IPSHU RESEARCH REPORT SERIES

THE INSTITUTE FOR PEACE SCIENCE,
HIROSHIMA UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH REPORT No. 6

The Concept Of Peace Research In Japan And Its Political Context

Hiroharu SEKI

Institute for Peace Science,
Hiroshima University

Institute of Oriental Culture,
Tokyo University

1. Characteristics of Japanese Peace Research

The militarization of global politics has developed and continues to develop under the impetus of an expected increase in the security of each sovereign state; in particular, that of the United States and the Soviet Union. However, it is now time to question whether or not militarization has already reached a threshold beyond which negative feedback is extremely difficult. If we do not raise such questions, militarization may go beyond this threshold without our being aware of it. Clearly, the most important contemporary issue is how to identify this threshold. It is rather ironical that the expectation of an increase in the security of each nation through a build-up in military strength has in fact produced a marked decline in the security of each nation. This is aptly illustrated by Kenneth E. Boulding's reference to the sovereign state's "loss of unconditional viability." The present international arena should in a sense be called a "global political crisis" in which the Westphalian international system is perhaps no longer viable for forecasting the inevitability of a total nuclear war.

In this context, the international and domestic political history of the post-war period in Japan is particularly useful in providing a future perspective for the development of global peace research, because post-war Japan started its history as a disarmed nation under the American Occupation and yet, in spite of the existence of the Japanese "peace constitution," clearly prohibiting the possession of any kind of armament, Japan has, step by step, gradually built up its military might and moved away from the founding principles of the constitution. The Japanese constitution is, in fact, rooted in the idea of a disarmed, neutral nation-state in the Westphalian system. Of course, the intellectual peace movement in Japan recognized this dilemma in the very early period of Japan's postwar history. It has moreover proved to be particularly sensitive to any kind of nuclear threat; indeed, Japan's move

away from "economical animal" to "military build-up" has been severely criticised by peace oriented intellectuals based on their own intuitive experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Not suprisingly, the concept of peace in Japan originated in this historical experience, for Japan was the first victim of the atomic bomb when one was dropped over Hiroshima and then over Nagasaki. Such an intellectual tradition in the Japanese mode of thinking continues as an effective brake at least preventing the manifest militarization of Japan and, perhapas in a later period, of the world.

In consideration of the above, therefore, the logical structure of Japanese peace research should have been developed within a framework constructed out of the experiences of the war victims. Howener, Japan's capacity to transform the Westphalian system has not been of a type able to prevent the formation of a "second" cold-war structure, even if Japan's economic power has increased tremendously. It is perhaps natural, therefore, that the recent increase in Japan's economic power should have inspired Japanese peace researchers to produce a type of peace research that is rooted in a deep sense of responsibility for Japan's role in the war as aggressor, as well as a type of peace research that is rooted in the experience of the victims of war. Thus, on the one hand, peace research from the standpoint of the victims of war produced a peace research of "revenge"; on the other hand, peace research from the standpoint of not becoming aggressors again produced a peace research of the "guilty." It should be emphasized that the political context allowing both types of peace research has graduallly developed in the post-war political and intellectual history of Japan.

Peace research itself should be objective insofar as it is a scientific and academic activity. However, it also incorporates historical characteristics because it deals with the most important and relevant aspects of the world as the central subject of research. It is also critical, because the existing policies of the nation-state cannot be effectively coped with

within the framework of the existing academic disciplines or through interdisciplinary approaches based on the stereo-typed values of the present system. Insofar as peace research is mission-oriented, moreover, a certain minimal, ideational creativity should be present, because peace research should provide fresh ideas for the creation of the future world. The above mentioned four characteristics of peace research, that is, scientific-objectivity, the historical, critical and ideational are, in a sense, universal to the development of peace research.[1] Still, depending on the particular time and situation, one or two of the four may become particularly important.

In the development of peace research in Japan, for example, the historical and critical aspects of peace research have been most important, particularly in the clinical peace research of the late 1940's and 1950's. In contrast, the scientific-objectivity of Japanese peace research increased in the 1960's and early part of the 1970's. Finally, the ideational has become important at the end of the 1970's. If we were to tentatively establish representative groups to coincide with the development of Japanese peace research, then the period from 1950–1960 would be represented by the Peace Issues Discussion Group, the period from 1964–1973 by the Japan Peace Research Group and the period from 1973–1979 by the Peace Studies Association of Japan.

Due to limitations of space I will in this paper only focus on peace research in the historical and political context, examining in particular the Peace Issues Discussion Group. Next, I will examin the problem of the relationship between the various types of peace research being conducted in Japan in terms of institutional dynamics. Here I will focus on the scientific objectivity of peace research in Japan by comparing the various types of peace research in Japan in which the Japan Peace Research Group and the Peace Studies Association of Japan are most influential. Finally, peace research within the university hierarchy will be discussed from the future perspective of the relationship with the United

Nations University. This suggests an important issue concerning future ideas for university reform not only in Japan, but also in the world at large.

2. Peace Research in the Japanese Political Context

In contrast to peace research in the United States and Europe, peace research in Japan is naturally different in several important ways.[2] One of the differences is that Japanese peace research is more oriented to clinical peace research compared to the basic peace research of the United States and Europe. As long ago as the late 1940's and early 1950's outstanding and pioneering achievements were made in the area of clinical peace research in Japan. It can be called "clinical peace research" in the same way that "clinical medicine" exists in the field of medical science.[3] At the time when the confrontation between the power blocs over the Berlin Blockade was intensifying, eight social scientists gathered at UNESCO and issued an important statement on peace. The statement became the starting point for post-war Japanese peace research concerned with the causes of tensions which produce war. The Japanese monthly journal, *Sekai* (The World), founded after the war in 1946, quickly published this statement in its January, 1949 issue. In response to this statement by the UNESCO social scientists, *Sekai* organized comprehensive research on peace in the fall of 1948 and, in its March 1949 issue, published the clinical oriented "Statement of Japanese Scientists on War and Peace." On this occassion, the Peace Issues Discussion Group was formed by scholars in Tokyo and Kyoto and a "Statement of the Group on the Peace Treaty Problem" was published in the March, 1950 issue of *Sekai*. Following the outbreak of the Korean War in June of that year, the Group compiled a research report entitled "On Peace 1950," attached to the Third Joint Statement on Peace. Of the above

three, the last one was the most outstanding achievement of clinical peace research in post-war Japan, many of the comments still being valid today. "On Peace 1950" was in four parts: (1) Our basic thought on the peace issue; (2) Conflict and accommodation between the two worlds; (3) A discussion of the constitution's pacifism; (4) A discussion of the problem of finding a solution to the various domestic, social and economic problems which are deeply intertwined with the establishment of peace.[4] The most penetrating section of the report concentrates on an analysis of the mode of thinking to employ in international politics and on understanding the cold war structure each in part (1) and part (2). In part (1) Japan's leading political scientist, Maruyama Masao, undeclared author of the draft of this report, begins by arguing that war is a self-defeating means. He evaluates the new reality in which idealism should play a central role, given the paradoxical truth of the nuclear age, and argues that, though it may appear to be a paradox, the idealistic position maintaining war to be the greatest evil and peace to be the prime value, has acquired validity, too, since war has reached the stage of nuclearization. Thus, Maruyama argues that the mode of thinking to be employed in considering the problem of peace is of tremendous importance.[5] He coins the term the "two worlds" for the cold war structure, rejecting the view that considers the peaceful co-existence of the two worlds impossible. It is important to note that Maruyama proposed the need to make a positive study of the conditions of such coexistence. In part (2) Maruyama criticises the cold war tendency to judge problems of world politics and diplomacy, not as the intertwining of a multitude of factors, but simply in terms of a priori, absolute criteria such as friend or foe, or good and evil, thereby restricting any option for a flexible response to problems of international politics. Thus, he attempts a reexamination of the conflict between the "two worlds" on three distinct levels: namely, 1. the conflict between liberal democracy and communism as ideologies; 2. the conflict between the Western Bloc, with the United States and the United Kingdom as the central props, and the

Communist Bloc, centering on the Soviet Union; 3. the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union as the superpowers of today. His criticism of cold war policies is more realistic than the so-called realist school of international politics in that, in judging the trends of world politics, the necessity to grasp the interwined nature of these multiple ideological conflicts is understood. He furthermore takes up the fallacy of the inevitability of armed conflict. Maruyama concludes that even if coexistence is tactically impossible in the short-run, long-term coexistence should be strategically possible.[6] The prescience of his forecast can easily be identified, given the development of relationships between the Western Bloc and the Communist Bloc in the 1960's and 1970's, even if coexistence has not yet been achieved. Moreover, "On Peace 1950" is solid, clinical peace research that provides a starting point for historical reflection by Japanese scholars, now in the midst of the development of contemporary peace research, regarding the creation of a politics of peace.

3. The Relationship between Various Types of Peace Research in Japan

Despite these early achievements, the development of basic peace research in Japan has been particularly slow. One of the reasons is that a number of leading intellectuals in the post-war period believed that even if "peace thought" is possible, peace research as a field of study is not. They developed the idea that "thought" and "scholarship" are completely separate. It is perhaps natural that there has always been a strong awareness of "peace thought" and the existence of the peace movement in Japan. Thus, from the beginning, an academic environment existed in which the development of basic peace research lagged behind that in the West. Indeed, in the case of Japan, "peace thought" and the peace movement have proved to be obstacles to the development of peace research.

It was in 1964 that a peace research group fully aware of the development of peace research as a new academic field was formed in Japan. The name of this group was the Tokyo Peace Research Group, later known as the Japan Peace Research Group. Some of those who played a major role in the formation of this group included the late Norman Wilson (at the time, representative for the American Friends Service Committee in Tokyo and also the Quaker International Affairs representative in East Asia), and Kenneth Boulding (at the time, Visiting Professor at International Christian University) and his wife Elise Boulding, who initiated several meetings to make prepatory arrangements for the organization of the group. In a similar way to that in which the first clinical research in Japan was inspired by the statement of the UNESCO social scientists, here also the impact on Japanese peace research was from outside Japan. Such is in fact the historical tradition of Japanese cultural development since the beginning of our history. Once the group was formed, however, internal creativity developed quite rapidly as a result of the already established influence on the advancement of peace ideology by the activities of the Peace Issues Discussion Group. Some of the younger members of the Peace Issues Discussion Group became core members of the Japan Peace Research Group after the Group changed from the Tokyo Peace Research Group under the impact of the creation of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA). However, the Japan Peace Research Group preserved a multi-faceted character by attracting a diverse membership. It also maintained intimate ties with Peace Research Society International (PRSI later PSSI) through the activities of some members of the Group. At the time of the Group's inauguration there were sixteen members, including Hosoya Chihiro (President, Japan Association of International Relations 1976–present), Ishida Takeshi (co-Director of the Group with Royama Michio 1972–1975), Kawata Tadashi (the first Director of the Group 1966–1972 and the second President, Peace Studies Association of Japan 1975–1977), Munakata Iwao, Mushakoji Kinhide (Vice Rector, United

Nations University 1975–present), Royama Michio, Sakamoto Yoshikazu (Director of the

Group 1975–present and the Secretary General of IPRA, 1979–present), Seki Hiroharu (the

first President, Peace Studies Association of Japan 1973–1975, and the first Director,

Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University 1975–1979) Tanaka Yasumasa, Ukita

Hisako (Secretary of the Group, 1966–present) and others. The Group followed a slow but

sure path and, in its own way, played a pioneering role in the development of peace research

in Japan by the publication of an English annual, *Peace Research in Japan,* and promoting

exchanges with peace researchers overseas. From the beginning, however, this group was no

more than an informal intellectual body; hence, it lacked the flexible and dynamic capacity

needed to promote the growth of peace research throughout Japan. The weakness of this

group arose from the informal, closed nature of the preceding Peace Issues Discussion

Group, even after the latter was dissolved in 1961. It was in one sense a kind of transfor-

mation of the traditional character of Japanese society.

World peace research began as a trend in the academic community in the late 1950's

and, from the latter-half of the 1960's, major advances were made in the process of a

worldwide institutionalization of peace research. The institutionalization of peace research

in Japan, however, has fallen considerably behind that of the United States and Europe due

to lack of progress in providing a peace research infrastructure. In spite of that, empirical

and behavioral aspect of peace research developed in Japan during the latter half of the

1960's. Eventually, by the beginning of the 1970's, voices were being raised by groups of

young Japanese scholars calling for the introduction of an association of peace studies which

would be non-exclusive and open. The debate was mostly concentrated on the question of

the character of the new assocation. One of the reasons for the closed nature of the Japan

Peace Research Group can be found in the member's idea of strengthening peace values

originating in the experience of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings and the spirit of ar-

ticle 9 of the Japanese constitution, incorporating the bombing experience as a principle. There were fears, particularly among the original members of the Peace Issues Discussion Group, that once an open-system association was established in the field of peace research, too, attitude towards peace which the Group originally demanded would be diffused. In spite of this, however, the way to establishing the *Nihon Heiwa Gakkai* (Peace Studies Association of Japan) was finally paved in 1973 through the close collaboration of Kawata Tadashi, Mushakoji Kinhide and Seki Hiroharu.

Establishment of the Peace Studies Association of Japan accelerated the further institutionalization of peace research. In the same year, the National Committee on the Problems of Peace and War was established in the Japan Science Council and has been active in playing the role of a liason for potential peace researchers. It was also in 1973 that the 28th United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution to promote peace research worldwide; moreover, the Assembly passed a resolution to establish the United Nations University in Tokyo. In November 1974, the Japan Science Council submitted to the Japanese Government a "Recommendation to Promote Peace Research in Japan" and organized a symposium on "A Search for a Peaceful World Order" at Hiroshima University. It was on August 1, 1975 that the Institute for Peace Science was inaugurated--though admittedly on a small scale--by the brave decision of the administration of Hiroshima University. On the other hand, Peace Science Society International (PSSI) was successful in establishing the Japan section of PSSI after organizing a PSSI East Asia Study Seminar in Osaka in September, 1974. Here it should be emphasized that the Japan Peace Research Group, the Peace Studies Association of Japan, the National Committee on the Problems of Peace and War in the Japan Science Council, the Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University and the Japan Section of PSSI are at present jointly promoting the development of peace research in Japan. This is illustrated by the fact that some scholars are members of more than one

organization.

The unique characteristics of Japanese society can also be seen to be valid in promoting co-operation between different peace research groups and associations. The PSAJ has here taken a leading role through its special type of loose and soft organizational principles that assure democratic and dynamic control of the Association. The Association represents more than twenty different disciplines and the thirty one members of its Board of Directors are elected from nine different regions of the country, ranging form Hokkaido to Okinawa. As of July 1979, the membership numbered more than 500. Its growth rate is thus extremely rapid as in 1973 the membership numbered only seventy two. The PSAJ is indeed the largest, most interdisciplinary and most nation wide scholarly peace research association in the world. In order to ensure that peace studies might not be confused with strategic studies, moreover, the rules of the Association forbid membership to any person who belongs to an organization or institute which may use the results of the Association's research for purposes of war.[7] Since its inauguration, the PSAJ has held an annual General Meeting in the autumn and a seminar meeting every spring. In addition, several ad hoc seminars have been organized, including those to which foreign scholars have been invited. At present the PSAJ has three commissions: planning, editorial and external relations. It is now planning to form several specialized research commissions such as a disarmament research commission, a marine peace research commission, a science and technology policy commission, an immigration and refugee research commission, a peace education commission and others in addition to a number of regional commissions. Since 1976 the PSAJ has published an annual review, *Heiwa Kenkyu* (Peace Studies)[8] and four newsletters each year. The sixth General Meeting of the PSAJ was held on October 7–8, 1978 at the Yokohama International Conference Center on the general theme, "Peace and Human Rights." This theme was especially appropriate in view of Japan's ratification of the International Decla-

ration of Human Rights. The most recent two meetings were respectively held June 23–25, at the Okinawa Pacific Hotel, concentrating on the theme "Okinawa in the 1980's: Peace and Autonomy——A Perspective for the Development of Okinawa" and November 24–25, at Chuo University, concentrating on the theme "Creating Global Security for Peace in the 1980's." The former was chosen in order to bring into focus the peripheral development of Okinawa within Japan as model of the development of the South under global structural violence. Thus, the PSAJ is not only moving in the direction of peace research in the most industrially advanced areas of the world, but also creating new research themes for the future development of peace research.

4. Peace Research within the University Hierarchy

As I have already emphasized, compared with the general development of the PSAJ, the institutionalization of peace research in Japan has fallen considerably behind that of the United States and Europe due to lack of progress in providing a peace research infrastructure. Moreover, except in a few cases (Hiroshima University and later Nagasaki Institute of Applied Science and Soka (Buddist) University) no institutes for peace research have been created.[9] Neither have existing social science research institutes devoted efforts to peace research activities. Of course, research institutes concerned with Asia did exist, but there was no attempt to apply peace research techniques to the analysis of the Third World. The main reason for this is the almost complete lack of neccessary material and non-material conditions.

In February 1975, under the advocacy of the Japan Peace Research Group, the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO was persuaded to organize a Symposium on Peace

Research in Tokyo where interested scholars from Asian countries would be invited. At the planning stage, however, a group of conservative Japanese scholars in the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO attempted to control the Symposium. In addition, UNESCO, in co-operation with the International Peace Research Association, quite recently sent out a questionnaire survey on peace research activities to peace research organizations and groups throughout the world; however, so far as Japan is concerned, the organizations and groups selected are both limited and inappropriate. In fact, the PSAJ was ignored until the executive made contact with UNESCO in Paris. This indicates that, because the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO is composed of conservative intellectuals, precise information pertaining to peace research in Japan was not forwarded to Paris. The Commission members, like certain bureaucrats from the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, have not yet rid themselves of the mistaken notion that peace research is somehow dangerous.[10] Such an atmosphere supports the contemporary hierarchical information order in which the university is located. The specialization of various disciplines also supports a conservative information order in which the creative institutionalization of peace research is extremely difficult to achieve. Various obstacles strengthen each other and build hidden barriers to prevent peace research from being institutionalized. In order to build peace on a global scale, there needs to be a reinvestigation of our science and technology policies from the institutional perspective, because the qualitative arms race is now the gravest factor in the militarization of the super-powers——the military use of science and technology is the basis of such a qualitative arms race. Accordingly, as a base for the reinvestigation of science and technology policies on a global scale, there is the urgent need for the realization of a new conception of university reform which goes so far as to include the positions of the faculties of engineering and science. Clearly, the development of peace research should be a major aim in designs for university reform; however, even in Japan,

where the "peace constitution" is deeply rooted, there are hardly any signs of this kind of awareness in designs for university reform.

On the other hand, however, the Japanese Government decided to establish the United Nations University in Tokyo. The charter of the United Nations University clearly states that peace research should be conducted within the University by its mention of the necessity for research into pressing global problems of human survival and several specific subjects such as coexistence between peoples having different cultures, peaceful relations between states and maintenance of peace and security. Other research subjects include economic and social changes in development, the environment and the proper use of resources, the application of the results of science and technology in the interests of development and universal human values related to the improvement of the quality of life.[11] These latter research subjects also belong to peace research in its broad conceptualization, ie. peace research defined as positive peace research. Thus, the United Nations University is located at the top of an information order that should be reshaped for the purpose of global peace building. However, the present Westphalian system in which the sovereign nation state is still one of the core units——in fact, the core unit——does not permit the United Nations University to carry out a creative role in the process of global peace building. This is true in Japan——a country which tried to go beyond sovereignty at the end of the Second World War by contemplating disarmed neutrality.

In the latter part of the 1940's, Tokyo Imperial University was reorganized as Tokyo University, removing the name "Imperial." In the development of universities in the post-war period, moreover, the development of the Japanese economy provide the boost for the universities, particularly the engineering departments. These departments played a leading role in university expansion by their rapid adaptation to differentiation in the industrial sector, but because of the "peace constitution" they were not militarized (at least formally).

The question remains whether or not the constitution can continue to act as a barrier against the militarization of the engineering departments. It is here that the United Nations University can hopefully play a vital role. By creating a peaceful world order on the research level, the militarization of the universities may be prevented. Various types of peace research groups could develop a transnational network of academic communities and thus create an atmosphere of innovative reform. This should not only be on the research level but also on the institutional level. The PSAJ is in fact in favor of such an idea. Whether or not it can be successful will mainly depend on the future value of the world intellectual community, a community which will be strengthened by the development of peace research centering on the United Nations University.

Notes

1 See in particular the article by Takayanagi Sakio in part IV, "Peace Research," in *Sengo Nihon no Kokusaiseijigaku* (The Science of International Relations in Postwar Japan). However, Takayanagi does not mention scientific objectivity as a criterion for peace research.

2 Several surveys or analyses of the postwar development of Japanese peace research have been published, though few in English. Many mre written from the standpoint of the Japan Peace Research Group, see Takahashi Susumu and Nakamura Ken'ichi, "Peace Research in Postwar Japan," in *Peace Research in Japan 1978–1979,* published by the Japan Peace Research Group. However, some of the group are critical of this article because it is oriented to the school of the present chairman, Sakamoto Yoshikazu. From the standpoint of the Peace Studies Association of Japan, see Seki Hiroharu, *Politics of Peace,* Kawata Tadashi, *Development of Peace Research in Japan,* both published in the *Japan Quarterly,* (Vol. XXIV, No. 3 July–September, 1977). Seki's *Politics of Peace,* is an extract from a much longer article in Japanese in the 1977 annual of the Political Science Association of Japan. From the same perspective also see Nishikawa Jun, *Toward the Advancement of Peace Research,* (PSAJ Newsletter, No. 1, May 1979). Seki, Kawata, Nishikawa and Tabata Shigejiro are respectively first (1973–1975), second (1975–1977), third (1977–1979) and forth (1979–present) presidents of the PSAJ. From the standpoint of the Peace Research Section of the Japan Association of International Relations, see the Japanese "Peace Research," op. cit. (no translation of this article is available). Also see Okamoto Mitsuo, "Possibilities and Priorities of Peace Research in Japan (1), the Case of the PSAJ," *Ronshu* (Treaties), Journal of Shikoku Gakuin University, Vol. 42, December, 1978.

3 Seki Hiroharu, *Mission Shiko Kagaku toshite no Heiwa Kenkyu* (Peace Science as a Mission Oriented Science) in *Kokusaiseiji, Heiwakenkyu* (International Politics, Peace Research), the Japan Association of International Relations, 1976.

4 Peace Issues Discussion Group, "On Peace — 1950," reproduced as a translation in *Peace Research in Japan 1976,* accompanied by an editorial introduction by Sakamoto Yoshikazu.

5 For a detailed discussion of this point, see Glenn D. Hook, "From Field-Work to 'Field-Back': Reality Definitions in Early Japanese 'Peace Research,' " *Ronshu,* (Treaties), Journal of Shikoku Gakuin University, forthcoming.

6 Sakamoto Yoshikazu and Seki Hiroharu, "Forecasting in Cross-National Perspective: Japan," in N. Choucri and T.W. Robinson (editors) *Forecasting in International* Relations (W.H. Freeman, 1978).

7 For the full-text of the statutes of the Peace Studies Association of Japan, see PSAJ Newsletter, No. 1 May, 1979.

8 The first issue of *Heiwa Kenkyu* (Peace Studies) was a collection of papers presented at the Association's second General Meeting on the "Methodology of Peace Research." The second issue was devoted to "Peace as a Value" and "Peace Education." The third issue was on "Social Structure and Peace–the Case of the Japanese Constitution," finally, the fourth, most recent issue, dealt with "The Theory of Peace Movements." The Association has also edited a book entitled *Kakujidai no Heiwagaku* (Peace Studies in the Nuclear Age), a collection of papers presented at the Third General Meeting, published by Jiji Tsushinsha 1976 and a book entitled *Heiwa to Jinken* (Peace and Human Rights), a collection of papers presented at the Sixth General Meeting, published by Waseda University Press. 1979.

9 See the discussion by Masui Michio, "Hiroshima's Constructive Effort——Establishment of the Research Institute for Peace Science at Hiroshima University," *Peace Research in Japan,* 1974—1975.

10 For a discussion of the influence of UNESCO on the development of peace education in Japan, see Glenn D. Hook, "Japan: Political or Apolitical Education for Peace," *Prospects,* Summer, 1979.

11 See 1 and 3 of article 1, purposes and structures in the charter of the United Nations University (UNU). At the present moment the only important peace research activities are those related to "Goals, Processes and Indicators of Development (GPID) in "Human and Social Development Program (HSD)" However, funds of the UNU have only reached one seventy of the original amount expected because the major powers (except for Japan and the United Kingdom) did not provide the funds originally agreed upon. For a discussion of the GPID, see Johan Galtung, *Goals, Processes and Indicators of Development, A Project Description* published by United Nations University. The GPID project includes twenty six institutions throughout the world, including the Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University. The Institute is co-operating with other institutes throughout the world on the study of militarization. For an example of some of the work being conducted, see Seki Hiroharu, "Global Militarization and its Remedy." (HSDRGPID—11/ UNUP—63)