

# *Japan Press Weekly*

JAPAN PRESS  
SERVICE

SEND AGAYA 4-25-6, SHIBUYA-KU, TOKYO 151-0051, JAPAN  
Telephone: +81-3-3423-2381, Fax: +81-3-3423-2383  
e-mail: INFO@japan-press.co.jp  
URL: <http://www.japan-press.co.jp>

ISSN  
0287-7112

**SPECIAL ISSUE - JUNE 2005**

## **BREAKING JAPAN'S DIPLOMATIC STALEMATE**

*An examination of Japan's relations with its Asian neighbors at the 60th year since the end of World War II*

**FUWA Tetsuzo**  
*Japanese Communist Party Central Committee Chair*

*Speech delivered on May 12, 2005, JCP Head Office, Tokyo*

=Contents=

- I. What is the Root Cause of Japan's Diplomatic Stalemate?
- II. What Was the Japanese War About?
- III. Japan's Post-war Political Position on this War
- IV. Koizumi Cabinet's Problem Arises from his Yasukuni Visit and History Textbook Issue
- V. Let's Face up to the Japanese History of War of Aggression and Colonialism
- VI. Three Proposals for Establishing a Strategy for Peace in Asia Diplomacy

**- Breaking Japan's Diplomatic Stalemate -1 -**

# **Breaking Japan's diplomatic stalemate**

*An examination of Japan's relations with its Asian neighbors at the  
60th year since the end of World War II*

FUWA Tetsuzo  
Japanese Communist Party Central Committee Chair  
Speech delivered on May 12, 2005, JCP Head Office, Tokyo

Good evening everyone.

Thank you all for coming to hear my views on current affairs. My greetings also go to all those who are listening to my speech via the communication satellite system.

## ***On the theme***

I also want to thank the many Japanese and foreign journalists as well as diplomats from foreign embassies in Tokyo for attending.

The theme I have chosen for my speech today is about Japan's diplomatic stalemate. This is a serious problem that has an important bearing on Japan's course in the 21st century.

I want to state our thinking about the root cause of this stalemate and ways to break it in the hope that this will be food for thought for you.

## **I What is the Root Cause of Japan's Diplomatic Stalemate?**

I must say that Japan's diplomatic stalemate is very serious today. This seriousness is not just limited to Japan's relations with China or South Korea; it has to do with all our Asian neighbors. All know that the major cause of this state of affairs is the Japanese government's attitude toward the wartime past, namely Japan's war of aggression and colonialism.

Recently Prime Minister Koizumi Jun'ichiro attended the Asian-African Summit in Jakarta, Indonesia, and on that occasion he expressed apology and remorse for what Japan did to Asian countries during the war (April 22). He also held talks with Chinese President Hu Jintao and the Japanese foreign minister had talks with the South Korean foreign minister. These meetings confirmed that efforts will be made in a forward-looking manner. As far as these meetings are concerned, it appeared that Japan managed the most critical stage.

But we must not forget the issues that have caused the present deadlock. They are the Japanese prime minister's visit to Yasukuni Shrine and the history textbook that whitewashes Japan's wartime past, and these issues have not been settled. If this situation continues, Japan will have to face even more serious problems.

If Japan is to break this deadlock in the real sense of the word, I believe it

necessary for Japanese people to take a fresh look at the fundamental issue of Japan's wartime past of colonialism within the context of contemporary world affairs.

This year marks the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II. On May 8 and May 9, events to commemorate the war's end were held throughout the world in accordance with the United Nations General Assembly resolution adopted in November last year. I believe that victorious countries and defeated countries alike are observing this anniversary by sharing the determination to not repeat wars of aggression in order to secure a peaceful future.

This determination is based on the common understanding that the war launched in Europe by Germany and Italy and the war waged in Asia by Japan were wars of aggression with no justification. This is precisely the conclusion that the international community unanimously drew from the historical tragic experience of World War II. In the present-day world, no one but a handful of ultra-right forces like the neo-Nazis are trying to reverse this shared understanding. To be more precise, there is only one country in the world that blatantly defies it.

Unfortunately, Japan is that one exceptional country. In Japan, not only politicians but mass media and even groups associated with children's education are calling for the Japanese war to be viewed in a favorable light. They are also arguing that the international judgment passed on the Japanese war was an arbitrary one imposed by the victorious countries.

The point is that the Japanese government is called upon to take responsibility for this extraordinary state of affairs. It is necessary for us to recognize that this has put Japan at odds with its neighboring countries and put Japan's diplomacy in disarray.

I would like to take this opportunity to examine this question from several points of view and consider ways to break the deadlock.

## **II What Was the Japanese War About?**

First, we need to question what the Japanese war meant to Japan and Asia.

The question of justification for war is now a major issue throughout the world in connection with the Iraq War. Waging war against another country without justifiable reasons is an act of aggression. There are 191 U.N. member nations, and only 49 countries representing 1.2 billion people supported the U.S. war against Iraq, while 142 countries embracing five billion people didn't support it on the grounds that it had no justification. This was what the international community felt about the war.

What about Japan's war record? I think that the Japanese war of aggression was far more unjust and lawless than the Iraq War.

*Aim of the war was to grab foreign territories on the grounds that they were Japan's 'lifelines'*

Above anything else, Japan went to war by making it clear that its aim was to grab foreign territories.

The war developed in three phases:

(1) In 1931, Japan invaded northeast China and established *Manchukuo* (Manchuria). In Japan, this affair was called the "Manchuria Incident." Japan at the time justified this action with the argument that Manchuria and Inner Mongolia constituted its lifelines.

(2) In 1937, Japan expanded its "lifelines" to the whole of China to wage a total war there.

(3) In 1941, the war further developed into the Pacific War. In 1940, Japan entered into a military alliance with Germany and Italy, further expanding its "lifelines." This time, Japan borrowed from Germany the term "sphere of survival" to assert that "Greater East Asia" is "Japan's sphere of survival." Prior to the alliance talks, the Japanese government adopted a decision that the sphere of Japan's survival would include not only China but the whole of Southeast Asia, India in the west and Australia and New Zealand in the east, plus the whole of the Western Pacific. With the goal of expanding its dominion, Japan called it the "New Order in East Asia."

In December 1941, Japan made a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor to start the war aimed at building a "New Order in East Asia," thus expanding its aggression to Southeast Asia and the Pacific.

Japan invented the concept of Japan's "lifelines" and "sphere of survival" to assert that this region has oil and other resources that Japan needs or that the region was Japan's strategic foothold. Japan insisted that it had the right to capture other countries' territories if it needed them. This was the justification which Japan publicly used to prosecute the war.

The Japanese war leaders at the time said that it was a war for "national survival and self-defense." The call for Japan's survival and self-defense has nothing in common with national self-defense or defense from foreign attacks. It was a slogan used to claim foreign territories on the grounds that they were necessary for Japan to survive.

Japan often tried to justify the objective of the war by calling for a "New Order in Great East Asia" or a "sphere of coprosperity," the real aim being to eject the Western forces (Britain, France, the Netherlands, and the United States) that had been the region's rulers and establish Japan's dominion of "Greater East Asia."

Both terms (a "new order in Great East Asia" and "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere") were synonymous with the policy of aggression and territorial expansion.

I was born in 1930, the year before the outbreak of the so-called "Manchuria Incident." The Japanese war in China was expanded to the whole of China when I was a second grader. The Pacific War began when I was a sixth grader. And in August 1945, when I was in the fourth year of middle school, I heard the news of

Japan's surrender on the roof of a factory where I was attached on student mobilization. So, as a child, I experienced almost all phases of the war.

### ***Realities of the war – Lawlessness and brutality***

Secondly, Japan resorted to every kind of lawlessness, brutality and atrocity to prosecute the war. Japan started the war of aggression in Northeast China with its Army blowing up the railway and laying the blame on the Chinese. The Japanese Army committed every kind of crime against Chinese people whether they were civilian or military: massacres, violence, plundering, and forced labor. They robbed Chinese residents of all food, causing widespread hunger. Numerous people fell victim to this war. These acts of aggression are recorded.

I would like to add to these war records the fact that this brutality that denied human dignity was even committed against rank-and-file Japanese soldiers. Just recall what happened in Guadalcanal, New Guinea, Burma, Imphal, and the Philippines during the war. In these battlefields, many soldiers were left behind in the reckless warfare that disregarded the need for supplies, and they starved to death. A researcher estimates that about 2.3 million Japanese soldiers lost their lives in the war, and 1.4 million of them, or about 60 percent, were estimated to have died of hunger.

### ***Colonization that trampled down the dignity of the nation***

Thirdly, the same lawlessness and brutality were applied to Japan's colonization of Korea.

Japan annexed Korea in 1910 following victory in the Russo-Japanese War. When the Japanese Cabinet decided on the annexation in 1909, it proudly sated that this was part of Imperial Japan's long-range plan. This meant that the colonization of Korea was a goal achieved in the 40 years after the beginning of the Meiji Era and that it pursued the goal by pushing past rival Russia and China and threatened the Korean dynasty to accept Japanese colonial rule. The colonization of Korea paved the way for its next step: aggression against China.

The 35 years following the annexation was a history of savage colonization that trampled down the national dignity of the Korean people by force. There are people who insist that the colonization of Korea had positive aspects as well as negative ones. This irresponsible explanation that represents the very position of the colonial rulers at the time shows that they simply know nothing about the hardships and distress the Korean people underwent.

It's inexcusable that what Japan did in the wartime past was nothing less than an unjust war of aggression and colonialism which run counter to world peace and the Japanese people's morals and interests.

This being the character of the war, our predecessors who founded the Japanese Communist Party in 1922 from the outset put up the slogan: Hands-off Korea, hands-off China. It stood firmly against the planned war of aggression against China and other Asian countries. The party defended this position at the cost of the lives of members. This is why we take pride in the history of the party.

### III Japan's post-war political position on this war

Let's look at how Japanese politics after World War II has dealt with the question of this war.

#### *World politics after WWII and the starting point of Japanese Constitution*

After the end of World War II, the international community convicted Japan and Germany of waging the wars of aggression. The prevention of the recurrence of wars of aggression marked the starting point of world politics. The United Nations Charter stood for this principle in establishing rules for a peaceful international order.

In Japan, remorse for the Japanese war was enshrined in the Constitution, and a great majority of the Japanese people firmly accepted this position as the starting point of the post-war era.

It is stated in the Preamble to the Japanese Constitution as follows:

*"We, the Japanese people.....resolved that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war through the action of government, do proclaim that sovereign power resides with the people and do firmly establish this Constitution."*

#### *Politicians who committed war crimes have assumed positions in political power*

However, Japanese politics has not been consistent with this principle.

The major problem was that the two major parties that promoted the war of aggression, namely the Political Friends Society (Seiyukai) and the Democracy Party (Minseitō) continued to control political power in post-war Japan.

Immediately after the war, when Japan was under the occupation of the Allied Powers, political leaders who were most cooperative in the war of aggression were expelled from the political world. However, many of them were later rehabilitated because the United States changed its occupation policy to one of reinstating former Japanese leaders in order to make it easier to have Japan better cooperate with the United States. Some politicians who had been accused of war crimes were given key cabinet posts.

In 1954, when Prime Minister Hatoyama Ichiro formed his cabinet, he appointed Shigemitsu Mamoru to be the foreign minister. Shigemitsu had served the Tojo Hideki Cabinet as foreign minister, and after the war, he was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment as a Class-A war criminal.

In 1955, when the two conservative parties merged to form the Liberal Democratic Party, Kishi Nobusuke was its first secretary general, the party's

number two position. Kishi had been the commerce and industrial minister under the Tojo Cabinet and a suspect of Class-A war crimes. Later, Kishi was appointed to be the foreign minister under the Ishibashi Tanzan Cabinet. He became Japan's prime minister in 1957. It was this Kishi Cabinet that concluded the revised Japan-U.S. Security Treaty in 1960.

In 1963, Kaya Okinori became the justice minister under the Ikeda Cabinet. Kaya had been sentenced to life imprisonment as a Class-A war criminal. During the war, he served the second Tojo Cabinet as finance minister.

This way of favorably treating war criminals was contradictory. In fact in Japan, in complete disregard of the constitutional provisions, those forces who hold that the war was necessary have long had influence on Japanese politics.

### *From my own experiences in Diet debates*

After that period, in December 1969, I became a JCP member of the House of Representatives. Since then, throughout the parliamentary debates I took part in, I acutely felt how absurd Japanese politics is in this regard.

Here is an episode from what happened in the Diet in February 1973, the year after Japan restored diplomatic relations with China.

I used my question time in the Diet about Japan's wartime past in connection with the restoration of state-to-state relations with China. To Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei who had just returned from China after concluding the agreement, I said: "In relation to Japan's war against China, do you think it was a war of aggression or not?" His reply astonished me.

I knew that while in China, he had atoned for the Japanese war in re-establishing Japan's relations with China. But he stated: "You can ask me to state my view on the history of Japanese wars, but all I can say is that future historians will have the answer to your question whether it was a war of aggression or not."

I could not but wonder what it was that this politician atoned for in China. I tried to take on him again by pointing out that world politics with the United Nations at its center as well as Japanese politics are based on the judgment passed by the international community on the past wars. I said that if someone who denies this judgment is in power in Japan, it will be a very grave question that will have an important bearing on Japan's political future. But he did not respond to this part of my questioning.

Since then, I tried to seize various occasions to put this question to later prime ministers, but none of them admitted that the Japanese war against China was a war of aggression.

In 1991, at long last Prime Minister Miyazawa Kiichi admitted that there had been a "fact of aggression." In 1993, Prime Minister Hosokawa Morihiro was the first Japanese prime minister to use the term "acts of aggression" to describe what Japan had done during the last war. That was in answer to a question in the Diet. No Japanese prime minister has ever admitted that Japan's war was one of aggression.

*It took 50 years, but .....*

In 1995, Prime Minister Murayama Tomiichi used his statement marking the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II to characterize Japan's policy "during a certain period in the past" as one of "colonial rule and aggression" and expressed an atonement for it.

The Murayama statement was as follows:

*"During a certain period in the not too distant past, Japan, following a mistaken national policy, advanced along the road to war, only to ensnare the Japanese people in a fateful crisis, and, through its colonial rule and aggression, caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations."*

Although this statement was inadequate in that it avoided using the term "war of aggression," he stated that Japan's "colonial rule and aggression" was a "mistaken national policy" and expressed remorse for "causing tremendous damage and suffering to Asian peoples," a sentiment that had never been expressed before. Thus, it took 50 years after the war's end for the Japanese government to express its remorse for its past war and colonial rule.

Prime Minister Koizumi made a statement of remorse at the Asia-Africa Summit on April 22, but that was a copy of the statement from 10 years ago.

*Japanese government has no criteria for telling what is right and what is wrong*

I have examined the question of the Japanese government's attitude toward its wartime past. Let me also talk about the negative influence this Japanese attitude has had on its foreign diplomacy.

A government which is unable to come clean about the clear fact of its past war of aggression cannot have the criteria for distinguishing what is just from what is unjust. Let me talk about two instances that proved it in the Diet.

*On Hitler's war*

One is about the attitude toward Hitler's war. On May 8, 1985, Richard von Weizsaecker, German president at the time gave a speech to mark the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II. Condemning in strong words Hitlerite Germany's invasion and oppression of other countries, he made it clear that the German people must be held responsible for it. This is a well-known speech that will go down in history.

Four years later (in February 1989), I took on Prime Minister Takeshita Noboru in the Diet. I asked him: "You do not admit that Japan's war was a war of aggression. What do you think of Hitler's war?" He said, "Scholars have yet to pin the blame on Hitler," thus even refusing to admit that Hitler's war was a war of aggression. Later in the day, an Associate Press reporter called me for an interview. The Takeshita remark, accompanied by my comment, was distributed throughout the world, thus astonishing the world. In Japan, U.S. Pacific Stars and Stripes, the



semi-official newspaper of the U.S. Pacific armed forces also reported Takeshita's remark.

This was an episode that clearly shows how unusual it is considered in the world for the Japanese government to refuse to admit that its past war was a war of aggression.

#### *On Iraq's Hussein government's invasion of Kuwait*

The other case I want to cite is Japan's view on Iraq's Hussein government's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990. On the day Iraq invaded Kuwait, the United Nations adopted a resolution condemning the invasion and calling on Iraq to pull out of Kuwait. Everyone knows that the Hussein government's rejection of this resolution led to the Gulf War. In November 1991, following the start of Prime Minister Miyazawa Kiichi's cabinet, JCP member of the House of Councilors Yoshioka Yoshinri rose for questioning in the Diet. He asked Prime Minister Miyazawa, "Do you regard Hussein's act as a war of aggression?" The prime minister said, "I cannot answer that question because I don't have the expertise" (November 15, 1991).

There was another story behind this. Three days earlier, I took the floor in the House of Representatives Plenary Session on behalf of the JCP to question the government about its view on Japan's past war. Prime Minister Miyazawa was persistent in avoiding the use of the term "war of aggression" for the Japanese war. This being fresh in his memory, he was unable to label the Hussein government's invasion of Kuwait as a "war of aggression."

As long as the Japanese government continues to refuse to face up to Japan's past war of aggression, it cannot have the criteria to judge whether a war is a just war or a war of aggression. My experience with these two cases has made me feel acutely how deep and serious the weakness of Japan's diplomacy is in connection with its inability to show remorse for its past war of aggression.

By contrast, when it comes to U.S. wars, the Japanese government readily gives them unconditional support even if it does not know in detail how they started. That was the case with the Vietnam War. The same applied to the Iraq War. It is only natural that Japan's diplomacy cannot earn the trust of the world.

## **IV**

### **Koizumi Cabinet's Problem Arises from his Yasukuni Visit and History Textbook Issue**

#### *Discrepancies between his words of remorse and political behavior*

It is 10 years since Prime Minister Murayama issued the statement expressing remorse for the war of aggression and colonization. What is the real issue in this question? I said that the Murayama view had weaknesses in the sense that it evaded admitting the fact of Japan's war of aggression. There is no foreign country that questions now whether Japan has shown real remorse for the war. The major question now is that the stated view has not been translated into action.

Worse still, present political developments show that the argument that backpedals on the Murayama statement is more prevalent than ever. This is an argument that insists that Japan waged a just war and calls for it to be re-evaluated. It is permeating not only politicians but the press and education. This tendency has been increasing dramatically since Prime Minister Koizumi took office.

The major issues in this context are Yasukuni Shrine and the "New History Textbook."

### **What is the question of Yasukuni Shrine?**

Let me begin with the issue of Yasukuni Shrine.

The question of Prime Minister Koizumi's official visit to Yasukuni Shrine has been described as a typical example of "expressing remorse in word but betraying it in deed." What is the truth?

Yasukuni Shrine is a Shinto shrine that helped to mobilize soldiers to battlefields during WWII, telling people that the war dead would be deified and enshrined at Yasukuni and that this was the greatest honor. That is why soldiers left their hometowns pledging to each other to "meet at Kudan," because Yasukuni Shrine is located in Kudan. Given its history, it's absurd for the prime minister to use worship at Yasukuni as an occasion to express remorse for the past war.

It poses two more serious problems.

### ***Yasukuni enshrines Class-A war criminals together with the war dead, an act denying 'war crimes'***

One is that Class-A war criminals responsible for the war are counted as war victims enshrined at Yasukuni. This measure was taken in October 1978 without the knowledge of the Japanese people or the Diet. The fact is that this marked a major change in the character of this question.

Do you know from what position Yasukuni Shrine has enshrined these war criminals? There is a brochure entitled "Yasukuni Encyclopedia - Our Yasukuni Shrine." It is a free brochure for Yasukuni visitors. Referring to Class-A war criminals, it states as follows: "*After the War, the Allied forces that include the United States, Britain, the Netherlands, and China held a sham trial. In this tribunal, these people were arbitrarily labeled as 'war criminals' and brutally executed.*" It also says that Yasukuni Shrine enshrines these people as "martyrs of Showa" and that they are "deified."

The point is that Yasukuni Shrine's official position is that no one in Japan committed war crimes, that in an arbitrary trial the Allied forces - Japan's enemy - falsely accused these people of committing war crimes, and that those Class-A war criminals are deified and enshrined.

Given the fact that the war criminals are enshrined and deified at Yasukuni, the question whether the prime minister's official visits are acceptable or not must be considered separately from the question whether it is good or not to mourn enshrined individual war dead. The prime minister's visits there mean that the

Japanese government denies the existence of “war crimes” regarding the Japanese war.

***Yasukuni serves as a major center for disseminating the argument in defense of the past war as a 'just war'***

What is more, Yasukuni Shrine is as the major center for propagating the argument that the war was a "just war."

Yasukuni Shrine claims that it has two missions.

One is to venerate "the divine spirits" instead of mourning the war dead. In Yasukuni Shrine's usage, "venerate" means praising "the brave" for their brilliant achievements. The shrine venerates their "acts of war."

The other is to "bring to light the truth of modern history which the divine spirits of fallen heroes followed." To put it plainly, it says that the “criticism of the Greater East Asia War” has obscured this truth, leaving “our country disgraced” (Yasukuni Shrine's Website) and that the shrine's mission is to wipe away the disgrace and explain the real meaning of the Japanese wars.

What is the real meaning of the wars which Yasukuni Shrine tries to convey? According to Yasukuni Shrine, all the wars fought by Japan, from the Sino-Japanese war in the Meiji Era to the Greater East Asia War "were unavoidable for establishing a modern Japan and for its survival and self-defense, and in the world historical context, for achieving a world of free and equal relations regardless of skin color.” This is a plain argument that Japanese wars were just. So, this propaganda is regarded as the centerpiece of Yasukuni's mission.

***This is how Yasukuni depicts Japanese wars***

Yasukuni Shrine has a war memorial museum called “Yushu-kan.” The name "Yushu" is said to be taken from an ancient Chinese document. The museum underwent a major renovation with the addition of a new building, and it now has 20 exhibition rooms devoted to relics from past Japanese wars from the Japan-China War to the Japan-Russia war and the Greater East Asia War. They have a booklet entitled "Yushukan Illustrated - Yasukuni Shrine." It gives details of the museum's exhibits. Let me tell you how the truths of the Japanese wars are explained in this booklet.

First, the so-called "Manchuria Incident." It says that “the fervor which was behind the overthrow of the Qing Dynasty and the founding of the new Republic of China turned into a radical movement that called for the restoration of national rights in disregard of the existing treaties with other countries and that this movement spread to Manchuria giving rise to an anti-Japan movement. The Japanese Army placed the movement under their control. This is what the "Manchuria Incident" is about. This is how the Yushukan Museum paint the affair upside down by shifting responsibility for the "Manchuria Incident" onto the Chinese anti-Japanese movement.

What about the full-scale Japanese war against China? Yasukuni Shrine continues to call this war "the China Affair," the term used by Japan at the time. The Yushukan booklet claims that a skirmish at the Marco Polo Bridge (Lugou Bridge) developed into a major conflict because of the Chinese regular forces' attack on the Japanese Army coupled with "the Chinese rejection of a peace with Japan." This is how the Yushukan booklet shifts blame onto China for everything, including the war and its escalation. It goes on to say that Chiang Kaishek (Jiang Jieshi) "expanded the battle front to Shanghai and Nanjing as a tactic to turn the whole of China into a battlefield and thus wear down the Japanese Army."

What does Yasukuni Shrine say about the Pacific War? It sticks to the name of the "Greater East Asia War," It is also the term used by the Japanese warlords. In explaining how the war started, it states that "Japan made every effort at the Japan-U.S. negotiations . . . in order to avoid war between Japan and the United States" but that the United States did not do the same. It adds that the United States prepared for a war with Japan but that the anti-war sentiments persisted among the U.S. public. "The only option left to Roosevelt" was to drive Japan into a corner by threatening to impose a trade embargo (banning the sale of oil to Japan) as a means of compelling Japan to declare war. Again, Yasukuni's account shifts the blame onto Roosevelt for the outbreak of war between the United States and Japan. It also argues that Japan attacked Pearl Harbor when it was driven into a corner and compelled to do so.

Finally, concerning the war's end, the Yushukan booklet says that Japan's long standing efforts bore fruit when the long cherished liberation of "Greater East Asia" came true. The text goes on as follows:

*"Japan's victory in the Japan-Russia War inspired peoples throughout the world, in particular Asian peoples, and many pioneering leaders visited Japan. However, the tumultuous First World War did not pave the way for national independence.*

*Asian nations' independence came about only after the Japanese Army's initial brilliant victories in the Greater East Asia War. The flame once kindled under the occupation of the Japanese Army did not subside even after Japan was defeated, but led to the birth of nation-states through wars of independence wars and other struggles."*

Thus, Yasukuni Shrine's museum publicly relates the history of the war emphasizing that the present independent Asian nations came into being thanks to the Japanese war.

### ***Documentary film sponsored by Yasukuni Shrine***

Let me add one more example. There is a video tape version of the documentary film "We will never forget" produced and sold under the sponsorship of Yasukuni Shrine. The title carries the message that distinguished military service by the divine spirits must not be forgotten. The film presents arguments even more intense than the exhibits at the Yushukan museum.

According to a war commentator appearing at the beginning of the film, the whole process of the war is depicted as a "war waged on behalf of Asia against the

Western colonial powers.” As I don't have time to talk in detail about the film, let me just read what is printed on the video cassette case.

First, the segment on the "**Manchuria Incident**" is entitled, "Exploring the truth: Japan as a country contributing to the stability of Asia, the anti-Japan movement in the Chinese continent, and the Manchuria Incident."

The section on the "China Affair," or the Japan-China war, says, "The Chinese Army fired at the Japanese Army at the Marco Polo Bridge (Lugou Bridge) and carried out attacks on the Japanese Army, leading to an all-out Japan-China war."

Next, on the Pacific War, which they call the "Greater East Asia War," it states, "The U.S. conspired to force Japan to war, and Japan made a difficult decision to go to war after enduring provocations patiently and prudently."

The final part deals with the question of war responsibility. It is entitled, "Reveal the injustice of the Tokyo Tribunal (International Military Tribunal for the Far East) that condemned Japan as an aggressor country, and look back on the bitterness of the 'war criminals' who were executed."

No further explanations may be needed regarding the shrine's position on Japan's past wars.

### ***An institution engaged in a movement with a specific political objective***

That's what Yasukuni Shrine is about. It is an institution engaged in a movement with a specific political objective, which is to implant the view that the "Japanese wars were justifiable." I think that the spirit underlying it is comparable to that of the neo-Nazis in Europe.

Prime Minister Koizumi insists that he visits Yasukuni Shrine to mourn the war dead. But we must say that his visits will inevitably link the mourning for the war dead to the argument that the war was just and correct.

### **So-called 'History Textbook' Question**

#### ***Arguments about the war have been former enemy countries' propaganda***

Let me move on to the next theme, the issue of the "New History Textbook."

This also is a product that has the same roots as the Yasukuni Shrine issue.

In 2001, the Society for History Textbook Reform edited and published this textbook entitled "New History Textbook."

This "Society" was founded with the aim of overturning the view that the Japanese war was a war of aggression.

In its founding statement the "Society" accused this historical view as "former

enemy countries' propaganda," publicly making clear that its aim is to sweep Japanese education of this "propaganda."

Four years ago, when this group's history textbook was approved by the education ministry, I was so appalled by its contents that I could not help speaking out forcefully. Although we were busy campaigning throughout the country for the coming House of Councilors election, I felt obligated to strongly criticize this textbook and began publishing an article in installments. These articles were published in two books. One is the booklet "This is the crux of the 'History Textbook' Question" published by Shin-Nihon Shuppan, Co., Ltd. and the other "History Textbook and Japanese Wars" published by Shogakukan Inc. Both the 2001 and 2005 editions of the "New History Textbook" are devoted to justifying Japan's past wars.

As this is a textbook, its text is not as brazenly straightforward as the texts of Yasukuni Shrine's museum. However, the last Japanese war is portrayed as an inevitable war for the cause of Japan's survival and self-defense as well as Asian countries' independence. Underlying this is an argument that call for this war to be reappraised. It shows no remorse over Japan's past "colonial rule and aggression" which the Japanese government has admitted to for the last ten years.

### *The same view as that held by Yasukuni Shrine*

Let me walk you through the most important points.

First, in describing the 15-year war against China (1931-1945), this textbook never uses the term "aggression." This does not mean that the authors of this textbook do not know the word "aggression." If you look at Hitler Germany's war in Europe, it repeatedly uses the term "invasion." It is also fond of using this word in describing what the Soviet Union did. In contrast, in both the 2001 edition and the 2005 edition submitted for the education ministry examination, the "New History Textbook" authors never use the word "invasion" or "aggression" in describing Japan's war against China and Southeast Asian countries.

In dealing with the Japanese war with China, it repeatedly emphasizes that the anti-Japan movement to attack Japanese citizens became active, that there was sabotage of railways and persecution of Japanese citizens, and that illegal acts were breaking out against Japanese citizens in Manchuria.

Apparently in an attempt to substantiate these allegations, the textbook gives an extra column to introduce an American diplomat's observation that "The Chinese, in their resurgence of racial feeling, had been willful in their scorn of their legal obligations, reckless in their resort to violence for the accomplishment of their ends, and provocative in their methods." In another instance, the textbook submitted for the education ministry screening carries a list of incidents caused by the anti-Japan movement using a map. This is the method the textbook authors use for the purpose of having students understand that the Japanese military action was in self-defense against these anti-Japan attacks. This way of shifting responsibility for the Japanese war of aggression onto the Chinese side is based on the same logic as that employed by Yasukuni Shrine.

Secondly, regarding Japan's annexation of Korea, the textbook shows no

understanding that this was based on a wrong national policy. There is only one reference to "colonial policy," which was added to at the instruction of the education ministry's textbook examiners. Believe it or not, that portion of the text states, "Some of the colonial policies implemented by the Government-General of Korea, established after annexation, were development projects designed to construct railroads and irrigation facilities; land surveys began. " Thus, the authors of this textbook portrays Japanese policies at the time as good things. This is howt they wrote about the colonization of Korea. They have no remorse for the colonial rule over Korea; on the contrary, they try to put the colonization in a favorable light.

Thirdly, their arguments justifying the war become even more straightforward in the Pacific War section. The authors stick to the use of the name of the "Greater East Asian War," in the same way as Yasukuni Shrine does. The "New History Textbook" explains that this term indicates that Japan waged a war for national survival and self-defense and that the aim of the war was to enable Asians to construct a Greater East Asia Co-prosperity by excluding Western forces. Having stated this, it deliberately revived the terms "Greater East Asian War" for this textbook. This is an express intention of the "Society"'s wish to justify the Japanese war of aggression.

In the description of how the war developed, the textbook repeats its view that it was a war to liberate Asia.

For example, it states:

*"Japan's initial victories encouraged the peoples of Southeast Asia and India, and instilled in them the hope that they too might achieve independence." It also states that leaders of the local independence movements cooperated with the Japanese military administration in order to achieve independence from Western Powers.*

The textbook carries extra columns to explain that the Japanese action "inspired the peoples of Asia" and that Indonesians "welcomed Japanese soldiers as a liberation army."

The textual explanation tries to depict the independence of Southeast Asian countries after the war as an extension of the Japanese war. This part was slightly changed as a result of the education ministry's screening process. The authors' true intention is more clearly expressed in the text they submitted for the education ministry examination. It stated as follows:

*"These colonial countries achieved independence one after another within a little more than ten years after Japan's withdrawal following its defeat in the war. Although the Japanese advance to the south was originally aimed at securing its own national survival and self-defense, it contributed to quickening the time needed for Asian countries to achieve independence."*

This view is completely the same as Yasukuni Shrine's conclusion.

They are thus bringing up the so-called "voices" of invaded countries and using them as "evidence" corroborating their view that the war was aimed at the liberation

of Asian countries. How devious it is for them to propagate this view. In Southeast Asia, three countries, Indonesia, Vietnam, and the Philippines, have published the numbers of victims of the Japanese war of aggression. The total number was seven million: four million in Indonesia, two million in Vietnam, and one million in the Philippines. How outrageous it is for the textbook authors to employ these countries as examples to prove that the war was a "liberation war."

### ***How can this 'New History Textbook' be approved?***

Fourthly, the textbook concludes this section by offering an item entitled "A sense of guilt for the war." It says:

*"During the occupation of Japan, the GHQ used mass media as a means of propaganda aimed at convincing the public how unjust the Japanese war was." It also says that this propaganda, along with the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, "nurtured the Japanese people's sense of guilt about the Japanese war, influencing the Japanese people's historical view after the war. "*

The text ends there, but the textbook authors are publicly calling for the sense of guilt about the war to be discarded because it is a product of the propaganda by the occupation forces. In other words, they are calling for the Japanese war to be seen in a favorable light, just as Yasukuni Shrine is demanding that the country's honor be vindicated.

This is the view on the war, which the Society for History Textbook Reform has introduced into the education process of children.

The Koizumi Cabinet's educational administration has approved this history textbook using its screening system. This is how the government is betraying its own statement that expressed remorse for the war.

## **V**

### **Let's face up to the Japanese history of war of aggression and colonialism**

#### ***Time for the Japanese people to face up to this fatal mistake***

This attitude of the Koizumi Cabinet and Liberal Democratic Party government will misguide Japan into abandoning the proper way to get along with the rest of the world.

I believe that it is time now for every Japanese citizen to face up to this issue.

Today, at a time when the world is trying to learn lessons from the past mistakes of waging wars of aggression and use them as the basis for world peace, the Japanese government is insisting that Japan waged a just war or that that was not a war of aggression despite what Japan did. How can the international community accept this attitude?



Moreover, the world is now undergoing a major change; the world in which Japan could get along with the rest of the world if it maintained good relations with the United States is history. The characteristic feature of the 21st century world is that Asia, Africa, and Latin America are increasing their influence in international politics. These regions in the past were under the dominion of imperial powers and were excluded from the affairs of the international community. They now form a large group of independent nations with sovereign power. They embrace 5 billion out of the world population of 6.2 billion. Without serious efforts to seek international understanding and solidarity with these regions of the world, Japan will not be able to secure its future in the 21st century.

Japan is an Asian country. Without trying to maintain friendship and solidarity with other Asian countries, it will not be able to have a good prospect for the future. If Japanese politics continue to refuse to face up to its history of aggression against China and other Asian countries, our country will not be able to develop solidarity and friendship with them. If Japan sticks to the present attitude, it will create an insurmountable gulf between Japan and the rest of Asia.

I would also like to emphasize that the need is not only for the Japanese government but also for all Japanese people to face up to the historical issues of the period of war and colonialism. Even if countries that Japan is dealing with have problems with their attitudes, that must not be used to justify its refusal to face up to this issue.

On the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II, German Chancellor Gerhard Shroeder published an article in the German daily *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (May 7, 2005), entitled, "We now stand at the end of the long postwar era." Looking back on Germany's bitter postwar era with deep remorse, he writes about the significance of the present stage of development that will lead to a bright future. He said that:

- The German people have faced up to their past in discussions for the last several decades and the German people have come to share the common position of accepting the responsibility for the crimes committed by Nazi Germany.
- It is a lasting moral duty of the German people to maintain this awareness.
- Without this effort, there would not have been a path opened for European unity and a path for the German people to cooperate with its former enemy, France.

I believe we can learn a lot from this accomplishment of the German government and people in Europe.

### *JCP experiences with the issue of Japan-China relations*

As for Japan's relations with China, the JCP has had varied experiences.

During the era of the so-called "Great Cultural Revolution" that swept China

from the late 1960s through the 1970s, the JCP was exposed to lawless interference and other forms of attacks from the Mao Zedong-led forces. We, of course, firmly reacted to them and defeated their interference. Even during that time, the JCP never ceased to denounce Japan's mistake in carrying out the war of aggression against China and held Japan accountable for it. It was during that time that I grilled Prime Minister Tanaka Kakuei in the Diet on this issue.

Due to this interference, our relations with the Communist Party of China were broken off by the act of the CPC. This state of broken relations between our two parties continued 32 years. This is what we may call an historical issue between the two parties,

In 1998, the CPC leadership made a "serious review and correction" of its past mistakes in interfering with the JCP. Although those in the present CPC leadership are persons who were never involved in the "Great Cultural Revolution" or the attacks on the JCP, they were serious about reviewing the CPC's history and make self-criticism of the mistakes. That was the basis on which they expressed their willingness to settle the historical problem in a reasonable manner based on historical facts.

This is how the "historical problem" was settled. Our two parties agreed to normalize relations in June 1998, and in the following month, I visited China for the first time in 32 years and held talks with two leaders, Jiang Zemin (CPC General Secretary at the time), and Hu Jintao (Chinese vice president at the time).

I used that occasion to put forward the following Five Principles that should govern Japan-China relations with the view of establishing friendship and stable relations for peace and solidarity between Japan and China.

1. Japan will strictly reflect on its past war of aggression;
2. Japan will stick by the "one-China" policy in international relations;
3. Japan and China will stand firm on mutual non-aggression and relations based on peaceful co-existence;
4. Japan and China will solve all problems by peaceful negotiations; and
5. Japan and China will cooperate with each other for peace in Asia and the rest of the world.

The last three items can be taken as general principles of peace and friendship, which are applicable to relations with any countries. In contrast, Japan and China can only develop their peaceful relations and friendship by strictly observing the first two principles.

The "one-China" principle is also very important because Japan took Taiwan from China and colonized it in 1895 but returned it to China 50 years later, in 1945. We put forward this principle because we are fully aware that Japan is the country with the heaviest responsibility to respect the "one-China" position.

### ***On anti-Japan demonstrations***

We have since developed friendly exchanges with the CPC as well as with the Chinese government.

We will not hesitate to be frank with the Chinese in taking issue with them whenever we discover problems on the part of China that we cannot overlook. It is natural for a party of sovereign independence to do so.

In a recent case in which demonstrations were organized in China in protest against Japan, while confirming that there was political wrongdoing on the part of Japan, which I have just talked about, we pointed out problems which we thought it necessary for China to address.

Initially, at a news conference on April 11, JCP Head of the Secretariat Ichida Tadayoshi raised three points with China.

Four days later, on April 15, JCP Chair Shii Kazuo used his meeting with visiting Chinese National People's Congress Vice Chair Lu Yongxiang to convey these three points to China.

The three points are as follows:

First, we asked China to draw a distinction between the history of the Japanese war of aggression and the Japanese private sector's present business activities in China. It may be true that Japanese products were a symbol of Japan's economic invasion of China before and during the war. But today, Japanese firms are doing business in China under agreement between our two countries, and both countries wish to develop mutual economic exchanges. However, the recent protests in China showed clearly a confusion regarding this difference.

Secondly, we asked China to make a distinction between the Japanese people in general and the tiny number of Japan's politicians who are going against the course of history. A great majority of the Japanese people are peace-loving people who wish to prevent Japan from repeating the mistake of going to war. In this regard, we pointed out the importance of solidarity between the two peace-loving peoples.

Finally, we raised the question of violence committed by Chinese protesters. We said that violence must not be used as a means of expressing protests against or criticism of moves by some people in Japan. We emphasized that any problems should be addressed in a reasoned and calm manner.

These are the points we raised with China.

Mr. Lu Yongxiang attentively listened to Shii's points. Confirming the three points in his own words, he said, "The points are clear. The Chinese government and people will certainly willingly try to meet the wish expressed by JCP Chair Shii." Mr. Lu Yongxiang stated this in earnest.

I think that subsequent developments in China show that they are taking steps in accord with what we discussed at that time.

This is how we frankly express our criticism and take issue with the other side

whenever the need arises. Of course, we must never lose sight of the major historical question of the war and colonialism. As a party engaged in Japanese politics, we believe it more important than anything else to first make serious efforts to resolve the problem currently facing Japan.

### ***Diplomatic activities with Asian countries***

I talked about the Five Principles we proposed in 1998 for Japan-China relations. We put forward this set of principles strictly as a JCP proposal. However, in a broader sense, we did this in the belief that they should be the principles for Japan, which has a history of war of aggression and colonialism, to maintain in its diplomacy with China. We must hold fast to these principles that must not be compromised by the attitude of the other side.

At the same time, these principles are not confined to Japan's relations with China. They represent the basic attitude that Japan should keep in mind in developing relations with countries Japan colonized in the past, including South and North Korea as well as Southeast Asian countries Japan put under military control during the Pacific War.

Various problems could arise, and are actually arising, in our relations with neighboring countries, including territorial claims and maritime border disputes. Even in such cases, if Japan comes clean with its wartime past, it will be able to deal with various issues without linking them to its understanding of the historical questions and develop conditions for proceeding with talks to explore a solution based on reason and fact.

In our relations with North Korea we have the issue of abductions. The Japanese people keenly wish to see the question settled as quickly as possible. In dealing with this question, if Japan is to win international understanding of its demand and position regarding the abduction issue, it is important that Japan come clean with its past mistake in putting neighboring countries under its colonial rule. Only by so doing can Japan show to the world that it not only stands for Japan's interests but is acting on universally accepted reason. That's the way for Japan to gain a deep moral strength that can earn international understanding and support.

We must prevent Japan from falling into a position of resorting to "diplomacy from strength" by losing sight of the general perspective on grounds that things do not advance as they want. This is the point we must bear in mind.

## **VI**

### **Three Proposals for Establishing a Strategy for Peace in Asia Diplomacy**

I have repeatedly stressed that it is absolutely essential to fundamentally review the present LDP government policy on this question and change its direction if we are to break the diplomatic stalemate facing Japan at present.

Finally, I would like to take this occasion to make several concrete proposals.

Prime Minister Koizumi in his speech at the Asia-Africa Summit in April

expressed remorse for Japan's wartime past. If this represents the Japanese government position, it must translate into action.

### *Stop Yasukuni visits*

First, he must stop visiting Yasukuni Shrine during his tenure. He can express remorse over Japan's "colonial rule and aggression" as many times as he wants to, but if the prime minister continues to refuse to acknowledge the existence of war crimes, it will only be an empty refrain. He may say that he visits Yasukuni Shrine for his personal beliefs, but he has no right to undermine Japan's national interest in maintaining friendship with neighboring countries for the sake of his wrong personal beliefs.

On the day when Mr. Koizumi gave his speech at the Asia-Africa Summit, LDP and Democratic Party members of the Diet together worshipped at Yasukuni Shrine. This aroused strong international criticism, including from the U.S. mass media. I will not reiterate the meaning of the Yasukuni Shrine question. However, I believe that politicians who are responsible for national political affairs should be seriously reminded that Yasukuni visits mean endorsing the war of aggression, which is contrary to the national interests.

### *Remorse for the war of aggression should be reflected in school textbooks*

My second proposal is that we should make efforts to get school textbooks to include passages about Japan's remorse for "colonial rule and aggression" that the government has expressed to other Asian countries. The present text screening process is not making that effort.

Some argue that textbooks are not government-designated. However, we must remember that the view expressed by the prime minister at the Asia-Africa Summit was a statement aimed to make clear that Japan has shown remorse for the history of its colonial rule and aggression. The government has the due responsibility to get this remorse reflected in textbooks.

This cannot be dismissed as a matter of passive efforts to mend fences with neighboring countries. As a country that has a history of wars of aggression and colonization of other countries, Japan has the responsibility to hand down its sense of guilt to future generations. Isn't this a duty that the Japanese people must fulfill in order to create conditions for Japan to develop good relations with the rest of the world with dignity and to secure their peaceful future?

Japanese children are the future builders of Japan. They are to live in this part of the world side by side with other Asian people for many years to come. We must never allow the fallacious view that "Japan's past war was justifiable" into the education system.

### *Need for a major strategy in the quest for peaceful relations with Asian neighbors*

Third, we should put in practice a broad ranging diplomatic strategy for increasing relations of peace with Asian neighbors. Many Asian countries say Japan "lacks an Asia strategy." In the face of such criticism and distrust, it will not be sufficient for Japan just to state how important Asia is to Japan or to just

increase Official Development Assistance to other countries. In its relations with all Asian countries, it is important for Japan to establish its long-term strategy and implement it with the aim of increasing friendship and exchanges in ways that match the actual conditions and mutual needs.

Now is the time for Japan to break with the present policy in line with the "Defense of Japan" report that calls for military responses to alleged threats from countries it assumes as enemies. Nothing is more important than basing Japan's diplomacy on a major strategy exploring peace.

***Every Japanese citizen is called upon to speak up for the future of Japan***

If we are to force the government to change its policy in this direction, people power will play an important role. Look at how the question of history is dealt with. Whenever we read documents from Germany, we realize that national discussions in Japan on this issue are far behind Germany, allowing the extraordinary argument that "Japan fought a just war" to prevail in opposition to the historical trend. In the 60th year since the end of World War II, I would like to call on every Japanese citizen to face up to the question "What was that war about?" in order to thwart the attempt to bring in the argument in defense of the Japanese war in disregard of the historical fact and to cut off Japan from the worldwide trend for peace.

I am sure that if such a political change takes place, it will give Japan, as a member of Asia, or more broadly as part of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, a chance to join forces with its neighbors to pave the way for a peaceful future full of vitality for Asia and the rest of the world.

Let me conclude my speech by expressing my confidence and firm determination to make every effort to reach this goal. Thank you for your attention.

E N D