

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

Japanese government launched in 1941, but also conceals the extent of Japan's defeat in 1945. In doing so, he further argues, the textbooks' authors and publishers are conforming to the ideology which the Education Ministry, reflecting a bureaucratic and political attitude towards the Japanese state and society that has roots in the pre-war period, has sought to impose and maintain for over half a century.

This last point echoes the writings of such anti-establishment historians and critics as McCormack, Bix and van Wolferen, and although some new evidence and arguments are brought to bear on the issue, the book's chief claim to significance rests on the originality of its linguistic approach. Many novel points are made, some of them thought provoking, others rather strained. With regard to the Nanking massacres, Barnard primarily focuses on his finding that almost all the textbooks describe them as being carried out by "the Japanese army". This, he argues, creates the impression that it was an organisation that was responsible, not individual soldiers. He also suggests that the textbooks' common assertion, that the massacres were only revealed to the Japanese people by the post-war International Tribunal for the Far East, works to the advantage of nationalist revisionism, since "by locating the revelation of knowledge of Nanking in what can very reasonably be argued were biased legal proceedings, this text gives those who claim that there was no major atrocity at Nanking very good grounds for denying the atrocity".

When Barnard turns to 1941, his analysis focuses initially on Japanese textbooks' customary reference to 'ABCD encirclement'. He criticises this usage partly on the ground that it unjustifiably includes China, but more importantly because the way in which it is presented leaves a false or ambiguous impression. "The ideology is", he asserts, "of Japan being pushed into a corner by the actions of the white races and China, who were attempting to constrain its very reasonable behaviour". His principal claim in this chapter, however, is that the language in which Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor is described differs significantly from that used in regard to Germany's attack on Poland. He marshals an array of evidence for this but particularly emphasises the use of noun-phrases such as 'Japan's Pearl Harbor attack', instead of more direct clauses such as 'Japan attacked Pearl Harbor'; and he claims that the German attack is given more prominence than Japan's as a result of its being 'encoded' in the main verb far more frequently. Whether or not this fully justifies his conclusion, that "there is a consistent pattern of language use that works towards lessening the responsibility of the Japanese state for the attacks", may be open to question, but the line of reasoning is certainly an interesting one. It is less easy, though, to share his view of the significance of the fact that no other country is described as "plunging into war", and to agree that this removes Japan "from the story as a party which is responsible for creating a particular state of affairs by acting in a certain way".

In examining the treatment of Japan's surrender Barnard turns to the concept of 'face'. He finds that the textbooks consistently avoid explicit reference to surrender in main clauses, downplaying it by writing less directly of the Japanese government's acceptance of the Potsdam Declaration or of its representatives later signing of the surrender document. He further contends that, by both ignoring the suffering of the Japanese people and the completeness of defeat and using verbs that suggest determination and freedom of choice, the textbooks convey the impression that the Japanese state had the option of not accepting the Potsdam Declaration. He also criticises them for using language that, by not giving ordinary people active roles in the narrative, emphasises their subservience. In consequence, he asserts, it "is made rather clear to pupils studying these textbooks what the writers of the textbooks regard as the normal relationship between the Japanese Government and Emperor, on the one hand, and the mass of Japanese people, on the other hand". Again, however, this seems to strain the evidence.

Barnard is not unaware that his methodology is open to question, and in particular he addresses the hypothetical objection that because the style of writing history that he criticises is normal in Japan he is reading into the language and grammar of the textbooks more significance than is justified.

To counter this he demonstrates that when textbooks deal with German aggression, they generally avoid the linguistic devices that he has discerned in the passages relating to Japanese actions. He does not, however, taken into account another objection: that the decision-making processes and international position of the Japanese state were sufficiently different to those of Germany to warrant the use of language which conveys a sense of lesser responsibility and intentionality. Moreover, he also fails to demonstrate that the linguistic style of the textbooks when dealing with the three topics he has examined is different from that which they employ when dealing with other, less ideologically significant, topics in Japanese history. Nor does he compare them with outline histories written by independently-minded historians and not subject to Education Ministry approval. A glance at one such work reveals that here too it is the Japanese army which is held responsible for the Nanking massacres and that no specific reference is made to Japanese soldiers. The conclusion must be that without a more extended comparison, Barnard's claim cannot be considered proven.

In conclusion, Barnard has produced a book that is often perceptive and offers insights, especially with regard to the treatment of Japan's surrender. There are times, however, when his argument seems one-sided or strained, or his grasp of historical events and processes simplistic. Moreover, as a teacher of language he may have overestimated the value of linguistic analysis. Nevertheless, he is to be congratulated for opening up a new dimension of understanding, and he has certainly justified his claim that content-type analyses of textbooks need to be supplemented by close scrutiny of the style of language in which they are written.

RICHARD SIMS

*School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London*