

For Exploring the Narrative of Humanity beyond National Borders¹

—Through the Bomb Earring Controversy—

Akiko Fukumoto

In August 1999, media in Japan and the U.S. reported a controversy between *Gensuikyo*² and the U.S. National Atomic Museum³ about atomic bomb earrings (A-bomb, hereinafter) (Hanaoka, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c; Roberts, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c; “Sales of atomic bomb earrings,” 1999). Figure 1 is a picture of the bomb earrings sold at the Museum. The earrings are shaped like the A-bombs that were dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Being designed for the 50-year anniversary of dropping the A-bombs, the earrings had been sold at the museum since 1995 (“U.S. National Atomic Museum,” 1999, “Gensuikyo protested,” 2001). They were the most popular souvenir at the museum shop and sold on the Internet as well (Roberts). Members of *Gensuikyo* found the earrings and other A-bombs related items at the museum’s web site. On August 4, 1999, *Gensuikyo* made an announcement of raising a protest against the U.S. government about selling the earrings. The basis of their protest was that they defamed the dead and living victims of the A-bombs (Hanaoka).

The National Atomic Museum changed its official stance on selling the earrings before and after August 6 in 1999, the anniversary of the U.S. dropping the A-bomb on Hiroshima. Before that day, the Museum Director Jim Walter expressed his intention to keep selling the earrings, denying a link between the earrings and their approval of using nuclear weapons against human beings (Roberts, 1999c). Walter, however, changed his words on August 6 considering the sensitivity of the issue and the sentiment of the people in Japan (Roberts,



Figure 1. A-bomb earrings sold
at The National Atomic Museum
(The Hiroshima Weekly, 1999)⁴

1999a, 1999b; “Bomb earrings,” 1999; “Bomb earrings, stop being sold,” 1999). Also, the museum received over 300 e-mails commenting on the sale of the earrings, and a slight majority of them were against the sale of the earrings at the museum (Roberts, 1999a). Although the media dropped the controversy about the earrings from their agenda after August 8, the general public in Japan and the U.S. discussed the earrings among themselves on the Internet.

The gap in interpretations about the use of the A-bombs has surfaced several times in 1990s within the U.S. and between Japan and the U.S. The canceled design of a postal stamp with the mushroom cloud by the United States Postal Office in 1995 is one example. Another example is the controversy about the Enola Gay exhibition at the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum in 1994–1995. Further, the U.S. opposed including Hiroshima Peace Memorial in the World Heritage List (UNESCO, 1996). These cases illustrated conflict about whose voice and power should be reflected on historical representation and collective memory.

In addition to those cases, an opinion poll in 1995 illustrated the gap in interpretation between the Japanese people and the U.S. Americans regarding the use of the A-bombs. CBS/NYT/TBS and WST/Nikkei conducted a poll for the occasion of the 50-year anniversary of the end of WWII (Kondo, 1997 quoted in Tadokoro, 2000). Its results contrasted how the people in Japan and the U.S. interpreted the use of the A-bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki: whether it was morally wrong, or whether it was necessary to end the Pacific War earlier to save people’s lives. In Japan, 89 percent of the people who were polled regarded the use as morally wrong, and 66 percent of them did not consider the U.S. actions as necessary to end the war. In contrast, 56 percent of the U.S. Americans who were polled considered that the use was not wrong morally, and 68 percent of them agreed with its necessity to end the war. Overall, the interpretation regarding the use of the A-bombs and its moral legitimacy were opposite between the sampled Japanese people and the U.S. American.

Several scholars pointed out the importance of managing the issues of the A-bombs and collective memories of the Pacific War in Japan and the U.S. Tadokoro (2000) warned that the A-bombs and related moral issues hold the highest potential that might damage the Japan-U.S. relationship. Gong (2001) advocated the significance of collective memories in the era of the Internet because people reinforce their own interpretations, reproduce past wounds in the present time, and form their views on relationship with others for the future. Accordingly, this study reviews how the gap between Japan and the U.S. has been constructed historically and, and examines how the gap is reflected on the bomb earring controversy in 1999 to explore keys for future dialogue on collective memory of the A-bombs.

Construction of a Gap

How has the gap between the Japanese and the U.S. Americans been constructed about collective memory of the A-bombs? This section reviews possible social factors that might have contributed to the gap starting from three narratives on Hiroshima by Dower (1996). The three narratives he identified are “Hiroshima as victimization,” “Hiroshima as triumph,” and “Hiroshima as tragedy.” Each of the narratives sheds a light on a different dimension of Hiroshima, the A-bombs, and the Pacific War. “Hiroshima as victimization” reflects the master memory widely shared among the Japanese people⁵. It is a story below the mushroom cloud and about innocent people’s sufferings. In contrast, “Hiroshima as triumph” reflects the mainstream meta-narrative of the war in the U.S.⁶ It starts from Japan’s Pearl Harbor attack and ends with the drop of A-bombs. Although he did not generalize the first two narratives to the people in Japan and the U.S., he implied the dominant narratives in the two countries did not reach the third narrative “Hiroshima as tragedy,” which critically seeks humanity beyond national borders. It is a story of inhumanness of wars and invasions, remembering lost lives and tragedy regardless of nationality. Based on these three narratives, the following sections review how social factors have influenced the first two narratives to be formed in Japan and the U.S., respectively.

Japan and Hiroshima as Victimization

Reviewing related literature illustrated four possible factors that might have contributed to maintain the narrative, “Hiroshima as victimization” in the Japanese society: the postwar policies and politics, domestic devastation, silencing, and popular culture.

Several postwar policies and international politics might have contributed to construct and maintain the narrative of victimization among the Japanese people. After the Pacific War, in order to maintain an order of the postwar Japanese society, Emperor Hirohito was exonerated from war crimes at the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal. That exoneration destroyed the opportunity for the Japanese people to acknowledge crimes that Japan committed as a victimizer during the war (Komori, 2001). Clemons (2001) pointed out that the U.S. arranged lenient conditions of compensation by Japan in signing the San Francisco Peace Treaty due to the beginning of the Cold War and the fight against communism. Dower (1996) analyzed that the Cold War policy by the U.S. influenced the depictions of the People’s Republic of China as a demonic communist country, downplaying Japan’s aggression in China. International politics after the war excused Japan for her past.

Domestic devastation and suffering during and after the Pacific War would be the second

factor of constructing the “Hiroshima as victimization” narrative. Defeat, unconditional surrender, and domestic devastation by the U.S. bombing made Japan feel victimized; the A-bombs especially allowed the Japanese to maintain victim consciousness (Dower, 1996; Yui, 1995). Sixty-six cities including Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed in Japan, and 400,000 civilians were killed by the U.S. air raids (Dower, 1998). These devastations and suffering experiences impacted the Japanese enormously.

Silence would be the third factor that contributed to the formation of victim identity. Silence was prevalent among the returning Japanese soldiers, expatriates from Asian countries, and the Japanese people in the postwar era. The returning Japanese soldiers and expatriates remained silent about the aggression and discriminatory behaviors of Japanese in other Asian countries, because they feared retaliation by Asian individuals (Komori, 2001). Furthermore, the Japanese people did not have opportunities to express their war experiences publicly. Cook and Cook (1992) were surprised by the incredible outbursts of emotion expressed by their interviewees who had not had opportunities to discuss their war experiences for the past 60 years. Tezuka (2002) attributed both cultural norms against negative emotional expression and the General Headquarters’ censorship to the silence of the Japanese people against the U.S. and its use of A-bombs. These silences deprived the Japanese people of their opportunities to discuss the war and their experiences publicly and to examine critically their war responsibility beyond individual perspectives and memories.

Frames of popular culture after the Pacific War might have been the fourth factor that contributed to the construction of a victim consciousness. Popular culture was the venue for a struggle of identities and memories when the society pursued economic prosperity during the 50s and 60s (Igarashi, 2000). In the 1990s, suffering and resistance of ordinary Japanese against the nation state and the war were the common themes in popular culture. Almost every summer during those years, a cartoon movie, *Hotaru no Haka*, (*Grave of the Fireflies*) was aired on TV. It was about two children who lost their parents and attempted to survive the post-war disorder. The movie does not simply advocate victim consciousness for viewers; it powerfully illustrates the suffering of ordinary people and the irrationality of the war. It, however, underrepresented Japan’s colonialism in Asia, focusing on the soil of Japan as the site of battles and suffering.

There might be other elements that might have contributed to “historical amnesia” of the Japanese people (Dower, 1996, p. 63), but these are the four elements found in the literature at the time of this research.

The U.S. and Hiroshima as Triumph

Reviewing related literature indicated three possible factors that might have contributed to the narrative, “Hiroshima as triumph” in the U.S. society: the beginning of the Cold War, popular culture, and other socio-psychological issues.

The beginning of the Cold War and destructive power of the A-bombs shifted the attentions of the U.S. Americans from devastation and human sufferings caused by the A-bombs to national survival in the nuclear age. Boyer (1985) examined the socio-psychological impacts of the bombs on the U.S. society. After the A-bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the U.S. Americans felt tremendous fear about their destructive power. The government and media hid the effects of radiation and advocated peace application of nuclear power, even though the application was illusive technologically at that time. Then, the former Soviet Union successfully developed nuclear weapons. That incident changed the tone in the society about A-bombs into nuclear deterrence and civil defense. The Vietnam War in the 1960s and 1970s averted the fear of nuclear bombs, further. The arm reduction agreement among the U.S., England, and the former Soviet Union (SALT2), and prohibition of atmospheric nuclear experiments clouded the impact of nuclear weapons.

Ideology communicated through popular culture also reinforced the triumphal narrative in the U.S. Dower (1986) compared cartoon descriptions of the enemy in the U.S. and Japan’s propaganda during WWII. In the U.S., Japanese were depicted as treacherous, subhuman animals. Englehardt (1997) analyzed triumphalism of the U.S. society or the victory culture, which dates back to early New England, is the goodness and righteousness of the U.S. against the nonwhite, evil enemy. It started with the battle against Native Americans, and peaked after WWII against the Japanese as an uncivilized, evil enemy. These negative depictions of Japan as the evil enemy justified the triumphal narrative in the U.S.

Several socio-psychological factors reinforced the triumphal narrative in the U.S. society. The Enola Gay exhibition controversy at the Smithsonian provides rich examples of these factors. Dubin (1999) attributed the strong opposition against the exhibition by the U.S. Air Force to their concerns for their declined popularity and difficulty in recruiting. The U.S. Air Force needed to maintain the positive images of their achievement in the past so as to attract youths. Young (1996) analyzed the Enola Gay controversy as a balancing act of the Vietnam War as a bad war against WWII as a good war, so that the U.S. can maintain the “Great America” meta-narrative of the founding fathers. In a larger context, Wallace (1996) analyzed the controversy as a backlash by Conservatives against civil rights movements and multiculturalism that have been promoted since the late 1960s. He pointed out that those who have power and influence education policies support the good war paradigm. These factors

have supported the triumphant narrative and have justified the use of the A-bombs.

Reviewing the literature identified possible factors of constructing the dominant collective memories of the Pacific War in Japan and the U.S. The remaining section of this study examines the reflection of those memories on the controversy of the bomb earrings in 1999 and seeks ways to transform them into a narrative of “Hiroshima as tragedy,” a story of humanity beyond borders.

Texts and Comments Examined

The data of this study were opinions on the bomb earring controversy that individuals expressed on the Internet. They were retrieved by search engines using a key word, “*genbaku piasu* (原爆ピアス)” in Japanese and “*bomb earrings*” in English. The texts that mentioned bomb earrings in passing, such as merely mentioning a newspaper title about the controversy without expressing personal opinions, were excluded from the analysis. The texts retrieved for the Japanese people and the U.S. American had different characteristics in their sources, forms, and time period.

The texts written by the Japanese people were retrieved from 41 different web sites. They adopted four different styles in expressing their opinions including diary, essay, art form, and message boards. Some of the Japanese posted their comments immediately after the controversy occurred, whereas some others posted theirs as a part of essays much later.

The texts written by the American people were retrieved from one web site of a public opinion poll (www.OpenPOLL.com), which was dated August 6, 1999. This was the only web site available on the Internet about the controversy except for news reports by media in the U.S. The style of expression was a comment on the earrings as an answer to the question set by the site. The call for opinions was as follows:

Tiny silver replicas of the first A-bombs that are being sold as earrings at the National Atomic Museum are stirring emotions in Japan. “It’s not the sort of thing you should be hanging from your ears or using to decorate your desk,” said Naomi Kishimoto of the anti-nuclear group Gensuikyo in Hiroshima. Should the Atomic Museum apologize for marketing the earrings and stop selling them?

Among the 44 respondents who voted (Definitely Yes: 20%, Probably Yes: 5%, Not Sure: 2%, Probably Not: 25%, Definitely Not: 48%), 18 individuals left 20 comments. Although the frame of the call was relatively provocative in expression, this was the only site available at the time of data collection, and thus adopted.

This study included only the texts that were written by those who could be assumed to be Japanese for the Japanese texts and U.S. Americans for the English texts. The decision on

nationality was made based on their reference to themselves such as “we Japanese” or “our country/society.” As a result, there were 69 texts or comments total from 65 individuals that were examined for this study (49 texts by 48 Japanese, 20 comments by 18 U.S. Americans).

Frame of Analysis: Fantasy Theme Analysis

Fantasy theme analysis was adopted for this study as a framework. It is a method based on Symbolic Convergence Theory developed by Bormann and his colleagues (Bormann, 1972; Cragan & Shields, 1998). It explains how a group of people creates, shares, and sustains a common message or fantasy (Bormann; Cragan & Shields). Foss (1996) proposed the procedure of fantasy theme criticism through four steps: formulating research questions and selecting materials to analyze, selecting a unit of analysis, analyzing the materials, and writing up the results. After formulating questions to guide the research and selecting materials to analyze, Foss suggested selecting a unit of analysis, either fantasy themes or rhetorical visions. This study adopted fantasy themes as the unit of analysis. Observing frequency of terms, phrases, and images, fantasy themes were identified. The researcher set 10 percent of frequency as a rule to count as a theme. This rule is reasonably low enough to include diverse opinions regardless of dominant opinions and high enough to avoid researcher’s bias. After the themes were compiled and categorized, rhetorical visions were created. Each of the rhetorical visions holds properties that include *dramatis personae*, plot line, scene, and sanctioning agent (Foss). Further, dynamic structural concepts were identified as an evaluation standard for each of the visions (Foss). Due to limited space, this study reports the detailed analysis of the U.S. Americans’ comments only. It reports the analysis of the Japanese comments briefly, because this part has already been published in Fukumoto (2004).

Emerged Fantasy Themes and Rhetorical Visions

Analyzing the data collected illuminated three rhetorical visions comprising of 13 fantasy themes from the Japanese texts and four visions of ten themes from the American texts. Names of the visions reflect their assumptions, respectively.

Themes and Visions Shared among the Japanese People

This section reports the themes and visions shared among the Japanese people only with tables. Fukumoto (2003; 2004) includes their details. Table 1 illustrates 13 constituting themes of each of the three rhetorical visions. Table 2 reports composite elements of the

visions.

Table 1. Fit of Fantasy Themes (FT-J) and Rhetorical Visions (JV)
Shared among the Japanese People

Fantasy Themes	JV1: Remote Island	JV2: Detached Criticism/Observation	JV3: Light Quest
FT-J1: Evil A-bombs.	XXX	XXX	XXX
FT-J2: A-bombs as tools.	---	XXX	---
FT-J3: Anger, natural response.	XXX	---	XXX
FT-J4: Eye for eye, natural response.	XXX	---	---
FT-J5: U.S./U.S. Amrcns., lack knowledge.	XXX	---	XXX
FT-J6: U.S./U.S. Americans, evil by nature.	XXX	---	---
FT-J7: Important rationality.	---	XXX	---
FT-J8: Postmemories for wisdom.	XXX	---	---
FT-J9: Historical information for wisdom.	XXX	---	XXX
FT-J10: Persuasive knowledge & actions.	---	---	XXX
FT-J11: Japan as a victim.	XXX	---	---
FT-J12: Japan as a victim & victimizer.	---	XXX	XXX
FT-J13: Good to bring people together.	---	---	XXX

Note. XXX denotes FT present in Vision

Table 2. Rhetorical Visions (JV) Shared among the Japanese People

Vision name	JV1: Remote Island	JV2: Detached Criticism/Observation	JV3: Light Quest
# of people in V	32 (66.7%)	9 (18.8%)	7 (14.6%)
Dramatis personae	Good JPN/Japanese <i>vs.</i> bad US/U.S. Americans.	Japan, the U.S., & other WWII participants.	JPN/Japanese & US/U. S. Americans. Both imperfect.
Plot line	Evil A-bombs/earrings. Good JPN & bad U.S. Complaining within a community or let's make our voice heard to others.	Multiple realities about A-bombs exist due to perspectives, positions & power. Logic & rationality are important to see <i>the problem</i> better.	Evil A-bombs/earrings. Importance of mutual steps & collaboration towards more knowledge &/or actions for change.
Scene	JPN & the U.S. relationship after A-bombs were dropped, Isolated past, present, & (future).	The world, Embedded past & present.	The world, Embedded past, present, & future.
Sanctioning agent	Being born and growing up in Japan. Inherited <i>I</i> .	Multiplicity, rationality, and fairness. Detached <i>I</i> .	Humanity, Collaboration across boundaries. Responsible <i>I</i> .
Predominant analogue	Righteous master analogue about the evaluations of A-bombs and their representation.	Righteous master analogue about the ways to see issues better.	Righteous & social m. a. about the evaluations of A-bombs & earrings & the approach for future.

As pointed by Dower (1996), JV1, which is similar to “Hiroshima as victimization” was the major vision among the Japanese texts. At the same time, JV3 which was seeking humanity and dialogue beyond national borders held the potentials to be the narrative “Hiroshima as tragedy.”

The following sections address themes and visions shared by the U.S. Americans.

Themes and Visions Shared among the U.S. Americans

Upon examination, ten fantasy themes emerged among the American people (FT-As, hereinafter) as listed in Table 3. Four rhetorical visions (AVs) were identified based on them. Table 4 shows the visions and their elements. Each vision starts with an example story.

Table 3. Fit of Fantasy Themes (FT-A) and Rhetorical Visions (AV) Shared among the U.S. Americans

Fantasy Themes	AV1: Good War Paradigm	AV2: Frustration	AV3: History Quest	AV4: Inside Out
FT-A1: The sales, matter of freedom.	XXX	---	---	XXX
FT-A2: The sales, matter of sensitivity.	---	XXX	---	XXX
FT-A3: Bombs or earrings for evil Japan.	XXX	---	---	---
FT-A4: A-bombs saved lives.	XXX	---	---	---
FT-A5: Earrings, bad taste or I won't wear.	XXX	---	---	XXX
FT-A6: Epistemology of apology.	---	XXX	---	---
FT-A7: Insignificant, whining.	XXX	---	---	---
FT-A8: Facts about Pearl Harbor.	XXX	---	XXX	---
FT-A9: Solution is only in an individual.	---	---	---	XXX
FT-A10: Past is past and over.	---	XXX	---	---

Note. XXX denotes FT present in Vision

Table 4. Rhetorical Visions (AV) Shared among the U.S. Americans

Vision name	AV1: Good War Paradigm	AV2: Frustration	AV3: History Quest	AV4: Inside Out
# of people in V	7 (38.9%)	5 (13.2%)	3 (16.7%)	2 (11.1%)
Dramatis personae	Japan v.s. the U.S.	U.S. society	Historian <i>I</i> & Pearl Harbor	An individual <i>I</i> , Bomb earrings & U.S. society
Plot line	JPN attacked Pearl Harbor & the U. S. dropped A-bombs to end the war early, save lives, & punish JPN for retribution. The earrings are an extension of this scenario.	Individuals were frustrated with social tendency that allows whining and insensitivity as legitimate voices.	Historians explore the truth of Pearl Harbor if the U.S. gov. knew the attack of the Harbor by Japan in advance.	I as an individual do not buy or wear the earrings, but the society is powerful with freedom of choices and actions.
Scene	Japan & the U.S. Past & present.	U. S. society at the present time. Cut our past.	Cognitive world about "the Day of Infamy."	U. S. society at the present time.
Sanctioning agent	Retribution determined by <i>I</i> as a policy maker.	Decency determined by <i>I</i> as a frustrator.	Historical Truth	Powerful society & powerless <i>I</i>
Predominant analogue	Right master analogue for retribution & justice.	Right master analogue for decency.	Right master analogue for info. Sources & credibility of historian	Right master analogue for freedom of choices

U.S. American Vision 1 (AV1): A Good War Paradigm

The first rhetorical vision shared among the American people was titled as *A Good War Paradigm*. Seven individuals (38.9%) belonged to this rhetorical vision. One individual framed that the claim by *Gensuikyo* was a whining of Japan as a country. He/she offset the claim against the earrings at the present time by bringing up a speculated number of the saved lives due to the use of the A-bombs. Like this, those who belong to this vision suggested that the use of the bombs was a rightful retribution for the past deed by Japan and that the sale of the earrings was an extension of the past retribution to the present time. The individuals in this vision expressed differently, but they commonly shared the assumptions about evaluation of the A-bombs and the earrings, time orientation, and attitudes towards the controversy. Each of the properties of this vision is as follows.

The *dramatis personae* in this vision were Japan vs. the U.S. The term, “versus” was a key of this vision. In AV1, they were in a bipolar opposition with a moral attribution, respectively. Japan is an evil and immoral country, whereas the U.S. is a morally good country which acts for justice.

In this vision, the *plot line* was about sneaky attack of Pearl Harbor by evil Japan. Immoral, evil Japan surprisingly attacked Pearl Harbor without a declaration of war (FT-A8: Facts on Pearl Harbor). The morally good U.S. ended the war by dropping two A-bombs as the rightful retribution of the harbor and the justice for all who suffered by the Japan’s colonialism (FT-A3: Bombs as Retribution). As a result, the use of the bombs saved millions of people which might have been lost if the war continued longer (FT-A4: Saved Lives). At the present time, Japan whines about the bomb earrings as representation. The earrings might be a bad taste and some people do not like wearing them (FT-A5: Bad Taste). The whining about the earrings, however, is an insignificant issue and does not change the justice done in the past by the U.S. (FT-A7).

The *scene* was a narrowly defined world in terms of space and time. There exist three major countries and areas including, Japan, the U.S., and countries which suffered by Japan’s colonialism. Although the individuals in this vision saw connection between the past (the use of A-bombs) and the present (the earrings), they punctuated time arbitrarily. The scene began with Japan’s attack of Pearl Harbor and/or its atrocities in Asia and ended with the use of A-bombs by the U.S. on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. No injustice existed prior to Japan’s attack and colonialism or after the drop of the bombs. Progress of time was backward from the present to the past. In order to maintain the legitimacy in dropping the bombs to the present time, the individuals framed the scene narrowly.

The *sanctioning agent* was being Americans. This *being Americans* accompanied several

interconnected assumptions. Those who were born and raised in the U.S. were assumed to inherit justice over time. An individual in this vision inherited the legacy of the U.S. which is morally right to punish evil Japan with the A-bombs (FT-A3: Bombs as Retribution, FT-A4: Saved Lives). The sales of bomb earrings were a symbolic extension of the justice in the past (FT-A3) and Japanese whining over the earrings does not overturn the justice of the U.S. regarding the use of bombs (FT-A7: Insignificant Whining). Like JV1, membership was a key to the maintenance of this vision. Justice in the past transcends time to the present for the Americans. This transcendence applies to the sales of the earrings, and thus acceptable.

The *predominant analogue* was righteous master analogues. The attack of Pearl Harbor was morally wrong and the use of A-bombs was an act of justice and mercy as the historical fact (FT-A3: Bombs as Retribution, FT-A4: Saved Lives, FT-A8: Facts on Pearl Harbor). Thus, the earrings as representation at the present do not significantly change the fact and justice of the U.S. in the past (FT-A7: Insignificant Whining).

U.S. American Vision 2 (AV2): Frustration

The second vision shared among the five American people (13.2%) was titled as *Frustration*. One individual in this vision questioned the legitimacy of the topic selected by the poll company. From this individual's perspective, news on the bomb earring is not an important topic to be paid attention to, because of the prevalence of illegitimate complains in the U.S. society. This story fits into this vision, *Frustration*. The individuals who belong to this vision suggested their frustration about the complaints and whining over sensitivity in the society. They varied in their sources of frustration, but shared perspectives about the social tendency, time orientation, and attitudes towards the controversy. Each of the composite properties of this vision is as follows.

The *dramatis personae* in this vision were individuals and the U.S. society. The individuals were anonymous who complain insensitivity in the U.S. society.

In this vision, the *plot line* was about the U.S. society which is filled with complaint against insensitivity. People complain and blame others for others' insensitivity towards past incidents and perceived injustice. The bomb earring is one example among many offensive and insensitive representations of past incidents (FT-A2: Matter of Sensitivity). Every behavior in the society offend other people one way or another and there exist some organizations and groups of people who encourage becoming vocal for their beliefs or business (FT-A2). Even though apology was demanded, those who are entitled to receive the apology have already passed away (FT-A6: Epistemology of Apology, FT-A-10: Past is Past).

The *scene* was the U.S. society at the present time. It encompasses a wide range of society

which includes diverse groups of people. Past, however, was cut out from the scene as irrelevant since it was already over (FT-A10: Past is Past). Accordingly, many of the complaints in the society were invalidated as insignificant or irrelevant to the present society.

The *sanctioning agent* was a frustrator *I*. An individual who is frustrated in the social tendency of the U.S. decides what is relevant and irrelevant to an ideal society. S/he manipulates time by selecting the present only as the relevant temporal period in the situation and by cutting off the past as irrelevant. The ideal society should be where people should not be self-serving or complain to fulfill own claim and needs, but strive for cooperation and benefits for all.

The *predominant analogue* was righteous master analogues for decency. The frustrator *I* set an ideal society where people should behave decently without self-serving complaints or claims (FT-A2).

U.S. American Vision 3 (AV3): History Quest

The third rhetorical vision shared among the American people was titled as *History Quest*. Three individuals (16.7%) belonged to this rhetorical vision. One of them responded to another individual who contested the facts about the Pearl Harbor attack by Japan on the site. The author of the story raised his interpretation of historical facts on the attack if the U.S. government knew the raid in advance and if the U.S. let Japan attack the harbor to use the attack to participate in WWII. This story fits into this vision, *History Quest*. The individuals who belong to this vision expressed his/her opinion on facts about the Pearl Harbor air raid by Japan. Their opinions were in bi-polar opposition if the U.S. government knew the raid in advance or not. They, however, shared assumptions in common about time orientation and attitudes towards the controversy. Each of the properties of this vision is as follows.

The *dramatis personae* in this vision were Japan, the U.S., and historian *I*. An individual as a historian explores the historical incident regarding Japan's attack of Pearl Harbor. Attributions to Japan and the U.S. were relatively neutral. Rather, historians placed emphasis on searching facts on the attack and challenged their credibility to each other.

As the above story exemplifies, the *plot line* was about exploration of historical facts over the Pearl Harbor air raid. Some individuals believed the U.S. government knew the raid in advance and let Japan attack the harbor to create an excuse to participate in WWII. Some other individuals believed that the U.S. government did not know the raid in advance or let American soldiers die in the raid on purpose. As historians, individuals in this vision exchange their facts and sources about the raid, attacking the other's credibility (FT-A7: Facts on Pearl Harbor).

The *scene* was a cognitive world about “the Day of Infamy” in the past. Other temporal periods (present, future), other countries, and other incidents were left out from the scene as irrelevant. Only the past and the Pearl Harbor air raid mattered as relevant to this scene.

The *sanctioning agent* was historical truths over the Pearl Harbor air raid by Japan. Not individuals, but only historical facts can tell the truth, which is under debate among amateur historians.

The *predominant analogue* was righteous master analogues for information sources and credibility of individuals in discussion. As amateur historians, the individuals in this theme negotiated about whose sources of information and credibility are better for searching historical facts on the Pearl Harbor raid. (FT-A7: Facts on Pearl Harbor).

U.S. American Vision 4 (AV4): Inside Out.

The fourth and last rhetorical vision shared among two of the American people (11.1%) was titled as *Inside Out*. The narratives in this vision touched many topics including sensitivity, commodification of tragic incidents, and a means for social changes. S/he explored thoughts related to the sales of the earrings for a while and found a solution inside of him/herself. According to one individual in this vision not wearing or buying offensive commodification of tragic incidents of a society is the solution in this type of situation. This story fits into this vision, *Inside Out*. The individuals who belong to this vision explored their thoughts on the earrings differently, but shared assumptions in the elements of their stories. Each of the properties of this vision is as follows.

The *dramatis personae* in this vision were individuals and U.S. society. These personae do not have particular attributions which were shared collectively. The individuals were not good or bad uniformly. The society was not good or bad collectively. Some of the individuals in the society see the earrings offensive and others did not.

As the above story exemplifies, the *plot line* was about commodification of negative historical incidents in the society such as the use of A-bombs against civilians. Those who were in this vision framed the earrings as offensive and insensitive (FT-A2: Matter of Sensitivity, FT-A5: Bad Taste). They, however, acknowledged other offensive commodifications of negative incidents in the society and others’ frames that do not see offensiveness in the earrings and other commodification (FT-A2). As a conclusion, they decided not to wear or buy those commodification, but to know that they have no control over others’ choices in the society since freedom of choices belong to them and that the society is powerful over an individual (FT-A1: Matter of Freedom, FT-A9: Solutions in Individuals).

The *scene* was the U.S. society over time. The time included two temporal periods (past

and present). Sometimes, the U.S. society commodifies tragedies of the past at the present. Future of the society in relation with other country was not addressed.

The *sanctioning agent* was powerful society over powerless individual. The U.S. society and its dominant tendency determine what is acceptable to sell and commodify under the name of freedom (FT-A1: Matter of Freedom). Individuals who have different choices from those of the dominant in the society are powerless to create a change (FT-A9: Solutions in Individuals). So, what they can do is to act individually and to maintain and talk about their own morality towards outside.

The *predominant analogue* was righteous master analogue for the freedom of choices. No one can override or deny the choices of others. Bad choices are also legitimate for those who make the choices under freedom guaranteed in a democratic society.

The next sections discuss all the visions (JV1~JV3, AV1~AV4) emerged in order to seek ways to transform them into a narrative of Hiroshima as tragedy.

Discussion and Conclusion

The goals of this study was (1) to explore narratives by the Japanese people and the U.S. Americans regarding the use of A-bombs stimulated by the bomb earring controversy in 1999 and (2) to seek ways to transform the narratives into a narrative of humanity beyond national borders. Comparing all the seven visions explicated above illustrated four dimensions that distinguished the visions: an evaluation of the use of A-bombs, identity, time concepts, and national borders.

The first dimension was an evaluation of the use of A-bombs. JV1 (Remote Island), JV3 (Light Quest), AV4 (Inside Out) were grounded on historical universalism towards the evaluation of the use of A-bombs. These visions considered that the use of A-bombs against civilians was morally wrong regardless of situations in the past. In contrast, AV1 (Good War) was grounded on relativism, which considers the use of the bombs as conditional. The remaining visions were either the mix of universalism and relativism (JV2: Detached Criticism) or impartial about the use of A-bombs (AV2: Frustration, AV3: History Quest). The differences among the visions reflect individuals' attitudes regarding acceptance about governmental justification and diplomatic policies or atrocities against civilians. Historical universalism does not allow such a justification, but historical relativism accepts it with certain conditions. A mix of universalism and relativism or impartiality reflects their distance to the controversy.

The second dimension that differentiated the visions was identity or identification of perspectives. Individuals in the seven visions adopted a particular perspective identifying

themselves with a government/policy makers or individual victims, or distancing themselves from the controversy as detached observers or individuals. Individuals in AV1 (Good War) adopted a perspective of the U.S. government/policy makers in the controversy. They identified their evaluation and decisions with that of the U.S. government/policy makers sanctioning behaviors for the country favorably. Individuals in JV1 (Remote Island), JV3 (Light Quest), and AV4 (Inside Out) adopted the perspective of individual victims. They connected the controversy at the present time with the use of bombs in the past, framing the earrings as insensitive commodification of atrocity in the past. Individuals in JV2 (Detached Criticism) remained impartial in the controversy, holding their mixed evaluation about the use of bombs and distancing themselves from the controversy as a rational critic/observer. Individuals in both AV2 (Frustrator) and AV3 (History Quest) distanced further, removing their evaluation about the use of bombs out of their comments. They remained as an frustrated individual for AV2 and a historian for AV3 who paid attention to issues except for the use of A-bombs. Based on the identity and identification, the individuals in the seven visions created narratives reflecting a particular perspective.

The third dimension that distinguished the visions was time concepts regarding selection of temporal periods (past, present, future), progression of time (backward, forward), and punctuation of time (beginning, ending). Individuals in the seven visions adopted time concepts arbitrary to construct and maintain their own narratives. AV2 (Frustration) and AV3 (History Quest) focused on only one temporal period, the present time for AV2 and the past for AV3. The present time was only relevant to individuals in AV2 who saw the bomb earrings as the matter of sensitivity without considering connection of the past incidents in the present society. AV3 engaged in discussion about historical facts as if only the facts in the past mattered in this controversy. JV1 (Remote Island), JV2 (Detached Criticism), AV1 (Good War), and AV4 (Inside Out) focused on two temporal periods, past and present. Individuals in the four visions acknowledged the connection between the bomb earring controversy at the present and historical incidents in the past. Their selection of time periods was merely to explain the connection between the past and the present. Only JV3 touched all the three temporal periods: the past, present, and future. The use of the bombs was inhumane. The bomb earrings at the present were the reflection of the inhumanity in the past. The inhumanity should be addressed better for the future.

Progression of time mattered to JV1 (Remote Island) and AV1 (Good War). Both two themes assumed goodness and righteousness of their own people/country. JV1 assumed the Japanese people were mere victims of the war and AV1 assumed goodness of the decision to use A-bombs. In order to maintain the goodness of their people and countries at the present time, individuals in the two visions had to select incidents in the past for the positive

representation of self/one's own group at the present, manipulating what to represent and what to under-represent. The remaining visions did not matter or merely followed natural flow of time (forward). Since they focused on only one temporal period, AV2 (Frustrator) and AV3 (History Quest) did not matter progression of time. JV2 (Detached Criticism), JV3 (Light Quest), and AV4 (Inside Out) did not assume goodness of one's own country.

Punctuation of time relates to the progression of time. Individuals in JV1 (Remote Island) and AV1 (Good War) had to manipulate the beginning and ending of their narratives to maintain goodness of their own people and countries. AV1 started the narrative when the Japan attacked Pearl Harbor. Its ending should be when the Enola Gay turned away from Hiroshima. Including stories beneath the mushroom cloud means witnessing death and sufferings of the people in Hiroshima, thus should be avoided. In contrast, individuals in JV1 started their story when the U.S. dropped an atomic bomb in Hiroshima and it does not end necessarily. They also omit Japan's colonial activities and atrocity or non-Japanese *hibakusha* in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, in order to maintain a victim identity for Japan and the narrative of Hiroshima as victimization.

The fourth and last dimension that differentiated the seven visions was treatment of social/national borders. All the visions except one (JV3: Light Quest) maintained or remained within their border. JV1 (Remote Island), JV2 (Detached Criticism/Observation), AV1 (Good War), and AV3 (History Quest) maintained the borders between Japan and the U.S. in their narratives. They competed over whose perspective is right and correct than the other along the line of social/national borders. A2 (Frustration) remained within its own society observing the controversy is another example of unfair or unproductive whining. Only JV3 (Light Quest) advocated collaboration across borders and mutual responsibility to bring justice and create peace in the world.

The result of this study became very similar to the statistics in 1995 for the 50th anniversary of the end of WWII as introduced previously. In this study, 81.3 percent of the Japanese people denounced moral wrongness of the use of A-bombs (JV1 & JV3) and 89 percents of those who were polled in the statistics denounced the use. In this study, 52.1 percent of the U.S. Americans (AV1 & AV2) saw the use of the bombs as not-morally wrong and 56 percent of those who were polled in the statistics saw moral correctness in the use of bombs. On surface, people in Japan and the U.S. had a complete opposite interpretation about the use of the A-bombs reflected in this controversy. The details of the seven visions, however, illustrated their diversity beyond simple pros and cons about the use of A-bombs. The diversity was due to the four dimensions, including a) an evaluation towards the use of A-bombs, b) with whom individuals identify self (identity), c) how to construct time (time concepts), and d) how to handle borders in a controversy.

Among the seven visions emerged, only JV3 (Light Quest) was the closest to the narrative of Hiroshima as humanity. The narrative for humanity should seek humanity across national borders beyond one's own justification and victimization (Dower, 1996). Although JV3 is not free from faults, it closely fits into the narrative of humanity as Dower defined. Examining JV3 illustrate five interconnected elements that qualify the vision for the narrative of Hiroshima as humanity. The first element is acknowledgement of inhumanity of bombs' use against civilians and wars. Individuals in JV3 supported historical universalism when they evaluate wars and atrocities. Wars and atrocities are morally wrong regardless of situations at any time in history unconditionally. The second element is the emphasis for actions. Individuals in the vision evaluate others not based on membership, but on actions. They evaluated the actions to seek for positive changes favorably and denounced inaction and indifferences to injustice. The third element is an adopted perspective of individual victims. Individuals in JV3 saw negative historical incidents and their representation from the perspective of individual victims. Although some of them still need to stretch their definition of victims, they emphasized sufferings and pains of ordinary people inflicted by nation-states in the past without excusing a particular group of people. This element relates to the fourth one. Individuals in JV3 are willing to act and reach out to others beyond the (national) border. Actions for justice should not be bounded by a boarder, but should go beyond the border. The fifth and last element is consideration of the future. In order to address justice and humanity beyond national borders, a goal in the future needs to be set. The goal should focus on actions at the present time, acknowledging wrongdoings in the past and seeking mutual prosperity and peace in the future through collaboration with others. The future can/should not be self-serving, but be humane for all people beyond (social/national) borders. Although each individual in JV3 still needs to stretch his/her views, the vision meets most of the criteria of the humanity narrative by Dower. It has to elaborate actions for future in details, but the remaining six visions lacked one or more of these five interrelated elements which are necessary to be qualified as the narrative of humanity.

When a conflict about a historical representation occurs, we tend to be trapped by a boundary of membership such as a group, community, or country. When we have a compelling need to defend our own group for positive images and representation, we might engage in the ugliest behaviors such as allowing governmental excuses and justification of attacking others, ignoring sufferings of people arbitrarily, and distancing self from the controversy. In such a case, we need to be reminded of and make efforts of creating a narrative of humanity, not humanity for our own group, but for us all.

Notes

- 1 The present study was partly funded by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 25370724.
- 2 Gensuikyo is an anti-nuclear organization in Japan known in English as The Japan Council against A and H Bombs.
- 3 The National Atomic Museum is the only museum of nuclear science and history chartered congressionally. Its goal is to inform the public of the scientific development of nuclear technologies, including the Manhattan Project, WWII, and the Cold War. The museum also displays weapons and their replicas, including the dropped A-bombs, Little Boy and Fat Man.
- 4 From *The Hiroshima Weekly*, by Chugoku Shimbun, retrieved on September 15, 2002, from <http://www.chugoku-np.co.jp/weekly/1999/990821.html>. Copyright 1999 by Chugoku shimbun Co./中国新聞社. Reprinted with permission.
- 5 Dower (1996) observed the awareness of victimizer consciousness among Japanese, introducing an opinion poll in 1994 which did not object against the adequacy of Japanese government's compensation to the invaded Asian countries. Toyonaga (2001) considers that both the government and Japanese society are indifferent to the A-bomb victims living abroad without enough compensation. Examining polls and studies merely reveals the complexity of collective memory, as well as, realities in Japan.
- 6 Dower (1996) criticized the inability of the U.S. to imagine destruction caused under the mushroom cloud created by the bomb dropped by the Enola Gay.

References

- A-bomb earrings. (1999, August 21). *The Chugoku Shimbun, Weekly*. Retrieved October 20, 2000, from <http://www.chugoku-np.co.jp/weekly/1999/990821.html>
- A-bomb earrings, stop being sold. (1999, August 8). *The Yomiuri Shimbun*, p. 26.
- Bormann, E. G. (1972). Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social reality. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58, 396-407.
- Boyer, P. S. (1996). Whose history is it anyway? Memory, politics, and historical scholarship. In E. T. Linenthal & T. Engelhardt (Eds.), *History Wars: The Enola Gay and other battles for the American past* (pp. 63-96). New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Boyer, P. S. (1985). *By the bombs' early light: American thought and culture at the dawn of the atomic age*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Clemons, S. C. (2001, September 4). Recovering Japan's wartime past — and ours. *The New York Times*.
- Cook, H. T., & Cook, T. F. (1992). *Japan at war: An oral history*. New York: The New Press.
- Cragan, J. F., & Shields, D. C. (1998). *Understanding communication theory: The communicative forces for human action*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dower, J. W. (1998). The bombed: Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japanese memory. In P. West, S. I. Levine, & J. Hiltz (Eds.), *America's wars in Asia: A cultural approach to history and memory*

- (pp. 27–50). Armonk, NY: An East Gate Book.
- Dower, J. W. (1996). Three narratives of our humanity. In E. T. Linenthal & T. Engelhardt (Eds.), *History Wars: The Enola Gay and other battles for the American past* (pp. 63–96). New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Dower, J. W. (1986). *War without mercy: Race and power in the Pacific War*. NY: Pantheon Books.
- Dubin, S. C. (1999). *Displays of power: Memory and amnesia in the American museum*. New York: New York University Press.
- Engelhardt, T. (1997). *The end of victory culture*. University of Massachusetts.
- Foss, S. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Fukumoto, A. (2004). Examining collective memory in Japan: Seeking collective memory literacy with the bomb earring controversy. *Human Communication Studies*, 32, 19–44. Communication Association of Japan.
- Fukumoto, A. (2003).
- Gong, G. W. (2001a). The beginning of history: Remembering and forgetting as strategic issues. *The Washington Quarterly*, 24(2), 45–57.
- Hanaoka, Y. (1999a, August 5). National Atomic Museum in the U.S. sells A-bomb earrings. *The Mainichi Shimbun*, Osaka morning ed., p. 25.
- Hanaoka, Y. (1999b, August 5). National Atomic Museum in the U.S. sells A-bomb earrings as souvenir. *The Mainichi Shimbun*, Tokyo morning ed., p. 26.
- Igarashi, Y. (2000). *Bodies of memory: Narratives of war in postwar Japanese culture, 1945–1970*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Komori, Y. (2001). *Posutokoroniaru*. [Postcolonial: Thinking in extreme] Tokyo: Iwanami.
- OpenPOLL (1999, August 6). OpenPOLL.com Survey. Retrieved October 20, 2000, from <http://www.openpoll.com/cgi/openpoll.pl?poll=0594&results=on>.
- Roberts, C. (1999a, August 6). National atomic museum gift shop pulls A-bomb earrings. *Dateline*: Kirtland Air Force Base, NM, AM cycle.
- Roberts, C. (1999b, August 6). Japanese protest museum's sale of atomic bomb earrings. *Dateline*: Kirtland Air Force Base, NM, PM cycle.
- Roberts, C. (1999c, August 5). Atomic museum defends sale of 'Fat Man' bomb earrings; Japanese protest. *Dateline*: Albuquerque, AM cycle.
- Sales of atomic bomb earrings draw protest from Japan. (1999, August 6). *The Desert News*, p. A02.
- Tadokoro, M. (2000). The media in U.S.-Japan relations: National media in transnational relations. In G. L. Curtis (Ed.), *New perspectives on U.S.-Japan relations* (pp. 175–211). Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange.
- Tezuka, (2002). An analysis of the Japan-U.S. perception gap regarding the atomic bombing from the perspective of silence and silencing. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 14, 79–97.
- UNESCO (1996). C. 1 *Properties which the Committee inscribed on the World Heritage List*. Retrieved on September 10, 2001, from at: <http://www.unesco.org/whc/archive/repcom96>.

htm#775

- Wallace, M. (1996). Culture war, history front. In E. T. Linenthal & T. Engelhardt (Eds.), *History Wars: The Enola Gay and other battles for the American past*, (pp. 171-198). New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Yui, D. (1995). *Nichibei sensoukan no soukoku: masatsu no shinsou shinri* [Conflicting views about wars between Japan and the United States: Deep psychology of their friction]. Tokyo: Iwanami.
- Young, M. B. (1996). Dangerous history: Vietnam and the "Good War." In E. t. Linenthal & T. Engelhardt (Eds.), *History wars: The Enola Gay and other battles for the American past* (pp. 199-219). New York: Metropolitan Books.
- U.S. National Atomic Museum stopped selling the bomb earrings. (1999, August 7). *JST*. Retrieved on October 20, 2001, from http://www2.cc22.ne.jp/~hiro_ko/2-61genbaku.html.