

the University of California. It was watched by scholars, some from abroad, and later televised. An invitation from the Smithsonian Institute to perform shamanic rituals in the USA as a part of the celebration of the hundredth anniversary of Korean–American diplomatic relations followed (1982) to the embarrassment of the Korean government, who initially refused her permission because, in its view, superstitious rituals performed in America would disgrace the Korean nation. When threatened with the cancellation of the programme by the Smithsonian Institute, the government relented, but insisted on replacing the reference to shamanic ritual with traditional dance. After numerous other performances at home and abroad, including academic gatherings, she was awarded the highest governmental recognition as the ‘Carrier of the Skill of the Intangible Cultural Property No. 82-B for the Western Coastal Boat Ritual and the Community Harmony Ritual’. The title is vested with a life-long stipend to train disciples. Fame as a performer of shamanic art and the financial security did not make Kum-Hwa Kim give up her shamanic vocation, but she makes a clear distinction between her shamanic theatrical performances and the secret *kuts* for clients, some of whom are even from governmental circles, despite the illegality of the practice.

The book is a good read for anybody. It is also, in spite of some drawbacks, a must for anybody interested in or researching shamanism. It is chatty and rather personal, on occasions repetitive, and the pieces of information relevant for academic research and the author’s conclusions on important points are scattered almost haphazardly throughout the book. Although the author says that his book is a revised version of his thesis, I can hardly imagine that it would have been acceptable in its present form, because a thesis should have a more systematic structure. So maybe the book is a rewrite for a wider public. I have the impression that there is a certain ambiguity about the whole project; I would regard it in the final assessment as rather inconclusive and not sufficiently thought through. Even so, it does contain some original material and some original ideas as well as useful references to a large number of academic and other sources. The details given about the author’s fieldwork experiences with ordinary village folks who availed themselves of the services of shamans are very important to know about. The author’s insistence that a true picture of Korean shamanism can be obtained only if it is studied within the cultural context of village life and not only from the point of view of shamans, especially those in an urban setting, is no doubt fully justified.

KAREL WERNER

*School of Oriental and African Studies  
University of London*

JAPANESE ARMY STRAGGLERS AND MEMORIES OF WAR IN JAPAN, 1950–1975. By BEATRICE TREFALT. pp. 272. London & New York, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.

DOI: 10.1017/S1356186304364606

Though much has been written about it, Japan’s attempt to create an empire in East and South East Asia in the twentieth century is still difficult to explain and understand. David Calman has written of it as ‘an anachronism . . . [Japan’s] “modern” imperialism belongs to the seventeenth century’ (*The Nature and Origins of Japan’s Imperialism*, London & New York, 1992, p. 209). Perhaps there can be no anachronisms in history. But the extraordinary ambitions of the modern period indeed had some sort of precedent in earlier centuries. “Even China will enter my grip”, Hideyoshi had claimed in the 1590s (quoted in Mary E. Berry, *Hideyoshi*, Harvard, 1982, p. 207). “With proper spirit and discipline on our part”, Sato Nobuhiro asserted more than two centuries later, “China would crumble and fall like a house of sand within five to ten years” (quoted in W. G. Beasley, *The Meiji Restoration*, Stanford, 1972, p. 80).

What part such ideas played in the 1930s, what part was played by fear and opportunism, incompetence and misjudgement, as well as by ambition, remains open to analysis. And that is a challenge to the Japanese as well as others. It is arguably indeed a greater challenge, even more difficult to meet, inasmuch as the venture, consumed by violence, ended in catastrophe, and the Japanese have been unable to come to terms with all its implications. The Renesque process of learning and forgetting has been the more fraught inasmuch as defeat was followed by reconstruction and destruction by prosperity. The continuities and discontinuities have not been easy to discern. "The significance of the conflict remains a recurring topic of discussion and dispute both within the country and overseas", Beatrice Trefalt writes (p. 3). Her work offers a novel contribution to an extended debate.

The 'empire' that Japan built was vast, including not only its earlier acquisitions, Okinawa, Taiwan and Korea, but also Manchukuo, large parts of China, most of South East Asia, its earlier mandates in the Pacific and its later conquests extending from the Aleutians to the shores of New Guinea. Its collapse was dramatic. At the end of the war – when Japan was deprived of all but Okinawa – more than six million Japanese were 'overseas' and awaiting repatriation. That process added eight per cent to the population of the homeland between 1945 and 1948, described by Wakatsuki Yasuo, as Trefalt says, as "one of the biggest concentrated population movements in the history of the world" (p. 25). Japan seemed to be unique in defeat as in victory, but not easier to comprehend as a result.

Not all were repatriated in those years. Large numbers were held back in the Soviet Union, and some soldiers served in the anti-colonial struggles in South East Asia. Trefalt's focus is at the other end of the scale, the 65 or so 'stragglers' who over the next twenty-five years emerged from caves and jungle fastnesses, having been unable or unready to surrender and rather too readily assumed to be dead by the Bureau of Repatriate Welfare. Though the numbers are small, their experiences are significant. The author tries with some success to depict their own attitudes and those of their families and fellow-citizens when they returned unexpectedly to a changed and changing Japan. But her main focus is on the public reaction to the repatriates, particularly as evidenced in reportage in newspapers and journals and in cartoons.

Though no one single view ever prevails, it is possible to trace a predominant reaction that shifts over time. The author traces it phase by phase with thoroughness and subtlety, if with a degree of repetition that, perhaps not entirely inappropriately, recalls the practice of military instructors: say what you are going to say, say it, then say it again. Burdened a little by the baggage of cultural studies jargon, the book is well organised and persuasively argued. The conclusion is that, despite the shifts in attitude, the series of debates that the stragglers' staggered return provoked never really encompassed the effect of the 'imperialist' war on the peoples of East and South East Asia. It remained concerned with the Japanese themselves.

The first phase described by the author covers 1950–2, the last years of the Occupation. Many Japanese had still to be repatriated, and the stragglers who returned then received relatively little attention. They "did not elicit pity so much as curiosity", and "were often portrayed as exotic or strange, and at times as hardly human" (p. 49), even as 'Tarzans'. In the years 1954–5 further stragglers were repatriated from Mindoro, New Guinea and Morotai. Those post-Occupation years were marked both by the growth of pacifist literature and by the publication of *senkimono* (memoirs and stories of the war), and the media's portrayal of the returnees put more emphasis on their military character than on their 'otherness'. There was a tendency to refer to those repatriated from New Guinea respectfully as "living spirits of the war dead" (p. 80).

The denigration of high-ranking military leaders, coupled with praise of self-sacrificing common soldiers, already emerging in this phase, developed in the next phase into a 'discourse' of victim consciousness. That phase was marked by the deep public controversy over the renewal of the mutual security treaty with the US that led to the fall of Kishi Nobusuke. "The stragglers of this period

returned to a nation that was negotiating the significance of the last war at a basic level and consciously debating notions of nationhood, national identity and national history” (p. 90). In the context of the pacifist discourse promoted by the treaty re-negotiation, stragglers were seen as citizens, compatriots and victims of militarism.

The notion that the soldiers were ‘victims’ was renewed when Yokoi Shoichi was discovered on Guam early in 1972. “His long exile was presented as the sacrifice of a victim rather than that of a willing participant in the war” (p. 118). That was coupled, however, with further reflection on the state of the nation to which he had returned. “What will this fossil think of us?” (p. 133). Though the war was a horrific experience, the war period was less hypocritical and less selfish than the prosperous and consumerist 1970s.

Those were reflections on Japan, not on its war. Though the author argues that the last straggler, Nakamura Teruo, found on Morotai late in 1974, “inescapably brought into the public sphere the legacies of Japanese imperialism and war outside of Japan” (p. 160), in fact that debate did not go very deep. He was a member of a Taiwanese minority people, the Ami, recruited into the Imperial Japanese Army. He was another ‘victim’, but still not one of Japan’s wartime aggression. His case “did not in the end”, as the author admits, “provide the grounds for a wider and more sustained exploration of the impact of Japanese imperialism” (p. 177).

His case does, however, offer material for current debates on ‘ethnicity’ and its ‘construction’. Nakamura had names in Ami as well as his Japanese name. Now he wanted to return to Taiwan, though it was, of course, no longer part of the empire. There he learnt for the first time that, as a result of the KMT government’s policy of assimilation, he was now Li Kuany-Hwei, though he did not speak Chinese.

NICHOLAS TARLING

*New Zealand Asia Institute, University of Auckland*

LANGUAGE, IDEOLOGY AND JAPANESE HISTORY TEXTBOOKS. By CHRISTOPHER BARNARD. pp. x, 190. London & New York, RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.

DOI: 10.1017/S1356186304374602

In view of the fact that school textbooks are one of the chief ways in which people learn about their country’s history, one might suppose that their role in shaping national consciousness in Japan would have been subjected to close scrutiny. In fact, however, few such studies have appeared in English, and *Language, Ideology and Japanese History Textbooks* represents one of the first serious attempts to explore this area. It is not, it should be pointed out, as comprehensive as its title might suggest, since it confines itself to an examination of how three related episodes – the controversial ‘Rape of Nanking’, Japan’s entry into war in 1941, and the 1945 surrender – are treated in current textbooks. Moreover, while not ignoring other kinds of evidence, Barnard relies primarily on critical discourse analysis, which, as he explains it, seeks “to answer questions related to how language creates meanings, the range of meanings that a language can create, why particular choices from the language system are made on particular occasions, and what other choices could have been made, what other meanings would have been created if different language had been used, how language influences society, and, in turn, how society is influenced by language”. He explains his methodology in a painstaking introduction, which takes up more than a quarter of the book but also includes a helpful review of the long-running history textbook controversy in Japan. His broad conclusions are that, without being guilty of outright distortion, Japanese history textbooks have used language that not only plays down Japanese responsibility for the atrocities that Japanese soldiers committed in 1937 and for the war which the