

Challenge and Dilemma for Peace Movements in Japan

Ohtori KURINO*

SUMMARY

The peace movements in Japan should have been pursuing, or having relations to some extent to, the principles of peace, which are contained in the Constitution of Japan. But, in most cases these movements have not been so keenly trying to achieve in their actual moves what the peace principles should demand. In many of them there has been observed a sort of dilemma between their achievements or even objectives and what they should be expected from the peace principles.

One perhaps very serious reason for above situation may be the fact that to most of the leaders engaging in the peace movements in Japan the profound significances of the peace principles have not been clear enough to become the core of their consciousness. Although most of the Japanese scholars of constitutional law have been maintaining that the peace principles should request the government of Japan to observe the fundamental policy or position of “no war, no armaments and neutrality”, there has remained room for different interpretations of the related provisions of the Constitution of Japan. Therefore, the author first tries to make the concepts and meanings of the peace principles clear. Analysing the sentences of Preamble and the provisions of Article 9, the author reaches the conclusion that these norms or principles will constitute “the Peace Principle” as a complex or system of norms.

In the light of the above-mentioned findings, or under “the Peace Principle”, the peace movements in Japan and some other movements “towards peace” are examined. After this the author proposes that the said principle could be taken up anew as an alternative or the basic norm for an alternative

* Advisor, Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University

security for Japan, by the peace movements.

The author then states that a dilemma can become a challenge, if those engaging in the peace movements should try to face it in the most square manner, and the author places a hope upon some of the movements “towards peace” in their roles in transforming the world into one that the Peace Principle should be realized.

1. Peace movements

Of these days the students of universities or colleges in Japan who are studying international relations will not find it so difficult to understand such terminologies as “negative peace” and “positive peace”, and “direct violence” and “structural violence”; and some of these students often use these words in writing reports about certain subjects of their studies.

On the other hand, few students in the same school or study know about “the right to live in peace” that has been stressed by some of the Japanese scholars of constitutional law, although this right is written in Preamble of the Constitution of Japan, which should be known by the Japanese students studying law or political sciences.

In the case of the leaders of the peace movements and those researchers who are closely working with them, their understandings of “peace” seem more limited than those of the Japanese students stated above. Among these leaders and others, it seems, “peace” still means only “international peace”; and their movements are separated from other movements of the Japanese citizens aiming at something wider than “peace” or “international peace.”

Very recently, some scholars of constitutional law in Japan have published their books (see note), in which they give detailed explanations about “the right to live in peace” and their ideas of an alternative system of comprehensive security for Japan. I have had chances of participating in their group meeting and of learning directly from them, in the past several years; and I may say that I am familiar with at least some parts of their findings and ideas. In this article, therefore, I will utilize what I could learn from them in analyzing the peace movements in Japan which will include the movements aiming at realizing “the right to live in peace, free from fear and want” for “all peoples of the world”, in the use of words of Preamble of the Constitution of Japan, or aiming at achieving such situation that not only “direct violence” but also “structural violence” will be eliminated and not only “negative peace” but also “positive peace” will be assured, if I use the terminology of some schools of peace research, whose influences have been reaching to some Japanese students.

2. Dilemma for the peace movements in Japan

Legally speaking it will be true that all the Japanese people and their actions including peace movements in either narrower or broader sense will come under the binding force of the provisions of the Constitution of Japan; and, also in the moral and political aspect the “peace principles” contained in the Con-

stitution of Japan will be binding those persons and their movements aiming at peace. But, it is really doubtful if the leaders of these movements and those researchers closely related to them have the perception or understandings of “the right to live in peace free from fear and want” and its realization will be the ultimate objective of their movements. If they do not have full perception or understandings of this point, it must be said that they are not fully exerting their efforts for achieving the peace principles of the Constitution of Japan, although they should be bound by it, legally, morally and politically. This situation may be described as a sort of dilemma, in the sense that they are falling in a contradicting situation as to the peace principles.

Take for example the case of “Anti-nuclear-weapons” movements that have been continuously been carried out since about 1954 till present, with ups and downs by every ten years or so, their ultimate objective should be to assure all peoples of the world such states of affairs that these peoples can enjoy “the right to live in peace” free from the fear of being exterminated by nuclear-weapons or nuclear warfare. But, in the actual movements aiming at banning nuclear-weapons, few leaders seem understand this point. In fact, as it was observed in some periods before and during the campaigns related to SSD I and II, the collection of signatures had become as if such actions were the objective itself, most of the people or leaders of the movements related to these actions disregarding for what ultimate objective they were working.

In the case of “Anti-Anpo” movements in 1959 and 60, their ultimate objective should have been to achieve such situation in Japan and East Asia that the peace principles of the Constitution of Japan could be strictly observed and realized. In other words, the leaders and those researchers closely related to the movements should give stress in the fundamental position of Japan and the Japanese people in their external relations the position or policy of “no war, no arms and non-alignment.” But this point was not clearly understood by most of those who engaged in the movements. Indeed, the idea and actions of “non-alignment” started in early 1960s and they were not yet known to the Japanese people, or even to the intellectuals. The leaders of “Anti-Anpo” movements and the researchers related applied the concept of “neutrality” that could not fully cover what the peace principles or “the Peace Principle” (to be explained later) of the Constitution of Japan should demand. In the movement there were confusions about their objectives, and it may be said that their leaders could not solve the dilemma they had to face.

Further back in 1949, 50 and 51, there were “Overall-peace” movements aiming at achieving peace treaties with all of the Allied Powers, overcoming the East-West conflicts or the situation of “Cold War” of that time. The movements could not attain their aims, mainly because the power of the related governments and conservative factions in Japan was stronger than that of the movements; and there were strong effects of Korean War upon the political and psychological or ideological aspects of the Japanese people. But it must be pointed out that the peace principles of the Constitution of Japan were not brought to the attention of most of those intellectuals who were engaging in the movements, even though the Yoshida government gave to the provisions of Article 9 such interpretation that Japan should not resort to war of self-defense and renounce all war potentials. It was the initial interpretation of the Japanese government but was soon amended by the same government and the succeeding ones, just to meet the changing situations and actions taken by them, under the US-Japan Security Treaty which accompanied San Francisco Peace Treaty, or “partial-peace” as was criticised by the side of “Overall-peace” movements. It seems strange that concluding the US-Japan Security Treaty, a military alliance, did not stir stronger opposition or resistance from the side of the people, nor among the intellectuals including the scholars of constitutional law. But the extent of the perception or understanding of the peace principles of the Constitution of Japan could not reach that of the Japanese scholars of these days, as a matter of fact. It was only after the other aspect of the military alliance became clear to the Japanese people, through some incidents directly affecting the life of the people, or “the right to live in peace” was violated. It may be said, perhaps, in the case of “Overall-peace” movements, even the above-mentioned dilemma was not realized by those who were engaging in these movements. (The question of the movements aiming at peace in the broad sense will be taken up later).

3. The Peace Principle

The provisions of Article 9 (hereinafter referred to as A-9) of the Constitution of Japan (C-J) are clear and plain enough, if they will be read as they are; and they will be interpreted as showing the principle of “no war, nor armaments, and non-alignment.” The renunciation of war will be applied to all wars including so-called war of self-defense, as “the right of belligerency is not recognized.” But, soon after the enactment of C-J, so-called “Ashida amendment”, or the phrase added by Mr. Ashida’s initiative “in order to accomplish the aim of

the preceding paragraph”, was used as a sort of proviso, and the original interpretation by the government was altered to that so-called war for self-defense should not be renounced. Then, to maintain armed forces was regarded permissible if these forces would be for self-defense. As to becoming a partner to a military alliance, there was such an argument to justify it as that A-9 did not prohibit Japan to conclude a military alliance with other states for the sake of self-defense. Since then among the politicians, journalists, intellectuals and some parts of the public in Japan there have been bitter arguments of pros and cons regarding the constitutionality of the Self Defense Forces and the US-Japan Security Treaty, and the public opinion seems confused and divided about it, although the majority is still favoring the present C-J.

In my view, in order to clarify any ambiguity contained in some of clauses of the constitution, it is necessary and appropriate to look into its other clauses, especially the sentences of Preamble. In the case of C-J, its Preamble has important, very meaningful sentences such as the following (the order is changed by the author in order to re-group the the sentences according to the objects covered by the norms contained in the respective sentences):

- 1) We, the Japanese people, desire peace for all time and are deeply conscious of the high ideals controlling human relationship, and we have determined to preserve our security and existence, trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples of the world. We desire to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace, and the banishment of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance for all time from the earth.
- 2) We believe that no nation is responsible to itself alone, but that laws of political morality are universal; and the obedience to such laws is incumbent upon all nations who would sustain their own sovereignty and justify their sovereign relationship with other nations.
- 3) We recognize that all peoples of the world have the right to live in peace, free from fear and want.
- 4) We, the Japanese people,..... resolve that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war through the action of government.....

These sentences may not need further explanations, except the words “the high ideals controlling human relationship” in 1) above. So far as I have studied no Japanese scholar of constitution could give detailed explanations to them. In my own view, they could mean such universal norms as the Golden Rule that will be ordinarily understood as a Christian norm but the similar norms are

found in almost all of other worldwide religions and teachings.

Also in my view the sentence in 3) above will be the most fundamental among these norms, which are called by most of the Japanese scholars of constitutional law as “the right to live in peace.” But, I feel it very important that this right is “free from fear and want”, which phrases are apparently reflecting parts of Roosevelt’s “Four Freedoms” and one paragraph of the Atlantic Charter of 1941. In the case of these declarations “to live in peace” was merely a desire or an ideal. But, in the C-J it is recognized as “the right” of human beings; and later the United Nations became to re-confirm it in one of the General Assembly resolutions, which contained “Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace” (resolution 33/73 of 15 December 1978).

With respect to “trusting in the justice and faith of the peace-loving peoples” in 1) above, there are some who argue that in the present international society not all peoples are “peace-loving.” But, this is very misleading, as such persons usually refer to some states or governments that dare to resort to war or threat or use of forces, when they say so, perhaps without exact knowledges about the facts or sometimes deliberately mentioning “peoples.” Even if some peoples actually lack the peace-loving minds they do not resort to war that should be through the action of state or government. In any case, it must be one of the tasks of the Japanese people to try to build up the circumstances where all peoples of the world could be actually, fully “peace-loving.” The Peace Principle should not be such a norm as the letters on a paper. It should be urged on Japanese people so that it could be realized in this world. This positive aspect of it should not be disregarded or forgotten.

I may add few more words about the problems of self-defense. First, if the provisions of A-9 would be interpreted to allow resorting to war of self-defense, the whole framework and meanings of the C-J regarding peace and security should become those under the treaty of non-belligerency of 1929 which illegalized war except the case of self-defense that was proclaimed by many of the governments of the signatories. If such interpretations should be accepted, there should be nothing new or unique in C-J.

Secondly, in my view, under C-J individual Japanese will have the right of self-defense, as well as the nation composed of these individuals, at least in theory and interpretation of all clauses of C-J. It must be pointed out, however, whether or not the state of Japan should be recognized to have the right of self-defense should be fundamentally different from the case of the individual Japanese and the nation. As to the state the matter should be decided by the

will of the nation or people, especially by the constitution; and the provisions of C-J should be interpreted as denying the right of self-defense to the state. Even if this point or question would be pursued further, the conclusion might not be so different from the above statement. Suppose the state of Japan is given the right of self-defense, it is very clear from A-9 that the state shall not exercise such a right by means of forces or war. Of course it is possible that the state will exercise the said right of self-defense in other ways such as diplomatic or economic measures. But, this belongs to the normal functions of any state or government under the Charter of the United Nations and the present international law. It may not be necessary for Japan or any state to be assured of such right of self-defense by constitution. The case of Japan is unique in the sense that C-J prohibits the state of Japan to have the right of resorting to war of self-defense, even though the state has the right of self-defense and other rights and functions to exercise it by other means.

Thirdly, many Japanese scholars of constitutional law, political leaders of the opposition parties and other intellectuals have maintained that under C-J and A-9 Japan should take the position or policy of “no armaments and neutrality.” In the 1940s and 50s there was no concept or practice of non-alignment; and it was inevitable to use the concept of “neutrality” as to the case of Japan. But, it must be pointed out that in the present international society all neutral states are maintaining armed forces and arms, mainly for the reason of executing their obligations that will accompany their neutrality or their position or status of neutrality which will be guaranteed by international agreements. Moreover, the concept of neutrality will presuppose the state of war between the countries, which may affect the neutral country. Even the concept of non-alignment may presuppose such situation where the aligned countries will wage war. But, in view of the present reality of the international society where the super-powers and other powers are heavily armed and maintaining military alliances to stress the theory, idea and practice of non-alignment must have tremendous significance. Neutrality is, on the other hand, rather a passive attitude in view of the said reality of the international society. Once some leaders of countries of so-called Third World maintained the policy of “positive neutrality”, it was before the idea and practice of non-alignment became well known to the world.

Fourthly and lastly, under the Peace Principle Japan must be specially well prepared against any chance of being induced into war; and the military alliances tend to cause war at least more easily than the position and policy of non-alignment. It is rather natural that Japan will take the position and policy of

non-alignment under C-J, A-9 and the Peace Principle.

In this connection I am tempted to add some words about what so-called “peace diplomacy” of Japan may mean.

Sometimes the Japanese diplomats and representatives of the Japanese government to international conferences speak about “peace diplomacy.” But, this may disclose their ignorance of history, international relations and diplomacy itself. From the ancient period of the human history, diplomacy has meant, at least in ordinary useage or in principle, peaceful means to adjust the international relations. In the days described in the Bible, there might not be diplomats, but there were such conducts as to be called diplomacy in the modern sense, that had been carried out by temporary emissaries and political leaders themselves. Peaceful means have been used, normally before the conflicts fell into the fightings and war, and such means have also been used after the wars began. Only during the period when wars were at peak, peaceful means or diplomacy could not play their roles. In other words, diplomacy is in most cases “peace diplomacy.” What the Japanese diplomats and others should do is to try to learn the true meanings of diplomacy and practise it.

4. Alternative security based upon the Peace Principle

An alternative or alternatives will mean what does not exist at present but is sought for. There are good example. The Final Document of the SSD I (Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to Disarmament) of 1978 contains, in its Introduction, such paragraphs as “..... States have for a long time sought to maintain their security through the possession of arms..... Yet the accumulation of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, today constitutes a threat than a protection for the future of mankind. The time has therefore come to put an end to this situation, to abandon the use of force in international relations and to seek security in disarmament..... The ending of the arms race and the achievement of real disarmament are tasks of primary importance and urgency. To meet this historic challenge is in the political and economic interests of all the nations and peoples of the world as well as in the interests of ensuring their genuine security and peaceful future.” Another example of alternative security will be found in one of “Ten Principles”, the second point concerning the definition, which were stated in the Final Document of the World Congress on Disarmament Education held by UNESCO in June 1980. The World Congress was not an inter-governmental conference but that of the representatives of so-called disarmament NGO’s. The said definition (of disarmament) included

the following sentence: "It (disarmament) may also be understood as a process aimed at transforming the current system of armed nation states into a new world order of planned unarmed peace in which war is no longer an instrument of national policy and peoples determine their own future and live in security based on justice and solidarity."

If I venture to imagine an alternative security in line with the above-cited documents, I may state as the following. There could be such a nation-state that its government and people are determined to pursue in their external relations such policies as (1) the state will aim at obtaining its security, primarily by more positive peaceful activities than resorting to threat or use of force, (2) it will not maintain any war potential, nor claim the right of belligerency, and (3) it will keep the position of non-alignment and strive for achieving the international society and the world, in which the general and complete disarmament and durable peace are secured. In other words, this state will implement positive peace diplomacy, keeping the position of "no war, no armaments, and non-alignment" on the government level, being fully supported by the peace-loving people.

As a matter of course, "national" efforts should not remain on the governmental level, but reach the citizens' minds and life. If the Peace Principle could be taken up by the Japanese people to the fullest scope and stirring their minds in the deepest place, should largely depend upon how the peace movements, and especially their leaders, would re-study it and utilize it as the norm of the alternative security; and in order to assure that these leaders would exert their efforts in such lines, I venture to state my views or expectations, as the following.

The first point is about the roles of intellectuals, and especially peace researchers including those in the field of constitutional law, in the relations with the practical world, peace movements of the grass-roots citizens, and the leaders of these movements. The researchers should try hard to make the results of their research much clearer, and especially so with respect to the fundamental points of the related matters and ideas: for example as to the state's right of self-defense and the interpretations of the Constitution of Japan in this regard.

The second point is that those who engage in peace movements in other countries could encourage the Japanese movements, by such means as clarifying their opinions and evaluations on the roles which the Japanese movement could play in furthering peace of the world. Of course, in the case of the movements in the countries of "South", their leaders may give priority to such issues as poverty, human rights, etc., higher than, or similar to, the peace problems, but

this attitude or policy can also benefit the Japanese movements, if the latter could be wise enough to have insight into the said attitude or policy on the part of the peace movements in “South” and understand the root-causes for such basic needs as “freedom from fear” and “freedom from want” among the peoples there. This is another form of encouragement for the Japanese peace movements, as it certainly concerns the fields in which the Japanese people feel some self-conviction and inclined towards positive measures of remedy. Of course, this is nothing to do with the sense or sentiment of “economic power” or the most advanced in Asia. Once should the Japanese people become fully aware of the significance of the Peace Principle of the Constitution of Japan and of the positive meanings of their movements for achieving what should be expected by it, they might overcome any such superiority-complex, narrow nationalism or paternal ideology and sentiments.

5. Linkage between peace, human rights and development

Before taking up such movements that will be aiming at peace in the broad sense and those taking up peace in close relations with some other matters, I feel it necessary to describe what has been done within and outside of the United Nations about the linkage between peace, human rights and development. The best reference material in this regard will be “UNITED NATIONS ACTION IN THE FIELD OF HUMAN RIGHTS”, a United Nations publication of 1983 presenting a detailed summary of development relating to human rights that have taken place within the United Nations system since its inception and up to 31 December 1982, which was issued in commemoration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted and proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 10 December 1948 (from its Preface). This document contains the chapters concerning the studies on the linkage between peace, human rights and development (in chapter XIV Human Rights, Peace and Development, pp. 258–268).

I may give here, however, some explanations based upon my own studies on this theme, rather than citing some paragraphs of the above-mentioned document. In my view, peace, human rights and development will form a very close relationship that may be described as a trinity-like linkage. Peace, human rights and development will be taken as both concepts and dimensions, each of which will cover the reality or substance in the actual life of human beings and in their world. The word “trinity-like” is my own invention, but it is on the suggestion given to me by Professor Anatol Rapoport, sometime in 1984 when I visited him

at his residence in Vienna. Upon my question about the most proper expression to describe the said linkage he mentioned “a trinity” without any implication of religion or Christianity. In other words, peace, human rights and development will form such linkage that each of these three will be defined by the other two (this description is adopted from the above-mentioned “Ten Principles” contained in the Final Document of the UNESCO World Congress on Disarmament Education of 1980). I have not yet been able to write comprehensive article on this theme; only I wrote “Study Note” in Newsletter of Peace Studies Association of Japan (April 1985) on this subject. As I referred to in the said “Note”, when the United Nations University, APRA (Asian Peace Research Association) and Kanagawa Prefecture held an international academic conference in which the main theme was “Peace and Transformation in Asia and Pacific Region” in March 1984, one of its sub-themes was “The Linkage between Peace, Human Rights and Development as the Tasks of Popular Movements in the Region”; and I submitted paper on it. To my surprise no other participants took up this sub-theme, perhaps as the subject was not so well known to them. What I have been saying is as the following. By applying the said linkage as a sort of paradigm in the respective research, say research of certain matters relating to peace or of a part of history, the researchers may be able to have the wider perspective and deeper insight into matters in question. Just for example, if we apply this paradigm to the present situation in some of the developing countries, we may find out the root-causes for such situation where peace is disturbed, human rights are neglected and development is distorted.

Another approach to the linkage between peace, human rights and development is from the side of education. According to some researchers in the Nordic countries, whom I have had close contacts in the last several years, when a researcher or educator would pursue “peace education”, he or she might come across the phases where the necessity for “education on respecting human rights” and “development education” should be strongly felt, and the similar necessity would be felt when one of the latter two would be taken up; and, as to the reason for this, the linkage at bottom between peace, human rights and development has been stressed by these researchers.

I have not yet reached any clear conclusion, however, as to the said linkage with respect to other concepts, dimensions, values, or norms, such as (preservation of) environment and (social) justice. Perhaps, if we would extend the scope of development, we could include environment or find some appropriate relations between development and environment, and accordingly between the said

linkage and environment. At this moment I can only apply the said linkage to some types of the movements aiming at something wider than “peace” or “international peace”, or some parts of the movements that concern, for example, environment. In any case, it is pointed out in this connection that the Peace Principle of the Constitution of Japan will be regarded as having something that is similar to the said linkage; “the right to live in peace, free from fear and want” will concern peace, human rights and development, at least in a general way; and, I feel, this must be one of the very unique and important aspect of the Constitution of Japan or the Peace Principle.

6. Some movements worth noticing

Now I will take up the movements aiming at something broader than “Peace” or “international peace.” But, for the reasons to be easily understood, it is impossible to cover all of these movements. In the past several years in Japan a great number of so-called grass-roots movements have risen among the Japanese citizens, perhaps for the first time since Japan has been forming the modern society where the citizens will have more or less important roles or status. There are some voluntary groups or agencies which are extending services for the relief of the refugees and for helping the unprivileged persons in some developing countries in their efforts for self-supporting societies, as well as some groups of the citizens which are trying to assist those in certain countries whose human rights are threatened or infringed by the acts of the authorities. In addition to them, there are growing activities and movements among the citizens, which are concerned about the pollution problem or about the questions of environment, in local, regional or even global scope. Take for example the movement for such aims as stopping or even abolishing some nuclear power-plants in Japan. Those who are engaged in this movement are conscious of the potential danger to be brought by the nuclear power-plants, not only to them but also to their posterities. They should naturally concern the questions of environment as a whole, in the respective area, region or even in the global scope. As their issue will relate to not only nuclear wastes but also the energy requirements, standards of living, economic systems, etc.; while some of them may notice the relations between the questions of environment and those of so-called peaceful uses of nuclear energy or materials, which should have close links with the production of nuclear-weapons in most of the big powers. Even if those who engage in this movement might not be realizing the relations between these problems they have to take up, or the Peace Principle or “the right to live in peace”, they will

eventually become aware of these relations, both in concepts and in the actual situations or affairs.

Also in most of other types of the grass-roots movements aiming at betterment of the world in the narrow or wide meaning, their leaders do not have consciousness about the relations between the objectives of their movements and the Peace Principle. It may be said, as different from the cases of the ordinary peace movements in Japan, the said movements are not in a dilemma as to the Peace Principle; and question will be whether their leaders should be advised to become aware of it or not.

I will take up two of special cases; HEIWA JIMUSHO (Peace Office) and the non-governmental Unesco movement.

Peace Office was set up some three years ago, in Tokyo, by a small group of those who were engaged in the peace movements in the traditional sense and some others mostly engaging in the studies of peace and other problems, with such aims that it could serve as a place where peace researchers and activists (not so-called radicals but those who will engage in some forms of activities towards peace) could get together and initiate the studies and actions that would relate to peace in a broad sense. Peace Office has held annual rallies or group meetings in which more than ten subjects or issues have been taken up; they were not limited to the questions directly related to peace but covered such varieties of issues as development and environment. But, in the perception or understandings of most of the participants to these gatherings, peace, human rights and development (and some aspects of the environment problems) were closely linked, at least at the bottom. Some of the participants understood that their aims should be to achieve the world where not only "direct violence" but also "structural violence" should be eliminated and "positive peace" could be secured, or in the terms of the Constitution of Japan "the right to live in peace free from fear and want" could be realized for "all peoples of the world."

The non-governmental Unesco movement was initiated in Sendai, Japan, just 41 years ago, and it soon spread to other areas and the Federation of Unesco Associations was formed in the same year. At present the Federation is composed of about 250 local associations and the total strength of their members are about 25,000 or more. The Japanese (National) Federation has tried to encourage the peoples of Asian countries to follow suit and it succeeded in setting up Asian Federation of Unesco Clubs and Associations (AFUCA) in 1974, and the similar movements spread all over the world and the World Federation of Unesco Clubs and Associations was established in 1981; this WFUCA has about

90 member federations (or associations or clubs in the countries where there is no federation) and more than 3,500 Unesco clubs and associations exist in about 100 countries in the world. Before the WFUCA was set up there were held the first World Congress of Unesco Clubs and Associations in 1978, and after the establishment the second and the third World Congress in 1984 and 1987, in Japan and Madrid, Spain. In case of Japan, there were held series of sessions in Sendai, Hiroshima, Tokyo and other places.

The general characteristics of the National Federation and members (local associations) are not so different from those of the similar organizations, such as the associations for the United Nations or UNICEF, which will be the promotion and public information of the ideals (of UNESCO), library and documentation, publication, and international exchange, both for the adults and for the youth. But, the Japanese National Federation and its member associations are carrying out some other programmes that will give them special characteristics, such as so-called "Co-Action Programme" which has been set up by UNESCO itself to enable interested groups and individuals to support self-help projects at community levels in developing countries, for about 20 years in the past. Co-Action Programme is intended to bridge the gaps between "North" and "South" mostly in the fields of education, science and conditions relating to cultural life.

There have been some points conspicuous to the Unesco movement in Japan since its start just 41 years ago. First of all, it has been intended and carried out with the consciousness of being a movement, something more than activities, and to some extent the citizens movement towards peace. In 1947 or so, only a few years since the defeat of war and the beginning of the occupation, most Japanese people were in such situation in their spiritual or mental aspect that their faith in national aims and social moral was lost and they were searching for new ideals. The Constitution of Japan which came into force on 3 May 1947 could offer them some of the ideals and especially the principles concerning peace. But, most Japanese at that time could not imagine how these principles or ideals should be implemented in the actual international society. The day when Japan could enter the United Nations was felt to be very remote, due to "Cold War" situation and atmosphere in the international society. But, there was UNESCO hoisting in its Constitution such idea or ideals that ".....Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed." This phrase touched the deeper part of the minds of great numbers of the Japanese people. The founders of the first Unesco associations in Japan (and in the world) tried to give institutional forms and practical

expressions to this “spirit of UNESCO” as it is often called. Even now, some 40 years since that time, among those who are engaging in the Unesco movement in Japan there are many pupils of these founders with the same “spirit”, although the founders became old or already died.

The above-mentioned “spirit” of the founders and their direct pupils in the Unesco movement in Japan could work as an important motive or motivation of the movement. But, in a sense it has made the movement as if it were a spiritual one. During the 41 years period of the Unesco movement in Japan there have been a great deal of changes in the international society, and accordingly in UNESCO itself. Since the latter half of the 1970s UNESCO has been in a “crisis”, about which detailed explanations may not be necessary. The said “crisis” has also given certain effects upon the Unesco movements both in Japan and in other countries of the world. The general attitude of the members of the WFUCA will be described as follows: those who are engaging in these movements are reconfirming their faith in UNESCO’s ideals and in their movements, thanks to the “crisis”, or more precisely to the steps taken by some big powers that are the founders of UNESCO itself, and most of them are trying to revitalize UNESCO through their movements. In Japan too, a number of those engaging in the movement have become more keenly aware of the importance of UNESCO and their movement, being stirred by some statements of the government officials, which sounded as if Japan were going to follow the suit of the USA and UK in withdrawing from UNESCO. On the other hand, in Japan there are some others even among those who have supported the Unesco movement, whose attitude reflects such sort of toadyism as had been seen in pre-war days, namely they show the tendency of blindly following what the governments of big powers decide, from the belief that these governments don’t make mistakes.

It is noticed, in the general attitude of the founders and their direct pupils of the Unesco movement in Japan, that they had not given enough considerations to another side of the “spirit” or ideals of UNESCO, such as that “a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind (also from Preamble of the UNESCO Constitution). In this sentence the importance of the role of the people, and accordingly that of the citizens movement, is very clearly indicated. It is observed, at the same time, that in Japan there are recently more citizens who are aware of the above-mentioned importance, with re-

spect to the Unesco movement too.

On the other hand the attitude and policies of the governments have changed in some of the big powers, even though the general attitude of their national commissions for UNESCO and non-governmental organizations related to the Unesco movement have remained as before. These governments criticized UNESCO, and especially its Secretariat, for so-called "politicization" of the manner of handling certain affairs, for giving stress to peace research, peace education and disarmament education, and for administrative matters such as personnel. It may not be necessary here to give detailed explanations to these attitudes or policies, except that to some extent they have had effects upon the non-governmental Unesco movement in Japan. But, at least those who have carried out the movement basing upon their conviction on "spirit of UNESCO" and the cause of peace have not been frustrated by such situation, and they are determined to pursue whatever they can for the promotion of the movement, including continuation of peace research and peace education.

My wish in this connection has been that peace researchers both in Japan and in other countries will give closer watch to the Unesco movement in their respective areas, so that in future they may be able to offer the leaders of the movement the most appropriate advices from their view-points of peace research. When I participated in "Lund Conference on the Study of Peace Movements" held in Lund, Sweden, 17–20 August 1987, I took advantage of the hour I could make my presentation in telling the above wish of mine to other participants, and I found that they were in agreement at least in giving much attention to the Unesco movement which they regarded as the movement towards peace, if not a peace movement (see note).

I am not attempting to give conclusion to this article, as my studies have not yet reached at that stage. There are too many points to be explored further, especially with the cooperation by a number of the researchers in various fields. Here I would like to state merely that a dilemma can be turned into a challenge, if those engaging should face it in the most candid manner. To the peace movements in Japan in the ordinary sense their dilemma can be a challenge, let alone to the movements towards peace, so far as those engaging in them perceive the meanings of peace in the broadest sense as I described in this article.

Note: In this article it may not be necessary to cite the reference materials except those to which I owe at least about some parts of my studies, such as

the following:

- 1) "SENSO HOKI TO HEIWATEKI SEIZONKEN" ("Renunciation of War and the Right to Live in Peace") by Tadakazu FUKASE, Professor of Hokkaido University; Iwanami Shoten, in May 1987.
"HEIWA KENPO NO SOZOTEKI TENKAI" ("The Creative Development of the Peace Constitution") edited by Hideo WADA, Professor of Meiji University, and three others; Gakuyo Shobo, in July 1987. Professor WADA was coordinator of the group of researchers who contributed articles to this book, after completing their joint study for about three years until 1986, in which I could take part on one occasion. Professor FUKASE was one of the members and the editors of this book too.
- 2) "UNESCO NO KIKI TO SEKAI CHITSUJO" ("The Crisis of UNESCO and the World Order") by Toshiki MOGAMI, Assistant Professor of International Christian University (international organizations and international law); Tohken Shuppan, in February 1987.
- 3) "The Lund Conference on the Study of Peace Movements" was held in Lund, Sweden, 17-20 August 1987, by IPRA (International Peace Research Association) Study Group on Peace Movements and Lund University Peace Research Institute (LUPRI), with the cooperation of the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tampere Peace Research Institute and Nordic Cooperation Committee. The main theme was "Towards a Comparative Analysis" and there were 43 participants from 19 countries, and in total 29 papers were presented. Its proceedings will be available at LUPRI, and selected papers will be published in 1988 by Tampere Peace Research Institute. One of the motives for my deciding to attend it was the fact that the main convenor and planner was Mr. Katsuya KODAMA, a graduate of Hiroshima University presently studying in LUPRI. Professor MOGAMI was also taking part in this conference as he began staying at Trananational Foundation for Peace and Future Research (TFF), Lund, just from the time when the conference was held.