

# CONTESTING MEMORIAL SPACES IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC

November 6-7, 2020

Venue: Kyushu University



## Organized by

Kyushu University Border Studies

## Supported by

Asia Week, Kyushu University  
Sustainable Development Goals

British Association of Japanese Studies

## With the Cooperation of

NIHU Area Studies Project for Northeast Asia (NoA-SRC)

"Society and representations of 'territory' in Northeast Asia"



# Contesting Memorial Spaces in the Asia-Pacific

Kyushu University, Fukuoka

November 6-7, 2020

**Organized by**

Kyushu University Border Studies

**Supported by**

Asia Week

Kyushu University  
Sustainable Development Goals

British Association of Japanese Studies

**With the Cooperation of**

NIHU Area Studies Project for Northeast Asia (NoA-SRC)

JSPP Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research “Society and  
representations of 'territory' in Northeast Asia”  
[Project No. 20H01460]

# Day 1

(For Day 2 click [here](#))

# Friday 6 November

08:00 – 08:05    **OPENING REMARKS**

08:05 – 09:50    [PANEL 1: Time to Remember](#)

“Kyoto’s Mimizuka: Transformation and Contestation Across Four Centuries”

- Daniel Milne (Kyoto University)

“Forgetting War and Remembering Progress at the Meiji Shrine”

- Peter Zarrow (University of Connecticut)

“Beyond a “Site of Memory”: The Puppet Emperor Palace Museum”

- Emily Matson (University of Virginia)

“Three faces of an Asian Hero - Commemorating Koxinga in Contemporary China, Taiwan and Japan”

- Edward Vickers (Kyushu University)

*Moderated by* Ran Zwigenberg (Pennsylvania State University)

10:00 – 10:45    **SPECIAL SESSION 1: Heritage Practices - Tangible and Intangible**

In conversation...

- Toshiyuki Kono (Executive Vice-President, Kyushu University & President, ICOMOS)
- Lila Ramos Shahani (former Secretary-General, Philippine National Commission for UNESCO)

*Moderated by* Edward Boyle (Kyushu University)

11:00 – 12:45 [PANEL 2: Geopolitics, Territory and its Memories](#)

“The geopolitics of geocultural pasts”

- Tim Winter (University of Western Australia)

“Nature and Sovereignty Conservation on Japan’s Disputed Islands”

- Paul Kreitman (Columbia University)

“Framing the Contention over South China Sea: Territorial Disputes and Social Movements in the Philippines and Vietnam”

- Ferth Vandenstein Manaysay (Ateneo de Manila University)

“The Demilitarized Zone in Korea and the Legal Status of the United Nations Command”

- Hyein Kim (Seoul National University)

*Moderated by* Nathan Hopson (Nagoya University)

13:30 – 14:55 [PANEL 3: Who Remembers?](#)

“Chinese Sites of Memory: The Recent and the Remote”

- Yujie Zhu (Australian National University)

“Negotiating Historical Memory in an Era of Purity Politics: The case of Komeito’s paradoxical position in Okinawa”

- Anne Mette Fisker-Nielsen (Soka University)

“Japanese Names in the Asan Bay Overlook Memorial Wall: A Critique on Divided Histories”

- Maria Cynthia B. Barriga (Waseda University)

*Moderated by* Shu-Mei Huang (National Taiwan University)

15:05 – 16:45 [PANEL 4: Official Memorials & Legitimizing Memory](#)

“Governing Memorial Desire: a case study in the Netherlands”

- Alana Castro de Azevedo (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

“Competing Memories of Victor's Justice vs Aggressive Warfare at Ichigaya Memorial”

- André Hertrich (Austrian Academy of Sciences)

“Too Close to the Bone: Augmented positionality amongst Ainu repatriation dichotomies”

- Nathaniel Thomas Sydenham (SOAS, University of London)

*Moderated by* Sophie Whiting (University of Bath)

17:00 – 18:30 [SPECIAL SESSION 2: Roundtable Workshop on “This Island is Ours”](#)

Film panel discussion featuring

- Alexander Bukh (Victoria University of Wellington)
- David Leheny (Waseda University)
- Jung-Sun N. Han (Korea University)

*Moderated by* Edward Boyle (Kyushu University)

## PANEL 1: Memory and the State

### “Kyoto’s Mimizuka: Transformation and Contestation Across Four Centuries”

Daniel Milne (Kyoto University)

Research about war memorials tends to focus on those from the 19th and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. However, with direct memory of World War I and II—the primary foci of previous research—all but transformed into history (Hirsch, 2012; Winter, 2009), we are struggling to understand the current and future role of memorial sites in the collective memory of these wars (Fukuma, 2020). Built in 1597, Kyoto’s “ear mound,” or Mimizuka (耳塚), provides an important example of how sites of memorialization can transform meaning for disparate mnemonic communities, and act as points of conflict and contact not only across decades, but across centuries. Mimizuka was built to enshrine ear and nose “war trophies” taken from Koreans and Chinese killed by Japanese armies under Toyotomi Hideyoshi in his unsuccessful and devastating series of invasions of the Korean peninsula at the end of the 16th century (No, 2013). Since its establishment, Mimizuka has taken on multiple roles: a symbol of strength, a site of mourning, a warning of military prowess, a node of diplomacy, an exotic tourist attraction, a reminder of brutality, and a place of peace and reconciliation. Even today, debate continues over how to suitably label or alter the site. This presentation will explore transformations in collective memories of Mimizuka through its representation to Japanese, Korean and Anglophone visitors across a series of historical junctures, ending with its recent integration by Kyoto City into human rights discourse.

## “Forgetting War and Remembering Progress at the Meiji Shrine”

Peter Zarrow (University of Connecticut)

The Meiji Shrine is both a memorial site and a sacred site. Opened in 1920, it is perhaps the single most powerful symbol that links Japan today to the story of its recent past. The Meiji Shrine today is perhaps more important as a part of modern Japan’s civic culture and historical consciousness than it is a sacred site or source of moral education, though it is still all of these things at once. In quasi-official historical memory, Meiji = progress = modernity—a modernity that is truly Japanese and rooted in the past. The main hall (*honden*) and other buildings in the Inner Precinct, and indeed the impressive forest as well, were designed to remind worshippers and visitors of the sacrality and virtue of the Meiji Emperor, while an emperor-centered history of the era (1868-1912) is presented at the Meiji Memorial Picture Gallery in the Outer Precinct. Between the two precincts, the Meiji Shrine as a whole succeeds in providing large and diverse audiences with diverse experiences that range from leisure and sports to political activism. As a mnemonic site, the “Meiji Shrine” is perhaps not so much contested as it is inherently unstable. This paper examines debates surrounding the shrine in the postwar period, focusing on the 1960s and 1970s.

## “Beyond a ‘Site of Memory’: The Puppet Emperor Palace Museum”

Emily Matson (University of Virginia)

The Puppet Emperor Palace in Changchun, China was originally constructed to serve as the imperial palace for the Japanese-installed emperor, Henry Puyi, under the puppet state of Manchukuo (1932-1945). Following the formation of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, however, the site’s complex legacy meant that the site was not revamped as a museum until the 1980s. Adapting the definition of Pierre Nora, as a “site of memory,” the Puppet Emperor Palace Museum (PEPM) was conscientiously erected in a physical location connected to an event of historical import. Over time, though, this study shows that many of the PEPM exhibits have strayed away from the historical “site of memory” function.

The museum curators over time have concealed the “site of memory” function of the PEPM to instead reconstitute it with officially designated symbolic meanings. For instance, to highlight the Chinese Communist Party’s salvific role in the life of Henry Puyi, only a fraction of the 1986 “From Emperor to Citizen” takes place in the PEPM. Furthermore, in detailing Japanese military atrocities in the region, the 2005 “Exhibit on the History of the Occupation of the Northeast” has little to do with the PEPM but much to do with earning the coveted status of a “Model Nationwide Patriotic Education Base.” Thus, if a museum is defined as an “institution of permanence,” the PEPM is an example of an “anti-museum” in the impermanence of its exhibits, conforming to shifting sociopolitical mandates from Beijing.

## “Three faces of an Asian Hero - Commemorating Koxinga in Contemporary China, Taiwan and Japan”

Edward Vickers (Kyushu University)

Koxinga, a half-Japanese, half-Chinese buccaneering general of the mid-17th century, achieved fame as a leader of Ming loyalist resistance to the Manchu invasion of China. Following the triumph of the Manchu Qing dynasty, he moved his forces to Taiwan, where they defeated and expelled the Dutch colonial regime. His family then ruled the island as an independent fiefdom for 20 years until the Qing invaded and incorporated it within their empire. Koxinga has enjoyed a long and varied posthumous career as a deified ancestor figure for Han colonists in Taiwan, a symbol during the colonial period of the island's intimate ties to Japan, and a totem of Chinese anti-imperialist nationalism. This chapter analyses how his heroic reputation has been reinterpreted or reimagined in contemporary Taiwan, mainland China and Japan, focusing especially on his portrayal in museums and public memorials. It argues that political and ideological changes in Taiwan and China have been reflected in major shifts in emphasis in Koxinga's portrayal. Almost universally viewed as a symbol of indissoluble 'Chinese' unity in the 1970s, today interpretations of his significance have diverged. While on the mainland Koxinga still symbolises monolithic ethno-cultural unity of all Chinese people, on Taiwan he has come to symbolise a multicultural Taiwan distinct from China.

## **PANEL 2: Geopolitics, Territory and its Memories**

### **“The geopolitics of geocultural pasts”**

Tim Winter (University of Western Australia)

This paper examines the growing trend towards linking separate sites into a single arc of heritage and collective memory. It takes up the case of the Silk Roads and the rival geocultural histories now appearing on the back of China’s Belt and Road ambitions. In so doing, the paper examines emergent discourses of ‘shared heritage’ within the shifting geopolitical conditions of Asia today. But as these ideas about connected pasts proclaim to celebrate cosmopolitan pasts and a dialogue between peoples, they are infused by national interests and increasingly assertive cultural nationalisms. So who gets to author these transnational collective pasts? And how are we to read the poetics and politics of geocultural heritage in Asia today?

## “Nature and Sovereignty Conservation on Japan’s Disputed Islands”

Paul Kreitman (Columbia University)

On Japan’s island borderlands, the politics of nature conservation and sovereignty conservation have become increasingly intertwined in recent years. On the one-hand, tub-thumping "national identity entrepreneurs" (Bukh, 2020) such as former Tokyo Mayor Ishihara Shintarō have demanded that the Japanese government take steps to protect the environment of disputed islands such as the Senkakus. For their part, Japanese conservationist ecologists have leant their support for these efforts in the hope that it will result in effective action to protect threatened species such as Steller’s Albatross and the Senkaku Mole. The Japanese Ministry of the Environment has also embarked on a project of satellite mapping the vegetative cover of the Russian-occupied Kurile Islands “as one means of demonstrating they are Japan’s inherent territory”. And the Tokyo Metropolitan Government has funded a project to restore coral reefs surrounding Okinotorishima, hoping to boost Japan’s claim that the atoll qualifies as an “island” under the provisions of UNCLOS (and therefore generates a 200-nm exclusive economic zone). Though initiatives such as these have flourished in recent years, nature conservation as a tool of Japanese sovereignty conservation can be traced back to the late 1940s, when anxieties about the nation’s place in the postwar international order intersected with the politics of the U.S. military occupation on the mainland and Okinawa. This talk provides an overview of this recent history, and considers the implications for present and future international relations in East Asia.

## “Framing the Contention over South China Sea: Territorial Disputes and Social Movements in the Philippines and Vietnam”

Ferth Vandenstein Manaysay (Ateneo de Manila University)

This paper analyzes the framing processes which have supported the emergence and development of South China Sea territorial disputes-related social movements in the Philippines and Vietnam. Connecting the international relations literature with the framing perspective on social movements, this paper demonstrates that the region's contested maritime boundaries have generated nationalistic rhetoric and influenced state-civil society interaction in the two countries. The argument of the paper is twofold. First, it argues that there are important similarities and differences between the ways in which activists from the Philippines and Vietnam have been able to raise their questions and grievances about the disputed territories. While activists in both countries have viewed the contested islands as symbols of China's rising dominance over Southeast Asia, there have been points of divergence in the dynamics of their contention. Second, the paper also contends that the Filipino and Vietnamese social movements have deployed parallel frames and protest tactics which have promoted solidarity and alliances between the activists in the two countries. These frames and tactics have enhanced the ability of the protesters to bridge the territorial disputes with related domestic issues and sentiments, including the influx of Chinese tourists and workers in the Philippines and the memories of China's 1979 war with Vietnam. In the context of the constraints facing the governments of the Philippines and Vietnam in managing their disputes with China, this paper suggests that the activists in the two countries have also taken advantage of the maritime rows to strengthen their rhetorical resources beyond the issues surrounding the resource-rich islands.

## “The Demilitarized Zone in Korea and the Legal Status of the United Nations Command”

Hyein Kim (Seoul National University)

Despite the contested memory accrued to the Korean War Armistice Agreement in 1953, the Demilitarized Zone (hereinafter ‘DMZ’) and the United Nations Command (hereinafter ‘UNC’) are at the crossroads for a transformation. The DMZ is being discussed as a natural heritage site, reshaping itself with new foreign policy agenda accentuating ‘peace’. In this context, some recent summit meetings were held in this zone, spawning vibrant political and legal issues. In addition, the UNC, dispatched in DMZ and in charge of compliance and enforcement of the armistice, has become a crucial actor in the discussion of a Peace Treaty on the Korean Peninsula.

The DMZ and the UNC modified along with the Korean, Northeast Asian and global understanding of the Korean War, and thus, seeking the trajectory of the changes could contribute to finding interdisciplinary implications. Delving into the question on the formation of the memories in this border, and the ways to delineate the scope of common understanding for a reconciliation in the future could offer new perspectives for the border studies. Henceforth, an in-depth analysis focusing on the revitalization and reconstruction of the memory regarding the DMZ and the UNC would serve as a steppingstone for the reconceptualization process of the border.

## PANEL 3: Who Remembers?

### “Chinese Sites of Memory: The Recent and the Remote”

Yujie Zhu (Australian National University)

Since the early twentieth century, heritage, museums and memorials have played active roles in constructing and reinterpreting the social memories of nation-states and sub-groups within the national population. In this paper, I examine how modern China remembers its remote and recent past through official heritage/memory devices. What follows is a discussion of the differences and similarities between the ways of remembering and forgetting the recent and remote past. How does the recent past become the remote? How do such changes reflect the ongoing social-political context of modern China? I argue that both of the remote and the recent serve the current political regime to show the idea of progress, development and the sense of continuity. However, while the remote past can sometimes be rewritten or romanticised with a relatively high degree of public consensus, the interpretation of the recent past is not always an easy task. The formation of official memory does not simply concern remembering: certain pieces of evidence of the past need to be erased or re-narrated - a phenomenon of collective amnesia - to facilitate the building of the homogenised, progressive national culture. During this process of creating a unified version of Chinese official memory, certain groups' past has been highlighted, while others, such as minorities including women and victims, have been forgotten.

## “Negotiating Historical Memory in an Era of Purity Politics: The case of Komeito’s paradoxical position in Okinawa”

Anne Mette Fisker-Nielsen (Soka University)

Japan’s security questions and Okinawa’s self-determination have never proven easy to address through a political rhetoric of binary positioning that channel a diverse historical experience into an all-out joined struggle against politics in Tokyo. The “All Okinawa” identity (Flint 2018), symbolically represented by opposition to a new military base construction in Henoko, is far from self-evident however. This is not because the majority of those who take an interest would not rather see a reduction in American bases, but because no simple position of opposition to the Henoko construction can provide the be-all answers to a complex socio-economic and geo-political reality. “You will not find people from Henoko protesting” a local business leader exclaims, “there is no position of being against or for”, a resident from Nago continues, “all those polls that demonstrate how many are ‘for’ or ‘against’ are useless as indicators of what is going on for Okinawan people,” a recently retired man from Naha sums up.

This paper explores the fluctuations in, and complexities of socio-political processes whereby local people negotiate complex historical memory amidst life-work/human-security issues that present central dilemmas rather than moral binary choices. Kōmeitō local politicians stand “against” while their national representatives stand (reluctantly) “for” the Henoko construction. Despite this seeming contradiction, this paper shows a political culture and mindset that challenge the use of historical memory that stirs a binary politics of “purity” rather than “governance of complexity and particularity”. The paper explores the challenge of effectively working to amalgamate otherwise fragmenting and at times hostile local politics bantered by assumptions about the Other’s position narrated as a collective identity that creates abstract assumptions about homogeneity rather than seeing the reality of difference and particularity of space and place (Tuan 2001).

## “Japanese Names in the Asan Bay Overlook Memorial Wall: A Critique on Divided Histories”

Maria Cynthia B. Barriga (Waseda University)

The historiography of the War in the Asia-Pacific is divided in two ways: the history wars that still plague former enemy countries and the conceptual divide between Asia and the Pacific. My paper seeks to cross both by focusing on those who had been straddling them since before the war. Concretely, it zooms in on the Japanese names in Guam’s Asan Bay Overlook Memorial Wall, a memorial for US military service men and Guam locals who suffered or died in the war against Japan.

First, the paper reviews the scholarship on the war in Guam, an island which is presently an unincorporated territory of the United States and identifies with the rest of similarly decolonizing Pacific Islands. Since postwar, US military histories had dominated it. From the 2000s onwards, Chamorro memory studies has critiqued the dominant Liberation narrative, particularly its portrayal of Chamorros as passive loyal subjects. Despite these historiographical developments, however, Guam’s Japanese locals remain absent or otherwise treated as Chamorros-mistaken-as-Japanese.

Next, the paper focuses on the Memorial Wall, specifically on the Japanese names in it. Searching for them in prewar sources and in oral histories, the paper puts them back in prewar Guam—with all its plurality and interweaving local bonds. Elsewhere I argue that the plurality enjoyed by Japanese locals prewar were made impossible by the social-historical borders erected postwar. In this paper, I suggest that contradictions within memorials can point to silenced stories which, if historicized, can lead to alternative approaches to reconciling divided histories.

## PANEL 4: Official Memorials & Legitimizing Memory

### “Governing Memorial Desire: a case study in the Netherlands”

Alana Castro de Azevedo (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

In 2014, the Amsterdam City Council announced its intention to build a new memorial to commemorate the victims of the Holocaust, on a proposal from the Dutch Auschwitz Committee (PVO). This initiative triggered a fierce, still ongoing dispute over the memorialization of the Holocaust, and in particular over the questions of whether, and how it should be commemorated in the public realm. As a result of these very different positions, this memorial became the subject of highly contestation that ultimately led to a legal battle against the Municipality. Aligned with critical approaches to analyzing democracy, public participation, memorialization and conflict I seek to highlight the power asymmetries, antagonisms and drawbacks that characterized the case of Amsterdam. From this perspective, I take account of the different strategies used by actors to influence decisions through opposition and identity politics. I also argue that, in this specific case, the depth of participation varied considerably among them. My preliminary findings suggest that only a handful of actors exerted influence over government decisions. By claiming legitimacy, they managed to merge their sectional interests with a national narrative of ‘shame’ with which the local government had a clear affinity. On the other hand, the interests of local residents have been marginalized. Given their lack of dispositional power, they had limited opportunities to take part in and influence decisions affecting them. This research is particularly timely as Amsterdam and many other cities rethink their policies for memorials, in response to the undesirable outcomes of recent commemorative works.

## “Competing Memories of Victor's Justice vs Aggressive Warfare at Ichigaya Memorial”

André Hertrich (Austrian Academy of Sciences)

When the former building which housed the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE) from 1946-1948 was on the verge of being torn down in the 1990s, conservative and progressive politicians and activists formed a highly unusual coalition to save the historically important building from being demolished. Both groups claimed the former IMTFE courtroom as a historical landmark for commemorating either the Allied's victor's justice and the wronging of Japan's wartime leaders or Japan's war of aggression and war crimes committed by Japanese soldiers.

The exhibition which finally was realized at Ichigaya Memorial's focusses clearly on the Imperial Japanese Army's military academy's rich tradition. Instead of being highlighted, the Tokyo Trial appears to be sidelined as the figurative "elephant in the room". But looking closely at the few items related to the trial, it becomes very clear that the exhibition strongly favors the notion of IMTFE being victor's justice.

In my presentation I will give an overview of how the IMTFE and the Japanese defendants are being depicted at Ichigaya Memorial and how this differs from how the Nuremberg Trial against German war criminals is commemorated in Germany at "Memorium Nuremberg Trials". It is precisely this German role model progressive Japanese activists have in mind, when they are still hoping to remodel the exhibition at Ichigaya one day.

## “Too Close to the Bone: Augmented positionality amongst Ainu repatriation dichotomies”

Nathaniel Thomas Sydenham (SOAS, University of London)

This paper discusses the sincerity of the newly opened Ainu museum and park in Hokkaido – named Upopoy – which purports to serve as a national centre for the revival and revitalization of Ainu culture. The incorporation of a memorial site set within the museum grounds bolsters an antagonistic historical representation that harks back to the trend of Japanese Universities collecting human remains under the guise of scientific progress. The official website description of the Ainu as an invaluable culture in Japan that remains under threat, employs a familiar ethnological trope, but information about the colonial relations between Japan and the Ainu, which have brought about such a ‘threat’ is dubiously missing. A major theme of this investigation is the application of anthropological approaches towards the study of death and mourning, addressed by a comparative analysis of memory and mortuary practice within modern-day Japan. Creating a theoretical reference point by employing the Japanese memorialization concept of ‘unrelated spirits’ (*muenbotoke*) the article expostulates on the national government’s interventions, towards the museum and toward the Ainu, as promoting the antipode to traditional Japanese ancestorhood. Thus, reducing any symbolic or sympathetic gesture towards contemporary Ainu-Japanese relations and denying future capacity for indigenous epistemologies and mnemonic agency to be constructed. Interrogating if this facility can veritably provide an apt and dignified memorial space for Ainu ancestral remains, the article concludes by questioning if such hidden symbolism may be interpreted as a precarious attempt to disenfranchise and detach Ainu heritage from Japanese history further.

## **SPECIAL SESSION II: Roundtable Film Workshop**

**This Island is Ours: Defending Dokdo/Retrieving Takeshima**  
(Contented Production 2016, 52 minutes)

The documentary is from a collaboration between Alexander Bukh and Nils Clauss, a Seoul-based professional film maker. It forms part of a broader research project that focuses on territorial disputes and civic activism in Northeast Asia. The territorial dispute between Japan and Korea over the ownership of Dokdo/Takeshima islets resurfaced in the early 2000s. The dispute is not limited to state to state relations as in both countries there are citizens' groups actively engaged in protesting, lobbying and educating the public. Who are these people? What do they do in their everyday life? What motivates them to engage in this kind of activism? How do they see the other side? The usually sensational media coverage of their activities does not answer these questions. This documentary offers some answers by providing the individual activists with a platform to talk about themselves, their activism and their views of the other country and people. The film focuses on two activists – one from Korea's National Federation for Protecting Dokdo and another from Japan's Association for Protecting Prefectural Territory Takeshima.

[The film will be available for viewing from a week prior to the conference, details to follow]

### **ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS**

**ALEXANDER BUKH** is a Senior Lecturer in International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. Alexander has published extensively on Japan's national identity, Japan's foreign policy and territorial disputes.

**DAVID LEHENY** is Professor at the Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University. David's research looks at Japanese Politics, East Asian Security, and the role of Culture in International Relations.

**JUNG-SUN HAN** is Professor at the Division of International Studies, Korea University. An expert in modern and contemporary Japanese history and culture, Han has worked on interwar and wartime Japanese political thought and the visual culture of modern Japan.

# Day 2

# Saturday 7 November

08:30 – 10:15 [PANEL 5: New Spaces of Memory](#)

“Contesting Memories Online: The Case of the ‘Comfort women’ page on English Wikipedia”

- Jonathan Lewis (Hitotsubashi University)

“Visualising Korea: The Politics of the Statues of Peace”

- David Chapman (The University of Queensland)

“The Memory and Legacy of Shinto Shrine Sites in Seoul: The Geography of Colonial Religious *Topoi*”

- John G. Grisafi (Yale University)

“Stolen Ainu Remains as Sites of Memory”

- Michael Roellinghoff (University of Tokyo)

*Moderated by* Paul Richardson (University of Birmingham)

10:30 – 12:15 [PANEL 6: From the Margins](#)

“Hayashi Fumiko’s In-betweens: Gendering Sites of War Memory”

- Linshan Jiang (University of California, Santa Barbara)

“Release Hiroshima from History? Denationalization of Memory in the film *Things Left Behind*”

- Nobuyuki Nakamura (Setsunan University)

“Reframing *Kakure Kirishitan*’s religious heritage as a landscape of multicultural coexistence”

- Tinka Delakorda Kawashima (Hiroshima University)

“Commodifying cultures, negotiating identities: the reproduction and performance of the Cordilleran cultural heritage in Tam-awan Village, Philippines”

- Fernan Talamayan (National Chiao Tung University)

*Moderated by* Steven Ivings (Kyoto University)

**13:30 – 15:15**    [PANEL 7: Narrating the Nation](#)

“Marcos, People Power, and Duterte: The People Power Monument, the Libingan ng mga Bayani, and the Problem of Historical Revisionism”

- Kerby C. Alvarez (University of the Philippines Diliman)

“Memory, Representation and ‘Public History’: Focusing on the Japanese Military ‘Comfort Women’ Statue and Museum Exhibition”

- Hyein Han (Sunkyunkwan University)

“The politics of Pacific War memorialization in Thailand’s *Victory Monument* and the Philippines’ *Shrine of Valor*”

- John Lee Candelaria (Hiroshima University)

“Tracing the inveterate (post-)colonial controls: Queen’s Pier in Hong Kong and the ‘Cape No. 7’ in Hengchun, Taiwan”

- Liza Wing Man Kam (University of Göttingen)

*Moderated by* Hyun Kyung Lee (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

**15:30 – 17:15**    [PANEL 8: Transborder Memorialization](#)

“Borders, Monuments and (Construction of) Sites of Cross-Border Memory in Europe. From Places of Conflict to Places of Cooperation (and back again)”

- Jarosław Jańczak (Adam Mickiewicz University)

“Shifting Memoryscape of the Pacific War: On Two Japanese Veterans’ Projects in Palau, Micronesia”

- Shingo Iitaka (University of Kochi)

“Cemeteries, Concrete, Connectivity: Memories of Infrastructured Spaces in Northeast India”

- Mirza Zulfiqur Rahman (Institute of Chinese Studies, Delhi)

“The remains of war: building postwar relationships when enemies are buried together”

- Alison Starr (University of Queensland)

*Moderated by* Mark Frost (UCL)

**17:15 – 17:30**    **CONFERENCE WRAP-UP**

## PANEL 5: New Spaces of Memory

### “Contesting Memories Online: The Case of the ‘Comfort women’ page on English Wikipedia”

Jonathan Lewis (Hitotsubashi University)

Pentzold argues that the online encyclopedia Wikipedia functions as a global memory place where memories are constructed through communication. While Wikipedia has been celebrated as a socially useful outcome of participatory culture, conflict is one of its main driving forces, as editors seek to have the current version of an article reflect their views. Wikipedia articles about historic events are thus important global sites where overt and competing assertions of national identity are made. This paper uses quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze one such site, the English article “Comfort women.”

Since its creation in 2003 the article has seen numerous “edit wars”, and the arguments on the article’s Talk page run to about 200,000 words. The main bones of contention have been the numbers of comfort women, the nature of coercion involved, the role played by the Japanese state, and the reliability of different sources. Arguments often deteriorate into mutual name-calling, while both sides appeal to the myriad of Wikipedia rules.

I address questions derived from previous research including Jemileniak’s ethnographic study of conflict on Wikipedia. Have editors on both sides of the “Comfort women” disputes been confrontational and committed (in which case, Jemileniak argued, consensus is unlikely to be reached)? Have editors from opposing camps sometimes reached agreement on certain points, or have arguments simply become exhausted, giving “victory” to the most persistent editors? Have mainstream views (in this case, not those of the Japanese right) tended to prevail in the end?

## “Visualising Korea: The Politics of the Statues of Peace”

David Chapman (The University of Queensland)

In 2015, the issue of the Japanese imperial army’s system of military sexual servitude/military prostitution became central to concerns in South Korean and Japanese relations. After the signing of a 2015 agreement meant to resolve disputes between the two countries, the Statue of Peace, an effigy of a young Korean woman, was reproduced in both physical form and through digital media expanding its visual presence in both the material and virtual worlds. In this study, I examine events between 2015 and 2018 through the lens of visual politics and argue that, in order to fully understand the power and political impact of the Statue of Peace it is crucial to assess it not only as a physical effigy as is commonly done, but also importantly as a form of digital reproduction. In doing so, I highlight that the mechanical reproduction of the Statue of Peace freed it from limitations as a physical representation to interact in more diverse contexts and locations as an additional tool of resistance against the Japanese government’s proposal and the Park government’s complicity with the 2015 agreement. This study adds to the analytical toolbox of visualising Korea with the aim of providing greater insight on an important issue facing South Korea and its relationship with Japan.

## “The Memory and Legacy of Shinto Shrine Sites in Seoul: The Geography of Colonial Religious *Topoi*”

John G. Grisafi (Yale University)

For nearly five decades (1897–1945) before and during the era of Japanese colonial rule of Korea, Japanese settlers and colonial authorities erected Shinto shrines in and around the Korean capital of Seoul. The shrines may be gone from the present-day South Korean capital, and few have been memorialized, but their traces remain. They are found not only as physical signs in the land and the space, but also in the cultural memory and the historiography at various scales, including that of the local spaces, of the city, and of Korea. My research has utilized digital humanities methodology to map not merely historic data points of shrine sites, but instead to map the legacy and memory of these sites in Seoul. Based on this research, I explain how and to what extent former Shinto shrines persist as *topoi*, places of the past, in Seoul today, and how geography influences the place they occupy in historical and cultural memory. Using instructive example sites, I detail the varying ways in which Shinto shrines, seemingly all but erased from the map, continue to exist as places of the past and how they have been reframed and transformed as sites of contested memory and layered history regarding Korea’s colonial and post-colonial past.

## “Stolen Ainu Remains as Sites of Memory”

Michael Roellinghoff (University of Tokyo)

In this presentation, I will discuss the Ainu redress movement which demands the return of Ainu skeletal remains stolen from gravesites across Hokkaido. These bones were stolen in the period between the 1890s and the 1930s either by academic excavation teams or by thieves who later sold them to universities and museums. Bones, and particularly crania, were studied and sometimes put on public display at such institutions. This theft (as well as the purportedly “scientific” craniometric research produced) was inextricably linked to wider settler colonial power structures and epistemologies. As this practice has become problematized, institutions have frequently opted to “forget” the history of this practice, keeping bones hidden away in university basements or other obscure places. Ainu activists and a growing number of Japanese allies have vocally campaigned for their return and for public acknowledgement of this practice. For many Ainu, the reticence of these institutions to commit to redress is deeply troubling, if not traumatic in and of itself. There is, moreover, intense dissatisfaction amongst some activists over the “compromise” which sees the continued maintenance of Ainu remains as public property in state-run institutions such as the National Ainu Museum. I will argue that the stolen Ainu bones are sites of memory through which the *longue durée* of Japanese settler colonial history is contested, and that Ainu activism aims to reveal such occluded histories, thereby disrupting the colonial amnesia which maintains asymmetrical power structures in Hokkaido to this day.

## PANEL 6: From the Margins

### “Hayashi Fumiko’s In-betweens: Gendering Sites of War Memory”

Linshan Jiang (University of California, Santa Barbara)

*Front* and *Northern Shore Corps* are two best-sellers of war reportage during the Second Sino-Japanese War, in which Hayashi Fumiko recorded her war experience as she was marching with the Japanese army to invade Hankou in 1938. She kept diaries on the battlefield and published them as books after returning to the home front, which came to be read as war propaganda. Through writing, her personal memories are transformed into collective memories and circulated among the Japanese community. My paper addresses questions of memory, writing, and war propaganda by focusing on the “peculiar site” Hayashi occupies on the battlefield. The battlefield is usually seen as a masculine space where bodies are directed towards combat, and the everyday necessities as a human being—eating, bathing, excretion, etc.—are neglected as secondary. Hayashi, as the only female writer, occupies an in-between space, and thereby illuminates distinct ways in which bodies are mobilized and disciplined on the battlefield. As a woman, she never joined the combat, but she heard the gunfire; she never killed, but she witnessed killing and the aftermath of the battlefield full of corpses. In this militant space, she created a humane and intimate space with Japanese soldiers, journalists, and even Chinese people working for the Japanese army. Her existence on the battlefield and her war memories through the act of writing interrupt the nationalistic and masculine discourse of war and the mainstream ideology of a female’s positionality within the physical war zone and the literary space of war literature.

## “Release Hiroshima from History? Denationalization of Memory in the film *Things Left Behind*”

Nobuyuki Nakamura (Setsunan University)

The documentary film *Things Left Behind*, directed by Linda Hoaglund, featured Ishiuchi Miyako's photo exhibition ひろしま *Hiroshima*, which was held at the UBC Museum of Anthropology in Vancouver. The photo exhibition, focusing on the relics left by *hibakusha*, allegedly sought to free Hiroshima from history, an aim shared by Hoaglund's film. This research aims at clarifying how they tried to free Hiroshima from history and what that means.

Memories have been entangled, cohabitated, reconciled, contested, conflicted, and negotiated across borders in global memory space — and several memories which appeared in the film were no exception. For example, the film showed two women who felt guilty regarding Hiroshima. First, Debra Sparrow, a Dene artist, made the opening remarks at the photo exhibition because the Dene tribe, one of the First Nations in Canada, continue to express remorse for Hiroshima and Nagasaki; uranium Dene men mined in the 1940s was used in the atomic bombs. The other woman is Andrea Geiger, a historian whose father was part of the Manhattan Project. These memories of the Dene and Geiger conflict with national histories of the Manhattan Project in the U.S., U.K., and Canada, which justify the atomic bombings on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Ishiuchi's photos at the exhibition were displayed without any information about the owners of the relics. In the film, every visitor imagined what type of person would inhabit those lives. This process of reproducing memories of Hiroshima germinated sympathy and sorrow toward *hibakusha* as well as an aversion against war and military actions. History as “centralized” memories often reveals people killed due to a certain types of identity or attribute, so the denationalization of the *hibakusha* undertaken by Ishiuchi's photo exhibition tries to re-interpret the memory of Hiroshima.

## “Reframing Kakure Kirishitan’s religious heritage as a landscape of multicultural coexistence”

Tinka Delakorda Kawashima (Hiroshima University)

The Nagasaki World Heritage Site consists of twelve locations, including the sacred sites and villages of Hidden Christians (*Kakure Kirishitan*). The *Kirishitan* villages, however, were not on the UNESCO Tentative list in the first application when the Catholic churches and monuments, i.e. the tangible heritage, prevailed. This paper examines ways in which various interested actors - from UNESCO and the Agency for Cultural Affairs (*Bunkachō*) bureaucrats to local administration and stakeholders such as, priests, practitioners, tourism and other entrepreneurs - framed the *Kakure Kirishitan*’s religious heritage in Hirado in the category of “cultural landscape”. Inventing multiple “stories”, the *Kakure Kirishitan*’s religious heritage was reframed as “fossil landscape representing multiple cultures in coexistence”. As a positive result of this classification, *Kirishitan*’s interaction with the environment, such as cultivating rice fields, using water, cutting trees, and everyday life became highlighted alongside their religious practices. However, this new “inclusive picture” had “excluded” the living *Kakure Kirishitan*s from the bid. Various interests affected such a conclusion. The paper, based on participant observation and interviews with *Kakure Kirishitan* and other inhabitants of Hirado, as well as the local tourism association and government officials, examines possible reasons for the emphasis on multicultural coexistence and exclusion of *Kakure Kirishitan* and how this emphasis was reflected in the processes of heritage-making at the regional and/or national level.

## “Commodifying cultures, negotiating identities: the reproduction and performance of the Cordilleran cultural heritage in Tam-awan Village, Philippines”

Fernan Talamayan (National Chiao Tung University)

Tourism, as a practice, involves a projection and performance of identity in response to what the market desires. Museums, on the other hand, convey a message through the collection, preservation, and exhibition of tangible and intangible cultural heritage. While the coverage of the two varies, their principles and operation often overlap, especially in the case of indigenous tourism and living museums. This paper examined the reproduction of the Cordilleran cultural heritage in Tam-awan Village, a “living museum” envisioned to preserve and promote the Cordilleran culture and identity. Using a qualitative and mixed methods approach, it looked into the connections between colonial stereotypes, the commodification of culture, the negotiation of identity, and the emergence of paradoxical perspectives and behaviors in a contemporary living museum. The study found that in the reproduction of colonial stereotypes, a new culture is generated—one in which the marginalized are simultaneously objectified, commodified, and empowered.

## PANEL 7: Narrating the Nation

“Marcos, People Power, and Duterte: The People Power Monument, the Libingan ng mga Bayani, and the Problem of Historical Revisionism”

Kerby C. Alvarez (University of the Philippines Diliman)

This paper analyzes two events that are emblematic of the present challenge of historical revisionism in the Philippines. First, in March of 2016, two months ahead of the national and local elections in the Philippines, a vandal defaced the People Power Monument, a site dedicated to the historic revolution of February 1986 (popularly known as EDSA Revolution) that toppled the dictatorial government of Ferdinand Marcos (1972-1986), with the words “*Marcos pa rin!*” (Marcos forever!). Second, in November 2016, the nation witnessed the burial of Marcos in the *Libingan ng mga Bayani*, a government cemetery devoted to those considered “heroes” by the standard of the state – soldiers, public officials and servants.

These events occurred during the early phase of another politically volatile administration in the country’s post-EDSA era. The election and administration of Rodrigo R. Duterte as president of the Philippines is a turning point in the Marcos family’s decades-long attempt to return to power, and a systematic plan to historically sanitize the Martial Law years through a complete denial of their patriarch’s plundering of the nation’s coffers and state-sanctioned human rights violations. Since the campaign period in 2016, Duterte has publicly uttered his admiration of Marcos. And he has, so far, successfully laid down measures to discredit reframe the “EDSA” narrative and has reinvented the authoritarian regime of Marcos as a justification to his version of an iron-fist rule in national politics.

## “Memory, Representation and ‘Public History’: Focusing on the Japanese Military ‘Comfort Women’ Statue and Museum Exhibition”

Hyein Han (Sunkyunkwan University)

The discussion on the public discourse concerning damages caused by Japanese imperialism has primarily focused on the Japanese military “comfort women” and the victims of “forced labour” during its colonial rule. However, the memory and “commemoration” of Japanese military “comfort women” have been represented through the clash of (contradicting) post-nationalistic and nationalistic methodologies. Civil society movements concerning Japanese military “comfort women” have emphasized the universal and ethical grounds of violence against women and has sought for (post-nationalistic) international solidarity, however, at the same time, also demonstrate a very nationalistic approach to the “comfort women” issue concerning the creation of a public discourse against Japan. The great example of this is the comfort woman statue (or statue of peace). The statue of the comfort woman was designed and created in 2009 to resemble one of Korea’s renowned anti-Japanese independence activist, Yu Gwan-sun. Thus, the statue of this 17-year-old girl who died in prison for fighting against the Japanese, has now become the representation of a young “comfort woman.” Moreover, it is not a coincidence that House of Sharing (*Nanumejib* or 나눔에집), one of the well-known museum for the Japanese military “comfort women,” was established in the form of a traditional Korean house, which exemplifies the national memory of the houses in the 1970s during the height of anti-Japanese sentiments. Therefore, even though civil society movements have tried to emphasize the post-nationalistic, universal elements of the violence against women, the way in which “comfort women” is being remembered and represented in Korea has become increasingly nationalistic. This presentation will attempt to analyze the methodology in which the Japanese military “comfort women” is being remembered and represented, and explore the reasons for this clash between nationalism and post-colonialism with regards to the representation of “comfort women” in Korea.

## “The politics of Pacific War memorialization in Thailand’s *Victory Monument* and the Philippines’ *Shrine of Valor*”

John Lee Candelaria (Hiroshima University)

While Japan’s imperialist adventure in Southeast Asia during the Pacific War is considered as a distinct period of hardship, starvation, violence, and oppression, it is also an important albeit contentious juncture in the history of the region, setting off nationalist movements and accelerating the struggle for independence. The war left an indelible mark in the region’s national identities that are apparent in the representation and memorialization of the Pacific War through heritage in the region, such as monuments and memorials. But how is the war memorialized in a region that had varying experiences and interpretations of the past? Why is memorialization more vibrant in some and restrained in others? This paper explored the politics behind the production and memorialization of the war by examining Thailand’s *Victory Monument*, an ambiguous memorial to Thai war heroes, and the Philippines’ *Shrine of Valor*, a historical shrine complex dedicated to Filipino and U.S. soldiers of the Pacific War. Highlighting or silencing remembrance is a matter of politics, agenda, and the benefits that commemoration brings to the state. By analyzing heritage sites such as monuments and memorials, this study illustrated that downplaying or highlighting commemoration served state aims—in Thailand, the inward justification and outward restraint were borne out of the challenging positions the state has taken in the past, while in the Philippines, memorialization as a state enterprise was undertaken to serve state agenda.

## “Tracing the inveterate (post-)colonial controls: Queen’s Pier in Hong Kong and the ‘Cape No. 7’ in Hengchun, Taiwan”

Liza Wing Man Kam (University of Göttingen)

The paper reflects on how colonial education and spatial design— as ideological and body control systems—resulted in two current physical spatial settings in Hong Kong and Taiwan and how such control sustains. Exemplified with the two captioned colonial spaces, the paper investigates their respective people’s sentiments (related) to the colonial past as expressed in the continual processes of the spatial production. Probing into Lefebvre’s and Soja’s ideas on spatial trialectics and Thirdspace connecting to A. Assmann’s work on collective memory, the paper questions, if and how, such control systems relate to the current rising Hong Kong and Taiwan identities.

Queen’s Pier was a significant site of power enunciation for the British colonisers before 1997. Six governors set their first steps in the colony on the pier for their inauguration ceremonies. The pier’s demolition in 2007, however, propagated reflections on the limits which both (post-)colonial authorities imposed on the colonised Hongkongers. In conserving the pier, Hongkongers’ demonstrations evolved from gentle petitioning to physically occupying bulldozers. Such turn incubated the forthcoming Umbrella Movement (2014) and Anti-Extradition Movement (2019). In Hengchun, ‘Ah Ka’s House’ as popular touristic spot purportedly romanticizes the Japanese colonial past. Together with the re-appropriated colonial Shinto shrine elements and Shipai (Stone Plaque) Park, the neighbourhood showcases how political paradigm shifts since the 1940s have shaped different Taiwanese generations’ perceptions to the past, and how this propagates further in self-identity formation.

The paper disentangles the colonial sentiments from its causal ideological/spatial controls and wrestles with the question: how does the perpetual (post-) colonial control in mind and body essentially relates to, hinders and/or facilitates people’s identification process in these two (former) colonies?

## **PANEL 8: Transborder Memorialization**

**“Borders, Monuments and (Construction of) Sites of Cross-Border Memory in Europe. From Places of Conflict to Places of Cooperation (and back again)”**

Jarosław Jańczak (Adam Mickiewicz University)

Cross-border cooperation nowadays plays a crucial role in Europe and is very attractive for the local authorities of border units and for border communities. It is especially visible in border twin towns—settlements located directly on a state border, and having a similar partner on the other side. This paper aims at filling a gap that exists in border studies by answering the question of how the idea of European integration and cross-border integration is symbolically manifested in the border relations of these towns, and how border territorial units employ this in their development strategies, by scale change. The research is conducted in the context of collective efficacy theory, with symbols representing specific ideas considered to be explanatory elements belonging to two variables stimulating change: spatial dynamic and supportive institutions. It is asserted that border conflict and cooperation legacies frame the context for symbolic policies of the sites of memory, alongside the duration of EU membership. The assumptions are verified against actual objects in public spaces, as well as in non-material symbols. This leads to the identification of three models of cross-border symbolism and also of the phenomenon of border “symbolic re-demarcation”.

## “Shifting Memoryscape of the Pacific War: On Two Japanese Veterans’ Projects in Palau, Micronesia”

Shingo Iitaka (University of Kochi)

This study examines Japanese veterans’ return visits to the former Pacific War sites and these visits’ emergence as memory projects that reflect changing memoryscape of Japanese wartime involvement in Palau, Micronesia. Particularly, projects by two prominent Japanese figures, both survivors of the Battle of Angaur of the Palau Islands in Micronesia, are investigated. The first memory project is by Hiroshi Funasaka, who organised one of the earliest nongovernmental memorial tours to Palau in 1968 to conduct memorial services (*ireisai*) and to build war memorials (*ireihi*). Funasaka had profoundly influenced the ensuing return visit activities by other eager Japanese including the Pacific War veterans, bereaved families and former immigrants to Palau. The other project, the Angaur State Nature Park Project, was launched in 2001 by Yōji Kurata when the Japanese memorial tours to Palau were declining. Kurata designed an ecotourism packages combining war-site tours to attract the Japanese population with no direct wartime experiences. These projects were assisted by Palauans of Japanese ancestry: their fathers were former Japanese immigrants. Both of these projects, however, in an overall scale have failed to involve the indigenous society, while Palauans have different trajectories for remembering the Pacific War.

## “Cemeteries, Concrete, Connectivity: Memories of Infrastructured Spaces in Northeast India”

Mirza Zulfiqur Rahman (Institute of Chinese Studies, Delhi)

Jairampur, a sleepy town on the Assam-Arunachal Pradesh border in Northeast India's easternmost fringes, holds important sites, such as cemeteries, concrete roads and aspirations of connectivity, serving as remnants and memories of World War II. The Chinese labourers toiled away in inhospitable conditions to build the historic Stilwell Road, described often as a 'mile-a-man' road, in order to open an alternative supply route to counter the invading Japanese during World War II. The borderlands of Northeast India and Myanmar are dotted with several cemeteries of soldiers and labourers, with a prominent one in Jairampur, however in ruins. The Stilwell Road as a concrete infrastructured space, in ruination, is likened to a cemetery, of the hundreds who died building it, and of the connectivity aspirations of borderland communities.

While there is a complete turnaround of sorts in the geopolitical configurations in Northeast India, eight decades on, where Japanese investments are allowed, and the Chinese are abhorred, particularly dictated by the security dilemmas of postcolonial India. Northeast India however remains jacketed in the collective memories of such infrastructured spaces of World War II vintage, falling into ruination and disrepair over the decades of neglect. At the same time, connectivity projects and concrete ribbons of roads are being pushed and built in various other alignments, even if they remain 'pickled' infrastructure for the borderland communities of Northeast India.

## “The remains of war: building postwar relationships when enemies are buried together”

Alison Starr (University of Queensland)

On a cold winter's morning in August 1944, Japanese prisoners of war staged a mass escape attempt from the No 12 prison camp, nearby to a small rural Australian town. Known as the Cowra Breakout or Cowra Incident, the event resulted in the burial of hundreds of Japanese prisoners and four Australian soldiers in a shared war cemetery.

The Japanese war dead have remained in the Cowra War Cemetery, the sole officially recognised war cemetery outside of Japan, for over seventy five years, with the cemetery the focus for the Cowra-Japan reconciliation relationship. As the events of the Asia-Pacific war event move beyond the primary sources of survivor testimony and on to post-memory (Hirsch 2008) and the landscape of shared cultural memories (Ashplant et al 2001), it is timely to investigate the role of war cemeteries as sites of memory, and as settings for the politics of post-war reconciliation relationships and memorial diplomacy (Graves 2015).

With many Asia-Pacific war dead still in unknown locations, the importance of having a known and designated location for war dead within a former enemy's borders is also examined, highlighting the role of a war cemetery as a mourning and commemoration space that sanctions the remembrance of war dead from both sides of conflict. Further consideration is given to acknowledging the tangibility of place as a focus for grieving (Winter: 1995:79), when its historical and cultural significance is claimed by a variety of actors, and continuously negotiated within a transcultural setting.