

Paper Cranes and Mushroom Clouds

Paper Cranes and Mushroom Clouds:

*The US - Japan Conflict
and the Function of Ethics
in Historical Writing*

By

Alexandra Perry

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Paper Cranes and Mushroom Clouds:
The US - Japan Conflict and the Function of Ethics in Historical Writing

By Alexandra Perry

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Alexandra Perry

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9532-6

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9532-3

DEDICATION

To my parents, who love me despite the fact that I grew up to be more liberal than you'd like. Thanks for always encouraging my love of books, and for having enough faith in me to save room on your shelf for books I haven't even written yet.

To Jon, I mean Dr. Jon, for far more than keeping my coffee cups full and my computer functioning. I am one lucky human.

And most importantly to my son, Jack, whose very existence is and always will be my most favorite accomplishment. Buddy, you are more persistent, eager, thoughtful, and reflective at a young age than more adults ever are. I know already that your successes will far outshine my own. I will always be your biggest fan. Now study hard, be a good teammate, eat your vegetables, and always remember to call your mother (I can see you rolling your eyes, you know).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
Chapter One.....	1
<i>Divine Powers and Executive Orders: A History of Peace and Conflict between Japan and the United States</i>	
Chapter Two	13
<i>Artifacts of Evil and Historical Possibility</i>	
Chapter Three	31
<i>Paper Cranes and Mushroom Clouds: The Problem of Moral Statements in History</i>	
Chapter Four	45
<i>History: Just the Facts?</i>	
Chapter Five	57
<i>Time Heals All Wounds: A Theory of Moral Statements in Historical Writing</i>	
Chapter Six	81
<i>“How Good an Historian Shall I Be?”</i>	
References	95

PREFACE

These madmen have a comet by the tail, but they think to prove their sanity by treating it as if it were a child's skyrocket. They play with it; they experiment with it; they dream of swifter and brighter comets. Their teachers have handed them down no rules for controlling comets; so they take only the usual precautions of children permitted to set off firecrackers. Without asking for anyone's permission, they have decided to play a little further with this cosmic force, merely to see what will happen at sea in a war that must never come.

Why do we let the madmen go on with their game without raising our voices? Why do we keep our glassy calm in the face of this danger? There is a reason: we are madmen, too. We view the madness of our leaders as if it expressed a traditional wisdom and a common sense: we view them placidly, as a doped policeman might view with a blank tolerant leer the robbery of a bank or the barehanded killing of a child or the setting of an infernal machine in a railroad station. Our failure to act is the measure of our madness. We look at the madmen and pass by.

Truly, those are infernal machines that our elected and appointed madmen are setting. When the machines go off, the cities will explode, one after another, like a string of firecrackers, burning and blasting every vestige of life to a crisp. We know that the madmen are still making these machines, and we do not even ask them for what reason, still less do we bring their work to a halt. So we, too, are madmen: madmen living among madmen: unmoved by the horror that moves swiftly toward us. We are thinking only of the next hour, the next day, the next week, and that is further proof that we are mad, for if we go on in this fashion, tomorrow will be more heavy with death than a mortuary.

—Lewis Mumford, in response to the bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, *The Saturday Review of Literature*, March 2nd 1946.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to a number of people for their support on this book. I would like to thank my dissertation advisor, Jaime Grinberg, for his guidance, encouragement, and feedback on my work when this project was only in its infancy.

My former colleagues at Marietta College, Gama, Christy, Rob, Dave, Tanya, Maribeth, Cristie, Heather, Ricci, Ben, and Jamie are without a doubt the best coworkers and friends that I will ever have. I miss you all, and am so grateful to you for the support, encouragement, and friendship that you all offered me during my time at Marietta.

The Marietta case study group provided hours of inspiration and thought-provoking discussion during our weekly meetings and trip to San Diego. Austin, Emily, Gene, Riley - thank you for your curiosity, your work ethic, and your friendship.

This book would not have been possible without my Japanese colleagues in Tokyo and Osaka for their feedback and advice. I am also indebted to the librarians at Harvard University's Gutman Library who helped me locate sources, offered advice on textbook research, and provided me with access to their archives.

Sara and Bobby of justAjar Design Press designed a cover for this book that exceeded my every expectation. Their work is amazing, seriously, check it out.

Finally and most importantly, in addition to my husband, son, and parents, this book would never have been completed without the support and sanity of my sister, Taylor, and my SisterFriend, Vanessa. What would I do without you both?

CHAPTER ONE

DIVINE POWERS AND EXECUTIVE ORDERS: A HISTORY OF PEACE AND CONFLICT BETWEEN JAPAN AND THE UNITED STATES

Paper Cranes and Mushroom Clouds

The Emperor is no longer divine. On January 1st, 1946 the Japanese emperor Hirohito signed an imperial rescript titled the *Humanity Declaration* denying the centuries-old concept that the emperor was a living god. This rescript effectively ended the longstanding conflict between Japan and the Allied Powers. Or was it the atomic bomb? The surrender of the Japanese?

Historical writing is a kind of storytelling, and the historian's use of the tools in front of her - facts, details, imagery, context, evidence, perspective, language - determine how the story might be told. Which details should she include in the narrative? How should he weigh the evidence? What motives should be ascribed to historical actors? Each of these decisions is woven into the historian's narrative, and the resulting story becomes truth.

There are two images that tend to be used by historians to signify the end of the conflict between the U.S. and Japan during World War II: the origami crane and the mushroom cloud. Though at first glance the two seem very different, both point to the fragility of human life, the resilience of human spirit.

A mushroom cloud filled the sky over Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945 after the Americans dropped an atomic bomb over the city. The bomb, named "Little Boy" by American troops, was the first of its kind to be used in modern warfare. Between 90,000 to 120,000 Japanese - most of them civilians - died in Hiroshima during the immediate aftermath of the bombing, most of burns and radiation sickness. Thousands more would die over the course of the next generation from cancers, stillbirths, and birth defects caused by radiation. Three days later, a second bomb was dropped over the city of Nagasaki, killing another 39-80,000. Again, a white,

mushroom-shaped cloud hovered over the city, almost hauntingly beautiful compared to the destruction below. Within a week, Japan surrendered and the war ended. The Japanese-American internment in the U.S. was lifted by Executive Order.

The mushroom cloud became the paradoxical symbol of fragility and resilience: it represented the fragility of the civilian lives taken by the war. One moment parents rushed around the busy city on a sunny summer afternoon with their children, the next moment they might be dead. For a generation they would be reminded of the war - if they survived at all - by leukemia, stillbirth, and injury. The mushroom cloud also symbolized resilience - the triumph of the American military, the success of the impending surrender, the concerted effort to support the troops on the home front finally being rewarded with victory, with the safe return of fathers, sons, and brothers who had been fighting overseas.

The paper crane is a very different symbol of the same conflict. Ancient Japanese senbazuru tradition held that folding 1,000 paper cranes would bring good luck to the person receiving them as a gift, and so they were traditionally offered to new babies, newlyweds, and the very sick. The practice became well-known to the rest of the world through the story of Sadako Sasaki, a young girl living in Hiroshima in 1955. Sadako was less than two years old when she survived the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, and soon after she began experiencing symptoms of radiation exposure. Finally diagnosed with leukemia, Sadako could no longer attend school and began to fold origami cranes. There is disagreement over whether she reached her goal of folding 1,000 cranes before she died at age twelve. After her death, Sadako's former classmates continued to fold the cranes to honor Sadako and her wish for peace in the world. A statue showing Sadako and one of her cranes was erected at the Hiroshima Peace Park.

Like the mushroom cloud, the crane paradoxically represents both fragility and resilience. Origami itself is fragile and delicate, and Sadako, only a toddler when she was exposed to radiation, is an example of the war cutting lives short. That peace is as fragile as human life is symbolized in the precise folds of the crane. The crane is also held as a symbol of the ability of societies to be resilient. Japan and the U.S. rebuilt after the war, and were able to rehabilitate their relationship after a half-decade of fighting. Today, the crane is often used as the symbol of peace and reconciliation, and the U.S. and Japan are held up as an example of friendship after war.

Historical narratives carry with them a bit of this paradox. Though historians might even agree about the facts, the way that they weave

morality and judgment through their telling of history will inevitably impact the interpretation of it, the very truth about the past that we come to know.

History, Redux

In 2011 Japan was struck by a tsunami that left close to 26,000 people dead or missing. The epicenter of the Tōhoku earthquake and tsunami was close to Sendai, a port city and the capital of Miyagi Prefecture. News of the tsunami quickly spread and within days the world's attention was focused on Japan. The tsunami raised questions about the stability of the weakened Asian stock markets, Japan's ability to bounce back from such catastrophe, and the danger of the Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant. It also raised questions about history, morality, and teaching.

Personal blogs and popular social networking outlets were flooded with comments such as, "Dear Japan, it's not nice to be snuck up on by something you can't do anything about, is it? Sincerely, Pearl Harbor" and "If you want to feel better about this earthquake in Japan, google 'Pearl Harbor death toll' or 'if this Earthquake is Japan's Karmic punishment for Pearl Harbor, I dread to see what ours will be for Hiroshima and Nagasaki'" (Asakawa, 2011, pg. 1). Quickly, media coverage on the Japanese disaster broadened to include debates about free speech.

Meanwhile, educators and policy makers have been engaged in debates over the content of textbooks used to teach U.S. history. In Texas, professionals raised questions over whether textbooks should have a socially-conservative bias, and later were criticized for "sugar-coating" the version of Islam that students were presented with (McKinley, 2010 and Huus 2010). A similar debate occurred when Arizona lawmakers proposed that schools lose funding if they continued to include ethnic studies in their history curriculum (Lewin, 2010).¹

At first glance, these situations seem unrelated: What have comments about the Tōhoku tsunami to do with debates over the U.S. history curriculum? As I hope to show, very much indeed. I argue that textbooks are the primary source of knowledge about history and historical events. The emphasis that is given to various historical events and actions, the way that morality and moral statements function in history, and the way that

¹ This proposal was particularly controversial because Arizona school districts have a large percentage of Mexican-American students, and many took the proposal as a direct attempt to marginalize these students or to keep them from learning about Mexican culture and history.

these elements of history change and are reflected over time construct the way that we make sense of history and the way that we understand the world.

This book focuses on one particular element of this issue: the use of moral statements in historical writing. That is, how authors reflect the trends of their own times as well as their own views about the moral objectionability or justification of historical events and actions in their writing, and also how historical writing deals with material that is up for debate with respect to morality. This book sets this problem against the backdrop of contemporary debates over textbooks and the content of U.S. History courses to explore the meanings that moral statements carry for the use of historical writing and history texts in education. I argue that in light of an understanding of the way that moral statements are used in historical writing and of the way morality is reflected in historical writing changes over time, a pedagogical approach that assigns a central role to pluralism is necessary for critical history education.

History textbooks are used almost universally in history courses as a reliable source of knowledge about historical events and time periods. The content of textbooks and historical writing accounts for much of the information that we know about the past. Yet, the material included in historical writing and the way that this material is covered changes over time and differs across sources. Lorenz (1996) notes, "Although historians usually claim to describe the past 'as it really was,' the variety of their descriptions and their changes over time is one of the most outstanding features of historiography" (p. 234). This accounts for the debates over textbooks and history curriculum currently being covered in the media, which are fueled on by disagreements over how best to present material and which content should be included or excluded.

These debates over history also have implications that reach far past the classroom. Indeed, it is common to hear talk of history repeating itself, historical cycles, and learning from the past in everyday conversations. Howard Zinn (2003) notes:

What we choose to emphasize in this complex history will determine our lives. If we see only the worst, it destroys our capacity to do something. If we remember those times and places - and there are so many - where people have behaved magnificently, this gives us the energy to act, and at least the possibility of sending this spinning top of a world in a different direction. And if we do act, in however small a way, we don't have to wait for some grand utopian future. The future is an infinite succession of

presents, and to live now as we think human beings should live, in defiance of all that is bad around us, is itself a marvelous victory (2004, p. 2).

In this way, the comments relating the Tōhoku tsunami to the attacks on Pearl Harbor, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki are very much connected to the discussion over history textbooks, what they ought to include, and how events should be presented.

It is hard to imagine those who made comments suggesting that the tsunami was “payback” for the attack on Pearl Harbor assisting in the relief effort in Japan. Zinn might argue that their “capacity to do something” has been “destroyed” by their choice to “see only the worst.” The problem runs much deeper than this, however. Individuals draw upon the knowledge that they have about history in order to make statements about historical events. Would the comments made in the wake of the tsunami have been different if the individuals who made them had learned about history from sources that had, for example, contrasted the death toll of both Pearl Harbor and the atomic bombs? It is impossible to answer such questions, although it is likely that the historical knowledge drawn upon in the post-tsunami comments is a reflection of the way that historical events were presented in history courses using history textbooks. The relationship between morality and historical writing has implications far beyond how students understand the material while they are enrolled in history courses. Indeed, these implications extend to the way we make sense of current events and how compelled we might feel to act.

In this book I explore the relationship between morality and historical writing. My goal is to understand the kinds of moral statements that are used in history textbooks and to understand the way that moral statements operate in historical writing. I approach this goal by looking at the moral statements that are included in sections of U.S. History textbooks that cover the Japanese-American internment and the use of nuclear weapons in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I look at the differences between the coverage of these two events and also look at the way that the coverage of both events in historical writing has changed over time by analyzing the use of moral statements in history textbooks across four different eras.

Three elements of this problem are critical to address at the outset: The first: What is the relationship between morality and historical writing? In addressing this question I will discuss the possibility of making moral judgments about the past, the kinds of ethical issues faced by historians in writing history, and the kind of epistemological issues that arise in historiography. Second, I aim to explore the kinds of moral statements that are made in historical writing. I use the term “statements” here broadly to indicate both moral judgments and those phrases included in historical

writing that center on morality without necessarily passing judgment. Finally, I will consider what implications understanding the function of moral statements in historical writing might bring to bear on history pedagogy.

Overview of Methods

History textbooks provide a wealth of information about the content of history courses. The role of textbooks in history classrooms is likely more central than the role of any other source of historical knowledge. Research on textbooks thus proves to be important in understanding the function and implications of historical knowledge. Many methodological approaches to analyzing writing are used for the media, literature, and so on. However, these approaches don't always stretch to fit textbooks, which are written and used in different ways than other kinds of text material. So what methods ought to be used to study textbooks?

Nicholls (2003, 2006) has outlined research methods that are well-suited to studying history textbooks. Nicholls writes:

Textbook research is underpinned by a series of closely connected philosophical assumptions. First, on the level of epistemology, there is the question of knowledge. Competing definitions over what constitutes, for example, 'history' or 'geography', are necessarily grounded in epistemological claims over what constitutes knowledge and about what it is possible to know.... what is considered to constitute historical knowledge is also a question of power or 'the politics of knowledge' (Nicholls, 2006, p. 24).

Nicholls goes on to explain how these philosophical assumptions shape the methods that ought to be used in researching textbooks. Ultimately he concludes that a method that critically engages the researcher in the analysis of texts by considering multiple perspectives is necessary. Nicholls refines the UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision (1974) in his proposed methods and outlines the process of defining a textbook sample, qualitative methods of textbook research that include hermeneutic analysis, linguistic analysis, cross-cultural analysis, discourse analysis, and contingency analysis. He also describes the methods of textbook research used in this book: disciplinary or historiographical analysis, critical analysis, and structural analysis.

In chapter four I give a detailed account of my methods for researching textbooks in this project. I follow Nicholls's proposed methods for textbook research in order to analyze the role of moral statements in

historical writing. In the following section I give an overview of the organization of this book.

Organization of Book

In the remaining sections of chapter one I offer a brief background to the historical events that I use in my study of historical writing. First, I discuss the Manhattan Project and the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Then I discuss the Japanese-American internment. These events were selected because they show both the domestic and foreign elements of the relationship between the U.S. and Japan during World War II.

Chapter two looks at two different types of historical skepticism in the context of the Smithsonian Controversy. In 1995, experts argued over what artifacts should be included in the Smithsonian's Hiroshima display, and over whose perspectives should be considered, and how those stories should be told. This case illustrates just how important the question of how moral statements are made in historical writing really is.

Chapter three introduces the problem of moral statements in historical writing. I explore the kinds of research questions that are taken up in the philosophy of history and describe the two branches of philosophy that are most relevant to history: epistemology and ethics and explain the most influential theories of each.

In chapter four I describe my research methods and provide some context for my study. I introduce two broad categories of moral statements, provide details about the textbooks I selected for my study, and include a rationale for comparing data across time periods. I also describe the methods involved in textbook research.

Chapter five introduces the theory of moral judgments that arose from my analysis of the moral statements in U.S. history texts. I offer in-depth accounts of the two general categories of moral statements, backward and forward-looking, and then describe the sub-categories that each contains by using examples from history texts.

Finally, chapter six specifically takes up the implications that a theory of moral statements in historical writing brings to bear on education. I discuss pluralism, which I argue ought to be a central feature of history education, and propose that negotiation between competing perspectives is advantageous to education because it resembles professional historiography. In each of these chapters I will use the two historical events - the atomic bombs used over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Japanese-American internment - in order to illustrate points that I make about morality and history. In the following section I introduce each of these events.

Ethics & History: U.S. and Japanese Military Interaction during World War II

Einstein's one mistake: the bombings of Japanese cities

When Albert Einstein, then a fellow at Princeton's Institute for Advanced Study, heard the news of the bombing of Hiroshima, the first use of nuclear weapons in history, he lowered his head in to his hands and declared, "Woe is me. I could burn my fingers that I wrote that first letter!" (Herweck, 2009, pg. 26). Six years earlier, Einstein had written to President F.D. Roosevelt advising him that a group of scientists led by Leo Szilard, had been conducting research on uranium and that this research had the potential to yield results that might be useful to the administration. Einstein wrote:

[I]t may become possible to set up a nuclear chain reaction in a large mass of uranium, by which vast amounts of power and large quantities of new radium like elements would be generated. Now it appears almost certain that this could be achieved in the immediate future. This new phenomenon would also lead to the construction of bombs, and it is conceivable -- though much less certain -- that extremely powerful bombs of a new type may thus be constructed. A single bomb of this type, carried by boat and exploded in a port, might very well destroy the whole port together with some of the surrounding territory. However, such bombs might very well prove to be too heavy for transportation by air...In view of this situation you may think it desirable to have some permanent contact maintained between the Administration and the group of physicists working on chain reactions in America.

Einstein, who considered himself a pacifist, had a clear justification for warning President Roosevelt: if the Germans were developing nuclear technology then the United States had better be able to beat them (Seelig, 1995). Einstein maintained that he was a pacifist and remained wary of the development of nuclear technology, repeatedly claiming that his support of the Manhattan Project was only insofar as the project was a necessary evil in light of German threats. Later, he would condemn the use of the atomic bombs and claimed that had he "known that the Germans would not succeed in developing an atomic bomb" he "would have done nothing" (Clark, 2001, pg. 752). In 1954, less than a year before his death, Einstein said to fellow scientist Linus Pauling: "I made one great mistake in my life...when I signed the letter to President Roosevelt recommending that atom bombs be made; but there was some justification - the danger that the Germans would make them" (Clark, pg. 752).

The question of whether the development of the atomic bombs was justified given enemy threats has been debated widely, as has the morality of using the bombs. The bombings of Japan began on April 18th, 1942, 690 miles off the coast of Japan when the U.S.S. Hornet launched sixteen military planes to raid Tokyo. This raid, now known as the Doolittle Raid, was the first large-scale strike against the Japanese Home Islands during World War II. Little damage was done to Tokyo during this raid, but the Doolittle Raid did much to boost morale among American soldiers and the American public. In February and March 1945, however, U.S. attacks on Tokyo did much more damage, with multiple bombings causing over 100,000 deaths in Japan, and destroying more than half of the city. Still, these attacks are both considered minor compared to the damage done by the atomic bombs later in the war.

While the Doolittle Raid is considered to be the first significant strike against Japan, the U.S. had been planning more attacks for some time. In June 1941, President Roosevelt had signed Executive Order 8807, creating the Office of Scientific Research and Development (OSRD). The OSRD focused much of its efforts on methods of isotope separation, in order to separate various forms of uranium. Many scientists from Ivy League universities, such as Robert Oppenheimer, conducted work on this project with the majority coming from Columbia University. The Manhattan Project was worked on in extreme secrecy. In July 1945, the group tested the first atomic bomb in Alamogordo, New Mexico.

In August 1945, the U.S. dropped atomic bombs, developed under The Manhattan Project, and destroyed two Japanese cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The first bomb, nicknamed "Little Boy," was dropped over Hiroshima from Enola Gay, a B-29 bomber, on August 6th, 1945. On August 9th, 1945, the second bomb, "Fat Man," was dropped from Bockscar, another B-29 bomber, over the Japanese city Nagasaki.

These bombings caused over 200,000 casualties combined in Japan, which was close to surrender by this point. Sixty-nine percent of Hiroshima was destroyed, and forty-four percent of Nagasaki. The ethical justification of the bombing of Tokyo, Hiroshima, and Nagasaki has been widely debated by scholars, some of whom argue that the bombings were unnecessary to cause surrender, and simply a way to show the world the strengths of U.S. military strategy and development. Still, other scholars argue that the success of these attacks prevented further attacks and countless casualties.

While the military waged war against Japan in the Pacific, civilians were growing increasingly uneasy about Japanese and Japanese-American populations living in and around the west coast. Eventually President

Roosevelt would sign Executive Order 9066, which would allow the secretary of war to designate geographic regions as “military areas” and would allow for the quarantine and relocation of “any and all persons” from these areas. The result was that individuals of Japanese ancestry were removed in great numbers from the west coast and relocated to remote areas of Arkansas, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona, Utah, California, and Idaho designated by the military as “internment camps” (Exec. Order No. 9066, 3 C.F.R. 1942).

Resident Aliens: The Relocation of Japanese-American Citizens

Quarantine was something of a theme during F.D. Roosevelt’s presidency. In October 1937, Roosevelt gave what is now known as his “quarantine speech” to crowds in Chicago. The nation was growing anxious of the tension in Europe and Asia, and Roosevelt aimed to insure that such tension would not affect the United States. Roosevelt commented on this tension by drawing an analogy to a public health crisis, and claimed that the United States would continue to quarantine itself off from this aggression. The following is a snippet from his speech:

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. And mark this well: When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease. War is a contagion, whether it be declared or undeclared. It can engulf states and peoples remote from the original scene of hostilities. We are determined to keep out of war, yet we cannot insure ourselves against the disastrous effects of war and the dangers of involvement. We are adopting such measures as will minimize our risk of involvement, but we cannot have complete protection in a world of disorder in which confidence and security have broken down. (Roosevelt, 1937)

This tension eventually reached the United States, which later became involved in World War II. One of the greatest sources of conflict for the United States was Japan. In December 1942, Japan launched an attack on a U.S. naval base in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, marking the official start of U.S. participation in the war. U.S. unease about Japan continued to grow as the level of conflict rose. This was especially true on the west coast, where the Japanese-American population was much greater than in the east. Many citizens became wary that Issei (Japanese immigrants), Nisei (the children of Japanese immigrants) and Sansei (second generation Japanese-

Americans) living on or near the west coast might be serving as spies for Japan. Racial tension was at an all-time high.

On February 19th, 1942, Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066. The order essentially allowed for the internment of Japanese-American residents, including U.S. citizens, living on the West Coast (Hutchinson, 2002). The order allowed for the designation of “exclusion zones” from which government officials could exclude any and all persons, with the exception of those living in internment camps. Japanese-Americans were transported to assembly centers, relocation facilities, and, in cases where criminal behavior was suspected, official internment camps. Overall, 110,000 Japanese-Americans were detained in eight different camps. These citizens were given the opportunity to voluntarily relocate outside of the exclusion area, but were not offered any help in doing so. Those remaining within the exclusion area were subject to a nightly curfew before being relocated.

When the relocation camps were finally constructed, Japanese families were often moved into them very quickly, without being told where they would be moving. They were not able to bring many possessions with them, so many left behind jobs and property when they were forced to move. They arrived at the facilities often unprepared for the weather conditions of the location, and were forced to share barracks with one another, and often shared bathroom facilities as well. They were offered little in the way of education for the children they brought with them, and had few opportunities for meaningful work inside the camp. In some instances, detainees were even shot for leaving the prison gates (Daniels, 1986). Some of the Japanese in the camps were asked to denounce Japan and swear allegiance to the United States, causing them to dishonor their own communities and heritage.

In December 1945, the internment camps were officially closed and detainees were offered twenty-five dollars in order to reestablish their lives outside of the camps. They were allowed to return home, though many had, by this time, lost their homes and their livelihoods. The U.S. public was unaware of the relocation for most of the war, and the government justified its actions by citing the need to quarantine potential dangers.

Eventually, the government recommended that apologies be made to individuals who were interned as well as their descendants, claiming that the “internment of the individuals of Japanese ancestry was caused by racial prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership” (S. 1009, 1987, pg. 4).

Limitations

There are some limitations to this study that ought to be recognized in consideration of any future research on the topic. The number of textbooks used in this analysis is small and therefore might not account for all of the material that is covered within the field. It is also important to keep the use of historical writing in perspective. Textbooks are one of many tools that historians and history teachers might use. The value of identifying and categorizing the different types of moral claims may outweigh these limitations in many cases. Future research on the way that history texts are utilized in the classroom and how teachers engage students over moral statements found in the text might be useful to further address these limitations.

Nicholls (2005) also pointed out that textbooks are relied upon as heavily to teach history in many other countries as they are in the U.S. As such, an international comparison of the inclusion and function of moral statements in historical writing might shed further light on the issues that I present in this book. In particular, historiographical and linguistic research on Japanese textbooks would, I'm sure, provide interesting insight into another element of the historical coverage of both the atomic bombs and the Japanese-American internment.

The presence and variance of moral statements within the texts suggest that teachers ought to and often do play a significant role in the presentation of ethical issues in history. The results of this study offer insight into what treatment moral statements are given in history texts. The development of the taxonomy, in particular, can serve to help the authors of history text and history educators further consider how they present ethical issues in history.

CHAPTER TWO

ARTIFACTS OF EVIL AND HISTORICAL POSSIBILITY

Contested History

In his essay, “On Human Dignity,” Kenzaburo Oé tells the story of a Japanese runner born in Hiroshima on the day that the Atomic bomb was dropped. The man was selected as the last man to carry the Olympic flame in the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games. He describes the runner, stating that if he “had keloid scars or some other sign of radiation injury, that is if he had been an unmistakable A-bomb casualty, then I would not have objected to the selection.” Instead, Oé continues, “the middle distance runner actually chosen had a perfectly healthy body; we were impressed by his stamina as he ran at full speed in the huge stadium, with the smile of one free of all anxiety” (Oé, 1996, p.108).

Though Oé was troubled by the selection, he explains that he was much more troubled by the reactions of an American journalist who “might be expected to understand Japan and the Japanese people” (Oé, 1996, p.108). Oé describes the journalist’s reaction as follows:

[T]he American journalist was displeased because the young man, born in Hiroshima on the atomic bombing day, reminded Americans of the atomic bomb. He preferred to erase all traces of Hiroshima from the American memory. Worse still, this preference occurs not only to the American mind. Do not all leaders who at present possess nuclear weapons also wish to erase Hiroshima from their memories? (Oé, 1996, pp.108-109).

This anecdote is indicative of the kinds of debates that arise at the intersection of epistemology and ethics. Can and should knowledge of particular historical events be erased? Should historical events like the use of the atomic bombs remain in public memory in the service of moral progress? What are we to make of ethics in history?

The Smithsonian Controversy

The mid-1990's saw a great deal of controversy over what history ought to make of Hiroshima, a half-century after the city became the target of the world's first use of nuclear weapons. This controversy arose in debates over how best to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and more precisely how the artifacts of the bombings ought to be preserved. The question of how to best memorialize Hiroshima would be of great significance to debates over heritage ethics and historical preservation. As historians and ethicists continue to grapple with the problem of preservation it becomes clear that the answer to this question is still quite elusive.

The debate over Hiroshima caught the public's attention when the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum (NASM) announced that it would display the fuselage of the *Enola Gay*, the B-29 heavy bomber aircraft that dropped the atomic bomb *Little Boy* over Hiroshima on August 6th, 1945. NASM planned to display *Enola Gay* in an exhibit that would open during the summer of 1995 in an effort to commemorate the fifty-year anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Draft scripts of the planned Smithsonian exhibit were circulated during the summer of 1994, and quickly the NASM designers were being maligned for their efforts to revise history and advance a "victimology thesis" that "lay embedded in the structure of the exhibition" (Wallace, 1996, p. 272). The editor of the Air Force Magazine, John Correll was outraged at the NASM's proposed approach to preserving the *Enola Gay*, which he claimed, "depicted the Japanese as defenders of their homeland and emperor but provided little background on Japan's earlier aggression, which had made such a defense necessary. In this telling of it, the Americans were cast as ruthless invaders, driven by revenge" (1994, p. 58). As the summer 1994 Op-Ed pages of all of the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Wall Street Journal* show, many historians and political commentators agreed with Correll's impression of the exhibit.

Charles Krauthammer wrote a 1994 editorial in *The Washington Post* where he described the exhibit and offered alternative approaches to preserving Hiroshima artifacts:

The Air and Space commemoration of Hiroshima promises to be an embarrassing amalgam of revisionist hand-wringing and guilt. What to do? General Paul Tibbets, the man who commanded the *Enola Gay*, has the right idea: Hang the plane in the museum without commentary or slanted context. Display it like Lindbergh's plane, with silent reverence and a few

lines explaining what it did and when. Or forget the whole enterprise and let the Japanese commemorate the catastrophe that they brought upon themselves (A27).

Eugene Meyer (1995) echoed Krauthammer's views almost exactly one year later as debates over the exhibit continued to rage on. Meyer described the proposed exhibit as "an anti-nuke morality play in which Americans are portrayed as ruthless racists hell-bent on revenge for Pearl Harbor, with the Japanese as innocent, even noble victims..." (p. DO1).

Many commentators were reacting to the designers' inclusion of the statement, "For most Americans, this war was fundamentally different than the one waged against Germany and Italy - it was a war of vengeance. For most Japanese, it was a war to defend their unique culture against Western imperialism" in the draft (NASM, 1993). Some of the artifacts that were to be included in the exhibit were also up for debate. The draft script proposed the inclusion of a child's lunch pail with "remains of peas and rice reduced to carbon" (Correll, 1994a, p. 24). In addition, critics of the exhibit were enraged at the preservation of photographs of the corpses of Japanese victims, particularly because the number of photographs depicting Japanese suffering was far greater than the number of photographs depicting American suffering.

Of course, there were those historians who think that the Smithsonian draft script proposed an ethical way to preserve the *Enola Gay*. Wallace (1996) points out, "any exhibition focused on the *Enola Gay* and its bombing run would, almost by definition, depict more Japanese than American casualties" (p. 318). He claimed that those who opposed the proposed *Enola Gay* exhibit were raising an objection "...to problematizing something deemed utterly unproblematic. Truman dropped the bomb to shorten the war and save lives, period" (319).

The draft of the exhibit shows plans to include a section about the atomic bombs labeled "Historical Controversies" in which copy accompanying the artifacts would tell of debates over the number of American lives spared through the use of the atomic bombs and over the legitimacy of claims that the bombings were necessary to bringing about Japanese surrender. One of the controversies included in the draft included the question over whether the Japanese would have surrendered if the U.S. had presented terms in which the security of the Emperor's position had been guaranteed, rather than calling for unconditional surrender. Winston Churchill, General MacArthur, and others claimed that this provision would have ended the war without the

use of nuclear force. Historians in favor of the exhibit claimed that the indication that such claims were controversial ought to have been enough to pacify critics.

The Smithsonian controversy illustrates how deeply philosophical debates over historical memory and preservation are. Such debates raise questions such as whether and when it is appropriate to preserve, how things ought to be preserved, and who should be permitted to make decisions about preservation. The subjects of preservation debates range from artifacts to heritage, art to the environment, documents to languages, and from embryos to human bodies. These debates span different disciplines, from art to archeology, literature to library science, museum studies to medicine. Their roots run particularly deep in history however, where arguments over preservation often raise questions about who owns the past and how it ought to be used.

Preservation and display in museums or exhibits is especially complicated, however, because these spaces often influence public opinion about history. The Smithsonian controversy illustrates this: critics of the exhibit's plans were not simply offended by the proposed content; they were alarmed by the story that the exhibit space might tell museum-goers. The story of Hiroshima could be told in two ways: the heroic and tragic last resort of a military desperate for an end to the war, or an unnecessary display of power with many innocent victims. The way that the NASM exhibit space was used would determine which of these stories was told 50 years after Hiroshima.

In this chapter I use this case to illustrate just how highly complicated the relationship between history and ethical judgment is by looking at the skeptical positions of Bernard Williams and R.G. Collingwood. This case not only highlights the controversy over the telling of Hiroshima, but it provides context and perspective on this controversy. In a way, this is the debate missing from the accounts of the U.S.- Japan conflict that I present later in the book. After all, history textbooks claim to present an unbiased and factual account of these events, so these biases are instead found well below the surface of the accounts.

After outlining the nature of debates over historical preservation and display, I argue that disagreements about who owns the past or who has a right to determine how it is understood make the ethics of historical preservation incredibly complex and perhaps resistant to conclusive appraisal. Williams's concept of a "relativism of distance" and Collingwood's "historical idealism" both present a challenge to traditional theories of preservation that rely on an understanding of who

might be said to have a right to particular historical narratives or artifacts through heritage or experience or assume that such an understanding is at least theoretically possible.

Artifacts of Evil and the Imperative to Preserve

The debate over the display of *Enola Gay* at the NASM illustrate how history exists as a political space and how historical narratives are always told in moral and political terms. Debates in history about whether and how to preserve the past include not only the consideration of artifacts, but of heritage, historical narratives, viewpoints and practices. Three points are critical at the outset of any discussion about preservation. The first: when is it appropriate to preserve? The impulse to preserve anything of apparent value is so strong that some have argued that preservation simply is the lens through which we see the world (Spellman, 2002). We aim to preserve paintings, artifacts, manuscripts, and the life of someone who is seriously ill: all tangible things. But often we also aim to preserve intangible things such as the rights of prisoners through concepts like restorative justice, the autonomy of those suffering from a mental illness that leaves them irrational, marriages that seem to be in disrepair, religious freedom for the devout, or the memory of a child who has died.

In history, the impulse to preserve is undoubtedly strong. The controversy over the *Enola Gay* exhibition was not simply about whether it was appropriate to preserve the fuselage of the plane, but also about whether it was appropriate to preserve the memory of the bombing of Hiroshima or the moral sentiments toward the bomb held by those who thought the bombing was essential to the end of World War II, on one side of the issue, and those who thought of Hiroshima as an unusually cruel display of power on the other. Some critics argued that the *Enola Gay*, forever a symbol of evil, ought to be destroyed altogether.

Second, debates over preservation often center on how to best preserve those artifacts, narratives, and practices that are regarded as worth preservation. The debate over the preservation of the *Enola Gay* was not simply a matter of whether it ought to be preserved, but also whether to display and offer access to it, what the exhibit ought to look like if it was displayed, and where it might best be preserved. Essentially, it was a debate over space and the political knowledge that would be produced as a result of its use.

Finally, decisions over preservation and display must include the

consideration of who might have the right to make decisions about the preservation of an archive, historical narrative or counter narrative. In the case of the *Enola Gay*, a variety of conflicting views toward whether to preserve the plane's fuselage and whether and how to display it led to debates over who might hold the right to determine such things. Should the decision be left up to Air Force Veterans? To the Smithsonian? Should Japanese views on the atomic bomb be considered at all? It is necessary to consider precisely how the right to a particular historical narrative might be determined because the answer to this question will be critical to any assessment of whether or how to preserve a particular artifact or narrative.

As Spellman (2002) pointed out, when considering matters of preservation, the impulse is to repair or preserve anything that might possibly be repaired or preserved. This impulse is evident in many preservation cases. A large number of exhibits and artifacts are stored in conservation and preservation wings of museums and will never be displayed, and developing sophisticated life-prolonging support measures has been a focus of modern medicine since before the ventilator was developed and approved for use in hospitals. But does this impulse to preserve reflect an obligation to preserve? Certainly there must be some criteria for what ought to be preserved, because it is necessary at times to destruct something or withhold preservation efforts. Most don't, for example, preserve food that has spoiled, and scientific theories that have been disproven are often taken to be of strictly historical interest.

In debates over ethics and preservation it has been common to use an approach to determining obligations to preserve that is rooted in value. Samuel Scheffler views preservation as a necessary extension of value, and asked "What would it mean to value things, but in general, to see no reason of any kind to sustain them or retain them or preserve them or extend them into the future?" (2007, p. 106). Certainly, value has an important place in determining whether or not to preserve a particular thing, whether that thing be an abstract idea or narrative, or a concrete artifact.

Value and destruction are not always at odds with one another. To value a particular thing is often to want to preserve it, but there are many cases where valuing something leads to the desire not to preserve it. In the case of end-of-life issues in healthcare, for example, often the value of life is cited as a reason to help a suffering patient to die quickly, thereby not preserving life but keeping the patient's dignity or quality of life intact.