbooks—while some textbooks underscore Japan’s war responsibility, others downplay it. In contrast, kagai perspectives are mostly absent in language arts textbooks. Despite the well-meaning emotional appeal of the gripping stories, this absence seems to work to justify the status quo. That is, the sentimental approach of these narratives that persuades the reader that “war is bad” in effect absolves the reader of responsibility to see kagai dimensions of the historical memory.

The contentious issues discussed thus far can be addressed in multiple ways in classroom teaching. As mentioned earlier, pedagogical implementation is still a work in progress. Below, some preliminary ideas are shared.

TEACHING IDEAS

Before discussing concrete teaching ideas, it is necessary to consider how student demographics might influence the situated ethics that need to be exercised in critical CBI. This is especially important in Japanese language programs that enroll many students from Asian backgrounds. For them, the emotional effect of learning about comfort women or the Nanking Massacre, for example, might not be the same for learners of European descent. Rather than setting out with a one-size-fits-all approach to selecting materials and pedagogy, critical CBI employs situated praxis for deeper understanding of perspectives. Opening the class with a discussion among students in order to acknowledge potential differences and to exchange ideas for creating a classroom environment that embraces mutual respect and provocative conversation can be helpful. Knowing students’ ethnic and educational background is also essential for developing sensitivity and situational ethics.

For instructional ideas, activities suggested by Chikamatsu (2008; 2011), which I mentioned earlier, are applicable to the topics discussed in this paper. With regard to
teaching materials, the resources mentioned in this paper (articles, book chapters, manga, and films) can be used. Table 1 shows a sample of the materials and activities being developed for a fourth-year content-based Japanese language course at the University of British Columbia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school Japanese history textbook (descriptions from Russo-Japanese War to the end of World War II)</td>
<td>• Read and understand key historical incidents.</td>
<td>• Build background knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss in what ways the contents and the use of passive/active voice position Japan as a victim or a victimizer (Chikamatsu, 2011).</td>
<td>• Identify the text’s stance on bigai/kagai and the political nature of history textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt from Fujiwara (2006) on kagai responsibilities and hibakusha narratives</td>
<td>• View online materials on Bravo nuclear test and other incidents mentioned.</td>
<td>• Develop historical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read text and discuss guiding questions on the content in small groups.</td>
<td>• Understand the author’s view and the complexity of bigai-kagai relationship in Hiroshima bombing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I of Kono (2004) (Yûnagi no machi sakura no kuni) manga and film and reviews of the film (online customers’ reviews and media review in a magazine)</td>
<td>• Read manga, watch film, and discuss feelings of hibakusha.</td>
<td>• Understand complex feelings of hibakusha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pay attention to features of Hiroshima dialect.</td>
<td>• Explore how bigai/kagai is manifested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read the reviews of the film and identify differences in views.</td>
<td>• Identify Hiroshima dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Write a review on a film related to the course topic.</td>
<td>• Identify different points of view in evaluative writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Express one’s critical appraisal in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpt from Van Wyck (2010) and Tanaka (2009). Village of Widows by Blow (1999) and the director’s talk</td>
<td>• Read English and Japanese historical accounts of uranium mining in Canada and discuss issues of bigai/kagai.</td>
<td>• Become aware of Canada’s involvement in A-bombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Watch the film, listen to the director’s talk, and ask the director questions.</td>
<td>• Compare/Contrast Dene’s approach to victimhood with other victimhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore social and economic issues behind uranium mining and aboriginal people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excerpts from Nakazawa (1975/1980) (Hadashi no Gen) manga</td>
<td>• Read manga and identify how bigai/kagai perspectives are demonstrated.</td>
<td>• Compare/Contrast the representation of bigai/kagai with other materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Sample teaching materials and activities

Other topics and reading materials can include the Battle of Okinawa (Akaza, 2005; Shinjô, 2001), the Fukushima nuclear disaster (newspaper articles), controversies in history textbooks (compare textbooks published by Teikoku Shoin and Jiyûsha); and “peace materials” from language arts textbooks.
The duality of *bigai/kagai* positions can be introduced at the beginning of the course by using a concrete example like the opening episode of Tōa Dōbun Shoin’s borrowing vs. occupying Jiaotong University’s campus. This episode works especially well for a Canadian classroom in which the majority of students are from Asian backgrounds. The development of individual students’ understanding of *bigai* and *kagai* can be assessed by their occasional reflective writing about their views of these concepts in relation to historical/current events. Learners’ symbolic competence can be developed and assessed through role playing or writing with a hypothetical context in which they are pushed to deal with disparities of opinions and to convince others of their own opinion in a socially, personally, and emotionally successful manner.

**CONCLUSION**

Foreign language learning aims to expand students’ worldview through guiding them to understand multiple perspectives on their own society and the target culture. Reflecting on the contested issues in history and the conflicts among public memories, such as I personally experienced in Shanghai and Hawaii, encourages learners to scrutinize their own historical knowledge and construct new memory. The topics and materials I have presented for critical CBI are meant to provide learners with not only factual information about key events in Japanese history, but also an understanding that each historical event involves political, economic, and social relations of power in the forms of domination, subordination, and resistance both in the target society and in their own. Such understanding can be achieved through critical readings of texts and other semiotic representations as well as dialogues among students, the teacher, other specialists, and community members to uncover hidden meanings.

The power relations and hidden meanings can be understood by examining *bigai-kagai* relationships. These perspectives constitute a critical approach to foreign language teaching, which recognizes the plurality and politics of historical memories and simultaneously problematizes power, knowledge, and discourse. In addition, critical CBI aims to confront past and present injustices, including the oppressive practices of domination and subordination among various groups and environmental exploitation, while envisioning a just and sustainable society without discrimination, oppression, military conflicts, or environmental abuse.

In order to fulfill these goals, it is necessary for teachers as intellectuals to explore critical understandings of the content of instruction, its political and ideological underpinnings, and multiple interpretations of teaching materials. As a content non-specialist, a language teacher can gain information and knowledge from colleagues, community members, and various resources. Although critical CBI taught by a language specialist would not be the same as a class taught by a content specialist in terms of the content depth and theory formation, critical engagement in materials would enable students to understand the politics of multiple perspectives, providing them with critical tools to understand any other topics and to prepare them for content study.
The topic focused on in this paper is by no means easy to discuss. Recognizing and addressing the *kagai* responsibility of the Self—i.e., teachers and students as members of a particular society—is particularly challenging. However, a critical CBI with a challenging content would enable learners to find multiple lenses to critically interpret events to reconstruct historical memory about the Self and the Other.

**NOTES**

1. The institution was established in 1900. It was formally recognized as *senon gakkô* [specialized school] in 1921 and then as a university in 1939 (see Reynolds, 1986).

2. Under the U.S. occupation of Japan, a precursor of Japan’s Self Defense Forces was formed in 1950 shortly after the outbreak of the Korean War. The present system was established in 1954.

3. The United States occupied Japan from 1945 to 1952.

4. Also read an interview with Nakazawa Keiji at http://www.japanfocus.org/-Nakazawa-Keiji/2638

5. In 2010, the US Ambassador to Japan visited Hiroshima Peace Memorial Ceremony for the first time.


7. The media reported in July 2011 that the Mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki would propose reducing reliance on nuclear energy in their speeches at the 2011 Peace Ceremonies and that *Nihon Hidankyô* changed their stance from pro- to anti-nuclear energy.

8. Before then, Japan’s anti-nuclear movement was suppressed by the U.S. occupation authorities.

9. One example is the recent revelation of the involvement of the Japanese government’s Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency in mobilizing local employees of the nuclear industry to participate in public information sessions about nuclear policies (e.g., introduction of nuclear fuel containing plutonium) for the purpose of downplaying oppositional voices.

10. According to *The Yomiuri Shimbun*, TEPCO reported on July 20, 2011 that of 8,338 workers who worked in March and April 2011, 198 remain unaccounted for.

11. One exception is Itsuki Hiroyuki’s essay entitled “Watashi ga aigô to tsuhyaku toki” [When I murmur aigo] (in Itsuki, 1994), in which the author recounts a personal episode in Korea where he grew up during Japanese colonialism.

12. The current official name is the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and technology (MEXT).
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