

The commemorative way: Public memory of wars and terrorism of the United States of America

Izumi T. Harris¹

Resumo: O artigo discute o modo de desenvolver comemorações em museus e memoriais dos Estados e analisa a política de negociar a memória entre as correntes dominantes e as minoritárias. A memória como símbolo estimula diversas tendências ao diálogo para criar a memória pública.

Palavras chave: memória pública, memória, símbolo, comemoração, museu, memorial, patriotismo, guerra, terrorismo, Estados Unidos.

Abstract: This article discusses the way to develop the commemoration in the U.S. museums and memorials and analyzes politics of negotiating memory between mainstream and minorities. In conclusion, memory as symbol encourages diverse people to dialogue in creating public memory.

Keywords: public memory, memory, symbol, commemoration, museum, memorial, patriotism, war, terrorism, United States.

Introduction

What make people's memory public? Who has authority to present official history? This issue has been explored by public historians who discussed how the general public's memory affects public memory. The general public's memory provides an interpretation differing from the official history developed by the ruling class, resulting in public memory created by negotiation. If so, how does public memory take a part in either unifying or splitting society? In considering this question, patriotism has become one of the main issues in public memory.

U.S. society has changed drastically regarding diversity. In recent years, the U.S. elected the first African American President who appointed the first female Secretary of State. Gay marriage has been legalized in some states. Concern over political correctness has influenced people's attitudes throughout the nation. Both the civil rights and women's liberation movements of 1960s and 1970s were successful in changing society. In spite of the success of such social reforms, conservative backlash has not disappeared. An example is the 1995 Enola Gay controversy. This presented the veterans' belief that the world's first atomic bombing ended the war and saved more lives. This conservative tendency continued in commemorations of wars in museums and memorials. The 9/11 Terrorist Attack in 2001 is another example. Those historic events and national tragedies made it more complicated to reflect diverse interpretations of commemorations in museum exhibits and memorials. The polarization of liberalism and conservatism is continuing and even intensifying. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq after the 9/11 Terrorist Attack caused serious social conflict. Nations are disintegrating from political competition, economical impoverishment, and social unrest, threatening the sense of unity.

Museums and memorials have influenced the social background through their commemoration of historic events. How can we present controversial history? Who should interpret ongoing historical and present events in exhibits and memorials? Is the strategy of uniting nations and arousing patriotic sentiment through memorials and exhibits still effective?

¹. PhD in Anthropology by University of Hiroshima. Professor in Indiana Japanese Language School. E-mail: izumi.t.harris@gmail.com

Creating memory, presenting commemoration

The discourse of war history is one of the most important ways through which governments validate their leadership. For instance, the Pacific War, which began in response to Imperial Japan's invasion that started with a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, is considered to have been a "Good War" [Boyer 1996; Dower 1986, 1996]. For nearly two decades between World War II and the Vietnam conflict, there was a sense of unity among the U.S. general public. However, strong protests to the Vietnam War that split the country made it difficult to negotiate a consensus version of history. The 9/11 terrorist attack united the country again, although it did not last long. Debate over the wars with Afghanistan and Iraq split the nation. Several years of war split the nation apart even more. In this situation, it is not clear who will be able to develop official history or how it will be done.

What makes history "official"? How is the general public's memory involved in official history? The concepts of nation and nationalism had been invented to pursue political-economic purpose [Anderson 2006 (1983)]. Even tradition has been reinvented to validate nations' authority [Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983]. When the myth of "true" history was exposed, memory became the key concept for the general public to influence the official history. The general public's life and values gained academic interest.

Memory is a version of historical discourse. Anyone can present his or her version of historical discourse so that memory is composed of multiple and plural testimonies. That means memory is reprehensive and symbolic as well². Marita Sturken calls that memory "cultural memory" [Sturken 1997]. The issue with multiple versions of historical discourse is determining which history should be an "official." Memories by diverse groups have been recognized in U.S. museums for decades; however, the mainstream resisted a drastic change in dominant memory and screened out diverse memories, thereby imposing their own values. Creating and reshaping memory is a competition between mainstream and minorities, each trying to make their memory dominant in society. Martha Norkunas explains that the ruling class controls the form and content of historical re-creation [Norkunas 1993]. Memory is highly political. John Bodnar indicates that public memory is produced from discussion between authorities and ordinary people. Further, it mediates the confrontation or imbalance between their interpretations. The central question for public memory is how effective vernacular interests will be in containing the cultural offensive of authorities [Bodnar 1992].

The history of wars has been presented in memorials, monuments, museums, and historic sites under the mainstream's own design; however, that interpretation is even more controversial between mainstream and minorities. Is it possible to develop an interpretation of history that is "official"? This article discusses historic representation since the 1990s in museum exhibits dealing with the atomic bombings of 1945 and the 9/11 terrorist attack of 2001.

Negotiating memory: interpretation of atomic bombing

Three and a half years after the Pearl Harbor attack, Imperial Japan was losing to the Allies the World War II. An atomic bomb known as "Little Boy" was dropped on the city of Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 followed by another bomb, "Fat Man", on the city of Nagasaki on August 9. Supposedly, 140,000 people in Hiroshima died by December, along with 70,000 people in Nagasaki. Imperial Japan was defeated August 15³.

² Clifford Geertz explains "symbol has been used to refer to a great variety of things, often a number of them at the same time" [Geertz 1973:91].

³ Allies occupied Japan to demilitarize and democratize. Japan restored sovereignty in April 28, 1952.

In 1995, the National Air and Space Museum planned a special exhibit of the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II⁴. The exhibit is named “The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of the World War II”; originally planned to explore the power of the bomb and the damage to Hiroshima. This was a unique challenge to show the horrific image in Hiroshima. The prevailing public view in the United States of the Pacific War is that it was a “The Good War,” which was “a noble struggle against forces that threatened not only Western values but the survival of civilization itself.” [Boyer 1996: 118]. This is based on the belief that the atomic bombing saved one million lives on both sides by avoiding a land invasion of Japan. This belief makes another interpretation of preventing atomic bombing difficult in the United States.

Veterans groups disagreed with description of historic events in “The Last Act.” Those groups, including the Air Force Association, American Legion, and others, put pressure on the museum to change the exhibit. They protested against the exhibit, lobbied to the United States Congress and appealed to the news media to create public opinion raising questions about the exhibit. “The Last Act” was criticized as “politically correct history” [Linenthal 1996:9], “historical revisionism at the worst...anti-American prejudice and imbalance of the exhibit...playing for left-wing ideologies” [Dower 1996:74].

Although the Smithsonian Institute is an independent organization, eight of seventeen members of the Board of Regents are the U.S. Vice President, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, three U.S. Senators, and three U.S. Representatives; in addition, the greater part of budget comes from the federal government. As the results, the exhibit script was cancelled, and it is concluded that there is no historical presentation on the exhibit⁵. This friction with respect to the script of the exhibit was the result of conflicting historical interpretations of the atomic bombing. Even though the Organization of American Historians protested to the Smithsonian for canceling the original exhibit script, the decision was not reversed. The controversy led to the resignations of both the director of the Air and Space Museum and the president of the Smithsonian Institute.

The Enola Gay controversy showed that it was extremely difficult to discuss the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the United States. However, the situation is changing gradually. When “The Last Act” was cancelled, American University and City of Nagasaki organized the “Hiroshima Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Exhibition” in July 1995. Since then, both the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and the Nagasaki City Peace Promotion have offered a traveling “Hiroshima Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Exhibition.” The exhibition includes A-bomb photo panels, artifacts, survivor testimony, and films.

The Atomic Testing Museum and the Nagasaki National Peace Memorial Hall co-hosted the Hiroshima Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Exhibition at the Atomic Testing Museum in Las Vegas, Nevada from August 5th to 27th, 2006. There were display panels explaining the power of the atomic bomb, damage to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and injuries to victims. Panels included historical photographs showing a burnt-out area and injured human figures. Display cases stored some atomic bomb victims’ artifacts, including a melted glass jar, a rosary, a uniform hat, and a short-sleeved blouse. A video in the hall showed an historical film and testimony by victims. Visitors had an opportunity to leave messages on cards hanging in the exhibit hall and

⁴ The National Air and Space Museum is the one of 19 museums including museum of art and zoo, and 9 research centers in Smithsonian Institute.

⁵ Harwit described the controversy in his 1996 book; *An Exhibit Denied: Lobbying the History of Enola Gay*.

make origami cranes for the museum to ship back to the atomic bombing memorial site in Japan.

The museum opened in 2005 to preserve the history of the Nevada Atomic Testing Site. The museum exhibits the history of the nuclear and atomic testing site, underground tests, atmospheric tests, effects on the environment, and the role of the testing site after the cold war. Although the museum had been criticized for its permanent exhibits by protestors from both sides, there was no protest against the Hiroshima Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Exhibition.

The opening ceremony on August 5th, 2006, was followed by greetings from directors of both the Atomic Testing Museum and the Nagasaki National Peace Memorial Hall and testimony of a survivor from city of Nagasaki. The session drew a large audience--167 according to a rough estimate. A question and answer session followed testimony by a survivor. Because of timing in the middle of the Iraq War, audiences were very receptive, eagerly seeking world peace. The "Hiroshima Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Exhibition" project was successful in developing an understanding of the victims' viewpoint at the grass-root level. The exhibition has traveled throughout the world, including 38 cities in 14 countries by 2011.

During the U.S. presidential campaign in 2007 and 2008, both the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and the Nagasaki City Peace Promotion held the "Hiroshima-Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Poster Exhibition." Their goal was to travel to Washington, D.C. and 2 cities in every state. They held the exhibits in 113 cities in 48 states by 2008. These exhibits consist of A-bomb photo panels and video. A-bomb survivor testimony was planned in 25 cities, then expanded to 41 cities, with support from survivors' groups and survivors who live in the U.S. This exhibits were continued in 2009 and 2010, and held 129 cities in 50 states in total.

Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) hosted the "Hiroshima-Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Poster Exhibition" in 2009⁶. Although most of guests were university students, high school students and teachers also visited the exhibit. The most difficult issue was how to help the survivors reach the audience, because those survivors are aged and have difficulty traveling. As a solution, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum proposed a web conference between the museum and IUPUI.

The live video conference with a Hiroshima survivor was hosted along with a panel discussion. The panel discussion featured four Indiana University professors, who discussed economic, historical and political perspectives on the bombings and the prospects for a world without nuclear weapons. After that discussion, a survivor shared his experiences. Takashi Teramoto, at the time⁷⁴, had been a young boy living in Hiroshima when the A-bomb was detonated over the city of Hiroshima. Teramoto discussed his terrifying experiences with a calm but trustworthy manner. A question and answer session followed the survivor's testimony. The audience had many questions and comments, ranging from fact checking to nuclear abolition. One participant commented in the post-session survey that the testimony changed her view of life. This session drew the news media's interest and was reported in Hiroshima⁷. This novel web conference was replicated in subsequent "Hiroshima-Nagasaki Atomic Bomb Poster Exhibition" visits in other cities.

⁶ I was an organizer along with Robert B. Harris, Director of the Center for Economic Education and Professor of Economics and Ian McIntosh, Director of International Partnerships and Professor of Anthropology.

⁷ http://www.hiroshimapeacemedia.jp/mediacenter/article.php?story=20090227121347205_ja (last view on January 12, 2014)

Through this process, discussion and negotiation of memory of atomic bombing have continued to develop. According to the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, there were some protests during planning but no interference during exhibitions. In the case of the exhibit at IUPUI, one of the organizers received an email criticizing IUPUI for holding the exhibit. The writer argued that because Imperial Japan was the invader in Asia, it had no right to protest the atomic bombing. Those negative comments notwithstanding, the exhibit has helped to develop an opportunity to negotiate the memory. Otherwise the exhibit improved communication between Japanese and Americans in the context of “peace free from nuclear weapons,” facilitating civic connection between the nations.

Although “The Last Act” was cancelled, the controversy was an opportunity to show the alternative historic interpretation of atomic bombing to the public. That chaotic debate deepened the confrontation between conservatives and liberals, yet it made possible bringing the temporary exhibits from Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This shows that the debate on a public memory opens up the way to tell an alternative history. However, diverse historic interpretation weakens the official history by reducing one of its attachments to society. Such controversies regarding official history tend to reduce the sense of unity in society.

Diverse memory: Commemoration of Terror

In the 1990s, when the Enola Gay controversy exposed differing historic interpretations of atomic bombing, it became clear that it was difficult to authorize an historic interpretation as “official”. After 2001, this tendency became even more complicated as a result of the 9/11 Terrorist Attacks. There were widespread debates over ways to commemorate the event.

The 9/11 incident was actually a series of four coordinated attacks by al-Qaeda. They hijacked four commercial airliners and crashed two of them into the World Trade Center in New York, one into the Pentagon, which is the headquarters of the United States Department of Defense, and one into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania. Total lives lost included 2,977 victims and 19 hijackers, for a total of 2,996 dead. This terrorist attack attracted the world’s attention, because of the incredibly large scale of the damage, including both human lives and destruction, which was almost unimaginable. Many countries sympathized with the U.S. over the horrific losses, and this national level emergency permeated American life.

This terrific sense of sacrifice was shared by Americans. It became even stronger when they witnessed news videos of people who were delighted by the success of the terrorist attack. The feeling of humiliation and hatred brought Americans together again, but this renewed sense of unity ended with the wars in Afghanistan (2001-current) and Iraq (2003-2011), which are the longest wars in the U.S. history. In addition to the problem of economic stagnation, U.S. politics and the nation as a whole were polarized. This growing polarization affected the way we chose to remember the horrific events of 9/11.

Although 9/11 occurred at four sites, the image of collapsed World Trade Center buildings represents the horrific events. The image looked as a scene from a movie, rather than one of reality. When the World Trade Center is showed on the films, art works, and photographs, it is difficult for Americans not to invoke the feeling of loss. Efforts at healing began during the early stages of recovery, including how to recover the site, how to memorize the attack, and how to commemorate the victims. Discussions, along with protests, led to several modifications in the early plans.

The recovery plans split up two. Because of the World Trade Center site was a center of business and commerce, the developer initially focused on rebuilding the site as it had been before the attack. Because the victims' families could not accept the plan at all, a new plan was arranged for the memorial site. The developer kept changing the plan to be more business-centered. This long process frustrated New Yorkers, including the governor, New York City mayor, and business owners. In 2002, all the wreckage was removed from the site and the search for corpses was canceled, and then finally construction of new world trade center building and subway started.

Sturken explained that this "rush to memorization" allowed people to feel that the horrid event was over, resulting in the site becoming a focal point for international tourism. [Sturken 2007:258]. The National September 11 Memorial opened to the public on the anniversary day in 2011. The Memorial contains two reflecting pools. The pools are located within the footprints of the original Twin Towers. The memorial is dedicated to the victims of those terror attacks, including those from the World Trade Center, Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and the Pentagon, along with the six victims of the World Trade Center bombing in February 1993. The names of victims are inscribed on bronze panels surrounding those reflecting pools. They are arranged to keep acquaintances' names together, to assist friends and colleagues paying their respects.

Although this site is a place of pilgrimage, the pieces of steel of World Trade Center carry the horrific memory of the attack to in and out of the United States. One of those memorials is in downtown Indianapolis, Indiana. The memorial consists of a pair of beams weighing 11,000-pound (5,000 kg), from the World Trade Center buildings. There are two walls behind the beams. Those are inscribed with remembrances of the attack in New York City; Washington, D.C.; and Shanksville, Pennsylvania. A life-size sculpture of an American Bald Eagle perched top of the one of the beams, with wings outstretched and gazing east toward New York City. This memorial, far from the sites of the original 9/11 attacks, shows that the memory is shared regardless of where you are.

Although the National September 11 Memorial is a focal site of three terrorist attacks and has become hallowed ground, the Flight 93 National Memorial in Shanksville, Pennsylvania shows a different approach to commemoration. Flight 93 was hijacked while crossing Pennsylvania. The hijackers turned the plane toward Washington D.C. The passengers and crew made calls to report the hijacking and then realized that their flight was part of a coordinated terrorist attack. They fought back, ending with a crash into a plowed into a field where the plane exploded. Flight 93 was the only one of the four hijacked aircraft that failed to approach the target. This helps to explain why the Flight 93 National Memorial is different from the other 9/11 memorials in New York and Washington D.C.

Congress authorized development of the Flight 93 National Memorial in 2002. The first features of the memorial, including the new entrance, new roads, and the Memorial Plaza, were completed and dedicated on September 10, 2011. The Memorial Plaza is designed to be self-guided, using panels providing a general overview of the event. The long sloping black wall divides the walk way for visitors from the impact site. You can still see the remains of a hemlock grove damaged by the crash of Flight 93, but the crater was filled in later. On the other side of the walkway there is the Wall of Names with forty inscribed white marble panels dedicated to the victims. At the Ceremonial Gate, only family members of victims are allowed to walk into the impact site.

Because of the hallowed nature of the impact site, it is closed to visitors other than family members. The victims fought back to the terrorists and saved Capitol Hill from being attacked, so that they became recognized as heroes. On the other hand, in contrast to revival of New York, this memorial highlights the sorrow. As a result, the National September 11 Memorial is open as a public and tourist destination, compared with the Flight 93 National Memorial which is more of a private space. This indicates that the way to commemorate varies depending on the meaning of the site.

Memory as symbol

The commemoration of the atomic bombing of the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the 9/11 Terrorist Attack shows that there is no authority to persuade diverse groups to an “official” history. The negotiation of the “Last Act” exhibit resolved the conflict but failed to unify the nation. The planning of the 9/11 memorials showed different meanings regarding a national event. In this process, is the strategy to use the patriotism in museums and memorials to unify the nation still effective?

Patriotism is a key value for Americans; therefore, museums have presented it in their exhibits repeatedly. Plimoth plantation is a living history museum presenting the settlement of the Plymouth Colony in 1627. This exhibit shows the hard work and cooperation of the first settlers who founded the nation. Colonial Williamsburg is another living history museum. Williamsburg presents colonial Virginia's capital and American Revolutionary War history. This historic presentation evokes national pride and romanticism related to the revolution. Both museums appeal to visitors' patriotic imagination.

Plimoth plantation and Colonial Williamsburg had something in common in terms of what they chose for their exhibits. Both had downplayed the role of minorities, including Native Americans and African Americans, in their history. These museums simplified their history and left the social conflict out. Neither explored conflicts with minority groups, including Native Americans from whom they took territory or the African Americans whom they held as slaves. The image that they developed exaggerated U.S. authenticity and unity. Both museums reviewed the historical accuracy of their exhibits in the 1980s and 1990s, resulting in the more complete inclusion of Native Americans and African Americans.

Since the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, minorities have been visible in the social and cultural spheres, including museums and historic sites. Museum exhibits are reviewed in terms of the minorities' point of view. As we saw at Plimoth plantation and Colonial Williamsburg, museums added or changed their exhibits in the 1980s and 1990s. Although some museums diversified their exhibits, others went in the opposite direction, becoming less diverse.

“Smithsonian's America” was a travel exhibit to Japan from National Museum of American History and the National Air and Space Museum in 1994 [Kurin 1997]. The exhibit presented the history of ethnic diversity. They displayed the ceremonial robe of the Ku Klux Klan, which is the icon of prejudice against African Americans. This caused some controversy among those who felt it was unpatriotic to dwell on the negative. This conflict led to a review of the international “Smithsonian's America”, leading to changes before the domestic version, “America's Smithsonian”, was presented. The domestic exhibit removed social conflict from “Smithsonian's America.” Kurin pointed out the one of the reasons that the Smithsonian was forced to change the “Smithsonian's America,” was the effect of the Enola Gay controversy.

The Enola Gay controversy caused a serious conflict between conservatism and liberalism. This “Culture War” [Kohn 1995, Wallace 1996] ended with “the

victory of those who felt threatened by obfuscation of the contours of controversial knowledge” [Yoneyama 2001:339]. The debate challenged the view that there is a consensus in historical discourse. Although the alternative point of view of the atomic bombing was rejected in the exhibit plan, that attempt provided the opportunity to bring the travel exhibit from the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This academic interest broadens the historic perspectives in the U.S. by challenging official history. This was the process from “museums as shrine” to “museum as forum”, which rejected the existence of “true” or “neutral” history⁸. However, when negotiations over the “Last Act” collapsed, they lost the opportunity to discuss the issue. This is similar to the issue of “ethnic enclave” that I previously described in terms of ethnic diversity [Harris 2013].

Since it is difficult to share an interpretation for a historic event, how do we commemorate the event? Historically, commemoration for wars was presented as monuments that were often obelisk style. The Bunker Hill Monument, established in 1843 in Massachusetts, was dedicated to the first major battle of the American Revolution. The Washington Monument, established in 1885 at Washington D.C., honored the nation's founding father, George Washington. The Gettysburg National Memorial, established in 1886 in Pennsylvania, commemorated the Civil War's bloodiest battle with 51,000 casualties and President Abraham Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address." Those monuments, both past and present, are an icon of American patriotism.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial, established in 1982 in Washington D.C., honored more than 58,000 Americans in service. The below-ground level walls are engraved with the names of KIA (Killed in Action) or MIA (Missing in Action) service men and women. A black granite surface shows a reflection of the viewers. The design, with its black walls, was controversial; it was not a conventional color and design, such as obelisk. Once it was called “a black gash of shame,” although later the criticism faded out [Sturken 1997]. However, there are still some veterans who are uncomfortable with the walls. Because of the controversy over the war itself, it was difficult to achieve consensus on how to commemorate the war and present patriotism. The reflective walls represent multiple interpretations of the war. There is no official story on the walls; audiences have the opportunity to explore their own way to commemorate. This does not suggest a lack of patriotism; rather, patriotism has been relativized. As a result, the representation of patriotism in war memorials has evolved over time.

The National September 11 Memorial and the Flight 93 National Memorial have different approaches to commemorate the victims. The news media discussed the similarity with the Pearl Harbor attack as a surprise attack. This discourse evokes the memory of a “good war” that united the nation during the Pacific War. The placing of the national flag at Ground Zero by New York firefighters was reminiscent of the Marine Corps War Memorial (also called the Iwo Jima Memorial⁹). Although 9/11 was once an icon of unity, differences of opinion regarding commemoration by the memorial cause that unity to disintegrate. As a result, The National September 11 Memorial is a place to acknowledge the loss rather than demonstrate patriotism. Audiences look down at the reflecting pools on the sites of the original buildings, rather than looking up toward the missing building. This is the reverse of the typical

⁸ Museums as temple are “timeless and universal function, the use of a structured sample of reality, not just as a reference but as an objective model against which to compare individual perceptions [yet as forum are for] confrontation, experimentation, and debate” discussed in Cameron 1972.

⁹ The memorial statue featured six marines raised the flag over Iwo Jima after the worst battle of the Pacific War.

memorial, which have audiences looking up at obelisks. In addition, this memorial is unlike the typical war memorial in that rather than honoring military personnel, it is for the civilian victims including passengers, crew, office workers and visitors at the World Trade Center buildings, along with the firefighters who lost their lives.

Although the Flight 93 passengers and crew were also ordinary civilians, they are named as heroes at the Flight 93 National Memorial. Even though the memorial consists of white walls with victims' name, it looks modest. Unlike the National September 11 Memorial, the Flight 93 National Memorial does not allow visitors to enter the crash site. The Flight 93 memorial is recognized as a hallowed place, because of its concealment. The National September 11 Memorial and the Flight 93 National Memorial commemorate the tragedy in different ways; however, both are destinations for sharing memory.

In recent years, museum exhibits and memorials have been presenting memory. That is because memory is created by people from diverse backgrounds; consequently, a memory represents diverse values. This explains why memory is highly symbolic. The diverse memory of museums and memorials encourages people to discuss uncertain historic events with those outside their own enclaves.

Conclusion

Commemorating wars and terror incidents is complicated in a diverse society. In the case of the Enola Gay controversy, alternative memory conflicted with the official history so that discussion broke down. When plans were developed to recover the 9/11 Terrorist Attack site, those plans conflicted with surviving families' memory. When diverse groups received the opportunity to apply their own value in interpreting wars and terrorism, defining patriotism became more complicated. The strategy to evoke people's patriotism in museums and memorials needed to be changed.

There is no authority to determine the U.S. historical discourse, so that official history is losing its meaning. Disbelief of official history caused even more intense competition among the diverse groups. In this process, minorities, including Native Americans, African Americans, Vietnam War veterans, and the 9/11 victims' families, competed and negotiated with the majority, making possible the incorporation of their perspectives into the historic presentation. Public memory of commemoration of those wars and terrorism was created by intermediation between opponents, negotiation, and redefinition of patriotism. The general public's memories brought politics into the museums and memorials.

The dichotomy between conservatism and liberalism has become extreme. Since 9/11, the debate over the Patriot Act¹⁰ has exacerbated that clash of ideologies. The dispute over the Snowden incident illustrates the growing anxiety over the loss of privacy that results from our efforts to increase security¹¹. As a result of the increasing conflict between the goals of privacy and security, the definition of patriotism has been contested again. Public memory continues to play a significant role in conciliating the confrontation.

Acknowledgements: I gratefully acknowledge the help with the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum and many other museums. I am most grateful to Chie Hirose for the encouragement in introducing this work to Dr. Jean Lauand, making it possible to publish in *Internacional Studies on Law and Education*. Finally I must thank Robert B. Harris, who explored museums and memorials with me, for providing me with helpful comments and proofreading.

¹⁰ It is signed into law by President George W. Bush on October 26, 2001.

¹¹ It leaks top secret of National Security Agency documents to several media in 2013.

References Cited

- Anderson, Benedict 2006 (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.
- Bodnar, John 1992 *Remaking America: Public memory, commemoration, and patriotism in the twentieth century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Boyer, Paul 1996 Whose History Is It Anyway? Memory, Politics, and Historical Scholarship. In *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past*. E.T. Linenthal and T. Engelhardt, eds. pp.115-139. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Cameron, Duncan F. 1972 The Museum: A Temple or the Forum. *Journal of World History*, 4(1):189-202.
- Dower, John W. 1986 *War without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War*. New York: Pantheon.
- 1996 Three narratives of our Humanity. In *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past*. E.T. Linenthal and T. Engelhardt, eds. pp.63-96. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Geertz, Clifford 1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books. New York: A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.
- Harris, Izumi T. 2013 “Ethnic diversity or ethnic enclaves? Representing African American history in U.S. Museums” *Educação & Linguagem* vol. 16(2), pp.58-76.
- Harwit, Martin 1996 *An Exhibit Denied: Lobbying the History of Enola Gay*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger 1983 *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kohn, Richard H. 1995 “History and the Culture Wars: The Case of the Smithsonian Institution Enola Gay Exhibition” *The Journal of American History* December: 1036-1063.
- Kurin, Richard 1997 *Reflections of a Culture Broker: A View from the Smithsonian*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Linenthal, Edward T. 1996 Anatomy of a Controversy In *History Wars: The Enola Gay and other Battles for the American Past*. E.T. Linenthal and T. Engelhardt, eds. pp. 9-62. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Norkunas, Martha K. 1993 *The Politics of Public memory: Tourism, History and Ethnicity in Monterey, California*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sturken, Marita 1997 *Tangled Memories: The Vietnam War, the AIDS Epidemic, and the Politics of Remembering*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press.
- 2007 *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Wallace, Mike 1996 “Culture War, History Front” In *History Wars: The Enola Gay and Other Battles for the American Past*. E.T. Linenthal and T. Engelhardt, eds. pp.171-198. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Yoneyama, Lisa 2001 For Transformative Knowledge and Postnationalist Public Spheres: The Smithsonian Enola Gay Controversy. In *Perilous memories: The Asia-Pacific War(s)*. T. Fujitani, G. M. White, and L. Yoneyama eds. pp323-346. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Recebido para publicação em 13-01-14; aceito em 15-02-14