

<国際関係学部研究会報告>

第1回 (2013年5月28日)

Peace Education at Peace Museums in
Japan and the World

YAMANE, Kazuyo

(Associate Professor, College of International
Relations, Ritsumeikan University
Vice director of Kyoto Museum
for World Peace)

Museums for peace are non-profit educational institutions that promote a culture of peace through collecting, displaying and interpreting peace related materials. They inform the public about peace and nonviolence using illustrations from the lives of individuals, the work of organizations, campaigns, historical events, etc.

There are some differences between war museums and peace museums. War museums tend to exhibit weapons and artifacts such as soldiers' uniforms to glorify war and they tend to justify war in the future. On the other hand, peace museums tend to criticise war and promote peace education for realizing peace. They can be a center for peace where visitors can think what they can do for the better future and discuss issues with others.

As for characteristics of peace museums in Japan, they were founded after World WarII and many Japanese peace museums were established in the 1990s. It is because of the peace movement in the 1980s in the world

and Japan. History education tends to be emphasized in Japan and there are some problems that should be dealt with. For example, Japan's aggression is not exhibited at many public peace museums. However, there are private peace museums such as Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Women's Active Museum, Grassroots House, Oka Masaharu Memorial Nagasaki Peace Museum that show Japan's aggression honestly. It should be pointed out that peace museums in Japan should be more future-oriented.

As for some differences of peace museums between Japan and other countries, there are exhibits on pacifists and peace movements and also conflict resolution workshops dealing with bullying at peace museums in England, Austria, Germany, etc. On the other hand, war and history tend to be emphasized at peace museums in Japan. It is noteworthy that there are many resistant museums against Nazism in Europe to educate children and citizens for peace.

There is a national network of museums for peace called the Japanese Citizens' Network of Museums for Peace: <http://www.tokyo-sensai.net/>. There is its newsletter called *Muse* both in Japanese and English, and they are available on the website of the Center of the Tokyo Raids and War Damage: <http://www.tokyo-sensai.net/>. The *Muse* newsletter has been edited by Emeritus Professor Ikuro Anzai of Ritsumeikan University, Mr. Masahiko Yamabe, a former curator of Kyoto Museum for World Peace and myself. There is also the International Network of Museums for Peace(INMP):

<http://inmp.net/>.

Museums for peace can promote not only peace education but also reconciliation at schools, communities and an international level. All the members of Ritsumeikan including pupils of Ritsumeikan elementary school and secondary school are very lucky to have opportunities to visit Kyoto Museum for World Peace. The peace museum on campus should be visited more not only by children but also students, professors, the staff and citizens. Since peace education should be based on peace research, professors of the College of International Relations are expected to contribute to peace research at Kyoto Museum for World Peace. Fortunately, there is a plan of making a peace research center which is affiliated with Kyoto Museum for World Peace. It would be a good opportunity for researchers in various fields to contribute to peace research and make it known through exhibitions at the peace museum on campus.

第2回 (2013年10月8日)

Non-Western IR, Civilisational Histories,
and the Problem of Historical Narratives

ATAKA, Hiroaki

(Associate Professor, College of International
Relations, Ritsumeikan University)

Recent International Relations scholarship has seen an emerging debate on the possibility and desirability of non-Western or national forms of understanding “the international,” with advocates arguing for the need to include ideas and experiences beyond the West, while critics cautioning the dangers of looking too much for “differences” (e.g. Acharya and Buzan 2010; Bilgin 2008, 2010). Perhaps a reflection of the rise of Asia (or the non-West more generally) in recent years, however, this invites one to question whether the Western/non-Western IR debate has produced relevant new insights for our understanding of the contemporary world. The most important contribution of this approach, it may be argued, is that it highlights the Eurocentric, Westphalian narrative (and its corollary of seeing the development of international history as the “expansion of European international society”) built in to the heart of IR—increasingly recognized as insufficient to understand the world today.

Yet it does have its limits. In particular, lapsing into relativism remains a constant danger, leading IR to retreat to the study of abstract principles or to just become a convenient legitimising discourse of great powers, East and West. Rather than

portraying the “West” and the “non-West” as a dichotomy, and attempt to rediscover lost “civilizational histories,” a better way forward may be to abandon the linear historical narrative of mainstream IR that determines sovereign states (and relationship between them) as absolute for a more plural understanding of world politics that gives weight to a variety of ideas, practices and experiences, but in a way that is relational and not merely creating unconnected historical narratives of world politics.

In an attempt to develop and contribute to a more relevant, critical IR theory, the paper argues that it is necessary to first *unthink* the Westphalian narrative engrained in the field in order to rediscover forgotten ideas and thinking that will open up alternative ways of conceiving the world (Patomaki 2002, Ch.5; Cox 1995). (Re) constructing multiple narratives and imagining plural futures, each reflecting experiences from both “West” and “non-West,” and comparing them with regards to whether it addresses the problems that matter to and are identified by groups in the local, national, and global communities (Flyvbjerg 2006), it seems, is a more fruitful path of questioning both the disciplinary and social boundaries of IR.

Lively discussion followed the presentation, particularly focusing on the role of history in the study of IR, the meaning of “connecting” history, and the implications of “post-Western” IR. I thank the participants for their useful feedback to the paper.

