

# **Transcending Historical Legacies: A Blueprint From Europe?**

Katja Weber  
Georgia Institute of Technology  
katja.weber@inta.gatech.edu

## **ABSTRACT**

Drawing on an earlier essay, this paper analyzes the relevance of the European integration experience for East Asia's future security architecture. It argues that the process of European security integration provides useful lessons that can inform a similar process in East Asia. In particular the paper suggests that the East Asians, much like their European counterparts, need to deal more effectively with their historical legacies and thereby create a solid foundation for integration to take off.

Prepared for Presentation at the EUSA Tenth Biennial International Conference,  
Montreal, Canada, May 17-19, 2007.

## **Transcending Historical Legacies: A Blueprint from Europe?**

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the relevance of the European integration experience for East Asia's future security architecture. The study asks what led European integration to take off in ways not found elsewhere (what made and still makes it work in Europe?) and what can this experience tell us about future East Asian security institutions? In a nutshell, the paper argues that the process of European security integration provides useful lessons that can inform a similar process in East Asia.

In an earlier paper (Weber 2007), I scrutinized the sophisticated multi-level governance literature scholars draw on so heavily in the European context. I then investigated Europe's institutional history from the early post-1945 period to the present and, extrapolating from the governance literature, tried to ascertain which European institutional arrangements might be copied in East Asia. I argued that a better understanding of the complex security relations in East Asia is contingent on the "cross-fertilization" of multi-level governance approaches with ideational and psychological conceptual frameworks. In doing so, I affirmed the need for "eclectic theorizing" (Katzenstein and Sil 2004) to make sense of East Asian security affairs, or, as Buzan and Waever (2003: 14) put it, the need to "mix" materialist and constructivist approaches.

Given that there are significant differences between post-1945 Europe and 21st century East Asia--including the U.S.'s promotion of regional institutions in Europe versus bilateral alliances in East Asia (Hemmer and Katzenstein 2002); more or less equal power capabilities in Europe versus the huge power asymmetry with respect to China in Asia; a fairly homogeneous European culture versus a heterogeneous Asian

culture; largely traditional security threats in Cold War Europe versus a whole range of non-traditional security threats in East Asia, etc.--the East Asians are unlikely to copy the exact same steps taken by the Europeans to improve their security, i.e., one model does not fit all. Nor does the promotion of stability/peace-building have to be unidirectional--economic cooperation, for instance, does not necessarily have to precede security cooperation.

Since history--due to Japan's troubled past with its neighbors, and the creation of two Koreas and two Chinas--is still a "neuralgic point in East Asia" (Berger, 2006: 3), it is argued that Japanese, Koreans and Chinese can be expected to develop a distinct path to stabilize the region. And yet, considering the multi-faceted nature of security threats, the main ingredient of the European success strategy, namely the institutionalization of trust on multiple levels, and hence the creation of a complex web of governance (Hooghe and Marks 2003), is likely to be emulated in the long run.

While institutions are being created to enhance transparency, efficiency and trust, the paper argues, it is of utmost importance that the East Asians address their historical legacies to promote security. Japan, in particular, more effectively and credibly needs to deal with its war guilt, while Chinese and Koreans are receptive to apologies from Japan. As Berger (2006) and Kaiser (2006) convincingly demonstrate in the German case, the dynamics of historical memory are quite complex. Germany has spent decades trying to come to terms with its war guilt by engaging in reeducation efforts, begging forgiveness, providing monetary compensation, building museums, etc. It is conceivable that this European experience, by building a solid foundation for further integration, may inform East Asia, i.e., that Japan may emulate the German model--rewrite its text books, extend

heartfelt apologies to its neighbors (which some argue it has already done), stop its visits to the Yasukuni shrine, etc. However, it is also plausible that Japan may prefer to take a different path and rely on different types of restitution. In any event, it is hypothesized that addressing this divisive issue, at a minimum, will help bring about greater cooperation and that, much like in the European case, dealing with historical legacies may in fact be necessary for the creation of structurally sophisticated security arrangements.

Here the literature on reconciliation is pertinent. As Long and Brecke (2003: 124), for instance, make clear, "[e]motions and reason are not generally antagonistic; they are complementary. ... Emotions recognize challenges and opportunities in our environment, and they identify our preferences." This then suggests that governance structures may be determined by much more than cost/benefit analyses of rational actors, namely also actors' emotions. Since Japan's apologies thus far have appeared "ad hoc and made grudgingly under international/regional pressure" (Suzuki 2007: 9), it can be hypothesized that resurfacing history problems, and emotional needs stemming from them, may have to be taken care of before institutional structures requiring a significant degree of commitment can be built. Or, put differently, the settlement of historical disputes may be a necessary prerequisite before further security cooperation can be achieved, but is unlikely to be sufficient.

In sum, the paper argues for a two-pronged strategy to enhance East Asian security: (1) dealing with historical legacies and war guilt—the topic of this paper; and (2) building trust via institutions (see Weber 2007). Since confidence-building, as the European case makes abundantly clear, does not happen over night, the goal is to remove

outstanding obstacles to cooperation and create institutional structures that promote mutual respect, trust and tolerance. Over time, and commensurate with their threat perception(s), East Asians may graduate to more sophisticated security arrangements to dilute, absorb and/or contain conflict and to reduce the likelihood of opportunistic behavior. Thus, in the long run, East Asia may also end up with a complex web of governance and “thick alphabet soup of international agencies” (Ullman 1991: 145) to promote peace, but, due to the differences between post-1945 Europe and 21st century East Asia mentioned above, unique indigenous developments, and significant changes in the international environment since the Europeans began their institution-building, this web/soup is unlikely to be a carbon copy of the European one.

After addressing an important caveat, I conduct a mini case study of Japan. Specifically, I examine historical legacies that still stand in the way of closer cooperation and, comparing Japan’s attempts at reconciliation with those of Germany, seek to make a number of policy recommendations.

Caveat: Asia is NOT Europe

As Friedberg (1993/94: 7) correctly emphasizes, “what is true of Europe may not be true for other parts of the world.” In Europe, he insists, there are various factors (democratic governments; equality; dense web of institutions, etc.) that mitigate instability, whereas in Asia, “many of these same soothing forces are either absent or of dubious strength and permanence” (ibid). France and Germany used to care about Alsace/Lorraine but, we are told (Friedberg 1993/94: 16-18), have long since moved beyond these differences. Not so in East Asia. Rather than to “converg[e] on a single,

shared interpretation of their recent past, the Asian powers show signs of divergence, each constructing a history that serves its own national purposes (ibid, p. 18). And, to make matters worse, there is the timing of institutionalization. In Europe this process occurred soon after World War II and continues to this day, whereas the East Asians got a much later start (ibid. p. 22).

Kang (2003) could not agree more with Friedberg's assessment. "Because Europe was so important for so long a period, in seeking to understand international relations," Kang (2003: 58) laments, "scholars have often simply deployed concepts, theories, and experiences derived from the European experience to project onto and explain Asia," a practice he finds "problematic at best." "Eurocentric ideas," in his mind seem to have obfuscated rather than aided our understanding of Asian alliance behavior in that they have "yielded several mistaken conclusions and predictions."

And yet, there are parallels between Europe and Asia. Case in point the Franco/German versus the Sino/Japanese axis. Just because China and Japan have not "begun to deal with their poisoned historical relations" (Kaiser 2006: 90), this does not imply that they could not learn from France and Germany's behavior in the aftermath of World War II. In fact, it is nonsensical to assume that Asia would discount valuable insights to be gained from the European experience, begin from scratch when it comes to trust and institution-building and "reinvent the wheel."

As Kaiser (2006: 90) makes clear, European history does provide important lessons for Sino-Japanese relations, particularly when it comes to "dealing with the past and the question of guilt, nationalism, integration and political leadership." He, for instance, explains that, although Japanese officials repeatedly have asked their neighbors

for forgiveness for Japanese atrocities, these acts did not achieve the desired results, “because they were not fully internalized by Japanese society as a whole” (ibid, p. 91-2). Kaiser then outlines a number of steps (issuance of formal apology, monetary compensation, preservation of memory, creation of trust, etc.) that were essential in bringing about reconciliation between Germany and its neighbors and, in his mind, are applicable to Sino-Japanese relations. These steps, along with other literatures on reconciliation, will be scrutinized in greater detail below.

### **Mini Case Study: Japan**

#### Historical Legacies

As Jansen (2002: 512) makes clear, “[t]hroughout history Japan’s stability had been related to that of China.” The problem of China, specifically “China-centrism,” was of utmost importance. Since China viewed itself as “the cultural center of the universe and ...all non-Chinese [as] ‘uncivilized’ barbarians,” and insisted on the “preeminence of the Middle Kingdom and a tributary system of foreign relations” (Vohra 2000: 24), Japan-China relations for centuries were characterized by the threat of invasion and warfare.

Particularly damaging for Asian relations was the Sino-Japanese war in 1895. For China, according to Vohra (2000: 66), this war meant “[a] crippling defeat at the hands of the ‘dwarf’ Asian barbarians, who had historically been looked down on as vastly inferior to the [Chinese].” Not surprisingly, therefore, China a year later signed a secret defense treaty with Russia but, ultimately, could not prevent its territory from becoming divided into “spheres of influence” by foreign powers (Vohra 2000: 81).

The image of Japan by its neighbors suffered further and, as Jansen (2002: 515) argues, “lasting damage” as a result of Japan’s actions during World War I (which Japan was committed to join to make good on its alliance with the United Kingdom) and its aftermath. Rather than to return bases it had seized from Germany to China at the end of the war, Japan elected to keep these holdings in its possession for a number of years. And although the Kellogg-Briand Pact (of which Japan was one of the original 15 signatories), by “renounc[ing] war as an instrument of national policy,” may have given Japan’s neighbors some hope that the country may be turning over a new leaf, all hope was shattered in the early 1930s when Japan decided to conquer Manchuria to develop a resource base to prepare for war with the USSR (Jansen 2002: 527, 580). Fearing the Soviet Union and communism, in November 1936 Japan signed the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany. Shortly thereafter, Japan began to encroach on China’s northern provinces and, in July 1937, was at war with China that lasted until the US defeated Japan in 1945. Korea, which had come under Japanese rule in 1894 when the Chinese lost their influence over Seoul, likewise, was not liberated until 1945.

What needs to be understood is that the atrocities committed by the Japanese against the Koreans (discussed elsewhere) and the Chinese, to this day, cause hatred and suspicion. Particularly gruesome—and thus still an issue in Sino-Japanese relations today--was the fall of Nanking (Nanjing) to Japanese armies in December 1937. In what came to be known as the “Rape of Nanjing,” victorious troops committed unspeakable crimes “against a totally unarmed and helpless civilian population and disarmed prisoners-of-war.”...[A]t least “20,000 women were raped once or repeatedly...and many thousands of men, women and children, and POWs were ruthlessly butchered.”...”Within



only six weeks after the fall of Nanjing the Japanese military apparatus ha[d] slaughtered more than 340,000 Chinese POWs and civilians” (Vohra 2000: 164). Prisoners were systematically mistreated and the disclosure by Korean and Chinese “comfort women” demanding restitution became a big problem for Japan in the 1990s (Jansen 2002: 656) and continues to this day.

Contrary to what happened in Europe where shared history helped to promote reconciliation, the steps taken thus far by China and Japan (war crimes trials, postwar reparations, peace treaty) have been “flawed and incomplete” (Rose 2005, 11). Hence the history problem resurfaces and, as Vohra (2000: 299) points out, in practically every top-level meeting the Chinese admonish their Japanese counterparts never to forget Japan’s wartime record. Although some Chinese believe that Japan has apologized enough (Rose 2005, 108), most Chinese feel strongly that Japan has to come to terms with its past and “face up to history” to aid in the normalization of relations between the two countries. As long as “a sizeable segment of the population feels little remorse and vehemently opposes any apology” (Kristof 1998: 39), “conservative elements in Japan...ma[ke] frequent efforts to deny the history of Japanese aggression” (Wu 2000: 297), numerous Japanese continue to believe that their country’s “purpose for invading its neighbors was...entirely noble” (freeing them from Western colonizers), and “cabinet ministers march to the Yasukuni Shrine” (Kristof 1998: 40), China’s resentment and mistrust of Japan is unlikely to diminish. Until serious change comes about, the Chinese can be expected to maximize their political utility by playing the “history card.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that there is a large literature that argues that China uses Japan’s historical legacy to enhance its own domestic legitimacy. See, for instance, Shambaugh 1996, Rose 1998, and Zhao 2000.

Does this mean that the prospects for improved Sino-Japanese relations are slim? Not necessarily. A significant number of Japanese and Chinese people appear to be ready to move on, confront and transcend the past, and work toward a better, more cooperative future. Assuming that the time has come to tackle the vexing problem of war guilt before further “apology fatigue” on the part of Japan (Green 1999: 158) creates additional obstacles, what concrete steps should East Asia take to transcend this significant hurdle that stands in the way of greater cooperation?

Here, the paper argues, European history can provide useful lessons for East Asia. Clearly, Europeans have come a long way from the dark days of World War II. They managed to deal with the past, make amends, and reestablish trust by giving rise to supranational institutions, thereby “forging new identities that extend beyond traditional ethnic and national boundaries” (Lebow 2006: 4). As will be discussed below, over the course of several decades, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and, since 1990, a unified Germany, undertook a variety of steps to confront its past, reach out to those who were harmed so gravely during the Nazi regime, and pledged never to commit such crimes again. As members of the nation in whose name atrocities were committed most Germans understand their responsibility to guard against the possibility of repetition and, no longer being the actual perpetrators of these crimes, they also appear to be reformulating their identity (Barkan and Karn 2006: 10).

In the following section the paper examines three crucial elements of reconciliation: (1) remembrance/truth seeking; (2) restitution/justice; and (3)

apology/settling the past.<sup>2</sup> Comparing various steps taken by Germany and Japan in settling their historical legacies, the paper makes clear why the latter thus far has been unable to successfully transcend its past.

### Remembrance/Truth Seeking

As Rose (2005: 2) points out, there have been very different interpretations of the events of 1931-1945 in China and Japan (as well as within Japan) and Japanese national memory, for several decades, has been a significant stumbling block for improved relations with Japan's neighbors. World War II from Japan's perspective (also known as the "Great East Asian War" or the "Pacific War") was viewed as "freeing Asia from the oppressive domination of the West" (Jansen 2002: 626). Since the Chinese were weak and had allowed themselves to become enslaved by the West, Japan, thinking of East Asia in terms of a "single house," had the duty to "liberate" China (Vohra 2000: 161). At the same time, Japan portrayed itself as the victim of nuclear attacks, rather than aggressor.

During the Tokyo trials the suffering of Chinese and other Asian victims. ('comfort women,' forced laborers, victims of biological experiments) was completely ignored (Rose 2005: 36). The trials not only failed to bring about justice, but led to what many scholars have termed Japan's "collective amnesia" for 40 years (Rose 2005: 37).

To make matters worse, the content of Japanese history textbooks ever since the Ministry of Education obtained the authority to screen them in 1953 has been highly controversial. Encouraged to adopt a "patriotic tone," and to "soften...Japan's excesses

---

<sup>2</sup> For an in depth study on Sino-Japanese relations which uses these three elements of reconciliation, see Rose 2005.

during World War II,” authors speak of “self-defense,” “liberation,” and label the Nanjing massacre a “fabrication” (Ienaga 1996: 332). The most recent revision of high school textbooks that caused a stir centers around the Imperial Army’s responsibility in the Battle of Okinawa. Instead of acknowledging the Army’s role in ordering civilians to commit mass suicide in the final weeks of WW II, the textbooks now merely state that “mass killings and suicides took place among the residents” (Financial Times April 2, 2007: 6). This “biased historiography,” time and again has led to calls by Chinese and other Asian victims for factual accuracy (Ienaga 1996: 348).<sup>3</sup>

In Germany there were the Nuremberg trials (1945-46), followed later by the Eichmann (1961) and Auschwitz (1963-65) trials, but Germans, for the most part, tried to come to terms with their past in post-war debates about the Nazi period and the Holocaust (*Vergangenheitsbewaeltigung*) which occurred in distinct stages. As Kansteiner (2006: 108) explains, in the 1950s the FRG experienced a period of “communicative silence” about the burden of the past. More concretely, “the consequences of war and ‘war crimes’ were acknowledged by the new political elites<sup>4</sup> in their dealings with their Allied supervisors, but not necessarily in communications with the German population” (ibid). In 1959 the appearance of anti-Semitic graffiti caused the German government to introduce educational reforms and, in the 1960s, a group of

---

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed discussion of the textbook issue see Rose 2005 chapter 3.

<sup>4</sup> Katzenstein (2005: 86-7) explains that the political class in Germany after 1945 was recruited from democratic parties during the Weimar Republic and therefore largely consisted of people who had been imprisoned or in exile during the Nazi dictatorship. These people had an interest in talking about Germany’s “problematic past” and wanted the history books to reflect adequately what had happened during the Nazi period. In Japan, on the other hand, the political class remained largely unchanged after the war, “except for the very top leadership,” and the government therefore favored “textbooks that expressed a strong, nationalist historiography.”

Germans who had belonged to the Hitler Youth—but who had been too young to have been involved in any crimes—became more vocal and sought to bring about further changes in the educational system (Kansteiner 2006: 112).

Moreover, German historians wrote “world-renowned” histories on the Holocaust and, aside from unearthing the historical facts, encouraged Germany to confront its past (Bindenagel 2006: 306). Since Germany cannot escape its historical legacy, German politicians reminded German citizens time and again, they have to deal with it squarely. In a speech on May 8, 1985, the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of World War II, German President Richard von Weizsaecker stressed: “All of us, whether guilty or not, whether old or young, must accept the past. We are all affected by its consequences and held responsible for it” (Bindenagel 2006: 290).

In the 1970s, the student movement assured that discussions of personal guilt would not be dodged. It was important that a “clear distinction be made between those who committed crimes and the nation they came from” (Kaiser 2006: 92). Since guilt is individual rather than collective, one needs to differentiate guilty perpetrators and their descendants. Although the latter hold responsibility for the future, Kaiser (2006: 93) makes clear, they are absolved from responsibility for the past. To guard against the possibility of repetition, the German government decreed that it is a crime to deny the Holocaust, endorses full archival openness to make sure information relating to Germany’s dark past will not be distorted, and continues to work hard to create new relationships of trust. Projects on common history textbooks are on-going, and town partnerships, youth and teacher exchange programs--created decades ago to combat the revival of nationalism--are still going strong.

## Restitution/Justice

Under the Potsdam declaration, the Allied powers decided that Japan would have to hand over assets and capital which would then be dispersed as reparations. Between January 1948 and September 1949 China received \$22.5 million worth of machinery and equipment and \$18.1 million-worth of stolen goods were returned to China (Rose 2005: 42). As Cold War tensions began to intensify, however, the U.S. government recommended to forgive reparations for fear of weakening Japan. In a Peace Treaty with Japan in 1952 Taiwan agreed to waive reparations and, in 1972, the People's Republic of China followed suit in a Joint Statement signed with Japan.

Although, as Rose (2005: 5) demonstrates, this left the door open for civil compensation, to this day, only a small number of Chinese victims have received compensation. In general, the success rate appears to be better if a complaint is directed against a company, rather than a government, but even then a variety of criteria need to be met (claims must be in the hands of legislators rather than the judiciary; claims must be supported by a large group; claims must have merit, etc.) “for civil redress to be successful” (Brooks 1999 quoted in Rose 2005: 77-78). Most cases are dismissed and, typically, judges either argue “that compensation claims were settled under international law, ... that under the Meiji constitution the Japanese state cannot be held liable, or that the twenty-year statute of limitations makes the claims invalid” (ibid 96).

Whereas victims of Japanese atrocities have not fared very well when it comes to restitution, victims of the Nazi regime, comparatively, have done much better in their search for justice. In 1947 U.S. occupation authorities launched the first German

restitution and compensation programs and some of these are aiding Holocaust survivors to this day. According to Bindenagel (2006: 294) the compensation programs provided by the FRG “were quite extensive” with the government paying “over \$70 billion ... directly to victims.” Also, in the 1990s, Germany launched a “\$700 million humanitarian effort” to aid victims of Nazi atrocities in Eastern Europe. Negotiations among German business leaders, politicians, and victims of Nazi slave labor conducted between 1999 and 2000 led to a \$5 billion settlement (Bindenagel 2006: 301) which was widely perceived as just. And, just this March, KarstadtQuelle agreed to pay \$117 million to the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany which had filed suit on behalf of the Wertheim family who—being Jewish--had lost its property in the late 1930s to the Nazis (New York Times March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2007, B3).

#### Apology/Settling the Past

Clearly, since the end of World War II, the Japanese government has issued numerous apologies for its conduct during the war, but, to this day, these apologies have not achieved the desired effect, i.e., improved Japan’s relations with its neighbors considerably. Why is this the case?

As Rose (2005: 19) suggests, for an apology to be effective certain criteria must be met: “it must be offered with the backing and authority of the collective so that the apology is official and binding; it must be made publicly and on the record; and it should acknowledge the violation, accept responsibility, and indicate that there will be no

repetition of such acts in future.” Moreover, reciprocity may be a must since each time an outstretched hand is not seized a further opportunity is lost (Kaiser 2006: 92).<sup>5</sup>

In any event, an apology must be “meaningful” (Kristof 1998: 38), “genuine,” “sincere,” and “backed by actions” (Rose 2005: 100). Over the course of several decades, Japan repeatedly has expressed “regret,” “keen responsibility for the suffering it has caused,” “remorse,” “sincere remorse,” “genuine contrition and deepest apologies” (Rose 2005: 101), but none of the apologies issued to date has been accepted by the majority of Chinese people. During a visit to Tokyo at the end of 1998, for instance, Jiang Zemin “pressed for a formal ‘apology’ (owabi) and ‘remorse’ (hansei),” but, as Green (1999: 158-9) explains, only got hansei.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, apologizing to former ‘comfort women’ in Korea in 1993, the Japanese government acknowledged “moral” but not “legal” responsibility (Rose 2005: 71).

To make matters worse, many Japanese Prime Ministers have insisted on visiting the Yasukuni Shrine. Obviously, Japanese citizens should be allowed to honor their war dead. Ever since Class A (leading) war criminals were enshrined at Yasukuni in 1978, however, any visit there by a Japanese Prime Minister represents a “political act of state recognition of the[se] souls” (Takahashi 2006: 156). The crux of the matter, as Takahashi (2006: 175) explains, is that tens of thousands of Taiwanese and Koreans, who had been drafted into the Japanese military during the Asia-Pacific War, are also enshrined at Yasukuni. These “victims of colonial rule by Japan [were enshrined] in precisely the same way as Japanese people who died perpetrating the colonial rule...as

---

<sup>5</sup> For studies that argue that an apology does not require reciprocity, in fact, may be more effective unilaterally, see Long and Brecke 2003:26; and Suzuki 2007: 6.

<sup>6</sup> It is important to understand that there are different levels of apology in the Japanese language and that the exact wording chosen is crucial.



‘gods who defended the nation.’ For the bereaved families...who suffered colonial rule, this is an insult” (ibid), and they therefore undertook legal proceedings to remove their relatives from enshrinement, but to no avail.<sup>7</sup>

There are at least two ways in which the Japanese government could defuse this politically charged situation. On the one hand, it could decide to create a politically “neutral” war memorial that would make no reference to Japan’s war criminals (Rose 2005: 125). Alternatively, Japanese Prime Ministers could “leave the commemoration and mourning of the souls enshrined at Yasukuni up to the priests at the shrine,” even if that would mean jeopardizing some domestic votes (Takahashi 2006: 157).

An analysis of apologies made by the German government to come to terms with the Nazi past shows that Germany has been much more successful in moving beyond this dark chapter in its history. This, as Kaiser (2006: 91) makes clear, in large part, is due to the fact that the Germans recognized that “the acceptance of guilt in the past must not only be open and public, but, in order to be truly meaningful and effective, it must generate a formal apology.” Case in point, former German Chancellor Willy Brandt’s reconciliation with the East. While visiting the Warsaw Ghetto Monument in 1970, Brandt spontaneously fell to his knees, “[doing]”, as he later explained in his memoirs, “what human beings do when speech fails them” (cited in Teitel 2006: 105). This “executive apology” was then followed by the signing of the Warsaw Treaty.

As part of the 1999-2000 settlement among German business leaders, politicians, and victims of Nazi slave labor mentioned above, German President Johannes Rau

---

<sup>7</sup> Priest Ikeda rationalizes the refusal to remove the souls by arguing that “at the time when they died they were Japanese, so it is not possible for them to stop being Japanese after they died” (Takahashi 2006: 176). As Takahashi is quick to point out, however, this completely ignores the fact that “the[se] people were semi-forcibly drafted into the war.”

offered a similar apology, “emphasizing acknowledgement and repentance rather than money” (Barkan and Karn 2006: 23). Rau told his audience, which included Holocaust survivors: “I know that for many it is not really the money that matters. What they want is for their suffering to be recognized as suffering and for the injustice done to them to be named injustice. I pay tribute to all those who were subjected to slave and forced labor under German rule, and, in the name of the German people, beg forgiveness. We will not forget their suffering” (reprinted in Barkan and Karn 2006: 24).<sup>8</sup>

So then what lessons can Japan draw from the European experience? “In the best cases,” as Barkan and Karn (2006:7) stress, “the negotiation of apology works to promote dialogue, tolerance, and cooperation between groups knitted together uncomfortably (or ripped asunder) by some past injustice. ... [An] apology can create a new framework in which groups may rehearse their past(s) and reconsider the present.” To the extent that apologies can “amend the past” (ibid. 8), their psychological value is immense. Germany seems to fit this “best case” scenario. Having addressed its historical legacies and “by building a new, shared identity with former enemies,” Germany, in Lebow’s mind, has been able to “transcend, at least in part, [its] Germanness” (2006: 30). Moreover, given that an “apology becomes an act of rehabilitation for the perpetrators and their descendants” (Barkan and Karn 2006: 17), “atoning for the war,” as Kristof (1998: 44) points out, “would not only liberate Japan’s neighbors; it would also free Japan itself.”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> To live up to this pledge, the German government regularly provides money to education programs and memorials (Bindenagel 2006: 294).

<sup>9</sup> For an interesting study that advocates an apology as a new strategy, see Suzuki (2007: 5-7). He argues that Japan, as a democracy, has “greater political space...to debate and forward alternative interpretations of history.” With time, an apology may lead to “collective identity transformations,” and help to “de-securitise” China’s identity.

Both of these developments, it seems, should enhance the prospects of future Sino-Japanese cooperation.

In the end, those who caution that East Asia is NOT Europe are correct. Whereas World War II and the Cold War ended in Europe a while ago, the same cannot be said for East Asia—where several states are still embroiled in territorial disputes, etc. And yet, there are important lessons East Asia can learn from Europe when it comes to creating a more solid basis for security integration. As this paper has shown, historical legacies not only need to be addressed but dealt with in a particular manner to remove the big stumbling block these issues still represent for East Asia. Specifically, studies of European reconciliation identify elements (remembrance, restitution, apology) essential in coming to terms with the past and thereby provide East Asia with a blueprint that it can follow and, where needed, modify to account for differences in timing, cultural heterogeneity, etc. Moreover, as discussed elsewhere (Weber 2007), to achieve the remarkable stability the Europeans have enjoyed since the end of World War II, it appears to be beneficial, if not imperative, to coordinate security provisions on multiple levels and, over time, give rise to a complex web of governance that can allay suspicions, reinforce rules, and promote trust. Finally, European integration demonstrates that spillover from one area of cooperation to another is likely, but, that it is also likely that there will be setbacks on the road to greater institutionalization.

Clearly, as mentioned previously (Weber 2007), East Asians are no longer solely relying on their bilateral security relations with the US, but also imbedding their security provisions in regional institutional structures. The Asia Regional Forum (ARF) is no NATO or OSCE, but it does represent a step in the right direction. Similarly, Japanese

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's recent conciliatory moves toward China are encouraging. It is about time both Japan and China take concrete steps to deal with their historical legacies, remove remaining obstacles to cooperation, and move beyond talking. If Europe is any indication, it is imperative to transcend historical divisions—rather than to remain “stuck in history”—in order to move the integration process along.

Conceptually speaking, if one seeks to understand why East Asian countries have given rise to the security structures in existence today, it is essential to “cross-fertilize” governance approaches with ideational and psychological analytical frameworks. Reason clearly mattered in these decisions, but an accurate understanding of why the actors behaved the way they did cannot be obtained without examining their ideas and emotions.

## *Bibliography*

- Barkan, Elazar and Alexander Karn, "Group Apology as an Ethical Imperative," in Elazar Barkan and Alexander Karn, eds., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 3-30.
- Berger, Thomas, *A Model Penitent? German Historical Memory and Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective*, (San Diego, CA: International Studies Association, 2006).
- Bindenagel, J.D., "Justice, Apology, Reconciliation, and the German Foundation: 'Remembrance, Responsibility, and the Future,'" in Elazar Barkan and Alexander Karn, eds., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 286-310.
- Buzan Barry and Ole Waever, *Regions and Powers. The Structure of International Security*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Friedberg, Aaron L., "Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia," *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Winter, 1993-1994), pp. 5-33.
- Green, Michael Jonathan, "Managing Chinese Power: the View from Japan," in Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross, eds., *Engaging China. The Management of an Emerging Power*, (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 152-175.
- Hemmer, Christopher, and Peter Katzenstein, "Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, and the Origins of Multilateralism," *International Organization* Vol. 56, No. 3 (2002): 575-607.
- Hooghe, Liesbet, and Gary Marks, "Unraveling the Central State, But How? Types of Multi-Level Governance," *American Political Science Review* Vol. 97 (2003), pp. 233-243.
- Ienaga, Saburo, "The Glorification of War in Japanese Education," in Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones and Steven E. Miller, eds., *East Asian Security*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996), pp. 332-351.
- Jansen, Marius B., *The Making of Modern Japan*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Kaiser, Karl, "European History 101 for Japan and China," *Internationale Politik* (Transatlantic Edition), Vol.7, No.3 (Summer 2006), pp. 90-97.

- Kang, David C., "Getting Asia Wrong. The Need for New Analytical Frameworks," *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Spring 2003), pp. 57-85.
- Kansteiner, Wulf, "Losing the War, Winning the Memory Battle: The Legacy of Nazism, World War II, and the Holocaust in the Federal Republic of Germany," in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds., *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 102-146.
- Katzenstein, J. Peter and Rudra Sil, "Rethinking Asian Security: A Case for Analytical Eclecticism," in J. J. Suh, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Allen Carlson, eds., *Rethinking Security in East Asia. Identity, Power, and Efficiency*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 1-33.
- Katzenstein, Peter, *A World of Regions: Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).
- Kristof, Nicholas D., "The Problem of Memory," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 6 (November/December 1998), pp. 37-49.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, "The Memory of Politics in Postwar Europe," in Richard Ned Lebow, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds., *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), pp. 1-39.
- Long, William, and Peter Brecke, *War and Reconciliation: Reason and Emotion in Conflict Resolution*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003).
- Rose, Caroline, *Interpreting History in Sino-Japanese Relations: A Case Study in Political Decision-Making*, (London: Routledge, 1998).
- Rose, Caroline, *Sino-Japanese Relations: Facing the Past, Looking to the Future?* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005).
- Shambaugh, David, "China and Japan towards the Twenty-First Century: Rivals for Pre-eminence or Complex Interdependence?" in Christopher Howe, ed., *China and Japan: History, Trends, and Prospects*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), pp. 90-01.
- Suzuki, Shogo, "Responsible Scholarship in Sino-Japanese Relations." Paper presented at the 48<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago, IL, Feb. 28<sup>th</sup>-March 3, 2007.
- Takahashi, Tetsuya, "The National Politics of the Yasukuni Shrine," (translated by Philip Seaton) in Naoko Shimazu, ed., *Nationalism in Japan*, (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 155-180.

- Teitel, Ruti, "The Transitional Apology," in Elazar Barkan and Alexander Karn, eds., *Taking Wrongs Seriously: Apologies and Reconciliation*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), pp. 101-114.
- Ullman, Richard H., *Securing Europe*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).
- Vohra, Ranbir, *China's Path to Modernization. A Historical Review from 1800 to the Present*, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000).
- Weber, Katja, "East Asian Security Revisited in Light of the European Experience," Paper presented at the 48<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Chicago, IL, Feb. 28<sup>th</sup>-March 3, 2007.
- Wu, Xinbo, "The Security Dimension of Sino-Japanese Relations: Warily Watching One Another," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 40, No. 2 (March/April 2000), pp. 296-310.
- Zhao, Suisheng, "Chinese Nationalism and Its International Orientations," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 115, No. 1 (2000), pp. 1-33.