

JAPAN AT THE CROSSROADS**A LECTURE BY****PROFESSOR DAISABURO HASHIZUME****GIVEN AT JAPAN CULTURAL CENTRE, SYDNEY
LEVEL 11, 201 MILLER STREET, NORTH SYDNEY****THURSDAY, 10 OCTOBER 1996 AT 6.40P.M.****LECTURE NO. 1**

Transcribed from sound recording by:

L.M. TRANSCRIPTS PTY. LIMITED
92 Brougham Street
Potts Point 2011Telephone: (02) 9357 3217
Facsimile: (02) 9357 1461LM
JCC

INTRODUCTION: Ladies and gentlemen, good evening and welcome to this special lecture presentation at the Japan Cultural Centre. It is my great pleasure to introduce our distinguished guest speaker, Professor Daisaburo Hashizume of the Department of Value and Decision Science of Tokyo Institute of Technology.

Professor Hashizume is a well known sociologist. His activities as a social commentator cut across various forms of media. Tonight he will talk on today's Japan under the title of Japan at the Crossroads. Tonight he will talk in Japanese and it will be translated.

So please welcome Professor Hashizume.

PROF HASHIZUME: Good evening and welcome. As introduced, my name is Hashizume. Today's lecture is titled Japan at the Crossroads, although there is a slight discrepancy in the translation because the Japanese originally used the word ... and that means that you have this direction and is where the direction changes.

I believe Japan is in a very difficult situation, and this changing direction I think was suggested by a series of incidents which occurred last year in 1995. Today I would like to divide my lecture into three parts, and the first part deals with the crisis in 1995. Here I would like to talk about the incidents which occurred last year. The second part of my lecture tonight will deal with the post-war Japan in order to identify the causes of why such an incident occurred last year. In the third part I would like to consider the relationship between Japan and the rest of the world in the next century. I would like to talk for about one hour and then I would like to take some questions from the audience.

The first part now deals with the 1995 crisis. First let me talk about the great Kobe earthquake which took place in January 1995. As you may know quite well about this earthquake, a big earthquake occurred which killed 5,000 people. The earthquake caused the stoppage of the supply of electricity, gas and also paralysed transport, the urban structure was put into halt totally.

This Kobe earthquake surprised everybody in Japan because it was believed that Kobe is the area where the earthquake will be very unlikely. However, this assumption by a majority of the people was false, according to the experts Kobe was a place where earthquake is likely to happen. However, on the assumption that the earthquake is very unlikely the city of Kobe pursued its city planning. Accordingly the building standard was not sufficient.

LM
JCC

Also, the wait after the earthquake, delayed primarily by the ineffective administrative organisation or administrative mechanism. Of course this earthquake in Kobe has reminded everybody of the possible earthquake in Tokyo. I myself am a resident of Tokyo, and Tokyo is famous for a series of minor earthquakes.

Tokyo experienced a huge earthquake in 1922, which is referred to as a great counter earthquake and it killed almost 100,000 people. The statistical analyses show that the earthquake, or a great earthquake, occur in the cycle of 60 years. Therefore it is not wondrous, even if the great earthquake occurs today.

I shouldn't perhaps say this publicly, but many Tokyo-ites felt quite relieved after the Kobe earthquake because it was not Tokyo but Kobe where such a disaster occurred. However, even after that earthquake Tokyo-ites are not quite seriously considering the consequences of such an earthquake in Tokyo.

Tokyo buildings are supposed to be earthquake proof, but is that right? Well, you remember that a great earthquake occurred in 1975 in Los Angeles, and the Japanese experts who visited and observed the collapse of the highways there remarked that at Tokyo such disastrous things would never happen to the Japanese highways because they are built very strongly.

However, the Kobe earthquake clearly revealed that a Japanese highway can collapse. The earthquake is bound to happen in Tokyo for sure, but the disaster after that would be 10 times, or even 100 times, greater than that of the Kobe earthquake.

I believe that the Kobe earthquake revealed how fragile the Japanese cities are, and also how ineffective the Japanese administrative mechanism was. Put simply, it revealed how fragile the base was on which the post-war Japanese economic prosperity was built.

There wasn't much discussion about the earthquakes after this Kobe earthquake because in March the same year there was an incident of armed sarin gas attack. I am sure that you are well informed of this incident but let me briefly review what happened. In this incident somebody released very poisonous sarin gas in a few locations in Tokyo, and as a result 12 people were killed and 5,000 citizens were hospitalised.

Initially nobody knew what happened or who had done it, but as the

investigation progressed it was revealed that this incident was caused by a religious cult sect. This religious group is called Aum Supreme Truth Group, and they started their activities in the 1980s. This group's activities were quite noticeable, however, many people thought that what they were doing as their activities were just a form of joke.

However, there was a lawyer who was quite aware of the danger that this religious cult could have. However, the investigation also revealed that this particular lawyer, together with his family, were kidnapped and murdered by the members of the cult in 1989. This affair had a great impact on the Japanese society and caused various types of arguments among the people of the country.

I personally believe that the very important point of this whole affair is the fact that this religious group had as its members graduates of top class universities and graduate schools, mainly they were scientists. Those people had a very good education which was introduced after the war, and those people were not supposed to have anything to do with such a criminal affair.

However, many people, younger people, in their 20s and 30s were made aware by this affair that they could have easily joined this cult group and became the members of it, and that caused them a great anxiety. There are a lot of young girls who believe in what the stars say, or the fortune tellers say, and it is not only the girls but the boys or men also, there are a lot of men who are interested in the mysterious aspects of religion. The Japanese education system is supposed to be very efficient, but it seems that there is a great problem with it.

As a third item, I would like to talk about the chaotic situation in the Japanese politics. We had a general election three years ago, and after that the Japanese political landscape has changed dramatically. Up to that last general election Japan had a very stable two party political system since 1955. However, this two party system was a rather strange two party system.

In this two party system we had the Liberal Democratic Party on the one hand and the Social Democratic Party, or the Social Party, on the other and since 1955 the Liberal Democratic Party had always been in power and the Social Democratic Party was there just as an opposing force to the Liberal Democratic Party.

This change in the political landscape I believe is the product of the collapse of the cold war world system. You see, the Liberal

Democratic Party was formed in 1955, and the main aim of this new party was not to let the Social Party to take power. Ever since the Liberal Democratic Party in power has maintained a very good relationship with the United States. After the collapse of the cold war there was no possibility left for the Social Democratic Party to take political power.

With this situation the Liberal Democratic Party started to split, and then came the coalition of the numerous non Liberal Democratic parties, except the Communist Party. This coalition was led by a man called Ichido Ozowa, but Mr Ozowa was too harsh to the Social Democratic Party and at the end of the Social Democratic Party decided to shake hands with the Liberal Democratic Party.

Of course this alliance between the Social Democratic Party and the Liberal Democratic Party really surprised the nation. They thought it was as if the devil and angel shook hands. This political alliance is still there, however we are to have another general election on 20 October this year. This general election will be the first elections where the single seat constituency system is introduced in the country.

Of course, there are people, the current politicians, who are not quite sure if they will be successful under a new system, so they formed a new party. According to the past statistics, the candidates belonging to the latest party have more possibility in being elected. So at the moment nobody knows what sort of outcome this upcoming general election will bring, but it is quite obvious that there will be a political alliance to form a new government.

The latest NewsWeek issue has the cover photos with a caption saying that "Finally democracy has started in Japan", but I am not quite sure about it personally. I am not sure about this beginning of democracy in Japan because we have seen a series of coalition governments and also one prime minister after another in a short span of time, but there was no consultation whatsoever to the people of the country.

I am sure that you are quite familiar with the situation in Japan and quite knowledgeable of the country, but since the prime ministers of Japan change so frequently maybe only a few of you know who they actually were.

I am sure that improvements are coming to this situation, but I doubt that it will be in the near future that Japanese electorates will elect the candidates that they strongly believe should take leadership in the Japanese politics.

Let me summarise what I have talked about so far. It became quite obvious in 1995 that the conditions which created the stability, peace and prosperity of Japan began to collapse. For instance, Japanese bureaucracy is supposed to be excellent, however it doesn't seem to be quite true, and also the Japan/US relationship which had a great significance in the past seems to have become vague. Also, it was revealed that the Japanese education system and democracy are still immature. In spite of those various problems, post-war Japan has achieved great economic prosperity. One wonders why it was possible.

I would like to review the 50 years after the war now. I was born in 1948, in other words, I was born after the war, and I was brought up, received my education, which is very often described as the democracy based education. So the textbooks that we used often said things like "The old Japan ended in 1945 and a new country started."

However, my older brothers' and sisters' memory of their textbooks are slightly different from mine. According to the story told by my older brothers and sisters, one day at school a teacher came into the classroom and asked the students to open their textbooks because there will be ink painting practice. The textbook he was talking about was produced before 1945. Here the ink painting practice, meaning that the student has to black out all the undesirable references in the text, so after so much putting ink on so many sections the textbook became illegible.

So that was the memory of my older brothers and sisters. As far as I am concerned, when I was young I firmly believed a new Japan started in the year 1945, but later I began to wonder about it. When you see that over the period before and after the war you could see various factions or discontinuity, but at the same time you see various aspects which continued.

Let me give you one example, that is the imperial system or emperor. The Emperor continues to be emperor even after the war. Another example is the Japanese bureaucracy, the pre-war bureaucracy remained almost intact after the war. Those two examples are the continuation of two aspects of the Japanese society and they remained because the occupying forces of the United States found them useful.

Recently in Japan there is a term which came into common use, that is 1940s system. Let me explain a little further about it. The Japanese Ministry of Health was established in 1940 and this was a copy of the ministry under the German Nazis. The Japanese income taxation

system was also introduced in 1940, that was introduced to ensure the financial stability during the war. So that was in 1940 when the bureaucracy took control over the Japanese economy in order to promote the war, and this 1940 system continued even until quite recently.

The German author Karl Van Fuelffen wrote the book entitled "The Enigma of Japan" and in the book he refers to this 1940s system as "Le System". His analysis of the Japanese system was written in this book and many Japanese agreed with his analysis, and that was the reason why his book became a best seller.

However, Japan is now coming to the time when it should make a shift from this bureaucracy led system. I think that the day of this shift would be quite near, because in the coming general election every single party promises the administrative reform.

Now I would like to move onto the relationship between Japan and the cold war. The cold war of course created the situation where every country is prepared for a possible war. This cold war of course was the nuclear war between the then Soviet Union and the United States. Because of the preparation for such a possible nuclear war under this cold war system for 50 years there was no major warfare. This was a very lucky thing for Japan because Japan was able to keep itself very safe under this cold war system.

For the first seven years of the last 50 years Japan was occupied by the United States, and in the following years up to the present Japan has maintained a stronger military relationship or alliance with the United States. You are aware that Japan still has many American military bases in the country.

There were no countries which were crazy enough to attack such a country with the American bases, because that would invite the nuclear attack by the United States. Of course, it was very lucky for Japan and that of course created the course of history. However, many Japanese believed that such luck was given naturally to them.

As you know, Japan has a peace constitution. This peace constitution declares the abolition of war and the abandonment of military. However, you know that there is a thing called the self defence forces, which look like a military but they are not called military, so then they are not a military.

The self defence forces always caused budgetary problems because many think that too much budget is allocated to the forces, because many people claim the budget is too large simply because one percent of the country's gross national product, or GNP, is given to the self defence forces.

In the cold war framework you have to remember that while Japan spent only one percent of its GNP for the self defence forces the United States spent seven percent and the Soviet Union spent 20 percent of their GNPs to their militaries. Of course, this may suggest that when those countries, namely the United States, Japan and other countries, were to take the race it was as if Japan had nothing to carry but the United States has to compete with Japan with a heavy sack on their back. It was a rather unfair competition.

The United States put up with such unfair economic race with Japan without much complaint because of the threat imposed by the cold war framework. There is also another aspect which we have to consider in relation to this subject, that is the relationship between the Japan-US security treaty and Japan's peace constitution. No matter how you look at it, this relationship seems to be contradictory.

In the old days the Social Democratic Party pointed out this contradiction between the Japan-US security treaty and the peace constitution, and they placed a priority over the constitution. Therefore they claimed that Japan should abandon the Japan-US security treaty. However, many Japanese thought the Social Democratic Party was reasonable but was not practical. That is the reason why the Social Democratic Party never won the majority.

However, the Japanese never tried to amend the peace constitution so that there will be no contradiction between the constitution and the US-Japan security treaty. I have to point out here that during the Gulf war because of the peace constitution Japan could not do anything whatsoever, and that caused a great impact on the Japanese society.

Unlike Germany, where the constitution was revised, Japan maintained the same constitution without amendment for the past 50 years, and one of the reasons for this lack of change is the assumption on behalf of Japanese that their country was not trusted enough by its Asian neighbours.

Very often you hear Japanese talking about the post-war this and the post-war that. However, I think this is because Japan has not truly

reflected on what the country has done during the war and made the attempt for any corrections whatever if that is necessary. Of course, it is very difficult for post-war generations like myself to consider the Pacific war - sorry, not the Pacific war but East Asian war.

You remember Mr Hosokawa who was briefly a prime minister of Japan, and also Ichow Ozowa, who is now leading the opposition party, all those leading characters in the Japanese political scene have received a post-war education.

The problem for the post-war generation as to how to address the war has resurfaced recently. It was about three years ago a young female parliamentarian in her 30s made the following remark in the parliament, she said: "I was born after the war, I did not exist during the war so I have no responsibility whatsoever for the war."

Of course there were a lot of young Japanese who agreed with her, but if this is true at the moment 80 percent of the Japanese population are not responsible for the war, and in a few years time no Japanese would be responsible for the war. However, there is something wrong with it, isn't there?

However, when Japan made the peace treaties with the various countries we have to see what the reactions of those partners were. For instance, China then had Chiang Kai-shek as the leader of the Kuomintang Party and he did not accept the compensation, or he did not want Japan to pay the compensation for the damage Japan caused to their country. Even when Japan and China renormalised their relationship, both Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai said that Japan did not have to pay the compensation for the war damage.

In 1965 Japan renormalised its relationship with South Korea by concluding the peace treaty. At that time Japan paid only \$300 million as the war compensation. However, when I visited China and paid a visit to the war memorial museum there I learnt that more than 30 million Chinese were killed during the war and the damage calculated in dollar terms was - I am not quite sure whether it was \$5,000 billion or \$5,000 trillion dollars, but it was an astronomical amount.

Assuming that the Japanese economic prosperity was achieved based on Japan not paying compensation to those victim countries, I am quite sure that the contemporary Japanese, no matter how young they are, must have some sort of responsibility, or if not the responsibility something to do with the war in that respect.

Of course, the war is dealt with in the Japanese education system, but not effectively. The main philosophy of the war education in Japan is the emphasis on the cruelty of the war, how miserable things became after the war, that atomic bombs will be dropped, how awful it is. That is the mainstream of the war education in Japan.

So in other words, Japan is treated as a victim of the war in the education system, not as the one which caused the misery on others. However, it is true that Japan was the one which started the war, it is the country which made the aggressive act on others and they are the ones who caused the suffering on the victims.

No matter how many people try to refuse that, we will never forget that was the truth. Japan should recognise officially this incident as the historical fact and the post-war Japanese government has to pay the due compensation. Unless Japan does it, no matter how democratic its politics may be presented as, its government will never be legitimate.

In the post-war Japan the emphasis was placed on the discontinuity, or the faction from the pre-war Japan, and very little emphasis was placed on the continuity. If the current international environment forces Japan to change its course the course will be perhaps from the post-war society to the pre-war society. In order to make a clear break from the pre-war Japan, Japan should recognise the continuity which existed over the war from the pre to the post-war Japan.

I would like to come to the last part, where I would like to talk about the world where the Asian countries become a major driving force of the international trend, and also the future for both Japan and its partners.

In the 1960s Japan made stunning economic growth. In the 1980s four Asian economies, namely South Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore made impressive economic growth. While those four dragons were making impressive economic growth, since 1978 China after its open door and economic driven policy started to show more than 10 percent economic growth in the 1980s and also the early part of the 1990s.

If this condition continues it seems that China will be the next centre of Asia. According to various American top think tank groups estimates, China will catch up with the United States in terms of GNP by the year 2020, and they believe that ultimately China will produce

a GNP twice as large as that of the United States. When this situation presents itself incidentally the order of the economic power then would be China at the top of the list, second the United States, followed by India and then Japan.

What this all means is that the economic centre will be shifted to the Asian region. Of course, this is not a very pleasant prediction for European countries, but as far as the Chinese are concerned perhaps this prediction is quite a natural thing. Of course, if we look back over the last 2,000 years China was the greatest power for 1,500 years. Only in those last 500 years did things not go as well as they should have.

In this situation what sort of direction should Japan take? The first thing one has to realise is that there are distinctive differences between Asia and Europe. European countries are quite similar to each other in many respects, and of course they do fight with each other, but if you leave them alone they eventually unite to one.

A good example, in the past the Roman Empire, the new Roman Empire, in recent times the EU would be a very good example. I think those countries do share fundamentally the Christian philosophy. In other words, they have a common culture as its base, namely the Christian culture, but Asian countries do not have such a common culture like the Christian culture through European countries.

There is a trace of the Chinese culture based aspects which are common to many Asian countries, but there are countries which cannot totally share with this Chinese culture based tradition, that is Mongolia, South Korea, Japan, Tibet and those surrounding countries.

In the past their Confucianism attempted or tried to spread through the region. However, at least Japan has never properly adopted the concept of Confucianism, and the Confucianism was not a contributory factor to the modernisation of Asian countries, rather, I would dare to say that it was a hurdle to the modernisation of the region.

In the past also Buddhism was popular throughout the region. Remember that Buddhism has disappeared in China and the influence of Buddhism in Japan is minute. What I am saying is that even if one tries to see a common culture, as the Christian culture in the European countries, in the Asian regions it is almost impossible.

Worse than that, there are many unstable elements existing in the

region. For instance, North Korea, even in the short term nobody knows how long this country can exist as a nation. The relationship between Taiwan and Mainland China is a very delicate one, and also nobody knows how long the Communist Party of China will stay in power. Even if those unstabilising elements are treated successfully a friendly relationship among Asian countries would take a lot of effort.

Apart from India, the countries which are most likely to take leadership in East Asia would be China and Japan. It is a well known fact that China loves to take leadership, whereas as far as Japan is concerned it is a bit worrying because they think that Chinese try to stick to their own ways and, mind you, the Chinese ways are very different from European or American ways which we are very used to.

Unlike China, Japan is not very good at taking leadership. About 70 years ago Japan attempted to take such leadership but it failed miserably. Speaking of Japan further, facing this upcoming new age of Asia, Japan is not fully prepared. This lack of preparedness has a lot to do with the modernisation of Japan. I should have said that this lack of preparedness has a lot to do with the process of the modernisation of Japan. During the modernisation process there was a character who was very influential, and his name was Yukichi Fukuzawa. Perhaps if you have seen a 10,000 yen bill, his face is on that bill.

He proposed the slogan which literally means leaving Asia and joining Europe. What he was saying in the slogan was that Japan should not look at China as it had always been as an example, but shift that view to the United States and Europe as an example.

You see, Japan is the country with little confidence in itself. However, Japan is very good at identifying other countries as an example and imitating them and becoming much better. So in the modernisation process Japan used the western countries as an example, paid great respect to those countries, used them as examples and made great progress in their own country.

This process at the same time created the discrimination against other Asian countries. This is clearly seen in the attitudes Japan took toward South Korea, China and Taiwan. Of course, the post-war generation will never obviously look down on those Asian countries. However, I think it is quite safe to say that they have such a discrimination against other Asian countries, perhaps unconsciously.

For instance, take the fashion magazines. What you see are the words like Paris, Milan, New York, never Beijing, Hong Kong, Singapore. Of course, there are many Japanese who tried to understand other Asian cultures and pay due respect to those countries, but it seems it is extremely difficult.

The difficulty comes from the fact that the Japanese themselves do not regard themselves as part of Asia. They are not aware of their Asian-ness, if you like, and they do not have confidence in their being Asians. Without such confidence in themselves as being Asians, how can you expect them to pay due respect to other Asian neighbours.

I think one of the failures that the post-war education system experienced was the fact that it failed to teach the pride that Japanese should have as being Asian. I do, though, think that there should be the development of healthy nationalism in Japan. However, this nationalism is looked upon by the left wing people with caution because nationalist movements share a similar sort of aspect with right-wing movements.

Initially the nationalism and the right-wing movement are two separate things, but it seems that there is a very vague distinction between the two in Japan. So Japan at the moment is too busy with the negative legacies from the pre and post-war periods to take leadership for the upcoming age of Asia. In other words, the country is not prepared for the upcoming period.

Of course, I am quite aware that what I should be doing here is to make a more constructive proposition for the future co-operation between the Australian people and Japanese. However, before doing that time is up, so I have to finish my speech here.

Thank you very much for your time, and of course I would like to take some questions if there are any.

QUESTION: In the short term, what can you expect of the next election for the so-called new democracy and in the longer term how do you see Japan reconciling this democracy with the future that is the challenge of China and the old alliance with America?

PROF HASHIZUME: First, in the general election, or in any general election, there should be the policy differences so that the electorate should be presented with multiple options. However, in Japan there are a lot of new parties being formed, but those who are forming new parties

themselves do not know exactly what political differences they have from others. You see, normally the policies are prepared by the bureaucrats and also presented by their advertising agency, and all those parties ask the same bureaucrats and the same advertising agencies, so they get the same thing at the end.

Of course, in such a situation successful elections cannot be expected, but as the Japanese electorates are used to their electoral systems, what they mean, I am sure in the future they will be demanding more of the policy differences. So perhaps we cannot expect a good result of the democratic movement in the upcoming elections, but we have to see the long term effect of such movements.

As for the relationship between Japan and China, I think it will be a wise move for Japan to have the United States between Japan and China. For example, Japan sees a lot of advantages of having an American presence in its region, and I am sure that countries like South Korea and China would see the same interests.

The problem is how long the United States can afford to have a presence in the region, and also how long the United States will be willing to stay in the region. So as far as Japan is concerned, it should help the United States to stay on and keep playing the role in the region as it has always been.

Suppose the situation when China has built too much power, then to counter-balance such extreme growth of the power of China the world will expect Japan to balance the power of China. So when China becomes too powerful Japan should take a role of - not having a fight with China, but to perhaps advise that it is getting a bit out of hand, so to speak.

If Japan can play such a role in relation to China, Japan will become a country which the world will see with respect. Of course, that requires excellent diplomatic skills and I sincerely hope that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its diplomats will be prepared for such a situation.

QUESTION: How is Japan going to deal with the Sankok Islands, which is owned by the family in Tokyo which is specialising in wedding ceremonies and claim that they belong to Japan, regardless of the government in China or Taiwan. The second question how Japan is going to advocate new nationalists in case of revival of new ethnic groups like Ainu or the Okinawans who may not want to come under the same flag.

PROF HASHIZUME: According to the official stance of the Japanese government, the Sankok Island belongs to, or is part of, Japan. However, China claims that the Sankok Islands is part of China without any problems. So while both countries are saying that the islands belong to each country respectively without any problems, there is a problem.

Deng Xiao Ping actually suggested that this Sankok Islands issue should be left to the next generation, or perhaps the generation after next. In other words, it should be put aside for the future issue. I think this Chinese leader's comment was a wise one, welcomed by Japan as well. The island itself is just a small piece of rock without much value to it, so I think it is a wise move to leave it as a future issue at present.

I understand that there is a campaign in relation to the ownership of this island in Hong Kong and Taiwan, but it seems that there is a cool attitude prevailing in Japan. This cool attitude of the Japanese is, I am not sure based on much thinking, but I think taking such an attitude is a wise one.

As for the minority groups such as Ainu and Okinawans in Japan, let me just say my personal opinion. As far as the Okinawans are concerned I believe that Okinawa is a part of Japan and it should be given self-governing authority so that it functions as an independent state within the country.

Like the special economic zone in China, if Okinawa is nominated as a special economic zone of Japan perhaps there will be a greater rate of progress or development on that island, but the problem is that it is not necessarily the wish of the Okinawans. Let me give you one example, while Okinawa was under the control of the United States there was a movement to raise the Japanese national flag, and also that the target of the movement was not to become an independent nation but to revert to Japan.

I mentioned that the Japanese feel embarrassment, if you like, about being Asians before, but I think the Okinawans also feel a similar sort of embarrassment or the shame of being Okinawans.

The Ainu situation is very different from Okinawans because of the number of the people of that ethnic background and also the geographical conditions they are placed in, so you can't talk about those two ethnic groups on the same terms, but I personally hope that the same thing is done to the Ainu people.

I also would like to add about the 700,000 Koreans living in Japan. I think there should be a special legislation which allows citizenship to those people, not necessarily their nationality change, but legislation which allows those Koreans to obtain the Japanese citizenship while maintaining their Korean national issues.

QUESTION: Over the last 50 years the emphasis of Japan was always placed on economic issues over the social and environmental issues, with the aging society what is the Japanese stance on those aspects?

PROF HASHIZUME: First let me say that every Japanese believes that there was too much emphasis on economics over the last 50 years. However, it seems it is extremely difficult for them to make a sudden directional change. I think the whole problem comes basically from the education system, which emphasises on the efficiency or the advantages that the students can learn when they are to gain employment, so even the young people who receive education within such an educational framework tend to emphasis the economy as much as the previous generations.

In other words, it may take a little more time when the emphasis shift occurs.

QUESTION: When you said that you felt that Japan had been aggressive in the war, you distinguished between the East Asian war and the Pacific war. A lot of Japanese will say "Yes, we were aggressive in the East Asia but not in the Pacific", what is your view?

PROF HASHIZUME: Yes, I think there are differences between the war against China and that against the Pacific nations. As far as the Japanese military at that time was concerned, the war against China was not really the act of war but it was the military deeds, if you like, or advancement of the military. In other words, it was indeed an illegal military invasion to China.

However, the Pacific war was an official war in the eyes of the authorities in Japan then in accordance with international law. However, whether the warring actions of the Japanese military personnel were in accordance with the international law or not is doubtful. I believe many actions they took were a breach of international law.

In the 1940s war was going on, and war itself was not against the international law, it was started according to the international law.

However, the Japanese military was totally ignorant of the international law, so as a result it committed various illegal acts. That is how I see it.

QUESTION: I have a lot of questions to ask, but let me just concentrate on one. After the experience of the war with Japan there are many Japanese and many Australians who still maintain a lack of trust, or mistrust, deep down and after the war Japan made a miracle economic growth and produced various excellent products which also made inroads to the Australian market.

Those Japanese products made a contribution, or played an important role, in the building of the infrastructure in Australia in the 1970s and 1980s, and I have to remind you that the Australian dollar was pretty strong around that time too. After the war, in other words, Japan was viewed in a way as the model for the economic development.

Now Australia is trying to find a way to survive within the Asian context, so taking that into consideration I wonder what is your view on what Australia can do within this Australia-Japan-Asia triangle relationships.

PROF HASHIZUME: I think there are very few problems between Japan and Australia because the two countries have a complementary relationship. Australia has a wonderful nature as its asset, and also the various resources. Japan, though the country's size is small, has a large population, in other words, the labour force, and also a large amount of capital and accumulated technological skills.

I think an exchange between such two countries would bring both parties a lot of benefits. However, not all countries can form such a relationship. Take many of the Asian countries as an example, those countries lack resources, beautiful natural environment, but a large population without much capital and skills.

So if those Asian countries begin to make that leap in their economic development of course the prices they pay for resources will go up without any doubt, and at that time I am sure Australia will begin to sell its resources to those Asian countries instead of Japan.

Whereas Japan will continue to make its capital investments and also provide the necessary technological skills, when those Asian countries have achieved development in the true sense they will no longer need such capitals and skills from Japan.

Perhaps the Australian resources alone would not be sufficient for maintaining the developed economics within the Asian region. So the true problem lies here, in other words, Japan and Australia have to maintain their bilateral relationship, but it is not enough, it has to have a trilateral relationship that is Japan, Australia and other Asian countries.

(The Lecture concluded at 7.30p.m.)