Inherited Memory

A Qualitative Study of How World War II Influences

the Japanese Postwar Generation

Submitted in fulfillment of the final project requirement
for the Diploma of Process Work
from the Process Work Center of Portland Graduate School

by

Ayako Fujisaki, M.A.

November, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study explores memories of World War II that have been inherited from the war generation by the postwar generation. In East Asian affairs, tensions resulting from unresolved World War II issues remain, both within Japan and between Asian countries. Now that almost 60 years has passed since the end of World War II, the issue of memories of the war, as well as the issue of compensation, has become crucial. The purpose of my study is to investigate what members of the Japanese postwar generation actually remember about World War II, and how the war still influences them. To this end, I interviewed eight Japanese people who were born after World War II, using focus groups as my approach to data collection. Thematic analysis was used for date analysis. The views and experiences of participants in my study support the suggestion found in related literature (Ishida, 2000) that Japanese people have a collective memory of victimhood. My study suggests that experiences that do not go along with victimhood tend to be left out of stories told by members of the postwar generation, and resurface as "ghosts," or disavowed figures (Mindell, 2002). The four main ghosts identified were "the killer," "the

authority," "the sufferer," and "the dead." My study recommends that weaving

these ghosts into the collective memory is an important way of changing the

collective memory, and may be useful in effecting reconciliation between Japan

and other Asian countries.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Human beings experienced numerous wars in the 20th century. This century is sometimes called the century of war, and it is said that 187 million people were killed in the wars that took place during this period of time (Kawai, 1999). Although we have turned the corner into a new century, many people are still losing their lives due to war. In the last two years, while I have been working on this study, the World Trade Center in New York was destroyed by terrorists, Afghanistan was attacked and the United States declared war against Iraq, to name but a few. When I look at history, it appears to me that hatred leads to more hatred, wounds leads to more wounds and one war leads to another. We are in a vicious cycle. Where did the cycle start?

I do not have the answer. However, I believe that one of the deepest wounds the world has experienced was World War II. Between 40 and 50 million people were killed around the world. People witnessed extreme brutality, such as the Nazi holocaust, the Nanjing massacre conducted by the Japanese Army, and the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States. In my opinion, the world has never recovered from the shock and the wounds of World War

II.

    I am Japanese and grew up in Japan. In Japanese society, there are unfinished issues concerning World War II. One example, which depicts these issues, is the controversy around Japanese Prime Minister's visits to Yasukuni-Shrine. This shrine worships the spirits of Japanese soldiers who were killed in various wars, including the fourteen A-class war criminals of World War II. During the war, the shrine was used as a symbol of nationalism. Every year, attention is drawn to whether or not the Japanese Prime Minister pays an official visit to the shrine on August 15th, the anniversary of Japan's surrender at the end of World War II. Some Prime Ministers have made an official visit to the shrine and this has evoked strong opposition both inside and outside of Japan. People have blamed these Prime Ministers for violating the principle of separation of government and religion, which became a part of the Japanese constitution after World War II, and for their lack of sensitivity to the victims of other nations. On the other hand, the conservative right and approximately 4.5 million members of Nihon Izokukai (Japan Bereaved Families Association) have pressured the Prime Minister to visit the shrine in order to show the government's appreciation of the war dead (Safier, 1996). Tension between these two viewpoints is so strong that Prime Minister Koizumi visited Yasukuni-Shrine in January this year as an attempt to avoid criticism from both sides.

Another example is a dispute concerning a controversial history textbook for middle schools, which was published in 2001. The textbook was written by a group called "*Atarashii-kyokasyo-wo-tsukuru-kai*", the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform. According to them, Japanese history education has focused too much on the negative aspects of Japan's past and has been hurting the national pride of Japanese people (Atarashii-kyokasyo-wo-tsukuru-kai, 1997). It claims that the Japanese need a new textbook that arouses the pride of the Japanese, because the textbooks now in use are "masochistic" and describe Japan as "a fateful criminal". The publication of the textbook resulted in a strong reaction from within Japan and from other Asian countries. People criticized the textbook for minimizing and omitting the invasive and aggressive acts of the Japanese military in modern history. On the other hand, it was argued that the society promoted by the Tsukuru-kai textbook appealed to a considerable number of people of various generations in Japan. The publication of this book created a heated dispute between these two sides. These polarities, which are also manifest in the Yasukuni-Shrine controversy, had existed in Japan for a long time, but the argument around the history textbook involved more people than ever. A number of books have been published, many articles in newspapers and magazines have been written and a lot of people have been participating in discussions on this matter.

Both controversies are about remembering. One side insists that we should remember efforts and sufferings of the Japanese soldiers and should not forget the greatness of the Japanese culture. The other side argues that we should remember the pain and agony of victims whom Japan has oppressed in the past and that we should not forget the faults Japan has committed. Gillis (1994) claims that any individual or group identity is maintained by remembering, and what is remembered depends on identity. As remembering is an act of restructuring the past from the viewpoint of the present, we are constantly adjusting our memories to our current identity (Gillis, 1994; Ishida, 2000). Therefore, the issue of memory is not an issue of the past but of the present.

The controversies surrounding the Prime Minister's visits to Yasukuni-Shrine and the history textbook show that many issues of World War II are not yet over in Japan. There are still strong emotions behind these arguments. Lessing (2003) states, in an interview with Moyers, that terrible events such as war leave "a kind of bruise" not only on an individual's psychology but also on the national psyche. One of the reasons that these controversies draw so much attention from society today is that we are finally able to look at the "bruise" left from World War II and begin to deal with unresolved issues. However, over 70 percent of Japanese were born after World War II (Kanpou-shiryou, 2002). The postwar generation in Japan is now challenged with

facing historical events that happened before they were born. Today, tensions resulting from events that occurred during World War II still exist. In a sense, the postwar generation has inherited tensions from the war generation.

Different names are used for the war that Japan fought until 1945. Before Japan attacked Pearl Harbor in Hawaii in 1941, it had started a war with China in 1931. That war is called the Sino-Japanese War or the 15-year War. Some people call the war between Japan and the United States, the Pacific War. The right-wing conservative like to call this war the Great East Asia War, insisting that the purpose of the war was to create "Great East Asia Co-prosperity" by saving other Asian countries from colonization by European countries. In my study, I use the name World War II, because it is more neutral and is used more prevailingly than other names. However, when I interviewed participants of focus groups, I used the expression of "the last war", so that they could also talk about stories of the Sino-Japanese war.

RESEARCH PURPOSE

Firstly, I will share a little about myself and about the personal purpose of my study. Several years ago, I attended a Worldwork seminar on the issue of World War II. At the seminar, I realized that I had been carrying deep sorrow about what happened during World War II and that I had suffered from guilt as a descendant of

people who caused extraordinary pain in other Asian countries. It was difficult to face these feelings, but the seminar also made me hopeful that we may resolve these issues through experiencing and sharing such feelings. After that seminar, I attended several Word Work seminars where the issues of World War II in East Asia were the focus. Though most of the participants were born after the end of World War II, they carried a lot of feelings about the war. Chinese people and Korean people expressed rage against Japan and spoke about their own or their parents' pain and agony during the Japanese occupation. Japanese people listened to them and apologized to them genuinely. I witnessed moving endings where mutual recognition, understanding and forgiveness happened. These experiences gave me hope for reconciliation on a larger scale.

However, when I look at society today, Japan has not come to reconcile with other Asian countries, as I have discussed earlier. For example, the former Minister of Justice, Nagano, said in an interview in 1994, "The Nanjing massacre was a make believe story." In 2000, the then Prime Minister, Mori, made a statement: "Japan is a divine country centered on the Emperor." This statement violated the Constitutional Principle which states that the sovereignty of Japan resides in its people, and showed that he still had a wartime mentality. Such statements have been made by different politicians repeatedly. They received severe criticism from

inside and outside Japan and were followed by the politician's apology for "slips of the tongue" and by dismissal. These slips of tongue appeared to me to be strong signals that Japan has not really felt remorse for the past. That is one of reasons why there is still tension between Japan and other Asian countries. While other Asian countries are frustrated by Japan's inability to apologize sincerely and take responsibility, Japan feels resentful about being constantly blamed for their past. It is a vicious cycle of hatred. My deepest personal motivation for this study has been to find a way to go beyond polarization and to bring reconciliation.

This personal purpose relates to the practical purpose of my study. Having experienced deeply touching resolutions in Worldwork seminars, I wondered how I could expand these experiences to the real world. It is obvious to me that Japan has been an aggressor against many Asian countries in the past. As a Japanese citizen, I feel responsible for initiating a move towards reconciliation. The practical purpose of this study, therefore, is to explore possible steps that the postwar generation can take toward reconciliation with other Asian countries.

My study also has research-oriented purposes. One such purpose is to obtain a deeper understanding of East Asian issues with regard to Worldwork. Process Work was developed mainly in Western countries. Although it has been practiced in Asian countries and has been well received, East Asian issues have not been studied much

in the Process Work community. I hope my study will contribute to greater understanding of these issues within the Process Work community. A further purpose of the study is to deepen understanding of the roles of victim and perpetrator, which often emerge in Worldwork and which sometimes interact vehemently. This kind of intense interaction is sometimes needed to allow deep feelings to surface and be expressed. However, better understanding of these roles may create a safer container for such interactions. Finally, the third purpose of the study is to gain a deeper comprehension of how historical events such as World War II influence people. I aim to explore how history and memory function as tools to create group identity.

RESEARCH QUESTION

The research question that I investigate in my study is what memories and feelings about World War II are inherited by the postwar generation from the war generation in Japan and how these memories and feelings influence them. Now that almost 60 years has passed since the end of World War II, it mostly depends on the postwar generation how to deal with the unresolved issues related to the war. Therefore, it is important to know what the postwar generation actually perceives the war.

METHOD

For this qualitative study, I used focus groups, a semi-structured group interview method, as a means of collecting data from a small, purposive sample of Japanese people who were born after World War II. I examined participants' stories about World War II, to investigate what the postwar generation had heard from the war generation, and gain an understanding of the explicit images of the war which had been passed on to the postwar generation. I also investigated whether or not unresolved feeling issues from World War II affected members of the postwar generation and if so, how these issues influenced them. For this purpose, I asked participants about their reaction to the stories of World War II. I studied focus group conversations and interactions using Process Work concepts, such as hot spots and ghost roles, to interpret the data. In this process of data interpretation, I was also particularly interested in exploring what it meant for members of the postwar generation to take responsibility for the war.

INTRODUCTION TO PROCESS WORK

Process Work is an interdisciplinary approach to individuals, relationships,

families and organizations. It has been developing through the work of Dr. Arnold Mindell and his associates since the early 1970's. Process Work has its philosophical roots in modern physics, Jungian psychology, Taoism, shamanism and alchemy. Influenced by Jungian psychology, it holds the teleological view, which believes that every event, even "problematic" ones such as illness and relationship conflicts, has its own meaning. Unlike most of Western psychology, Process Work does not have preconceived ideas about how individuals, couples or organizations should look and behave. Instead, Process Work believes that the resolution to a "problem" lies within the problem itself. To unfold the meaning of an event and find its solution, it is important to notice what is happening in the moment and to amplify it. Then, the meaning reveals itself. In order to follow the flow of nature and find its wisdom and meaning, "multicultural and multileveled awareness" is essential to Process Work (Mindell & Mindell, 2002).

The applications of Process Work cover a wide range including work with body symptoms, altered and extreme states of consciousness such as "psychotic state", addiction, relationship conflicts, small and large group process and organizational development.

Worldwork

Worldwork is an area of Process Work which works with small and large groups of up to a thousand people (Mindell, 1995). The purpose of Worldwork is community-making and conflict-resolution (Mindell, 2002). It deals with a wide spectrum of issues ranging from business meetings to large, emotional meetings. In large, open and emotional meetings, collective and deep-rooted issues such as sexism, homophobia, racism, classism and war are often processed. The goal of such meetings is not immediate resolution but exploration and discovery (Mindell, 2002). Since the topic of my thesis is related to Worldwork, I will introduce some important concepts of Worldwork.

Deep Democracy

Deep democracy, a term coined by Dr. Arnold Mindell, is the feeling attitude that comes from the belief that all parts of ourselves and perspectives in the world around us are equally important (Mindell, 1992). What Worldwork tries to create is not a conflict-free community, but a sustainable community (Mindell, 1995). To create such a community, we need the ability and intention to follow the ever-changing flow of the nature of the group. Deep democracy, which requires openness to and appreciation of all the voices and feelings of the group, creates space for the group

to become whole and for nature to flow. This attitude is also necessary for me as a researcher, who is studying a Worldwork related topic. Without this attitude of deep democracy, my study would contribute to a further polarization of the issue.

Fields

Fields are dreamlike feelings that influence each one of us in a given group, such as family, organization and nation (Mindell, 1992). They are invisible and manifest in the moods, motivation, conflicts and depression. Although they are not tangible, they strongly influence us, like electromagnetic forces affect iron filings. They can pull us together or push us apart into two polarities. Their dreamlike nature uses individuals and groups as "the battleground for the characters in the myths to complete their mythical conflicts (Mindell, 1992)."

Roles/Timespirits

Fields create opposing energies. The roles that we play in groups are these energies. Mindell creates the term, 'timespirits', for these roles, to describe their fluid nature. Roles are not static. Rather, they change, escalate, transform and even disappear. Relationships between two timespirits may trouble fields and

members of the group may feel tension between these timespirits. It is important to give space for these roles to allow them to express themselves, to listen to them or even to become them temporarily. Then, they will change and transform.   For example, in the controversies over the Yasukuni-Shrine and the history textbook, we can see two distinct polarities. One side wants to forget the faults of the past and remember the greatness of Japan. The other side tries to remember the agony and pain of the victims of Japan. These two polarities are roles.

Ghosts

Ghosts are roles which are talked about but not directly represented by anybody in a given group (Mindell, 2002). They appear in gossip, stories from the past and the future. For example, if members of an anti-war group complain about President Bush's aggressiveness but are not identified with their aggressive style of social action, President Bush and aggressiveness are ghosts. Everyone in the group senses the presence of ghosts, but they can not see them. Its intangibility actually makes a ghost role more powerful, because members of the group can not interact with them directly. The reason why people are afraid of ghosts and nobody wants to bring out these roles explicitly is that they challenge the identity of the group.

However, representing ghosts and interacting with them make them less powerful and help to make the communication of the group more fluid. In Chapter V, I will explore what kind of ghosts appeared in the focus group discussion and how they affected participants in discussion.

Hot Spots

Hot spots are intense moments in groups. They may be characterized by strong emotions, tense silence or sudden theme changes. Although they contain essential feelings and core issues of the group, people tend to ignore them, because they are too "hot" and tense (Mindell, 2002). However, if we hold such moments and go into them, it is possible to change and transform the group. I will discuss hot spots that happened in the focus group discussion, as those that can be observed in society, in the discussion in Chapter V.

OVERVIEW OF THIS THESIS

Following this introduction, in Chapter II, I will discuss general issues pertaining to qualitative research as the methodological framework of my study. I will also present general information about the use of focus groups as a data collection procedure, and will discuss the evaluative criteria I used to establish the soundness or validity of

my study. After this, I will describe my research method in detail, as it pertains to this particular study. This description will include the recruitment of participants, the conduct of the focus groups, questions asked in the focus group discussions, analysis of the data, ethical considerations and the issue of translation.

In Chapter III, I discuss the personal biases and assumptions with which I approached this study, recognizing the importance of this in qualitative research which depends on the 'researcher-as-instrument' as an important aspect of its method.   This means that the researcher is expected to reflect on herself and become aware of her biases and assumptions, in order to make them explicit and enable her to use them more consciously in the research process (Clark, 2002). Stating biases openly helps to establish the credibility of a study as well. For the purposes of this study, this entailed examining my biases in relation World War II issues. Firstly, I will share some personal memories relating to World War II and showed how they connected me with Process Work, so that the reader will have a sense of who I am as a researcher. Secondly, I will examine my biases by reflecting on my experience in a group process on the issue of World War II. This reflection serves as a framework for my understanding of myself in relation to my research topic. Thirdly, I will report on the innerwork that I did to raise my awareness as a

researcher. In Chapter III, I will present innerwork where these roles dialogue. Dr.

Arnold Mindell developed an innerwork method to work with ourselves, which

helps us to follow our inner experiences. Even though these experiences appear to

be disturbing, they have important messages for us. The innerwork method is a way

to reveal the messages (Mindell, 1990). Process Work values innerwork as an

important aspect of working with groups. First of all, the facilitator's inner

experiences are seen as closely connected to outer events, because fields have

no boundaries and permeate everything. Therefore, working on yourself and

becoming aware of your inner experiences in a sense equals working with a group

and becoming aware of outer events (Mindell, 1992). Secondly, deep democracy

is essential for Worldwork. As I stated already, this is a feeling attitude of openness

and compassion toward all the voices and feelings in a given group. As a

researcher studying a topic relating to Worldwork, it is important that I also have

this attitude. The innerwork I describe in this chapter is an attempt to allow myself

to be more open to sides or positions that I usually do not appreciate.

In Chapter IV, I will introduce the findings from my thematic analysis of the

focus group discussions. In Chapter V, I will discuss issues and considerations

generated by these findings. I will introduce the concept of collective memory,

which is the memory shared by individuals most prevailingly and collectively in a given group (Ishida, 2000). I will explore how the collective memory influences the structure of each individual memory. I will also integrate the literature review into this discussion, since I chose to collect and analyze data without too much of a preconceived theoretical framework, as is common in inductive and exploratory studies such as mine (Hoffman, 1995). Another reason for this placement of the literature review is that it enables me to compare the outcome of my study with other research in related areas. This is intended to enhance the transferability of my study (Ratcliff, 2002). Finally, in Chapter VI, I will conclude my thesis by focusing how my study contributes to Process Work and to my personal growth and awareness. I will also discuss the limitations of my study and implications for future research.

CHAPTER II

Methodology

In the first part of this chapter, I will discuss the methodological framework of my study, and the method that I used to collect and interpret data. I will also describe the evaluative criteria used to establish the soundness of the study. In the last part of the chapter, I will describe my research method in detail, including the research questions investigated by the study, selection of participants, the procedure of the focus groups, ethical considerations, and data collection and analysis.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological framework of my study is the qualitative research paradigm. Qualitative research evolved in the social sciences where the researcher studies social and cultural phenomena (Myers, 1997). Interest in qualitative research has been increasing in recent decades, and has been used in many different areas, such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, education

and nursing (Flick, 1995). Denzin and Lincoln (1994) offer a generic definition of qualitative research.

> Qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretative, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that the qualitative researcher studies things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

Oka and Shaw (2000) name three major characteristics of qualitative research. Firstly, qualitative research tries to understand the meaning of people's behaviors or social phenomena. In other words, its attempt is to understand their experience "from the inside". Oka and Shaw give an example of studying users of a residential care house for people with physical limitations. The qualitative researcher would ask them, for example, how they felt about living there, how they thought about staying at the house and how they dealt with conflicts with roommates, so that they could understand the viewpoints of the residential care users. Secondly, the qualitative researcher often goes into the natural environments of the people whom they study and has "direct contacts" with them. This is important, because phenomena concerning human beings are influenced by the contextual conditions, such as location, time and situation, in which these phenomena occur (Flick, 1995). Thirdly, qualitative research uses analytic induction

as its main logic. Society has been changing drastically and people's lives have diversified. As a result, new social contexts and perspectives arise, which social scientists have never encountered before. Deduction, which a lot of researchers have used, can not be applied to the diversity and complexity of research subjects (Flick, 1995). In qualitative research, on the other hand, the researcher creates new theory from data.

Examples of qualitative data sources are observation and participant observation (fieldwork), interviews and questionnaires, documents and texts, the researcher's impressions and reactions, historical, interactional, and visual texts (Denzin & Licoln, 1994; Myers, 1997). Within the broad scope of qualitative inquiry, various research traditions or orientations to inquiry guide data collection and interpretation. Such traditions include action research, ethnography, narrative inquiry and case study (Myers, 1997).

Focus Groups

I chose to use focus groups as the method of data collection in this study. This is one of several semi-structured group interview methods available to the qualitative researcher. Morgan (1996) defines a focus group as "a research technique that collects data through group interaction on a topic determined by the researcher".

Typically focus groups consist of four to ten people. They are led by a skilled moderator and involve group discussions that last 1 – 2 hours. Focus groups have been used in the field of market research since the 1920's (Morgan, 1996; Robinson, 1999). More recently, the method has been employed in a wide range of social sciences including health research and media studies (Gallagher & Maclachlan, 2001; Twinn, 1998; Kitzinger, 1999).

The major characteristic which distinguishes focus groups from other types of group interview is the insight and data generated by interaction amongst participants. Unlike other group interview methods, the moderator does not ask each participant the questions in turn. Instead, she lets the participants discuss a particular topic with each other. As the interaction helps participants to investigate and define their perspectives, focus groups are especially useful for studying attitudes and experiences, and feelings and emotional responses to the given topic (Gibbs, 1997; Kitzinger, 1995; Vaughn et al, 1996). The researcher offers a permissive and non-threatening environment to encourage participants to share their perceptions and perspectives (Kruger, 1994). Participants can often express themselves more freely in focus groups than in individual interviews, because they can receive support and anonymity from the group setting, which the individual interview can not provide (Vaughn et al., 1996).

The use of focus groups also has some limitations. As the number of participants in each group is relatively small and because participants are not recruited by means of random sampling procedures, the research findings are not generalizable to whole populations. They can only be used to understand a particular topic more completely or in greater depth (Kruger, 1997). Another important issue is that the quality of focus group results relies highly on the skills of the facilitator (Twinn, 1998). The required skills for the facilitator include encouraging equal participation, re-focusing the interview if necessary and pulling participants back together, if two or three discussions take place (Twinn, 1998).

There are several reasons why the use of focus groups is suitable for my study. Firstly, since little research has been conducted on how the postwar generation perceives World War II, focus groups are suitable for such exploratory research. Secondly, because the theme is closely connected to the social issues, rich data is more likely to be elicited in the social gathering and interaction which are inevitable in focus groups (Gibbs, 1997). Thirdly, the permissiveness and non-threatening environment that focus groups offer encourages participants to talk more freely about sensitive topics, such as the topic of World War II.

Evaluation of This Study

Though qualitative research is now more widely accepted as valid scientific research, the criteria by which it is evaluated for soundness or validity is still controversial (Jones, 2001). Criteria for evaluating quantitative research, notably validity, reliability and generalizability, are not consistent with the epistemological foundations of the qualitative research paradigm. Since the mid 1980s, alternative criteria for evaluating qualitative research have been developed (Flick, 1995). Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose trustworthiness as an alternative to validity. This notion has four elements: credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability.

Credibility concerns how the reconstruction of the researchers reflects the realities and views of participants. There are several ways to ensure credibility, such as "prolonged engagement", "peer debriefing", "negative case analysis" and "member checking" (Lincoln &Guba, 1985). Transferability refers to whether the results of qualitative research can be transferred or applied to other settings (Trochim, 2000). Providing sufficient descriptive data is important to attain transferability, because readers can evaluate if the results are applicable to their own context (Oka & Shaw, 2000). Another way is to find similarities between the results of a particular study and previous research reports. Dependability corresponds to reliability in

traditional quantitative research. Reliability is equivalent to replicability or repeatability in qualitative inquiry. It concerns the possibility of getting the same result if you measure the same thing again. In qualitative research, it is impossible to measure the same thing twice, because qualitative research studies the ever-changing context. Guba and Lincoln (1989) claim that changes actually show that the inquiry is maturing and the important thing is that such changes are tracked and trackable. Confirmabilty refers to objectivity in quantitative research. It refers to the extent that the findings of the research can be confirmed by others (Trochim, 2000).

There are many ways to establish the trustworthiness of qualitative research. In this study, I used rich data, reflexivity and feedback to enhance trustworthiness.

Rich Data

Rich data are data that are accurate and complete enough to describe what actually happened (Maxwell, 1997). This is essential for the trustworthiness of qualitative research. I recorded and videotaped the focus group discussions. Then I transcribed the tape-recordings verbatim, and checked the transcription with the videotapes. I kept these tapes, videotapes and transcriptions. I also took detailed notes of the development of my method, and maintained a research journal.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity refers to the sensitivity with which the collected data has been shaped by the researcher (Mays & Pope, 1995). For example, prior assumptions and experiences can influence the process of collecting data. It is important to make explicit the researcher's biases. In the next chapter, I will discuss my subjectivity as a researcher by showing who I am, what my biases are and how I worked on my biases.

Feedback

Feedback is a useful strategy to enhance confirmability. I asked a few people, who have different background to my own, to give me feedback on my study, to check on my own biases, and weak points in my logic and method.

Placement of Literature Review

In traditional research, the literature review should precede the method discussion, as the contextual grounding and rationale of the study. However, this order does not always fit qualitative research, because of its inductive nature. The researcher will not always know what literature is relevant to her findings, until she

has obtained them, especially when the topic of the research has rarely been studied. So the literature review can be included in discussion of findings (Hoffman, 1995).

I chose to integrate the literature review with my findings, because my study is an exploratory one, and in such studies, it is preferable not start out with a preconceived framework. Another reason for this placement of related literature is that it enabled me to compare the results of my study with previous studies. It also establishes the transferability of my study, by showing similarities between my study and other research (Ratcliff, 2002).

CURRENT STUDY

In this section, I will describe research questions and the procedures used in my study, including details of how participants were selected, questions used in focus groups, issues of translation and transcription, and my approach to analysis.

Participants

Invitation flyers were sent to the email string of the Japanese local community of Process Work and were also available at some Process Work community gatherings in Japan. Eight people volunteered to take part in the focus group

session: seven females and one male. Participants' ages ranged from 28 years old to 52 years old; one in their 20's, four in their 30's, two in their 40's and one in their 50's. All of the participants were born after the end of World War II. They had all traveled abroad, and three of them had lived outside of Japan for more than a year.

The eight people were divided into two groups, with four participants in each group. It was important that the group was small enough that each participant had time to talk and share. Furthermore, Japanese people generally are not trained to discuss in larger groups, and tend to feel shy to speak up in front of many people. Therefore the smaller group was preferable to allow them speak more freely. Each group met once for about two hours. The sessions were held in a room rented in a city building in Tokyo, which was relatively accessible for everyone. Refreshments were provided. I moderated both groups. With the permission of the participants, the discussions were video-taped and audio-taped. As the moderator, I was also taking notes during discussions.

The participants were assured of confidentiality. I informed them of the purpose of the research. They were encouraged to speak freely but were also told that they did not have to answer all the questions, if they did not feel like.

Questions

I developed a series of questions, around which the focus group discussion could be based. The following were the questions asked in the focus groups.

1) Have you heard of any stories related to World War II? If so, what were those stories?

2) How did you feel about those stories when you heard them?

3) What do you think about the responsibilities of the postwar generation for World War II?

4) Have you ever had experiences of World War II influencing your relationship to those who are of different nationalities? If so, what were those experiences?

These questions are meant to explore the research questions mentioned in the last chapter. The first two questions were designed to explore how the story of World War II had been told to and perceived by the postwar generation. The third question was meant to explore how the postwar generation positioned themselves in terms of the experience of World War II. The forth question was posed to explore how unresolved issues of World War II influenced individual relationships with people of other countries. The reason these relationships were taken up is that the unresolved issues tended to manifest more clearly in relationship to other nations, as

war is a fight between nations (Koji-en, 1995),

Analysis

The audio tapes were transcribed verbatim. After finishing the first transcript, I listened to the tapes again to check mistakes and to note paralanguage including stress, pause, tone of voice and laughter. I used a generic form of thematic analysis in my approach to data interpretation. This is a form of analysis which identifies themes in textual data. Themes are patterns found in qualitative information that describe possible observations or interpret aspects of the phenomenon (Boyatzis, 1998). I made two sets of hard copies of the transcripts and cut up one set, comment by comment. I sorted out participants' comments according to the questions to which they responded. The comments that did not answer the four questions were put aside. The next step was grouping comments with a similar theme. After grouping, I read the comments of each group to see if a common pattern emerged. If I found a clear pattern, I developed a code or category which described the pattern. If I did not find a clear pattern, I reconsidered the grouping. I repeated the procedure until I found a code for each group. In the process, I sometimes needed to break a comment into pieces, because one sentence or phrase could be categorized into one group and the other sentence or phrase could be sorted into

another group. Because one category had notably more material than other codes, I developed sub-categories for it. I followed the same procedure to find sub-categories.

Ethical Considerations

As qualitative research studies phenomena related to human beings "from the inside", researchers ask respondents to share personal experiences. The information that is shared with researchers can be deeply personal and significant to the participant. Actually, such information is something that researchers are hoping to attain. In return, qualitative research interviewers have to face ethical questions. These questions include emotional safety, confidentiality, reciprocity and informed consent (Knapik, 2002; Oka & Shaw, 2000). I will discuss here these four questions in order.

Emotional safety is crucial for qualitative research, because of the personal nature of the information it seeks. Some participants might feel later that they revealed too much about themselves in the interview (Knapnik, 2002). Some topics are too sensitive to talk about for certain people. World War II was such a tragedy and certain aspects of the war are still taboo to talk about in Japan, such as the responsibility of the Emperor (Buruma, 1994). To increase emotional safety and

benefit for the participants and to decrease the possibility of harm, I clearly stated the topic and purpose of the study, when I recruited participants of focus group interviews. All the participants volunteered and were willing to talk about their experiences related to World War II. At the beginning of each group discussion, I told participants that they could ask me to erase any parts of the video-tape in which they appeared, and not to include their statements in the study, if they wished.

Confidentiality is important to protect the privacy of participants. I use a single identifying letter (A, B, C, etc.) as a substitute for participants' real names. When I quoted their statements, I avoid revealing personal information that might identify the participant to others.

There is a tendency that the relationship between researchers and research participants can become more personal, and the reciprocity of research is therefore important (Oka & Shaw, 2000). Some researchers report that they have received positive feedback from participants about sharing their stories (Knapik, 2002). For example, some were grateful of the opportunity for discussion and other even reported that they had better sleep after the interview. As a researcher, I am indebted to all the participants for the valuable information they provided, and approached my research with the intention that wherever possible, it could be beneficial for them to share their experiences and thoughts in focus groups.

Regarding informed consent, the topic and purpose of this research was clearly stated in the letter for the recruitment (See Appendix A). Before the discussion started, the participants read and signed the informed consent form, which included the purpose of the study, a confidentiality agreement and a video-release form (See Appendix B).

Issues of Translation

In my study, the Japanese language was used in the focus group discussions. A factor that needs attention is the issue of translation from Japanese to English. Twinn (1998) conducted focus groups with Hong Kong Chinese women. They spoke Chinese in the discussion. She points out the complexity that comes with translation of data that might influence the quality of data: not being able to find equivalent English words and differences in grammatical style. Japanese is also very different from English. It is at times hard to find the equivalent word or expression in English. There is also a considerable difference in grammatical structure between Japanese and English. For example, the subject is not always needed in Japanese sentences, while it is necessary in English. The difference sometimes makes the data difficult to translate. You need to guess from the context who or what the agent of the act is. Twinn (1998) suggests analyzing data in the original language in order to maximize

the quality of data. Following her suggestion, the data of this study was coded for recurrent themes without being translated into English. For quoting, I translate the remarks. When the sentence does not have a stated subject, the author infers it and the inferred subject is enclosed in parentheses.

SUMMARY

In the first part of this chapter, I discussed the methodological framework and data collection method that I used in this study. I also discuss evaluation criteria and placement of the literature review. In the latter part of the chapter, I described the details of my research method as they pertained to this study. This included the recruitment of participants, the conduct of the focus groups, questions asked in the discussion, the analysis of data, ethical considerations and the issue of translation.

CHAPTER III

SUBJECTIVITY OF THE RESEARCHER

In qualitative research, the researcher's bias is inevitable. However, it is not seen as an obstacle but as an invaluable asset of a researcher (Maione, 1997). "The researcher is the research instrument", states Clark (2002). She claims that it is important to hone the researcher's perspective so that she can analyze and argue about the phenomenon in a sophisticated manner, instead of removing it. To use the researcher's perspective in a productive way, a researcher should reflect on herself and become aware of her values and preconceptions (Oka & Shaw, 2000; Maione, 1997). She also needs to state them openly in the interests of the credibility of the study.

World War II is a very controversial theme, as we have seen in the previous chapters. Strong polarities always emerge around issues related to the war. The researcher who is studying those issues is likely to be polarized. Therefore it is especially important for me as a researcher to examine my values, beliefs and prejudices, and identify the polarities with which I tend to align myself. . With this

awareness, I can find a perspective which encompasses the polarities, and treat the data and discussion more fairly. This also contibutes ot the soundness of the study, in that it allows the reader to assess my findings with an understanding of the lens through which they have been filtered.

In this chapter, I will share about myself so that the reader can know a little about me and my bias. In the first part, I will talk about myself in relationship to World War II. Then I will discuss an open forum on East Asian issues, which was held in October, 2002 in Portland, Oregon. This will be presented as a reference to the different roles around this issue. I will use this forum to examine my own bias, which roles in the field I tend to side with and which roles I tend to marginalize.

ME, MY DREAM, THE WAR AND PROCESS WORK

In this section I will write about myself and some memories related to the World War II. I will also describe how these are connected to my   motivation to study Process Work and to conduct the research presented here.

Memories

I believe that I have a memory of my birth. I had just come out of my mother's womb and was lying on the bed. I felt sad and disappointed that I had come into

this world. On the right side above me, there was a window. Out of that window, I saw the evening sky at dusk and felt sort of homesick.

I was born in Japan in 1965, 20 years after the end of World War II. In the previous year, the Olympics were held in Tokyo. My parents watched the opening ceremony on television in a restaurant on their honeymoon trip. For Japan, the Olympics were a symbol of recovery from the war and of Japan's re-acceptance by the world after its defeat. The Japanese economy was in a high-growth period and people were busy with working for their companies and their future. Hardly anybody looked back at their past. Growing up in that period, I did not see any traces of the war, except a few old hand-dug holes which had been used as air-raid shelters for citizens during the war.

My first war-related memory was that my paternal grandmother showed me some medals that my grandfather received during the war. I must have been eight years old. It was right after my grandfather died. Although my grandmother appeared to be proud, I felt a sense of secrecy. I felt honored to be shown the medals, but at the same time perplexed. The medals made me think for the first time about the possibility that my grandfather killed people. Although I had known that he was a veteran, I had not really thought about what that meant. My grandfather was a typical man from his era; quiet, reserved, dignified, strict and

responsible, yet he was very sweet to us, his grandchildren. I still remember that he tried not to show his tears, when he saw me and my sister off at the station after our visit during the summer vacation. I did not quite put those images together, the one of him as a sweet grandfather and the other of him as a Japanese Army officer killing people.

I recall another memory when I was in the fourth or fifth grade. I read a book about the childhood of an author, who grew up before and during the war. He portrayed how he became nationalistic and militant as a boy influenced by education, media and adults around him. I was shocked by the story, because his story reminded me of myself. I was so naïve that I usually believed what I was taught or told by my teachers and my parents. I could have been like him, if I had lived back then. I became very afraid of being brainwashed like him. I started to doubt what the media and adults around me tried to tell me.

Around that age, I had a conversation with a friend of mine. We were walking home from school chatting. From the hill, she pointed at a slum down below and told me that there lived a lot of "Chosen-jin", a derogatory name for Koreans. She said that her grandmother told her that they were poor, dirty and dangerous and she should not talk to them. I had not known that Koreans were living there and did not have any historical knowledge about Koreans who were

forcefully taken to Japan before and during the war. However, I sensed injustice in her comment and the tone of her voice. I responded to her firmly and passionately that if what she said was true, there must be a reason why they stayed poor and why they sometimes needed to act violently. I continued to tell her that the reason must be that they had been treated unfairly in Japan. I do not know if I convinced her, but she at least listened to me. I myself was a bit surprised at my comment, because I usually did not disagree with friends. I also wondered where the thought and the passion came from.

At the age of 19, I went to the United States to take an English course during the summer vacation. There were a number of students from Japan and South Korea. Most Japanese were girls, most Koreans were boys and we were of similar age. We became friends and spend some time together. Some of them were flirting with each other like any other boys and girls of that age. One day, a Japanese girl came to me crying. She told me that she was raped by two of the Korean boys. She thought they were friendly and visited their room. They suddenly became violent. While they were raping her, they told her that Japanese women like sex so much. I was infuriated but she did not want to accuse them of the crime. I wish I had known better what to do in terms of taking care of her and taking legal action. In their horrifying act and comments, I sensed strong hatred, maliciousness

and revenge. My friend left the school right away. It was not my only reason,   but I also left the school soon after she did.

In my early twenties, I stayed in Germany for a year as an exchange student. My roommate was a girl from Taiwan and a Korean girl was living on the same floor of the dormitory. We quickly became friends and spent a lot of time together, cooking and eating together, talking about life and studying together. I had some good German friends, but I could be much more relaxed with my friends from East Asia. Our personalities were so different but we had something in common. I felt really fortunate to have such good friends. One night, we were chatting in a room. The Korean girl was talking about the politics of North and South Korea and mentioned the responsibility of Japan on dividing Korea into two countries. I started to defend Japan without much knowledge about that matter. She explained how it happened. She looked upset by the fact that I did not know such an important thing. I was very embarrassed because I hardly knew about the issue and I became defensive. We stayed friends during my stay but there seemed to be an invisible wall between us.

Looking back at these memories from my early years, I can see how the unhealed wounds from the war influenced me and my life. Yet, I was not aware of the depth of this influence.

Process Work and My High Dream

In 1995, the 50th anniversary of the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, one of my friends told me about a Process Work seminar on that issue. It was called Worldwork, and was going to be held in Seattle. As soon as I heard about the seminar I decided to go, even though I was living in Japan at that time. I felt strongly about the issue and angry at the United States because of this. I felt righteous and wanted to bring "our" voice as victims into the seminar.

On the second day of the seminar, we started the group process. The first person who spoke up though was a Chinese Canadian who had emigrated to Canada from Hong Kong. She said something like, "I know that we are going to talk about the Hiroshima issue, but I do not want you to forget the people in Asian countries who were oppressed and killed by the Japanese Army." Her comment shocked me, because I was not prepared for it. I thought I was there to represent the victim side, but now I was a descendant of perpetrators. I was confused. Though I had only exchanged greetings with her, I had already become fond of her. I really wanted to come closer to her to hear her stories, to apologize and to become her friend. However, I felt so embarrassed and guilty about our past that I could not move forward. I realized that the guilt that I felt came especially from

the fact that my grandfather was a Japanese army officer. Thanks to the help of Arnold Mindell, who was one of the facilitators, I finally came up to her and apologized to her for the past. She said that it was not my fault and smiled. I felt accepted by her. I was deeply touched by the process and a part of me felt healed by it. The seminar made me aware, for the first time, of how deeply I had been affected by our past.

In 1996, a year after the seminar in Seattle, I participated in another Process Work seminar in San Francisco that dealt directly with the unresolved issues from World War II amongst Asian countries. The stories that Chinese and Korean participants shared were horrific and painful. I was so sad that I could not stop crying. Then I was accused of my ignorance by a Korean participant. I became frozen between pain and guilt. I wanted to join Chinese and Korean participants and cry with them, but I was a granddaughter of a Japanese soldier and they hated me. How dare I come to their side? It was an extremely lonely place. After crying for a few hours, suddenly I realized that feeling guilty does not do any good, but taking responsibility does. Today I still have not figured out how I can take responsibility, but the insight saved me from the hopeless place.

These experiences in the seminars made me realize how much guilt and shame I had been carrying as a Japanese citizen, how much I had suffered from

the gap between me and other Asian people, and how much pain I had felt for the atrocities of World War II. I saw how the unresolved issues of the past still affected us and caused pain on both sides, including my Japanese friend who had been raped. At the same time, the experiences of the group process made me hopeful that the gap can be filled and wounds can be healed. I was convinced that Process Work would be a great tool for that.

Later I worked on the memory of my birth, since Process Work believes that a person's earliest memory or dream conveys his or her life myth, revealing patterns that emerge throughout life. In the memory, I was so disappointed to have come into "this world" and felt homesick. I asked myself what it was about "this world" that disappointed me and what kind of world I was homesick for. The answer was that "this world" was where we are all separated, its atmosphere was cold and conflicts were happening all the time, while the world that I was longing for was a world of unity where no boundaries exist between people and nature, and peace and love prevail. These are polarities that keep appearing in my life.

A world of unity is something that I long for. Process Work would call it a high dream, one's deepest wishes and hopes for the world. Now thinking back about how I was drawn to Process Work, I must have seen the possibility of making my high dream come true. However, interestingly enough, I also witnessed that it

could happen only through honest, sometimes painful dialogue between two sides.

I admit that I feel somehow at home when such intense dialogues are happening

in front of me. It is better than living in a tense atmosphere without knowing where

it came from. The methods of Process Work do not marginalize any of the polarities

that appeared in my first memory.

Next Step

In 1998, I came to Portland to study Process Work. During my studies, Asian

issues have come up many times. In 1999, for example, we had a large Worldwork

seminar in Washington D.C. to discuss and process world issues, including sexism,

racism, homophobia and poverty. I organized an Asian sub-group to meet during

the lunch break. Participants were from China, Korea, India, Japan, the Philippines,

the United States, England and some other countries. We had a chance to work in

front of the large group as a sub-group. We mainly focused on unresolved issues

between China, Korea and Japan from World War II. Later I co-facilitated an

internet class with Max Schupbach. We used the video-tape from the Asian

process at the conference and processed the issue deeper. I also organized a

community meeting in Tokyo focusing on issues of foreigners, especially Koreans,

living in Japan.

Each process was invaluable and healing. I learned a lot from each of them. In most of the processes, we had a beautiful ending with mutual understanding and forgiveness. Those processes touched me deeply and gave me hope for reconciliation on a larger scale.

Actually the cultural exchange between Japan and other Asian countries, especially Korea, has become quite active in the last few years. You can listen to Asian pop music on TV and radio in Japan. Some Japanese singers are now very popular in some Asian counties. In the year 2002, the World Cup was held both in Korea and Japan. It accelerated the exchange between those two countries. More and more movies, dramas and songs from Korea, which were hardly shown 10 years ago, now are being introduced in Japan. In Korea, songs in Japanese are still banned for sell and broadcast. However some Japanese singers have given concerts in Korea in the last few years.

However, when I look at the political situation of Japan in relationship other to Asian countries, nothing seems to have changed. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, a history textbook that glosses over and even idealizes the past, was published despite repugnance from inside and outside Japan. Political attitudes do not seem to have changed since wartime, as revealed in a comment by the then Prime Minister Mori; "Japan is a divine country centered on the Emperor." None

of the Korean or Chinese who were forced to work as sex slaves or who were

forced to work in terrible conditions during the war have won a legal   case asking

for a formal apology from the government or compensation. Koreans who lived in

Hiroshima when the atomic bomb was dropped there have hardly received any

aid from the government. I am frustrated by that. I have puzzled over why it is so

difficult for the Japanese people, especially the Japanese government, to listen to

them and their pain. At the same time, I have wondered if I am too one-sided and

if I might have missed something. I wanted to know more about what Japanese

people think about World War II. So I decided to pick the topic of   World War II

and explore the experiences, beliefs and attitudes of the post-war generation for

the current research.

THE EAST ASIAN OPEN FORUM

In October 2002, the East Asian Open Forum was held at the Process Work

Center of Portland. Its focus was on Korea-China-Japan relationships   See

Appendix C . Amy and Arnold Mindell facilitated the forum. Because it was the most

recent group process on these issues, and because it displayed the different roles

clearly, I will use it as a reference to examine my biases in approaching my topic. First,

I will give the reader a summary of the forum and then I will examine show where

these reflect my own biases.

Summary of the East Asian Open Forum

First, three speakers from Korea, China and Japan gave speeches and facilitators asked participants from East Asia to share their feelings on East Asian issues. Most of the participants with East Asian background were Japanese. Some Japanese participants expressed sadness and guilt towards the misdeeds and colonization committed by Japan during the war. Some said that pressure from the West made Japan fight against other Asian counties. A Japanese woman was critical of the Korean and Chinese governments. According to her, they were using anti-Japanese sentiment among citizens to bolster their nationalism. Some Japanese men talked about their fathers who survived the war as a soldier or who went through a drastic change after the defeat. A Japanese man talked about his father who fought as a soldier in the South Pacific, where 95 per cent of Japanese soldiers were killed.

The facilitators picked up two polarized roles from these comments. One role was that of the perpetrator, a rational and linear voice that said, "The past is the past. Our parents were not all that bad. Don't talk about those things, we should just get along." The other role was the victim, who was emotional and non-linear saying,

"You destroyed me. I'm furious, upset and angry." The facilitators invited participants to play out those roles.

A few of the participants started the role play and then more people joined in. The perpetrator was more or less identified as Japanese and the victims were identified as Korean and Chinese. The victim side accused the perpetrators of their cruelty including raping, torturing and killing. The perpetrators defended themselves saying that orders from the emperor and pressure from the West made them act like that. They said that they acted for their own survival. A participant on the perpetrator's side even blamed Korea for their lack of self defense when Japan invaded. The victims' side asked the perpetrator's side why they did not just take over without killing and torturing people. To answer the question, the perpetrators started to explain how they were scared of the threat from the West. Then one participant who had been outside of the role play yelled at him in Japanese. He told him not to run away from the issue using such an excuse. Arnold Mindell reformulated what the man said. He said, "If you said it was fear that did that (colonized and tortured people), you are avoiding the essential fact. That is the reason that there has never been reconciliation between counties." However, the perpetrators continued to excuse themselves. The victims got furious. Then Arnold Mindell went over the side of the perpetrators and tried to guess into the "killer mind." From that

role, he said that they wanted more than just to control the other side, they also wanted to destroy, hurt and eradicate everything human. Then a person from the perpetrators admitted that there was a rage and it was directed not only toward Koreans but also towards themselves, the Japanese people. Arnold Mindell formulated that as "suicidality". The person agreed but other people from the perpetrators' side did not pick it up and they again started to excuse themselves for their violent behavior.

We took a break and both facilitators named a few ghosts, which are roles talked about but not represented by anybody in the given group. These were the killer, the West, history and the dead. Arnold Mindell picked several people who could represent Korea and its dead, China and its dead, Japan and its dead and the West. He suggested that those seven people act those roles out with slow movement, because seeing things acted out in this way would bring up different emotions.

These people moved for about 10-15 minutes, trying to feel into their respective roles, and moving from there. After watching this role play , people were deeply affected, and the atmosphere of the room shifted. The woman who played the role of Korea felt support from the dead. A man who played the role of Japan said that he felt the strength of the dead. He realized that real strength was not in blaming the

other but having the courage to talk about taboos which have not been talked about. An American woman spoke up about her sorrow that the United States had three wars against Asia in last 60 years. Arnold Mindell apologized to Japan for the dropping of the atomic bombs. A Japanese participant followed him and expressed an apology to Korea and China.

Another Japanese participant shared that he was scared of the man who yelled at him in the first part of the process. The man responded to him that he was more scared than the Japanese man. Taking up his courage, he disclosed that his father was Korean, while his mother was Japanese and that he had grown up in Japan. He had experienced harsh discrimination when he was a child and had hidden his origin for over 30 years. It had been also difficult for him to be half Korean and half Japanese, because it meant for him that he had both the aggressor and its victim inside him. He said that he got enraged when some Japanese tried to excuse their past actions. People were listening to him attentively. Arnold Mindell appreciated him for speaking up. The forum closed with all participants doing some innerwork, or quiet reflection on what had taken place.

My Bias

To examine my bias, I will focus on the first part of the forum, because that is

when the strong polarities emerged in the group process. The perpetrator was rational and linear, and said that Japan could not help invading Korea and China because of pressure from the West. The perpetrator thought that everyone should move on without looking back. The victim side was emotional and nonlinear, and tried to get the other side to listen to it. The victims got furious at the perpetrators, because they just excused themselves. Although a lot of Japanese participants identified with the former role, and although the latter role is usually associated with the Koreans and Chinese, the same polarities existed among the Japanese participants. This is also seen in the example of the discussion about the controversial history textbook, on the issue of comfort women, on the issue of the Prime Minister's visit to Yasukuni Shrine and so on. One side insisted that Japan has already given compensation, has been too subservient to Korea and China and does not have to apologize to those countries anymore. The other side argued that Japan has not listened to the victims' voices seriously, has not reflected on themselves enough, and needs to take more responsibility. This kind of argument is often strongly associated with the conflict between the right wing and left wing.

From the beginning of the first process, I was drawn to the side of the victim, which I usually feel closer to. I was extremely frustrated by all the excuses that the perpetrator was making. They did not listen to the victim side but just explained all

the alleged reasons why they invaded Korea and China and why they tortured, raped and killed so many people of those countries. What shocked me was that one person from the perpetrator's side even blamed Korea for not protecting themselves. At the same time, I felt a little scared and lonely, as I saw five to six Japanese participants standing on the other side. I was one of two people and the only Japanese person who was standing for the role of the victim. I was wondering if I was totally unaware of something or if I was crazy. So I changed sides in order to understand the perpetrator. However this was not successful. I could not feel into the role at all. Then I returned to the side of the victim.

When Arnold Mindell talked about "suicidality" and a person on the perpetrator side admitted that this was true, I could feel a little closer to those on that side. But they did not pick up their destructive, almost suicidal power. They went back to their rational style again.

When the first part was over, I started to feel really sad and I could not stop crying. First I was not sure what made me so sad and I found myself feeling a bit stupid, because I looked like the only person who was affected by the process so much. However, thanks to the support of my partner and friends, I tried to take my feelings more seriously. I noticed that I was crying not only for the role of the victim but also for the pain that the perpetrator's side might feel. I was really sad that we

were so polarized and were fighting each other, as if we were totally different people. When I realized that, I started to open up to the perpetrator side too. I felt for the father of a Japanese participant who survived battles where most of his comrades were killed, and who could not talk about his experiences even to his family. I sympathized with the father of another Japanese participant who could not believe in anything including himself in his whole life, because he had witnessed that the authorities had suddenly started to say something completely different from what they had said before the defeat of the war. Through this experience, I began to understand the perpetrator side a little better. However, I am aware that I tend to side with the victim and to marginalize the perpetrator.

INNERWORK ON THE POLARITIES

The polarities of the perpetrator and the victim are so strong in the field that I can not avoid being polarized. As we saw in the previous section, I have a strong tendency to side with the victim and to marginalize the perpetrator. Nevertheless, I always have the dialogue between those two roles in my mind, every time I think of the issue. Arnold Mindell (1992, 1995) argues for the importance of innerwork, in working with groups. Without innerwork, it is difficult to stay in the heated discussion or tense atmosphere which may occur when a group tries to transform, because

you lose your awareness. He recommends completing an inner dialogue between two polarities to gain detachment. Since my study involve the worldwork issue, it is important for me as a researcher to do innerwork to raise awareness and gain detachment. I need to have a better view of the conflict between the polarities and to understand especially the perpetrator side better. So I chose to work on the conflicts of the polarities using Process Work methods of innerwork and relationship work.

I wrote up the dialogue, taking both victim and perpetrator sides as well as a facilitative role. As facilitator, I helped communication between thee polarities, including picking up accusations and working on double signals that did not go along with the content of what was being said.

My Innerwork

Below is the dialogue between the two roles and facilitator. In my mind the victim is an old Korean woman and the perpetrator is a middle aged Japanese man. V stands for the victim, P for the perpetrator and F for the facilitator.

V: I'm furious at you! You've never understood how much pain you caused us!

P: We have already compensated our past. Your government also agreed with us as well. Why do you still need something from us?

V: No! You haven't really apologized for what you have done. You have never shown real remorse for the misdeeds of Japan.

P: We have already apologized but you have never heard that, have you?

V: You might have said something like an apology, but why do we again and again need to hear politicians make such stupid comments like "The Nanjing massacre was a make believe story"? Why haven't any of the comfort women received a formal apology from the Japanese government or any compensation yet?

P: They were just a slip of the tongue.

V: Just? We've heard enough of them already!

F: (to P) You said it was just a slip of tongue, but it happened more than just a few times. Maybe a part of you thinks that what happened in the past wasn't necessarily Japan's responsibility?

P: Hmmm. That may be true. I don't think it was only Japan's responsibility. At that time, European countries and the United States had already colonized many African and Asian countries. We just followed them. We did what the West was doing. Look at what they did to other countries including the dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Why do we always need to be the only one to be accused? Is it because we lost the war?

F: You feel that Japan was treated unfairly?

P: Yes.

V: How about us? Have you treated us fairly? NOT AT ALL!!! You treated us

as if we weren't human beings! Why do we need to hear your excuses? I'm so mad and feel crazy!!!

F: Now things are escalating. So let's go slow here. (To the perpetrator) Do you see any truth in what she is saying? Do you think that you treated them fairly and as equal human beings?

P: Well, not really. But it was how the West had treated people of color.

F: You have mentioned the West several times. Why do you think the West could exploit the African and Asian countries so unfairly?

P: I think they looked down on people of color. They didn't think that people of color, including Japanese people, were the same human beings as they were. That's why the United States could drop atomic bombs. They wouldn't have dropped them on the cities of Germany.

F: You look upset about that.

P: Yes, I'm very angry about that.

F: Tell us what makes you so angry.

P: Thousands and thousands of innocent people including children were killed. It was like hell.

V: Then how come you can't imagine what happened with us? Now you are the West! Look at me! What do you see in me? How do I look to you? Do you see me as a human being?

P: Of course, you look like a human being to me.

F: How about taking a good look at her and tell her what you see?

P: Well, … You look angry and …a bit scary.

F: What else do you see?

P: Strange, but I start to think of my parents. My father died in the war and

my mother needed to raise her three children including me by herself. She worked really hard for us. The wrinkles on your face remind me of my mother's face.

F: You see a real human over there?

P: Yes.

F: You looked touched or something.

P: I haven't really thought of my parents until now. I'm now thinking how scary it was for my father to be in the middle of a battle field and how sad and helpless my mother felt when she found out about her husband's death. I have never thought of that.

F: You are saying you have never paid attention to the feelings of your parents? How about your own feelings?

P: I needed to work so hard to go to university, because we were poor. After my graduation, I worked again really hard for my company. I was too busy to think how my parents would have felt or how I felt. I've just worked and worked without looking back.

V: It is a relief to see you feel something. You look more human to me now. I still want to know why, why did you do such cruel things to us?

P: There must have been a demon like energy in us. In the early time, the old wisdom about fine balance kept the demon under control. For example, East Asia kept an intricate balance under the superiority of China. When the West came into Asia, we lost that balance and the demon in us came out. It is so demonic that most people were intoxicated. It made us think we were so powerful that we could control everything. We killed and killed and killed, believing that the world would

be ours. But what we didn't notice was that the demon was killing us as well. How many Japanese soldiers died? It was stupid of Japan to think we could beat America. The demon blinded us. The demon hates everything and everyone. It just wants to destroy.

F: It is not just Japan who has that demon. Everybody knows that demon. Do you know what the essence of the demon is?

P: ......The power of change. It takes everything we think we own and forces us to let it go. Then something new will come out.

F: Let's take the relationship with her, what needs to change?

P: I need to let go of my fear of being attacked and start listening to her.

F: You are listening to him as well.

V: I haven't forgiven Japan yet, but I started to see a human in front of me.

F: I don't think this is the end of the conflict but a true dialogue seems to have started.

Learning from the Innerwork

The biggest learning from my innerwork was to get to know the demon. I have wondered why Japan attacked Pearl Harbor to start the war with America. Any one with any intelligence would not have started the war. America had more resources, technology and power than Japan. However, the demon tempted Japan to enter the war without any chance of winning. The demon must have made Japan inflated and greedy. On the other hand, I also found that the power

of the demon is not only bad. Its essence, the deepest root which exists even before it manifests in consensus reality, is the power of change. We can use this power more constructively. For example, the power of the demon must own Japan's miraculous economic success after the defeat in the war. As a Japanese participant said at the end of the open forum, 'real strength lies in the courage to talk about taboos which no one has talked about, the power of change must be the key to breaking the pattern and changing the relationships between the Japanese people and people of other nationalities'.

I also learned through the open forum and my inner work how many feeling Japanese people must have suppressed. Many of them must have felt pain, terror, sorrow, anger, guilt and remorse about World War II. However, those feelings have hardly been talked about. After the war, people were too absorbed in their own survival and recovery to feel and look back at what happened during the war. If they could not look at their own feelings, how could they understand someone else's feelings? This must be one of the reasons why the perpetrator is unable to open up and listen to the victim's pain.

What surprised me was how it changed the victim's attitude that the perpetrator became more human and showed his feelings. That relieved the tension in me. I noticed that I, myself, was a bit scared of their hurt and anger,

though I identified myself as being more on their side. In a sense, I did not expect that the victim had such integrity and strength. I must have seen them only as poor people who needed help.

I am sure that I will need to work on the polarities again and again, but I feel the mood shift inside me now. It is not as polarized as it was before and my inner atmosphere has become more relaxed, happier and more open to both sides.

Reflection on Myself

According to Arnold Mindell (1992), "Individuals and groups are the battleground for the characters in the myths to complete their mythical conflicts". He emphasizes the importance of dealing with conflicts wherever they appear, because fields do not have boundaries. The issues could come up in a group, in your relationship or in your fantasy.

I can see how the conflict between two sides, the perpetrator and the victim, emerge in my own personal life as well. My innerwork taught me that I have been afraid of my power, which can be aggressive and destructive, if I do not use it consciously. I have sensed this power, but have also marginalized it. Many Japanese people do not like to look back at the atrocities caused by Japan in the past and complain that the United States, for example, was cruel and unfair. But I

too am like them. Instead of working on my demonic power, I criticized Japanese people for their misdeeds in the past and the lack of reflection in the present.

I ask myself how I can use this power to help with unresolved issues from World War II. My answer is to fight against the fear in me that my thoughts are worthless, and to fight against hopelessness, and the belief that we can not stop the cycle of hatred that leads to war. This cycle is something that I want to destroy with this power.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I examined my personal biases around the issues of World War II. Firstly, I shared some memories relating to the war and showed how they connected me with Process Work. Secondly, I introduced the group process from the East Asian Open Forum to display the different roles that pertain to the issue: the perpetrator who had a rational and linear style and the victim, who had an emotional and nonlinear style, both emerging as strong polarities. I mentioned my one-sideness, which is a tendency to side with the victim and to marginalize the perpetrator. Lastly, I reported my innerwork on the polarities that emerged in the Open Forum to raise my awareness as a researcher. Through the innerwork, I understood the perpetrator side better. There was a demonic power that drove

Japan to fight a desperate war. It caused tremendous pain not only to Korea, China and other countries but also to Japan itself. However, the Japanese people seem to have suppressed their pain in order to move forward. I also found how I myself have avoided looking at my own power. By looking at it, I found ways of using it positively and productively.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this chapter, I will present the findings from my analysis and interpretation of the conversations that took place in the focus groups that I conducted. In the focus groups, I asked participants four questions that focused on: 1) wartime stories told in their family; 2) their perception of the stories; 3) their thoughts on the responsibility of the postwar generation for World War II; and 4) their experiences of the war in relationship to people of other nationalities. The themes that I identified through my analysis of the data will be introduced under four headings related to these questions.

To protect participants' privacy, I use an identifying initial, A, B, C, and so on, instead of their names. In quotation, stressed words are underlined and omitted parts are indicated with three points (…). To help the reader to understand what certain comments mean, I provide historical background, if needed.

1) WARTIME STORIES

All the participants had heard stories of wartime from their parents or

grandparents. Five themes were found in those stories; hardship and struggles, luck and miracles, luxurious life, death of the other side and war in the present. In the theme of hardship and struggles, four sub-themes were categorized.

Hardship and Struggles

All the participants had heard stories from their parents or grandparents that contained the theme of hardship and struggles. This theme appeared in the discussions notably more often than any other theme and characterizes a large majority of all the stories shared by the participants. The stories can be classified into four sub-categories; shortage of food and other goods, loss of family members, restriction of speech and experience of hatred.

Shortage of Food and Other Goods

During the war, goods of every description were in short supply. If you had extra rice or wheat, you were supposed to deliver them to the government. Food was rationed, but it was not enough. People needed to find food on their own, so a lot of people went to farmers and bought or bartered for food illegally from them. The struggle around getting food was one of the most common themes in stories told by the war generation.

D: I heard that (grandparents of my mother side) went to buy food at the farmers or they hid rice behind the Buddhist altar. I always heard those stories, when I visited (my grandparents) in the summer vacation. The grandparents on my father's side also told that they didn't have enough food and medicine as well, though my father got often ill as a child.

B: My grandmother was a large and strong woman. So she went to the countryside and carried a lot of Japanese radishes on her back to feed her family.

A participant heard about the shortage of food in a nuance that did not allow her to ask further questions.

H: I hesitate to ask them (the war generation) more questions.

<Why?>

H: Because they had already told me that they starved. The message that I sensed from them was, "what else do you need to know?"

Loss of Family Members

Some participants heard that some of family members died because of the war.

F: The worst experience for her (my mother) concerned her brother. He was mentally retarded because of hydrocephalus. He could barely read Katakana (the easiest characters in Japanese). But still he was drafted and later came home with a <u>terrible</u> condition. He was in

> such a <u>terrible</u> condition psychologically and physically, because he was beaten so badly. He died because of it.
>
> G: I heard (from my father) that they didn't have enough food and his brother died of malnutrition. (My father) is a poor talker, but he wrote a book (on the experiences of the war). I read the book and he sometimes tells us such stories at the dinner table.

Tokyo and other cities were attacked from the air by the United States Air Force. A lot of people lost their homes or died from the bombing. For example, in a large air raid, known as Tokyo dai-kusyu, more than 120,000 people died in one night in Tokyo.

> B: One of my relatives was trying to run away during the air raid holding his mother's hand, but he lost her hand. Because he was so scared of being killed, he didn't look for his mother. He wrote (in his book) that this was a terrible thing he did.

Tokko (Special higher police or thought police); Restriction of Speech

During World War II, fascism, militarism and nationalism ruled Japan. People did not have freedom of speech. The Japanese government could punish any of those who criticized the emperor, government or military, and those that did not actively support the war. There was the special police called "Tokko." They arrested and tortured people who were suspected to be against the national policy. A participant heard about the fear of Tokko.

F: (My mother told me that) you couldn't even use the word "society", because there was something like Tokko. You couldn't tell <u>anything</u>.

The word "society" would be associated with "socialism" which was incompatible with the fascism. Another person heard a story of her grandfather who talked relatively freely at that time without being scared of Tokko. Her story surprised the other participants.

E: My grandfather on my father's side seems to have been an eccentric person. He openly said that Japan was going to lose the war, because he knew about America. Tokko kept their eye on him but he wasn't so concerned about it.

Unidentified Speaker: Wow! Really?

Experience of Being Attacked

Some stories were told about being attacked by somebody else. One participant shared their parents experience after the war in "Manchuria", which is located in the northeast China and was occupied by the Japanese Army during the war.

A: As soon as the war was over, The Chinese living in their neighborhood turned against them (my parents). They for example threw stuff at

them. (My parents) didn't have enough to eat. They told me it was really hard to escape from there and to get back to Japan.

A lot of children in bigger cities were evacuated to rural regions. The father of a participant told her his difficulties.

> B: My father says, "I hate country <u>bumpkins</u>." He was evacuated to the countryside during the war. Because he was so impertinent, he was taken to woods, locked up somewhere and beaten with rocks by <u>bastards</u>. That's why he said he hate country bumpkins.

Luck and Miracles

The second most frequent theme after "Hardship and struggles" was about luck and miracles that helped them to survive.

> A: This is something my father often told me. He was about to fly back to Japan. Somebody asked him to give his place to him. He wanted to go back to Japan immediately, because there was a problem with his wife. He gave his place in the airplane and the airplane was shot down. He always said how lucky he was.
>
> D: My grandfather on my mother's side was a soldier and he told me how he survived the war. For example, when he came back from the latrine, he found somebody shot in the place he was before. Another story was that he left a ship to take another ship for some reason. The first ship was attacked and sunk. Those stories were told as a proof of

his bravery.

E: At the end of war, living in Tokyo was getting dangerous (because of air raids). (My mother and her family) went to Chiba (a city outside of Tokyo) to look for a house to rent. In the evening, (the landlord) told them to stay over night because it was already pretty late to go home. They stayed there that night. The next day when they went back to Tokyo, they found that their entire house in Tokyo was destroyed by the air raid except for a pot made of stainless steel. If they had gone back home that night, they all would have died.

While most stories of the other themes are rather fragmented, the stories about miracles and luck are elaborated, coherent, structured and "story-like". They seem to have been told again and again in the family almost as family myths.

Luxurious Life

Japan invaded a larger part of Asia including Korea, China and Indonesia. Not only soldiers, but women and children moved from Japan to live there. Two participants heard of a luxurious life abroad. One story is more explicit than the other.

A: My mother was working in Singapore and somewhere in Southeast Asia. When Japan was still beating the others, there were parties every night. Officers picked up them (her and her friends) with their cars and they went to the parties. They seemed to have a really

good time.

The other participant came from a region where civilians got involved in battles. A lot of them lost their family members and homes. They are usually seen as victims in Japan.

> H: I don't think they (people in the region) were only victims. Some people moved to Taiwan including my grandmother on my father's side. When (she and her family) were in Taiwan, they seem to have kept a few maids.

Death of the Other Side

Not too many participants heard stories of death, pain or struggles of the other side. Only two of them heard stories of death of Americans. Only one story entails an actual murder.

> H: Recently, I heard one cruel story. An American soldier drifted to an island. (People from the village) discussed what to do with him. If they let him live, they thought, it would be taken that they are harboring him or it would set a bad example as Japanese citizens. They decided to kill him. I hadn't heard such stories before, and I was a bit surprised. People in the area are usually seen as victims, but I realized it is not all true. They were actually involved with war willingly.

In another story, the person witnessed the death of an American pilot.

> F: My father hardly told me (about the war). One of the few things he

told me is that he went to see a crashed B29. It was as tall as the third floor and he saw the pilot dead in the airplane.

War in the Present

Two have fathers who are re-experiencing the war at the moment in an altered state of mind.

> A: My father has been suffering from Alzheimer's. But experiences from the war seem to stay with him. He talks a lot and in detail about the war. …He says to me (without recognizing that I'm his daughter), "This war is really difficult, but do your best." Or, "China is now attacking us. It is a very strong country." In his mind, we are still in wartime.

> B: When he gets drunk, he often says, "Yanks," he calls Americans Yanks, "Yanks came and dropped bombs." …He often says "they are sly dogs. We are going to beat them soon."

Above are the themes of stories of wartime that the participants have heard. "Hardship and struggles" appeared most frequently and had more variety in the stories than other themes. Almost half of participants shared stories with the theme of "luck and miracles". The stories tended to be told more in details than other themes. The rest, "luxurious life" "death of the other side" and "war at present", appeared in the discussions much less frequently.

2) PERCEPTION OF THE STORIES

The next question I asked in the focus groups was how the participants felt about the stories told by the war generation. Most of participants experienced a "sense of taboo" in one way or another. Some participants had the "desire to know the war generation's feelings and thoughts". One participant clearly stated that she found "no reality" in those stories.

Sense of Taboo

Some people said that they perceived the sense of taboo. They could listen to what was being said, but they did not feel free to inquire further.

> D: When my grandfather told me stories of the wartime, I innocently felt happy that no gunshots hit him. …What I was really wondering was why he volunteered to be a soldier. But I couldn't ask. I felt it would accuse him of being someone who killed people in the war. I felt I needed to deny that side of him in order to be with him. I tried to think the grandfather who played with me and the grandfather who killed people were different.

> F: What was really difficult for me was that (my mother) implied stuff (about wartime) but didn't really talk about it. … She told me about her brother, who died after coming back from the war. The way she told me sounded so <u>terrible and nasty</u> that I couldn't ask any questions. It was like putting a lid on something that stinks. You can't

see what's in there but you can smell it. I think it is a family problem which was amplified by the war.

     H: There seems to be a lot of horrible stories. Because (My mother) lost her father, they were really poor and miserable. But they must have thought that it wouldn't do any good to complain about that, as there were people who had had even worse experiences. …Maybe it is why I don't ask questions that I don't know who experienced such terrible things. It feels like walking on land mines (to ask about their wartime experiences).

A participant remembered an interaction in her family that depicts the sense of taboo.

     F: I remember my father said, "It was stupid of Japan to start the Pacific war." Then my grandmother on my mother's side reacted to his comment and said, "You are making my husband's struggle (as a soldier) meaningless!" The atmosphere there got really awkward. The other family members tried to calm them down and that was it.

At the end of the discussion in one group, a participant appreciated me for making the opportunity to talk about the war. Everyone in the group agreed with her and they shared how difficult it is to talk about the war.

     H: Thank you for making such an opportunity (to the researcher).

     F: Yes, thank you! I feel the same. Outside of the activist group that I was involved in, I always needed to think about whether or not I could talk about the war to the other person.

G: Yah, I think about that too. If I say, "I hate war", that could be taken as a political statement.

F: That's right! You would be put in a certain category.

H: I'm afraid of being put into a 'strange people' category. "Yah, that person is strange, she is a left-winger." Then I would be pushed away.

F: It is the same with feminism. To be seen as part of the feminist movement, is a put down. Though I feel close to feminism, I can't say that I'm a feminist, because I'm so afraid that people will think 'she is a hysteric like T (a well-know feminist in Japan)'.

H: If I talked about the war at my workplace, I would be marginalized.

F: No, we can't talk.

The sense of taboo seems to prevail in many generations. It appears not only in the family but also elsewhere in the society.

Desire to Know the War Generation's Feelings and Thoughts

A participant realized in the discussion that he had been frustrated that facts and details of everyday life had been told without emotions and thoughts about the war. This aroused strong reactions from the group. Some participants resonated with him strongly and the other opposed him.

C: They told me details of their everyday life, like how they escaped back to Japan after the war rather than the war as a whole. …It was difficult for me not to be able to hear how they felt about the war.

<Would you say more about that?>

C: It wouldn't matter what they said. It could be, "I didn't like the war" or "We couldn't help but to move into the war." I wanted to hear anything about what they felt and thought.

D: I'm so inspired by what you just said. Now I remember a feeling, which I had as a child. It was so subtle that I hardly recognized it. I felt that something was wrong here. I really agree with you. Difficult events were told, but somehow they didn't say what they thought about the war. It is strange.

B: (Aggressively) It makes total sense to me that they could only talk about difficult events, because they went through a really difficult time. I don't think they need to think, "I'm against war" or something like that.

Another person in the other group also felt a gap between what was told and how it was told.

E: I was very surprised when I heard the way (my family) told the story in a very indifferent fashion. It wasn't said as something important.

No Reality

Only one participant said clearly that she did not find any reality in the stories from wartime.

B: My grandma took me to an old site where bombs were dropped and a lot of people were killed. I was listening to my grandma. I was

nodding while I was feeding some doves but those stories didn't have any reality for me, actually not at all.

The sense of taboo was the most common experience around war. It did not matter if it was about World War II or war in general. Some participants expressed that they wanted to know more about the feelings and thoughts of their parents or grandparents.

3) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE POSTWAR GENERATION

The third question was about whether or not the postwar generation was responsible for World War II. Participants did not agree that they were responsible for the war.

We Are not Responsible

Some of them stated clearly that they were not responsible.

> A: I have seen some (Japanese people) who were born after the war apologize for the war. I feel troubled by that. I wasn't there when it happened and I didn't do anything. …To be honest, I don't think I have any responsibility for the war.
>
> C: Why do I need to represent Japan? I would like to say, "Give me a break!" …Japan definitely did something wrong to Korea and other counties. But in the past, Koreans came to Japan and pushed Ainu

(indigenous people in northern Japan) away.　They are just like us.

We Are Responsible

Some felt responsible for the war as the postwar generation. Some focused

more on the action and others focused more on the apology.

> G: I think we are responsible. What we are responsible for is to become a
> country that will not be involved in any war.

> F: I used to feel so guilty that I couldn't do anything, when I was with H or
> M (colleagues of hers who were victims of the war). But when I read a
> book on racism, it said that guilt doesn't do anything but taking
> responsibility does. For me, taking responsibility is to talk about the
> victims, especially about comfort women.

> D: I think we are responsible. …If somebody would ask me to apologize
> to them as an individual, I would feel at a loss. But as a member of a
> country, we need to keep apologizing to them, though we are the
> postwar generation.

Two female participants mentioned comfort women who were of different

nationalities and were forced to work as sex slaves. Both felt responsible for them

as women.

> G: My father in-law says something like, "Those comfort women were
> paid, too." But what if one of my family members was one of them?
> As a woman like them, … (in tears) I imagine how difficult the
> experience would be. I think somebody who feels their pain needs to

apologize to them.

    F: What I really wanted to be involved with was the issue of comfort women. Since I was younger, I myself have experienced sexual harassment including stalking and got traumatized. So I couldn't believe what happened with those women and I got involved with the support group as a volunteer. That's how I take responsibility. …That is the worst scenario as a woman, isn't it? I thought I should help them (the comfort women) to retrieve their honor.

4) WAR IN PARTICIPANTS' RELATIONSHIP TO PEOPLE OF OTHER NATIONALITIES

Every participant had the experience that World War II influenced their relationship to those who were of different nationalities. Some of them had difficult experiences and some of them had good experiences where mutual understanding happened. Most of them felt guilty within themselves, when they met people from other Asian countries.

Hatred from Others

Some participants had the direct experience of feeling hated, just because they are Japanese.

    F: When an Indonesian introduced himself in a classroom, he said, "As you know, Indonesia was occupied by Holland first and next by

Japan". I was so shocked and thought myself, "Why did he need to tell us about that?"

B: I met a man from the Korean peninsula in 90's. He seemed to have experienced the war and to have been tortured as well. His energy felt something like he wanted to make me feel bad. It was a sharp and aggressive energy. That night, I had a dream that I was cut with a laser all over my body.

Mutual Understanding

Some had positive experiences with people from other countries through interacting with them.

F: Victims from other counties change their feelings toward Japan, when they visit Japan after 50 years. …For example, an old woman from Korea (who was forced to work as a comfort woman in wartime) said to me, "I didn't think that there are also women, children and old women in Japan. The way women speak Japanese sounds really gentle." Because she had only heard men shout at them, she thought Japanese language was like that. That encouraged me a lot. Inviting those women and making them known to Japanese people was worthwhile.

B: I appreciate this experience. In Korea, I met a young Korean guy in his twenties, who hated the Japanese so much that he even wanted to kill us. We needed to sleep on the same futon, since there was just one. I felt really close to him. The fact that I was sharing a futon and

was able to create such a relationship with someone who might try to kill me touched me a lot.

Guilt

Most of the participants expressed guilt within themselves. They felt guilty, even though the victim side had not accused them.

> F: I worked with H (who was Dutch, and was put in a concentration camp as a baby in Indonesia by the Japanese Army and got infantile paralysis.) Her health was getting worse and I was in a good shape. I was wondering what it meant. …(Japan) hasn't compensated others for what we have done. The countries that Japan occupied are still poorer than Japan. We are rich materially and we ignore people who were wounded psychologically as well. That's why we feel guilty. … I thought I needed to start (to take responsibility) and I started (to get involved with a social activism). But now I'm not doing that and I feel guilty again (laughter).

> E: When I was in college, I went to a Japanese language school for Koreans as a volunteer. There were 40 to 50 Koreans in a class room. I was forced to introduce myself to them. I could not just say my name and greet them. So I said, "There is a complicated history between Japan and Korea and I feel sorry for what Japan did to Korea." … I wasn't fully congruent with what I said. There was an obsessive thought that I should apologize.

> H: I'm afraid of feeling guilty. I would be at a loss, if somebody pointed a

finger at something that I didn't do. I'm also afraid that it would hurt them further that I wouldn't be able to say anything.

Even those who stated that they were not responsible for the war expressed guilt about people who came from the country invaded by Japan. They had a realization that they unconsciously felt responsible.

> A: When I was living in NY, I made friends with Koreans and Chinese, as they were more approachable for me as an Asian. Especially Japanese and Koreans are easy to get along. I had a Korean friend. We had such a close relationship that we sometimes cooked together but I felt indebted to her, though she didn't say anything. … I realize now that I felt guilty. The historical events that I learned about must have influenced me. I was afraid that she would point a finger at (those events). That's why I couldn't become her real friend.

> C: It is complicated. Though I would say, "I'm not responsible", Something happens, when I meet a Korean or Chinese person. I can't stop thinking that they must hate me, because I'm Japanese. If I really believe I'm not responsible, I wouldn't feel that way. I must feel responsible somewhere. … When the war is discussed, I look down and think, "Japanese did something terrible, so you won't forgive us."

It is notable that those who have encountered hatred from people of other nationalities have also had the experience of mutual understanding. Most of the participants, including those who did not think they were responsible for the World

War II, felt guilty when they encountered people from other countries which Japan oppressed during World War II. This feeling seems to be independent from how the other side acted. Participant H and A talked also about their fear that someone from a different nationality would bring up issues from the war.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I presented thematic findings from my analysis of the focus group discussions.

All the participants had heard wartime stories from their parents or grandparents. The theme of "hardship and struggles" appeared most frequently. The second most frequent theme was "luck and miracles". The stories with this theme tended to have more elaboration. The rest of the themes, including "luxurious life" and "death of the other side", appeared sporadically.

The most common reaction to listening to wartime stories was feeling a sense of taboo. Most of the participants could not inquire further about wartime in their families. This sense of taboo actually seemed to spread to the society. All the members of one group agreed that they hesitated to talk even about war in general with their friends or colleagues.

Participants did not agree that they were responsible for the World War II.

However most of them, including those who did not think they were responsible, admitted that they felt guilty when they met people from other Asian countries.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I will discuss questions generated by the thematic analysis of the focus groups that I conducted. First, I will explain the concept of the collective memory and how it influences the individual memory of World War II for Japanese people. Then I will discuss how and why the collective memory marginalizes certain roles in the narratives and how those marginalized roles affect us. Finally, I will explore how the postwar generation can take responsibility for the war. The literature review will be integrated in this chapter. I have translated quotations from the literature written in Japanese into English.

COLLECTIVE MEMORY OF WORLD WAR II FOR JAPAN

Unlike in quantitative studies, it is not so important in qualitative research how frequently a certain theme appears in focus groups. However, it is notable that the theme of hardship and struggles came up much more often than any other theme in answer to the question, "What stories from World War II have you

heard from the war generation?" All the participants had heard of wartime stories

that included the theme of hardship and struggles. This theme by itself accounts

for the majority of responses to the question and contains the sub-themes including

the shortage of food, loss of family members, and fear of special higher-police.

These images are very close to those which we see in movies, dramas, novels and

theaters that portray wartime life in Japan. In other words, they are stereotypical.

The second most frequent theme that appeared in the discussion was the

luck and miracles that saved people's lives. About half of the participants had

heard stories with this theme. The rest of the themes came up only sporadically. It

could be expected that most people would have experienced the war in a very

similar way, because World War II involved all the citizens in Japan. Nevertheless, it

is noteworthy that there was not much variety in the stories and other themes

rarely showed up. From the narratives presented in this study, it appears that, in

summary, the war generation presented itself to the postwar generation as

innocent, passive and powerless victims of the war, who were at the mercy of fate,

forced to be involved in the war, and who made desperate efforts for survival and

were saved by miracles.

However, in view of the fact that Japan colonized Korea from 1910 to 1945 and invaded China and other Asian nations, the Japanese people were perpetrators too. Some Japanese killed their enemies, because it was wartime. Some Japanese enjoyed profits at one point or another that came with the occupation and colonization. Though at least half of participants had parents or grandparents who were living in the occupied nations, only one had heard the explicit story about a luxurious life in a Southeast Asian country. The only story which contained the aspect of the perpetrator involved people from Okinawa, the southernmost islands in Japan, who killed an American soldier who drifted there. This was a story that had been hidden for a long time and leaked out only recently. Even in this story, it was not clear who killed the American soldier and there was an implied figure, the then government or Army, that pressured them to kill. So no one in any of the stories that emerged in the focus groups was an active agent of any aggressive actions in wartime. I would like to discuss here why stories shared by the war generation lacked variety and why certain aspects, such as the aspect of the perpetrator, were not talked about.

Collective Memory

Ishida (2000) defines the collective memory as the memory that is shared most prevailingly and collectively by individuals in a given group such as family, social class and nation. The collective memory is a reconstructed image of the past according to the predominant thoughts of the group in the present (Halbwacks, 1992). The education system and media had the strongest influence on its formation (Ishida, 2000; Bar-Tal, 2002). It does not necessarily describe the truth of the historical event, because its intention is actually to talk about the past to serve the group existence and function (Bar-Tal, 2002).

Gillis (1994) argues that individual or group identity, which exists as a sense of constancy over time and space, relies on what is remembered. King (2002) also claims that the identity of the group depends on what of the past the members weave into their group narratives. So the collective memory is crucial for the identity of the group (Halbwachs, 1992). It is a description of how the members of the group perceive themselves (Bar-Tal, 2002). As their perception of themselves changes, the memory is also revised to match their current identity (Gillis, 1994).

Facts that do not go along with the collective memory tend to be forgotten (Ishida, 2000). Ishida uses the great Kanto earthquake as an example. In 1923, the earthquake hit the metropolitan area (Kanto) and followed by a large fire killed more than 100,000 people. The earthquake and fire eradicated the old urban areas, but that happened to help the groundwork for a new metropolis. During the turmoil, a false rumor was circulated that Koreans were poisoning wells to kill Japanese people. Many Japanese believed the rumor and killed a few thousand Koreans living in Tokyo. If the earthquake is given a meaning of speeding up the reconstruction of the metropolis, states Ishida, the selection of memory occurs and the massacre of Koreans tends to be forgotten.

Another good example is found in the controversy around the exhibition of the Enola Gay planned by the Smithsonian Institute in 1995 for the 50th anniversary of the dropping of the atomic bomb on Japan. The content was factually correct including a display that showed the bomb's destructive power. However, it aroused strong antipathy from congressional lobbyists, including the American Legion and the Air Force Association. They criticized the exhibition for displaying an antiseptic and fanciful story of the bomb which glossed over the true importance of the bomb, which was that it stopped the war. Finally the exhibition was

cancelled and the director of the Smithsonian Institute resigned. The controversy

tells us that Americans generally share the collective memory that the two atomic

bombs on Japan stopped World War II and saved a lot of American soldiers' lives.

The reason why the planned exhibition received such a strong rejection was

that it challenged the collective memory of the atomic bombs. Bar-Tal (2002)

describes the collective memory as unique, distinctive and exclusive. Its intention is

drawing the boundary between who people are and who they are not. If anything

questions the collective memory, it will most likely be excluded, because it

threatens the identity of the group.

Influence of the Collective Memory on Individual Memory

Halbwachs (1992) argues that the social process affects our personal memories,

because it is usually in society where people acquire, recall and restructure their

memories. Ishida (2000) claims that the collective memory has its own force and

tends to control the individual's thinking as a social framework. So I think beliefs

behind the collective memory affect our individual memories and perceptions,

especially when those individual memories are closely related to historical events,

like wartime memories. We remember the events of our personal life that go along

with the collective memory better than ones that do not go along with it. We adapt our personal stories to the collective memory, when we talk about them. The experiences that do not go with the collective memory tend to be dropped, not to be talked about and forgotten. Because the memory is not something we think *about*, but something we think *with* (Gillis, 1994), the choice and adaptation happen mostly unconsciously.

As we have seen, wartime stories that participants of the focus groups had heard were limited in variety and most stories were very stereotypical. A plausible explanation for this, given the literature on collective memory and individuals' capacity to reconstruct events accordingly, is that the war generation, who participants of the focus groups had heard the wartime stories from, structured their stories of the war according to the collective memory. The stories were selected and modified to adjust to the collective memory.   In the focus group discussions, the war generation presented themselves as innocent, passive and powerless victims and nobody took responsibility for the war or any violent actions that occurred during the war. So we can trace the collective memory back from their stories. That is, World War II for Japanese people was just a misfortune that Japan could not help plunge into, nobody had control over it and therefore nobody was responsible for it.

SENSE OF TABOO

Many of the participants, who were part of the postwar generation, expressed a sense of taboo around wartime stories and had difficulty asking further questions. For example, a participant shared that she innocently felt happy that her grandfather was not killed as a soldier during the war. At the same time she had some questions. For example, why did he volunteer to be a soldier and what did he do as a soldier? Yet, she could not allow herself to ask, because she was afraid that her inquiry would become an accusation of murder against her grandfather. For another participant, asking about the war was like walking on "landmines", because her questions might draw out somebody's painful and terrible experiences. She was from a region called Okinawa where the Japanese and American Armies had a fierce battle. A lot of citizens, including women and children, got involved and were killed. Some of them were even forced to kill their babies or to commit suicide by the Japanese Army.

While the first participant was afraid of the aspect of the perpetrator of her grandfather, the latter was afraid of the aspect of the victim of their parents and grandparents. However, both felt the sense of taboo, which prevented them from talking about the war. In the experience of the participants in this study, the postwar

generation listened to what the war generation told them, but it was difficult for them to question the war generation further about their experiences during World War II because of the sense of taboo.

Unspoken Agreement

A daughter of a notorious ex-Kenpei, a military policeman during the war, admitted that she did not ask her father about wartime, though she was actively involved with the antiwar movement during the Vietnam War. The atmosphere where she grew up did not support her to ask such questions (Kurahashi, 2002). Bar-On (1989) interviewed children of Nazi members and found out that they were not told what their parents did or witnessed. He argues that there is a wall of silence between two generations and it was built by not only parents but also by children. Parents put a wall around feelings about atrocities that they witnessed or took part in and children too built up the defense wall. They stayed silent about the crimes of the Nazi regime. Rosenthal (1998) interviewed three generations of Nazi perpetrators and came to a conclusion that not only the first generation involved with Nazi crimes but also their children and grandchildren interactively participated in blocking out the family past (Bar-On, 1989).

There is also evidence that many of survivors of the holocaust do not talk about

their past in order to protect their children and grandchildren from being burdened by the painful past (Danieli, 1982; Rosenthal, 1998). The children and grandchildren also do not ask about their parents' and grandparents' experiences of the Shoah, because they are afraid of imagining their parents and grandparents in horrifying situations and they feel guilty that they are not able to relieve their parents' and grandparents' sufferings (Rosenthal, 1998).

The sense of taboo, which then creates a "wall of silence", exists between the war generation and postwar generation regardless of which side they were on during wartime, the perpetrator or the victim. It draws the line between what they can talk about and what they can not. There seems to be an unspoken agreement in the society where the line is drawn. This is reflected in the experience of the participants in my study. If the agreement was more personal and each family had a different agreement according to their family myth, participants of the focus groups would have heard stories with more variety from their parents or grandparents. However, their stories did not have variety. Participants looked as though they were afraid of breaking the agreement. Outside that agreement, it was like a land with a lot of "mines", where aggression, cruelty, pain, hurt and sorrow could explode.

Hot Spots

What would happen if somebody tried to cross the wall of silence? One person in the focus group spoke about an interaction between her father and his mother in-law. Her father said that it was stupid of Japan to start the Pacific War and his comment upset his mother in-law, because she took it as humiliating to her husband's struggle as a soldier. The atmosphere of the family got tense. In Process Work, an intense moment like this is called a "hot spot", which contains essential feelings and core issues of the group (Mindell, 2002). However, people tend to ignore hot spots and avoid dealing with issues, because they are too "hot" and tense.

In one of the focus groups, another hot spot occurred. A person realized in the discussion that he had been frustrated that his parents did not tell him what they really thought or felt, while they told him details of everyday struggles. Another person was inspired by his comment and agreed with him strongly. However, a third participant reacted aggressively to his comment and disagreed with him. She raised her voice and said that it made total sense that they could only talk about everyday struggles. It again was a hot spot.

These two hot spots erupted when one side challenged the beliefs of the collective memory of World War II for Japan, which basically says, "We did not have any other choice than entering the war, we were the innocent victims, we did our

best and were not responsible for it." If those beliefs are questioned, a strong resistance occurs to protect them.

Similar hot spots can be observed at the social level, as found in the literature. As we have seen in the example of the controversy around the exhibition of the Enola Gay, there is a strong reluctance to bring up experiences that do not go along with the collective memory. Noda (1998) introduced one of the threatening letters that a Japanese World War II veteran received. He is one of a few veterans who confessed to having committed misdeeds in China during the war. The letter says, "I am furious at your report on the vivisection (on Chinese people). I do not understand your intention. Are you seeking publicity? How silly! … Shame on you!" It is common that those veterans who admitted to committing atrocities were threatened by other veterans or citizens (Buruma, 1994; Kurahashi, 2002; Noda, 1998). In 1990, the mayor of Nagasaki, Motojima, said in an interview that he thought that Emperor Hirohito bore some responsibility for World War II. Almost nobody in Japan talks in public about the responsibility of the Emperor for the war. The mayor broke the taboo. A few days later, he was shot in the back by a right-winger who was upset with his comment. Fortunately, the mayor survived, in spite of serious injury. Burma (1994) understands that Motojima's comments

threatened the victim image that Japanese people have for themselves in relation to the war. Many Japanese people like to think that Emperor Hirohito was not responsible for World War II, but was a victim deceived by the military leaders. He is a symbol of innocence and victimhood for Japanese people. These two people, the veteran and Motojima, threatened the collective memory by challenging its victimhood. These challenges provoked a strong reaction, hot spots, in society.

GHOSTS

We have considered how the collective memory has a strong boundary protected by a strong sense of taboo, which operates like a wall. If somebody, in spite of the sense of taboo, tried to cross the boundary, they would get strong resistance from the group. The stories that do not go along with the collective memory tend not to be talked about or not to be inquired about. Where do those stories go? Do they just disappear and do people forget them?

Takahashi (1999) argues that the memory of the war is ghost-like and anachronic. What he means by anachronic is that wartime memory does not follow chronology and comes back when oblivion reigns in society. It appears to cross time and borders, like ghosts. He gives an example of a Jewish survivor of a

concentration camp in Germany, who was shot in the head at the last execution

before a Russian Army came in. He escaped death by a miracle. He is one of only

two people who survived the camp where 400,000 people were killed. He was

discovered by a movie director, Lanzmann, thirty-odd years after the liberation

and went back to the camp to receive an interview for Lanzmann's movie called

"the Shoah". Takahashi considers him a ghost, because he was supposed to be

dead, unable to return to the concentration camp. In 1991, three Korean women

raised a lawsuit against the Japanese government. They sought an apology and

compensation for an inhumane war crime, sex slavery. According to Takahashi,

those women are ghost-like as well, because their existence and experiences were

ignored for a long time both in Korea and Japan. Then they returned, with

long-sealed stories. In passing, the fact that the Japanese Army took those comfort

women to the front had not been hidden during and after the war. Both Korean

and Japanese people knew about that. However, they did not consider them

victims, because of strong sexism and the lack of the sense for human rights. What

made it possible for those women to come forward was a shift in societal

perception (Ueno, 1998). These people are threatening like ghosts, because their

existence confronts the citizens (Germans in the former case and Japanese in the

latter case) with the memories that they have tried to forget or ignore. In Process

Work, there is a similar concept called "ghosts" or "ghost roles". Mindell (2002) explains ghosts as events or people who are talked about but are not directly represented in a given group. For example, if people of an organization always complain about a tyrannical boss and nobody identifies with their own tyrannical tendency, the boss is the ghost. If members of a family always talk about their grandfather, who has already died, the grandfather is the ghost role for the family. Everyone in the group senses the presence of the ghosts, but they can not see them, because the role is not occupied by anybody in the group. Nevertheless, they influence the group and everyone is afraid of them, because they challenge the identity of the group, as the ghost-like memory challenges the collective memory. Mindell's concept of ghosts is not limited to events or people in the past, but includes anything outside the identity of the group that is mentioned. Nonetheless, I think those two concepts are very close to each other, because both of the concepts name the roles in a given group that are marginalized and challenge the identity of group.

According to Mindell (1995, 2002), it is not only the identified victims, such as the Jewish man or three Korean women in Takahashi's examples, who bring back the ghost-like memories of World War II. The ghosts also appear in gossip in the

group about people, events, past and future (Mindell, 2002). People try not to wake up the ghosts and this is an unspoken agreement in the group. In the focus groups, most participants felt the sense of taboo around talking about the war, because, as one participant said, talking about the war was like walking on "landmines". These landmines appeared to be ghosts that they feared. However, they appeared in the discussion. In a sense, these ghosts are inherited by the postwar generation. Now I will look at specific ghosts that appeared in the focus groups, and the ways in which they manifested.

The Killer

The killer is indispensable to the war. However, it is rare that the role of killer is explicitly represented. In the focus group discussions, some people had heard stories where the killer was implied, but it was not clear in these stories who the killer was. For example, a participant in the focus groups who grew up in Okinawa heard that an American soldier who drifted onto an island was killed by the village people. However, the focus of the story was on the one who was killed, not on the one who killed him. Nobody represented themselves as the killer. The killer was the ghost in the story.

Another participant was challenged by the idea that her grandfather might have killed people, because she knew he had been a soldier during World War II. Yet, she could not allow herself to ask her grandfather further questions, because she was afraid that her question could have been taken as a criticism of him as a killer. I myself am a granddaughter of a World War II veteran. After his death, my grandmother showed me medals that he received for his accomplishment during the war. As an eight year old child, I understood that these medals might be a symbol that he contributed to killing a lot of people. I was annoyed by the image of him as a killer and tried to repress it by thinking that he only managed soldiers, and did not kill anybody himself. Both of us were spooked by the image of grandfathers as killers and tried to soothe the image by not asking about it or by rationalizing it. Rosenthal (1998) also finds that children and grandchildren of Nazi perpetrators have fantasies about perpetrators' crimes, although their parents or grandparents did not tell them what they did during the Nazi period. The killer can also appear in thoughts and fantasies of the postwar generation.

The Authority

Behind the killer, there is another ghost who pressured people to become killers. The ghost was, for example, implied in the story of the murder of an American soldier. People of the island killed the soldier, because they were afraid that it would be thought that they were harboring the enemy, if they did not kill him. Of whom were they afraid?

Okinawa consists of many islands located in the southernmost part of Japan. It was an independent kingdom until 1897. Native people were seen as second class citizens who lacked patriotism during World War II. The Japanese government was suspicious of them, because they did not have a long history of being "Japanese" and many of them had relatives who had immigrated into the United States. The Japanese Army killed a lot of citizens on suspicion of spying. Some people were killed, only because they spoke in their dialect (Hayashi, 2001).Under these conditions, the village people could have been killed, if the Japanese Army suspected that they gave harbor to the American. So they murdered an American soldier to protect themselves from the Japanese Army. Behind the murder, there was the Japanese government and Army, an authoritarian figure, who pressured the village people.

In the East Asia Open Forum, the side of the victim blamed the side of perpetrator for the atrocities and cruel acts. People on the perpetrator side tried to excuse themselves in the discussion. They explained that it was pressure from the West or the order from the Emperor that made them act so violently. Again there were figures, like the West and the Emperor, who had power over people and pressured people to be killers.

This oppressive and authoritarian figure appeared in another story. A mother of a participant complained that they could hardly talk about anything because they were afraid of the Special Higher-police (Tokko). As I explained in the previous chapter, Tokko was the police force that censored citizens' thoughts and actions. If a citizen fell under suspicion that his thoughts and activities were against the then government, the emperor and the war, the police could arrest, torture and even kill these citizens. All the participants of one focus group agreed that they did not talk much about the war inside or outside of their family. The reason that they gave was the fear that they would be identified as a "strange person", "political person" or "left-winger" and would be "marginalized". They were threatened by a figure who judged them, put them down and at worst ostracized them. This is almost a mirror image of the Special Higher-police. They were still under the influence of an

authoritarian figure and could not feel free to talk about World War II. Authority appeared in stories and fear that people felt, but it was not consciously represented by anybody.

The Sufferer

Comfort women were mentioned several times during the focus group discussion. They were sexual laborers for the Japanese soldiers before and during World War II. They were of different nationalities and ethnic groups including Korean, Filipinas and Japanese and were forced to participate in sex labor. In my view, they are some of the most victimized people, because they were put into the sex slavery by Japanese soldiers during the war and they were ostracized by their own society after the war. Two of the female participants talked about them with strong emotion and one of them even cried for them in the discussion.

After the group process in the Asian Open Forum, I felt really sad and could not help crying. I felt pain not only for the victim side but also for the perpetrator side. I experienced deep sorrow for people who died, were tortured, lost family, fought in a terrible situation and had to kill others. Process Work believes that what you experience in a group belongs not only to your personal psychology but also to the group. My experience was probably a manifestation of an important role that

tended to be marginalized in the process. Though two polarities argued hotly and both identified themselves more or less as victim, their deep pain, sufferings and mourning were not represented. We talked about people who were tortured, raped and killed, but nobody represented them. The sufferer was a ghost.

The sufferer also appeared in the focus group discussion. A participant talked about her mother's brother, who was mentally retarded. He was drafted despite his mental and physical disabilities. He was beaten up in the army and died. The father of another participant was evacuated to a rural region without his parents and was bullied severely by local children. A family of third participant lost their home because of an air raid. Though they complained about what happened and presented themselves as victims, the way they talked about it was very detached or indifferent. Grief for their loss and suffering was rarely expressed by the war generation. Some participants realized in the discussion that they were frustrated by that. Mitscherlich and Mitscherlich (1967) criticize German people for their lack of mourning work not only for Nazi victims but also for their own trauma after World War II. It does not seem to have been done enough among Japanese people as well. The experiences of participants in my study suggest that unfinished grieving can sometimes manifest in the feelings of the postwar generation, in addition to in stories.

The Dead

In World War II, numerous people died all over the world. Though war leaves a lot of dead behind, usually nobody represents them. They are definitely a ghost. Mindell (2002) argues the importance to represent the dead, because the dead can have more wisdom than the living. They often appeared in stories in the focus groups and in the Asian Open Forum. Some of participants, for example, had heard about family members who died in the war. Two of them had heard stories of the deaths of American soldiers. A Japanese participant of the Open Forum mentioned a large number of soldiers who died in the southern Pacific. The dead showed up in different stories, but it was not until facilitators in the Open Forum suggested representing the dead that the dead were brought into the discussion.

WAR AS NATIONAL TRAUMA

In World War II, it is said that 40– 50 million people were killed all over the world, including three million Japanese and countless Asian people murdered by the Japanese Army. People who were injured and lost their family run into astronomical figures worldwide. Lessing (2003) states in an interview with Moyers

that terrible events such as World War II leave damage on individual psychology as well as on the national psyche. War is traumatic not only for individuals but for the nation at large. As an individual tries to forget terrible events in his or her life, the nation tries to forget events such as war. German psychoanalysts, Mitscherlich and Mitscherlich (1967), criticize West Germany for their lack of mourning after the end of World War II. According to them, most Germans have not mourned the ravages of Nazism, while they have pursued economic growth. They do not grieve the tragedy that happened to the Jewish people and other victims. At the same time, they do not confront their own trauma. Though the book was written thirty odd years ago, it can be applied to how most Japanese people have dealt with World War II up until now.

Right after the end of World War II, Japanese people were too busy with earning their daily bread (rice) to deal with their trauma from the war. However, even after the economy had recovered, people did not look back on what really happened to them and to people of other nations. In 1956, the economic white paper, which was issued by the Japanese government, declared that the "postwar" was over, because economic production had gone beyond prewar levels. The phrase, "the postwar is over", became the craze. People applied the

phrase to many different situations. Takahashi (1999) points out that there were still

a lot of scars of World War II in 1956. He considers the declaration an evidence of

the desire to forget the memories of the war. From the end of 1980's and still today,

a lot of victims from Asian countries have come out to accuse the Japanese

government of war crimes. We are still living in the "postwar" era where issues of

World War II have not been processed and a lot of ghosts from the war are still

hanging around. I will discuss what and how we have avoided facing these issues

up until today.

Avoidance of Responsibility

Though Japan has the collective memory of itself as the victim of World War II,

it was not only a victim. Japan invaded a lot of countries in Asia and caused

enormous pain among people there. How is the collective memory full of

victimhood and justification kept intact? How do Japanese people avoid their

responsibility for the war?

Rosenthal (1998) found three major strategies that perpetrators and

collaborators of the Nazi regime use to hide their past, when they talk to their

children and grandchildren about their past. The first strategy is "blocking out Nazi

crimes and dehumanizing the victims". They gloss over Nazi crimes in their life

stories and present themselves as victims of National Socialism and innocent

witnesses without giving the details of what they really saw. Their children and

grandchildren cooperate with them in blocking out Nazi crimes by avoiding direct

dialogue because of their fear. This shutting off of Nazi crimes couples with a lack

of imagination about the victims of the Nazi regime. The first generation

dehumanized the victims by ignoring or participating in the atrocities to victims,

especially Jews during the Nazi period. They still continue to dehumanize them in

the present by staying silent about the past. The dehumanization is passed on to

the next generations and fails to address the victims.

The second strategy is "blaming the genocide on the Jews, and the

perpetrator – victim inversion". The families of Nazi perpetrators often talk about

the genocide as if Jews were responsible for it. For example, some people accuse

Jews for their lack of resistance against Nazi regime. On the contrary, they present

themselves as victims. Some families focus only on the difficult time that their

grandfather had as a prisoner after World War II and ignored the time when he

was active as a soldier. The third strategy is "Pseudo-identification with the victims".

Some children and grandchildren of the Nazi perpetrators got involved with the

theme of the Jews and Judaism. However, they did not deal with their own family

past. Rosenthal considers the identification with the victims as a defense against

revealing the family history.

It is not appropriate to simply compare Japan to Germany. Misdeeds of the

Japanese Army including, the Nanjing Massacre, sex slavery, experiments on living

Chinese people and forced labor were as cruel as what the Nazi regime did.

However, most of them happened outside of Japan, unlike the holocaust in

Germany. Therefore citizens who lived in Japan were less likely to witness these

atrocities than citizens in Germany. It is also not fair to apply what Rosenthal

discovered in her interviews with families of Nazi perpetrators to the findings of this

research, because the participants of the focus groups are not necessarily

descendants of perpetrators. Still, it is an undeniable fact that Japan was an

invader and oppressor for many Asian countries before and during World War II.

Some Japanese people, including the parents and grandparents of some

participants, were perpetrators one way or another.

We can see the first and second strategies that Rosenthal found, in the

findings of the focus group discussion. The first is "blocking out Nazi crimes and

dehumanizing the victims". At least three of the participants have parents or

grandparents who lived in countries under Japanese control before and during

the war. At one point or another they must have reaped the benefits of being

Japanese citizens, invaders and must have witnessed or have been involved with

the mistreatment of native people. Yet, no one in the focus group heard about the

pain and hardship of native people, while their parents or grandparents

complained a lot about their struggles after the war. Two participants' parents

witnessed the death of American soldiers, but the way it was shared did not show

any sympathy for the soldiers. They were indifferent about the pain of the other

side and did not reflect on their own behavior that might have been hurtful and

unjust. They blocked out the crime and oppression by the Japanese Army,

government and people by focusing on their struggles. They dehumanized the

other, that is, Asian people and American soldiers, by not mentioning them or by

being indifferent about them.

Ueno (1998) finds that in memoirs written by Japanese women who used to

live in Manchuria, there was hardly any evidence of understanding that they were

identified with the invaders and that they were protected by the Japanese Military

Power. These women wrote mostly about their own sufferings. Tabata interviewed

Japanese women who were in Korea before and during the war as colonizers

(cited in Ueno, 1998). What she discovered was that they were nostalgic about their privileged life there, and indifferent about how the injustice brought them those privileges. The findings of the focus groups and these examples suggest that there is a strong tendency also among Japanese citizens to block out their unjust past and to dehumanize victims on the other side, by simply ignoring what happened to them or not sympathizing with them.

The second strategy that Rosenthal finds in the interviews with Nazi perpetrator families is "blaming the genocide on the Jews, and the perpetrator – victim inversion". This blaming tendency is found in the experience of focus group participants also. One of the participants heard her father in-law say, "those comfort women were paid, too." He was basically saying that those women more or less voluntarily became prostitutes for money, therefore they were responsible. This is the kind of comment we actually hear from some Japanese people including members of the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, who published the controversial history textbook, and their followers. These people place the responsibility for the terrible sex crimes by the Japanese Army and government on the ex-comfort women, who were the very victims of the crime and suffered during and after the war.

In the Asian Open Forum, a participant on the Japanese side asked the Korean side why Korean people did not protect themselves, when Japan started to invade them. As she later admitted that she enjoyed attacking the Korean side, the tone of her voice was very aggressive and accusatory. It was not actually a question, but an accusation and her hidden message that I understood was the following. "Yes, we invaded you, but it was because you were not strong enough. You could have protected yourself better. Our invasion to your country was not all our responsibility." Inversely, she represented Korean victims as perpetrators by blaming Koreans for their lack of self defense, instead of looking at how unfairly Japan treated Korea.

While some Japanese people are hard on victims such as comfort women and demand responsibility from the victims, they are soft on themselves. They talk about their struggles but not their responsibility. A parent of a participant of the focus group talked how they struggled after the war, including their being attacked by Chinese people, but they did not talk about how they had treated Chinese people during the war. They presented themselves only as victims and they blamed the Chinese people for their violent acts after the end of the war.

In these examples, we can observe "the perpetrator – victim inversion" among Japanese people. They presented themselves only as victims, as they focused mainly on their struggles and difficulties. At the same time, they blamed the atrocities and injustices by Japan on the victims, as they did, for example, in blaming the comfort women.

It can be said that focusing on hardship and struggle is a way to avoid taking responsibility for the war. Rosenthal (1998) coins a term, "screen stories", which is derived from Freud's concept of "screen memories". Screen memories are the memories which are remembered in place of the repressed memories (Shinpan Seishin Igaku jiten, 1992). Screen stories cover the stories which people do not want to remember. Former Nazi accomplices often talk about less threatening stories which function as a screen or wall to more gruesome stories. I do not doubt that the war generation went through real hardship and struggles and stories shared in the focus groups were real experiences for them. However, it is possible that these stories had an aspect of screen stories, particularly where these stories were told more in a detached fashion, did not have variety and where there was an attitude of indifference toward what happened to people of other nationalities.

Avoidance of Pain

Now another question arises. If the collective memory is structured around

victimhood, why is there a sense of taboo on the victim side to talk about their

painful experiences, as happened in the families of the holocaust survivors or in the

family of a participant of the focus groups who was Okinawa?

At the social level too, it has not always been easy for victims to talk about

their experiences,   even within their own groups. For example, it was not until 1961,

when survivors of the holocaust took the witness stand in the Eichmann trail, that

they started to talk about their unspeakable experiences in the concentration

camps. Before the trial, the survivors and victims of the holocaust were seen as

cowards who were sent to the gas chambers without resistance and uprising, "like

sheep to the slaughter". (Voelter et al., 1998; Ueno, 1998).

In 1991, 46 years after the end of World War II and the liberation of Korea from

Japan, a Korean woman came out for the first time in Korea and admitted that

she used to be a comfort woman for the Japanese Army. None of the comfort

women in Korea had been able to reveal their painful past, even to their families

or closest friends, because those women took their experiences to be shameful.

Korea (and Japan as well) is such a Confucian and patriarchal country that

people tend to think those women brought shame on themselves (Asia Josei Shiryo

Center, 1997; Ueno, 1998). Korean people thought that talking about those

comfort women would hurt Korean men's pride, because it would show that the

men could not protect these women (Ueno, 1998). The survivors of the atomic

bombs and their children in Hiroshima and Nagasaki also suffer from prejudice

from their own society, in addition to the physical aftereffects. A lot of them hid

their past, because the fact that they were the survivors of the atomic bombs

could make, for example, their marriage or employment difficult. In the Asian

Open Forum, a Japanese participant talked about his father, who fought in the

South Pacific as a soldier where the Japanese Army lost 95% of their soldiers. He

himself lost most of his comrades. He was a war victim as well. However, the pain,

fear and agony of soldiers such as this man have not been heard enough in Japan,

even as people identify themselves as victims. Eitinger, a psychiatrist who has

worked with holocaust survivors, states that, "War and victims are something the

community wants to forget; a veil of oblivion is drawn over everything painful and

unpleasant" (cited in Herman, 1992).

Rosenthal (1998) discovers a difference between the family myth in perpetrator families and the family myth in the survivor families of the Nazi regime. While the myth of perpetrator families stresses their victimhood, the myth of the survivor families puts emphasis on their strength and resistance. For a group or nation who had gone through severe oppression and atrocities, it appears to be more important to talk about how much they fought against the oppressor than how much they suffered. They can talk about their suffering, as long as it depicts their indomitable spirit. Rosenthal (1998) interprets the survivors' emphasis on the strength and resistance as their attempt to heal their powerlessness. For Korean men, the comfort women were a symbol of their powerlessness and helplessness during the occupancy by Japan, of which they could not be proud.

As discussed before, the collective memory is important for the formation and maintenance of the group identity. It needs to offer a foundation for a feeling of commonality. Cohesiveness, belonging, uniqueness and solidarity are important (Bar-Tal, 2002). Having an enemy outside of the group is the fastest way to build solidarity. For this purpose, it makes sense to focus on the injustice, cruelty and violence of the other side and to emphasis their own suffering. However, it is also important for people to present themselves as strong people in order to make the

members of the group proud of their uniqueness, to make them want to belong to the group and to fight against the enemy. I assume the collective memory can tolerate suffering as long as it is not too overwhelming, so that it can make the members competitive against or even resentful of their adversary, but does not make them feel weak and powerless.

Issue of Rank

In my study, it was evident that differences in rank in a group played an important role in the intolerance of pain. Mindell (1995) describes rank as "the sum of a person's privileges" and "a conscious or unconscious, social or personal ability or power". Some rank comes from social status. If you are a white person living in the United States, you have more social rank than a person of color. If you are more educated, you have more privileges than one who is less educated. This means you have better access to social resources.

The Korean comfort women and female survivors of the atomic bombs are less privileged, because of sexism in their patriarchal societies. People from Okinawa were seen as second class Japanese citizens, because the area had not

belonged to Japan in the past. These victims were in a lower rank in their own society, even before the oppressor came or the tragedy happened. They suffered more than other people of the same group, because the unfairness and injustice existed before oppression by another group. They could not protect themselves as much as privileged people could. Unfortunately, the oppression has not shifted much and they remain underprivileged. The fact that the Korean comfort women and female survivors of the atomic bombs have lower rank in their society means they are not seen as important in their society. Therefore, their presence tends to remain unnoticed, their voices are easily ignored and their suffering is overlooked. As a result, their stories are not woven into the collective memory. This is true for the group identified as perpetrator and the group identified as victim.

Socially privileged people tend to use suffering of their own people to feel righteous about revenge and hostility against an outside enemy or to excuse their dreadful misconduct, and they do not really listen to the victims' voice. For example, Japanese people use the tragedy in Hiroshima and Nagasaki as a "screen story" of their misdeeds before and during the war and are content with the victim position. However, most Japanese people do not know how the atomic bombs affected victims' lives after they were dropped.

The fact that stories of people with less social rank are not included in the collective memory creates a vicious cycle. Because they do not appear in the collective memory, their voice remains unrecognized and they stay underprivileged. A Japanese-American professor, Takaki (1993) gives an example of his experience in a town on the East Coast of the United States. He was asked by a taxi driver, who was a white man, how long he had been in America. The driver was impressed by Takaki's English, thinking he was not an American. Takaki explains that the taxi driver had a narrow but widely shared perspective of American history, that Americans have a root in Europe. Americans are hardly taught or informed in school about the history of Japanese-Americans, black-Americans, Native Americans and other minority groups. The focus of the history is mainly on white males. In Japan too, the focus of Japanese history is mainly on privileged Japanese men. This tendency is observed also in novels, movies and TV dramas, all of which are important in forming the collective memory. In the collective memory of Japan, it looks like there are no women, no indigenous peoples (Ainu), no outcastes, Okinawans, Koreans or other minorities in history. It means that their existence in the present society is unrecognized and their sufferings in the past and present are ignored. The issue of the collective

memory is not an issue of the past but of the present. I will discuss this later in this chapter.

Issue of Guilt

Most of the participants of the focus groups said that they felt guilty about World War II, especially toward Asian people. Even those who did not think they bore any responsibility for the war realized in the discussion that they had felt guilt unconsciously. One of participants, who did not think she was responsible for the war at all, admitted that she always got afraid that she was hated when she met Korean or Chinese people. This can be understood as a projection of her self-hatred of being Japanese. Having guilty feelings lowers self-esteem (Seishin Shinrigaku Jiten, 1981). It almost looks like guilt has led the Japanese postwar generation to self-hatred.

Guilt is defined as: 1) the fact or state of having done wrong or committed an offence, 2) responsibility for a criminal or moral offence deserving punishment or a penalty, 3) remorse or self-reproach caused by feeling that one is responsible for a wrong or offence (Collins English Dictionary, 2000). Guilt is connected to wrongdoings that a person has committed. However, all the participants were born after the war and were therefore not involved with criminals or offences during World

War II. They were not responsible for any wrongdoings during the war. Why did they need to feel guilty, especially when they have only heard stories of victimhood?

As we have seen, narratives of victimhood and justification create a lot of ghosts. In the focus group discussion and in the East Asia Open Forum, we found the killer, the authority, the sufferer and the dead as ghosts. Participants of the focus groups inherited these ghosts as well as the collective memory with victimhood. I suggest that the guilt that participants felt resulted from living with these ghosts. The sufferer was asking them to pay attention to their sufferings, while participants were also feeling the presence of the killer and the authority. They felt guilty, because they did not listen to the sufferer, who needed the postwar generation's help. However, they were scared and ran against the sense of taboo, if they started to listen to them, because they needed to face the killer spirit and the authority did not like them to break the taboo. Rosenthal (1998) finds that the more secretive the family is about their past, the more powerful the impact of the past will be on the postwar generation. This is true of families of victims and families of perpetrators. In other words, ghosts affect us more strongly than the any other roles presented. I draw a conclusion from the results of this study that the postwar generation is strongly influenced by these ghosts and is caught between feelings of guilt and fear (See Appendix D).

CONCLUSIONS

We have seen that the wartime stories that participants of the focus groups had heard had little variety. The most frequent theme was hardship and struggles and the second frequent theme was luck and miracles that saved them. I have come to the conclusion that the reason why these stories did not have variety was that the war generation had adjusted their experiences and memories to the collective memory, when they talked about them to participants. The collective memory of World War II for Japan appears to be based on victimhood and to be protected by the sense of taboo. The outcome of my study, in conjunction with related literature, suggests that experiences that do not go along with the collective memory tend to be dropped or forgotten and that this causes resistance if somebody tries to talk about forgotten experiences. My study also shows that these dropped stories and experiences show up in the stories, fantasies and feelings of participants as ghosts. The ghosts that appeared in the focus group discussions and in the East Asia Open Forum were the killer, the authority, the sufferer and the dead. In a sense, participants inherited not only told stories but also ghosts that were not identified by anybody. Most participants, including those who did not think they bore any responsibility for Word War II, had feelings of guilt. Half of the participants admitted that they were afraid of

talking about war, because they were afraid to be judged as a strange person. I suggest that participants were caught between guilt and fear because they were affected by ghosts, and caught in between them. For example, if they did not pay attention to pain of the sufferer, they felt guilty. However, they were also afraid of listening to the sufferer, because in doing so they would have to face the killer and the authority.

RECOMMENDATION FOR THE POSTWAR GENERATION

In my opinion, the movement of the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform was started as a reaction to guilt and fear that the Japanese people carry. One of the members, Nishio (2001) believes that the Tokyo trial and the consequent view of history, which says that Japan started the war unfairly and the victory of America was the victory of justice, has implanted guilt in Japanese people's mind. They say that Japanese people have a "masochistic" view of their own history and they are lacking in pride as Japanese (Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, 1997). What they mean by "masochistic" is being hard on Japan. They insist that the younger generation should be educated in a way that they can be proud of being Japanese. Therefore, they argue, history needs to emphasize Japan as a special nation and the focus should not be on failures. In their textbook, comfort women are

not included, because they take comfort women's testimonies as questionable and they assert that it is too early to teach junior high-school students about sex crimes (Komori et al., 2001). In this study, we have seen that narratives of wartime were by no means "masochistic". The war generation was not hard on themselves. I do not think self justification and self-praise without reflection will bring real pride. As we have seen, when we marginalize certain roles, they will come back as ghosts and they have more impact on us than any other roles. The collective memory glossing over the past prevents us from appreciating and respecting ourselves. Without dealing with these ghosts, we will not be able to overcome guilt and fear. We have to find an alternative. In the next section, I would like to make a recommendation to the postwar generation on how to deal with the past war in the moment.

Postwar generation as co-creator of the collective memory

Ueno (1998) considers history a battle field of discourse among different realities, instead of thinking there are objective facts in history. There are still heated controversies about different issues of World War II in Japan. We are still in a sense at war. The victim side and the perpetrator side are arguing over whose reality is valid. Even if you do not actively participate in the debate, you are there as a witness. Herman (1992) points out that it is impossible for the witness to stay neutral in the

conflict between victim and perpetrator. The witness is compelled to take sides. It is easy for them to take the perpetrator side, because the perpetrator does not ask you to do anything. On the other hand, the victim asks the witness to act, engage and remember to share their pain. We, the postwar generation, are the witness. We are challenged by the pain and suffering that the victim asks us to remember. It is easy for us to ignore their voice and listen to the perpetrator's excuses. According to Herman (1992), the perpetrator does everything to avoid responsibility for their crimes. The first thing they do is to stay silent. If silence does not work, they make an assault on the credibility of their victim. That is how the Japanese government has treated comfort women and other war victims. If we, the postwar generation, also stay silent about that, we are inadvertently on the perpetrator's side.

Japan and other Asian countries have not resolved the problems politically, legally or emotionally, and these nations still have tension 57 years after the war ended. It is mainly because we, especially Japanese people, have not taken the side of the victim enough. Gillis (1994) points out that constructing a new society after the war required Japan to forget the past. Gluck states in a lecture about the collective memory in contemporary Japan (cited in Gillis, 1994). Japan was forced to give up its military force after the war. The dissolution of the military actually encouraged Japan to forget its militaristic past and Japan started to treat the war

era as an aberration. Japan has not made enough effort to reconcile with its victim countries. It is crucial for reconciliation of the two groups to change the collective memory (Bar-tal, 2002). Both group need to be able to share a perception of the past or at least to acknowledge each other's narratives. According to Bar-tal, recognition of the group's own responsibility for the outbreak of the conflict and admission of its misdeeds are necessary for the changed memory, these are lacking in the collective memory of Japan.

Halbwachs (1992) claims that the past is not preserved, but is reconstructed based on the present. In other words, what we remember about the past relies on our beliefs and perception about the present world. If we were more aware of sexism in Japan, it would not be an issue to include comfort women in the history textbook. If we knew more about how racial minorities, such as Koreans and indigenous people, suffer from racism today in Japan, their stories would be included in the war generation narratives. What we remember is not a matter of the past but a matter of the present. The postwar generation is not responsible for what happened during World War II, because we had not been born. Though, we are responsible for creation of the collective memory about the war, because it mirrors what we believe now. If the postwar generation stays silent about stories outside of the collective memory, we are on the perpetrator's side. We have a responsibility to create a more

democratic collective memory. This equals creating a more democratic society.

Weaving Ghosts in the Collective Memory

It is by no means easy to change the beliefs of the collective memory, because it requires a change in identity of the group (Bar-tal, 2002; Gillis, 1994). The education system and the media have the strongest influence on formation of the collective memory (Ishida, 2000). Some people have challenged the collective view of the war, by writing books, making movies and TV programs and suing the government for their excessive censorship on history textbook or for their war crimes during the war. Though they have not succeeded in changing the collective memory entirely, they have definitely contributed to raising our awareness. Nevertheless, many people do not have accesses and the energy to approach the media and education system, or they have a different style that does not approach the media. I think we can start the change through conversations with our family, friends and colleagues. If you notice the presence of some ghosts, you will simply name them. For example, if you want to talk about the war, but are afraid of being judged, you can say, "I'm interested in talking about the war, but I'm also afraid that you will think I'm strange". When your grandmother talks about her brother who died in the war, you can ask her, "What do you think your brother would say to us, if he was around?" As we have

seen, the collective memory can be passed on through conversations in the family.

So the conversation with your family members or friends can be a very political act.

You can change the world from there. If you do not bring ghosts in and stay silent,

you are on the perpetrator side. If you bring ghosts in, you are changing the

collective memory and awareness by weaving ghosts back into the collective

memory. That is one of many ways, I believe, the postwar generation can take

responsibility for World War II.

SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have discussed issues generated by the thematic analysis of

the focus groups. We have seen that there is a collective memory of World War II for

Japanese people. It claims that Japanese people were innocent and unfortunate

victims. The stories and feelings that do not go along with the collective memory

tend not to be talked about. However, it was not only spoken stories that the

participants of the focus groups inherited. Unspoken stories and feelings were also

passed on to them as ghosts. These ghosts appeared in the fantasies, gossip and

feelings of the postwar generation. Four main ghosts were found in the focus group

discussion, they were: the killer, the authority, the sufferer and the dead. These ghosts

affected the postwar generation strongly. Many participants admitted that they

were afraid of talking about issues related to World War II. They were scared of being judged and ostracized if they brought up these issues. As a result, they felt guilty, because they consciously and unconsciously knew that there were unfinished issues around World War II.

In the last section, I made a recommendation to the postwar generation. Though the collective memory talks about the past, what is remembered depends on the belief and awareness in the present. Therefore, the postwar generation is responsible for co-creating the collective memory. A resolution to this problem can be achieved by brining ghosts back into many types of conversations.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I will review the outcome of my study and will discuss how my study contributes to Process Work and to my personal growth and awareness. The limitations of my study and implications for future research will be examined as well.

REVIEW OF MY STUDY

When we look at the East Asian situation, dealing with unresolved issues from World War II is unavoidable. In all of the Worldwork seminars in which I have participated, in which there was a focus on East Asia, issues of World War II always appeared and became the central topic. Now that the number of the postwar generation has exceeded by far the number of the war generation, both in Japan and in other Asian countries, the issue of memories of World War II has become crucial, in addition to the issue of the compensation. The heated debate concerning a controversial history textbook for middle schools in Japan is symbolic of the importance of memories. The publication of this textbook led to a strong dispute and even affected diplomatic relations between Japan and other Asian countries.

Criticism of the book is directed especially towards its minimization or omission of invasive and aggressive acts committed by the Japanese military in modern history. On the other hand, the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, who wrote the textbook, and their followers criticize Japanese history education for its excessive emphasis on the negative aspects of Japan's past (Atarashii-kyokasyo-wo-tsukuru-kai, 1997). The focus of the dispute is on how World War II and the preceding invasion by the Japanese military are contextualized. In other words, the argument centers on how World War II is remembered.

Another extreme example of this kind of debate is the controversy around the authenticity of Nanjing massacre. In December 1937, the Japanese Army attacked Nanjing and occupied the city. They plundered Nanjing, killed a number of surrendered Chinese soldiers and citizens and raped girls and women. Iris Chang's book, "The rape of Nanking", was published in 1997, which was 60 years after the atrocity. Her book accuses the Japanese Army of cruelty in the Nanjing Massacre and became a best-seller in the United States, Hong-Kong and Singapore (Fujiwara, 2001; Takahama, 2001). This suggests that there are a lot of people who want to know more about the massacre and to remember it. On the contrary, some Japanese people argue that China overrates the number of victims and some even insist that there was no such massacre in Nanjing. For example, the former

Minister of Justice, Nagano, made a statement in 1994, "The Nanjing massacre was a make believe story." One side tries to remember the pain and agony of the massacre, while the other side tries to minimize or even denies the existence of the atrocity itself.

In these kinds of arguments, two sides seem to be too polarized to listen to each other and the discussions do not seem to go anywhere. In my study I have taken the approach that it is not useful simply to join these endless disputes around memories of World War II. Instead, I chose to explore what Japanese people actually remember about World War II in the hope that this would provide some clues how we might deepen disputes around memories of World War II. The central questions around which my research resolved were followings: What memories and feelings of World War II are inherited by the postwar generation from the war generation in Japan? How do these memories and feelings influence the postwar generation? In order to investigate these questions, I interviewed eight Japanese people who were born after World War II, using the focus group interview method. The focus group discussions were structured by the following questions: 1) Have you heard of any stories related to World War II? If so, what were those stories? 2) How did you feel about those stories when you heard them? 3) What do you think about the responsibilities of the postwar generation for World War II? 4) Have you ever had

experiences of World War II influencing your relationship to those who are of different

nationalities? If so, what were those experiences?

Memory of World War II for the Japanese postwar generation

In the last chapter, I introduced the concept of the collective memory, which is

the memory shared most prevailingly and collectively by individuals in a given group

(Ishida, 2000). It does not necessarily tell the truth of the historical event, because its

function is to talk about the past in a way that serves the group existence (Bar-tal,

2002). The views and experiences of participants in my study support the suggestion

found in related literature that Japanese people have a collective memory of World

War II in which they represent themselves as innocent, passive and powerless victims

of the war, who had no control over the war, made desperate efforts for survival,

and were saved by miracles.

For reconciliation to occur between two conflicting groups, Bar-tal (2002)

suggests that it is crucial that each group change its collective memory and share a

perception of the past. According to Bar-tal, the changed collective memory must

contain recognition of the group's own responsibility for the outbreak of the conflict

and admission of its own misdeeds (2002). For example, Japan did not simply fight

with other Asian countries in World War II. It invaded and colonized these countries. It

seems reasonable to conclude that the fact that Japanese people share a collective memory of victimhood makes the reconciliation process difficult.

My study suggests that stories which do not go along with the collective memory may be left out of the memory altogether. For example, one participant had a grandfather who had been a soldier during World War II. He talked to his grand-daughter about the struggles and miracles that saved his life in the battle field, but makes no mention of any experiences that would identify him in the role of the killer. The people of the postwar generation whom I interviewed felt a sense of taboo talking about World War II, and did not feel free to inquire about wartime. Another participant in the focus group discussion said that asking about the war was like walking on "landmines", because her questions might draw out somebody's painful and terrible experiences. The collective memory of victimhood appears to be protected by a sense of taboo. However, roles that were disallowed by this taboo did not disappear altogether. They appeared as ghosts. I found four main ghosts in the focus group discussions and the East Asian Open Forum investigated in my study. These were the killer, the authority, the sufferer and the dead. In the experience of the participants in my study, the postwar generation has inherited these ghosts, as well as the collective memory of victimhood.

Most of the focus group participants, including those who did not think they

had any responsibility for World War II as members of the postwar generation, admitted that they felt guilty toward other Asian people. The findings of my study raise the possibility that this can be explained by the fact that the ghosts of the killer, the authority, the sufferer, and the dead, have not been dealt with. The ghost roles of the sufferer and the dead asked the participants in the groups to listen to them. Participants were afraid of facing the killer and felt threatened by the presence of the authority who did not want them to break the taboo. In a sense, they were caught between a sense of taboo and a feeling of guilt. One participant had even feared that she was hated by Chinese or Korean people, because she was Japanese. It can be understood that she projected her self-hatred onto Chinese and Korean people. One of the conclusions I draw from my study is that the collective memory of victimhood made participants feel guilty, and that these feelings of guilt sometimes led even to self-hatred.

The Roles of the Perpetrator and the Victim

While my study indicates that Japanese people have a collective memory of victimhood in relation to World War II, it also identified four main ghost roles, namely the killer, the authority, the sufferer and the dead. This suggests that aspects of the perpetrator role, such as the killer and the authority, can not be simply forgotten.

They appeared in the stories, fantasies, thoughts and fears of study participants from the postwar generation, and sometimes plagued them. For example, one participant and I myself had grandfathers, who were soldiers in World War II, and both of us were troubled by the image of our grandfathers as killers. All of the participants in one focus group thanked me at the end of the discussion for giving them an opportunity to talk about the war. They were usually too afraid that they would be seen as a "strange person" to bring up issues of the war in the conversation. The ghost here was an authoritarian figure who judged them, or at worst ostracized them.

A particularly fascinating outcome of my study is that the sufferer was also a ghost in the experience of focus group participants, despite their identified role of victimhood in the collective memory. Though study participants had heard stories of hardship and struggles, these stories did not convey real feelings of pain and agony. Identifying with victimhod does not necessarily mean identifying with real suffering. One focus group participant had a realization in the discussion that he had been frustrated that emotions and thoughts about the war had not been shared, while facts and details of everyday life were told. Unshared feelings came up as a ghost. For example, comfort women were mentioned several times in discussions and some participants became very emotional talking about their victimization and suffering.

The sufferer also came up in the stories that participants told. One participant's mother had a brother who was mentally retarded. In spite of his handicap, he was called up for the Army. He was bullied so severely in the Army that he died from those wounds. One of participants of the East Asia Open Forum had a father who fought as a soldier in the South Pacific. The battle there was so fierce that his father lost most of his comrades. Those soldiers were true war victims, who were forced to be killers, were threatened with death, or were actually killed. Though Japan has a collective memory of victimhood, the agony, fear and pain of its war victims have not been really listened to. Eitinger claims that, "War and victims are something the community wants to forget; a veil of oblivion is drawn over everything painful and unpleasant" (cited in Herman, 1992).

Even in a victimized group, those who suffered most during wartime tend to be marginalized by their own society (Voelter et al., 1998; Ueno, 1998). For example, comfort women in Korea were considered to be a disgrace to Korean society for a long time, as a result of strong sexism and patriarchal thinking (Asia Josei Shiryo Center, 1997; Ueno, 1998). The survivors of the atomic bombs and their children in Hiroshima and Nagasaki also faced strong prejudice and discrimination in their own country. They had difficulty obtaining a job or getting married. However, the fact that the two atomic bombs were dropped became the basis of Japan's

identification with victimhood (Burma, 1994). No matter which side a given group is considered to be on from the outside, be it the perpetrator or the victim, the group will tend to identify with the role of victim. The experience of those in the group who were actually victimized is to justify this identification. However, the voices of the victims tend not to be heard, and are marginalized instead. For example, after the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, President Bush presented one of the people killed in the attacks as a hero, as one way of justifying the attack by the United States on Iraq. The man was killed on September 11th, because he stayed to attend his physically handicapped colleague in the aftermath of the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center. The victim's sister later protested against the use of her brother's name in support of the war on Iraq. However, her voice was not heard (Kitagawa, 2001).

No group is solely a perpetrator or a victim. These two roles of perpetrator and victim are present within each group, regardless of whether it identifies primarily as a perpetrator or as a victim. The findings of my study highlight the complexity of these two roles, without minimizing the pain and agony that Japan caused other Asian countries. The experience of participants in my study, and the related literature, make it clear that Japan needs to make more effort to change its collective memory of victimhood in order to reconcile with other Asian countries. However, blaming

Japan for its misdeeds has not been effective in changing the collective memory of Japan. Mitscherlich and Mitscherlich (1967) maintain that mourning is particularly important in changing the post war collective memory of the German people. According to Mitscherlich and Mitscherlich, Germans need to mourn not only for Nazi victims but also for their own trauma. This can also be applied to Japanese people. Given that Japanese people have a collective memory of victimhood, they may need to look first at their actual victimhood, namely their feelings of suffering and grief, in order to be able to open up to the pain of others. This is perhaps suggested by the example of Yasukuni-Shrine controversy, whichI mentioned at the very beginning of this paper. At this shrine, the spirits of Japanese soldiers killed in various wars are worshipped. Those on one side of the controversy want the Prime Minister of Japan to pay an official visit as a symbol of the government's appreciation to the war dead. Those on the other side criticize his visit for its lack of sensitivity to the victims of other nations (Safier, 1996). Although the two sides appear polarized, they share a common that their sufferings be recognized. Both sides want to bring the ghost of the sufferer into the field.

The Function of Memories

Exclusivity is one of main characteristics of the collective memory, because its

intention is to create the identity of a given group (Bar-Tal, 2002). In Japanese

society, when the collective memory of World War II (characterized by

victimhood) is questioned, strong resistance occurs (Buruma, 1994; Kurahashi, 2002;

Noda, 1998). Such moments are called hot spots in Process Work terminology.   In

my study, some focus group participants reported hot spots in their family

conversations. Similar hot spots occurred during focus group discussions also. This

suggests that the collective memory has a strong influence not only on society at

large, but also on individuals. It excludes certain roles even within a small group,

such as a family. This may explain why there was no variety in most of the stories

that focus group participants had heard from the war generation. As someone

who did not go through World War II, it might be impolite of me to call these stories

stereotypical. However, these stories are disproportionately concentrated on

hardship and struggles. One of the reasons they lack variety may be that the war

generation adjusted their personal memories to the collective memory, and

restructured their memories of wartime accordingly. Their sharing of these

re-structured memories with the postwar generation subsequently reinforced the

collective memory. One of the conclusions I draw from my study overall is that, at

least in the experience of participants in the study, collective memory and

individual memory interact and influence each other strongly. This suggests that

everyday conversation can be highly political. If anyone attempts to bring out the ghosts in a conversation, this may eventually change the collective memory in some way.

CONTRIBUTION TO PROCESS WORK

Although East Asian issues have often been a focus of Worldwork, there has been little research in this area in the Process Work community. My study, of course, does not elucidate all the aspects of these issues, but it does offer a new perspective which may help others to get a better grasp of these issues. To put it more concretely, my study sheds light on how Japanese people remember World War II and how unidentified roles become ghosts and haunt the postwar generation. It suggests how this memory influences the reconciliation process with other Asian countries, and in doing so, makes a contribution to the ongoing development of World Work theory and practice.

In World Work, the roles of the perpetrator and the victim often emerge and sometimes interact strongly. At times, the interaction between them is so vehement that some people cannot help leaving the room. I understand that it is important for these two roles to communicate genuinely, and that the exchange may appear aggressive, because of the need to express feelings which have previously been

suppressed for a long time. However, it is important for a World Work facilitator to have a deep understanding of these two roles, in order to be able to facilitate conflict between them more effectively. The outcome of my study reveals the complexity of the roles of perpetrator and victim. It suggests that those who identify with the victim role do not necessarily identify with real suffering. While no single solution or program is sufficient to resolve a deeply rooted conflict, it may be helpful for a facilitator to be aware that the sufferer can often be a ghost in an emotional interaction between perpetrator and victim, even though both roles are identified with the victim role.

CONTRIBUTION TO MY AWARENESS

My study started from a question with which I had been grappling for some time. I wondered why it was so difficult for Japan to take responsibility for the past. I was frustrated that Japan had not reconciled with other Asian countries. Although I am Japanese myself, Japan was, in a sense, more mysterious to me than other nations. I even secretly hated Japan because it lacked a sense of responsibility. I noticed that whenever discussion on the issue of World War II came up, I became very polarized and one-sided. While I was upset with Japan, I was not happy about my one-sidedness. My one-sided was challenged and changed by this study. Before I

started my research, I tended to identify Japanese people only as perpetrators, even though I knew people experienced difficulty and suffering during World War II. Conducting this study taught me that the voices of true war victims in Japan, such as the participant's father, who fought in the South Pacific, have also not been heard and have long been forgotten. As far as I know, no Japanese former comfort have come out to ask for compensation, while some of these women from other nationalities have been able to do so, because of their courage and support from society. Japanese society marginalizes war victims who are Japanese, as well as people from other Asian countries. This realization has helped me to become less polarized around East Asian postwar issues. Interestingly enough, when I feel less one-sided, it is easier for me to stand more strongly for what I really believe, which is that Japan needs to take responsibility for the past oppression. This is because I now know that I can listen more fully to the other side.

Another realization I have had as a result of working on this research project happened at a recent party. Most people around me were American and I was asked about my thesis. I explained the theme and overview of my study and this led to a discussion about the war against Iraq. The atmosphere got tense and some people became polarized. However, I found myself very calm in the discussion. This does not necessarily mean that I was neutral. I did have an opinion on the subject.

Nevertheless, I was able to maintain openness to opposing opinions. I realized that my two years of struggling with the complexities of my topic, and the constant innerwork that has accompanied them, has given more strength to be centered in such a polarizing situation.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

War involves multileveled and multi-faceted issues. We need different areas of study as politics, economics, history, ecology, technology, sociology and psychology in order to understand the war. My study does not seek to address every aspect of World War II issues. Instead it focuses on its psychological influence of World War II on the Japanese postwar generation.

One of the limitations of my study concerns its lack of diversity in terms of the political views of focus group participants. As we have seen, the issues of war can be highly political. The polarities that are observed in discussions on World War II are often seen as conflict between the liberal and the conservative or the left and the right. Because Process Work is based on the principle of deep democracy and tries to bring marginalized voices forward, it tends to attract people whose political stance is more liberal than conservative. The participants whom I interviewed were recruited through Process Work meetings and the email string of the Japanese local

community of Process Work. Though not all the participants were involved with Process Work, they had an affinity for Process Work. So it can be imagined that their political orientation was more liberal. Similarly, it can be assumed that the topic of my study would have been more attractive to some groups of people than others. As I have discussed before, World War II is not a topic that people discuss in everyday conversation in Japan, because there is a sense of taboo around talking about the war in general. It is likely that participants in this study were more interested in the topic of the war and social issues, and more willing to discuss them, than some sections of the general population might have been. For these reasons, it is important to note that the outcomes of my study are not generalizable to Japanese people as a whole, or even to the sub-groups whose views may be represented here. Rather, the study explores in some depth the views and experiences of those who participated in the study, and as such invites future study to explore its conclusions on a wider and more representational basis.

FUTURE STUDIES

In this research project, I studied the World War II memories of members of the postwar generation in Japan. As I have already noted, focus groups participants were not diverse in terms of their political views. Further study, based on a more

representative sample of the general population and the diverse positions within it, are needed to obtain a fuller picture of this issue. In this study, my main intention was to obtain a deeper understanding of East Asian issues and to explore what this might suggest in terms of possible directions for reconciliation between Japan and other Asian countries. Overall, my study emphasizes the importance of sharing perceptions about the past in changing aspects of the collective memory, and in working towards reconciliation between two conflicting groups. In particular it points to the need for Japanese and non-Japanese people to remember, share and compare memories of World War II in working towards reconciliation between the people of East Asian nations.

EPILOGUE

When World War II was over, Japan had lost almost everything. Japanese society was in extreme chaos, because its value system, as well as its social system, had changed drastically. Emperor Hirohito's denunciation of his manifest deity was symbolic of these changes. People were confused, but they needed to adjust to the changes in order to put food in their mouths. They could not afford looking back on what World War II meant to them. There were no resources, no infrastructure, and no confidence in Japan from the rest of the world. People literally started from scratch. Japan's postwar rehabilitation and its subsequent economic prosperity are a true miracle.

When I was born, the Japanese economy had already recovered. About a decade before my birth, economic production had gone beyond prewar levels. I have benefited from Japan's economic success my whole life. I did not come from a rich family, but I have never had to worry about food, was able to receive a good education, have traveled abroad a lot and even studied in foreign countries, to name but few of these privileges. I am deeply indebted to people who have worked so hard to create such a wealthy society.

As we, the younger postwar generation, inherit such affluence, we also inherit

some debt. Unresolved issues of World War II are part of this debt. The war generation was too busy earning their bread and too traumatized to face these issues. As we enjoy the benefits, we need to pay back our debts as well. Some of these debts are more tangible, such as the payment of compensation to war victims. Or they may involve working on the guilt that a lot of us suffer from. There are many different ways to work on reducing our debt. My study investigates what was actually passed on to members of the postwar generation, in terms of stories and memories. It suggests that we inherit a collective memory of victimhood, as well as ghosts that are not represented in the collective memory. One way of changing the collective memory is to weave these ghosts into it. This is an important way in which the postwar generation can contribute to the future of Japan. It may help to make Japan a more democratic and mature society, and may also assist in Japan's reconciliation with other countries.

REFERENCES

Asia Jyosei Shiryo Center. (1997). Ianfu mondai Q & A: Jiyuu syugi shikan e onna tachino hanron. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten

Atarashii rekishi kyokasyo wo tsukuru kai (Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform). (1997). Tsukuru kai setsuritu syuisyo. Atarashii rekishi kyokasyo wo tsukuru kai home page. [Online] Available: http://www.tsukurukai.com/index.htmlBarbour, R. S., & Kitzinger, J. (1999). Developing focus group research; Politics, theory and practice. London: Sage

Bar-On, D. (1898). Legacy of silence: Encounter with children of the Third Reich. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bar-Tal, D. (2002). Collective memory, intractable conflict, education and reconciliation. Stockholm International Forum: Truth, Justice and Reconciliation. [Online]. Available: http://www.stockholmforum.com/dynamaster/file_archive/020430/6ee0f27c1e 60230dcab319c11b624e81/Bar%5ftal.pdf

Berger, A. L., & Berger, N. (Eds.). (2001). Second generation voices: Reflections by children of holocaust survivors & perpetrators Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). <u>Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Buruma, I. (1994). <u>Wages of guilt: Memories of war in Germany and Japan.</u> New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Clark, L. S. (2002). Constructivist Methods in the Symbolism, Media and the Lifecourse and the Symbolism. <u>Meaning and the New Media. @ home project</u> [Online] Available: http://www.colorado.edu/Journalism/mcm/mrc/symbolism/symbol-method.htm#top

<u>Collins English Dictionary.</u> (2000). San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). <u>Handbook of qualitative research.</u> Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flick, U. (1995). <u>Qualitative Forschung.</u> Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag GmbH.

Fujiwara, K. (2001). <u>Sensou wo Kiokusuru, Hiroshima, Holocaust and genzai.</u> Tokyo: Kodansha Gendaishinsho

Gallagher, P., & Maclachlan, M. (2001). Adjustment to an artificial limb: A qualitative perspective. <u>Journal of Health Psychology, Vol6</u> (1), 85-100

Gibbs, A. (1997). Focus Groups. <u>Social Research Update.</u> [Online],Issue Nineteen.

Available: http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/sru/SRU19.html

Gillis, J. R. (Eds.). (1994). Commemorations: The politics of national identity. Princeton,

NJ: Princeton University Press.

Halbwacks, M. (1992). On collective memory. Chicago and London: University of

Chicago Press

Hayashi, H. (2001). Minsyu no shiten kara mita sensou: Okinawasen. [Online].

Available: http://plaza18.mbn.or.jp/~modernH/paper40.htm

Herman, J.D. (1992). Trauma and recovery. New York, NY: BasicBooks

Hoffman, R. (1995). Some alternatives for placing the literature in a qualitative

dissertation.   [Online].   Available:

http://www.ualberta.ca/~jrnorris/hofmann.txt

Ishida, T. (2000). Kioku to boukyaku no seijigaku: Douka seisaku　sensou sekinin

syugouteki kioku. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten.

Kanpo-Shiryo-ban. (2002). [Online], Available:

http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/kanpo-shiryo/2002/0508/siry0508.htm

Kawai, H. (1999). 20 seiki wo furikaeru: Kokusai Seiji. Yuhikaku. [Online]. Available:

http://www.yuhikaku.co.jp/shosai/20c/19990102.html

King, R. H. (2002). Reflections on memory, identity, and political action. [Online],

Available: http://www.vanderbilt.edu/rpw_center/ls02a.htm

Kitagawa, M. (Director). (2001). High vison special: Peaceful tomorrows, 9/11 Tero

sensou hantai wo uttaeta izokutachi. Tokyo: Nihon Hoso Kyokai

Kitzinger, J. (1995). Introducing focus groups. British Medical Journal, 311 299-302

Knapik, M. (2002). Ethics in qualitative research: Searching for practice guidelines.

Linking   Research   to   Education.   [Online].   Available:

http://www.ucalgary.ca/~distance/cll institute/Mirijam Knapik.htm

Koji-en. (5th ed.). (1998). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Komory. Y., & Takahashi, T. (Eds.). (1998) National History wo koete. Tokyo: Tokyo

Daigaku Syuppan Kai

Komori, Y., & Sakamoto, Y. & Yasumaru, Y. (Eds.). (2001). Rekishi Kyokasyo naniga

mondai Ka: Tettei kensyo Q & A. Tokyo: Iwanami SHoten.

Kruger, R. A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. Newbury

park, CA: Sage

Kurahashi, A. (2002). Kenpei datta chichi no nokoshitamono. Tokyo: Kobunken.

Lessing, D. (2003). [Interview with Doris Lessing]. Now with Bill Moyers. [Online].

Available: http://www.pbs.org/now/printable/transcript_lessing_print.html

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Maione, P.V. (1997). Choice Points: Creating Clinical Qualitative Research Studies. The Qualitative Report, Volume 3, Number 2. [Online] Availabe: http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/maione.html

Maxwell, J. M. (1996). Qualitative research design: An interactive approach. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

May, M., & Pope, C. (1995). Qualitative research: Rigour and qualitative research. BMJ. [Online], Available: http://bmj.com/cgi/content/full/311/6997/109

Merton, R.K. (1987). Focused interviews and focus groups: Continuities and discontinuities. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51 550-566

Mindell, A. (1987). The dreambody in relationships. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul

Mindell, A. (1990). Working on yourself alone: Inner dreambody work. NY and London: Viking-Penguin-Arkana.

Mindell, A. (1992). The leader as martial artist: Techniques and strategies for resolving conflict and creating community. San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco.

Mindell, A. (1995). Sitting in the fire: Large group transformation using conflict and diversity. Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press

Mindell, A. (2002). The deep democracy of open forums: Practical steps to conflict prevention and resolution for the family, workplace, and world. Charlottesville,

VA: Hampton Roads

Mindell, A., & Mindell, A. (2002). Introduction to Process Work. Amy and Arny Mindell Website. [Online]. Available: http://www.aamindell.net/processwork_frame.htm

Mitscherlich, M. (1987). Erinnerungarbeit: Zur Psychoanalyse der Unfaehigkeit zu trauen. Frankfurt: Fisher Verlag GmbH.

Morgan, D.L. (1997). Focus groups as qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Myer, M. D. (1997) Qualitative Research in Information Systems. [Online]. Availabe: http://www.qual.auckland.ac.nz/

Nishio, K. (2001). Atarashii rekisi-kyokasyo tsukurukai no syucho. Tokyo: Tokuma Shoten

Nishio, K. et al. (2001) Shihaihon Atarashii Rekishi-kyokasyo. Tokyo: Fuyo Sha

Noda, M. (1998). Senso to zaiseki. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten

Oka, T., & Shaw, I. (2000, September). Qualitative Research in Social Work. [Online]. Available: http://pweb.sophia.ac.jo/~t-oka/qrsw.html

Ratcliff, D. (2002). Validity and reliability in qualitative research. [Online]. Qualitative research resources . Available: http://don.ratcliff.net/qual/validity.html

Robinson, N. (1999). The use of focus group methodology – with selected examples from sexual health research. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 29 (4), 905-913

Rosenthal, G. (Ed.). (1998). The holocaust in three generations: Families of victims and perpetrators of the Nazi regime. London and Washington: Cassel.

Seifer, J. (1996). Yasukuni shrine and the constraints on the discourses of nationalism in twenty century. (Master Dissertation, University of Kansas, Kansas, United States, 1996)

Seishin Shinrigaku Jiten. (9th ed.). (1989). Tokyo: Seishin Shobo

Shinpan Seishin Igaku Jiten. (1st ed.). (1992). Tokyo: Kobun Do

Takahama, T. (2001). Nihon no sensou sekinin toha nanika. Tokyo: Asky

Takahashi, T. (1999). Sengo sekinin ron. Tokyo: Kodan Sha

Takaki, R. (1993). A different mirror: A history of multicultural America. Boston: Back Bay Books.

Trochim, W. M. (2000). Research Methods Knowledge Base. [Online]. Available: http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb.qualval.htm

Twinn, S. (1998). An analysis of the effectiveness of focus groups as a method of qualitative data collection with Chinese populations in nursing research. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 28 (3), 654-661

Ueno, C. (1998). Natonalism to gender. Tokyo: Seido Sha

Vaughn, S., Schumm J.S. and Sinagub M. (1996). Focus group interviews in education and psychology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Appendices

Appendix A

LETTER FOR THE RECRUITMENT

The original letter was written in Japanese.

Research Title: Inherited Memory; A Qualitative Study of How World War II influences the Japanese Postwar Generation
Researcher: Ayako Fujisaki
The Process Work Center of Portland
Portland, Oregon, USA

This year, 56 years after the end of World War II, the media in Japan have taken up the controversies of the history textbook published by Atarashii-kyokasyo-wo-tsukuru-kai and the Prime Minister's Koizumi's visit to Yasukuni-shrine. This shows that the issues of World War II have not resolved yet. Now that the number of the postwar generation has exceeded the number of the war generation by far, the issue of memories has become very important in addition to the issues of apology and compensation, that is to say, what we remember about the war and how we talk about it. This involves not only the war generation but also the postwar generation.

I am interested in what the Japanese postwar generation actually remembers about World War II, what they think about it and how the memory influences them. I am looking for volunteers, who are the Japanese postwar generation, for group discussions on this matter. To speak more concretely, four to six people will get together and discuss for about two hours on the issues of World War II. Please note this will not be Worldwork.

You do not need any special knowledge or interest in World War II to be a

volunteer. Your response will be used for research purposes only, and will be kept anonymous and confidential. Please contact me if you want to participate or if you have any questions.

Please choose a group which you want to attend.

Group A
   Date: Dec. 4th
   Time: 7:00-9:00
   Place: Sendagaya
Group B
   Date: Dec. 11th
   Time: 3:00-5:00
   Place: Sendagaya
Group C
   Date: Dec. 17th
   Time: 3:00-5:00
   Place: Jinguu

Contact: Ayako Fujisaki
      Tel: 044-954-2854 (Japan)
         1-503-358-1009 (Portland)
      Email: Ayakofj@aol.com

Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

The original form was written in Japanese.

Inherited Memory

A Qualitative Study of How World War II influences
the Japanese Postwar Generation

Ayako Fujisaki, M.A.
Phase II student of Process Work Center of Portland

This group discussion is a part of a project which I conduct as a fulfillment for the Diploma of Process Work. In this project, I am exploring what the Japanese postwar generation remembers about World War II, think about it and how they are influenced by it.

The discussion will be videotaped and it will be viewed only by the researcher. Your participation in this group discussion is entirely voluntary. You do not have to answer all the questions and you can leave the discussion at any point in the discussion, if you wish. You can also ask me to erase your response from videotapes or from the verbatim after the discussion. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me.

Ayako Fujisaki
Tel: 044-954-2854 (Japan)
    1-503-358-1009 (Portland)
Email: Ayakofj@aol.com

I, _____ , consent to participate in the group discussion conducted by Ayako Fujisaki. I understand that the data collected will be used for research purpose. I also agree to be videotaped during the discussion.

_____

Singature   Date

Appendix C

THE EAST ASIA OPEN FORM

This is the verbatim of the process following three speakers' talks at East Asia Open Forum. It was held on Oct. 18th 2002 at Process Work Center of Portland. To protect privacy, alphabets are used for participants and F1 and F2 stand for the facilitators. When two sides are dialoguing, one side is written in italic to help the reader understand. (???) indicates incomprehensible passages, … indicates pause and stressed phrase are underlined.

F1: We would like to hear your various feelings about the East Asian issues. Just listen to individual to speak for a couple of minuets a piece. And then, we will, let's start. A few minuets of listening to you and we start to process some of the issues in the background too.

F2: You can add to or comment about what people have already or you bring new things that are important to you to talk about.

F1: I'd like to say, I know that the open forum itself, in a way how we are doing it, has ah … a cosmopolitan goes around the world might not but not everybody used to speaking in public. Or some cultures don't support people to speak in public. So I'd like to support some of you who might be shy about saying something, if you would like to. Say something, we would like to hear your view point, for example I see A here. I would <u>love </u>to hear you, a couple of words of your interest.

A: Just I usually for me, in such a place, meaning discussing the East Asia issues. Usually I have a lot of things inside, but I can not talk always. Why can't I talk? <u>Why</u>? Someone teach me or tell me <u>why</u> I can not talk. B (one of the speaker) told today very nice thing about the 17th constitution, the first Japanese rule. I was very much appreciated to you, but in a sense, I'm not totally agree to your attitude to the present situation. For example, North Korean attitude. If I may misunderstand you, however you directly connect this to what Japanese did during the World War [and what North Korean did or doing now. I don't agree about it. It is quite different. That is our generation's issue. We have a discrepancy between your generation and my generation. I'm more than 60 years old. Just I'd like to know, I <u>always </u>want to know <u>why I can't talk</u>.

F1: You are doing great. I don't know, you are a great speaker. Good to hear that there is diversity. C, I see you (???).

C: I was hoping that you didn't ask me to speak… I have a lot feelings around the past,

especially during the war and occupation of other Asian countries by Japan. My name is C and I'm from Japan. All the speakers talked about harmony. And in the moment, we can't or at least I can't feel the harmony with other Asian countries, because of the past. I feel guilty and responsible and also what I inherited from my ancestor feels too much. But I also would like to do something more, and I want to be a friend wth other Asian countries and learn from them and learn from each other.

D: My name is D and I'm from Japan too. For me, well, my father was a soldier. He survived but he lost thousands of thousands of his comrades. He was fighting in Saipan that's where 95% of Japanese soldiers were killed. (???) Most of soldiers he trained with died. Not just that, (???) a lot of soldiers died in pacific. I read some journals how the soldiers fought, how they dealt with the situation, I can't just say that what those people did was just wrong. (???) It doesn't feel right to me. … That's why I felt. Honestly I don't know what to say anything making sense right now.

F1: Who are you pointing at, E?

E: I'm pointing at F.

F: I don't feel like talking right now. (Translated from Japanese)

G: (???) I'm here tonight because I have learned so much from different friends from different countries. I know from China, I know from Korea, I know from Japan. How grateful I am that (?) at least a place to speak about that, to speak about culture. (???)

E: I'm not sure what can I say. I have so much to say. But I can't pinpoint one of the things. At this moment, I'm Japanese but at the same time I lived in Indonesia for 3 years. A part of me is Indonesian or Javanese. I have a kind of wider perspective than being Japanese. Asia is so diverse and East Asia or China, Korea are kind of (?) family, but we have so much fight between family, among family. It is so sad, at the same time I have a huge feeling for China and Korea. Like C said, I feel guilty with the activities during the war, but Japanese has a whole reason why we did that. Korean people and Chinese people have all reason why they have done so much. Relation among East Asian Countries and other Asian countries is so related to relation to Westerners. A huge pressure from the Western counties is one of the reasons why we fought. Actually in a sense I'm blaming the westerners, but at the same time I don't blame. It's a kind of timespirit and the pressure to fight each other. In a sense, we can't control. That makes me sad. (???) I want to have some kind of space for F. He has so much to say. At this moment, he is not willing to say that. But at certain point of the forum, I would like to give a space for him. It's my wish. Thank you.

G: Recently I talked with my father, because my father is hospitalized. So we don't have so much time to talk to my father. (??) He don't like China, he don't like Korea. His young era was militarism. He didn't go to the war. But his education was militaristic. After Japan was defeated, education is all changed. What is good turned bad. If he

started to talk deep things, he says I don't know what is right, what is wrong. I find it (??), a part of me is disempowered. "I don't know what is right or what is right." Even now I'm struggling to get an authority. I don't like the United States Army in Japan. I don't like Japanese nowadays attitude. I don't like old Japanese way of something like militarism. Very difficult to find the center, talking about politics.

H: My name is H, I'm from somewhere. I'm also, ya, easy part that I can say is I am very interested in developing relationship with Asian countries. I just talk about what I experienced. There is an email discussion group which is people who are in Japan and who has Korean background. There is a minority group, Japanese Korean or Korean-Japanese. Sometimes, rightwing Japanese people write email there. It is just difficult to hear. I kind of beat up him with whole my knowledge, with full power. What I found is what I wrote … , it is difficult to say. I felt what I wrote was used by other person to, I felt this was used by people who specially working for international information specialist. Some people work for government, intelligence. I found that it is crucial not to be too one-sided. (??)

F1: Maybe it's time for dialogue.

I: My name is I, came from Japan one month ago. I feel very good, comfortable in states, even I can not speak English. There is a reason. I look for a reason. One thing is I can talk directly to people. I know the harmony is very important. But sometimes it is too much. When I was in Japan, I killed my self to harmonize. If I want to say something, I don't say this time. Or generation, we have a big generation something. We have to respect old people. Of course I respect old people, but I sometimes killed myself, I'm too young to say. But now I can speak like this. Even if F1 is a teacher, But I can call you, "Hey, F1 (first name)!" Like this. Very comfortable for me, but in Japan I don't call teacher like that. So I want to say one thing right now. So maybe that's it.

J: Hi, I'm J. I'm anxious to get into dialogue. Before we do, I just want to appreciate deeply speakers, everybody who has spoken. I just feel so deeply touched to just listen and hear you. I know we don't always have the atmosphere. It is the quick Western style. To listen as much as we have opportunity tonight and I have longing for just listen and hear more. I just wanna appreciate everybody.

F1: Anybody from East Asia who hasn't spoken want to speak?

K: My name is K, also from Japan. I always look at the East Asian security issues from political perspective. Diplomatically Japan has apologized to China and to Korea. But it's never been accepted or heard by those countries, because I think, the governments of China or especially Korea are trying to manipulate anti-Japanese sentiment to raise nationalism. This year, August 15th, Korea's independence day, south Korea and north Korea people got together and promised for the unification based on anti-Japanese sentiment. Japan needs to for its own sake … I know Japan has

apologized diplomatically, but what is more important is what is going to do in future. Last year, summer 2001, Our Prime Minister Koizumi paid a visit to political shrine, Yasukuni shrine dedicated to war vet. That caused anti-Japanese sentiment in Korea, although it wasn't publicized in China. I think for Japan's role it has to be recognized, it has to go beyond the wage of war, meaning to keep the security and stability and peace in East Asia. Japan, I believe, has capability to do that.

F1: Wage, do you mean costs?

K: Compensation.

L: Hello, my name is L. I have a mixed feeling about Japan, Korean, China issue. I really deeply feel sad about what happened in the past. Like what Kazuko said in the beginning … in Japan, I sometimes find that people are so ashamed what we did in past that we don't have any pride or dignity for country. School have often taught children what a terrible country Japan is and although I feel deeply sad about what happened, I also feel sad about our county who is ashamed of itself. My hope is for each country to be able to stand for itself. I know it's very complicated issue. It's not matter of compensation, but maybe there are unresolved emotional issues, very complicated. My hope is for each country to feel good about itself and to go beyond that. Sometimes when I talk about it, I tend to get emotional too, to side with Japan or to side with either. But that's the time I'm thinking politically. I also find it really important to come down to the personal level. For example, I was talking to the small group while ago, in my high-school I made a best friend. She later told me that her nationality is not Japanese but Korean. Same thing happened to me again in the college. I had a good friend. She later told me that she is from Korea. I really feel sad about my friends who weren't able to trust me for a big reason. Because they were afraid, they couldn't trust anybody. After one year, they were able to say. Things that I take for granted, they can't take for granted. I feel sad about that. I don't know what I'm saying but I want to share the difference between political thinking and personal thing.

F1: When I'm listening to closely as people are speaking, I think, what do you think everyone here? The role of harmony was very important at different points and conflicts are also very important. Conflicts between, I heard many times people mentioning Korea and Japan, China. Conflicts existing in old conflicts, someone spoke, I heard a lot of feelings come up in the given moment. What do you think? Maybe we should focus on that.

F2: Also difference of, like in Japan many different view points, of course everybody does not necessarily think same. I heard different view points. It would be great to go into that.

F1: Can you give me a sense of hmmmmm if it does sound right to you?

Participants: Hmmmmmm

F1: And no if you think it's not so good to go into that.

Participants: …

F1: I understand, no is hard to say in public. It is very very hard. And depending on culture. I think we can't go to far wrong, a lot of emotions tied up with that. And maybe somebody, help us. I think there are two roles. One role is like saying, "Listen, the Past is the past. We don't understand the past. Our parents, well, they were maybe not all that bad." Another role that says, "You destroyed me."

F2: "You destroyed me. (???) I'm furious, upset and (???). Something like that.

F1: Could somebody speak one of these sides. This is an ancient conflict, that has never been, or is difficult to bring up and talk about. Maybe as a role, you can speak. You don't have to say your own personal feelings, unless you want to.

F2: you can represent either side.

F1: Who would try?

(A participant stepped in to take the victim side.)

F1: Don't talk about these things.

F2: We should get along. (???)

C: *Until my hurt and pain is understood by the other side, I can't, I can't think of harmony.*

F1: We didn't do things that were all that bad. We had to go to the war and we did. The war is the war. We had to kill people.

C: *You stepped on us, you raped us, you killed us.*

B: I go to the war, because I can't resist. It was order from the emperor.

C: *Are you saying that I need accept that excuse? Are you saying that I just need to say, "OK."*

B: I'm saying just I can't. It was emeperor's choice, you know. He is God.

F1: *We would like you to talk to that God and give him a good kick in his ass.* (Laughter)

F2: We have our own reasons, you maybe don't care, but we had own reasons of this side to go to war. Everybody had own reasons to go to war.

F1: What is your reason to go war?

E: Survival. We need to go to war, because of our own survival. If we can't attack you, we might be attacked by others. We don't want to die, that's why we killed you.

C: *You don't have to kill so many people, so many women and kids. You just raped us and you made us into sex slavery. You are not just fighting. You are invading us, stepping on us.*

F1: *And Torture us and humiliate us in a way that people still don't talk about that in any*

place. We're hoping for some reconciliation but there is an aspect of life over there that just don't listen to the problem.

B: This is war situation.

M: How can you blame us to kidnap a few people after you kidnapped millions of Korean? How can you demand for explanation on this and on that, and demand this, demand that. Explain this and explain that! And you create your own history and say, "it was a little accident."

E: It was war. (???) It was our survival.

M: Nobody was invading you, nobody was attacking you.

E: Westerners did. If Japanese didn't, somebody did.

C: But they were not trying to invade you. You invaded us out of selfishness. You wanted more.

H: If you guys fight each other, it is easier for us to control.

F2: Are you the West?

F1: (??) Keep going, keep going.

B: We are fighting to protect Asia.

M: You know, that's what you said 1886. You will protect us. Instead of protecting us, you colonize us and took underline everything from/underline us. You took flag from us, you took our name, language, everything, you took all the material resources, rice. And we ended up with poverty. You said I'll protect you. Your son marry my daughter, that's what you said. We'll give you money and you sign up and let us have your country and we'll protect you. And this is what you are doing. How do you expect me to trust you.

A: I understand what you said. But, but underline what did your government or underline what your Korean people did at that time? underline Why didn't you underline protect your country, your culture, everything. Why didn't you do anything?

F1: Why didn't we protect?

M: Wow, very strong. I hear you're very angry. And now you are accusing us not protecting ourselves?

A: I don't know, please teach me.

M: Once upon a time, very clever diplomate came to Korea, very interested in expanding came to Korea and said, "Well, we are gonna doing this and this and that." Just before that, there was a civil revolution brought up by farmers. The government lost against the farmers. The government wanted to have some help, didn't want to give up the power, so asked Japanese to come and help, Chinese to come and help, and Russians to come and help. Japanese came in and helped us a little bit. Then they thought it would be fine. But later on, Japanese comes in, comes in, bribery and everything. Will you marry my daughter? We'll give you a lot of money and you'll have a lot of power and we'll protect your government, your position and your power, you

will have it.

F1: *And you could say this side, perhaps that we did not protect ourselves at that time. Because, Why did we have to protect ourselves? (???) Aboriginal peoples, other groups come in many any aboriginal people don't protect themselves.>*

A: Korean country, in ancient time, was divided (??) to several countries. At ancient time, we respected you, we studied from you. You were a great country. My question is why, why your country lost your power. Lost your widsdom.

M: *Good question. This question is diverting the issue. I can't tell you how many times Japanese invaded Korea, by the way.. 15th century, a huge invasion from Japan and Korean fought. We were very kind to you. Yes, you respected us, we shared everything with you. As time went on, you had your own troubles in your country and you decided to invade Korea. There was a huge war. Then, we lost so many people. Oldest farmer had to rise up again to protect our own country, because the government, the military lost to you. You were so strong. You <u>came on, invade us.</u> Since then, we had our own army. But we were also pressured by China. We were like in brother relationship. China had to control Korea and said, "You can't have an emperor, king of Korea can't be an Emperor, because the Chinese emperor is the emperor of the world. Center of the universe." So I can't not go on and educate you with the history. This is a long story. But I want to just focus on at the end of 19th century, when you came in and the situation then. I'm shaken in the moment to hear you accuse me and attack me saying, "how come you didn't protect yourself?"*

A: Yes, I attacked you, because this is a very nice chance (laughter).

I: We were invited.

F2: You would like to attack her?

I: I was invited by Western countries.

F1: I just want to step in right here. You said, "It is a good time to attack." And you asked why they didn't defend themselves. So I'm going to help to defend them. You said it's a good experience to attack them. You wanna say more about feeling?

A: You said I attack, why you? I felt rather you accuse me, because I attacked you now. I am attacking you now. You <u>always</u> attack me.

F2: Are you talking personally?

A: No, no, no.

M: *I've got to sit down, my legs are shaky. May I sit down?*

A: I would like to ask you to listen a little bit. I just wanted to ask you about, just…. I accepted that we invaded your country in 20th century. I'd like to ask you, after that, the world war changing, you know. You already told, you know. Western countries invaded Asia and my country Japan also had very hard time. Your country of course had hard time. Sometimes we have to, I mean, Japan has to do something, so we did.

Before our invading, you also had time to prepare or to do something. I don't accuse you, but I'm curious about it.

F2: Why didn't they prepare for the attack?

A: Yes.

M: *At that time, my brother China and my brother Japan accepted foreigners and having a little tiny battles here and there. So we, Korea closed the door. We would kill the first foreigner who landed in Korea. We were hostile to them, because we didn't want the same thing happen to Korea. We had to close the door to the Westerns.*

A: We did the same thing.

N: A, sake of the benefit of those who are outside maybe, why is it that this role, this position had to invade? Could you say something more about that?

A: Those people say we have to survive. We have to survive.

H: We are very, the Western countries, Holland, British, French, everybody goes to other countries, colonize other counties. It looks so delicious. Japan is a strong country, why not we do colonize. Looks like the World standard, we wanna join.

F2: Take as much land as they can?

H: Right.

H: It seems to be a game and I want to join, colonize them.

F1: Speaking about the West coming in, it means the West is the ghost in the moment. I'm gonna stand up on that side. "Actually what you are experiencing is a form of the colonization that nobody admits to. Between various countries, colonization also is a possibility. I can't speak for Japan, because I don't know much about it. We would like to take over your country and colonize it."

F2: Why?

C: Because you want to be a westerner.

F1: We want to be westerner like. We want more power. We want to take over, what is so unusual about that, everybody does it.

M: *You know what, if you had said upfront, "I want to colonize you", we would have fought against you, because we are very independent people.*

F1: We are saying it now, aha, that's right, that's a good point.

N: Colonizer always say they just wanna protect you.

H: Japan is so strong and intelligent. If we do the western style, it doens't succeed. We know the Asian style how to colonize. Going indirectly is very important for Japanese culture.

M: *It's not that you colonized us is the big issue, it is also atrocity that you had done to the people. It's a big thing that so many people died.*

F1: We speak to that. We've not only colonized but on top of that like other colonizers, done incredible things, like holocaust in East Asia which rarely talked about. Yet there is

one, has been one. You are asking why that happened. Why didn't they just take over but also basically killed and tortured people?

M: *You buried us alive, you raped all these women, you slaved us, I mean.*

D: I would like to say something. We were very, very scared in 19th century when we realized how helpless we were and how powerful Europeans and Americans were. We saw what was happening in China, India and in Africa. People were enslaved and killed all over the world. We were.

E: *Hei! Don't avoid the issue. (Spoken in Japanese and Translated by another Japanese participant)*

D: Are you talking to me? I don't quite understand what you are trying to say. If you want to say it, please say it.

E: *Don't change the subject, just say it directly.*

D: Wait, wait. Very confused. I'm very confused what these two people are trying to say.

F1: I can say it for you. They are saying simply they feel you are avoiding. Saying that it was fear creates the difficulty. Do more than just colonize, but torturing, if you said it was fear that did that, then you are avoiding the essential and basic fact. That is the reason that there has never been a reconciliation between countries. They didn't say quite that way.

F2: They are talking about responsibility.

D: Responsibility to the atrocity? We were very afraid and what we decided to do, seems like to me, that for one we wanted to be like European and American. We industrialized the country really fast with a lot of sacrifice. (??) We have to change. We have to prosecute Buddhism, which was really important for us before. But we really needed to get strong fast, so we don't get squished, destroyed. Then, in the process, what we ended up doing was, if Korea or China had been strong enough to ally with us and fight against European, we would have been happy to do that, because…

C: *I don't believe you, I don't believe you. You wanted to escape from Asia and wanted to be a part of European countries. You were not interested in Asian countries at all.*

A: That is one thing, yes, we had this strange attitude but one part, we really…

M: *You know, I'm so sorry, I need to stop you.. I used to get so angry, my stomach gets so sick. I was screaming and yelling and (?) destroy you! . But I'm not gonna go there.*

F1: Maybe you are not doing that, because he is so rational.

M: *Oh, yeah.*

I: As a Western person, I would say, "become more western and Asian issues are too much for you. Join us. You would be happy"

F1: We don't go over the border into the bombing land. I want to (??) I'm now on the Japanese side now. Please correct me. You are more emotional. Many of us are more rational. You are asking us what was the killer mind. I wanna go over the edge and I'd

like to get into that. I don't know what it is I'm going to do. (?) unspoken part of history. It's something about wanting not only to control you, not just to have power over you or kick the West out, it is a kind of inner … putting down somebody such a way, make them suffer so much, that it's like something wants to destroy and hurt and eradicate everything human, it's like mindlessness somehow. Why is … get rid of everything which doesn't belong to our group. It is not just us Japanese that have done something like this. All have had a moment, but it is us right now strongly. Please correct me, I'm sorry if I'm wrong.

D: There is a rage in Japanese part too, that was … not just toward Korean or anybody else but also toward ourselves too. We pushed ourselves so hard, we fought so hard. We were not only mean to Korean or Chinese but we were meant to all the soldiers too. We were ordered to attack until all died.

F1: That's right.

M: *Who's we then?*

D: I don't know. It feels like, to me one thing I'm pissed about the concept of harmony is that, that concept of harmony actually, (??) most of soldiers thought the harmony is more important than their lives. They just obeyed the order. Everybody, Everybody attacked with (?)

F1: It is a kind of suicidarity?

D: Yah, it's suicide tendency. It's like…

F2: Self rage and it comes out…

D: So much self rage or something

F1: *It hurt badly on this side.*

D: Something is really hurting and rather than doing something, they rather fight hard and die.

F1: *We don't like that.*

A: *we trusted you, why did you betray us?*

M: *We were always so kind to you, we helped you when you ask for help, we sent you everything, we shared everything with you, we want to cooperate. You approached us friendly and … my nature doesn't accept this, I can't imagine, it is not in our nature. It's not in our nature. We haven't attacked you. We haven't gone and took (?), because, we, Koreans, are peace loving, anger, rage, resentment … we dissolved it, dissolved it and dissolved it. We are just free loving people.*

F1: *We are not just perfect though exactly. We also worked so hard, we worked ourselfves to death almost.*

?: You'll attack each other.

M: *That's hmmm, No, that's wrong, it's misunderstanding. Excuse me, you are taking another thing, about North Korea and South Korea thing.*

F1: Let's go another 4,5 minuets.

M: *OK, briefly about that. After independence, 1945, August 15th, you didn't know what to do with Korea, because it was a colony. So they went back 45 years back and they found a treaty that was made by Japanese. "Oh, there was a line there, let's cut it in half." (?) Russian to the North and America, we went to South. Korea didn't want that. We celebrated the independence. We were so exhilarated to have our flag back and we were one again, but it didn't take us long. But North Koreans who were fighting against Japanese in Shanghai, Manchuria and also some South Koreans in the United States for independence, they came in, they wanted to have their own power by the way. They have difference in their view. So right after independence, we had like 145 parties, roles. They wanted to have power and government. But this another chapter, westerners came and this is the way that we are going to do things, because you don't know anything about the government.*

D: Japan somehow, we managed to stay together. And Korea doesn't have good enough condition to do that. It feels like … Japan was almost divided by France and British. They wanted divide us into two groups and make us fight.

M: *You are very angry about that too.*

D: Japanese are mostly transformed so much fear we have. We realized we are so small and helpless. We enjoyed 260 years of peace in Japan. We were not ready for all those violent people around us and trying to attack us.

F1: You are saying truth but there are people on this side who feel very ??? about what has happened. You tried to explain where it came from. There was a lot of unhappiness about what has happened, but hasn't yet had a chance to come out. Maybe I think we should take a break. Do you want to say something before we take a break?

F2: I appreciate both of you. It's so deep.

M: Let's pause.

F1: Oh, M, I have never said that. (Laughter)

F1: Thank you everybody.

Collective Memory, Ghosts and Hot Spots

Killer

Sense of Taboo

Authority

Hot Spots

Guilt

Collective Memory

Hot Spots

Suffering

Dead