

‘Be Concise and Be Sensitive, Cassandra’: Case Studies in Censorship in Civil Society

John Levan Bernhart

As a father¹ of a one-year-old child writing in Tokyo six months after 11 March 2011, both the danger of environmental carcinogens and the gap between empirical reality and the rhetoric of corporate spokesmen, government officials, and their apologists in academia and the media feel greater than ever; yet, as a trained historian, I question my feelings as a fallacy of presentism. On the one hand, thanks to exposés by whistleblowers² such as Rachel Carson and Samuel Epstein, long have I been aware of but able to dissociate from the very real health risks of pesticides, hormones, petrochemicals, automobile exhaust, and electromagnetic radiation from transformers, cellular telephones, and wireless Internet networks; on the other hand, I find it impossible to dissociate from the health risks of radioactive pollution, despite intellectually realizing that it merely represents an incremental increase of risk for

people living in an environment already horrendously contaminated by unnatural carcinogens. Perhaps, no amount of propaganda can negate the images of the victims of the wartime atomic bombings and peacetime atomic tests. Similarly, I have extensively researched and utilized the concept of ideological false consciousness, condemned by social critics³ from Antonio Gramsci to George Orwell but praised by defenders⁴ of the status quo such as Sigmund Freud and his nephew, Edward Bernays. Indeed, decades ago, the educator Paulo Freire warned us not to “deny” the “very obvious” fact that “those who make reality opaque through the dominant ideology...are swimming with the current!”⁵ Yet, being forced to make life decisions post- March 11 has helped me to realize personally what philosopher Bill Martin meant when he wrote that “even those of us who know better on some level find it difficult to accept

¹ This essay is dedicated to Koki, who did not live to see the world as it is, and to Utah-Alistair, whom I wish could see the world as it is not now. The author expresses his appreciation for the companionship and support of Lina Zheng.

² Rachel Carson, *Silent Spring* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1962) and Samuel Epstein, *The Politics of Cancer* (San Francisco: Sierra Club, 1978).

³ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971) and George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1949).

⁴ Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion, The Standard Edition*, edited by James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton, 1989) and Edward Bernays, *Propaganda* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1928).

⁵ Quoted in Richard Kahn, “Operation Get Fired: A Chronicle of the Academic Repression of Radical Environmentalist and Animal Rights Activists-Scholars,” *Academic Repression: Reflections from the Academic Industrial Complex*, edited by Anthony J. Nocella II, Steven Best, and Peter McLaren (Oakland, California: AK Press, 2010:200).

this reality [that those with power deny us the right to discuss the true, the good, and the beautiful so we]...keep it unreal?...not accepting that this reality could ever be legitimate.”⁶ Before March 11, I found it much easier to keep the real ‘unreal’ in my professional life as an adjunct professor, but when the World Health Organization has announced that their researchers will find no increased health risks for those of us living in Tokyo *before* even conducting their research,⁷ I fear that I cannot “even... find it [my work] at all,” as Martin concluded,⁸ in post- March 11 Japan. Nevertheless, my re-

sponsibilities toward my son require that I continue ‘to swim against the current.’

Case Study 1: Be Concise

As a known anarcho-communist, I was contacted by the Japanese Communist Party in January 2004 and asked to provide proofreading services for English translations of speeches originally given in Japanese at the JCP’s 23rd Congress in Atami, Shizuoka. I was then introduced by JCP members to the Japan Confederation of A- and H-Bomb Sufferers Organi-

⁶ Bill Martin, “Postmodern Fascism and the Long Arm of Israel: Reflections on the Finkelstein Case,” *Academic Repression: Reflections from the Academic Industrial Complex*, edited by Anthony J. Nocella II, Steven Best, and Peter McLaren (Oakland, California: AK Press, 2010:225).

⁷ The assertion that the World Health Organization (WHO) researchers have predetermined their conclusions was made by Christopher Busby, Scientific Secretary of the European Committee on Radiation Risk (ECRR), in a lecture given at Waseda Hoshien Scott Hall in Tokyo on 17 July 2011. A streaming video (<http://www.ustream.tv/recorded/16056589>) of the lecture was accessed on 15 September 2011. In this lecture, Busby compared the current situation to that after Chernobyl, a situation in which researchers who challenged the WHO assertion that deaths attributable to Chernobyl were minimal were censored and fired from their positions. Busby contrasted an official model that predicts 6,158 cancers within a 200 kilometer radius of Fukushima over the next 50 years with the ECRR2003 model that predicts 416,559 cancers. More importantly, Busby noted that the exposure related effects of internal radiation are not limited to cancer: competing causes of early death may result in an average loss of ten years of lifespan for those exposed to low level internal radiation. Busby warned that “they have already started covering this up. Professor Wolfgang Weiss of the German Federal Office for Radiation Protection has just been promoted to the head of the United Nations Science Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation. Weiss has just stated that he is beginning a study on the health effects of Fukushima for the World Health Organization. He says they do not expect to find any effects, so that is what they will find.” Busby has become a controversial figure because he challenges the legitimacy and objectivity of scientists working for powerful international organizations, but a structural analysis of the International Commission for Radiological Protection (ICRP), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the WHO demonstrate that the institutions are openly beholden to the nuclear industry (see Frank Barnaby and Shaun Burnie, “The Fukushima-Daiichi Accident—Question of Motives of International Bodies Attending the Nippon Foundation Symposium” (http://www.greenaction-japan.org/internal/110908_Burnie_Barnaby.pdf) (accessed 15 September 2011)). Barnaby and Burnie cite the ICRP draft 2005 guidelines, in which the organization announced that its “primary aim” was to “not unduly limit the beneficial actions giving rise to radiation exposure” (http://www.icrp.org/docs/2005_recs_CONSULTATION_Draft1a.pdf), and the 1959 agreement between the IAEA and the WHO whereby the WHO recognized that the “primary responsibility” of the IAEA was “encouraging, assisting, and coordinating research on the development and practical application of atomic energy” and agreed “to adjust” WHO “programs and activities” through “consultation” with the IAEA (see 28 May 1959 WHO/IAEA Agreement, World Health Assembly, the governing body of the WHO, ratified Agreement with the IAEA (annex 1)). Barnaby and Burnie conclude that “Japanese authorities are cherry picking the scientists to suit their aims of minimizing the scale of the accident and its consequences.” While a handful of professors in Japan, including Yukio Hayakawa of Gunma University, Tomoya Yamauchi of Kobe University, Kunihiko Takeda of Chubu University, and Toshiso Kosako and Tatsuhiko Kodama of the University of Tokyo, are attempting to present ‘the true, the good, and the beautiful’ for public discussion, discourse is being dominated by those who seek to make ‘reality opaque,’ such as Shunichi ‘Damashita’ Yamashita and Haruki ‘Detarame’ Madarame, thanks to their powerful industry and military supporters.

⁸ Martin, “Postmodern Fascism,” 226.

zations (*Nihon Hidankyo*) and the Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (*Gensuikyo*), where similarly I was asked to provide proofreading services beginning in July 2004 for English translations of speeches given in various languages at the World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs held annually in August in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. As a proofreader, my role was limited to that of language specialist: I could offer internal comments on the texts I proofed but I could not influence the content of the texts or officially offer any dissenting point of view. After five years assisting *Nihon Hidankyo* and *Gensuikyo* as a proofreader, I desired a larger role as an activist and participant in the World Conference able to present ideas for consideration and arguments for discussion. This was particularly important because I found troubling several key aspects of the speeches I was proofing. First was the constant repetition of the phrase 'Japan, as the only [*sic*] A-bombed country.' While it is true that Hiroshima and Nagasaki are the only major urban populations to be bombed, thousands of nuclear bomb tests have resulted in significant injury and death, particularly to indigenous peoples, including the Tibetans, the Kazakhs, the Australian Aboriginals, the Marshall Islanders, and the Western Shoshone, who have been "disproportionately affected by the health and environmental impacts" of the nuclear industry not only because of nuclear bomb tests but also because of uranium mining, which is mostly done on indigenous lands and is quite hazardous to human health.⁹ The Western Shoshone Nation is the most heavily-bombed, having suffered more than 700 nuclear tests on its land against its sovereign wishes. Covering up this sordid history by claiming that Japan is the *only* A-bombed nation is racist and discriminatory.

Moreover, since the World Conference aims to unite groups across national boundaries in international solidarity, it seemed to me to be counterproductive to repeat a phrase which could be interpreted to imply Japanese exceptionalism or Japanese victimhood, particularly for an international audience that includes victims of Japanese aggression who vividly remember Japanese atrocities, such as the systematic rape of Asian women euphemistically called 'comfort women,' a crime against humanity never seriously addressed by the Japanese. I hoped that as a participant in the World Conference I could present an argument for ending the use of this questionable phrase.

The second concern I wished to raise as a participant was what I saw as an artificial removal of the issues of nuclear weapons and the needs of the *hibakusha* from their global context. I wished to ask how nuclear weapons could be divorced from depleted uranium munitions, conventional weapons, biological and chemical weapons, and militarism in general, including the U.S.-Japan Security Alliance. Must we not also oppose the military alliance and the Japanese Self-Defense Forces? How could we consider militarism without also considering its driving engines: capitalism, military Keynesianism, and neo-imperialism? Can we realistically expect states to give up nuclear weapons without giving up capitalism? Considering "nuclear power has never been economically viable without massive government subsidy and the true costs, including waste disposal and decommissioning of old reactors are problems that have never been properly addressed,"¹⁰ must we not consider that the true rationales for the existence of nuclear power plants are to provide the enriched materials for nuclear weapons and to provide propaganda to mislead the public, promoting the false ideology

⁹ Reaching Critical Will, *Indigenous People and the Nuclear Age* (<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/technical/factsheets/indigenous.html>) (accessed 15 September 2011).

¹⁰ Tatiana V. Mukhamedyarova, "In Our Lifetime," *2009 World Conference against A and H Bombs*, conference proceedings (Tokyo: Organizing Committee, World Conference against A and H Bombs, 2009:52).

that nuclear technology is beneficial?¹¹ If so, must we not oppose Japan's energy policy of relying heavily on nuclear power? I hoped that as a participant in the World Conference I could pose a series of questions that were not being adequately considered, if at all.

Most importantly, I was concerned with the issue of effectiveness. The activities organized and discussed at the World Conference were always limited to (1) educational fora at which surviving *hibakusha* told their stories, youth read the testimonials of *hibakusha*, and photographs of the devastation of the atomic bombings and of the mutilation of the *hibakusha* were displayed; (2) peace marches across Japan; (3) signature collection drives for petitions to be submitted to the United Nations Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference; and, (4) public support for lawsuits filed by *hibakusha* against the Japanese government for failure to recognize their medical conditions as caused by the atomic bombings and to provide appropriate remediation. Through appeals and legal maneuvering, the Japanese government's policy appears to be one of waiting for the plaintiffs to die, so support for a legal process which favors the defendant does not seem the most effective tactic for helping *hibakusha*, especially if there is no more militant action to speed up the legal process. As for "the much-ignored nonproliferation treaties," Peter Gelderloos¹² reminds us that they

only came after the arms race had already been won, with the U.S. as undisputed nuclear hegemon in possession of more nuclear weapons than was ever practical or useful. And it seems clear that proliferation continues as needed, currently in the form of tactical nuke development and a new

wave of proposed nuclear power facilities. Really, the entire issue seems to have been settled more as a matter of internal policy within the government than as a conflict between a social movement and a government. Chernobyl and several near meltdowns in the U.S. showed that nuclear energy (a necessary component of nuclear arms development) was something of a liability, and it does not take a protestor to question the usefulness, even to a government bent on conquering the world, of diverting staggering resources toward nuclear proliferation when you already have enough bombs to blow up the entire planet, and every single war and covert action since 1945 has been fought with other technologies.

Thus, the antinuclear movement cannot claim credit for promoting or achieving nuclear disarmament. Moreover, Dr. Rosalie Bertell¹³ estimated more than twenty million lives were taken by the nuclear powers from 1945 (starting with the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki) to 1984 (not including the 'wars on terror' conducted by Bush and Obama) alone, concluding

the prognosis...is poor. As nuclear powers increase their own pollution because of distorted military short term thinking, the people of their nations will give birth to more physically damaged offspring. These offspring will be less able to cope with the increasingly hazardous environment. Thus, a death process is underway, even if there is no catastrophic accident or nuclear holocaust.... There is no pretense that things are normal or one must believe the

¹¹ One might additionally argue that another reason for the continued reliance on the unprofitable nuclear power industry is to serve as a vehicle for transferring wealth from the poor to the rich through the use of taxes to subsidize the industry to the benefit of private investors.

¹² Peter Gelderloos, *How Nonviolence Protects the State* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: South End Press, 2007:10).

¹³ Quoted in Mike Ryan, "On Ward Churchill's 'Pacifism as Pathology': Toward a Revolutionary Practice," in Ward Churchill, *Pacifism as Pathology* (Oakland, California: AK Press, 2007:127).

experts. The stance is to attempt to heal the possibility of mortal wounds or sit with the dying earth. Honesty is the fundamental medicinal approach.

Thus, the antinuclear movement cannot claim credit for saving lives. Furthermore, honesty requires us to acknowledge, as Ward Churchill¹⁴ “put it,” that

there is not a petition campaign that you can construct that is going to cause the power and the status quo to dissipate. There is not a legal action that you can take; you cannot go into the court of the conqueror and have the conqueror announce the conquest to be illegitimate and to be repealed; you cannot vote in an alternative; you cannot hold a prayer vigil; you cannot burn the right scented candle at the prayer vigil; you cannot have the right folk song; you cannot have the right fashion statement; you cannot adopt a different diet or build a better bike path. You have to say it squarely: the fact that this power, this force, this entity, this monstrosity called the State maintains itself by physical force and can be countered only in terms that it itself dictates and, therefore, understands.

Thus, the antinuclear movement must reexamine its tactics, and I hoped that as a participant in the World Conference I could suggest that we abandon ineffective tactics and begin actions to achieve our goals.

Realizing that presenting such a speech at the 2009 World Conference might meet with some opposition, I requested a meeting with Hiroshi Taka, Secretary General of *Gensuikyō*, several months before the conference to discuss

my desire to participate not only as proofreader but as presenter so that I could introduce important ideas which were not being considered by the other presenters. At the meeting, we discussed cultural differences in rhetorical styles, and Taka suggested that native English speakers tend to rely more on logical argumentation than do Japanese writers. Nevertheless, Taka invited me to write a speech and to submit it for consideration. I prepared a draft of my speech and asked Taka to review it. He kindly made some suggestions as to tone and to content which I took into consideration when revising the speech. I submitted the speech in its final form entitled “An Alternative 2020 Vision” (see the appendix). Still concerned about the possible reception of my speech at the conference, I attempted to sound him out, but Taka remained vague, claiming he was not a professional activist and that the members of the organizing committee would review the speech. Taka did state I would be able to participate in the conference and that *Gensuikyō* would cover my hotel expenses in Hiroshima during the conference.

Upon arrival at the conference, I was given the schedule of speeches and discovered that my speech had not been included. When I inquired as to why my speech was not included, I was told that the speech was not concise. Concision is a structural constraint that censors what may or may not be discussed, as Noam Chomsky¹⁵ explains:

the beauty of concision...is that you can only repeat conventional thoughts.... Suppose [you regurgitate conventional pieties], you do not need any evidence; everybody just nods. On the other hand, suppose you say something...that is the least bit unexpected or controversial.... You know, people

¹⁴ Quoted in Derrick Jensen, “Preface (to the 2007 edition),” in Ward Churchill, *Pacifism as Pathology* (Oakland, California: AK Press, 2007:10).

¹⁵ Quoted in Mark Achbar, editor, *Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media* (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 147–58).

will quite reasonably expect to know what you mean. “Why did you say that? I never heard that before. If you said that, you better have a reason, you better have some evidence, and in fact you better have a lot of evidence because that is a pretty startling comment.” You cannot give evidence if you are stuck with concision. That is the genius of this structural constraint.

Thus, I appealed to the organizers, explaining that I had to provide a great deal of evidence and argumentation because I was presenting unique ideas that had not been covered by any other speaker during the five years in which I had been proofreading the speeches, but to no avail. Photocopies of the English text of my speech and of a Japanese translation of my speech prepared by *Gensuikyō* were provided to conference attendees on a table in the back of the conference hall, but I would not be permitted to speak. Moreover, the English text of my speech was not to be included in the printed and published proceedings of the conference; *Gensuikyō* applied the rule of concision to not only the spoken word but to the written word as well. Unable to present my speech, I requested to be able to ask a question from the floor during the session. The organizers demanded that I submit the question in writing and that it be *very* concise. Thereby, I was able to ask one question at the conference, and I used that opportunity to ask concisely how many drawn-out lawsuits and ineffective, annual petition campaigns must be carried out before there will be discussion and implementation of actions that result in fair treatment for all *hibakusha* and in the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. Chomsky warns that those who attempt to express unconventional thoughts concisely will “sound like they are from Neptune,”¹⁶ and the chairwoman facilitating the question and answer session took the opportunity to grossly and unfairly mischaracterize my question as

an *ad hominem* attack on Japanese by an American before asking Taka to reply to my question. Taka’s response was to argue a hypothetical: without the petition campaigns, the situation would be much worse. There was no opportunity for rebuttal.

Lest we forget the larger issues of nuclear weapons abolition and of *hibakusha* rights, it is important to keep in mind that what happened to me as an individual is trivial and happens to many others with dissenting points of view. That is why it is necessary to analyze the structure and effectiveness of the conference generally. Needless to say, if the NGOs in question were bringing about effective change, I would be guilty of misusing an academic forum to air sour grapes. I am arguing, however, that the organizational structure of the World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs serves to discourage alternative, confrontational points of view generally. The conference is held in a large meeting hall with a raised platform at the front. On this platform sit a dozen international ‘leaders’ of the antinuclear movement, and the other participants sit submissively facing these individuals. So the conference clearly divides leaders and followers. Approximately the front third of the hall is outfitted with rows of tables at which the invited delegates (mostly non-Japanese) sit. In the very front rows are representatives from local and national governments. These government officials are afforded unduly the opportunity to speak first, and many of them leave after speaking, bizarrely emptying the front of the hall for much of the conference. Behind the government officials sit representatives of various international antinuclear groups. The norm seems to be to invite only representatives of groups to participate, so it was unusual for someone like me—an anarcho-communist unaffiliated with a group—to participate. I was seated in the back rows of tables. Behind me in the rear-most two-thirds of the hall were seats

¹⁶ Quoted in Achbar, *Manufacturing Consent*, 158.

for perhaps a thousand members of the Japanese public to observe the conference. So the conference clearly divides Japanese and non-Japanese. The seating created a rigid hierarchy of control and deference that set the tone of the conference. Every year, Chairman of the Japanese Communist Party Kazuo Shii is permitted to present (rather inappropriately for a conference ostensibly organized by and for civil society) a political stump speech in the opening session. Then follow repetitive speeches that broadly fall into two categories: experiential speeches given by *hibakusha* and superficial speeches of solidarity given by international delegates. There are few opportunities for discussion. Ryan’s depiction of the peace movement accurately describes the scene in Hiroshima: “It is clear that the peace movement, rather than offering vital connections and a direction for popular discontent (which plainly exists), has failed to offer anything more than a repetitive and increasingly boring spectacle.”¹⁷ The only distraction at the 2009 World Conference was provided by an outbreak of ‘Obamania.’ The conference took place four months after President Barack Obama’s Prague Speech in which he rhetorically announced support for nuclear disarmament. A few Japanese participants wore rubber Obama masks, breaking out with Obama cheers. Sickeningly, Obama t-shirts were for sale inside the memorial museum to the victims of the Hiroshima bombing. The seasoned activists attending the 2009 World Conference should have known better: “a year later, the Obama administration released its Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), which instead of pushing away from nuclear weapons...in fact puts more focus and

effort into replacing and increasing nuclear weaponry.”¹⁸ Instead of the World Conference presenting an honest assessment of Obama’s Prague speech, it encouraged activists to get excited about an illusory political program.

Based not merely on the censorship of one speech but on the analysis of six years of speeches, one is driven to the conclusion without hyperbole that the *Nihon Hidankyo* and *Gensuikyo* NGOs are pro-nuclear weapon organizations. I would like to believe that those in positions to make decisions in these NGOs suffer from delusions rather than believe in the more cynical explanation that they are State agents tasked with co-opting grassroots activists. For despite their anti-nuclear weapon rhetoric, these NGOs, as Arundhati Roy comments on NGOs in general, “end up functioning like the whistle on a pressure cooker. They divert and sublimate political rage and make sure it does not come to a head. Eventually, they disempower people.”¹⁹ Indeed, on 18 March 2011, *Gensuikyo* issued a statement urging the government to take more appropriate action in a time of crisis, but importantly, the statement describes the situation as an “accident.”²⁰ Not backed up by any civil disobedience, such a statement has had no influence on state policy, but more importantly, the statement reinforces in the minds of the public the dominant ideology that the events of 11 March 2011 were accidental, making reality opaque. As historian Howard Zinn noted, such incidents are not accidental; they may not be deliberate, but they are predictable. Such incidents that fall between being deliberately planned and being accidents may be described as “‘the natural selection of accidents,’ in which, if there

¹⁷ Ryan, “On Ward Churchill’s ‘Pacifism as Pathology,’” 128.

¹⁸ *New Nuclear Posture Reviews Reveals US Hypocrisy* | *The Media Freedom Foundation* (<http://www.mediafreedominternational.org/2011/03/15/new-nuclear-posture-reviews-reveals-us-hypocrisy/>) (accessed 15 September 2011).

¹⁹ Arundhati Roy, *The Checkbook and the Cruise Missile: Conversations with Arundhati Roy*, interviews by David Barsamian (Cambridge, Massachusetts: South End Press, 2004:82).

²⁰ The Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, *18 March 2011 Statement* (http://www.antiatom.org/GSKY/en/biblioteca/11/110322_stmnt-fukushima.html) (accessed 15 September 2011).

is a certain structure to a situation, then these things will eventually happen, whether anyone plans them or not.”²¹ The State did not deliberately plan the March 11 incident, but its actions predictably resulted in the crisis. By misidentifying the situation as an accident, *Gensuikyo* gave ideological support to the State.

Case Study 2: Be Sensitive

On 17 June 2011, the Japanese Diet passed ‘The Computer Network Monitoring Law,’ which “will enable the police to monitor anyone’s Internet activity without restriction,” according to Makoto Ibusuki of Seijo University.²² Empowered by this law, the Agency for Natural Resources and Energy of the Ministry of Industry and Trade (METI) solicited bids on 15 July 2011 from private contractors to outsource its police powers and implement ‘The Nuclear Power Safety Regulation Publicity Project.’ The company winning the bid will be tasked with “monitoring blogs on nuclear power and radiation issues as well as Twitter accounts...around the clock, ...conducting research and analysis on incorrect and inappropriate information that would lead to false rumors, and...reporting such Internet accounts to the Agency [for Natural Resources and Energy].”²³ The distinction drawn between ‘incorrect’ and ‘inappropriate’ information suggests that METI officials seek not only to protect the public from false rumors but also to deny the public accurate information which is politically inconvenient. Moreover, the officials who initially condemned ‘false rumors’ have been

forced eventually to concede the validity of many of these ‘rumors’ as overwhelming evidence amounts in the subsequent weeks and months since the disaster began.²⁴ Therefore, the actions of officials may be characterized as a campaign of censorship and misinformation, creating a climate of uncertainty and fear within civil society. This campaign may have included the direct intimidation of individuals, as journalist and teacher Kenji Higuchi reportedly “surmises that the government has implicitly threatened universities not to touch on the nuclear issue in any critical way.”²⁵ In such a climate of fear and repression, one would be hard pressed to supply statistical evidence for censorship in civil society. Anecdotal evidence of the chilling effect on public discourse will have to suffice for present. One such anecdote²⁶ of a professor being censored for not being “sensitive” may be found on the Internet:

I teach part-time at this particular college and have freely published many articles there, but for the first time my submission which was to be on the nuke disaster was turned down because the issue was deemed “too sensitive.” It is noteworthy that one of the more academically open, meaty, and progressive-minded schools in Tokyo is now telling people to keep their mouths shut. When I wrote a reply to the editor asking that if I would submit to peer review they would still consider my article, I received no response.

Thus, in addition to concision, sensitivity has

²¹ Howard Zinn, *Artists in a Time of War* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2003:64–65).

²² Quoted in Theodora Filis, *New Japan Law ‘Cleanses’ Bad Nuclear News | UK Progressive* (24 July 2011) (<http://www.ukprogressive.co.uk/new-japan-law-cleanses-bad-nuclear-news/article13589.html>) (accessed 15 September 2011).

²³ Filis, *New Japan Law*.

²⁴ See, for excellent ongoing English and Japanese coverage deconstructing the misinformation provided by officials, *EX-SKF Financial and Economic News, Data, Links, Analysis and Commentary* (<http://ex-skf.blogspot.com/>) (accessed 15 September 2011).

²⁵ Richard Wilcox, *Censorship in Japan: The Fukushima Cover-Up | Dissident Voice* (29 June 2011) (<http://dissidentvoice.org/2011/06/censorship-in-japan-the-fukushima-cover-up/>) (accessed 15 September 2011).

²⁶ Wilcox, *Censorship in Japan*.

become a structural constraint effectively hindering discussion of the true, the good, and the beautiful.

Conclusion: Complicity and Futility

Ammon Hennacy swam mightily against the current. Beginning in 1955, Hennacy challenged a New York state law requiring all to participate in civil defense air raid drills. During the drills, school children ducked and covered, sheltering under desks, while adults retired to basement shelters if possible or huddled in doorways. Failure to participate could result in a one-year prison sentence and a \$500.00 fine. Hennacy saw the drills as "foolish" and dangerous because sheltering under desks, in basements, or in doorways would not offer protection from nuclear attack yet they psychologically normalized nuclear warfare.²⁷ He publicly refused to participate in the annual drills and was arrested and sentenced to jail time for five consecutive years. By 1960 the civil disobedience over the farcical civil defense drills had gained enough media attention that the police hesitated and did not arrest Hennacy. The *New York Post*, the *Village Voice*, the *Nation*, and *Commonweal* printed editorials, articles, and photographs favoring civil disobedience. The *New York World Telegram* reported "yesterday's test can be called meaningful and successful only if a potential enemy's plan is to drop marshmallow puffs on New York City—and to advertise in advance what time they are coming."²⁸ Hennacy and two thousand others refused to participate in the 1961 drill, and again the police backed down. The 1962 drill was cancelled, ending the seven years of compulsory drilling. What measure of victory, however, did Hennacy achieve? The madness of mutual assured destruction of the Cold War

continued unabated as did conventional warfare using chemical and biological weapons. Similar to the duck and cover drills of the 1950s, the legally permissible level of radiation regulations being promulgated in Japan today farcically have no basis in science but are important in that they psychologically normalize the reality of widespread radioactive pollution contaminating the water table, food supply, and the environment in general. Psychological acceptance of the regulations creates an opaque reality in which the unsafe is safe.

When I consider how a population can reject empirical reality in favor of political rhetoric, I am confronted by my own complicity. Undergraduate instruction in English as a foreign language in Japan can only be described as a simulacrum of education: the reliance on a disposable contingent workforce denied even a miniscule level of participation in academic governance; the compression of four years of study into the first two years of college so that students freed from classes can focus on seeking employment as upperclassmen; the emphasis on passing students who have made no discernible academic effort so as to collect their tuition, resulting in a meaningless grading system; and a tenured faculty more interested in keeping their privileged positions, avoiding student or parent criticisms, and servicing the needs of business than in creating a vibrant academic community in pursuit of the true, the good, and the beautiful.²⁹ I have become a grotesque parody of a teacher for what I am truly teaching students is that empirical reality is unimportant so long as we pretend together that what goes on in the classroom is humanistic education. Individuals trained in such a culture of make believe undoubtedly find it easier to accept assertions of safety, to dissociate from reality, to subordinate any independent emo-

²⁷ Ammon Hennacy, *The Book of Ammon*, fifth printing (N.P.: 1970:286).

²⁸ Hennacy, *Book of Ammon*, 293–4.

²⁹ See for another point of view Brian McVeigh, *Japanese Higher Education as Myth* (Armonk, New York: Sharpe, 2002).

tion, thought, or feeling to the dominant ideology. For example, nuclear weapons designers at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, instead of questioning the ethics of their work, complained that their computers were inadequate and that international test-ban agreements made their work more difficult and less accurate.³⁰ We may not come to wholeheartedly believe the dominant ideology—many of us simply cynically adjust our behavior, but “well-informed cynicism is only another mode of conformity.”³¹ I have not subordinated myself to the dominant ideology; nor have I cynically adjusted my behavior, but I might as well have because the outcome has been failure. I honestly cannot conceive how I can effectively do the work of researching and teaching the true, the good, and the beautiful. I am without hope of finding my work.

In 2007 reading Derrick Jensen’s *The Culture of Make Believe*,³² I learned for the first time in detail of the

major river systems [in the U.S.] that have been irradiated beyond any foreseeable recovery, [of] a generation of downwinders in eastern Washington, southern Nevada and Utah, Colorado, and several other states that have found themselves beset by leukemia and other cancers, and [of] Rocky Flats, the Hanford Nuclear Reservations, Oak Ridge Reservation, and the Savannah River Site [that] have all been hopelessly irradiated, [and of the] millions of tons of materials that will be dangerous in some cases for a quarter to half a million years.

Secretive releases of radioactive contaminants into the environment in the United States were (and continue to be) routine; the Rocky Flats site alone released hundreds of kilograms of

plutonium into the environment, which would amount to “a lethal dose for every human being on the planet if properly distributed.”³³ These atrocities, however, remained remote to me. Likewise, even though I grew up in Pennsylvania in the shadow of Three Mile Island, I was too young at the time to appreciate what was really happening. I am not too young now to not appreciate what is happening in Fukushima. Fukushima represents for me the final push toward futility. I grew up in the Lutheran Church—before the great hymns and musical liturgy were replaced with soulless modern tunes, and one thing the Lutherans got absolutely correct was the concept of the ‘calling’ or, in secular terms, ‘socially meaningful labor.’ I intuitively believe we are hardwired to need a calling; yet, subordinating ourselves to the dominant ideology makes it impossible for us to have a calling as there is no socially meaningful work to be had. The result is that we become psychopaths if we abandon our need for a calling or depressives if we hold onto our desire for one. Those psychopaths who are in positions of power create double binds that rope the rest of us to them. If we subordinate ourselves to their dominant ideology, we sit with a dying earth; if we resist, we are denied employment, and without employment we find ourselves without the financial means for providing for ourselves and for our families. All of us, not only those of us in Eastern Japan, face this double bind. Even if the choice is futile, we still have a choice to make. Cancer is a pain-intensive, wasting death; it is a biological manifestation of our psychopathic society and technology. My comrade Alistair Hulett died at the age of fifty-eight within a month of being diagnosed with cancer. I thought I would have years of his comradeship, but his passing was too sudden to afford us an opportunity even to say goodbye. I

³⁰ Jeff Schmidt, *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes Their Lives* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000:201, 207–08).

³¹ Max Horkheimer, *Eclipse of Reason* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947:113).

³² Derrick Jensen, *The Culture of Make Believe* (White River Junction, Vermont: Chelsea Green, 2002:278).

³³ Jensen, *Culture of Make Believe*, 433.

never met my wife's father to sit with him, to learn firsthand of his life, and to assure him that his family would continue; he suffered for nearly a decade battling cancer before dying young. My father recently lost his baby sister to cancer; I can only estimate the grief of outliv-

ing a younger sibling. If constant financial insecurity, fascism, militarism, environmental degradation, psychopathy, depression, and premature death be the costs of our civilization, I want naught of it. What choice will you make?

Appendix: Text of Censored Speech (“An Alternative 2020 Vision”)

Fellow conference participants, I stand before you filled with feelings of humility, shame, and frustration. It is a humbling experience to be speaking to this august assembly in this city forever scarred by evil. Even though I was born twenty-five years after the U.S. bombing of Hiroshima, as a U.S. citizen I take responsibility for the decisions and actions of the leadership of my country for moral opposition does not shield one from complicity and culpability. I humbly apologize to the people of Hiroshima who were so grievously harmed by my nation. This is my first time to participate directly in this conference, but after moving to Japan in 1999, I started assisting the Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs and the Japan Confederation of A- and H- Bomb Sufferers Organization by editing English documents for public release, so I feel that I have been participating in this conference behind the scenes for several years. While it is definitely not my intention to offend, I would like to use my opportunity to speak to raise concerns about the efficacy of our movement.

Speaking for myself, I am opposed to war, to the maintenance of armies, and to the creation of conventional, biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons. Believing that capitalism is a political-economic system that necessitates war, I am opposed to capitalism as a precondition for achieving a peaceful world. Additionally, I am opposed to all civilian nuclear industries because they litter our planet with toxic pollution. After the invasion of Iraq by the United States with the support of Japan in 2003, I joined the hundreds of American war tax resisters who, following an honorable tradition begun by Henry David Thoreau after the invasion of Mexico by the United States, refuse to pay federal taxes. But in all honesty, living in Japan safely out of reach of the Internal Revenue Service, my refusal to pay U.S. income tax is a no-regrets option for me. I can safely protest the fact that 50% of U.S. federal funds

are spent financing past, present, and future wars. In all honesty, I am not doing enough. I am ashamed to admit that I do pay tax to the Japanese government which not only uses my tax payment to finance Japan's 5 trillion yen military budget but also to subsidize the U.S. military through various sympathy budgets. So, in my rejection of armies, weapons, wars, and the nuclear industry, I have yet to take action that carries real personal cost. Furthermore, in my daily life, I am a college professor, and while I do teach students about the need to eliminate armies, weapons, wars, and the nuclear industry, I am keenly aware that teaching is not doing. I also know that I must judge myself not by my intentions but by the results of my actions. Based on this criterion of efficacy, I stand before you in shame. Every day that we allow the Japanese government to delay recognition of Hibakusha status to suffering individuals, to impose needless burdens on Hibakusha, and to deny much-needed assistance to Hibakusha fills me with shame. Each day that we allow states to maintain nuclear arsenals and to use war as a means for furthering economic and political agendas fills me with shame. Each day that we allow the civilian use of nuclear power fills me with shame.

The final emotion I am feeling is frustration. Working with young Japanese in the college classroom, I struggle to teach historical understanding, critical thinking skills, ethics, and empathy. Most college students I meet support revising Japan's peace constitution or believe that the dispatch of the Japanese Self-Defense Force to foreign combat zones is not unconstitutional because such missions are for peace-keeping purposes. Many students believe that Japanese security requires continued reliance on the U.S. nuclear deterrent or on a greatly expanded Japanese Self-Defense Force capable of securing Japan independently of the United States. Of course, Japanese students are greatly influenced by media propaganda

and ideological education, but this does not relieve them of their responsibility to think for themselves. While there are activists in Japan who risk their professional careers and personal security to help others see beyond the walls of inculcation, it seems to me that for tactical reasons, we in the anti-nuclear and anti-war movement in Japan have chosen to sacrifice our long-term goals for short-term ones by not demanding rigorous discussion and analysis of history, politics, economics, ethics, and tactics. We have established and held fast to a number of myths that might increase public participation in our movement but also stand in the way of real progress. Perhaps some may feel that a discussion of this issue best belongs in small meetings of committed activists, but to the contrary, we cannot rely on a radicalized vanguard. We need to radicalize the membership to have real power. The goals that we share of eliminating nuclear weapons and of eliminating war are too important to allow our underestimation of the public's ability to engage in rigorous discussion and analysis to misdirect us. We need to be perfectly clear about the lessons we can learn from Hiroshima so that others will be less easily misled by rationalizations of war and by rationalizations of nuclear policy.

With a gentle voice, I would like to remind us that Japan was never the only country to be A-bombed, nor were those in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 the only Hibakusha to be created by the evil of nuclear technology. I understand that Japanese may use the phrase 'the only A-bombed country' to encourage Hibakusha to speak out and to emphasize Japanese responsibility for achieving a nuclear-free and peaceful world, but this historical myth invites a needless exceptionalism that isolates Japanese from the broader movement. I live in Koto City in Tokyo a few kilometers away from Yumenoshima where the residents of Koto City erected a memorial hall to preserve the *Lucky Dragon No. 5* whose crew members were exposed to the March 1, 1954 Castle Bravo nucle-

ar bomb test at Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands. Certainly, these men are properly considered Hibakusha, and they remind us of the horrible truth that the nuclear powers have conducted more than two thousand nuclear tests, and all of these tests have caused death by poisoning the homelands of countless people, injuring the health of many people, and devastating the cultures and traditions of many people, particularly that of indigenous people. The Western Shoshone Nation, whose land is occupied by the United States, has been bombed more than seven hundred times. The Shoshone have repeatedly gone to the United Nations to demand that their nation not be bombed but to no avail. The Marshall Islanders suffer abnormally high cancer rates and birth abnormalities stemming from tests conducted in the South Pacific. The Maralinga Aborigines of Australia were bombed by the British, destroying their community. The Soviet Union conducted most of its nuclear tests on the lands of the Kazakh nation. The Tibetans and Uighurs and the Algerians and Polynesians have suffered the effects of nuclear testing by the Chinese and French respectively. Besides nuclear weapons testing, Hibakusha have been created in many other ways. We must remember that uranium mining is the most hazardous nuclear industry creating the most radioactive waste and the most number of people exposed to the most number of doses of radiation. All of these injured uranium miners are properly considered Hibakusha. So too we must remember the victims of nuclear power plant incidents (not accidents) such as at Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, and Tokaimura. As long as we continue using nuclear power plants, incidents will happen either because of human error or because of natural events such as earthquakes, creating more Hibakusha. Ethics and empathy require us to stand in solidarity with all victims of the nuclear industry and to recognize all of these victims as Hibakusha because all of them have faced discrimination, because all of them have had their lives inalterably worsened, and be-

cause all of them deserve our immediate support. Further, we must not forget the victims of experimentation: those who were purposefully exposed to radioactive materials so that the effects of radiation could be studied such as the downwinders of the Hanford (Washington) Nuclear Reservation. Finally, we must not forget that the population of an entire nation (the Iraqis) is being turned into Hibakusha. The U.S. military creates more than 750,000 tons of radioactive waste annually. The storage and disposal of this radioactive waste used to be problematic, but since 1991, the U.S. military has been recycling this toxic waste by using it to manufacture depleted uranium ammunition. Depleted uranium is mostly U-238 but includes other toxic substances such as plutonium. Depleted uranium burns at such high temperatures that it can penetrate the most advanced armor, but when it does, it creates an insoluble uranium oxide aerosol that has a radioactive half-life of 4.5 billion years. The extensive use of depleted uranium ammunitions in Iraq has covered the country with a fine radioactive dust. Breathing in this dust, which is nearly impossible to remove from the body, exposes Iraqis to radiation equivalent to one chest x-ray every few minutes, according to physicist Michio Kaku, and causes cancers, birth defects, and behavioral disorders. In 1997, the U.S. admitted to test-firing depleted uranium ammunition in Okinawa in December, 1995 and in January, 1996. Considering this extensive history of atomic bombing and Hibakusha creation, our monthly Sixth and Ninth Day activities that focus on Hiroshima and Nagasaki need to be expanded to First, Third, Sixth, Ninth, and Thirtieth Day activities. On the first day of the month, we may remember the victims of nuclear testing, such as in the March 1, 1954 Bikini Test. On the third day of the month, we may remember the victims of depleted uranium, such as on the three undisclosed days that depleted uranium rounds were test-fired in Okinawa. And on the thirtieth day of the month, we may remember the victims of

civilian nuclear industries, such as in the September 30, 1999 Tokaimura incident.

The second myth divorces the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki from the historical context of war. Without doubt, the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were war crimes, but war itself is a crime against humanity. Yes, the use of nuclear weapons creates long-term harm, but so does the use of cluster bombs that may not explode on impact, landmines that remain buried after the conflict formally ends, and biological and chemical weapons such as Agent Orange that remain in the environment creating cancer and birth defects for many years. Moreover, only an insane individual like Robert McNamara would even attempt to comparatively assess the value of human lives lost. A human life cannot be measured by standard values. Each individual is unique and irreplaceable. So in a very real sense, the death of each individual devalues us. While we must note the number of people murdered in particular war crimes, we must not enter into ranking atrocities by number of deaths. All acts of war are atrocious. Whenever we remember Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we must remember the massacres at Nanjing and My Lai, the fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo, and every other senseless act of war. The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki does not teach us only to oppose nuclear weapons; it teaches us to oppose all war. That is why the demand that the *U.S.S. Washington* cannot be homeported in Yokosuka because it is a nuclear powered aircraft carrier is a ridiculous demand. First, I do not believe many of those who oppose the homeporting of the *U.S.S. Washington* also oppose civilian nuclear power generation (although they should), so I am not sure why they object to nuclear powered military vessels. Second, such a demand is misleadingly redundant. No aircraft carrier, conventional or nuclear, should be homeported in Japan. So arguing that the *U.S.S. Washington* should not be homeported because it is nuclear powered suggests falsely that if it were not nu-

clear powered its homeporting would be acceptable. We in the anti-nuclear and anti-war movement need to be much more precise about our demands. We want an end to war. We want an end to all weapons of war.

The third myth concerns Japan’s peace constitution and the categorization of Japan as a peaceful country. Meaningful peace means more than the absence of officially declared hostilities. To be a peaceful nation requires foreign policies and international trade policies not based on *real politik* or capitalist self-interest but on principles enshrined in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But if we are to be honest, Japan’s foreign policies and international trade policies are based on *real politik*. For example, the Japanese state supported the military coup of General Suharto, his establishment of a brutally murderous dictatorship, and his invasion of East Timor, and Japan benefited greatly from Suharto’s economic policies. When Suharto died, Japanese Prime Minister Yasuo Fukuda expressed his heartfelt sorrow on behalf of the Japanese people. Japan also offered asylum to Peru’s Alberto Fujimori, who is now imprisoned for crimes against the Peruvian people. Again, Japan benefited greatly from Fujimori’s economic policies. Since World War II, Japan has been militarily occupied by the United States and has adopted policies incestuously entwined with U.S. militarism, indirectly supporting U.S. wars of aggression against Korea and Vietnam and directly supporting U.S. wars of aggression against Afghanistan and Iraq. As a powerful member of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, and the G8, Japan has helped to impose a violent economic system on the people of the world. Indeed, the maintenance of the Japanese lifestyle is based on the continuing functioning of an economic order requiring military regimes to be maintained. Moreover, Japan established the National Police Reserve in 1950 equipping it with military small arms. In 1952, this proto-military was expanded as

the National Safety Forces. The rearmament of Japan became a reality in 1954 when it was reorganized as the Self-Defense Forces. In my college classes, I teach an American folk song composed and written by Utah Phillips called *Enola Gay*. The last verse of the song gives us an important message: “Look out, look out from your schoolroom window! Look up, young children, from your play! Oh, when you see those war planes flying, each one is named *Enola Gay*.” Utah Phillips clearly reminds us that in function each military aircraft is insanely identical. How can the Japanese, an A-bombed people, permit the existence of so many *Enola Gay*’s in the Japan Air Self-Defense Force? By confronting my students with this question, I am hoping that they will act to disband the Japanese Self-Defense Forces because, regardless of false rationalizations, the Self-Defense Forces are an army, violate the peace constitution of Japan, and are a psychological preparation for war. By permitting the existence of the Self-Defense Forces, Japanese are admitting that some international disagreements cannot be resolved peacefully. Wars are inevitable. Thus, Japanese militarism is prohibited *de jure* but exists *de facto*. Relying on the U.S. nuclear deterrent, maintaining a military, and following violent economic and foreign relations policies, it is utmost hypocrisy for Japanese to demand North Koreans to abandon their nuclear deterrent, particularly as recent Japanese administrations have been attempting to formally change the peace constitution to recognize the reality of Japanese militarism. From a Japanese perspective, North Korean saber rattling rationalizes Japanese militarism; from a North Korean perspective, Japanese militarism rationalizes North Korean militarism. A truly peaceful nation must break this cycle and adopt a meaningful peace. To do this, many in the anti-nuclear and anti-war movement have been organizing to defend Japan’s peace constitution. But we lost this fight to defend the peace constitution fifty-nine years ago when the National Police Reserve was formed, so our

efforts to become a truly peaceful nation are disingenuous. The North Koreans know this. Instead, we should be fighting to transform Japanese foreign and economic policies to ones of peace. We should be fighting to remove every U.S. military base from Japan. We should be fighting to disband the Self-Defense Forces. Instead, of fighting to defend the peace constitution from adverse revision, we should be fighting to enforce the peace constitution. Then we can in good faith ask the North Koreans to live in a peaceful world with us.

The fourth myth concerns our movement's relationships with officials and the effectiveness of our movement's tactics. For too many years, we have been kowtowing to the very officials that have created the structures of militarism we hope to dismantle. We can never believe the rhetoric of officials and politicians. President Obama was elected with a clear mandate to end the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. One of his first acts as President was to issue an executive order closing the illegal prison at Guantanamo Bay and reaffirming that detainees must be tried in the court system, albeit in a year's time. But we have seen that he has already rescinded his order to close the prison and to follow the rule of law. We have also seen that he plans to keep troops in Iraq indefinitely and that he wants to expand the war in Afghanistan. Any suggestion by President Obama that he will work towards the elimination of nuclear weapons is not credible. We must adopt a confrontational stance to politicians and officials. They are not our allies but our enemies. They will only make real change when they are forced by the people to make change. More realistically, change will only come when the people remove these politicians and officials. Considering this, our movement has been rendered ineffective by our commitment to reform and to the party politics of representative democracy. To offer another example of our inexplicable respect for power, I simply cannot understand our movement's response to Henry Kissinger's January 8, 2007

statement on "A World Free from Nuclear Weapons." Considering the deaths that Henry Kissinger is directly responsible for in Chile, East Timor, and Vietnam, how can we even consider the words of this self-serving war criminal and mastermind of *real politik*? The time has come for us not to be lulled by the rhetoric of our so-called leaders. The time has also come for us to recognize that the General Assembly of the United Nations is incapable of imposing its will on the Security Council and on the club of nuclear nations because of the anti-democratic structure that the World War II powers imposed on it. In order to achieve our goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and free of war, we have up to now been mostly educating others about the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and collecting signatures on petitions to present to our leaders. I am so frustrated because, instead of recognizing that our efforts have met with no success, we congratulate ourselves on what we say we have accomplished. Why do we cling to the myth that collecting a few million more signatures will have the effect we desire? Why can we not see that our tactics are not effective? Certainly, we should continue to educate others about the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Certainly, we should continue to collect signatures on petitions. Let me repeat that. Collecting signatures has a place in our movement. They allow people to participate, but they can only ever be a very tentative first step. Unless the people who sign the petitions are educated and organized to engage in civil disobedience, governments can simply ignore them. In the past, signature campaigns may have been more effective because the government feared that the public would respond to inaction with civil disobedience, but today, the government has much more effective police power to prevent civil disobedience and we in the movement are not emphasizing civil disobedience. We must adopt, or offer strong support to others who adopt, more extreme tactics to achieve our goals. And we must be honest with ourselves and the public about the complete

inefficacy of signature campaigns without a real threat of civil disobedience. Failing to do this, the Japanese peace movement, like that in the United States, is suffering from the pathology of pacifism.

I would like to conclude by suggesting an alternative 2020 Vision plan. Imagine if we could organize two groups of twenty million Japanese to engage in civil disobedience on August 6, 2020. Imagine if at 3:00 A.M., five million Japanese were to cut the fences at Narita International Airport and sit down on the runways. Simultaneously, five million Japanese would occupy the runways at Haneda Airport, five million Japanese would sit down on the tracks of the JR Chuo Line in Tokyo, and five million Japanese would sit down on the tracks of the JR Yamanote Line in Tokyo. The second group of twenty million Japanese would be acting in support, bringing rice balls and green tea to the first group of twenty million occupying Tokyo’s major transportation arteries. Imagine if these two groups of twenty million Japanese would continue their act of civil disobedience until the Japanese Self-Defense Forces were disbanded, until every U.S. military base in Japan were closed, until every nuclear power plant in Japan were closed, until the

Japanese government announced that the principles of peace, cooperation, and humanism would from henceforth govern Japanese foreign and economic policies. Yes, it is a dream, but it is more realistic than our dream that petitions alone will be effective. I am not suggesting that we must adopt my 2020 Vision plan. But I am suggesting that if we want to become an effective movement, we must stop allowing our myths to guide us. We must stop congratulating ourselves on our fictitious gains. But I wonder if secretly in our hearts we know that our lifestyle depends on militarism. Perhaps we don’t want to give up our convenient lifestyle so we pay lip service to the goals of nuclear disarmament and the establishment of world peace. Considering how our movement misdirects the energy of progressive people into ineffective tactics, one might even conclude that our real purpose is to block the elimination of nuclear weapons and to prevent world peace. But if we truly desire the eradication of nuclear weapons and world peace and if we truly are willing to radically alter our way of life so that disarmament and peace are possible, we must start to consider alternative tactics. Until we do, when we search our souls, we will find only shame and frustration.