

RITSUMEIKAN KOKUSAI KENKYU

The Ritsumeikan Journal of International Studies

Vol. 18 No. 3

March 2006

Special *Festschrift* Dedicated to
Professor Ikuro Anzai

Published by

ISARU

The International Studies Association

of

RITSUMEIKAN UNIVERSITY

Ritsumeikan University, 56-1 Tojiin-Kitamachi, Kita-ku, Kyoto 603-8577 Japan

Phone : (075) 465 - 1267 Fax : (075) 465 - 1277

ISSN 0915-2008

立命館国際研究

18 卷 3 号

安齋育郎教授退職記念論集

2006年3月

立命館大学国際関係学会

CONTENTS

Professor Ikuro Anzai: A Selected Bibliography and a Short History of his Major Scholarly Activities		i
Professor Ikuro Anzai in the College of International Relations	OGI, Hirofumi	XV
FAREWELL LECTURE COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT		
Retrospecting the ups and downs of my life	ANZAI, Ikuro	1
ARTICLES		
Preventing Catastrophe: The World's First Peace Museum	DUNGEN, Peter van den	23
Preventing Future Genocide: A vision for Peace Museum in Cambodia	NGARM, Soth Plai	37
Controversial Exhibitions at Peace Museums in Japan	YAMANE, Kazuyo	47
Impacts of International Politics Towards Domestic Politics		
—Role of External Factors for Legislating the Civil Rights Acts in the U.S.	ANDO, Tsugio	61
UN Peacekeeping Operations and the Use of Force	ISHIHARA, Naoki	77
A study of the Transformation of Industrial Capital into Industry-equity		
Capital from the Viewpoint of 'Goodwill'	ITAKI, Masahiko	93
Verweigerte Identität —Adorno als "Halbjude"—	INOUE, Junichi	121
The Jewish American Identity in <i>Broken Glass</i>	OIKAWA, Masahiro	139
A Cultural Analysis of the Significance of Prime Minister Koizumi's Visit to Yasukuni Shrine	XIA, Gang	167
Revisiting the Pacifism of the Japanese Constitution	KIMIJIMA, Akihiko	191
Human Security in Japanese Diplomacy	SATO, Makoto	207
A Road to East Asian Economic Community	SEKISHITA, Minoru	223
Participation, democracy, and power in Brazil under the Workers Party local governments program	MATSUSHITA, Kiyoshi	253
Phonological Studies from Biolinguistic Point of View	MIYAKE, Masataka	287

立命館国際研究 18巻3号 2006年3月19日 抜刷

ARTICLE

Preventing Catastrophe: The World's First Peace Museum

Peter van den DUNGEN

ARTICLE

Preventing Catastrophe: The World's First Peace Museum

In praise of Ikuro Anzai and Jan Bloch

Peter van den DUNGEN*

Abstract

The advent of the nuclear age has seen the creation of many peace museums, especially in Japan. They are important instruments of public peace education. As director of the Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University, Professor Ikuro Anzai has played a central role in their development. The world's first peace museum was established by Jan Bloch in Lucerne in 1902, to warn of the dangers of a new large war. He belongs to a rich tradition of peacemakers and peace educators from the past, whom the world does not remember. Their inspiring lives and ideas should also be told in peace museums. In order to enhance the effectiveness of the atomic bomb museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, such museums should also be established outside Japan. The creation of an Atomic Bomb & Peace Museum in Lucerne would provide a great stimulus for the movement for the abolition of nuclear weapons, and of war.

In September 1992, the first conference of what would soon become the International Network of Peace Museums was convened in Bradford by the small British Quaker charity 'Give Peace a Chance', in association with the Department of Peace Studies of the University of Bradford. This was the first global meeting of directors and staff of peace and anti-war museums and related institutions'. Among the participants was also Professor Kimio Yakushiji who represented the Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University, which had opened its doors a few months before, in May. For peace researchers and educators, who see peace museums as vital instruments for the promotion of peace education and the creation of a culture of peace, the Kyoto Museum has always been an inspiring example, not least because of its institutional setting. Given the responsibility of universities as the prime centers in every country of the world for the discovery and dissemination of knowledge, it was heartening to know that there was at least one university - and a prominent one, too - whose campus incorporated a peace museum. It can be noted that the European Museum for Peace, which was opened in 2000 in the castle in the small Austrian village of Stadtschlaining, is part of a family of institutions which also comprise the Austrian Study Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution and the European Peace University. However, as this is not a university in the ordinary sense, it seems that

* Visiting Lecturer, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, Bradford, UK

the Kyoto Museum at Ritsumeikan University remains unique on account of its incorporation into a university.

In order to stimulate the plans for a peace museum in Stadtschlaining, and also support the fledgling International Network of Peace Museums (which the Bradford conference had decided to create), Dr. Gerald Mader, president of the Austrian Study Center, hosted the network's second conference, which was held in August 1995. Professor Ikuro Anzai, as its new director, represented the Kyoto Museum. The contrast between the two localities could hardly have been more striking: Kyoto - the former imperial city which continues to be the cultural capital of Japan, with one and a half million inhabitants; Stadtschlaining - a sleepy village of 700 inhabitants in rural Burgenland. However, the village is not without history as is evident, particularly, by the presence of the imposing castle, dating back to the Middle Ages. Now the home of the peace museum, it has become a veritable 'fortress of peace' which provides another contrast with the modern, purpose-built museum in Kyoto.²

Towards the end of the Stadtschlaining conference, participants had the satisfaction to be informed by the Japanese delegation of its endeavours to organise the third international conference in Japan. This promise, and its subsequent realisation, owed much to the vision, determination, and efforts of Professor Anzai. The third - large, and highly successful - international conference was made possible through the cooperation of five important peace museums in Japan. The conference took place in November 1998 in Osaka and Kyoto, and for foreign participants was enriched with optional excursions to the peace museums in either Hiroshima, Nagasaki, or Okinawa. The fact that from the beginning the conference secretariat was based at the Kyoto Museum is indicative of the central role played by its director, ably and enthusiastically assisted by Ritsumeikan University Professor Atsushi Fujioka, the Secretary General of the Conference's Organizing Committee.³ Peace museum experts the world over will always remember with gratitude and fondness this outstanding event.

At the Fifth International Conference of Peace Museums, organised by the Gernika Peace Museum Foundation in the Basque Country (Spain) in May 2005, Professor Anzai presented the renewal project of the Kyoto Museum for World Peace. In order to keep up to date, and continue to attract visitors - both old and new - the need to reconsider at least every ten years the content of a museum and the way it displays its materials and presents its message is a widely accepted principle in the general museum world. How much more is this true for museums dealing with war and peace, incorporating as they do such related themes as human rights, development, environment, and security which are subject to fast-moving developments - both in the conceptual field and in the real world. Because of his great expertise, Professor Anzai has been called upon to assist in the renewal of other peace museums in Japan and beyond. The successful extension and renewal in recent years of such museums as the Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Museum,⁴ the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Museum, and the War Remnants Museum in Ho Chi Minh City (Vietnam) have

benefitted from his creative input.

It is a further measure of Professor Anzai's great commitment to the peace museum idea, and firm conviction of the importance of such institutions in promoting a better world, that he regards the Kyoto Museum for World Peace at the Kyoto Campus of Ritsumeikan University as only the first in an ambitious and imaginative peace museum complex, comprising three further components. These other components consist of a Science & Technology Museum for Peace at the University's Biwako Lake Campus, an International Understanding Museum for Peace at Ritsumeikan Asia-Pacific University in Oita Prefecture, and a Digital Resource Museum for Peace Education related to the complex of primary, junior and senior high schools of Ritsumeikan University.⁵

It can be said with little fear of contradiction that in today's world Professor Anzai is the leading figure as regards the conceptualisation and creation of museums for peace. It is not surprising that his country is Japan, and his institutional home Ritsumeikan University. The annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the continuing threat represented by the arsenals of what has worryingly become a growing club of nuclear weapons states, inevitably continue to make nuclear abolition a high profile issue for the country. The two cities, in particular, regard it as their grave responsibility to preserve for all humanity the reality of nuclear war, and to prevent its repetition by striving for the abolition of nuclear weapons and the promotion of world peace. The age-old cry of suffering humanity, 'No more war!', has never been uttered with as much agony, desperation, and passion as by the Hibakushas. Their voices are heard, and their testimonies recorded, for all posterity in the peace museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the first such museums to be established anywhere in the wake of World War II. Education for a broad public about these and related issues - the dangers inherent in current defence and security policies of the nuclear powers, the urgent necessity of new thinking and its translation into more constructive policies, the physical, social and psychological damage caused by violent conflict, the potential for peaceful conflict resolution, the power of nonviolence - remains a prime function of peace museums everywhere. As a nuclear physicist by training, Professor Anzai is more aware than most of what is at stake.

As exemplified at the Kyoto Museum, an important factor in establishing trust between countries is an honest appraisal of the past. Together with Osaka Peace, the Museum was the first in Japan to draw attention to the fact that the country was not only a victim in World War II, but also an aggressor. To the extent that this aspect of recent Japanese history has been unsatisfactorily dealt with in school textbooks, the role of the few museums which are brave enough to squarely address this issue (which remains highly sensitive, both in Japan and in the region) assumes great significance. Japan is of course not the only country whose destiny in the first half of the 20th century was tragically shaped by an aggressive imperialism driven by a strong military. Together with the rest of the educational sector, universities were both victims and instruments of the new, brutal order which suppressed the most fundamental human rights and values, at

home and abroad. Following World War II, Ritsumeikan University recognised its responsibility for the country's debacle, and committed itself to an educational policy based on an absolute respect for human dignity, and which also aimed to infuse the values of international peace and cooperation in all its endeavours. This philosophy readily explains the prominent presence of the Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University, as well as the plans for the complementary museums mentioned earlier.

Taking a wider view of history and of peace museums, the latter institutions are also ideal vehicles for bringing before a large public an aspect of history which has traditionally been ignored in textbooks the world over, namely the struggles and campaigns against war and militarism and for peace and nonviolence. They can be found in all cultures and at all times but their documentation, as well as positive appreciation, is largely confined to the modern period. Indeed, whereas military history and the history of war have a long tradition (and are also well represented in universities, next to national military or war academies), peace history only emerged in the 1960s as a distinct, deliberate approach.⁶ There is a rich tradition and legacy of ideas concerning peace, nonviolence, anti-militarism, internationalism and cosmopolitanism - with its philosophers and practitioners, as well as campaigns and movements, instruments and institutions - and with a complex record of achievements as well as failures. A greater awareness of this aspect of history - which has frequently been deliberately ignored, distorted, and suppressed (because of fears of subversion of established authority, or alleged treachery, or anti-patriotism, or similar reasons) - is a necessary corrective to the one-sided image of history as an inevitable succession of wars and violent confrontations. At the same time, peace history is able to provide intellectual and moral sustenance, and even practical support, for those who believe that a world without war is possible.

Peace museums should therefore also see it as part of their mission to showcase peacemakers, war-resisters, heroes of nonviolence of all kinds, of the past and present, and the causes for which they stood, as a popular and effective means to inform and inspire their visitors. It is of course already the case that many peace museums highlight the ideas and achievements of leading figures from the peace and nonviolence movements, such as Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela and Aung San Suu Kyi. Indeed, museums fully dedicated to a single peacemaker are among the most moving of peace museums. They show that preventing war and violence, and building a world of freedom and justice by nonviolent means, is no less challenging than war. It was the intention of Alfred Nobel, when he instituted in his last will and testament the annual peace prize which bears his name, that 'champions of peace' should be honoured, and be given the means to be able to dedicate the rest of their lives to the wholehearted pursuit of peacemaking. The prehistory of this prize reminds us of the rich ferment of peace ideas and efforts to prevent and abolish war at the time when Nobel drafted his will (1895). It was precisely because he became convinced that the peace movement of his day was not a utopian enterprise, but represented a promise which deserved support, that he - a brilliant scientist, fertile inventor, and hard-nosed businessman - established a prize for peace. It was first awarded

in the opening year of the 20th century. With only few exceptions, those honoured with the prize - individuals as well as institutions - have been among the most dedicated and inspirational actors for peace. Regrettably, and perversely, even *their* work has been largely forgotten.⁷ How much more is this the case for the many other workers in the great cause of world peace, internationalism and nonviolence who may have been nominated for this singular honour, but who did not become Nobel peace laureates. To say nothing of the many nameless, or at least fameless, who have dedicated their lives to the same cause, often at the expense of great personal sacrifice.

Among the most fascinating and important of forgotten 'peace champions' - whose nomination for the first Nobel Peace Prize was strongly supported⁸ - is Jan Bloch (1836-1902), the Polish industrialist, banker, railroad tycoon, and - in the final decade of his life - peace researcher, peace educator, and peace activist. He did not live to see the opening in June 1902 in Lucerne (Switzerland), of his pioneering International Museum of War and Peace, the first peace museum ever established. It deserves to be remembered not merely because its creation was without precedent, but also and especially because of the motivations which inspired its foundation, and the functions assigned to it by its initiator. Such motivations and functions will be readily recognised by those who are involved in peace museums today and who are convinced, as Bloch was, that such institutions are potentially vital instruments for disseminating important information about war and peace to a wide public. In this way, these museums can contribute significantly to the education of public opinion and the development of the public debate, eventually affecting the decision-making process in matters related to national and international security.

Bloch was driven to find ways and means to reach the widest possible audience for his message that, at the end of the 19th century, war had become counter-productive, and that it could no longer be regarded as a rational instrument of statecraft. After a ten-year long period of intensive and highly original, empirically-based research, for which he engaged a team of experts from the military world, he had come to the conclusion that a future great war between the European powers was likely to result in human slaughter as well as material destruction on an unprecedented scale. He predicted that such a war would last years, that any 'victory' would be a Pyrrhic one only, that the pauperisation of the masses which it entailed would result in revolution, and that it would be tantamount to the end of European civilisation. It was for him a foregone conclusion that such a war should be prevented at all costs. In the few remaining years that were left to him, he did more than anyone else to try to convince his contemporaries of the validity of his theory.

Bloch put forth his vision of the nature of a future war in a monumental treatise in six volumes, entitled *The War of the Future in its Technical, Economic and Political Relations*. Originally published in Russian in 1898, the author had it translated and published into several other languages within the next few years⁹. The work proved to be stunningly prophetic, as was recognised already during the very war that Bloch had argued should not be allowed to happen. For instance, when H. G. Wells visited the battlefields in northern

France in 1916, he found that they 'were samples of the deadlock war; they were like Bloch come true'. Twenty years later, Major-General J. F. C. Fuller, one of Britain's leading military theorists, commented that the picture that Bloch had painted of future war was so accurate in every detail that 'had this book remained in manuscript it might easily be questioned as a forgery'. There are various reasons which help to explain why Bloch, alone among his contemporaries, saw so clearly what lay ahead. The fact that he was not a professional soldier, and therefore was not blinkered by any military dogma, or attached to any military values or alleged virtues, is significant. As an outsider, Bloch approached the subject of the nature of future war in a comprehensive fashion which integrated - as suggested in the title of his study - military-technical, financial and economic, as well as social and political aspects.

Although Bloch was an outsider in the sense that he was not a professional soldier, from the start of his business career, he had frequent contacts with the military whose way of thinking was not unknown to him.¹⁰ In all other respects it can be said that Bloch was very much an insider in the sense that he had first-hand knowledge of the various economic and social developments which affected European society in the second half of the 19th century (and which were also affecting the nature of war). Indeed, he played a leading role in the industrialisation of the kingdom of Poland, then under Tsarist rule, especially as a banker and railroad tycoon. It was in his capacity as the leading railroad entrepreneur that Bloch had many contacts with the military hierarchy as strategic considerations played a vital role in the construction of railways. This work provided Bloch with valuable experience and insights in the management of large-scale projects. Thus, when he started to address, towards the end of his career, the question of future war, including the requirements and consequences of large-scale mobilization, he was not a novice but had a keen appreciation of the complexities involved. At the same time, he had established several financial institutions, and had written profusely on financial matters. Bloch's obvious talents - as an economist, successful industrialist, and prolific scholar - resulted in various prestigious official appointments. He was even considered for the post of Russian Finance Minister. By this time, his contacts extended to the highest levels of the Tsarist empire - a significant factor when, in the last phase of his life, when he alone had seen the 'shape of war to come', he raised the alarm.

Among the several factors which influenced Tsar Nicholas II to call what has become known as the First Hague Peace Conference (1899), an important role has to be given to Bloch and his great book. The publication in August 1898 of *The Future of War* and the issuing in the same month of the Tsar's appeal, also in St. Petersburg, is no mere coincidence. Neither is the fact that, in the view of some, the Tsar's two-page appeal constituted an excellent summary of the message contained in the more than 3,000 pages of Bloch's work. The essential themes of both were the need to halt the increasing armaments burden, the danger that spiralling armaments would result in a new and catastrophic war, and the need therefore to develop instruments for the peaceful resolution of international conflict. While it is difficult today to establish the precise nature of Bloch's influence on the

calling of the conference and on the subsequent diplomacy, there is no doubt of the prominent role he played - as a private individual, since he was not part of the official Russian delegation - during the conference when it met in The Hague during ten weeks in the summer of 1899.¹¹ For Bloch, this unprecedented gathering of the leading statesmen, diplomats, and military experts of the world's major countries provided a godsend opportunity to expound his views on the nature of future war and the imperative to prevent it. The four public lectures (illustrated with slides) which he organised were well attended and widely commented upon.

The next great opportunity which presented itself to Bloch to publicise his theory of future war - this time before a large, international audience - was the world exhibition held in Paris in 1900. Using his own money, he intended to construct a large exhibition hall, comprising three floors, in which the visitor would be shown the evolution of war from the past until the present, and projected into the future. Bloch was eager to ensure that the visitor was being made aware of the great differences between wars of the past, and the war which loomed on the horizon. The new weaponry had greatly altered the nature of future warfare, and the impact of the latter on society would be unprecedented. In 1899, in a publication entitled, 'War at the Exhibition in Paris', he set out in great detail the rationale and contents of the exhibition that he was planning. Unfortunately, his plans were frustrated owing to objections from leading Russian military figures, and he had to settle for a much more modest display.

Bloch was well aware of the fact that his voluminous work was never going to enjoy a large readership; he recognised that the studying of his theory as set out there was difficult and strenuous, and would be largely confined to military professionals. They, however, were overwhelmingly conservative in their outlook, and not inclined to accept the revolutionary views of an outsider who argued that war had no future in a society which was not intent on committing suicide. Bloch was therefore eager to reach as large an audience as possible and this required the popularisation of his great work. In order to make it easy for people to grasp his vision of the 'impossible' war, he realised that his theory had to be visualised and this explains his deep immersion in the preparations for the exhibition (and, later, museum). He was in effect an early and efficacious advocate of audio-visual education.

He stipulated that explanations and captions had to be provided in three languages (English, French, and German - all of which he spoke fluently, in addition to his native Polish, and Russian), and that all manner of popular brochures and catalogues had to be prepared in order to support the message of the exhibition, and thereby make it easy for the visitor to grasp his central message that future war would be suicidal and had to be avoided at all costs. He also anticipated that after the world exhibition in Paris, his exhibition would continue to function as a travelling display, visiting first London and then Europe's other major cities. Its resting place would be in a permanent museum in The Hague or Bern. Bloch proposed the former city because of its hosting of the recent peace

conference whereas the Swiss capital city was the home of the Permanent International Peace Bureau (which the international peace movement at its congress in Rome in 1891 had decided to create, and which was under the inspiring leadership of Élie Ducommun¹²).

However, Bloch soon abandoned these plans and returned to his earlier idea for a large exhibition which would be able to do full justice to the importance of the subject. What had not been possible in Paris in 1900, he was now able to realise, in the shape of a permanent museum, in the picturesque city of Lucerne, in the heart of Switzerland. It was here that, in June 1902, his International Museum of War and Peace was festively opened. The facts that his modest display in Paris had been shown in the Swiss section of the Social Sciences exhibition, that Swiss military officers had been entrusted by Bloch with its preparation and execution, and that he knew Lucerne well, all influenced his decision to choose Switzerland, and Lucerne, as the ideal location for his grand educational project. Equally important were such considerations as Switzerland's neutral status and its reputation as a centre for international tourism, together with ready offers of assistance on the part of the municipal authorities. The practical translation of Bloch's ideas into an attractive museum lay largely in the hands of the same military experts who had assisted him in Paris. An impressive range and number of weapons was collected and displayed; their purpose was to illustrate Bloch's thesis that the increasing lethality of weapons and the growing destructiveness of war this brought in its wake, was rendering war - for all thinking people - a thing of the past. In Bloch's words, war itself was testifying against war. Its history bore in it the seeds of its own necessary demise, at least if humanity was to survive. From the day of the museum's opening, and continuing in the following years, a discussion raged in the peace movement about the nature of the museum which for many resembled a war, rather than peace, museum.

It is not necessary to address this issue here as it has been well documented and analysed elsewhere.¹³ Suffice it to say that, with the museum founder having passed away at the beginning of 1902, the museum authorities were able to refer to his instructions as well as overall vision for the museum to defend its content and approach. Over the years, they also accepted and implemented several of the ideas and suggestions put forward by peace advocates in order to make the peace message more explicit. This controversy and debate can be seen to anticipate to some extent the discussion about the concept of peace, and particularly of peace museums, in our time. With his museum, and its prediction of great slaughter and devastation, Bloch hoped to educate his contemporaries about the need to abolish war and to develop instead instruments for the peaceful resolution of international conflict. The museum was meant to warn the world of the dangers of another great war and thereby to contribute to its avoidance, but ironically it became a victim of it, and was dissolved in 1920. An even more catastrophic world war, only two decades later, witnessed the use of atomic weapons. The atomic bomb museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, through the artefacts they display and the gruesome story they tell, keep the memory of these shocking events alive and in this way convey a very vivid and powerful warning for future generations. To that extent, these museums - and many similar ones

which have been created, especially in Japan, to document also the devastation of many of its other cities in air raids - can be seen as anti-war museums which attempt to show the reality of war and in this way stimulate the anti-war sentiment among visitors. Whereas the Lucerne museum anticipated the war of the future, and aimed to forestall it, the museums in Hiroshima and Nagasaki document the atomic war of the past, and aim to prevent its recurrence.

The remembrance of war, and the depiction of its stark reality, as a deterrent to its future occurrence, has always been the central message of both the individual critic of war and the organised peace movement. Whether we read Erasmus's *The Complaint of Peace* (1517), or William Penn's *Essay Towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe* (1693), or Henry Dunant's *A Memory of Solferino* (1862), or Bertha von Suttner's *Lay Down Your Arms!* (1889)¹⁴ - or whether we contemplate the etchings and paintings by Francisco Goya, or Käthe Kollwitz, or Pablo Picasso, or Iri and Toshi Maruki - they all depict the horrors and inhumanity of war, and suggest the possibilities of its elimination. It is especially this last aspect which peace museums have traditionally been slow to address, starting with Bloch's museum (as noted). However, this aspect, concerning the *possibility* of peace, is as vital as the message suggesting the *desirability* of peace. The former can be referred to as comprising the positive peace concept, whereas the documentation and depiction of the costs of wars can be seen as constituting the negative peace concept. Today, peace museums the world over are slowly but surely embracing both aspects which are fully complementary.¹⁵

Even today, when the destructive power of war has come to the end of the trajectory projected by Bloch a century ago, having reached its zenith, war is still often regarded by the general public - as well as by social and political philosophers, to say nothing of the military - as a tragic inevitability, an inextricable part of human history. The First World War, for instance, is frequently portrayed in this way. It is of course true that in all the major European countries everything - not least, the mentality of people - had been prepared to make war inevitable. In this climate, finding all the cards stacked against them, those speaking out against the looming war were indeed unlikely to be heard. Even less, it seems, have they been heard afterwards. Even though the opponents of war were proven right, they are not at all remembered. While posterity mourns the millions of soldiers who died in that war, and lovingly tends their graves - poignant reminders of a great catastrophe - it fails to remember, let alone honour, those who laboured to avert it, first and foremost Jan Bloch. As mentioned before, this is an aspect of history which remains hidden in most countries, and where peace museums can make an important contribution.

They can provide a necessary corrective to the way history is traditionally presented by thus incorporating in their exhibitions the ideas and achievements of the great peacemakers and peace movements. This will also ensure, most importantly, that the rich storehouse of ideas and instruments for avoiding war and promoting peace, as put forward

in the past, as well as regarding the present and the future, will be opened up for the visitor who will thereby become not only better informed but, hopefully, also inspired and encouraged to become actively engaged in work for peace. As long as people remain in ignorance of the rich variety of instruments and institutions, techniques and tools, and methods and mechanisms which can be drawn upon to prevent violent conflict and promote peaceful settlement of disputes, they may remain apathetic or defeatist. The same is true as long as people fail to realise the real power they possess to effect change - even in matters seemingly beyond their control such as in the realm of war and peace. In sum, to the extent that the vital topic of war and peace is inadequately and often one-sidedly dealt with in history school textbooks, and to the extent that peace education, in general terms, is marginalised at best in the educational policies of most countries, peace museums have a vital role to play by addressing these issues and thus filling significant gaps in the education of a large and often confused public.

The gap that Jan Bloch perceived to exist between what his scientific investigations of the nature of future war had revealed,¹⁶ and what was generally believed in society at large - a divide which his museum was meant to help close - is also to be found a century later. This, notwithstanding the intervening catastrophes, especially the two world wars. This fact may be regarded as cause for worry, and some will see in it confirmation of the old adage that history teaches that we do not learn from history. It is no accident that the historical era which has seen the emergence, use and proliferation of nuclear weapons has also witnessed the growth of peace research and peace studies. Their practitioners are unanimous in their view that humanity and nuclear weapons cannot co-exist. It is also no accident that, from the start of the nuclear era, nuclear scientists have been among the most vigorous and outspoken critics of the nuclear arms race¹⁷ - as well as supporters of peace research and peace education. Professor Ikuro Anzai, as noted above, belongs to this tradition of 'concerned atomic scientists'. The world cannot afford not to heed their message as there is unlikely to be another chance.

The legacy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is more important than ever, and both cities continue to be diligent in promoting that legacy worldwide and striving for a world free of nuclear weapons. Their travelling exhibition is a powerful instrument in this process. In order to heighten the impact of the Hiroshima-Nagasaki experience, serious consideration should be given to the creation of permanent atomic bomb museums outside Japan, in order to bring this experience closer to the peoples of the world. Such a museum should be considered for each of the continents, and taking into consideration the fact that resources for peace are scarce (unlike for war), the first 'outpost' should be established in Europe. Europe contains two powers with nuclear weapons, and in several countries there are strong grassroots anti-war and peace movements, including for nuclear abolition (such as in Germany, Italy, Spain and the U.K. as regards the larger countries, and also in Austria, Belgium, Ireland, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries). Public opinion in the European Union is likely to be greatly strengthened and galvanised through the impact of a prominent, high-profile atomic bomb museum in its midst. Such a museum, incidentally,

