

Politics of Conflict and Memory
WMG03401
Term 3, AY2023–2024
Tuesdays, Periods 1–2; 3–4 (08:45–10:15; 10:30–12:00)
IDEC 201

Instructor: John Lee Candelaria, Ph.D.
Contact: leecandelaria@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

Course Overview

We will explore the profound role that memory plays in shaping our humanity, extending beyond individual consciousness and into the realms of society, culture, and politics. Memory serves as both a bridge that connects us to our communities and fosters solidarity, and a potential source of division and discord. It possesses the dual capacity to promote social justice or perpetuate injustice.

Through the lens of Memory Studies, we will study the multifaceted roles memory assumes in conflicts. This journey will involve striking a balance between grasping the theoretical underpinnings of socially embedded memory and gaining practical insights from case studies. These case studies will illuminate the intricate complexities of the politics of remembering conflicts and atrocities. Our exploration will challenge us to consider how memory, despite its seemingly abstract nature, exerts a palpable influence on the functioning of societies entangled in conflict.

Course Requirements

1. **Class Presentation (25%)** Each student will select one assigned reading for a class presentation. During the first class meeting, you will have the opportunity to choose your reading. Presentations should not exceed 30 minutes and should encompass: (1) a comprehensive discussion of the chosen reading, (2) an identification of key issues within the reading, and (3) a reflection on the topic's significance, including agreement or disagreement with the reading's approach, substantiated with reasoning. After your presentation, you will lead a group discussion based on questions raised by your peers. Evaluation will consider the clarity of your presentation and the depth of your engagement with the readings.
2. **Prepared Questions (10%)** Excluding the week when you present, you must come to class with well-considered questions related to that week's readings. These questions should delve into the substance of at least one of the readings, avoiding trivial inquiries. Questions can vary widely based on your interests and reflections, such as addressing challenging aspects of the readings, exploring themes in greater depth, seeking peer perspectives, or other inquiries that demonstrate active engagement with the assigned texts. A total of 10 questions throughout the term is required to receive the maximum 10% for this requirement.
3. **Case Study Paper (40%)** You will select a conflict and memory case study not covered in our class and write a term paper about it, within the range of 3000-3500 words. Your paper should establish a clear thesis in the introduction and develop this thesis in the body through insightful analysis and relevant examples. Incorporate a minimum of

seven academic sources and use formal citations (APA or Chicago Styles preferred). Evaluation will consider the clarity and effectiveness of your writing, as well as the strength of your argument and depth of analysis. The paper deadline is December 8.

4. **Case Study Presentation (25%)** You will present your case study paper on the last day of class (November 28), providing an opportunity for feedback to enhance your paper before submission. You will be assessed based on clarity of presentation and depth of analysis.

Course materials. All readings are available and accessible in Momiji and Moodle.

Learning Management System. It is essential to access Moodle for submission of student outputs and consequent feedback from the instructor.

Class Schedule. Take note of the following important dates:

October 17. Asynchronous session. We do not meet this day. Class lectures are pre-recorded and may be viewed the entire day through Moodle.

October 24. Synchronous session. Students will watch pre-recorded lectures and a short film in class.

November 21. We will meet in IDEC Large Conference Room for lecture and a film showing.

November 27. Deadline of submission of case study PowerPoint presentations, to be submitted through Moodle.

November 28. Students will present their case study papers in class.

December 8. Deadline of case study papers, to be submitted through Moodle.

Rules on Plagiarism and AI-generated writing. Our class is committed to upholding the university's standards regarding plagiarism, the utilization of AI technology (specifically ChatGPT), and the handling of other academic integrity concerns. It is expected that all students create their outputs without resorting to plagiarism or undue reliance on AI-generated text. Your work should reflect your own thoughts and ideas, with proper citations when using external sources or AI-generated assistance.

Seeking support and maintaining wellbeing. Given the sensitive nature of the topics we engage with in this course, which may include graphic content and emotionally charged subjects, it is crucial for you to communicate with the instructor if you find yourself emotionally or mentally impacted by the material discussed in class. While we aim to approach these matters with objectivity and academic rigor, it is understandable that some topics may become too personal or emotionally taxing for individuals. In such instances you are encouraged to promptly inform the instructor.

Your mental and emotional wellbeing are our top priorities. We are committed to creating a learning environment that supports your overall health. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you ever feel the need for assistance, guidance, or simply someone to talk to. We are here to ensure your comfort and provide any necessary support as you navigate through the course material. Your well-being is valued and respected.

Class Outline. Readings marked with stars can be chosen as your class presentation topic.

Lesson 1A: Introduction (October 3, IDEC 201)

Halbwachs, M. (1980). Historical Memory and Collective Memory. *The Collective Memory*. Trans. Francis J. Ditter, JR and Vida Yazdi Ditter. Harper & Row, 1980. 50–87.

Nora, P. (1989). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Representations* 26(Spring), 7–25.

Olick, J.K. (1999). Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. *Sociological Theory* 17(3), 333–348.

Lesson 1B: Memory as Conflict (October 3, IDEC 201)

Devine-Wright, P. (2004). A theoretical overview of memory and conflict. In E. Cairns and M.D. Roe (Eds.), *The role of memory in ethnic conflict* (9–33). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bet-El, I.R. (2004). Unimagined Communities: The Power of Memory and the Conflict in the Former Yugoslavia. In J.W. Müller (Ed.), *Memory & Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past* (206–222). Cambridge University Press.

Denich, B. (1994) Dismembering Yugoslavia: Nationalist Ideologies and the Symbolic Revival of Genocide. *American Ethnologist* 21(2), 367–390.

Lesson 2A: Memory and Mass Violence (October 10, IDEC 201)

Winter, J. and Sivan, E. (1999). Setting the Framework. In J. Winter and E. Sivan (Eds.), *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (6–39). University Press.

*Linke, U. (2002). Archives of Violence: The Holocaust and the German Politics of Memory. In A.L. Hinton (Ed.), *Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide* (229–271). University of California Press.

* Dixon, J.M. (2010). Defending the Nation?: Maintaining Turkey’s Narrative of the Armenian Genocide. *South European Society and Politics* 15(3), 467–485.

Lesson 2B: Memory and Counter-Memory (October 10, IDEC 201)

Jelin, E. (2003). “Political Struggles for Memory” and “History and Social Memory.” *State Repression and the Labours of Memory* Trans. Judy Rein and Marcial Godoy-Anativia (26–45; 46–59). University of Minnesota Press.

*Sheftel, A. (2011) ‘Monument to the international community, from the grateful citizens of Sarajevo’: Dark humour as counter-memory in post-conflict Bosnia-Herzegovina. *Memory Studies* 5(2), 145–164.

Lesson 3A: Memory, Justice, and Reconciliation (October 17, Asynchronous)

Minow, M. (1999). The Work of Re-Membering: After Genocide and Mass Atrocity. *Fordham International Law Journal* 23(2), 428–439.

Henri, Y. (2003). Reconciling Reconciliation: A Personal and Public Journey of Testifying Before the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In P. Gready (Ed.), *Political Transition: Politics and Cultures* (262–275). Pluto Press.

Shaw, R. (2007). Memory Frictions: Localizing the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Sierra Leone. *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 1, 183–207.

Lesson 3B: Memory and Human Rights (October 17, Asynchronous)

Levy, D. and Sznajder, N. (2010). The Ubiquity of Human Rights in a Cosmopolitan Age. *Human Rights and Memory*. Pennsylvania State University Press, 1–23.

Palmie, S. (2010). Slavery, Historicism, and the Poverty of Memorialization. In S. Radstone and B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (363–375). Fordham University Press.

Rosoux, V. (2004). Human Rights and the “Work of Memory” in International Relations. *Journal of Human Rights* 3(2), 159–170.

Lesson 4A: Memory and Archive (October 24, IDEC 201)

Steedman, C. (2001). “The Space of Memory: In an Archive.” *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History*. Manchester University Press, 66–88.

Cox, R. (2012). Archives, War, and Memory: Building a Framework. *Library & Archival Security* 25(1), 21–57.

Lesson 4B: Memory and Digital Media (October 24, IDEC 201)

Garde-Hansen, J. (2011). “Introduction: Mediating the Past” and “Digital Memories: The Democratisation of Archives”. *Media and Memory* (1–10 and 70–87). Edinburgh University Press.

Brooker, C. (2011). The Entire History of You. *Black Mirror*. Netflix. [TV Show]

Lesson 5A: Memory and Heritage (November 7, IDEC 201)

Sodaro, A. (2018). Memorial museums: The emergence of a new form. *Exhibiting atrocity: Memorial museums and the politics of past violence*. Rutgers University Press. 12–29.

Candelaria, J.L. (2023). The politics of Asia-Pacific War memorialization in Thailand’s Victory Monument and the Philippines’ Shrine of Valor. *Asia Pacific Journal: Japan Focus*.

Ševčenko, L. (2011) Sites of Conscience: Reimagining Reparations. *Change Over Time* 1(1), 6–33.

Lesson 5B: Memory and Gender (November 7, IDEC 201)

- *Coombes, A. E. (2010). The Gender of Memory in Post-Apartheid South Africa. In S. Radstone and B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (442–457). Fordham University Press.
- *Jacobs, J. L. (2010). Gender and Collective Memory: Women and Representation at Auschwitz. *Memorializing the Holocaust: Gender, Genocide and Collective Memory*. I. B. Tauris. 27–48.
- *Henry, N. (2013). Memory of an Injustice: The “Comfort Women” and the Legacy of the Tokyo Trial. *Asian Studies Review* 37(3), 362–380.

Lesson 6A: Memory and Trauma (November 14, IDEC 201)

- *Caruth, C. (1991). Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History. *Yale French Studies* 79, 181–192.
- *Becker, G., Beyene, Y., and Ken, P. (2000). Memory, trauma, and embodied distress: The management of disruption in the stories of Cambodians in exile. *Ethos: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology* 28, 320–345.

Lesson 6B: Witnessing (November 14, IDEC 201)

- Das, V. (2000). The Act of Witnessing: Violence, Poisonous Knowledge, and Subjectivity. In V. Das, A. Kleinman, M. Ramphela, and P. Reynolds (Eds.), *Violence and Subjectivity* (205–225). University of California Press.
- *Hirsch, M. and Spitzer, L. (2010). The Witness in the Archive: Holocaust Studies/Memory Studies. In S. Radstone and B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (390–405). Fordham University Press.
- *Allan, D. (2007). The Politics of Witness: Remembering and Forgetting 1948 in Shatila Camp. In A. Sa’di and L. Abu-Lughod (Eds.), *Nakba: Palestine, 1948 and the Claims of Memory* (252–282). Columbia University Press.

Lesson 7A: Forgetting (November 21, IDEC Large Conference Room)

- Connerton, P. (2008). Seven Types of Forgetting. *Memory Studies* 1 (1), 59–71.
- *Buckley-Zistel, S. (2006). Remembering to Forget: Chosen Amnesia as a Strategy for Local Coexistence in Post-Genocide Rwanda. *Africa: The Journal of the International African Institute* 76(2), 131–150.

Lesson 7B: Postmemory (November 21, IDEC Large Conference Room)

Hirsch, M. (2008). The Generation of Postmemory. *Poetics Today* 29 (1), 103–128.

Oliver L. 'Like Pebbles Stuck in a Sieve': Reading Romushas in the Second-Generation Photography of Southeast Asian Captivity. *Journal of War & Culture Studies* 10(4), 272–286.

Obaru, H. (2020). *Abandoned: The Stories of Japanese War Orphans in the Philippines and China*. [Documentary].

Lesson 8A: Student Presentations (November 28, IDEC 201)

Lesson 8B: Synthesis (November 28, IDEC 201)

Grading Rubrics: **Class Presentation**

Criteria	Outstanding Achievement	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Developing Proficiency	Foundational Understanding
Comprehension of Reading (30 points)	Demonstrates exceptional understanding of the reading, with insightful interpretation and thorough comprehension. (30)	Shows a strong grasp of the reading material with minor gaps. (25–29)	Displays a good understanding of the reading, covering essential points. (20–24)	Basic comprehension is evident, but lacks depth and detail. (10–19)	Shows minimal understanding of the reading material. (0–9)
Identification of Key Issues (25 points)	Excellent identifies and critically analyzes all key issues. (25)	Identifies most key issues with thoughtful analysis. (20–24)	Identifies some key issues, but analysis may lack depth. (15–19)	Struggles to identify key issues; analysis is surface-level. (8–14)	Fails to identify key issues or provides irrelevant analysis. (0–7)
Reflection and Critical Analysis (20 points)	Offers deep, nuanced reflection and sophisticated critical analysis. (20)	Provides clear and well-reasoned reflection and analysis. (16–19)	Some level of reflection and analysis, but may lack depth or originality. (12–15)	Limited reflection; analysis is basic and lacks depth. (6–11)	Minimal or no reflection; fails to critically analyze the topic. (0–5)
Presentation Clarity and Organization (15 points)	Exceptionally clear, coherent, and well-structured presentation. (15)	Clear and well-organized presentation with minor room for improvement. (12–14)	Generally clear and organized but with some noticeable issues. (9–11)	Presentation lacks clarity or organization in several areas. (4–8)	Presentation is unclear and poorly organized. (0–3)
Engagement and Discussion Leadership (10 points)	Excellent facilitation of discussion, actively engages peers, and superbly addresses their queries. (10)	Effectively leads discussion and engages with peers with minor lapses. (8–9)	Adequately leads discussion but may lack full engagement with peers. (6–7)	Limited effectiveness in leading discussion or engaging peers. (3–5)	Struggles to lead a discussion or engage with peers. (0–2)

Grading Rubrics: **Case Study Presentation**

Criteria	Outstanding Achievement	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Developing Proficiency	Foundational Understanding
Depth of Analysis and Insight (50 points)	Provides a deep, insightful analysis, demonstrating thorough understanding and original thought. Offers nuanced interpretations and substantial evidence. (50)	Analysis is thorough and well-reasoned with minor gaps in depth or insight. (40–49)	Provides a reasonable analysis but lacks depth or original insights. Some points may be superficial or underdeveloped. (30–39)	Analysis is basic and lacks depth. Key points are not fully explored or supported. (15–29)	Minimal or no meaningful analysis. Lacks depth and fails to provide insight into the topic. (0–14)
Clarity and Organization (30 points)	Presentation is exceptionally clear, logically organized, and coherently structured. Information flows seamlessly and is easily comprehensible. (30)	Presentation is clear and well-organized with minor lapses in logic or structure. (24–29)	Presentation is generally clear but may have some organizational issues or lack smooth transitions. (18–23)	Presentation has noticeable issues in clarity or organization. Information may be disjointed or confusing at times. (9–17)	Presentation lacks basic clarity and organization. Information is poorly structured and difficult to follow. (0–8)
Interaction and Engagement (20 points)	Exceptionally engaging, encourages active participation, and effectively responds to questions. Demonstrates strong leadership in guiding discussion. (20)	Engages the audience well, responds competently to questions, and facilitates discussion with minor lapses. (16–19)	Adequate engagement with the audience. Handles questions reasonably well but may lack full control over the discussion. (12–15)	Limited engagement with the audience. Struggles to address questions effectively or to maintain a fluid discussion. (6–11)	Poor engagement. Fails to respond effectively to questions or to facilitate any meaningful discussion. (0–5)

Grading Rubrics: **Case Study Paper**

Criteria	Outstanding Achievement	Highly Proficient	Proficient	Developing Proficiency	Foundational Understanding
Thesis and Argument Development (30 points)	Clearly articulated, original thesis; excellent development and support throughout the paper. (30)	Well-defined thesis; strong development and support. (25–29)	Clear thesis; adequate development and support. (20–24)	Thesis present but lacks clarity or depth; weak development. (10–19)	Thesis is unclear or missing; poor or no argument development. (0–9)
Critical Thinking and Analysis (30 points)	Exceptionally insightful, deep analysis; demonstrates advanced critical thinking. (30)	Strong analysis; good evidence of critical thinking. (25–29)	Adequate analysis; some evidence of critical thinking. (20–24)	Basic analysis; limited critical thinking. (10–19)	Minimal or no analysis; lacks critical thinking. (0–9)
Research and Use of Sources (15 points)	Extensive research; excellent integration and citation of sources. (15)	Solid research; very good use and citation of sources. (12–14)	Sufficient research; adequate citation of sources. (9–11)	Limited research; some issues with source integration and citation. (4–8)	Poor or no research; incorrect or no citation of sources. (0–3)
Organization and Structure (15 points)	Exceptionally well-organized; logical flow and effective structure. (15)	Well-organized; good logical flow and structure. (12–14)	Adequately organized; some issues with flow or structure. (9–11)	Disorganized; significant issues with flow and structure. (4–8)	Poorly organized; lacks logical flow and coherent structure. (0–3)
Writing Quality and Style (10 points)	Excellent writing quality; clear, concise, and stylistically appropriate. (10)	Very good writing; minor errors or stylistic issues. (9)	Good writing; some errors or stylistic issues. (8)	Writing needs improvement; numerous errors or stylistic issues. (6–7)	Poor writing quality; major errors and stylistic issues. (0–5)