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Welcome to the Autumn 2015 edition of IAFOR’s Eye Magazine – The International Academic Forum’s own in-house e-magazine publication. It is our pleasure to again present to you a great lineup of articles and opinion pieces. In this edition of IAFOR Eye Magazine we reflect on the past, in both the historical and political sense, through a range of cultural practices within literature, the arts, film and society. Much of this past is centered on Japan. This year is the 70th commemoration of the first dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and we have a couple of outstanding articles that take a look at the tragedy and upheaval of that time and the years that followed in Japan. Theron Fairchild contributes Atomic Narratives about the political, social, economic, moral, and speculative discourse around the atomic weapons used against Japan and David McCormack in American Caesar writes about the role General McArthur played during the post-war occupation. Also in this edition, Wajiha Raza Rizvi takes a brief look back at the documentary film The Atomic Cafe made in the early 1980s, which captures the paranoia, propaganda and politics of the early years of the nuclear age in postwar America.

This issue of IAFOR Eye also looks back at a couple of cornerstone works of literature that have shaped modern consciousness. Arthur Shattuck O’Keefe examines the thematic underpinnings of authority and the individual in the novels Connecticut Yankee and Huckleberry Finn of legendary 19th-century American author Mark Twain. Qiang Fu in his article Shopping in the Metropolis: Consumerism in Jean Rhys’s Voyage in the Dark and Good Morning, Midnight – textual tropes of empire and colony to formulate postcolonial literature. These two novels both register commerce and consumer capitalism as part of the literal and figurative administration of empire and the articulations of Englishness of the early 20th-century period in which they were based.

When citizens appreciate important buildings for how they help tell the stories of the past, quality of life in the city improves. It is this sentiment that Charles Laurier reveals in his fascinating article about the collective cultural memory of Ueno Station, an 82-year-old building in the Shitamachi area of eastern Tokyo. Laurier in his article Tokyo’s Ueno Station in Japanese Cultural Memory reports of astonishing statistic that forces us to reflect on the role of architectural preservation. The average lifespan of a Japanese person is among the highest in the world, in the mid to high 80s, however, the average lifespan of a building in Tokyo, may be as little as just 17 years. Alexandre Avdulov contributes Listening To The Waves: Chanoyu Outside Japan and discusses the delicate balance between conservation and internationalisation of the traditional tea ceremony – that core cultural and distinguishing practice of Japanese life. Avdulov articulates how this tradition is being carefully transplanted to new places in its most original form and how it is taking root. A further cultural practice that is more contemporary and has achieved Japanese ‘cultural ownership’ is Cosplay. Though it began its life US amongst the Sci-Fi fan community in the 1970s, it was popularised in Japan in the 1980s and 1990s and from that base it is now a 21st-century, global popular culture phenomenon. Taiwanese writers Shih-Pang Tsai and Ming-Hsiu Mia Chen examine the creative and sub-cultural underpinnings of these global Cosplayers in their article From Fiction to Reality: An Exploration into Cosplay. Finally Vineet Kaul, a recent Doctoral Program Graduate reflects on what research means personally, as he embarks on an academic career in his opinion piece Developing my Passion for Research.

As Editor, I must give special thanks to Thad Pope who assisted in the production of this edition. It is his hard work and advice, which has helped in getting this magazine together and looking so good. I would also like to thank our new publications manager, Rachel Dyer, for her invaluable assistance in producing this edition. Lastly, I must again thank the voluntary contributions of our featured contributors. They are the people who really make Eye the insightful, intelligent and interdisciplinary magazine that it is. If you feel that you have something new and interested to offer as a written contribution to a future issue of IAFOR’s Eye Magazine please don’t hesitate to contact me at mkedzlie@iafor.org.

Sincerely,

Michael Liam Kedzlie
Editor
A Story

The bombs were dropped. A war was ended. Japanese mourned. Americans rejoiced. The weapons were tragic but necessary. Order ensued. Prosperity emerged. Japan and the United States became friends.

The first accounts of any historical event tend to become the benchmarks by which all subsequent accounts are measured. And for the past 70 years, this popular narrative, concerning the atomic bombs and the final chapter of the Asia-Pacific War, has continued relatively unabated in the global imagination. Backed by early years of scholarship and official government positions on both sides of the Pacific, the story eventually became known as the traditional account. It remains an easy pill to swallow. The weapons came first, the surrender happened shortly thereafter. Thus, the first caused the second. What is left to know?

Despite its tenacity, the traditional account has been dismissed from most serious historical scholarship for at least two decades. A major problem with the narrative is that it potentially delivers little more than a post hoc fallacy (“after this, therefore because of this”). It also contributes to a muddying of facts and moral considerations, along with a reduction of several key military, political, and economic variables, into a dichotomy of dropping the bomb, good or bad?

In a more nuanced, evidence-supported interpretation, the use of atomic weapons against Japan, in August of 1945, remains an enormously complex, emotional, and even paradoxical subject, one that undoubtedly supplies no single, satisfactory narrative for everyone. In his chapter on Robert Oppenheimer, from a book entitled *The Dark Side of Creativity*, David Hecht noted that if any single event has ever called into question faith in science, creativity, and human progress itself, this one is it. Oppenheimer himself, writing critically in 1948, described his shared, atomic creation as “an unparalleled instrument of coercion”.

Numerous scholars, activists, and other scientists, both before and after, would join the critique. The motives to build the atomic bomb, the decision to use it during wartime, the actual role it played in ending the war, the ultimate moral ramifications since its use, and the question of whether it was even needed, are interconnected yet distinct issues for discussion and debate. The 20th century was the
scientific century, when humankind would pursue scientific truth to liberate itself from superstition and social and physical illnesses. At the same time, backed by an array of new scientific vocations and institutions, modern violence itself had taken on a scientific character, increasingly impersonal, rationally organised, and infused with economic principles.

A Bomb

The nuclear device known as “Little Boy,” an enriched uranium-235 fission weapon, which cost the United States roughly 14 times more in initial development than the production cost of an entire WWII aircraft carrier, annihilated an estimated 70-80,000 people at 8:15am, on Monday, August 6, Hiroshima time. As a result of injury and radiation poisoning, the disputed death toll reached somewhere between 90,000-160,000 by the end of the year, and climbed to over 200,000 within the next five years, making the detonation the single largest destruction of human life as a result of an engineered weapon. By comparison, during the night of March 9-10 earlier that year, 279 B-29s had dropped close to 2,000 tons of mostly incendiary bombs over the densely populated eastern wards of Tokyo. The prevailing winds, which were factored in during pre-strike planning, helped ignite a firestorm that destroyed approximately 15.8 square miles (25.4 square km) of the city, killing 100,000 people and injuring nearly a million.

Three days after Hiroshima, on August 9, the more complex, more powerful, and equally expensive plutonium implosion device, known as “Fat Man” (a copy of the original Trinity test device in New Mexico), was detonated over Nagasaki. The city was actually the secondary target on the mission, the primary being Kokura, the historic city-arsenal at the Straits of Shimonoseki between Honshu and Kyushu. Except cloud cover, and the smoke from nearby conventional bombing, forced the B-29 to divert one hour and 18 minutes of flying time to Nagasaki, where the plane was running short of fuel.
By comparison, the United States has never offered compensation, neither to its own severely affected POWs interned near the two sites at the time of the bombings...

The facts of the atomic devices, from the “what” of their design and construction, to the “how” of their deployment and detonation, remain undisputed. The dilemma arises with questions regarding the “why”, including the essential questions of whether the bombs were necessary, and whether their uses could be considered crimes against humanity. For the historically minded, how accurate and complete these questions are, and not simply how well argued they are, remains tantamount.

In a 2012 paper, entitled *Dissociative Entanglement*, Yuko Shibata discussed the way in which both Japanese and American literary interpretations of the atomic bomb, beginning with John Hersey's 1946 novel, *Hiroshima*, became inextricably woven into the public discourse from the outset. John Dower, the award-winning American historian of Japan and the Pacific War, took this a step further. Throughout the body of his work on the predominantly U.S. postwar occupation, Dower made the case that such interweaving was deliberate, with the Japanese and Americans working together to construct tenable stories about the war and about the bombs, which included pushing the hibakusha out of sight as a means of buttressing censorship and propaganda. The efforts included misinformation and discrimination, where public ignorance about radiation sickness and its alleged contagiousness, as well as the shame of disfigurement, were exploited by the tightly controlled Japanese press.

Not until the 1950s and '60s, after the end of the occupation, and after considerable activism on the part of the hibakusha themselves, did the Japanese government provide special medical and monetary assistance to atomic blast survivors. By comparison, the United States has never offered compensation, neither to its own severely affected POWs interned near the two sites at the time of the bombings, nor to its own citizens who surveyed the sites after the war and suffered the effects of radiation.

The postwar information control, engineering, and relief detachments, American military personnel were largely kept at a distance from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In fact, from 1945 to 1951, the occupation of Hiroshima prefecture, along with the surrounding areas and Shikoku Island, were placed under the control of the British Commonwealth Occupation Force (BCOF), which numbered 37,000 personnel during its peak (45,000 total over the period). The American position was, because of the shock of the atomic weapon used against the city of Hiroshima, the U.S. should hand over occupation duties of the entire region to non-American forces, to aid in the pacification process.

The largest staffing of the BCOF came from Australia, reaching about 12,000 personnel at any given point, and a total of more than 16,000 for the period. For their efforts, hundreds of these Australians later reported disproportionately high rates of cancers, particularly individuals who had spent considerable time near the centre of the blast or eaten a fair amount of locally grown food. Over the years, many of these veterans filed claims for special services or assistance, with both the Australian and Japanese governments, but to date neither nation has acknowledged them.

A recent fact sheet released by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs would appear to back the government decisions. Though readily acknowledged that Japanese persons and Allied POWs received massive doses of radiation, from the Hiroshima and Nagasaki blasts and during the subsequent weeks of fallout, by the time occupation forces had arrived, in October 1945, radiation levels at the center of Hiroshima had fallen to about 1.25 rem or less. This is roughly twice the daily dose of natural radiation absorbed by the human body, which is still considered a safe level, and for every kilometer away from ground-zero the fallout levels dropped significantly. The problem with this accurate, nonetheless general, analysis is that it cannot account for individual incidents of radioactive...
exposure or contamination, and to date, determining the biological effects of such radiation remains an inexact science, where susceptibility to negative consequences can be case-by-case.

As for keeping American service personnel away from Hiroshima, another reason for this strategy was to help control perceptions of atomic devastation back home among the American public. The United States was becoming a technological superpower and the economic master of the world, and images of children or the elderly with their skin falling off, due to atomic blasts, ran counter to nuclear power as a symbol of American progress, and to the nation’s justification for taking any and all life in the name of preserving life and democracy. The problem was that whereas the Occupation authorities could keep a fairly tight lid on official television and newspaper sources, many of the greatest day-to-day accounts of the entire war and subsequent occupation, including many of the most graphic images, were recorded by military personnel on the ground. Among the photographs of atomic bomb survivors that eventually made it to the U.S., some of the most disturbing were captured by U.S. marines and soldiers who had passed through Hiroshima or Nagasaki.

A Narrative

Someone with early access to the accounts of atomic bomb survivors was John Hersey, who got the idea to write his genre-defining Hiroshima after discovering the documents of a Jesuit missionary who had lived to tell. Hersey, with two years of experience as a war correspondent, in both Europe and the Pacific, and one of the few journalists permitted entry into Hiroshima early in the occupation, was commissioned by The New Yorker to write a series of articles about nuclear devastation. Hiroshima, constructed entirely from Hersey’s interviews with six blast survivors, was so shocking that The New Yorker published the entire 31,000-word
piece as a stand-alone article in its August 31, 1946 edition, before it was released as a book that November.

In predictable fashion, relying on official accounts and honoring the narrative of wartime necessity, which was part of a public relations campaign endorsed by the U.S. State Department from the fall of 1945, *The Atlantic* ran its own article on December 1, 1946. The piece justified the bomb because it supposedly stopped an impending invasion of the Japanese home islands, one that would have killed tens of thousands of Americans pitted against Japanese “peasants, and the ignorant masses,” blind followers who simply placed no value on life. The rhetoric was crucial, and would eventually be employed throughout the Cold War against other Asians, particularly in the Korean and Vietnam wars to come.

As for the actual, intended U.S.-led operation, codenamed Olympic, and slated for November 1945 against the Japanese home island of Kyushu, the projected casualty levels were higher than *The Atlantic* had assumed: at least an estimated 150,000 Americans for the entire campaign, and a minimum of 600,000 Japanese in just the first month of the operation. It was also true that the Japanese Imperial war planners, rather than negotiating some kind of end to the war, partly to protect their own power and to protect themselves from postwar prosecution, were training (exploiting) thousands of children and the elderly in how to fight with bamboo spears against American flamethrowers and machine guns.

At the same time, the binary of either the Invasion or the Bomb no longer holds much weight among scholars. President Harry Truman, General George Marshall, Admiral Ernest King, and other leading political and military figures were, based on the intelligence they were receiving during the summer of 1945, already having serious doubts about Olympic. Given the severity and effectiveness of the U.S. blockade-and-bombing strategy up to that point, it seems reasonable that Olympic would have been at least postponed and probably even cancelled, with or without the atomic bomb.

On the Japanese side, according to the minutes of the Imperial Administration emergency session on the night of August 9-10, called in the wake of the Nagasaki bomb and the Soviet invasion of Manchuria, both earlier that same day, the principle concern, particularly with the Emperor, was the “domestic situation”. The military and imperial administrators had been in agreement for months that Japan would eventually surrender. The terms of that surrender remained an obstacle, with the military entrenched in an Armageddon strategy of undermining the American will to fight by inflicting as many casualties as possible, which entailed the sacrifice of millions of Japanese civilians in the process. Recognising a nation on the verge of mass starvation, the Showa Emperor (Hirohito), who was perhaps more responsible for a ceasefire than anyone, foresaw internal political and social collapse if Japan continued diverting all of its resources to the military’s gambit. Given the outcomes of Germany and Russia in World War One, both of which had collapsed under similar circumstances, followed by the destruction of their respective imperial institutions, the Japanese emperor invariably found a better option for preserving his own legacy in the Americans than at home.

If the atomic bomb played any role in ending the Asia-Pacific war, it was to hasten imperial and military leaders to a ceasefire.

Ultimately, the narratives that have grown up around the atomic weapons used against Japan have histories of their own, each influenced by political, social, economic, moral, and speculative arguments. Though some of these are more accurate, telling, and better researched than others, a definitive account will likely never emerge. Histories of controversial subjects tend to be histories of relevance and perspective, of agendas and power structures. In the quest for narrative coherence, they often devolve into simplistic interpretations misrepresented as ones of clarity. Seven decades since the end of the turmoil, and drawing on records that paint more detailed strokes, it is best to realise which narratives remain overly simplistic and belong in the bin of myth.

Theron Fairchild is currently a lecturer in the Department of International Business and Management, Kanagawa University, Japan. Previously he has worked at the Visual History Foundation in Los Angeles. He is also a published science fiction author with academic interests in science, creative writing, and synthetic development. A referenced version of this article is
By the summer of 1945, much of Japan lay in ruins, its cities having been incinerated by the American bomber fleets. Industry had been shattered, the merchant fleet all but destroyed. Two million people had perished, a third of them civilians. Never in modern times had a country been so devastated by war. On August 15, Emperor Hirohito broke with tradition by broadcasting to the nation. His address was couched in courtly language peppered with classical phrases rather than colloquial Japanese. Despite this, many understood his meaning when he informed the stunned and bewildered nation that, “to continue the war would ultimately mean the extinction of our people and the utter destruction of human civilisation”. However, not all heeded the Emperor’s message.

On August 22, Air Corps units based on the Kamikaze home base at Atsugi airfield near Tokyo dropped leaflets over the capital encouraging the population to “rise up against their leaders and repel the invasion”. This call to arms was unsuccessful as it failed to inspire a general uprising. However, small military cliques in the
MacArthur also displayed the imperious aloofness with which the Japanese people could both identify and respect.

The occupation began in a low-key manner on August 28, when a C-46 Skytrain transport aircraft circled the Atsugi airfield, before finally touching down at 08.28 hrs. This was the lead aircraft in a flight of 16 bearing Colonel Tench, commanding his advance party on behalf of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. The landing of the C-46 caused some anxiety on the ground as the United States representatives were one hour early and no one was ready to receive them. General Seizo Arisue commanding the Atsugi reception committee quickly recovered his composure and after assembling his reception committee set off to meet the American representatives. After proffering a stiff salute to Tench, the American group was led towards a tent in the centre of the airfield which served as the reception area. The atmosphere in the tent was frosty, strict military protocol taking precedence. When Tench was offered a drink of orange punch and some food, he instinctively refused, thinking that it had been poisoned. Only after Arisue took a punch and some food, he instinctively refused, thinking that it had been poisoned. Only after Arisue took a drink himself did Tench relent with a resultant relaxation of tension within the tent.

Following a perceptible thaw in the atmosphere, discussions began with Tench outlining his mission as being to reconnoiter the airfield to determine suitability for follow up operations, establish supply and support services, coordinate improvements on the airfield and to establish communications with the newly repaired runways from 07.00 hrs onwards, thus providing a much more substantial occupying force. One of the first aircraft to land carried Major General Joe Swing, the division’s battle-hardened commanding officer. Swing assumed command from Tench and began conferring with Arisue regarding arrangements for General Robert Eichelberger’s imminent arrival, and that of MacArthur, who was expected later that day. Swing’s four engined transport aircraft were landing every two to three minutes, bringing in additional troops and supplies.

The last C-54 to land was MacArthur’s personal aircraft Bataan II, in which he was discussing the future administration of Japan with his military secretary and chief of psychological warfare Brigadier General Bonner Fellers. After touching down at 14.29 hrs, MacArthur paused at the top of the ladder and was heard to say “This is the payoff”. With his corncob pipe clenched firmly between his teeth,
MacArthur descended the ladder to shake hands with Eichelberger, saying “Bob, from Melbourne to Tokyo is a long way, but this seems to be the end of the road”. A cavalcade of decrepit old cars and trucks, led somewhat incongruously by a spluttering bright red fire engine ferried the Supreme Commander and his staff to the New Grand Hotel, serving as temporary headquarters in Yokohama. MacArthur was shown to room 315 personally by the hotel owner Yozo Namura. A further 159 general officers were quartered at the hotel, including the former British commander of Singapore, General Arthur E. Percival and the defender of Corregidor, General Jonathan Wainwright.

MacArthur quickly established his administrative priorities and saw his first task as feeding the population. To this end he established army kitchens and brought in 3,500,000 tons of food from bases across the Pacific. When a Congressional Committee later questioned MacArthur’s actions, his answer was unequivocal, “give me bread or give me bullets”. The arrival of transports laden with supplies did much to reduce Japanese anxieties and paved the way for the occupation to proceed in an orderly fashion. The American troops were, on the whole, well behaved (MacArthur had introduced the death penalty for rape), and the population readily accepted the security offered by the new administration.

The occupation may be divided into four distinct phases: demobilisation, constitutional and religious reform, political reform and economic reform. The first phase, that of disarming and repatriating in excess of 6,000,000 soldiers was carried out within a year. The General Staff was abolished and military officers barred from public service. War criminals were brought before an international tribunal, seven leading personalities including General Tojo were hanged.

MacArthur also displayed the imperious aloofness with which the Japanese people could both identify and respect.
method of enforcing the Potsdam protocols was to work directly “through the Japanese government instructed by the Emperor”. This scenario fitted in with MacArthur’s plans, and so the scene was set for his historic meeting with the incumbent of the Chrysanthemum Throne.

Two weeks after his meeting with Shigemitsu, MacArthur had his first face to face meeting with the Emperor at the United States Embassy in Tokyo. The Emperor arrived with his retinue dressed in a rather formal black ensemble, which provided a stark contrast with MacArthur’s more casual appearance. To many Japanese officials, the image of a tieless MacArthur wearing a slightly creased uniform and towering over the Emperor was deeply humiliating, symbolising as they saw it, his effective usurping of the throne. Nonetheless, the meeting went well, with MacArthur greeting the Emperor with the words, “you are very, very welcome sir”. No stenographic records were kept of the 50-minute meeting which revolved around MacArthur’s desire to promote the Emperor as “the first gentleman of Japan”. As such, the question of possible war crimes charges were not raised as MacArthur firmly believed that the Emperor not only held the key to Japan’s surrender, but also to postwar change.

In keeping with MacArthur’s reform priorities, a new constitution came into effect on May 3, 1947. Reforms were largely carried out by Japanese bureaucrats, technocrats and outside advisors, with MacArthur’s staff providing the directives. MacArthur placed anti-militarist ideas at the very centre of the new national charter. The so called “Peace Clause”, enshrined within Article 9 of the constitution, effectively outlawed war as a means of settling international disputes. Article 9 proscribed the possession of the means to wage aggressive war. However, the provisions of the constitution did not in any way deny Japan’s inherent right to self defence. As such, the Japanese government subsequently interpreted Article 9 as allowing them to possess the minimum level of armed forces and combat power needed to exercise their right to self defence.

The militarists in Japan had decreed that Shinto would be the state religion. On December 15, the new administration set about severing the close ties between Shinto and the state. The Directive for Disestablishment of State Shinto was a powerful indictment of the abuses of religion by the state. Whilst not destroying Shinto, the Directive sought to “prevent recurrence of the perversion of Shinto theory and beliefs into militaristic and ultra-nationalist propaganda designed to delude the Japanese people and lead them into wars of aggression”. Some elements of Shinto were allowed to remain, concurrent with the cleansing of nationalist and militaristic elements in the aforementioned Article 9 of the constitution.

The third stage of institutionalising reform involved two major changes to Japan’s political structure. The Emperor was not only reduced to being a symbol of the state with little political influence, but also to being a mere mortal. His Humanity Declaration, partly derived from the Five Charter Oath of 1868, was issued as part of a New Year’s statement on January 1, 1946. In this declaration in the form of an imperial rescript, he agreed to purge himself of divine pretensions by stating that “the ties between us and our people have always stood upon mutual trust and affection. They do not depend upon mere legends and myths. They are not predicated on the false conception that the Emperor is divine”. By repudiating the concept of being a living god, the Emperor greatly facilitated the promulgation of the new constitution.

The second change within the political sphere came the abrogation of old laws and replacing them with new civil and criminal codes. Reform of the civil code eliminated the legal foundations of the patriarchal family system, thus strengthening the position of women in areas such as inheritance and divorce. In addition, long established authoritarian structures such as the Home Ministry which controlled the Police and prefectural governments were abolished, the largest surviving department being renamed the Autonomy Ministry. Political reform served as the harbinger of economic and social reform as American planners had been correct in their assumption that a more equitable distribution of wealth, opportunity and power would ensure the future stability of Japan as a peaceful and democratic nation.

The fourth and final phase of the occupation authorities reforms began with a purge of the financial magnates (Zaibatsu). The Zaibatsu families had their assets frozen and the bulk of their capital seized by the government in a general levy. Great families, such as the 17th-century house of Mitsui faded into economic and political obscurity. The land reform programme improved the situation of the tenant farmer. Educational reform produced a generation of students free from the restrictive discipline of the past.

In 1947, Washington began to
consider ways of bringing the occupation to an end through a peace treaty. The Cold War was in its infancy, tensions were growing and Soviet Intransigence in agreeing upon terms for a formal treaty would prolong the occupation by several years. Two external developments served as catalysts for change, the invasion of South Korea and the dismissal of MacArthur.

The invasion of South Korea by the Soviet trained/armed North Korean Army on June 25, 1950, diverted Washington’s attention from Japanese domestic affairs. MacArthur in his role as Commander in Chief of the United States Far Eastern Command, assumed control over the United Nations force. The North Korean Army had made rapid inroads, establishing a perimeter around the city of Pusan. MacArthur’s response was to launch operation Chromite, breaking out of the Pusan perimeter, simultaneously carrying out amphibious landings at Inchon. Operation Chromite was a resounding success, transforming certain defeat into a spectacular military victory. In Washington, earlier fears that the North Korean invasion signalled a general Communist offensive proved groundless. The Soviets distanced themselves from the North Korean regime, not wishing to commit themselves to the Korean adventure.

The policymakers in Washington were satisfied that the fighting in Korea had remained localised. President Truman and the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarded Korea as an exercise in containment. This made for a very frustrating war for some Americans, MacArthur most of all. The ambiguous nature of the war fuelled MacArthur’s conviction that the Washington administration had been subverted by Communists and British Imperialists. In increasingly theatrical tones, MacArthur issued statements that ran contrary to current U.S. policy. His belief that the war against the Communists in Korea should be extended to China became an obsession. In a letter to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, MacArthur outlined his ideas for unleashing the Nationalist forces of Chiang Kai-Shek, against the Communist regime of Mao Tse Tung. He also wrote to Washington urging pre-emptive strikes against China’s war industries. Incredibly, he even conceived of a plan to create a impassable no man’s land on the 38th parallel by sowing radioactive waste.

In Washington, President Truman stated that with the North Korean forces driven back to their starting point, it was now time to bring the war to a conclusion. MacArthur responded with a stream of statements criticising the Washington administration. Senator Wayne Morse observed that the United States was in possession of two distinct foreign policies, “that of General MacArthur and that of the President”. On April 6, 1951, President Truman held a meeting with his closest advisors at the White House. A decision was reached to dismiss MacArthur from his posts, with the proviso that it received the support of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Two days later, the Joint Chiefs met in General Bradley’s office in the Pentagon and following two hours of discussion gave their recommendations that MacArthur be dismissed on the basis of the need for a commander more receptive to control from Washington. In Japan, the Emperor was successfully taking on a more temporal role by establishing himself as a man of the people, ironically at a time when MacArthur was becoming increasingly unapproachable, adopting the style of a colonial viceroy. Truman had never cared for MacArthur, considering him something of a primadonna. His aloofness smacked of hubris and played a significant part in his downfall. For the Japanese people the dismissal of the American Caesar provided a valuable insight into the democratic process. A military governor of great stature had been replaced with apparent ease by a civilian government. General Ridgway was appointed to succeed MacArthur at a time when the transition from occupation to self government was almost complete. The signing of the peace treaty in San Francisco on September 8 1951 paved the way for the formal transfer of authority on April 28, 1952.

General MacArthur would return home as a hero. In a speech to the House of Representatives he would draw a veil on his long career as a soldier. Taking inspiration from the old ballad “Old soldiers never die. They just fade away”, MacArthur closed by saying, “like the old soldier of that ballad, I now close my military career and just fade away – an old soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty. Goobye”. Thus ended the reign of the American Caesar.

As for the Emperor, his reign would continue until his death at the age of 87 on January 7, 1987. The nature of his wartime role remains somewhat obscured. However, his six decades on the throne can best be characterised by the transition of a “sacred and inviolable” personage to that of a man of the people, one who served his country gracefully as a symbol of unity and national regeneration.

Following a career as a certified social worker David McCormack graduated from Salford University as a mature student with a first class honours degree in Contemporary Military and International History. Since April 2012, Mr. McCormack has worked as a military historian and battlefield guide with UK-based Leger Battlefield Tours.
Common Core’s Leviathan
Bill Gates and (Mis)Adventures within American Public Education
by Craig Sower
The debate over the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI) is not politics as usual. At first blush it may appear to be just another round in the 100-years’ war between progressive and traditional educators, but on closer inspection it is deeply weird. Instead of the usual suspects divided along predictable ideological lines, the CCSSI has made unlikely allies of groups with little else in common. Proponents of the Core have included Republican and Democrat governors, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE), state DOEs, teachers unions, the mainstream media, and two of the richest men in the world, Warren Buffet and Bill Gates. Large corporations such as Exxon-Mobil, Microsoft, Hewlett Packard, Houghton-Mifflin, McGraw-Hill, IBM, and Pearson, to name but a few, have invested heavily in the curriculum and infrastructure to implement the CCSSI. This nexus between Big Government and Big Business has spurred growing opposition from a disparate group of parents, teachers, and citizens. In something akin to a secular miracle, unionised public school teachers find common cause with parochial schools and homeschoolers in resisting standards, curricula, and tests over which they have had no say. Much of the debate concerns substantive disagreements over details of the standards. Vital as these issues are, however, it is more important for traditionalists and progressives alike to focus instead on the dubious process used to develop, fund, and implement the CCSSI. The system being put in place would harm students, parents, teachers, and society no matter what the standards finally contain. It behooves anyone interested in liberal education to join in stopping the CCSSI.

Advocates claim the CCSSI is state-led, internationally benchmarked, and based on the latest research, yet it is none of those things. In addition to manifest pedagogical shortcomings, Common Core is dangerously close to an army of crony capitalists, anxious to cash in on the bonanza of federal, state, and local contracts. Critics charge the CCSSI with doing for education what the military-industrial complex has done for defense – spawning expensive and wasteful boondoggles overseen by burgeoning bureaucracies that harm the very people the system purports to help. The groups pushing the Core operate in a murky area between government and business in which their activities are shielded from the oversight normally afforded civil servants by public hearings, sunshine laws, and FOIA requests. Unlike regular government programs, the CCSSI is opaque and unaccountable. Equally important, top-down control of the standards, curricula, and tests will lead ineluctably to prescriptive practices that reduce teachers to assembly-line workers punching out widgets.

History

The story began in 2008, when then-Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano, director of the National Governors Association (NGA) Educational Policy Division, created a taskforce of governors, education leaders, and corporate CEOs to recommend changes in science and math education. The CCSSI’s Ur-document was the taskforce report. After the report was issued, three groups funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation — the NGA, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and Achieve, Inc. — formally joined forces to make the goals of the report a reality. The U.S. DOE began providing funds in 2009.

Gates has been the driving force behind the CCSSI. In addition to creating and funding Achieve, Inc., to draft the standards, he has lobbied state and federal governments to assure ongoing funding and compliance with the program. On July 21, 2009, a month after receiving commitments from 46 state governors and CCSSOs (and a year before the final standards had even been written) Gates told the National Conference of State Legislatures:

“We’ll know we’ve succeeded when...
This nexus between Big Government and Big Business has spurred growing opposition from a disparate group of parents, teachers, and citizens. In something akin to a secular miracle, unionised public school teachers find common cause with parochial schools and homeschoolers in resisting standards, curricula, and tests over which they have had no say.

the curriculum and the tests are aligned to these standards. Secretary [of Education] Arne Duncan recently announced that $350 million of the stimulus package will be used to create just these kinds of tests – next-generation assessments aligned to the common core. When the tests are aligned to the common standards, the curriculum will line up as well – and that will unleash powerful market forces in the service of better teaching. For the first time, there will be a large base of customers eager to buy products that can help every kid learn and every teacher get better …”

Gates was forthright about the creation of a huge captive market paid for with billions of taxpayer dollars. He was also frank about standards being inextricably linked to curricula and assessments. Despite his candor on some issues, however, the transparency of the process used to write the standards is debatable since deliberations were kept secret by mandatory confidentiality agreements. Confidentiality is common in test preparation, but the CCSSI is public policy, which normally requires and benefits from the input of people most affected by proposals. The CCSSI’s authors may have reasoned (correctly) that had people understood the standards they would have strangled the Core in its crib. While the authors may have been cagey about this, the states also share the blame for failing to do due diligence before joining.

According to the Huffington Post, the Obama administration incentivised the CCSSI with its Race to the Top [RTTT] competition. Stunned by the recession, cash-starved states signed up before knowing what they were getting into. Funding for RTTT alone, announced in July 2009, was $4.35 billion, not including billions of state and local tax dollars used to implement the CCSSI. To receive federal funds, states were required to adopt the standards and join one of two approved assessment consortia: the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), or the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). These consortia began overseeing high-stakes testing in 2014-15. The U.S. DOE withheld funds from states that did not submit to the CCSSI (and PARCC or SBAC). Initially, 46 states and Washington, D.C. joined. Minnesota, Nebraska, Virginia, and Texas refused. By February 2015, 17 states had quit the consortia (New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Oklahoma, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Wyoming, Arizona, Utah, and Alaska). Four more are now undecided or actively considering withdrawing (Massachusetts, New Jersey, Louisiana, and Michigan). This 46 percent dropout rate is telling. Many school districts have already spent millions on new Core-aligned textbooks; that money is gone, further locking them into the untried standards. Regardless, half the states have quit. The more teachers, parents, and state officials learn about Common Core, the less they like it. Supporters say the CCSSI is state-led and voluntary; critics say federal funding is bribery and intimidation.

As Gates was addressing legislators in 2009, the 24-member Standards Development Work Group was writing the Common Core math standards (CCMS) and standards for English language arts (ELA). The Gates Foundation and its creature, Achieve, Inc., probably selected the staff though exactly who, how, why, and upon what criteria the decisions were made is unknown due to confidentiality constraints. The members came mostly from the staff of Achieve, Inc., and three companies: American College Testing (ACT), America’s Choice, and College Board. Two Work Group members were businessman David Coleman, and Bennington College professor Dr. Jason Zimba. Dr. Sandra Stotsky and Dr. James Milgram were named to the 25-member CCSSO/NGA Validation Committee (VC) to review the standards. In 2010, Stotsky and Milgram, among others, refused to approve the standards.

Coleman, a businessman with a Masters degree in philosophy, was lead author of the ELA standards. Zimba, Coleman’s friend and business partner, was lead author of the CCMS. Their Chicago company, Grow Network, had multimillion-dollar contracts from 2001-04 with Chicago Public Schools (CPS) when Arne Duncan was CEO of CPS. In 2004, they sold their business to McGraw-Hill, which continues to service CPS. It sells copyrighted materials including “lesson plans, and curriculum resources … identical to those now being used with Common Core,” according to EAG News. Coleman has since become president of College Board where, in accordance with plans announced by Gates, he is revising the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)
to bring it into line with the Core. These changes in the SAT are seen as crucial since methods embedded in the standards would thereby be codified in college admissions tests. Changing the tests effectively forces states to change curricula or see students fail. The proposed ELA and American history standards have been severely criticised, but since literature and history are fuzzier than math, we will limit ourselves here to the CCMS and SAT.

**Groovy Math**

On November 29, 2012, Coleman declared his support for “reform math” thus: “There are two types of people in math in my judgment. There are the kind of groovy, understanding people, then there are the mean, rote people.” According to experts, however, the reform math in CCMS does not add up. They say the standards fail to prepare students for careers in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), and are a retreat from current best practice in many states. Dr. Milgram, the only mathematician among the members of the VC, is professor of mathematics emeritus at Stanford University, and served on the Advisory Board of NASA. In 2011, he told Texas legislators he refused to approve the standards because committee members wanted to make them as “unchallenging as possible” and to make “sure their favorite topics were present, and handled the way they like.” He explained, “by the end of fifth grade the material being covered … is more than a year behind most high-achieving countries … By the end of seventh grade Core Standards are roughly two years behind.” The CCMS delay or eliminate high school requirements in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II, and exclude Euclidean geometry including proofs and deductive reasoning. While most countries expect high school graduates to have passed calculus, the CCMS do not even mention it.

Dr. Stotsky is professor of education reform emerita at Arkansas University, a former member of the VC, and former Senior Associate Commissioner of the Massachusetts DOE where she was in charge of developing that state’s
leading ELA program. The literature-heavy curriculum she developed for Massachusetts is credited with that state’s first-place ranking in national reading scores. Like Milgram, she refused to approve the final Core standards. In a white paper prepared for the Pioneer Institute titled, Lowering the Bar: How Common Core Math fails to prepare high school students for STEM, Milgram and Stotsky tackled the issue of whether the standards are capable of accomplishing their declared goal of making American students college- and career-ready. In their paper, Milgram and Stotsky explained that they refused to sign off on the CCSSI because the standards are not rigorous and do not do what they purport to do, despite repeated assurances to the contrary. Stotsky and Milgram’s detailed critiques to the Work Group were ignored without comment.

Milgram and Stotsky’s paper details a dispute over comments made by Jason Zimba, lead writer of the CCMS. In 2010, Zimba told the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education that “the concept of college readiness [in the standards] is minimal and focuses on non-selective colleges.” In 2013, Zimba claimed he was misquoted. Fortunately, a video of the meeting exists including his exchange with Stotsky, who was a member of the board. In his opening remarks, Zimba said, “We have agreement to the extent that it’s a fuzzy definition, that the minimally college-ready student is a student who passed Algebra II.” When Stotsky asked him to clarify his remarks he stated, “Well, for the colleges most kids go to, but not for the colleges most parents aspire to.” Stotsky: “Not for STEM? Not for international competitiveness?” Zimba: “Not only not for STEM, it’s also not for selective colleges … whether you are going to be an engineer or not, you’d better have precalculus.” Stotsky objected to Zimba’s claim the standards make students college-ready.

Milgram also coauthored a Pioneer Institute white paper with Richard Phelps titled The Revenge of K-12: How Common Core and the new SAT lower college standards in the U.S. Phelps is the author of four books on standardised testing and founded the Nonpartisan Education Review. Their paper details many discrepancies between the declared values of the CCSSI and the standards produced. Phelps and Milgram were especially critical of the lack of qualifications of the lead writers of the standards. In particular, they noted that Coleman and Zimba were former business partners and that Coleman has “no teaching experience in K-12 or above.” Furthermore, they reported that Zimba “had never written K-12 standards before or studied the standards of high-achieving countries … Both he and Coleman were likely selected to be standards writers by the [Gates Foundation].” Other writers for CCMS and ELA are closely connected to the Gates Foundation, but similarly ill equipped for writing usable standards. Milgram and Phelps found no evidence that the CCMS standards had been compared with international standards, much less benchmarked. To the contrary, they found the standards inferior to “Korea, Japan, China, Singapore, [and] the Netherlands.” Phelps and Milgram
wrote, “The CCMS ended up as a political compromise. The document was designed to look attractive to both education schools and content experts. However, in mathematics, these are mostly incompatible objectives.” They concluded that the standards are “poorly written and very confusing.”

Yet another issue raised by Phelps and Milgram is the ruinous effect of likely changes in the SAT. They wrote, “the greatest harm to higher education may accrue from the alignment of the SAT to Common Core’s high school standards, converting the SAT from an adaptable test predictive of college work to an inflexible retrospective test aligned to and locking in a low level of mathematics.” There are two kinds of tests, they wrote: “Achievement tests are retrospective, they measure knowledge already learned, whereas aptitude tests are predictive, measuring readiness for future activities.” The two types of tests have different purposes and measure different, though overlapping, skill sets. To create a high-quality aptitude test, the makers correlate items on the test with later performance. They explained the key differences: “Predictive tests can be periodically adjusted to optimise their predictive validity (tossing poorly predictive test items and drafting new ones); retrospective tests are less flexible — their test items must cover the high school content domain, whether or not they are predictive. Further, in the case of … PARCC and SBAC, they are required to test the material listed in the … standards.”

Since its inception, the SAT has been a predictive test, something Coleman intends to change. Phelps and Milgram wrote, “On March 5, 2014, Coleman announced planned changes in the Mathematics SAT.” While the precise questions have yet to be unveiled, the changes appear to resemble the 1989 and 2000 standards of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) that moved away from assessing mathematical skills and techniques to assessing philosophical ideas about mathematics. This does not bode well, since the NCTM standards to which they referred “met catastrophic failure after lowering outcomes in every state that attempted” to implement them. According to Phelps and Milgram, reform math was too groovy even for California: “The NCTM standards were adopted there in 1992. By 1996 the resulting problems had become so acute that a rebellion led by parents and the state’s high tech industries forced the state to create new standards.” Maryland and Kentucky suffered similar fates in the 1990s.

The scholarly work of Stotsky, Milgram, and Phelps is in stark contrast to Coleman’s views, which one must read to fully appreciate. On November 29, 2012, a few weeks after becoming head of College Board, Coleman spoke at the Brookings Institution. According to the Brookings website, Coleman explained: “assessment is an extremely powerful signal for instruction, but you’ve got to own it. You’ve got to cut the [expletive] when you’re like, ooh we wrote this test and all these people are doing test preparation. They shouldn’t test preparation. They should look at the standards. I mean, is it a — like [expletive] you, like no. I hate that disingenuousness. If you put something on an assessment, in my view, you are ethically obligated to take responsibility that kids will practice it 100 times. So when I look over an instrument like SAT, I want to say to myself is it worth it. Is this work worth doing?” Maybe Coleman got carried away; perhaps he did not yet grasp the function of the SAT; or maybe he was, like, stricken with logorrhea.

Parents should be troubled by the fact that their children’s education is in the hands of unqualified and unelected people like Gates, Coleman, and Zimba. Teachers should be troubled by the fact that an assessment system run by unaccountable elites will inevitably lead to a prescriptive national curriculum with neither local control, nor room for the reflective practice of teaching. The standards belong to the CCSSO and NGA; publishers hold proprietary rights to curricula and textbooks; and assessments are owned by testing companies. Teachers can modify exactly none of this. Even if everyone agreed with NCTM’s reform math, Coleman’s groovy math, and turning the SAT upside-down, the fact that the system empowers an inscrutable, centralised bureaucracy impervious to input even from its own Validation Committee should give us pause.

We must assume that the road to CCSSI was paved with good intentions. The idea of common educational goals, a national curriculum to reach them, and a robust data collection system to track it all must have made sense to Gates, Coleman, and Zimba. Surely they did not anticipate the reaction their plans have elicited. Advocates claim Common Core is independent of the federal government, internationally benchmarked, and based on research, but as we have seen, it is far from it. Supporters use buzzwords like global competitiveness, 21st-century, critical thinking, career- and college-ready, and higher-order thinking. However, students, parents, and teachers are learning the hard way that calling something magic does not make it so. There are better ways to build a curriculum than corporate cronyism and secret standards. The question remains: Is this the best we can do? Clearly it is not. The CCSSI should be rejected on the merits because it fails to provide for a high-quality liberal education for American children.

Prof. Craig Sower is a Professor of English at Shujitsu University, Okayama, Japan, where he has taught writing and teacher education at graduate and undergraduate levels since 1998.
The Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI) has created a system to produce and sell standards, curriculum materials, textbooks, and assessments. Working with federal agencies and corporate sponsors, the CCSSI has foisted itself upon half the states. The last piece of the system is data collection. Bill Gates and government officials have long sought to track students’ beliefs and performance. Now they would like to micromanage educators, as well. This puts the CCSSI on a collision course with parents, teachers, and civil libertarians who do not trust the government to use such data wisely. According to the Gates Foundation website, on July 21, 2009, Gates told the National Conference of State Legislatures:

“Common standards define what the students need to learn; robust data systems tell us whether they’re learning it — and they tell us a whole lot more than that … The stimulus package contains funding for longitudinal data systems; I hope you will use this funding to support systems that track student performance from early childhood education through high school and college and into the workplace … All states and districts should collect common data on teachers and students. We need to define the data in a standardised way, we need to collect all of it for all of our students … Of course, if you do build this system and get this data, you may have to deal with people who don’t want you to use it.”

“Dealing with people” who do not want strangers using their children’s data sounds a bit ominous, but at least Gates was honest about it. Unfortunately for supporters, the CCSSI has come online at a time when distrust of the government is high. The recent scandal with Internal Revenue Service (IRS) agents using confidential taxpayer information to punish citizens whose political beliefs differ from their own makes people nervous about the government collecting sensitive data on children. Assurances that bureaucrats only want to help are likely to fall on deaf ears, especially in light of what federal agencies have already written and put into motion. In February 2013, the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) Office of Educational Technology issued a report titled “Promoting Grit, Tenacity, and Perseverance: Critical Factors for Success in the 21st Century”. The report focuses on how fine-grained data about students can be gathered, stored, processed, and used. It reads in part:

“[M]easurement may focus on sequences of behaviors, emotions, physiological reactions, and/or thoughts that unfold over time during learning, extracting indicators of persistence and giving up. New
technologies using educational data mining and ‘affective computing’ (the study and development of systems and devices that can recognise, interpret, process, and simulate aspects of human affect) are beginning to focus on ‘micro-level’ moment-by-moment data within digital and blended-learning environments to provide feedback to adapt learning tasks.” The technical implements to accomplish this are shown on page 44 of the report (see above).

The report goes on to say, “Ed Dieterle and Ash Vasudeva of the [Gates Foundation] point out that researchers … are beginning to use multiple methods to explore how specific brain activity is correlated to other cognitive affective indicators that are practical to measure in school settings.” The authors briefly mention ethics in a section titled, “Ethical Considerations for New Types of Personal Data.” It reads: “As new forms of measurement emerge and new types of personal data become available, the field must also deal with critical ethical considerations … especially when leveraging data available in the ‘cloud’ that users may or may not be aware is being mined … Learners and educators have the potential to get forms of feedback about their behaviors, emotions, physiological responses, and cognitive processes that have never been available before … developers must carefully consider the impacts of releasing such data, sometimes of a sensitive nature, and incorporate feedback mechanisms that are valuable, respectful, and serve to support productive mindsets.” The concern seems to be that students, parents, and teachers may be incapable of handling the information collected about them.

A search of this 126-page report finds the word “ethical” used four times including in the title of the above section and the table of contents. On the other hand, the report is expansive about the data they think should be gathered on students, including their “beliefs, attitudes, dispositions, values, and ways of perceiving oneself.” Gathering such information violates a slew of existing federal regulations including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. As with laws forbidding federal involvement with K-12 curriculum, however, the DOE is skirting the need for parents’ permission before collecting data. In effect, the information belongs to whoever gathers it; they may retain, dispense, or use it as they see fit. The National Center for Education Statistics has taken the position that parental approval is required only for studies funded directly by the U.S. DOE, and therefore does not apply to data collected by other entities.

Bill Gates and government officials have long sought to track students’ beliefs and performance. Now they would like to micromanage educators, as well.

One shudders to think where we are headed. Do children have any right to privacy, or does “affective computing” preempt it? Will teachers remain free to adjust lesson plans to better serve students, or will a new Taylorism be the wave of the future? Will the new mind-reading technologies obviate the need for the reflective practice of teaching? Are there any limits on government or on how intrusive technocrats can be? How much data is enough, and will the same people control it as controlled the IRS files? The Panopticon planned by developers is one more reason parents, teachers, and citizens should oppose the CCSSI.

Prof. Craig Sower is a Professor of English at Shujitsu University, Okayama, Japan, where he has taught writing and teacher education at graduate and undergraduate levels since 1998.
Over the past few decades, the imperial dimensions of Jean Rhys's *Voyage in the Dark* (1934) and *Good Morning, Midnight* (1938) have received significant critical attention. While Jean Rhys's apparently anti-imperialist political views have already been traced in her novels, critics like Veronica Marie Gregg and Mary Lou Emery have also acknowledged the intimacy of complicity and critique in Jean Rhys's narratives of England and West India in her descriptions of the British Empire. As these critics suggest in separate arguments, such complexities place her texts in a contested middle ground, relying upon the very textual tropes of empire and colony to formulate postcolonial literature.

Although she always rejected him in the past this time, Sasha embraces him and pulls him onto the bed, saying, “Yes---yes---yes.”

*Voyage in the Dark* tells us a story of a Creole girl named Anna Morgan who, like Rhys herself, falls in love with a wealthy man only to be abandoned later, resorting to prostitution in order to keep on living. Anna’s dark voyage, from a chorus girl to Walter’s lover and finally to a prostitute, ends with a catastrophic abortion, after which Anna breaks down completely both mentally and physically. The heroine of *Good Morning, Midnight*, Sasha Jansen, is the eldest of Rhys’s female protagonists. When the story begins, Sasha is on a two-week trip to a Paris that she knows well. During her stay, she remembers rooms, streets, and scenes from her past, meets a few foreigners, has several unpleasant encounters with the man next door whom she dubs the commis voyageur, and meets a gigolo who later attempts to rape her in her room. Sasha drives him away but later regrets it. She opens the door hoping he will come back again, but the commis enters instead. Although she always rejected him in the past, this time Sasha embraces him and pulls him onto the bed, saying, “Yes---yes---yes.”

Both these two novels register commerce and consumer capitalism as part of the literal and figurative administration of empire and the articulations of Englishness with racial categories. On the other hand, Jean Rhys’s texts use the tropes of the marketplace in ambivalent ways, challenging us to determine the status of resistance and complicity within capitalist and imperialist regimes. *Voyage in the Dark* and *Good Morning, Midnight* enables us to trace the effects of a consumer capital which affects colonised women ideologically, psychologically, politically, and economically, placing them in an impasse where they cannot obtain what they desire through consumption.

**Dream and Promise**

Alissa Karl (2009) precisely notes how consumer capital “promises belonging to the foreign and in this case explicitly colonial woman” in Rhys’s *Voyage in the Dark*. Shopping falsely promises Anna Morgan with a way that she can locate herself in England and assume an English identity. Fellow critic Anna Snaith (2005) pointed out that Anna quickly recognises this form of dressing up as a potential and effective way “out of her fixity”; in other words, as a way to change her fate. With the money given to her by Walter, she purchases new clothes, which represent a re-
Anna herself understands ‘purity’ as it circulates in the marketplace, yet as it is naturalised by capital and empire.

Invention. In the shop, she thinks: “This is a beginning. Out of this warm room that smells of fur I’ll go to all the lovely places I’ve ever dreamt of. This is the beginning.” Here, at the “scene of the sale” Anna imagines her possibilities in terms of consumer practice that will enable her to start a new life in England. For both critics Snaith and Karl, this dress shop scene indicates the promises of consumption. Karl contends that such instances indicate “not how Anna wants to become ladylike, but rather how she understands discipline as a matter of displaying commodities and avoiding visual conspicuousness.” However, it is my own claim that Anna wants to become ladylike in order to conform to the English discipline and mores, believing it as the only effective way to change, even momentarily.

By showing how commodities shape her characters’ self-invention, Rhys identifies the sexualisation of foreign women. On the one hand, fashion and commodity locate them, allowing them to re-invent themselves. On the other hand, however, being alone and foreign, these characters are extinguished by the fashion commodities, which increase the awareness of foreignness. For instance, when Anna returns from the dress shop, dressed up to the nines, the landlady concludes, “I don’t want no tarts in my house, so now you know.” The irony is that the mannequins in the dress shop are not considered as a tart although being clothed in an identical dress. In addition, Anna’s anxiety over her ladylike appearance reflects her feeling of exclusion from English culture and identity. Feeling that the houses are sneering at her and that she will be laughed at for her inappropriate clothing, Anna is ashamed of her “hideous underclothes” and determines to “do anything for good clothes.” According to Rosalind Coward (1985), women are always subordinated to and disempowered by the gaze in a consumerist context.

Furthermore, Anna depends on men for economic survival, which determines her status as a sexualised commodity whose social and economic currency fluctuates with male desire. The scrutiny directed toward her body not only commodifies her femininity but also confirms men’s control and mastery behind the gaze. Walter, for example, speculates about Anna’s body; he notes Anna’s white teeth during their first encounter and comments twice on her teeth, as a slave owner would while purchasing slaves. Anna survives in the novel by exposing herself to specularisation and commodification in order to secure her economic circulation. The end of the novel affirms this cycle of commodification and desire when the doctor remarks after abortion, that Anna should be “[r]eady to start all over again in no time.” This remark suggests that Anna will continue to circulate as a sexual commodity. When women from the fringes of empire try to conform or assimilate into the dominant society, these women, with a colonial perspective, try to apply the dominant viewpoint into their own bodies. Meanwhile, the consumer relationship, with men as consumers of women’s bodies, establishes a dynamic of colonial visuality in the metropole as well as the specific procedures of consumer capitalist markets.

The consumerist masculine gaze that dominates Voyage in the Dark and Good Morning, Midnight recalls the cultural negotiations of gender. The visual norm, which is based specifically upon Anna and Sasha’s being looked at, both keeps them separate and controls them. When Sasha leaves the shop after her hat-buying, she is pleased because no one stares at her anymore. Anna worries about her looks and clothes when she meets Walter one evening and is glad that Walter makes no comment on her appearance. Both women adjust themselves to this form of visual regulation, where the display of fashion commodities satirically traps those marginalised women into inconspicuous circulation. Therefore, the marketplace enables economic authority to produce a gendered logic of consumerism.

Furthermore, the importance of visual regulation for the shopper cannot be denied, as Rachel Bowlby (1985), stresses:

Consumer culture transforms the narcissistic mirror into a shop window, the glass which reflects and idealizes image of the woman (or man) who stands before it, in the form of the model she could buy or become. Through the glass, the woman sees what she wants and what she wants to be.

The shop window raises Anna’s aspirations and fantasies with a transformative power, which can bring her an altered identity. While shopping gives Anna the hope for change, the act of gazing into the shop windows foreshadows the impossibility of such a transformation: “The shop-windows sneering and smiling in your face, and then you look at the skirt of your costume, all crumpled at the back.” The shop window even strips her naked and sees through her “hideous underclothes.” This is
a kind of self-reflexive female gaze. Her desire for fine clothes causes her financial dependence on Walter. As a result, she has to acquire money to dress well in order to sell her body to attain more money.

**Circulation and Aging**

Both *Voyage in the Dark* and *Good Morning, Midnight* depicts a woman who trades on her body and has to maintain her beauty in order to sustain herself financially and survive in sexual circulation. For example, in *Voyage in the Dark*, when Anna meets her stepmother Hester, she is afraid to tell Hester that she is living on the money from Walter: I sat here. I didn't know what to say. There wasn't anything to say. I kept on wondering whether she would ask me what I was living on. ‘What is Purity? For Thirty-five Years the Answer has been Bourne’s Cocoa.’ Thirty-five years...Fancy being thirty-five years old. What is Purity? For Thirty-five Years the Answer has been....’ (Rhys 1934, p.59)

This scene suggests that the discourse of purity is associated with upper-class gentility, as Walter insists that virginity is important and that “it’s the only thing that matters” As Alissa Karl interprets, just as the colonial import cocoa is brought back to England for
processing and “purification,” “Anna herself understands ‘purity’ as it circulates in the marketplace, yet as it is naturalised by capital and empire.” Here, purity becomes a commodity to fit the imperial narrative that is constructed by British male society.

Both protagonists act as consumers and objects of consumption, needing to consume goods in order to maintain themselves as objects of consumption. Albeit the decrease of their value, “like coins or stamps that enter circulation,” (Port, 2005) they continue to invest in their clothes and appearance to sustain themselves as devalued commodities. Good Morning, Midnight in particular emphasizes the heroine’s dread of female aging as “an economy of loss” which requires constant funding of an investment that will inevitably lose value. As Sasha approaches middle age, her anxiety grows:

Now, money, for the night is coming. Money for my hair, money for my teeth, money for shoes that won’t deform my feet (it’s not so easy now to walk around in cheap shoes with very high heel), money for good clothes, money, money. The night is coming (Rhys 1939, p.120).

In his essay entitled “Femininity,” Sigmund Freud observes that a woman of about thirty often frightens us with her psychical rigidity and unchangeability as her libido has assumed a final position and seems incapable of exchanging this position for others. Likewise, Sasha devotes her energy to preventing herself from being deemed obsolete. In other words, she resists this “unchangeability.”

For Sasha and the other female characters, money links the present and the future “by allowing women to cover up evidence of the past”

In order to “compensate for the loss of youth through purchases that mask or prosthetically renew the surface of the body,” (Port, 2005) she cosmetically alters her face and body to conform with commodified femininity.

As she approaches the “midnight” of middle age, Sasha is also anxious about, in addition to money, the linear progression of time and hopes that by spending money on fashion items, the “sensation of spending” could relieve this anxiety:

Tomorrow I’ll go to the Galeries Lafayette, choose a dress, go along to the Printemps, buy gloves, buy scent, buy lipstick, buy things costing fcs.6.25 and fcs.19.50, buy anything cheap. Just the sensation of spending, that’s the point. I’ll look at bracelets studded with artificial jewels, red, green and blue, necklaces of imitation pearls, cigarette-cases, jeweled tortoises … And when I have had a couple of drinks I shan’t know whether it’s yesterday, today or tomorrow. (Rhys 1939, p.121)
With some drinks, Sasha wishes to lose track of the passage of time without remembering yesterday, today, or tomorrow. In his famous work *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, John Maynard Keynes suggests that “the importance of money essentially flows from its being a link between the present and the future.” For Sasha and the other female characters, money links the present and the future “by allowing women to cover up evidence of the past” (Port, 2005). While her shopping plan at first is situated in a future time (tomorrow), Sasha’s moves from alienating present to traumatic memory are ultimately suspended since it might be yesterday, today, or tomorrow. Out of a linear progression and into a cyclical marketplace, Sasha constructs a narrative, motionless impasse, which obscures perceptions of past, present, and anxieties about the future. While the black dress, new hat, or fresh hairstyle fixes Sasha in time and place, the perpetual circulation in the department store allows Sasha to fight against the fixing and fragmenting. *Good Morning, Midnight* applies the requirement of capital–circulation as an alternative method of shopping for identities.

Both novels witness Rhys’s vaguely foreign and marginal heroines being offered the promise to fulfill their dreams in the capitalist marketplace and being absorbed into urban life as they participate in the consumer culture and visual economies. However, they fail to locate themselves, and their positions are always held at bay. Recent critical works on Rhys have examined how her early novels treat urban space as a metonym for colonial subjectivity. These works almost exclusively discuss *Voyage in the Dark* perhaps because it is the most explicitly colonial of Rhys’s early novels. The consumer culture in her novels also plays a vital role in rendering the marginalisation of Rhys and her heroines in the metropolitan space.

### The Marketplace's Circuit Of Endless Desire

Capitalism reshapes the psyche of colonial women like Anna and Sasha. To avoid the “imperial gaze” and to fulfill their dreams, they choose to dress in a ladylike way, to conform to the imperial norm, and to adopt social and sexual discipline. Both novels not only exemplify the contradictions of consumer choice in the marketplace, but also emphasise the marketplace’s circuit of endless desire. Anna and Sasha circulate as sexualised commodities according to the rules of British male society which dominate female sexuality and link the metaphorical colonisation of women’s bodies through “commodification, visual control, and imperialist tropes of specular fantasy to actual colonizations (economic, military, cultural and sexual)” (Karl, 2009). The unattainable desires generated by the marketplace force these heroines into the impasse of economic and imperial paternalism.

Born in China, and moving to Japan in 2006 Qiang Fu is currently a Ph.D. Candidate at the University of Tokyo, Japan. A fully referenced version of this article is available on request from the Editor at publications@iafor.org
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The theme of the individual versus authority in the works of Mark Twain has relevance not only to the world Twain lived in, but to our own, and to human society generally. The particular Twain protagonists I'd like to focus on in this article are Huckleberry Finn (from *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*) and Hank Morgan (from *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*).

The central assertions I'd like to make are that Twain's works have occasion to reflect the view that resistance to malignant authority in defiance of law and social convention is justified, and that lying, deception, escape, and direct resistance are morally imperative means to do so. Moreover, I'd like to assert that there are two motifs in each of the two Twain texts I will focus on which directly support this element of Twain's writings. One is the connection between power relationships and moral clarity, which I see as especially relevant in *Huckleberry Finn*. Huck's resistance to authority contains an element of surety that is high when he's resisting an authority figure closer to himself in social status, but which plummets when he's dealing with an authority figure that is much more powerful, essentially what he views as the Abrahamic God or his perceived representatives. The other motif, which I see as a major element of *Connecticut Yankee*, is what I call “the morally imperative lie”. That is, the protagonist lies because it is right and proper to do so.

All of this applies quite importantly to the question of what the relationship should be between the alienated individual and authority. This question, I would assert, is a timeless one, particularly as long as the institution of the state exists. It's not a question I will presume to definitively answer. But I do plan to stick my neck out a bit and speculate as to what Twain would have thought about certain institutions that appeared in the decades after his death, such as the rise of totalitarianism, and how these might have modified his views.

So first, let us take a trip down the river with Huckleberry Finn. If you had to make a list of the most morally conflicted, self-doubting Twain protagonists, Huckleberry Finn would be at or near the top. This is most famously illustrated in Huck's decision to tear up the letter he had written to Miss Watson revealing the whereabouts of Jim, her escaped slave. A lot of commentary has been made over the years about this scene in the novel, but relatively few analyses explicitly place Huck's dilemmas in the wider context of his relationship to various kinds of authority. So yes, Huck is resisting authority in the form of what he sees as a God-sanctioned slave system, and he does experience inner conflict over it. And this is very important. But this is not the only form of authority he deals with, so if we contrast his responses to different forms of authority, we see that he also sometimes resists authority without any qualms or hesitation at all. It depends on who it is and how Huck sees these authority figures as compared to himself. This is what I term moral clarity.

Leo Levy has accused Twain (as well as Twain's critics on this issue) of “verbal quibbling” on the point of making a distinction between conscience and morality. In an attempt to approach this aspect of the novel as concisely as possible, by “moral clarity” I mean one's level of conviction on how right or wrong a given action is, and in the case of Huck Finn this means action against authority.

Huck considers himself to be a person of little value, and in fact that's what the term “huckleberry” was used for in 19th-century America, to describe a person of no account. That's why when he believes he is resisting the will of God in assisting Jim, he is terrified. But a less intense example of this is when, upon hearing two different versions of Heaven from his guardians the Widow Douglas and Miss Watson, he decides that there must be “two Providences”, and that he prefers the Widow's, but seriously doubts that he could qualify to enter. Concluding that there are two Providences is the only way Huck can reconcile this contradiction without questioning the competence (and hence the authority) of at least one of the two adults. He doesn't consider himself morally fit to do otherwise.

When Huck decides to escape from his abusive father Pap, faking his own death in the process, he has no qualms at all. Whatever parental authority Pap has is mitigated by the fact that he is, other than being a white adult male, essentially no higher than Huck in whatever social hierarchy may exist. Similarly, when dealing with the sham aristocrat con artists known as the King and Duke, Huck expresses not the slightest twinge of guilt when he steals and conceals the money the
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two men are attempting to swindle from the Wilks family while posing as relatives from England.

The King and Duke have little power in society at large, but can act as conduits to bring the greater power of ante-bellum society to bear on Huck and Jim. As adults, they automatically have an implied authority over Huck. As white men, they carry the potential threat to turn Jim in, or sell him, which they do. As sham aristocrats, they use their false titles as a rationale for treating Huck and Jim like servants. Huck soon realises that “these liars warn’t no kings, nor dukes, at all, but just low-down humbugs and frauds” (836). In an 1889 letter to Sylvester Baxter of the Boston Herald, Mark Twain condemns the institution of monarchy as “the grotesques swindle” ever devised by man. The King and Duke simply represent the starkest manifestation of such a swindle. Twain places the issue of royalty in the microcosm of the river, stripping it to its bare essence: Huck and Jim, representative members of the “lower” orders of society, are cruelly used for the benefit of the parasitical “royalty.” Huck sees through this particular version of it, and so experiences no dilemma regarding moral clarity. He quickly realises that other than being adults, the two men are no “better” than himself in the context of ante-bellum Southern society. So Huck experiences no sense of guilt when he steals and conceals the money the two men are attempting to swindle from an unsuspecting family. This is in sharp contrast to Huck’s actions regarding Jim and the slave system, which he sees as God-sanctioned, that is, he assumes he will go to hell if the takes any action to help Jim maintain his perceived fugitive status.

So Huck’s responses to pressure from authority are determined by moral clarity which is in turn determined by the relationships of power.

On to Connecticut Yankee. Lying and deception figure greatly in this novel, and in fact I identify this recurring motif as the morally imperative lie.

In several of his essays, Twain postulates the lie as a natural underpinning of civilisation that spans all levels of human interaction, and by implication all of human history. Garden variety lies are nothing to fret over; we can’t avoid them in any case. But if lies per se are unavoidable, the “big lies” that aid the machinations of malignant authority are what one should condemn. Lies in and of themselves are not evil. The moral quality of a lie is defined by its objective. Connecticut Yankee serves as a fictive framework for these same assertions.

Since at least the 1960s, a common assertion about Hank Morgan, the 19th-century factory foreman who gets inexplicably transported to Arthurian England, is that he is a malign figure, at best a well-meaning fool, at worst a kind of incipient totalitarian dictator. One of the main pillars of this argument is that Hank lies and deceives in order to gain power. My argument here is that Hank has no other choice but to lie and deceive from the outset of his adventure up to the very end.

Soon after he appears in sixth-century England, Hank is captured by the knight Sir Kay the Seneschal. He is then accused of being a man-devouring ogre and sentenced to burning at the stake. Hank only saves himself by using a fortuitous solar eclipse to claim to be a wizard with the power to destroy the sun, convincing the King to release him and granting
him the rank of first minister.

This event is pivotal in establishing the vital role of deception in Hank's relationship to authority, and is consistently not mentioned in those analyses that try to paint Hank as an incipient Hitler who is on a morally equal footing with his antagonists.

Parallels between Twain's non-fictional statements on the subject of monarchy and those of Hank Morgan in Connecticut Yankee strongly indicate that Hank served not as a cautionary example of a deranged dictator, but as a vehicle for Twain's personal views on monarchy. In an 1888 notebook entry Twain states that “the institution of royalty in any form is an insult to the human race.” Hank Morgan virtually mirrors this when he says “any kind of royalty, however modified…is rightly an insult” (990). A notebook entry of Twain's from the same year insists that if all the male monarchs of the earth were stripped naked and marched around a circus ring with 500 naked mechanics, the crowd would be unable to pick out the monarchs. This is essentially identical, in Connecticut Yankee, to Hank Morgan's statement regarding a prisoner he had released from Morgan le Fay's dungeons, whose crime had simply been to say that “if you were to strip the nation naked and send a stranger through the crowd, he couldn't tell the king from a quack doctor, nor a duke from a hotel clerk” (1039). Unless one wishes to simply ignore authorial intention altogether, any attempt to paint Hank Morgan as a megalomaniac must be reconciled with the parallels between these fictional and nonfictional statements. It seems clear that Hank Morgan was a character the author personally identified with, and thus whose deceptions were, in Twain's eyes, morally imperative.

In conclusion, then: Huck Finn's quest for freedom in lighting out for the Territory ultimately proved to be a transient ideal for Americans in real life (not to mention its implications for Native Americans). The frontier was rapidly disappearing in the period that Huckleberry Finn was written and published. As Twain was doubtless aware of this, perhaps a sense of poignant nostalgia was partly what prompted him to write the novel.

The hope that Connecticut Yankee served as a vehicle for, namely the erasure of Church-backed monarchies, has partially come true. The monarchies that now remain are largely stripped of power. But Twain would surely be disappointed to know that they were replaced in some cases by cruel secular dictatorships and totalitarian states rivaling or even surpassing their predecessors in inhumanity. He might also be surprised to see that some of the so-called "modified" monarchies he was skeptical of are now peaceful, prosperous, and free societies.

Yet considering Twain's willingness to change his views over time (such as he did with slavery and women's suffrage), it seems certain that he would have conceded that monarchy and religion per se are not automatically manifestations of tyranny.

Today, unlike Huck Finn, we are all registered, numbered and monitored in various ways, and daily face a ubiquitous, subtle, technology-armed authority that Huck would undoubtedly find confusing and perhaps frightening. This is less menacing in some states than in others, and may give us more “security.” Yet it can also make us wary or even fearful of a force which in its own way is even more powerful than the monarchies Twain railed against. This inspired certain writers in the generation following Twain's death – notably Zamyatin, Huxley, and Orwell – to explore the individual's relationship to authority in the dystopian novel. In Huckleberry Finn Huck escapes "sivilizing" and Jim is freed, but in the Orwellian nightmare we are all slaves and have no Territory to light out to. And Pap is sober, smart, and everywhere at once. Yet Twain was ultimately an optimist. If he had not been, he would not have bothered to write such impassioned pleas to resistance as “The Czar's Soliloquy” and “The New Dynasty.” He believed it was possible to make the world a place of more justice, of more moral right. Huckleberry Finn ends with Huck and Jim achieving different brands of freedom. Connecticut Yankee ends on a more poignant note, with the Church triumphant and the aged, dying Hank back in the 19th-century, yearning for his wife and child. But it is a tale of a thwarted utopian attempt rather than a dystopia. The novel as a whole carries an air of positive possibilities, especially as we know that the reinstated feudal system will eventually be displaced by a democracy. There's not a glimmer of such hope when Winston Smith is tortured and brainwashed into submission in Orwell's 1984, or when the citizens of OneState all have their imaginations surgically removed in Zamyatin's We. As important and defining as the dystopian novel has been to 20th-century literature, it seems doubtful that Twain would have joined in its development had he lived to see the era of Stalinist pogroms and the dawn of Nazism. He tended to prefer happy endings, or at least endings in which the victory of “the bad guys” is not absolute.

Mark Twain was both optimist and rebel, and his was a rebellion of the pen. He doubtless outraged autocrats of all stripes in the uncompromising expression of his convictions. And he doubtless delighted in doing so.

Arthur Shattuck O'Keefe currently researches and teaches at Showa Women's University, Tokyo. This paper is based upon an oral presentation combining portions of several of the author's previously published works. A fully referenced version is available on request from the Editor at publications@iafor.org.
This year marks 70 years since the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. What happened that morning of August 6, 1945 was a destructive force never witnessed before with the exception of the secret Trinity test held a fortnight earlier in the Jornada del Muerto desert of New Mexico. The world has simply never been the same and never will be.

Over the years much has been written about the Manhattan Project that built those first nuclear bombs as well as the awful aftermath that the citizens of Hiroshima suffered. However, the events of the actual mission as it unfolded are less well known. The vagaries of the weather that August morning sealed the fate of four cities. Three survived and one was obliterated.

At approximately 2.45am on August 6, 1945 USAF pilot Colonel Paul Tibbets, taxied the silver Boeing B-29 Superfortress towards the end of the floodlit runway ‘A’ at North Field, Tinian Island in the Marianas. When the huge bomber named ‘Enola Gay’ after Tibbets’s mother, reached the end of the runway it turned 90 degrees and was pointed in the direction of the Japanese islands some six hours’ flight time away. At the controls Tibbets and his co-pilot Captain Robert Lewis carefully built the four Wright R-3350 engines to the roar of full power, released brakes and slowly began to lumber down the 2,500-metre runway. The Enola Gay was 7,500 kilograms overweight due to the heavy fuel load and the weight of its onboard ordinance that morning. It took every ounce of horsepower, every metre of tarmac to get the 60,000 kg aircraft airborne. Thirty seconds later USAF Operations Order No. 35 was rising into the inky blackness of the northern Pacific skies on an initial flight path to Iwo Jima where it rendezvoused with mission support aircraft whose primary role would be to document what happens over the next few hours on film and through scientific telemetry. Three other supporting B-29s had left Tinian an hour earlier to conduct weather reconnaissance over the selected targets on the Japanese mainland. From Iwo Jima, the Enola Gay and its two support aircraft veered...
eastward towards the island of Honshu and increased their cruising altitude to 9,500 m and settled into a sustained speed of around 200 kilotons. What many people don’t realise is that even at that midway point in the mission the flight crew of the Enola Gay did not yet know exactly where the target was going to be. They had onboard “the gadget”, a single bomb ordinance called “Little Boy”, yet they had up to three other possible alternate targets. Though the prime target was Hiroshima in the early hours of August 6, 1945, the first operational atomic bomb used in warfare could have ended up elsewhere. For example, if the city was too overcast or too windy that morning, the bomb might have fallen on Yokohama, Niigata or Kokura, which were deemed the alternate mission targets.

High over the city of Hiroshima at around 7am one of the mission support aircraft flew a reconnaissance course and an air raid siren rang out around the city. The aircraft called Straight Flush sent through a radio message, which was picked up by Enola Gay. “Cloud cover less than 3/10th at all altitudes. Advice: Bomb Primary.” On the ground an all-clear siren was sounded ten minutes later and soon the people of Hiroshima once again continued to go about their lives, walking to school, eating breakfast, opening their stores, catching their tram to work. To them August 6 would be just another day.

Two hundred miles away flying over the Pacific, the Enola Gay had the prime target confirmed. It was 7.30am. The target was the T-shaped Aoio bridge in the central business district of Hiroshima. At 8.10am the crew of the Enola Gay lined up for their bombing run and Colonel Tibbets switched over to the onboard autopilot. Control of the mission at this point was now handed over to the aircrafts bombardier, Major Thomas Ferebee who would aim and release the bomb. It was only five minutes later that the Enola Gay arrived over the target at an altitude of 9,470 m. Ferebee calibrated aim-sight crosshairs, lined up the Aoio Bridge and released the bomb. It was 8.15am local time.

Little Boy took 43 seconds to free-fall to the predetermined detonation height of 600 m above the target, where barometric triggers initiated the firing mechanism and detonated an explosive force equivalent to 15 kts of TNT inside the steel casing of Little Boy – a uranium gun-type atomic weapon containing 64 kg of enriched uranium. Immediately on detonation, X-ray-heated air created a 6,000°C fireball that was almost 400 m in diameter, generating a five psi pressure wave at a velocity greater than the speed of sound, that fanned out in all directions. It simply vapourised people to the point that all that was left of them was a shadow burnt into the concrete where they stood. Little Boy destroyed completely everything within a 1,600 m radius and created a firestorm that was 3 km in diameter. Over 70 percent of the buildings in the urban area that was around 12 km² were destroyed. Approximately 70,000 people or over a third of the population were killed instantly as a direct result of the Hiroshima blast, with 60 percent of immediate deaths were caused by the firestorm. Some 50,000 of those killed were regular citizens, many of them children or the elderly. A further 70,000 were injured. Many receiving lethal doses of nuclear radiation and would die in the months and years ahead.

In those 43 seconds from the bomb release to the point of detonation the Enola Gay had traveled 18.5 km from the point of ground zero before the crew felt the shock wave turbulence from the blast rocking the aircraft. It was then that Colonel Tibbets got on the aircraft’s intercom and reported to the crew “Boys you have just dropped the first Atomic Bomb.” As the aircraft raced back across the Pacific to the Mariana’s on that clear blue morning the crew were still able to observe the infamous mushroom cloud rise above the city to a height of almost 13,000 m some 360 km away. After 12 hours of mission time the Enola Gay and her crew touched down on Runway ‘A’ at Tinian. It was at 3pm. USAF Operations Order No.35 was completed. Three days later the second atomic bomb dubbed ‘Fatman’ was dropped on the Kyushu city of Nagasaki with comparable lives lost and damage done. It was a terrible end to a terrible war that never bears repeating, but bears all of us to always remember.
“Cosplay” is a portmanteau word of the English words costume and play. It is a performance art in which participants wear costumes and accessories to represent a specific character or idea from specific art work.

The term was coined by Nobuyuki Takahashi of the Japanese studio “Studio Hard” while attending the 1983 World Science Fiction Convention (Worldcon) in Los Angeles. Takahashi was impressed by the event and its costumed fans and subsequently reported on both in Japanese science fiction magazines. The coinage “cosplay” reflects a common Japanese method of abbreviation in which the first two moras of a pair of words are used to form an independent compound.

Thus, costume and play combine to become cosplay.

Cosplayers often interact to create a subculture centered on role-play. A broader use of the term cosplay applies to any costumed role-play in venues apart from the stage, regardless of the cultural context. The characters can come from many sources, from manga, anime, game, comic books, through to films, dramatic programming, novels, and light novels. Any entity from the real world or virtual world that lends itself to dramatic interpretation might be considered as a subject for cosplay.

Since 1990, the number of people who take cosplay as a hobby has gained rapid growth, and has made cosplay a global popular culture phenomenon. The rise of the internet has played a significant role in this popularity, enabling many cosplayers to create their own websites or blogs to communicate with other cosplayers or fans around the globe. These personal websites and blogs usually focus on cosplay activities such as outdoor shooting, studio shooting, tour shooting or events recording. However, community-based forums on the internet comparatively have a far greater internet footprint. These cosplay communities allow fellow cosplayers to share stories, photographs, news, opinions and general information between each other.
From Fiction to Reality
An Exploration into Cosplay

Practice of Cosplay
Cosplay costumes vary greatly and can range from simple, themed clothing to highly detailed costumes. As such, when in costume, cosplayers will often seek to adopt the affect, mannerisms and body language of the characters they portray. The characters chosen to be cosplayed may come from a variety of sources, but the practice of cosplay is often associated with replicating anime and manga characters. In order for cosplay to be practiced it must have an element of characterisation. An individual who simply wears a costume, without the element of play, acts merely as a clothes-hanger. On the other hand, only play, without costume, would be chaotic for the audience, because there is no indication as to what exactly the main subject is. Costume and play, based on the character, have to be grounded in reality, and cosplay is based on the costume and play has to be put into existence. This is the reason why the cosplay must have a specific character to be put it into cultural and performance practice.

Costumes
Most cosplayers create their own outfits, referencing images of the characters in the process. In the creation of the outfits, much time is given to detail and qualities, thus the skill of a cosplayer may be measured by how difficult the details of the outfit are and how well they have been replicated. Because of the difficulty of replicating some details and materials, cosplayers often educate themselves in crafting specialties such as textiles, sculpture, face paint, fiberglass, fashion design, woodworking and other uses of materials in an effort to accurately render the look and texture of a costume.

Cosplayers often wear wigs in conjunction with their outfit in order to further improve the resemblance to the character. This is especially necessary for anime and manga characters which often have unnaturally coloured and uniquely styled hair. Simpler outfits may be compensated for their lack of complexity by paying attention to material choice, and overall excellent quality. The process of creation may then be very long and time consuming, making it a very personal journey and achievement for many. This taxing
The rise of the internet has played a significant role in this popularity, enabling many cosplayers to create their own websites or blogs to communicate with other cosplayers or fans around the globe.

and often expensive process is known to unite cosplayers and is considered a part of the culture of cosplay. Cosplayers obtain their apparel through many different methods. Manufacturers produce and sell packaged outfits for use in cosplay, in a variety of qualities. These costumes are often sold online, but also can be purchased from dealers at conventions. There are also a number of individuals who work on commission, creating custom costumes, props or wigs designed and fitted to the individual; some social networking sites for cosplay have classified ad sections where such services are advertised.

Cosplayers who prefer to create their own costume use materials like unstyled wigs or extensions, hair dye, cloth and thread, liquid latex, body paint, shoes, costume jewellery and prop weapons. The characters in anime and game usually have weapons, armours or other accessories, which are hard to replicate, and conventions of the community have strict or hidden rules for those weapons, which makes cosplayers pay more attention to crafting. Many cosplayers engage in some combination of methods to obtain all the items necessary for their costume.

Fiction to Reality

Props are the thorniest problem in cosplay, especially for the beginners. Even though cosplayers could obtain their apparel through many different methods, such as having them custom made by craftsmen, or purchasing the finished products, this is usually a high cost way to acquire, which beginners cannot afford. Cosplayers with economic concern and a strong desire for cosplay will make props and outfits by themselves. Unlike in many western countries, cosplayers in Taiwan mostly do not have enough space for crafting, therefore they use many other techniques, skills and materials. A cosplayer’s main considerations when deciding on materials are price and manufacturing convenience.

The main considerations for cosplayers when it comes to materials are price and manufacturing convenience. It ideally will allow the cosplayer to design and craft in-house, using simple tools such as a penknife, glue stick and scissors.

Conclusion: Characters in animation are mostly surreal, some of them existing only as two-dimensional pictures. It is a challenge to actualise the fictional character in real life through the production of costume and props. A sense of design is extremely important when producing the props and costumes.

Cosplayers may differ in age, generation and background, but the pattern of their crafting is highly similar.

Shih-Pang Tsai and Professor Ming-Hsiu Mia Chen are from the Institute of Industrial Design, Tatung University in Taiwan.
Originating in ancient China and refined in medieval Japan, Chanoyu (Japanese, literally “hot water for tea”), commonly known as the Japanese tea ceremony, had jumped continents by the end of the 20th century and found new homes in lands far and near from its origins. A delicate balance between conservation and internationalisation enabled this tradition to transplant to new places in its most original form and take root. It developed to accommodate local conditions while conversely influencing the original tradition in its motherland. Though the globalisation of Chanoyu is just a raindrop in a hurricane of cultural globalisation, it is a complex and diverse transmission across national borders on multiple levels. As John Tomlinson wrote: “...the huge transformative processes of our time that globalisation describes cannot be properly understood until they are grasped through the conceptual vocabulary of culture, likewise that these transformations change the very fabric of cultural experience and, indeed, affect our sense of what culture actually is in the modern world.”

Chanoyu literally means “hot water for tea” which is not really very helpful as a definition. Chado or Sado translates as The Way of Tea and refers to the path of practice. It is a discipline, a tradition and a learning complex. Paul Varley defines Chanoyu as “a unity of ritual, methods of expression, setting and highly structured environment.” As such Chanoyu is a synthesis of various aspects: spiritual, philosophical,
moral, aesthetic and artistic. All senses are brought into play in a complex ritual, which involves food, wine, two types of fire and two types of tea preparations. A tea gathering typically takes three to four hours with one host and up to five guests. It has been called meditation in motion.

Tea students usually visit their teacher’s tearoom three times a month and study one of dozens of different forms of making two types of tea: thin whisked tea and thick kneaded tea. They learn by watching others and practicing one of the forms themselves. Variations on the basic forms of increasing complexity encourage mindfulness, awareness and memory. The student, depending on interest and ability, studies calligraphy and its reading in Japanese and Chinese, cooking, flower arranging, Japanese garden and tearoom design, the history and philosophy of tea, poetry and so on to the end of one’s life or physical and mental ability which, by the way, remains remarkable in tea practitioners. Tea is the perfect paradigm for life-long learning. Chanoyu comes very close to the definition of culture itself.

The origins of Chanoyu are in 12th-century Zen Buddhist monasteries in China. The monks, using tea as the rare medicine, offered it at the altar and then drank it communally. This communal sharing of a single bowl of tea is still at the heart of currently practiced Chanoyu. Japanese monks took back tea seeds and the tea-sharing ceremony to Japan as part of their import of the Zen (meditative) school of Buddhism. Over the next 400 years as the drinking of tea as a beverage became popular, it gradually left the temples and Chanoyu became a primarily secular pursuit. The tea drunk in today’s tea room is the same now: powdered tea leaves are whipped into a foamy infusion by mixing tea with hot water using a bamboo whisk.

By the 16th-century Chanoyu had been formalised, under the patronage of the military elite, which ruled Japan. It then spread to the mercantile and artistic communities. The foremost among these formalisers was Sen Rikyu (1522-1591) whose descendants have carried on the tradition for 16 generations. Rikyu’s 20th-century descendant, Sen Soshitsu XV, was instrumental in globalising tea.

Globalisation of Chanoyu can be considered in a number of different dimensions. The first is that it is taught as an art form and a discipline to thousands of people around the world. The huge learning curve and dependence on innumerable accouterments have prevented it from achieving the millions of adherents of its Asian cousin’s yoga and tai chi. Nevertheless, it has reached a critical mass of enough people to be considered part of global culture. The second dimension is apparent in the influence Chanoyu has on its connected arts, such as cuisine, architecture, design, gardens, pottery and other crafts. Few would know that Japanese cuisine actually derives from “kaiseki”, the formal Chanoyu meal, which in turn had its roots in Zen Buddhism. Thought to predate the better-known French formal meal, the food of tea has influenced western cuisine through its emphasis on seasonality, beauty of presentation, small portions, staggered service and the elevation of native and natural tastes. The architecture of the tearoom, spare and empty, has influenced the work of such architects as Stanford White, Frank Lloyd Wright, Walter Gropius and others. The tea garden, “roji” literally “dewy ground”, has greatly influenced western garden designers, not only as something to incorporate, but also as an inspiration for the re-consideration of the concept of space itself. Yanagi Soetsu writing in 1972 defined Chanoyu as “a complete university of artistic taste.” Several philosophical and aesthetic qualities associated with Chanoyu have been influential in the West, for example, wabi (natural beauty), sabi (beauty of age and patina) and shibui (astringency). Not widely understood in their native land, they nevertheless have influenced artists, designers and writers far beyond Japanese borders.
The third dimension is the most fascinating. It is the nascent application of the forms of Chanoyu itself which could be adapted to areas from education, business, leadership, hospitality, business, art appreciation, psychological testing to memory and sensory improvement. Take for example, learning. The whole pattern for learning tea can become a model for learning of almost any other subject. Things like the “loop” review, the specific emphasis on learning rather than being taught and the panoramic style of learning opposed to a vertically structured one could be applicable to learning any subject. Study of principles and structure of curriculum can also become a valuable resource for other disciplines.

Chanoyu represents so-called “hand made” cultures, the ones that preserve and protect the old ways of doing things. Today, when most things in our lives are not made or grown by yourself, but mostly bought or ordered, Tea practice offers something like a security system for the humankind and can diffuse de-humanising of our lives.

Paul Varley considers the concept of harmony as being central to Chanoyu. He describes harmonious interaction between people, nature and objects in a very limited space for an extended period of time and concludes that this experience could be fully applicable to the ways human society strives to function. It can be linked to the areas of a number of environmental issues such as sustainability, slow food and many others. In a way, “tea” became an adjective, at least among practitioners to define certain style or approach.

First to encounter Chanoyu in Japan were the early Europeans, mostly Portuguese and Spaniards who arrived in Nagasaki in the mid 16th century. They were mainly diplomats, merchants and Jesuit missionaries. The latter group stayed and lived in Japan having to learn about the country and its culture and find ways to fit in. It was due to the non-religious but deeply spiritual quality of Chanoyu that it was chosen (by the missionaries from the multitude of cultural complexes available) as a path to the hearts and minds of their future converts and as a key to this unknown civilisation. Acute observers of culture, the Jesuits have left us accurate descriptions of early Chanoyu in letters, diaries and reports. Since Chanoyu is mainly an orally transmitted tradition, equivalent texts of similar age and value don't exist in Japanese. Their accounts are invaluable since they shed light on the prototypes of the forms, which exist now. Michael Cooper in his article “The Early Europeans and Chanoyu” writes about three Portuguese Jesuits: Luis de Almeida (1525-1583), Alessandro Valignano (1539-1606) and Jao Rodrigues (1561-1633) and gives their perspective on the forms of Chanoyu and its role in Japanese society as well as their view of the possibility of a wider application of its characteristics and principles. Luis del Almeida described the actual teahouse the following way. “The place was a little larger than the courtyard and seemed to have been made by angels rather than by men... no words can describe the order and the cleanliness of it all.” Being a European of the 16th century he certainly saw things to learn and implement back home. Cooper writes, that Alessandro Valignano who was supposed to inspect the work of missionaries and implement appropriate changes in policy, not only reorganised the structure of the missions according to the order and principles of the Rinzai school of Zen but went as far as to insist that missionaries learn to speak “correct and elegant” Japanese and ordered that all Jesuit residences should possess “their own Chanoyu”, meaning that not only the ceremony was to be conducted but also a special place had to be designated and utensils to be acquired – he provided a list of approximately 40 objects everyone had to have. “Obviously, Valignano understood that the
success of the Christian mission in Japan hugely depended on how deeply the missionaries themselves learned and adapted to the customs of the new land … hardly a startling thought for the 20th century, but practically a revolutionary concept for a 16th-century European” It was Chanoyu that he selected as the all-encompassing cultural repository of Japan. The descriptions of Chanoyu were not limited to its external form only. Jao Rodrigues who spent most of his life in Japan, suggests that “the qualities required to appreciate Chanoyu have a much wider application and can be extended to every branch of cultural life.”

Therefore, Chanoyu was recognised not only as a formal introduction to the Japanese culture and society but also as a deeply spiritual, indeed unique practice with great potential for intercultural communication. Immersion in Chanoyu allowed the Jesuits access to Japanese society. It subsequently made its way to Europe in the form of objects, descriptions and stories. The connection worked both ways and enriched both sides. At least three of the seven closest disciples of Sen Rikyu became converted Christians.

It is apparent that there was a very close connection between the early Europeans and Chanoyu. It was the first and most important cultural encounter between the two civilisations just before Japan was to tightly shut its doors to anything foreign for the following 300 years.

Dr. Alexandre Avdulov, teaches in the Department of Modern Languages and Classics at Saint Mary’s University, Halifax, Canada. A fully referenced and extended version of this article is available on request from the editor at publications@iafor.org
Directed by Jayne Loader and Kevin Rafferty, 1982’s The Atomic Café is a devastating take on the chronological snobbery of American disbeliefs and the scant knowledge of the A-experts at the advent of the atomic age. The film, informative yet entertaining, horrific yet hilarious, dwells on stereotypes of those first ten years of public ignorance and nuclear paranoia during the Cold War era, as well as errors and atrocities of its inventors.

With its wonderful montages of Cold War kitsch compiled with archival materials from the 1950s and 1960s reflect, The Atomic Café officially normalises the character of nuclear war. In doing so, it acts just like the other conciliatory propaganda films that were aimed at the American public for mystifying the nuclear fallout paranoia presenting a devastating collage is a true mirror of the official and unofficial attitudes towards American use of the atom bomb against Japan in the years following WWII and preceding the Cold War.

The film opens to the archival clips of the first successful Trinity Test at Alamogordo, a thriving Pre-
WWII Hiroshima, the civilian target A-bombed, narration by Paul Tibbets, the pilot of the Hiroshima bomber, the irradiated city baked and flattened, dying citizens, a Japanese shoe burnt into a bridge, and Captain Kermit K. Beehan, the pilot of the Nagasaki atomic bomber expressing that he was absolutely thrilled. The scene canonises domination to mirror the modernist aesthetics of desublimation. The hysterical triumph is turned into a Pyrrhic victory. According to critic Oloruntoba John Olubunmi, the camera, in a vérité moment, unobtrusively captures Harry S. Truman's grin before he announces the use of the atomic bomb at the virgin civilian targets for the purpose of bomb damage studies and, ironically, he thanks God for guiding America to use the bomb “in His ways and to His purposes.” The Atomic Café cuts a sequence of Americans celebrating victory, peace and the baby boom, an American Navy officer advising Marshallese islanders of the Pacific Ocean to surrender to God’s will and move to a remote island as their true tropical paradise Bikini Atoll became “uninhabitable by human beings for the next 500 years.”

In the traditions of Soviet filmmakers Esfir Shub and Dziga Vertov, The Atomic Cafe delivers media caricatures of Burt the Turtle from the “Duck and Cover” campaign from 1951, an unrealistic normalising corporate response, but it never undercuts the seriousness of the atomic issues. This reflects public and soldier paranoia in juxtaposition to propaganda newsreel, government films, and military clips such as WWII victory celebrations, advertising, or demonstration films concerning the Trinity Test in the Alamogordo, on the Jornada del Muerto (Journey of Death) desert. In a children’s training film, Burt the Turtle demonstrates his ducking skills inside the safety of his shell whenever a firecracker explodes in his vicinity, advice for “children to crawl under their desks” and cover “their eyes” if exposed to the flash of an A-blast.

The film rivals any comedy in this sense because of what Peter Rollins describes as “film irony”. A powerful technique in which image and sound contradict each other through a process of compilation aimed at decontextualising, and recontextualising through exposé quotation or change of immediate context of shots for the purpose of reinterpretation. A powerful example of the simultaneous intermixing of these techniques can be seen in the newsreel of Hiroshima survivors that juxtaposes the clips of two radio comedians making fun of Hiroshima attacks, “It looked like Ebbets Field after a doubleheader with the Giants”. The sequence bears the spirit of an attack for a noble cause as the enemy dies for no cause. In another hilarious sequence, a doctor diagnoses a patient with nuclearosis (nuclear war paranoia) and, while looking at A-charts, comments “it is absurd that 85 percent of the population should be so fearful when only 15 percent would be killed in an all-out nuclear war.” These satirical montages reflect the faith and confidence of the United States public figures in the American dream. The God-gifted atom bomb becomes a symbol of American love for international peace, freedom, and democracy, until the red communists test their power. The communists’ paranoia first parallels and then dismisses the nuclear paranoia. The public faith in the American dream is reflected in their trust in “duck and cover” and “fallout shelter”, you live if you survive the alpha particles for eight to ten days. It also mirrors their trust in A&H-bombs compared to “red” fever as a Southern Californian businessman, who believes that “shopping centers are an expression of the free world”, sponsors a nuclear defense drill. Similarly, the lens of a Navy periscope in juxtaposition to an American family watching television evokes the meaning that the people are being watched. Critic John Olubunmi sees a dialectic collision between “the inherent perspective of the original archive and its radical reuse” during recontextualisation, which according to Paul Arthur inverts “conventional meanings” and causes “a politicised activation of suppressed ideas”.

The Atomic Cafe hints at several American wars, conflicts, threats, and fears of communism, the iron curtain. In a hilarious sequence, a father tells his kids that in case of mass deaths following a nuclear detonation, survivors would have more to eat and divide among themselves. The film also refers to several eastern and western block political tussles by naming leaders like Eisenhower, Truman, Nixon, Reagan, Wilson, and several U.S. military figures. This chronological snobbery is brutally honest about a history of American paranoia and the officially normalising attitude toward the nuclear war. Its powerful and disturbing intellectual montages of anticommunist, pronuclear, paranoia films prefer a strategy of subjectivity over objectivity to efficiently mix satire with drama with apocalyptic black humor to leave viewers immersed in the absurdity of American historical truth and Bush’s first-strike policy in pursuit of political ideals. Though now over 30 years old and reflecting on an era fast fading from memory it is for these reasons that The Atomic Café, is still relevant today and still very funny.

Wajaha Raza Rizvi is the founding director of the Film Museum Society of Lahore. She collects the archives of Pakistani cinema, conducts research, produces films, and provides consultancy to a number of established film and media institutions.
A Passion for Research

Doctoral Program graduate Vineet Kaul reflects on what research means as he embarks on an academic career

Simply put, passion is the engine that drives excellence. It is what motivates us to continue pursuing our dreams when times get tough, when we get tired, or when others tell us we can’t possibly succeed. And when passion and performance meet, we experience our greatest satisfaction and impact in life. In the summer of 2010, during my senior year of college; I faced a hard decision about my future career. I had a job offer from a reputed national English daily and an acceptance letter from the Media and Communication doctoral program at the DA-IICT University. I had also just handed in the manuscript for my first nonfiction book, which opened the option of becoming a full-time writer. These are three strikingly different career paths, and I had to choose which one was right for me.

For many of my peers, this decision would have been fraught with anxiety. Growing up, we were told by guidance counselors, career advice books, the news media and others to “follow our passion”. This advice assumes that we all have a pre-existing passion waiting to be discovered. If we have the courage to discover this calling and to match it to our livelihood, the thinking goes, we’ll end up happy. If we lack this courage, we’ll end up bored and unfulfilled — or, worse, in law school. To a small group of people, this advice makes sense, because they have a clear passion. Maybe they’ve always wanted to be doctors, writers, musicians and so on, and can’t imagine being anything else.

But this philosophy puts a lot of pressure on the rest of us — and demands long deliberation. If we’re not careful, it tells us, we may end up missing our true calling. And even after we make a choice, we’re still not free from its effects. Every time our work becomes hard, we are pushed toward an existential crisis, centered on what for many is an obnoxiously unanswerable question: “Is this what I’m really meant to be doing?” This constant doubt generates anxiety and chronic job-hopping.

As I considered my options during my senior year of college, I knew all about this Cult of Passion and its demands. But I chose to ignore it. The alternative career philosophy that drove me is based on this simple premise: The traits that lead people to love their work are general and have little to do with a job’s specifics. These traits include a sense of autonomy and the feeling that you’re good at what you do and that what you do is having an impact on the world. Decades of research on workplace motivation back this up. (Daniel Pink’s book “Drive” offers a nice summary of this literature.)

These traits can be found in many jobs, but they have to be earned. Building valuable skills is hard and takes time. For someone in a new position, the right question is not, “What is this job offering me?” but, instead, “What am I offering this job?”

Returning to my story, I decided after only minimal deliberation to go to DA-IICT University... true to my alternative career philosophy, I was confident that all three of my career options could be transformed into a source of passion, and this confidence freed me from worry about making a wrong choice. I ended up choosing DA-IICT., mainly because of a slight preference for research, but obtaining a research higher degree is the pinnacle of formal education achievement. As a high-achieving student with an analytical mind and an intrinsic desire for problem solving, I will have the opportunity to master new skills, overcome obstacles and make a contribution of new knowledge to my chosen discipline. The chance to immerse myself in my topic and persevere with my research over a number of years will give me an overwhelming feeling of great personal achievement.

I would have been equally content heading out to the media world. Or, with the advance from my first book, I could have hunkered down in a quiet town to write.

During my initial years as a graduate student, I certainly didn’t enjoy an unshakable sense that I had found my true calling. The beginning of doctoral training can be rough. You’re not yet skilled enough to make contributions to the research literature, which can be frustrating. And at a place like DA-IICT., you’re surrounded by brilliance, which can make you question whether you belong.

Had I subscribed to the “follow our passion” orthodoxy, I probably would have left during those first years, worried that I didn’t feel love for my work every day. But I knew that my sense of fulfillment would grow over time, as I became better at my job. So I worked hard, and, as my competence grew, so did my engagement.

The option of a career in academia is likely always to remain open for you if you complete a Ph.D., both immediately after graduation and as you continue to build knowledge and gain experience in your discipline graduates regularly report that their research journey was extremely challenging.
and because of that, highly rewarding. The research program normally involves several milestones starting with the research proposal, literature review, data collection, confirmation, regular progress reporting, analysis, and several thesis drafts before the final version is ready for examination. A higher research degree can be likened to a full-time job. Candidates generally work on their research 9 am to 6 pm, Monday to Saturday from January to December with four weeks off for recreational leave usually over the summer period. Research involves defining and solving problems and constantly striving for improvement in your chosen discipline. We regularly receive feedback from graduates that doing a Ph.D. has given them a real sense of achievement and the feeling of having contributed to something positive for the future.

Today, I’m a professor teaching Media & Communication and I love my job. The most important lesson I can draw from my experience is that this love has nothing to do with figuring out at an early age that I was meant to be a professor. There’s nothing special about my choosing this particular path. What mattered is what I did once I made my choice.

National prosperity depends on having people with the skills, knowledge and expertise necessary to drive innovation and respond to global challenges. Research is a growth industry, and gaining a research higher degree will give us an advantage for future employment. Workforce projections indicate that demand for research qualified people is set to grow at a faster rate than overall employment demand in our economy over the decade to 2020, with the number of employed individuals with a doctorate by research qualification alone expected to rise by 3.2 percent per annum over this period (Access Economics 2010).

To other young people who constantly wonder if the grass might be greener on the other side of the occupational fence, I offer this advice: follow your passion, it is something that will follow you as you put in the hard work to become valuable to the world. Once you’ve done all this, go get it. Hold tightly to your passion and never let go. Let it infuse your life with meaning and purpose and become the motivator for everything you do. Then, put in the hard work needed to turn your dreams into reality. Discovering and claiming something you love to do has an amazing effect on your entire life. It’s like a tiny perfect raindrop landing on a previously smooth, unremarkable expanse of water. The instant the drop arrives, beautiful waves of ever-enlarging rings flow across the entire surface, spreading out virtually to infinity.

Vineet Kaul recently completed his Ph.D. in Media & Communication and has embarked on an academic career at DA-IICT University, Gujarat India.
Legally Vague in a Lethal World
Is it time for International Humanitarian Law 2.0?

By Michael Liam Kedzlie

The late Karin Tackaberry, in her July 2007 essay “Time to Stand Up and Be Counted: The Need for the United Nations to Control International Terrorism” noted that with respect to international law, terrorists and other non-state actors engaging in armed conflict were now openly operating in an international dimension, and were orientated territorially, politically, or ideologically, with specific interests, approaches or outcomes in mind. Tackaberry, who was one of the most engaging and foresightful international lawyers specialising in the field of International Humanitarian and Armed Conflict Law, forewarned in a series of essays in the years preceding her untimely passing in 2012 of a number of contemporary terrorist scenarios that unfolded later. Boston, Bangkok, Ottawa and Sydney are representative of this precedence, however it is when you read Karin Tackinberry through the retrospective lens of ISIL/ISI, how it started, how it was allowed to fester and grow, and the consequences of the international community not constructively intervening, makes for sobering reading. Would the mass exodus to continental Europe from Syria and Iraq be happening at the extent it is today? International Humanitarian Law and its application (or not, as the case may sometimes be), its legal standing and efficacy in its wider sense, should not be just about terrorism and state-on-state conflict, but about avoiding human created disaster, neglect and brutality.

The principles of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) are mostly embodied in the broad framework that encompasses what is popularly known as the Hague Law, the Geneva Law and the United Nations Charter. For much of the last 70 years this “Geneva framework” has provided guidance and rationality amongst international institutions and nation states. However, given the recent surge in the number of conflicts since the end of the Cold War, and even more significantly, how those conflicts are technologically conducted and by whom or even what, serious questions are emerging over how effective or even relevant the current regime of international humanitarian law is. Deliberate environmentally destructive acts or eco-terrorism, cyber attacks or cyberterrorism, the use by proxy of private military and security companies, the use of robots and autonomous drones, the lone wolf or small wolf pack ability to commit international acts of violence are now all part of, or potentially part, of the milieu when it comes to modern threats to humane conduct amongst the international community. If we except that position, then do we believe that it fails to protect the innocent or impedes the need to meet new threats?

If so, your answer maybe that even though the Geneva framework is largely working for what it was primarily designed for – governance of armed conflict between UN member states. It, however, lacks coherency when the framework is applied to these contemporary threats, as well as technological developments that are now emerging and were not part of the intellectual or political consciousness back in September 1945 when the United nations first came together in San Francisco.

But first a little background to the uninitiated regarding IHL and its context in recent events and developments. Following World War Two, the Geneva laws were enacted to develop humanitarian conduct and behaviour of member states and thus control international armed conflict. IHL covers two broad areas. Firstly, international armed conflict law which usually refers to inter-state conflict such as the four
Geneva Conventions of 1949 (with the exception of common article 3) and the 1977 Additional Protocol I, and secondly the Common Article 3 to the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Additional Protocol II concerning non international armed conflicts which usually refer to intra-state armed conflicts.

The UN Charter has, since its enactment, legally restricted the ability to go to war, and generally nations have complied as few state-on-state wars between nations have occurred since the UN was formed. However, initially with the end of the Cold War and then definitively bookended following September 11, 2001, another global change has taken place requiring the same genuine level of collective response from all UN members, like they took in 1945. Of course that collective response is based upon the Geneva frameworks of IHL. However, at the same time, running in parallel over the last decade and a half, it has also been a period of time that has seen the rise of a technological revolution develop from the confines of the military-industrial complex into the hands of the individual and everyday usage wherever they may live. Global access to technology can be sought and used, and this is where it touches upon IHL abused, whether in a village in the South Sudan or in an affluent seaside metropolitan area anywhere in the OECD.

When an international collective response is required it is through the mandate powers within Chapter VII of the UN Charter that gives the UN Security Council (UNSC) the authority and responsibility to determine the existence of any “threat to the peace” or acts of aggression that are reported to it by member nations, as well as the response to it through armed enforcement to re-establish peace. It was under Chapter VII resolutions following September 11 that counter terrorist operations began in Afghanistan. The attack on the World Trade Center and the hunt for Osama Bin Laden have clearly revealed the fundamental difference between armed conflict operations in the counter terrorist context from the classical inter-state wars that the Geneva Laws were guarding against during the Cold War. The UNSC when evoking Chapter VII action against the Taliban and Al Qaeda, deemed it an act of global terror and not an isolated territorially specific action, as had previously been regarded as the prior context of terrorism. More recently, Resolution 2170 (2014) condemned the gross, widespread abuse of human rights by the extremist group ISIS/ISIL/ Daesh in Iraq and Syria and called on member nations to suppress the flow of foreign fighters, financing and other support to Islamist extremist groups. A US/NATO led response using air strikes and Special Forces began in late December 2014. Of course China and Russia, permanent members of the UN Security Council, were in diplomatic speak “rather unhelpful” in widening the scope of what was possible under the mandate, as well as others relating to Syria using their veto powers and thus constraining a full response under Chapter VII.

Some critics allege that one of the barriers to moving ahead with any real change to our current regime of armed conflict law relating to terrorism has been the inability of the UN to reach a consensus on a workable definition of terrorism since the 1960s. They argue that this lack of a definition has caused an ineffective framework of criminal law-based treaties that rely on domestic laws for the adjudication of actions that are considered terrorist offences. Therefore, it seems if progress is to be made, the first step for the UN General Assembly is to at least agree to a broader definition. Because at international law level their really isn’t one. Though contentious, a couple of explanations are probably wise to include at this juncture. Karin Tackinberry wrote that the “Terrorism” is frequently used to characterise acts of violence that increasingly fall within the category of armed conflict and argued that this does not entirely suffice as a definition as the modern terrorist does not employ violence as a necessary evil but as a desirable form of action. In another nuanced explanation of terrorism Paul Jones (1993) noted, “… to terrorists, violence is not a political weapon, to be used in extremis: It is a substitute for the entire political process.” To Jones and Tackinberry the problem with traditional explanations is that terrorism provisions under the current Geneva laws of armed conflict are only meant to apply to situations involving “Members” of the UN and “High Contracting Parties”.

Since the Cold War ended, the nature and rationale for warfare has evolved into more intra-state conflicts involving asymmetrical warfare and less of a conventional state against state military engagement. That state on state military events are more or less contained through diplomacy and mutual self interests. This is borne out by the fact that there have been more intra-state conflicts in the 20 years since the Berlin Wall fell than the previous 45 years of the Cold War. The UNSC evoked Chapter VII of the UN Charter 18 times for the 12 years from 1990 to 2002 compared to the six times during the Cold War between 1946 and 1989 (Johansson 2003). Asymmetrical warfare has led to the use of tactics and weapons suited for countering the technological advantage of standing armies. An example revealed by Michael N. Schmitt in his article “The Vanishing Law of War: Reflections on Law and War in the 21st Century” published in the Harvard International Review (Spring 2009) is the use by Al Qaeda aligned insurgents of improvised explosive devices as a means of neutralising US mobility and firepower in Iraq and Afghanistan, without exposing themselves to the risks of confronting the Americans head-on. “Unable to engage the enemy directly, insurgents have adopted tactics and strategies that either skirt the law, or violate it outright”. Technology and its use for destructive purposes is rapidly moving from the state level...
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to the small group and individual level. Ideologically-driven lone wolf attackers in urban environments? A young sociopathic computer nerd with a politically disruptive agenda that puts infrastructure at risk, and through that, civilian lives? Low-cost UCAV drones with remote operators? Eco-attacks or enviroterrorism to destroy an economic and socially viable community rival? Not to mention the autonomous lethal robots that may sound like the stuff of a Hollywood sci-fi plot but are a technological more capable than one may think. All are potential activities that go beyond the legal orbit of criminal events within a civil society and transgress into the new grey area not fully captured by the Geneva framework. They are activities that present a direct challenge to a sovereign states security and not just criminal nuisance or malfeasance.

It all boils down to a lack of clarity in our legal framework regarding the scope and application of IHL. If military operations between a state and a terror movement, even if they involve the states’ armed forces operating outside its own territory, they are still not enough to bring them within the full scope of provisions regarding international armed conflict in the 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1977 Geneva Protocols.

Adam Roberts (2002) outlined the dilemma by noting that that anti-terror operations in this context may only assume the form of interventions by a State against those forces conducting terror activities within its own territory, or by countering organised opposition forces that are attempting to overthrow the government and only if those forces are perceived to be committing terrorism. “The principle agreement on non-international armed conflict, Common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Convention provides the core rules surrounding what actions must be avoided, but says little about the application of these rules.” Roberts argues that the problem with Common Article 3 when read with the Protocols, is that it is “based on an assumption that there is a conflict between at least one state actor and at least one non-state group and that non-state group is organised, under command, exercise partial territorial control and can sustain concerted military operations.” In his view this has created the incoherency in the current armed conflict law arrangements.

However, other opinions exist reflecting the status quo, and regard the current Geneva framework as all too relevant in our post September 11 world and that the current legal framework appropriately triggers the application of criminal responsibility for grave breaches during armed conflict. Gabor Rona (2004), for example, considers that “criminal responsibility should only rest with current legal frameworks via the set up of international criminal courts to deal with transgressions of humanitarian law and abuses during the conduct of armed conflict”. Rona and others
like Antoine Bouvier (2006), who also support the status quo, argue that no alternative system is available, and that it would take considerable time to have new rules of international law universally ratifying the context of terrorism. They also take the view that the ability to achieve justice under the present rules should not be underestimated as the current system in their view continues to function in most of today’s conflicts. In some ways that is their achilles heal – “most of today’s conflicts” – most does not mean all conflicts and going back to Tackaberry and Roberts, conflict, both state and non-state, is becoming more asymmetrical, more autonomous and yet very much in the international sphere.

The arguments that a criminal law ‘trigger’ is available via Common Article 3 when read with 1977 Protocols, still assumes that a UN sanctioned counter terror operation using armed force under a Chapter VII resolution is up against at least one non-state group and that non-state group is organised, under command, exercise partial territorial control and can sustain concerted military operations. It could be argued that Rona and Bouvier fall into the mistake of confusing armed conflict as envisioned by Hague and Geneva Laws with contemporary terrorism and that the criminal law response is the complete panacea. Most – is still not all, most still presents a grey area and the law whether it is criminal, civil or with respect to armed conflict, despises any uncertainty or lack of clarity. International human rights law was designed originally to govern the state/individual relationship, with the state the bearer of the obligation and the individual the possessor of the right. International criminal law gives rise to individual criminal responsibility and, accordingly, certain provisions of war crimes law are interpreted in a narrower fashion than their international humanitarian law counterparts. If the law is to be applied directly in situations of armed conflict, this vertical relationship according to Sivakumaran (2011) may require re-thinking, with non-state armed groups, however small, potentially being held subject to human rights obligations.

Though an organised ‘military’ counter-terror response will no doubt be the response under Chapter VII resolution, the terror group they are targeting is not necessarily likely to be under a traditional and identifiable command structure, nor can sustain concerted military operations. That is not always the actual nature of conduct in contemporary terrorist operations, especially now that the unconventional is becoming increasingly more likely. It may not even be a group or populist terrorist cause. Former CIA director Leon Panetta in his recent memoir stated that the rise of the lone wolf or small autonomous or independent terrorist cells are becoming more prevalent, more dangerous. As soon as the ink was dried on Panetta’s book according to the US Congress Research Report of October 10, 2014, ideological sympathetic, geographically transient, yet autonomous informal splinter groups arrived on the international terrorist scene. And the tools and methods are changing faster than the legal framework’s snail-like speed.

Despite those calls that the current regime of international law in combating terrorism does not need changing, even with the escalating level of violence conducted by terrorist groups with international reach, the few anti-terrorism treaties that actually exist are based in criminal law, and not within IHL. Paulettta Otis (2007) argues this point most convincingly stating that to effectively punish and limit terrorism, the UN must move on from the vagaries and scarcities of the treaties prohibiting the crimes of terrorism, and craft a new body of law premised on the law of terrorism within the scope of armed conflict. Her view is that the current regime of anti-terror treaties are not robust enough in the modern context to combat terrorism, nor are they able to remedy the situation. What are needed is new laws are needed that can, or as Rama Mani (2007) puts it, “fill the void in the existing law of armed conflict,” and by creating “a new proposed convention on international terrorism that should focus only on non-State actors.”

It stands to reason that if the world community is actually serious about finding a long-term solution to combat terrorism, shouldn’t the world community find it somewhat easier, faster and more effective to work together and streamline a new international legal solution? One that would cover the vagaries currently surrounding non-international conflicts between terrorists and the United Nations members concentrating on non-state actors? One which would shape and scope coherant and embracing responses to new technological and tactical threats that are beginning to emerge and challenge the current and aging IHL framework? The UN Charter has since its enactment restricted a nation’s ability to go to war, and nations have generally complied as few ‘wars’ between nations have officially occurred since the UN formed over 60 years ago. The existing regime of IHL including the ad-hoc arrangement of criminal treaties, are inadequate to address the violence and aggression waged by non-state actors such as modern trans-national terrorist cells or even lone wolf operator scenario with sympathetic ideological and logistical support. The old IHL is like an analog response to a digital world. It needs an upgrade, a kind of IHL 2.0 to legally capture the new tactics and technology present in armed conflict, terrorism and other acts of anti-humanitarianism. We must give clarity and coherency to an area of international law that is still legally vague and yet, if unchecked, illegally lethal.

Michael Liam Kedzlie is the IAFOR Research & Policy Manager and the Editor of IAFOR Eye Magazine.
Thank you for reading the eighth edition of Eye Magazine

The magazine of The International Academic Forum

If you would like to subscribe to Eye Magazine or if you would like to contribute, please email magazine@iafor.org

Issue 8 – Autumn/Winter 2015
Editor: Michael Liam Kedzie
Assistant Editor: Rachel Dyer
Original Design & Layout: Thaddeus Pope

Produced by:
The International Academic Forum (IAFOR)
Published under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

ISSN: 2187-8935