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Abstract

Groups in conflict develop different and often contesting interpretations of the past, particularly if that history involves a violent injustice. How both perpetrator and victimised groups deal with their past history is critical to the successful resolution of protracted conflicts. When the harm is left unacknowledged and unaddressed, feelings of victimisation, humiliation, and shame emerge and frequently prolong the conflict between the transgressor and transgressed. The perpetrator's acknowledgment of responsibility for immoral acts is therefore an essential prerequisite in promoting reconciliation. Debates about historical injustices, however, focus on whether guilt and responsibility for past wrongs should be passed on from the original perpetrators to the generational descendants.

Seventy years have passed since the end of the Second World War, and yet the memories of the war continue to negatively affect the relations between China and Japan. While Chinese victims and their descendants continue to seek apology and closure, the Japanese public are experiencing 'apology fatigue'—a feeling of frustration that no matter what they do, the victims will never be satisfied. This thesis seeks to examine the extent to which present-day Japanese are willing to accept some degree of inherited responsibility for the acts of aggression committed by their ancestors. Drawing on social identity, basic human needs and reconciliation theories, this research aims to identify the social psychological factors impeding Japanese acceptance of collective responsibility for its past. Using a mixed methods approach, this problem is examined and explored with a sample of 162 Japanese university students representing a generation who were never directly involved in the nation's misdeeds.
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CHAPTER 1

1. Introduction

"We must not let our children, grandchildren, and even further generations to come, who have nothing to do with the war, be predestined to apologize."

Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, in his message commemorating the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, August 14, 2015

1.1 Inherited Responsibility for Historical Injustices

Groups in conflict develop different and often contesting interpretations of the past, particularly if that history involves a violent injustice. Polarized and divisive memories of past violence can perpetuate a sense of grievance among the victims and thereby increasing the risk of intolerance and revengeful act towards the former adversary (Nadler & Shnabel, 2008; Frijda, 1994). Competing victim vs. perpetrator narratives of the same historical event pose one of the most challenging obstacles to peaceful resolution of conflicts (Bilali & Ross, 2012). How both perpetrator and victimised groups deal with their past history of violent trauma is critical to the successful resolution of intractable conflict (Staub, 2006; Lederach, 1997; Brooks, 1999; Minow, 2002). Whether the trauma is a result of genocide or of war, if it is left unacknowledged and unaddressed, feelings of victimization, shame and humiliation emerge which frequently prolong the conflict between the transgressor and the transgressed (Scheff, 1994; Lindner, 2006; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008). The perpetrator group's acknowledgement of responsibility for its immoral acts is therefore an essential pre-requisite in promoting reconciliation (Minow, 1998; Kelman, 2008).

Debates about historical injustices, however, have focused on whether responsibility and guilt for past wrongs should be passed on from the original perpetrators to generational descendants. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's (2015) commemorative war message—"We must not let our children, grandchildren, and
even further generations to come, who have nothing to do with the war, be predestined to apologize”—illustrates that it is not common for descendants of perpetrator groups to accept 'inherited responsibility' for the pain and suffering inflicted on other groups. Against this backdrop, Kwak and Nobles (2013) nonetheless argue that that the descendants of perpetrators bear 'inherited responsibility' for past harm and should contribute in some way, to its remedy (Kwak & Nobles, 2013). These scholars insist that the issue of 'inherited responsibility' needs to be seriously addressed if there is to be a 'thick' reconciliation in East Asia. Miller's (2007) theory also claims that intergenerational responsibility for historical wrongdoings is both an inherited and a national responsibility. Citizens of perpetrator nations cannot escape responsibility since historical injustices are perpetrated by peoples rather than by states even if the state issues the orders (Miller, 2007, 135-61). Abdel-Nour (2013) also supports this argument by stressing that it is the citizens' membership in a political community that forms the basis for such 'inheritance'.

This thesis, therefore, assumes theoretically that the acceptance of inherited responsibility for a nation's misdeeds is an important component of intergroup reconciliation (Kwak & Nobles, 2013; Kelman, 2008b). Other scholarship in social psychology also indicates that acknowledgement of collective responsibility and guilt contributes to reconciliation by promoting pro-social actions amongst members of the perpetrator group in order to redress the past (Wohl et al., 2013; Iyer et al., 2003). The theory on inherited responsibility, however, stands in tension with scholarship on protracted conflicts which reveal that there are identity-driven needs and motivations that stand as barriers to the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility. Social identity theory posits that individuals are driven to protect the collective esteem of their primary social reference group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Because collective guilt arises from negative evaluation of the in-group's actions, in-group members often avoid accepting responsibility for their group's transgressions in order to defend their group's positive identity and reputation. The most critical threats to group identity occurs when its collective morality and reputation are questioned (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999). When confronted by accusations of their in-group's immoral past, individuals defend the
group's moral status by averting collective guilt and denying responsibility (Sullivan et al., 2012).

It is a central assumption of this thesis that intergroup reconciliation will not be achieved until the perpetrator group [and their descendants] acknowledge responsibility for their past ill treatment of others. In light of this, this thesis seeks to examine the extent to which present-day Japanese accept some degree of inherited responsibility for the acts of aggression and injustice committed by their forebears. Why do some contemporary Japanese feel responsibility for their nation's past while others do not? The purpose of this mixed methods study is to examine empirically what conditions and which factors impede the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility for the transgressions of their ancestors. This problem was examined and explored with a sample of 162 Japanese university students who represent a generation of 'descendants' who were never involved in Japan's wartime past. Japanese lack of contrition for the past continues to stand as a major obstacle to the offering of forgiveness and reconciliation between Japan, China and South Korea both of whom experienced aggression, occupation and colonisation at the hands of Japan during the twentieth century. Drawing on scholarship on identity-driven intractable conflicts, this study examines the potential role of social psychological factors in impeding the perpetrator group's acceptance and acknowledgement of collective responsibility.

This chapter begins with an overview of the background and context within which the question of inherited responsibility is addressed. This is followed by the presentation of the research problem, the purpose of the study and accompanying research questions. It will briefly outline the research approach and the definitions of the key terms used in this thesis.
1.2 Background: The Sino-Japanese 'History Problem'

Nearly seventy years have passed since the end of the Second World War, and yet the 'history problem' still deeply affects relations between China and Japan. While Chinese victims continue to seek apology and closure, the descendants of the Japanese who committed atrocities in China (and South Korea) seem to prefer a policy of deliberate amnesia. Japan's lack of contrition and 'historical amnesia' represented by its political leaders' denial of the Nanjing Massacre, sanitization of history textbooks, and its Prime Ministers' controversial visits to the Yasukuni Shrine has generated considerable hostility from victim nations in East Asia. While China and Korea continue to demand Japan's sincere apology and contrition, the Japanese public are experiencing 'apology fatigue'—a feeling of frustration that no matter what they do, Chinese and Korean victims will never be satisfied. As the Japanese people's sense of remorse for their forebear's past diminishes with successive generations, the prospects for true reconciliation in East Asia become ever more bleak.

Despite years of developing multi-layered networks to restore positive relationships, divisive interpretations of war history continue to obstruct the process of reconciliation between China and Japan. While bilateral economic and trade ties remain strong, large-scale anti-Japanese demonstrations in both China and Korea are a salutary reminder that war history has not been put to rest and will not be forgotten. In 2012, immediately after the outbreak of the Senkaku/Diaoyu territorial dispute, Kyodo News Agency reported that more than 80,000 Chinese citizens staged anti-Japan rallies in over 50 cities to protest the purchase of the islands.¹ These were the largest anti-Japan demonstrations in China since the two countries normalized diplomatic relations in 1972. These Sino-Japan tensions raise a question mark over the solidity of negative peace in East Asia and challenge simplistic neoliberal assumptions that economic interdependence will always restrain conflicts and ensure

¹ “Over 80,000 Chinese in over 50 cites join anti-Japan protests,” Kyodo News, September 16, 2012.
durable peace. The escalation of tension between China and Japan over the past decade has more to do with the activation of deeper socio-cultural dynamics in defense of national values and identity than with the maintenance of functional economic relationships.

Recent public opinion polling demonstrates that these dynamics are widespread and pervasive across a broad cross section of both the Chinese and Japanese public. Scholars like Gries (2005, 105) have argued that the recent rise of anti-Japanese public sentiment in China should not be viewed simply as an outcome of politically orchestrated nationalist tactics by the Chinese Communist Party to legitimize its rule. They stress that the historiographic divergence caused by conflicting war narratives have stimulated hostilities and mistrust in both countries.

The recent joint survey by Genron NPO and China Daily (2016)\(^2\) showed that public perceptions between Chinese and Japanese are significantly worsening, with 91.6 percent of the Japanese claiming that they have negative perceptions of China, and 76.7 percent of the Chinese having negative perceptions of Japan. Polls reveal that 70.5 percent of Chinese respondents reported that the greatest source of their negative perceptions of Japan was 'Japan's lack of proper apology and remorse over its history of invasion.' On the other hand, 41.7 percent of the Japanese answered that the major reason for their hostility toward China was because they are tired of hearing 'repeated anti-Japanese criticisms in the media.' These findings are consistent with the polls conducted more than ten years ago, suggesting that contentious historical interpretations of the war continue to feed mistrust between both countries. In a joint public opinion poll by *Asahi Shimbun* and the Chinese Academy of Social Science in September, 2002, 80 percent of Chinese cited the problem of 'Japan's lack of historical awareness' represented by 'the Japanese Prime Ministers' visits to the Yasukuni Shrine' and 'the controversial revisions to Japanese history textbooks' to be a major source of mistrust. These data reinforce my assumption that one of the key drivers of mistrust and hostility among Chinese and Japanese is the perpetrator's lack of repentance and denial of the past.

1.3 Gap in Sino-Japanese Literature

As friction between China and Japan has intensified over the years, academic literature and media have extensively analysed the conflict between the two Asian superpowers. They largely argue that the breakdown of the Sino-Japanese relationship can be explained in terms of 'great power transitions' and wider international relations, foreign policy and security theories. Realists argue that ongoing bilateral tensions highlight 'structural changes' in the post-Cold War geopolitical system, and that it is shifts in the balance of power which have caused the region to become extremely volatile (Takahara, 2004; Kokubun 2003; Green 2001). Realist scholarship views the future of China and Japan with pessimism, expecting the 'simmering rivalry' between the two countries to become a major source of instability in the twenty-first century (Friedberg, 1993; Calder, 2006; Christensen, 1999). Some argue that China is a hegemon with a political ambition to demonstrate that it is not a second rank nation in the region (Christensen, 2006; Peou, 2010, 23). Similarly, other realists point to China’s aggressive actions in the East and South China Seas as hegemonic signals intended to displace the United States as the dominant power in Asia (Friedberg 2005, 18; Glosserman, 2003).

Liberal and Neo-liberal Sino-Japanese scholarship offers a more optimistic vision of the future of East Asia. Liberal theorists argue that interstate trade and economic interdependence discourages states from entering into wars. Scholars like Keohane and Nye (2000), for example, argue that the growth of 'complex interdependencies' in the region should lead to improved diplomatic relations and security cooperation between the nations. Similarly, Tønnesson (2015, 2017) argues that the decades of ‘negative peace’ in East Asia is an outcome of the region’s leaders shifting its national priority on economic growth which requires both internal and external stability. However, is the region’s economic interdependence solid enough to sustain East Asia's negative peace in the face of the recent resurgence of nationalism, and reactivation of unresolved historical animosities. When we observe the rising tension between China and Japan, there seems to be no strong evidence that growing
economic interdependence in Asia is bringing the two countries closer together—at least not in terms of public perception of the other.

Although not a dominant voice in the discourse of international relations, there are other scholars who see issues of historical memory, identity and nationalism as the key sources of regional instability and potential conflict between China and Japan (Jager, 2007; Callahan 2004; He, 2007b; Suzuki 2007; Gries, 2005; Rose, 2005; Wang, 2012). Deep hostilities generated from clashing national identities embedded in divisive historical memories may explain why the potential for bilateral schism is proving more potent than the dynamics of integration and cooperation. Several works have identified the issue of rising nationalism as the principal factor responsible for the deterioration of Sino-Japanese relations (He, 2007a; Heazle, 2007; Gries, 2005: Rozman, 2002).

Although an understudied area, Japan’s identity change as a source of conflict in Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations has been explored by various scholars in recent years (Hagström & Gustafsson, 2015). One argument posits that the traumatic consequences of Japan’s invasion has left a deep scar on the Chinese psyche which is easily transferred across generations so that it is as potent today as it was in the 1930s. Manifestations of this can be seen in China’s swift reactions to any possible revival of Japanese imperialism (Whiting, 1989; Whiting & Xin, 1990, 115-20). Scholars who have observed Sino-Japan tensions as identity-driven have analysed how the legitimacy-challenged Chinese Communist Party has used history education as a means for the glorification of the party, the consolidation of national identity, and the justification of the party’s rule after the Tiananmen incident (Rose, 1998; Zhao, 1998).

A growing strain of thought among Chinese and Japanese specialists is that the Chinese Communist Party strategically and rationally uses the history of Japanese imperialist aggression for its own national political purpose (Whiting, 1989; Zhao, 2000). These theorists argue that the history issue is manipulated to take advantage of Japan’s war guilt and draw out political concessions from Tokyo. Other scholars
note that the 'victimization' narratives of Japan’s wartime aggression are utilized by the CCP leaders in their 'patriotic education campaign' to arouse nationalist sentiments. Declining credibility in communism has led the Chinese government resort to the ideological framework of nationalism to boost its internal solidarity (Komori, 2003; Zhao, 1998, 288; Gries 2005, 109). After all, memories of Japanese imperialism are widespread and can be easily activated to boost patriotic nationalism in China (Suzuki, 2007).

Recent studies examine the formation of China’s national identity and the role Japan plays as a 'negative other' in the construction of China’s victimhood narrative (He, 2007b). He outlines Japan’s role in this process as follows, “A country that had invaded and humiliated China in the past, and whose historical amnesia was notorious, Japan became an easy target of China’s assertive nationalism….Those who now replaced the KMT as the worst villains in the history of war were the ‘vicious Japanese imperialist aggressors’” (He 2007b, 57). While the top-down patriotic education campaign of the 1990s and 2000s is seen as the primary stimulus of popular nationalism in China, Suzuki (2007) and Gries (2005) both stress that elite-driven 'national humiliation' would not have been effective without a large and sympathetic audience. The scars and narratives of violent trauma and humiliation are not merely 'official history' in textbooks but are real stories heard from parents and grandparents that are entrenched deeply in the Chinese psyche (Suzuki, 2007).

The enduring impact of the 'history problem' on Sino-Japanese relations has drawn much attention from both academics and the media in recent years. A vast amount of scholarly work has been devoted to the history of the textbook disputes in Japan (Hein & Selden, 2000; Nozaki, 2008: Rose 1998; Saaler 2005; Bukh, 2007; Kim, 2008; Fukuoka, 2011). Other scholars have extensively researched the issue of Japanese revisionist interpretations of the war in the 1990s, and the conflicting understandings of the events of the war as depicted in war museums and memorials in both China and Japan (Jager & Mitter, 2007; Seaton, 2007; Gustafsson, 2011). The repeated visits of Japanese Prime Ministers to the contested Yasukuni Shrine have also been at the centre of international debate and are a source of tension between
Japan and China. Some scholars argue that the Yasukuni issue goes to the very heart of the debate about Japan’s war memory and responsibility and its perceived inability to reconcile with China and other Asian neighbours (Whiting, 1989; Breen, 2008; Nakano, 2014). Bukh and others have provided analyses of Japanese victim consciousness, especially atomic victimhood, which is one of the most prevalent tropes found in post-war Japan’s relation with its wartime past (Bukh, 2007; Orr, 2001). Orr (2001) identified the constant presence of 'victimhood mentality' in Japanese elementary and junior high school textbooks and emphasized that Japan’s status of victimhood served to conceal its role as victimizer against other Asian countries during the war.

Recent works on reconciliation in East Asia have mainly focused on content analyses of divisive historical narratives in Japan, China and South Korea (Kim & Schwartz, 2010; Kim, 2016). These studies argue that historical memories are a major obstacle to reconciliation in the region and focus on the genealogies of these memories and how they get incorporated into each country's master narratives (Shin & Sneider, 2011; Tsutsui, 2009; Seraphim 2006; Gluck, 2013; Fukuoka, 2015). East Asian reconciliation literature is normatively oriented to the ways in which China, Japan and Korea can harmonize incompatible memories of war, defeat and victory (Togo & Hasegawa, 2008; Shin et al., 2007; Kim, 2016).

Territorial disputes, conflicting interpretations of history and a growing lack of mutual trust over the past years have caused Sino-Japan relations to sink to their lowest point since the two countries restored diplomatic ties in 1972. Although many East Asian scholars argue that 'the history issue' is the underlying cause of diplomatic tensions between China and Japan (Rose 2005, 2011; Dudden, 2008; Lind, 2008; Shin et al., 2007; Togo & Hasegawa, 2008), the existing literature does not shed much light on the factors generating contentious and disparate interpretations of the common painful history. Historical differences flow from different identity-related needs, the satisfaction of which will have a significant impact on the perpetrator nation's willingness to acknowledge and atone for its wartime atrocities.
In recent decades, the role of identity in international conflict management has received a great deal of attention. Conflict scholars argue that traditional methods of negotiation and interest-based bargaining, while appropriate for distributional conflicts are not appropriate strategies for handling protracted identity-based conflicts. These conflicts are not generated by competition over territories and resources but are instead driven by a group's needs for positive identity and recognition (Burton, 1990). When fundamental needs are unmet, humiliation is a likely result. This humiliation can then give rise to internalized and externalized aggression, making conflict transformation problematic (Scheff, 1994). Deep identity-driven conflicts cannot be resolved by political or diplomatic arrangements alone. On the contrary reconciliation processes need to address the social psychological needs of both victims and perpetrators (Fisher, 1990).

In order for China and Japan to overcome the current obstacles to positive relationships, an analysis of the conflict through the social psychological lens of collective esteem and social identity may offer new perspectives on what is driving division and wider nationalist movements in Japan and China.

1.4 Research Problem

Polling data (Genron NPO, 2016)\(^3\) have demonstrated that one of the primary sources prolonging the conflict between China and Japan is Japanese lack of remorse and repentance for atrocities committed in its colonial and wartime past. The polls (Pew Research Center, 2016)\(^4\) reveal that successive generations of Japanese descendants feel diminished responsibility for the actions of their forebears in Asia during World War II. Some might argue that this should enable a transcendence of

\(^3\) See Genron NPO 2016 survey  

\(^4\) See Pew Global survey 2016  
the past in order to develop a peaceful future while others argue that an acceptance of 'inherited responsibility' for past harms is critical to East Asian reconciliation processes. However, there is little empirical data on the extent to which the current Japanese generation is willing to accept such 'inherited responsibility' for the nation's wartime past and what internal and external factors account for willingness or unwillingness to move in this direction.

1.5 Purpose and Research Questions

Previous studies have shown that acceptance of collective responsibility by the perpetrator group is an important pre-requisite for intergroup reconciliation, especially when conflicts are protracted (Nadler & Shnabel, 2008; Kelman, 2008b). This study was guided by the key assumption that all social groups have fundamental needs for positive identity and recognition and that a failure to meet these needs can result in a prolongation of conflict between groups (Burton, 1987). An examination of identity-driven factors that may be impacting the Japanese acceptance of responsibility and contrition is an important counterpoint to the realist-driven literature on Sino-Japanese conflict and may offer some new insights on how to improve future Sino-Japan relations.

The aim of this research is to identify key impediments to Japanese acceptance of collective responsibility for the nation’s wartime injustices. Because of the protracted nature of the Sino-Japan conflict, this research hypothesized that various identity-related needs are potentially negative predictors of contemporary Japanese acceptance of war responsibility. To develop a complete understanding of these factors, the thesis employed mixed methods to integrate both quantitative and qualitative data. In the first phase, quantitative data was obtained from a survey of 162 Japanese university students to test a range of internal and external predictors of Japanese collective responsibility. To understand the perceptions and experience of the participants at a more detailed level, fifteen survey participants who reported low levels of collective responsibility (mean ≤ 2 on a 1-7 scale) as well as ten who
reported high levels of collective responsibility (mean $\geq 6$ on a 1-7 scale) were selected and interviewed in relatively open ended qualitative interviews. Using both quantitative and qualitative methods generated a comprehensive and nuanced insight into the behaviour of fourth generation descendants of the Japanese perpetrator group.

Social identity theory assumes that to preserve a positive conception of group moral status in the face of shameful episodes in history, groups remember the past in ways that suppress or eliminate humiliating events altogether from their historical narratives. A sense of victimhood protects the group members’ self-esteem and prevents feelings of guilt for harmful acts against the other group (Bar-Tal et al., 2009). This research is the first empirical study to examine the influence of identity-related needs in the context of the Sino-Japanese conflict. Literature suggests that those who feel strong attachment and identification with their in-group will be likely to react self-protectively to threats to their group's collective esteem (Crocker, Thompson, McGraw & Ingerman, 1987). Drawing on social identity theory, this thesis explores with a purposive sample of Japanese descendants to deepen our understanding of the relationships that exist between the perpetrator group’s need for positive identity and moral status, competitive victimhood and acceptance of collective guilt and responsibility.

To shed light on the potential impediments to Japanese descendants' acceptance of 'inherited responsibility,' the following research questions were addressed:

(1) To what extent are contemporary Japanese willing to accept inherited responsibility for the injustices committed by their forebears? How prevalent is ‘apology fatigue’ amongst contemporary Japanese?

(2) What are the social psychological factors impeding current Japanese acceptance of inherited responsibility for their nation's past misdeeds?
a) Do the Japanese descendants feel that their moral identity is threatened when confronted with criticisms from the victimized nations about the nation’s immoral past? To what extent do threats to Japanese moral status affect the descendants' acceptance of collective responsibility for their nation’s past transgressions?

b) Do contemporary Japanese engage in competitive victimhood? To what extent does the salience of Japanese victimhood [during World War II] affect the descendants' willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?

c) Do contemporary Japanese identify with their nation (in-group identification)? To what extent does in-group identification affect Japanese descendants' willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation’s past transgressions?

(3) What are the external factors that are impeding current Japanese acceptance of inherited responsibility for their nation's past misdeeds?

a) How is the history of Japanese transgressions presented to contemporary Japanese? To what extent does the descendants' awareness of their nation's past transgressions affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?

b) To what extent does the descendants’ negative out-group attitude affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?

c) To what extent does the descendants’ contact with the out-group affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?
1.6 Defining Key Concepts

This thesis will draw on socio-psychological concepts that are related to intergroup conflict and reconciliation. These concepts are explained in detail in the Literature and Theory Chapter. This section briefly defines the key concepts that are operationalised for the purpose of this research.

**Intractable or protracted conflicts:**
Today, the majority of prolonged communal and interstate conflicts around the world are perceived as identity-driven (Lederach 1997; Tint 2010). This has led to an increased interest among scholars in the nature of protracted, intractable conflicts, especially those which defy traditional conflict resolution strategies such as negotiation, arbitration or mediation (Azar 1983, 1990; Burton 1987, 1990; Bar-Tal 2007; Kriesberg 1993, 1998, 2007; Coleman 2000, 2003; Fisher 1997; d'Estrée, 2012). Azar (1983, 1990) defined these long-term hostile disputes as ‘protracted social conflicts’ stressing that their real source is not in material interests, power or territorial claims. John Burton (1987, 1990) described them as ‘deep-rooted conflicts’ to denote that the underlying source lies in the denial of fundamental human needs that touch on the group’s identity, security, recognition, participation and welfare. Because these conflicts are often based on deep-rooted identity needs, focusing on power politics to resolve them will only exacerbate or prolong the dispute (Burton, 1987).

**Social identity:** Social identity theory posits that individuals attain a sense of self-esteem or self-worth not just from their identity as individuals, but also from their membership of social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). According to social categorization theory, how we identify with a group frames how we interpret an event (Turner et al., 1987). Individuals are motivated to maintain a positive moral evaluation of their social group. This need drives groups involved in prolonged, violent conflicts to compete over various psychological resources, including their victim status (Kelman, 2008a). In social psychology, the term in-group is defined as a social group with which an individual identifies and belongs psychologically. By
contrast, an out-group is defined as a social group with which individuals do not identify and to which they have no particular sense of belonging.

*Inherited responsibility:* Kwak and Nobles (2013) argue that the descendants of perpetrators bear some responsibility for a past harm and should contribute, in some way, to its remedy (Kwak & Nobles, 2013, 5). Miller (2007)'s theory also claims that intergenerational responsibility for historical wrongdoings is an 'inherited' national responsibility that citizens must bear as historical injustices are perpetrated by peoples rather than by states (Miller, 2007, 135-61). In this thesis, inherited responsibility will be operationalised as collective responsibility that descendants bear for the injustices committed by their forebears.

*Collective responsibility:* Collective responsibility is based on the perception that one's in-group is accountable for committing an unjustifiable, illegitimate harm to another group (Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). The acceptance of collective responsibility implies a psychological willingness to share in the collective blame for the misdeeds of one's in-group—even if one did not personally take part in those misdeeds (Cehajic & Brown, 2008). Acceptance of collective moral responsibility should not only refer to those who committed or supported the atrocities but also to all members, including the descendants, of the present political community (Cehajic-Clancy, 2012). Past research has demonstrated that perceiving the in-group as responsible for harming the out-group increases the feeling of collective guilt. Acknowledging in-group responsibility for national wrongdoing is a critical step that can lead to pro-social actions such as apology and/or reparation for the victims (Cehajic & Brown, 2010; Branscombe & Doosje, 2004). Hence, acceptance of collective responsibility is viewed as a critical pre-requisite for advancing intergroup reconciliation (Minow, 2002; Lederach, 1997; Kelman, 2008b).

*Collective guilt:* When group memberships are salient, people feel emotions on account of their group's position or treatment, even if they have had little or no personal experience of the actual intergroup relationships themselves. Drawn from social identity and self-categorization theories (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg,
Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), this general hypothesis provides the basis for the first theorizing and research into collective guilt, the emotions that can be felt when it is perceived that one's group has mistreated an out-group (even if there was no direct involvement). Collective guilt arises mainly when group members perceive that they have some responsibility for their in-group's misdeeds (Branscombe, Slugoski, and Kappen, 2004; Leach et al., 2006; Lickel, Schmader & Barquissau, 2004). Scholarship has shown that feelings of collective guilt should generate tendencies to repair the damage done to the out-group (Branscombe et al., 2004; Lickel et al., 2004). Feelings of guilt may be associated with empathetic consciousness and a capacity to think of oneself in the shoes of the victims.

**Moral identity threat:** Studies based on social identity theory have shown that individuals are driven to maintain a favourable evaluation of the social group with which they associate and that morality is the most important characteristic individuals use to evaluate the positive identity of their in-group. Any challenge to moral reputation, therefore, will problematize individual and group esteem, which will often generate defensive responses. Being accused of past transgressions threatens the group’s moral identity and drives individuals to react defensively in order to bolster the group’s moral status and defuse the reputational threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Noor et al., 2012).

**Competitive victimhood:** This means that members of conflicting groups experience a strong desire to establish that their in-group was subjected to more injustice and suffering than other groups. A threat to group identity, therefore, will motivate group members to engage in competitive victimhood, claiming that the in-group has suffered more than the harmed out-group (Noor et al., 2012). Studies have also shown that competitive victimhood reduces the perpetrator group’s sense of collective guilt and responsibility for the harm done to the out-group.

**In-group identification:** In-group identification can be defined as the degree to which individuals define or see themselves as group members (Turner et al., 1987). In-group identification can also be regarded as the significance that a group membership
holds for an individual (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). In-group identification has also been described as pride in one's group (Smith & Tyler, 1997) or attraction to one's group (Jackson & Smith, 1999). Individuals who identify more strongly with their in-group (national identity) have been found to be more inclined to justify their in-group’s position and feel less collective guilt and responsibility than those who are low in identifying with their group (Doosje et al., 1998). In this thesis, the assessment of in-group identification was made using the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES) (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992).

*Prejudice or negative out-group attitude:* Prejudice and stereotyping can overlap, and stem from various sources. Both phenomena involve a preconceived negative evaluation of a group and its members. Prejudice can also be described as an antipathy based upon faulty and inflexible generalizations one makes of a group (Allport, 1954, 9) and can become a determinant of intergroup conflict. Past research has demonstrated that negative out-group attitude can be a significant predictor of diminished collective guilt for in-group transgressions (Hewstone et al., 2004).

*Intergroup contact:* Intergroup contact in this thesis specifically refers to interaction between the in-group and out-group[s] engaged in conflict (Allport, 1954). Past studies on intergroup contact have shown that successful contact with the out-group can provide individuals with enhanced knowledge about their own group, help them to take the perspective of the out-group, reduce feelings of anxiety, and combat prejudice. The intergroup contact hypothesis first proposed by Allport (1954), suggests that positive effects of intergroup contact are generated when contact occurs under four key conditions: equal status, intergroup cooperation, common goals, and support by social and institutional authorities. Various studies have been conducted which aim to understand the effects of different types of contact in mediating and moderating intergroup prejudice, with recent work demonstrating that intergroup contact yields the most effective positive outcomes when contact takes the form of cross-group friendships (Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Davies et al., 2011). This study will examine the relationship between high quality contact with the out-group and collective responsibility for out-group harm doing.
Collective memory: Collective memory can be defined as social representations or shared knowledge of the past that may not have been personally experienced but are collectively constructed, transmitted and remembered by members of the society through both formal and informal communications (Moscovici, 1988; Bar-Tal, 2007; Paez & Liu, 2011). At the institutional level, collective memory can be transmitted through official histories, textbooks, commemoration, monuments, rituals and museums, and at the popular level, through the mass media and interpersonal storytelling and conversations (Paez & Liu, 2011; Olick & Levy, 1997). Collective memory contains the narratives, the symbols, the models, the myths, and the events that mould the identity of the group. Collective memory binds a group together, and the raw material for constructing such ethnic memory is history (Volkan, 2001; Billig, 1995, Halbwachs, 1950/1992).

Descendants of the perpetrator group: As the purpose of this research is to examine present-day Japanese individuals' acceptance of inherited responsibility for the atrocities committed by their forebears, the term descendant refers to the present generation who share genealogy with the original perpetrators but had no direct involvement in the acts of transgression.

1.7 Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 1 begins by providing an overview of the background and context of the problem that frames this research. This is followed by a presentation of the research problem, the statement of purpose of the study and accompanying research questions and hypotheses. This chapter also discusses the research approach employed in order to collect the necessary data, the significance of this research and the definitions of the key terminology used.

Chapter 2 provides a systematic review of the relevant academic literature and theories that have guided the construction and design of this study. In terms of academic literature, the chapter introduces key social psychological theories and
concepts that explain why perpetrator and victimized groups become locked in intractable conflicts. The review of reconciliation literature also establishes the rationale for conducting research on social identity needs and their relationship with the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility. The latter half of the chapter presents a critical review of existent scholarship on collective guilt and responsibility and how perpetrator groups respond to reminders about their in-group's historical transgressions.

Chapters 3 and 4 provide contextual information for the selected cases in this study. Chapter 3 examines the factors underlying the victim nations' rejection of the perpetrator’s apologies; why both China and South Korea are dissatisfied, and why China and Korea believe that Japan’s expressions of remorse are not 'genuine and sincere.' This chapter analyses the obstacles to reconciliation and discusses what makes Japan’s apologies unacceptable to its victims in East Asia. Chapter 4 also offers relevant background information and a contextual analysis of how Japan's identity crisis in the 1990s led the nation's conservative elites to promote historical narratives that deny Japan's involvement in wartime atrocities in order to protect the nation's collective esteem.

Chapter 5 provides a detailed description of the methodology of this research study. It outlines the rationale for choosing a sequential mixed methods approach to address the research questions and analyse impediments to contemporary Japanese acceptance of collective responsibility for past Japanese transgressions. This chapter explains how the two-phase quantitative and qualitative study was designed and implemented.

Chapter 6, 7 and 8 present the findings that emerged from this study. Chapter 6 presents the main findings of the quantitative phase based on the multiple hierarchical regression analyses which examined to what extent social psychological factors such as the need for positive moral identity, in-group identification and competitive victimhood impede Japanese descendants' acceptance of collective responsibility for Japanese aggression in Asia. The association between three other
external factors such as awareness of in-group transgression, out-group prejudice, out-group contact and the outcome variable of collective responsibility was also assessed. Chapter 7 and 8 present the descriptive statistical data related to the six significant predictors of collective responsibility, together with qualitative findings with selected respondents who represented the perpetrator descendants' perspectives. As the aim of this research was to identify key impediments to Japanese acceptance of collective responsibility for Japanese wartime transgressions, the qualitative findings in Chapters 7 and 8 focused mainly on the perspectives of the survey respondents who reported low levels of collective responsibility (CR\textsubscript{Low}, n=15). These findings were then compared with the contrasting perspectives of survey respondents who indicated high levels of collective responsibility (CR\textsubscript{High}, n=10) in Chapter 9.

Finally, Chapter 9 summarizes, integrates and discusses the key findings of this research. It also examines the findings' implications in terms of both practice and future research. The chapter discusses the limitations of this present research together with actionable recommendations and concludes with a brief discussion on how the insights resulting from this research can contribute to the improvement of relations between the perpetrator and victimized nations in East Asia.
CHAPTER 2

2. Literature and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

This thesis examines the social psychological obstacles to Sino-Japanese reconciliation with a very specific focus on why contemporary Japanese feel a diminished sense of remorse and responsibility for their nation’s wartime past. Most scholarship has analysed Sino-Japanese tensions from realist and neo-liberal perspectives. There has been little work examining the emotional and social psychological needs of the descendants of Japanese perpetrators and the protraction of the Sino-Japan conflict.

This chapter, therefore, examines the literature on the dynamics of protracted/intractable conflicts, and identity-driven needs in order to diagnose and understand the social psychological factors inhibiting contemporary Japanese from acknowledging Japanese war crimes and expressing remorse to their Chinese victims’ descendants. It also explores the importance of satisfying basic human needs and the perpetrator’s responsibility in creating ripe conditions for apology, closure, social healing and reconciliation. It does this through the optics of 'collective guilt' and 'collective responsibility.' These two concepts are closely related. The first referring to emotions and feelings individuals experience when they accept direct or indirect responsibility for their in-group's harmful behaviour. The second being the motivator of behaviour aimed at restoring positive relationships. As the aim of this thesis is to explore the factors influencing the perpetrator group's acceptance of responsibility, the scholarship on collective guilt provides the conceptual framework for developing the research questions to be investigated and analysed in this study.
2.2 Intractable Conflicts and Basic Human Needs

Because most prolonged communal and interstate conflicts are identity-driven (Lederach, 1997; Tint 2010) theorists and practitioners have focused attention on the roles of personal and social identity in both generating and resolving conflict. This is particularly so in relation to protracted, intractable conflicts, which defy traditional conflict resolution strategies such as negotiations, arbitration or mediation and are perceived to be complex, deep-rooted and persistent (Azar, 1983, 1990; Burton 1987, 1990; Bar-Tal 2007; Kriesberg, 1993, 1998, 2007; Coleman, 2000, 2003; Fisher, 1990, 1997; d'Estrée, 2012). Azar (1983, 1990) defined these long-term hostile disputes as ‘protracted social conflict’ and John Burton (1987, 1990) described them as ‘deep-rooted conflicts’ based on the non-satisfaction of basic human needs for esteem, identity, security, recognition, participation and welfare. (Burton 1987). Kelman (1995, 2002) further argues that negotiations without prior and adequate attention to identity-related needs and issues can exacerbate conflicts and polarize the parties. Examples of these intractable conflicts include Israel-Palestine, Cyprus, Northern Ireland, India-Pakistan, Kashmir, the Horn of Africa and for the purpose of this thesis, the prolonging conflicts between Japan, China and Korea with most attention directed towards the Sino-Japan conflict.

A positive sense of self (both personal and collective) is regarded by needs theorists like Oscar Nudler (1980) as a fundamental requirement for constructive human development. Scholars who have studied the development, maintenance, and transformation of intractable conflicts (Northrup, 1989; Kriesberg, 1993; Bar-Tal, 2007) also contend that challenges to or the “spoiling” of group identity will generate aggressive or violent behaviour (Fisher, 1997). Intractable conflicts prolong when groups perceive that their needs are unsatisfied and their identity is threatened through the denial of recognition, security, equity, and political participation (Fisher 1997, 5). Threats to group identity can cause or escalate conflict and when a conflict between parties involves challenges to core values the conflict will be difficult to resolve and may often become intractable. Framing intractable conflicts in terms of
group identity needs, therefore, is more likely to generate favourable outcomes than focusing on material interests alone.

2.3 Social Identity Theory

A positive sense of personal and social identity is critical to individual and collective well-being. Challenges to or a negative sense of self and collective identity, on the other hand, is a critical factor in the escalation and rigidification of spontaneous and organized conflict (Northrup, 1989; Roccas & Elster, 2012). Henri Tajfel and John Turner’s social identity theory explores these elements in explaining intergroup conflict and, more broadly, intergroup behaviour. Individuals derive a sense of positive self-esteem not only from their individual identity but also from their membership in social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The theory explains how identity emerges from the processes of social categorization and comparison and how it influences intergroup relations. Self-categorization theory posits that an individual’s self-concept is created from many components or self-categories which become activated in specific situations (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reischer, & Wetherell, 1987). We categorize objects in order to understand them, and we categorize people and ourselves in order to understand our locations in particular social environments. We identify with groups which we think we ought to belong to (reference groups) and those social groups to which we do belong. In this way we develop concepts of collective identity in-group versus out-group, “we” versus “them.”

Group members enhance their self-worth and self-esteem through a positive identity with the social group they belong to. These groups maintain their positive distinctiveness by engaging in social comparisons which allow them to conceive their in-group as both different from and superior to other groups to which they do not belong (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The basic theoretical tenets of social identity theory therefore can be summarized as follows: 1) individuals strive to achieve or maintain positive social identity; 2) membership in a group contributes to an individual’s social identity; 3) evaluation of an individual’s own group is based on
social comparison with other groups; and 4) a positive social identity is based on favourable comparisons (Fisher, 1990, 29).

Ethnocentrism, is, therefore, a process of in-group glorification driven by a group’s need to achieve a positive social identity by enhancing the qualities of the in-group and denigrating the qualities of the out-group (Fisher, 1990, 62). Social identity theory reveals that the mere perception of belonging to a group is sufficient to produce intergroup discrimination favouring the in-group (Fisher, 1990). Building on this notion, Abrams and Hogg (1988) elaborated the self-esteem hypothesis. This contends that there is a direct relationship between self-image and prejudiced views of the out-group—that successful out-group discrimination elevates self-esteem and that threatened self-esteem promotes intergroup discrimination (Abrams & Hogg, 1988, 317). The simplest way of generating strong in-group identity therefore is by devaluing the out-group, creating an 'us' versus 'them' dynamic. When this is used as a basis for political mobilization it generates intense political emotion and, if not checked, the basis for political violence.

2.4 Identity and Collective Memory

History and memory have been found to be key components fuelling protracted conflict, especially when they are entrenched in past experiences of traumatic violence (Bar-Tal, 2000a, 2003). A number of studies on the politics of memory focus on the role of history in the formation of a group’s identity (Billig, 1995; Volpato & Licata, 2010; Liu & Hilton, 2005). Collective memory can be defined as social representations or shared knowledge of the past that may not have been personally experienced but are collectively constructed, transmitted and remembered by members of the society through both formal and informal communications (Moscovici, 1988; Bar-Tal, 2009; Paez & Liu, 2011). At the institutional level, collective memory can be transmitted through official histories, textbooks, commemoration, monuments, rituals and museums, and at the popular level, through the mass media and interpersonal story-telling and conversations (Paez & Liu, 2011; Olick & Levy, 1997). Collective memory contains the narratives, the symbols, the
models, the myths, and the events that mould the identity of the group. Collective memory binds a group together, and the raw material for constructing such ethnic memory is history (Volkan, 1997; Billig, 1995, Halbwachs 1950/1992). Ethnic, national, and religious identities are built on historical myths which define who a group member is, what it means to be a group member, and typically who the group’s allies and enemies are (Paez & Liu, 2011). These myths are usually based on some concept of truth, but are selective or exaggerated in their presentation of history. Regardless of their accuracy, historical memories serve to create the foundation of how people understand the origins, story, and characteristics of the group (Bar-Tal, 2003; Bilali & Ross, 2012; Billig, 1995; Halbwachs 1950/1992). A group’s representation of history defines what it was, is, can and should be, and is an essential component in the construction of its identity, norms, and values (Liu & Hilton 2005, 537). A group’s collective remembering of its history not only determines how the group sees the present, but it also shapes the future by indicating how it should respond to new situations and threats (Bilali & Ross, 2012).

The purpose of collective memory therefore is not to convey an objective history of the past, but rather to recount the past in such a way that it is functional and relevant to society’s current concerns, needs and future aspirations (Halbwachs, 1992). It creates a socially constructed narrative that has some basis in actual events, but is biased, selective, and distorted in ways that meet society’s present needs (Bar-Tal 2009; Liu & Hilton 2005). These narratives become disseminated in society as cultural products and discourse through various institutional channels such as the media, literature, museums, films and textbooks (Bar-Tal, 1998b; Wertsch, 2002; Hammack, 2008, 2011). Various scholars have examined the politics of history textbooks and how elites influence their content. Ever since the rise of the nation-state, history textbooks have been used by states and their leaders as instruments to spread narratives that glorify the nation, consolidate national identity, and justify particular forms of social and political systems (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991, 10).
2.4.1 ‘Chosen Glory and Chosen Trauma’

Group identity is shaped by the actions of individual members and by significant struggles, challenges or achievements experienced through time. This is particularly true of experiences of suffering. If these are particularly traumatic, they can generate a sense of woundedness, humiliation and injustice that will be transmitted through successive generations (Staub & Bar-Tal 2003). A group’s collective memory, therefore, is constructed from its “chosen traumas” and “chosen glories” (Volkan, 1997). Chosen traumas are those horrors of the past that cast shadows onto the future; and chosen glories are the idealized myths about a group’s glorious achievements that are passed onto succeeding generations via collective memory by parents and teachers and through participation in ritualistic ceremonies (Volkan, 2001). Groups incorporate the memory of traumatic events into their collective identity, which through processes of socialization enables one generation to transfer enmity to the next. As collective memories become institutionalized and internalized, later generations share the anger and suffering of past generations although they themselves did not take part in the original historical trauma. Like chosen traumas, chosen glories become heavily mythologized over time (Volkan, 1997, 48) and serve to increase members’ self-esteem by being associated with the group’s glorious past (Volkan, 2001).

2.4.2 How memory protracts a conflict

Collective memory determines how members of a group relate to other peoples and has influence over the development of present day conflicts. Key historical events are critical in defining a group’s identity and determining how that group behaves in conflict situations (Bar-Tal, 2007). Collective memory of past conflicts can increase social cohesion, salience of in-group identification and fuel feelings of hostilities towards the out-group, which comes to be identified as the current foe (Paez & Liu, 2011). Memory of past conflicts can shape a society’s perception of the out-group and evoke threat and fear, which inevitably delegitimizes the out-group and creates mistrust (Bar-Tal, 2007; Bilali & Ross, 2012).
Historical memories can be used instrumentally to promote the interests of those in power and mobilize popular action (Wersch, 2002; Hammack, 2011). Re-enacting collective memory of past atrocities can elicit fear, motivate collective action and justify harmful actions against out-group members (Liu & Hilton, 2005). For instance, in ethnic conflicts, leaders manipulate the past to justify discrimination against other ethnic groups. Kaufman (2001) stresses that people are taught ethnic hatred, not born into it. Powerful elites take real events in a group’s history and manipulate the narratives to delegitimize the out-group members, and justify harms against them. And these events must resonate with some concrete experiences and incidents in popular consciousness in order to have any currency (Kammen, 1991). War occurs as a result of symbolic politics in which leaders use emotions evoked by historical memories to promote hostility toward other groups and pursue ethnic domination (Kaufman 2001; Kammen, 1991; Staub, 1998). Historical memories of past conflicts enable people to blame the out-group for provoking the conflict and perceive their in-group’s aggression as a response to their provocation (Bilali, Tropp, and Dasgupta, 2012; Staub, 1998).

2.4.3 Divergent historical narratives

Studies have shown that groups in conflict often have different interpretations of the past and distinct narratives attached to those histories. Scholars argue that there are group-based needs, goals and motives that contribute to shaping a group’s historical memories (Bilali & Ross, 2012) and that these psychological needs explain why groups develop conflicting narratives of past events. Competing narratives of the same historical event play an integral role in prolonging the conflict between the perpetrator and the victimized (Hammack, 2008; Bar-Tal, 2007). Societies engaged in intractable conflicts become entrenched in conflict-supporting narratives that would be used to justify the maintenance of the conflict (Bar-Tal, 2007). Divided memories of past violence can lead to renewed outbreaks of violence and perpetuate the sense of grievance amongst the victims, thereby increasing the risk of revengeful acts and intolerance towards the former adversary (Brewer & Pierce, 2005).
People are motivated to view their in-group favourably and because historical memory constitutes an essential core of a group’s identity, perpetrator groups may avoid remembering the past in a way that would challenge its morality and put its group to shame (Bilali & Ross, 2012). Those who identify strongly with the in-group are therefore motivated to maintain a positive group identity by distorting their memories in systematic ways (Baumeister & Hastings, 1997; Liu & Laszlo, 2007).

Victim and the perpetrator groups will often present their own side’s historical narrative as the accurate ‘truth’ and accuse the opposing group of distorting or ignoring history (Bilali & Ross 2012, 124). While victims tend to emphasize the gravity of the violent harm and the perpetrator’s responsibility for the injustice, perpetrators, on the other hand, are prone to downplay and mitigate the consequences of their actions, and criticize victims for exaggerating the facts (Baumeister & Hastings, 1997).

In the face of a shameful past, perpetrator groups may defend their positive identity by deleting accounts of past injustices from their master narratives. 'Collective amnesia,' for example, is a conscious decision by the group to forget which is likely to emerge when the group is confronted with past injustices.

Another means by which the perpetrator group protects its esteem is by emphasizing the harm inflicted on the in-group while simultaneously minimising the severity of the harm they themselves have inflicted on the out-group (Branscombe & Miron, 2004). Focusing on the in-group’s own suffering and victimization rather than its harmful actions defends the moral status of the in-group (Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008). Collective victimization of the past can perpetuate cycles of violence between the perpetrator and the victim and has been examined as an important source of intractable conflicts (Vollhardt, 2009, 2012). The psychological wounds of past trauma are transmitted through the commemoration of victim narratives, the way history is taught, and the way parents transmit the past to their children (Bar-Tal, 1998b). As events in the present become interpreted through the lens of past
injustice, collective victimization can give rise to defensive and violent responses (Staub, 2012, 282).

2.5 Competitive Victimhood

Groups that have engaged in long term intractable conflicts are prone to compete over their victim status (Bar-Tal, Chernyak-Hai, Schori & Gundar, 2009; Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008). Competitive victimhood refers to a group’s perception and effort to establish that it has suffered more than its adversaries (Noor et al., 2008, 2012).

At the group level, perceptions of collective victimization have been positively correlated with feelings of in-group entitlement (Bar-Tal et al., 2009). Victim status can actually give groups moral license to commit acts that would normally be condemned (Sullivan, Landau, Branscombe, & Rothschild, 2012, 779). This moral license means that social groups of both high and low status compete for acknowledgement of greater relative victim status (Noor et al., 2008).

Collective victimization emerges when individuals believe that 1) they were harmed; 2) they were not responsible for the occurrence of the harmful act; 3) they could not prevent the harm; 4) they are morally right and suffering from an injustice done to them; and 5) they deserve sympathy (Bar-Tal et al., 2009). Bar-Tal et al emphasize that the mere experience of harm is not enough. In order to have a sense of victimhood, individuals need to perceive the harm as undeserved, unjust and immoral, an act that could not be prevented by the victim (Bar-Tal et al., 2009, 232). To prove that their in-group has been subjected to more physical victimization than the out-group, groups may simply quantify suffering and portray their in-group as having endured a larger share of the overall suffering (Noor et al., 2008).

In the state of competitive victimhood, groups develop narratives to establish that they have been subjected to more injustice at the hands of the out-group and that their suffering is unique (Noor et al, 2012, 353). Although seeking a common
narrative about the past is considered a core element of reconciliation, Bilali and Ross stress that creating a shared history between the harm-doers and the victims is a daunting process. This is because whatever the objective truth is, the victim and the perpetrator groups will have their own truth, their own victimhood narrative and adhere to their own 'collective memory' of events (Bilali & Ross, 2012).

2.6 Reconciliation

Unresolved trauma, historical memory and identity anxieties generate the ideal conditions for conflicts to protract. Recent decades have seen an increased interest in and research on reconciliation due to the many prolonged ethnic and interstate conflicts which emerged after the end of the Cold War. Even after the establishment of peace agreements and democratic processes for conflict resolution, reconciliation remains a long and onerous process, especially for groups which have experienced violent trauma. The key obstacles to reconciliation often involve deep psychological wounds that stem from unaddressed violence and historical injustices. If these past wrongdoings are not dealt with appropriately, they can lead to the derailing of the peace process and to the recurrence of violence (Noor et al. 2008). Hence, intergroup reconciliation must involve the removal of the conflict-related emotional barriers which compromise the success of conflict resolution (Nadler & Shnabel 2008, 39).

In the previous section, the literature on the dynamics of intractable conflicts was reviewed as an important framework within which to analyse the socio-emotional drivers that may be contributing to the tensions between China and Japan. At the core of many protracted conflicts are deep-rooted divisions that arise from the unmet needs of each party. Existing literature on reconciliation is an invaluable resource for the analysis of Sino-Japanese conflict, especially as studies stress the importance of looking beyond pragmatic interests of conflicting communities to the transformation of internalized societal beliefs within them (Bar-Tal, 2007).

In order to understand the necessary factors that facilitate reconciliation, it is useful to draw on Herbert Kelman’s (2008b) distinction between conflict settlement,
conflict resolution and reconciliation. While conflict settlement is a negotiated agreement that aims to meet the interests of both parties, conflict resolution goes beyond tangible interests and explores the causes of conflict in threatened or unmet needs for identity, security, recognition, autonomy, and justice (Burton, 1990; Kelman, 2008a). The peace agreement may be supported by publics but does not lead to changes in attitudes toward the adversary. Although conflict resolution transforms the adversarial relationship to a pragmatic partnership in which the parties can cooperate and co-exist, Kelman (2008b) points out that this instrumental relationship may still be fragile and vulnerable to changes in circumstances, such as the interests of the political leadership.

Reconciliation, on the other hand, entails a difficult and long-term process. Kelman stresses that reconciliation requires changes in the identities of the conflicting groups. Further, Staub and Bar-Tal define reconciliation as “mutual acceptance by members of hostile or previously hostile groups of each other and the societal structures and psychological processes directly involved in the development and maintenance of acceptance,” adding that, “genuine acceptance means trust in and positive attitudes toward the other, and sensitivity to and consideration of the other party’s needs and interests (Staub & Bar-Tal, 2003, 733).

Confronting history and acknowledging past wrongs is an essential component of the process of reconciliation. The re-examination of historical narratives and the re-evaluation of national myths—on both sides of the conflict—are critical components of reconciliation processes (Kelman, 2008b). Reconciliation requires acceptance by both sides of the harm committed to the other during the course of the conflict. Many scholars believe that it may be unrealistic to establish a single, objective truth. However, Kelman stresses that it is nonetheless important to recognize that the different narratives of different groups exist and that they reflect different historical experiences. Reconciliation does not require writing a joint consensual history, but it does require accepting the other’s truth in one’s own narrative.
2.7 Importance of Acknowledging Collective Responsibility

Collective acknowledgement of past wrongs is critical to the healing of damaged relationships (Lazare, 2004; Tavuchis, 1991; Minow, 2002; Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004). Many protracted conflicts have their roots in traumatic memories of past violence. Recognizing this, an increasing number of governments have been offering apologies to aggrieved citizen groups and states (Barkan, 2000). Govier (2003) stresses that the wrongs of the past need to be acknowledged by perpetrators to assist social healing. Barkan (2000) and other scholars (Brooks, 1999; Minow, 2002) also argue that the primary purpose of apologizing for wrongdoing is to begin addressing the victims’ grievance and trauma, and to validate their self-worth. Whether it be genocide or massacres, acts of harm to others imply that the victims do not matter, and that their personal needs, interests, moral dignity and status as human beings are of no consequence (Govier, 2003, 84). Acknowledgement and assumption of responsibility for the harm done dignifies the victim and accords him/her/them the respect they need to reconsider and restore functional relationships.

Despite the recent growth in scholarship examining the role of public apologies in forgiveness and reconciliation, there is still little research on when, why and how government apologies for historical injustices are effective (Blatz et al. 2009, 221). Nonetheless, apology is a key component in reconciliation. Without acknowledgement of responsibility, the wounds caused by the historical injustice continue to fester, causing resentment to deepen and exacerbating conflict "because the lack of acknowledgement indicates that people condone the wrongs and do not care about the baneful results" (Govier, 2003, 85).

Cehajic and Brown (2010) further stress that acknowledgement of in-group responsibility forms an important psychological foundation for such emotions as guilt or empathy for the out-group to arise. Feelings of guilt, driven by acceptance of responsibility, have been found to increase the members of the perpetrator group's motivation to redress the past harm (Brown & Cehajic, 2008; Doosje et al., 1998; Iyer et al., 2003; McGarty et al., 2005). Reconciliation therefore requires acceptance
of responsibility for the wrong that was done to the other, together with appropriate apologies and concrete measures of restitution.

2.8 Victims and Perpetrators Have Different Needs

Victims suffer a threat to their identity as political actors whereas perpetrators suffer a threat to their identity as moral actors. The differential threats to power and moral identity evoke feelings of powerlessness and moral inferiority, respectively. To avoid these negative feelings and ameliorate threatened identities, victims are motivated to regain the identity of powerful actors and perpetrators are motivated to regain the identity of moral actors. Revenge and social distancing are two ways in which groups can unilaterally ameliorate their feelings of powerlessness and moral inferiority. (Nadler & Schnabel, 2008, 46)

Scholars who have analysed the role of emotions in international conflicts make similar arguments by noting that victims’ feelings of humiliation (in this case nations that have been humiliated in the past) can generate enmification, polarization, and hostility (Lindner, 2006; Scheff, 1994). To cope with these threats, victims need to restore feelings of self-worth, self-control and social equality. Perpetrators who hold power over the victim during the conflict have control but worry about their image as moral social actors. This is especially so when this power is challenged or as in the case of Japan when they are defeated. This reputational threat results in feelings of guilt, shame and moral inferiority, which is driven by perpetrators’ fear that they will be rejected from moral communities to which they belong or would like to belong (Tavuchis, 1991). To cope with these threats perpetrators strive for acceptance as moral actors.

Victims can restore their identity as powerful actors by taking revenge on their perpetrators. Revenge changes the power asymmetries between victim and perpetrator and makes relations more equal (Frijda, 1994). Revenge, however, is unlikely to contribute to the ending of conflict because of its unilateral and conflict creating nature. While revenge may restore victims’ feelings of power and control, it
may not satisfy the perpetrator’s need for acceptance. Revenge will not promote the prospects of reconciliation since what one party sees as justified revenge, the other will commonly view as unjustified aggression that needs to be avenged. Acts of revenge therefore are likely to lead to an increased cycle of violence and the prolonging of the conflict (Scheff, 1994)

Perpetrators can defend threats to their moral identity by denying the painful consequences of their actions and/or their responsibility for having caused them (Shnabel & Nadler, 2008). They can distance themselves from the pain and suffering of their adversaries by belittling them or by feeling no empathy with the victim’s sufferings. Since increasing social distance between oneself and one’s victim reduces empathy (Nadler & Shnabel, 2008), the ultimate tactic of social distancing is the dehumanization of the victim. This common practice of parties in intractable conflicts (Bar-Tal, 2007) allows one to feel no empathy for the victim.

2.9 Collective Guilt

Accepting and acknowledging collective responsibility has been found to be a necessary precursor of experiencing collective guilt for the in-group's transgressions (Cehajic & Brown, 2010). A group-based emotion that is closely related to collective responsibility and relevant to the design of this research is collective guilt, a prerequisite for promoting reconciliation (Sullivan et al., 2012). Substantial amount of literature in social psychology has been focused on 'collective guilt'.

Social identity theory posits that feeling guilt for events for which an individual is not personally responsible is feasible because people categorize themselves as members of a group (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). Hence, the actions taken by the in-group can elicit an emotional response to the degree that the individual associates him/herself with the in-group. This is what distinguishes personal guilt from collective guilt: collective guilt can be experienced by group members who were not in any way involved in the harm doing (Doosje et al., 1998). Individuals can experience collective guilt as long as an important in-group is
perceived as responsible for having committed an illegitimate harm against another group (Doosje et al., 1998; Branscombe, Doosje, & McGarty, 2002; Branscombe, 2004). In support of this, (Mackie, Maitner, & Smith, 2009) in intergroup emotions theory suggest that individuals can experience emotions based on their in-group’s actions during conflict, regardless of whether or not they actually participated. These emotions are considered collective emotions because they arise from an individual's shared identity with a particular social group. They involve appraisals of an in-group’s actions and can foster behaviour aimed at maintaining in-group distinctiveness relative to an out-group. Although the experience of collective emotions may seem similar to individual emotions, the antecedents and consequences are different because collective emotions arise from a shared in-group identity (Mackie & Smith, 2002).

Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead’s (1998) pioneering work on collective guilt demonstrated this phenomenon using Dutch students. Dutch participants expressed guilt about their nation’s colonial occupation of Indonesia and the past harm done. In the case of this study on Dutch colonialism, group-based guilt led participants to support material restitution to Indonesia, the harmed group.

2.10 Antecedents of Collective Guilt

In order for a feeling of collective guilt to emerge, certain antecedent conditions must be met (Branscombe, 2004; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). The first antecedent has to do with an individual’s attachment to a collective identity. If the individual is to feel any moral responsibility for the group’s past wrongdoing, that group needs to be an important part of his or her self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner et al., 1987). Therefore, the basic precondition of collective guilt requires that the individual self-categorizes as a member of the relevant group, identifies with and even feels a strong attachment to that group. In support of this hypothesis, Zagefka, Pehrson, Mole and Chan’s (2010) research demonstrated that essentialism or strong identification with a group is a necessary antecedent for collective guilt. Their study revealed that when participants felt deeper connection and attachment with an in-
group across time, they felt greater collective guilt for the historical victimization of the out-group.

According to social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), as the group becomes more important to one’s self-conception, the more likely that emotions derived from that group membership will be experienced. Past research has shown that collective identity is an essential component of collective guilt; however, evidence regarding in-group identification’s relationship with collective guilt has been mixed. In some studies, researchers have found a positive relationship between in-group identification and guilt. In Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead’s (2006) study, when Dutch participants received information about the Netherlands’ colonial transgression, those who strongly identified with their in-group reported feelings of greater guilt. This was particularly so when influential in-group members validated and sanctioned the negative information. On the other hand, various studies have revealed a negative relationship between group identification and collective guilt, especially when highly-identified group members defend their group’s past behaviour (Branscombe, 2004; Doosje et al., 1998). Consistent with that notion, Castano and Giner-Sorolla (2006) found that higher identification with being British predicted lesser guilt for the treatment of Australian Aborigines.

As mentioned earlier, an important antecedent of guilt that is closely examined in this thesis is collective responsibility—the perception that one’s in-group is responsible for committing unjustifiable harm to another group (Branscombe, 2004; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). Past research (Iyer et al., 2003; Leach et al., 2006; Iyer, Schmader, & Lickel, 2007; McGarty et al., 2005) demonstrates that perceiving the in-group as responsible for harming the out-group increases collective guilt. Hence, even if the harm done is perceived as severe, if one’s salient in-group is not seen as responsible for those outcomes, then it is less likely that collective guilt would be experienced. In past studies that have examined feelings of responsibility for historical injustices, such as the Dutch colonial oppression of Indonesians (Doosje et al., 1998), white settler victimization of Native Americans (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006), and Australian mistreatment of Aborigines (McGarty et al.,
2005), when participants perceived the in-group as responsible for harmful actions against out-group members, they experienced greater collective guilt. When the responsibility was diffused across other groups and the in-group was not seen as uniquely responsible for the transgression, this led to lower guilt assignment to the perpetrator group (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008). Accepting collective responsibility, therefore, is an essential precursor for experiencing collective guilt for the in-group's harm doing.

The third antecedent of guilt is whether the harm is perceived as illegitimate. When in-group behaviour toward out-groups is appraised as illegitimate and immoral, collective guilt can be experienced (Iyer & Leach 2008; Mackie et al., 2002). Branscombe (2004, 326) argues that although responsibility and legitimacy are empirically and conceptually intertwined, when disentangled, legitimacy may at times outweigh responsibility. One such instance is the American people’s lack of collective guilt for the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Although the atomic bomb is universally acknowledged as a weapon of massive destruction and the United States clearly responsible for its use, because Americans perceive the act as legitimate and justifiable, feelings of collective guilt are assuaged. Thus, for collective guilt to emerge, the in-group needs to accept responsibility for committing an illegitimate and immoral harmful act.

2.11 Positive Consequences of Collective Guilt

One positive effect of collective guilt directly relevant to this thesis is its promotion of behaviours that foster reconciliation between groups. Various studies have examined how guilt resulting from the moral transgression of one’s in-group can lead to pro-social attitudes which serve to promote reconciliation between groups. Some theorists contend that because guilt focuses on the misdeed itself and personal responsibility for the particular moral failure, it can be action-oriented, motivating compensatory political action, and linked to support for expressing sincere apology.
2.11.1 Reparations

Collective guilt has been associated with support for reparations. A wide range of studies have shown that collective guilt among perpetrator groups is related to greater support for reparations to victim groups. Research has proven that guilt increases reparative attitudes (Leach et al., 2006; Brown, & Cehajic, 2008; Allpress et al., 2010, Brown et al., 2008). Doosje et al.’s (1998) study showed that guilt leads to compensatory behaviour regarding the in-group’s historical misdeeds. In Brown and colleagues’ (Brown, Gonzalez, Zagefka, Manzi, & Cehajic, 2008). longitudinal study, collective guilt and shame predicted participants’ desire to make reparations to indigenous Chileans. In Leach, Iyer, and Pedersen’s (Leach et al., 2006) work, guilt was causally related to predicting positive political action towards Aborigines in order to compensate for the material and cultural advantages of non-Aboriginal Australians. Further, stronger collective guilt for Dutch (Zebel et al., 2008) and Serbian actions during the Bosnian War (Cehajic & Brown, 2008) was related to more general support for reparations to Bosnian Muslims.

2.11.2 Apology and Forgiveness

Guilt has also been found to strengthen the will to apologize (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994). Given that apology is a form of restitution, studies have shown that guilt strengthens support for government apologies for historical wrongdoings (McGarty, Pedersen, Leach, Mansell, Waller, & Bliuc, 2005; Allpress et al., 2010). McGarty et al. (2005) found that stronger guilt among white Australians was associated with more support for an official government apology to indigenous Australians.

Other studies have examined the relationship between collective guilt and intergroup forgiveness. Cehajic, Brown, and Castano (2008) found that collective guilt increased feelings and perceptions of responsibility which led the transgressors to engage in forgiveness-seeking behaviour. Stronger guilt for historical violence was found to be related to greater willingness to forgive out-groups for violence against the in-group (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008; Manzi & Gonzalez, 2007).
2.11.3 Positive Attitudes

Collective guilt has also been associated with increased positive attitudes toward the victimized group. Various studies have found guilt to be positively associated with constructive responses, perspective-taking and increased empathy towards the out-group (Tangney, Wagner, Hill-Barlow, Marschall, & Gramzow, 1996; Tangney 1991). Similarly, greater guilt for white Americans’ treatment of African Americans predicted more favourable attitudes toward African Americans and support for affirmative action (Swim & Miller, 1999; Powell et al., 2005; Harvey & Oswald, 2000; Iyer et al., 2003). Wohl, Matheson, Branscombe, and Anisman (2013) also found that greater collective guilt was related to stronger expectations that apologies would encourage positive intergroup relations.

Other studies have examined the relationship between collective guilt and support for social and economic redistribution policies. Iyer and associates (2003) found that greater collective guilt among white Americans was related to stronger support of affirmative action for African Americans. Stronger collective guilt in European New Zealanders was associated with more support of redistribution policies for native New Zealanders (Sibley, Robertson, & Kirkwood, 2005).

2.12 Avoiding Collective Guilt

Collective guilt is an aversive emotion, which means that while it can lead to positive changes and promote reconciliation, individuals are often motivated to avoid or reduce feelings of collective guilt through a variety of different means. Social identity theory posits that individuals are driven to perceive their important social in-group in a positive light (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Because collective guilt arises from a negative evaluation of the in-group’s actions, in order to defend threats to the group’s positive identity, group members may be motivated to avoid or mitigate feelings of collective guilt. The most critical threat to a group’s identity occurs when its collective morality is questioned (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999).
2.12.1 Moral identity threat

Accusations that the in-group has committed illegitimate harm against another group can be seen as a major challenge to its moral status. A growing body of research shows that morality is a crucial dimension in the process of in-group identification. Morality has been found to be a fundamental quality that people consider when forming evaluations about themselves and others (Leach, Ellemers, & Baretto, 2007; Tauber & van Zomeren, 2012; Wojciszke, 1994, 2005; Sullivan et al., 2012). It is because morality is so critical to social and cultural order that it becomes such an important attribute. A single immoral act has more impact on how an individual or a group is evaluated than a number of acts of incompetence and the potential consequences of being judged immoral are more severe than the consequences of being judged incompetent. Being judged immoral involves the risk of being excluded from the moral community. Becoming a target of moral exclusion is to be perceived as undeserving, expendable, and a nonentity (Opotow, 1990).

Because morality is so important to individuals and groups, being reminded of the group’s immoral past can become an aversive experience (Monin, 2007), and accusations that one’s dominant in-group has committed acts that are incompatible with moral standards can be very threatening. Leach, Ellemers, and Barreto’s (2007) study demonstrates that a group’s moral status is more important for the positive evaluation of the in-group than other attributes such as competence or sociability. Furthermore, Ellemers et al.’s (2008) work showed that people are more motivated to improve the status of their group when they perceive it has high moral standing as opposed to higher competence (Ellemers, Pagliaro, Barreto, & Leach, 2008). Various studies on individual responses to moral threats (Monin, 2007; Leach et al, 2007; Tauber & van Zomeren, 2013) have demonstrated that defensiveness appears to be the most prominent reaction. In Monin (2007), for example, individuals engage in defensive strategies to defuse threats elicited by being confronted with a morally superior comparison target. Similarly, Tauber and van Zomeren (2013) show that when the in-group’s moral status is threatened, instead of feeling motivated to improve the situation, individuals defend their social identity and direct their outrage towards the out-group.
Consistent with prior research, Sullivan and colleagues demonstrate that when confronted with accusations of in-group transgression, individuals defensively attempt to bolster the in-group’s moral status in order to defuse the threat to its positive identity (Sullivan et al., 2012). And one way in which members can avert feelings of collective guilt and restore the group’s moral identity is by focusing on the in-group’s own past victimhood (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008).

2.12.2 Victimhood

Remembering the in-group’s previous victimization can help diminish feelings of guilt and responsibility for the harm done to the out-group (Sullivan, Landau, Branscombe, & Rothschild, 2012). According to Kelman, the increasing salience of Nazi victimization of the Jewish race resulted in Israeli harm doing being perceived as a defence of the in-group rather than an offence against another group threatening harm (Kelman, 1992). In what is referred to as competitive victimhood, members of conflicting groups experience a strong desire to establish that their in-group suffered more at the hands of the out-group than vice versa. Groups establish and disseminate particular historical narratives about their victimization through media coverage, textbooks, political leaders’ speeches and rituals to construct a discourse that revolves around competitive victimhood for the whole group as a collective (Noor et al, 2012, 353).

Wohl and Branscombe’s (2008) research was the first to demonstrate that feelings of collective guilt for harm to the current adversary are reduced when members are reminded of past victimization that befell their own group. Referencing the in-group’s past victimization (Holocaust) led Jewish participants to accept less collective guilt for their group’s harmful actions toward the Palestinians. Similarly, less collective guilt was felt by American participants for the group’s harmdoing in Iraq when they were reminded of the September 11 terrorist attacks. Reminders of historical victimization by a victim group often instigate a negative defensive reaction in the perpetrator group rather than an empathetic response towards victims leading to pro-social behaviour to amend the wrong. Wohl and Branscombe’s results
suggest that such reminders can, therefore, be counterproductive, as they are particularly threatening to the group that endured the historical harm (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008).

For the above reason, past collective victimization can become an important source of conflict in the present—perpetuating ongoing, intractable conflict and instigating renewed violence (Vollhardt, 2012, 136). According to Volkan (2001), when groups are driven by chosen traumas, they are less likely to show empathy for the out-group’s sufferings. Chosen traumas may increase the in-group’s legitimization of the harms done to the adversarial group. Consistent with this theory, past research has demonstrated that reminders of past collective victimhood decrease the in-group’s acceptance of collective responsibility and guilt for inflicting harm on the out-group (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008).

### 2.12.3 Denying collective responsibility

Various studies have examined the tendency of group members to deny shared responsibility in order to lessen the feeling of guilt. They may do so by asserting that the victim 'brought it on himself or herself,' or by attributing harmful actions to external constraints. Denying the consequences for the victim (or one’s own responsibility for them) reduces perpetrator guilt and the threat to moral identity. For example, white Australians who rejected the notion of collective responsibility were less likely to report collective guilt for harm to native Australians (McGarty et al., 2005). The denial of collective responsibility has been found in political rhetoric regarding historical victimization of Australian Aborigines (Augoustinos & LeCouteur, 2004). This research examined political speeches made by Prime Minister John Howard in which he stated that current generations cannot, and should not, be held responsible for the wrongs of previous generations. Thus it can be seen that political rhetoric can weaken collective guilt by undermining shared responsibility.
**Blaming the harmed group as deserving of the suffering**

Individuals may place the blame on the out-group’s past action for causing the historical event, making it look like the out-group deserved the suffering. As a means of dispelling guilt, group members may deny or distort past injustices and shift the blame on to the victims (Dresler-Hawke, 2005). We can identify this phenomenon in the Nazi rhetoric which identified Jewish conspiracy as the cause of Germany’s defeat in World War I and blamed Jews for the suffering that followed. By blaming the victim, the perpetrators feel less distress when faced with accusations about their in-group’s immoral behaviour (Bandura, 1990).

Several other studies have examined in-group members’ tendency to deny or reduce the illegitimacy of in-group behaviour. One way to reduce the illegitimacy of in-group behaviour is to portray out-group members as a threat. For instance, Wohl and Branscombe (2008) found that Israelis who justified their treatment of Palestinians as responses to terrorism were less likely to experience collective guilt for their behaviour. Other research has demonstrated similar results (Zagefka et al., 2010; Zebel et al., 2008).

**Placing the blame on a few deviant group members**

According to Wohl, Branscombe, and Klar (2006), another means by which group members can absolve themselves from collective responsibility for wrongdoings (without actually denying the occurrence of harm-doing) is to hold a few deviant in-group members responsible. In Doosje et al.’s (1998)’s study, when confronted with information about Dutch violence against Indonesians, Dutch participants who identified highly with their in-group tended to isolate responsibility for the wrongdoing amongst a deviant few, thereby avoiding harming the positive image of the group as a whole.

**Legitimizing the immoral act**

Even if responsibility for the wrongdoing cannot be denied, collective guilt can be reduced by legitimizing the immoral act. While acknowledging that a past injustice had been committed, a group’s moral status can be sustained by legitimizing the
group’s decision to commit the act. As noted above, United States’ official narratives justifying the decision to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were portrayed by Truman and the media as unavoidable and legitimate since they ended the war early and saved countless lives as a result.

**Minimising harm and group responsibility**

Another means by which members of a group avoid responsibility for the harmful treatment of another group is by minimising the severity of the harm committed (Branscombe & Miron, 2004; Leach et al., 2006).

**Temporal Distancing**

Members of in-groups may restore their collective esteem through defensive temporal distancing. In Peetz, Gunn, and Wilson (2010)’s study, German participants were induced to perceive the Holocaust as either subjectively close or subjectively distant. Participants who viewed the Holocaust as ‘closer’ admitted greater guilt and a willingness to seek pro-social actions to compensate the victims. On the other hand, participants who regarded the atrocity as ‘an event of the remote past,’ felt reduced collective guilt. This research demonstrated that individuals may relegate the in-group’s immoral acts to the distant past in order to reduce the threat to their collective identity. Individuals can ameliorate the threat to their identity as moral actors by denying the painful consequences of their actions and distancing themselves from the pain and suffering of the out-group by belittling them or by feeling no empathy with the victim’s sufferings. Increasing social distance between oneself and the victim lowers empathy (Fry, 2006; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008); the ultimate result of social distancing is the dehumanization of the victim.

**Motivated Forgetting**

Historical memories play an important role in mobilizing collective action of a group or a nation. Reviving historical memories has been crucial to the building of national identity and the reenactment of past victimization becomes shared through narratives and rituals. Volkan (2001) asserts that collective memory of past victimization becomes institutionalized in society as 'chosen trauma.' On the other hand, groups
that have committed historical injustices against members of other groups are likely to experience collective 'forgetting' (Baumeister & Hastings, 1997; Branscombe & Miron, 2004; Sahdra & Ross, 2007). When confronted with the in-group’s past immoral conduct, threatened collective identities can elicit defensive reactions such as ‘motivated forgetting’ (Rotella & Richeson, 2013). 'Motivated forgetting’ is the process by which individuals attempt to avoid or forget information that could be embarrassing, painful, or threatening (Rotella & Richeson, 2013; Hein & Selden, 2000). Refusing to acknowledge threatening information can be considered as motivated ‘forgetting’ as a way to restore people’s esteem for their important in-group.

Motivated ‘forgetting’ of in-group aggression was demonstrated in Sahdra and Ross’ (2007) study of Hindus and Sikhs. Participants had clear memories of past events in which their in-group was victimized, but recalled fewer instances of aggression committed by their own in-group. Rotella and Richeson (2013) further examined how information that one’s in-group has harmed another group affects memory and collective guilt. When American participants were given information describing historical injustices to Native American Indians, perpetrators of violence were described either as early Americans (in-group) or as European settlers (out-group). Remembering negative historical events was significantly diminished when the perpetrators were framed as Americans (in-group) versus Europeans (out-group). In terms of guilt, American participants who were primed to be high identifiers reported significantly less collective guilt. When the in-group’s moral status is threatened, group members often experience collective forgetting to diminish that threat. This phenomenon of motivated ‘forgetting’ under threat was evidenced in Imhoff and Banse’s (2009) study in which majority of German participants whose positive group identity became threatened by information on the suffering of Jews today (threat condition) either rejected acknowledgement or simply forgot the passage they read about the Holocaust.
Identity Discontinuity
Branscombe (2004) claims that it is plausible that collective guilt in response to past harms may serve to enhance identity discontinuity in which the members of the perpetrator group disconnect the current generation from harm done by earlier generations (Augoustinos & LeCouteur, 2004). Studies have shown that the present generation can experience collective guilt and be motivated to remedy past harms because it enables them to distance themselves from racist ancestors. Admission of collective guilt to promote a sense of temporal discontinuity allows current generations to protect their positive social identity.

2.13 National Identification and Collective Guilt
Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1987) suggest that social categorization together with in-group identification are both necessary for individuals to experience group-based emotions. When in-group identification is salient, individuals link their self-concept and image with the group. For highly identified individuals, studies have shown that the distinction between the 'I' and the 'We' is blurred, and events that affect members of the in-group are experienced as if they affect the self (Roccas & Elster, 2012). High identifiers of the group therefore will feel strong emotions as a response to events that have occurred to other group members, even if they themselves were not in any way involved (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999).

As such, one of the important antecedents of collective guilt that has been studied is in-group identification. When people self-categorize as members of a perpetrator group, they are more likely to feel collective guilt for their group’s harmful behaviour (Branscombe, 2004). Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead’s study (2006) has shown that salient self-categorization with the perpetrator group could elicit collective guilt. From this theoretical perspective, one may expect that people who are strongly identified and most invested in maintaining a positive image of the group are most likely to experience collective guilt. Since group-based guilt is ‘guilt by association’ (Doosje et al., 1998), one would expect to see a positive relationship
between in-group identification and collective guilt. Other research, however, has demonstrated a negative relationship between in-group identification and collective guilt. These studies have shown (Doosje et al., 1998; Branscombe et al., 2004) that high identifiers are more prone to defend their group’s past harm-doing, as individuals who identify strongly with a group are motivated to maintain a positive image of the group. For instance, Doosje et al.’s (1998) study supports this theory and reveals that high-identifying Dutch participants reported lower levels of guilt than low identifiers when they were confronted with ambiguous information about Dutch colonial harms in Indonesia. They may respond with various defensive measures which were described earlier, such as denial, justifying, legitimizing, minimising the harm to the other group or by focusing on their own victimhood.

Recent studies have offered a deeper understanding of the relationship between guilt and collective identity. One such example is the research conducted by Roccas and colleagues (Roccas, Klar, & Liviatan, 2006) in which they addressed the inconsistencies found in past findings on the relationship between in-group identification and group-based guilt. They suggested that inconsistent empirical findings may result from the complex effects of in-group identification as an antecedent. They proposed that identification with a group may simultaneously increase and decrease the propensity toward group-based guilt (Roccas et al., 2006, 699). To address these complex effects, they used a more finely tuned approach by distinguishing between two modes of identification with the national group: glorification versus a more liberal form of in-group attachment.

Glorification of the national group involves the motivation to view the group in the best possible light. It entails the viewing of the national in-group as more worthy than and superior to other groups and as having respect for various national symbols such as flags and leadership. High national glorifiers are therefore likely to reject information that indicates that the in-group has been involved in immoral actions in the past. Individuals with critical attachment to the group (attachment without glorification), on the other hand, would categorize themselves as in-group members, be patriotic, wish to contribute to the welfare of the nation, and still be capable of
seeing the group in a critical light. When tested in the context of Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Roccas and colleagues' key findings (Roccas et al., 2006) revealed that the two partly overlapping modes of national identification have opposing relations to reactions to information about their group’s moral transgressions. Glorification was associated with lower levels of guilt, and when the glorification component was controlled for, attachment was consistently associated with stronger feelings of guilt. Furthermore, the studies revealed that high national glorifiers are likely to employ ‘exoneration cognition’ and avoid feeling morally responsible by justifying the group’s actions. On the other hand, critical attachment (when glorification was controlled for) was associated with a reduced tendency to legitimate or justify the in-group’s transgressions. These studies indicate that different dimensions of identification have different effects on attitudes toward the out-group. It would be useful, therefore, to differentiate the types of identification in order to gain a better understanding of intergroup relations.

2.14 Conclusion

What one can draw from the literature on intergroup conflict and reconciliation is that unaddressed and unresolved historical harm-doing and identity anxieties generate many impediments to reconciliation and may protract the conflict. This chapter has elucidated the social psychological literature that provides the theoretical framework to guide the methodology, design and data analysis of this research. The ongoing conflicts between Japan and its East Asian neighbours have their roots in unresolved history of injustices. Kelman’s model for reconciliation and Nadler and Shnabel’s Needs-based Theory of Reconciliation have both shed light on the importance of satisfying victims’ psychological needs to restore their esteem and positive identity. In order for the victims to heal and for the damaged relationship to be mended, responsibility for the wrongs of the past must be accepted and acknowledged by the perpetrators.

This chapter has examined the potential factors that can facilitate or inhibit feelings of collective guilt. Existing scholarship and theories on the psychological barriers
that impede the perpetrator group’s acknowledgement of its past has offered important insights to identify the key variables to test in this study. The next chapter will outline the research design and methods used to examine whether or not contemporary Japanese are willing to accept inherited responsibility for their ancestors' past behaviour and what this means for Sino-Japanese rapprochement or more optimally reconciliation.
CHAPTER 3

3. Context: Apology and Forgiveness in East Asia


3.1 Introduction

This chapter will analyse some of the obstacles to reconciliation in East Asia. In particular, it will address why China and South Korea are unable to accept Japan’s apologies and expressions of remorse as ‘genuine and sincere.’ It will also analyse the psychological drivers that motivate Japanese revisionists to nullify the government’s official apologies, making Chinese and Korean forgiveness problematic.

Nearly seven decades have passed since the end of the Second World War, and the 'history issue' still haunts East Asia. Japan continues to be accused of failing to apologize and express remorse for its past injustices. Various scholars argue, however, that it is not accurate to simply conclude that Japan has failed to 'address its past' (Seaton, 2007, 65). Yamazaki, who has conducted an extensive rhetorical study of Japan’s past war apologies, also contends that it is a “common simplistic view that Japan has never apologized” (Yamazaki, 2006, x). Dujarric further argues that in view of the number of official apologies issued by Japanese leaders in the past, “this is far more apologizing and contrition than the world average” (Dujarric, 2013). Why then has Japan gained so little recognition for its efforts for reconciliation?

Although the post-war political environment was not conducive to processes facilitating reconciliation in East Asia, the emergence of global human rights norms in the last three decades has revived active discussions about war guilt, justice, memory and apology. The 1990s saw increased calls for unresolved compensation
and justice for human rights violations of the Second World War. Barkan (2001, 46) described this trend as “a sudden rush of restitution cases all over the world.” This international political climate placed considerable pressure on Japan to respond to the demands of the former victims for reparations and proper apology. The 1990s saw a series of official apologies issued by the Prime Ministers of Japan. However, despite the many apologetic statements offered, critics in China and South Korea still repeat their demands that Japan 'has not apologized.' What are the factors underlying the victim nations’ rejection of the perpetrator’s expressions of remorse? What are the impediments to their willingness to forgive and reconcile? Apology is an issue that needs to be addressed as it has long been a major linchpin in Japan’s deteriorating relations with its neighbouring countries in East Asia. This chapter provides an important context and historical background in understanding one of the essential puzzles of this thesis, why the majority of the Japanese population feel they have done enough while the victim nations continue to denounce Japan for its lack of remorse.

3.2 Apology and Basic Human Needs

Many prolonged conflicts have their roots in traumatic memories of past violence. To manage and prevent such conflicts governments are increasingly offering apologies to aggrieved citizen groups and states to acknowledge their complicity in historical injustices. Scholars argue that collective responses to historical injustices are critical to the healing of damaged relationships (Lazare, 2004; Tavuchis, 1991; Minow, 2002). Recently, there has been growing scholarship devoted to understanding how public apologies may contribute to forgiveness and reconciliation, but there is still a dearth of research on when and why government apologies for historical injustices might or might not be effective (Blatz et al., 2009, 221). Nonetheless, apology is a key component in reconciliation. Barkan (2000) and other scholars (Brooks, 1999; Minow, 2002) assert that in the process towards reconciliation, the primary purpose of apology is in the healing of the victims’ sense of trauma, grievance and validation of identity. Without amends and reparations, the wounds from a historical injustice will continue to fester, causing resentment to deepen and conflict to exacerbate.
As explained in Chapter 2, the perpetrator group's full acknowledgement of guilt and responsibility for the past injustice is critical for the victim group's social healing and restoration of self-worth and power (Minow, 1998; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008). The kind of action that contributes to reconciliation therefore is that which addresses the deep emotional and psychological needs of both the victims and the perpetrators. In this chapter, I will examine the Japanese government’s official attempts to redress the past injustices which fail to satisfy the fundamental needs for recognition and restoration of self-esteem amongst the victimized nations. It will demonstrate how conflicts are likely to protract when the feeling of humiliation and pain makes needs satisfaction challenging for both the perpetrator and the victim (Burton, 1987; Kelman, 1995; Nadler & Shnabel, 2008; Azar, 1990).

3.3 What Makes an Apology Effective?

Lazare (2004) contends that there are certain psychological needs that successful apologies can satisfy. He proposes that for an apology to help heal a damaged relationship, one of the important psychological needs that must be met is the “restoration of dignity and self-respect.” Many historical injustices are humiliating. They rob the victims of self-respect and dignity, and reduce them to inferior positions where they feel powerless. Hence, a successful apology must somehow restore these vital aspects of the victims’ self-esteem in order for them to heal (Lazare, 2004, 45). Furthermore, Blatz and colleagues have conducted a systematic analysis of what improves or undermines the effectiveness of intergroup apologies for reconciliation. These researchers have discovered that the following key elements are necessary to increase the perceived sincerity and potential effectiveness of an apology: 1) the perpetrator’s acceptance of responsibility; 2) acknowledgement of harm and/or victim’s suffering; 3) expression of sorrow and remorse; 4) admission of injustice or wrongdoing; 5) forbearance, or promises to behave better and never repeat the mistake again and; 6) offers of reparations/to repair the damages (Blatz et al., 2009, 221). Studies showed that these elements were found to enhance sincerity and effectively promote forgiveness.
3.3.1 Sincerity

If apologies are to be accepted as a symbolic redress of transgression, then they are only effective as long as they appear to be sincere. In an interpersonal context, sincerity can be defined as congruency between inward thoughts and outward expression. For some apologies to be effective, victims need to see the wrongdoer suffer and that suffering becomes evident when they express their remorse, guilt, shame, and humiliation for what they have done (Lazare, 2004, 61). Although sincerity is difficult to measure with public apologies, it can be evaluated based on how thorough the acknowledgements of the offence are whether there is “consistency and consensus as visible in public record” (Yamazaki, 2006, 21). As Yamazaki aptly notes, “actions speak louder than words”; government representatives need to avoid actions or statements that seem to contradict the nation’s apologetic stance (Yamazaki, 2006, 21). Sincere apologies can underscore the transition from an unjust past to a peaceful future, whereas insincere apologies may serve to reinforce the original injustice (Iyer & Blatz, 2012). As such, a great deal of effort is often placed into communicating sincerity in an apology.

3.3.2 Representation

Norma Field stresses that for a national apology to be of value, the issue of representation becomes a key component (Field, 1997, 7). Tavuchis (1991, 48) also agrees that for a collective apology to be considered satisfactory, it must be offered with the backing and authority of the collective so that the apology is official and binding and must be made publicly and on the record. For example, many who argue that Japan has 'never apologized' are attached to the fact that there has not been any parliamentary resolution issued (e.g. the case of 'comfort women'). To the extent that is possible, apologies should be formally endorsed by government representatives (Field, 1997).
3.3.3 Clear acknowledgement of the offence

For an apology to be effective, it needs to clearly acknowledge the offence. It is important to specify the wrongdoing, especially if the apology is to be seen as genuine. An inability to clearly identify who was responsible for the grievance, and to whom the apology is owed and to recognize the impact of the offence on the victim(s) leads to failed apologies (Lazare, 2004, 75). Clarifying the details of the offence demonstrates that the party is fully aware of the seriousness of the moral offence that they have violated. Apologizing for specific offences is an important element that makes a national apology credible. Instead of apologizing in abstract terms with passivity and ambiguity about agency, Tavuchis (1991) claims that the most important function of collective apologies is to provide an official record that outlines the specificity of the nature of the wrongdoing and who was responsible.

Apologies are considered deeply significant since they recognise the victims’ own memory of suffering, and acknowledge perpetrator guilt, all of which helps the healing process. Apologies have been often found to be more significant than material compensation in the beginning of reconciliation processes.

3.4 Japan’s Official Stance

The Japanese government has been criticized frequently by the international community for its wartime conduct. Accusations of Japan’s wrongdoing occur at two levels: first, specific atrocities like the Nanjing Massacre, inhumane treatment of prisoners of war, the forced sexual services of 'comfort women' for Japanese soldiers, medical experimentation in Manchuria and on a more general level, Japanese aggression, annexation and colonial rule in Asia (Yamazaki 2006, 24).

In response to these accusations, the Japanese government has explained its official position regarding war history and reparations in the following document issued by the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs in July 2005:

During a certain period of the past, Japan followed a mistaken national policy and caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many
countries, particularly to those Asian nations, through its colonial rule and aggression. Japan squarely faces these facts of history in a spirit of humility. With feelings of deep remorse and heartfelt apology always engraved in mind, Japan, underpinned by its solid democracy, has resolutely and consistently strived for peace by adhering to a strictly defensive security policy, preventing the escalation of international conflict, and dedicating itself to international peace and stability by mobilizing all its resources…After the end of World War II, Japan renounced all rights, titles and claims to Korea, Taiwan, the Kurile islands, a portion of Sakhalin, and other territories, and accepted the judgments of the International Military Tribunal of the Far East (Tokyo Trial), in which 25 Japanese leaders had been convicted of war crimes. Many other Japanese were convicted in other war crimes courts. Japan has dealt with the issues of reparations, property and claims, in accordance with the San Francisco Peace Treaty, the bilateral peace treaties, agreements and instruments. Japan paid reparations to Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam, while others waived them. After the normalization of its relations with the Republic of Korea, China and other countries, Japan extended a substantial amount of economic cooperation. With the parties to these documents, the issues of reparations, property and claims, including the claims by individuals, have been settled legally (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2005, cited in Seaton, 2007, 66).

Many critics and activists stress that in order for reconciliation to take place in East Asia, Japan needs to issue a clear apology and pay reparations to its former victims. However, Japan’s official position is that the country has already accepted war responsibility, has issued clear apologies, and has fulfilled all its legal obligations to pay reparations and compensation. From an interests-based realpolitik perspective, Japan feels it has fully addressed the past.

3.5 Legal Reparations

Through the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, Japan signed peace treaties and paid reparations to almost all the countries that it had occupied or invaded. These agreements sometimes took the form of technological or economic assistance, but it was understood that they were meant to serve as wartime compensation. Most of these treaties contained clauses saying that the compensation issue had been finally resolved by those treaties, and this understanding constitutes the core of the Japanese official position. Seaton (2007) has offered explanations as to why the demands for compensation stipulated in San Francisco Peace Treaty have been so 'lenient' on
Japan. The Versailles Treaty of 1919 demonstrated how excessively punitive post-war treaties can lay the grounds for future conflict. In Japan’s case, preventing a resurgence of militarism or a backlash against the harshness of the post-war treaties were key aims (Seaton, 2007).

Japan and South Korea signed a treaty in 1965 normalizing diplomatic relations. At that time, they also signed a separate agreement for Japan to provide financial aid to Seoul, in return for South Korea relinquishing its right to claim wartime compensation. Likewise, the Chinese government relinquished the right of pursuing claims for wartime compensation after gaining the possession of Japanese assets in China at the end of the war. In 1972, the Japan-China Joint statement waived reparations. The Joint Communiqué of the Government of Japan and the Government of the People’s Republic of China (excerpted) states:

> The Japanese side is keenly conscious of the responsibility for the serious damage that Japan caused in the past to the Chinese people through war, and deep reproaches itself…

> (5) The Government of the People’s Republic of China declares that in the interest of friendship between the Chinese and the Japanese peoples, it renounces its demand for war reparation from Japan (Tanaka and Chou, 1972).

So, why are Japan’s efforts to apologize and restore relationships with its former victims failing to bear fruit? Barkan claims that restitution is a process where “victims and perpetrators (come) face to face to barter the suffering and responsibility for the past and create a future, which both sides can subscribe to…” (Barkan, 2001, S-49). It can encompass compensation to victims, an admission of guilt, recognition of suffering and responsibility for the past. An important element he emphasizes is the “willingness of governments to admit to unjust and discriminatory past policies and to negotiate terms for restitution or reparation with their victims based more on moral considerations than on power politics” (Barkan, 2000, 317).
According to the earlier theories on effective collective apology (Tavuchis, 1991, 101), the apology has to be: 1) official, in the sense that the prime minister of Japan acts as the representative of the collective and; 2) on record and therefore binding. An apology needs to be accompanied by an assurance that there will be no repetition of the acts to reassure that the perpetrator is genuinely sorry. Barkan states that an apology needs to validate and show respect for the victims’ memory and identity, the very recognition of past injustices constitutes the core restitution. It is recognition that transforms the trauma of victimization into a process of mourning which allows for the rebuilding of relationships (Barkan, 2000, 323) With these criteria in mind, let us look at some representative cases of official apologies that Japan successfully issued in the past to understand why they were accepted as genuine and sincere by its former victims.

3.6 Sincere Apologies by Japanese Leaders

In August 1993, Hosokawa Morihito became the prime minister of a coalition government consisting of eight minority parties including the Socialist Party. For the first time since 1955, the conservative Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) had lost its majority in the Diet and was out of power. During his brief nine-month term in office, Hosokawa made more than four official apologies for Japan’s “aggressive acts” and “colonial rule” causing “intolerable pain and suffering” to the people of Asia and around the world. Hosokawa’s statements were hailed as having shifted the apology discourse of the Japanese government. The new administration of Hosokawa marked a significant break with the past. In the international arena, the end of the Cold War cast a new light on Japan’s position in the international community. “Comfort women” lawsuits and the surrounding publicity continued to plague the Japanese government. Despite apologies by Prime Minister Miyazawa in January 1992 and investigations conducted by the Japanese government in 1992 and 1993, the comfort women issue continued to gain momentum. During the 1990s there was a shift toward greater contrition in the official narrative.
The Hosokawa administration shift in war apology discourse was exemplified in a press conference statement of 10 August after his inauguration as the prime minister: “My understanding is that it was a war of aggression and it was wrong” (Asahi Shimbun, 1993). This was the first time a Japanese Prime Minister had acknowledged that the war was wrong and a mistake. Hosokawa’s statements made front-page headlines and the statement was welcomed enthusiastically by China and South Korea.

On 23 August 1993, in his speech at the 127th Diet Session, Hosokawa made another apology in his first policy speech to the Japanese Diet:

> Going back just four turns of the twelve-year cycle, it was with the end of the war in August 1945 that we realized the great mistake we had made and vowed to start a new, resolutely determined never to repeat the wrongs of the past.

> I would like to take this opportunity to express a new our profound remorse (hansei) and apologies (owabi) for the fact that Japanese actions, including acts of aggression and colonial rule, caused unbearable suffering and sorrow for so many people and to state that we will demonstrate our new determination by contributing more than ever before to world peace (Hosokawa’s policy speech to the 127th session of the National Diet, 23 August 1993).

The final example of Hosokawa’s apologetic statement was made during his trip to South Korea to meet with the new President Kim Young Sam on 7 November 1993.

> Because of our country’s past colonial rule, residents of the Korean peninsula experienced various forms of unbearable pain and grief, including such things as not being allowed to use their own language in school, being forced to change their names to Japanese style names, and the requisitioning of military comfort women. As the perpetrator of these actions, from the heart we want to express our deep remorse (fukaku hansei) and apologize (chinsa) (Asahi Shimbun, 8 November 1993).

In this statement, what makes Hosokawa’s apology to Korea strong and effective was his explicit reference to the details of Japanese occupation in Korea. President Kim responded to Hosokawa’s apology positively, especially in relation to the issue of comfort women:
I want to commend PM Hosokawa’s understanding of history. Previous administrations have requested compensation for the former military comfort women. We have decided that, although looking to the past and keeping alive the lessons of history is important, it is more important to build a relationship [for the future]. As for the comfort women issue, although previous administrators have pursued compensation, [we find it] unnecessary (Asahi Shimbun, 8 November 1993, cited in Yamazaki, 2006).

Hosokawa’s apologies in 1993-94 were considered the “zenith of Japanese apologies, judging by their reception in neighboring countries, and his apologies seemed to be taking Japan on a bold new course” (Seaton, 2007, 87). Hosokawa’s apology statements were positively accepted by Korean leaders. The Korean Foreign Minister even said, “The summit was 110 out of 100. The issue of past history is closed” (Yomiuri Shimbun, 10 November 1993).

Japanese public opinion concerning Hosokawa’s usage of the term 'aggression' and 'colonial rule' was positive. A public opinion poll of 3,000 respondents conducted by the Asahi Shimbun on 13 November 1993 revealed that 76% approved Hosokawa’s Diet speech while only 18% opposed it. National apologies for the country’s past wrongdoing must gain acceptance from the domestic audience. For the government to maintain its political legitimacy apologies must be justified to the audience in such a way that they still protect positive national pride and identity. Hosokawa differentiated himself from the old LDP political establishment and was able to apologize with a renewed determination without making the nation lose face. Moreover, Hosokawa never compromised or nullified his apologies with other actions, which is why they were treated as sincere.
3.6.1 Murayama’s apologies

Towards the fiftieth anniversary of the war, it was hoped that it might be possible for Japan to produce a definitive resolution in the Diet which would include an apology to Asian victims of the war, and an assurance that Japan would not follow the same path again (Rose, 2005; Field, 1995). Plans for the adoption of a resolution for the renunciation of the war was advanced by a project team of the government under Prime Minister Murayama Tomiichi of the Socialist Democratic Party. The internal politics of the coalition government (SDP, LDP and Sakigake) in addition to opposition from LDP hard-liners led the final draft to become a disappointingly watered down version. Despite the promise that the LDP would support the Socialist call for an apology, the Diet resolution was passed in June in a greatly altered version from the original draft amid much public criticism of the Japanese government. The final draft failed to include the words 'apology' or 'renunciation of the war' as was originally intended. Prime Minister Murayama tried to salvage the situation by issuing a personal statement. On 15 August 1995, Murayama called a press conference at his home where he read a statement in which he apologized for Japan’s wartime conduct:

During a certain period in the not too distant past, Japan, following a mistaken national policy, advanced along the road to war, only to ensnare the Japanese people in a fateful crisis, and through its colonial rule and aggression, caused tremendous damage and suffering to the people of many countries, particularly to those of Asian nations. In the hope that no such mistake by made in the future, I regard, in a spirit of humility, these irrefutable facts of history, and express here once again my feelings of deep remorse (tsuusetsu na hansei) and state my heartfelt apology (kokoro kara no owabi) (Murayama, 15 August 1995, cited from Yamazaki, 2006).

Murayama redeemed the situation with his ‘heartfelt apology’ by mentioning “colonial rule and aggression” and having caused “tremendous damage and suffering.” The phrase “irrefutable facts of history” was interpreted as a rejection of the revisionist historical views of the conservatives and nationalists. The Chinese government adopted Murayama’s statement as a benchmark against which to evaluate subsequent official statements and apologies for the war (Rose, 2005, 103).
His personal integrity and his long-time association with leftist politics gave his statement credibility and the sincerity and emotional content of his speech was persuasive in indicating true repentance (Yamazaki, 2006, 109).

Reactions to Murayama’s statement were generally positive. The statement was not representative of the Japanese government as a whole, but Murayama nonetheless obtained a cabinet endorsement (kakugi kettei). This move reflected his wish that his statement would be interpreted both at home and abroad as the general will of the Japanese cabinet, which then would politically bind future cabinets (Mukae, 1996, 1029). Subsequent Japanese prime ministers did use Murayama’s statement as a model for their own apologies. Prime Ministers Hashimoto and Koizumi modelled their apologies in accordance with Murayama’s speech and the Japanese Foreign Ministry repeatedly affirmed this speech as the official government statement on apology.

China and South Korea accepted it in a reserved manner as they felt that Murayama’s speech was a personal gesture rather than an official position. Added to this, in the afternoon on the same day of the press conference, more than half of Murayama’s LDP cabinet visited the Yasukuni Shrine, showing how little support he had from his own cabinet despite the prior cabinet approval.

### 3.7 Why Japanese Apologies Have Failed

The main problem surrounding the apparent failure of the Japanese to come to terms with the past is (from the Chinese and Korean points of view) the refusal of successive Japanese governments to offer genuine, sincere apologies to the Chinese people, backed up by consistent actions and behaviour that support the apologies.

Although the Japanese government, politicians, and the public may feel that apologies have already been offered on a number of occasions, this view is at odds with the Chinese and Koreans who contend that Japan still has not apologized for its
past. Repeated requests from leaders of Korea and China are evidence of the failure of Japanese apologies.

Based on the criteria explained earlier, Japanese apologies have expressed remorse and regret for the harm done. Another important aspect of regret concerns the expression of emotion in apologies. The success of Murayama’s speech owes much to his 'heartfelt' apology. In terms of representation, as the elected head of state, the prime minister appropriately represented the Japanese people as the legitimate person to apologize. However, those who argue that Japan “has never apologized” focus on the lack of a parliamentary resolution of apology. The failure to pass a Diet apology resolution in 1995, along with the wrangling over words, have undermined the impact of the past official apologies made. The issue of representativeness was also the main reason why former 'comfort women' were dissatisfied with the Japanese act of apology on their issues.

3.7.1 Comfort women apologies

During the 1990s, Japan came under international pressure to make amends for its historical crimes during World War II. International pressures together with domestic criticisms forced Japan to revisit its responsibility for wartime acts and the core of the dispute was over Japanese treatment of the ‘comfort women.’ The practice of sexual slavery was brought into international prominence in 1990. The Japanese government, the two Koreas, China, the UN, and several nongovernmental, and women’s organizations became embroiled in the question of how to respond to injustices inflicted upon these women fifty years ago.

It was not until 1991 that a public testimony by a former comfort woman Kim Haksoon was given in Korea. The Japanese government initially denied direct involvement in the recruitment of comfort women. The Japanese government gave a statement in 1990 rejecting any official connection to the management of the brothels. Instead, the government attributed the coordination to private contractors.
However, after historian Yoshiaki Yoshimi discovered government records in the Japanese Defence Agency library in 1992 providing a direct role in managing the brothels. The lawsuits promoted the appointment of a Japanese committee to study the comfort women issue. This led to several official expressions of remorse, including that of Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama who acknowledged Japan’s 'mistaken national policy' and offered his 'feelings of deep remorse' and 'heartfelt apology.'

In 1993, then-Chief Cabinet Secretary Yohei Kono made a statement regarding “the involvement of the military authorities” in the 'comfort women' issue and added that “Japan would like to extend its sincere apologies and remorse to all those...who suffered immeasurable pain and incurable...wounds.” Several Japanese prime ministers wrote to surviving sex slaves noting that “with an involvement of the Japanese military, it was a grave affront to the honor and dignity of large numbers of women...our country, painfully aware of its moral responsibilities, with feelings of apology and remorse, should face up squarely to its past.” Although these statements mark a turning point in the official position of the Japanese government, the former comfort women rejected them as merely individual responses that did not represent the people of Japan, as long as the Diet refused to issue an apology. Added to this, there is considerable ambiguity and passivity in these statements.

While accepting some involvement in the military-servicing brothels, the government evaded legal responsibility toward the comfort women. The government’s denial, then downplaying of the state’s position in institutionalizing sexual slavery during the war, is the reason why the Japanese government’s statement failed to satisfy the emotional needs of the former comfort women. The victims argue that official acknowledgement and apologies are both necessary. When the Japanese government apologized to the comfort women in August 1993, it was welcomed by the victims’ groups only until it became evident that compensation would be 'unofficial' via the Asian Women’s Fund set up in July 1995. The victims wanted monetary reparation to be directly from the government as a symbolic gesture of taking responsibility for the harms caused (Chang, 2009).
Although Murayama released statements that expressed remorse and apologies toward former comfort women and their suffering, his message was taken as an individual’s message, and not representing the reluctant government. “For such a significant issue, individuals cannot speak convincingly on behalf of a heel-dragging government” (Chang, 2009). Hence, the Japanese Diet has largely been considered not to have extended formal acknowledgement, apologies, or acceptance of responsibility.

Even this acknowledgement was recently challenged by Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s remarks in 2007 that there was “no evidence to prove that there was coercion as initially suggested.” Abe's statement was widely denounced by international organizations and other nations.

### 3.7.2 Prime Ministers’ visits to the Yasukuni Shrine

Gestures and remarks made by Japan’s nationalist leaders have nullified the official apologies and help to explain why Japan is widely perceived as having inadequately addressed the past. Despite the number of apologies made, Prime Ministers Koizumi and Abe’s Yasukuni Shrine visits have provoked the greatest public anger in East Asia. Such contradictory messages and actions cast doubt on the sincerity of any apology, and therefore nullify its effect.

For China and South Korea the most problematic issue that destroys the authenticity of the past apologies is that of Japanese prime ministers’ controversial visits to the Yasukuni Shrine. The Yasukuni Shrine is where the souls of over 2.5 million war dead are enshrined. The shrine originated from the wishes of the new Meiji leaders to perform rituals for those who had died in wars for the nation.

Japanese Prime Ministers and cabinet ministers have made regular visits to the Yasukuni Shrine from 1951 onward. The problem first emerged in the 1980s when Yasuhiro Nakasone paid a visit in his official capacity on 15 August 1985. But it was not until Koizumi became prime minister that the issue developed into a diplomatic
problem once again. The heart of the problem is the fact that those honoured and worshipped there include fourteen convicted Class-A war criminals, such as Prime Minister Tojo Hideki.

When there is a threat to the perpetrator group’s moral identity, memory would be used to valourize the group and restore its collective esteem (Tajfel and Turner, 1986; Nadler and Shnabel, 2008). In the process of valourizing Japan, one critical memory that Abe and the nationalists needed to reshape was the history of humiliation following the judgments rendered by the Tokyo Tribunal. Recently, in a written message sent to an annual memorial ceremony honouring Class-A and other war criminals in August 2014, Abe asserted that those executed by the Allied Powers are “the foundation of the nation” and should be hailed for having “staked their souls to become the foundation of their nation so that Japan could achieve the peace and prosperity of today” (AJW, 2014). In his message sent to the ceremony in 2013, Abe further expressed his own preferences by stating, “I want to establish the existence of a new Japan that would not be an embarrassment to the spirit of the war dead” (AJW, 2014). As the inscription on the statue honouring the 1,180 war criminals at the Yasukuni Shrine also stresses, to Abe and his supporters, the International Tribunal for the Far East (Tokyo Tribunal) was “a harsh and retaliatory trial never before seen in the world” (AJW, 2014), one which needs to be denounced for the sake of posterity.

Abe and the conservatives have repeatedly voiced their frustrations that the Japanese people have been forced to live far too long under the shadow of their defeat and it is time they restore a strong national identity with dignity and pride. From this perspective, it is therefore imperative that they negate the verdict of the Tokyo Tribunal which convicted Class A war criminals on charges of “crimes against peace” and “crimes against humanity” thereby erasing the stain of being “descendants inheriting the DNA of people who have committed heinous crimes” (Abe & Hyakuta, 2013, 154).
To the revisionists, the Class-A war criminals were victims who were unjustly punished under victor’s justice. Abe’s essential argument is that “the military tribunal was a scheme designed by the victor to impose its political judgment upon the vanquished and as such, it had no moral authority” (Abe, 2006, 69-70). This blatant glorification of Class-A war criminals in his messages demonstrate Abe’s resolve not only to exonerate his own grandfather, Nobusuke Kishi, who was imprisoned as a Class-A war criminal (later released) but to reject the tribunal’s verdict that the past war was an act of aggression.

By paying obeisance and patronizing the Yasukuni Shrine, Abe and past prime ministers of Japan are viewed by China and South Korea as endorsing the shrine’s public position nullifying Japan’s past apologies, claiming that the Tokyo Tribunal should be rejected and “the recent great war was not a war of aggression, but a war of self-defense, in which the very survival of Japan was at stake and which aimed, moreover, at liberating Asia from European and American colonial oppression” (Takahashi, 2005, 115). As social identity theory suggests, in the face of shameful events in history, groups are driven to remember the past in ways that eliminate humiliating events altogether from their historical narratives (Bar-Tal et al., 2009). Abe and the nationalists’ efforts to honour the wartime leaders and whitewash the past can be interpreted as their way of defending the nation’s damaged moral status and replacing it with a glorious trope of which its citizens can be proud. And for China and South Korea, this act appears only as further evidence of Japan’s lack of remorse over its wartime conduct.

### 3.7.3 Apologies nullified

The table below highlights why political leaders in China and Korea feel agitated by the verbal apologies which are then subverted by the Japanese leaders’ nationalist actions. China is very insistent that 'actions speak louder than words,' especially on delicate questions as acknowledgement and responsibility for wartime atrocities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime Minister</th>
<th>Apology Content</th>
<th>Apology Negation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanaka Kakuei</td>
<td>25 September 1972: as part of the restoration of Sino-Japanese relations, expresses remorse for the “trouble” (meiwaku) Japan caused. The comments cause some anger because the word “meiwaku” does not express sufficient remorse.</td>
<td>Visited Yasukuni Shrine 5 times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Miyazawa Kiichi | 26 August 1982: Miyazawa statement on history textbooks  
Note: Miyazawa statement led to the adoption of “neighbouring countries clause” in the textbook screening standards of the Ministry of Education  |                                                                                                                                                              |
| Nakasone Yasuhiro | 22 August 1984: in Korea, expresses “deep remorse” (fukai hansei) for the trouble and “terrible damage” (sangai) in the past.                                                                                                           | Makes “official” worship to Yasukuni Shrine on 15 August 1985, and marks the internationalization of the Yasukuni issue.  
July 1986: Education Minister Fujio Masayuki states, “The erroneous view that only Japan committed aggression must be corrected…the verdict that Tojo was a Class-A war criminal was wrong” (Fujio was later dismissed by Prime Minister Nakasone). |
| Takeshita Noboru | 6 March 1989: in the Diet, states that the “militaristic aggression” (gunjishugi ni yoru shiruyaku) of our country cannot be denied.  
30 March 1989: expresses deep remorse and “feelings of regret” for colonial rule to North Korea, the first such statement to the North.                                                                 |                                                                                                                                                              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaifu Toshiki</th>
<th>3 May 1991: At the ASEAN summit, Kaifu expresses deep remorse for the “unbearable suffering and sadness” (taenikui kurushimi to kanashimi) caused by “our nation’s acts.”</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hosokawa Morihiro | 10 August 1993: makes a statement it was “an aggressive war and a mistake” (shimryaku senso).  
15 August 1993: Hosokawa becomes the first prime minister to offer condolences to Asians on 15 August.  
6 November 1993: In Korea, Hosokawa lists specific Korean grievances such as the “comfort women” and comments that “as the aggressor” (kagaisha to shite) he expresses remorse and a “deep apology” (fukai chinsha).  
20 March 1994: In China, expresses remorse and an “apology.” | |
<p>| Kono Yohei | 1993 Kono Statement: Yohei Kono, the then Chief Cabinet Secretary made a statement regarding “the involvement of the military authorities” in the “comfort women” issue and added that “Japan would like to extend its sincere apologies and remorse to all those…who suffered immeasurable pain and incurable…wounds.” | |
| Murayama Tomiichi | 15 August 1995: the Murayama statement (danwa) tried to salvage the widely criticized Japanese Diet statement (9 June). Murayama’s “personal heartfelt apology” became the standard for later apologies by Japanese prime ministers. | May 1994: Justice Minister, Nagano Shigeto repeatedly objected to the term of Nanjing Massacre, calling the incident a fabrication. He did not deny that there was killing, rape and pillaging but he argued that the term “massacre” was too strong. He also claimed that “the war should not be called an aggression since Japan’s intent was to liberate colonies and establish a co-prosperity sphere.” Nagano was forced to resign and apologize. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 August 1994</td>
<td>Sakurai Shin, Director General of the Environment Agency stated that Japan did not fight with the intention of waging an aggressive war, and thanks to Japan Asia could “throw off the shackles of colonial rule” (Sakurai resigned two days later).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 November 1995</td>
<td>Director General of the Management and Coordination Agency, Eto Takami, rejected Murayama’s apology statement and said that he believed “Japan also did good things during its colonial rule.” Eto was forced to resign. This led Murayama to issue a written apology to South Korea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 January 1996</td>
<td>Hashimoto states it was aggression and restates the content of Murayama communiqué.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 June 1996</td>
<td>Hashimoto apologizes (owabi) to the “comfort women.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 August 1996</td>
<td>Hashimoto expresses remorse to the Asians, but he also praises the soldiers who fought for “the security of the nation” and sacrificed their precious lives (totoi gisei).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 January 1997</td>
<td>In China, Hashimoto repeats the Murayama communiqué.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 November 1998</td>
<td>President Jiang Zemin visits Japan. Obuchi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Hashimoto Ryutaro | 15 August 1998: Obuchi repeats Hashimoto and Murayama position. |
|                   | 8 October 1998: Obuchi expresses remorse (hansei) to President Kim Dae-jung as part of the Japan-Republic of Korea Joint Declaration. |
|                   | 25 November 1998: President Jiang Zemin visits Japan. Obuchi |

Hashimoto’s words were taken with skepticism because of his position as the former head of the War Bereaved Association (izokukai), his private visits to Yasukuni Shrine, and his earlier comment that he had “lingering doubts about whether it could be called a war of aggression” (when he was Minister of Trade and Industry).
issues a verbal apology but there is wrangling over a written joint declaration which only mentions remorse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shinzo Abe</td>
<td>October 2006: Abe expresses an apology for the damage caused by its colonial rule of aggression.</td>
<td>Abe’s apology was followed on the same day by a group of 80 LDP lawmakers’ visit to Yasukuni Shrine. 1 March 2007: Abe stated that “there was no evidence that the Japanese government had kept sex slaves, even though the Japanese government had already admitted the use of brothels in 1993. The fact is, there is no evidence to prove there was coercion.” Abe claimed that the Class A war criminals “are not war criminals under the laws of Japan.” Abe expresses doubt on Murayama apology saying, “The Abe Cabinet is not necessarily keeping to it.” “There is no definitive answer either in academia or in the international community on what</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14 August 2015, Abe issued his statement on the 70th anniversary of the Second World War in which he expressed “deepest remorse” and “sincere condolences” to wartime victims both home and abroad. | constituting aggression. Things that happened between countries appear different depending on which side you’re looking from.”

December 2013, Abe makes a surprise visit to Yasukuni Shrine. 

Abe at the same time stressed that Japan has “repeatedly expressed the feelings of deep remorse and heartfelt apology for its actions during the war” and that future generations should not be obliged to apologize for Japan’s wartime actions 70 years ago. 

Abe sent a monetary offering to Yasukuni Shrine the following day on August 15 on the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II. 

15 August 2015: Three cabinet ministers—Haruko Arimura, state minister for women’s empowerment, Sakae Takaichi, minister for internal affairs and communications, and Eriko Yamatani, minister in charge for the abduction issue—paid their visits to Yasukuni Shrine. 

66 Diet members also jointly visited the shrine that day. |

(Sources: *Asahi Shimbun*; Seaton, 2007)
3.7.4 Abe’s war anniversary statement

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s 14 August 2015 statement marking the seventieth anniversary of the end of World War II was issued at a sensitive time when tensions were rising in Japan’s diplomatic relations with its neighbouring countries in Northeast Asia. As China and Korea closely watched the outcome of the war anniversary statement, South Korean President Park Geun-hye expressed her hopes that Prime Minister Abe's statement would uphold the views held by past cabinets on wartime history "to show the Japanese government's mature attitude in trying to make a fresh start in relationships with neighbouring countries, including us" (Reuters, 2015). Abe’s statement was drafted as he juggled conflicting priorities, amidst pressure to appease both his conservative supporters and the approval of the pacifist-leaning coalition partner, Komeito. The resulting anniversary statement drew mixed responses from both camps. One key issue was whether Abe’s seventieth anniversary statement would continue the legacy of the landmark fiftieth war anniversary statement made by then-Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama in 1995 in which he expressed “feelings of deep remorse” and a “heartfelt apology” for Japan’s “colonial rule and aggression.” Ten years later, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi repeated the same expressions in his own statement. Abe referred to the statements of his predecessors stating that “Such positions articulated by the previous cabinets will remain unshakable into the future.” This could be taken as a compromise for Abe and his conservative cohorts who have repeatedly questioned the rulings of the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal that singled out Japan to be guilty of aggressive war.

Chinese and South Korean leaders were far from satisfied with Abe’s war anniversary statement. According to the Asahi Shimbun, China’s first vice foreign minister Zhang Yesui summoned the Japanese Ambassador to convey Beijing’s stance on the issue. “Japan must clearly explain the nature of its war of aggression, as well as its responsibility for the war, while also making a sincere apology to the peoples of nations that suffered from the war. It should not try to gloss over this important and fundamental issue” (AJW, 2015b). Chinese, Korean media and left-leaning groups in Japan also criticized it as a step back from the Murayama Statement for not including a more explicit acknowledgement of Japan’s actions.
Although Abe’s statement repeated several of Murayama’s key phrases, it was criticized for its ambiguity in failing to clarify the scope of Japan’s responsibilities during the war. For example, Abe used the word “aggression” without clarifying whose aggression he was referring to: “Incident, aggression, war—we shall never again resort to any form of the threat of use of force as a means of settling international disputes. We shall abandon colonial rule forever and respect the right of self-determination of all people throughout the world” (Abe, 2015).

South Korean leaders were dissatisfied with the indirect use of terms, particularly “aggression.” Another issue that was raised by Korean officials was the indirect reference made to “comfort women” as “women behind the battlefields whose honor and dignity were severely injured.” He failed to acknowledge that Japanese military authorities coerced tens of thousands of Asian women to work as sex slaves, a claim he has consistently denied.

Although Abe did include such key words as “aggression,” “colonial domination,” “deep remorse” and “apology,” Murayama dismissed his successor’s anniversary statement for not having upheld the spirit of his 1995 statement. At a news conference following Abe’s delivery of the statement, Murayama made critical remarks regarding the ambiguity and indirect language. He said Abe’s address did not make clear for which actions Japan was apologizing (AJW, 2015a).

Another area of focus was whether the Prime Minister would express “apology” for Japan’s actions seventy years ago. Abe in fact expressed “feelings of profound grief” and “eternal, sincere condolences” to the victims of war at home and abroad in his statement. However, these words of remorse were questioned by Japan’s neighbours when he stressed that “Japan has repeatedly expressed the feelings of deep remorse and heartfelt apology for its actions during the war” (Abe, 2015). He further added that “We must not let our children, grandchildren, and even further generations to come, who have nothing to do with the war, be predestined to apologize. Even so, we Japanese, across generations, must squarely face history. We have a responsibility to inherit the past, in all humbleness, and pass it on to the future.” To suggest that Japan
has done enough apologizing reflects not only the conservatives’ position: according to the recent Pew survey, more than 50% of the Japanese public feel that they have apologized enough.

Critical Chinese and Korean media questioned the sincerity of Abe’s apology pointing out to his attempt to use “rhetorical twists” to appease both the conservative camp and critics in China and South Korea. Xinhua news agency described Abe’s war anniversary statement as “rife with rhetorical twists” and “carefully calibrated context into which he has embedded those too-fundamental-to-avoid terms, the apology was diluted one at best, thus marking only a crippled start to build trust among its neighbors (Xinhua.net, 14 August 2015). As mentioned in the earlier section, specificity of the wrongdoing is a critical element that makes a national apology genuine (Tavuchis, 1991). Abe’s statement failed to satisfy the victimized nations with his ambiguous rhetoric that avoided specifying the nature of the wrongdoing and who was responsible for it.

3.8 Conclusion

Unresolved and unacknowledged harm, historical memory and identity-based needs generate deep contextual dynamics that protract tensions and conflict in East Asia. This chapter has examined some of the factors underlying the victim nations’ rejection of the perpetrator’s apologies and explained why both China and South Korea are dissatisfied that Japan’s expression of remorse is not 'genuine and sincere.' Sincerity of an official apology requires the appearance of consistency and consensus in government statements, actions and institutions. Many scholars have highlighted the insincerity of Japanese apologies as each one becomes subverted by a steady stream of cabinet officials visiting the Yasukuni Shrine. This insincerity is further exacerbated by conservative politicians seeking to revise history by denying or minimizing the impact of Japanese wartime atrocities. Revisionist history especially in the area of textbooks is another indication of insincerity on the part of the Japanese government.
Given the current tense relationships between China, Korea and Japan, it is imperative that ripe conditions are established for the giving and receiving of apologies considered acceptable to China and Korea. Some of these conditions have been mapped out in this chapter. The most important of which, however, is that official apologies are not subverted by provocative subversion of the statement by the actions of the Japanese leaders.
CHAPTER 4

4. Context: Japan’s Identity Crisis and Sino-Japanese Relations


4.1 Introduction

The social crises of the 1990s and the disastrous earthquake of March 2011 served to undermine the confidence, sense of security and positive self-esteem of many Japanese. This chapter examines the resurgence of nationalist discourse in Japan as an effort to reinterpret, reshape and restore what is perceived as Japan’s damaged reputation. The rise of nationalist discourse in Japan is an attempt to deal with Japan’s identity crisis in the face of insecurity and anxieties generated by economic stagnation, natural disasters, and increasing competition with China. Japanese elite's revamping of Japan’s national identity as a proud, beautiful, and strong nation fuels tension with China. Drawing on social identity theory, I will explore some of the drivers of the Sino-Japanese 'history problem'.

Growing anxieties about China’s economic rivalry, potential threats from its rapid and opaque military buildup, the intrusion by Chinese submarines into Japanese territorial waters, and the unilateral declaration of an Air Defence Identification Zone (ADIZ) by China have contributed to growing divisions between China and Japan. Many scholars agree, however, that the underlying driver of this division is the gulf between each nation’s interpretation of the past. China and Japan are caught in a vicious cycle that is fuelled by conflicts over history. Every example of Japan ‘forgetting’ its role as perpetrator in World War II catalyses a resurgence of
nationalist fervor in China. Chinese and Korean criticisms of Japan for its denial of the past serve to deepen Japanese resentment towards these countries and increases tensions in the bilateral and trilateral relationships.

National or ethnic identities are shaped in large part by certain struggles or glorious achievements a group has experienced (Volkan, 1997). Social identity and social categorization theories posit that the more important a group identity is to the self, identification with that group or nation becomes a source of individual pride and self-esteem (Tajfel, 1986). Past studies have demonstrated that high national identification may be oriented to a more right-wing political stance (Doosje et al., 1998). Individuals who identify highly with the nation are likely to collectively ‘forget’ the nation’s past injustices and attempt to distinguish the nation by glorifying its past or by enhancing memories of its past victimization (Bilali and Ross, 2012, 128). Ruling elites who strongly identify with the nation are therefore prone to construct narratives that bolster solidarity and protect the nation’s positive identity.

In the light of this research on how national identities are formed or reshaped, this chapter will explore the ways in which a quest for positive self-esteem and a proud identity has driven Japan’s conservative elites to elevate its ‘Chosen Glory’ (narratives and myths as well as its ‘Chosen Trauma’ (shared mental representation of a group’s massive trauma that drives narratives of victimhood and humiliation) myths, both working to construct a collective memory that serves nationalist and neo-nationalist aspirations (Volkan 1997, 48-49). These narratives of ‘Chosen Glory’ and ‘Chosen Trauma’ have strengthened Japanese conservative efforts to bolster the nation’s self-esteem after a series of social crises and natural disasters from the 1990s onward.

4.2 Japan’s Identity Crisis

The end of the Cold War and the collapse of the ‘bubble economy’ generated a mood of deep insecurity and a desire to develop a new Japanese sense of identity and purpose. The 1990s was a ‘lost decade’ for Japan as the nation experienced the worst
political and economic crisis since the end of the war. Economic stagnation and the collapse of stock and real estate markets meant that Japan was no longer a developmental model for the world. Nonperforming loans mounted to more than one trillion dollars and dozens of financial institutions declared bankruptcy. Pyle states that as Japan suffered from the breakdown of its economic system, its international stature dramatically diminished (Pyle 2007, 6).

Moody’s Investors Service in 2002 downgraded Japanese government bonds one grade below the African nation of Botswana. For the status conscious Japanese to be rated below a country that was a recipient of Japanese aid provoked public outrage.

Japan’s international status as a miraculous economic superpower was further challenged by the rise of China. Economic stagnation produced other identity-threatening results. Until the 1990s, Japan’s international identity was enhanced by substantial economic assistance and advice given to countries in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. In 1991, Tokyo provided US$ 13 billion for the United Nations operation in the Gulf War. However, the economic downturn deprived successive Japanese governments of the funds needed to finance ‘aid diplomacy’.

The prolonged recession deprived Tokyo of economic largesse—both in the form of overseas development assistance and overseas private-sector business networks—which were used to compensate for its refusal to use the military as an instrument of state power. (Glosserman & Snyder, 2008, 4).

This undermined Japan’s status in the international community and diminished its diplomatic influence, as the country was no longer viewed as a great power to be reckoned with.

On the domestic front, Japan faced various developments that further threatened its postwar identity as a model state. The 1990s was a time when the Japanese people faced a shocking failure of what they always believed to be the most secure and stable social system in the world. Such national crises as the Hanshin earthquake and the Aum Shinrikyō sarin gas attack in the Tokyo subway revealed weaknesses in the ‘Japanese system.’ “The earthquake that devastated one of the largest metropolitan
areas in the country...also became a striking symbol of the government’s bureaucratic rigidity and ineptitude in crisis management” (Yoda and Harootunian 2006, 20). Japanese bureaucracy, once hailed as critical to economic growth, became a source of media scandals because of its corruption, greed and ineptitude, leading to further loss of public confidence. Japan was no longer the envy of the world, a model of a robust economy, with an effective bureaucracy and secure social system. As Japan struggled desperately to regain its economic and political standing, The Great East Japan Earthquake hit Japan’s northeast coast on 11 March 2011. It was an unprecedented catastrophe in which the 9.0 magnitude earthquake and enormous tsunami led to unimaginable social and nuclear havoc.

Allison (2013) states that when the earthquake hit on March 11, 2011, Japan was already struggling with social 'precarity' and vulnerability. Japanese society following the 'lost decades,' as Kingston (2004) notes, was also crippled by ongoing problems such as falling birthrates, growing unemployment, homelessness, a rising suicide rate and increasing crime. Allison further portrays the 'precarity' of Japanese society after the burst of the bubble economy with the following sobering statistics:

> Today one-third of the labor force but one half of youth between the ages of 15 and 24 and 70% of women work in irregular employment: part time, contract, dispatch, day labor....In a country where employment secures not only livelihood but one’s place in the social—identity, safety net, status—the un(der)employed are materially precarious and socially dead....(Allison, 2012, 345)

As these numbers suggest, Japan was already facing severe social malaise and instability before the earthquake hit. The earthquake and tsunami only reinforced the inherent vulnerability of Japan. The country suffered from a lack of strong leadership, made worse by a sclerotic and decrepit political system. With the nuclear meltdown unresolved, the Japanese people live with a deep uncertainty about the actual risks of the radioactive leakage from Fukushima.

Although much of the discourse of the March 11 earthquake also emphasized the social solidarity (kizuna) of the Japanese people, a year after the disaster, 86 percent
of Japanese were dissatisfied with the state of Japanese politics, 60 percent of Japanese disapproved of the government’s recovery efforts and only 7 percent were optimistic about the economic situation. The March 11 earthquake exposed on various levels the precarity of a society in crisis and further deepened the insecurity of a people already demoralized by two decades of economic stagnation and deflation. The pressing demands about how to respond to a series of crises led Japan’s political elites to engage in discussion on the need to not only reshape its national interests but even its national identity.

4.4 Abe’s Vision of 'Chosen Glory'

The gradual resurgence of nationalistic sentiments amongst Japanese can be seen as a response to their fragile, spoiled identities and a desire to be identified with something stronger and more glorious. Nakano observes that Japan has been constantly moving rightward over the past decades with the “shifting pendulum dynamics of the elite-driven process of rightward shift obscuring the shift itself” (Nakano, 2014). Obscure or not, Prime Minister Abe Shinzō returned to office in 2012, this time with greater intensity and a resolve to rid Japan of its sense of defeat and reestablish Japanese pride and collective self-esteem. Thomas Berger (2014) adds that “one of the root causes of Japan’s current difficulties is a loss of self-confidence. They [conservative politicians] see restoring Japan’s ‘confidence’ as vital to getting the country back on track….Abe wants to convince Japan—and the world—that ‘Japan is back.’”

In a February 2013 Statesmen’s forum at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), in Washington D.C., Abe stated in his opening remarks:

Last year, Richard Armitage, Joseph Nye, Michael Green and others published a paper about Japan. They asked if Japan would end up becoming a tier two nation. Secretary Armitage, here is my answer to you: Japan is not and will never be a tier two country. That is the core message I’m here to

---

make, and I should repeat it by saying I am back and [laughter, applause] and thank you and so shall Japan be. (Abe, 2013)

This is the statement of a Prime Minister dedicated to ensuring that Japan will not slip down in world systems rankings from tier one to tier two. Abe Shinzo has returned to make sure Japan is back, and this time with a revamped national identity.

The vision of 'Chosen Glory' that Abe Shinzō is advocating is reflected in his book *Utsukushi kuni e (Toward a beautiful Japan: My vision of Japan)*, a nation in which the Japanese people can take pride in their nation’s achievements, tradition and autonomy. Abe has been quite clear with his goals from the outset, and one of them is to “cast off the post-war regime.” Abe and fellow nationalists are on a mission to discard the masochist view of Japan’s war history which asserts that “the nation had engaged in immoral, unjustifiable, and illegitimate wars of aggression against its neighbours and that Japan well deserved the punishment it received based on the verdicts of the Tokyo Tribunal following its defeat in the Second World War” (Akaha 2008, 157). They are frustrated that the verdicts of the Tokyo Tribunal and the postwar regime imposed by the United States have denied and destroyed all sense of national pride and esteem in the Japanese people. They further blame the postwar educational system for having implanted a sense of defeat and created a population that has been forced to live in shame.

Abe also feels that Japan’s post-war pacifism, represented by the war-renouncing Article 9 of the constitution supported by Japan’s leftist intellectuals, allowed other countries like the United States to restrain Japanese power and influence in the world. Abe and his supporters therefore believe it is imperative that Japan’s identity be renewed as a ‘normal nation,’ disengaged from the US security umbrella and equipped with a more robust and autonomous military. To this end, they believe that the outdated Peace Constitution needs to be revised. To the nationalists, Japan’s Pacifist Constitution is a reminder of their humiliating defeat in the last war and of post-war Japanese subservience towards the United States. Essentially, Abe is determined to restore the glory of Japan as a strong, tier one nation with economic, military and diplomatic power (Clements, 2017).
In 2013, Abe implemented security-related changes which he described as a move from “passive pacifism” to “proactive pacifism.” These were aimed at enabling Japan to become more involved in international cooperation and peace building in the world. He set up the Japanese National Security Council followed by the establishment of the first National Security Strategy and the National Defense Program Guidelines. In December 2013, the government announced that $239 billion was to be spent for the Mid-Term Defense Program. Around the same time, Abe’s government forced through the Diet the new State Secrecy Law. Although concerns have been expressed by liberal intellectuals that this law poses a serious threat to democracy and the fundamental constitutional principles of popular sovereignty, “the law is an integral part of Mr. Abe’s crusade to remake Japan into a ‘beautiful country’”(*New York Times*, December 16, 2013). This goal envisions expanded government power over the people and reduced protection for individual rights—a strong state supported by a patriotic people. Despite strong public protest, Abe successfully reinterpreted the constitution to allow for the exercise of the right of collective self-defense. In 2015, his goal was to change Article 9 of the pacifist constitution, which would enable him to complete his agenda to cast off the shackles of the postwar regime. In his statement commemorating the sixtieth anniversary of the enactment of the Japanese Constitution, Abe stated his agenda as follows:

....while we continue to uphold the fundamental principles of the present Constitution as abiding values, a bold review all the way back to its origins and an in-depth discussion of the Constitution toward realizing a new Japan will lead to a spirit of laying the path to a new era (Abe, 2007).

China’s aggressive moves on the Islands, dispatching patrol planes and boats and unilaterally establishing an Air Defense Identification Zone makes many Japanese fearful of China’s short and long term intentions. This shift in negative public perception justifies rightist claims that the Constitution needs to be revised. Abe and his supporters’ long-awaited ambition is to legitimate the use of military force and reestablish Japan as a stronger, more self-reliant, autonomous country that shines with dignity and pride.
Volkan defines 'Chosen Glory' as a group’s future vision which induces a sense of success, pride and triumph. From this perspective, Japan’s past UN diplomacy can also be seen as an integral part of Japan’s attempts to be recognized as a great power and restore its esteem. Japanese conservatives have long been dissatisfied with Japan’s current position in the United Nations, which they feel fails to fully reflect Japan’s economic power and rising political status in the world. Despite the fact that Japan makes a significant financial contribution to the UN, it feels it has been excluded from the “great power club” (Li, 2008, 115). Being a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) would serve Abe’s agenda well as Japan would be expected to be more responsible for maintaining international peace and security, which could include UN sponsored military deployment and peacekeeping missions. Securing a seat in the UNSC therefore serves Abe and the conservative politicians’ motive to revise the pacifist constitution and become a normal military power. China’s vociferous opposition to Japan’s bid to gain a permanent seat on the UN Security Council is particularly irritating to Japanese nationalist elites who see it as a threat to the positive national identity they are striving to build.

4.4 'Chosen Glory' of the War Criminals

Social identity theory posits that in a time of crisis, when there is a threat to a group’s identity, memory is used to valorize the group and restore its collective esteem. As identity is challenged, undermined, or possibly shattered, so memories are drawn on and reshaped to defend unity and coherence, to shore up a sense of self and community (Bell, 2006, 6). In the process of valorizing Japan, one critical memory that Abe needed to reshape was the history of humiliation following the judgements rendered by the Tokyo Tribunal.

Abe’s sentiment is also shared by Matsudaira Nagayoshi, the chief priest of Yasukuni Shrine who carried out the enshrinement of the Class-A war criminals in 1978:
Even before I became the chief priest of Yasukuni, I have always argued that Japan’s spiritual revival will not be possible unless we reject the Tokyo Tribunal which placed the entire blame on Japan (Matsudaira, 1992, 162-71).

By paying obeisance and patronizing the Yasukuni Shrine, Abe and former prime ministers of Japan are viewed by China and other Asian neighbours as endorsing the shrine’s public position that Japan was not at fault, the Tokyo Tribunal should be rejected and “the recent great war was not a war of aggression, but a war of self-defense, in which the very survival of Japan was at stake and which aimed, moreover, at liberating Asia from European and American colonial oppression” (Takahashi, 2005, 115). Groups are driven to remember the past in ways that eliminate shameful and humiliating events from their historical narratives (Bar-Tal et al., 2009). Nationalist efforts to honour wartime leaders and whitewash the past can be interpreted as their way of replacing Japan’s damaged moral status with a glorious trope that its citizens can be proud of. And for China and South Korea, this act only appears as further evidence of Japan’s lack of remorse over its wartime conduct.

4.5 The Japanese Textbook Controversy

History books are key to the construction and reconstruction of national narratives that develop a group’s collective identity and its positive distinctiveness. Michael Apple argues that the selection and organization of school curricula is an ideological process that serves the interests of particular classes and social groups (Apple, 1992, 8). Textbooks are often used as ideological tools to promote a certain belief system and legitimize an established political and social order. “Ever since the rise of the nation-state, history textbooks have been used by states as instruments for glorifying the nation, consolidating its national identity, and justifying particular forms of social and political systems” (Apple and Christian-Smith, 1991, 10). Social identity theorists claim that as a way of maintaining positive self-concept and esteem, individuals tend to prefer favourable historical portrayals of their group. Group members are therefore motivated to reinterpret or silence events of the past that could reflect poorly on their group and by extension, themselves (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).
As the social crises of the 1990s eroded the Japanese people’s confidence, pride and security, a powerful neo-nationalist discourse emerged offering the promise of “renewed pride and purpose through a reconnection with the unalloyed (and unpolluted) Japanese spirit as it existed in the traditional past” (Nathan, 2004, 122).

The 1990s were also a time of huge political shifts. In 1993, the long rule of the conservative Liberal Democratic Party was replaced by the Japan New Party and the new Prime Minister, Hosokawa Morihiro, made clear-cut public statements on the Asia-Pacific War: “I personally recognize it as a war of aggression, a mistaken war.” In 1995, Hosokawa’s successor, Prime Minister Murayama Tomiichi, issued a statement to China and other Asian nations containing formal expressions of apology and regret. This spurred Japanese right-wing political movements and various revisionist groups to go on the offensive to counter the revisionist trend. These conservative actions spanned a wide range, from academic efforts to revise history textbooks, to popular nationalist mangas that portrayed Japan’s imperialist past in a positive light and presented highly contentious positions on issues such as the Nanjing Massacre and 'comfort women.'

In 1993, a committee (Rekishi kentō iinkai) was formed with more than a hundred senior members of the Liberal Democratic Party to review history textbooks. Their objective was to publish a new textbook claiming that the Greater East War was one of self-defense and liberation, that the Nanjing Massacre and accounts of the comfort women were fabrications, and that a new textbook battle was necessary in light of the emphasis on damage and invasion in recent textbooks (Rose, 2005, 19). The conservative political elites of Japan were not prepared to incorporate Japanese war crimes into the national narrative and collective memory. And in constructing this 'bright' narrative, it was essential for them to exclude the 'dark' chapters of Japan’s wartime history and to reinterpret the war in a positive way (Saaler, 2005, 25).

The key group at the centre of the textbook debate was the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform (Tsukuru-kai). This group launched a campaign to
challenge the “masochistic” view of Japanese history and build a “proud and confident Japan.” The nationalist group’s main concern was that postwar Japanese education is afflicted by a self-negating view of Japanese history, written “to reflect the combined perspectives of the Asian nations’ hatred of Japan, and the national interests of the Western Allies” (Fujioka, 1996, 2). In terms of specific issues, it was the mention of comfort women in junior high-school textbooks that provoked the group to campaign for a rewriting of Japan’s history. The group argued that there was no such thing as comfort women. These women were not forcibly recruited by the army, but were prostitutes, and prostitution was not illegal in pre-war Japan. The rightist camp argued that the mentioning of “comfort women” in school texts would lead to “the spiritual degeneration of the Japanese state” (Tawara, 1997, 2). The group also questioned the validity of the Nanjing Massacre, doubting the accuracy of the estimates of victim statistics. On the ground of inconsistency of such figures, the group claimed that the massacre may not have happened at all (Fujioka, 1996, 22).

The Tsukuru-kai’s new history textbook, which represented the revisionists’ agenda, was finally approved in 2001 after many officially-requested revisions. The textbook itself remained a marginal presence with the adoption rate being considerably low among schools in Japan; however, it nonetheless became an object of deep contention for China and South Korea.

The motivation of the revisionists is explained in Prime Minister Abe’s dialogue with the novelist, Hyakuta Naoki (Abe & Hyakuta, 2013, 152-54):

What is the purpose of teaching pure and innocent children fabricated lies [by China and South Korea] about “300,000 massacred in Nanjing” or “Forced sexual slavery of the comfort women”?....it only serves to make the children become disillusioned by their country, hate their ancestors and become ashamed of their evil conducts. That will lead to an even more horrifying outcome. It will rob them of a sense of pride to live as worthy individuals.

If succeeding generations are to restore national esteem in Japan, Abe and fellow nationalists feel it is imperative that they omit dark episodes of the past that might demoralize the nation. This goal is also driving Abe and his supporters to reform the postwar education system, which they believe was designed by the US occupation to
disempower the Japanese in the second half of the twentieth century. Abe’s recent educational reforms are aimed at replacing what he thinks of as a degenerate education system with one that teaches morality and patriotism, and which will encourage future generations to serve their country with pride (Abe, 2006).

4.6 Narratives of Victimhood and 'Chosen Trauma'

The term 'Chosen Trauma' refers to the collective memory of an episode that has caused the group to feel victimized. Myths about suffering and humiliation resulting from historical events are as essential to group identity as chosen glories. The memory of victimhood becomes transferred through socialization processes to successive generations and becomes heavily mythologized and at times manipulated by powerful elites (Volkan, 2001). A sense of victimhood protects group members’ collective self-esteem and prevents feelings of guilt for committing harmful acts against the other group. Victimhood narratives constructed and promoted by Japan’s ruling elites have strategically served to minimize the consequences of the nation’s historical injustices.

Various scholars claim that post-war narratives encouraged the Japanese people to identify themselves as victims and diverted their attention from their nation’s wartime aggression by blaming the military regime for their victimization (Orr, 2001; Yoshida, 2005). They point out that this mythology of victimhood was developed with the help of the United States. The Tokyo Tribunal exonerated the Emperor from all war responsibility, and enabled the Japanese to become victims at the hands of the militarists. The ordinary people came to see themselves as having been “duped by leaders who started a war that could not be won” (Fujiwara, 2006, 149). The Japanese narrative of victimhood is essentially a discourse narrated by non-combatants, where only Japanese civilians appear as victims of war.

The most salient victimhood narrative for the Japanese is the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Orr (2001, 6) examines the atomic victimhood narrative as
the driving force behind Japanese post-war peace movements, giving the Japanese a unique sense of mission to protest against the use of nuclear weapons.

The vision of the Japanese as innocent war victims reached its purest expression in the public dialogue over nuclear weapons. The Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings privileged the Japanese nation with an exclusive claim to leadership in the ban-the-bomb movement and provided the country with its first powerfully unifying national myth after the defeat.

This victim mentality came to dominate Japanese public memory via popular cultural products such as literature, film and arts. A large proportion of post-war literature on pacifism is devoted to the wartime sufferings of Japanese civilians from massive air raids and atomic bombs. *Hotaru no Haka*, an animated drama film produced by Studio Ghibli in 1988, more widely known by its English title, *The Grave of the Fireflies*, elicited a deep identification of viewers with the innocent victims of the war. Set in Kobe in 1945, it is a realistic drama based on an autobiographical essay by Nosaka Akiyuki, which focuses on the suffering and eventual starvation deaths of fourteen-year-old Seita and his four-year-old sister, Setsuko. The film vividly portrays its child protagonists as passive and pitiful victims of chance and reinforces in the public mind the horrors and tragedies of war experienced by civilians. It also attempts to construct an ideology of victimhood and loss that allows for a national identity in which the loss of the war gives depth to the Japanese soul (Landsberg, 2004, 173). The historical narratives of civilian victimization “cancel out responsibility for Pearl Harbor and simply glosses over the colonization of Korea and the previous ten years of aggression against China” (163).

The Japanese victimhood narrative in mainstream media accentuates the suffering of the innocent civilians of the homelands, i.e. the sight of the burnt wastelands and women and children fleeing in flames. The resulting victim consciousness makes it difficult for individuals to view things from the rival group’s perspective, empathize with their suffering and accept responsibility for the harm inflicted by its own group (Staub, 2006). Bar-Tal (2006, 252) claims that this tendency is found in today’s Japanese society:
The historical narrative that has been canonized and passed down there focuses on the death and suffering of Japanese soldiers and Japan’s civilian population, omitting the death, suffering and destruction endured by other Asians at the hands of the Japanese during the years of World War II. The younger generation thus mostly views Japan as a victim of the war, not the perpetrator or aggressor. A result of this self-perception of victimhood is that many Japanese find it psychologically disorienting to be asked to recognize the victimhood of others, especially when it involves admitting the unfamiliar responsibility of Japan as victimizer and perpetrator.

Japanese victim mentality is a key issue that sits at the heart of the Sino-Japanese conflict. Yoshida (2005, 59) states that Japan’s postwar public discourse on war was about ordinary citizens having been deceived by a handful of “bad militarists” thus leading to the narrative of a victimized nation. Dissatisfied with the common claim that “Japanese victim consciousness” is a conservative tactic to avoid responsibility, Orr (2001, 13) argues that “a victim mindset simply does not fit the style of proud, self-consciously virile conservatives…” Seaton (2007, 26) also questions, “since judgments about the responsibility remain open to debate, victim consciousness cannot act as a truly unifying factor in the context of war memories.” As he posits, there may be multiple victim consciousnesses or victim mentalities depending on how high or low an individual identifies with a collective called Japan. To understand the role victimhood plays in the high identifiers’ agenda to restore proud Japan, it is necessary to examine how a group’s moral standing generates high or low levels of in-group identification. Studies have shown that perpetrators feel that their identity as moral actors is threatened when faced with accusations about harms done to out-groups (Branscombe & Doosje, 2004). Hence, they would be driven to reduce that threat by denying the consequences of their past actions and the moral responsibility for having caused them. This is because victim status affords a certain amount of moral license (Sullivan et al. 2012). Another tactic groups may employ is to distance themselves from the suffering of the victimized out-group by “dehumanizing” and belittling them, and legitimizing the consequences on the basis that the out-group deserved them. Victimhood, therefore, is not a status for the weak, it is a status that gives a group high moral standing and a means to protect itself from feeling inferior in the face of shameful episodes in history.
4.6.1 Victimhood narrative of the kamikaze pilots

Kingston (2014) argues that Abe is waging a culture war to redefine Japanese national identity, one that he thinks is grossly masochistic. Hyakuta Naoki, the author of the best-selling novel *Eien no Zero [The Eternal Zero]*, is a powerful ally of Abe in this cultural undertaking. He shares Abe and the rightists’ sentiment that there is a need to encourage the downcast country of Japan and to urge its people not to lose pride in being Japanese. *Eien no Zero* sold four million copies (as of February 2014) and the film adaptation of the novel, known by its English title *The Eternal Zero*, grossed 8.5 billion yen and topped the Japanese box office for eight consecutive weeks since its release in December 2013, becoming one of Japan’s top ten most successful films of all time. Internet reviewers have recommended “everyone who has no knowledge of the war to go see this,” and warned that several handkerchiefers will be required as “one will be moved to tears.” Abe Shinzo not only publicly commented that “he was moved,” but according to a Japan Times article on February 20, 2014, his wife, Abe Akie also wrote: “I couldn’t stop crying….The film made me really think how we should never wage war again, and we should never ever waste precious lives that were lost for the sake of their country.”

The tale of victimhood of the Zero fighter pilot in *The Eternal Zero* is different from those of kamikaze pilots glorified as willing fighters dying heroically for the Emperor and their country as depicted in conventional rightist narratives. The hero of the story, Miyabe Kyuzo, is determined to return home alive to fulfil the promise he made to his wife and daughter. He openly admits that he doesn’t want to die, and despite being an outstanding fighter pilot, he is despised by some of his comrades and superiors as a coward.

The story humanizes kamikaze pilots as ordinary people who felt fear, despair and wanted to live to return to their loved ones. Thus it strikes a chord of sympathy with today’s audience and makes the tale more relevant and engrossing. Nonaka Hiromu, former secretary-general of the Liberal Democratic party, also admitted that he was moved to tears in his interview with *Asahi Shimbun* (14 August 2012):
I read *Eien no Zero*, a novel about kamikaze pilots, twice last year with tears. I went to see its movie adaptation and wept for the third time, but was disillusioned later to learn that Naoki Hyakuta, author of that work, is not opposed to war but is looking in the opposite direction and is calling for powerful Japan. I regretted very much that I had wept.

It is uncertain how many people are aware that Hyakuta Naoki is one of the new board members that Abe personally appointed to the NHK [Japan’s national public broadcasting corporation]. It is also unknown how many know that Hyakuta made a controversial statement that the “Nanjing Massacre is a fabrication.” In his published dialogue with Abe Shinzō titled “Bloom proudly, Oh Japan, bloom in the heart of the world,” Hyakuta describes Abe as a hero, “the Ace player who has returned to launch a counterattack and save Japan from the crisis” (Abe and Hyakuta, 2013, 164). Both Abe and Hyakuta (2013) agree that during wars, some military personnel may have committed cruel acts, but that is not a situation peculiar to the Japanese. They feel that it makes no sense to teach such “masochistic” history to children who are still in compulsory education. They urge that what first needs to be taught to children is “what a wonderful nation Japan is, and instill in them a sense of pride and confidence” (152-154). *Eien no Zero* was written with the aim of reminding the Japanese not only of the horrors of war but of the heroism of the soldiers who sacrificed their lives for Japan despite their anguish and fears. The book wraps the tale of victimhood in a heart-wrenching narrative framed as a message of peace that appeals to the Japanese ear.

The narrative of victimhood of the kamikaze pilots woven into Hyakuta’s novel and presented in the museums dedicated to memorialise these young pilots’ heroism (e.g., Yushukan on the grounds of Yasukuni Shrine and Chiran Peace Museum in Minami Kyushu) is personalized, and the pilots are humanized as ‘ordinary’ people who courageously died to protect their homeland. What is excluded from these sentimental narratives is the inhumaneness of the military strategy that forced these young, innocent citizens to sacrifice their lives for suicidal attacks to satisfy the Imperial agenda, and the many American lives that were lost as a result of these brutal tactics.
In the past, extreme right-wing discourse was marginal and out of touch with Japanese mainstream thinking. Rightist narratives advocating imperial jingoism or hatred towards minorities were basically frowned upon and dismissed. However, Hyakuta’s *Eien no Zero* has demonstrated that when the message is packaged appropriately, it can effectively enter the mainstream market. Abe and his allies are gradually changing the marginal right-wing discourse to become a dominant discourse with the potential for public acceptance.

### 4.7 Conclusion

As we have seen, nationalist discourse in Japan, based on its chosen glories and traumas, emerged as the country and its people struggled to restore their pride and positive identity following decades of social malaise and economic impasse. Although the Japanese public is not necessarily in support of Abe’s constitutional amendments, or rewriting of history, his rhetoric about building a stronger Japan against threats like China and North Korea resonate with many members of the public.

China and Japan share a conflicted history, and neither can project its own concept of national identity without provoking interpretative questions from the other side. Both nations share common war experiences—one as victim, one as aggressor—giving rise to very specific kinds of historical narratives that play into the present. Confronting these war narratives has led to simmering distrust and a stereotyping of the other in both countries.

When these factors are embodied in educational curricula they become deeply entrenched in popular consciousness. Decisions made by political leaders in both China and Japan shape strong nationalist public sentiments in both countries and stereotyped reactions to each other. Popular nationalism deeply rooted in historical memories can exacerbate mutual threat perception, and become a catalyst for future conflict.
CHAPTER 5

5. Methodology and Research Design

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of the research presented in this thesis is to identify the impeding factors to the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility for the in-group's historical injustices. This phenomenon is examined and explored with a sample of Japanese university students, representing a generation that were never directly involved in the nation's misdeeds. This chapter presents the research methodology of this study and addresses the following relevant components: (1) overview of the research and rationale for selecting mixed methods as the research approach, (2) description of the research sample, (3) overview of the research design, (4) methods of data collection, (5) methods for data analysis, (6) ethical considerations, and (7) limitations of the study.

5.2 Background and Context

As was explained in Chapter 1, extensive research analyzing Sino-Japanese relations continues to be dominated by realist and liberal perspectives focusing on strategic geopolitical rivalry and economic interdependence in Asia. The purpose of this empirical research is to move beyond the analyses of Sino-Japanese relations predominantly centred around security and international relations, and to look at the relationship from a different perspective, specifically, examining the possible social psychological drivers that may be prolonging the conflict between China and Japan. Japanese people's lack of genuine contrition for the past continues to stand as an obstacle to forgiveness and reconciliation related to nations that were victimised by Japan during the Second World War. The theories and existent literature presented in Chapter 2 suggest that the social psychological needs of the perpetrator group may
diminish its members’ acceptance of collective responsibility for past misdeeds committed by their in-group. Drawing on these theories, I have chosen in this thesis post-war Japanese descendants as a sample for a case study to examine the key factors that may be impeding the perpetrator group’s inherited responsibility for the nation’s past injustices.

5.3 Research Overview

A mixed methods approach employing a sequential explanatory design involving two phases was utilised in this study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The quantitative phase was carried out to guide a broad understanding of situational and contextual factors shaping participants' perceptions and behaviours. After completion of the quantitative phase, semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected survey respondents in order to gain a deeper contextual understanding of the results of the quantitative analysis.

This research is based on the assumption that unresolved historical trauma drives the intractability and recent escalation of the conflict between China and Japan. This study explores the possibility of the perpetrator group's identity-related needs to defend their collective esteem impacting its members' willingness to accept and acknowledge responsibility for the past.

5.4 Key Constructs and Social Psychological Variables

Scholarship in social psychology suggests that to preserve a positive identity of their group in the face of shameful episodes in history, groups may eliminate humiliating events altogether from their historical narratives and feel less collective guilt and responsibility. A sense of victimhood protects the group members' positive identity and prevents feelings of responsibility for harms committed to the other group (Bar-Tal et al., 2009; Sullivan et al., 2012). Further, when the group's moral identity is threatened, those who identify strongly with the in-group will attempt to defend the
in-group's positive image by denying the injustices (Sullivan et al., 2012; Tauber & van Zomeren, 2013; Wohl & Branscombe, 2008).

Guided by the theoretical insights above, the quantitative strand of the research examined to what extent identity-related variables impede Japanese acceptance of collective responsibility when compared to other variables such as out-group contact, out-group attitudes, and awareness of in-group's historical transgressions.

Collective responsibility: Feelings of collective responsibility for harm done to the out-group are lessened when one’s in-group’s identity is threatened by accusations about its immoral past (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008).

Variable 1: Moral identity threat: Accusations that one’s in-group has perpetrated illegitimate harm can pose a threat to the group’s moral identity (Sullivan et al., 2012). When confronted with these accusations of in-group harm doing, individuals will attempt to bolster the in-group’s moral status in order to defuse the threat (Noor et al., 2012).

Variable 2: Competitive victimhood: A threat to the group’s identity will motivate the group members to engage in competitive victimhood, claiming that the in-group has suffered more than the harmed out-group (Noor et al., 2012). Studies have also shown that competitive victimhood reduces the perpetrator group’s sense of collective guilt and responsibility for the harm done to the out-group.

Variable 3: In-group identification: Individuals who identify more strongly with their in-group (national identity) are more inclined to justify their in-group’s position and feel less collective guilt and responsibility than those who are low in identifying with their in-group (Doosje et al., 1998).
5.5 Research Questions

To obtain an understanding of Japanese post-war descendants' acceptance of 'inherited responsibility,' the following research questions were addressed:

1) To what extent are contemporary Japanese willing to accept inherited responsibility for the injustices committed by their forebears? How prevalent is ‘apology fatigue’ amongst contemporary Japanese?

2) What are the social psychological factors impeding current Japanese acceptance of inherited responsibility for their nation's past misdeeds?
   a) Do the Japanese descendants feel that their moral identity is threatened when confronted with criticisms from the victimized nations about the nation’s immoral past? To what extent do threats to Japanese moral status affect the descendants' acceptance of collective responsibility for their nation’s past transgressions?
   b) Do contemporary Japanese engage in competitive victimhood? To what extent does the salience of Japanese victimhood [during World War II] affect the descendants' willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?
   c) Do contemporary Japanese identify with their nation (in-group identification)? To what extent does in-group identification affect Japanese descendants' willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation’s past transgressions?

3) What are the external factors that are impeding current Japanese acceptance of inherited responsibility for their nation's past misdeeds?
a) How is the history of Japanese transgressions presented to contemporary Japanese? To what extent does the descendants' awareness of their nation's past transgressions affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?

b) To what extent does the descendants’ negative out-group attitude affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?

c) To what extent does the descendants’ contact with the out-group affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?

5.6 Methodology

In order to gain an in-depth understanding of the impeding factors affecting Japanese descendants’ acceptance of collective war responsibility, this study employed a case study approach using sequential mixed methods design. Mixed methods is a relatively new methodology originating around the late 1980s (Creswell, 2009) and combines both quantitative and qualitative data in the analysis (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The use of mixed methods design is becoming widespread in the social sciences, health sciences and other disciplines for its strength of drawing from both quantitative and qualitative data and minimizing the limitations of both approaches (Creswell, 2009, 218). By offering a complex and sophisticated approach, mixed methods can be employed as an effective means by which to gain a more complete understanding of the research problems and questions. By affording the vigour and broad applicability of the quantitative data and depth of understanding of the phenomenon from the qualitative data, mixed methods approach provides a holistic analysis of the research problem (Onwuegbuzie et al., 2010).

An empirical examination of social psychological factors that impede feelings of remorse and responsibility by present-day Japanese for the nation’s immoral past is a complex phenomenon where a variety of causal factors come into play. Although
there are some existing polling data on the Japanese public's perception of war responsibility, it is nonetheless an area in which little inferential study has been made. According to Creswell and other experts (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998, 2009), a case study entails an exhaustive description and analysis of a phenomenon or social unit bounded by time and place. Hence, within the framework of mixed methods, I felt that this study, which attempts to gain an in-depth view of a present-day phenomenon, seemed most suited for case study design.

The use of sequential explanatory mixed methods approach involves a two-phase design. In the first phase, the study analysed quantitative data obtained from the survey, then built on the results to explain them in more detail with qualitative study in the second phase. The qualitative segment of the research was intended to complement the quantitative segment by expanding the breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration (Johnson et al., 2007, 123). The use of sequential explanatory design allowed for the understanding of the process; with the *how* and *why* of the results revealed in the quantitative data. By themselves, neither the quantitative nor qualitative approach would adequately deal with a research problem as complex as the identity-related needs and war responsibility of present-day Japanese. Mixed methods provided me with an opportunity to take advantage of both quantitative and qualitative data to gain a richer, more comprehensive, and nuanced understanding of the complex real-life phenomena, perceptions and behaviour of individuals in a group locked in a protracted conflict. Taking into consideration culturally relevant factors, the qualitative interviews are critical to explaining and making sense of the quantitative findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2010).

5.7 Procedures

The two-phase design began with the collection and analysis of quantitative data from the survey, followed by the subsequent collection and analysis of qualitative data from interviews with selected survey participants. The purpose of the quantitative phase was to statistically analyse the possible impeding factors to
present-day Japanese acceptance of responsibility for the nation's immoral past. A survey was designed to investigate the relationship between acceptance of collective responsibility and six variables that emerged from the review of the literature. These included three identity-related variables of 1) moral identity threat, 2) competitive victimhood, and 3) in-group identification and potential moderating variables of 4) out-group attitudes, 5) out-group contact and 6) awareness of in-group's transgressions. This was followed by the next phase of qualitative research comprised of in-depth interviews with selected survey respondents as a follow-up to further explain the quantitative findings of the survey. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted based on a purposive sampling of survey respondents who reported low vs. high levels of collective responsibility. Participants with both high and low measures on the collective responsibility scale were selected so that the reported phenomenon could be explored and expanded in depth (Druckman, 2005). The mixed methods approach was appropriate for the Japanese case study as the study required particular attention to actual contents of local and cultural processes that shaped the participants’ psychological outcomes (Lonner, 2003; Yin, 2003).

The following three hypotheses were investigated in the quantitative phase:

**Hypothesis 1**: Members of the perpetrator group who experience threats to their group's moral status are less likely to accept collective responsibility for the in-group's past injustices.

**Hypothesis 2**: Belief in the in-group's own history of victimhood is likely to negatively affect the members' acceptance of collective responsibility for the in-group's past injustices.

**Hypothesis 3**: Individuals who are highly identified with their in-group (with strong collective self-esteem) are likely to feel less responsibility for the immoral actions of their in-group.
Independent variables:
1) Threat to moral identity
2) In-group identification
3) Competitive victimhood
4) Awareness of in-group's transgressions (moderator)
5) Negative out-group attitudes (moderator)
6) Contact with the out-group (moderator)

Dependent variable: Collective responsibility for the in-group’s historical injustices

Control variables: Gender, income level, religiosity, political orientation

5.8 Research Sample

Purposeful sampling is a method typically employed in a case study in order to gain in-depth information about a specific phenomenon that is under study (Silverman, 2010). A purposeful sampling procedure was used to select the sample for this study. Participants were 162 Japanese university students (91 female, 71 male); age ranged from 18 to 30 years ($M=19.5$). All participants identified themselves as Japanese. The researcher recruited students of Japanese nationality at a number of universities in Tokyo (Waseda University, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Sophia University, Meiji Gakuin University, Meiji University, Tokyo University of Science and Shirayuri Women’s University) and from Osaka, Kyoto, and Hiroshima (Hiroshima Shudo University, Ritsumeikan University and Osaka University). Letters were emailed to the key contacts (faculty members) of these universities describing the purpose of the research and requesting their help in recruiting students who would be willing to participate in it. After a positive response was received, an email including a short description of the research project was sent together with the link to the survey. A hard copy version of the questionnaire was also developed for participants who preferred to have the questionnaire completed after class. All the participants were asked to provide informed consent when completing the survey. The questionnaire was made available in Japanese language (translated and thoroughly checked by professional Japanese-English translators) and was either completed by the participants during class or completed online after receiving the
survey link via email. With the support of faculty members from the above universities, a total of 162 under- and postgraduate Japanese students were recruited to complete a self-administered survey on Sino-Japanese relations between March and September 2014. (258 students were contacted and 166 responded) Four participants were excluded from the sample for not meeting the criteria of Japanese citizenship.

The sample of this study represents highly-educated descendants of the perpetrator group who have not directly experienced or witnessed the harm-doing of the ingroup, and whose understanding of the out-group’s suffering is based entirely on exposure to socially constructed narratives. With increasing economic interdependence and cultural and academic exchanges between the two countries, one would assume that the negative imaging of the other would diminish or be neutralized as intergroup contact increases and successive generations’ memories of the war wane with the passage of time. This has not been the case in Sino-Japanese relations. An examination of the factors inhibiting the sense of contrition felt by the future elites of Japan—the issues shaping their collective memory of the war and their nation’s past misdeeds in China—offers valuable insights for breaking the impasses in Sino-Japanese relations.

5.9 Research Design

The following list summarizes the steps of the research design:

1) **Review of Literature**: Preceding the collection of data, a thorough review of the literature was conducted to gain the insights of other researchers who have studied the relationship between identity, collective memory, collective guilt and responsibility. Literature on Japanese war guilt and responsibility was also reviewed to identify areas that warranted further study.

2) **Ethics Approval**: After the research proposal was developed, the researcher obtained necessary approval from the University of Otago’s Ethics Approval Committee (Reference 13/258). The ethics approval process involved outlining all procedures and processes needed to ensure adherence to standards put forth for the
study of human subjects, including participants’ confidentiality and informed consent.

3) **Survey Development:** In order to develop the survey and identify the key variables to examine, several experts of Japanese and Sino-Japanese studies were consulted from October-December 2013 to verify if the measurement instruments drawn from existent social psychology literature were suitable for the Japanese context. Experts on studies of collective responsibility, competitive victimhood and social identity were consulted to ensure the validity of the instruments. Their feedback was used to develop and refine the constructs of the survey.

4) **Pilot Test:** Prior to administering the survey, a pilot survey was conducted in February 2014 with a purposefully selected sample of 30 Japanese university students. The purpose of the pilot-tested survey was to assess the reliability of the instruments and test their internal consistency based on the measurement of Cronbach's alpha. All items were translated into Japanese and adapted to suit the Sino-Japanese context. The survey was reviewed by Japanese participants and experts on the question type, clarity of the language used and completeness of the survey. Their feedback was used to modify the final survey.

5) **Phase I Quantitative Data Collection:** Potential research participants were recruited by faculty members of ten universities across Japan. Those students who agreed to participate were asked to complete the final questionnaire after class, or were sent an email with the link of the online survey and a short description about the research.

6) **Quantitative Data Analysis:** Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted using SPSS version 22 to test the three hypotheses and identify strong predictors of Japanese participants' feeling of collective responsibility for the nation's past misdeeds. Descriptive statistical information from the survey was also analysed using SPSS version 22.

7) **Phase II Qualitative Data Collection:** In a sequential explanatory mixed methods design, the qualitative data in the second phase is intended to follow up the quantitative findings in Phase I (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The qualitative follow-up study was conducted from February 2015 to gain a more complete understanding of the processes that were shaping the Japanese descendants'
perceptions as revealed in the survey results, specifically focusing on factors that were either diminishing or augmenting their experience of collective responsibility. Semi-structured, in-depth interviews were conducted with a purposeful sampling of 15 individuals who reported significantly low measures of collective responsibility and with 10 individuals with high measures of collective responsibility. The interview protocol was designed to prompt participants to explain the 'why and how' of the perceptions and experiences revealed in the quantitative survey.

8) **Qualitative Data Analysis**: Transcribed interviews and extracted statements were managed and analysed using NVivo 10 for Mac. Thematic analysis (Guest et al., 2012) and code development were performed focusing on patterns and themes that provided insight regarding congruence and differences of perceptions among high-responsibility and low-responsibility participants (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

9) **Integration of the Quantitative and Qualitative Results**:
Integration in mixed methods involves a combined analysis of both quantitative and qualitative components of the study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The researcher used integration of both data sets to draw conclusions in the Findings and Discussion Chapters.

5.10 Phase 1: Quantitative Data Collection

**Pilot survey**
Prior to administering the survey, in February 2014 a pilot survey was tested with a selected sample of 30 Japanese university students who agreed to participate in research on Sino-Japanese relations. The results of the internal consistency analysis of the measures tested are shown in Table 2. Interviews were conducted after the participants completed the pilot survey to solicit feedback on the type of questions, clarity of the language used, and completeness of the survey. Based on the feedback from survey participants, eleven items were reworded for clarity in Japanese language. All items and concepts were translated by professional translators to capture the nuanced meaning, carefully adapted to suit the Sino-Japanese context and verified by sociology scholars specializing in Japan studies. This process of
verification was repeated when transcribing and translating the interview data into English as well.

Table 2: Pilot Test Internal Consistency Analysis (n=30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collective responsibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moral identity threat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive victimhood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In-group identification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Out-group attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Awareness of injustice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Contact with out-group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section describes the instruments using Likert-scale that were used to measure the participants' perceptions. Several other types of questions were also added to the survey to gather descriptive information to complement the findings.

5.10.1 Main measures and validity of instruments

Content validity gauges the degree to which the content of an instrument matches the content it is intended to measure (Druckman, 2005). A panel of experts including Daniel Bar-Tal and John Hunter were consulted to judge the relevance of the items to the content the test is meant to measure. Content validity of the measures used in this survey were assessed and validated after some minor revisions. In order to increase the validity of the instruments, the researcher conducted extensive reviews of the literature to locate standardized measures that have been successfully tested and used in the past. In order to ensure good content validity for the measures, the questionnaire went through several stages of refinement and rigorous procedures of instrument-scale development.

**Collective Responsibility Measure:**
Collective responsibility refers to a realization and acceptance of in-group responsibility when one’s group has illegitimately harmed another group and not
repaired the damage done. Studies have shown that acceptance of in-group responsibility is a necessary precursor of experiencing collective guilt for the in-group's historical misdeeds (Iyer et al., 2003; McGarty et al., 2005). Group responsibility items from the widely tested Collective Guilt Scale developed by Branscombe, Slugoski, and Kappen (2004) were adapted to assess the extent to which the Japanese felt collective responsibility for their nation's wrongdoing in the past.

1) “Our generation should not be held responsible for Japan's military actions during the last war.” [Collective responsibility acceptance; reverse coded]
2) “As Japanese, we should feel remorse for Japan’s military actions during the war.” [Collective guilt]
3) “We should not have to feel responsible for the actions of our forebears.” [Collective responsibility acceptance; reverse coded]
4) “As Japanese, we should accept responsibility for Japan's injustices in the last war.” [Collective responsibility acceptance]
5) “I think as Japanese, we are accountable for what the other Japanese did in the past.” [Whole Group accountability]

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). The measures produced a reliable scale (Cronbach’s α=.94, n=162).

Apology Fatigue:
1) Japan has apologised enough for its military actions during the last war.
2) I am tired of hearing endless demands from China to apologise.

Moral Identity Threat Measure:
Threat to Moral Identity:
A scale of 6 items was developed based on the Moral Outrage Scale introduced by Tauber and Zomeren (2013) to assess Japanese participants’ negative responses [annoyance, anger, irritation] when their moral status became threatened by China’s
accusations of Japan’s harm doing and denial of the past. Six items were designed to measure the participants’ level of annoyance/outrage when their moral identity was challenged:

1) “As a Japanese, I feel annoyed every time China demands that Japan apologize for its past actions.”

2) “I wish China would stop criticizing that Japan is unrepentant about its past actions.”

3) “I get annoyed when the Chinese blame Japan for making them suffer during the war.”

4) “I feel irritated when China attacks Japan for not facing up to the past.”

5) “I think Japan deserves to be criticized for its wartime actions.” [Reverse coded]

6) “As a Japanese, I don’t want to hear about the cruelties committed by the Japanese soldiers in the past.”

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) The measures produced a reliable scale. (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .93$, $n=162$)

**Moral Identity Scale:**

The Moral Identity Scale developed by Aquino & Reed (2002) was used to assess how important moral identity is to the participants’ perception of the self. Five items from the scale were selected to measure the degree to which individuals’ self-concepts and identity centre on moral traits (caring, fair, honest, responsible, compassionate). According to Leach, Ellemers and Barreto (2007), morality is an important dimension on which individuals evaluate their in-group. A single-item question was added to measure the importance of morality in group identification: “It is important for me that Japan has these moral traits.” Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree)
**Competitive Victimhood Scale:**

To preserve a positive image of their group in the face of shameful episodes in history, groups may remember the past in ways that eliminate humiliating events altogether from their historical narratives. A sense of victimhood protects the group members’ self-esteem and prevents feelings of responsibility for committing harmful acts against the other group (Bar-Tal et al 2009). A competitive victimhood scale was designed with five items reflecting Noor and Bar-Tal’s (Noor et al., 2008; Bar-Tal et al., 2009) theories of competitive victimhood that posit the following conditions to be met: the group has suffered more than others; the group has suffered from an undeserved injustice; the group could not prevent the harm; the harm was immoral and should not be compared with other tragic events.

1) **Atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was the most inhumane and immoral act in history.**
2) **The dropping of the atomic bomb was the most horrendous act perpetrated in human history.**
3) **Japanese civilians suffered as victims of the war.**
4) **As the only country in the world that has ever been atomic-bombed, we must never forget this history.**
5) **The magnitude of the destruction wrought by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima cannot be compared to any other tragic event of war.**

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) The measures produced a reliable scale. (Cronbach’s α =.96, n=162)

**In-group Identification Measure:**

In-group identification was measured as past studies show that it moderates how individuals interpret an event. Luhtanen and Crocker’s findings showed that people with high collective self-esteem versus those with low collective self-esteem, react self-protectively to threats to their collective self-esteem. People who strongly identify with their social group may distort information to enhance their group’s
image (Crocker, Thompson, McGraw & Ingerman, 1987). Luhtanen and Crocker’s Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992) was used to assess the participants’ level of in-group identification.

1) “I am so glad to be a Japanese.”
2) “Japan is a country highly regarded by people around the world.”
3) “The nation I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.”
4) “I am proud to be a Japanese.”
5) “I am a contributing/worthy citizen of Japan.”

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree) The measures produced a reliable scale. (Cronbach’s α =.93, n=162)

**Nationalism Measure:**
Nationalism subscales were drawn from Kosterman and Feshback’s Nationalism Scale (1989) and adapted based on Karasawa’s study (2002) to differentiate nationalism vs. patriotism and assess the full picture of Japanese participants’ national identity.

1) “I love my country, Japan.”(Patriotism)
2) “In view of Japanese economic superiority, it is only right that we should have a bigger say in the United Nations.”(Nationalism)
3) “The Japanese people are among the finest of the world.”(Nationalism)
4) “The remarkable growth of Japan after the war is mainly due to the excellence of the people.”(Nationalism)
5) “Japan is the best country in the world.”(Nationalism)

Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree). The measures produced a reliable scale. (Cronbach’s α =.82, n=162)
Historical Memory Measures:

Memory of Japanese war history: After identifying the first thing that comes to mind when thinking about the history of the war, participants were asked to answer how and where they learnt about that history by indicating the top three sources of information they could think of.

Awareness/Knowledge of in-group’s transgressions: Participants were asked to answer on a 4-point scale (1=not aware at all, 4=very aware) to what extent they were aware of Japan’s wartime atrocities in China, i.e. the Nanjing Massacre. If they answered “aware,” then in the following question the participants had to indicate how they came to learn about that particular history, i.e. the Nanjing Massacre. (Salience of these historical narratives was explored in-depth in the second qualitative phase.)

Negative Out-group Attitude Measures:

Various instruments were employed to measure Japanese participants’ attitudes and perceptions of China and the Chinese people.

Negative stereotype index (Stephan & Stephan, 2000): To assess the degree of negative stereotyping of the Chinese, a list of four positive and negative traits was produced in discussion with Sino-Japanese specialists: friendly, aggressive, self-centred, do not conform to rules. The participants were asked to score these traits on a 5-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Higher positive score indicated that the stereotype is viewed more negatively (positive traits were reverse coded). Studies have shown that high levels of negative stereotyping are associated with a greater likelihood of prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

Perception of the Chinese: A question asking the participants to describe their perception towards the Chinese. Participants rated their perception towards the Chinese on a 5-point scale ranging from “very favourable” to “very unfavourable.”
Trust scale: This scale was included because a dominant feature of the relationship between the groups involved in a prolonged conflict is a lack of trust. Generalized distrust is a common emotional reaction of protracted conflicts and one that poses an obstacle to the process of reconciliation (Bar-Tal, 2007). Participants were asked to score on a 5-point scale from “trust completely” to “do not trust at all.”

Realistic threats:
To measure the extent to which realistic threats are driving the negative perception of China, a scale of five items was adapted from Stephan et al.’s (2002) realistic threats scale (political, economic, and military threats). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree; Cronbach’s α = .71, n=162)

5.10.2 Quantitative data analysis
The quantitative sample consisted of 162 respondents. Data obtained from the survey was managed and analysed using SPSS version 22. The researcher conducted hierarchical regression analyses for two purposes: first, to identify significant factors that were impeding participants’ acceptance of collective responsibility; and second, to determine the extent to which identity-driven variables (moral identity threat, competitive victimhood, in-group identification) predicted participants’ feelings of responsibility and remorse. Multiple regression analyses were used to examine the association of the independent variables in relationship to collective responsibility while controlling for individual characteristics including gender, age, religiosity and political orientations.

5.11 Phase 2: Qualitative Data Collection
In sequential explanatory research design, the second phase of qualitative study is conducted for the purpose of explaining and expanding the results from the quantitative research (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007). Following the analysis of the data obtained from the survey, a qualitative study based on in-depth interviews was
conducted with selected participants of the survey who reported low vs. high levels of collective responsibility.

5.11.1 Research sample

Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted based on a purposive sampling strategy of 25 survey participants who reported significantly low levels (n=15) vs. high levels of collective responsibility (n=10). The target population for the qualitative follow-up study was required to be individuals who participated in the initial quantitative study. Survey respondents were asked to indicate their email address and the name of their university if they were willing to be contacted for a follow-up interview. Using SPSS software, the researcher was able to identify participants who reported significantly low level vs. high level of responsibility (\(\text{CR}_{\text{high}} \geq 6; \text{CR}_{\text{low}} \leq 2\) on a scale of 1-7). The 55 participants who met these criteria were sent emails inviting them to participate in the follow-up study. In the end, 15 low-responsibility and 10 high-responsibility respondents agreed to be interviewed. Interviews were conducted between February-May, 2015. Each semi-structured interview lasted approximately 60 minutes, was audio-recorded and then transcribed for thematic analysis. According to Patton (1990), “the logic and power of purposive sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth, with an underlying focus on intentionally selecting specific cases that will provide the most information for the questions under study” (Patton, 1990, 169). Purposive sampling enabled the researcher to select only those cases that might best illuminate the key findings of the quantitative research of Phase 1.

5.11.2 Interview protocol

The content of the interview protocol was guided by the results of the quantitative strand of the study. Questions for the semi-structured interviews were designed to explore and expand on the quantitative findings that revealed six variables to have strong association with Japanese collective responsibility. Questions focused on the processes – the how and why – to explain the three identity-related variables that emerged as significant predictors of Japanese acceptance of collective responsibility.
Inherited responsibility acceptance:
1) Do you think Japanese people today should be/should not be held responsible for the nation's actions in the past? Please explain why.
2) Do you think Japan as a nation should apologize to China for its role in the Second World War?
3) Do you think that the Pacific War was a war of aggression? Please explain why.
How did you feel when you first learned about Japan's wartime actions in China (through textbooks, the media, people, etc)? Why did you feel that way?

Threat to moral identity:
1) Why do you think you get irritated when China accuses Japan of cruelty during the war; e.g. the Nanjing Massacre? What is the problem? (CRLow-Low-responsibility respondents)
2) Is it important to you that Japan is a country with moral traits you can be proud of? Is being Japanese an important part of who you are?
3) How do you feel when the Chinese criticize Japan for being immoral, unrepentant and unapologetic?

Salience of victimhood narratives:
1) When I say victims of the' past war,' of whom do you immediately think?
2) Do you think that Japanese citizens were victims of the war? (If answered yes, then probe on why)
3) Have you seen “Grave of the Fireflies” or “Barefoot Gen”? What was your response when you saw these movies/read the books? (These popular books/films represent narratives of Japan’s wartime victimization.)

Awareness of in-group’s transgressions:
1) How much do you know about the Japanese military's atrocities in China during the war?
What do you know about the Nanjing Massacre, Unit 731 experiments and the comfort women issue? (Probe on the process and sources of information)
Collective memory of the war:

1) What comes to mind first when I say 'the last war' (‘saki no sensō’ is a common term in Japan to imply the Asia-Pacific War or World War II)? (If the respondent immediately associated the war with the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, then probe on the process and sources of information)

2) How did you learn about the history of 'the last war'?

In-group identification:

1) Is being Japanese an important part of who you are?

2) How would you describe your feelings towards your country?

5.11.3 Qualitative data analysis

An IC recorder was used to digitally record the 25 interviews conducted in Japan. Interviews were conducted in Japanese and were transcribed by the researcher and translated into English by a professional translator. Consistency and validity of the obtained data was increased by having the same translator perform all the translations.

A 6-step process was used to conduct a thematic analysis of the transcriptions of the recorded interviews (Guest et. al, 2012). Thematic analysis and code development focused on patterns and themes that provided insights regarding the congruence and differences of perceptions among high-responsibility and low-responsibility participants (Creswell, 2009; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The first step was comprised of preliminary exploration of the data. The transcript was read and reread so that the researcher became familiarised with the data content. In the second step, the researcher extracted significant phrases from the transcripts. In the third step, initial coding of the data was conducted by labeling the extracted phrases. Commonalities were identified among the extracted phrases. In the fourth step, the researcher developed categories and sub-categories from the codes by aggregating similar codes together. In the fifth step, a number of recurring, emergent themes were identified. In the sixth step, the findings of the qualitative study were analysed with
respect to relevant empirical findings and were compared with issues that had been raised by the broader academic literature.

5.12 Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Data

In the final analysis of this mixed methods study, quantitative and qualitative data sets were integrated and triangulated (Crewell & Plano Clark, 2007). The two data sets were synthesised and analysed to consider the broader implications of the research. Conclusions on the impeding and facilitating factors of Japanese descendants' collective responsibility were drawn from the two data sets (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009) and recommendations were made for future research and policy makers.

5.13 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues relating to the protection of the participants are of great importance in any research study (Merriam, 1998). As researchers we are responsible for both informing and protecting respondents. Therefore, participants were thoroughly informed of the purpose and content of this study prior to their participation. Various safeguards were employed to ensure that participants' rights were respected. An informed consent was requested from each participant throughout the study, and a written consent to voluntarily proceed with the study was received from every participant. Participants' rights and interests were considered of primary importance with regard to the reporting and dissemination of data. The researcher assured the participants that all names and other significant identity characteristics would be kept confidential by using pseudonyms. Cautionary measures were taken to secure the storage of research-related records and data inside the university. Nobody other than the researcher had access to the material.
5.14 Limitations of the Study

The principal aim of this study was to examine the various social and psychological factors that may be inhibiting Japanese descendants from acknowledging collective responsibility for the injustices perpetrated by the past generations during the ‘last war.’ This study was conducted with a purposive sample of a specific population of Japanese college-educated youth in Eastern and Western regions of Japan (n=162). Efforts were made to recruit students from ten universities with diverse interests and disciplines ranging from humanities, arts, sciences, technology to political science. However, it should be noted that the data of this study does not constitute a representative sample of Japanese university students. The researcher acknowledges that the data does not allow generalized statements or conclusions for (i) all Japanese university students and (ii) all Japanese. To address this limitation, the findings of this research are compared and contrasted in Chapter 9 with other institutes’ past polling data which involved larger Japanese samples.

Another potential limitation of the qualitative phase of this study comes from the self-reported data of the in-depth interviews with respondents who expressed high/low levels of collective responsibility. Self-reported data may contain potential sources of bias such as selective memory of what the interviewees remember hearing or learning about Japan’s negative war history. Furthermore, the study was conducted following the heightened tensions between China and Japan surrounding the dispute over Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands in 2012. It is highly likely that the respondents have been exposed to critical and negative media coverage about ‘aggressive China.’ Perhaps a longitudinal observation in the future can be conducted to assess the impact of negative media coverage of China in Japan.

The third limitation of this study concerns the subjectivity and potential bias of the researcher being a Japanese national. Qualitative research is concerned with meaning, how people make sense of the world and how participants experience events from their perspective (Willig, 2001). However, Malterud (2001, 483-484) points out that "a researcher's background and position will affect what they choose to investigate, the angle of investigation, the methods judged most adequate for this
purpose, the findings considered most appropriate, and the framing and communication of conclusions." Hence, assumptions and interpretations are framed from the researcher's perspective. Recognizing these challenges, the researcher used reflexivity as a strategy to reduce the researcher's bias and address the issue of personal subjectivity. Reflexivity is a commonly used method in qualitative research to validate research practices. The researcher reflects continuously on how their own actions, values and perceptions, social and political identities may have an impact upon the research setting, data collection and analysis (Gerrish & Lacey, 2006; Pillow, 2003). This recognition can help the researcher to address possible bias while gaining insight into and understanding of the phenomenon under exploration. Moreover, the decision to employ mixed methods enabled the researcher to use quantitative techniques to supplement the weakness of the qualitative research.

In the quantitative phase, I selected variables of investigation on the basis of theoretical and empirical interest and developed hypotheses from the findings of current research in this area. Standardized measures were used to increase construct validity and produce objective, numerical data that can be statistically analysed. In this design, the qualitative data material further validated the results of the quantitative phase. Consequently, the triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data sets in mixed methods design and having advisors and colleagues scrutinize the thematic analysis of the qualitative findings also helped address the limitations of this research.

5.15 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a detailed description of the methodology of this research study. A sequential mixed methods approach was employed to examine the impeding factors to the present-day Japanese generation's acceptance of responsibility for the nation's past injustices. The two-phase design began with the collection and analysis of quantitative data from the survey, followed by the subsequent collection and analysis of qualitative data from interviews with selected survey participants. The participant sample of the first phase of the quantitative study was comprised of 162
purposefully selected Japanese university students across ten universities in Japan. The purpose of the quantitative phase was to statistically analyse the possible predictors of Japanese acceptance of responsibility for the nation's immoral past.

An extensive review of literature was conducted to devise a conceptual framework for the design and analysis of the study. Drawing on the theoretical assumptions from the literature, the survey was designed to investigate the relationship between acceptance of collective responsibility and six variables, three of which were the identity-related social psychological factors of moral identity threat, competitive victimhood, and in-group identification. This was followed by the next phase of qualitative research comprised of in-depth interviews of selected survey respondents as a follow-up to further explain the quantitative findings of the survey. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with survey respondents who reported low/CR_{Low} vs. high/CR_{High} level of collective responsibility to analyse their perceptions and experiences in depth. In order to evaluate the inhibiting factors to collective responsibility, qualitative analyses in the Findings chapters primarily focused on the perspectives of the CR_{Low} participants. Similarities and differences in the perspectives of the two samples (CR_{Low} vs. CR_{High}) were then explored and presented in the Discussion Chapter. This chapter highlighted how the use of multiple methods and triangulation of data sets was critical to obtaining an in-depth understanding of the complex present-day phenomenon of Japanese collective responsibility. The two data sets from the quantitative and qualitative phases were integrated, analysed and compared with the theoretical assumptions and the broader literature. The findings and key themes of the study are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 6

6. Findings: Multiple Hierarchical Regression Analyses

6.1 Introduction

As was explained in Chapter 5, multiple hierarchical regression analyses were performed for two reasons: first, to identify the main factors impeding participants’ acceptance of collective responsibility; and second, to determine the extent to which identity-driven variables (moral identity threat, competitive victimhood, in-group identification) affect participants’ feelings of remorse and acceptance of responsibility. These regression analyses revealed the following key variables to be significant predictors of collective responsibility:

1) Moral identity threat*
2) Awareness of in-group’s transgressions
3) Competitive victimhood*
4) Negative out-group attitude
5) Out-group contact
6) In-group identification*
(*Identity-driven variables)

The following hypotheses were tested in order to understand the underlying factors that are associated with the perpetrator group’s collective responsibility.

Hypothesis 1: Members of the perpetrator group who experience threats to their group's moral status are less likely to accept collective responsibility for the in-group's past injustices.
Hypothesis 2: Belief in the in-group's own history of victimhood is likely to negatively affect the perpetrator group members' acceptance of collective responsibility for the in-group's past injustices.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who are highly identified with their in-group (with strong collective self-esteem) are likely to feel less responsibility for the immoral actions of their in-group.

Multiple Hierarchical Regression Analyses
Predicting the Descendants' Collective Responsibility

Multiple hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to identify strong predictors of Japanese people's feelings of collective responsibility. First, control variables were selected for the analyses. In the first step of the regression analysis, demographic variables such as age and gender were entered together with other factors such as political ideology and the importance of religion (or level of religiosity), factors which have been shown to influence intergroup attitudes and behaviour in previous social psychological studies (Brown, 2000).

In the second step, variables identified in previous studies as moderators of collective guilt were entered. These included inter-group contact, and negative out-group attitude (prejudice). Both of these variables were important correlates of collective guilt and responsibility in Hewstone et al’s study on forgiveness and guilt in Northern Ireland (Hewstone et al., 2004). Awareness/knowledge of the out-group's suffering was also included, as scholarly discourse on Japanese war memory tends to highlight Japanese amnesia on wartime atrocities in Asia.

In the third step, three key identity-driven variables—in-group identification, competitive victimhood and threat to the group’s moral identity—were entered simultaneously to assess the extent to which they accounted for variance in collective responsibility.
6.2 Descriptive Data

Tables 3 and 4 provide a summary of the correlations, means, and standard deviations for the measured variables.

Table 3: Basic Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collective responsibility</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moral identity threat</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive victimhood</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In-group identification</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Awareness of transgressions</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Out-group contact</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative out-group attitude</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Correlations Between Predictors and Collective Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Collective Responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moral identity threat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>-.78</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive victimhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In-group identification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Awareness of transgressions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Out-group contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Negative out-group attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01, correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 5: Coefficients of Regression Models for Collective Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.99(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.29(n.s.)</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Religion</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.55(n.s.)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.69(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.47(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.48(n.s.)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness transgression</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.Out-group attitude</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.75(n.s.)</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.30(n.s.)</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ideology</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.44(n.s.)</td>
<td>-.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.43(n.s.)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness transgression</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.Out-group attitude</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.007**</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group identification</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.027*</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive victimhood</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.002**</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral identity threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n.s.=not significant, * p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001
Table 6: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>Sig.F change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.005**, p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.000***, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.000***, p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

Dependent variable: Collective responsibility

Step 1 Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Political ideology, Religiosity.

Step 2 Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Political ideology, Religiosity, Awareness of in-group’s transgressions, Contact, Negative out-group attitude

Step 3 Predictors: (Constant), Age, Gender, Political ideology, Importance of religion, Awareness of in-group’s transgressions, Contact, Negative out-group attitude, In-group identification, Competitive victimhood, Moral identity threat

6.3 Key Findings

Step 1
The results of the hierarchical regression analysis predicting Japanese participants' acceptance of collective responsibility for the nation's past harm are summarized in Tables 5 and 6. The model in the first step was significant at the .05 level and accounted for 7% of the variance in collective responsibility, F_change (4, 157) = 3.84, p < .01. This was mainly due to the contribution of the religiosity variable. The importance of religion emerged as a significant positive predictor of collective responsibility, p < .01, although it became non-significant in the next two steps. The
rest of the control variables of gender, age and political ideology remained non-significant throughout the analyses. Although liberal political ideology is normally assumed to be a significant positive predictor of collective responsibility, in the case of contemporary Japanese youth, many were unable to indicate any significant political orientation.

Step 2
By way of contrast, Step 2 showed that the additional predictor variables explained a further substantial 73% of the variance in collective responsibility, $F_{\text{change}} (3, 154) = 201.8, p < .001$. Consistent with past studies, increased contact with the out-group and awareness about in-group’s historical transgressions were both positively associated with acceptance of collective responsibility. These two variables had equal weight in contributing to predicting collective responsibility with a standardized coefficient of .27. In this step, negative out-group attitude (prejudice) emerged as the strongest negative predictor of collective responsibility with the highest standardized coefficient of -.45 and significant at the level of $p < .001$.

Step 3
As was hypothesized, in the final model, the three identity-driven variables—ingroup identification, competitive victimhood and moral identity threat—all emerged as significant negative predictors of collective responsibility. Adding the three variables in Step 3 increased the explained variance at the level of $p < .001$, $F_{\text{change}} (3, 151) = 19.17$ and explained an additional 5% of the variance in acceptance of collective responsibility. This step revealed that amongst the tested identity-related variables, threat to a group’s moral identity is the most significant negative predictor of collective responsibility ($p < .001$) followed by competitive victimhood ($p < .01$) and in-group identification ($p < .05$).

In sum, the above analysis revealed that the measured predictors were able to explain a total of 86% of variance in collective responsibility. The analyses also provides good support for all three hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 and demonstrates that an increase in moral identity threat, in-group identification and competitive victimhood
will predict a decreased willingness to feel remorse and accept collective responsibility for the past transgressions of the in-group.

Social identity theory posits that individuals attain a sense of self-esteem and self-worth not just from their identity as an individual, but also from their membership in social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Individuals are therefore driven to maintain a positive evaluation of their social group. The possibility that one’s group has perpetrated an unjust act can pose a threat to the in-group’s positive moral identity (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). When confronted with accusations of in-group malevolence, individuals will try and bolster the in-group’s moral status in order to defuse real or potential reputational threat (Sullivan, Landau, Branscombe, & Rothschild, 2012, 778). One strategy groups employ to restore positive esteem and moral status is competitive victimhood. This enables the accused group to claim that they have suffered more than those who are being critical (Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008; Noor et. al., 2012). This study hypothesized that Japan’s lack of repentance, which is at the heart of the Sino-Japanese conflict, is driven by a need to defend and protect a positive national identity. Based on the aforementioned theories, this thesis examined the extent to which identity-driven responses such as ‘moral identity threat,’ ‘competitive victimhood,’ and ‘in-group identification (degree of national identity)’ may be affecting Japanese acceptance of and remorse and responsibility.

Consistent with these hypotheses, the hierarchical regression analysis identified the three identity-driven variables as significant predictors of collective responsibility. One key finding from the regression analyses was that individuals who felt that their in-group’s moral status was threatened when confronted with accusations of past injustices defended their in-group's positive identity by avoiding acceptance of collective responsibility. As previous studies have shown, threats to moral identity and esteem were positively associated with competitive victimhood which also emerged as a negative predictor of collective responsibility. The regression analysis further indicated that participants who strongly identify with their nation experience less collective responsibility, while those with high levels of contact with the out-
group are likely to feel more remorse. Those with less salient knowledge and awareness about their nation’s transgressions are less likely to feel responsible for their ancestors’ misdeeds.

6.4 Descriptive Statistics: Collective Responsibility

Previous opinion polls have aimed to uncover the Japanese public’s sense of responsibility and apology for the war. However, this is the first empirical study which deploys tried and tested psychological measures to assess Japanese descendants' acceptance of collective and inherited responsibility. Table 7 presents the statistical data obtained from survey participants’ responses to the Collective Responsibility Measure adapted from the widely-accepted Collective Guilt Scale developed by Branscombe, Slugoski and Kappen (2004).

Table 7: Collective Responsibility Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/Somewhat agree (%)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/Disagree/Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
<th>Mean/Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Our generation should not be held responsible for Japan’s military actions during the last war. [Reverse coded]</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>M=3.43 SD=2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As Japanese, we should feel remorse for Japan’s military actions during the war.</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>M=3.96 SD=1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We shouldn’t have to feel responsible for the actions of our forebears. [Reverse coded]</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>M=3.4 SD=1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. As Japanese, we should accept responsibility for Japan’s injustices in the last war.</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>M=4.2 SD=1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think as Japanese, we are accountable for what the other Japanese did in the past.</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>M=3.92 SD=1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Items 1 and 3 were reverse scored, so that higher scale scores denote greater acceptance of collective responsibility. (N = 162)
To measure the degree of collective responsibility for the nation’s past transgressions, participants were asked to answer to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the five items presented in Table 7. A major issue raised in the Japanese public debate about war memory and contrition is the question of ‘for how long current generations should continue to feel responsible for the actions of their ancestors.’ This question about the temporality of collective war responsibility was posed in the survey. Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with such statements as “our generation should not be held responsible for Japan’s military actions during the last war.” Survey results showed that 64 percent of respondents felt that they did not and should not have to bear any responsibility for what their forebears did during the war, while 36 percent felt that the current generation should assume some ongoing guilt and responsibility for the nation’s past actions.
Figure 1: Inherited Responsibility

‘Our generation should bear responsibility for Japan’s military actions during the last war.’ [reverse coded]

Note: Scale ranges from 1 to 7, with higher numbers indicating greater agreement with the items. N=162.

6.5 Qualitative Responses: Inherited Responsibility

'Our generation should not have to feel guilty for the mistakes of our forebears.'
The qualitative segment of this study explored the processes underlying participants’ perceptions of war memory and collective responsibility for Japan’s past atrocities. Following the regression analyses, which identified the key variables predicting participants’ collective responsibility, semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with two samples; 15 participants who had exhibited low levels of collective responsibility/CR\text{Low} (mean ≤ 2) and 10 who had demonstrated high levels of collective responsibility/CR\text{High} (mean ≥ 6). These in-depth interviews allowed the participants to clarify their reasons for feeling little if any responsibility, and also aimed to better understand the processes which impeded their feelings of remorse.
A dominant argument that emerged in the qualitative findings among CR_{Low} respondents is the unreasonableness of demanding that today’s Japanese feel contrition for war crimes committed seven decades ago. These twenty-first century descendants wish to distance themselves from Second World War Imperial and military Japan. Their comments demonstrate the attitudes of a post-war generation that feels diminished responsibility for the ‘sins’ of its ancestors. They feel that modern Japan is a far cry from the regime that committed cruel atrocities during the Asia-Pacific War. Furthermore, they believe that they should not be held accountable for the crimes committed by a generation of Japanese (especially the Japanese military clique responsible for the war) with whom they cannot and would not wish to be identified. Their emotional distance from the perpetrators of war crimes and human rights abuses leads them to question whether further apology—made after nearly three generations have passed—would seem disingenuous, insincere, and even absurd. Consistent with my survey and past poll data, respondents are frustrated that they are expected to share some collective blame for atrocities that they did not commit.

Yuji: All these accusations by China have nothing to do with me. What happened during the war has nothing to do with my generation. We should not be held liable for what the Japanese did long time ago.

Tatsuya: I don’t feel responsible for what happened during the war. I don’t see myself as part of the group of militarists who committed those horrible crimes. We are from entirely different generations. I cannot feel responsible for something I never took part in. I wasn’t even born then. And most of the people who committed the atrocities are dead.

Satoko: Because I was not directly involved, even if I apologize to the Chinese, it wouldn’t be sincere.

Kuniko: If a Chinese friend asked me to apologize, I probably might…but deep in my heart, I would question, “Does this apology have any meaning?” I acknowledge that the Japanese committed brutal acts in the past but I cannot feel any guilt or remorse for what these people did. I was never directly involved. That is why I wonder, would my apology have any significance?

These verbatim comments help explain why this generation of students finds it difficult to feel responsibility for Japan’s past actions. The same participants also
scored high on the in-group identification scale (mean ≥ 6), indicating that their collective self-esteem is strongly associated with a positive conception of the nation. In the qualitative interviews, however, the majority of respondents expressed difficulty identifying themselves with those Japanese who committed atrocities during the war. These reactions support my assumption—based on social identity and social categorization theories—that high identifiers detach transgressors from their group in an attempt to protect the group’s positive identity. The issue of ongoing culpability is hotly debated among intellectuals not only in Japan but also in Germany; namely, whether post-war generations should be expected to continue to shoulder the burden of moral guilt for their nation’s past injustices (and if so, for how long). This is a fundamental ethical and political question of ‘inherited responsibility’: how should nations deal with perpetual collective guilt imposed upon them by the ancestors of their victims?

6.6 Qualitative Responses: Apology Fatigue

'Japan has apologized enough for its wartime past'

Japanese perception of what constitutes a sufficient apology may be different from what the victimized nations think. The following survey results reveal that 'apology fatigue' is prevalent. Majority of today's descendants believe that their government has done enough and feel frustrated that 'no matter what they do, victims will never be satisfied.' My survey results (2014) revealed that 66 percent of participants felt that ‘Japan has apologized enough for its wartime past’ while 33 percent felt that the Japanese government had not offered a sufficient apology to the victims.
The majority of interviewed participants showed strong defensive responses to China’s demands for apology by insisting that the nation had apologized enough and wartime reparations had already been settled with both China and Korea. These participant perceptions seem to be profoundly influenced by discussions in the Japanese mass media that the Japanese government has already issued many apologies to China in the past and has therefore made sufficient atonement for past war crimes. These comments echo the official narrative of the Japanese government introduced in Chapter 3. The following qualitative perspectives shared by participants are consistent with the survey findings which demonstrate that the majority of Japanese participants feel that enough has been done to atone for the grievances of the victimized nations.

Seijiro: I am not certain how many times Japan has offered apologies in the past but I feel it has done enough. How long do we have to continue apologising? Are these people [victimised nations] ever going to be satisfied?

Shinji: I do accept that Japan has committed terrible war crimes. However, Japan has already offered numerous apologies and compensation for the damages incurred during the war. We signed a friendship treaty with China and both countries agreed that the war has ended and the two countries were ready to move on. Despite that agreement, why is China bringing out the past again and deliberately flaring up anti-Japanese sentiments amongst its people? Why now?

Emiko: I am quite sure that Japan has already issued official apologies and paid necessary reparations. I am not aware of the details though. Are the Chinese people dissatisfied with the amount of reparation? Did they find our government’s apologies to be insufficient? If that is the case, then we should reconsider these matters but I am skeptical about the timing. Why are the Chinese suddenly angry now? It is strange that they are suddenly demanding apologies after all these years.

Kuniko: We did commit horrible acts so I think their criticisms are justified. However, after the war, Japan had already atoned for its past by offering numerous apologies and compensation. I find it annoying that they are re-enacting the whole issue today. What is their real objective?

Toshiyuki: My honest reaction is who are they kidding? Based on the bilateral agreement, China said that they will not raise the war crimes as an issue. Japan offered and already paid war reparations. When China tells us to apologize, I would like to argue that the Chinese also killed many Japanese
soldiers a long time ago during the Sui dynasty. This becomes an endless argument. I find their persistent demands to be frankly annoying.

6.6 Summary

The outcomes of the hierarchical regression identified the critical identity-related predictors of collective responsibility that will be further analysed in the subsequent chapters. One key finding from the regression analyses was that individuals who felt their moral identity was challenged in the face of China’s accusations about Japan’s lack of contrition avoided acceptance of collective responsibility. Threats to moral status were positively associated with competitive victimhood which also worked to diminish the participants’ willingness to acknowledge responsibility. This chapter has also illustrated the CR_{Low} participants' perspectives on inherited responsibility; that their nation has done enough to atone for the past misdeeds. In the next Chapter, I will present the descriptive data and qualitative findings related to the three identity-related predictors of collective responsibility—moral identity threat, competitive victimhood and in-group identification. The qualitative responses provide deeper insight into the dynamics that threaten participants’ conception of their in-group’s moral status and the defensive mechanisms that emerge to protect their group’s positive identity.
7. Findings: Identity-related Factors

7.1 Moral Identity Threat

Social identity theory argues that individuals are driven to maintain a favourable evaluation of the social group with which they associate and that they do so primarily through a commitment to the shared values, norms and morality of that group. Any challenge to moral reputation, therefore, challenges individual and group esteem. When this happens, group members move into a defensive mode in order to bolster the group’s moral status and defuse the reputational threat (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999). Drawing on this theory, my survey first assessed the importance of moral identity for Japanese participants’ perception of self using the moral identity scale developed by Aquino and Reed (2002).

7.1.1 Morality is the most important trait on which individuals evaluate themselves and their in-group

Participants were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the four statements in Table 8, Moral Identity Scale. As the results reveal, an overwhelming majority of respondents reported that values and morality were a critical element in their determination of positive self-identity. They also want to ensure that their own values and morality are reflected in and consonant with those of their group and country. The mean score on this scale was 6.34 and the Standard Deviation was .81. This finding supports previous research by Leach, Ellemers, and Barreto (2007) in which high moral repute was proven to be the most important dimension on which individuals evaluate their in-group. Their study showed that a group’s perceived moral status was more important than other qualities such as competence or sociability when asked to describe factors generating pride within their in-group. As the bar graph indicates, for all four items measuring the importance of moral identity,
more than 90 percent of respondents consistently agreed to statements that claimed that moral traits were important to their self and collective identity.

**Table 8: Moral Identity Scale**

Q: Here are some characteristics that might describe a person: caring, compassionate, fair, kind, honest and responsible. How much do you agree of disagree with the following statements?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Having these characteristics is not really important to me. [reverse coded]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I want my own country to also have these characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Item 3 was reverse scored, so that higher scale scores denote greater importance on moral identity. (N = 162)

**Figure 2: Importance of Moral Identity**

![Morality Scale](image)
7.2 Responses to In-group’s Moral Identity Threat

This study examined to what extent participants felt that their group’s moral status was threatened when facing China’s accusations about Japan’s invasion, occupation and war crimes in China. Threat to moral identity was measured with Tauber & Zomeron’s moral outrage scale (2013) which was adapted for the Japanese context. The scale assessed participants’ levels of annoyance and outrage when their moral status was threatened by accusations about the in-group’s historic injustices and current denial of the past. Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Item 3 was reverse scored, so that higher scale scores denote greater degree of moral identity. The measures produced a reliable scale with Cronbach $\alpha = .90$, $n=162$.

As the data in Table 7.2 indicates, 61 percent of respondents consistently claimed that they had negative feelings when confronted with victim group accusations while 37 percent were either indifferent or disagreed. This finding is consistent with the ratio of respondents reporting high versus low collective guilt and the regression analysis which showed that moral identity threat was the strongest predictor of collective guilt. These findings highlight that the majority of Japanese participants felt frustrated that their moral status was threatened by China’s accusations of their group’s past wrongdoing and supports my guiding hypothesis that individuals who experience moral identity threat will experience less collective responsibility and guilt.
Table 9: Moral Identity Threat Scale

Cronbach’s $\alpha = .93$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/Disagree/Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
<th>Mean/Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As Japanese, I feel annoyed every time China demands Japan to apologize for its past actions.</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>M=4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I wish China would stop criticizing that Japan is unrepentant of its past evils.</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>M=4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I get annoyed when the Chinese blame Japan for making them suffer during the war.</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>M=4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel irritated when China attacks Japan for not facing up to the past.</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>M=4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think Japan deserves to be criticized for its wartime actions. [reverse coded]</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>M=4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. As a Japanese, I don’t want to hear about the cruelties committed by the Japanese soldiers in the past.</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>M=4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Item 5 was reverse scored, so that higher scale scores denote greater moral identity threat. (N = 162)

7.3 Qualitative Responses: When In-group's Moral Status is Threatened

Previous studies by social psychologists have shown that groups have a variety of means available to them for avoiding accusations damaging to their individual or collective reputation (Branscombe, Doosje & McGarty, 2002). My interviews were aimed at exploring the kinds of emotions evoked when Japanese participants felt their moral status was threatened by China’s persistent accusations about war crimes committed by Japan in China. The purpose of this section is to reveal the various defensive responses aimed at protecting their positive individual and collective
esteem. The qualitative findings therefore will mainly focus on the reactions of the $CR_{Low}$ descendants.

Ryutaro: I don’t want Japan to be accused and I don’t want to feel responsible for what happened. China is obsessed with its past. I am utterly fed up with their behaviour.

Toshiyuki: I find China’s persistence to be annoying, frustrating and tiresome.

Seijiro: I am not that knowledgeable about the Nanjing Massacre or the comfort women. However, I am not going to deny that these incidents did not happen. I am aware that they actually occurred in the past. I am just not aware about the details of what happened. My honest reaction to the Chinese and Korean people’s criticisms about our past is…why are you so persistent and stubborn about the past? I don’t get outraged every time I see the Chinese attack us on television, but I do find it detestable.

Hiromi: I shouldn’t be blamed for what happened in the past. I find it suspicious that they are bringing out the issue now. Why now? I find their political tactics to be distasteful.

The majority of the respondents were also repulsed by the aggressive nature of Chinese demands and wanted the issues to be dealt with more calmly and in what they perceived to be a more civilized manner. For those who believe that the Japanese government has already issued numerous apologies and paid compensation, China’s persistent criticism and demands were viewed as illegitimate and driven by ulterior motives. Other respondents like Ryutaro expressed their frustrations that no matter what they do, the victims will never be satisfied.

Akemi: I don’t like it when the Chinese portray themselves to be the victimized heroines. If their demands were expressed in a different way, in a more rational and calm manner, I may feel differently. The fact that they are constantly stressing that they are the victims in a pushy, aggressive way is just annoying. They should calmly ask Japan to apologize and try to engage in a dialogue. They seem to be doing this to get the world media’s attention and their tactics are so political.

Kyoko: I cannot feel guilty because China’s demand is so forceful. They come out so aggressively, unilaterally accusing us and portraying to the world that they are the ultimate victims. I just find that to be repulsive.
Rieko: If the actual victims came to me and asked me to apologize, I would. But when China relentlessly attacks us for being unremorseful, mixes this issue up with politics and territorial disputes, that dampens my willingness to apologize. I only feel resentment towards their demands and their motives start to appear ‘black and malicious.’

Ryutaro: No matter how many times we apologize, they will not stop attacking us. They will always come up with something to complain about. I am completely fed up with their incessant criticisms. I would be curious, what if we offer the most sincere apology to them…what would be their next move? Personally, I feel that no matter how many times we apologize, they are never going to be satisfied. They will always come up with something to accuse us…

7.4 Defensive Reactions When Moral Status Becomes Threatened

Previous studies by social psychologists have shown that groups have a variety of means available to them for avoiding the conclusion that their group’s history is immoral (Branscombe et al., 2002). My interviews were aimed at exploring the kinds of emotions evoked when Japanese participants felt their moral status to be threatened by China’s persistent accusations about war crimes committed by Japan in China. The interviewees revealed five types of defensive responses aimed at protecting their positive individual and collective esteem.

Ryutaro: I don’t want Japan to be accused and I don’t want to feel responsible for what happened. China is obsessed with its past. I am utterly fed up with their behaviour.

Toshiya: I find China’s persistence to be annoying, frustrating and tiresome.

Seijiro: I am not that knowledgeable about the Nanjing Massacre or the comfort women. However, I am not going to deny that these incidents did not happen. I acknowledge that they actually occurred in the past. I am just not aware about the details of what actually happened. My honest reaction to the Chinese and Korean people’s criticisms about our past is…why are you so persistent and stubborn about the past? I don’t get outraged every time I see the Chinese attack us on television, but I do find it detestable.

Hiromi: I shouldn’t be blamed for what happened in the past. I find it suspicious that they are bringing out the issue now. Why now? I find their political tactics to be distasteful.
The majority of the respondents were tired of hearing the emotional demands by the Chinese and desired the issues to be dealt with more calmly.

Akemi: I don’t like it when the Chinese portray themselves to be the victimized heroines. If their demands were expressed in a different way, in a more rational and calm manner, I may feel differently. The fact that they are constantly stressing that they are the victims in a pushy, aggressive way is just annoying. They should calmly ask Japan to apologize and try to engage in a dialogue. They seem to be doing this to get the world media’s attention and their tactics are so political.

Kyoko: I cannot feel remorseful because China’s demand is so forceful. They come out so aggressively, unilaterally accusing us and portraying to the world that they are the ultimate victims. I just find that to be repulsive.

7.4.1. (1) History issue is China’s political card

Previous studies have shown that one way groups defend their positive moral identity is by acknowledging the occurrence of past harm-doing but placing the responsibility on ‘a few deviant group members’ (Wohl et al., 2006). Consistent with this conclusion, a large majority of the low-responsibility respondents rationalised the victims’ accusations and demand for apology as highly politicized and insincere. Their comments support the dominant discursive argument in the Japanese media that the history issue is essentially orchestrated by the Chinese government. According to this argument, Chinese demands for Japanese repentance are nothing but a political strategy of the Chinese Communist Party to shift public attention from internal grievances to outrage towards an external opponent. For this reason, the participants find government-manipulated demands for apology to be disingenuous and distasteful.

Jiro: I find Chinese demands for apology to be questionable. Why now? Their plea seems quite un-genuine. It looks more like a diplomatic or a political tactic. That is why I feel annoyed. I can see their ulterior political motive to put pressure on Japan to gain better negotiating power.

Rieko: I find their demands to be frankly annoying. They should get over it and move on. They are just using the anti-Japanese criticisms to shift their own people’s attention from domestic grievances to a diplomatic issue. So I honestly feel… “Again?! Haven’t you said enough to us already?”
Hiromi: I am not denying that the Japanese army committed horrible acts during the war and the Chinese people’s anger is justifiable. However, I still feel that they are overdoing it. They are using criticisms against Japan for the past war as a diplomatic negotiating card. The criticisms were suddenly revived after all these years. It must be for a political purpose. The same could be said about the Korean criticisms involving the comfort women. If the actual victims who suffered in Nanjing raised the issue, then I could understand. However, for the state to revive the accusations after the issue was settled many years ago, can only be interpreted as a political move. I cannot understand how such accusations can lead to positive relations between the two countries. They don’t look to me like they are sincerely asking for an apology. I find that to be disrespectful towards the actual victims.

7.4.2 (2) Chinese should move on and focus on the future

In addition to questioning the persistence and transferability of collective war guilt other Japanese argued that since you cannot turn back the clock it is more constructive to focus on the future. Participants who endorse this pragmatic argument felt that focusing (some would say fixating) on the past will serve no purpose for Japan and China nor contribute to the betterment of bilateral relations.

Kyoko: I feel frustrated every time they criticize Japan for the past war. I wish they would stop bemoaning what happened in the past. It is really about time they let go and move on.

Yuji: China should try to look to the future and stop attacking us. Is this the kind of issue that needs to be addressed right now? Why now? Shouldn’t we focus our energies towards building a better relationship?

Yumi: Every time I hear their criticism, I want to say, “Again??” I am tired of hearing the same thing repeated over and over. It is about time they get over their past and end this.

Rieko: What happened to the Chinese people is tragic, but, again?? Can’t they put the past behind them and work towards improving the bilateral relationship between China and Japan?

Satoko: I really don’t know much about what actually happened. I believe Japan did terrible things to them. But then, we were never involved in all that. They can continue to complain about what happened in the past but is that really going to lead to positive developments for the two countries’ future relationship?
These temporal arguments have more traction with the current generation of under 25-year-old Japanese than they do with the over 60s. This raises some interesting questions about the ways in which chosen traumas are transferred across generations while feelings of guilt for past transgressions are not transferred in the same way and willfully buried by the current generation of Japanese.

7.4.3 (3) Justification for the atrocities: ‘It couldn’t be helped’

Survey participants tried to deny the veracity of historical events by making evidential arguments against the accusations and by reframing the motives for Imperial Japan in a positive rather than negative light. The respondents generated questions about the veracity of the atrocities committed by Japanese soldiers in two ways: first, by highlighting numerical differences between Japanese and Chinese over facts such as the death toll in Nanjing and elsewhere; and second by arguing that, among the range of motives for the war, few, if any, were intentionally aimed at massacring others or committing gross violations of human rights. In other words, atrocities that did occur were accidents of war.

Kuniko: The Japanese soldiers did not massacre the people in Nanjing because they wanted to. They were forced to under the circumstances. In wars, things happen. The soldiers had no other choice but to follow the orders from the top and commit these acts. I agree that the massacre was inhumane and unpardonable. However, at the same time, these soldiers did not have any other option. This fact should be taken into consideration.

Yumi: War comes with tragedies. Japan also suffered immensely from the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Jiro: I am not a denier. I admit that the Nanjing massacre was an atrocious act. However, when I consider the circumstances under which the Japanese soldiers were placed in Nanjing, I can understand why this kind of conduct took place. It is not at all that surprising. Japanese soldiers were forced to engage in a guerrilla war. All the Chinese, including citizens, were suspected of being soldiers. They couldn't distinguish civilian from combatant, so they [Japan] felt compelled to kill them all. When reading about history, it is important to understand the mood of the times and circumstances surrounding the soldiers at that time.

Shinji: People should feel guilty if their nation has started the war…but then, that applies to all other countries. Japan happened to lose the war, but why
should Japan be the only country that gets criticized for its war conduct? I just cannot accept that. It is not fair.

7.4.4 (4) Facts are dubious

Some participants echoed neo-nationalist conservative arguments in Japanese society questioning the horrors of the Nanjing massacre by emphasising scholastic differences about death tolls. The debate around death toll is aimed at mitigating the extent to which Japan should be condemned for its atrocities. If, for example, only 110,000 instead of 300,000 Chinese were killed at Nanjing by Japan, then—according to the proponents of this argument—the necessity for Japan to respond to war crime accusations is mitigated if not negated.

Hiromi: First of all, we need to confirm whether China’s accusations are really accurate or not. I heard that the numbers are debatable.

Kuniko: I think Japan has apologized too many times in the past. After all, the historical facts are not very clear. I don’t like to be unilaterally attacked when the facts are still so questionable.

Jiro: I heard from my history teacher that “the Nanjing incident” could have happened but it was not the kind of enormous massacre Chinese exaggeratedly report about.

7.4.5 (5) Indifference: ‘I don’t know and I don’t care’

The following comments reflect the indifference expressed by some of the participants about their country’s past. These responses support Seaton’s (2007, 23) categorization of ‘the don’t knows and don’t cares’ who represent the historical consciousness of Japan’s post-war generation, those born with little or no knowledge of war history. However, it should be noted that this does not mean that the younger generation is completely unaware of what occurred in the past. The Senkaku-Diaoyu Islands dispute and the recent rise of popular protests in China and South Korea have seen an increase in media coverage of the ‘history issue’, leaving few younger Japanese ignorant of their nation’s military history. Whether conscious or unconscious, indifference and apathy towards Japan’s history of transgression allows
individuals not only to associate themselves with a positive image of today’s peaceful and prosperous Japan, but also detaches them from their nation’s dark history and dispels any possible guilt for it.

Seijiro: I am not that interested in understanding the criticisms of China and Korea. Even if these issues come up in the news programmes, I feel like it has nothing to do with me, but is someone else’s business.

Satoko: I don’t know much about it and I don’t really care. I don’t even know what the Japanese soldiers actually did. It is difficult for me to feel any sense of responsibility or guilt.

Tatsuya: I feel perplexed every time they attack Japan. I don’t know much about what actually happened and it is wrong to ask us to apologize for something we don’t even know about. I cannot argue back with facts either, so I just feel perplexed.

These comments illustrate the diverse ways in which modern Japanese youth seek to dissociate themselves from painful reminders of Japan’s fractured unjustifiable history.

7.5 Summary

After investigating the possible factors that hinder Japanese participants’ feeling of collective responsibility, ‘moral identity threat’ emerged as the strongest negative predictor of collective guilt. This discovery was further analysed and confirmed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Common arguments from in-depth interviews with a selected sample of 15 participants who scored low in collective responsibility were presented in this section. The findings of the interviews support my overarching hypothesis that when confronted with accusations about their nation’s past, individuals and groups will attempt to defend their positive identity by employing a range of different defensive arguments. The key responses of the CR_Low participants can be summarised as follows: 1) history issue is China’s political card, 2) China should move on and focus on the future, 3) atrocities could not be helped, 4) facts are dubious, and 5) indifference.
The interviews also revealed that with limited awareness of their nation’s history in Asia, the present generation of Japanese are perplexed and frustrated by the persistent accusations of China attacking their country as unremorseful and unapologetic. It is noteworthy that one of factors that seemed to trigger strong negative reaction among the respondents was the vehemence or tone of the Chinese accusations.

### 7.6 Competitive Victimhood

The previous section examined how Japanese participants respond to moral identity threats when criticised about their in-group’s past harm-doing, and how these responses serve to diminish a sense of collective guilt and responsibility. The research data identified a number of defensive justifications developed by participants to ameliorate the threat to their positive identity. Sullivan and colleagues have demonstrated that one of the strategies a group employs to defuse the threat to moral identity is to engage in competitive victimhood (Sullivan et al., 2012, 779); one can lessen feelings of guilt by claiming that one’s own group has suffered as much as if not more than others.

One of the hypotheses of this study is to examine the function of competitive victimhood in lessening Japanese participants’ sense of collective responsibility for past harm-doing. In this section, I examine in depth the phenomenon of Japanese competitive victimhood—the sources, dynamics and social processes that shape Japanese victim consciousness and memory of the war. Although some scholars have introduced the notion of Japanese victim consciousness following the war, there have been very few empirical and inferential studies of Japanese competitive victimhood. This chapter will first examine to what extent competitive victimhood exists within the Japanese mentality and then analyse how salient the victim trope is in shaping Japanese historical consciousness. Competitive victimhood has been identified as a significant negative mediator of collective guilt and it is therefore vital that the nature of this phenomenon be thoroughly explored in this study through qualitative interviews.
7.6.1 Competitive victimhood scale

In order to assess the level of competitive victimhood amongst the Japanese, participants were asked to answer to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the five items in the competitive victimhood scale (see Table 10) on a seven-point scale (1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree). As the data in Table 10 suggests, on average 74 percent of survey participants agreed that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima was the most tragic event in war history, and that the Japanese were the victims of this inhumane catastrophe. A strong majority of survey participants indicated that atomic victimhood was salient in their consciousness.

The survey results presented in Figures 1 and 2 show participants’ responses to the two items of the competitive victimhood scale: ‘atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was the most inhumane and immoral act in history’; and ‘the magnitude of the destruction wrought by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima cannot be compared to any other tragic event of war.’ The findings indicate that more than 70 percent of Japanese participants feel that the horrific suffering wrought by the atomic bomb was an experience unique to Japan which should not be compared to any other event in human history. There was no invidious comparison, however between the suffering of China and Japan. No one said that the Hiroshima catastrophe was far worse than the Nanjing Massacre. In fact, many respondents refused to compare the degree of suffering in the two tragedies as they were not certain about the actual death toll in China.

In stark contrast to this, a survey conducted by Nanjing Normal University in 2004 revealed that 93 percent of Chinese university students (N = 973) felt that the ‘Nanjing Massacre in which 300,000 Chinese civilians were killed must never be forgotten’ and 88 percent believed that ‘China should continue to dwell on the history of Japanese invasion.’ These findings when considered together with those of this study, show that both victim and perpetrator nations assert that they were the real victims of the war. These two conflicting findings relating to the salience of Chinese
vs. Japanese victimhood shed an important light on why it is a huge challenge to resolve this prolonged conflict.

Table 10: Competitive Victimhood Scale

Cronbach’s α = .96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/ Somewhat agree (%)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Disagree/ Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
<th>Mean/ Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was the most inhuman and immoral act in history.</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>M=5.50 SD=1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The dropping of the atomic bomb was the most horrendous act perpetrated in human history.</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>M=5.30 SD=1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Japanese people suffered as victims of the war.</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>M=5.38 SD=1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. As the only country in the world that has ever suffered from a nuclear bomb, we must never forget this history.</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>M=5.67 SD=1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The magnitude of the destruction wrought by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima cannot be compared to any other tragic event of war.</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>M=5.31 SD=1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scale scores denote greater competitive victimhood. (N = 162)
7.6.2 Salience of Japanese victimhood

As the mentality of competitive victimhood is difficult to self-report in questionnaires, the survey used a tested psychological scale. Added to this measure, the survey also tried to assess unconscious thoughts and perceptions using an implicit association question in which participants were asked to choose the first image that came to mind when they thought about the Asia-Pacific War. A majority of 60 percent of participants answered that the first thing that comes to mind when they think of the War is the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The second-most dominant image evoked in association with the Asia-Pacific War was that of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour; and the third-most dominant image was that of the Tokyo air raids. In the latter two cases the percentage was much lower, less than 10 percent. It should be noted that only 8 percent cited the Nanjing Massacre as their main association with the Pacific War. In sum, the survey results demonstrate that for 75 percent of participants the Pacific War is automatically associated with the key events that represent Japanese victimhood and the suffering of innocent civilians.
7.7 Qualitative Responses: Japanese Victimhood

The psychological technique of free or spontaneous association was employed in the in-depth interviews when discussing participants’ victim mentality and war memory. This method entails eliciting words or thoughts that are inspired by a stimulus. Respondents were asked to share everything that came to mind when they think of the ‘last war’ (the expression commonly used in Japan to refer to the Pacific War or World War II), including words, thoughts and images. Their perceptions of the war should indicate to which the official narrative of Japanese victimhood is particularly salient amongst individuals who are reluctant to accept collective responsibility for the nation’s past.

As explained in the context chapter, because of the salience of the victimhood trope in Japanese educational and political institutions, it is not surprising that the first thing that comes to mind for most respondents when considering the Pacific War is the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
Seijiro: I thought of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki when thinking of the war. It is the horrifying image of people suffering.

Tatsuya: I feel sad and frustrated when I think about the tragedy of Japan as a vanquished nation. I also thought of the firebombs and air raids.

Toshiyuki: Mushroom clouds of the atomic bombs.

Hiromi: I associate the war with the suffering of Japanese civilians and the images of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and air raids. I have watched different television programmes on the war, but what really influenced my understanding of the war was what the teacher taught me in elementary and junior high school during history class. History of the Pacific War was all about Japanese war history. That is why to me the Pacific War is about the suffering of the Japanese people. That image is deeply embedded in my mind. It was only after I entered college that I learned for the first time that the Pacific War was not just about Japan’s suffering.

7.7.1 Who are the victims of the war?

Participants were further asked who they perceived as the victim and victimizer in the last war. All the CR\textsubscript{Low} respondents answered that ordinary Japanese people were the victims of the war and the Asia-Pacific War was automatically associated with scenes of civilian suffering. A majority of the CR\textsubscript{Low} respondents found the identity of the victimizer more difficult to determine; they believed the Japanese public to have had little choice regarding their mobilization into the war, with only a handful of military leaders implicated as culpable.

Emiko: Majority of the people who supported Japan’s war efforts were forced to. It was a time when absolute obedience to the Emperor was demanded. Who was responsible for the war? It was the top political and military leaders of Imperial Japan and the elites who created the mood of the times. I don’t think ordinary Japanese people should be held responsible for what happened as they were clearly the victims.

Naoki: Class A war criminals should be held accountable for all the evils committed. They were the bad guys.

Jiro: The Pacific War was a war we shouldn’t have fought. The military leaders decided to fight a war that could not be won.

Toshiyuki: It was just like Germany under the Nazis. The top leaders mobilized the people to believe that the war was sacred and just. Japanese soldiers were influenced by wartime propaganda and went to China,
massacred the Chinese and raped the women or used them as ‘comfort women.’ It was a top-down decision and the public was forced to obey the military regime. The soldiers were victims of the war, too.

Although a majority of the respondents felt that the blame should be on the military leaders who started the war, there were a few who felt that the people should also be held accountable for having blindly followed the leaders.

Tatsuya: The war was started by the military leaders of Imperial Japan and I feel they should be held responsible. However, I learned later that after the Great Depression, Japan as a nation suffered from extreme poverty. The victories of the Sino-Japanese War and Russo-Japanese War enabled Japan to expand its colonial territories and feed its population. Japanese people benefited from the nation’s colonial expansion. I am sure there were those who supported the war because of these material interests.

On the other hand, a majority of the CR<sub>Low</sub> respondents said that although they were initially exposed to war stories related to Japanese people's suffering, as they grew older they discovered facts about other victims of the war. They came to realise that Japan was not the only country that suffered from the consequences of the war.

Hiromi: I thought that Japanese people were the victims of the war, but as I grew older, I later found out that our nation also caused a lot of harm to others.

Shizue: My teacher in high school questioned how war history was taught in our textbooks. He repeatedly reminded us that our textbook only highlights the victimhood of the Japanese people, and this was not correct. He told us, this is about war; naturally, there were people who were victimized by the Japanese army. Since then, I remember that the Chinese people were also victims of the war.
7.8 Information Sources Shaping Japanese Memory of the War

To get a better understanding of the process with which the collective memory of the current generation of Japanese is shaped by Japanese society’s war narratives, participants were asked to choose which three sources they considered to be most important in influencing their views of the Asia-Pacific War. 88 percent of the respondents selected textbooks and school education (teachers) as the most prominent sources shaping their views on the Pacific War; 57 percent chose the medium of television (informational programmes and television dramas and documentaries); and 38 percent selected news programmes.

Figure 5: Information Sources on War History

7.9 Qualitative Responses: Sources of War Memory

To discover how participants had become familiar with the public narratives of war, both CR_{High} and CR_{Low} interviewees were asked to elaborate on how and where they learned about Japan’s war history. Together with textbooks, visual media such as
television programmes and films were found to be powerful sources for embedding images of Japanese civilian victimization.

Namie: My family watches war-related television programmes that are aired every year in August commemorating the end of the war. Because of the images of the war-related television dramas and documentary programmes, when I think of the war, I immediately associate it with the suffering of Japanese civilians. Until I entered college, I strongly believed that Japan was a country that suffered as the victim of World War II. The war to me is about the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Japan becoming a defeated nation. I have no doubt that most Japanese think of themselves as the victims of the war.

Emiko: My image of the war comes from television dramas and animated films like “Hotaru no haka” (Grave of the Fireflies). I associate the war with images of people getting fire-bombed in air raids. People desperately running to seek safety in bomb shelters as the air raid sirens blasted. They are surrounded by fire and people around them are suffering and dying. When I think of the war, I can only think of the sight of these ordinary people suffering.

Some participants had stories of wartime suffering and struggles related to them first hand by family members.

Satoko: When I was in junior high school, we had to talk to someone who experienced the war first hand. I asked my grandmother about her war experience and that story left an indelible impression in my mind. She was still a small child but she remembers the horror of the American bombs falling from the skies and Tokyo turning into a hellish inferno. She told me that a young man next to her had his arm severed off. When I think of the war, I see images of ordinary citizens suffering.

Ryutaro: Based on the stories my grandparents told me, Japanese people were clearly the victims of war. My grandparents never were convinced about the whole idea of revering the Emperor. They only talked about their own suffering and miseries during the war. They were starving.

7.9.1 Memory of the atomic bombs

Both CR_{High} and CR_{Low} respondents were asked how they came to learn specifically about the history of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Respondents of both samples revealed that the first time they were exposed to the information was through textbooks, but that it was other sources such as manga, books or animation
films that left an indelible impression of the tragic consequences of the A-bomb. It is interesting to note that many CR_{High} and CR_{Low} interviewees claimed that reading the manga or the book version of “Barefoot Gen” (*Hadashi no Gen*) in elementary school awakened them to the horrific realities of the atomic bomb and left a scarring image in their minds. The responses also show the role that museums play in contributing to this image of horror and destruction.

Seijiro: When I think of the war, I immediately think of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima. I read the manga “Barefoot Gen” (*Hadashi no Gen*) when I was little. That is when I realized how horrible and destructive the atomic bombing was. And as I grew older, I gained more knowledge about it. I happened to find the manga book of “Bare-foot Gen” in the school library. That is how I learned about the horrors of war.

Yuji: I learned general information on the atomic bombing through school textbooks. But I realized how horrible it was when I visited the Hiroshima atomic bomb museum and reading the manga “Barefoot Gen.” (*Hadashi no Gen*)

Shinji: My war image is that of the atomic bomb. I think that comes from the book (not manga) that I read when I was in elementary school. It was called “Barefoot Gen” (*Hadashi no Gen*). That left a strong impression in my mind.

Satoko: I visited Hiroshima with my family and we went to the atomic bomb museum. I also read the manga “Barefoot Gen” (*Hadashi no Gen*) when I was in elementary school and learned about the horrible tragedy of the children of Hiroshima. It was horrendous.

Yuji: I read “Barefoot Gen” (*Hadashi no Gen*) when I was small. I also learned about what happened through interviews of the atomic bomb survivors that were featured on television.

Naoki: I think 60-70% of my knowledge of Hiroshima is from school textbooks. I found the book “Barefoot Gen” (*Hadashi no Gen*) in the library when I was junior high school. I started reading it but stopped and never finished it because the descriptions were too vivid and it was too much for me to handle.

Emiko: When I was in elementary school, we went on an excursion to visit the Hiroshima atomic bomb museum and the Dome. I also got to listen to the experiences of the bomb survivors. I also learned about the tragedy through watching various television dramas about the atomic bombs. I have a close friend who is from Hiroshima and she told me in great detail what actually happened to the victims.
7.9.2 The role of the United States in atomic victimhood

Both quantitative and qualitative findings indicate that a sense of victimhood arising from the Hiroshima atomic bombing is deeply embedded in Japanese historical consciousness. This then raises a question as to why Japanese, unlike the Chinese victims, do not harbour the same degree of anger towards the Americans. During my interviews, I probed into the role of the United States as perpetrator in terms of the bombing of Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Tokyo. Surprisingly, a large majority of the respondents felt no negative feelings towards America and chose to justify the US decisions as inevitable. In fact, some respondents even expressed positive emotions and aspirations towards the United States. Only two of the 25 respondents felt that the United States should reflect on its own crime against humanity.

Hiromi: I don’t feel any anger because the United States did so much for Japan after the war. Without the United States, we wouldn’t have been able to reconstruct our country this quickly. Japan gained a lot of positive benefits from the United States.

Akihiro: I am so glad that it was the US that was involved in Japan’s postwar reconstruction and not the Soviet Union. Imagine what Japan would have been like?

Namie: When I was still in elementary school and I heard for the first time that the United States was Japan’s enemy and dropped the atomic bombs, I did feel some anger. However, as I grew up, I learned later that it was a tactical decision in order to save more human lives. If the US had not dropped the bomb, the war would have been prolonged further and we could have been colonized by the Soviet Union.

Kuniko: I don’t feel any anger because it was a necessary move to end the war early. I found this explanation to be convincing. Without the United States’ support we would not have recovered this quickly after the devastating defeat.

As the above comments demonstrate, young Japanese today feel appreciation towards the United States for its involvement in postwar Japan. As much as a sense of atomic victimhood is highly salient in Japanese society, so is the US led postwar narrative about its contribution toward helping Japan get back on its feet. I investigated further, asking respondents what kind of information sources shaped
their views regarding America’s strategic decision to drop the atomic bombs in order to prevent the loss of more lives.

Hiromi: I heard it from my history teacher in high school. To stop the Soviet invasion of Japan through Tsushima, the United States had no choice but to drop the atomic bombs. United States wanted to help Japan recover quickly after the occupation so that our country would not be occupied by the Russians. I believe the US wanted Japan to become its strong ally because the two Cold War superpowers were already eyeing each other with suspicion.

Kuniko: I had to do this research project for my junior high school history class. I read about that in one of the books in the library as well as the supplementary material that was distributed in class. The argument which convinced me most was that the dropping of the atomic bombs minimized the casualties from the war. As a result, there were fewer Japanese civilian deaths. Otherwise, if the US troops fought the war on Japanese land, there would have been many more Japanese civilian deaths. I feel sorry for the people of Hiroshima whose lives were sacrificed but as a result, total death toll was minimized.

7.10 Summary

In this section I have demonstrated that this thesis' survey data substantiates the assumption that a competitive victimhood mentality exists amongst the majority (70 percent) of Japanese participants. The survey data also reveals that a majority of Japanese automatically associate the Asia-Pacific War with the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Further, findings from the competitive victimhood scale showed that a majority believe that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima is ‘the most inhumane event in human history,’ and a ‘uniquely Japanese tragedy’ that should not be compared with other war atrocities. Consistent with these results, participants of the qualitative interviews also predominantly viewed the Pacific War as one in which Japan was the victim.

This section also examined the process by which Japanese victim mentality is constructed via exposure to various societal channels. Findings revealed that the top three sources shaping participants’ understanding of the war were: 1) textbooks/school education; 2) television programmes (dramas, documentaries,
information programmes); and 3) news programmes. This research reveals that the process is more complex, and involves a variety of cultural channels. Although the survey data showed that textbooks and school education are the dominant sources for learning about Japanese war history, the interviews revealed that the narratives of civilian suffering disseminated through popular cultural channels such as television, books, and films have also been influential in promoting the salience of victimhood in Japanese mentality.

7.11 In-group Identification

Nationalism or Patriotism?

This section seeks to understand another identity-related predictor of collective responsibility, in-group identification. In-group identification has been studied as an important antecedent of collective guilt and responsibility, prejudice and competitive victimhood. However, past studies have revealed a paradoxical element to the relationship between in-group identification and individual responses to moral transgressions within the group. One strand of research (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears & Manstead, 2006) has demonstrated that, since collective guilt is a group-based emotion, salient self-categorisation with the perpetrator group could generate high levels of collective guilt. Conversely, other studies (Doosje et al., 1998) have demonstrated that high national-identifiers are prone to feel less collective guilt because they are driven to defend their group’s esteem. Therefore, high-identifiers may deny or reject the notion that their group has committed immoral acts in the past. In-group identification in the context of moral challenges is a nuanced phenomenon and is the kind of topic that will benefit from a close examination of contextual information obtained from qualitative interviews.

Social identity theory posits that the degree to which an individual identifies with the collective—whether it be an ethnic, religious group or a nation—can become a source of individual pride and self-esteem. In this study, I hypothesize that individuals who identify strongly with the nation are likely to ‘forget’ or ‘justify’ its past transgressions and feel less guilt and responsibility. Using the collective self-
esteem scale developed by Luhtanen & Crocker (1992) I assessed the extent to which Japanese participants identify with the nation and how much of their esteem hinges on the positive identity of Japan. If a high level of national identification is likely to reduce an individual’s willingness to feel remorse for the nation’s wrongful past (Doosje et al., 2004), it is important to determine what triggers these attitudes. The regression analysis revealed that Japanese national identification predicted lower feelings of collective guilt. To further understand the nature of Japanese in-group identification, I adapted Karasawa’s nationalism scale (2002) to investigate whether the mode of Japanese attachment to the nation is closer to patriotism or right-wing glorification of the nation.

As I described in Chapter 4, post-war Japan has sought to discard the negative identity of wartime imperialist aggressor and shift to a new, twofold national identity as the victim of the atomic bomb and peacemaker. Within the context of Japan’s shifting national identity, the qualitative results of the CR_{low} participants with high levels of in-group identification sheds light on how the high identifiers’ attachment to national identity impacts their reactions when faced with accusations about Japan’s past.

### 7.12 Collective Self-Esteem

As described in Chapter 5, Luhtanen and Crocker’s collective self-esteem scale (1992) was used to measure in-group identification. Participants were asked to rate, on a 7-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 7=strongly agree), their level of agreement to four categories and measures of self-esteem:

1) private collective self-esteem—how good one’s in-group is
2) public collective self-esteem—how one believes others evaluate their own in-group
3) importance of identity—how important one’s in-group is to one’s self-concept
4) membership esteem—how worthy a member of the group one is.

The measures produced a reliable scale (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .93 \), \( n=162 \)) with mean = 5.38 and SD = 1.20.
The descriptive data in Table 11 and Figure 6 reveal that a large majority of Japanese participants reported an extremely high degree of collective self-esteem. Findings showed that 85 percent are glad to be Japanese, 80 percent feel that Japan is respected in the world, 83 percent feel that the nation they belong to is an important reflection of who they are, 81 percent are proud to be Japanese, and 77 percent feel they are worthy citizens of the nation. Highly identified individuals define themselves in terms of the social group and perceive its membership as an important part of their sense of 'who they are.' The collective self-esteem findings reveal that a large percentage of Japanese participants identify strongly with the nation and feel that Japan’s image is important for their positive self-concept and self-worth.

7.13 Qualitative Responses: High Identifiers

In past studies, collective self-esteem has been found to influence how individuals respond when their in-group’s positive identity is threatened (Doosje et al., 2006; Branscombe 2004; Luhtanen & Crocker 1992). Consistent with these findings, interviewees who reported high in-group identification with Japan and collective Japanese self-esteem, reacted self-protectively to threats to their moral identity and showed less responsibility when confronted with accusations about the nation’s past misdeeds. The following comments are consistent with the qualitative analysis of the interviewees’ responses to moral identity threats. Interviewees who identified strongly with the nation expressed strong resistance to Chinese accusations and chose to defend Japan’s position.

Yumi: I don’t like the way China and Korea accuse us about the past. I wish they would calm down and try to approach this in a more civilised manner. After all, we have already taken necessary diplomatic actions to atone for the past.

Toshiyuki: I am disgusted with China’s belligerent claims. Japan has already done everything it can, and has apologised. War reparations were settled between the two countries. Under these circumstances, their sudden demands seem nothing more than spurious.
Yoko: I am extremely uncomfortable with China’s unilateral accusations. I think the government is using ‘the history issue’ as a political tool. I don’t understand why both China and Korea keep on fabricating the truth. If those at the top continue to inventing new truths to the people, I guess it is only natural that they would come to hate the Japanese.

The above comments suggest that individuals who identify highly with their nation tend to accept the nationalist discourse in Japanese society that denies the 'so-called Nanjing Massacre' and believe it to be a fabrication. It should be noted that in-group identification emerged as a negative predictor of collective responsibility but also significantly correlated with negative out-group attitude ($r = .64$, $p < .01$) and competitive victimhood ($r = .67$, $p < .01$). As identification can also be manifested in the perception that the in-group is better and more worthy than other groups (Kosterman & Feshback 1989), high identification can lead to in-group favouritism and out-group bias. Similarly, high identifiers are likely to feel motivated to defend their group’s esteem in the face of accusations about their immoral past by engaging in competitive victimhood.
Table 11: Collective Self-Esteem Scale

Cronbach’s α = .93  Mean = 5.38, SD = 1.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/Somewhat agree (%)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/Disagree/Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
<th>Mean/Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am glad to be a Japanese. (private)</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>M=5.70 SD=1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Japan is a country highly regarded by people around the world. (public)</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>M=5.30 SD=1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The nation I belong to is an important reflection of who I am. (identity)</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>M=5.42 SD=1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am proud to be a Japanese. (private)</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>M=5.46 SD=1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am a contributing/worthy citizen of Japan. (membership)</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>M=5.35 SD=1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scale scores denote greater collective self-esteem.

Figure 6: Japanese Collective Self-Esteem
7.14 Nationalism

A number of Japanese scholars have raised concerns over the increasing numbers of youth endorsing Prime Ministerial visits to the controversial Yasukuni Shrine, and the upsurge in racist comments exchanged on the Internet (Takahara, 2006; Honda, 2007). These scholars have warned that the Japanese, and in particular Japanese youth, are shifting rightward and becoming increasingly nationalistic. Opinion polls, however, have revealed that patriotism is decreasing amongst young Japanese. Nationalism and patriotism is a controversial issue that has been a subject of active social debate. In this study, an attempt was made to understand the nature of national identification amongst the surveyed sample to assess whether the nationalism exhibited by the Japanese is closer to patriotism or to a glorified nationalism. Japanese nationalism was assessed with an adapted measure based on Karasawa (2002) and Kosterman-Feshbach’s (1989) nationalism-patriotism scale.

Kosterman and Feshbach (1989) defined ‘nationalism’ as a view that one’s nation is superior and should be dominant and differentiated from ‘patriotism’, which was defined as a feeling of attachment to one’s nation. To a subscale item measuring patriotism towards one’s country, “I love this country Japan,” an overwhelming majority of 94 percent agreed with this statement. The percentage of participants who agreed was also high (86 percent) for a subscale for nationalism which implied Japan’s national superiority, “In view of Japanese economic superiority, it is only right that we should have a bigger say in the United Nations.” For another nationalism subscale question, “The remarkable growth of Japan after the war is mainly due to the excellence of the people,” a lower majority of 60 percent agreed. To a cruder statement of nationalism, “Japan is the best country in the world,” only 50 percent agreed. These findings indicate that although an overwhelming majority of participants feel attached to and patriotic towards Japan, glorification of the nation remains discomfiting. There is demonstrable unease, too: 50 percent of participants did not agree to items 3 and 5 of the scale, which represented blind nationalism and Japanese racial superiority. However, for the other two scales representing national superiority, participants reported moderately high scores.
7.14.1 Qualitative responses: Nationalism vs. Patriotism

In the qualitative interviews, all but one of the CR_{Low} respondents (14) showed strong patriotic attachment to their nation and answered that if they were to be born again, they would choose to be born Japanese. By way of explanation, participants cited various positive traits and qualities that they find appealing about Japan.

Seijiro: I like Japan simply because it is my country. I feel a sense of security and safety living in Japan. There is really nothing to complain about. Japanese people are always polite and courteous, they are responsible and have high moral values. We place importance on cleanliness and we are resilient in face of crises as was demonstrated in the 3.11 Tohoku earthquakes.

Yuji: I like Japan because it is so safe and everything is so convenient. You can walk along the streets at night without having to worry about getting mugged. Japan is one of the safest nations in the world. There are not many countries like that.

Tatsuya: I love Japan. It is clean, safe and so convenient. I would rather be born Japanese than any other country. We are peaceful and respect ‘wa’ [harmony] in this country. That’s why the crime rate is very low and we can walk along the streets at night feeling completely safe. But the main reason is because it is stable, comfortable, the food is great and the overall quality of products and services is excellent compared to other countries, so I heard. I am also proud that Japan rose from the ashes as a major economic power after the defeat of the war.
Table 12: Nationalism Scale

Cronbach’s $\alpha = .82$  Mean = 4.86, SD = 1.34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/Somewhat agree (%)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/Disagree/Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
<th>Mean/Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I love this country of Japan. (PAT1)</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>M=6.07, SD=1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In view of Japanese economic superiority, it is only right that we should have a bigger say in the United Nations. (NAT1)</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>M=5.46, SD=1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Japanese people are among the finest in the world. (NAT2)</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>M=4.16, SD=1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The remarkable growth of Japan after the war is mainly due to the excellence of the people. (NAT3)</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>M=4.43, SD=1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Japan is the best country in the world. (NAT4)</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>M=4.21, SD=1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scale scores denote greater degree of nationalism. PAT=item to measure patriotism, NAT=item to measure nationalism.

Figure 7: Japanese Nationalism
All the interviewees in the qualitative strand of the research (100 percent) answered that they were proud to be Japanese. Five of the interviewees cited Japan’s economic superiority as a principal reason for their national pride, and offered China’s rise as an economic and military power as a source of anxiety. However, it should be noted that despite the realistic threats they feel from China’s expansion, the majority of the high-identifiers interviewed were not wholly in support of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s recent efforts to revise the constitution and expand Japan’s military role abroad.

Yumi: When I first saw the leaked video [from the Japanese coast guard] of a Chinese ship colliding with a Japanese coast guard vessel, I felt seriously alarmed. We have been too complacent with peace [heiwa boke]. I am proud that Japan has risen from the ashes of the war and became one of the biggest economic powers of the world. I also love the pacifist values that we uphold. However, the Senkaku Island dispute made me realize that we cannot just remain passive. I hope the government will seriously consider how we should respond to China’s threats. However, I do not agree with Prime Minister Abe or the other nationalist leaders’ belief that we are taught ‘masochistic’ history in school and are inhibited from feeling proud of Japan. I also don’t support his agenda to revise the Japanese Constitution and enable Japan to militarise. We should avoid war at all costs.

The survey results in Table 13 (Support for Prime Minister Abe’s Security Policies) also show that participants’ attachment to the nation is not a driver for any extreme reactions which might endorse Japanese leaders’ nationalistic moves to revise the post-war constitution. Prime Minister Abe’s plans to amend the constitution are increasingly divisive for Japan and have sparked demonstrations from both supporters and opponents alike. International opposition is especially vocal from China and Korea, who view the change in Article 9 of the constitution as Japan’s return to its militarist past and cause for concern for the security of the Asian region. As the findings in Table 13 reveal, although scoring high on the nationalism scale, a strong majority of participants are still opposed to revising the constitution, strengthening the self-defence forces or engaging in any kind of military conflict with China.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/ Somewhat agree (%)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Disagree/ Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We should revise the Japanese Constitution in the face of future security threats.</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Japan should bolster its self-defense force in the face of future security threats in Asia.</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whatever happens we must avoid war with China.</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scale scores denote greater degree of support for government’s security policies.

7.15 Summary

This section sought to gain a better understanding of Japanese participants’ in-group identification and the nature of Japanese nationalism. This study revealed that Japanese participants’ in-group identification was one of the key predictors reducing their willingness to accept collective responsibility. Both the regression analysis and qualitative interviews in Chapters 6 and 7 revealed that high-identifiers felt diminished remorse and tended to defend the moral status of their in-group by rationalising China’s accusations as a politically orchestrated tactic and therefore disingenuous in nature. Another common defensive reaction of high-identifiers was ‘identity discontinuity’ (Augoustinos & Le Couteur, 2004). These interviewees strongly identified with and found pride in a modern, peaceful Japan that emerged as a major economic power, but distanced themselves from the perpetrator group that committed atrocities in China.

This study attempted to measure Japanese nationalism using Karasawa’s (2002) and Kosterman & Feshbach’s nationalism-patriotism scales, which differentiated between patriotic attachment and glorification (overall mean = 4.86, SD = 1.34). While 93 percent of participants in my study reported patriotism, participants also scored moderately high on nationalism subscales. However, half of the participants were
reluctant to agree with statements that crudely glorified the racial superiority of the Japanese.

The findings revealed that an extremely high percentage of Japanese participants’ self-esteem is associated with the positive conception of the nation. That attachment, however, cannot be simply categorised as right-wing nationalism. These participants seem to be deeply in love with their country but are at the same time rational enough to oppose its leader’s nationalistic agenda.
CHAPTER 8

8. Findings: Knowledge, Prejudice, and Contact

8.1 Awareness of In-group Transgressions

“Forgetfulness, and I would even say historical error, are essential in the creation of a nation. …Yet the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that they have forgotten many things.”
Ernest Renan (1822)

After 'Moral identity threat,' the second strongest predictor of collective responsibility identified in the hierarchical regression analysis was ‘Awareness of in-group transgressions,’ or the extent to which participants were knowledgeable about the atrocities committed by Japan against China and its other Asian neighbours during the Second World War. There is consensus among scholars of protracted conflicts that groups deliberately forget uncomfortable knowledge of their past. This practice is defined by some as ‘chosen amnesia,’ a mode of forgetting by which a society deliberately excludes unwanted or unsavoury aspects of their national past (Buckley-Zistel 2006, 133-4 in MacDonald). Nations and groups have histories that are remembered through cultural narratives, rituals and memorials. Collective “forgetting” is likely to occur if the group does not want to be reminded of the shameful history of wrongs committed (Branscombe & Miron, 2004). If historical narratives of wartime atrocity are not salient in society, then it is difficult for individuals to feel any remorse or responsibility for that past. In the previous chapter, I demonstrated that the Japanese collective remembrance of the Asia-Pacific war primarily focused on its history of victimization and selectively downplayed its history of aggression. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that regression analysis revealed that those with little knowledge of the harms committed in China felt less guilt and responsibility for Japan’s past transgressions.
This section aims to understand the degree to which ‘historical amnesia’ is prevalent amongst the Japanese people. To begin, however, it is important to ask whether ‘historical amnesia’ can be diagnosed as a complete loss of memory, or more accurately partial or selective amnesia? To answer this question there is a need to assess the extent to which the Japanese are aware of the history of their nation’s atrocities and the sufferings inflicted on China and other Asian neighbours during the war, and to consider how this catalogue of transgressions is expressed in national historical narratives. To begin, this section introduces the survey results to provide a snapshot of Japanese knowledge and awareness of the history of the Nanjing Massacre. This will be followed by qualitative data revealing the processes by which respondents came to learn (or not learn) about Japan’s wartime transgressions. This research is particularly interested in discovering respondents’ sources of information about the war and whether these were influential in shaping their views about national history and responsibility for suffering inflicted by the Japanese army on the peoples of China and Korea.

8.1.1 Historical awareness of the Nanjing Massacre

Participants were asked to indicate to what extent they were aware of the history of the Nanjing Massacre and other wartime atrocities committed by the Japanese Imperial Army. A majority of 60 percent answered that they were somewhat aware of the incident while a combined 32 percent were unaware of the historical circumstances. The survey results highlight fundamental gaps in the participants’ awareness of Japanese military’s transgressions during the Second World War, with the majority simply answering that they are ‘somewhat aware.’ This indicates only minimal levels of consciousness and at least some desire to forget or gloss over what is known. It does indicate, however, that most Japanese have some awareness of Japanese complicity in and responsibility for wartime atrocity.
8.2 Qualitative Responses: Historical Awareness of Japan's Transgressions

The following comments from the qualitative interviews demonstrate what CR_{Low} respondents meant when they answered 'somewhat aware' in the survey. Both Satoko and Tatsuya, like many who admitted they are ‘somewhat aware,’ explained that the Nanjing Massacre was briefly mentioned in history classes but not in any depth and quickly glossed over by the teacher.

Satoko: I really don’t know much about the history of what the Japanese soldiers did in Nanjing. I did learn about it briefly in junior high and high school through history textbooks. The number of deaths from this incident that the Chinese claim is far greater than what we think it is. In class, the teacher quickly breezed through it and refrained from explaining anything in depth. He just said such an incident happened. So I do accept that horrible war crimes were committed but I still think China’s demand for apology is a political tactic.

Tatsuya: I answered ‘somewhat aware.’ I first learned about the Nanjing incident in my history class in junior high and high school. The teacher at that time added that it is doubtful that the so-called “Nanjing Massacre” actually happened. In all my history classes, the teacher only briefly mentioned that
such an incident occurred and never discussed the matter in depth. So, to this
day, I don’t really know much about what actually happened.

It should be noted that a major difference that emerged between the two samples
with high and low collective responsibility was in the degree of awareness and
knowledge about the historical injustices that were committed by their in-group
during the war. Several of the CR_{High} respondents described their awakening
experience when they visited a war museum in Nagasaki, a city that suffered from
the American atomic bombing in 1945. Already at an early age, both Hayato and
Haruko were exposed to the history about the Nanjing Massacre from the
information introduced in the war museum.

Hayato: I learned about the atrocities committed by the Japanese army at an
early age....I was in fifth or sixth grade. There is a war museum in Nagasaki
that introduces not only about Japanese victimization but also the history of
the Nanjing Massacre, Unit 731 and the comfort women. I saw these vivid
photographic panels that described what the Japanese did when we colonized
our Asian neighbours. I think it is such an important museum but
unfortunately, it gets never introduced in official tour guide books or to
visitors.

In the quantitative survey, respondents were asked to select the top three information
sources from which they learned about the Nanjing Massacre. The results revealed
that 84 percent learned about the massacre through history textbooks at school,
followed by 31 percent who learned about it through Japanese news programmes and
25 percent who cited television programmes (including information programmes,
dramas and documentaries). These results show clearly that school textbooks are the
primary source of information about Japanese war history.
8.2.1 Qualitative responses: How I learned about the Nanjing Massacre

In the follow-up interviews, almost all the CRLow respondents claimed that they first learned about the Nanjing Massacre through history textbooks but admitted that their knowledge was extremely sparse. Participants were further asked to describe how the Nanjing Massacre was introduced in the textbooks and what their reactions were when exposed to information about it. Interviewees explained that because the Japanese education system focuses on the rote learning of a massive number of historical dates in preparation for high school or university entrance exams there is little time to delve into controversial historical incidents like the Nanjing Massacre. The respondents also indicated that references to the Nanjing Massacre in the history textbooks were extremely brief and hardly noticeable, a single one-line footnote stating that ‘a massacre took place when Japanese armies invaded Nanjing.’ The ambiguity of this statement should be noted: the use of the passive voice means that no perpetrator is identified.

Jiro: For your information, the Genpei War between the Genji and Heike clans is described in much more detail in history textbooks than the Nanjing Massacre. It only appears inside a tiny box at the bottom of the page as a
footnote. That made me think that this piece of information is not that important for us to learn in history. I first read about it when I was in sixth grade but I felt nothing. I remember the incident was introduced together with a photo of a soldier on a horse and there was one line that said, “the surrender of Nanjing.” I have no doubt that the massacre must have happened but nobody really knows how many were actually killed. In wars things like that happen. It is all part of a war. Also, I recall the reference on Nanjing was written like it was some kind of a heroic act.

Tatsuya: The Nanjing Massacre was only mentioned briefly at the bottom of a page of my history textbook as a footnote. Even in the supplementary material, it was a short account and the only thing I can remember is the photo of the soldier on a horse. At school, we spent much more time studying older Japanese history because it appears in the entrance exams. That was more important for us.

Toshio: The Nanjing Massacre was mentioned as a footnote in my textbook. There was no explanation of what kind of conflict it was. Although we learned about it through history textbooks, I cannot say it is a good source. And the teacher avoided discussing the topic in depth because he needs to cover a lot of history in such a short time.

The following comments by CR_{Low} respondents show that, following the recent territorial dispute between China and Japan and the increase in media coverage of the history issue, uninformed members of the younger generation have taken to the Internet in an effort to learn more about Japan’s past. With cyberspace flooded with Japanese revisionist accounts of war history denying that the massacre took place, there is a possibility that any ignorance is as likely to be compounded by dominant nationalist war narratives which aim to expunge Japanese responsibility for suffering inflicted upon others.

Toshiyuki: Most Japanese students who took history in school must have heard about the Nanjing Massacre in class or have read about it briefly in history textbooks. So I am not surprised why many would say they have ‘some knowledge’ but are not sure of the details. I first learnt about it in the textbook but I later did my own research using the Internet.

Researcher: Why did you decide to do a search on the Internet?

Toshiyuki: I learned on the news that Japan was being virulently attacked by the Chinese about the Nanjing Massacre. I was perplexed by their emotional behaviour. So I became interested to find out more about this incident. What I read on the Internet were explanations that represented the pro-Japanese
perspective defending Japan’s position so I cannot say it was entirely objective.

Yuji: I heard about the Nanjing Massacre for the first time after I entered college. It was featured on a television news programme. This triggered my interest and I wanted to know more about it so I decided to do my own research. I also took a course on post-war Japanese history in my university. I went through several books on what happened in China during the war. My conclusion after having studied the incident is that nobody really knows the truth. The university professor who studied this history in depth told us that “the incident probably did take place, but China is exaggerating the number of deaths.” I sort of believe that must have been the case.

Although the survey indicated that the primary source of information on Japan’s history of military actions is school textbooks, the following comments highlight the integral role teachers play in shaping Japanese people’s interpretation of history. Teachers may opt to spend only minimal amounts of time on Second World War history—thereby implicitly reinforcing a denialist interpretation—or they may choose to go beyond the textbook, attending to contending accounts of the massacre, the various explanations for it, and its consequences. The following cases show the ways in which two teachers viewed the material through contrasting ideological lenses:

Toshio: I cannot say I am knowledgeable about the history of Nanjing but I did learn about it in junior high and high school history classes. Yes, I am aware that these incidents happened. But I still find it annoying that the Chinese are so persistent in their criticism that we’re not apologetic enough. In our history classes, we only briefly went over the history of the so-called Nanjing Incident and never really discussed it in depth. The same thing can be said about the comfort women. I didn’t know about the ongoing debate until I learned about it through the television news. I do remember that our history teacher mentioned in class that it is doubtful that a systematic massacre called Nanjing Massacre, as the Chinese describe it, actually happened.

Ryutaro: I first learned about the Nanjing Massacre through textbooks that were used for exam preparation at the cram school. The teacher at my cram school was quite passionate about this topic and discussed this in depth. He said that the number of deaths may be still debatable but some scholars say that there were more Chinese deaths than from the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. If that is true, then that is a shocking truth. We committed a horrible crime.
Hiromi: In our class [university], the professor made us watch a documentary film about what the Japanese army did in the Philippines during the war. I was utterly shocked. It was just horrifying. I have to admit that it is indeed a shameful past...a sad page in Japanese history. War comes with tragedies but we should reflect on the past and make sure this kind of mistake is never repeated again.

I probed those respondents who revealed that they had conducted their own investigations into the Nanjing Massacre. I was particularly interested in understanding how they felt when they were made aware of the full scope of the incident. All three respondents wanted to distance themselves from the event and despite their increased awareness they blocked or had no particularly empathetic feelings for the victims. When seen through the lens of social identity theory, these participants’ responses could be taken as a defensive reaction aimed at protecting their in-group’s positive moral status.

Tatsuya: I cannot feel any remorse because they’re debating about numbers of deaths. It is a historical event that happened in the distant past. If you told me that 8000 people were killed in Tokyo today, that would really shake me up. But if you told me 8000 people were killed 100 years ago in China, that doesn’t really grab my attention. To me, the Nanjing Massacre is like that—an incident that happened in the distant past.

Jiro: Nanjing Massacre is an incident of the past. It is like hearing, “Toyotomi Hideyoshi [Shogun] invaded Korea and killed thousands of Koreans.” It is just another historical fact. The Imperial Army of the Pacific War and Shogun Hideyoshi’s army are the same in my mind. It is all part of history, something that happened in the distant past.

Ryutaro: It has nothing to do with me personally. But if you showed me details of how Chinese women and children were actually raped and killed, I would feel very sorry. I would feel sympathy towards the victims. But I cannot associate today’s bellicose Chinese with the poor victims.

8.3 Was the Asia-Pacific War a War of Aggression?

Another question that was asked in the survey was whether respondents thought that the Asia-Pacific War (1931-45) was a war of aggression or not. This is an issue that sits at the heart of Chinese and Korean criticisms against Japan’s ‘historical amnesia’—i.e. whether Japan admits that the war from 1931-45 was a war of
aggression or not. Nearly 70 percent of respondents agreed that the last war was a war of Japanese aggression. These responses support the survey’s findings that majority of the Japanese interviewed do know that Japan engaged in aggressive acts during the war, but that they wish to deal with this knowledge at an abstract and general rather than specific and concrete level.

**Figure 10: Was the Asia-Pacific War a War of Aggression?**

![Bar Chart](image)

**Q: Do you think that the Asia-Pacific War was a war of aggression?**

- **Yes**: 80%
- **No**: 10%
- **I don't know**: 0%

### 8.4 Qualitative Responses: War of Aggression?

Similarly, in the qualitative interviews, all twenty-five interviewees acknowledged that the Asia-Pacific War was a war of aggression. Particularly for those respondents who expressed low collective responsibility, this acknowledgement resulted in neither expressions of sympathy for the victims nor feelings of guilt. Japan’s victimhood trope seemed to inhibit interviewees from feeling any remorse for Chinese victims as they felt that ‘everyone suffered in the war.’

Satoko: Yes, I think it was a war of aggression. I am not too knowledgeable about this history but I believe we were taught that Japan occupied other countries in Asia. But that didn’t really make me feel sorry because in a similar sense, Americans also wrought horrifying damages and sufferings to the Japanese during the war. I felt they were similar incidents in history…it is all part of war. All countries experienced equally dark tragedies.
Toshiyuki: Yes, I learned from history textbooks that Japan did invade China. But we suffered from the atomic bombs, too. Do we still bombard America with criticisms for dropping the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki? No! We moved on, letting bygones be bygones. We lost the war but we were positive in our attitude and focused our energies on preventing the same tragedy from happening again. China, on the other hand, is still living in the past.

8.5 Summary

Historical memories are embedded in people’s minds through different kinds of educational, social and political sources. The findings of the survey indicated that the current generation of young Japanese is not entirely ignorant about the specifics of the war, with 60 percent claiming that they are ‘somewhat’ aware of the war atrocities committed in Nanjing and a combined 32 percent (‘not aware at all’ and ‘not really aware’) unsure of what happened. My qualitative interviews shed light on some of the ways in which Japan’s historical transgressions are downplayed in the Japanese education system.

As for the Japanese participants’ perception of the last war (1931-45), a strong majority of 70 percent agreed that it was a war of aggression. However, the interviews show that while students know that Japan invaded Asia, war narratives in textbooks and other media still emphasize the suffering inflicted on the people of Japan. In qualitative interviews CR$_{Low}$ respondents reinforced the forgetfulness of atrocity by arguing for Japan’s suffering and victimisation to be given as much weight as the suffering of others.
8.6 Negative Out-group Attitude

Prejudice and stereotyping are inextricably linked. Both phenomena involve a preconceived negative evaluation of a group and its members. Prejudice is, an antipathy based upon faulty and inflexible generalizations (Allport, 1954, 9) and can become a determinant of inter-group conflicts. Past research has demonstrated that negative out-group attitudes can also be a significant predictor of diminished collective guilt and responsibility (Hewstone et al., 2004). The hierarchical regression analysis presented in my study supported this finding by showing that Japanese prejudice towards the Chinese was the third strongest negative predictor of collective responsibility acceptance. Consistent with recent poll results conducted by various institutes, my survey results also showed that a large percentage of Japanese harbour negative attitudes towards the Chinese. As prejudice is a critical factor in the protraction of conflict and hinders efforts at reconciliation, it is crucial to explore the socio-political dynamics that generate this increasing antipathy towards the Chinese. Japanese prejudice towards China and the Chinese reflects some deeply held national stereotypes. The present study will draw on Stephan et al.’s integrated threat theory to explore the extent to which the prejudice of Japanese participants is driven by negative stereotypes, symbolic threats, inter-group anxiety and realistic threats. The aim is to understand the drivers of negative out-group attitudes which reduce Japanese willingness to accept responsibility for past injustice. The qualitative data is based on interviews conducted with survey participants who reported low levels of collective responsibility and high levels of prejudice towards the Chinese.

8.6.1 Descriptive Data: Perception of the out-group

Participants were asked to indicate their image/perception of the Chinese on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (favourable) to 5 (unfavourable). Higher scores denote greater negative perception of the out-group. Findings showed that 77 percent of the Japanese participants had ‘unfavourable’ views of the Chinese.
8.6.2 Qualitative responses: China vs. Chinese

Although the survey questions specifically asked respondents to think about the Chinese, I reconfirmed in the qualitative interviews that their impressions were driven in the main by their feelings towards China as a state, as opposed to the Chinese as a people. Qualitative interviews revealed a difference in perception: participants’ views on China as a state or system were distinct from their views on its people. Namie’s statement reveals that her image of the Chinese is more positive than that of the state. The majority of my interviewees shared this perspective.

Namie: The Chinese in mainland China seem to be violent, unruly and out of control. So my image of China is quite negative. However, the Chinese people I am acquainted with are actually quite friendly and cheerful.

Researcher: If you were to choose a colour/shade in the range of black-grey-white to describe your perception of the Chinese people, what would that be?
Namie: Black for my overall image of China, grey for the Chinese people in China, and whitish grey for Chinese individuals I have met here in Japan.

8.7 Prejudice

Past research based on integrated threat theory (Stephan & Stephan 1996; Stephan et al., 1999) has investigated the underlying sources and predictors of prejudice and identified four key variables—realistic threats, symbolic threats, inter-group anxiety, and negative stereotypes. Integrated threat theory posits that ‘realistic threats’ or threats to the very existence of the group, ‘symbolic threats’ or threats that challenge the worldview and traditional values of the group, ‘inter-group anxiety’ or feelings of threat that arise out of concern about negative outcomes from interactions with the out-group and ‘negative stereotyping’ all contribute to significantly heightened prejudice towards the ‘Other.’

A modified out-group attitude scale based on integrated threat theory was employed to measure the participants’ level of prejudice towards the Chinese. Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with different evaluative and emotional reactions towards the Chinese on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A recognized way of operationalising prejudice is to identify items that typify stereotypes found amongst the out-group (Madon et al., 2001). Negative stereotyping was measured by assessing to what extent the Chinese were perceived to possess such negative traits as ‘un-trustworthy (reverse-scored),’ ‘aggressive,’ ‘self-centred’ and ‘un-friendly (reverse-scored).’ Symbolic threats were assessed with the item ‘the Chinese don’t follow rules’, which poses a challenge to Japanese moral values that place importance on ‘conformity to law and order.’ Past studies have demonstrated that when these negative traits are attributed to an out-group, in-group members are likely to have negative expectations concerning their interaction with out-group members, leading them to fear negative outcomes in the course of inter-group interaction. This fear may then lead them to hold negative attitudes towards the out-group (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). Findings have demonstrated that a high level of negative
stereotyping can increase the perception of threat from out-groups and a as well as the likelihood of prejudice. Lastly, an item related to ‘China’s military threat’ was included to measure participants’ attitudes towards realistic threats posed by China. Realistic threats were also evaluated using a separate measure which will be later analysed in depth.

Findings showed that on average 50 percent of the participants (M = 3.16, SD = 1.12) associated negative traits with the Chinese. At 56 percent, more than half felt that the Chinese cannot be trusted, 46 percent found the Chinese to be aggressive, 49 percent felt that the Chinese do not conform to rules, 50 percent found them to be self-centred and 66 percent did not find them to be friendly. In sum, the descriptive data suggests that negative stereotyping is salient amongst the Japanese, resulting in moderately high levels of prejudice towards the Chinese. The following sections will explore the underlying sources that may be contributing to different threat perceptions.

Figure 12: Negative Out-group Attitude, Prejudice

![Figure 12: Negative Out-group Attitude, Prejudice](image)

- **Aggressive**: 0.46 Agree, 0.4 Disagree, 0.14 Don't know
- **Friendly (reverse coded)**: 0.3 Agree, 0.66 Disagree, 0.04 Don't know
- **Can trust (reverse coded)**: 0.33 Agree, 0.56 Disagree, 0.1 Don't know
- **Don't follow rules**: 0.49 Agree, 0.37 Disagree, 0.14 Don't know
- **Self-centred**: 0.5 Agree, 0.35 Disagree, 0.15 Don't know
8.7.1 Realistic threats

Realistic threats are threats that are perceived to jeopardize the very existence of the group. To understand the extent to which the Japanese perceive China as a realistic threat, a scale was adapted based on Stephan et al.’s realistic threat model with 5 items representing China’s political, economic, military and health-related threats (See Table 14). Participants responded on a 7-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7). As the figures in Table 1 suggest, an extremely high percentage of Japanese feel anxious about China’s realistic threats (M = 5.57, SD = .90). However, when compared with ‘moral identity threat,’ ‘realistic threats’ showed weaker correlation with ‘negative out-group attitude’ (r = .18, p < .05) and did not emerge as a significant predictor of collective guilt. It should be noted that participants’ relatively high scores for realistic threats may owe much to the heavy concentration of media coverage related to the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands dispute and the air pollution problem prior to the survey.

Table 14: Realistic Threats

Cronbach’s Alpha = .71, Mean 5.57, SD=.90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly agree/Agree/ Somewhat agree (%)</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree/ Disagree/ Somewhat disagree (%)</th>
<th>Mean/ Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel anxious when I see Chinese vessels entering Japanese territorial waters.</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>M=5.67 SD=1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. China establishing its ADIZ over Senkaku Islands is worrying.</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>M=5.56 SD=1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. China’s actions to secure energy resources seem selfish.</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>M=5.6 SD=1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. China’s military build-up is a threat to our security.</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>M=5.43 SD=1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. China’s pollution is affecting Japanese people’s health.</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>M=5.60 SD=1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Items are scored from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scale scores denote greater realistic threat. (N = 162)
8.7.2 Qualitative responses: Realistic threats

Past polling data has revealed that Japanese esteem of the Chinese declined around the time a Chinese fishing boat collided into a Japanese coast guard vessel in 2010, and in 2012, when the Senkaku-Diaoyu Islands dispute increased tension between the two countries. During this period, coverage of Chinese military threats increased in the Japanese media. The following interviewees’ comments reflect a widely-held view amongst the Japanese public that ‘China acts unilaterally in international affairs.’ The majority of respondents felt anxious about China’s aggressive and self-interested moves to claim natural resources in Asian territories in contravention of international norms and the interests of other countries.

Yumi: China unilaterally designated an air defense identification zone over the Senkaku Islands. Who does that in this day and age? They don’t play by international rules. China is trying to build security in Asia with China as the centre whereas Japan finds peace and security based on US-Japan and US-South Korea relations. I am not sure about the politics of all this, but Chinese behaviour to me looks unilateral and aggressive. For this reason, my image of China is black. I find the Chinese to be intimidating.

Kuniko: I was recently shocked by the news about China expanding its claim in the South China Sea and digging up undersea resources in the Philippines. They are so self-centred and greedy.

News about China’s toxic air pollution having a negative impact on Japanese health generated considerable media attention in Japan before the interviews were conducted. The interviewees felt that China’s hazardous air pollution affects the safety of people in neighbouring countries and is yet another example of China’s self-centredness and irresponsible behaviour.

Emiko: I have never been to China so my impression is purely shaped by what I see and hear in the media. I don’t have a good impression of China or the Chinese. It is worrying that their air pollution of over PM 2.5 is affecting the Japanese environment. I was appalled by the illegal copying of theme park characters. It was obvious to anybody’s eye that it was a knock-off of Disney’s characters but they were so blatantly unashamed as to present them as their original creations. In terms of cleanliness, I heard that Japanese business travellers are advised not to swallow water when taking a shower in China. It is definitely not a country I want to visit in the future.
The following comments mirror increasing apprehension amongst the Japanese public towards China’s continuous military assertiveness as the geopolitical power in the Asian region. The comments indicate that China’s military expansion and maritime border disputes are posing realistic threats and exacerbating Japanese anxieties. The high concentration of media coverage of the Senkaku Islands dispute has caused the participants’ perception of China to deteriorate rapidly. Fifteen interviewees mentioned that they found their aggressive behaviour to be ‘irrational’, ‘scary’ and ‘difficult to understand.’

Yuji: The news on the islands dispute really reinforced my negative image of China. I found their moves to occupy our islands to be ‘irrational.’ I just couldn’t understand their behaviour. Why can’t they settle this issue diplomatically?

Hiromi: When the world in general is making efforts to build peace, I find it very alarming and scary that China is expanding its military and posing a threat to its neighbouring countries, especially Japan. I find it difficult to understand. I find them to be scary.

Kuniko: China is a fast-growing economy but instead of investing in military expansion there are other things they should be spending their money on. The Cold War is over. I don’t understand what they are after….what is the point of strengthening its military power now? For what purpose? Based on what I see on the news, it seems like China is trying to compete with and become more powerful than its rival, Japan. I find that scary and difficult to understand.

Rieko: China is trying to compete with Japan militarily. Their move into Japanese territorial waters is a sign of their rivalry. If they want to compete so much, why not compete in terms of economic power or technology? That should be the posture of a mature, developed country. They are countering the world’s trend towards building peace and security.

As shown in Section 8.1, because Japanese participants have limited knowledge about Japan’s past misdeeds during the war, belligerent attacks by Chinese protestors on television (for example) appear perplexing and uncivilized.

Ryutaro: My impression of the Chinese is negative. I see them as a group of aggressive people unilateraly attacking us and flaring up anti-Japanese sentiments. I guess it comes from the television images of angry Chinese bashing Japanese cars and destroying Japanese shops in China. Their violent behaviour seems so irrational and uncivilised to me.
Yumi: I have an impression of the Chinese as forceful and high-handed. I don’t understand their logic. Their angry claims about Japan not facing up to the past are irrational and difficult for Japanese to understand or accept. I want to ask them to please calm down and try to talk about this in a cordial manner. I find the heavy-handed statements that the Chinese leaders make on television to be particularly shocking. It makes me wonder if they genuinely want to resolve this issue or not.

Shinji: My negative perception of the Chinese stems from the fact that I cannot understand or trust them. Why does the country go out of its way to purposefully generate hatred towards the Japanese? I understand that their anti-Japanese sentiments are rooted in what happened during the war. But I cannot agree with the Chinese government’s move to constantly play the 'victim of the tragedy' card. They play dirty. Of course, Japan should reflect on its wrongdoing in the past but I thought this issue was resolved based on a bilateral agreement signed by two countries. It is a settled issue. We need to focus more on creating a better relationship for the future. Hatred is not going to produce any beneficial results.

8.7.3 Symbolic threats

Japanese negative attitudes towards the Chinese are shaped by the interplay of various complex factors. Drawing on Stephan et al.’s integrated threat theory, another possible factor that may be contributing to increasing Japanese antipathy towards the Chinese is ‘symbolic threats’, threats posed by perceived differences in cultural values and beliefs (Stephan et al., 2002). As Japanese cultural values tend to attach considerable importance to qualities such as ‘harmony,’ ‘conformity’ and ‘adherence to law and order,’ media portrayals of rude and uncivilised Chinese behaviour, coupled with negative contacts with Chinese, led many interviewees to experience aversive emotions towards them. ‘They don’t play by fair rules’ was a common observation voiced by the interviewees. Examples included China’s counterfeit culture, Chinese lack of social moral behaviour, and a lack of good public manners.

Seijiro: My impression of China is based on what I hear on the television news or read on SNS [social network]. I don’t have any good images of the country. It is still underdeveloped, dirty and environmentally backward. Chinese people don’t play by fair rules; they copy and steal ideas and sell a lot of counterfeits. I don’t have any friends who are Chinese so a lot of my perception is shaped by what I see on television and the Internet.
Yuji: I studied in England last year for one year and met many Chinese exchange students there. My overall impression is that they are self-centred and unwilling to conform to rules. They do their own thing and did not try to accommodate other people’s needs especially when we tried to organize group activities amongst the international students.

Even in Tokyo, I see a lot of Chinese tourists walking on the streets and they are so noisy. Also, they never wait in line. Why do the Chinese always cut in line? This is unthinkable. They are rude, with no manners or consideration for others.

Rieko: When I went to Chinatown in Yokohama, I was stunned by how pushy and greedy the Chinese merchants were. That image was further reinforced when I saw the Chinese political leaders’ belligerent statements criticizing Japan on television.

8.8 Qualitative Responses: Why China Cannot be Trusted

One of the anxieties expressed was about China’s dishonesty. Recent scandals involving the recall of Chinese food products were widely publicized in Japanese news programmes. Interviewees’ comments reveal that these scandals generated a strong perception that the Chinese cannot be trusted. Awareness of unreliable Chinese products was found to be extremely high amongst the Japanese. According to the Pew Research Center’s survey conducted in 2008, a near-unanimous 96 percent of the Japanese said that they were aware of the recalls of food products and other goods manufactured in China. The news about tainted and toxic food being supplied to the Japanese market came as a shock to the Japanese, who value integrity and conformity to rules and regulations.

Satoko: My perception of the Chinese people became negative after hearing the news about frozen dumplings made in China containing a high concentration of toxic herbicides. And they were sold to Japan! I don’t personally know any Chinese people but because Chinese products cannot be trusted, my general impression is that the Chinese are untrustworthy as well.

Hiromi: I find the Chinese to be irresponsible and dishonest. Recently, on the television news, I heard about the McDonald’s chicken nugget scandal in which tainted meat was supplied by a Chinese company to McDonald’s. The Chinese supplier was completely irresponsible and failed to manage the quality of food products. I find it absolutely appalling that rotten meat was supplied to make chicken nuggets that we eat. I was shocked by how these
Chinese companies are self-serving, with no concern for customers’ health and well-being.

8.9 Sources of Information About the Out-group

Information provided by societal channels and institutions exert considerable influence in shaping stereotypes about out-groups (Bar-Tal, 1997, 505). In order to understand which sources are influential in forming Japanese negative attitudes towards the Chinese, participants were asked to choose the top three sources of information they rely on for their knowledge of China and the Chinese people. The results were largely consistent with Genron NPO’s survey results (2014), in which 95 percent of the respondents cited Japanese news media as the primary source of information, followed by 25.2 percent who chose Japanese television programmes as the second largest source of information on China.

Figure 13: Sources of Information about the Out-group
8.9.1 Do you trust Japanese media coverage on China?

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they trusted the information on China that was released in the Japanese media. Close to 50 percent of the Japanese believe that domestic media provide trustworthy coverage of China and the Chinese while 28 percent answered that they do not trust the objectivity of coverage of China in the Japanese media.

Figure 14: Credibility of Domestic Media Coverage on China

8.10 Summary

For this study, a number of approaches were used to examine the sources underlying Japanese negative attitudes toward the Chinese. As the earlier regression analyses revealed, negative out-group attitude is an important predictor of diminished collective guilt. A straightforward question in the survey asked whether the respondents had a favourable or an unfavourable impression of the Chinese and a strong majority of 77 percent answered that their perception was unfavourable.
As prejudice is an attitude that participants normally wish to hide, various implicit measures were employed to assess the extent to which prejudice is consciously or unconsciously salient among the participants. The Negative out-group attitude scale attempted to measure participants’ responses to negative stereotype traits frequently attached to the Chinese (trustworthy [reverse coded], aggressive, self-centred), and symbolic threat (won’t follow rules). Results showed that about 50 percent of the respondents associated these negative stereotype traits with the Chinese (M = 3.16, SD = 1.12).

Of particular relevance to this research is the salience of identity-related factors in driving both prejudice and the lessening of collective responsibility. This study’s findings showed that, as societal channels work to suppress Japanese people’s war memory, the threat to Japanese moral identity from China’s accusations about Japan’s past injustices significantly heightens negative emotions toward the Chinese, diminishing feelings of remorse and guilt for the past and hindering possibilities for reconciliation.

8.11 Intergroup Contact

Ignorance about the out-group is known to engender negative stereotyping and prejudice. Past scholarship on intergroup contact has shown that quality contact with the out-group can provide individuals with enhanced knowledge about the other, help them take the perspective of the out-group, reduce their feelings of anxiety, and combat prejudice. Intergroup contact therefore has played an important mediating role in reducing intergroup anxiety and prejudice. The intergroup contact hypothesis first proposed by Allport (1954), suggests that positive effects of intergroup contact are generated when contact occurs under four key conditions: equal status, intergroup cooperation, common goals, and support by social and institutional authorities. Various studies have been conducted which aim to understand the effects of different types of contact – direct and indirect – in mediating and moderating intergroup prejudice, with recent work demonstrating that intergroup contact yields the most
effective positive outcomes when contact takes the form of cross-group friendships (Pettigrew, 1997; Davies et al., 2011).

This section determines what kind of contact conditions exist between the Japanese and Chinese, and whether they are sufficient to influence the former's perceptions of the latter, or to encourage Japanese descendants to view their own war history through the lens of Japan's victims. This study’s hierarchical regression analysis indicated that high levels of contact with the out-group was not only correlated with a decrease in prejudice but also predicted higher levels of collective responsibility among Japanese participants. The aim of this section is to explore the nature of the contact participants have with the Chinese both in terms of quantity and quality. Qualitative interviews were conducted with both CR\(_{\text{Low}}\) and CR\(_{\text{High}}\) respondents to further understand at what level they interact with the Chinese, and to assess whether instances of contact are adequate in terms of frequency and closeness to allow meaningful relationships to develop between the two groups. I will explore whether there is a relationship between Japanese individuals’ limited contact experiences with the out-group and their diminished sense of collective responsibility for the nation’s past harm-doing.

### 8.11.1 Contact with the out-group

In the survey, participants were asked to indicate the type of contact settings they have with the Chinese. Participants’ level of contact was measured on a 5-point scale (1: no contact, 2: no personal acquaintance but have contact with the Chinese, 3: tourist visit, 4: having a work- or schoolmate(s) who is Chinese, 5: having a close friend(s) who is Chinese), with higher scores denoting greater quality of contact. Respondents were asked to choose one of the five contact settings that best described their engagement with the Chinese.

Descriptive data in Table 15 indicates that only 22 percent of the participants reported having close friends who are Chinese, 26 percent meet with Chinese regularly at work or at school, 51 percent have no Chinese personal acquaintances but have contact with the Chinese in their immediate environment, only 1 percent
have visited China in the past, and 25 percent have had no contact with the Chinese. With a steady increase in the number of Chinese students enrolled in universities in Japan, Japanese students must surely be presented with more opportunities for interactions with the Chinese compared to the general public. And yet, despite the recent increase in multi-dimensional exchanges between the two countries, these findings show that a significant majority of 76 percent do not have any substantive interaction with the Chinese. Intergroup contact can become a starting point for reducing out-group bias, and distrust and facilitating better relations. However, certain prerequisite conditions must be present for contact between groups to be successful. In the current sample, participants share an equal status with the Chinese as fellow students but whether that relationship is cooperative or not depends on the proximity that they share. Further, weak or negative contacts with the out-group are unlikely to be effective in reducing prejudice and improving the individual’s perception of the ‘other.’

In evaluating the quantity of out-group contact, participants were asked to indicate how frequently they met with Chinese. As seen in Figure 16, 14 percent of participants have daily interactions with the Chinese, 35 percent have weekly contact and 14 percent have monthly contact. The remaining 37 percent have no contact or their contact is less frequent than once a year. Overall, most Japanese participants’ interactions with the Chinese are insufficiently frequent for the fostering of close, interpersonal relationships that have the potential to lead to cross-group friendships. This may be considered a wasted opportunity, as Japanese university students have more opportunities than the general public to interact closely with Chinese students and engage in equal-status contacts that have the potential to affect a reduction in prejudice. The interviews explore the nature of the contact between CR_{Low} and CR_{High} participants and the Chinese and investigate if there are any factors making participants’ negative image of the out-group resistant to change.
Table 15: Contact with the Out-group

Mean = 2.94  SD = 1.56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Setting</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a close friend who is Chinese</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a Chinese school/workmate whom I regularly see</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have visited China before (tourism)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no personal acquaintance who is Chinese (but I meet Chinese in my immediate environment)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no contact with the Chinese</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15: Contact with the Out-group
8.12 Qualitative Responses: Contact with the Out-group

During the interviews, CR_{low} participants were asked to describe their relationships with the out-group. All fifteen interviewees who reported low levels of collective guilt said that they have no friends who are Chinese, let alone close friends. Although some participants regularly see Chinese students on campus, their interactions are extremely sporadic and not intimate enough to enhance their knowledge or shift their perception of the ‘other.’ Even for those interviewees who have reported their encounters with the Chinese to be neutral, these experiences seem not to be strong enough to counter the negative images of the Chinese that have been salient in the Japanese media. This finding is consistent with past contact studies that have revealed passive contacts between groups have very little effect in lowering prejudice toward the out-group (Pettigrew, 1997). The following comments of the CR_{low} interviewees were indicative of their lack of quality contact with the out-group.

Shinji: There are two Chinese exchange students in our department but they always hang out together and hardly ever talk to us.

Naoki: There are Chinese students enrolled in my department but I think I have only talked to them once. Mind you, I am not prejudiced and it is not
because they are Chinese. I don’t have anything negative to say about these students. Chinese students in Japan are more educated and objective about what is happening so they don’t really express strong anti-Japanese sentiments. It is the mainland Chinese who are brainwashed by the Chinese government and the media and are aggressive in their attacks. My negative image is shaped by ‘those Chinese.’

Emiko: There are two Chinese exchange students in my university. I do talk to them sometimes. I don’t find them to be unpleasant at all. I have nothing bad to say about them. But I still have a very negative impression of the Chinese and it is not because of these students. It is because of what I see and hear in the media.

Although interviewees may hold an opinion of Chinese acquaintances that is not generally negative, if they observe in their encounters certain cultural traits which seem to oppose Japanese traditional values then these instances of negative contact may work to reinforce existent stereotypes, pose symbolic threats and reconfirm anxieties toward the Chinese.

Yumi: I currently live in the university dormitory and there are many Chinese students there. They are very loud, talkative and not very considerate of others. They are basically cheerful people so I don’t have any negative impressions of them. But they are quite demanding and assertive and I just find that to be a bit overwhelming. My negative image of the Chinese is shaped by how they behave and what I see on television. I find them to be a bit scary.

Recent research on intergroup contact and prejudice reveals that the affective dimensions are critical for reducing negative feelings towards the out-group. 'Feelings of closeness' have been shown to strongly affect the group’s positive emotions toward the out-group. Studies have shown that while intergroup contact typically reduces prejudice, it is most effective for reducing prejudice when it consists of close, high-quality intergroup relationships such as those afforded by cross-group friendships (Davies et al., 2011). It is therefore concerning to discover that only 22 percent of Japanese participants engage in ‘high quality contact’ with the Chinese while an overwhelming majority of almost 78 percent have passive or no contact that fails to provide them with opportunities for a more personalized interaction and cognitive learning of the ‘other.’
Past research on the effects of contact has demonstrated that general knowledge about the out-group may not in itself be enough for contact to induce positive mediating effects and reduce prejudice. Both the quantitative and qualitative results of this study showed that the majority of the participants who felt reduced guilt for their group’s past injustices lack any kind of substantial contact with members of the out-group, the kind of engagement that is likely to increase trust and understanding.

8.12.1 When intergroup contact fails: Negative contacts

This study revealed that even if the interactions are frequent, not all intergroup contact leads to positive outcomes that induce better understanding of the ‘other’ and reduce prejudice. However, when a negative contact occurs, it has been found to increase threat perception and anxiety. When there is limited contact and a salient stereotyped image of the out-group in society, a lack of cultural understanding of the other results in negative contacts reconfirming respondents’ existent negative evaluation of the out-group. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Japanese culture places particular importance on conformity to rules and politeness. The interviewees’ observations of Chinese behaviour in their everyday environment only confirmed their anxiety about and exacerbated their negative opinion of the Chinese.

Satoko: I don’t have any personal acquaintances who are Chinese. However, I am working part-time at a bakery and I meet with Chinese customers perhaps three to five times a week. There are polite ones and rude ones. There are Chinese customers who are polite and don’t forget to say, “Thank you” to me. On the other hand, there are other Chinese customers who do unbelievable things like touch the bread with their bare hands before buying it. They are supposed to use tongs! I was appalled by their irresponsible behaviour!

Rieko: I went to Chinatown in Yokohama. I was overwhelmed by the pushiness of the Chinese people. I did hear that they are quite aggressive in their sales tactics but I saw firsthand how greedy and pushy they are. The Chinese students at my university are also pretty brash and overbearing and at times, I feel uncomfortable with their ‘in-your-face’ behaviour. I get the same image when I watch Chinese political leaders speaking on the news. They are so direct and aggressive. In reality, my actual contact with Chinese people is quite limited.
8.13 Summary

Contact emerged as one of the significant positive predictors of collective guilt and negatively correlated with participants’ prejudice towards the Chinese. This section explored the nature of Japanese participants’ interaction with the Chinese. An important finding of this study highlights that out of 162 survey participants, only 22 percent reported having close friendships with the Chinese. Further, and consistent with survey results, none of the fifteen interviewees with low collective responsibility indicated that they had any intimate, friendly relationship with a Chinese.

Although Japanese university students have more opportunities than the general public to interact with Chinese students in classroom settings or even participate in cooperative group activities on campus, less than 30 percent answered that they have regular contact with Chinese school- or workmates. Further, the qualitative interviews with the participants revealed that even if participants engage with the Chinese on campus, (two interviewees said they participate in extracurricular activities with Chinese students), their contact with each other does not develop into cross-group friendship.
CHAPTER 9

9. Discussion and Conclusions

9.1 Summation of Key Findings and Revisiting the Research Questions

The previous chapter presented the findings of both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the research and focused on the analyses of factors that may be standing as inhibitors to Japanese descendants’ acceptance of collective responsibility for their nation’s past injustices. The purpose of this chapter is to interpret these findings by revisiting the thesis' central research questions and by providing a more holistic and integrated understanding of the study in relation to the existent literature on collective guilt, responsibility, collective memory and positive identity needs. This section will present qualitative data that compares and contrasts the perceptions of CR$_{Low}$ participants with those of CR$_{High}$ participants who, although much smaller in proportion, were willing to accept responsibility and redress the past. Their experiences help augment the present study’s understanding of why some Japanese are unable to accept responsibility for the nation’s past misdeeds and raise some normative questions about what needs to be transformed for deeper contrition to take place amongst descendants of the perpetrator group.

Revised Question 1) To what extent are contemporary Japanese willing to accept inherited responsibility for the injustices committed by their forebears?

9.1.1 Finding 1: The majority of Japanese participants felt that they should not be blamed for their ancestors' past mistakes

The first research question sought to assess the extent to which the contemporary Japanese are willing to accept responsibility and express repentance for the harm committed by their ancestors. This study examined the survey’s statistical data and considered it together with qualitative interview results in order to understand why some Japanese feel collective responsibility when confronted with accusations about
their nation’s negative past and why others do not. The findings revealed that the majority of participants felt that they should not have to assume responsibility for their ancestors' past mistakes. Five items of the collective responsibility scale employed in this study were designed to measure to what extent the participants felt that 'the present generation should bear ongoing responsibility for Japan’s military actions during the war [inherited collective responsibility] and to what extent 'they felt remorse for these actions [collective guilt].' Survey findings showed that 64 percent of the respondents felt that they did not and should not bear any responsibility for what past generations did during the war while 36 percent felt that the current generation should assume some ongoing guilt for the nation's past actions.

One of the most contested issues in Japanese public debate on wartime history revolves around the question of how long each generation should continue to bear responsibility for the actions of their forebears. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's official statement on 14 August, 2015 marking the seventieth anniversary of the end of World War clarifies his position regarding the issue of the present generation's ongoing responsibility for the war by stating that, "Japan has repeatedly expressed the feelings of deep remorse and heartfelt apology for its actions during the war....We must not let our children, grandchildren, and even further generations to come, who have nothing to do with the war, be predestined to apologize." While he implies that Japan has apologized enough and future generations should not have to continue apologizing, the statement continues, "Even so, we Japanese, across generations, must squarely face history. We have a responsibility to inherit the past, in all humbleness, and pass it on to the future" (Abe, 2015). This ambiguity of 'inheriting the past without the need to apologize' seems to be reflected in divided Japanese public opinion on the issue. NHK's survey of May 2000 (Makita, 2000) assessing the attitudes of the Japanese public towards their nation's war history asked the following question, 'Do you think the post-war generation should still bear responsibility for Japan's actions during the last war?' Results showed that 50 percent of the Japanese agreed that the post-war generation should assume responsibility for Japan's actions during the war, while 27 percent denied Japan's continuing
responsibility and 5 percent felt that Japan did not have any responsibility for the war in the first place (Makita 2000, 19).

**Question:** Do you think the post-war generation should still bear responsibility for Japan’s actions during the last war?

**Figure 17:** NHK Opinion Poll (May, 2000) Post-war Generation's War Responsibility

![Bar chart showing responses to the question: Do you think the post-war generation should still bear responsibility for Japan's actions during the last war?](image)

Source: Makita 2000, 19.
Note: No responsibility=those who believe that Japan lacked any responsibility for the outbreak of the war. N= 2,143

As this study is the first to assess Japanese inherited war responsibility using a multiple-item psychological measure, direct comparison with past studies' data sets may be problematic. In an attempt to explore whether Japanese descendants' willingness to accept inherited responsibility has increased or diminished over time, the results of this study were compared with previous NHK opinion poll data of 2000. Although the samples are not identical, compared to 14 years ago, the findings of this study indicate that the proportion of Japanese descendants who feel that present generations should bear responsibility for their ancestor's past misdeeds decreased by 14 percentage points while the number of Japanese who reject the notion of collective responsibility increased dramatically by 32 percentage points.
(from 32 percent [which includes 5 percent who deny any responsibility in the first place] to 64 percent).

This study's results were further compared with a research conducted by Sven Saaler (2005) with a similar but larger sample of Japanese university students (n = 816) from 2002-2004. In Saaler's study, 66 percent of the respondents answered that the postwar generation bore ongoing responsibility for the war, while 8 percent disagreed with 3 percent claiming that Japan did not have any responsibility for the war in the first place. When compared with Saaler's study, this study's findings show that Japanese university students' willingness to assume responsibility for the actions of their forebears fell by 28 percentage points since 2004. The primary finding of this study therefore is that there is a diminished sense of collective responsibility amongst the current generation of educated Japanese youth.

The qualitative segment of this study further explored the processes underlying the participants' perceptions of inherited war responsibility. The dominant argument that emerged in the comments of CR_{Low} respondents [low collective responsibility] centred around the temporal and emotional distance they felt with the original perpetrators of the in-group who committed the atrocities. They insisted that present generations cannot be blamed for the crimes committed by their ancestors and that they should not be held accountable for the mistakes of a generation of Japanese with whom they cannot identify. As represented in Tatsuya's comments, most CR_{Low} participants felt frustrated that they were expected to assume responsibility for something that they were never part of.

Tatsuya: I don't feel responsible for what happened during the war. I don't see myself as part of the group of militarists who committed those horrible crimes. We are from entirely different generations. I cannot feel responsible for something I never took part in. I wasn't even born then. And most of the people who committed the atrocities are dead.

For the CR_{Low} respondents, the war history of Imperial Japan and the perpetrators who committed the injustices are something from the remote past and disconnected from the collective that they refer to as Japan. As is also evident from the comments
presented in the previous chapter, the notion of 'inherited responsibility' for the mistakes of past generations is clearly denied by participants of this sample.

9.1.2 Comparing perspectives on Japanese 'inherited responsibility'

In contrast, while the CR_{Low} respondents attempted to sustain a positive image of the in-group by denying inherited responsibility for the nation's past injustices, CR_{High} respondents [high collective responsibility] insisted that accepting moral responsibility was an integral part of feeling positive esteem and respect for their nation. The following comments represent their key arguments about why today's Japanese descendants must shoulder some ongoing responsibility for the mistakes of their forebears. Shizue, like majority of the CR_{High} respondents, feels that by accepting responsibility, she and the other Japanese can feel proud of being a Japanese. Many of the CR_{High} respondents were therefore critical of Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and other nationalist politicians' rationale to build a 'proud Japan' by making sure that the successive generations do not have to be exposed to a 'masochistic history' they would be ashamed of.

Shizue: Although we were never directly involved in the atrocities committed during the war, as a citizen of Japan, we have to acknowledge our injustices. Unfortunately, other Japanese in my generation strongly feel that what happened in the past is somebody else's business. But I think it is irresponsible for the Japanese to ignore the past. The victims in these [Asian] countries will never forget. Japan has to continue apologizing to China and Korea until they are satisfied; instead of pretending like this is a finished business. We will feel more proud as a nation only when we have the courage and morality to accept our mistakes and reach out to the victimized countries. I think Prime Minister Abe's wish to protect younger Japanese generations from this shameful past is absurd.

CR_{High} respondents feel concerned that unless the past is properly acknowledged, there will be no reconciliation or healthy foundation for future Sino-Japanese relations to flourish. Satoru argues that it is important to be regretful and she criticizes the absurdity of fighting over the number of deaths resulting from the Nanjing Massacre.
Satoru: The Japanese public criticizes China for over-exaggerating the number of deaths from the Massacre. So what if the numbers are exaggerated? The Massacre did occur! It is an undeniable historical fact that the Japanese soldiers committed cruelties in China and other Asian countries during the war. Only by accepting that responsibility can we reconcile, our generation and build a healthy relationship with China and Korea. Unless we build that foundation, we would never be able to interact with them on an equal basis. I would feel more proud of my country if we can accept our sins and reach out to them to build a friendly relationship.

Another dominant characteristic of CR_{High} respondents which distinguishes them from CR_{Low} respondents is the degree of self-awareness about the historical injustices that had been committed and the frustrations they feel about the ways in which the Japanese government has been mishandling this matter.

Satoru: Japan needs to apologize specifically for two things; first, for colonizing the countries and secondly for starting a war of aggression. The Japanese government has been offering apologies and reparation to Western POWs who are mainly European, American or Australian for the past twenty years. However, they have always been reluctant to be as apologetic towards the Asian victims. What is worse, our Prime Minister wants to deny that it was a war of aggression. This really bothers me.

Kaori: If the Chinese want me to apologize, I would readily apologize. The reason is because it is an undeniable fact that Japan invaded China. And as Japanese, we have to accept that responsibility. If you were to look at things from the victims' standpoint, their demands are completely understandable.

Satoru and Kaori represent an overwhelming majority of the CR_{High} sample who are convinced that Japan is guilty of atrocities committed during the war and it would be morally wrong to forget them. These comments show that the respondents display high levels of willingness to reflect on the past and view the picture from the perspective of the 'other.'

9.1.3 Finding 2: Majority of Japanese participants believe that 'Japan has apologized enough'

In an attempt to further understand the phenomenon of inherited war responsibility, Japanese participants' experience of 'apology fatigue' was also explored in this
survey. The study revealed that 66 percent of the respondents felt that 'Japan has apologized enough for its wartime past' while 33 percent felt that Japan has not offered sufficient apology to the victims. Again, although the samples are not identical, the findings of this study were compared to those of the Pew Research Center's global attitude survey of 2016 in which the respondents were asked if they thought 'Japan has apologized sufficiently for its military actions during the 1930s and 1940s.' 53 percent of the Pew survey respondents indicated that Japan had apologized enough and a further 17 percent believed that there was no need for Japan to apologize in the first place. When the two scores are combined 70 percent of Japanese believe that there is no need for Japan to apologize for the nation's past actions. Pew survey's results mirror the findings of this study which showed a majority of 66 percent feeling that Japan has sufficiently atoned for its past. When Asahi Shimbun's 1994 survey asked the public if 'Japan had offered sufficient war compensation to its victims,' 26 percent answered that Japan had offered sufficient compensation while 62 percent felt that Japan had not provided enough redress to its victims. Although the data sets are not identical, when compared to survey results conducted in the 1990s, the findings of this study has confirmed that the proportion of Japanese who believe that Japan has apologized enough for the nation's wartime past is clearly increasing over the decades.
The data on whether Japan has apologized enough was also compared with data from surveys conducted in China, the victimized nation. This comparison revealed that while a majority of Japanese felt less contrition than in the past, an overwhelming majority of Chinese felt that Japan’s acknowledgement and atonement was insufficient. Pew studies from 2006-2016 indicate that the Chinese perception towards 'sufficient apology' continues to be incompatible with that of the Japanese; 2016 study showed that only 10 percent of the Chinese were satisfied with Japan's apologies. Related to this, other opinion polls (see the 2005-2014 survey by Genron NPO) have also indicated that the key reason behind the Chinese public’s
unfavourable perception of Japan is 'Japan’s lack of proper apology and remorse over the history of invasion of China.' Japan's growing resistance to apology and reparation incenses Chinese victims and helps to explain why historic antagonisms persist in Northeast Asia. This study confirms that continuing hostility between China and Japan has its basis in this discrepancy in perception; for most Japanese, the past is behind them and need not be contended with, while for an overwhelming majority of Chinese, there are unresolved historical grievances requiring immediate attention. The results of this study seem to mirror the state of deteriorating relations between the two countries; the Japanese are feeling less remorse than in the past, making it more important than ever to investigate what factors may be working to prevent their acceptance of collective responsibility.

9.1.4 Comparing perspectives on Japanese 'apology fatigue'

An overwhelming majority of the CR\textsubscript{Low} respondents were annoyed with China's constant demands for apology stressing that Japan has apologized enough. The following comments seem to echo what is frequently argued in the Japanese mainstream media as well as the official stance of the Japanese government (See Chapter 3) that 'Japan has properly dealt with the issues of reparations, property and claims, in accordance with the San Francisco peace treaty, the bilateral peace treaties, agreements and instruments' (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2005, cited in Seaton, 2007, 66).

Shinji: How long do we have to continue apologizing? Are these people [victims] ever going to be satisfied? I do accept that Japan has committed terrible war crimes. However, Japan has already offered numerous apologies and compensation for all the damages incurred during the war. We signed a friendship treaty with China and both countries agreed that the war has ended and the two countries were ready to move on....why is China bringing up the past again and deliberately flaring up anti-Japanese sentiments amongst its people? Why now?

Ryutaro: No matter how many times we apologize, they won't stop attacking us....I am completely fed up with their incessant criticisms.

CR\textsubscript{Low} respondents perceptions seem to reflect the majority of the Japanese public who are tired of having to listen to the victims' seemingly endless accusations. Not
only are they convinced that their genuine efforts to apologize would never satisfy the victims, they also believe that China has ulterior motives for repeatedly bringing up the past.

Conversely $CR_{\text{High}}$ respondents insist that the only people who can determine whether an apology is sufficient or not are the victims, and not the perpetrators. Hence, they argue that it is not up to the Japanese to decide whether they have 'apologized enough' or not.

Kaori: Japan may have apologized many times in the past. However, an apology would not be sufficient unless it satisfies the victims' desires. I don't think there is an international model that determines what a sufficient government apology is. So we need to ask the victims what would satisfy their needs and we should make every effort to satisfy them.

Furthermore, $CR_{\text{High}}$ respondents who felt that 'Japan has not apologized enough' seemed to view the Japanese politics of apology objectively and question the sincerity of the government's past gestures.

Satoru: I am aware that the Japanese government has issued numerous apologies to China and Korea in the past. However, the wording is carefully chosen and deliberately made vague so that the politicians will not antagonize their domestic constituency. The government formed the Asian Women's Fund, a non-profit organization to distribute the monetary compensation to the comfort women instead of making it official. Of course the victims are not going to accept it as sincere gesture of apology or reparation. I find it understandable why the victims express their dissatisfactions.

Kaori: We have issued numerous apologies but it is also a fact that our Asian neighbors have dismissed these apologies as insincere. Instead of arguing that 'we have done enough and the Chinese and the Koreans will never be satisfied,' shouldn't we look into the reasons why they were not accepted?

As such, compared to the $CR_{\text{Low}}$ sample, $CR_{\text{High}}$ respondents displayed high levels of willingness to reflect on the inherited responsibility of present-day Japanese and take necessary pro-social actions to remedy that past
Research question 2) What are the social psychological factors impeding current Japanese acceptance of inherited responsibility for their nation's past misdeeds?

Social identity theory posits that individuals attain a sense of self-esteem and self-worth not just from their identity as an individual, but also from their membership in social groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Individuals are therefore driven to maintain a positive evaluation of their social group. The possibility that one's group has perpetrated an unjust act can pose a threat to the in-group's positive moral identity (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). When confronted with accusations of in-group malevolence, individuals will try and bolster the in-group’s moral status in order to defuse real or potential reputational threat (Sullivan, Landau, Branscombe, & Rothschild, 2012, 778). One strategy groups employ to restore positive esteem and moral status is competitive victimhood. This enables the accused group to claim that they have suffered more than those who are being critical (Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008; Noor et. al., 2012). This study hypothesized that Japan’s lack of repentance, which is at the heart of the Sino-Japanese conflict, is driven by a need to defend and protect a positive national identity. Based on the aforementioned theories, this thesis examined the extent to which identity-driven responses such as ‘moral identity threat,’ ‘competitive victimhood,’ and ‘in-group identification (degree of national identity)’ may be affecting Japanese feelings of guilt and remorse.

Consistent with the hypotheses, the hierarchical regression analysis identified the three identity-driven variables as significant predictors of collective responsibility. One key finding from the regression analyses was that individuals who felt that their in-group’s moral status was threatened when confronted with accusations of past injustices defended their in-group's positive identity by avoiding acceptance of collective responsibility. As previous studies have shown, threats to moral identity and esteem were positively associated with competitive victimhood which also emerged as a negative predictor of collective responsibility. The regression analysis further indicated that participants who strongly identify with their nation experience less collective responsibility, while those with high levels of contact with the out-group are likely to feel more remorse. Those with less salient knowledge and
awareness about their nation’s transgressions were less likely to feel responsible about their ancestors’ misdeeds.

Research Question 2a) Do the Japanese descendants feel that their moral identity is threatened when confronted with criticisms from the victimized nations about the nation’s immoral past? To what extent do threats to Japanese moral status affect their acceptance of collective responsibility for their nation’s past transgressions?

9.1.5 Finding 3: Threats to the participants' moral identity were negatively associated with their acceptance of collective responsibility for the nation's past transgressions.

After investigating the possible factors hindering Japanese participants’ feeling of collective responsibility, ‘moral identity threat’ emerged as the strongest negative predictor of collective responsibility. This discovery was further analysed and confirmed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Previous empirical studies have indicated that because morality is an important attribute to individuals and groups, being reminded of the group's immoral past can be an aversive experience that can lead individuals to respond defensively (Monin, 2007). Consistent with prior research (Sullivan et al., 2012), an overwhelming majority [more than 90 percent] of respondents reported that values and morality are a critical element in the determination of their self and collective identity. One of the key aims of this study was to examine the extent to which Japanese participants felt that their group's moral identity was threatened when confronted with China's accusations about Japan's wartime aggression. Common arguments from in-depth interviews with 15 CR_{low} participants provided strong support to my overarching hypothesis that when confronted with accusations about in-group's transgressions which challenge current moral status, individuals will attempt to defend their in-group's positive identity by employing a range of different defensive measures. Previous studies have shown that defense of the in-group's moral status may result in individuals denying collective responsibility, placing the blame on the victimizing group or distorting past injustices.
(Dresler-Hawke, 2005). Other common defensive reactions revealed in past literature include 'placing the blame on a few deviant group members' (Wohl, Branscombe, and Klar, 2006), 'legitimising the immoral act,' 'temporal and social distancing' (Peetz, Gunn, and Wilson, 2010; Fry, 2006) and 'minimizing the severity of the harm committed' (Branscombe & Miron, 2004). A number of these defensive responses were revealed in the discourses of this study's interviewed participants. First, the CRLow respondents rationalised China’s accusations as disingenuous, state-manipulated tactics using history disputes as a political foil for China’s internal grievances. Second, temporal arguments emerged in which respondents stressed that they were not born when the atrocities took place and that present generations should not be blamed for the mistakes of their forebears. Third, participants chose to isolate the ‘Japanese Imperial Army’ as the responsible party for the wrongdoing and stressed their moral detachment and social distance from that group. Fourth, while acknowledging that transgressions occurred, participants challenged death toll numbers and problematised the lack of objectivity of the victims’ claims. Fifth, participants defended the moral status of their nation by stressing that countless apologies and war reparations have already been offered and that the issue was officially settled between the two countries a long time ago, with China only reviving the history problem as a political strategy to boost internal unity. Sixth, some participants justified the massacre of the Chinese as self-defence and therefore a necessary evil during war. Seventh, there was a strong belief that since one cannot undo the past, China should ‘move on,’ as it is more constructive to focus on the future than to be mired in a traumatic past.

The interviews also revealed that with limited awareness of their nation’s past transgressions in Asia, the present generation of Japanese are perplexed and frustrated by the persistent accusations of China and South Korea attacking their country as unremorseful and irresponsible. Findings in this study indicate that Japanese ‘amnesia’ about the war should not simply be defined as 'ignorance.' None of the CRLow respondents denied the occurrence of historical misdeeds. However, behind a superficial willingness to acknowledge the occurrence of the injustices, majority of survey respondents [more than 60 percent] demonstrated strong
defensive emotions to China’s persistent reminders about Japan’s unapologetic attitude [See Table 3: Moral Identity Threat Scale Results]. It is especially noteworthy that one of the factors that triggered strong negative reaction among the CR$_{\text{Low}}$ respondents was the vehemence of Chinese accusations.

Akemi: If their demands were expressed in a different way, in a more rational and calm manner, I may feel differently. The fact that they are constantly stressing that they are victims in a pushy, aggressive way is just annoying.

9.1.6 Comparing perspectives on moral identity threat

In contrast to the CR$_{\text{Low}}$ respondents who expressed anger and irritation towards victimized nations' reminder of their in-group's immoral past, CR$_{\text{High}}$ respondents expressed remorse and guilt when confronted with the same accusations. Hayato, like other CR$_{\text{High}}$ respondents showed not only a willingness to accept ongoing responsibility for the nation's transgressions but he acknowledged and defined the specific mistakes his own generation should be blamed for. He distinguishes his generation's 'sins' from that of the original perpetrators.

Hayato: I don't get annoyed or angry when my Chinese or Korean friends remind me about what Japan committed during the war. I believe that different generations have to bear different forms of responsibility and guilt. The original perpetrators of Imperial Japan are guilty for actually committing the atrocities. Our parents' generation is guilty for not having passed on the sense of responsibility to the next generations. And our generation is guilty for continuing to ignore and deny that responsibility. If the Chinese were to ask me to apologize, I will say, 'I cannot apologize for the actual killing, but if you want me to apologize on behalf of my own generation who continues to ignore this history, I would willingly accept that guilt and apologize.'

Another dominant theme that emerged from the responses of the CR$_{\text{High}}$ respondents was their willingness to view the conflict from multiple perspectives, in particular the out-group's perspective. There is extensive body of evidence that has shown 'perspective-taking' or ability to imagine the Other's perspective in a conflict to be a critical factor in reducing prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000) and increasing empathy towards the out-group (Leith & Baumeister, 2008). CR$_{\text{High}}$ respondents’ comments illustrate the importance of perspective-taking.
Haruko: I feel bad and uncomfortable when the Chinese people express their frustrations about the way we have dealt with war history. It is understandable if you try to see things from the victims' perspective. Their anger is justifiable. No matter how many times the government apologizes, these apologies lack substance and integrity. We are not walking the talk [jittai ga tomonatte inai].

Hayato says one good example of a government apology without substance is the recent agreement (2016) between the Japanese and South Korean governments regarding the 'comfort women' dispute which seems to ignore the victims' needs.

Hayato: This is how I see the recent agreement between Japan and Korea to settle the 'comfort women' issue. Japan apologized and offered payment to satisfy their own political agenda; they wanted to see those shameful comfort women statues to be removed for eternity and the Koreans to shut up for good.....I have a good analogy. Let's say I got into a fierce fight with my friend and hurt him real bad. I refuse to apologize and we were in a deadlock. But my parents didn't want this incident to go public so they approached my friend's parents and settled this dispute with some money. My friend's parents accepted the money and promised to keep quiet without consulting my friend who was the real victim. His parents kept most of the money themselves, and the mother bought him a 60-yen Gari-gari-kun [popsicle] just to appease him. Of course, my friend would be frustrated with the outcome. When you try to see things from the victims' perspectives, you understand why they criticize Japan's actions to be insincere.

Studies have shown how individuals living in societies engaged in protracted conflicts tend to accept and adopt the shared in-group narratives (Bar-Tal, 2007). Adherence to in-group's narratives about the conflict have been found to hinder individuals from taking multiple perspectives. The perceptions of the CR<sub>Low</sub> participants have illustrated this tendency. Conversely, CR<sub>High</sub> participants who were willing to accept collective responsibility were more empathetic towards and inclined to view the conflict from the victims' perspectives.

**Research question 2b:** Do contemporary Japanese engage in competitive victimhood? To what extent does the salience of Japanese victimhood during World War II affect the descendants' willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?
9.1.7 Finding 4: The majority of survey participants [70 percent] felt that 'the atomic bombing was the most inhumane and immoral act in human history.' Salient victim consciousness among Japanese participants was negatively associated with their acceptance of collective responsibility for the nation's past transgressions.

Scholarship drawing on social identity theory has demonstrated that when confronted with shameful episodes in history, the group will remember the past in ways that lessen the humiliation and maintain the positive image of the group (Sullivan et al., 2012). Studies have shown that a sense of competitive victimhood—the belief that one’s group has suffered more than others—protects group members’ self-esteem and positive identity (Bar-Tal et al., 2009). When the in-group's victimization is salient, individuals were found to feel less collective guilt and responsibility for the injustices perpetrated by the in-group (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008). Sullivan and colleagues’ (2012) research revealed that the key motivation leading groups to engage in competitive victimhood was defending threatened moral identity. Consistent with existing literature, this study showed that competitive victimhood amongst Japanese participants served to lessen their sense of collective responsibility for harms done to the out-group.

While many scholars have noted the prevalence of Japanese victim mentality concerning the war there has been a dearth of empirical evidence evaluating this phenomenon. The statistical data garnered from the survey's competitive victimhood scale substantiated the assumption that victimhood mentality is salient amongst the majority (70 percent) of Japanese participants. The descriptive data further revealed that a majority (60 percent) of survey respondents automatically associated the last war [Asia-Pacific War] with the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki while less than 8 percent cited the Nanjing Massacre as their predominant association with the Asia-Pacific War. Further, findings from the competitive victimhood scale showed that a majority believe that the atomic bombing of Hiroshima is ‘the most inhumane event in human history,’ and a ‘uniquely Japanese tragedy’ that should not
be compared with other war atrocities. Consistent with these results, participants of the qualitative interviews also predominantly viewed the Pacific War as one in which Japan was the victim. When implicit questions were used to explore participants’ spontaneous association with the Pacific War, all 15 CR_{Low} respondents automatically associated the war with the atomic bombs and the 'horrifying images of Japanese people suffering.' These results are also compatible with past annual surveys conducted in the 1990s by the Association of History Teachers in Japan (n = 4000) in which majority of students age six to 18 claimed that the atomic bombing was ‘one of the worst tragedies in the war.’

Scholarship on intractable conflicts shows that groups encode significant experiences in their collective memory, especially experiences of victimization, and pass them on to successive generations (Staub & Bar-Tal, 2003). Because of this, groups engaged in protracted conflict compete over their victim status by developing ongoing narratives that establish that the suffering they have been subjected to is unique, distinctive and worse than their opponents (Noor et al., 2008). Although the data sets are not identical, the following comparison of perceptions amongst the Japanese vs. Chinese university students on historical victimization shed light on how collective memories of in-group's victimhood become maintained by successive descendants who never experienced the harm-doing. In my survey, 75.3 percent of the Japanese respondents agreed that 'as the only country in the world that has every suffered a nuclear bomb, we must never forget this history.' A survey conducted by Nanjing Normal University with a larger sample of Chinese university students (n = 973) in 2004 revealed that 93 percent of Chinese university students believed that 'the Nanjing Massacre in which 30,000 Chinese civilians were killed must never be forgotten.' These findings in Japan and China reveal that both societies are determined to sustain the salience of the history of wartime victimization for many more generations to come.
Figure 19: Never Forget Memory of Hiroshima (N=162)

‘As the only country in the world that has ever suffered from a nuclear bomb, we must never forget this history.’ (Data from this study with Japanese university students, 2014)
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Figure 20: Never Forget Memory of Nanjing Massacre (N=973)

‘Nanjing Massacre in which 300,000 Chinese civilians were killed must never be forgotten’ (Data from survey with Chinese university students, Nanjing Normal University, 2004)

![Bar chart showing agreement on remembering the Nanjing Massacre.]

Source: Nanjing Normal University survey of 2004
This study expanded on the regression findings by further exploring the process by which Japanese victim mentality is constructed via exposure to various societal channels. The top three sources shaping participants’ understanding of the war were: 1) textbooks/school education; 2) television programmes (dramas, documentaries, information programmes); and 3) news programmes. The issue of textbooks and school education shaping Japanese war memories has been critical to the frequent accusations of Japan’s ‘historical amnesia.’ This research reveals that the process is more complex, and involves a variety of cultural channels. As part of NHK’s survey of Japan’s 1995 50th anniversary commemorative programming, Germany and other countries analysed the contents of Japanese television programmes and the impact of war-related television on Japanese war memories. The poll results showed that television broadcasting in Japan focuses on victimhood and only to a lesser extent its wartime aggression (Seaton 2007, 115). This point was also validated in my interviews. Although the survey data showed that textbooks and school education are the dominant sources for learning about Japanese war history, the interviews revealed that the narratives of civilian suffering disseminated through popular cultural channels such as television, books, and films have also been influential in homogenizing the salience of victimhood in Japanese mentality.

9.1.8 Comparing perspectives on competitive victimhood

The qualitative responses of CR_{Low} participants presented in the previous chapter illustrated how their remembrance of the Pacific War is exclusively about the victimization of the Japanese people, one that glosses over the history of Japanese aggression in Asia and colonization of Korea, China and other Asian countries. In contrast, findings showed that despite the exposure to the society's narratives of Japanese war victimhood, CR_{High} respondents felt less need to protect their in-group's moral image and engage in competitive victimhood. On the contrary, their responses indicated an 'inclusive victim consciousness' (Vollhardt, 2010, 2012) or a common identity that 'we are both victims of the conflict.'

Hayato: My grandparents were victims of the atomic bombing in Nagasaki so my understanding of Japanese war history initially was shaped by the stories of A-bomb victims I heard as a child. However, when I was in 5th or 6th
grade, I went to a war museum in Nagasaki. There I learned about the history of the Nanjing Massacre, Unit 731 and comfort women. The visual panels described what the Japanese did during the war. That is when I realized that we caused massive suffering to other Asians and that we were not the only victims of the war.

Asako recounts the time when she was first exposed to the history of Chinese victimization through a friend whose family members were massacred in Nanjing. As these comments reveal, exposure to the out-group's victimization can lead to perspective-taking, positive affective responses like empathy and above all, to acknowledgement of responsibility for the nation's transgressions.

Asako: There was a Chinese girl in our class whose grandparents were massacred by the Japanese in Nanjing. She repeatedly told me about the horrifying stories of what the Japanese did. I felt empathetic towards her grief and anger. Our history teacher briefly explained about the Nanjing incident in class saying, "This incident occurred as Japan tried to expand its influence in Asia, however, the actual number of people killed is unknown." The teacher hoped to breeze through it because we had to focus on other contents for the entrance exam. However, my Chinese friend didn't let him. She stood up and showed us a book about her family's victimization in Nanjing. When she told the entire class, "Japan has not issued sufficient apology to the Chinese victims," majority of the class angrily retaliated saying, "Stop blaming us! You need to move on!" I felt terrible seeing most of my classmates show no sympathy towards her or the Chinese victims. It was terrible. How would they feel if their own family members were massacred like that?

The comments of the CRHigh respondents reveal that victim beliefs when 'inclusive' and not 'exclusive' can lead to positive emotions and pro-social responses. Although this research has shown that victim mentality is often problematic and stands as a major impediment to the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility for its past transgressions, qualitative findings also revealed that when exposed to diverse perspectives about out-group suffering, some individuals are able to acknowledge the victimization of the other party, experience empathy and feel some responsibility for the mistakes committed by their forebears.

Research question 2c: Do contemporary Japanese identify with their nation? To what extent does in-group identification affect Japanese descendants' willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation's past transgressions?
9.1.10 Finding 5: A large majority of Japanese participants reported a high degree of collective self-esteem and strong identification with the nation. Those who highly identified with their nation felt increased resistance to accept collective responsibility for their nation's immoral past.

In-group identification has been studied as an important antecedent of collective guilt, prejudice and competitive victimhood. However, past studies have revealed a paradoxical element to the relationship between in-group identification and individual responses to moral transgressions within the group. One strand of study (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears & Manstead, 2006) has demonstrated that, since collective guilt is a group-based emotion, salient self-categorisation with the perpetrator group could elicit members’ collective guilt. Conversely, other studies (Doosje et al., 1998) have demonstrated that high national-identifiers are prone to feel less collective guilt and responsibility because they are driven to defend their group’s self-esteem. Therefore, high-identifiers may deny or reject the notion that their group has committed immoral acts in the past. As in-group identification is a complex phenomenon, a careful and nuanced analysis was conducted with Japanese qualitative interviews to determine how CR_{Low} respondents who were also high identifiers would react to the victims’ accusations.

Social identity theory posits that the degree to which the individual identifies with the collective—whether it be an ethnic, religious group or a nation—can become a source of pride and self-esteem. In this study, it was argued that individuals who identify strongly with the nation are likely to ‘forget’ or ‘justify’ its past transgressions and acknowledge less responsibility. Using the collective self-esteem scale developed by Luhtanen & Crocker (1992) this study assessed the extent to which Japanese participants identify with the nation and how much of their esteem hinges on the positive identity of Japan. If a high level of national identification is likely to reduce an individual’s willingness to feel remorse for the nation’s wrongful past (Doosje et al., 2004), it is important to determine the nature of Japanese national attitude. The regression analysis of Chapter Seven revealed that Japanese participants’ national identification predicted lower acceptance of collective
responsibility. To further understand the nature of Japanese in-group identification, an adapted version of Karasawa’s nationalism scale (2002) was used to investigate whether the mode of Japanese attachment to the nation is closer to patriotism or right-wing glorification of the nation.

Postwar Japan has sought to discard the negative identity of wartime imperialist aggressor and shift to a new, twofold national identity as the victim of the atomic bomb and as peacemaker. Within the context of Japan’s shifting national identity, the results of my in-depth interviews with CR_{Low} participants explored the emotional impact of high identifiers’ attachment to national identity when facing accusations about Japan’s past.

This study sought to gain a better understanding of Japanese participants’ in-group identification and the nature of Japanese nationalism. In-group identification has produced conflicting results in relation to collective guilt. In previous studies, attachment to one’s group led to an enhanced sense of responsibility for the moral violations of the in-group and elicited collective guilt (Doosje et al., 2006). In other studies (Branscombe 2004; Doosje et al. 1998; Castano & Giner-Sorolla 2006), findings showed that a high level of national identification was likely to undermine individual willingness to accept guilt for the group’s past injustices due to a need to protect group esteem from being shamed by immoral acts. Past studies have shown, therefore, that national identification can both increase and decrease feelings of collective guilt.

This study revealed that Japanese participants’ in-group identification was one of the key predictors reducing their willingness to accept collective responsibility. In-group identification was measured using Luhtanen and Crocker’s collective self-esteem scale. Results indicated that Japanese participants reported high levels of in-group identification, implying that their own esteem was closely associated with a positive image of their nation. Both the regression analysis and qualitative interviews in Chapter 7 revealed that high-identifiers felt diminished remorse and tended to defend the moral status of their in-group by rationalising China’s accusations as a politically
orchestrated tactic and therefore disingenuous in nature. Another common defensive reaction of high-identifiers is ‘identity discontinuity’ in which the members of the perpetrator group disconnect the present-day generation from the original perpetrators (Augoustinos & Le Couteur, 2004). The CR_{low} interviewees strongly identified with and found pride in a modern, peaceful Japan that emerged as a major economic power, but distanced themselves from the original perpetrators that committed atrocities in China.

Yuji: What the Japanese soldiers committed in China has nothing to do with me. What happened during the war has nothing to do with our generation. I therefore feel frustrated every time China and Korea blame us for the militarists' past crimes.

A majority of the CR_{low} respondents stressed the social and temporal distance they felt from the 'immoral' collective called Japan which outraged the Chinese. From a social identity perspective, it seems plausible that those individuals whose self-worth is closely tied to the positive conception of the nation would more likely reject the claims about the nation’s negative history.

9.1.10 Comparing perspectives on national identity

Roccas and colleagues' study (2006) distinguished two modes of national identification—glorification of the national group versus a liberal form of in-group attachment—in order to explain the complex effects of in-group identification on acceptance of guilt and responsibility. Consistent with their findings, CR_{high} respondents showed a more healthy attachment to their nation and a willingness to see their nation in a critical light. Gaertner and Dovidio's research (2000, 2012) on a Common Identity Model suggests that when members of conflicting groups develop a common 'superordinate identity' instead of attaching to separate identities, more harmonious intergroup relations can be expected. In support of this theory, Satoru and Kaoru state that they feel no attachment to their identity as a Japanese but associate themselves more with a cosmopolitan identity.

Satoru: I like my country but I have no special attachment to being a Japanese national. I see myself more as an Asian and moreover, as a global citizen, or
even a resident of the planet earth. I find nationalities to be an unwanted hindrance to peaceful coexistence of people. I started thinking like that when I faced life and death; when I lost the most important people in my life.

Kaoru: I have never lived abroad but I don't strongly identify with Japan. I see myself more as a world citizen. My friend who is a staunch nationalist once asked me if there were two people drowning, one being Japanese and the other non-Japanese, who would I save first. My nationalist friend said she would definitely save the Japanese first. I said I would reach out to the one whom I can save first. Although I like Japan, I have difficulty relating to her kind of nationalism.

Adherence to superordinate identity has been associated with individual willingness to acknowledge out-group's suffering and reduce competitive victimhood (Shnabel et al., 2013). Compared to CR\textsubscript{Low} respondents, CR\textsubscript{High} respondents displayed less attachment to being a Japanese and a stronger inclination to transcend their national identity.

Research question 3a: How is the history of in-group transgressions presented to contemporary Japanese? To what extent does the descendants' awareness of their nation's past transgressions affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?

9.1.11 Finding 6: The majority of participants (60 percent) indicated that they were 'somewhat aware' about Japan's past transgressions while 32 percent answered that 'they were not aware at all.' Lack of awareness and knowledge of in-group transgressions was found to reduce the descendants' acceptance of collective responsibility.

A strong predictor of collective responsibility identified in the hierarchical regression analysis was ‘awareness of in-group transgressions,’ or the extent to which participants had knowledge about the sufferings Japan caused to China and other Asian neighbours during the Second World War. The insight among some scholars is that groups deliberately forget uncomfortable knowledge of their past (Baumeister & Hastings, 1997; Branscombe & Miron, 2004; Sahdra & Ross, 2007). This practice is defined by some as ‘chosen amnesia,’ a mode of forgetting by which a society
deliberately excludes unwanted or unsavoury aspects of their national past (Buckley-Zistel, 2006; Rotella & Richeson, 2013). Nations and groups have histories that are remembered through cultural narratives, rituals and memorials. Collective ‘forgetting’ is likely to occur if the group does not want to be reminded of the shameful history of wrongs committed (Branscombe & Miron, 2004). If historical narratives of the in-group's injustices are not salient in society, then it is difficult for individuals to feel any remorse or responsibility for that past. The findings on competitive victimhood presented in Chapter Seven demonstrate that the Japanese collective remembrance of the Asia-Pacific war primarily focuses on its history of victimization and downplays its history of aggression. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that regression analyses revealed that those with little knowledge of the harms committed in China felt less responsibility for Japan’s past transgressions. The data presented in this study illuminates an important issue that continues to protract the conflict between China and Japan: the disparate memories of war that continue to divide victims and perpetrators.

Historical memories are embedded in people’s minds through different kinds of educational, social and political experiences. As described in Chapter Four, Japanese textbooks are at the centre of an ideological tug of war between conservative and progressive elites regarding which interpretation of the war should be taught to future generations. The debates over what should or should not be included in Japanese textbooks about Japan’s wartime conduct have gained much attention in both the international and domestic media. The textbook issue is also at the heart of the frequent criticism of Japan’s 'historical amnesia.'

The findings of the survey indicate that the current generation of young Japanese is not entirely ignorant about the specifics of the war, with 60 percent claiming that they are 'somewhat aware' of the war atrocities committed in Nanjing and a combined 32 percent (‘not aware at all’ and ‘not really aware’) unsure of what happened. However, it should be noted that the majority who reported that they were 'somewhat aware,' revealed in the qualitative interviews that 'somewhat' meant that
they have heard about the 'Nanjing Incident' but lacked any knowledge of the specifics.

Satoko: I answered 'somewhat aware' but I really don't know much about the history of what the Japanese soldiers did in Nanjing. I did learn about it briefly in junior high and high school through history textbooks. The number of deaths from this incident that the Chinese claim is far greater than what we think it is. In class, the teacher quickly breezed through it and refrained from explaining anything in depth.

Although a direct comparison is difficult due to different data sets, this study's finding seems to support the results of the Asahi Shimbun opinion poll conducted from March to April of 2015 (n = 3000 adults) in which Japanese respondents were asked if they believed they received sufficient instruction about World War II at school. According to the poll, only 13 percent of Japanese answered that ‘they were taught sufficiently about the war’ and 79 percent said that 'their war education was insufficient.' The Asahi Shimbun poll also compared its results to a similar survey conducted in Germany in March 2015 (n = 1000 adults) in which Germans were asked if ‘they were sufficiently taught about the Nazi era.’ Findings showed that 48 percent of Germans claimed that they had been given sufficient knowledge about Nazi war history. The Asahi Shimbun poll data supports the findings of my survey: the current Japanese education system provides students with very little knowledge about Japanese wartime aggression and systematically draws a veil over the suffering inflicted on those who experienced Japanese occupation during the war. There is a definite knowledge gap in both the formal education system and in popular awareness regarding the conduct of Japan during the war. This facilitates both collective amnesia and moral distancing from sufferings inflicted on the Chinese during the war. It makes it challenging for the current generation of Japanese descendants to empathize with those who were victims of Japanese aggression.
Figure 21: Comparison of German vs. Japanese Education of WWII

Source: Asahi Shimbun opinion poll (March-April 2015, n=3000 adults)

The qualitative interviews with the CR_{low} respondents in Chapter 8 shed light on some of the ways in which Japan’s historical transgressions are downplayed in the Japanese education system. The scant educational attention to Japan's wartime actions generates a lack of salience in popular consciousness and awareness. Japanese textbook content can thwart a deep awareness of historical events that can generate feelings of regret and remorse. What makes it even more challenging is the way in which the education system prioritises rote learning of ‘historical facts,’ a practice which places pressure on teachers to cover the entirety of Japanese history in one year. It is easy to see why controversial issues like the Nanjing Massacre, therefore, would not figure prominently in the pressured curriculum. When this is added to teacher bias it is clear that much historical amnesia is generated by the way this history is taught in most Japanese schools. When curious students want to find out more information on their own, Internet searches more often than not lead to right wing nationalist history. This once again prevents the development of a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the ways in which Japan committed atrocities during the war.

The survey finding revealed that a strong majority of 70 percent agreed that the 'last war (1931-45)' was a war of aggression. However, the qualitative interviews showed
that while students know that Japan invaded Asia, war narratives in textbooks and other media still emphasize the suffering inflicted on the people of Japan. The qualitative responses reinforced this study's assumption that Japan’s suffering and victimisation during the war is given more weight than the suffering of its victims.

When asked about the first thing that was associated with the 'last war,' the images shared were all related to the sufferings of the Japanese civilians. The following comments show that the stories of Japanese victimization are passed on to them at a relatively young age through visual sources such as animations, films and photographs.

Satoru: I associate the last war with the hideous images of people burning in the air raids. I think it is because of the film I watched as a child called 'Hotaru no haka' [Grave of the Fireflies] which was produced by Studio Ghibli. It was tragic and sad.

The visual images of Japanese civilians' victimization during the war have been disseminated widely in popular cultural media and seem to have left a strong imprint on the collective conscience of today's Japanese descendants.

9.1.12 Comparing perspectives on history of in-group transgressions

Although today's descendants are predominantly exposed to war narratives that focus on the suffering of the Japanese people, qualitative findings showed that respondents who were willing to accept collective responsibility were exposed to alternative narratives of out-group suffering through various channels besides official textbooks such as teachers, films and museums.

Haruko: I went to the Oka Masaharu Memorial Peace Museum in Nagasaki which chronicles the atrocities of the Japanese Imperial Army against the Chinese and the Koreans. It was a school field trip. I was shocked to find out so much information about Japan's actions which were not really taught in our history textbooks. I think our generation should all go to this museum. However, unfortunately, this museum is not introduced in any of the official guide books.
Kaoru: Our history classes were designed to prepare us for the entrance exams. My junior high school teacher went over dry facts that the Nanjing Incident occurred while adding that the death toll is contentious and nobody knows the actual number of Chinese who were killed. On the other hand, my high school teacher was passionate and frustrated that our textbooks only focused on Japanese victimization. He showed us films on other people's victimization like the Holocaust, the Nanjing Massacre and Japanese Imperial Army's atrocities committed in Singapore and other parts of Asia. So I think it all depends on the teacher.

Knowledge and awareness of the in-group's transgressions and out-group's suffering is a basic and critical condition for the members of the perpetrator group to acknowledge collective responsibility. Awareness of the out-group's victimization have been found to transform perceptions of the conflict and negative attitudes towards the out-group.

**Research question 3b) To what extent does the descendants' negative out-group attitude affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?**

9.1.13 Finding 7: The majority of participants (77 percent) indicated that they had an unfavourable perception of the Chinese. Negative attitude towards the out-group was found to reduce the descendants' acceptance of collective responsibility.

Prejudice and stereotyping are inextricably linked. Both phenomena involve a preconceived negative evaluation of a group and its members. Prejudice is as an antipathy, based upon faulty and inflexible generalizations (Allport, 1954, 9) and can become a determinant of inter-group conflicts. Past research has demonstrated that negative out-group attitude can also be a significant predictor of diminished collective guilt (Hewstone et al., 2004). The hierarchical regression analyses presented in this study supported this finding by showing that Japanese negative attitudes towards the Chinese was a strong negative predictor of acceptance of collective responsibility. Consistent with various polling data collected in the same year as this study, this thesis' survey results also showed that a large percentage (77 percent) of Japanese harbour negative attitudes towards the Chinese. This study's
survey results (2014) mirrored the findings of Pew Research Center’s Global Attitudes and Trends Survey (released July 2014; n = 1000) and a poll by Genron NPO (released September 2014; n = 1000) in which a similar question was asked. To make a direct comparison, two scores for ‘somewhat favourable’ and ‘favourable’ / ‘somewhat unfavourable’ and ‘unfavourable’ were combined. Results from both the Pew Research Center and Genron NPO’s polls revealed that an overwhelming majority of more than 90 percent of the Japanese have an unfavourable opinion of China. This study's result was slightly lower, with 77 percent reporting unfavourable impressions. This difference may have resulted from the wording of the question, which specifically asked for participants’ views of ‘the Chinese’ whereas the other two polls asked for participants’ opinions of ‘China.’ The qualitative interviews revealed that participants have a stronger negative image of China as a state than of Chinese individuals. Nonetheless, all three surveys clearly indicate that the Japanese public’s perception of the Chinese and China is alarmingly negative.

Figure 22: Perception of the Out-group: A Comparison (2014)

As prejudice is a critical factor in the protraction of conflict and hinders efforts at reconciliation, it is crucial to explore the socio-political dynamics that generate Japanese antipathy towards the Chinese. Japanese prejudice towards China and the Chinese reflects some deeply held national stereotypes. This study drew on Stephan
et al.’s integrated threat theory to explore the extent to which the prejudice of Japanese participants is driven by negative stereotypes, symbolic threats, inter-group anxiety and realistic threats. The aim of this research was to understand the sources of negative out-group attitudes which reduce Japanese acceptance of guilt and responsibility.

For this study, a number of approaches were used to examine the sources underlying Japanese negative attitude toward the Chinese. As the earlier regression analyses revealed, negative out-group attitude was revealed to be an important predictor of diminished collective responsibility.

**Negative out-group attitude scale**
The Negative out-group attitude scale attempted to measure participants’ responses to negative stereotype traits frequently attached to the Chinese (trustworthy [reverse coded], friendly [reverse coded], aggressive, and self-centred), and symbolic threat (won’t follow rules). Results showed that about 50 percent of the respondents associated these negative stereotype traits with the Chinese ($M = 3.16, SD = 1.12$).

Of particular relevance to this research is the salience of identity-related factors in driving both prejudice and the lessening of collective responsibility. This study’s findings showed that, as societal channels work to suppress Japanese people’s war memory, the threat to Japanese moral identity from China’s accusations about Japan’s past injustices significantly heightens negative emotions toward the Chinese, diminishing feelings of remorse and guilt for the past and hindering possibilities for reconciliation.

**Symbolic threats**
The CRLow participants’ comments suggest that their negative out-group perception is fuelled by ‘symbolic threats,’ which jeopardize their beliefs in the moral correctness of their cultural values. As mentioned earlier, Japanese values attach much importance to politeness, harmony and conformity to law and order. They feel their standards are challenged by what they see as immoral Chinese behaviours such as
'cutting in lines,' 'lack of consideration for others’ needs,’ ‘irresponsible actions jeopardising consumers’ health by selling risky food products’ and ‘producing counterfeit products.’ Major television stations in Japan have frequently featured news on ‘toxic dumplings,’ ‘tainted chicken nuggets’ and ‘Chinese counterfeits.’ Hence, it is not surprising that the wide media coverage of China-related scandals has fed into anti-Chinese sentiments amongst the Japanese.

Realistic threats
With the outbreak of the territorial dispute surrounding the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands, and the repeated television images of Chinese vessels encroaching into Japanese territorial waters, Japanese anxieties about realistic threats have increased considerably. This is clearly indicated in the descriptive results of this study, with an overwhelmingly high percentage of respondents feeling anxious about realistic Chinese threats: 90 percent expressed anxiety about Chinese vessels entering Japanese waters, 84 percent were worried by China’s unilateral declaration of an air defense identification zone, 81 percent felt threatened by China’s military expansion and 85 percent were concerned about Chinese pollution affecting their health.

Japanese prejudice towards the Chinese is an outcome of multiple factors. Of particular relevance to this research is the salience of identity-related factors in driving both prejudice and the lessening of collective responsibility. My study shows that, as societal channels work to suppress Japanese people’s war memory, the threat to Japanese moral identity from China’s accusations about Japan’s past injustices significantly heightens negative emotions toward the Chinese, diminishing feelings of remorse for the past and hindering possibilities for reconciliation.
Research question 3c) To what extent does the descendants' contact with the out-group affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?

9.1.14 Finding 7: Quality contact with the out-group was found to facilitate acceptance of collective responsibility.

Past studies on intergroup contact have shown that positive contact with the out-group provides individuals with enhanced knowledge about their own group, helps them to develop a positive perspective of the out-group, reduces feelings of anxiety, and combats prejudice. Ignorance about the out-group is known to engender negative stereotyping and prejudice, and contact has played an important mediating role in reducing intergroup anxiety and prejudice. The intergroup contact hypothesis first proposed by Allport (1954), suggests that positive effects of intergroup contact are generated when contact occurs under four key conditions: equal status, intergroup cooperation, common goals, and support by social and institutional authorities. Various studies have been conducted which aim to understand the effects of different types of contact in mediating and moderating intergroup prejudice, with recent work demonstrating that intergroup contact yields the most effective positive outcomes when contact takes the form of cross-group friendships (Pettigrew, 1997; Davies et al., 2011). Contact emerged as one of the significant positive predictors of collective responsibility and negatively correlated with participants’ prejudice towards the Chinese. The present study explored the nature of Japanese participants’ interaction with the Chinese. An important finding of this study highlights that out of 162 survey participants, only 22 percent reported having close friendships with the Chinese. Consistent with survey results, none of the 15 interviewees who reported low collective responsibility said that they had any intimate, friendly relationship with a Chinese.

This is an important finding in relation to intergroup reconciliation as past contact research has shown that cross-group friendship lessens feelings of anxiety towards the out-group and diminish negative emotions about them. In a longitudinal study of students’ contact experiences conducted in UCLA, Levin, van Laar, and Sidanius
(2003) revealed that a greater number of cross-group friendships during college years predicted both significant reductions in intergroup anxiety and intergroup prejudice by the end of college. Although Japanese university students have more opportunities than the general public to interact with Chinese students in classroom settings or even participate in cooperative group activities on campus, less than 30 percent answered that they have regular contact with Chinese school- or workmates. Further, the qualitative interviews with the CR_{Low} participants revealed that even if participants engage with the Chinese on campus, (two interviewees said they participate in extracurricular activities with some Chinese students), their contact with each other does not develop into inter-group friendship. These regular contacts do not satisfy the key conditions that make contact effective in reducing negative preconceptions of the out-group. Several interviewees stressed that the image of the Chinese they encounter in their own environment is not necessarily negative. Nonetheless, the cognitive and affective results of their contact are not strong enough to challenge the pre-existing stereotypes and prejudices shaped primarily by the Japanese media.

Today, the Japanese public is exposed to a high concentration of negative information about China. As the findings presented in earlier chapter on moral identity threat have revealed, an extremely high percentage of Japanese feel threatened not only by frequent news on realistic threats of a rising China, but their moral identity is also challenged by persistent Chinese accusations about Japan’s immoral history and lack of repentance. These factors all contribute to a heightened negative perception of the Chinese and reduce feelings of remorse for Japan’s historical injustices. While sources driving negative attitudes towards the Chinese continue to intensify, it is clear that current levels of intergroup contact are not powerful enough to counter the legacy of historical trauma and the ongoing dynamics of the schism in Sino-Japanese relations. Notwithstanding these pessimistic results, it should be noted that qualitative findings of the CR_{High} participants revealed that those who accepted collective responsibility for Japan’s past all reported to have close friendships with the members of the out-group.
Comparing experiences of intergroup contact

All ten CR\textsubscript{High} respondents indicated that they have close friendship and frequent quality interaction with the members of the out-group. The respondents who showed willingness to accept responsibility were given opportunities to engage in in-depth dialogue about the history issue with the members of the out-group.

Saki: My older sister studied in Korea on an exchange programme. Through her, I became close friends with Korean people. We talked a lot about the 'comfort women' issue. We may never agree on a common history. I knew we couldn't be friends if I ignored this issue. I felt that engaging in a dialogue with them was the necessary step. One of them asked me how I felt about the Japanese leaders denying history. I explained that these politicians do not represent the entire Japanese population. There are also Japanese individuals who are willing to accept responsibility for what we did during the war. I told them about Kono statement and the apologies made by other Japanese leaders in the past. I think what made them most happy was the fact that I acknowledged that the Japanese army did use comfort women and it was not an imagined history. The same applies to my Chinese friends.

The CR\textsubscript{High} respondents recounted important interactions with the out-group members that led to a transformation in their perception about the history issue. For some it was an eye-opening experience that made them realize how skewed their knowledge of war history had been.

Satoru: My grandfather went to the battlefield in China as a doctor. He often told me not to believe all the negative things about the Chinese on television. He told me stories about good-hearted Chinese people who helped him out. After I entered college, I had the opportunity to become close friends with Chinese and Koreans. We went out drinking at a pub. They got drunk and a heated discussion about the history issue started. I was taken back by the outburst of strong emotions from them. They were relieved to learn that there were young Japanese who were willing to acknowledge responsibility for the war atrocities. This was a moment of reconciliation between myself and my Chinese and Korean friends. They seemed happy and I felt great afterward. I realized the importance of apology and it was a memorable moment when our friendship deepened.

Hayato: I have a Chinese friend I hang out with. We normally avoid the topic of the history problem but when we went out to dinner, he asked me how war history was taught in Japanese classrooms. I am glad we were able to talk about this so openly. My Chinese friend is very understanding and he assured me that the past is past, and he had no intention to blame the present Japanese
generations. He wanted China to let go of the past, forgive Japan and move on. This was such an eye-opening experience for me.

Saki also stated that the initial talk with her Chinese and Korean friends over a drink started with an emotional argument and debate. However, she recounted later that it was a moment when she realized how ignorant she had been about the suffering of the Chinese and Koreans. She said it was an enlightening moment.

Saki: Out of drunkenness, I jokingly said, 'Hey, you Koreans are erecting too many statues of comfort women in the States, what is going on?' My usually cheerful Korean friends suddenly became outraged and an emotional history debate began. I couldn't respond to any of their criticisms. I was completely ignorant about these issues. This is when I realized that the war history we had been taught in classrooms had been carefully tailored with many historical facts deleted.

Existing scholarship on intergroup conflict suggests that the most effective form of intergroup contact is that which is based on cross-group friendships (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Contact that has the potential of developing into friendship is likely to generate most positive attitude change (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). Consistent with a study conducted by Cehajic and Brown (2010), the findings that emerged from the qualitative interviews with CR_{High} respondents showed participants with quality contact and deep personal friendships with out-group members express greater willingness to accept collective responsibility for their in-group's past transgressions.
### Table 16: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Impediments to Japanese Collective Responsibility [Exemplar quotes]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inherited responsibility:</strong></td>
<td>The majority of the participants [60 percent+] felt a diminished sense of inherited responsibility and felt that they should not be blamed for their ancestors’ past mistakes.</td>
<td>Temporal and emotional distancing seen in participants: CR-low respondent: “I don’t feel responsible for what happened during the war. I don’t see myself as part of the group of militarists who committed those horrible crimes. We are from entirely different generations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are the contemporary Japanese willing to accept ‘inherited responsibility’ for injustices committed by their forebears?</td>
<td>Supports theory of ‘identity discontinuity’ and collective guilt (Branscombe 2004; Augoustinos &amp; LeCouteur, 2004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apology fatigue:</strong></td>
<td>The majority of the participants [66 percent] were experiencing ‘apology fatigue,’ convinced that the Japan has done enough to redress the past.</td>
<td>‘We have apologized enough’: CR-low respondent: “How long do we have to continue apologizing? Are these people [victims] ever going to be satisfied?...Japan has already offered numerous apologies and compensation for the damages incurred during the war.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How salient is ‘apology fatigue’ amongst contemporary Japanese?</td>
<td>Data supports Pew Research Center survey of 2016: “Japanese are increasingly likely to believe they have apologized enough for actions during WW II” (p. 213)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral identity threat:</strong></td>
<td>Moral identity threat emerged as the strongest negative predictor of collective responsibility. Replicated prior research (Sullivan et al., 2012).</td>
<td>Participants reported defensive reactions and frustrations with China’s aggressive demands for contrition: CR-low respondent: “I cannot feel guilty because China’s demand is so forceful. They come out so aggressively, unilaterally accusing us and portraying to the world that they are the ultimate victims. I find that to be repulsive.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Identity-driven variable]</td>
<td>Morality was considered an important component of the participants’ positive group identity. Victims’ constant accusations and reminders of the in-group’s immoral harm-doing during WWII led to denial or defensive reactions particularly from high in-group identifiers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the Japanese feel that their moral identity is threatened when confronted with criticisms from victimized nations about the nation’s immoral past?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does moral identity threat affect the participants’ willingness to accept collective responsibility?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competitive victimhood:</strong></td>
<td>This study provided the first statistical evidence demonstrating the salience of competitive victimhood with a contemporary Japanese sample. The majority of participants [70 percent] expressed that ‘the atomic Asia-Pacific War was immediately associated with the suffering of Japanese civilians: CR-low respondent: “I associate the war with the suffering of Japanese civilians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Identity-driven variable]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the salience of Japanese victimhood [during WWII] affect the participants’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **willingness to accept collective responsibility?** | bombing was the most inhumane and immoral act in human history.” Study revealed that the history of atomic victimhood is collectively remembered in Japanese society. Salient victim consciousness was negatively associated with the participants’ willingness to accept collective responsibility for their nation’s past transgressions.
Data substantiated claims regarding Japanese victim mentality after WW II (Orr, 2001; Yoshida, 2005; Seaton, 2007; Bukh, 2007) and the images of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and air raids.”
“Majority of the people who supported Japan’s war efforts were forced to. It was a time when absolute obedience to the Emperor was demanded. Who was responsible for the war? It was the top political and military leaders of Imperial Japan…” |
| **In-group identification: [Identity-driven variable]** | A large majority of participants reported high degree of collective self-esteem and strong identification with the nation. Those who identified highly with the nation felt increased resistance to accept collective responsibility for their nation’s immoral past. Data replicated previous research by Doosje et al. (2004).
Data also challenged numerous Japanese scholars’ concerns over rise of youth nationalism in Japan (Takahara, 2006; Honda, 2007). Japanese national identification was found to be more ‘patriotic’ than glorifying ‘right-wing nationalism.’
High national-identifiers found pride in modern, peaceful Japan that emerged as a major economic power after WWII and distanced themselves from the cruel perpetrators who committed atrocities in China [identity discontinuity].
CR-low respondent: “I love my country, Japan. It is safe, clean, and convenient…. We are peaceful and respect ‘wa’ [harmony] in this country. Crime rate is very low….am proud that Japan rose from the ashes as a major economic power after the defeat of the war.” |
| **Knowledge/Awareness of in-group’s transgressions:** | After moral identity threat, the second strongest predictor to collective responsibility was ‘Awareness of in-group’s transgressions’ or the extent to which participants were knowledgeable about Japan’s wartime atrocities in China. Lack of knowledge of in-group transgressions was found to diminish participants’ acceptance of collective responsibility.
The majority of participants [60 percent] answered that they were ‘somewhat aware’ of the history of the Nanjing Massacre while 32 percent said they were ‘not aware at all.’
Partial amnesia: Current generation of young Japanese is not entirely ignorant. However, 60 percent who answered ‘somewhat aware’ meant that they have heard about the ‘Nanjing Incident’ but lacked any knowledge of the specifics.
CR-low respondent: “I really don’t know much about the history of what the Japanese soldiers did in Nanjing. I did learn about it briefly in junior high and high school through history textbooks. The number of deaths from this incident that the Chinese claim is far greater than what we think it
Findings supported previous research (Buckley-Zistel’s, 2006; Baumeister & Hastings, 1997; Sahdra & Ross, 2007) on ‘collective forgetting,’ that groups do not want to be reminded of the shameful history of wrongs committed in the past. Data substantiated prevalence of ‘partial amnesia’ amongst contemporary Japanese.

*Negative out-group attitude/Prejudice:*
To what extent does the participants’ negative out-group attitude affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?

The majority of participants [77 percent] indicated that they had an ‘unfavourable’ perception of the Chinese. Negative out-group attitude was found to reduce the participants’ acceptance of collective responsibility.

Findings replicated previous research (Hewstone et al., 2004) which demonstrated prejudice to be a significant predictor of reduced collective guilt for in-group’s transgressions.

Data was also consistent with Pew Research Center and Genron NPO’s 2014 polling data that revealed more than 90 percent of the Japanese to have an unfavourable opinion of China.

*Intergroup contact:*
To what extent does the participants’ contact with the out-group affect their willingness to accept collective responsibility?

Quality contact [cross-group friendship] with the out-group was found to facilitate participants’ acceptance of collective responsibility.

Contact emerged as a significant positive predictor of collective responsibility and was negatively correlated with out-group prejudice. Findings replicated previous research (Levin et al., 2003; Cehajic & Brown, 2010; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

All ten respondents who felt high levels of collective responsibility reported that they have close friendship and frequent quality interaction with members of the out-group.

CR-high respondent: “I have a Chinese friend I hang out with….when we went out to dinner, he asked me how war history was taught in Japanese classrooms. I am glad we were able to talk about it so openly. My Chinese friend is very understanding and he assured me that the past is past and he had no intention to blame present Japanese generations…this was such an eye-opening experience for me.”

is. In class, the teacher quickly breezed through it and refrained from explaining anything in depth.”


\textbf{9.2 Conclusions and Recommendations}

Many protracted conflicts have their roots in memories of past violence. How the perpetrator acknowledges responsibility and makes an effort to redress past injustices has been found to be critical in healing the victims’ psychological wounds and advancing the process of reconciliation. On the other hand when past injustices are left unaddressed, feelings of victimization, shame and humiliation can prolong the conflict between the transgressor and the transgressed. This has been the case with the friction between Japan, China and South Korea in East Asia. While the victimized nations continue to demand a sincere apology and contrition, the Japanese public seems to be experiencing ‘apology fatigue,’ a feeling of frustration that no matter what they do, the victims will never be satisfied. Debates about historical injustices have revolved around whether responsibility and guilt for past wrongs should be passed on from the original perpetrators to generational descendants. Is intergenerational responsibility for ancestral wrongdoing both an inherited and national responsibility for citizens?

The present study aimed to provide empirical data on why some descendants are unwilling to accept ‘inherited responsibility’ for the acts of their ancestors and the processes that shape their attitudes and behavior. The research was designed to identify the key impediments to contemporary Japanese participants’ acceptance of collective responsibility for the nation’s wartime harmdoing. Because of the protracted nature of this conflict, this study hypothesized that identity-related needs may emerge as potential impediments to Japanese acceptance of war responsibility.

A mixed methods approach employing sequential explanatory design involving two phases of data collection was utilised in this study. The quantitative phase using a survey was carried out to guide a broad understanding of the contextual factors that shape present-day Japanese descendants’ perceptions and behaviours (n=162). Measures were used to gauge the participants’ acceptance of ‘inherited responsibility,’ and other potentially impeding factors such as 1) moral identity
threat, 2) competitive victimhood, 3) in-group identification, 4) collective memory or level of knowledge of in-group’s transgressions, 5) negative out-group attitude, and 6) contact with the out-group. This was followed by the next phase of qualitative research comprised of in-depth interviews with a purposive sampling of survey respondents who reported low vs. high levels of ‘inherited responsibility’ (n=15 low-responsibility, 10 high-responsibility respondents). The qualitative findings enabled the researcher to also gain a comprehensive, and nuanced understanding of the complex real-life phenomena of how societies disseminate narratives and how these cultural products and discourse affect citizens’ acceptance of collective responsibility.

The results of this study provided evidence that majority of the participants felt that their generation should not have to feel guilty for the mistakes of the past generations of Japanese. Those who reported low levels of collective responsibility demonstrated temporal and emotional distancing with the group of militarists who committed war crimes and stressed that they ‘belong to an entirely different generation.’ The survey results also revealed that ‘apology fatigue’ was indeed prevalent amongst majority of the Japanese participants [66 percent]. Interviews with the CR$_{Low}$ respondents highlighted that they genuinely believe that the Japanese government has done enough to redress the past and expressed frustrations for the victims’ endless demands for sincere apology. Majority of the CR$_{Low}$ participants wished to distance themselves from the perpetrators of the Second World War and believed they should not be held accountable for the sins of their ancestors that they were never directly involved in.

As for identity-related variables, the results of this study added evidence to past scholarship on collective guilt and moral identity threat. When the positive identity of the in-group was threatened by constant accusations about their forebears’ immoral actions, high identifiers in particular moved into a defensive mode and expressed their annoyance, stressing that China’s criticisms are illegitimate and even driven by ulterior motives. These results replicated previous analyses by
Branscombe, Doosje and McGarty (2002) that groups employ various strategies to defend their in-group’s esteem in the face of accusations about its shameful history.

Second identity-driven variable that seemed to hinder Japanese descendants’ acceptance of collective responsibility was competitive victimhood. The results provided one of the first pieces of empirical evidence demonstrating the salience of competitive victimhood amongst contemporary Japanese. This study attempted to assess unconscious perceptions using an implicit association question in which the respondent was asked to choose the first thing that came to mind when they thought about the victims of the Asia-Pacific War. The majority of the participants associated the last war with the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. CR_Low respondents reported that when they thought about the victims of the war, they immediately thought of ordinary Japanese citizens. The present research results substantiated various scholars’ claims about Japan’s dominant atomic victimhood trope and that post-war narratives encouraged a victimhood mentality that enabled the Japanese people to identify themselves as victims of the war and divert their attention from their nation’s wartime aggression (Orr, 2001; Yoshida, 2005; Bukh, 2007; Seaton, 2007).

The third identity-driven variable, in-group identification, also emerged as a negative predictor of Japanese participants’ collective responsibility. Past scholarship revealed that in-group identification can lead to two different pathways; in one strand of research, because collective guilt being a group-based emotion, salient identification with the perpetrator group generated strong collective guilt among the high national identifiers (Doosje et al., 2006). The results of the present research replicated the study of Doosje and colleagues (1998) by demonstrating the high national identifiers to defend their collective esteem by rejecting the notion of or justifying the nation’s past transgressions. Data showed that high levels of national identification significantly reduced the participants’ willingness to accept responsibility for their in-group’s historical harmdoing. Although the survey findings revealed that a high percentage of Japanese participants associated their self-esteem with a positive conception of the nation, the qualitative data showed this attachment to be more
nuanced and patriotic than what can be simply categorized as ‘glorifying’ right-wing nationalism. These findings challenged the claims of various Japanese scholars on the rise of youth nationalism today (Takahara, 2006; Honda, 2007).

The present study also provided empirical evidence on how current generations of Japanese ‘remember’ the history of their ancestors’ misdeeds and to what extent these ‘collective memories’ affect their acceptance of responsibility to redress that past. Collective memory can be transmitted via historical narratives in official textbooks, commemorations, mass media and through interpersonal story-telling. The findings affirmed that Japan’s policy of chosen ‘historical amnesia’ or downplaying the information about the Japanese acts of aggression in its public discourse has led many participants’ to have limited knowledge about the Nanjing Massacre and coercion of ‘comfort women’ (1930s-1945). A strong negative predictor of collective responsibility identified in this research was therefore ‘awareness of in-group transgressions.’ However, the present research findings further revealed that contemporary young Japanese are not entirely ignorant about Japan’s war history with 60 percent claiming that they were ‘somewhat’ aware of the atrocities committed in Nanjing while 32 percent reported that they were not sure of what happened. Added to this finding, a strong majority of 70 percent of the participants admitted that the last war (1931-45) was a ‘war of aggression.’ Nonetheless, this study demonstrated that Japanese collective memory and public discourse of the Asia-Pacific war focusing on its own people’s victimhood combined with suppressed knowledge of Imperial Japan’s past transgressions are together diminishing the participants’ willingness to acknowledge guilt and responsibility for the historical harms committed in China. This study’s data substantiated various scholars’ claims that ‘divisive memories of the war’ is the critical factor that is protracting the conflict between China and Japan (Clements, 2017; Kim, 2016; He, 2007b; Hein & Selden, 2000; Jager & Mitter, 2007).

Findings of this study also replicated previous scholarship that showed how negative out-group attitude can become a significant predictor of reduced collective guilt and responsibility (Hewstone et al., 2004). The present research attempted to probe into
the possible socio-political sources that may be contributing to Japanese participants’ negative evaluation of the out-group. 95 percent of the respondents cited the domestic news media as the primary source of information they rely on for their knowledge of China and the Chinese. The second largest source of information reported to be influencing their perception of China was the television media, and nearly 50 percent of the participants reported to trust their domestic media’s coverage of China and the Chinese to be objective. The study’s findings additionally demonstrated that while China’s accusations about Japan’s immoral past threaten participants’ positive identity, these negative emotions were further reinforced by the Japanese media’s narratives about China’s realistic threats, particularly when the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands dispute led to heightened bilateral tensions.

Lastly, this research’s regression analysis provided an important finding relevant to future bilateral reconciliation; that the Japanese participants’ high levels of contact with the out-group was not only correlated with reduced prejudice but it was also associated with increased levels of collective responsibility. The study’s data was consistent with previous scholarship on effects of contact in reducing intergroup conflict (Levin et al., 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Hewstone et al., 2006) and increasing acknowledgement of in-group responsibility (Cehajic & Brown, 2010). The qualitative data of the CR<sub>High</sub> respondents in this study advances the existent literature on contact and in-group responsibility by defining the type of ‘quality contact’ that can facilitate increased levels of collective responsibility and empathy towards the out-group. CR<sub>High</sub> respondents who showed willingness to accept responsibility indicated that they have close friendship and frequent quality interaction with the members of the out-group in which they have engaged in in-depth dialogue about the ‘history issue’ dividing their countries. These close interactions proved to be vital in leading to transformative perspective-taking and promoting empathetic understanding of the experience of the other. This study highlighted the importance of positive affective processes of effective contacts in advancing intergroup reconciliation.
Japan’s lack of contrition for the nation’s wartime transgressions continues to lie at the heart of the Sino-Japanese divide. Although many scholars have analysed contentious war narratives between China and Japan, there are few studies that have explored the social psychological and emotional factors that may be impeding Japanese rapprochement with China. This research, therefore, is the first to empirically examine Japanese willingness to acknowledge and accept inherited responsibility for the past war and its association with identity-based needs of the perpetrator group.

Understanding what impedes perpetrator group descendants from accepting some degree of inherited responsibility and guilt for past acts of Japanese aggression is an important area of research for conflict resolution practitioners, political leaders and policymakers. It is particularly important for those political actors interested in generating more harmonious relationships between China and Japan. On a basis of the present research I would like to offer some normative recommendations that will advance these objectives.

9.2.1 Recommendations

1) Recommendation 1: Dealing with Perpetrator Group's Moral Identity Threat

This study examined the impediments to Japanese lack of contrition, focusing on the perpetrator group’s need to defend its positive identity as a moral actor. The first significant finding of this research is that when Japanese feel that their moral status is threatened by accusations about their nation's past transgressions, they are less likely to accept collective responsibility. This finding is consistent with wider social identity theory which posits that individuals are motivated to maintain and defend the favourable image of their significant reference groups. Any challenge to the group's moral reputation, therefore, problematises Japanese personal and collective esteem. When confronted with harsh accusations of Japan's immoral past, the CR_{Low} respondents reacted defensively. The interviewees reported strong negative emotions when criticised by China about Japan's imperial past. A frequent theme in the
discourse of the CR_{low} respondents is that they were annoyed and irritated by the vehemence and aggressiveness of Chinese criticisms. On the other hand, respondents who were willing to assume collective responsibility revealed that engaging in quality dialogue with the aggrieved out-group enabled them to discuss the 'history problem' in depth and transform their perspectives of Chinese in a positive direction. Any reconciliation must begin with acknowledgement in order to create ripe conditions for dialogue. Akemi represents the majority of the CR_{low} respondents' view that "if their demands were expressed in a different way, in a more rational and calm manner, I may feel differently. The fact that they are constantly stressing that they are victims in a pushy, aggressive way is just annoying." The normative conclusion, therefore, is that if the Sino-Japanese relationship is considered valuable to both parties then it is important that each side (particularly the victimised) make conciliatory gestures that will reduce the perpetrator group's psychological 'identity' threat. This is best done by enhancing communications which bolster rather than diminish the self-esteem and moral reputation of the perpetrators. Attacking the moral reputation of the Japanese will generate defensiveness, competitive victimhood and a desire to either revise or forget painful history. As outlined in Chapter 4, this phenomenon is clearly manifested currently in the efforts of the Japanese conservative politicians to revamp its identity and deny and/or rewrite Japanese history.

Recommendation 2: Interventions to promote 'inclusive' victimhood mentality

Another key finding was the salience of victim consciousness among post-war generations of Japanese. This study has shown that exclusive victim beliefs (Vollhardt, 2012) are an impediment to the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility. Scholarship on intractable conflicts reveals that when groups are engaged in making exclusive claims for their victimisation and promote 'competitive victimhood,' they spend considerable time and effort on establishing that their in-group has suffered more than the other. Because of this suffering there is an implicit expectation that they deserve empathy and compassion rather than criticism.
The majority of the respondents in this study revealed that Japan's formal education promotes a narrative of Japanese victimhood and diminishes narratives of Japan as an aggressive actor. These narratives were found to be a serious impediment to the perpetrator group's acceptance of collective responsibility for past transgressions. The study also revealed that respondents who were willing to accept collective responsibility were those who were exposed to information about Japan’s aggression and perpetrator status. In the light of this, programmes which foster higher levels of empathetic awareness and an 'inclusive victim mentality' [acknowledging that others have also suffered] (Vollhardt, 2012) should be introduced more widely in both China and Japan. One example that emerged from the CRhigh participants' responses was the impact of learning about the history of the other's victimization from [private] peace museums like the Oka Masaharu Memorial Museum in Nagasaki. This research's finding underscores the importance of peace education. Creating a common historical narrative between perpetrators and victims in a protracted conflict is extremely challenging (Bilali & Ross, 2012). Efforts should be made, however, to introduce more programmes which acknowledge the suffering of all sides during war. My interviews revealed that popular cultural products such as Studio Ghibli's 'Grave of the Fireflies' played an important role in shaping contemporary Japanese perception of war victims. Similarly, showing films or animations focusing on the tragic and traumatic experiences of Chinese civilians may help Japanese post-war descendants to humanise the 'other' and empathise with the victims' suffering. Perhaps the most important thing that China and Japan could do together would be to highlight the suffering of both sides during past wars while admitting and acknowledging the special role of Japan as the primary initiator of violent conflict before and during the Second World War.

**Recommendation 3: Interventions to promote cross-group friendship and dialogue**

The findings of this thesis have also confirmed the importance of intergroup contact more specifically, high quality contact which generates sustained friendships across ethnic and cultural lines. Research on intergroup contact and prejudice reveals that
affective dimensions are critical for reducing negative feelings towards out-groups. 'Feelings of closeness' have been shown to strongly affect the group's positive emotions toward the out-group. While intergroup contact typically reduces prejudice, it is most effective for reducing prejudice when it consists of close, high-quality intergroup relationships such as those generated by cross-group friendships (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2011, 117). It is therefore worrying that only 22 percent of Japanese participants engage in 'high quality contact' with Chinese while an overwhelming majority of almost 78 percent have little or no contact. This lack of contact diminishes opportunities for more personalized interaction and a deeper cognitive learning about the ‘other.’ Past research on the effects of contact have demonstrated that general knowledge about the out-group may not in itself be enough for contact to induce positive effects and reduce prejudice. For this reason, interventions and programmes which encourage extended and intimate contact will lay a solid basis for transformative dialogue and a deeper empathetic appreciation of the 'other.'

**Recommendation 4: Interactive problem-solving workshops among media professionals**

This empirical research has confirmed that Sino-Japanese conflict is an identity-based conflict. Identity-based protracted conflicts are difficult to resolve with traditional interventions because of deeply held societal beliefs, competing collective memories about the conflict and a tendency to constantly demonise the out-group in society through time (Bar-Tal, 2007). It is evident from the thesis' survey data as well as qualitative responses that the media plays an important role in defining the Japanese perception of the Chinese and shaping their interpretation of the nation's war history. In this study, 92 percent of the survey respondents indicated that they rely on Japanese news media as a primary source of information about China and the Chinese. In the light of this, I propose that those interested in generating harmonious relationships between China and Japan explore a range of innovative intervention processes that might change perception and consciousness and generate creative ways of replacing mistrust with trust and nervousness with confidence in Sino-Japan
relationships. One such process is the expansion of analytical, interactive problem-solving workshops in the region. These are normally with political influentials, and policymakers (Kelman, 1995, d'Estree, 2006). It may be beneficial to work with representatives of media organizations in these processes so that they might generate more conflict-sensitive journalism. Interactive problem-solving is a conflict intervention method that has been tried in many protracted conflicts such as the Middle East, Sri Lanka, Cyprus and Northern Ireland. Because the sources of protracted intergroup conflict are rooted in unmet human needs, past research on the benefits of interactive problem-solving have revealed that discussions focusing on underlying needs, threats and fears have increased empathy, enabled inclusive rather than exclusive perspectives, enhanced self-understanding, transformed thinking and behaviour and reduced prejudicial attitudes towards the other (Kelman, 2008b; Fisher, 1997; d'Estree, 2012). While it takes time for these processes to take effect, there is not doubt that problem-solving workshops and similar techniques are crucial first steps in the transformation of perceptions about the 'other.'

**Implications for Future Research**

This thesis makes a number of contributions to knowledge about collective responsibility and its relationship to collective guilt. Acknowledgement of in-group responsibility, however, can also be a trigger to emotions like shame (Branscombe & Doosje, 2004). This study did not explore the two related but different concepts of 'shame' and 'guilt' amongst contemporary Japanese. The role of shame in conflict situations may be influenced by cultural context and deserves future investigation. The notion of shame is closely related to the concept of face saving in Asian cultures. Past studies have compared and contrasted Japan's wartime memories with those of Germany contending that Japan is a shame culture more than a guilt society.

In guilt-driven cultures the main emphasis is on the action and its negative consequences whereas shame driven cultures are marked more by a focus on the self, and ways in which the behaviour generates reputational damage to the perpetrator (Lewis, 1971; Brown, Gonzalez, Zagefka, Manzi, & Cehajic, 2008, 75-76). Previous
research (Tangney et al., 1996; Tangney, & Dearing, 2002) has found that, compared to guilt, shame is typically experienced as more distressing and painful and therefore more strongly associated with depression, anger and externalization of blame. Shame is associated with a sense of worthlessness and guilt with a sense of responsibility. Guilt leads to constructive behaviour, motivating perpetrators to make restitution for the wrongdoing (Tangney et al., 1996; Tangney & Dearing, 2002). Shame has been associated with decreased empathy toward others while guilt has been associated with increased empathy toward others (Tangney & Fischer, 1995). Although both emotions are aversive, guilt and shame were found to be associated with distinctive consequences. Because guilt is primarily focused on the individual’s misdeed and responsibility, it should be more likely to lead to positive actions to redeem the mistake such as apology and reparation. Conversely, shame has been found to be characterized by self-blame, and can therefore lead to defensive responses like withdrawal from and avoidance of the transgression, and even self-defensive aggression. However, research on the effects of collective shame on prosocial behaviour towards the victims have shown mixed empirical results in the past and requires further investigation in different cultural contexts including Asian societies.

9.12 Transforming Sino-Japanese Relations

Painful memories stemming from the traumatic experiences of the Japanese invasion of China are deeply engrained in the Chinese psyche and resurface in virulent public protests against Japan. While the Chinese people continue to feel bitter about their suffering and the lack of genuine Japanese atonement for the war, the findings of this study confirmed that the majority of Japanese people feel diminished inherited responsibility for their ancestors' mistakes and are frustrated with endless Chinese demands for apology and reparations. This thesis has demonstrated that the underlying drivers of protracted conflicts—need for positive identity and recognition—are the factors exacerbating tensions between China and Japan.

Popular animosity, borne out of deep-rooted historical violence, cannot be easily eradicated by functional economic relationships. Incompatibility based on different perceptions of history, national stereotypes and rigid worldviews are as likely to
generate transnational conflict as clashes over territorial interests or sovereignty. Indeed these emotional factors can rapidly polarize otherwise negotiable disputes. Decisions made by political leaders in both China and Japan reflect strong nationalist public sentiments in both countries and the enduring power of traumatic memory. Popular nationalism deeply rooted in historical memories can exacerbate mutual threat perception, shape foreign policy decisions and become a catalyst for future conflict. Building peaceful relationships may require more than formal agreements between nations. In sum, I argue that the deeper psychological identity needs of both perpetrator and victim groups must be addressed for true reconciliation in East Asia to be realized.
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Appendix A: Information Sheet and Questionnaires

Reference #: 13/258

From Fear to Friendship: Connectors and Dividers in Sino-Japanese Relations

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS
ONLINE SURVEY ON SINO-JAPANESE RELATIONS

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?

This project is undertaken as part of the requirements for a thesis research in peace and conflict studies at the University of Otago, under the supervision of Professor Kevin Clements. The purpose of this research is to explore how Chinese and Japanese people perceive the main drivers of conflict in Sino-Japanese relations. The data collected in this study will help identify future measures that can reduce the tension between the two countries.

What Type of Participants are being sought?

Approximately 100 Chinese and Japanese undergraduate and postgraduate students (age 20-30) from universities in both countries will be recruited to participate in an online survey on Sino-Japanese relations. Participants must be willing to share their views on the current tensions between China and Japan. In order to prevent potential selection bias, Chinese and Japanese students must be residing in their respective countries. Hence, Japanese students studying in China, and Chinese students studying in Japan will be excluded from the sample. Questionnaires are offered in Japanese and Chinese so the respondent can choose the language they feel most comfortable with. The survey URL will be emailed to you using a popular online medium called SurveyMonkey. Participants are therefore required to have access to
internet and email. There will not be any monetary compensation and your participation will be voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw even after your initial consent.

**What will Participants be Asked to Do?**

Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to complete an online survey that will be sent to you by email (linking to SurveyMonkey). Technical instructions on how to access and respond to the questionnaire will be provided together with the survey link in the email. The survey should take 30-60 minutes to complete.

You will be asked to share your demographic information such as age, nationality/ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation, and level of education. Since the aim of this study is to understand your perception of the “other” in Sino-Japanese relations, you will be asked about your perception of China/Japan, how you understand the history of World War II, your sentiments toward your country and your contacts with the people of China/Japan.

Please note that you may decide not to take part at any time during the project without any disadvantage to yourself.

**What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?**

The information collected through this online survey will be on your perception of the “other” in Sino-Japanese relations. Aside from the personal views presented in the answers to the questionnaire, this study will also obtain each participant’s basic demographic information such as age, ethnicity, gender, religious affiliation, and level of education. (Please see the outline below).

1) Demographics
   - age, gender, location, ethnicity, religious affiliation, level of education

2) Perception of the other
   - Your impressions of China/Japan

3) Contact with the other
   - Sources of information shaping the view of the other

5) Memory of the war
   - How the history of World War II is remembered
   - Main sources of information that has shaped your understanding of World War II

6) National identity
   - Level of your confidence and pride in your country

7) Future of Sino-Japanese relations
   - Expectancy of future military conflict between the two countries

Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the interview, the Committee has not been able
to review the precise questions to be used. In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable, you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and to withdraw from the project at any stage without disadvantage to yourself of any kind. Personal information such as names and contact information will be viewed only by the researcher and used for the sole purpose of communicating with the participants. Participants will be allowed to access the data they offered and will be able to view the final analysis of the survey once presented in thesis format. The results of the project will be presented as part of a doctoral dissertation, may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve your anonymity.

On the Consent Form you will be given options regarding your anonymity. Please be aware that should you wish we will make every attempt to preserve your anonymity. However, with your consent, there are some cases where it would be preferable to attribute contributions made to individual participants. It is absolutely up to you which of these options you prefer.

The raw data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only the researcher will be able to gain access to it. Data obtained as a result of the research will be retained for at least 5 years in secure storage. Any personal information of the participants, such as contact details, will be destroyed at the completion of the research, however, the data derived from the research will be kept for much longer or possibly indefinitely.

Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?

You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What if Participants have any Questions?
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (NCPACS)
Ria Shibata and Professor Kevin Clements
NCPACS
NCPACS
+64 3 471 6462 +64 3 479 9468
ria.shibata@postgrad.otago.ac.nz kevin.clements@otago.ac.nz

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256 or email gary.witte@otago.ac.nz). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey conducted by the University of Otago's National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies. The objective of this research is to better understand Japanese young people's perception of China and the Chinese people. The questionnaire is anonymous and your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Thank you for your cooperation!

* 1. Please tell me which prefecture you are from?

* 2. How old are you?

* 3. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

* 4. Please indicate your nationality.
   - Japanese
   - Non-Japanese

* 5. What is your major in university?
* 6. Please tell us your family's income.
   - [ ] Below 2 million yen
   - [ ] 2-4 million yen
   - [ ] 4-7 million yen
   - [ ] 7-10 million yen
   - [ ] Above 10 million yen
   - [ ] Not sure

* 7. Are you affiliated with any religion or religious organization? Please choose from the choices below.
   - [ ] Buddhism
   - [ ] Christianity
   - [ ] Shinto
   - [ ] New religion
   - [ ] Islam
   - [ ] No religion
   - [ ] Other
     - [ ]

* 8. How important is religion to you?
   - [ ] Very important
   - [ ] Somewhat important
   - [ ] Not sure
   - [ ] Not very important
   - [ ] Not important at all
9. Where do you get information about China? Please choose the top three sources of information you rely on.

- Conversations with Chinese
- Visited China
- Japanese news
- Japanese television shows (information programs, dramas)
- Internet/Blogs
- School textbooks/Classrooms
- Japanese books/publications
- Movies
- Stories by friends/families
- Things I heard from people
- Anime, Manga
- Chinese media
- その他（指定してください）

10. To what extent do you trust Japanese media's coverage on China?

- Trust completely
- Trust somewhat
- Neutral
- Don't trust much
- Don't trust at all

11. How much do you agree or disagree with the following characterizations of the Chinese people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not follow rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-centred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Please choose one answer that best describes your perception towards the Chinese people.

- Very favourable
- Favourable
- Neutral
- Unfavourable
- Very unfavourable

13. To what extent do you feel these emotions towards China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) affection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) ambivalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I get concerned when I see Chinese vessels entering Japanese territorial waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) China establishing its ADIZ over Senkaku Islands is unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) China's actions to secure energy resources seem selfish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) China's military build-up is a threat to our security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) China's pollution problem is affecting Japanese people's health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**15. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) As Japanese, I feel annoyed every time China demands Japan to apologize for its past actions.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) I wish China would stop criticizing that Japan is unrepentant for its past harming.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) I get annoyed when the Chinese blame Japan for making them suffer during the war.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) I feel irritated when China attacks Japan for not facing up to the past.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) I think Japan deserves to be criticized for its wartime actions. [reverse coded]</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) As a Japanese, I don't want to hear about the cruelties committed by the Japanese soldiers in the past.</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**16. Which of the following best describes your contact with the Chinese people? (multiple choices)**

- [ ] I have a close friend who is Chinese
- [ ] I have a Chinese school/workmate whom I regularly see
- [ ] I have no personal acquaintance who is Chinese (but I meet them in my immediate environment)
- [ ] I have visited China before (i.e. tourism)
- [ ] I have no contact with the Chinese
* 17. How often do you have physical contact with someone from China?

- Daily
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Yearly
- Less than 5-yearly
- No contact
- Other (please explain)

* 18. Next, we would like to ask you some questions about history of the war. When you think of the 'last war,' what is the first thing that comes to your mind?

- Nanjing Massacre
- Kamikaze pilots
- Air raids and bombing of Tokyo
- Atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- Attack on Pearl Harbor
- The Bataan death march
- Unit 731 and biological warfare
- Other (please explain)
19. How did you learn about Japan's history of the Pacific War? Please choose the top three sources of information you can think of.

- News programs
- Japanese television (information programs, dramas)
- Internet/Blogs
- Textbooks/School
- Books/magazines/other publications
- Films
- Museums
- Stories of friends and families
- Anime, Manga
- Foreign media (books, films, news)
- Other

20. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was the most inhumane and immoral act in history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The dropping of the atomic bomb was the most horrendous act perpetrated in human history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Japanese civilians also suffered as victims of the war.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) As the only country in the world that has ever been atomic-bombed, Japan must never forget this history.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The magnitude of the destruction wrought by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima cannot be compared to any other tragic event of war.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*21. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Our generation should not be held responsible for Japan's military actions during the last war.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) As Japanese, we should feel remorse for Japan's military actions during the war.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) We should not have to feel responsible for the actions of our forebears.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) As Japanese, we should accept responsibility for Japan's injustices in the last war.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I think as Japanese, we are accountable for what the other Japanese did in the past.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Japan has apologised enough for its military actions during the last war.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I am tired of hearing endless demands from China to apologise.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Do you think the Pacific War was a war of aggression?

- □ 1) Yes, it was a war of aggression.
- □ 2) No, I don't think it was a war of aggression.
- □ 3) I don't know

23. To what extent are you aware of Japan's wartime actions in China, i.e. Nanjing massacre.

- □ Very aware
- □ Somewhat aware
- □ Not really aware
- □ Not aware at all
* 24. How did you come to learn about the Nanjing massacre?

- Conversations with the Chinese
- Visited China
- Japanese news
- Japanese television (information programs, dramas)
- Internet/Blogs
- School textbooks/classroom
- Japanese books/publications
- Movies
- Manga/Anime
- Things I heard from people
- Stories by friends/families
- Don't know

Other (please explain)

* 25. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I am glad to be a Japanese.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Japan is a country highly regarded by people around the world.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The nation I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I am proud to be a Japanese.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I am a contributing/worthy citizen of Japan.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I love this country of Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) In view of Japanese economic superiority, it is only right that we should have a bigger say in the United Nations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The Japanese people are among the finest in the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The remarkable growth of Japan after the war is mainly due to the excellence of the people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Japan is the best country in the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) We should revise the Japanese Constitution [Article 9] in the face of future security threats.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Japan should bolster its self-defence forces in the face of future security threats in Asia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Whatever happens we must avoid war with China.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. How would you describe your political orientation?

- Conservative
- Liberal
- Socialist
- I don't know
- Other (Please indicate)
29. If there were to be a national election tomorrow, which party would you vote for?

- Liberal Democratic Party
- Democratic Party of Japan
- Japan Restoration Party
- New Komeito
- Japan Communist Party
- Other (Please indicate)

* 30. Here are some characteristics that might describe a person: caring, compassionate, fair, hardworking, honest, responsible. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Having these characteristics is not really important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I want my country to also have these characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 31. Please indicate your name, university and email address in the box.
* 32. Consent Form

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:
1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. Personal identifying information such as names and contact information will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;
4. In the event that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable with the questions, I may decline to answer particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind;
5. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand) but every attempt will be made to preserve my anonymity.

For more information, please contact Ria Shibata  Email: ria.shibata@postgrad.otago.ac.nz
University of Otago, National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies

☐ I agree to participate in this research.

☐ I do not agree to participate in this research.
この度は日中関係に関する意識調査にご協力をいただき大変ありがとうございます。

今回の調査はニュージーランド・オタゴ大学・平和と紛争解決研究所の博士号論文のための研究となります。ケビン・クレメンツ博士の監修の元、実施いたします。

調査の主な目的は日中関係が現在冷え込んでいる中、両国におけるお互いの認識を理解する上で、日本の若者の中における意識をアンケートを通じて分析をしたいと思っております。皆さまからの貴重なデータは今後の両国の意識のギャップを埋めるための重要な示唆になると考えます。率直に感じていることをお聞かせいただければ幸いです。大変お忙しい中お手数をおかけいたしますが、アンケートにご協力を宜しくお願い致します。

* 1. あなたの出身地（都道府県）を教えてください。

* 2. あなたの年齢を教えてください。

* 3. あなたの性別を教えてください。

  ○ 男性
  ○ 女性

* 4. あなたの国籍を教えてください。

  ○ 日本人
  ○ その他（具体的に）

* 5. あなたの大学での専攻学部を教えてください。


6. ご家族の年収は次のどれにあたりますか？
○ 200万円以下
○ 200-400万円
○ 400-700万円
○ 700-1000万円
○ 1000万円以上
○ わからない

7. あなたは信教を持っていますか？いずれかに当てはまる答えを選んでください。
○ 仏教
○ キリスト教
○ 神道
○ 新宗教
○ イスラム教
○ 信仰はない
○ その他 (具体的に)

8. あなたはどの程度宗教が重要だと思いますか？
○ 非常に重要
○ やや重要
○ どちらともいえない
○ あまり重要ではない
○ 全く重要ではない
9. あなたは中国に関する情報をどこから最もよく得ていますか？下記の選択肢の中から上位3つ的情報源を選んでください。

- 中国人との直接の会話
- 中国を訪問
- 日本のニュース
- テレビの情報番組、テレビドラマ
- インターネット（ブログを含む）
- 学校の教科書・教室で学んだこと
- 日本の書籍
- 映画
- 家族や友人、知人に聞いた話
- なんとなく耳にする話し
- アニメ・まんが
- 中国のメディア
- その他
- その他（具体的に）

10. 日本のマスコミが報道している中国に関する内容を事実として信用していますか？当てはまる答えを1つ選んでください。

- 信用している
- ある程度信用している
- どちらともいえない
- あまり信用していない
- 信用していない
11. あなたが持っている中国人に対する印象についてお答えください。５段階の中から、あなたの考えに一番近いものを選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>全然そう思わない</th>
<th>あまりそう思わない</th>
<th>どちらともいえない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思う</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>友好的</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>信頼できる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>好戦的</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ルールを守らない</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>利己的</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. あなたが持っている中国人に対する印象についてお答えください。５段階の中から、あなたの考えに一番近いものを選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>全然そう思わない</th>
<th>あまりそう思わない</th>
<th>どちらともいえない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思う</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>好意的な感情</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>腹立たしい</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>怖い</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>よくわからない</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. あなたは中国人に対してどのような印象をもっていますか？答えを一つ選んでください。

○ 良い印象をもっている
○ どちらかというと良い印象をもっている
○ 良くも悪くもない
○ どちらかというと悪い印象をもっている
○ 悪い印象
**14. 下記の文章に対し、あなたの考えに最も近いものを1つだけ選んでください。**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>中国船を日本の海域に侵入させないためにも日本は防衛を強化すべき。</th>
<th>全然そう思わ ない</th>
<th>そう思わない</th>
<th>あまりそう思わない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>中国による尖閣諸島領空の防空識別圏の設定は阻止すべき。</td>
<td>全然そう思わない</td>
<td>そう思わない</td>
<td>あまりそう思わない</td>
<td>ややそう思う</td>
<td>そう思う</td>
<td>非常にそう思う</td>
<td>わからない</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>エネルギー等の資源を確保する中国の行動は自己中心的である。</td>
<td>全然そう思わない</td>
<td>そう思わない</td>
<td>あまりそう思わない</td>
<td>ややそう思う</td>
<td>そう思う</td>
<td>非常にそう思う</td>
<td>わからない</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>中国の軍事力の増強は心配である。</td>
<td>全然そう思わない</td>
<td>そう思わない</td>
<td>あまりそう思わない</td>
<td>ややそう思う</td>
<td>そう思う</td>
<td>非常にそう思う</td>
<td>わからない</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>中国の大気汚染問題は我々日本人の健康まで脅かしている。</td>
<td>全然そう思わない</td>
<td>そう思わない</td>
<td>あまりそう思わない</td>
<td>ややそう思う</td>
<td>そう思う</td>
<td>非常にそう思う</td>
<td>わからない</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**15. 下記の文章に対し、あなたの考えに最も近いものを1つだけ選んでください。**

| 中国の執拗な日本に対する謝罪要求にうんざりする。 | 全然そう思わない | そう思わない | あまりそう思わない | ややそう思う | そう思う | 非常にそう思う | わからない |
| 中国に日本が戦時中に犯した罪に対して反省していないと批判されたくない。 | 全然そう思わない | そう思わない | あまりそう思わない | ややそう思う | そう思う | 非常にそう思う | わからない |
| 日本は戦時中中国人に多大な被害を与えた、と中国に非難されたくない。 | 全然そう思わない | そう思わない | あまりそう思わない | ややそう思う | そう思う | 非常にそう思う | わからない |
| 中国の「日本は歴史を反省していない」と批判にイラっとする。 | 全然そう思わない | そう思わない | あまりそう思わない | ややそう思う | そう思う | 非常にそう思う | わからない |
| 戦時中の侵略行為について日本が責められてもそれは当然だと思う。 | 全然そう思わない | そう思わない | あまりそう思わない | ややそう思う | そう思う | 非常にそう思う | わからない |
| 日本軍の過去の残酷行為についてはあまり聞きたくない。 | 全然そう思わない | そう思わない | あまりそう思わない | ややそう思う | そう思う | 非常にそう思う | わからない |
* 16. あなたの中国人との関係について当てはまる答えを選んでください。複数選択可

□ 中国人の親しい友人がいる
□ 多少話しをする知人がいる程度（学校、職場）
□ 中国人の知り合いはいない
□ 中国に旅行で行ったことはある
□ 中国人に殆ど会わない

* 17. 中国人とどれくらいの頻度で会っていますか？

□ 毎日
□ 週に一回程度
□ 月に一回程度
□ 年に一回程度
□ 5年に一回以下
□ 接触することはない
□ その他（具体的に）

* 18. 戦争の歴史について伺います。「先の戦争」と聞くと、まず始めに思い浮かぶイメージを1つだけ選んでください。

□ 南京大虐殺
□ 神風特攻隊
□ 東京大空襲
□ 広島・長崎原爆投下
□ 真珠湾攻撃
□ パターンの死の行進
□ 731部隊
□ その他（具体的に）
* 19. 太平洋戦争の歴史についてどのような情報源を通じて知りましたか？以下の選択肢から上位3つの情報源を選んでください。

- 日本のニュースメディア
- テレビ（情報番組、ドラマ等）
- インターネット（ブログを含む）
- 学校の教科書・教室で学んだこと
- 日本の書籍
- 映画
- 戦争・平和資料館
- 家族や友人、知人に聞いた話
- アニメ・漫画
- 外国のメディア（書籍、映画、テレビ番組）
- その他（具体的に）

* 20. 下記の文章に対し、あなたの考えに最も近いものを1つだけ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>全然そう思わな</th>
<th>あまりそう思わない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>広島・長崎の原爆投下は最も非人道的かつ不条理な死を招いた悲劇である。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>原爆投下は人類史上最も悲惨な戦争の歴史である。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本の国民は戦争の被害者としてとても苦しんだ。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本は戦争における世界唯一の被爆国として原爆の悲惨な歴史を決して忘れてはいけない。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>広島の原爆は歴史上類を見ない規模の惨劇だった。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
全然そう思わないと考えますか？

第二章に示す内容に対し、あなたが最も近いものを一つだけ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>全然そう思わないと考えます</th>
<th>そう思わない</th>
<th>あまりそう思わない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>我々の世代が過去の戦争責任を負う必要はないと思う。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>日本軍が戦時中に犯した行行動に対し我々は日本人として深く反省すべきである。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>昔の日本人の行為に対し我々の世代が責任を感じる必要はない。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>日本人として、先の戦争で日本軍が与えた被害に対し責任を負うべきである。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>過去に日本が犯した行為に対して日本人として責任を感じるべきである。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>日本は国として日本軍の戦時中の行為に対し十分に謝罪をしてきた。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>中国のしつこい謝罪要求には正直うんざりする。</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
<td>〇</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. 太平洋戦争は侵略戦争だったと思いますか？

〇 そう思う
〇 そう思わない
〇 わからない

23. 日本と中国の近現代史：南京大虐殺をめぐる歴史問題についてどの程度認識していますか？

〇 よく知っている
〇 やや知っている
〇 あまりよく知らない
〇 全く知らない
* 24. 南京大虐殺についてはどのように知りましたか？

☐ 中国人との直接の会話
☐ 中国を訪問
☐ 日本のニュース
☐ テレビの情報番組、テレビドラマ
☐ インターネット（ブログを含む）
☐ 学校の教科書・教室で学んだこと
☐ 日本の書籍
☐ 映画
☐ アニメ、漫画
☐ なんとなく耳にする話し
☐ 家族や友人、知人に聞いた話
☐ 知らない
☐ その他

その他 (具体的に) 

☐ その他 (具体的に) 

* 25. 下記の文章を読み、自身の気持ちに最も近い答えを1つ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>文章</th>
<th>全然そう思う</th>
<th>あまりそう思わない</th>
<th>そう思わないと</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>自分は日本人でよかったと思う。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>一般的にいっても、日本は世界でも高く評価されている。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>私にとって日本人であることは自分自身を表す上で重要な要素である。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>私は日本人であることを誇りに感じる。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>私は日本国民として国に貢献したいと思う。</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* 26. 下記の文章を読み、自身の気持ちに最も近い答えを1つ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>全然そう思わ な る</th>
<th>あまりそう思 わない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思 う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>日本という国が好きである。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本の経済力を考えれば、国連における発言力はもっと大きくあるべきだ。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本人は世界で最も優れた民族の一つである。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本がか戦後驚異的な発展を遂げたのは国民の優位性による。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本は世界で一番いい国だと思う。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 27. 下記の文章を読み、自身の気持ちに最も近い答えを1つ選んでください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>全然そう思わ な る</th>
<th>あまりそう思 わない</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思 う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>将来の安全保障上の脅威に備え憲法第9条は改正すべきである。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>アジア地域における安全保障上の脅威に備え日本は自衛隊を強化すべきである。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>たとえ、どんな場合でも中国との戦争は回避しなければならない。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 28. ご自身の政治スタンスを表す分類を1つ選んでください。

- 保守
- リベラル
- 社会・共産主義
- わからない
- その他（具体的に）
* 29. 明日、国政選挙があるとしたら、どの党に投票したいと思いますか？

○ 自民党
○ 民主党
○ 日本維新の会
○ 公明党
○ 日本共産党
○ わからない

その他（具体的に）

* 30. 以下の要素があなたにとってどれくらい重要か教えてください：公平、寛容、責任感、勤勉、正直、他者への思いやり。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>全然そう思わ</th>
<th>そう思わない</th>
<th>あまりそう思</th>
<th>ややそう思う</th>
<th>そう思う</th>
<th>非常にそう思</th>
<th>わからない</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ような質を有する人間になったらいいなと思う。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ような質を持つことは自分自身にとって重要なことである。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ような質を持っていなかったとしても別にかまわない。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>日本もこのような質を持つ国になってほしい。</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 31. 大学名、メールアドレスの記入をお願いいたします。もし、確認したい点があった場合だけ、ご連絡いたします。公開されることは一切ありませんのでご安心ください。
32. 同意書
今回のプロジェクト（日中関係についての調査）に関する目的と内容に関する説明を受け、以下の点について理解しております：
1. 調査対象者としての参加はあくまでも自主的なものである。
2. 調査の途中で放棄する権利、調査に参加しない権利を持っている。
3. 今回の調査で収集した個人データは機密扱いされる。調査対象者の匿名性を厳重に保護される。氏名、メールアドレスなどの個人情報は調査プロジェクトが完了した時点で破棄される。調査の生データは5年間以上保護された形で保管される。
4. 途中いかななる時点で、もし質問内容に回答したくない場合は拒否してもかまわない。また、途中で調査から退出する権利が保証されている。
5. プロジェクトの調査結果は将来的に出版され、公開されるか、またはオタゴ大学・図書館（ニュージーランド、ダニーデン市）にて保管される。その場合、情報はすべて匿名化される。
以上の点を理解した上で、調査対象者として今回のプロジェクトに参加することを同意する。

お忙しいところご協力をいただき本当にありがとうございます!
ご不明な点がありましたら、いつでもご連絡ください。

柴田理恵 ria.shibata@postgrad.otago.ac.nz
University of Otago, National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies
○ 同意します
○ 同意しません