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Introduction

The Nanjing Massacre in 1937 is considered by both Chinese and international scholars to be one of the most horrific atrocities committed by the Japanese military during the Second Sino-Japanese War. Although the Japanese had been nibbling away at Northeastern China for some time, starting with the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905 and focused mainly in Manchuria, the Second Sino-Japanese War (in Chinese, 抗日战争, or the War of Japanese Resistance) is considered by many to have started after the Marco Polo Bridge Incident on July 7, 1937. This Incident led to the break-out of full-scale war between China and Japan. By August, the Japanese military had advanced as far as Shanghai. The Battle of Shanghai was one of the longest, bloodiest battles in the War of Japanese Resistance. Although fighting began in Shanghai on August 13th, it did not end until the end of November, over four months later.

After suffering devastating losses from the Battle of Shanghai, the Japanese army determined to march on the Nationalist capital of China, Nanjing, where Chiang Kaishek’s government was located. Having expected an easy victory in Shanghai, the Japanese military was angered and frustrated by the toll the battle took on their soldiers. In their frenzied march from Shanghai to Nanjing, the Japanese soldiers killed and looted in the name of conquering Nanjing and eventually forcing Chinese surrender. By the time the soldiers reached the city, they were hungry for goods, women, and revenge.¹

On December 13, 1937, the Japanese troops entered the city of Nanjing. The preconditions for disaster were further augmented by the Nationalist Army, whose chaotic, cowardly retreat from the city not only left Nanjing’s civilian population defenseless, but also stranded around 100,000 troops. These Nationalist troops disguised themselves in civilian

¹The Nanjing Massacre in History and Historiography, Ed. Joshua A. Fogel (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2000), 18
clothing to blend in with the crowds, making it difficult at times to distinguish between the combatant and the noncombatant.²

When the city fell, those who remained in Nanjing and in the surrounding area were subjected to what Chinese-American author Iris Chang has dubbed “six weeks of horror.”³ The first six weeks of the Japanese occupation are considered the most concentrated period of the atrocities committed by the Japanese soldiers against the civilians of Nanjing. The Nanjing Massacre is most well-known for the slaughter and rape of many thousands of Chinese civilian non-combatants. Although the exact number is still contested, most scholars concur that the total number of Chinese victims (including both civilians and soldiers) was on the scale of hundreds of thousands; the official Chinese government figure, which is prominently displayed at the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall in Nanjing, is 300,000. Civilians were not merely killed; they were often killed in brutal, inhumane fashions:

Among the mass killings, in addition to those who died by the sword and firing squad, others were burned, buried alive, or drowned. Several, after being soaked with gasoline, were set on fire by gunshot, causing the wounded person to lie covered in flames, rolling and writhing underground, until finally dying a miserable death. Individual, sporadic acts of torture and killing included splitting, gutting, slicing, piercing alive, and dog biting. Some were even burned with acid and then left, burning all over. Others were tortured to death. Two Japanese lieutenants amused themselves by having a killing contest. The first one to reach 100 killed won the “game.” Then they raised the limit to 150. In addition to killing, the Nanking Massacre also involved rape, arson, theft, and other violent crimes. The Japanese troops who attacked Nanking raped tens of thousands of women, many of whom were then murdered.⁴

The innumerable rapes by Japanese troops led to another well-known name for the Nanjing Massacre: the Rape of Nanking.

---

⁴ Sun, 36-37
The Nanjing Massacre was by no means an isolated occurrence, but rather one of many atrocities committed by the Japanese military in conquered areas of China during the Second Sino-Japanese War.\(^5\) Such wartime atrocities are by no means limited to the Japanese, but are a stain on the written history of humanity as a whole. When looking at atrocities such as the Nanjing Massacre, it is all too easy to slip into demonizing the Japanese. This is a dangerous tendency, though, because it is unfair to blame an entire ethnic group\(^6\) for the evils committed by a small subsection of the population. Unfortunately, the propaganda in China’s Patriotic Education Campaign has often erred on the side of over-generalizing “the Japanese,” which is a dangerous trap to fall into.\(^7\)

It is often the case that a specific historical event will take on a symbolic meaning that is greater than the objective details of the event itself. Such has been the case with the Nanjing Massacre. It is the Nanjing Massacre, rather than any other atrocity in the Second Sino-Japanese War, that has evolved into a powerful, modern-day symbol of Japanese military aggression in Chinese national rhetoric. In the 1990s, the Nanjing Massacre was utilized as an important symbol in China’s Patriotic Education Campaign, initiated by Jiang Zemin in 1994 through the CCP (Chinese Communist Party)’s Propaganda Department. Through creating a stronger correlation between the Nanjing Massacre and Japanese aggression, Jiang Zemin contributed to

---

\(^5\) Other symbolic atrocities include massacres in other Chinese cities, the “three alls” campaign, Unit 731 and other biological experiments, the “comfort women” issue, etc. – *The Nanjing Massacre in History and Historiography*, Ed. Joshua A. Fogel (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2000), 24

\(^6\) Japan is more ethnically homogenous than most nations. Thus, when I say the “Japanese,” I am referring to both the Japanese ethnic group and the Japanese nation. (Different ethnic groups do exist, such as the Ainu in the north, the Okinawans in the south, and the Koreans, but these groups compose a very small percentage of the Japanese population as a whole.)

\(^7\) As European studies scholar Charles S. Maier writes in his forward to Fogel’s *The Nanjing Massacre in History and Historiography* (ix), “Historians should remain distrustful of any easy generalization concerning nations as a whole. Modern nations represent communities of debate and dissent united by language or by shared tensions over language; by a sense of shared, though often contested, history; by a partial commitment, though again contested, to redistribute some material resources among citizens; and ultimately by some unitary representation in the world of states. When it comes to what nations think and believe, we generalize at our peril.”
the decline of Sino-Japanese relations during his term as President of the PRC (People’s Republic of China).

The historiography of the Nanjing Massacre is not just about the past, but equally about the present. When I use the term “historiography,” I mean the collective body of materials through which the Massacre has been interpreted from 1938 until the present. Not only does this historiography include the work of historians and journalists, but also entertainment, such as novels and films; physical sites, such as the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall; educational resources, such as textbooks, documentaries, and even websites; and even government-initiated propaganda. My understanding of historiography follows that of China scholar Michael Berry, whose research for *A History of Pain: Trauma in Modern Chinese Literature and Film* is based on the premise “that fiction, film, and other popular media play an important and fundamental role in shaping popular conceptions and imaginations of history and, in this case, historical atrocities.”

Historiography is always biased by the sociopolitical circumstances surrounding the person or group interpreting the historical event. In turn, the historiography of an event can have a significant impact on the present. As European studies scholar Charles S. Maier puts it, “Historical self-reflection cannot escape politics and will always be deeply affected by it because different versions of the past are so important for legitimating claims on power in the present.” However, I take this idea a step further: I believe that not only is historiography *influenced* by the present, but that it also *influences* the present. In the case of the Nanjing Massacre, its historiography in mainland China – most of which has been controlled by the CCP – has had a significant effect on both how the Chinese people view the Japanese and, subsequently, on

---

9 Fogel, xv
international relations\textsuperscript{10} between China and Japan. I will take the above quote describing the inhumane slaughter of civilians in the Nanjing Massacre as an example.

The above quote is part of a book entitled \textit{Nanking 1937: Memory and Healing} that was an outgrowth of the Princeton University Nanking 1937 Conference. The conference was held on November 22, 1997, and was one of the first scholarly events in the United States to address the Nanjing Massacre.\textsuperscript{11} Chinese, Japanese, and American scholars at the conference presented a wide range of viewpoints concerning the Massacre. \textit{Nanking 1937} contains articles written by these various scholars divided into four sections – Nanking in a Global Context, Revisiting Nanking: Views from China and Japan, Remembering Nanking, and Healing the Wounds. The above quote is part of an article entitled “Causes of the Nanjing Massacre” (part of Remembering Nanking) by Sun Zhaiwei. Sun is a renowned Chinese historian at the Jiangsu Academy of Social Sciences and the editor-in-chief of the book \textit{南京大屠杀} [\textit{The Nanking Massacre}], a collection of Chinese scholarly views on the Massacre which was published in Beijing in 1997. In his article, Sun provides a detailed analysis of both the direct and indirect causes of the Nanjing Massacre.

Taking the historical context into account, how can we interpret the above quote in light of what we know about the author and the sociopolitical circumstances that surrounded him as he wrote? First, Sun Zhaiwei is a widely recognized Nanjing Massacre historical scholar in mainland China, and his arguments are representative of those of the mainland Chinese scholarly community.\textsuperscript{12} Since he was the editor-in-chief of an influential book on the Massacre published in mainland China, we can assume that his views reflect the CCP officially-sanctioned view of

\textsuperscript{10} I discuss what I mean by “international relations” later in the introduction.
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Nanking 1937: Memory and Healing}, Ed. Fei Fei Li, Robert Sabella, and David Liu (Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2002), xxv.
\textsuperscript{12} Sun Zhaiwei, 35
the Massacre. This is because scholarly work published in China, especially when it deals with politically sensitive topics, is censored for consistency with official truth claims. Since Sun’s research was conducted in the 1990s, we can also assume that he was influenced by Jiang’s Patriotic Education Campaign according to circumstances I will explain further below.

An integral part of the Patriotic Education Campaign was the teaching of history in a manner to promote nationalism; thus, this affected how Japanese military atrocities were presented in popular media and in the classroom. To promote nationalism among the youth, more time was spent in class learning about modern Chinese history and the Century of Humiliation, particularly the Second Sino-Japanese War. As part of this, Japanese military atrocities in general and the Nanjing Massacre in particular were elaborated on and emphasized more in both the classroom and in the public sphere than they had been previously. Sun describes the inhumane actions of the Japanese soldiers in the Nanjing Massacre in horrific and nuanced detail, which is a representative depiction of the Massacre in the contemporary Chinese scholarly community during the 1990s.

Sun’s research on the historical details of the Nanjing Massacre has been widely accredited in mainland China. In one of his most influential works of research, “The Nanking Massacre and the Nanking Population,” he asserts that the death toll in Nanjing was even greater than 300,000, the official number of victims adhered to by the Chinese government. Not only was Sun’s work influential in the perceptions of the Nanjing Massacre in mainland China, but also in the international community. His research was cited in Iris Chang’s *Rape of Nanking*, which was also published in 1997 and contributed to a greater awareness of the Massacre in the

---

13 We can safely assume this because up to the present in China, anything that contradicts government-sanctioned views is censored, and will not appear in the press or in published scholarly works that are circulated among the public.
West. In fact, Chang heavily relies on Sun’s research, and considers him to have conducted the most thorough study of the death toll in Nanjing.\(^{15}\)

A scholarly work based on a historical event can have a strong influence on other scholarly works, such as Sun’s research did on Chang’s book. Furthermore, it can have a significant effect on both public opinion and, indirectly, government responses. For instance, less than a month after Sun had presented his research at Princeton, he also participated in a conference in Tokyo, “How to Perceive the Nanking Massacre: Verifications by Japanese, Chinese, and American Researchers,” on December 13-14, 1997. Since 1997 was the 60\(^{th}\) anniversary of the Nanjing Massacre, it was quite a sensitive year for Sino-Japanese relations, particularly in light of the fact that by 1996, relations between China and Japan were already at an all-time low since the reestablishment of diplomatic relations in 1972.\(^{16}\) As I will discuss throughout this thesis, the historiographical depictions of the 1937 Nanjing Massacre during the 1990s shaped both international perspectives on the Massacre and Sino-Japanese relations during and after this period.

In writing about China and Japan’s complex relationship, when I use the term “international relations,” I am referring to more than the traditional realist interpretation of international relations,\(^{17}\) which rather simplistically boils international relations down to the formal diplomatic relations between one state and another – in this case, between China and Japan. Although diplomatic relations are certainly important, I view international relations as a


\(^{17}\) The traditional realist theory focuses on the role of the state in international relations, focusing on how the government of one state relates to another. This term ‘realism’ was coined due to the argument that “in reality, only relations amongst state governments ‘mattered’ in world politics.” – R.J. Barry Jones, Peter M. Jones and Ken Dark, *Introduction to International Relations: Problems and Perspectives* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 5
wider term, closer to the constructivist theory,\textsuperscript{18} as a social construct that encompasses not only the state but also the individual and non-governmental groups. I believe an important component of international relations between two nations is how the peoples of two nations perceive the “other” – in this case, how the Chinese people view the Japanese people, and vice versa. As I will show, public attitudes have a powerful, often unintentional effect on diplomatic relations that cannot be taken lightly.

Historiography is not static, but evolves constantly. In the case of the Nanjing Massacre, from the establishment of the People’s Republic of China on October 1, 1949 to present, the Nanjing Massacre has been utilized for different political agendas in China, not only to heighten Chinese nationalism vis-à-vis Japan, but also vis-à-vis other nations. For instance, during the Korean War, Chinese propaganda utilized the Nanjing Massacre to promote anti-American sentiments, claiming that Americans who remained in Nanjing during the winter of 1937 chose to protect their property over protecting Chinese lives.\textsuperscript{19} In the 1960s, the PRC government utilized the Nanjing Massacre to attack the Guomindang government in Taiwan, recalling the cowardice of the Guomindang troops as they abandoned the civilians of Nanjing in the face of the Japanese invasion.\textsuperscript{20} During this decade, the government also chose not to publicize details of the Massacre. Namely, this was because as a young nation that had just rid itself of foreign encroachment, the PRC did not want to promote a victim mentality, but rather a strong mentality

\textsuperscript{18} The constructivist theory in international relations developed more recently than the realist school, and involves the individual actor as well as the state. Different actors have different interests and objectives that influence international relations, and can be found in many different societal spheres – not only in government, but also in education, scholarly circles, the media, literary circles, etc.: “Constructivists see [society] as a constitutive realm, the site that generates actors as knowledgeable social and political agents, the realm that makes them who they are...they emphasize the social determinants of social and political agency and action.” – Scott Burchill, et. al., \textit{Theories of International Relations} (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 199


\textsuperscript{20} Fogel, 26
that emphasized revolutionary progress. This can be contrasted with the 1980s and 1990s, when the PRC had begun its economic development under Deng Xiaoping’s Open Door Policy and was no longer an unstable, fledgling nation.

The Nanjing Massacre became a notable part of the PRC’s nationalist rhetoric in the 1980s with events such as the 1982 Textbook Controversy and the 1985 protests triggered by the fortieth anniversary of the end of World War II. As part of the commemoration of this fortieth anniversary, the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall was opened on August 15, 1985. This was a significant step in the historiography of the Nanjing Massacre, and it represented the government’s official view on the Massacre. Although the Memorial was created to commemorate the past, it was also intricately linked to both domestic and international politics in the 1980s. On a domestic level, the ultimate focus of the Memorial was (and still remains) to connect the nation’s past to the present leadership of the Communist Party and to promote national loyalty through patriotic education. As the symbol of past Japanese military aggression, the Massacre became a focal point for anti-Japanese sentiments among the Chinese public.

Although anti-Japanese protests increased in China during the 1980s, the Chinese public ended up focusing their protests on the shortcomings of their own government, ultimately culminating in the Tiananmen Square Massacre of 1989. As a result of Tiananmen, Deng Xiaoping’s political reputation was damaged, and he retired from the political scene in 1992. The following year, on March 27, 1993, Jiang Zemin became the president of the PRC. During the Jiang era, from 1993 to 2002, Sino-Japanese relations deteriorated significantly due to a number of factors, including China’s hardened stance on Taiwan, China’s continued nuclear tests, the

---

22 Shirk, 160.
23 Fogel, 34.
24 Fogel, 35-36
25 I discuss this further in Chapter II.
Diaoyu Islands territorial dispute, and China’s stance against Japan becoming a permanent member on the UN security council. Keeping all of these factors in mind, however, I am focused on the Patriotic Education Campaign and how it created a stronger correlation between the Nanjing Massacre and Japanese aggression in the Chinese popular psyche. The campaign led to increasing anti-Japanese sentiments among the Chinese public, and in turn, Sino-Japanese diplomatic tensions were also exacerbated.

My initial interest in the Nanjing Massacre began when I read Iris Chang’s *The Rape of Nanking* as I was flying to Beijing to study abroad for a year. Although I have since come to realize that her book has multiple flaws,26 I still consider it as an important starting point for my research on the historiography of the Massacre. After reading through *The Rape of Nanking*, I decided to do research in Beijing on how the Nanjing Massacre had evolved into such a strong symbol of Japanese cruelty, particularly in mainland China. The main component of my research was through interviews: I interviewed multiple Chinese college-aged students in Beijing. The purpose of my research was to gauge the relevance of the Second Sino-Japanese War and the Nanjing Massacre for the younger Chinese generation. In my interviews, I asked students various questions concerning their education on the Nanjing Massacre and the impact of popular media on their views. My results showed that there was a strong emphasis on both the Nanjing Massacre and Japanese military aggression in both Chinese primary and secondary education.

After reading *The Rape of Nanking*, I read more serious scholarly books dealing with the historiography of the Nanjing Massacre from the perspectives of American, Chinese, and Japanese scholars. Of particular use to me were the works of Joshua Fogel, Takashi Yoshida, and Susan Shirk. Most of my research has been conducted in English; however, although I have not used many Chinese language sources, all of my interviews in Beijing were conducted in

26 I will discuss this further in Chapter II.
Mandarin, which has helped shape my understanding of Sino-Japanese relations in the context of Chinese linguistic and cultural practices.

My thesis is interdisciplinary, dealing with the overlap between multiple different fields: international relations, domestic politics, historiography, literature and film, and education. The historical scope of this research is China from the Second Sino-Japanese War to the present. However, my specific focus is China in the 1990s. The overall goal for my paper is to more fully understand how the Nanjing Massacre has become such a potent focal point for anti-Japanese sentiments in China, and how this in turn has impacted Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations.

The first chapter will give an overview of Mao Zedong, Deng Xiaoping, and Jiang Zemin’s respective approaches to Sino-Japanese relations. In Chapter 2, I will discuss the historiographical developments for the Nanjing Massacre, both in scholarly circles and in popular media, in the 1980s and 1990s. The rise of the Patriotic Education Campaign and the strengthening of the correlation between the Nanjing Massacre and Japanese military aggression will also be included as part of this section. Chapter 3 will take a closer look at Sino-Japanese relations as a whole in the 1990s and how the Nanjing Massacre fits into this.

Chapter I: Jiang Zemin and His Predecessors

To understand why Jiang Zemin’s approach to relations with Japan in the 1990s was noteworthy, it is essential to compare his approach to that of his predecessors, Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping. Unlike Jiang, who in his focus on domestic politics largely neglected diplomatic relations with Japan, both Mao and Deng were very intentional in building positive Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations: Mao mainly for political reasons and Deng mainly for economic reasons.
There were strong anti-Japanese sentiments during the Mao era (1949-1976), particularly among the older generation, who still had bitter, painful memories of the Japanese occupation that had wrought such destruction. However, Mao was such a strong leader that he could control these public sentiments. Thus, even though those in Mao’s generation had the most reason to hate the Japanese, during the Mao era (1949 to 1976), Mao and his premier, Zhou Enlai, promoted peaceful and friendly relations with Japan, as Susan Shirk notes. During the 1950s, when the Cold War was in full swing, Mao and Zhou sought good relations with Japan as a counterbalance against the United States.\(^\text{27}\) In the 1970s, after relations with the Soviets had spiraled downward, Mao sought to use Japan as a counterbalance against the USSR. Indeed, during the Mao era, Sino-Japanese friendship was a major theme in political education and media propaganda.\(^\text{28}\) If Mao needed to mobilize the public against an international threat, he would target the United States or the Soviet Union as scapegoats, but never Japan.\(^\text{29}\) Good relations with Japan were seen as crucial as a ‘buffer’ to Western imperialism and, later, Soviet-style communism.

Since Mao was a powerful figurehead for the Chinese populace, what he said was followed; thus, when Mao stressed good relations with Japan as a high-level political decision, this decision was followed by the public. For example, in August of 1955, PRC delegates participated in the first World Rally against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs held in Hiroshima. The PRC donated 7.2 million yen to help cover the costs of the event. In 1972, when diplomatic relations were normalized between China and Japan, Mao did not seek an apology from Japan for the atrocities committed during the Second Sino-Japanese War as necessary; he believed that

\(^{27}\) Shirk, 158  
\(^{28}\) Shirk, 158  
\(^{29}\) See examples in Section II on how the Nanjing Massacre was utilized politically by the PRC in the 1950s against the United States, particularly during the Korean War.
forcing a generation of Japanese to shoulder the indemnity from a war they did not commit was unfair.\textsuperscript{30}

In the September 29\textsuperscript{th}-30\textsuperscript{th} 1972 joint communiqué, the Japanese side expressed that it was “keenly conscious of the responsibility for the serious damage that Japan caused in the past to the Chinese people through war, and deeply reproaches itself.”\textsuperscript{31} Apparently, in the original wording of the apology, stated by Japanese Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka in a 1972 dinner speech in Beijing, Tanaka had apologized for the “big trouble”\textsuperscript{32} Japan had brought China during the war. Mao and Zhou were not happy with this wording, because they believed it did not emphasize the Japanese atrocities enough. However, the following day, they were able to persuade the Japanese-then foreign minister, Ôhira Masayoshi, to change the wording of the statement to acknowledge Japan’s war responsibility.\textsuperscript{33} After this apology, neither Mao nor Zhou considered it necessary for Japan to make any further verbal concessions. There were few publications on the Second Sino-Japanese War in the 1970s precisely because Chinese leaders had instructed scholars to steer clear of this sensitive historical topic.\textsuperscript{34} Mao and Zhou’s approach can be strongly contrasted with Jiang’s: Jiang both aggressively emphasized the history issue in the Patriotic Education Campaign throughout his term\textsuperscript{35} and vigorously sought an official apology from Japan during his 1998 diplomatic visit to Tokyo.\textsuperscript{36} The fact that the Chinese leaders one, renounced China’s demands for war reparations from Japan and, two, were able to convince the

\begin{flushright}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Shirk, 158
\item \textsuperscript{32} Shirk, 296
\item \textsuperscript{33} Wan, 89
\item \textsuperscript{34} Wan, 89
\item \textsuperscript{35} Shirk, 164
\item \textsuperscript{36} Kazuo Sato, “The Japan-China Summit and Joint Declaration of 1998: A Watershed for Japan-China Relations in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century?” (The Brookings Institute, 1 January 2006), 6
\end{itemize}
\end{flushright}
Japanese representatives to change the wording of their apology showed a remarkable ability to reach compromise that is largely absent in Sino-Japanese government interactions today.

Like Mao, Deng was a confident and dynamic leader; he prioritized Sino-Japanese relations and quelled anti-Japanese sentiments amongst the public. Deng also had great political authority during his term in office and good reason for positive, stable relations with Japan. However, in contrast to Mao, Deng’s motivation was more economic than political: Deng saw China’s relationship with Japan as essential for his economic reforms to succeed. When Deng promoted his Open-Door Policy, Japan was considered a model example to follow for economic reform. Japan’s “economic miracle” created a very positive image in China at the time; Japan was considered an “Asian economic and technological tiger worthy of emulation.” Japan’s economic success gave great hope to the Chinese, who saw their East Asian neighbor’s success story as something that should be aspired to in their own country. Deng became the first Chinese leader to visit Japan in December 1978, shortly before he announced his economic reforms, and later visited Japan for a second time. In the early 1980s, Deng initiated an effort to invite a few influential Japanese to advise the PRC’s economic modernization, and created the Sino-Japanese Economic Knowledge Exchange Association. During the Deng era, a Sino-Japanese agreement to increase trade was signed, as well as a Treaty of Peace and Friendship.

There were certainly anti-Japanese sentiments among the Chinese public in the 1980s. Public antagonism toward Japan noticeably began in 1982, the year that the history issue – Chinese concern over contemporary Japanese attitudes toward the Second Sino-Japanese War – became a defining factor in Sino-Japanese relations. First, in 1982, the Chinese public was

---

37 Shirk, 159
38 Shirk, 159
39 Shirk, 159-160
40 Wan, 89
angered by what is known as the first Japanese Textbook Controversy. This controversy centered on the Japanese Ministry of Education’s alleged approval of the change of the verb *invaded* in the phrase “the Japanese *invaded* northern China” to the phrase “*advanced into*” in Japanese textbooks. In addition, atrocities such as the Nanjing Massacre were blamed on the resistance of the local populace.\(^{41}\) Unlike in the 1970s, by 1982, the CCP allowed Chinese scholars to publish sensitive research on the Second Sino-Japanese War, which led to a greater awareness of historical issues among the Chinese public. Testimonies from survivors of the war, including those who had lived through the Nanjing Massacre, were frequently publicized in *Renmin Ribao* (People’s Daily), along with almost daily articles on the Textbook Controversy.\(^{42}\) This would push the history issue to the front of Chinese government’s agenda.\(^{43}\) The following year, in 1983, a joint statement issued by the Propaganda Department and the Research Office of the Secretariat of the CCP Central Committee called for a renewed emphasis on patriotic education for the people of China.\(^{44}\)

The second event triggering a strong anti-Japanese reaction among the Chinese public was on September 18\(^{th}\), 1985. What started as school ceremonies in Beijing commemorating the anniversary of Japan’s invasion of Manchuria quickly devolved into a march to Tiananmen Square. Chinese demonstrators had been angered by the Japanese Textbook Controversy and by the Japanese Prime Minister at the time, Nakasone Yasuhiro’s, visit to the Yasukuni Shrine.\(^{45}\)

\(^{41}\) Fogel, 28
\(^{42}\) Yoshida, 104
\(^{43}\) Wan, 90
\(^{44}\) Yoshida, 105
\(^{45}\) The Yasukuni Shrine is a Shinto shrine located in Tokyo that commemorates Japan’s war dead. It is believed that the *kami*, or spirits, of the war dead reside there. Japanese citizens, including officials, often journey to the Shrine to pay their respects to the dead. The Shrine itself was originally built in June 1869 under orders of the Meiji Emperor to honor those who had died in bringing about the Meiji Restoration. In 1959, the *kami* of over a thousand Class-B and Class-C war criminals who had been sentenced to death and executed by the military tribunals of the Allied Forces after WWII were enshrined in Yasukuni. However, the real controversy around Yasukuni started in 1978 when the *kami* of 14 Class-A war criminals, as determined by the IMTFE (International
However, Deng kept his cool, and he met with Nakasone a few weeks later, on October 10th, to ensure that the student demonstrations would not harm Sino-Japanese friendship. It is speculated that a “gentlemen’s agreement” of sorts was reached between Deng and Nakasone: if Nakasone would cease to visit the Shrine, China would not condemn visits to the Shrine by lesser-known Japanese officials.46 In addition, Nakasone was willing to order the Ministry of Education to revise the offending phraseology in the textbooks. As with the compromises reached during the 1972 Joint Communiqué with Mao and Tanaka, Deng and Nakasone’s compromise showed that both sides highly valued good relations.

Another flare-up in Sino-Japanese relations had to do with the Diaoyu (Senkaku) Islands. The islands, which are northeast of Taiwan and lie between China and Japan, have been argued over since the early twentieth century. However, after offshore oil explorations began in the 1970s, the islands became much more valuable, and the territorial dispute became more volatile.47 Both sides agreed that in order to preserve good relations with Japan, it would be better to leave the issue untouched. Deng believed that the issue would be better left for the next generation, perhaps in 10 years or so, when tensions would hopefully have cooled.48 Ironically, when the issue again came to the forefront in the 1990s under Jiang, it became even more volatile. Neither the Chinese nor Japanese side was as willing to negotiate as they had been in the 1970s.

Military Tribunals of the Far East), were enshrined at Yasukuni. Included among these 14 war criminals were men such as Tōjō Hideki, who was Prime Minister during much of the war and was considered as one of the major masterminds behind Japanese military conduct in the war, including atrocities such as the Nanjing Massacre. What has generated the most outrage among the Chinese populace has been the visits of Japanese politicians, prime ministers in particular, to the Shrine. Prime Minister Suzuki Zenko’s visit to the Shrine in 1982 provided the trigger for yet another sensitive issue in Sino-Japanese relations. More recently, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi greatly angered the Chinese public with his annual visits to the Yasukuni Shrine throughout his term. His first visit was in 2001, and his last was in October 2005.

46 Shirk, 163
47 Daniel Dzurek, “The Senkaku Islands Dispute” (18 October 1996), http://www-ibru.dur.ac.uk/resources/docs/senkaku.html
48 Shirk, 160
Jiang Zemin was not as powerful or dynamic a leader as Mao or Deng, who had been revolutionary leaders. Thus, he relied heavily on popular nationalism to legitimize the state under his leadership. Whereas during the Mao and Deng eras, the state had a great ideological hold over society, during the Jiang era, the state’s role relative to society was weakened due to both less charismatic party leadership and political reforms.\(^\text{49}\) It was during the Jiang era that Sino-Japanese relations really started to deteriorate. With the Tiananmen crisis of 1989 and worries about challenges from rival leaders, since Jiang had succeeded Deng as a compromise choice in the CCP, Jiang was much more sensitive to popular public opinion than his predecessors had been.\(^\text{50}\) Under Mao and Deng, communism was the dominant ideology that legitimized the state. In contrast, under Jiang, Chinese nationalism – loyalty to one’s country and one’s people – became the dominant ideology.\(^\text{51}\) Chinese popular nationalism is decidedly anti-Japanese in nature due to historical issues from the Second Sino-Japanese War. Because of this, the nationalist political strategy initiated under Jiang’s Patriotic Education Campaign has had an adverse effect on China’s Japan policy.\(^\text{52}\)

In order to understand Jiang’s actions in the 1990s and their impact in the sociopolitical context of Chinese society at the time, it is necessary to consider Jiang’s personal background. He was born on August 17, 1926 in Yangzhou, a city in Jiangsu Province, to an intellectual family. As such, he grew up during Japan’s occupation of China. He was only 11 years old when the Japanese attacked Nanjing, and his memories of his teenage years would have been of war. When World War II ended in 1945, he was already a young man. His uncle, Jiang Shangqing, died in World War II fighting for the CCP against the Japanese and was considered a national
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revolutionary hero. Since Jiang Zemin’s uncle’s family was left without a male heir, Jiang’s father allowed him to be adopted by his uncle’s family, and there is no doubt Jiang was greatly influenced by his uncle’s legacy. It is commonly believed, both in China and in Japan, that Jiang’s personal experiences with the Japanese military during the Second Sino-Japanese War shaped his intense dislike of both Japan and the Japanese.\textsuperscript{53} This strong dislike is clearly visible in the Patriotic Education Campaign, where anti-Japanese nationalism is stressed.

Jiang first attended university in the Department of Electrical Engineering at the National Central University in Nanjing while it was still under Japanese occupation. He was later transferred to Shanghai Jiaotong University and graduated there. Although his time in Nanjing was not more than a few years, the destruction wrought by the Japanese in the city must have left a powerful impression on his young mind. The Nanjing Massacre was not promulgated by the Chinese government as a symbol of Japanese aggression until the 1980s, but Jiang was most likely conscious of the atrocity before this point in time. Considering his background, it is not coincidental that his Patriotic Education Campaign in the 90s strongly emphasized the Nanjing Massacre as a symbol of Japanese aggression.

In his early career, Jiang’s focus was technical administration; in the 1950s, he even spent a year in the USSR to study the Soviet automobile industry. However, in the 1980s, his career shifted to a focus on government. He was the mayor of Shanghai from June 1985 to July 1989. Jiang became the secretary general of the CCP promptly after the Tiananmen Massacre, although his real power was not apparent until the 1990s after he became president of the PRC.\textsuperscript{54}

When Jiang was the mayor of Shanghai in the 1980s, he had to deal with many of the anti-Japanese protests that were triggered in urban centers (such as Beijing and Shanghai) across
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the country in response to events such as the Textbook Controversy and the fiftieth anniversary of the end of World War II. His confrontations with the protestors were often face-to-face, as was the case in December 1986, when he spoke at his alma mater, Jiaotong University. In an effort to halt anti-Japanese student protests, Jiang addressed the students with a recitation of the Gettysburg Address in English. The student reception of Jiang’s speech was hostile, to say the least, and they accused him of “spouting empty platitudes.”

Jiang’s experience with strong anti-Japanese nationalism, particularly among the student protestors, when he was mayor of Shanghai might have made him more sensitive to and fearful of public nationalism during his term as the president of the PRC during the 1990s. This sensitivity can also be attributed to the fact that as a compromise choice in the CCP to succeed Deng, Jiang was also very concerned about potential rivalries from other leaders within the Party.

The Tiananmen Massacre also strongly influenced Jiang and his Patriotic Education Campaign. Of the 1980s protests that snowballed into the Tiananmen Crisis, 1985 was dominated by anti-Japanese student protests (triggered by the fiftieth anniversary of World War II, the Textbook Controversy, and Nakasone’s visit to Yasukuni Shrine), which focused on rebutting Japanese militarism and the “second occupation,” which referred to the domination of Japanese goods in the foreign products sold in Chinese markets. Although Deng was able to suppress the protests in a way that appeared to do no damage to either Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations or domestic sentiments toward the CCP, there were in fact repercussions.

After the mid-80s, while Deng started to take a more hard-line approach to Japan, CCP General Secretary Hu Yaobang and Premier Zhao Ziyang continued to stress a softer, more
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moderate approach of engaging Japan. Nakasone’s visit to Yasukuni in 1985 triggered an inner-Party struggle as Party members disagreed on how to best approach China’s Japan policy. The timing of the protests, which were right before the shift in China’s Japan policy, suggests that public opinion has, indeed, played an important role in influencing political decisions in China on Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations.\(^{58}\) As scholar Yinan He aptly observes, since harmonious relations with Japan was one of the major components on which Hu had built his career, the 1985 protests adversely affected Hu’s leadership in the Party.\(^ {59}\) William Callahan concurs:

This case suggests that in periods of elite division and bilateral tensions, public opinion can become politically significant for China’s Japan policy. The 1985 protests also marked the first time in the reform era that China’s nationalist rhetoric on Japan’s wartime invasion had contributed to anti-Japan demonstrations. It would not be the last.\(^ {60}\)

In 1986, there was a second round of student protests – this time, however, the students’ target was not Japan, but rather their own government. They resented the fact that their anti-Japanese protests in 1985 and 1986 had never been reported by the press, and spoke out for freedom of speech and freedom of the press in China. Angered by this second round of protests, Deng, who had originally supported Hu’s stance on Sino-Japanese relations, shifted to the more conservative faction.\(^ {61}\) As an outspoken proponent of Sino-Japanese relations, Hu’s viewpoints ultimately contributed to his political demise.\(^ {62}\) Only two years after the initial protests, on January 16, 1987, Hu’s resignation was accepted by the CCP Politburo.\(^ {63}\) Since Hu was ousted,
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\(^{62}\) Another reason that Hu was ousted from power was that he was also an outspoken proponent of political reform. On April 22, 1989, following his death on April 15\(^ {56}\), university students marched to Tiananmen to demand that the CCP reverse the verdict that had led to his resignation in 1987. Hu’s advocacy of freedom of speech and of the press influenced the students, whose protests escalated into general criticism of the government and call for reforms. This, in turn, was what eventually led to the Tiananmen Massacre on June 4, 1989.

no subsequent Chinese leader has dared soften their attitudes toward Japan and pursue a policy of conciliation as marked as that of Hu.  

In 1989, the third round of student protests, which culminated in the tragic Tiananmen Massacre that received worldwide attention, was also focused on the shortcomings of the Chinese government, particularly government corruption and the lack of democratic political reform. Although these protests were initiated by students, they soon spread to other segments of the population. Since this was the first major popular protest directed against the CCP, and not foreign imperialism, the Chinese government faced a domestic security crisis, a crisis of “nontraditional security of the party-state: the ideological security, regime security, and cultural security of the CCP.”

As a response to this domestic security crisis, China’s leaders decided that the focus of China’s youths must be redirected from domestic to foreign issues. Thus, they started to reemphasize China’s Century of Humiliation, which has served to legitimize the CCP as the only political party in China able to stand up to the foreign imperialists and the suffering that they inflicted on China. The teaching of modern Chinese history from a CCP-sanctioned
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66 What is known in China as the Century of Humiliation (百年国耻) actually lasted for 110 years, starting in 1839, the date of the first Opium War, when the British militarily forced the rulers of the Qing Dynasty to open up their markets to the opium trade. This led to a century of foreign powers – first Western powers, and later Japan – encroaching on China and exploiting its populace and natural resources. Domestically, this century was also a great time of upheaval, with many rebellions and wars with foreign powers fought on Chinese soil. After the collapse of the Qing Dynasty and the entire dynastic system in 1911, warlords wreaked havoc on China while the weak Republican government exerted minimal military control. The Chinese Civil War, between the GMD (Guomindang) and the CCP, started in 1927, but was put on hold by the Second Sino-Japanese War, at which point a United Front between the two parties was formed in order to fight the Japanese. After the Japanese surrendered to the Allied Forces, which marked the end of World War II, the GMD and CCP resumed their battle. According to the CCP, the official end of the Century of Humiliation was 1949, the year when Mao formally declared the founding of the People’s Republic of China and the GMD was forced to flee to Taiwan.
perspective was a major part of this patriotic education policy. However, this patriotic education policy went far beyond school textbooks; it also included a wide range of activities for patriotic education that would take place not only in schools, but also in museums (such as the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall), in literature and film, and in other forms of popular media such as newspapers and television. Chinese patriotic education has since focused noticeably more on the Japanese invasion of China, symbolically culminating in the horrors of the Nanjing Massacre, than on the crimes of any other imperialist power during the Century of Humiliation.

Deng believed that the events at Tiananmen in 1989 represented the failure of the CCP propaganda system to properly educate the Chinese people. He saw patriotism not as something natural, but rather as something that had to be inculcated in the minds of China’s youth. Efforts toward patriotic education were initiated soon after Tiananmen, with events such as the 1990 publication of the first National Humiliation history textbook since 1937. The disintegration and collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 also worried China, providing another incentive to legitimize the CCP through patriotic education. However, the CCP’s Central Propaganda Department did not propose its final, official outline for the Patriotic Education Campaign until 1994, under the leadership of Jiang Zemin.

Unlike under Mao, when Sino-Japanese friendship was a major theme in political education, when the CCP Propaganda Department started its “patriotic education campaign,” a nationalist attachment to the Chinese state became the dominant theme in both schools and in the
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media.\textsuperscript{73} In the 1990s, the “new authoritarianism” argument claimed that only the CCP was strong enough to hold China together. In particular, this was based on historical example: the CCP had liberated the suffering Chinese people from the oppression inflicted upon them by foreigners, particularly Japan, during the Century of Humiliation. As a plaque at the Nanjing Memorial Hall reads: “The government was in disorder and our nation was weak. How could we have been safe?”\textsuperscript{74}

Chapter II: The Historiography of the Nanjing Massacre and the Patriotic Education Campaign

Why did the Patriotic Education Campaign end up disproportionately emphasizing Japanese military atrocities, as opposed to other historical grievances from Western imperialism during the Century of Humiliation? First, it is important to note that the original purpose of patriotic education was \textit{not} to promote anti-Japanese sentiments. Its main goal was to legitimize the CCP through both celebrating the long-standing, glorious tradition of Chinese society\textsuperscript{75} and by portraying the CCP as the only political entity that was able to save China from victimization by foreign powers and end the Century of Humiliation. The Patriotic Education Campaign’s main purpose was to boost support for the CCP and its objectives of economic progress and strengthening the state.\textsuperscript{76} For example, in Chinese history textbooks, it has been taught that World War II ended because of the heroic efforts of the CCP in the War of Resistance against Japan.\textsuperscript{77} Since the Patriotic Education Campaign’s objective was to place the CCP in as positive
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a light as possible, tragedies inflicted upon the Chinese people by the CCP itself, such as the Great Leap Forward, the Cultural Revolution, and the Tiananmen Massacre, were not mentioned.  

Jiang Zemin and the CCP Propaganda Department formulated their “Outline of Implementing Patriotic Education” in August of 1994, stating that: “It is the sacred duty of the press and publishing, radio, film, and television departments of all levels to use advanced media technology to conduct patriotic education to the masses.” The atrocities committed in World War II by the Japanese military, particularly the Nanjing Massacre, were relatively fresh in the collective Chinese psyche and held much potential for invoking strong emotional reactions. The Japanese invasion of China in the early twentieth century inflicted more lasting damage on China than that of the other, earlier imperialistic advances by Western powers. Thus, it was natural for Japan to be the scapegoat for Chinese nationalism, alleviating pressure on the CCP and placing public scrutiny on Japan instead. In this way, the CCP was able to place the history of the Chinese people’s pain on Japan’s shoulders, salvaging its own reputation among its domestic audience:

by placing the lion’s share of the blame for China’s past suffering, longstanding backwardness and current socioeconomic difficulties on Japan, the new narrative evaded many sensitive issues that might hurt national self-respect or the party’s prestige.

Invoking a strong emotional reaction from Chinese youth in particular was a way to ensure that the Patriotic Education Campaign would fulfill its objective of legitimizing the CCP. Inciting China’s “indignant youth” (fennuqingnian, 愤怒青年) to focus their energy toward
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foreign issues, particularly those related to Japan, was a way to encourage them to contribute to developing their own country.\textsuperscript{82} The youth are one of the most prosperous sections of Chinese society, and their strong emotional reactions to Japan’s wartime legacy have helped created a strong sense of nationalism among them.\textsuperscript{83}

Reemphasizing the Nanjing Massacre in the public conscience in China first in the 80s, and most noticeably in Jiang’s campaign in the 90s, was a political move by the CCP. Prior to the 1980s, the PRC directed most of its antagonism toward its own people, those “class enemies,” according to Communist terminology, and “traitors to the Han race” (hanjian, 汉奸).\textsuperscript{84} However, after the 1980s, hostility was directed more toward the Japanese. Prior to the 1980s, the CCP had used the Nanjing Massacre to vilify Chiang and the KMT. However, after the 1980s, when the CCP’s regime had become more stable, the political rhetoric on a “unified China,” in which PRC was the only recognized government of both the mainland and Taiwan, became more pronounced. In political rhetoric, the CCP was no longer trying to vilify the KMT, the US, or the USSR; blame for the Nanjing Massacre fell squarely on the Japanese nation.\textsuperscript{85} This becomes more obvious when the portrayal of the Massacre in the Chinese public sphere in these decades is compared to what it was before the 1980s, when the Nanjing Massacre was not promulgated by the government as a symbol of Japanese aggression. Due to a changing political agenda in the 1980s, the CCP began to emphasize patriotism through education.\textsuperscript{86} This trend sped up after the Tiananmen Massacre, and particularly after Jiang took office.
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During the Second Sino-Japanese War itself, from 1937 to 1945, the Nanjing Massacre did not stand out as a salient symbol of Japanese aggression. Many atrocities were inflicted upon the Chinese people by the Japanese military, including mass killings, human experimentation and biological warfare (of which perhaps the most infamous example is Unit 731), the use of chemical weapons, bombings, forced labor, torture of POWs, rape, looting, and the comfort women. As Japanese Nanjing Massacre scholar Yoshida Takashi observes, “The international and domestic political realities of the time tended to divert attention elsewhere…The rape of Nanjing was not an isolated incident of Japanese violence, either in the eyes of most Chinese or in the opinion of the government.” The Nanjing Massacre was not extensively used as a government propaganda tool during this period, although those in Nanjing did maintain a strong interest in conducting research on the issue. During the war, the Nationalist government, which was then in power in China, had decided that relating Japan’s chemical warfare to the international community would produce more outrage against Japanese aggression than would relating an event such as Nanjing.

After the end of World War II and the surrender of Japan on September 2, 1945, the Chinese Nationalists and Communists resumed their civil war for control of the Chinese mainland. After Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists were ousted, neither the CCP on the mainland nor the Kuomintang on Taiwan utilized the Nanjing Massacre as a symbol of Japanese aggression. For them, it was more important to defeat their current enemies than to dwell on the past; for the PRC, the main enemy in the 1950s was the United States. The Japanese people were
not blamed for the war, but rather considered as victims of their military leaders.\(^{91}\) In China in the 1950s, the Nanjing Massacre was not considered as horrific as the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The PRC was sympathetic toward the victims of the atomic bombs, as they, too, were greatly concerned about the American nuclear threat.\(^{92}\) How vastly different this approach is from the historiographical focus of Iris Chang in 1997, who claimed that by using Sun Zhaiwei’s calculation of 377,400 victims in Nanjing, the death toll in Nanjing was greater than that of Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined.\(^{93}\)

During the Korean War, the Chinese government utilized the Nanjing Massacre, but not as a symbol of Japanese aggression. Seemingly counterintuitive from the lens of the twenty-first century, the Nanjing Massacre was a CCP propaganda tool against the United States and American imperialism during the Korean War. A 1952 article published by *The New China Monthly* (*Xinhua Yuebao*) claimed that those Americans who had stayed behind in Nanjing to establish a Safety Zone for Chinese refugees not only chose to protect their property over Chinese lives, but had also assisted Japanese troops and sent Chinese troops off to be executed. The *Xinhua Yuebao* article also featured photographs from the Nanjing Massacre with the caption, “Remember the Nanjing Massacre, Stop American Remilitarization of Japan!”\(^{94}\) In another article the previous year, American missionaries such as the “goddess of Nanjing” Minnie Vautrin, who is currently viewed as a heroine in China for saving countless lives during the Massacre, were accused of being “imperialists and fascists.”\(^{95}\)

In conjunction with propaganda against the United States, which was part of the larger anti-capitalist, anti-feudal political agenda at the time, the CCP also included propaganda against
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the GMD. The United States supported the GMD during the Cold War, and the GMD threatening to take over the mainland. As such, the CCP used the Nanjing Massacre as a propaganda tool during the 1950s to discredit the GMD. CCP leaders directly blamed the GMD’s cowardice and incompetence for the horrible tragedy in Nanjing. Chiang Kai-shek and his commander, Tang Sheng-chi, who abandoned Nanjing right as the city was about to fall, were strongly vilified in the narrative of the Massacre.\textsuperscript{96} Chiang himself left the city on December 8\textsuperscript{th}, and Tang abandoned the city on December 12\textsuperscript{th}, right before it was about to fall, leaving behind him disorder among the officers, troops, and panic among the city residents.\textsuperscript{97}

Due to pressing domestic issues, the desire to eschew a victim mentality, and strong incentives for preserving good relations with Japan,\textsuperscript{98} the Nanjing Massacre did not play a significant role in Chinese domestic politics until the 1980s. Along with the rise of patriotic education, the Nanjing Massacre reentered the Chinese national consciousness in the mid-1980s, and began to play a prominent role in government propaganda and popular media.\textsuperscript{99} As a truly horrific and tragic atrocity, the Nanjing Massacre has served well as a focal point for remembering the Century of Humiliation and foreign aggression, specifically against Japan, with whom the Chinese have had a love-hate relationship for centuries.\textsuperscript{100} Although there were other massacres in other cities during the Second Sino-Japanese War, none of them were equal in
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intensity or scale to the Nanjing Massacre. In addition, whereas atrocities such as Unit 731 and the “comfort women” happened slowly over a longer period of time, the time frame of the Massacre was shorter and more intense, making it ideal for a symbol of Chinese suffering.\textsuperscript{101}

At the same time, though, it is important to realize that the maintenance of Sino-Japanese friendship was a key aspect in China’s Japan policy after the normalization of diplomatic relations between the two countries in 1972. However, it was difficult to balance this goal of friendship with patriotic education initiatives. As Yoshida notes, “in the post-Mao period, the teaching of war was linked with the political goal of promoting patriotism and loyalty to the party, a party now eager to encourage the creation of more literature and memorials regarding the Anti-Japanese War.”\textsuperscript{102}

In the 1980s and 90s, there was a great flourishing of popular media related to the Nanjing Massacre, commemorating its horrors and serving to symbolize Japanese aggression as part of the Century of Humiliation. In turn, this focus on an external scapegoat, Japan, through the narrative of the Nanjing Massacre served both to domestically legitimize the CCP and, particularly in the 90s, to take the focus off of domestic issues.\textsuperscript{103}

It is important to note that in the patriotic education initiatives, 20\textsuperscript{th} century modern Chinese history, as opposed to China’s long dynastic history, was the focus in both education and in popular media. Thus, although the Nanjing Massacre is known by nearly every Chinese, not as well known is the fact that Nanjing’s history is wrought with destruction and tragedy. As Michael Berry, a prominent China scholar and professor of contemporary Chinese cultural studies, notes, “perhaps more than any other Chinese capital, the city formerly known as Jinling
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金陵 has been riddled by dynastic failure, violent political suppressions, natural disasters, and atrocity throughout its history.\textsuperscript{104}

Nanjing has served as a capital city during ten distinct historical eras in China, starting from the Kingdom of Wu (222-280) and ending in the Republican era (1928-37). The first major destruction to the city was in 589, after the former Chen dynasty had fallen to the Sui dynasty. The first emperor of the Sui had all architectural and historical sites related to the Chen demolished, resulting in a comprehensive destruction of the city’s material culture.\textsuperscript{105} However, Nanjing has a long history not only of material destruction, but also of the destruction of human lives. Much more recently, the Taiping Rebellion (1851-1864) also left a bloody mark on the city of Nanjing. It was not so much the Taiping insurrection itself, which established Nanjing as the capital of the Kingdom of Heavenly Peace, that is remembered, but rather the brutal suppression of the Taipings by an army sent by the Qing dynastic court to crush the rebellion, which allegedly killed thousands.\textsuperscript{106}

In China, the noticeable increase in historical publications related to the Nanjing Massacre started around the mid-80s. The primary focus of these publications was to “prove” the brutality of the Nanjing Massacre and to provide evidence that the atrocities had, indeed, occurred to the extent the Chinese government claimed (their official figure is 300,000 victims).\textsuperscript{107} Indeed, the theme of proof or testimony, \textit{jianzheng} (见证), looms large in historical accounts of the Nanjing Massacre in China.\textsuperscript{108} This theme was not only limited to historical publications, such as documentary film, photos, wartime diaries, and witness testimonials, but
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was also present in film and literature at the time. ¹⁰⁹ For instance, in August 1983, an 85-page booklet titled *Historical Sources: Materials on the Nanjing Massacre Committed by the Japanese Army of Invasion* (史料选集侵华日军南京大屠杀史料专集) was published by the Research Committee on Historical Materials of the City of Nanjing. Although the booklet was only meant for a small audience of domestic viewers, the fact that it was even published represented a shift from the earlier CCP stance, when very little scholarship on the Massacre was permitted circulation in China.¹¹⁰

Many books on the Nanjing Massacre have been purposefully published on historically significant dates. For instance, as the fortieth anniversary of World War II on August 15, 1985 approached, numerous scholarly books on the Nanjing Massacre, mostly concerned with the “proof” narrative, were published in China. These included: *Historical Materials on the Nanjing Massacre Committed by the Japanese Army of Invasion* (侵华日军南京大屠杀史料), which included a translation of Dr. Lewis S.C. Smythe’s book *War Damage in the Nanking Area*, survivor testimonials, eyewitness reports, and diaries from soldiers and civilians; and *Japanese War Atrocities: The Nanjing Massacre* (日军侵华暴行: 南京大屠), published by Gao Xingzu, a professor at Nanjing University.¹¹¹ In November of 1987, a month before the fiftieth anniversary of the Nanjing Massacre, *Archival Materials on the Nanjing Massacre Committed by the Japanese Army of Invasion* (侵华日军南京大屠杀档案), which included a number of declassified documents from the Massacre, was published.¹¹² These publications reflected the government-approved, politically correct view of the Massacre; the government kept a close watch over classified documents related to the Massacre that were preserved in the Number Two
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China Historical Archives and the Nanjing City Archives. Due to government restrictions, certain themes loom large in documents on the Nanjing Massacre published during this time:

Photographs must show Japanese brutality only; Japanese villains must not have human faces; it must be accepted that the Japanese military ferociously killed at least 300,000 innocent Chinese after the fall of Nanjing; and the literature must contribute to stirring patriotism and loyalty to the party among the people in China, including Taiwan.  

Closely following the publication of the Archival Materials, the first reportage book on the Nanjing Massacre was published in China in December, 1987, for the fiftieth anniversary of the Massacre. The book, simply called The Nanjing Massacre, was written by Chinese journalist and reportage writer Xu Zhigeng; according to Xu, the book was an immediate success and sold 150,000 copies in its first month on the market.  

In addition to scholarly documents, there were also novels published on the Nanjing Massacre in the 1980s in mainland China. In reality, some of these fictional portrayals of the Massacre had been written much earlier. However, the chaotic political climate, Cold War politics, and the PRC’s struggle to modernize made fictional representations of the Massacre “a low priority of a political impossibility” until the 1980s. One of the first novels published, Zhou Erfu’s The Fall of Nanjing (南京的陷落), was made available to the public on the fiftieth anniversary of the Nanjing Massacre in 1987 as a “symbolic literary commemoration.” Along with many other CCP-endorsed works, Zhou (b. 1914), who had attended Mao’s famous Yan’an forum on literature and art in 1942, has written a six-volume opus concerning important people and events in the Second Sino-Japanese War. The Fall of the Nanjing was published in 1987 as the opening novel in A Portrait of Ten Thousand Miles Along the Great Wall of
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China.\textsuperscript{118} The series culminated with \textit{Chongqing in Mist}, published in 1995 to commemorate the 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the end of World War II. However, although Zhou had envisioned a novel about the Nanjing Massacre during the War of Resistance, he did not have a finished draft until 1982.\textsuperscript{119} This earlier novel is different from later novels about the Nanjing Massacre because of its lack of focus on the atrocities committed by the Japanese military: the novel ends right before the atrocities begin, with the Japanese breaching the city wall.\textsuperscript{120}

Like Zhou, Ah Long (a pen name for writer Chen Shoumei) was also in Yan’an while it served as a communist base (1939), although he had to leave for Xi’an soon after for medical treatment. While he was recovering, he devoted two months of his time to writing his novel on the Nanjing Massacre, simply entitled \textit{Nanjing}. He completed the novel in October 1939, making it the earliest Chinese literary work to attempt to expose the Japanese military atrocities in Nanjing.\textsuperscript{121} However, \textit{Nanjing} was not published until 1987, twenty years after Ah Long’s death, coinciding with the fiftieth anniversary of the July 7 Incident (\textit{七七事变}) in August of 1987.\textsuperscript{122}
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The July 7 Incident, also known as the Marco Polo Bridge Incident (\textit{卢沟桥事变}) is considered by many to mark the start of the Second Sino-Japanese War. The Marco Polo Bridge is located outside the town of Wanping to the southwest of Beijing. By the beginning of 1937, the Japanese military controlled all of the areas north, west, and east of Beijing by the beginning of 1937. In June of 1937, the Japanese military started conducting military training exercises near the western end of the Marco Polo Bridge at night. Each time they conducted exercises, the Chinese government was informed in advance in order not to alarm the local inhabitants. However, on the evening of July 7, 1937, the Japanese forces carried out exercises without forewarning, causing the local Chinese forces to think an attack was underway and fire a few rifle shots. After a brief exchange of ineffective fire around 11 PM, a Japanese officer reported one of his soldiers as missing. Believing that the soldier had been captured by the Chinese, the Japanese forces requested entrance into Wanping. After skirmishes broke out on the bridge, a ceasefire was declared on July 9\textsuperscript{th}. However, what would have ended as a skirmish turned out to be just the beginning of the fighting, as both Japanese and Chinese forces continued to breach the ceasefire conditions and build up forces on either side of the bridge. The Battle of Beiping-Tianjin at the end of July and the Battle of Shanghai in August followed in the aftermath, representing the first major battles in the Second Sino-Japanese War.
which is also an important historical date in the Chinese conscience. Like Zhou’s novel, Ah Long’s *Nanjing* focuses mainly on the events that preceded the Massacre, although *Nanjing*’s narrative did focus more on the lives of ordinary Chinese individuals. However, despite the fact that the Japanese military atrocities are not described in the novel itself, for its publication in 1987, the novel’s name was changed from *Nanjing* to *Nanjing Bloody Sacrifice* (*Nanjing xueji* 南京血祭). This reflected the CCP’s shift toward patriotic education and increased emphasis on the Century of Humiliation, in which the Nanjing Massacre served as an important component of national rhetoric.

Works on the Nanjing Massacre in the 1980s were not merely limited to writing, but also included the production of films concerning the Massacre (both documentaries and fictional narratives). In 1987, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Massacre, PRC director Luo Guanqun’s film *Massacre in Nanjing* was released. Similar to the literary works published on the Massacre in the 1980s, *Massacre in Nanjing* focuses on the burden of proof. The main plot of the film centers on a doctor’s attempts to recover photos of Japanese atrocities in Nanjing in order to prove that the Massacre did, in fact, occur. Even the title of the film in Chinese, which literally translates to English as “Bloody Evidence in the Massacred City (屠城血证),” points toward this burden of proof. In the opening credits, black-and-white documentary footage from the War of Japanese Resistance is created, highlighting the ‘authenticity’ of the film’s narrative. Adding
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123 The July 7 Incident, as well as the September 18 Incident (九一八事变), or the Mukden/Manchurian Incident, which commemorates the date in 1931 when the Japanese staged a dynamite explosion near a railway to justify their subsequent invasion of Manchuria, is still commemorated in China today as a day of national humiliation from the Century of Humiliation.
124 *Nanjing* does, however, weave many important individuals from Republican China throughout its narrative. Strangely enough, though, there is no real protagonist in the story. This leads Berry to suggest that the city of Nanjing itself, which is the only real constant throughout the novel, might very well serve as the true protagonist. – Berry, 145
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to this effect, the opening credits end with the title “December 13, 1937,” followed immediately by the number “300,000,” the official CCP-approved number of victims.  

As mentioned in the introduction, historiography is not limited to scholarly works, or even to literature and film, but also includes educational resources, such as textbooks, and even commemorative historical sites. In mainland China, these types of historical sites reflect the official view of the PRC, who is in charge of their construction and how they are subsequently used. Thus, as was the case with the literature and film on the Massacre during the 1980s, the construction of the state-sponsored Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall reflected the CCP’s increased emphasis on patriotic education through historical commemoration. The Memorial Hall was opened in Nanjing on August 15, 1985, to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of World War II. As with the literature and film on the Massacre, the opening date of the memorial was intentionally chosen to trigger the greatest impact among the public. The Memorial Hall places a heavy emphasis on the burden of proof: on the façade of the Memorial Hall, inscribed on a stone wall, the words “Victims 300,000” loom large. This represents the key role the high death toll plays in the politically correct narrative of the Massacre in post-1980s China.

The Memorial Hall is a testament to the success of the Chinese Communist Party, as opposed to the Nationalists or, for that matter, any other group, in bringing China out of its Century of Humiliation into an era of national strength and economic prosperity. Thus, the Memorial Hall has become a part of the CCP’s historical narrative, placing the Massacre within a larger framework of revolutionary development in China. This theme is even seen within the
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127 There has been scholarship on the complexities of ways that propaganda materials are taken up by different audiences. In other words, the making may be top-down, but the people involved in the making and the viewing have some space for diversity of creation and response.
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displays in the Memorial Hall itself – at the Memorial’s exit, for instance, is a treatise on building up China through revolutionary reform.\textsuperscript{129}

While the CCP started to noticeably prioritize patriotic education and the role of the Nanjing Massacre therein during the 1980s, this trend crescendoed in the 1990s after Jiang Zemin and the CCP Propaganda Department implemented the official Patriotic Education Campaign, which became the dominant political discourse both in the classroom and in the popular sphere.\textsuperscript{130} As a result, the government’s emphasis on patriotic education had a direct impact on how the Chinese public, particularly China’s youth, perceived Japanese wartime atrocities.\textsuperscript{131} This can be seen in educational discourse in the 90s, in commemorative events across the nation (particularly in 1995), in films and literature, and even in the expansion of the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Museum in the 90s.

The Nanjing Massacre Memorial’s architect, Qi Kang, describes the first phase of construction of the Nanjing Massacre Memorial, which was finished in 1985, as focused on the themes of “disaster, indignant grief, and depression.”\textsuperscript{132} In contrast, the second phase of the Memorial, which was completed in 1995 for the fiftieth anniversary of the end of World War II, focuses more on the themes of “pain” and “hatred”\textsuperscript{133} than it does on grief. While the focal point of Phase One is mourning and commemoration of the victims, Phase Two is more active, “focusing on China’s unfinished historical business with Japan.”\textsuperscript{134} Phase Two transitions the memorial from past to present, dynamically shifting the Nanjing Massacre from merely a historical tragedy to a current struggle for remembrance, as well as a part of the current CCP
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regime’s political agenda in promoting nationalism in China’s youth through patriotic education. For instance, since 1996, it has become mandatory for Chinese schoolchildren to visit the Memorial.\footnote{Fogel, 36}

Education in China shifted noticeably toward nationalism in the 90s. A year before Jiang and the CCP Propaganda Department had officially initiated the Patriotic Education Campaign, on April 28 and 29, 1993, sixteen delegates from different party organizations attended a forum on patriotic education held by the Propaganda Department. Patriotic education was not limited to school textbooks, although textbooks and the school curriculum as a whole have certainly been a vital component of the Patriotic Education Campaign. On the contrary, suggestions from the forum for “effective means of patriotic education” included:

- the use of mass media such as newspapers, film, and television and radio programs;
- the establishment of museums and memorial halls;
- the popularization of patriotic art and literature;
- and the creation of systematic outlines for the patriotic education in kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools, and colleges and universities.\footnote{Yoshida, 196}

Just as the historiography of the Nanjing Massacre is expressed in multiple forms, so are the patriotic education initiatives. Since the government controls a politically correct version of the Nanjing Massacre as part of the patriotic education initiative in China, we see that there is almost a complete overlap between contemporary narratives of the Nanjing Massacre available in mainland China today and the Patriotic Education Campaign.

Since 1990 marked the 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the end of the Second Opium War (1856-1860), the Chinese State Education Commission determined that this would be an opportunity to introduce a more in-depth patriotic education program in schools for all ages. Indeed, as part of a book series on “history, patriotism, and socialism,” the first National Humiliation history textbook since 1937 was published in mainland China in April 1990 on the evening of the 150\textsuperscript{th}
anniversary of the Opium War. This textbook and others like it served two major purposes: one, to promote the version of history that proved the CCP’s legitimacy to Chinese youth; and two, to draw attention away from the recent Tiananmen movement. The State Education Commission announced on June 1, 1991, that more classroom time would be spent learning about Chinese modern history. Modern history began with the first Opium War and continued through the Century of Humiliation to the present, when the CCP was able to free the Chinese people from the yoke of imperialism and lead them into a new era of national strength and prosperity.

Films and novels about the Massacre, both from the Chinese mainland and from the international community, were abundant in the 1990s. The year 1995 is especially significant for popular media concerning the Nanjing Massacre, as it was the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. This anniversary, where Japanese military aggression was the central focus, played an important role in the Patriotic Education Campaign. In August of 1995, there were celebrations across China commemorating the Chinese victory over Japan. Jiang Zemin himself, along with his colleagues, attended no less than seventeen official celebrations of this victory.

In 1995, two films – Black Sun: The Nanjing Massacre and Don’t Cry, Nanking – were both released in China to correspond with the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Immediately, then, the films cannot be separated from mainland politics at this time, as they were released as part of a greater narrative of historical commemoration. However, the two films were exceedingly different in their portrayal of the Nanjing Massacre. Black Sun, directed by Hong Kong filmmaker T.F. Mou, is largely impersonal – most of the Chinese characters’ names,
for instance, are not even provided for the audience. Interestingly, ten out of the eleven named characters are, in fact, Japanese. Berry speculates that the director’s strategy in doing this was to emphasize the accountability of the victimizers. However, the end result is a silencing of the victims’ voices.\(^\text{142}\)

Because of its graphic violence in its portrayal of the atrocities in Nanjing, *Black Sun* was the first-ever film to receive a Category III rating in Hong Kong, which corresponds to a rating of NC-17.\(^\text{143}\) Although produced with the intention of becoming a part of the politics of commemoration in mainland China, *Black Sun* was banned in China by the PRC censors. It was probably banned because of its overly violent content and fears that, if widely viewed in China, it would strain Sino-Japanese relations.\(^\text{144}\) Again, it is important to remember that the goal of the Patriotic Education Campaign was *not* to strain Sino-Japanese relations, but merely to strengthen patriotic nationalism and loyalty to the party. Although anti-Japanese public sentiments, particularly among the Chinese youth, increased noticeably in the 1990s, this was not an intentional move by the CCP. Rather, it was an unfortunate miscalculation of the effects domestic politics could have on foreign relations, as I discuss below.

While *Black Sun* was banned in mainland China, Wu Ziniu’s film *Don’t Cry, Nanking* was widely viewed both in China and internationally. Out of the three influential films concerning the Nanjing Massacre directed by Chinese filmmakers during the late-80s to mid-90s – *Massacre in Nanjing*, *Black Sun*, and *Don’t Cry, Nanking* – it was the latter that was viewed the most.\(^\text{145}\) *Don’t Cry, Nanking* was actually funded by Taiwan, both making it the most expensive Nanjing Massacre film by 1995 and showing that the Nanjing Massacre has
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increasingly become a historical issue over which the governments of the PRC and of Taiwan can find common ground. The cast and crew of the film included stars from Taiwan, Hong Kong, mainland China, and even Japan, facilitating a more creative and in-depth view on the Nanjing Massacre and a wider audience for Don’t Cry, Nanking, than for Massacre in Nanjing or for Black Sun.

Although Wu’s film does not reach the gory level of Black Sun, it is also a quite violent portrayal of the Massacre. However, unlike Black Sun, Don’t Cry, Nanking focuses much more on character development than Black Sun. The two main characters are a Chinese doctor, Chen Xian, who has married a Japanese woman named Rieko. They, along with their children, form the central narrative of the film, which shows their struggle to stay together amidst the horrors of the Nanjing Massacre. The Japanese wife, Rieko, is presented in the film as innocent and completely separate from the guilty Japanese soldiers who victimize the residents of Nanjing. The result is that Don’t Cry, Nanking presents a more humanistic view of the Japanese, avoiding the tendency of popular media in China to demonize the Japanese and serving as a more general denouncement on the brutality of war and depraved human nature as a whole, which makes any human being, whether from China, Japan, or elsewhere, capable of such horrors.146

Like in Luo Guanqun’s Massacre in Nanjing, both Black Sun and Don’t Cry, Nanking are concerned with the burden of proof that continues to dominate the politically correct portrayals of the Nanjing Massacre in mainland China. All three of the films end with subtitles of the 300,000 death toll, working to authenticate this number into the collective memory of the viewers, even at a time when this number, outside of the PRC’s official rhetoric, is still debated by the international community of Nanjing Massacre scholars.147 Furthermore, through violent
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portrayals of the Massacre (although *Black Sun* is clearly in a category of its own regarding the gory, NC-17 depictions of the atrocities), all three films are concerned with authenticating the historical reality of the Massacre.\textsuperscript{148} This emphasis on proof is not to convince the Chinese public that the Nanjing Massacre actually occurred – they are in little need of such proof. Rather, “proving” the Nanjing Massacre through such popular media identifies a particular audience as Chinese and, at the same time, alludes to the other, the Japanese audience.\textsuperscript{149} At the same time, this type of “proof” generates strong emotions of indignant anger, outrage and nationalistic pride among Chinese viewers, which has been the main goal of the Patriotic Education Campaign.

There were also several literary publications on the Nanjing Massacre in this period. In 1995, Xu Zhigeng, who was an experienced author of “party-sponsored reportage literature,”\textsuperscript{150} released his book *Lest We Forget: Nanjing Massacre, 1937*. *Lest We Forget* tells the story of the Massacre in photographs, continuing the trend of emphasizing visual proof of the Massacre in popular media. Around this same time, Sun Zhaiwei, whose quote on Nanjing is mentioned in the introduction of this paper, published his *Nanjing Elegy: Records of Atrocities Committed by the Japanese Army*. Sun himself recommended that this book “be used for educational and research purposes.”\textsuperscript{151} However, both Sun and Xu’s books, though claiming to be historically accurate, do not contain bibliographies, footnotes, or references to back up these claims. Although both of these books claim to be examples of accurate historical research, due to their literary embellishments and lack of citations, they also tend toward the genre of historical fiction.\textsuperscript{152}
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In the following year, 1996, contemporary author Ye Zhaoyan published his novel *Nanjing 1937: A Love Story* (1937 的爱情, *1937 de aiqing*) in mainland China. Similar to Ah Long’s *Nanjing*, the plot in Ye Zhaoyang’s *Nanjing 1937* also takes place in the months preceding the Massacre, rather than focusing on the Massacre itself. The focus of the story is on the splendor and the material and economic prosperity of the city of Nanjing just before the Massacre. Curiously, it is written in the style of Mandarin Duck and Butterfly literature, which is traditionally considered an apolitical genre.

Through this, Ye Zhaoyan’s novel focuses on two different levels of nostalgia – nostalgia for the literary traditions of the Republican Era and nostalgia for the long-forgotten glory of the past grandeur of the city of Nanjing. The fact that the Massacre is not figured in the plot makes its presence that much more powerful – the reader, who knows more than the characters trapped inside of the book’s historical chronology, is fully aware of the tragedy that is about to unfold, making the former grandeur of Nanjing that much more poignant to behold.

In the 1990s, as the Nanjing Massacre came to play a greater role in social media in China through Jiang’s Patriotic Education Campaign, it also began to enter into the international social conscience, particularly in the West. In 1995, two authors based in the United States, R.C. Binstock and Paul West, both published novels based on the Nanjing Massacre. Although Binstock’s *The Tree of Heaven* takes place in the aftermath of the Massacre, the memories of the
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153 The term "Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies" (鸳鸯蝴蝶) refers to a genre that became popular in the 1910s in the new Republican China. Originally, it was limited to classical-style love stories. However, after the May Fourth Movement in 1919, the genre was expanded to include other types of fiction. Although it has traditionally been looked down upon by historians of modern Chinese literature as popular literature with no scholarly value, thanks to scholars such as Perry Link, whose book *Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies: Popular Fiction in Early Twentieth-Century Chinese Cities* explores the different waves of Butterfly Literature and how it relates to China today, there has been a rediscovery of the value of Butterfly Literature in scholarly and literary circles in recent years as a powerful genre for both subtle social criticism and realism. Aware of both the historical context of the development of the Butterfly Genre and its usefulness for portraying social reality, Ye Zhaoyan purposefully chose to use Butterfly Literature for writing his historical novel on Nanjing, which took place during Republican China.
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Massacre itself continue to haunt the protagonists and guide the central plot.\textsuperscript{155} Similar to Wu Ziniu’s \textit{Don’t Cry, Nanking}, which was released during the same year, \textit{The Tree of Heaven} also features a cross-national romance, this time between a Japanese man and a Chinese woman. In Paul West’s \textit{The Tent of Orange Mist}, the protagonist is a sixteen-year old Chinese girl, who becomes the favorite of a Japanese official and is forced to prostitute herself to survive. Like in \textit{The Tree of Heaven}, West’s novel also portrays Sino-Japanese romance, albeit in very different form.\textsuperscript{156}

Two years later, to commemorate the 60\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the Nanjing Massacre, Chinese-American journalist Iris Chang published her influential \textit{Rape of Nanking: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II}. After the book’s initial publication in 1997, it quickly rose to the \textit{New York Times} bestseller list, where it remained for over two months, and received popular critical acclaim, favorable reviews, and little public criticism among US audiences.\textsuperscript{157} The American public quickly accepted Chang’s book as an authoritative source on the Massacre. Due to Cold War politics, the American government had pursued Japan as an ally to counter the USSR and China. For the US, this led to a more hands-off approach to historical issues, due to the fact that the US did not want to embarrass Japanese leaders who had been involved in World War II and were now in power under the US occupation.\textsuperscript{158} Largely due to the influence of John Hersey’s report on Hiroshima, the American public’s perception of Japan had largely been as victims, not as victimizers.\textsuperscript{159} Through Chang’s efforts, many Americans learned about the Nanjing Massacre for the first time.
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In the beginning of the 21st century, Chang’s *The Rape of Nanking* triggered an outpouring of Nanjing Massacre scholarship, particularly in the United States, but also in the international community. Much of this scholarship was in reaction to the black-and-white, emotionally-based portrayal of the Japanese in her narrative. Not only does Chang present the “Rape of Nanking” as a historical atrocity, she portrays it as an injustice that continues into the present. What she dubs the “second Rape of Nanking” is the attempt by “the Japanese” today to cover up the Nanjing Massacre as if it had never happened. As Chang claims:

> Whatever the course of postwar history, the Rape of Nanking will stand as a blemish upon the honor of human beings. But what makes the blemish particularly repugnant is that history has never written a proper end for the story. Sixty years later the Japanese as a nation are still trying to bury the victims of Nanking – not under the soil, as in 1937, but into historical oblivion…The book started out as an attempt to rescue those victims from more degradation by Japanese revisionists and to provide my own epitaph for the hundreds upon thousands of unmarked graves in Nanking.

This claim is patently false, and fails to sufficiently recognize the wide range of voices that exist in contemporary Japan. Through Chang’s monolithic portrayals of “the Japanese” and “the Japanese psyche,” she unintentionally equates “the Japanese” with “the Japanese revisionists,” the far right-wing in Japan that seeks to tone down the Nanjing Massacre Japan’s war crimes. The most extreme right-wing members claim that the Massacre never happened. However, this extreme group comprises a small minority in Japan, and through lumping the Japanese into a homogenous group of revisionists, Chang does a disservice to the many serious Japanese scholars such as Yoshimi Yoshiaki, Awaya Kentarō, Kasahara Tokushi, and Honda Katsuichi, who have labored long to increase both Japanese and international awareness of the Massacre.
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As a journalist by training, not a historian, Chang’s knowledge of history, particularly of Japanese history, is shaky at best. She paints a simplistic portrayal of the Japanese military occupation of Nanjing, using flawed sources such as David Bergamini’s *Japan’s Imperial Conspiracy*, in which there is no room for “good” Japanese or “bad” Chinese. However, some of Chang’s historical research is fairly accurate, such as her description of the Japanese invasion of Nanjing. In addition, her work has both increased the knowledge of the Nanjing Massacre among the American public and furthered international Nanjing Massacre scholarship.

Chang furthered international scholarship mainly through her discovery of primary source documents. Arguably her most important contribution was the discovery of the Diary of John Rabe. Not only has Chang’s scholarship contributed to Nanjing Massacre scholarship in the United States and in the international community, but also in mainland China. When she traveled to Nanjing to do fieldwork and interview survivors, Chang was able to make photocopies of primary source documents from US archives to give to scholars in Nanjing. This included the diary of Minnie Vautrin, with countless photographs, and over a thousand pages of information concerning the Tokyo Trials, none of which had ever been seen before by Chinese scholars.
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164 Often referred to as the “Schindler of Nanking,” Rabe was a German businessman and member of the Nazi party who was in Nanjing at the time of the Massacre. As the German head of the Safety Zone Committee in Nanjing, Rabe helped shelter thousands of Chinese refugees from the Japanese army. His diary is an important primary source document for research on the Massacre because it provides an eyewitness account of the atrocities. Rabe’s original diary also included more than 20 photographs. Not only was Rabe’s diary important in its daily observations of events in Nanjing, but it has also helped historians to confirm survivors’ testimonies. – Yoshida

165 Minnie Vautrin was an American missionary who, along with John Rabe and other foreigners, saved thousands of lives by sheltering Chinese refugees in the Nanjing Safety Zone.

The reception of Chang’s book in mainland China was very positive. From enthusiastic accounts on Chang written in mainland China, we can see that Chang’s view of the Massacre has been fully endorsed by the CCP and by individual journalists and scholars.\textsuperscript{167} This can be further evidenced by the bronze statue of Iris Chang that was erected posthumously\textsuperscript{168} at the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall in 2005. Although this was unlikely Chang’s original intention in writing the book, \textit{The Rape of Nanking} has become a powerful tool in further promoting the CCP’s official view of the Nanjing Massacre in mainland China. The book both provides a heavily symbolic interpretation of the Massacre in relation to Japanese military atrocities and connects the Massacre to Japanese war guilt in contemporary politics. Chang emphasizes the inhumanity of the atrocities in great detail, provoking a sense of outrage among those who read her book.

It has been the Chinese American community that has publicized the Massacre in the United States to inform the American public of what happened in Nanjing. In 1987, the year of the 50\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the Massacre, the Chinese Alliance for Memorial and Justice was founded, and held a public event to commemorate the Massacre’s victims. Up until the present, they have publically commemorated the Massacre every year on December 13\textsuperscript{th}.

The overseas Chinese community as a whole has shown strong anti-Japanese sentiments. It was the US-based group ‘Alliance for Preserving the Truth of the Sino-Japanese War,’ for instance, that initiated the recent 2005 global signature campaign in opposition to Japan’s efforts to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council.\textsuperscript{169} Chinese Americans began publicizing the Massacre around the same time the Massacre and patriotic education began to be
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\textsuperscript{167} Again, as a refresher, since the CCP censors freedom of speech, if a certain viewpoint is widely publicized in popular media, we can assume that it is endorsed or, at least, tolerated by the CCP.
\textsuperscript{168} After suffering from depression, Chang committed suicide in November of 2004. Many believed that Chang was psychologically weakened from extensively researching the Nanjing Massacre.
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emphasized more in mainland China.\textsuperscript{170} Indeed, it has been the Chinese diaspora that has been largely responsible for spreading awareness of the Massacre on an international level.\textsuperscript{171} Iris Chang is representative of the voice of the Chinese diaspora. The success of her book was largely due to the help of the overseas Chinese community: it was a group of Chinese Canadians from Toronto that arranged Chang’s book tour, and she also received assistance from Chinese-American activists and the ALPHA (the Association for Learning and Preserving the History of World War II in Asia) group in her book promotion.\textsuperscript{172}

In this way, international relations between nations – in this case, mainly the US, China, and Japan – are influenced by popular media, which is influenced by and in turn influences public views of ‘the other.’ As is seen in the case of Jiang Zemin, these public sentiments have both crucial implications for domestic policies and unexpected repercussions in diplomatic relations on the international level.

\textbf{Chapter III: Sino-Japanese Relations in the 1990s}

Jiang Zemin’s Patriotic Education Campaign was an important influencing factor in the deterioration of Sino-Japanese relations in the 1990s. Although it cannot be isolated from other events at the time, such as the territorial disputes over the Diaoyu Islands or China’s continued
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\textsuperscript{171} After the 1949 split between the CCP and the GMD, more and more Chinese started to emigrate abroad. With the establishment of a sizeable Chinese diaspora community came the issue of establishing the identity of ethnic Chinese living abroad. Since these overseas Chinese often were not well-grounded in the Chinese language or in cultural customs from their motherland, they searched for a symbolic commonality on which to base their identity. Sadly, the Nanjing Massacre is becoming a negative symbolic representation of Chinese identity. As Ian Buruma notes in his article on “The Nanking Massacre as a Historical Symbol” (\textit{Nanking 1937: Memory and Healing}): “It has become more and more common for minorities, not only in the United States, to build their identities around symbols of collective suffering. As religious habits dwindle, languages fade away and cultural habits are narrowed down to eating bagels or dim sum, symbols of collective suffering become a kind of badge of common identity. This is a sad development, for instead of celebrating a rich tradition, it tends to lead to resentment and collective self-pity.” – p 9
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nuclear testing from 1993 to 1996, neither can it be ignored. The Patriotic Education Campaign directly influenced Chinese public opinion on Japan, particularly through its symbolic use of the Nanjing Massacre. Thus, the historical issue of the Massacre was directly connected to contemporary Sino-Japanese politics, and had a direct bearing on the lens through which the Chinese public perceived events involving the Japanese. In China, Japan’s identity in the 1990s was tied back to its militaristic past. However, the Japanese people were not blind to the anti-Japanese backlash in mainland China. They were aware of what was going on; subsequently, this led to an anti-Chinese backlash in Japan, and a dangerous vicious cycle was started.\textsuperscript{173}

After the tragedy of Tiananmen in 1989, Japan was actually one of the first countries to resume Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Beijing; Tokyo’s third yen loan package to China was announced in 1990.\textsuperscript{174} Japan chose a different response to Tiananmen than the West had. Although Japan also signed the July 1989 G-7 statement condemning what had happened,\textsuperscript{175} it was reluctant to isolate China for fear of what a chaotic China would do to the region.\textsuperscript{176} In addition, as Japanese Prime Minister Uno Sosuke stated, in view of Japan’s own historical grievances from World War II, the Japanese government was reluctant to condemn the Chinese government’s actions in Tiananmen.\textsuperscript{177}

In 1991, Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu was the first political leader from a developed country to visit China since Tiananmen. Japan seemed ready to restore positive diplomatic relations with China. However, although Japan was diplomatically softer in its response than the West, the Japanese public attitude toward China underwent a great change. Tiananmen shocked
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the Japanese public into the awareness that China was still an authoritarian state that had the potential of brutally suppressing those who opposed it.\textsuperscript{178} According to a Japanese government survey taken in 1989, the percentage of Japanese who felt close with China decreased from 68.5 percent in October 1988 to 51.6 percent in October 1989.\textsuperscript{179}

Although Japanese public sentiments were already starting to shift away from China after Tiananmen, the Japanese government still adopted a practical stance toward relations with China in the early 1990s. If the Chinese state collapsed, this would have major negative implications for Japan both politically and economically.\textsuperscript{180} Japan worried that if China collapsed, this might send a massive wave of Chinese refugees to Japan. Realizing as well that China was becoming a major economic power, the Japanese government did not want to jeopardize this valuable relationship with China.

At the beginning of the 1990s, the Chinese government also tended toward positive diplomatic relations with Japan. Naturally, Beijing reacted with gratitude to Japan’s support of the Chinese regime post-Tiananmen. Both Deng and Jiang spoke highly of Japan; Deng referred to Sino-Japanese friendship as “precious,” and Jiang commended “Japan’s positive role in building peace and prosperity in Asia as well as the whole world.”\textsuperscript{181} In response to Beijing’s request, the Japanese Emperor made a historic visit to China in 1992. Both the Chinese and Japanese governments had great hope for Sino-Japanese relations after this visit – Beijing saw the Emperor’s visit as an excellent chance to promote economic ties between the two nations,
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and Tokyo saw it as a chance to put historical issues behind them and usher in a new age of Sino-Japanese friendship.  

Although the Emperor’s visit was a definite plus for Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations, public sentiments at the time in China tell a much different story. Largely influenced by the push toward patriotic education that had started in China during the 1980s, a questionnaire was circulated among Beijing graduate students. According to the results of the questionnaire, many participants were in support of demanding an apology from the emperor for Japan’s war crimes. Many government officials were also supportive of this questionnaire, but the central Chinese government suppressed this protest movement before it could spread. Although the Chinese government was behind the patriotic education efforts, it did not wish to antagonize Japan. However, the responses of the youth to patriotic education had begun to grow stronger. A separate event in 1992 also provoked public alarm in China: the Japanese Diet passed legislation that permitted the Japanese Self-Defense Forces to participate in UN Peacekeeping Operations. Since this could be interpreted as moving in the direction of abolishing Article IX, the Chinese state media responded with great alarm. The years 1992 and 1993 also saw anti-Japanese public protests in China, where civilians demanded that Japan pay war preparations from the Second Sino-Japanese War.

As the visit of the Japanese Emperor in 1992 shows, relations between two nations cannot be limited merely to formal, diplomatic relations. Public sentiments play an important role in foreign policy. In Sino-Japanese relations,
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Societal anger and resentment constrain the two governments’ abilities to broaden cooperation. Emotion may serve an instrumental purpose as well. They add urgency and seriousness to an issue on the table. Emotions may either help to resolve the issue in favor of the initiator or may have a backlash effect. Emotions have thus evolved to serve foreign policy objectives.187

As such, when considering Sino-Japanese relations in the 1990s, it is imperative to consider public opinion as well as formal diplomatic processes. Even in the early 1990s, when diplomatic relations seemed to be running smoothly between China and Japan, there was already malcontent brewing under the surface. I have already mentioned that in Japan, public sentiments were shifting away from China largely due to the Tiananmen Crisis. In China, public sentiments were also shifting away from Japan, but for very different reasons.

After the Tiananmen Massacre, domestic efforts in China to promote patriotic education increased. The break-up of the Soviet Union only added to this trend – after Tiananmen, China was afraid of a break-up similar to what the USSR had suffered.188 However, at the same time that the CCP domestically promoted patriotic education to legitimize the regime, internationally, it pursued positive diplomatic relations with Japan. One reason was clearly economic – between 1986 and 1992, for instance, Japanese foreign direct investment (FDI) in China increased sevenfold. Despite all of the political issues that came to the forefront of diplomatic relations in the 1990s, the economic ties between the two countries served to stabilize relations. China was interested in Japan’s technology and investment, while Japan was interested in commercial opportunities in China whereby it could exert influence on China’s stability and development as a whole.189 During the 1990s, as Japan suffered from stagnation after the bursting of its economic bubble, China’s economy experienced rapid growth.190 Japan’s initial rise to power
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after the Meiji Restoration had corresponded with China’s decline as the Qing Dynasty crumbled. More than a century later, for one of the first times in history, Japan and China were both strong nation states at the same time; diplomatic tension was, perhaps, inevitable.

The 1994 Patriotic Education Campaign intensified the already-existing shift in government policy toward nationalism. The Nanjing Massacre, which had only been used as a symbol of Japanese aggression in mainland China since the 1980s, grew in symbolic importance after Jiang’s campaign began. Indeed, the Nanjing Massacre Museum’s construction and expansions – in 1985, 1995, and later in 2005 – perfectly coincide with the greatest periods of anti-Japanese protests (the 40th, 50th, and 60th anniversaries of the end of World War II). In this way, as China scholar Susan Shirk aptly notes, “it became a focal point of Chinese popular nationalism and a counterpoint to Japan’s Yasukuni Shrine.”191 In 1996, a poll of Chinese youth by the China Youth Daily found that among 83.9 percent of participants, the word “Japan” “most easily” made them think of the Nanjing Massacre. For 81.3 percent of participants, the word “Japan” also conjured up thoughts of “Japanese denial” and “the war of resistance against Japanese aggression. In addition, when asked to choose an adjective to describe the Japanese, 56.1 percent chose “cruel.”192 As these statistics show, the Patriotic Education Campaign had been all too successful in its efforts to promote nationalism through commemoration of the Century of Humiliation, the Second Sino-Japanese War, and the Nanjing Massacre.

Examining the role of the Nanjing Massacre in popular media and as part of the Patriotic Education Campaign, as was done in Chapter II, is crucial because it acts as a gauge for understanding both the Chinese politics of identity, which is very tied up with the Century of
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Humiliation, and Sino-Japanese relations as they continue into the twenty-first century.\textsuperscript{193}

Starting in the 1980s and increasing in the 1990s with the Patriotic Education Campaign, the Nanjing Massacre has played an important role in recounting China’s Century of Humiliation and the Second Sino-Japanese War. Although descriptions of the Massacre are, for the most part, short, they are a powerful part of the overall narrative of the Second Sino-Japanese War, which ends with China’s victory over Japan:

\begin{quote}
  The Nanjing massacre takes on particular symbolic weight because of its pivotal placement in Chinese history and historiography. In terms of physical and spiritual trauma, the Nanjing massacre is both the worst atrocity for China in World War II, and the worst atrocity in the Century of National Humiliation as a whole. The physical trauma of these rapes and murders takes on symbolic significance: the Nanjing Massacre represents the lowest point in modern Chinese history…Within the war itself, the Nanjing massacre is framed as a turning point whose barbaric atrocities ‘aroused the spirit of the Chinese race.’\textsuperscript{194}
\end{quote}

From the 1990s onward, a major development in these portrayals of the Massacre has been its prominence on internet sites. This has been a particularly dangerous medium because in cyberspace, it is easy to detach images from their original contexts. Thus, meanings are easily distorted, particularly with graphic pictures, which are often accompanied by minimal text.\textsuperscript{195}

In 1991, changes were made in junior high school history textbooks to reflect the new push toward patriotic education. In particular, the new textbooks contained a greater emphasis on the Second Sino-Japanese War and the Nanjing Massacre. Textbook accounts of the Nanjing Massacre used strong and graphic language. These accounts also connected the past Massacre with the present Japanese responsibility to atone for their past. For example, a passage on the Massacre from one textbook published during this time read: “Corpses and bones were scattered,
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rubble piled up into hills, a prosperous historical city suddenly became a hell on earth. The debt of blood caused by the Japanese aggressors will never be forgotten by the Chinese people.”

By the mid-90s, Jiang’s Patriotic Education Campaign had fueled strong anti-Japanese sentiments among the youth. From the early 90s on, polls show that Chinese youth are more nationalist than any other age group in China. However, they are also more obsessed with the Japan issue than either their parents’ or grandparents’ generations. Again, this was not the original intention of the Patriotic Education Campaign; it was a move intended to promote Chinese nationalism among the youth, to draw attention away from domestic issues. In this regard, the Patriotic Education Campaign has been extremely successful; China’s young people are quite loyal to the state. Influential China scholars such as Suisheng Zhao and Zheng Wang agree that official state propaganda has been directly responsible for the nationalistic sentiments among the Chinese public in the mid-1990s. To put it plainly, the CCP had dug itself into a hole. By creating very successful nationalistic propaganda through popular media and through schools, the government was successful in promoting patriotism among the youth. The propaganda, through targeting China’s tragic past and the atrocities of the Japanese in Nanjing, was successful at legitimizing the current CCP regime. However, this success came at an unforeseen cost to China’s diplomatic relations with Japan: “official propaganda implicated the CCP’s legitimacy in a nationalist discourse from which it would find it difficult to extricate itself when public emotions swelled beyond the government’s pragmatic state-strengthening objectives.”
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The years 1995 to 1996 are considered to be the lowest point in Sino-Japanese relations since diplomatic relations had been normalized between the two nations in 1972. Granted, the Patriotic Education Campaign is not the only reason for this, but it is a prominent factor. In 1995, there were massive celebrations across China to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. The year 1995 was considered to be the peak of the Patriotic Education campaign, with a great volume of propaganda produced to cover Japanese war crimes.\textsuperscript{201} In schools, there were required educational activities to commemorate the end of the War of Japanese Resistance. In August, homage was paid to veterans across the country. Troops came to schools to teach lessons on patriotism; their central theme was “The CCP was the mainstay of the force that led the Anti-Japanese War.”\textsuperscript{202}

In 1995, Japanese public opinions of China also took a sharp turn for the worse. Even in October 1994, a Japanese Public Opinion Survey on Diplomacy showed that those Japanese who felt a ‘sense of affinity toward China,’ 51.3 percent, still outnumbered those that did not, 44.3 percent.\textsuperscript{203} However, by the following year, 1995, relations had started to deteriorate. There are three major incidents from this year that concretely mark the deterioration of Sino-Japanese relations during this year: not only did the commemorations of the end of World War II strike a dissonant chord among the Japanese, but China’s continued nuclear testing and the reemergence of the sensitive Taiwan issue also strained bilateral relations.\textsuperscript{204}

China’s continued nuclear testing from October 1993 to July 1996 had left a very bad taste in the mouths of the Japanese. Not only did the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) conduct nuclear weapon tests, but it continued to conduct them a few days after China’s participation in
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the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, in which China, along with the four other nuclear powers, committed itself to cut back on nuclear tests in 1995. Since the memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki are still fairly recent, and Japan remains the only country to have been victimized by atomic bombings, the country is hypersensitive to issues concerning nuclear activity. Thus, the act of continued nuclear testing in the face of international disapproval caused Sino-Japanese relations to deteriorate. After China’s nuclear test in May 1995, Japan felt it necessary to cut off humanitarian aid, which had come in the form of Official Development Assistance (ODA), to Beijing. Beijing reacted angrily to the cutting off of ODA, citing historic grievances and claiming that the aid was a form of war reparation and thus must continue.

This triggered a vicious cycle in which anti-Japanese sentiments in China led to anti-Chinese backlash in Japan. Subsequently, this anti-Chinese backlash in Japan further antagonized China, who doubted Japan’s sincerity. The Japanese were alarmed by their perceptions of anti-Japanese movements in China. For instance, in June of 1995, a public opinion poll conducted by the Japanese newspaper *Showa shinbun* interviewed people in seven large cities across Asia, asking them whether or not Japan was now trusted by Asian countries. In Beijing, 85 percent responded negatively; in Shanghai, it was 78 percent. The percentage of Chinese participants responding in the negative was significantly greater than in cities of other East Asian countries included in the survey: for instance, in Seoul, 61 percent responded in the negative, and in Manila, only 45 percent. In 1997, public opinion polls in Japan showed that over half of Japanese respondents ‘did not feel friendly toward China.’

Largely in reaction to anti-Japanese sentiments in China, anti-Chinese sentiments in Japan grew in the years 1995-96. According to a Japanese government survey in 1996, the
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Japanese who did not have “close feelings” toward China increased to 55.5 percent, whereas those who did have “close feelings” decreased to 39.9 percent. This represented the first time since the initial establishment of the survey in 1978, shortly after official diplomatic relations had been restored with China, that the percentage of Japanese with negative perceptions of China outweighed those with positive perceptions. Reflecting the increasing tension between China and Japan, Japan’s Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto visited the Yasukuni Shrine on July 29, 1996 – the first time a Japanese prime minister had visited the Shrine since Nakasone’s visit over a decade earlier.

Starting in 1996, China had started to use the ‘history card’ more, demanding that Japan apologize for historical wrongs. By the late 90s, the viewpoint that Chinese foreign policy was dominated by emotional nationalism had increased in Japan. The Japanese saw the Chinese as ungrateful for all of the ODA they had poured into the nation. Along with this came the feeling of indignation in Japan that China was acting in an extremely hypocritical manner, constantly demanding apologies for Japanese military aggression while the CCP has a horrendous modern history record of its own. Adding to this hypocrisy, in the Japanese view, was that China’s accusations of nationalism in Japan came at a time when Chinese nationalistic sentiments were increasingly on the rise. China’s clear vote against Japan becoming a permanent member of the UN Security Council was also a sore spot in diplomatic relations. As Japanese resentment toward China increased, by the end of the 1990s, Japanese public opinion had shifted toward a foreign policy of containing China. A more conservative, hard-line approach to Japan became popular by the late 1990s; this was manifested most clearly in Junichiro Koizumi’s rise to power
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Conservatives in Japan believe that Japan has apologized far too many times to China, and that China has gone too far in continuing to demand reparations and an “official apology.” They angrily ask of the Chinese, “What more do they want, blood? How many more generations must we beg to be forgiven?”

While Japan’s anger toward China over nuclear testing was not directly related to historical grievances, the CCP soon connected the issue back to Japan’s “obligation” to repay China for the suffering inflicted upon it by the hands of the Japanese military. Especially in 1995, for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II, and from 1997-1998, the 60th anniversary of the Nanjing Massacre, the Chinese strongly questioned the Japanese for their “denial” of historical truths concerning the war.

The third issue in 1995 that antagonized Japan was China’s more forceful messages toward Taiwan. After President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan’s KMT party visited the US in 1995, and in the hopes of influencing the outcome of Taiwan’s 1996 presidential election, the PLA conducted a series of military exercises off of Taiwan including missile firings. Often referred to as the Third Taiwan Strait Crisis, these aggressive tests were part of an attempt from China to dissuade the Taiwanese from re-voting President Lee, who was seen as moving the ROC away from the One-China Policy, into office. However, although the exercises were directed toward Taiwan, they also fell dangerously near Japanese territorial waters. This flexing of China’s military muscle served to stress to the Japanese that the Chinese government would go as far as it had to, using force if necessary, to achieve its political goals.
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In 1996, yet another issue rousing tension between China and Japan emerged. The two nations had long held a territorial dispute over the Diaoyu, or Senkaku, Islands in the East China Sea near Taiwan. It was not until the 1980s, when natural oil reserves were discovered, that both China and Japan made stronger claims to the island. When Deng Xiaoping was Vice Premier of the PRC, he decided that in order to preserve friendly relations between China and Japan, it was better if the island dispute was left untouched. The next generation would surely be able to handle the issue better.\textsuperscript{215} Ironically, when the issue resurfaced under Jiang, it was worse: a series of events served to push the issue back to the surface. In 1996, the Japanese found a Chinese oil rigger off the coast of one of the islands.\textsuperscript{216} In response, to push for Japan’s sovereignty over the islands, the Japanese Youth Federation built a lighthouse on one of the islands. (The last time they had built a lighthouse on a Diaoyu Island had been in 1978, almost two decades earlier.) A year later, protestors planted the flags of both the PRC and the ROC on the main island. These flags were later removed by the Japanese. Although mass movements in response to the Diaoyu issue had broken out in Taiwan and Hong Kong in response to the 1996 event, it was not until 1998 that a similar campaign, called \textit{baodiao} (保钓, defend the islands) emerged on the mainland. In 1998, activists from the mainland attempted to board boats from Hong Kong bound for the Diaoyu Islands for the first time.\textsuperscript{217}

Perhaps the ultimate Chinese diplomatic faux pas was Jiang Zemin’s 1998 visit to Japan. Since both Mao and Deng both had important diplomatic documents concerning relations with Japan during their leadership (under Mao, the Japan-China Joint Communiqué in 1972; under Deng, the Treaty of Peace and Friendship in 1978), Jiang also wished to have a document related
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to Sino-Japanese relations ascribed to his legacy.\textsuperscript{218} Jiang’s visit was planned to coincide with the twentieth anniversary of the normalization of Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations in 1978. However, due to flooding in China, his visit was delayed; subsequently, a month prior to Jiang’s visit, the South Korean president Kim Dae-jung had also visited Japan, where he was presented with a written apology from the Japanese government for Japan’s wartime misdeeds in Korea. In exchange, Kim promised that Korea would never bring up the history issue again in diplomatic negotiations.\textsuperscript{219} Although Jiang had not originally planned on receiving a written apology, after Kim’s visit, Jiang also wanted a written apology to bring back to China. However, there was not sufficient time for extensive diplomatic negotiations between China and Japan on this matter.\textsuperscript{220}

The Japanese prime minister at the time, Obuchi Keizo, refused to grant a written apology to China. There were several reasons for this: first of all, Obuchi believed that the visit of the Emperor to China in 1992, where the emperor expressed great remorse for Japan’s wartime legacy in China, had been sufficient to settle the historical issue. Not only had the Emperor physically gone to China, which had been unprecedented, but he had humbly expressed his sorrow over the suffering Japan had inflicted on China. The Emperor had never visited South Korea, nor had he directed apologetic sentiments toward its citizens.\textsuperscript{221} Secondly, Jiang was unwilling to concede, as Korea had been, to renounce China’s right to playing the “historical card” at future summits and meetings between Chinese and Japanese leaders.\textsuperscript{222} Obuchi was unconvinced that China would ever cease to play its “history card,” even if a written document
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was signed, and so decided to only include a verbal apology to China during Jiang’s visit.\textsuperscript{223} Thirdly, Obuchi was largely pressured by his party, the LDP, to abstain from providing China with a written document. He did not have enough of a political base to risk isolating his party.\textsuperscript{224}

Originally, Jiang had not planned on pressuring the Japanese on the history issue. However, prior to the summit, domestic pressure on Jiang – both from the public and from those in the government – increased to take an aggressive stance on the history issue. The popular media reflected popular demands as well; for instance, an editorial in \textit{The South China Morning Post} in July of 1998 opined that “China should get an apology every bit as profuse as Korea’s.”\textsuperscript{225} If Jiang could not successfully resolve the history question, he was pressured to cancel his entire trip. Thus, Jiang’s political agenda on his visit to Japan was largely shaped by popular opinion.

While in Japan, Jiang clearly placed the promotion of Chinese nationalism, a domestic issue, as his top priority. Before his visit, since economic relations between the two countries had become more and more intertwined during the 90s, after 1996, there was a strong incentive to keep Sino-Japanese relations from further decline. As such, relations did not significantly improve, but were contained. However, Jiang’s 1998 visit to Japan ended up being a diplomatic catastrophe for Sino-Japanese relations. Originally, Jiang had three major discussion topics: Taiwan, Japan’s US alliance, and historical grievances. However, Jiang dropped the first two discussion topics and only focused on historical grievances, pressing his case at every meeting he was at. The Japanese – even the more liberal left-wing – found this extremely rude; Japan experts in China later reported to the Central Committee that Sino-Japanese relations were at a very dangerous dipping point because Jiang’s focus on history had produced a strong backlash in
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Japan.\textsuperscript{226} In contrast, the inexpert popular media in China largely heralded Jiang’s visit as a success. The Chinese-language newspaper \textit{People’s Daily} lauded it as “a visit of the utmost significance for the development of friendly future relations.”\textsuperscript{227} These domestic reports failed to mention the angry backlash in Japan that Jiang’s visit produced. \textsuperscript{228}

In reality, the majority of China’s Japan and international relations experts considered Jiang’s visit a failure. In response to Jiang’s disastrous visit, the Chinese government attempted to adopt an approach of “smile diplomacy”\textsuperscript{229} toward Japan, softening up on the history issue and emphasizing gratitude toward Japan for its economic aid.\textsuperscript{230} However, although this was a valiant effort on China’s part to repair the damage that had been done, it was too late; the dominance in negative emotions in Sino-Japanese relations has continued from the 1990s into the 21\textsuperscript{st} century.\textsuperscript{231} Both Chinese and Japanese public sentiments had escalated vis-à-vis the ‘other.’ Particularly in China, these public sentiments had gone too far – much farther than the CCP Propaganda Department had intended when it established the Patriotic Education Campaign. With the public rallying around the symbolic Nanjing Massacre, Chinese opinion toward Japan had soured. Domestically, then, it would take a lot more than a mere shift in government policy to psychologically shift the Chinese collective consciousness regarding Japan. Indeed, the CCP had already spent two decades creating a strong psychological correlation between Japan, the War of Resistance, and the Nanjing Massacre in the minds of China’s youth. As the 21\textsuperscript{st} century dawned, massive anti-Japanese protests among China’s youth would only get worse.
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Conclusion

Without awareness of the Patriotic Education Campaign’s role in mobilizing public opinion in China, it would be all too easy to blame the rough patches in contemporary Sino-Japanese relations on Japan’s former Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi. He was elected prime minister in April 2001, concurrently serving as president for his Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), and stayed in office until 2006. During his time in office, Koizumi certainly did aggravate China. To give a few poignant examples: First of all, he both responded to and stimulated public interest in amending Japan’s post-war constitution and strengthening Japan’s Self-Defense Forces. In particular, he was in favor of amending Article IX, the anti-war clause by which Japan renounces maintaining military capabilities for launching an offensive war. In addition, every year during his term, he visited the Yasukuni Shrine annually, provoking great outrage among the Chinese populace. Although Chinese diplomats tried to calm public fury when Koizumi first visited the Shrine in August 2001, by the time Koizumi visited the Shrine for the second time in the spring of 2002, there was nothing the Chinese government could do to limit the Chinese public backlash in the media. Needless to say, China’s leaders did not dare invite Koizumi back to China after this, for fear of incurring public disapproval. In response to Koizumi’s most recent visit to the Shrine, in October 2005, China’s leaders cancelled a scheduled summit with Koizumi at the APEC (Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation) meeting in Busan in November.

Certainly, “Koizumi diplomacy” worsened Sino-Japanese relations as a whole. However, Koizumi’s tough stance on China can be placed under the vicious cycle of ever-escalating anti-Japanese sentiments in China and anti-Chinese sentiments in Japan. This cycle had really
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become visible during the 1990s with Jiang’s increasing use of the “history card” and the furious response of the Japanese public. I believe that one factor that can be attributed to Koizumi’s popularity in Japan was his hard-line stance on China. As mentioned above, by the end of the 1990s, Japanese public sentiment had shifted decidedly away from China. The Japanese people had grown tired of the continuous pressure to apologize for Japanese military atrocities, and they wanted a strong leader who could stand up to China’s bullying. Counterintuitively, Jiang’s Patriotic Education Campaign contributed to the strengthening of the conservative right in Japan and created the tendency to favor the containment of China amongst the Japanese public, which was part of the reason for Koizumi’s wide popularity.

It must be emphasized here that both Japan and China are to blame for the cooling of bilateral relationships. The Chinese and the Japanese have been caught in a vicious cycle of reaction and counterreaction; as Rozman notes, “China heightened Japan’s alarm and then took that alarm as evidence of nefarious intentions.” However, my focus of this thesis has been on the often over-simplistic message of the Chinese Patriotic Education Campaign, through which the Chinese people tend to place almost exclusive blame on Japan for poor relations between the two countries. In a study conducted in 2005, it was found that 90 percent of Chinese blamed Japan for the deterioration of relations. In contrast, more than half of Japanese respondents said it was difficult to determine which side was more to blame. Through the Patriotic Education Campaign, most of the blame for the deterioration of Sino-Japanese relations continues to fall on
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Japan. This is worrisome; as Shirk notes, “people in China see every Japanese act through the lens of history and fail to recognize the impact of China’s own actions on Japan.”

In Japan, Jiang and his Patriotic Education Campaign are blamed for most of the negativity that surrounds Chinese perceptions of Japan today. The Patriotic Education Campaign certainly has had a strong impact on the negative anti-Japanese sentiments in China that persist until today. Since the early 1990s, the Nanjing Massacre has received more attention than ever before in both mainland China and in the international community. The Patriotic Education Campaign has continued to be implemented in education and popular media until today in China. In 2001, Chinese textbooks were edited for the first time since the 1980s, including more graphic descriptions of events such as the Nanjing Massacre.

In March of 2003, Hu Jintao succeeded Jiang as the PRC President in 2002. Hu and his premier, Wen Jiabao, have tried to strike a balance between appeasing the nationalist sentiment encouraged during Jiang’s reign in China and keeping it under control to avoid domestic instability or conflict with Japan. However, the weak and uncertain government stance on anti-Japanese activism has done nothing to deter activists, but rather encouraged anti-Japanese protests. When looking back at the beginning of the 21st century, anti-Japanese protests among the Chinese public have only increased in scope. In 2003, protests broke out across China after news circulated of Japanese businessmen arranging an “orgy” with hundreds of Chinese prostitutes in Guangdong on September 18th, one of China’s National Humiliation days. In 2004,
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violent riots broke out in Beijing among Chinese soccer fans after the Japanese team beat China in the Asia Cup.244

The year 2005 saw some of the most intense anti-Japanese protests to date: on April 9th, more than ten thousand students marched to Zhongguancun, an electronics market in Beijing’s university district. The symbolic target of the student protests was Japanese electronic products displayed in the shops; students violently smashed store windows and billboards advertising Japanese goods. There were several triggers for these protests. First, the Japanese government had recently approved a new textbook that white-washed the Nanjing Massacre and denied Japan’s guilt for military aggression during the Second Sino-Japanese War. In addition, Koizumi had recently visited the Yasukuni Shrine yet again: protestors wore shirts with blood-stained images of Koizumi and carried signs denigrating him. At the same time, the United Nations was considering Japan’s reapplication to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council. The demonstrations continued for around three weeks and spread across the country before the CCP clearly signaled that it was time to stop. The largest demonstration was in Shanghai on April 16th: some eyewitnesses estimate that the crowd was as large as one hundred thousand.245

Two decades after the first round of anti-Japanese protests in China, and the triggers were the same: textbook revisions and a prime minister’s visit to Yasukuni Shrine. However, in 2005, the CCP was much less equipped to deal with popular animosity toward Japan. With Koizumi’s rise to power at the beginning of the 21st century and the continuing of patriotic education in mainland China, anti-Japanese public sentiments on the mainland have only continued to escalate. The CCP has unleashed a monster that it cannot tame. Even with its recent “smile diplomacy” initiatives, China has found it difficult to tone down anti-Japanese sentiments
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among the public. After all, most nationalist propaganda from the 1980s to the early 2000s was focused on remembering Japan’s wartime atrocities.

In response to anti-Japanese public sentiments, Japanese public opinion toward China has become increasingly more negative in the 21st century. This was noticeable in 2004 after the Asia Cup protests, when Japanese public opinion on China sharply dropped. The following year, after the anti-Japanese protests in 2005, a poll by the Japanese newspaper Yomiuri Shinbun showed that the majority of the Japanese public favored a containment strategy toward China. Public approval of containment of China was apparent in the 2005 reelection of Koizumi’s LDP Party into the Diet with a greater majority than ever before.246 Disturbingly, Japanese and Chinese public opinion have turned sharply against each other, particularly in recent years. Shirke notes that “as of 2006, only 28 percent of the Japanese and 21 percent of the Chinese had positive views of each other, and people in both countries consider the other competitive, greedy, and arrogant.”247

What can we conclude from such statistics? First, historiography, public sentiments, and international relations are intricately intertwined. In the case of China and Japan, is impossible to clearly separate the Chinese historiography of the Century of Humiliation and events such as the Nanjing Massacre from CCP propaganda. Furthermore, it is impossible to separate this from anti-Japanese public sentiment in China and the role this has played in aggravating Sino-Japanese diplomatic relations. This should also serve as a strong wake-up call to both governments as they react and respond to public sentiments. As has been the case in Jiang Zemin’s Patriotic Education Campaign, domestic politics can have unintended repercussions on international diplomatic relations.
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