

**COMPARATIVE INQUIRY OF MUSEUM PEDAGOGY: HIROSHIMA'S
TWO MUSEUMS AND THEIR TEACHING OF CATASTROPHE**

Makito Yurita*

Abstract

This article proposes a unique method to inquire into visitor notebooks in order to explore the pedagogical impacts of two museums that have the same subject but different approaches in presenting their artifacts. The museums are the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and the National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims, both located within the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park. This study offers a unique method to utilize museum visitor notebooks for evaluating the pedagogical impacts of museum exhibitions.

Keywords: Visitor Notebook, Museum, Exhibition, Pedagogy, Evaluation.

INTRODUCTION

The study described in this chapter inquires into two museums inside the larger Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park: the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, which opened in 1955, and the National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims that opened a half century later. These two museums stand only fifty-meters apart from each other, and they both collect and preserve memories and traces of the atomic bombing and the catastrophe the bomb wrought to both the city and the people of Hiroshima. The educational role of the two museums is defined as their *raison d'être* (Hooper-Greenhill, 1999 & 2006). Exhibiting the horrors of the atomic bombing, the museums share the common purpose of building awareness of the importance of peace and generating a firm opposition to wars and nuclear weapons. To do so, however, the two museums have very different approaches to representing the atomic bombing and its atrocities.

* Dr. Makito Yurita is Associate Professor in the Faculty of Education at Shimane University, Japan. He earned a Ph.D. in American Studies from Michigan State University. His research focuses on the political theory of liberalism; communicative rationality; and historiography, and seeks ways to ensure peaceful coexistence of diverse "others" in a global public sphere. He is also working with Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency to develop the Agency's educational Outreach project and its evaluation.

Hiroshima became the first victim of atomic bombings at the end of the Second World War. The bomb's nuclear explosion had literally evaporated almost everything near the epicenter. The city's busiest commercial and residential district had turned into ashes at the end of the war. Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park stands there today to commemorate the catastrophe and war's devastating consequences to the future generations.

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum was erected in 1955 for collecting and preserving the mementos of the atomic bomb victims. In the 1970s, when the world began facing an acceleration of the nuclear armament race, the museum undertook the role of educating people about the horrors of atomic bombings in order to build voices against wars and nuclear weapons. The fall of communism again made the museum undergo a major renovation, and it added a new wing in 1994. In this renovation, the museum added an exhibition to give the reasons why the city became the first target of atomic bombing. This addition however invited controversies. The museum's efforts to put the bomb within a context of history seemed to give a rationale to use a weapon with such destructive power against humans. The National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims was then erected in 2004 inside the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park (not in response to, but never outside of the circumstances) for the sole purpose of commemorating and preserving the memories and testimonies of the atomic bomb victims. The circumstances around these two museums and the roles they carry will be developed later in this chapter.

Identifying in detail the different representations of exhibition subjects offered by each museum can provide meaningful insight for analyzing museum exhibitions as curriculum. When one applies curriculum theory to an exploration of museums, anything comprising an exhibit can be seen (and inquired into) as curricular artifacts. Museum exhibits have both implicit and explicit curricula (Longstreet & Shane, 1993). What is absent in an exhibit should be considered its null curriculum (Eisner, 1994), and thus examined for its educational potential. Artifacts exhibited, the exhibitions provided by the curators, even the very building and its architecture, are all parts of a museum's curriculum. They constitute a curriculum because, by definition, they convey pedagogical messages to audiences through what it is they do and/or do not present and how presentations and the physical space they hold and embody, invite audiences to think about, interact, and explore the world in particular ways. Museums, much like the practice of schooling, thus, employ diverse pedagogical approaches and exhibitions are important venues through which to analyze a museum's pedagogy and its practice. The challenge, however, is to compare the effectiveness of learning within the diverse spectrum of these pedagogical approaches offered to museum audiences and how they impact audiences as they go through the museum.

APPROACHING AUDIENCES

The study reported here investigates Hiroshima's two museums as pedagogical mediums capable of effecting awareness of the importance of peace and generating a firm opposition against wars and nuclear weapons. Each museum's exhibitions will first be interpreted as a unique curriculum that offers pedagogical messages for audiences. Through detailed descriptions of how each museum represents its subject matter, this study examines the exhibitions through the lenses of curriculum theories developed to discuss pedagogical practice of public schooling. The purpose of this study is not limited to identifying museums as curricula and highlighting pedagogical differences between them. Instead, in order to measure the effectiveness of museums as curricula, this study also inquires into the correlation between a museum's pedagogy and the impact it has on its audiences. For the latter purpose, this study examined the visitors' responses to each museum's exhibitions by accessing the museum visitor's notebooks.

"Visitor studies" is a discipline within museum studies that intends to measure the impact that museum exhibitions have on their audiences. The Standards for Museum Exhibitions issued by the American Association of Museums suggests that a museum exhibition "is successful if it is physically, intellectually, and emotionally engaging to those who experience it" (AAM, 2009). Today it is widely recognized that the mere number of visitors cannot measure the success of museum exhibitions, because the number of visitors often tells more about a museum's marketing strategies than the strengths of its exhibits (Chambers, 1999: 31). Accessing the audiences to systematically gather information is not a simple task, and thus museums and scholars of museum studies have debated the methodologies for accessing the audiences (Hooper-Greenhill, 2006). From the wide range of methods that have been applied to study museum visitors and their engagements to museum exhibitions, this study employs museum visitor's notebooks to access audience responses.

In her discussion of using visitor notebooks as a resource to access museum audiences, Sharon Macdonald (2005) points out three advantages: First, the act of writing a comment in visitor notebooks is completely voluntary, and thus visitors are unaware that they are being studied. Second, because visitors are unconcerned about the presence of researchers when they write their responses, visitor notebooks can contain raw responses that are undisturbed by the researchers and their research agenda. Finally, the writings in visitor notebooks are direct voices of visitors, and they provide insights that cannot be accessed through observations of visitor behaviors. These three points do not suggest that visitor notebooks can replace other data collection methods such as interviews, observations, surveys and other approaches to visitor studies. These points, however, do show the potential for using visitor notebooks to access audiences' reactions to museum displays.

EXHIBITION AS CURRICULUM

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum has been collecting and preserving the memories and remains of the atomic bomb catastrophe to convey the horrors of war to future generations. The museum continues to carry the torch of building world peace by opposing not only nuclear weapons, but also the legitimacy of war altogether. However, the museum's pacifist principle seems to be losing its impact today as military tensions and threats of nuclear proliferation are rapidly growing. Nuclear proliferation of recent years in particular has brought about political debates for revising the Japanese pacifist constitution to consider the possibility for Japan's rearmament. Internationally, there have been talks about the possibility for Japan to go nuclear. Furthermore, public debates over the Smithsonian's National Air and Space Museum's planned exhibit on the *Enola Gay* in 1995 confirmed the different and highly contrary explanations of the atomic bombing existing outside Japan (Asada, 1993; Bernstein, 1995a, 1995b; Sodei, 1995a; Jo, 1996). This realization resulted in a turning point in Japan's postwar explanations and understandings about the Second World War: Japan was neither an absolute victim nor the absolute aggressor in the war and its violence (Asada, 1995; Sodei, 1995b; Takaki, 1995; Yoneyama, 1998).

The last half decade of the twentieth century thus saw increasing criticisms against peace museums throughout Japan. Those criticisms suggested that many peace museums are overly self-critical and even masochistic when representing the war in which Japan was defeated (Takahashi, 1998; Fujioka, 1998). The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum faced such criticisms when it doubled its exhibition space and added historical explanation as to why Hiroshima became the target of the atomic bombing. Ironically, providing an explanation of war atrocities, whatever the explanation might be, potentially gave legitimacy to what cannot be justified. For example, Elie Wiesel (1978), a Holocaust survivor, bemoaned that the Holocaust cannot be represented: "whoever has not lived through the event can never know it. And whoever has lived through the event can never fully reveal it" (p.202). Traumatic events in history that exceeded the rationality of humans cannot be fully represented within the rationality of language, and an attempt to represent them in the form of museum explanations would likely omit what must not be omitted (Linenthal, 1995). In fact, when providing an explanation as to why Hiroshima became the bomb's target, the museum exhibition portrays Hiroshima as the forefront of Japanese militarism and its aggressions in Asia. This information provided in the exhibition is historically accurate, but acknowledging such explanation potentially justified the American decision to drop the atomic bomb. Even when it does not lead to justifying the use of the atomic bomb, the explanation might justify the attack itself, and thus the casualties and atrocities are explained as unfortunate but necessary consequences.

Public controversies about representing the Second World War, therefore, have made museums and museum curators more conscious of the difficulties of representation today than ever before. In order to avoid criticisms and controversies, museums and museum curators seem to turn away from the nineteenth century assumption that views museums as Enlightenment institutions. "Museums must not look to educate visitors to a singular point of view" (Bunch, 1995: 59). Instead, it is emphasized today that the goal for museum's education is "to create an informed public" (Bunch, 1995: 59). Elizabeth Ellsworth (2005), when analyzing the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, asserts, "the power of the address of the pedagogy of the museum lies in its indeterminacy" (p.100). The Holocaust Memorial Museum, instead of definitive and prefixed meanings, exhibits the dilemmas and impossibilities of representing the Holocaust as a historical event. Museums, in this respect, are making a shift away from its knowledge-centered pedagogy that aims to simply transmit knowledge to audiences.

The National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims, as opposed to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, maintains an approach that intentionally avoids representing or explaining the atomic bombing and its atrocities from a singular point of view. In this respect, the museum exhibition, when representing the atomic catastrophe, does not offer a single and definitive explanation to audiences. Instead of transmitting the knowledge, the museum offers an audience-centered pedagogy that has a constructivist approach to knowledge. Museum audiences are exposed to a multitude of voices and of perspectives elaborating and evaluating the atomic bombing. Without an inquiry of their own, the audiences are left with the reality that remains complex and complicated with diverse views of reality. The National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims provides no single voice to dictate the reality. Instead it prepares a space where the event remains unexamined and unevaluated to set prefabricated meanings. In other words, the audience-centered pedagogy situates museum exhibitions in a pedagogical space in which the audiences engage in meaning-making or knowledge construction.

The choice of such pedagogy in the National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims resulted from the criticisms the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum faced for its knowledge-centered pedagogy. The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, while approaching knowledge deterministically, offers an instructional space to transmit the prescriptive knowledge to audiences. Let us thus examine both museums to illustrate the different approaches to knowledge and the pedagogical differences embedded in their exhibition spaces.

THE HIROSHIMA PEACE MEMORIAL MUSEUM

The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum (Peace Museum) opened first in 1955 - just ten years after the atomic bombing. The East Building, which was added in a 1994 reorganization, conveys to visitors the history of Hiroshima before the

bombing and the commitment of Hiroshima to building a world without nuclear weapons. The Main Building, which was originally erected in 1955 to convey the devastation caused by the atomic bombing, continues exhibiting the bomb's devastating impacts and the endurance of victims.

Throughout the East Building, the exhibition is composed of many tall, rectangular expository panels, each of which has textual explanations with either a set of two photographs or a set of a map and a photograph. The panels are aligned against the walls of the exhibition room and surround the dioramas showing how the epicenter was before and after the bombing. These panels provide direct and explicit explanations about the bombing. The exhibition illustrates the historical development of Hiroshima as a city of military importance before exhibiting the moment in which the bomb impacted Hiroshima. The order in which the museum exhibit gives the historical context of the bomb forms a narrative that Hiroshima became the target of atomic bombing because the city had military significance. In fact, the panels illustrating the U.S. decision to drop the bomb give a definitive explanation:

The United States thought that if atomic bombing could bring an end of the war, it would help keep the Soviet Union from extending its sphere of influence in the world; in the way, the U.S. Government could justify to the American people the A-bomb development project, which entailed tremendous expenditure. The world's first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. (Panel, Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum).

Scholars, both in Japan and the United States, have pondered the question why the United States carried out the atomic attacks against Japan. The issue of racism (Dower, 1993) and even the psychological makeup of the then President of United States (Takaki, 1995) have been identified as factors contributing to the U.S. decision to drop the bomb in Hiroshima. The museum exhibition, however, provides a narrative explanation that excludes diverse factors that may project contrary perspectives to the explanation represented in the museum space. In this respect, the knowledge exhibited in the East Building is built and controlled through the omission of particular realities that may construct contrary knowledge presented by scholars debating on the very issue of the decision to drop the bomb and the legitimacy of such decision.

The Main Building, where the museum exhibits the devastation and human suffering, similarly controls the way audiences view the atomic bombing and its catastrophe. The museum displays the mementos of civilian casualties of the nuclear attack in an exhibition space with a backdrop of wall-size photographs depicting the devastation of Hiroshima after the atomic bombing. The exhibition displays uniforms and other personal belongings of mobilized students who became victims of the bomb: a pocket watch that was stopped at the time of explosion, school-badges, name tags, a sandal, a lunch box with charred rice still inside, a

melted water bottle, and other belongings of students who were working near the hypocenter. Illuminating the victims who were unlikely targets of the war and the bomb, the museum fosters an understanding that the bomb obliterated not so much the military targets, but instead the lives of mere citizens living in the city. It even provides a misguided sense that most victims were children and students who were rather innocent in the nation's war.

Illuminating children and students as the primary victims of the atomic bomb is likely to invite audiences to be unable to justify not only nuclear attacks, but also war in general. Regardless of political and historical rationales given to the use of the atomic bombs as exhibited in the East Building, the exhibition makes it difficult for audiences to rationalize the devastation of the bomb as war's necessary sacrifices. In this respect, the museum is successful in guiding its audiences to construct a particular understanding that is a product of carefully controlling the knowledge exhibited in the museum space.

Much like the knowledge-centered curriculum in the practice of schooling (Bruner, 1963 & 1981), the museum defines the knowledge exhibited. The entire exhibition, with its accompanying explanatory panels, demonstrates the Peace Museum's *master narrative* intended to transmit its canonical knowledge to audiences. The museum also has peace volunteers who explain and guide the visitors to see particular meanings in the exhibited artifacts. This suggests the museum's intent to accurately transmit to the visitors particular knowledge about the devastation brought by the atomic bomb. Much like the knowledge-centered curriculum in the practice of schooling, the museum omits certain perspectives and/or realities for the benefit of effective transmission of canonical knowledge, while not inviting any critical inquiry into the canon itself (Ellis, 2004).

Applying a lens proposed by Hegel, the Peace Museum carries a curriculum with an idea that history produces subjects. The museum exhibits the atomic catastrophe as a result of history's constructing Hiroshima as the city with military importance, and that the United States' decision to bomb Hiroshima was made not by humans, but as a result of historical and political determinants. The explanations given in the exhibition leave almost no room for human agency and keep history's actors obscure. The Main Building seems to provide history's apparatus by exhibiting children and students as casualties of the nuclear attack. However, the notion of an apparatus remains not only obscure, but also absent of human perpetrators. Through highlighting the innocence of civilian victims, the museum makes the nation-states, military and political leaders into the ultimate perpetrators of war and war violence. In turn, the exhibition launders war responsibilities of individuals by blurring individual agencies participating in the nation's war.

THE NATIONAL MEMORIAL HALL FOR THE ATOMIC BOMB VICTIMS

The National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims (from here on, Memorial Hall) is mausoleum-like, with most of its building structure underground. Visitors to Memorial Hall find a monument symbolizing a clock stopped at the time of the bombing. The monument is surrounded by rubble, unearthed from the ground where the Memorial Hall now stands. The monument and rubble making up Memorial Hall's roof convey the notion of a mausoleum under the very ground where the bomb had turned everything into rubble. Immediately after entering Memorial Hall, visitors walk down a slow, counterclockwise spiral slope to the lower level. This dim-lit pathway, according to the museum's architect, was designed to give visitors a sense of travelling back in time to the moment in which the atomic bomb struck Hiroshima (CSE, 2002).

Throughout the Memorial Hall, visitors find no explicit explanation for the dropping of the bomb except along this downward pathway to the memorial space (the explanation given here is not part of the original planning of the exhibit). The five dim-lit panels give visitors a brief explanation as to why the bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. The explanation consists of no more than 400 words in total, and the panels are less noticeable since they are placed as in-set décor in an alcove-like space. The Memorial Hall placed these panels as a result of criticisms brought by civic groups who argue that, as a national museum, the Memorial Hall must provide explicit statements to highlight the Japanese responsibility as a state in waging a war that brought about the catastrophe and human sufferings. The message exhibited in the panels is almost identical to the master narrative given in the Peace Museum.

However, those dim-lit panels alongside the pathway are the only explicit explanation given inside the Memorial Hall. The pathway then leads visitors into the Hall of Remembrance where the bomb's victims are commemorated. The hall has a sacred atmosphere and it exhibits no physical artifact and no explanation. The panoramic image depicting Hiroshima after the strike of the atomic bomb covers the wall of the orbicular hall, and the silence in the hall makes visitors feel that they are standing in Hiroshima's past. There is an absence of *language* to represent the devastation and the number of casualties caused by the atomic bomb. Instead, the Memorial Hall uses 140,000 small ceramic tiles that are individually unique to form a collage of the panorama of Hiroshima's ruin. Each tile represents one victim who died as a result of the bomb between August 6, 1945 - the day the bomb was dropped and the end of that year. There is an explanation about what the tiles represent only in the leaflet given to visitors at the entrance. Represented by individually unique tiles instead of a list of names, victims remain anonymous until visitors actively inquire into the exhibited materials. Furthermore, by not representing the volume of casualties with a number, the Memorial Hall manages to represent the victims as individuals.

Exiting the Hall of Remembrance, there are portraits and names of victims who (and whose family) have given the Memorial Hall permission to exhibit their identity. The Memorial Hall also exhibits some artifacts in glass-cases, but the museum gives no explanation for them. Instead, the museum offers the testimonies that are relevant to the artifacts exhibited. Each artifact also has a computer-assisted terminal to show related information, photographs and maps to give the audiences further knowledge and information as the visitors read through the testimony. The Memorial Hall upholds it as a principle to make no selection amongst the memoirs and testimonies. Instead, it constitutes a repository for any and all voluntarily offered experiences of the bomb. This ensures that the visitor is exposed to a wide span of situations, identities and perspectives that come with the stories and testimonies of the ones who lived the event in different ways and in different points of their experiences. Through this approach, the Memorial Hall refused to provide a master narrative, and thus its exhibition space is strikingly different from the Peace Museum. The Memorial Hall instead gives visitors the opportunity to freely browse on their own through the space of the exhibition, including the abstract spaces of the memoirs. Visitors thus architect their own relationships with the diverse and complex narratives of the survivors.

The museum continues collecting testimonies and writings from A-bomb survivors and their families who have suffered from the aftermath of the bomb and of its radiation effects. The Memorial Hall makes an effort to construct webs of memories through connecting those testimonies. It uses the names of individuals, places and other keywords to link thousands of testimonies archived to make all testimonies searchable and enhance their pedagogical potential.

The Memorial Hall, using a perspective advocated by curriculum theorist Michael Apple (1995), appears to bring forward a curriculum that is hidden in the exhibition space of the Peace Museum. The museum builds its exhibition space in which the turbulence of diverse and complex memories is collected and exhibited without a master narrative. The study of Hiroshima testimonies reveals the reality that many survivors of Hiroshima's atomic bombing had refused to speak about their experiences (Yurita, 2007). Even those who gave their testimonies had suffered by having their experiences misrepresented, evaluated, and questioned within the master narrative that was framed within Japan's postwar discourse on peace. In fear of criticisms and questions, many survivors have kept silent. Therefore, our understanding of Hiroshima's atomic bombing has always been incomplete and tentative. If we also apply a lens inspired by Henry Giroux, the Memorial Hall constructs a *border pedagogy* that brings diverse lenses to form the learners into a critical subject for social change (Giroux, 1983; 1988; 1992). The purpose of this pedagogy is to make the learners into critical subjects that move beyond the consciousness bordered by difference and power (Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991). The

turbulence of diverse and complex memories represented in the survivors' testimonies confronts the Memorial Hall visitors. No master narrative is explicit although, as a memorial museum, there is overwhelming silence to set an atmosphere of memorializing the deceased victims. The audiences confronted by the diverse and complex testimonies experience the indeterminacy of meanings to rationalize all diverse testimonies and meanings of the atomic catastrophe. Memorial Hall, in this respect, makes its visitors into critical subjects by confronting them with diverse meanings that are uncontainable in one master narrative.

The Memorial Hall makes its visitors encounter the problems of representing the diverse experiences that are not representable with language. Visitors are invited to engage with this problem through this exhibition in which meaning is indeterminate. The Memorial Hall, therefore, offers a learner-centered curriculum or an activity-centered curriculum (Ediger, 2001), in which both the museum and its audiences are taking a constructivist approach to knowledge. The museum becomes a pedagogical space in which audiences engage with the indeterminacy of knowledge exhibited in the testimonies of atomic bomb survivors.

INQUIRING INTO VISITOR'S RESPONSES THROUGH VISITOR NOTEBOOKS

Museums and researchers both have no definitive control over what visitors write in museum notebooks. In this respect, visitor notebooks collect more multitudinous and raw responses from the audiences than the responses collected through interviews and surveys. This, of course, does not mean that visitor notebooks have more authentic and direct responses from museum audiences regarding the museum exhibitions. The comments inscribed in visitor notebooks inform us very little, if any, about the contexts in which the audiences shaped their thoughts on the exhibitions. Studying the museum visitor notebooks alone, therefore, cannot inform us whether the act of inscribing comments in the notebooks was a sincere act, or if it was a socially situated performance.

This study finds that it is pointless to visit visitor notebooks to inquire about the authenticity and/or sincerity of what the audiences inscribed in them. Macdonald (2005) points out that the study of visitor notebooks allows "researchers to better specify the kinds of socially situated performances" (122) expected and carried by museum audiences. It is however not the purpose of this study to illustrate the kinds of socially situated performances demonstrated by museum visitors. Instead, this study employs a comparative approach to inquire into visitor notebooks of two museums in Hiroshima that have a common audience and common pedagogical goals. Even if comments inscribed in the notebooks are socially situated performances—as they surely are, we can still study comparatively the visitor notebooks to specify the kinds of performances that are common between museums that have a common audience and carry common pedagogical goals. Similarly, it is also possible to identify the kinds of performances that are unique to each museum.

This study examined all comments, including graffiti, inscribed in the notebooks between February and March 2006, except those that are illegible or not written in Japanese, English or Chinese. To contextualize, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum visitor notebook receives on average over 20,000 comments per year, and the National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims has approximately 1,200 entries annually.

The National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims opened its doors to the public in 2002. In its first two years, a half million people explored its exhibitions. The visitor notebooks of 2006 examined for this study would, thus, likely have comments on the matured museum exhibitions, following the museum's initial adjustments since inauguration. The decision to explore comments written between February and March reflects an attempt to avoid the influence of other forms of commemoration of the dropping of the atomic bomb that might "influence" visitors' comments. Both August and December are symbolic months for the Japanese to remember the war. December is the month Japan dived into the morass of the Second World War. August is the month of the atomic bombing, the attack by the Soviet Union, and the nation's surrender to the Allied Forces. Japanese mass media tend to feature programs about the war and the atomic bombing every August and December. This study, therefore, inquires into the visitor notebooks of the months of February and March in order to minimize the impact of media and other commemorations on audience perspectives and interpretations.

Upon coding the visitor notebooks, 50 comments were coded by two coders separately. Inter-rater reliability for the 50 comments calculated by using Kappa was .71, which was acceptable (Bakeman & Gottman, 1986; Nishibe, 2002). The disagreements were then solved by discussion between the two coders. Then, two coders examined 250 comments from the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and all comments (89) from the National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims inscribed between February to March, 2006.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

The two museums aim to have audiences encounter the Spirit of Hiroshima—"the yearnings for a global commitment to build peace through remembrance of Hiroshima's tragedy" (Yurita, 2008). Most comments addressed the exhibitions' main educational/pedagogical objectives—the yearning for peace and the opposition to nuclear armament, but there are noticeable differences between the audiences' responses to the two museums. This study developed the following questions/categories to identify the differences in the responses of the audiences between two museums:

- Whom do audiences speak to through the notebooks?
- How do audiences address the notion of peace?

- How do audiences address their own responsibility for past wars?
- How do audiences address their roles in constructing peace and a world free of nuclear weapons?
- Who do audiences perceive as responsible for past/present/future wars and/or conflicts?

The study began by examining possible differences in visitor comments between the Peace Museum and the Memorial Hall. Addressing the desire for peace, there seems to be no statistical difference between responses to the two museum exhibits. Among visitors to both museums, there is a frequent emphasis on the yearning for global peace, $\chi^2(1) = .01, p = n.s.$, as well as the opposition to wars in general, $\chi^2(1) = 2.12, p = n.s.$ It is not at all surprising to find such comments in two museums exhibiting the consequence of one of the major war atrocities in history. However, when inquiring about the issue of responsibility for the Second World War and the prevention of future wars or the construction of world peace, there are significant differences between the two museums.

Visitor comments that explicitly addressed anything about responsibility are identified in the visitor notebooks. Chi-square test revealed that visitors to the Memorial Hall tend to comment on responsibility issues of the past war and wartime experiences more frequently than the visitors to the Peace Museum, $\chi^2(1) = 15.31, p < 0.01$ (Table 1). Furthermore, chi-square test revealed that there were significant differences in the frequency of comments dealing with world peace in the future based on the visitor's choice of facilities, $\chi^2(4) = 33.65, p < 0.01$ (Table 2). The most prominent tendency was that visitors to the Memorial Hall tended to claim that they themselves or they as well as others were responsible for world peace in the future more often than visitors to the Peace Museum. In contrast, visitors to the Peace Museum often either attached responsibility for future world peace to the behavior of others or their comments did not specify who has the responsibility for constructing future peace. More precisely, visitors to the Peace Museum tended to write their comments more as general wishes for peace than an expression of active commitment to it.

The study also examined the degree to which visitors' comments reflected thoughts about being a responsible actor in society. There are multiple comments in which visitors write explicitly about their roles in fighting against wars and bringing world peace. One university student, for example, who wrote in the Memorial Hall notebook, expressed his/her awareness of the necessity to think actively about what needs to be done for peace rather than weeping about past war atrocities (MH, March 3, 2006). Yet, the visitor notebooks of the Peace Museum rarely included comments that addressed bringing about world peace through one's own actions. It is frequent to find a comment that expresses *hope* as the only action for peace. For example, a visitor from Australia wrote, "We can only hope the world learns from their

mistakes” (PM, February 27, 2006). The comments inscribed in the Peace Museum’s notebooks rarely have active voice that defines the carrier of any actions for peace. In fact, the chi-square test revealed that there were significant differences in the degree to which visitors acknowledged their responsibilities for world peace as citizens between those who visited the Peace Museum and those who visited the Memorial Hall, $\chi^2(3) = 55.26, p < 0.01$ (Table 3). Results show that visitors to the Memorial Hall tended to perceive that citizens were responsible for world peace, whereas visitors to the Peace Museum tended to perceive that either leaders of countries, nation-states or society itself was responsible for making peace in the world. Finally, chi-square tests also revealed the differences in visitors’ beliefs about their active involvements in world peace based on the museum displays. Compared to the comments of visitors to the Peace Museum, significantly more comments of visitors to Memorial Hall reflected visitors’ belief that they can take parts in working toward world peace, $\chi^2(1) = 22.47, p < 0.01$ (Table 4).

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

The analysis of visitor notebooks reveals that even though the two museums have a common pedagogical goal, audiences’ responses can be significantly different. Both museums have attempted to promote a firm opposition against war and nuclear weapons, and both led audiences to confirm the importance of peace in the world. However, while the Peace Museum had relatively passive responses toward individual roles in constructing world peace, the visitors to the Memorial Hall ruminatively addressed the roles individuals should, and might in fact take to build a world free of war and nuclear weapons.

The Peace Museum audiences wrote their comments using verbs such as *pray*, *wish*, *hope* and *desire* when they wrote about peace and a world free of nuclear weapons. Audiences firmly opposed nuclear weapons and war in general by reciting the horrors of the atomic bombing that were elaborated throughout the museum’s exhibition space. A visitor from the United Kingdom wrote, “So horrific. Must never be repeated.” (PM, February 28, 2006). A visitor from New York wrote, “The tricycle and helmet display says it all. Peace and the end of nuclear weaponry now.” (PM, February 26, 2006). Many visitors similarly noted one or two specific artifacts exhibited in the museum. We can understand from such comments that the museum exhibition was informative and that it made a notable impression to audiences.

While almost all comments inscribed in the notebooks recited the Spirit of Hiroshima with the language and artifacts exhibited in the Peace Museum, the overwhelming use of the aforementioned verbs suggests a sense of powerlessness on behalf of the audience. The powerlessness of individual actors to actively work toward world peace is also evident in visitors’ comment, which, for example, stated: “We can only hope the world learns from their mistakes”. (PM, February 27, 2006). Notable also is the fact that there was almost no mention of individual determination

to take actually work toward peace. An American visitor wrote, "I can only hope that the future leaders of the world...will take real and quick steps toward non-proliferation and disarmament [of nuclear weapons]". (PM, March 1, 2006). Many other visitors sought non-human power to solve human problems "God be merciful to us all and may this Peace reign!" (PM, March 2, 2006). The Peace Museum audiences frequently stressed politicians and others in positions of power, instead of themselves as individuals, as agents for making peace.

There occasionally was a statement suggesting that visitors were thinking critically about individual action for peace. In fact, many Peace Museum visitors inscribed comments referring to the idea that they were left only with the power of prayer to attain peace. A visitor from the Philippines wrote, "May we one day learn to stop wars and inhumanity to other and work for peace and justice." (PM, February 26, 2006). Another visitor wrote, "We can only pray for no repeat [of the atomic catastrophe]." (PM, February 26, 2006). These inscriptions suggest that, instead of one's own action, humans should wait for God and/or other abstract entity to bring about world peace. These comments reflecting powerlessness also suggest that audiences saw peace as a product of hope. Visitors often held prayer as the one substantial means to attain that hope. While it is undoubtedly true that prayer, even if it is not a direct action toward peace, is nonetheless a form of individual action. Yet, Peace Museum visitors' choice of prayer as an individual action is notable as it suggests that the Peace Museum, while it is successful in transmitting the Spirit of Hiroshima, lacks substance to mobilize its visitors to make a direct action toward peace.

Memorial Hall visitors, on the other hand, exhibited a much more direct sense of individual responsibility for world peace than did visitors to the Peace Museum. Visitor notebooks of the Memorial Hall revealed that the Spirit of Hiroshima has touched the audiences as well, even though the Memorial Hall provided no definitive or official explanation about the atomic bomb and its catastrophe. More notable is that the visitor notebooks of the Memorial Hall had an overwhelmingly larger number of statements that were written with an active voice. A student who came to Hiroshima before graduating from college, for example, asserted that he would think deeply about what he himself could do to prevent the repetition of such atrocity in the future (MH, March 7, 2006). Memorial Hall audiences often wrote long commentaries in the visitor notebooks to express their desire and will to think actively toward constructing world peace. Many visitors' comments also showed that Memorial Hall audiences were often confronted with challenging questions following their visit to the exhibition space.

A visitor whose mother had survived the atomic bombing wrote that their visit to the museum reminded him of his mother and her story. His mother told him that she had immediately lost all her emotions, such as sadness, fear, and anger, when she saw hundreds of bodies floating on the river after the bomb hit Hiroshima.

He expressed his concern that Hiroshima being represented in testimonies and stories would rapidly be further romanticized after the survivors died. This visitor concluded that he must appreciate all words survivors have divulged to testify to their experiences. He then affirmed that peace is a collective product of individuals who put their efforts to keep memories alive (MH, March 10, 2006). Another visitor noted that the museum exhibition made him feel the reality of the horrors brought on by the atomic bombing. However, he wrote that he came to the realization that he would not be able to come close to an understanding of the horrors the survivors actually experienced. This visitor concluded his statement with an assertion that he would have to think deeply about what he should do for future peace (MH, March 7, 2006). These writings assert that visitors' individual responsibility for future peace is a rare finding in the visitor notebooks of the Peace Museum. In this respect, as many visitors noted, the Memorial Hall applies pedagogy that is more "thought provoking" than that of the Peace Museum.

DISCUSSION

Hiroshima's two museums, standing almost side-by-side and exhibiting the same pedagogical goal, display distinctively different outcomes. Each museum, however, speaks to its audience with quite a different voice within the conception of peace. This study employed curriculum theories that were originally generated to illustrate curriculum approaches in schools to inquire and exhibit pedagogical impacts and their difference between Hiroshima's two museums and their exhibition spaces.

As data illustrated, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum was successful in conveying the importance of peace, and it has given audiences a firm desire for peace. The museum provides a broader historical framework and accounts of the events, setting up the atomic bombing of Hiroshima in the greater context of the Second World War. Together with raw accounts of the bombing and the aftermath of the destruction, Hiroshima is framed as a city and a community with a significant role and participation in the unfolding of the war. This political unfolding of war exposes visitors to political perspectives on whether the bombing was a necessary means in the context of war. The view of Hiroshima as "a victim of atomic bombing" therefore meets the challenges of the city's involvement in the war. However, the Peace Museum organizes its exhibition space to turn all historical and political contexts of the atomic bombing into a minute issue in the face of nuclear atrocities and human sufferings more generally. In this respect, the Peace Museum's exhibition space marks the master narrative that only allows a limited degree of freedom in interpreting the event.

The National Memorial Hall for the Atomic Bomb Victims, on the other hand, introduces audiences to a rather different experience of learning. We witness a shift in the exhibition subject, from the historical staging of war/the bomb to the

individual accounts of war/the bomb and its aftermath. The pain, emotion and personal turmoil appeal to the community of human experience with fear, pain and loss. Memorial Hall visitors emphasize with the feelings of the victims, and they can relate to the turmoil and thoughts even though most visitors can only do so by means of imagination. The Memorial Hall has opened the gates to visitors' participating in the inner turmoil and the questions being raised by the storytellers by way of bringing the experiences of A-bomb victims to a personal level for the audiences. The Memorial Hall has thus managed to foster a critical learner-centered pedagogy and curriculum by not defining any master narrative to guide the audience to have a particular learning experience. Visitors are left to generate their own understanding through what they take away from their contact with diverse and uncensored lived experiences of individual victims. This amalgam of accounts and testimonies gives visitors agency in making their own choices, and constructing their own meanings in reference to individual realities.

Museums, as sites for pedagogy, indeed carry similar approaches to those invoked in schools. The Peace Museum, in its exhibition space, carries diverse perspectives and conclusion of peace and war, along with technical, scientific, political and historical information. Peace in its complexity cannot be easily grasped, and therefore, the Peace Museum sets a master narrative that guides the visitor's understanding not only of the events in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but of peace itself. In other words, the driving voice belongs with the Peace Museum itself, and audiences are subjected to acquiring (sometimes acquiescing) the knowledge shaped through the museum's master narrative. This knowledge has become, by virtue of what the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park represents in the world today, a knowledge considered canonical on the subject; thus this knowledge is *teachable* without much active involvement by audiences (learners) in the process of knowledge construction. This teachable-knowledge has a well-structured, connected, compact storyline, and it organizes the ways in which information is accessed and attempts to discipline both newly acquired knowledge and possible previous ideas about wars, the A-bomb and peace. However, this mode of receiving knowledge eschews visitors' active participation in meaning making, and museum visitors are made into mere consumers of knowledge that is arguably constructed beyond their reach. As a result, the museum's exhibitions are significantly less successful in initiating in visitors a sense of agency and individual involvement in the process of peace building. In this respect, the Peace Museum is most successful in making its audience into a medium professing the knowledge that is exhibited in a *teachable format* and is built outside of their immediate individual realities.

Unlike the Peace Museum that retains the authority over knowledge and, using a master narrative, exercises control over what is being learned, the Memorial Hall sets up the environment for individual agency and taking responsibility for one's own learning. However, it runs to a risk of losing certainty over what is being

learned. The latter is pervasive in the Memorial Hall notebooks, making them very different from the Peace Museum's notebooks. Visitors to the Memorial Hall talk about the necessity for active involvement of their own in the process of peace building, and it is emphasized that the responsibility for working towards peace belongs in the hands of all individuals. Alas, it is important to note that rhetorical statements that hold responsibility evenly to all people result in a defused responsibility for individuals to take specific action and specific responsibilities needed to actually accomplish a plan for peace. Hence, while the Memorial Hall was successful in building individual agency for peace building, it may lack a curriculum that constructively sees agency at work and in action beyond rhetoric.

The Memorial Hall was successful in opening access to those personal dimensions of the experiences that are beyond prescriptive political frameworks, and, thus, it can be said to carry a learner-centered curriculum that is reflective of critical pedagogy. The experiences exhibited in the museum space are difficult to represent and are fully articulated through language. Therefore, at least part of the content of their exhibits remains incommunicable within a single framework of knowledge, and thus *unteachable*. The Memorial Hall provides a space to represent such voices that may stand in conflict with or overlooked by/in a canonical discourse on Hiroshima and its atomic bomb experiences. Those voices can be heard when we remove the frameworks that have suppressed such voices from being heard outside the intimate framework of narrators. The Memorial Hall's exhibition space gives access to aspects of war, peace and atomic bombings that are, in themselves, unteachable by means of language and structure, and it gives access to the diversity of voices that may not be expressed within the framework of official canonical knowledge. The Memorial Hall thus acts to empower not only the audience as learners, but also the survivors (narrators) as participants in the process of learning. Yet, at the same time, the Memorial Hall loses its control over what learners make of knowledge from their active engagement in the museum's exhibition space.

Hiroshima's two museums offer us an insight into the difficulties for museums to exhibit those controversial subjects that are yet to be formed a coherent understanding and/or meaning as the knowledge. It is a struggle in ensuring objectivity in representing those events that are inviting political and historical controversy. The Peace Museum, for example, sought objectivity by way of representing two canonically different views about the atomic bombing: one by illustrating the bombing as a military strategy that put an end to Japan's militarism; another by highlighting the bomb's catastrophic damages to individual human lives. The Memorial Hall, on the other hand, pursued objectivity by opening its exhibition space for subjective representations of the bomb's survivors and victims. The Memorial Hall thus allows the subjectivity of its visitors when interpreting and inquiring of the multitudinous meanings represented in the museum's exhibition

space. Hiroshima's two museums, therefore, jointly provide spaces where visitors are not only able to subscribe prescriptive official knowledge but they can also actively negotiate meanings from multitudinous representations that are often hidden behind the official knowledge. In this respect, this study argues a possibility of museums to use their exhibition spaces not only to represent teachable knowledge—the knowledge visitors can take home without their active participation to the knowledge construction—but also to provide a dialogical environment where visitors can negotiate meanings to take a part of knowledge construction. Indeed, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park has a fortune of having two museums offering unique spaces to provide us an insight. However, Hiroshima's two museums can still be an important site of experiments for seeking a museum's pedagogical potentials.

CONCLUSION

This study displayed the Peace Museum and the Memorial Hall as curricular environments complement each other by filling each other's gaps. The examination of visitor notebooks from both museums suggests that they both fall short of the museums' particular goals: The Peace Museum teaches the knowledge intended and packaged, and it apparently manages to reach a shared understanding of the process of peace building in relation to the atomic bombing. However, although canonical knowledge has been acquired, visitors feel powerless and without agency in imaging their roles in constructing peace. At it turns out, the Memorial Hall supports active learning and individual agency, yet it may lose access to a critical understanding of what is being learned. The Memorial Hall, nevertheless, acts to deconstruct parts of the master narrative ensued from the Peace Museum. The Peace Museum, meanwhile, highlights the limitations of the Memorial Hall, where learning threatens to become unreliably inconsistent and diverse because it is too subjective and too chaotic and depends on learners' choices in their involvement in knowledge construction. Even though both museums similarly aim for constructing an active involvement in the process of peace with a deeper understanding of the complexity in the war and peace process, one can hardly say, judging from the outcomes visible in the visitor notebooks, that any one of the two museums was more effective than the other in attaining their pedagogical goal.

This study has also shown a potential use of visitor notebooks as an evaluating tool for measuring the kinds of pedagogy embedded in a museum's exhibition space. Perhaps more importantly, this study also opened a possibility of using visitor notebooks to evaluate the effectiveness of a museum's exhibition space as a curriculum. Hiroshima's two museums and their exhibition spaces resembled closely curriculum approaches in schools. This study thus employed curriculum theories to illustrate the kinds of teaching and learning that could occur in each museum by way of reading through their exhibition spaces as a readable text. Then, through inquiring into visitor notebooks, this study has identified what kinds of learning are actually generated in each museum's exhibition spaces. In so doing, this

study has demonstrates the usefulness of inquiring into museum's exhibition space as a curriculum text to examine its pedagogical potential. Furthermore, it demonstrates that museum visitor notebooks are indeed useful resources for evaluating the kinds of learning actually occurring in a museum's exhibition space.

Through reading a museum's exhibition space as a curriculum text, we can apply the curriculum theories to inquire into a museum's pedagogical potentials and possible shortcomings. However, it must be noted that simply applying curriculum theories invoked from the study of schools is perhaps not sufficient to inquire into the kinds of teaching and learning occurring in a museum's exhibition space. Museums do not have teachers to act as agents mediating between conflictive curriculum approaches to drive audiences toward constructive ends. The exhibition space and exhibition themselves are the primary pedagogical tool for museums. Lacking teacher agency means that there is no active agent outside of museum audiences themselves to negotiate learning in/with museum's exhibition space. Put otherwise, both the agency of mediating different learning experiences and the responsibility of constructive learning are left in the hands of individual audiences whether museums borrow knowledge-centered curriculum or learner-centered curriculum. This important difference between museums and schools as pedagogical spaces makes it seemingly insufficient to carry on a study of museums as pedagogical environment solely because both environments are designed for and/or intended for learning.

That said, and as this study exhibited through examining Hiroshima's two museums standing almost side-by-side and carrying the same pedagogical goals, curriculum theories can provide a useful lens to inquire not only into the kinds of teaching museums do with their exhibition spaces, but also the kinds of learning possible in them. This study also proved that visitor notebooks could be used as a substantial resource for an understanding of the kinds of experiences museum audiences had. Yet, more important is that visitor notebooks could provide a resource for evaluating the effectiveness of museums in generating the kinds of learning through their exhibition spaces. This study thus concludes with the thought that, in order to further enrich the educational role of museums, further inquiry is meaningful into the curriculum theories applied in the contexts of learning that are absent of teacher-agency.

TABLES

Table 1

Contingency table of responsibility for the past among visitors to Memorial Museum and Memorial Hall

		Facility		Total
		Memorial Museum	Memorial Hall	
Responsibility for the past	Responsibility mentioned	2 (0.6 %)	8 (2.6%)	10 (3.2 %)
	Responsibility NOT mentioned	227 (73.0 %)	74 (23.8 %)	301 (96.8 %)
Total		229 (73.6 %)	82 (26.4 %)	311 (100%)

Table 2

Contingency table of responsibility for the future peace among visitors to Memorial Museum and Memorial Hall

		Facility		Total
		Memorial Museum	Memorial Hall	
Carrier of Responsibility (carrier of responsibility for the future peace)	Individual Self	9 (2.9%)	12 (3.9%)	21 (6.8 %)
	Specific Others	26 (8.4 %)	3 (1.0%)	29 (9.3 %)
	Collective (self/others)	7 (2.3 %)	11 (3.5 %)	18 (5.8 %)
	Abstract*	45 (14.5 %)	4 (1.3 %)	49 (15.8 %)
	Not Mentioned	142 (45.7 %)	52 (16.7%)	194 (62.4 %)
Total		229 (73.6 %)	82 (26.4 %)	311 (100%)

* “Abstract” indicates there is no real carrier of responsibility. This includes comments that mentioned nothing about responsibility.

*COMPARATIVE INQUIRY OF MUSEUM PEDAGOGY: HIROSHIMA'S TWO MUSEUMS AND
THEIR TEACHING OF CATASTROPHE*

Table 3

Contingency table of the sense of responsibility among visitors to Memorial Museum and Memorial Hall

		Facility		Total
		Memorial Museum	Memorial Hall	
Sense of responsibility	Civic Responsibility	7 (2.2%)	26 (8.3%)	33 (10.5 %)
	Responsibility on Political Leaders	16 (5.1 %)	1 (0.3%)	17 (5.4 %)
	Responsibility on Society in General	14 (4.5 %)	2 (0.6 %)	16 (5.1 %)
	Not Mentioned	194 (62.0 %)	53 (16.9%)	247 (78.9 %)
Total		231 (73.8 %)	82 (26.2 %)	313 (100%)

Table 4

Contingency table of the roles to the museum's exhibition subject (construction of peace and the abolishment of nuclear weapons) perceived among the visitors to Memorial Museum and Memorial Hall

		Facility		Total
		Memorial Museum	Memorial Hall	
Perceived roles	Active Engagement as a Party Interested	16 (5.1%)	22 (7.0%)	38 (12.1 %)
	No Engagement as a Party Interested	215 (68.7 %)	60 (19.2%)	275 (87.9 %)
Total		231 (73.8 %)	82 (26.2 %)	313 (100%)

REFERENCE:

- AAM (Standing Professional Committees Council of the American Association of Museums). (2009) *Standards for Museum Exhibitions and Indicators of Excellence*. Online: <http://name-aam.org/about/who-we-are/standards> Retrieved on September 18, 2009.
- Aronowitz, S. and Giroux, H. (1991) *Postmodern Education*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Asada, Sadao. (1993) "Kinokogumo to Kokumin Shinri." *Amerika to Nihon*. Tokyo: Sairyusha, pp. 81-107.
- Asada, Sadao. (1995) "Genbaku Toka no Shogeki to Kohuku no Kettei: Genbaku Ronso no Aratanaru Shiza." *Sekai*. 616, pp. 232-242.
- Bakeman, R. & Gottman, J.M. (1986) *Observing Interaction: An Introduction to Sequential Analysis*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, Barton J. (1995a) "Understanding the Atomic Bomb and the Japanese Surrender: Missed Opportunities, Little-Known Near Disasters, and Modern Memory." *Diplomatic History*. 19(2), pp. 227-274.
- Bernstein, Barton J. (1995b) "Atomic Bombing Reconsidered." *Foreign Affairs*. January-February, 1995.
- Bruner, Jerome. (1963) *The Process of Education*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bunch, Lonny. (1995) "Fighting the Good Fight." *Museum News*. 21, pp. 32-35, 58-62.
- Chambers, Marlene. (1999) "Critiquing Exhibition Criticism." *Museum News*. 78(5), pp. 31-37.
- CSE (Chugokuchihou Seibikyoku Eizenbu). (2002) "Kokuritsu Hiroshima Genbaku Shibotsusha Tuitou Heiwa Kinenkan: Irei/koukyu heiwa heno inori to shimin no ikoi no ba." *Kensetsukai*. 27(3), 34-36.
- Dower, John W. (1993) *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Ediger, Marlow. (2001) *Teaching Social Studies Successfully*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Eisner, Elliot. (1994) *The Educational Imagination: On design and Evaluation of School Programs*. (3rd ed.) New York: Macmillan.
- Ellis, Arthur K. (2004) *Exemplars of Curriculum Theory*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Ellsworth, Elisabeth. (2005) *Places of Learning: Media, Architecture, Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

- Findlen, Paula. (1994) *Possessing Nature: Museums, Collecting, and Scientific Culture in Early Modern Italy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fujioka, Nobukatsu. (1998) "Heiwa Kinenkan' Kensetu Iinkai Koubo Iin no Henko-do." *Seiron*. 312, pp. 274-282.
- Giroux, Henry. (1983) *Theory and Resistance in Education: Towards a Pedagogy for the Opposition*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey Publishers.
- Giroux, Henry. (1988) *Schooling and the Struggle for Public Life*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giroux, Henry. (1992) *Border Crossing: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Hunkins, F. (1980). *Curriculum development: Program improvement*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- HPMMa (Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum). (no date) *Leaflet*.
- HPMMb (Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum). (no date) *Virtual Museum*. Online:
http://www.pcf.city.hiroshima.jp/virtual/VirtualMuseum_e/visit_e/est_e/panel/ (Retrieved, July 12, 2009).
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. (1999) *The Educational Role of the Museum*. (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. (2006) "The Power of Museum Pedagogy." Hugh H. Genoways, ed., *Museum Philosophy for the Twenty-First Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Altamira, pp. 235-246.
- Jo, Yukiko. (1996) "Smithsonian Kyokai Genbakuten ni Taisuru Beikoku Shuyoshi no Roncho Bunseki." *Current English Studies*. 35, 51-62.
- Linenthal, Edward T. (1995) *Preserving Memory: The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Longstreet, W.S. and Shane, H.G. (1993) *Curriculum for a New Millennium*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Macdonald, Sharon. (2005) "Accessing Audiences: Visiting Visitor Books." *Museum and Society*. 3(3), pp. 119-136.
- Nishibe, Jiro. (2002) "Shizen Kaiwa Data 'Guzen no Shotaimen' no Kokai: Sono Houhouron ni Tsuite." *Jinbungakuho*. 330, pp. 1-18.
- Oliva, P. (1992). *Developing the curriculum*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Sodei, Rinjiro. (1995a) "Public History towa Nanika: Smithsonian Genbakuten to Heiwa Kinenkan." *Sekai*. 607, pp. 38-44.
- Sodei, Rinjiro. (1995b) "Smithsonian Genbakuten Ronso kara

Manabukoto.” *Senso Sekinin Kenkyu*. 10, 48-55.

- Takahashi, Shiro. (1998) “Heiwa Hakubutsukan no Giman: ‘Henko Kyokasho’ ni Junkyo shita Tenjinaiyo wo Saikentoseyo.” *Voice*. 244, pp. 132-140.
- Takaki, Ronald. (1995) *Hiroshima: Why America Dropped the Atomic Bomb*. New York: Back Bay Books.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1995). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Yoneyama, Lisa. (1998) “‘Kakusan’ no Pedagogy: Sumithsonian Genbakuten Ronso ga Toikaketa Mono.” *Inpaction*. 109, pp. 48-57.
- Yurita, Makito. (2007) “Reclaiming the Authorship of Hiroshima Testimonies: Differentiating Testimonies and Memories of Historical Events.” *Graduate Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*, 5(2): 34-52.
- Yurita, Makito. (2008) *Metahistory and Memory: Making/Remaking the Knowledge of Hiroshima’s Atomic Bombing*. Dissertation, available via ProQuest Reg. No. TX 6-656-450.
- Yurita, Makito & Reed, Dornan. (2009) “Hiroshima: Whose Story Is It?” *Children’s Literature Association Quarterly*. 34(3), pp. 229-240.
- Wisel, Elie. (1978) *A Jew Today*. New York: Random House.