

A Report of National Committee for Peace Research

Recommendation for Promoting Research on Peace Studies

A Self-Reflection of Japanese Academic Researchers

**National Committee for Peace Research
The Science Council of Japan**

November 26, 2002

Recommendation for Promoting Research on Peace Studies

A Self-Reflection of Japanese Academic Researchers

Prologue

- I. Promotion of Peace Studies and the Science Council of Japan**
- II. International Peace Research Association and Peace Studies Association of Japan**
- III. Significance and Purpose of Establishing Departments of Peace Studies**
- VI. An Overview of Peace-Related Studies in Universities in Japan Today**
- V. Careers for the Graduates of Departments of Peace Studies**

Epilogue

Appendix

In a world that is plagued by war, hunger, injustice, and suffering, we believe that universities nurture life through the creation and transmission of knowledge. We join in supporting research and teaching programs that will increase our common understanding of the causes of conflicts and their resolution, the relationship between peace and development, and the sources of injustice and hunger. In so doing, we shall better discharge our responsibilities to educate the men and women who will lead our societies into the twenty-first century.

Talloires Declaration of University Presidents, September 15, 1988

Prologue

Research on the causes of war and the conditions for peace as well as educational curricula based on such research have become increasingly popular in Japan in recent years under the titles of "heiwagaku" or "Peace Studies" and "heiwakenkyu" or "Peace Research". The growth of peace-related curricula in higher education can be understood as an academic response to a world situation where wars, conflicts, poverty and hunger (also called structural violence) pose continuing problems.

Since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, military preparedness to combat terrorism has been intensified in the US and elsewhere. On the other hand, academic efforts to address the root causes of terrorism and resolve basic world problems by peaceful means have also been reinforced. Although the danger of global nuclear war between the US and the former Soviet Union has almost disappeared since the end of the Cold War, the problem of potential nuclear war still lingers, as the development of nuclear weapons in India and Pakistan in 1998 has demonstrated. In addition, the reduction of nuclear arsenals agreed upon between the US and Russia has not made the initially anticipated progress. The new American move toward Missile Defense (MD) and its military strategy as revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) are pregnant with serious consequences for the return of the nuclear arms race and further global proliferation of nuclear weapons. In the Middle East, an irreconcilable all-out conflict between Israelis and Arabs has gone on for half a century, and in North Ireland a quasi-religious antagonism between Protestants and Catholics does not seem to admit a lasting solution. Security in the countries of the former Yugoslavia, which was the presumed justification claimed for the bombing by NATO forces, is still far from being realized. There are also many regions such as Indonesia and the former Soviet Union where ethnic conflicts and wars for independence continue to erupt. Furthermore, in South Asia, Africa, and Latin America, in addition to poverty and underdevelopment, violent conflicts arising from ethnic and religious differences make it difficult to establish a stable and peaceful social order. Absolute poverty, hunger, disease, social disorder, crimes, and human rights violations, coupled with frequent occurrences of war and violent conflict in developing countries, are viewed by many experts as the background causes of terrorism.

As quoted above, “in a world that is plagued by war, hunger, injustice, and suffering” it is a responsibility of the university to support “research and teaching programs that will increase our common understanding of the causes of conflicts and their resolution, the relationship between peace and development, and the sources of injustice and hunger”. It means that such research and education constitute the necessary conditions for creating a durable international order in the 21st century.

In order to satisfy such needs, attempts have been made in many countries to institutionalize and educate men and women who engage in effectively resolving international problems. It is of prime importance for a country with certain national strengths, such as Japan, to respond to the call from international society with good faith through institutionalizing systematic and organized peace-related studies.

As a critical self-reflection of academic researchers in Japan, a country with the special qualifications of having experienced nuclear holocaust and having a Peace Constitution, we offer the present report as a means of addressing the necessity to institutionalize peace studies/peace research in higher education at both undergraduate and graduate levels. We hope that the report will serve as a pertinent incentive for such an endeavor.

I. Promotion of Peace Studies and the Science Council of Japan

Ever since its establishment in 1949, the Science Council of Japan, recognizing the necessity of academic research and scientific development for rebuilding a country devastated by war, has emphasized world peace and international stability while acting as a promoter of peace. Therefore, the establishment of the National Committee for Peace Research at the sixty-fourth General Conference of the Science Council of Japan in April, 1973 stood out as a landmark of publicly recognizing the necessity and importance of an academic approach to peace issues.

In the wake of interest in peace studies/peace research, which were conspicuous both here and overseas in the 1970s, and through appraising both the national and international situation, the Science Council of Japan adopted a recommendation entitled “On the Promotion of Peace Research in Japan” (November 20, 1974). This report shows the positive attitude of the Science Council of Japan toward peace studies/peace research and has remained the fundamental policy of the Council to this day. In an attempt to promote this policy, the Science Council of Japan showed much interest in the rapid progress of the institutionalization of peace studies/peace research overseas. It also started an investigation of the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), which was playing a pivotal role in promoting peace studies/peace research on a global scale. As a result, *IPRA Katsudo Yoran* or *IPRA Activities Compendium* (a pamphlet) was published in 1977 as one of the Council’s overseas research documents. As a result of these actions, a comprehensive picture of the international movement of peace studies/peace research was first introduced to Japanese academia.

The Science Council of Japan showed high esteem for the responsibility and possibilities of the group of peace researchers associated with IPRA. The Council has consistently demonstrated its support of IPRA by sending an official representative of the Council to the biennial IPRA General Conference. Such participation was essential in exploring international trends of peace studies/peace research and sharing its fruits with the Japanese research community.

From the mid-1960s, a momentum grew in Japan to organize an academic society of peace studies/peace research. In 1964, Nihon Heiwa Kenkyu Kondankai or the Peace Research Group in Japan (PRGJ) was founded. In 1973, Nihon Heiwa Gakkai or the Peace Studies Association of Japan (PSAJ) came into being. The interaction between these academic associations and the National Committee for Peace Research of the Science Council of Japan further reinforced the development of peace studies/peace research. In 1992, the General Conference of IPRA was held in Kyoto through the cooperation of the Science Council of Japan and the Peace Studies Association of Japan. Also, the fifteenth National Committee for Peace Research was able to make a report entitled “Heiwa ni kansuru Kenkyu no Sokushin ni tsuite Heiwagaku no Rekishi, Genjo oyobi Kadai” “On the Promotion of Research on Peace Past, Present, and Tasks of Peace Studies” (April 1994) as an inter-academic report. In cooperation with members of the National Committee for Peace Research,

this report was later published as a monograph with additional research papers on peace studies/peace research (Saito, Tetsuo, Hiroharu Seki, and Kenji Yamashita (eds.): *Heiwagaku no Susume Sono Rekishi, Genjo, oyobi Kadai or Recommending Peace Studies Its Past, Present, and Tasks*. Horitsubunkasha Publishing Co., 1995).

II. International Peace Research Association and Peace Studies Association of Japan

(1). International Peace Research Association (IPRA)

The International Peace Research Association (IPRA) was established at the CIBA Foundation in London in December 1964 and its Inaugural Conference was held at the Polemological Institute at the University of Groningen in Holland in July 1965. The IPRA General Conference, which is held every two years in various countries, has galvanized the peace studies/peace research movement and contributed to its institutionalization in many countries (Cf. *IPRA Katsudo Yoran or IPRA Activities Compendium*), March 1977, published by the Science Council of Japan). The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) welcomed the creation of IPRA and contributed to its growth by providing financial support for holding General Conferences in different regions of the world. IPRA adopted from the outset an unusual policy of funding the participation of peace researchers from developing countries in order to address the root causes of North-South problems and tried to avoid gatherings which would predominantly reflect the vested interests of the wealthy North. This policy would have probably been impossible without the financial assistance of UNESCO.

The countries where the IPRA GC was held since its foundation are as follows:

The Netherlands (1965), Sweden (1967), Czechoslovakia (1969), Yugoslavia (1971), India (1973), Finland (1975), Mexico (1977), West Germany (1979), Canada (1981), Hungary (1983), United Kingdom (1985), Brazil (1987), The Netherlands (1989), Japan (1992), Malta (1994), Australia (1996), South Africa (1998), Finland (2000), and South Korea (2002).

The number of participants in IPRA GC increased gradually and its membership has grown to cover various regions of the world. As the result, regional IPRA affiliates have come into being in North America, Latin America, the Asia-Pacific region, Europe, and Africa. They are as follows:

North-American Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development (COPRED)
Consejo Latinoamericano de Investigaciones sobre la Paz (CLAIP)
Asia-Pacific Peace Research Association (APPRO)
European Peace Research Association (EUPRA)
African Peace Research Association (AFPRA)

Furthermore, peace research activities by IPRA and its regional affiliates prompted the foundation of national peace studies associations in the United States, Canada, the Netherlands, Belgium, Scandinavian and Latin American countries, Japan, South Korea, and others. These national associations are active in many areas such as publishing academic peace studies journals, promoting international exchange programs, offering opportunities for peace researchers to publish, and providing peace education for citizens. *The International Peace Research Newsletter*, published quarterly, contains the details of these activities, and selected papers presented at IPRA GC are in principle published as monographs called *IPRA Proceedings*.

(2). The Peace Studies Association of Japan (PSAJ)

Nihon Heiwagakkai or The Peace Studies Association of Japan (PSAJ) was founded on the occasion of a research symposium and general conference at the International House of Japan (IHJ)

in September 1973. Both the Peace Research Group in Japan and the Japanese branch of the Peace Science Society (International) cooperated in founding PSAJ and after a few years the both groups ceased their activities by actively assimilating themselves into the newly established academic association.

The Statement of Purpose of PSAJ defines its mission as follows:

We shall, of course, utilize the behavioral-scientific method as well as quantitative method on the one hand, but we also intend to reap full advantage of traditional or philosophical method on the other hand. The true intention of establishing PSAJ is to promote and develop a genuinely scientific and objective science of war and peace through integrating various research methods and thus to consolidate the conditions for a lasting peace.

An Academic Conference in combination with the General Conference, which is held annually in June and November, constitutes the central activity of PSAJ. In addition, it holds academic symposia, smaller *ad hoc* research meetings, and local conferences as part of its activities every year in all Regional or District Units. These units exist in the following six geographical areas: Hokkaido, Kanto, Chubu, Kansai, Chugoku/Shikoku, and Kyushu/Okinawa. These regional meetings are designed to promote sharing of research results, publication plans, expanding PSAJ, mutual exchange, and the fellowship of members. The number of members amounted to some 800 as of spring 2002. In principle, research articles of the members of PSAJ are published in the official journal called *Heiwakenkyu* or *Peace Studies* after presenting them in the General Conference and reviewing processes. Furthermore, from 1979 through 1989 major research papers of members were published in *Heiwakenkyu Soshu* or the *Series of Peace Research* (six volumes) and *Heiwagaku Koza* or the *Theories of Peace Studies* (four volumes), respectively published by the Waseda University Press. Another series of publications is in preparation to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the founding of PSAJ in 2004. There are also numerous independent publications by members of PSAJ. The *PSAJ Newsletter* is also published in Japanese a few times every year and once a year in English in order to provide information on various activities of PSAJ and international peace studies/peace research movements.

The main activities of PSAJ include, among others, teaching and promulgating research results in peace studies/peace research, integration of this research, the offering of opportunities of mutual exchange of information, and institutionalizing peace studies/peace research. Concrete examples are relatively small *ad hoc* symposia when prominent overseas peace researchers visit Japan.

As the aforementioned infrastructure of peace studies/peace research in Japan has been enjoying a certain international reputation, coupled with the outstanding scholarly competence of Professor Yoshikazu Sakamoto, IPRA moved its headquarters in the office of Professor Sakamoto at the University of Tokyo from 1979 to 1983. The establishment of this office has accelerated the promotion of peace studies/peace research in the Asia-Pacific region. One of its fruits was the establishment of the Asian Peace Research Association (now called Asia-Pacific Peace Research Association) in Yokohama in 1980. As already touched on, the Science Council of Japan and PSAJ collaborated in hosting the 14th IPRA General Conference in 1992. It was held at both the Kyoto International Conference Hall and at Ritsumeikan University with great success. The Kyoto IPRA GC was attended by some 500 participants from 40 countries of the world and gave an enormous impetus to the Asia-Pacific region where peace studies/peace research had been underdeveloped.

IPRA headquarters continually moves to the institution of the Secretary General (President) who is elected at the biennial GC. As he or she is usually reelected for a second term, the headquarters stays at the same institution for four years. Since 2000 it has again been housed in Japan at Mie University, as Dr. Katsuya Kodama (member of the National Committee for Peace Research of SCJ and Council Member of PSAJ) was twice elected Secretary General of IPRA (in 2000 and 2002).

III. Significance and Purpose of Establishing Departments of Peace Studies

Establishing Departments of Peace Studies, both undergraduate and graduate levels, is conceived as an academic response to the demands and international trends as described above. If peace studies/peace research, which investigates the causes of war and other forms of violence and explores the conditions for peace (including expert technology for peace-making, peace-keeping, and peace-building) can be institutionalized as an integral part of higher education, it will enable graduates to bear responsibility for establishing a peaceful 21st century by mobilizing the expert knowledge they have acquired.

The emergence of modern society overlaps with a historical process in which people were liberated from the habit of retaliation and the legal order of a fair trial was established. The underlying idea was based on reflections that retaliation aggravated problems and caused devastation of the land, collapse of economies, incapacitation of politics, environmental disruption, all of which caused countless deaths, starvation, and refugees. Anachronistic means of continuing retaliation in war and terrorism can be considered as a barbarous challenge to the progress of human history.

Peace studies/peace research in the nuclear age is an attempt based on the principle: "If you want peace, prepare for peace" (*si vis pacem, para pacem*) to rescue humanity from nuclear holocaust and create an alternative international society of peace and security. It means a Copernican reversal of the motto of pre-nuclear age common sense, namely, "If you want peace, prepare for war" (*si vis pacem, para bellum*). The ideal is the establishment of a non-military world order and ultimate peace with general and complete disarmament. One cannot deny that situations are different throughout the world and that there are regions where national survival depends on a minimum military defense capability. At the same time, however, there are vast regions in the world laid out in the form of a checkerboard where preparation for traditional military armament seems unnecessary. For example, the possibility of war is almost inconceivable among most advanced countries, in particular, the North-West European countries, Scandinavian countries, between the USA and Canada, between Australia and New Zealand, and so on. In addition, a country like Costa Rica has survived in the last half century without an army. The global expansion of peace in areas that are formed like a checkerboard is a great challenge for peace studies/peace research.

As Theo Lenz, the author of *Toward a Science of Peace*, 1955, emphasized that availability of a sufficient number of peace researchers is the key for the science of peace to fulfill its responsibility, one of the objectives of establishing Departments of Peace Studies lies in educating a sufficient number of researchers on peace. The very increase in peace researchers superceding the number of war researchers is essential in reaching a scientific result to defeat the advance of military and war studies. The skyrocketing costs of war, armament, and the arms industry demand unbearable sacrifices from a large majority of human beings. However, the cost of establishing and running Departments of Peace Studies is incomparably smaller than military cost. Far greater will be the profit to be brought about by war prevention as the result of endeavors pursued by Departments of Peace Studies. The 20th century was characterized by the unprecedented destruction of two World Wars which killed countless numbers of people and wasted vast amounts of wealth. Humanity now again stands at a critical crossroad of either making the 21st century even more bellicose or to create a new century of peace without war.

Not only war, but also reckless development plans and the failure of development policy (both are called mal-development), and the unfair distribution of wealth, natural resources, technology, and information are all inflicting unendurable suffering on the majority of humanity. The difference between living standards of industrialized and developing countries has been widening ever more. In addition, the unhealthy situation of a parallel existence of affluent consumer life on one side and scarcity and poverty on the other is likely to produce more local conflicts, causing serious barriers to peace and sustainable development. The newly started 21st century is already full of problematic events and the prospect for the development of a bright future appears bleak.

The hope of a peaceful future stirred by the end of the Cold War has met a heavy blow by the Persian Gulf War and was further damaged by the terrorist attacks on 9/11 and the subsequent war of retaliation in Afghanistan.

The age of naked imperialism where great powers colonized territories of weak people and exploited their wealth is over. All nations, great or small, must enjoy equal rights under international law, and the privileges of great nations should be limited by the United Nations. A powerful nation must not be allowed to arbitrarily sanction a smaller nation and bring it to its knees. If the law of jungle prevails in the world, occurrence of further desperate terrorists attacks will be unavoidable and human civilization will cease to exist. This image of a future is a nightmare. But the advent of such a nightmare is not inevitable. When the scale of war was much smaller and its influence limited, prowess was a virtue and the old dictum: "*si vis pacem, para bellum*" was perhaps a piece of human wisdom. However, the situation has dramatically changed with the progress in military technology in terms of weapons of mass destruction like nuclear weapons. War may now become the ultimate means of destruction through its irreversible damage to the essential means of global relations and mutual dependence in the areas of politics, economy, information, transportation, communication, education, etc.

Therefore, the idea that preparedness for war guarantees the security of a nation and its people has become an anachronistic fix. There is no persuasive ground for the argument that it is indispensable for a country's security to have sufficient funds in its military budget to buy the most sophisticated weapons to enhance its defense capability. Rather, it must be understood from a long-term perspective that building a society characterized by freedom, equality, justice, welfare, and prosperity is the foundation of security and has an effect on war prevention. Preparation for peace means an indefatigable commitment to peace.

One of the preminent conclusions of the theories of contemporary political science is: "democracies do not fight with each other". It can be understood as the modern version of the philosophical wisdom thoroughly thought out by Immanuel Kant who claimed that a perpetual peace requires abolishment of a standing army and establishment of a republican government (democratic government). To concretize this wisdom and materialize it is the direct road to perpetual world peace which peace studies/peace research intends. Of course, Departments of Peace Studies would neither be the panacea for resolving all the problems nor an immediate answer. It would be no less different than a medical school or a law school, which neither provide a panacea nor an immediate answer in their respective areas. However, both medical schools and law schools have contributed to society by providing experts committed to the solution of health and legal problems. Similarly, it can be expected that Departments of Peace Studies or Schools of Peace Studies would contribute to society by providing experts committed to issues of peace.

As to the careers of graduates of Departments of Peace Studies, the whole of Section V is dedicated to this question. Suffice it to say here that many of them would opt for peace-related careers, social work, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), non-profit organizations (NPOs), international civil service in such organizations as United Nations and others, or the foreign office of their own country. Considering that the increased role of NGOs and NPOs in contemporary international relations and domestic social relations means an increase in the need for volunteer workers, the arena of those who have mastered methods of peaceful conflict resolution would really be global. Even when the graduates of Departments of Peace Studies would not opt for jobs appropriate for their training, they would be able to utilize their know-how by becoming an exemplary citizen while building a peaceful democratic society in their everyday life. This perspective suggests that the graduates of Departments of Peace Studies can contribute to society regardless of their choice of jobs or how they would live their lives.

Although establishing Departments of Peace Studies would have a monumental significance as elaborated above, currently there is no single Department of Peace Studies in Japanese universities. It is true that the classes of "Peace Studies" have been increasing in Japanese universities and are very popular among students. However, these courses of "Peace Studies", either in the form of a lecture or a seminar, are so limited as to give students only two to four credits at most. There are no systematically organized courses of Peace Studies as such. Japan's

educational policy may be seriously questioned as Japan's self-image is that of a peaceful nation and it desires "to occupy an honored place in an international society striving for the preservation of peace" (Preamble to *The Constitution of Japan*).

Students' interest in and support for Peace Studies has been overwhelming and in most universities the courses entitled "Peace Studies" are often over-registered. To fulfill such desires and needs of students, it is urgent to establish Departments of Peace Studies and implement its programs. It is especially important to note that similar departments overseas exert a strong attraction worldwide and, in particular, Japanese students are being attracted at a time when the decrease in the number of eligible university students is posing a serious threat to the survival of universities in Japan. For example, it is reported that 10% - 15% of the graduate students at the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford University in England are always Japanese students (in fact, Japanese students constituted 14 out of 80 MA candidates in fall 2001 to spring 2002). As it is, those who take an undergraduate course in Peace Studies in Japan are forced to study abroad if they want to major in it in graduate studies. It is for this reason also that the institutionalization of Peace Studies at the BA, MA, and Ph.D. levels is an urgent responsibility for Japanese universities.

IV. An Overview of Peace-Related Studies in Universities in Japan Today

As an element of the curriculum, a course in Peace Studies was first introduced to a Japanese University (Shikoku Gakuin University) in 1976 and these courses have steadily increased in number ever since. Surveys of such courses were twice conducted in the past and three characteristics were pointed out: 1) a variety of topics appeared which were considered to be elements of peace studies/peace research, 2) there was an unexpectedly rapid increase of such courses, 3) students showed strong interest in and support for such courses (Cf. Mitsuo Okamoto: "Nihon no Daigaku niokeru Heiwagakukanrenkoza no Jittaichosa" or "Peace Studies in Colleges and Universities in Japan A General Survey" in *Heiwakenkyu* or *Peace Studies*, Vol. 12, 1987, published by The Peace Studies Association of Japan; ditto, "Nihon no Daigaku ni okeru Heiwagakukanrenkoza no Dainiji Jittaichosa" or "Peace Studies in Colleges and Universities in Japan A Second General Survey" in *Hiroshima Heiwakagaku* or *Hiroshima Peace Science*, Vol.20, 1997, published by the Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University). Similar surveys were conducted by the same researcher in the UK in 1984 and in the USA in 1985, respectively. A taxonomy of topics of peace studies was introduced as the result of the surveys in these three countries.

A Birdseye View of Topics Found in Peace Studies

A. Research and Education on War and the Military (Critique & Conquest of Violence Manifested in Physical Conflicts)

Examples: war (conventional/nuclear), arms race, militarization, military intervention, prevention of war, avoidance of war, national security, historical research on the atomic bombings, genocide, nuclear technology development, nuclear testing, development and deployment of weapons (conventional, bacteriological, chemical), arms transfer, ethnic conflicts, refugee issues, war crimes, terrorism, militarism, armament, military alliance, (compulsory) military service, mercenary, diplomacy, peace keeping, arbitration, mediation, cooperation, crisis management, civilian defense, non-offensive defense, non-violent states, disarmament, conscientious objection, non-violence, arms reduction, nation states, state system, capital punishment, international law, international organization, world court, world government, European Union, the United Nations, etc.

B. Research and Education on Political, Economic, Cultural, Religious, and Racial Liberation (Critique & Conquest of Violence against the Weak)

Examples: North-South problems, multi-national corporations, neo-colonialism, international economic order, OPEC, NAFTA,, international division of labor, mal-development, economic inequality, Third World poverty, latifundium, accumulation of national debts, sustainable development, economic aid, economic dependence/interdependence, agri-business, international trade, international transfer of labor, illiteracy, minority issues, foreign laborers, child-labor, sexism, xenophobia, racism, apartheid, ethnic prejudice, repression, revolution, human rights violation, etc.

C. Research and Education on Re-inventing Lifestyle (Critique & Conquest of Violence against Nature)

Examples: energy issues, over-population, limit of natural resources, ecology, carnivorous culture, vegetarian culture, big science, nuclear power plants, run-away technology, over-production, over-consumption, environmental destruction, pollution, adequate technology, local industry, local technology, simple life, self-determination, local autonomy, pesticide-free/organic agriculture, recyclable/alternative energy, earth-friendly technology and lifestyle, accident-viable technology, peace with nature, ecological symbiosis, eco-sophy, etc.

D. Research and Education on Learning Process and Attitude Formation (Critique & Conquest of Psychological/Educational Violence)

Examples: fascism, authoritarianism, bureaucratism, ideological inculcation, indoctrination (leftist or rightist), innate aggression myth, chauvinism, homogeneity orientation, meritocracy, IQ-ism, efficiency myth, nationalism, groupism, corporal punishment, imprisonment, socialization, bullying, communication technology, conflict resolution workshop, conviviality, de-schooling, tolerance, flexibility, creative imagination, critical learning, forms of education, hetero-cultural interaction, international interaction, learning through exposure, etc.

E. Research and Education on Philosophical, Ethical, Theological, and Religious Peace Thinking (Theoretical Grundlegung or Systematization of Peace Studies)

Examples: research on peace concepts, deepening of peace concepts, religious/secular eschatology, eutopianism, theoretical Grundlegung of Peace Studies, pacifist world view, pacifism, non-violent anthropology/psychology, critical evaluation of nuclear age, perspectives of nuclear-free future, philosophy of peace, ethics of peace, theology of peace, theology of liberation, Philosophy of Nuclear Age, etc.

The topics illustrated in “A) Research and Education on War and the Military” presupposes the conventional concept of “negative peace” in terms of “absence of peace” and its focus of interest lies in the studies of armed conflicts including nuclear war and their alternatives. In “B) Research and Education on Political, Economic, Cultural, Religious, and Racial Liberation” presupposes both concepts of “structural violence” and “positive peace”. In a nutshell, a society with absolute poverty and grave starvation is not peaceful even when war is absent.

In “C) Research and Education on Re-inventing Lifestyle” the idea that “war is the greatest destroyer of nature” is shared and “peace with nature” and “earth friendly technology and lifestyle” is contrasted to “human violence against nature”. In “D) Research and Education on Learning Process and Attitude Formation” beginning with “simulation on conflict resolution” international mutual understanding through multi-cultural communication and education with non-ideology are considered. In “E) Research and Education on Philosophical, Ethical, Theological, and Religious Peace Thinking (Theoretical *Grundlegung* of Systematization of Peace Studies)” a grand design of scholarly and systematic Peace Studies in a more or less classical form of *Wissenschaft* can be created.

As noticed, there has been a fundamental shift of the concept of peace in the last decades which is the background of diversity of peace studies/peace research. To summarize, peace does not only mean the “absence of war” but it means economic/political stability, respect for fundamental human rights, political freedom and participation in political process, benign and safe environment,

improvement of welfare, and life of economic satisfaction. Peace in this sense is called “positive peace” in contrast to “negative peace”, meaning “absence of war”. The articulation of the concept of peace has become almost universal and is being used in international organizations including the UN (Cf. Appendix). Some of the advantages brought forth by introduction of peace studies/peace research into the curriculum of higher education are: first, it has facilitated research and teaching of topics which were difficult to deal with within the traditional curriculum; second, it has enabled an analysis and investigation of new global problems from the viewpoint of “common values which recognizes unity and diversity of humanity” (Akira Iriye); third, it has facilitated addressing new problems arising from rapid globalization and the emerging borderless world.

According to a survey conducted in 1996, there are 29 universities as of April 1995 where a course entitled “Peace Studies” is offered, and 8 universities where “Peace Research” is offered. (After the survey was concluded five additional universities have started to offer “Peace Studies”, making the total number of “Peace Studies” courses 34).

Universities and Colleges offering “Peace Studies”(“heiwagaku”)

Aichi Educational University, Osaka University of Industry, Okinawa International University, Kagoshima University, Kansei Gakuin University, Keisen Women’s University, Keiwa Gakuin University, Shikoku Gakuin University, Jumonji University, Sophia University, Seikei University, Senshu University, Chuo University, University of Tokyo, Tokyo Christian University, Tokyo University of Economy, Tokyo Women’s Christian University, Dokkyo University, Niigata International University of Information, Hiroshima University, Hiroshima Shudo University, Hiroshima Women’s University, Hosei University, Hokkaido Tokai University, Hokkaido Bunkyo University, Matsuyama Shinonome University, Meiji Gakuin University, Rakuno Gakuen University, Ryukyu University, Ryukoku University, St. Paul’s University, Ritsumeikan University, Lutheran College, and Waseda University (34 universities and colleges).

Universities offering “Peace Research” (“heiwakenkyu”)

Keisen Jogakuen University, Kyushu University, Kurume University, International Christian University, Sophia University, Daitobunka University, Hiroshima Shudo University, and Yokohama City University (8 universities).

Other peace related studies like “Theory of Peace” (heiwaron) offered at Kobe University, Chukyo University, and Niigata University, as well as “Theory of International Peace” at Tokai University and Mie University, “Theory of Peace and Conflict” at Tsukuba University, and “Research on Human Rights and Peace” at Seinan Gakuin University, are considered as dealing with similar issues as “Peace Studies” and/or “Peace Research”, although their titles are different. “Integral Studies on War and Peace” at Hiroshima University and “Interdisciplinary Studies on Peace” at Hokkaido University are nothing but “Peace Studies” as far as their contents are concerned. Furthermore, there are 37 national universities (37.76% of national universities), 14 public universities (26.92%), and 108 private universities (26.02%) where peace related courses are offered under such titles as “Theory of International Conflict”, “War and Peace”, “Peace and Human Rights”, “Dealing with Nuclear Issues”, and so on. It means that in 159 universities (28.14%) out of 565 universities (in 1995) some sort of peace studies/peace research in a broad sense is being offered.

Peace Research Institutes in Japan (March 2002)

There are ten peace research institutes in Japan as follows (institutes which advocate peace through military forces are not included):

Hiroshima Peace Institute

Institute for Peace Science, Hiroshima University
International Christian University Peace Research Institute
Nagasaki Peace Research Institute
Nagasaki Institute for Peace Culture of Nagasaki Sogo Kagaku University
Okinawa International Peace Research Institute
Peace Research Institute at Meiji Gakuin University
Soka University Institute for Peace Issues
Tokai University International Institute for Peace Strategy
Toda Peace Research Institute

In addition, there are peace research institutes in a broad sense of the word, such as the Institute for International Relations at Sophia University, the Institute for International Relations at Tsuda University, the Institute for International Understanding at Teizukayama University, etc. Among peace museums which function as educational facilities, the Peace Museum at Ritsumeikan University stands out as a unique peace studies/peace research institute annexed to the university and is recognized internationally as a valuable asset to peace research.

It is important to note that there are domestic and international students who are engaged in peace studies/peace research under the guidance of professors attached to some of the aforementioned peace research institutes. This is particularly true in those peace research institutes with good libraries in such historic cities as Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Okinawa. However, the number of such students is limited due to a paucity of infrastructure as such. There are no peace institutes in Japan which have similar functions of departments and/or graduate schools holding many such students as can be observed in Western countries.

When a public symposium on “Development of Peace Studies in Universities” was held in May 2001 at Meiji Gakuin University under the joint auspices of the Peace Research Institute at Meiji Gakuin University and the Kanto District Unit of Peace Studies Association of Japan, some 70 students and professors engaged in peace studies/peace research in the Greater Tokyo Metropolitan Area, namely, at Meiji Gakuin University, Ferris Women’s University, St. Paul’s University, Bunkyo University, and the University of Tokyo came together to discuss the issues. It is noteworthy that a peace research institute together with an academic association, which usually commit themselves solely to theoretical issues, contributed to the development of curriculum in peace studies/peace research through an exchange of people and opinions who share similar interests.

V. Careers for the Graduates of Departments of Peace Studies

With regard to the types of jobs available to the graduates of Departments of Peace Studies, one can get a rough idea from fragmentary records of careers of the graduates who have majored in peace studies/peace research at American and European universities, especially, the graduates of the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford University in England established in 1972. Of course, the majority of the graduates who major in peace studies/peace research do not necessarily find themselves at jobs fit for their educational background, the situation being similar to the graduates with major in history or sociology.

However, the ground for the existence *raison d’être* of the department would be questioned if a certain proportion of its graduates cannot embrace careers of their own expertise. This is especially true in the case of a “newcomer” in academia like Departments of Peace Studies. The very fact that the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford University has not only continued to exist for over 30 years but has enlarged in size and capacity is an effective answer to the question and testifies that the supply and demand of the Bradford’s graduates has been functioning on balance. Unfortunately, there are no systematic follow-up data for careers of the graduates who majored in peace studies/peace research. What is reported here, then, simply shows a summing up of the findings in research papers, brochures of universities, internet information, and fragmentary replies obtained by directly asking career offices of the universities concerned.

As specialists majored in peace studies/peace research, many of them seem to have made conscientious options to work as social workers, staff members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and non-profit organizations (NPOs), agents of peace-building and/or peace-keeping operations, promoters of international conferences, specialists in think-tanks, military analysts, negotiators, etc., and most of them are engaged in borderless work situations. Demands for workers in refugee camps and various international volunteer organizations are said to be particularly high. It is expected that demands for these occupations as target careers for graduates of Department of Peace Studies will increase in future. It is usually not their job to become engaged in actual negotiations of ceasefire. For, these tasks are mostly done by politicians, the military, and diplomats. However, doors are also open for the graduates of Departments of Peace Studies to make career options for a variety of jobs like politicians, diplomats, international bureaucrats, researchers, scholars, lawyers, etc. In fact, a Japanese with a Ph.D. from the Department of Peace Studies at Bradford University is presently a member of the Japanese parliament. If expert training for peace-building and peace-keeping is obtainable in such institutions, it will be a remarkable contribution to a peaceful society.

Many of the graduates also work as pure volunteers. In relatively wealthy countries where economic constraints of young people are benign, quite a few youngsters build up experience by volunteer jobs. There must be a special expertise which can be acquired only through experiencing volunteer works. There are of course graduates who are engaged in such jobs as teachers, civil servants, lawyers, local public service officials, journalists, librarians, etc. which are no different from those who majored in other areas of studies. It is also important to note that the know-how and training they obtained have been utilized in preventing conflicts in workplaces and communities, thus contributing to the maintenance and promotion of peace in human relationship. It is reported that, at job search, graduates of Departments of Peace Studies and other equivalent institutions have been rather successful. Their application is seldom rejected partly because employers are curious about the qualifications of the graduates of such institutions.

It is a universal desire to turn present *peacelessness* into *peacefulness*. It may not be possible to *eliminate* all nuclear weapons, wars, terrorism, poverty in developing countries, along with inequality, but it should be possible to *minimize* them. If that is the aim of peace research/peace studies, a fertile field of activities looms large in a global scale for people who want to contribute to world peace. The establishment of Departments of Peace Studies intends, on the one hand, to impart technical "know-how's" to perform paid and/or unpaid jobs as described above. At the same time, however, its another intention will be to offer alternative policies and show peaceful future blueprints to the international society through profound study of the philosophy of non-violence in order to overcome the present crisis threatening to terminate human civilization.

Epilogue

It is commonly known that today's Japan, unlike the bellicose Japan before the end of WW II, is a peace oriented nation and is expected by the world community to contribute to a stable international society through its independent peace diplomacy. Invaluable lessons learned from the merciless Asia-Pacific War and the contrasting economic prosperity after WW II bring home that nothing is gained by war, but almost everything is gained through peace. It is indeed through peace that prosperity has been brought about in Japan after WW II.

The proposal to establish Departments of Peace Studies in universities in Japan is an academic response which reflects such assessments and expectations mingled with self-critical reflections. Given a realization of this innovative project, it will not only contribute to Japan's national interest but also to human interest in general which will be welcomed by the international community. As it is, as for peace studies/peace research the whole Asian region is way behind the Western countries. Therefore, the new Japanese move would throw a positive influence on other Asian countries with the result that Japan will be able to show leadership in this field of academic discipline. It will provide an excellent incentive to the Japanese people as well as to the world at large.

The Constitution of The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) declares in its preamble “that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed”. In order to construct “the defenses of peace” in the minds of men and women, it goes without saying that no period is more important than the period of elementary and secondary education. It is expected, therefore, that Departments of Peace Studies will contribute significantly to educate and train teachers who will be competent enough to construct “the defenses of peace” in the minds of young people.

Peace will not come by itself or it cannot be created if people remain idle spectators. As it has been said since time immemorial, “Blessed are the peacemakers” (*The New Testament*). Peace remains something to be created. However, without research, education, and learning of peace, it will not be possible. Therefore, it is the purpose of Departments of Peace Studies to help, nurture, and produce such practitioners and to contribute to stabilize world peace. That will be “the wisdom in the nuclear age” where the dictum “*si vis pacem, para pacem*” (if you want peace, prepare for peace) will prevail. As mentioned above, it is a remarkable phenomenon that peace-related subjects are being taught in so many universities in Japan. Perhaps no other country in the world has a similar percentage of universities where peace-related subjects are offered. It is a pity or a shame all the more that even to this day there is not a single Japanese university which has a Department of Peace Studies. No serious efforts have ever been made to organize such educational activities and offer students a systematic knowledge and technique of peacemaking by means of establishing educational peace institutions as observable overseas.

It may not be a desirable policy for Japan to lack balance with such major countries as the US, the UK, and Germany in the field of peace studies/peace research. It is feared that the question of why there is no single Department of Peace Studies in Japan cannot expect a reasonable answer and will remain as an enigma. It might breed distrust of Japan where people have experienced merciless war with devastation of the land by aerial bombings and atomic holocaust. This is especially true in the age of internet when information is shared globally and people can choose a university on the ground of their knowledge obtained through internet. Due to transparency of information, they know exactly what kind of research and educational policy is pursued in respective countries. With the introduction of broadband system in the area of internet communications, this tendency will be reinforced and the global race to obtain gifted students will become inevitable. As a matter of fact, an inexpedient situation currently exists, as already mentioned, that if a Japanese student wants to major in peace studies/peace research, he or she is forced to study overseas.

To address seriously the inexpedient situation and make every effort to satisfy the needs of Japanese students by establishing Departments of Peace Studies should be an academic as well as moral responsibility of higher institutions in Japan. It would be welcome news for international students in Japan as well as those who come from conflict ridden countries and regions. It is particularly bizarre and unnatural that no Department of Peace Studies exists in such historic cities as Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Okinawa where the legacies of WW II are still keenly felt, although there are a number of universities in these localities and even peace research institutes.

When a long awaited two-credit course of Peace Studies was offered for the first time at the University of Tokyo in the spring of 2001 (the title of the course was “Heiwagaku no Genzai Heiwa no Seiki o Tsukuru tameni” or “Peace Studies in the Making Toward a Peaceful Century”), quite a few peace researchers were invited and they gave lectures in the course. Among them was Johan Galtung, one of the founding fathers of Peace Studies, who confronted the students with a question: “Why is the University of Tokyo afraid of Peace Studies?” The fact that the course which was originally planned only for the first semester in 2001 was resumed in the spring of 2002 could be a positive response to Galtung’s question.

[Appendix]

Evolution of the Concepts of Peace and Violence

The concept of peace has undergone a significant evolution. One of the reasons for the evolution stems from the fact that people have come to perceive miseries caused by wide-spread starvation and ecological disruption as violence which can be equated with miseries caused by war. The discourse of the dichotomy of “war and peace” has efficiently been replaced by “violence and peace”. For example, the book published as the product of the Asian Peace Research Conference in 1980 was entitled *Boryoku to Heiwa* or *Violence and Peace* (edited by Yoshikazu Sakamoto, Asahi Shimbun Publishing Co., 1982).

Such new concepts of peace and violence have been in use not only in peace studies/peace research, but also in organizations like UNESCO and the World Bank. The definition of peace and violence entered in various encyclopedia in the last two decades or so also endorses the evolution of the concepts. As an illustration, the entry of “heiwa” or “peace” in the *Tetsugaku/Shiso Jiten* (*Encyclopedia of Philosophical Thoughts*) Iwanami Shoten Pub. Co., 1998, is translated into English below.

[Definition of Peace]

Heiwa: Peace (English), Friede (German), Paix (French)

Traditionally, peace is defined as absence of war, but this says only “what peace is not”, but does not say “what peace is”. Due to this negative definition, peace as absence of war is often called “negative peace” and used as such also in the United Nations. A definition can be narrow or broad and the negatively defined peace as absence of war is limited, static, and the narrowest definition of the word. However, it is not to connote that the condition of absence of war is negatively valued. On the contrary, the positive value of absence of war is retained here and it corresponds to the universal desire of humanity to establish a world without war. Peace defined positively as “what it is” is called “positive peace” and its connotation evolves in accordance with historical change and the definition is elastic and dynamic. Some of the basic elements of “positive peace” are affluence, decent social order, security, justice, fairness, freedom, equality, democracy, and the respect for human rights, but it is elastic enough to include good health, social welfare, cultural life, sustainable ecology, and so on. For example, previously the serious issue of peace was the threat posed by a global nuclear confrontation between the two superpowers, but after the end of the Cold War the serious issue of peace is now perceived as the threat of large-scale pollution of the environment.

The Meaning of Peace in Different Cultures

In a historico-conceptual context, the original meaning of peace was not confined to absence of war. The word “peace” in different languages and cultures show its diverse meanings. For instance, “shalom” in the ancient Israel or “salam” in the Islamic culture *primarily* means the realization of justice and fairness by the divine power, whereas the *primary* meaning of the Greek “eirene”, the Roman “pax”, and the Chinese “huping” was “law and order” and prosperity, and in the Indian “ahimsa” meant *primarily* “no killing”. To elicit the primary meaning of these words in different cultures indicates their multiplicity and contradicts the narrow concept of peace as “negative peace”. It also contradicts the ordinary use of the words in expressions like “peaceful scene”, “peace of a family”, and the like. A question is often posed in a questionnaire in social surveys: “Do you think Japan is peaceful today?” Given the narrow meaning of the word, the question would be absurd as Japan has never been involved in war for over half a century.

At a time when domination and subordination prevailed, it was the privilege of the dominant to pontificate the common understanding of the world and the definition of concepts. However,

when in-depth understanding of mythological thinking and the cosmology became available with the help of cultural anthropology, and the presence of researchers from underdeveloped area was keenly felt and their voices heard, the split of the common understanding of the world was obvious and the redefinition of such concepts as peace, freedom, equality, human rights, etc. became inevitable. It coincided with the increase of independent nations in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and heterogeneous understanding and multi-cultural interpretation of concepts in politics, economy, culture, education, and entertainment gained the ground. Furthermore, researchers of women's studies called attention to historical limitation of the traditional concepts including that of peace and criticized patriarchalism that underlay the ground of those concepts.

Direct Violence and Structural Violence

Sugata Dasgupta, an Indian peace researcher, coined a word "peacelessness" and introduced it into the broader discussion as the new concept of peace. He avoided the dichotomy of "war and peace," insisting that the antithesis of peace is not war but "peacelessness". Absence of war may be a sort of peace in developed countries, but mere absence of war cannot be equated with peace in underdeveloped countries. There the dichotomy of war and peace is irrelevant, because their state of poverty and powerlessness produces the lethal condition of peacelessness. Recognition of this reality is the indispensable premises of the new definition of what peace is. In contrast to "direct violence," which implies such acts as war, terrorism, etc., Johan Galtung introduced a revolutionary concept of "structural violence," which refers to such miseries as poverty, social disorder, insecurity, injustice, unfairness, political repression, inequality, starvation, disease, lack of medical facility, and illiteracy. Replacing the traditional dichotomy of "war and peace" with "violence and peace", Galtung thus gave conceptual articulation of Dasgupta's idea of "peacelessness." Describing this reality as a situation of "no war plus no peace" enabled scholars and activists for the first time to address the new demands of peace studies/peace research in the 20th century.

References: J. Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research", *Journal of Peace Research*, VI, no.3, 1969. Sugata Dasgupta, "Peacelessness and Maldevelopment", *IPRA Studies in Peace Research, Proceedings of the IPRA Second Conference*, vol. II, 1968. B. Reardon, *Sexism and War System*, 1985. Takeshi Ishida, *Heiwa no Seijigaku (Politics of Peace)*, 1970. Mitsuo Okamoto, *Heiwagakuku o Tsukuru (Peace Studies in the Making)*, 1993. [Mitsuo Okamoto]