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Introduction

Patriotism is defined as a feeling of loyalty that aims “…to promote the interests of all the persons born or living within the same patria, i.e., country.”¹ Patriotic individuals have “…commitment to one’s country, a special concern with its well-being,” and this commitment requires “…a readiness to make sacrifices on its [the country’s] behalf.”² There are various “depths” of patriotic sacrifice, but one may argue that an extreme depth is risking and sacrificing one’s life for the country’s welfare.³ How does one garner a sense of patriotism? One way is through government sponsored public education. Governments use public education to mold citizens with similar sets of knowledge and values that create a collective identity and sense of belonging to the country. Within the realm of education, one subject that relates closely with patriotism is national history. National history education can provide “…an important emotional charge which is destined to create identification (with the motherland’s national heroes and forefathers) and a feeling of loyalty and belonging, strengthened by the use of patriotic symbols, icons and anthems in daily school routine.”⁴ Thus, depending on how a government manipulates general and national history education, this can impact how citizens cultivate patriotism and determine the depth of sacrifice that citizens are willing to make for the country.⁵

This thesis focuses on post-WWII government sponsored patriotic education in Japan through the study of what I term as the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. The Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement is a top-down political campaign (from late 1982

¹ Karl Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication; an Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality (Cambridge: Published Jointly by the Technology of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Wiley, New York, 1953) 232.
⁵ Ibid. 5-6.
to the present) aimed at promoting pride and patriotism for Japanese culture and history among youth though two means: reforms of general education objectives and revisions of national history curriculum/textbook content. Former Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone’s inauguration marks the start of this movement, because he revitalized discussions of patriotic education at the national level, laid out the fundamental arguments and ideologies for government-sponsored patriotic education, and actively pursued general patriotic education reforms after entering office. Other principal participants of this movement include nationally-oriented politicians, bureaucrats, academics, and members of right-wing organizations who want to use patriotic education for one or more of the following goals: cultivating respect for Japanese tradition and a non-fascist sense of national pride and unified cultural identity, encouraging personal definitions of societal well-being and community cohesiveness, and embracing multicultural understanding and participation in international affairs. Similar to prewar patriotic education practices, government entities shape and control the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, and its main goal focuses on increasing feelings of loyalty and pride towards the country. The major differences, however, are that this movement disassociates itself from the religious (Shinto), emperor, and military centered patriotic ideologies of the past.

The goals of this thesis are to understand the complexity and significance of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. In particular, I examine three key questions: Why are patriotic reforms of general education objectives and revisions of national history curriculum/textbook content central aspects of this movement? How did supporters of this movement carry out these reforms and revisions? And, how does Kanagawa Prefecture’s recent national and local history initiative for public high schools, a local offshoot of this movement, intend to promote patriotism? These questions will be explored in three chapters. Chapter 1
investigates the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement’s reforms of national education objectives and educational law sponsored by Prime Ministers Nakasone, Obuchi, Mori, Koizumi, and Abe. Chapter 2 examines national history curriculum and textbook revisions related to this movement. Chapter 3 focuses on the local offshoot of this movement in Kanagawa Prefecture. Finally, I conclude with my insights and opinions regarding the political execution of this movement at the national and local levels, the sense of patriotism and cultural identity promoted by supporters of this movement, and the future of patriotic education in Japan.
Chapter I: The Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement and General Education Reform

Since the Meiji Restoration, government-sponsored patriotic education has played an important role in fostering nationalism among Japan’s populace. For example, the government drafted the Imperial Rescript on Education in 1890 and had it recited regularly at schools nationwide to strengthen students’ devotion towards the emperor and his ancestors as a form of nationalism. Patriotic education encouraged loyalty towards the emperor in order to justify imperialism and militarism. This subsequently became an important factor that contributed to tragedy for Japan in World War II. Many Japanese at the end of WWII came to associate the idea of patriotism with haunting memories of emperor worship and fascism; as a result, this negative link caused government-sponsored patriotic education to remain dormant for almost four decades.6

In the early 1980s, government sponsored patriotic education reforms would arise once again. This chapter delves into the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement’s reforms of national education objectives and educational law promoted by Prime Ministers Nakasone, Obuchi, Mori, Koizumi, and Abe. I will use historical context, include statements from prime ministers regarding the importance of patriotic education reforms, and analyze documents issued by the government and education bureaucracy from the 1980s to mid-2000s to understand the ideology and goals behind these reforms. First, I briefly summarize important social, economic, and political events in post-WWII Japan that influenced the direction of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. Second, I explain how Prime Minister Nakasone pioneered the

---

discussion and implementation of patriotic education reforms under the theme of “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism.” Next, I review the controversy behind revising the Fundamental Law of Education and how Prime Minister Obuchi took the lead in reforming this law. Thereafter, I clarify how Prime Ministers Mori, Koizumi, and Abe guided the eventual revision of the Fundamental Law of Education and examine the patriotically-oriented revisions therein. Finally, I assess overarching themes and conclude with my own thoughts regarding the political implementation and substance of these patriotic education reforms.

Leading to a New Patriotic Education Movement, 1947-1982

Domestic Factors: Occupation Era Education Reforms and the Rise of Juvenile Delinquency

Reforms associated with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement targeted and sought to reverse two domestic developments: revisions of Japanese educational policy by Occupation Forces and the trend of increasing juvenile delinquency beginning in the mid-1960s. Following the end of WWII, Allied Occupation Forces in Japan restructured several aspects of state and society in order to prevent a reoccurrence of emperor worship, militarism, and fascism. In the realm of education, they decentralized Japanese government control by bestowing responsibilities of choosing curriculum and textbooks to individual schools and teachers. Moral education was eliminated and the Monbushō’s (Ministry of Education—hereafter MOE) role became limited to “…issuing outlines, suggestions and teaching guides.” The Occupation Forces invited a group of American education experts, known as the United States Education Mission, who “…came to Japan for three weeks in March 1946 and left behind a set of

---

recommendations which formed the basis of the Occupation reform programme. These recommendations included decentralizing Japan’s education system; incorporating the standard use of *romanji*; limiting the MOE’s control over local schools; implementing a new tax-supported compulsory education system; teaching to encourage individuality/independent thinking, personality development, and democratic citizenship; providing educational opportunities for adults; creating more universities; and establishing academic freedom. The Diet, under the guidance of Occupation Forces, referred to these recommendations to draft the new Fundamental Law of Education and adopted this law in 1947. This law replaced the former Imperial Rescript on Education, a pre-WWII document distributed to all Japanese schools that associated values of education, loyalty, and patriotism to the emperor and his ancestors. The Fundamental Law of Education stated that

…education shall aim at the full development of personality, striving for the rearing of the people sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labor and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with an independent spirit, as builders of a peaceful state and society. This law departed from the emperor’s personal message within the Imperial Rescript on Education that centered on the link between education and public loyalty towards that state. Also, it ended pre-WWII patriotic and moral education and declared that education could not be used improperly by the government. With the Fundamental Law of Education in place, education became subject to the will of the general populace, encouraged the development of individuality, and deemphasized the promotion of patriotism and Japanese tradition. The Contemporary

---

8 Schoppa 37.
Patriotic Education Movement’s reforms would eventually challenge these points by emphasizing public well-being, love for the nation, and respect for Japanese culture.\textsuperscript{11}

Moving two decades forward to the mid-1960s, cases of juvenile delinquency began to steadily rise nationwide, and the Japanese media’s increased focus on this problem in the late 1970s and early 1980s caused the public to link this problem with a general deterioration in education quality. In the mid- to late-1960s, the MOE addressed rising juvenile delinquency problems and youth social behavior in their reports and White Papers and reinstituted moral education curriculum in schools. Cases of juvenile delinquency, however, continued to grow, and in the late 1970s, “[j]uvenile delinquency and violence at schools became a major news story and remained a focus of media attention for much of the early 1980s.”\textsuperscript{12} This media attention caused the public to perceive the Japanese education system as “…being in a state of crisis,”\textsuperscript{13} and in response to public concerns, the MOE pushed for further educational reforms. For example, in the early 1980s, the MOE published “…a ‘directive concerning the prevention of delinquency of pupils,’”\textsuperscript{14} changed the content of moral education, and began surveying how moral education was being taught in primary and secondary schools. These actions had a limited overall impact, but the theme of using education to remedy youth delinquency problems became well established and remained central to the bureaucratic and political advocacy of moral and patriotic education from the 1980s onward.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{International Factors: The Yoshida Doctrine}

The Yoshida Doctrine’s emphasis on economic advancement impelled Prime Minister Nakasone to overturn the doctrine’s aims, encourage national pride, and make Japan more

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{11} Schoppa 33, 34.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid. 22.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. 21-23.
\end{flushright}
engaged in international political, military, and security affairs by initiating reforms central to the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. Following WWII, Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida (1946-54) took the lead in shaping Japan’s economic and political future. Yoshida advocated that Japan should mainly focus on rebuilding its economy while taking a passive stance in foreign affairs. His ideas came to be known as the “Yoshida Doctrine,” which centered around three tenets:

1. Japan’s economic growth should be the prime national goal. Political-economic cooperation with the United States was necessary for this purpose.
2. Japan should remain lightly armed and avoid involvement in international political-strategic issues. Not only would this low posture free the resources and energy of its people for productive economic development, it would avoid divisive internal struggles—what Yoshida called a “thirty-eighth parallel in the hearts of the Japanese people.”
3. To gain a long-term guarantee for its own security, Japan would provide bases for the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force.\(^\text{16}\)

These tenets stood at the forefront of Japan’s national and foreign policy. Until the early 1980s, prime ministers pursued policies that reinforced Japan’s “…neo-mercantilist role in the world”\(^\text{17}\) and shied away from involvement in world security affairs.\(^\text{18}\)

Under the Yoshida Doctrine, Japan’s economy grew rapidly in the 1950s, 60s, and 70s and became the second strongest economy in the world behind the U.S. With this growth, however, criticism from the U.S. and Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) politicians mounted against Japan’s passivity in foreign relations and security affairs. By emphasizing economic development, Japan essentially became a nation that solely pursued its own material interests and “…benefited immeasurably from the international order but failed to contribute to its

---


\(^{17}\) Ibid. 247.

\(^{18}\) Ibid. 245-247.
In particular, conservatives within the government declared that the Yoshida Doctrine led Japan to rely on the U.S. military for its security and had the effect of repressing national pride among Japanese. In order for Japan to become a “true leader” within the world order, they asserted that Japan’s economic achievements needed to be coupled with stronger national pride and presence in military and foreign affairs.

Yasuhiro Nakasone was one prominent LDP politician who promoted these ideas. From the beginning of his political career, Nakasone was a candid nationalist who wanted Japanese to have more pride in their nation and culture and for the international community to respect Japan’s role on the world stage. He avidly opposed Prime Minister Yoshida’s passive political and military vision for Japan. For example, during the Dulles-Yoshida negotiations at the end of WWII, he “…made a bold protest against the prime minister’s policy. The 32-year-old Nakasone addressed a 7,000-word petition to General MacArthur asking for constitutional revision and an independent defense establishment.” Moreover, he “…spoke repeatedly about attacking [nationalistic] taboos, settling postwar accounts, and ‘overhauling the postwar socio-economic framework of the nation to meet the challenge of the twenty-first century.’” Nakasone viewed the Yoshida Doctrine as a barrier to the future international well-being of Japan. He wanted Japan to play a central and leading role in the international system, and in order to attain this goal, he felt that one of the most important ideas that needed to be established and promoted was a public sense of national pride. Thus, once Nakasone became Prime Minister in November 1982,

---

19 Pyle 243.
20 Ibid. 243, 251.
21 Ibid. 251.
22 Ibid. 243.
he sought to overturn the Yoshida Doctrine and create his own “Grand Design,” a vision that would endorse national pride through patriotic education.\textsuperscript{23}

**Prime Minister Nakasone: “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism”**

A few months after Nakasone’s inauguration as prime minister, two important cases of school violence and juvenile delinquency occurred, and Nakasone capitalized on public concerns toward these cases to start and fuel reforms associated with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. On February 5, 1983, a group of ten middle school aged students killed three and injured thirteen homeless people in a Yokohama park while they were sleeping.\textsuperscript{24} These kids were part of a youth gang and decided to attack homeless people as a “fun pastime.”\textsuperscript{25} The second incident took place on February 15\textsuperscript{th} at a middle school in Machida. Before leaving for home, an English teacher was taunted and confronted by two students, and claiming to act in “self-defense,” the teacher took out a knife from his pocket and lightly stabbed one of the students in the chest.\textsuperscript{26} These events garnered widespread media and public attention, served “…to dramatize what the statistics showed was a rapidly growing problem in schools,”\textsuperscript{27} and caused the public to focus on the correlation between these issues and problems with the education system.

Nakasone viewed rising public concern towards juvenile delinquency as a prime opportunity to incite public opinion and encourage support for educational reform and his

\textsuperscript{23} Pyle 243, 251, 253.  
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{27} Schoppa 49.
nationalist agenda. Nakasone and a majority of LDP politicians within the government attributed the rise of juvenile delinquency and violence in schools to a lack of culturally-rooted general and moral education. Instead of learning respect for Japanese culture, their responsibilities as Japanese citizens, and how to behave civilly, they asserted that students were learning too much about individuality, freedom, and independence. Also, they stated that teachers did not educate students enough about respect towards others and the value of human life.

For Nakasone personally, it seems that speaking about the link between juvenile delinquency and educational reform was merely a way to garner public support for his political agenda—it did not embody his main personal priorities. Rather, he had two other and more important reasons for driving educational reform. First, he viewed education reform as a way to fulfill his desire to restructure society as a whole. Making changes to the education system would “…help him change the ideologies of the Japanese people.” In particular, Nakasone wanted to institute a political strategy aimed at gradually eliminating the taboo towards government-sponsored patriotic education—a taboo that formed as a result of anti-WWII nationalistic and pro-public centered education themes laid out in the Fundamental Law of Education, the MOE’s and former prime ministers’ compliance to this law, and strong opposition from Nikkyōso (Japan’s largest teachers union) and progressive politicians towards patriotic education and government controlled education. He firmly believed that strengthening patriotic education would instill pride in Japanese youth and prepare them for a stronger international leadership role.

29 Schoppa 49.
30 Ibid.
31 Hood 35.
32 Schoppa 34, 48, 94, 151.
Also, Nakasone engaged in education reform as an initial step towards “The Total Clearance of the Post-War Political Accounts” (*sengo seiji no sōkessan*).\(^{33}\) He ultimately wanted to eliminate the “foreign” occupational influence on the Japanese education system.\(^{34}\) By moving towards an education system based on patriotism and Japanese tradition, “[h]e saw such a move as another step towards Japan’s emergence as an independent country on the world stage as well as a means to break free from the Yoshida Doctrine.”\(^{35}\) With these goals in mind, he made educational reform a central domestic policy issue.\(^{36}\)

To defend patriotic education, Nakasone argued that students needed to learn to respect Japanese culture first in order to correctly understand the “…obligations and responsibilities that go with peace, democracy, human rights and freedom.”\(^{37}\) Moreover, he associated the promotion of nationalism in schools with Japan’s international well-being by declaring:

> …[It is important that] we contribute culturally, politically, and economically to the rest of the world, that we join together with other nations in seriously considering these issues, and that we share our prosperity with the rest of the global community. Yet we cannot have any of this unless we are also confident of our own identity. A nationalism that endeavors to foster self-identity in this sense is a completely justifiable nationalism. And we must teach this through education.\(^{38}\)

In order to try and lessen the contention over government-sponsored patriotic education, Nakasone advocated an ideal of nationalism that differed from the emperor/state-centric *kokkashugi* type of nationalism promoted in Japanese schools prior to World War II. He sought to encourage what he termed a pre-Meiji *kokuminshugi*, a “healthier” form of nationalism based on a more general appreciation for Japanese culture.\(^{39}\)

---

\(^{33}\) Schoppa 48.

\(^{34}\) Hood 35.

\(^{35}\) Ibid.

\(^{36}\) Ibid. 34-35, 37.

\(^{37}\) Ibid. 56.


\(^{39}\) Hood 52-53.
Under the theme of “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism,” Nakasone encouraged education reform that inculcated love for Japan while increasing tolerance and respect towards foreign nations.  

He described “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism” as:

...[e]ach country has a long history, traditions and culture...its heritage. That is the foundation...It is to love the long history, traditions and culture. On top of this, it is then to use them to contribute to the rest of the world. Without knowing the foundation, you cannot exchange with other countries...It is to plant a flower of Japan in the global garden.

Nakasone stressed that education should help students form a “Japanese” identity, an identity that recognizes and values Japan’s unique traditions and strengths, while learning about global society. He added that students must understand their own culture first before they can learn about and appreciate other cultures. By reforming education with these goals in mind, he ultimately desired a society where “…one is expected to love Japan as a Japanese…and [to] try to build his character with a broad international and global perspective that covers all humanity.” Sharing all of these thoughts publically, Nakasone laid out his main ideas for patriotic education reform.

The Establishment of Rinkyōshin

Desiring to shape the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, gain more control over the implementation of its reform policies, and remove the “patriotic education taboo” that pervaded Japanese society, Nakasone subsequently strove to establish an ad hoc council on education. Ad hoc councils function as top-down political mechanisms that, if established and managed properly, could create policy reports that circumvent the norm of the Japanese political

41 Hood 52.
42 Schoppa 48.
43 Pyle 263.
44 Ibid. 261, 263.
45 Hood 40.
process, a bottom-up process dominated by consensus-oriented bureaucrats, zoku politicians ("…Diet members who have a considerable amount of expertise and practical experience about a particular area of government policy and enough seniority in the party to have influence on a continuing basis with the ministry responsible for that policy area"),\textsuperscript{46} and interest groups.\textsuperscript{47}

There have been various ad hoc councils created prior to Nakasone’s education reform desires, but an effective council became defined by process characteristics such as crafting politically-feasible assignments and/or recommendations and emphasizing interaction with the public and press regarding its policies. In the end, proposals created by an ad hoc council with these characteristics have the potential to be implemented more swiftly.\textsuperscript{48}

Nakasone reasoned that simply relying on the MOE’s Central Council on Education (CCE) alone to review the education system would result in insignificant improvements and accomplishments. Furthermore, he “…argued that the [education reform] issue was so great that it required expertise and experiences of people from wider areas, and should not be left to Monbushō alone.”\textsuperscript{49} Thus, he wanted to create a separate education advisory council that would champion, legitimate, and follow-through with his patriotic education reform agenda.\textsuperscript{50}

In order to gain enough Diet member support for the creation of an Ad Hoc Council on Education, Nakasone appointed Yoshirō Mori (a young LDP education zoku member) as Education Minister and stated that he would not pursue reform of the Fundamental Law of Education.\textsuperscript{51} With these actions, Nakasone established Rinji Kyōiku Shingikai (Rinkyōshin) as the

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid. 82.
\textsuperscript{49} Hood 40.
\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid. 43.
Ad Hoc Council on Education on August 21, 1984 and the MOE suspended the education review capacities of the CCE for the next three years.\textsuperscript{52} Rinkyōshin’s board members comprised of twenty-five well-known academics, businessmen, and opinion leaders who were sympathetic to Nakasone’s views.\textsuperscript{53} This education advisory council became the first of its kind to report directly to the Prime Minister rather than the MOE, which strengthened their proposals in relation to other ministries.\textsuperscript{54} Also, Nakasone ran Rinkyōshin in an open fashion by reporting all of its deliberations to the public. This contrasted with the “…previous ‘behind-closed-doors’ bureaucratic method,”\textsuperscript{55} and as a result, Rinkyōshin’s “…recommendations carried authority with the public.”\textsuperscript{56} As public support for Rinkyōshin’s education reform recommendations increased, the MOE “…found it difficult to object to them.”\textsuperscript{57}

Rinkyōshin backed Nakasone’s theme of “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism” by echoing his call for students to understand and respect Japanese culture. From 1985-87, Rinkyōshin published four reports that promoted Nakasone’s vision.\textsuperscript{58} For example, one report in 1987 specifies:

From now on the Japanese must have a deep understanding, respect and affection for Japanese culture as well as be tolerant toward other cultures…It must be understood that a good world citizen [yoki kokusaijin] is also a good Japanese [yoki nihonjin], and our education must teach people love for the country [kuni o aisuru kokoro] and a firm sense of the individuality of the Japanese culture as well as deepen the knowledge of the culture and traditions of all foreign countries.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{52} Hood 43.
\textsuperscript{53} Pyle 258.
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} Roesgaard 97.
\textsuperscript{59} Hood 56.
These reports defined how patriotism could be used in schools and “...served as the starting point for further work on educational reform.”\(^{60}\) Particularly, Rinkyōshin noted that revising and expanding moral education and teaching respect for Japanese culture, the Hinomaru (the red sun flag), and Kimigayo (an anthem entitled “The Emperor’s Reign”) were changes that needed to be made in schools.\(^{61}\)

**Success and Nakasone’s Legacy**

Nakasone’s push for “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism” and Rinkyōshin’s educational proposals based on this theme defined the beginning reforms associated with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, and these reforms gradually garnered support from the MOE. Following Rinkyōshin’s final report in 1987, the MOE created a headquarters for implementing education reform in August of that year and used Rinkyōshin’s suggestions as a basis for developing education reform policies.\(^{62}\) In 1989, the success of Nakasone and Rinkyōshin’s suggestions became apparent when the MOE revised its curriculum guidelines to strengthen moral education and include a patriotic education provision that required the flying of Hinomaru and the singing of Kimigayo at school ceremonies. Specifically, the...

...use of the flag and anthem at school ceremonies would no longer be merely desirable (nozomashii), it would be something that ‘must be done’ (suru mono to suru). Prior to 1989, less than half of elementary and senior high schools had complied with Ministry wishes...The Ministry was now aiming for 100% compliance and was prepared to discipline principals who resisted.\(^{63}\)

In addition to these changes, the MOE White Papers in the mid-1990s began referencing Nakasone’s theme of “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism” and suggestions from

---

\(^{60}\) Roesgaard 97.
\(^{61}\) Schoppa 248.
\(^{62}\) Sasamori 145.
Rinkyōshin’s four reports. For example, the MOE’s 1994 White Paper asserts that education requires

…an approach that gives priority to the development of understanding and respect for the diversity of other cultures and lifestyles from the perspective of a thorough understanding of Japanese cultures and traditions. It is vital that we strive to achieve further improvement on education from this viewpoint.64

These educational guideline revisions illustrate the groundbreaking roles that Nakasone and Rinkyōshin played in the patriotic education movement: their efforts influenced the MOE to require all schools to use Japan’s national symbols in ceremonies and include patriotic goals within general education guidelines.65

Prime Minister Nakasone initiated and led national reforms associated with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, and two factors explain the initial success of these reforms. First, Nakasone executed these reforms through a high-profile, individualistic, and top-down style of leadership, and this distinguished him from his post-war predecessors. His unique leadership style came to be known as “deliberative council politics” (shingikai seiji). Rather than relying on the consensus-focused and “bottom-up” politics of the MOE bureaucracy, he created Rinkyōshin, hand-picked the members of this council, and set preliminary guidelines in order to influence education policy in his favor. Rinkyōshin worked directly with Nakasone, published four reports from 1985-87 that offered patriotic education policy reform suggestions based on his ideas, and disbanded the same year that Nakasone stepped down as Prime Minister.66

Second, and arguably more important, Nakasone’s theme of “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism” caused what Hood terms as an “attitudinal shift” among the Japanese government and populace towards nationalism and its promotion in schools. Nakasone broke the

64 Hood 57.
65 Ibid. 57, 170, 171.
66 Muramatsu 311-312.
taboo surrounding the discussion of teaching post-war nationalism in schools through two methods: formulating a “new” kind of nationalism and devising a political strategy to evade the barriers that reinforced this taboo. He created the theme of “healthy nationalism” to encourage a peaceful Japan, provide a public façade for resolving juvenile delinquency, strengthen pride and leadership among Japanese youth, and advance an international mindset in schools. Also, he established *Rinkyōshin* as a way to advance his patriotic education agenda and circumvent MOE bureaucratic challenges and opposition from other political entities. In order to gain public trust and support for his ideas, he reported *Rinkyōshin*’s deliberations and recommendations to the public and created “…a dialogue with the people by frequently appearing on television and explaining his policies in simple terms.”\(^{67}\) Due to these efforts, Nakasone made education reform a central policy of the LDP and eventually gained public and political support for government-sponsored patriotic education. With the adoption of his vision for patriotic education by the MOE in the 1990s, Nakasone set the long-term direction of reforms promoted by the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.\(^{68}\)

**Revising the Fundamental Law of Education**

Following Nakasone’s accomplishments, the next political reform that defined the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement was revision of the Fundamental Law of Education. Prime Minister Obuchi, who had patriotic education reform ideals similar to Nakasone, initiated this revision process in 2000, and subsequently Prime Ministers Mori, Koizumi, and Abe supported and carried out Obuchi’s visions to the end. These efforts resulted in a new Fundamental Law of Education adopted by the Diet in 2006 that included language on

\(^{67}\) Muramatsu 312.

\(^{68}\) Hood 101, 169, 170.
the importance of patriotic education and its link with the well-being of Japanese society. The new Fundamental Law of Education became a crown achievement of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, and this section details how the new law came into being.

As mentioned previously, Occupation Forces drafted the Fundamental Law of Education and the Japanese government adopted this law in March 1947. Nationalistically-oriented politicians, however, protested this law and felt that Occupation Forces implemented education reforms that were too liberal. They argued that within a short period of time, “foreign” ideas that disregarded Japanese society and culture took over the education system. In particular, these politicians objected to the Fundamental Law of Education because it “…was (1) not created by the autonomous will of the Japanese people but ‘imposed’ by American officials; (2) modeled on foreign thoughts based on a different historical and cultural tradition; (3) doing considerable damage to Japanese traditional values as a result of too much emphasis being placed on ‘individuality,’ or kosei; (4) too liberal to suit the conservative image of what Japanese education should be; and (5) lacking in assertion of the importance of Japanese ‘traditional’ morality and values such as pledging people’s loyalty to the State, filial piety, family obligation, etc.”

Thus, from the mid-1950s, the government under LDP leadership tried to implement a “reverse course of education,” meaning that attempts were made “…to remove those parts of the Occupation reforms that were considered ‘excessive’ from the conservative point of view.” By the end of the 1960s, the LDP succeeded in changing five aspects of education policy: “…school board reform, textbook screening, teacher evaluation, establishment of moral education and

---

70 Ibid. 429.
71 Ibid.
diversification of the [Occupation imposed] 6-3-3-4 [education] system.” These reforms gave the LDP government greater control over education policy, but due to strong opposition from Nikkyōso, progressive politicians, and other public opponents, the LDP’s ultimate goal of revising the Fundamental Law of Education was not realized. It would not be until 2000, during the era of Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi, that actions to revise the Fundamental Law of Education advanced.

Prime Minister Obuchi wanted to amend the Fundamental Law of Education with patriotic provisions, and his arguments and strategies mirrored Nakasone in many ways. Concerning reform, he “…long held the view that the present education system was ‘imposed’ by the American Occupation authorities, and wanted drastic changes through the revision of the 1947 Fundamental Law of Education.” Additionally, he mentioned on several occasions how the Fundamental Law of Education failed “…to champion ‘traditional’ Japanese values.” In order to initiate swift education reform, Obuchi wanted to create a private advisory board under his control; this desire mimicked Nakasone’s reasoning behind the creation of Rinkyōshin. By creating a new education advisory board, Obuchi hoped that “…the MOE would bring about the same kind of large-scale proposals for changes that he had seen in the Ad-Hoc Council’s previous attempts.”

In early March 2000, Obuchi gained enough political support to establish an education advisory board for developing a reform agenda called the National Commission on Education

---

72 Okada 430.
73 Ibid. 428, 431.
76 Ibid.
Reform (NCER). For board members, Obuchi handpicked representatives from the business sector, the bureaucracy, and his own intellectuals. The NCER held its first meeting on March 27th to analyze the state of Japanese education and offer reform policy suggestions. Although the NCER wanted to consider several aspects of the education system, its most important focus was revision of the Fundamental Law of Education.

On April 1st, Obuchi unexpectedly suffered a stroke, and Yoshirō Mori (the former Minister of Education under Nakasone) replaced him as prime minister. Prime Minister Mori expressed his intention to continue Obuchi’s focus on education reform and worked closely with the NCER. The NCER submitted a final report to Mori on December 22nd entitled “Seventeen Proposals for Changing Education,” and following the publication of this report, the advisory board disbanded.

There were six main recommendations:

1. Revision of the Fundamental Law of Education
2. Re-examination of history textbooks and introduction of ‘new perspectives’ into Japanese history
3. Introduction of ‘voluntary activities’ for all students from elementary to high school
4. An increased emphasis on moral education
5. Reform of the 6-3-3-4 system and establishment of a diversified education which is suited to each individual’s different abilities
6. Recommendation of ‘special educational measures’ that would allow gifted upper secondary school students to experience university-level education research in a scientific field

Recommendations one, two, and four especially referred to actions associated with strengthening patriotic education: revising the Fundamental Law of Education, stressing moral education, and revising the content of history textbooks.
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The NCER also provided details regarding the emphasis on patriotic education. In the report, the advisory board asserted that the current Japanese education system is no longer adequate for dealing with crises in Japanese society. They noted that “[c]ontinued occurrences of bullying, students who refuse to go to school, school violence, classroom disruption, violent juvenile crimes and other problems concerning education have become serious.”

Viewing the decline of Japanese morality as the root of these problems, the NCER suggested that revision of the Fundamental Law of Education and patriotic education reforms must be implemented in order to improve the tarnished state of Japanese society. Another part of the report states:

Self-discipline, consideration for others, love of nature, a feeling of deep respect for that beyond an individual’s capability, respect for traditional culture and social norms, fostering a mentality and attitude which show affection toward one’s own homeland or nation, [and] learning basic knowledge or culture required for life in society must be the basis for all education.

Like Nakasone, this report viewed patriotic education as a solution to Japan’s social ills. By using patriotic education to cultivate students’ hearts and minds, the NCER believed that Japanese youth would become respectful, model citizens.

Prime Minister Mori continued to push education reform as a top government priority until Junichirō Koizumi, another LDP politician, took over in April 2001. Koizumi picked up where Mori left off, and at the 151st Diet session held in May of that year, he declared, “Educational reform is necessary in order to engender in youth both pride and self-awareness as Japanese, as well as to help develop skills critical for rebuilding Japan. My goal is to promote a national debate on how to proceed with a review of the Fundamental Law of Education.”

During Koizumi’s next five years in office, he referred to the NCER’s report as an initial
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guideline and collaborated with bureaucrats from the Central Council of Education (the advisory body of the MOE) and politicians from the LDP and New Komeito Party to draft a bill for revising the Fundamental Law of Education. The final draft of this bill was submitted to the Diet on April 28, 2006\textsuperscript{86} and Diet members discussed this bill during the next session (September 26).\textsuperscript{87}

Shinzō Abe replaced Koizumi as Prime Minister in September 2006. As an avid LDP nationalist, Abe strongly believed in the need for patriotic education reform in Japan. His ideas on nationalism and patriotic education were especially apparent in a book entitled *Utsukushii kuni e (Toward a Beautiful Country)*, which he wrote and published prior to his inauguration as prime minister. To summarize the main ideas within this book, Abe deplores the fact that most Japanese since the end of WWII have a tendency to perceive nationalism as “bad” and avoid discussion of nationalism and patriotic education.\textsuperscript{88} He asserts that because of this mindset, the post-war education system has failed Japan.\textsuperscript{89} Throughout his book, Abe embraces Nakasone’s “Healthy Nationalism” (*kokuminshugi*), highlights the importance of respecting the *Hinomaru* and *Kimigayo*,\textsuperscript{90} and emphasizes the importance of Japanese people learning to be proud of their history and culture.\textsuperscript{91} He relates that the purpose of education should be “…to cultivate citizens and create a dignified nation”\textsuperscript{92} and concludes that a revival of education with patriotic elements must be carried out in order for Japan to become a “beautiful (patriotic) country” again.\textsuperscript{93}
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Abe utilized the aforementioned ideas in his political rhetoric and put the Diet bill that would revise the Fundamental Law of Education at the forefront of his agenda.\textsuperscript{94} Like Koizumi, his first policy speech to the Diet focused on the necessity of reforming the Fundamental Law of Education in order to “…nurture people who value their families, their communities, and their country”\textsuperscript{95} and linked patriotic education reform with Japan’s domestic and international well-being. With a majority of Diet member support, Abe succeeded in passing the reform bill in December of that year.\textsuperscript{96}

Prime Ministers Obuchi, Mori, Koizumi, and Abe played important roles in the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement by creating and endorsing political processes that targeted patriotic revisions of the Fundamental Law of Education. Obuchi set the foundation for reform by establishing the NCER, and Mori built off of this foundation by supporting the NCER’s efforts. The NCER’s final proposals then became a model for how to go about crafting a bill to amend the Fundamental Law of Education. Koizumi referred to these proposals and played a leading role in creating and submitting a Fundamental Law of Education reform bill to the Diet towards the end of his term. Finally, Abe supported and carried out the process of approving this bill into law.

Analysis of the Old and New Fundamental Law of Education\textsuperscript{97}

Compared to the older version, the revised Fundamental Law of Education is longer (eighteen versus the previous eleven articles) and includes provisions regarding tradition, love of

\textsuperscript{94} Liederbach 57.


country, a “public spirit,” cross-cultural understanding, and international cooperation. So what specific differences are apparent in the new law and how do these changes provide insight into the type of education that the government views as necessary for Japanese society? Starting from the Preamble, one notices differences in wording in the first sentence:

**Old:** Having established the Constitution of Japan, we have shown our resolution to contribute to world peace and human welfare by building a democratic and cultural state.

**New:** We, the people of Japan, desire to further develop the democratic and cultural state we have built through our untiring efforts, and contribute to world peace and the improvement of human welfare.

The old law states that the Japanese nation is founded on a constitution and that society endeavors to maintain and abide by these constitutional ideals. In the revised version, however, the Japanese nation is based on “…a notion of undefined ‘Japanese-ness.’” If one refers to the Japanese version of both documents, this contrast in wording and emphasis is even more apparent. The older version uses the word *warera*, a colloquial pronoun meaning “we,” written in hiragana, whereas the revised version uses *wareware nihon kokumin*, a bombastic phrase meaning “We, the people of Japan” written in kanji. In essence, “…the ‘we’ of the old law were citizens of a constitutionally based body politic; now, ‘we’ are in effect national subjects.”

Moreover, the revised Fundamental Law of Education neglects to mention the Constitution until the third paragraph.

The revised Preamble also provides a new explanation regarding the purpose of education. The second paragraph states:
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Old: We shall esteem individual dignity and endeavor to bring up the people who love truth and peace, while education which aims at the creation of culture general and rich in individuality shall be spread far and wide.

New: To realize these ideals, we shall esteem individual dignity, long for truth and justice, honor the public spirit, and endeavor to bring up people who are rich in humanity and creativity, while promoting an education which transmits tradition and aims at the creation of a new culture.  

There are two noticeable differences in the revised law. First, the idea that education aims for creating a culture that is “general and rich in individuality (kosei yutaka na bunka no sōzō wo mezasu)” has been deleted. Second, new goals for education, “transmitting tradition (dentō wo keishō suru) and creating a new culture (atarashii bunka no sōzō wo mezasu),” are added. This “new culture” most likely refers to “…the slogan ‘breaking free from the postwar regime’ often used by Prime Minister Abe.” Both of these revisions indicate a shift in educational emphasis towards understanding and appreciating Japanese culture and valuing public well-being. The focus on education for public well-being is also clear in Article One entitled “Aims and Principles of Education:”

Old: Education shall aim at the full development of personality, striving for the rearing of the people, sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labor and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with an independent spirit, as builders of the peaceful state and society.

New: Education shall aim for the total development of personality and strive to nurture people sound in mind and body, who are imbued with the qualities necessary for the builders of a peaceful and democratic state and society.
In this case, the notion of an “independent spirit” (*jishuteki seishin*) has been eliminated in the revised version. This deletion accentuates the link between education and a healthy “public spirit.”

Moreover, the revised version of Article Two includes five new “Objectives of Education.” Three of these objectives deal with the importance of education in relation to morality, the public spirit, patriotism, and internationalization:

1. Acquire wide-ranging knowledge and culture, foster a disposition to seek the truth, cultivate a rich sensibility and sense of morality, while developing a healthy body.
2. Foster a disposition to value justice, responsibility, gender equality, mutual respect and cooperation, and actively contribute, in the public spirit, to the building and development of society.
3. Foster a disposition to respect Japanese tradition and culture, love the country and homeland that nurtured them, together with respect for other countries and a desire to contribute to world peace and the development of the international community.

Interestingly, all of these objectives coincide with Nakasone’s “Healthy Nationalism and Internationalism” and initial education reform goals. Objective one describes the importance of teaching morals in schools. Objective three links education with building a “public” spirit. Lastly, objective five explicitly states the importance of education for fostering “respect for Japanese tradition and culture (*dentō to bunka wo sonchō suru*)” and “love for the nation and homeland (*kuni to kyōdo wo aisuru*),” garnering “respect for other countries (*takoku wo sonchō suru*),” and contributing to “world peace and the development of the international community (*kokusaishakai no heiwa to hatten ni kiyo suru taido wo yashinau*).” Upon referring to the Japanese version of these objectives, objective five terms “homeland” as *kyōdo*. *Kyōdo* “…appeared originally in the
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folklore (minzokugaku) anthropology school of the early twentieth century popularized by Yanagida Kunio, and influenced by Yanagida’s work, “...the Education Ministry developed a ‘homeland education’ curriculum [kyōdo kyōiku] in the 1930s.”\textsuperscript{110} Thus, various politicians and scholars argue that the use of this term evokes memories of patriotic education and its relationship with militarism in pre-WWII Japan.\textsuperscript{111}

Finally, it is important to note that the values of individuality and developing an independent spirit in education are not completely eliminated in the revised version of the law. For example, the second objective of education within Article Two states:

\begin{enumerate}
\setcounter{enumi}{1}
\item Respect the value of individuals, develop their abilities, cultivate their creativity, and foster a spirit of autonomy and independence, while emphasizing the connection with profession and daily life, and nurturing respect for the value of labor.\textsuperscript{112}
\end{enumerate}

This objective clarifies the important role that education plays in developing individuality and creativity (\textit{koin no kachi wo sonchō shite, sono nōryoku wo nobashi, sōzōsei wo tuchikai, jishu oyobi jiritsu no seishin wo yashinau to tomoni}) within society/the public sphere (\textit{shokugyō oyobi seikatsu to no kankei wo jūshichi shi, kinrō wo omonzuru taido wo yashinau koto}).\textsuperscript{113} The second fundamental in the chapter entitled “Fundamentals of Education Implementation (Compulsory Education)” also emphasizes the link between education, individuality, and society as a whole:

The objectives of general education, given in the form of compulsory education, shall be to cultivate the foundations for an independent life within society while developing the abilities of each individual, and to foster the basic qualities necessary for the builders of our state and society.\textsuperscript{114}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[111] Ibid.
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\item[113] Japan, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, \textit{Kaisei Zengo no Kyōiku Kihonhō no Hikaku}.
\end{footnotes}
Here again, the objective of education is to cultivate individuality, which will then lead to fostering “…the basic qualities necessary for the builders of our state and society (kokka oyobi shakai no keiseisha to shite hitsuyō to sareru kihonteki na shishitsu wo yashinau koto wo mokuteki to shite okonawareru mono to suru).”\textsuperscript{115} Thus, not only does education seek to build a “public spirit,” but it does so by encouraging a foundation of individuality.

Within the new Fundamental Law of Education, slight changes in wording and added educational objectives give an overall impression that patriotic education needs to be implemented in order to value tradition, expand international understanding, and establish a “public spirit” while cherishing individuality. Nationalistic language is included at several points to stress the importance of understanding and respecting Japanese tradition. By valuing Japanese culture, it is automatically implied that one will learn to love the nation. Additionally, the revised law “…introduces the idea of honor of the public spirit as a goal of education.”\textsuperscript{116} In certain articles, the law concentrates more on education’s role in forming a collective identity. At the same time, however, other articles highlight the role that education has in nurturing individuality for the benefit of society and the state. Finally, the new law includes an objective that links education with the propagation of world peace and cross-cultural appreciation. Through these revisions, the government establishes patriotic education as key to reforming Japanese society and promoting internationalism.

**Nakasone and Obuchi’s Patriotic Visions for Education Fulfilled**

Beginning in the 1980s, Prime Minister Nakasone promoted national education reforms pertaining to the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. Through these reforms, he

\textsuperscript{115} Japan, Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, *Kaisei Zengo no Kyōiku Kihonhō no Hikaku*.

\textsuperscript{116} Liederbach 61.
wanted to cultivate a sense of “healthy” national pride, internationalism, and cultural unity among Japanese youth and distance government sponsored patriotic education from the emperor-centric and military-driven images of the past. Learning about and respecting Japanese and foreign cultures and encouraging individuality, a “public spirit,” and love for the nation were objectives that embodied the foundation of this movement. The political implementation of these objectives broke away from the “norm” of relying on the education bureaucracy. Prime Minister Nakasone established central control over the direction of patriotic education reform by creating an ad hoc council on education and handpicking its members. This council bypassed the bureaucracy and worked directly with Nakasone, which allowed him to influence policy recommendations. Furthermore, Nakasone openly shared his ideas and the council’s deliberations with the public, and this resulted in stronger public support and weakened opposition from political and bureaucratic opponents. His actions became the political model that Obuchi imitated in 2000 to initiate discussions for revising the Fundamental Law of Education. Then, Prime Ministers Mori, Koizumi, and Abe built upon Obuchi’s framework for reform and followed through with the adoption of a new version of the Fundamental Law of Education by the Diet in 2006.

Media attention and public concern regarding juvenile delinquency and its supposed roots in the Japanese educational system were important issues that allowed politicians to pursue public discussion of patriotic reforms. Starting with Prime Minister Nakasone, there was a tendency for prime ministers involved in the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement to link education reforms with juvenile delinquency and student morality, and Rinkyōshin and the NCER based part of their reform recommendations on this link. By discussing patriotic education as a way to resolve educational/social ills and positively impact Japanese youth, prime
ministers and members of these ad hoc education councils seemed to use this tactic in order “soften” the image of government-sponsored patriotic education (i.e. steer away from pre-WWII images of patriotism) and make reforms more “digestible” to the general public. I would argue that this rhetoric was intended to mainly gather public support. If solving these social problems were at the top of their political agenda, then local teachers and academics who deal with these issues would have been included as members of Rinkyōshin and the NCER. Instead, these prime ministers capitalized on public concerns of rising juvenile delinquency and worsening education quality and used them to drive patriotic education reforms for their own purposes. Their ultimate motivations were to establish an education system that eliminated the “foreign imposed” Occupation reforms and inculcated Japanese youth with the cultural pride, values, and mindset that they deemed necessary for Japan to thrive domestically and internationally.

Nevertheless, one cannot assume that these prime ministers ultimately intended to revert back to pre-WWII nationalism through these reforms. Although the new version of the Fundamental Law of Education encourages the ideas of education for the “public spirit” and love for the homeland, I believe that these analyses are insufficient for arguing a strong connection with pre-WWII patriotic education. The new Fundamental Law of Education introduces the link between education, patriotism, and public well-being, but it does so while stressing education’s role in developing individuality and internationalism. Also, even though the Education Ministry used kyōdo to refer to “homeland education curriculum” prior to WWII, this one word cannot characterize the new Fundamental Law of Education as a reversal towards the past. Through a detailed analysis of the new Fundamental Law of Education, I would argue that the Japanese government set the foundation to promote a credulous connection between patriotic education,
love for the nation, and national/international well-being, and there is not sufficient evidence yet
to claim that this government sponsored ideal is a revival of the past.
Chapter II: History Education and the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement

Along with the general patriotic education reforms at the national level reviewed in the preceding chapter, revisions of Japanese history curriculum and textbook content comprise the other fundamental aspect of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. Prime Ministers, Diet politicians, and members of right-wing organizations championed these revisions in order to inculcate youth with a positive historical view of wartime Japan and an overall patriotic cultural identity. The history of and national debates surrounding textbook revisions can be illustrated through the History Textbook Controversy, which occurred from the late 1940s till the late 1990s. History textbook content fluctuated several times between nationalistic and peace-and-justice perspectives over this period of time. Supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, however, began impacting this controversy in the early 1990s and ultimately pushed MOE bureaucrats and textbook publishers to approve and publish more nationalistic historical content.

This second chapter focuses on three important aspects of the history curriculum and textbook revisions related to the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement: theories behind the state’s use of national history to encourage patriotism; the MOE’s bureaucratic structure and guidelines for history education in Japanese schools; and the history of contention surrounding the portrayal of Japanese history in textbooks. As in the previous chapter, I will include discussion of well-known national politicians and their role in promoting patriotism through history education. The main focus of this chapter, however, will be on discovering how public and state interests over history education conflict, how these conflicts affected MOE policies, and how the academic community received the outcomes of these policies. Not only will this
information add to overall comprehension of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, but addressing these points will set a solid foundation for examining Kanagawa Prefecture (a local offshoot of this movement) as a case study in the next and final chapter.

I introduce theoretical and bureaucratic frameworks, utilize historical context, and incorporate a literary analysis in order to understand why high school history curriculum guidelines and history textbook content revisions are important aspects of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. First, I present a general theoretical overview behind the state’s use of national history education to advance patriotism. Second, I review the bureaucratic processes behind the construction of educational guidelines and school textbook review and specifically examine changes in the MOE’s Course of Study history education guidelines over the past four decades. Then, I summarize the History Textbook Controversy and include a brief literary review of well-known textual analysis research conducted on contemporary Japanese history textbooks. Finally, I reflect upon the relationship between the MOE’s national history education guidelines, history textbook content, and patriotism.

As one will notice in this chapter, a majority of the prime ministers who implemented patriotic reforms in general education and educational law (as discussed in Chapter 1) also played important roles in the History Textbook Controversy. Prime Ministers Nakasone, Mori, Koizumi, and Abe backed nationalistic revisions of history textbook content in one of three ways: supporting the goals and history textbook publications of right-wing organizations, advocating for nationalistic history perspectives through political mobilization, or a combination of both. These actions shaped the direction of the History Textbook Controversy, influenced the whitewashed history content present within a majority of school textbooks today, and contributed to the foundation of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.
Theoretical Connection between History, Education and Patriotism

Investigating the theoretical relationship between history, patriotism, and state-sponsored education provides answers to the question of why national history curriculum and textbook content revisions are important aspects of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.

History has three important functions in society. First, history “…is expected to serve as a primer of morals,”\(^\text{117}\) meaning that history lessons teach the present how to avert past mistakes. Second, history explains the origins of the political system and how current political systems came into being. Finally, history has a close relationship with patriotism. Concretely speaking, within the realm of patriotism, pride in national history acts as a “…glue which binds the nation together, saving it from ‘disintegration’ in the face of external threats or internal insecurities.”\(^\text{118}\) History and patriotism coexist and work together within state and society to endorse a nation’s existence and majesty.\(^\text{119}\)

Throughout history, groups in power around the world have utilized national history and manipulated historical content in order to promote their interests: such groups strive to create their own “correct” view of history and use this view to formulate a consensus among the public. By officially endorsing a certain perspective of national history, the state can “…dominate public perception of the nation’s past”\(^\text{120}\) and “…create a sense of unified identity among people.”\(^\text{121}\) Even if the state encourages a version of history that is not based on fact, this version will be regarded as “true history” once the public accepts and believes that it is “factual.” Over time,
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“true history” can transform into a collective memory, and this type of memory “…gains persuasive power over people’s thinking about not only their past, but also their present.” Thus, control over public perceptions of history equates to control over the construction of national pride and cultural identity.

Once the state establishes a national education system, schools become “…important cultural sites responsible for defining, reproducing and maintaining clearly defined sets of knowledge and values” and these sets of knowledge and values constitute one’s cultural identity. State approved textbooks used within the classroom present teachers and students with “legitimized” knowledge and values. Additionally, textbooks become educational mediums that allow citizens from different geographical areas within the nation to share a collective cultural identity through unified values, ideas, and/or beliefs. History education, in particular, plays an important role in shaping the cultural identity of young citizens. History textbooks approved by the state tend to reflect the views of the current political administration, and through the use of these textbooks, history classrooms have the propensity to turn into spaces where an “official ideal” of patriotism is inculcated. Since history education and textbooks are intertwined with the power to transmit “…hegemonic and ideological control” among the public, the creation and control of history textbook content is often associated with conflict and competition among various groups in power. This is true in the case of Japan, where history
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education and textbooks have been important sites of struggle and competition between various political and social groups. These struggles and competitions center on the relationship between public education, national history portrayal, and the promotion of patriotism.\textsuperscript{130}

**The Ministry of Education’s Control over the Course of Study and Textbook Review**

The MOE’s bureaucratic framework for creating the Course of Study and approving textbooks shows how the government controls and packages history education for local consumption. Education in Japan is governed at three levels: national, prefectural, and municipal. All of these levels contribute to and create education policy, but the MOE functions as the supervising body. The MOE has two important responsibilities: developing national education curriculum guidelines entitled the Course of Study (\textit{gakushū shidō yōryō}) and evaluating textbooks for use in schools. Whenever the MOE makes revisions to the Course of Study and requests textbook revisions, textbook companies and authors must change their content accordingly.\textsuperscript{131}

From the late 1940s till the present, the MOE has published eight Courses of Study: 1948, 1951, 1956, 1963, 1973, 1982, 1994, and 2003. (The next Course of Study will be implemented sometime between 2012 and 2013.) Before creating a new Course of Study, the MOE reviews external school evaluations, analyzes previous Course of Study evaluations conducted by the National Assessment of Academic Ability and the National Center for University Entrance Examinations, and receives advice and suggestions from the Central Council for Education


(CCE) and the Curriculum Council (CC).\textsuperscript{132} Regarding the CCE and CC, the MOE appoints members such as “…academics, writers and other opinion leaders, industry leaders, education specialists, politicians, and retired high officials of the ministry”\textsuperscript{133} to these councils each decade. Council members then conduct research and deliberations over a period of three years and submit final reports to the MOE.\textsuperscript{134}

Subsequently, the MOE utilizes the CCE and CC’s reports as references for the new Course of Study and designates writing committees for each subject area. These committees consist “…of university subject-matter specialists, school curriculum specialists, department heads, administrators, and former teachers employed by the ministry”\textsuperscript{135} and are responsible for creating a list of required courses, course goals, and time for each course. Once this report is completed, the MOE publishes the new Course of Study and implements it nationally in approximately two or three years after publication.\textsuperscript{136}

Regarding the implementation of Course of Study guidelines at the local level, the MOE allows some flexibility. For example, the MOE urges principals and teachers to add elective subjects and “…to develop their own curriculum in response to local conditions and students’ interests.”\textsuperscript{137} Hence, individual schools “…often consult other schools and their local board of education when introducing a new kind of course,”\textsuperscript{138} and local administrators give teachers more freedom to decide how to teach these courses.\textsuperscript{139} Furthermore, the MOE has limited power
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in executing reforms at high schools due to two main factors: high school curriculum focus on university examination preparation and more dominant control over local high schools by prefectural boards of education. Thus, although the creation of educational guidelines in Japan is a highly centralized process, varying degrees of guideline conformity exist at the prefectural and local levels.¹⁴⁰

After the Course of Study is published, the MOE organizes briefing sessions for textbook publishing companies, and these companies begin writing and editing textbooks based on the new educational guidelines. Publishing companies hire well-known professionals in academia and teaching to write and contribute material to textbook drafts, and these drafts are submitted to the MOE for review.¹⁴¹ Then, textbook review committees determine how closely the textbook content follows the Course of Study and “…evaluate the empirical validity of statements made in the textbook.”¹⁴² At the end of this process, these committees submit reports to publishing companies containing mandatory and optional textbook changes. Once publishers revise content to the MOE’s satisfaction, their textbooks receive approval. In the final stage, publishers display approved textbooks in school exhibitions held at prefectural capitals. Prefectural and municipal boards of education send administrators and teachers to attend these exhibitions, and these individuals review and recommend which textbooks to adopt. Local school teachers and administrators have the final say in determining which textbooks to use, but it is important to emphasize that all textbook approval for mandatory subjects is controlled by the MOE.¹⁴³

Comparative Analysis of the 1973 and 2003 Courses of Study for Japanese History

¹⁴⁰ DeCoker 148, 153.
⁴¹ Crawfor 4.
¹⁴² DeCoker 8.
¹⁴³ Ibid. 8, 10.
There have been eight Japanese history Courses of Study (1949, 1951, 1956, 1963, 1973, 1982, 1994, and 2003) since the end of WWII, and a comparison of the 1973 and 2003 versions\textsuperscript{144} reflects the influence of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement on national history objectives. I refer to the 1973 Course of Study rather than prior versions because notable changes in detail and wording appeared after this version. Contrasting this version with the most recent 2003 Course of Study will show the cumulative impact of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.

The 1973 Course of Study contains five overall goals for Japanese history education:

1. By utilizing a broad perspective, students will understand our country’s history correctly. In particular, by considering the connection of Japanese culture with historic periods and the overall course of history, students will grasp the historical development that led to the formation of present day Japan, deepen their awareness as Japanese citizens, and cultivate the demeanor and ability to participate in the development of a democratic nation and society.

2. Students will understand the fundamental aspects of our country’s history, cultivate a historical thought process, grasp the characteristics of various historical periods and how these periods transitioned, and consider the meaning of history.

3. Students will understand the basics of international relations and cultural exchange from our country’s history, consider the formative process of our country’s culture and status in world society, and cultivate a spirit of international cooperation.

4. Students will deepen their understanding of our country’s cultural traditions and how our ancestors endeavored to create, develop, and pass on culture; become more familiar with cultural assets and foster an appreciation for these assets; and heighten their motivation to create and develop new aspects of culture.

\textsuperscript{144} Appendix A includes the original Japanese and translated English versions of the 1973 and 2003 Courses of Study.
5. Students will utilize materials, *foster the ability to understand history empirically and scientifically, consider historic events with a multifaceted mindset, and cultivate the attitude to judge fairly*.¹⁴⁵

Regarding specific differences, this version clarifies that students will learn to contribute to democracy *(minshuteki na kokka · shakai no hatten ni kōryoku wo yashinau)* and international cooperation *(kokusaikyōchō no seishin wo yashinau)*. Moreover, the fourth point identifies studying the endeavors of one’s ancestors *(sosen no doryoku)* and Japan’s cultural assets *(bunka isan)* as sources for learning about and valuing one’s cultural identity. Finally, the fifth point (which one may argue to be the most important) explains how students will be taught to analyze and view history with a broad *(hiroi shiya ni tatte)*, factually based, comprehensive, and unbiased mindset *(shijitsu wo jishōteki, kagakuteki ni rikai suru kōryoku wo sodate, rekishitekijishō wo takakuteki ni kōsatsu shi, kōsei ni handan suru taido wo yashinau)*.

Overall, the 1973 Course of Study states that students learning national history will value Japanese history and culture, gain a fundamental understanding of international society, contribute to democracy and international cooperation, and acquire a historical viewpoint based on rationality.¹⁴⁶

Two aspects of the 1973 version remain mostly intact in the 2003 version. These are cultivating a historical thought process *(rekishiteki shikōryoku wo tsuchikau)* and deepening/cultivating an awareness as Japanese citizens *(kokumin toshite no jikaku wo yashinau)*. Beyond these points, however, the 2003 Course of Study illustrates dramatic changes in content. From 1994, the MOE decided to create two separate Japanese history courses, “Japanese History
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A” and “Japanese History B;” hence, the 2003 Course of Study has two separate but almost similar objectives for both courses:

Japanese History A

_Utilizing a perspective based on world history_ and considering our country’s modern historical development and how our country connects with the international environment, students will cultivate a historical thought process, awareness as Japanese citizens, and _traits as a proactive Japanese citizen living in an international society._

Japanese History B

_Utilizing a perspective based on world history_, students will understand the development of our country’s history comprehensively. By deepening their knowledge of our country’s cultural and traditional characteristics, students will cultivate a historic thought process, awareness as Japanese citizens, and _traits as a proactive Japanese citizen living in an international society._

The 2003 version does not specifically address how students should contribute as a Japanese citizen to domestic and international society. A simplistic phrase concerning this relationship states that students studying Japanese history will develop “…traits as a proactive Japanese citizen living in an international society” (kokusai shakai ni shutaiteki ni ikiru nihonjin to shite no shishitsu wo yashinau). Furthermore, the MOE greatly simplified the type of analytical mindset that students will garner to a perspective based solely on world history (sekaishiteki shiya ni tatte). In sum, the 2003 version loosely states that students learning about national history will foster a “worldly” historical point of view and an identity as a Japanese citizen living in an international society.

In the 1973 and 2003 Japanese history Courses of Study, the MOE establishes a link that emphasizes the importance of learning about history/culture, cultivating a deeper awareness of
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one’s cultural identity, and constructing a collective national identity among students. Two fundamental shifts of direction, however, have occurred during the time between these Courses of Study. In the 2003 Course of Study, what characteristics and behaviors define a Japanese citizen in domestic and international society are not expanded upon. Also, this version does not detail how students should analyze and view history. Leaving these explanations vague seems to lead to two conclusions. First, the MOE can screen history textbook content without any major restrictions. Second, this ability permits the MOE to promote a bias view of national history associated with the goals of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. With these objectives in place, the ideological battle over how to inculcate patriotism through national history education transfers to textbook content and approval.

**Japanese History Textbooks: History of Controversy and Literature Review**

The nationalistic history textbook content revisions that comprise a vital aspect of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement transpired as a result of the History Textbook Controversy. This controversy is a series of ideological conflicts between politicians, education bureaucrats, historian Saburo Ienaga, history activist groups who support Ienaga, and right-wing organizations over the history textbook content used in Japanese schools from the late 1940s to the present. After the end of WWII, history textbook authors vividly described Japan’s wartime atrocities, but nationally-oriented LDP politicians against these descriptions influenced the MOE’s decision in the mid-1950s to appoint more conservative members to textbook screening committees. This caused history textbook content to incorporate a more nationalistic viewpoint. As a result, Saburo Ienaga sued the MOE in the 1960s and contended that the state interfered too
heavily in the portrayal of national history and thereby violated his rights as a textbook author. Even though Ienaga did not win all of his court cases, he succeeded to some extent in challenging the legitimacy of state textbook screening. Ienaga’s court cases, combined with political opposition from China and Korea, compelled the MOE to relax its policies, and more textbook authors from the early 1980s began writing about wartime history from peace-and-justice perspectives. Efforts from nationalistic politicians and right-wing organizations in the early 1990s, however, caused the MOE to shift towards favoring positive historical treatments. The MOE then influenced publishers, who began the practice of voluntarily whitewashing history textbooks. As a result, a majority of history textbooks used in present-day schools lack detailed descriptions of Japan’s wartime atrocities, but members of citizen activist groups that support peace-and-justice history perspectives seek to change this trend. This section will detail major events associated with the History Textbook Controversy, explain how supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement impacted history textbook revisions, and introduce the existing ideological struggle between supporters of nationalistic history revisions and advocates of peace-and-justice history perspectives.

After Japan’s surrender on August 15, 1945, Occupation Forces led by the United States reformed several areas of the Japanese educational system, and most history textbook content during the occupational period included descriptions of Japan’s WWII atrocities. Three years later, the MOE strengthened control over textbook content by adopting a textbook screening system and creating a screening committee. Then, following the merger of the Democratic Party and Liberal Party into the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) in November 1955, the LDP
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held a majority of seats in the Diet, and several LDP politicians initiated a campaign aimed at criticizing history textbook descriptions that were biased against Japan. The LDP also put pressure on the MOE regarding textbook content guidelines. Consequently,

…[the Ministry] increased the number of screening council members to add conservatives to the board and created full-time examiner positions, filling the social studies positions with nationalists holding the emperor-centered view of history and eager to defend the empire and Japan’s Asia Pacific Wars.\textsuperscript{151}

Furthermore, the MOE issued an ordinance in 1958 stating that their guidelines for textbook revisions would have legal force. Once these bureaucratic changes were in place, most history textbook authors wrote content based on the desires of the nationalistic oriented screening committee members. Historian Saburo Ienaga, however, decided to challenge the MOE’s biased screening policies.\textsuperscript{152}

Ienaga was known as one of Japan’s most influential postwar historians. He wanted to balance the portrayal of wartime Japan as both an aggressor and victim and “…unequivocally argued the need for the Japanese themselves, through their own judiciary, to pursue the issue of war crimes and address the matter of war responsibility.”\textsuperscript{153} He was also one of the first historians to create a national history textbook after WWII entitled \textit{A New History of Japan (Shin Nihonshi)},\textsuperscript{154} which depicted wartime Japanese history in an unflattering light. Within later versions of \textit{A New History of Japan}, Ienaga wrote vivid and detailed descriptions of war atrocities such as the Japanese military’s treatment of Korean and Chinese comfort women (sexual slaves who were raped and beaten), Unit 731 (a Japanese military unit that was in charge
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of bacteriological warfare in China), and the Nanking Massacre of 1937 (an event where Japanese soldiers raided Nanking, raped women, and killed hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers and innocent civilians). Even though several schools circulated and used his textbook throughout the first post-WWII decade, it eventually came under attack by reviewers of the MOE’s textbook committee. Textbook committee members wanted Ienaga to make several revisions and argued that *A New History of Japan* contained historical inaccuracies that went against three goals of learning about Japanese history: “…to recognize the efforts of ancestors, to heighten one’s consciousness of being Japanese, [and] to instill a rich love of the race.”\(^{155}\) In response, Ienaga filed lawsuits against the MOE in the mid-1960s, and several historians and academics supported Ienaga’s cause by forming the Association of People Involved in Historical Studies and Supporting the Textbook Screening Lawsuit (*Kyōkasho Kentei Soshō wo Shien Suru Rekishigaku Kankeisha no Kai*, hereafter APIHS) in 1965.\(^{156}\) Ienaga’s history textbook became the focal point of three well-known court battles,\(^{157}\) and APIHS helped “…Ienaga’s legal team in matters specifically related to history, including writing some portion of court documents, and selecting and supporting expert witnesses.”\(^{158}\)

Although Ienaga’s lawsuits against the MOE had different foci (the first civil suit and second administrative suit centered on the MOE’s textbook screening policies, and the third civil suit specifically concentrated on the issue of including war atrocities within history textbook content), all three suits shared the overlying themes of questioning the state’s ability to screen textbooks and establishing Ienaga’s rights as the textbook’s author. These court cases continued over the next two to three decades. Regarding the verdicts, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of
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the MOE in the first suit by clarifying that the state “…functions to decide the content of education in order to protect children and the common good of society.” The second suit ended without a proper conclusion, and for the final suit, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of Ienaga by declaring that several of the revisions that the textbook screening committee demanded were unjustifiable. During the time of these court rulings, rising protests from the Korean and Chinese governments regarding the approval of nationalistic Japanese history textbooks put further pressure on the MOE. As a result, the MOE began relaxing its textbook guidelines and screening practices.

From the early-1980s to mid-1990s, a growing trend emerged whereby more Japanese history textbooks included and expanded upon descriptions of Japan’s wartime conduct. Since the Japanese government wanted to maintain positive international relations with its neighboring countries, the MOE’s textbook screening policies concerning the negative portrayal of wartime Japan became more lenient. Furthermore, due to the influence of Ienaga’s history textbook lawsuits, “…historical research produced more empirically supported knowledge on many aspects of the war and colonialism,” and textbook authors in general wrote more about war controversies from peace-and-justice perspectives. This trend, however, would not continue unchallenged. Reacting to Ienaga’s lawsuits, protests from China and Korea, and the MOE’s relaxed textbook policies, nationalists initiated a counteroffensive.

Beginning in the early 1980s, right-wing organizations became more actively involved in the History Textbook Controversy. The two main goals of these organizations were counteracting the idea that the Japanese government needed to apologize for its WWII actions.
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and eliminating the history textbook content that portrayed Japan’s wartime actions in a negative manner. These groups felt that “…each nation is entitled to decide the content of its own school curriculum, and it was humiliating from a diplomatic perspective that Japan had to apologize for its textbooks to countries such as China and South Korea.” To counter the trend of including Japan’s war atrocities within history textbooks, the National Conference to Defend Japan (Nihon wo Mamoru Kokumin Kaigi), one of the largest right-wing organizations, announced the creation of its own high school Japanese history textbook Shinpen Nihonshi. This nationalistic textbook portrayed wartime Japan in a positive light, and a draft of this textbook was submitted to the MOE textbook review committee during the summer of 1985. After a round of revisions, some committee members argued that Shinpen Nihonshi was biased and unfit for publication, but due to political pressure (the then Prime Minister Nakasone was in favor of Shinpen Nihonshi’s publication), the textbook was published in 1990.

During the early 1990s, Prime Minister Hosokawa’s public apologies regarding Japan’s wartime actions caused several nationally-oriented LDP politicians to mobilize and directly impact the History Textbook Controversy: they organized into a political group that advocated for textbook revisions associated with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. On August 23, 1993, Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa (Japan New Party) made his first speech to the Diet, and within this speech, he commented on several aspects of Japan’s wartime behavior. For example, he recognized WWII “…as a shinryaku sensō (war of aggression), [and] an ayamatta sensō (wrong war).” Furthermore, in his next speech, “…he called the colonization of Korea ‘colonial rule’ (shokuminchi shihai) instead of using the conventional euphemism
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‘annexation’ (heigō). These were the first such clear-cut admissions by a postwar Japanese prime minister.”

Hosokawa’s comments stirred anger among nationally-oriented LDP politicians who regarded these comments as “leftist propaganda” and “anti-Japanese.” Thus, a few months later, these politicians created the Committee for the Examination of History. Made up of roughly 100 LDP Diet members (including future prime ministers Ryutaro Hashimoto, Yoshiro Mori, and Shinzo Abe), this committee began a Japanese history revision campaign with the aim of justifying the Asia-Pacific War and refuting historical evidence of comfort women and the Nanking Massacre.

Once Ryutaro Hashimoto became prime minister in January 1996, the LDP returned to government power, and the nationalistic side of the History Textbook Controversy intensified. First, the Committee for the Examination of History focused more heavily on history textbooks and the removal of content that depicted a negative view of Japan’s past. Second, history textbook content became a topic that was frequently discussed in the Diet, and the LDP worked with opposition parties to counter the trend of unflattering wartime descriptions in national history textbook content. Finally, Prime Minister Hashimoto “…expressed his intention to consider a reform of the textbook screening system as a part of his education reform agenda.”

Thus, attacks on history textbook content served the LDP as a focal point of inner-party unity and as a bridge to create alliances with nationalistic aspects of other political parties. The LDP’s
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involvement in Japanese history education became one of two important factors that influenced textbook publishers to eventually whitewash negative historical content.\footnote{Nozaki 142-144, 150.}

The second factor was the 1996 establishment of the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform (Atarashii Rekishi Kyokasho wo Tsukurukai, hereafter JSHTTR), another major right-wing organization that became actively involved in supporting history content revisions related to the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. The founder of JSHTTR was Nobukatsu Fujioka, a professor of education at the University of Tokyo. In 1995, he headed a group called the “Liberal View of History Study Group” (Jiyūshugi Shikan Kenkyūkai), which paved the way for the founding of JSHTTR. Regarding Fujioka’s views towards history education, he stated publically on numerous occasions that “…textbooks focusing on Japan’s alleged wartime wrongs were unhealthy for the country’s students”\footnote{Norimitsu Onishi, "In Japan's New Texts, Lessons in Rising Nationalism," The New York Times, 17 Apr. 2005, 11 Aug. 2009 <http://www.katayama.org/jk/diary/site/20050418NYT.pdf>.
} and that these types of textbooks teach students a “masochistic” (jigyakuteki) and “anti-Japanese” (hannichi) historical perspective.\footnote{Yoshida 65.} Fujioka believes that history education “…must benefit the Japanese state and should make Japanese ‘proud of their nation again.’”\footnote{Aaron Gerow. "Consuming Asia, Consuming Japan: The New Neonationalistic Revisionism in Japan,” in Laura Hein and Mark Selden, ed., Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany, and the United States (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2000) 74.} Fujioka’s ideology guided the activities and goals of JSHTTR. For example, in 1999, JSHTTR submitted a revisionist high school history textbook entitled The New History Textbook for the MOE to review, and this textbook was approved for publication in 2001. Moreover, JSHTTR strengthened its relationships with the Committee for the Examination of History, LDP Diet members, and other right-wing organizations. In particular, former Prime Ministers Junichiro Koizumi and Shinzo Abe were
known for adamantly supporting nationalistic history textbook revisions and JSHTTR’s activities.\(^{175}\)

Members of the LDP and the JSHTTR combined forces to promote nationwide history textbook revisions that eliminated coverage of controversial wartime events. Three critical changes regarding history textbook content occurred as a result of their efforts. First, the MOE’s textbook screening process began favoring nationalistic historical views once again. Second, pressure from politicians and MOE officials caused history textbook publishers to “…reconsider their choice of [textbook] authors”\(^{176}\) and practice “…‘voluntary restraint’ to eliminate ‘masochistic statements.’”\(^{177}\) Finally, influence from JSHTTR at the local level caused some education boards to gradually revise “…their [textbook] adoption procedures to lessen teacher influence.”\(^{178}\) Consequently, from the late 1990s, detailed descriptions of Japan’s war atrocities and “peace-and-justice” perspectives in history textbooks gradually waned.\(^{179}\)

From the late 1990s until the present, the overall history textbook content concerning Japan’s wartime controversies changed noticeably. As an example, historian and educational specialist Keith Crawford documented changes regarding the description of the Nanking Massacre in the 1997 and 2002 versions of eight different history textbooks. Six of the eight 1997 textbooks declared “…that hundreds of thousands died, and [out of these six textbooks,] four refer to Chinese claims of 300,000 victims.”\(^{180}\) In the 2002 versions, only two textbooks “…mention the number of victims, and none refer to the Chinese claim,”\(^{181}\) and the remainder
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state that “…‘a lot of people’ or ‘many’ were killed.”

Hence, Crawford concludes that although all of the textbooks mention Japan’s wartime atrocities (i.e. comfort women, the Nanking Massacre, etc.), the descriptions of these controversies are quite vague.

Although a majority of history textbook content regarding wartime Japan became whitewashed due to efforts from supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement, the history organization Children and Textbooks Japan Network 21 (Kodomo to Kyōkasho Zenkoku Netto 21, hereafter CTJN21) has battled against this trend and advocated for more descriptive content of Japan’s wartime atrocities. Following the conclusion of Ienaga’s lawsuits, APIHS disbanded and members from this organization created CTJN21 in August 1998 to encourage peace-and-justice perspectives in history education and the democratization of the history textbook publication and adoption process. Currently, CTJN21 is one of the largest peace-and-justice advocacy organizations with a membership of 97 groups and around 2000 individuals. CTJN21 issues bimonthly newsletter reports regarding the MOE’s textbook policies and various issues relating to textbook adoption and “…encourages citizens to establish their own local chapters, plan their own activities, and form networks with other citizen groups.” Thus far, CJN21 has succeeded in lobbying several local school boards against adopting JSHTKR’s Shinpen Nihonshi (current rate of adoption: 0.04% of all schools), and this organization
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continues to play an important role as a grassroots movement against the history textbook revision goals of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.\footnote{186 Inokuchi and Nozaki.}

The textbook revisions that took place during the History Textbook Controversy show how supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement wanted to use history education to promote a patriotic cultural identity among students. Japanese history textbook content over the past 70 years fluctuated several times between “peace-and-justice” and nationalistic perspectives. From the early 1990s, nationalistically-oriented politicians mobilized and combined forces with right-wing organizations in order to influence revisions of history textbook content, and their influence eventually caused content to shift towards whitewashed descriptions of Japan’s wartime atrocities. Supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement wanted history textbooks to promote pride in Japanese history and culture, and the content of most textbooks today attest to the accomplishment of their revisionist goals. Nevertheless, members of CTJN21 who promote peace-and-justice history perspectives continue to challenge these nationalistic revisions through mobilization and advocacy campaigns at the national and local level. Since the present condition of the History Textbook Controversy still remains in flux, one may argue that neither side of this controversy can proclaim “absolute victory” yet.

\textbf{Literary Analysis of History Textbook Themes and Narratives}

What type of content reflects the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement’s history textbook revisions? Several historians and academics have examined dominant themes and
narratives found in Japanese elementary, middle, and high schools from the end of WWII until the present. For the purposes of this report, four recent and well-known history textbook analyses conducted by Julian Dierkes, Christopher Barnard, James Orr, and Alexander Bukh will be briefly summarized. Dierkes analyzed thirty-three middle school history textbooks approved by the MOE from 1950 and 2000 and focused on how the Japanese nation was portrayed in six historical episodes (the origins of human life in Japan, the Kaga Uprising [Ikko Ikki], the Meiji Restoration, Taisho Democracy, the Asia Pacific War, and postwar reconstruction). He asserts that even though descriptions of the Asia Pacific War had slight changes in the 1980s and 1990s, the overall narrative for the six aforementioned historical episodes remained uncritical, empirical, and monolithic in nature. By portraying history “…as a series of chronologically organized events that were set in motion by individual or collective actors whose motives were seen, by and large, as unproblematic,” Dierkes concludes that Japanese history textbooks contain a neutral and bureaucratic historiography. Barnard takes a different approach by analyzing the structure of the language used in eighty-eight high school history textbooks published in 1995 to describe the Nanking Massacre, Japanese attacks against the Western allies, and Japan’s surrender in 1945. He declares that the textbook language “…not only protects the negative face of the Japanese state, but also defers to its positive face,” and this leads him to the final assessment that “…the present day MOE identifies itself closely with the Japanese state of 1945, and the power structures within that state.”
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The final two academics, Orr and Bukh, both focus on the theme of victimization within history textbook narratives. Orr studied narratives in elementary and middle school history textbooks issued from the end of WWII until the late 1970s. He notes that for a couple of decades after WWII, most textbooks disregarded Japan’s responsibility for the victimization of other Asian people during WWII and focused on depicting the Japanese people as victims of Western powers. From the 1970s, however, Orr contends that this trend shifted towards more emphasis on Japan’s victimization of Asia, which invited greater awareness of Japan’s wartime responsibilities. Finally, Bukh utilized seven popular history textbooks from the mid-1980s and early 2000s to conduct his case study on historical narratives of victimization and its link with Japan’s national identity. Instead of relying solely on descriptions of WWII narratives, Burk also included an analysis of narratives regarding the Russo-Japanese War. He determines that even though all of the textbooks include “…more extensive depictions of ‘atrocities’ inflicted on other Asian peoples, Japanese victimhood is still a central feature in the contemporary narrative in the most recent textbooks.” Additionally, he states that two important changes in Japanese history narratives have occurred:

First, the monolithic view of Japanese victimhood has been contested through detailed depictions of the battle for Okinawa. Secondly, inclusion of the narratives of the victims of Japanese atrocities in the textbooks has challenged the exclusive right of Japanese historians and the state over writing national history. 

Bukh associates these historical narratives of victimization with Japan’s post-war pacifism and harsh view towards the state’s militaristic policies. From the textual analyses conducted by Dierkes, Barnard, Orr, and Bukh, one can conclude that the historic narrative within most
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textbooks remains fundamentally monolithic, unreflective, one-sided, “face-saving,” and pacifistic in nature.

Learning from the Past and Preparing for the Future

Three key questions characterize the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement and its link with national history education revisions: How should the Japanese government depict national history? How should these depictions be included in public education? And, through these depictions, what type of collective identity does the government want students to garner? The Japanese government established the MOE as the bureaucratic entity that implements the answers to these questions through the decennial publication of the Course of Study and the textbook review system. Regarding the Course of Study for Japanese history, the guidelines within this document have undergone dramatic changes in wording over the past four decades. The 1973 Course of Study contained specific goals for cultivating one’s identity as a Japanese citizen, participating as a member of international society, and developing a certain type of analytical mindset. In contrast, the most recent 2003 Course of Study eliminates these details and limits the goals of history education to a vague cultivation of a “Japanese citizen living within in an international society.”

A similar fate has befallen Japanese history textbooks. For the first decade after WWII, the content of Japanese history textbooks included discussions of Japan’s wartime atrocities. Once LDP politicians acquired the reins of political power, however, they campaigned for a view of Japanese history that would make students more prideful of their national identity. The MOE’s textbook review policies followed in the footsteps of these politicians until Saburo
Ienaga challenged the ministry’s policies in court in the mid-1960s. Although Ienaga did not win all of his court cases, his legal actions over the next two decades combined with Korean and Chinese government disapproval of nationalistic textbook content caused the MOE to change textbook content policies and support “peace-and-justice” perspectives. By the late 1990s, this trend shifted towards nationalism due to nationalistically-oriented politicians and right-wing organizations who were supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. In favor of promoting a patriotic cultural identity though history textbook revisions, both groups joined forces and influenced the MOE and textbook companies to reduce unflattering history textbook content of wartime Japan. Ultimately, nationalistic revisions prevailed and now a majority history textbook content leaves discussions of Japan’s war atrocities vague and unreflective and themes within these textbooks remain monolithic and focus on Japan’s victimization. Citizens against nationalistic history textbook revisions, however, formed activist groups in order to defend peace-and-justice history content and perspectives at the national and local level. Thus, the permanence of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement’s history textbook revisions has yet to be set in stone.

Through the discussion and analysis of national history curriculum and guidelines, it is apparent that one of the most important questions to address is how history education in Japan can be utilized to balance national pride with critical reflection. I believe that the Japanese government and MOE have yet to fully engage academics and the general populace with meaningful dialogue regarding this question. Without bringing all of the stakeholders (representatives of government/bureaucracy, peace-and-justice activist organizations, academia, and the general public) together to discuss this issue, no semblance of compromise or consensus will ever be reached. Also, I would argue that only analyzing and criticizing Japanese history
textbook content will not bring a solution to this issue. Examination and discussion of the national history Course of Study guidelines must be included as well. After the publication of the 1973 Course of Study, the MOE has gone away from detail and opted for brevity, vaguely defined goals, and an elimination of discussions regarding the mindset needed for studying history. I do not consider this to be a positive trend. Since the Course of Study forms the basis of textbook content, guidelines regarding history education need to be in detail and explain how students should think about history at a personal, national, and international level. These aforementioned factors, in my opinion, need to be addressed first in order to understand what role government-sponsored history education should play in cultivating citizen identity and patriotism in Japan.
Chapter III: Case Study: Kanagawa Prefecture’s Compulsory Japanese History and Elective Local History Initiative and its Relationship with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement

Kanagawa Prefecture’s mandatory Japanese history and elective local history initiative represents an important offshoot of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. In 2008, this prefecture made national headlines by becoming the first prefecture in Japan since the end of WWII to require all prefectural public high school students to take a Japanese history course starting from 2012. Additionally, the then governor of Kanagawa Prefecture and the superintendent of the Kanagawa Board of Education decided to create two new subjects based on local history to offer as high school curriculum electives. Strengthening patriotism and cultivating a “Japanese” identity among students dominated the political rhetoric behind both of these decisions, and this rhetoric generated prefectural-wide debates. Examining Kanagawa Prefecture’s history education initiative provides a key example of how one prefectural government supports and implements local reforms related to the goals of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.

The mandatory Japanese history and elective local history initiative in Kanagawa Prefecture is a top-down (prefectural to local) initiative created and supported by former prefectural governor Shigefumi Matsuzawa and former head of the prefectural board of education Takaichi Hikichi. Their arguments for implementing this initiative coincide with the goals that form the basis of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. In this final chapter, I provide details regarding the history, debates, and goals of this initiative and analyze how this initiative intends to promote patriotism and internationalism among youth. First, I summarize the history of this initiative from 2006 to the present. Next, I introduce and
deconstruct the arguments between nationalists (supporters of this initiative) and non-nationalists (critics of this initiative). Subsequently, I concentrate on “Local History Kanagawa,” a new elective local history subject, and investigate the content and objectives of this subject through interviews, textbook content analysis, and classroom fieldwork. Finally, I reflect upon this initiative and end with my own thoughts on its connection with patriotism.

**History of the Initiative**

The Kanagawa prefectural government’s dissatisfaction with the MOE’s 1994 Course of Study social science revisions caused discussions concerning the national history education initiative to occur. Social science education in high schools is comprised of three subjects: world history, Japanese history, and geography. In 1994, the MOE made world history mandatory for all high schools and justified this action by pointing to the rapid progression of globalization, the increasing need to cultivate internationally-minded citizens, and the emphasis on Japanese history and geography at the elementary and middle school levels. It left the two remaining subjects (geography and Japanese history) intact as electives, reconstituted them into four different subjects: “Japanese History A and B” and “Geography A and B,” and required all high school students to take one of them. Regarding content, “Japanese History A” focuses on Japan’s modern historical development within an international context, “Japanese History B” centers on Japan’s overall history and culture within an international context, “Geography A” highlights
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Prior to the start of Kanagawa Prefecture’s history initiative in 2006, a summary of Shigefumi Matsuzawa and Takaichi Hikichi’s political background provides some insight into their ideological connections with the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement. Shigefumi Matsuzawa was born in Kawasaki on April 2, 1958 and after graduating from Keio University, he entered the Matsushita School of Government. Following graduation from the Matsushita School of Government, Matsuzawa served as a member of the Kanagawa Prefecture Assembly from 1987 to 1993 (independent) and a representative of Kanagawa Prefecture in the national Diet’s Lower House from 1993 to 2003 (member of Shinseitō Party: 1993 to 1999, member of the Democratic Party of Japan: 1999 to 2003). Then, he left the Democratic Party of Japan, ran for the position of Kanagawa Prefecture governor in 2003 (independent), and was elected. During his time as a member of the national Diet, it seems that he may have made a close friendship with former Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone. There are two reasons behind this conjecture. First, one year after his election as prefecutral governor, Matsuzawa invited Nakasone to a political fundraising party in Yokohama as a guest speaker to discuss “The Political Situation and Japan’s Challenges.” Regarding the reasoning behind inviting Nakasone, Matsuzawa mentioned that he worked with Nakasone on issues relating to Haneda Airport and revising the national Constitution. Second, for a 2010 book written by Matsuzawa entitled Ninomiya Sontoku: Hatenkōryoku, Nakasone wrote a positive review that urged the
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Japanese populace to read this book. On the cover of this book, Matsuzawa included Nakasone’s review and referred to him as “sensei,” meaning a teacher or mentor. Thus, Matsuzawa may have drawn inspiration from Nakasone’s patriotic education ideology.

Takaichi Hikichi was born in 1948. He served as the welfare director of the Kanagawa Prefectural Citizens’ Activities Support Center until April 2005, and then the Kanagawa Board of Education appointed him as the new superintendent of the board of education. Over the next three months, Hikichi worked with Matsuzawa on the issue of enforcing the use of *Kimigayo* (national anthem) and the *Hinomaru* (national flag) in entrance and graduation ceremonies at public and private high schools. Concerning problems with high school teachers not standing during *Kimigayo*, Hikichi commented that these teachers should stand and proposed strict measures that would deal with this issue. These actions echoed Matsuzawa’s sentiments of valuing the national anthem and flag. Thus, one may hypothesize that Hikichi’s thoughts on patriotic education also reflected the fundamental ideology of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.

Public discussions regarding mandatory Japanese history education in Kanagawa prefectural public high schools began in February 2006. During a prefectural assembly meeting among the then Governor Shigefumi Matsuzawa, prefectural Diet members, and the Kanagawa Board of Education, Matsuzawa received a question regarding history education and its relationship with present-day Japanese society: “What are your thoughts regarding the necessity
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of learning about history for Japanese citizens living within an international society?" He responded, "Along with world history, Japanese history should also be made mandatory. I want all high school students to learn [Japanese history]." Until this time, superintendent Hikichi did not know that world history was mandatory, Japanese history was an elective, and that several students from prefectural public high schools graduated every year without learning about Japanese history. Consequently, Hikichi met with Matsuzawa afterwards and discussed non-mandatory Japanese history education in high schools and its impact upon Japanese youth. After several conversations with Matsuzawa and other members of the Kanagawa Board of Education, Hikichi stated at a press conference on May 19, 2006 that the Board of Education would investigate the MOE’s decisions regarding history education within the Course of Study. In addition, Hikichi declared that he would confer with other Board of Education superintendents from Tokyo, Chiba, and Saitama prefectures about this issue.

The board of education superintendents from Tokyo, Chiba, Saitama, and Kanagawa Prefecture held their annual meeting on August 31, 2006 and discussed the current status of Japanese history education. At the end of the meeting, a unanimous decision was made: all four superintendents would work together to draft and submit a petition to the MOE requesting that Japanese history become a mandatory subject within the next Course of Study guidelines. The four superintendents advocated mandatory Japanese history education, linked this subject with strengthening one’s awareness as Japanese within an international society, and suggested the adoption of one of three options: (1) Make both Japanese and world history mandatory. (2)
Instead of world history, make Japanese history mandatory. or (3) Create a new subject entitled “Modern History” that incorporates elements from both modern Japanese and world history and make this subject mandatory.\textsuperscript{210} This petition was submitted on September 12\textsuperscript{th}, and the prefectural assemblies of Ishikawa, Kagawa, and Ibaraki Prefecture offered support for this petition.\textsuperscript{211}

Despite strong support for mandatory Japanese history education from the aforementioned prefectural governments, the MOE ultimately decided on January 17, 2008 to keep world history mandatory and Japanese history optional. The ministry concluded that “…based on the current status of students learning about Japanese history, Japanese geography, and world geography in elementary and middle schools, our decision regarding the current mandatory and elective subjects for the high school level is rational.”\textsuperscript{212} Both Hikichi and Matsuzawa publically expressed their discontent with this decision and felt that if they did not take matters into their own hands, several years would pass without any progress made on this issue. Therefore, on February 14\textsuperscript{th}, the Kanagawa Board of Education announced at a press conference that plans were in place to create two new Japanese history subjects based on local history (on top of the standard “Japanese History A and B”) and to require all students attending prefectural public high schools to take one of four Japanese history subjects in order to graduate. Regarding this announcement, Matsuzawa asserted, “…[M]andatory Japanese history education in high schools nationwide will make Japan shine once again, and I firmly believe that this will become the first step towards progressing as a nation that holds self-respect and exerts leadership
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on the international stage.213 This educational initiative, largely directed and supported by Hikichi and Matsuzawa, would come into effect by the tentative date of the 2013 school year—the same year that the MOE planned to implement a new Course of Study. Hikichi then stepped down as superintendent a month after this announcement, but he continued to be involved in this initiative.214

Reacting to this announcement, the MOE commented, “As long as the Kanagawa Board of Education does not deviate from the Course of Study guidelines, there is no problem with creating a mandatory subject [at the prefectural level].”215 The MOE holds a similar policy regarding new school subjects at the prefectural level, and textbooks for these subjects do not need to be reviewed and approved by the MOE.216 In fact, referring to previous examples, the Tokyo Metropolitan area and Ibaraki Prefecture require public high school students to take the subjects of Service and Ethics respectively.217 Furthermore, Hyōgo Prefecture’s Board of Education created an elective subject entitled “Japanese culture” and introduced this subject to public high schools in 2008. Finally, with regards to local history education, several cities and prefectures in Japan provide students with elective local history programs and classes. Kanagawa Prefecture, however, would become the first prefecture in Japan since the end of WWII to create

high school curriculum and textbooks based on local history and make Japanese history mandatory for all public high school students.\(^{218}\)

In order for the prefectural government to gain support for this movement at the local level, members from the Kanagawa Board of Education promptly met with the Kanagawa Principals’ Association over the next two months and received their approval. Then, the Kanagawa Board of Education, with input from Hikichi and Matsuzawa, announced the titles of the two new Japanese history subjects: “Local History Kanagawa” and “Modern History and Kanagawa.” To receive a variety of feedback regarding the content of these new subjects, the Kanagawa Board of Education created the Association for Japanese History Research and held the association’s first meeting in late July of 2008. The members of this association included historians/academics, principals, and representatives from various PTAs, and over the next two years, this association met several times to discuss how to design new curriculums and textbooks. With this input, the Kanagawa Board of Education finished the textbooks and curriculums for “Local History Kanagawa” and “Modern History and Kanagawa” by September 2010. Since this date was earlier than expected, the board decided to fully implement mandatory Japanese history education at all public high schools by 2012, a year earlier than planned. These actions also influenced the Tokyo Metropolitan Government in 2010 to require Japanese history in public high schools and offer local history electives starting from the 2012 school year.\(^{219}\) Thus, one can conclude that Kanagawa’s groundbreaking initiative influenced other prefectural governments to follow its example.\(^{220}\)

\(^{218}\) Asahi Shinbun, 15 Feb. 2008.


At the beginning of the 2011 school year this past April, the Kanagawa Board of Education designated twenty schools from around the prefecture to become “test schools” that offer “Local History Kanagawa,” “Modern History and Kanagawa,” or both courses to students. As mentioned previously, the Kanagawa Board of Education is requiring all public high school students to take one of four Japanese history electives, but it is up to high school administrators to decide which elective(s) will be offered to students. Thus, depending on the school, students may be able to choose from all four electives, either “Local History Kanagawa” or “Modern History and Kanagawa,” or only one Japanese history subject may be offered. (As an example, half of the twenty test schools offer only “Local History Kanagawa,” “Modern History and Kanagawa,” or both courses.) Finally, each test school has different class sizes, number of instructors, and course times per week.221

The mandatory Japanese history initiative for Kanagawa prefectural public high schools sparked off of disagreements between the national and prefectural governments and ultimately turned into a top-down movement from the prefectural to local level. Hikichi and Matsuzawa wanted the MOE to change their Course of Study guidelines by making Japanese history mandatory at the high school level. In order to accomplish this goal, Hikichi consulted and worked with other prefectural Board of Education superintendents, and these superintendents submitted a letter of request for the MOE to change this policy. The MOE, however, rejected this request, and Hikichi and Matsuzawa took leadership of this initiative and implemented it at the prefectural level. Moreover, they added another aspect to this initiative by creating two new elective local history subjects. Both government figures worked to gather support for this initiative at the local level through approval from the Kanagawa Principals’ Association, news

conference promotions, and the creation of a history research association. Ultimately, Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s efforts succeeded, and from the start of the 2012 school year, Kanagawa will become the first prefecture in Japan since WWII to require Japanese history in public high schools and offer local history electives.

Arguments For and Against Mandatory Japanese History Education in High Schools

Kanagawa Prefecture’s mandatory Japanese history and elective local history education initiative ignited prefecture-wide debates concerning the political motivations behind this initiative and the relationship between history education and the cultivation of patriotism and cultural identity. There are two sides to this debate: pro-nationalists (whose views are illustrated through Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s political rhetoric) and non-nationalists (mainly composed of parents and members from the Kanagawa Teachers Association). This section will introduce and deconstruct the main arguments from both sides in order to gain a better understanding of the issues surrounding Kanagawa Prefecture’s offshoot of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.

Hikichi and Matsuzawa: Pro-nationalist Arguments

Hikichi and Matsuzawa initiated, promoted, and defended mandatory Japanese history education. They view mandatory Japanese history education as a positive step for Japanese society domestically and internationally, and there are four main arguments that both men use to support this education initiative: (1) Japanese history education helps students solidify and appreciate their cultural identity as “Japanese” and garner patriotism for Japan; (2) Japanese students who learn national history can explain their country to foreigners and contribute to
internationalism; (3) the percentage of high school students who do not take national history and/or do not have a general knowledge of modern national history is too high; and (4) learning about national history encourages students to cultivate a “Japanese” compassionate heart and unselfish mindset, and these qualities will contribute to the reduction of school problems and the improvement of Japanese society in general.

First, Hikichi and Matsuzawa contend that learning Japanese history is necessary for students to develop and maintain their cultural identity as Japanese and garner patriotism. With the rapid progression of globalization, Matsuzawa asserts that valuing one’s local and national identity is becoming more important, and Japanese history education is a vital tool that should be used to maintain one’s ties with his or her hometown and nation. 222 Hikichi states that students who study Japanese history learn to “…value oneself”223 and gain “…awareness as Japanese in an international society.”224 At a press conference, Matsuzawa also mentioned the link between Japanese history and cultivating one’s self-consciousness as “Japanese” by commenting, “[F]or living in an international society, it is important [for Japanese citizens] to understand Japan’s history and culture.”225 Moreover, studying Japanese history causes students to develop patriotism and pride towards the nation, two values that Hikichi and Matsuzawa regard highly. 226 Matsuzawa warns, “[C]itizens of a nation who distance themselves from national history education will definitely perish. Citizens who do not try to learn about their elders’
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accomplishments will definitely perish.”\textsuperscript{227} Finally, students with knowledge of Japanese history can pass on Japan’s history and culture to future generations.\textsuperscript{228} This ensures the continuity of Japanese culture and history in a rapidly evolving international environment.

Second, students who understand Japanese history can share this knowledge with the world, and this action contributes to the prosperity of internationalism. Matsuzawa defines “true internationalism” as “…[the process of] various national identities bumping into each other, and while these identities are in the process of garnering respect towards each other’s cultures, traditions, and history, new values will be generated.”\textsuperscript{229} Globalization is causing cultures from around the world to interact more closely and more often, and Matsuzawa and Hikichi believe that sharing one’s national history and culture with others and contributing to multicultural understanding is critical.\textsuperscript{230} Specifically, Hikichi recounts that after talking with several students who have studied abroad, he found that most of these students felt embarrassed that they did not know much about Japanese history whereas students from other countries knew their national history quite well.\textsuperscript{231} He concluded that these conversations concretely show that Japanese history must be a mandatory subject in high schools “…in order to produce people who can properly explain our country to the world.”\textsuperscript{232}

Third, Hikichi makes the statistical argument that a significant percentage of high school students in Kanagawa Prefecture are graduating without learning about modern Japanese history. Every year, the Kanagawa Board of Education conducts a survey regarding what electives high
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school students take before graduation. Referencing these survey results, Hikichi claims that since 2005, around one-third of all high school students in Kanagawa Prefecture (approximately 10,000 to 11,000 students) graduate without taking a modern Japanese history course. Moreover, even though all elementary and middle school students are required to learn Japanese history, the amount of history that needs to be covered is too extensive. Consequently, a majority of elementary and middle school teachers do not teach Japanese history from the Meiji Period onward (the period often classified as modern Japanese history). Finally, Hikichi notes that Kanagawa Prefecture’s mandatory Japanese history education initiative will not have much of an impact on college entrance examinations. He analyzed National University Exam Center statistics from 2006 onward and discovered that the largest percentage of students choose to take Japanese history for their university entrance examinations. Both Hikichi and Matsuzawa strongly feel that all students should have a basic knowledge of modern Japanese history and understand how Japan became the country that it is today, and Hikichi utilizes the aforementioned statistics to supplement his argument with empirical and objective evidence.

Finally, Hikichi and Matsuzawa equate learning Japanese history with developing a compassionate heart and unselfish mindset, and both men epitomize these characteristics as being “Japanese.” Hikichi feels that most Japanese living in present-day society lack a compassionate heart towards others and adds, “Problems concerning [compassion in] the heart is a large theme [in contemporary Japan], and in order to cultivate Japanese people for acceptance into international society, isn’t it good to have students learn ‘Japaneseness’ through history?”

Hikichi does not detail what constitutes a “compassionate heart” (omoiyari no kokoro) or
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“Japaneseness” (nihonjinrashisa), but he classifies having compassion towards others as a Japanese ethical trait. He also takes this idea a step further by asserting that the prevalence of school problems in Kanagawa Prefecture such as bullying, truancy, and violence is associated with the lack of a compassionate heart among students. Thus, through Japanese history education, he alludes that students will develop the morality necessary to decrease juvenile delinquency problems within schools.\textsuperscript{236}

Matsuzawa makes a slightly different argument by stressing that Japanese history education will help students garner an unselfish mindset—a mindset that cares about others and the world around him or her. He uses two terms when referring to this mindset and its relationship with Japanese history: horizontal and vertical. Regarding the differences between these terms, he states, “…when learning Japanese history, utilizing a ‘horizontal mindset’ is important. Learning how our ancestors created this country and fixing our eyes upon what to pass on to future offspring, we can think about what we should do [as a nation].”\textsuperscript{237} Not learning about Japanese history, however, causes one to become “vertically-minded,” which means that a person thinks “…as long as I am doing well or as long as the present [situation] is well, everything is well.”\textsuperscript{238} In other words, vertically-minded people selfishly think about their own pursuit of happiness. Matsuzawa believes that Japanese people are becoming more “vertically-minded” in general and states that a remedy for this is learning about national history, especially during the modern period. He also claims that learning about national history causes one to “…think of society as a whole”\textsuperscript{239} and consider the “…link between the past, present and
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future.” By studying Japanese history, Japanese can become selfless and “harmonious” within contemporary society and proactive towards the future well-being of the nation.

In sum, Hikichi and Matsuzawa believe that mandatory Japanese history education in high schools will help students develop, value, and pass on a national identity; interact with others from around the world and contribute to a healthy sense of internationalism; and cultivate positive and distinctly “Japanese” social traits that will benefit society as a whole. Both Hikichi and Matsuzawa emphasize the important relationship between learning about one’s history and culture and developing pride towards one’s national identity. This identity, however, is not meant to be discriminatory or intolerant: the goals for Japanese history students are to understand their own national traditions, convey these traditions, and increase multicultural understanding. Moreover, Hikichi points out that mandatory Japanese history education will not be a burden for students, and both men underline the positive impact that students with knowledge of Japanese history will have on school and society. Overall, Hikichi and Matsuzawa symbolize mandatory Japanese history education as a pathway for Japan to flourish both domestically and internationally.

Non-nationalist Arguments

Non-nationalists believe that prefectural bureaucrats and politicians are infringing upon the rights of local schools and promoting a link between history education and patriotism that is reminiscent of pre-WWII Japan. Non-nationalists focus on four main points to argue against mandatory Japanese history education: (1) utilizing government sponsored history education to promote patriotism and ethics is dangerous for contemporary society, (2) Hikichi and
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Matsuzawa’s initiative does not consider students of non-Japanese ethnicity, (3) local schools should be in control of curriculum changes, and (4) mandatory history education puts an unnecessary burden on high school students.

First, non-nationalists contend that the local history textbooks created by the Kanagawa Board of Education and Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s rhetoric regarding cultivating “Japanese” morals through history education echo pre-WWII patriotic education goals. Prior to WWII, the government utilized state-sponsored textbooks as one way of strengthening national patriotism and loyalty to the emperor among students. These textbooks portrayed Japanese history one-sidedly (in a monolithic, prideful, and positive way) and supported emperor worship and militarism. Since the Kanagawa Board of Education’s textbooks for “Local History Kanagawa” and “Modern History and Kanagawa” do not require approval from the MOE, non-nationalists believe that the content within these textbooks have the strong possibility of serving nationalistic interests and impacting society negatively. Therefore, these textbooks should not be endorsed for use in high schools.

Additionally, non-nationalists feel that Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s drive to inculcate proper “Japanese” morals through history education harkens back to WWII patriotic education. Specifically pointing to Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s use of terms such as “Japaneseness” (nihonjinrashisa), “patriotism” (aikokushin), “compassionate heart” (omoiyari no kokoro), “awareness as Japanese” (nihonjin toshite no jikaku), and “problems with the heart/mind” (kokoro no mondai) in correlation with the goals of mandatory Japanese history education, non-nationalists label these words/phrases as either suspicious or problematic in nature. Moreover,
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several questions regarding these phrases and the relationship between history and moral education arise: What defines “Japaneseness” and a “compassionate heart?” How will history education be used to inculcate these ideals? Should morals be taught with history? Can students who take Japanese history courses learn the “proper” morals that are necessary to improve problems within schools and society? What kind of patriotism does the prefectural government want to promote through mandatory history education? By neglecting to answer these questions, Hikichi and Matsuzawa leave non-nationalists mistrustful of their intentions.\textsuperscript{244}

Second, non-nationalists deem the mandatory Japanese history initiative inappropriate because Hikichi and Matsuzawa do not specify what students of non-Japanese heritage will gain from studying Japanese history. In all of the press conferences and writings pertaining to mandatory Japanese history education thus far, Hikichi and Matsuzawa have mentioned only how their initiative will impact ethnically Japanese (\textit{nihonjin}) students. Kanagawa Prefecture, however, has a large segment of the population that is of non-Japanese descent, and several foreign students attend high schools around the area. Non-nationalists conclude that Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s policy focus on history education for the Japanese student populace is discriminatory, and they suspect that the type of patriotism that Hikichi and Matsuzawa want to promote will hinder the growth of world peace and internationalism because of its ties with ethnicity.\textsuperscript{245}

Third, the mandatory Japanese history education initiative is top-down in nature and violates the right of high schools to compose their own course curriculum. The Kanagawa Teachers Association in particular uses this argument to protest prefectural government-enforced
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Japanese history education. As mentioned previously, local school administrators and teachers typically determine what subjects to make elective or required (aside from those designated as mandatory by the MOE’s Course of Study). The Kanagawa Teachers Association defends the right of local curriculum creation by declaring that all school administrators and teachers shape curriculum based on students’ diverse interests and needs.\textsuperscript{246} Thus, Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s push to make Japanese history education mandatory at the prefectural level violates the curriculum rights of local schools. Even though a majority of members from the Kanagawa Teachers Association are supportive of Japanese history education in general, they believe that this initiative is unwarranted and a step back towards pre-WWII educational standards (when the national government held supreme power over curriculum and textbook content).\textsuperscript{247}

Finally, requiring Japanese history in all prefectural public high schools will impose an unnecessary burden on students. Non-nationalists explain that since Japanese history is required in elementary and middle schools, there is no rational reason for changing Japanese history education from an elective to a requirement in high schools. Furthermore, in accordance with the Course of Study, students who have an interest in focusing on Japanese history for the university entrance exam will naturally choose to take this course in high school, and this pattern applies to students who have an interest in geography as well. Making Japanese history mandatory will have a negative impact on students interested in geography: these students will be required to take additional coursework. Non-nationalists also argue that the prefectural government’s intent to add local history electives is unbeneficial for students. Since Kanagawa prefectural history is
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not tested on university examinations, students who choose to learn about local history course cannot use this information to prepare for the Japanese history entrance exam.  

Non-nationalists view Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s promotion of mandatory Japanese history education as an initiative associated with WWII ideals of nurturing student morality, ethnic patriotism, and government controlled education. Referring to the production of local history textbooks by the Kanagawa Board of Education; Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s rhetoric regarding cultivating “Japaneseness,” “compassionate hearts,” and “patriotism” through history education; and prefectural government restriction of curriculum control, non-nationalists are apprehensive of Hikichi and Matsuzawa’s intentions and believe that their initiative will harmfully impact not only the local educational system but Japanese society as a whole. Non-nationalists also deny the correlation between the mandatory history education initiative and a “healthy” internationalization. Instead, they assert that this initiative excludes foreigners residing in Japan, focuses solely on a Japanese ethnic-based patriotism, and adds an unnecessary burden to high school students.

Analysis of Local History Kanagawa (Kyōdoshi Kanagawa)

As part of the mandatory Japanese history education initiative, the Kanagawa Board of Education created two new local history electives, “Local History Kanagawa” and “Modern History and Kanagawa,” to diversify and augment the history curriculum within prefectural public high schools. Out of these two subjects, I chose to focus on “Local History Kanagawa” for this thesis in order to discover how local history education relates to the promotion of a cultural identity and patriotism among students. (Also, a few high schools in Kanagawa Prefecture have
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adopted “Local History Kanagawa” already as the only subject that high school students can take to satisfy their Japanese history requirement.) From May to July 2011, I conducted research in Yokohama and Kamakura on “Local History Kanagawa.” During this period of time, I interviewed two members of the Kanagawa Board of Education and former prefectural governor Shigefumi Matsuzawa about “Local History Kanagawa,” obtained a copy of the textbook *Local History Kanagawa* and conducted textual analysis, and observed a one-hour and ten minute “Local History Kanagawa” class conducted at Kamakura High School. I present my research findings in this section.

*Interviews with the Kanagawa Board of Education and Former Governor Shigefumi Matsuzawa*

My interviews with two members of the Kanagawa Board of Education and former governor Matsuzawa provided insight into the reasoning behind creating “Local History Kanagawa,” the textbook content of *Local History Kanagawa*, and the intended educational goals for students taking this course. Due to their busy schedule, the two members of the Kanagawa Board of Education only allowed me approximately fifteen minutes of interview time. First, I asked why the Kanagawa Board of Education created “Local History Kanagawa” as a history elective for high schools and what students could gain from learning about local history that they could not gain from national history. The board members responded that Kanagawa Prefecture has played an important role in Japanese history and that there are several culturally and historically important places and artifacts scattered throughout the prefecture. Also, until this year (2011), they explained that most students in Kanagawa Prefecture were not given the opportunity to learn about local history. By creating “Local History Kanagawa” as an elective, the Kanagawa Board of Education hopes that students will gain more of an interest in local and national history. Then, I posed a question regarding what the Board of Education hoped Japanese
and non-Japanese students taking “Local History Kanagawa” would gain from this subject, and the two members declared that the educational goals were the same for both groups of students.\textsuperscript{249}

My interview with former Kanagawa Prefecture Governor Matsuzawa lasted approximately forty-five minutes, and for this section, I review the main points of our conversation. First, concerning the reasons behind creating “Local History Kanagawa,” Matsuzawa expressed his hope that students learning about prefectural history will acquire a love for one’s hometown and encourage them to contribute to the future development and well-being of Kanagawa Prefecture. Next, we discussed historical perspectives of modern Japanese history. Matsuzawa strongly felt that since the end of WWII, Japanese citizens have had to continue reflecting upon Japan’s wartime wrongdoings and apologizing to China and South Korea for these actions. He conceded that wartime reflection and apologizing for past actions are still important but added that many Japanese are “brainwashed” (\textit{sennō sarete iru kokumin mo ooi}) with a masochistic historical view (\textit{jigyakushikan}) of wartime Japan and do not consider other historical perspectives. As an example, Matsuzawa mentioned that wartime Japan also had “…‘sound’ goals of creating a new modern nation, leading Asia, and developing Asia [economically]” and that Japanese citizens must also be exposed to this historical perspective as well. In conclusion, Matsuzawa advocated for Japanese history education curriculum and textbooks, especially modern Japanese history content, to contain various historical perspectives.\textsuperscript{250}
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Lastly, I asked former Governor Matsuzawa three questions: What is your personal definition of “Japaneseness” (nihonjinrashisa)? Can “Japaneseness” be learned through national and local history? and If so, what specific “Japanese” values and morals can be learned? He responded to the first question by defining “Japaneseness” as the characteristics of a Japanese person (nihonjin) acquired through history, culture, and ideologies. He added that not only learning “Japaneseness” but also learning about other cultural identities and respecting these identities is important for living in an international society and contributing to world harmony. Next, he agreed that qualities of “Japaneseness” can be learned from history and gave four major examples: (1) valuing family (kazokushugi); (2) discovering that throughout history, Japan has been skilled at the process of receiving foreign technologies and ideas, making them “Japanese,” and using these technologies and ideas to further Japan’s development; (3) deemphasizing personal gain and valuing the community; and (4) attaching importance to consensus and harmony.251

Through my interviews with the Kanagawa Board of Education and former Governor Matsuzawa, I discovered that the prefectural board of education and Matsuzawa created “Local History Kanagawa” as an elective for two main reasons: to showcase the role that Kanagawa Prefecture plays in national history and to provide students with a curriculum that strives to spark a wider interest in Japanese history and culture. Former governor Matsuzawa added that he also hoped the curriculum would cultivate love of the hometown and prompt students to give back to the local and prefectural community. Regarding the content and goals of “Local History Kanagawa,” the board of education members asserted that the curriculum does not contain an ethnic bias. Finally, Matsuzawa’s extensive commentary about the importance of learning
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various historical perspectives and traits of “Japaneseness” seemed to allude to two goals for
Local History Kanagawa: exposing students to a variety of historical perspectives and
inculcating them with specific ideas and values related to a “Japanese” cultural identity.

Structure of Local History Kanagawa

A textual analysis of Local History Kanagawa shows how textbook content can
contribute to the development of a student’s cultural identity and sense of patriotism. Published
by the Kanagawa Board of Education on March 1, 2011, this textbook is seventy-six pages in
length (sans table of contents and index) and divided into one special chapter on Kamakura
(Let’s Examine the Cultural Heritage of Kamakura) and twelve chapters based on chronology:

Chapter 1: “Stone Artifacts and Earthenware”
Chapter 2: “Settlements Surrounded by Moats and Ancient Burial Mounds”
Chapter 3: “Government and Temples in Ancient Japan”
Chapter 4: “Samurai Society in the Kamakura and Muromachi Periods”
Chapter 5: “Go Hōjō Family and Odawara”
Chapter 6: “Roads and Post Towns”
Chapter 7: “Flood Control and the Development of Rice Fields from Marshland”
Chapter 8: “The Opening of Japan and the Establishment of the Modern Nation”
Chapter 9: “Modern Industry and Transportation Development”
Chapter 10: “War and Kanagawa”
Chapter 11: “War Reconstruction and Kanagawa”
Chapter 12: “Rapid Economic Growth and Kanagawa Afterward”

Individual chapter construction displays a common pattern. First, at the beginning of each
chapter, there are a few learning points that specify what students should think about while
reviewing the chapter material and a half to one page summary of national history during a
specified historical period of time. Next, there is a chronology chart divided into three rows (era,
historical events in Japan, and historical events in Kanagawa) that is adorned with pictures
entitled “Local History through Chronology and Pictures.” Then, there is a section entitled
“Walking through Local History” which delves into prefectural history during a particular
historic period of time. Aside from explanations of historical events, this section includes “People and Kanagawa,” an article about famous historical figures that left an impact on Kanagawa Prefecture, and “Learning about this Historical Era by Region,” a page dedicated to exploring famous museums and landmarks in Kanagawa Prefecture. The “Learning about this Historical Era by Region” page contains a chart divided by prefectural region, places to visit, and what to research; a regional map of Kanagawa with the designated places indicated by numbers; and a picture of a famous artifact or landmark. Finally, two short columns entitled “Let’s Investigate” and “Let’s Pursue Field Work” are scattered throughout each chapter. “Let’s Investigate” asks students to think about, research, and discuss certain questions related to local history and “Let’s Pursue Field Work” offers an example field trip itinerary for students and teachers to use as a supplement for work in the classroom.\(^{252}\)

Like the textual analyses conducted by Crawford, Orr, and Bukh described earlier, I examine the portrayal of controversial historical events and whether a historic narrative of victimization or victimizer is present in the chapters “War and Kanagawa” and “War Reconstruction and Kanagawa.” I also go beyond what these academics focused on regarding textual analysis of Japanese history textbooks. I investigate how the structure and content of \textit{Local History Kanagawa} aims to create a strong link between personal memory and local history and how the section “Kanagawa and People” illustrates historical actors and associates these actors with certain values. Finally, I explain how \textit{Local History Kanagawa}’s lack of controversial national history events, link between personal memory and history, and portrayal of local historical figures correlate with the textbook’s aims of promoting patriotism and local identity formation.

Portrayal of Controversial Historical Events and the Theme of Victimization

Local History Kanagawa neglects to discuss several important and controversial events in the chapter “War and Kanagawa,” and the historical information provided within this chapter does not encourage students to consider other historical perspectives. At the beginning of this chapter, a three paragraph summary briefly describes national history from the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) until the end of WWII (1945):

After undergoing the Meiji Restoration and becoming a modern nation, Japan advanced into the Korean Peninsula and Chinese mainland. However, this action created conflict with China and Russia (another nation advancing into East Asia), and as a result, the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) and Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) occurred. Japan won both of these wars, and in 1910 (Meiji 43), Japan took control of the Korean Peninsula through annexation and advanced into Manchuria.

On account of participating in WWI in 1914 (Taishō 3) and issuing the Twenty-One Demands in 1915 (Taishō 4), Japan inherited the Shandong Peninsula from Germany and expanded vested interests in China. Moreover, due to the 1931 (Shōwa 6) Manchuria Incident, Japan established the nation of Manchuria. The international community, however, did not approve, and in 1933 (Shōwa 8), Japan left the League of Nations and isolated itself internationally.

In wake of the 1937 (Shōwa 12) Lu Gou Bridge Incident, the Second Sino-Japanese War began, and Japan’s conflict with the U.S. and Great Britain deepened. Eventually, Japan declared war on the U.S. and Great Britain in 1941 (Shōwa 16) and the Pacific War began. At first, Japan was advantageous in the course of this war, but its position gradually worsened. On August 15, 1945 (Shōwa 20), the emperor told Japanese citizens that he accepted the terms of the Potsdam Declaration (a declaration demanding unconditional surrender), and the Pacific War ended. As a consequence of air raids on cities and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, numerous Japanese citizens lost their lives.253

This short summary highlights major wars and describes how these wars started and/or ended, but due to the brevity of this entry, many key details are left out. In particular, the discussion of controversial issues and events surrounding the annexation of the Korean Peninsula, comfort
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women, the Nanking Massacre of 1937, and Unit 731 are not mentioned at all. Moreover, one notices that the end of WWII is referenced, but the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 (when the U.S. declared war on Japan and entered WWII), a controversial international event in modern Asia-Pacific history, is absent as well. The language is mainly neutral in tone, and this passage does not implore the reader to consider differing historical perspectives.254

The chapter “War and Kanagawa” invokes a theme of victimization by referencing the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and including several passages on the air bombings of Kawasaki, Yokohama, Hiratsuka, and Odawara. As shown in the previous paragraph, the last sentence of the section regarding national history during wartime refers to Japanese citizens who lost their lives during the U.S. air raids and the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Then, the chapter shifts focus towards Kanagawa prefectural history from 1880 to 1945 and introduces the U.S. air bombings within the prefecture:

As the wartime regime strengthened, the lives of residents within Kanagawa Prefecture grew increasingly severe, and in 1944 (Shōwa 19), several prefectural cities prepared for the intensification of air raids and hastened the evacuation of school children. Meanwhile, student mobilizations began, and students from middle schools and girls’ high schools started to work at military factories around the prefecture. Then in 1945 (Shōwa 20), Kawasaki, Yokohama, Hiratsuka, and Odawara experienced air raids and several people fell victim to these attacks.255

Following this introduction, a section of “Walking through Local History” on page 62 dedicates the entire page to the U.S. air raids: this page shows pictures of an air raid hood, incendiary bombshells, and damage done by the raids and specifies when the attacks occurred in each city, what types of bombs were used for the air raids, and how the devastation and destruction played out. Finally, a “Let’s Investigate” section on page 63 supplements this information by introducing a monument in Kawasaki called “Kagayakesugi Children” (a monument dedicated to
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the school evacuations caused by air raids), detailing the emotional and physical difficulties that children faced after evacuating schools to escape air raids, and asking students to research and present on the air raids and school evacuations. Taken as a whole, the extensive descriptions of the air raids and school evacuations in “War and Kanagawa” appears to emphasize a one-sided historical reflection—a reflection that focuses on the WWII victimization of Kanagawa Prefecture and its citizens.  

The “War and Kanagawa” chapter’s heavy focus on the U.S. air raids and school evacuations within the prefecture and lack of wartime national history information leaves the reader with a one-sided, victimized historical perspective and no knowledge of Japan’s wartime atrocities. Local History and Kanagawa points out the minimal dates and events necessary to acquire an average and objective knowledge of national history from the late 1890s to the mid-1940s. Unlike a majority of Japan’s national history textbooks published after WWII to the present, this textbook does not provide any descriptions or references related to WWII controversies. Rather, the textbook’s emphasis on deaths caused by air raids and school evacuations within the prefecture gives one the impression that wartime in Kanagawa Prefecture was a one-sided tragedy. The overall structure of this chapter lends itself to three fundamental questions: Will high school students who take “Local History Kanagawa” have enough knowledge of modern Japanese history? Why was there a focus on victimization and no discussion of Japan’s wartime atrocities committed against others? And, did any soldier from Kanagawa Prefecture play a role in these atrocities and is this information relevant and important to convey in a local history textbook?

Local History Kanagawa and Personal Memory

---

256 Kanagawaken Kyōikuinkai Kyōikukyoku Kyōikushidōbu Kökōkyōikushidōka 59-63.
Local History Kanagawa’s structure and content promote a link between history and personal memory. In general, even though history education and textbooks have the ability to form a collective memory among citizens, both have the tendency to fall short in creating a connection with personal memory. Referring back to the section of this paper concerning theories behind the relationship between the state, history, education, and patriotism, the state endorses a certain view of history and teaches this view within schools to create a unified collective memory among citizens. Most history taught in schools, however, deals “…with events both chronologically and socially remote from the lives of most ordinary people.”

By making national history education a series of memorized dates, events, and people, the state tends to present history in a way that does not involve critical thinking and exists outside of citizens’ everyday lives. Moreover, the patriotism expressed through national history education is generally “…a sense of loyalty to the nation’s leaders and pride in their great deeds,” but it rarely includes “…a sense of participation: a feeling that ‘my memories’ are the stuff of which national history is made.”

On the other hand, if the state presents history in a way that integrates individual memory with the national past, then it has the potential to “…win popular assent,” and “…it could be used to foster a ‘solid’ rather than a ‘fickle’ patriotism.” Thus, if government sponsored history education promotes the integration of personal memory with national history, citizens have the stronger potential to claim “I am a part of history” and develop more powerful patriotic ties with the nation.
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Instead of simply presenting historical facts for memorization, the sections “Let’s Pursue Field Work,” “Learning about this Historic Era by Region,” and “Let’s Investigate” within *Local History and Kanagawa* encourage students to experience and critically think about history while fusing aspects of history with individual consciousness. “Let’s Pursue Field Work” and “Learning about this Historic Era by Region” give students the opportunity to venture outside of the classroom; explore historic sites, landmarks, and museums related to an era of prefectural history; and apply historic knowledge outside of the classroom. “Let’s Investigate” presents subjective and objective questions to students that involve critical thinking. For example, in the chapter “Go Hōjō Family and Odawara,” there are three learning points for students: “Let’s think about the progression of the Go Hōjō Family as a daimyo family in the Warring States Period,” “Let’s find out about the history and characteristics of Odawara Castle,” and “Let’s investigate the castles and battles associated with the Go Hōjō Family.” In order to satisfy these points, the “Let’s Pursue Field Work” section offers an example excursion course for learning about Odawara Castle during the Go Hōjō era: Odawara Station → Hachimanyamakokaku → Higashikuruwa Historic Park → Komineogane no Daiyouhrikiri Eastern Moat → Hayakawakuchi Ruins → Graveyard of Hōjō Ujimasa and Hōjō Ujiteru. Then, the subsequent “Let’s Investigate” section urges students to think about the reason(s) why the Go Hōjō Family built Odawara Castle and how commercial, distribution, and territorial governance systems and culture associated with the Go Hōjō Family impacted other daimyo families, the Toyotomi political regime, and the Edo Shogunate. Finally, at the end of this chapter, the “Learning about this Historic Era by Region” separates Kanagawa Prefecture into seven regions (Yokohama, Kawasaki, Sagamihara, Yokosuka/Miura, Shōnan/Hiratsuka/Hatano, Western Kanagawa, and
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Central Kanagawa); designates castles, temples, irrigation ditches, and ruins in each region; and provides research topics and thought-provoking questions. For instance, if a student chooses to visit Tamanawa Castle near Kamakura, that student is given the task of thinking about the role that Tamanawa Castle played in the historic development of the Go Hōjō Family’s reign.  

Another example of where the sections “Let’s Pursue Field Work,” “Learning about this Historic Era by Region,” and “Let’s Investigate” come together to promote an interaction between history and personal memory is in the final chapter “Rapid Economic Growth and Kanagawa Afterwards.” The three learning points for this chapter are “Let’s find out about societal change from the period of rapid economic growth to the present,” “Let’s think about the influence that rapid economic growth has had on Kanagawa,” and “Let’s talk about the future of our ‘hometown’ while reflecting back on Kanagawa’s history.” One part of this chapter focuses on the development of the Minato Mirai district in Yokohama and its representation as an area fused with domestic and international business and culture. Following this discussion, the “Let’s Pursue Field Work” section offers a field trip itinerary based on exploring Minato Mirai: JR Sakuragichō Station → Landmark Tower → Pacifico Yokohama → Akarenga Park → Zō no Hana Park → Head of Ossambashi Pier. Next, the chapter examines the present day characteristics of each region within Kanagawa Prefecture and specifies each region’s goals for the future. At the end of this segment, a “Let’s Investigate” section urges students to “[r]esearch what kind of roles your region has played within the history of Kanagawa Prefecture” and “…discuss what kind of role your region should play in the future.” These instructions urge students to think about their hometown within the broader framework of prefectural history and
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to consider the future goals that his or her hometown and its citizens should strive for. Finally, “Learning about this Historic Era by Region” provides students with examples of modern development projects throughout Kanagawa prefecture. Based on the development project that students choose to examine in person, they are urged to think about how these projects relate to the issues of internationalism, globalization, industrialization, environmental protection, etc.²⁶⁷

“Let’s Pursue Field Work,” “Learning about this Historic Era by Region,” and “Let’s Investigate” expose students to an unconventional way of studying history—one that explores history education through fieldwork, critical thinking, and individual memory. “Let’s Pursue Field Work” provides a student with opportunities to view and experience history in a way that makes it more interactive (utilizing all senses) and personal. “Learning about this Historic Era by Region” performs the same functions as “Let’s Pursue Field Work” except that it indicates historically important places all over Kanagawa Prefecture. Therefore, no matter where a student is located in Kanagawa Prefecture, he or she can explore a historically important place near his or her hometown. Also, even if more than one student chooses to pursue the same fieldwork excursion, each student will most likely remember aspects of this excursion differently and have a unique experience to present back in the classroom. In any case, every student who participates in fieldwork will be generating a personal memory associated with prefectural history. Of course, what kind of personal memory will develop depends on several factors (teaching style, personal interest in the topic, etc.), but through textual analysis of “Learning about this Historic Era by Region” and “Let’s Pursue Field Work,” one forms two strong impressions: these sections vigorously promote the interaction between history and personal memory and appear to aim towards the goal of inculcating students with a stronger sense of local identity and patriotism.

²⁶⁷ Kanagawaken Kyōikuinkai Kyōikukyoku Kyōikushidōbu Kōkōkyōikushidōka 71-74 and 76.
Finally, “Let’s Investigate” urges the reader to think about history in a way that applies critical thinking, objective knowledge from the classroom, and subjective judgment. This section causes students to consider historical development and how it impacts not only the self but others living in the past, present, and future as well.

**Historical Actors within Local History Kanagawa**

(Local History Kanagawa) showcases several individuals who made an impact on local history and culture. In history textbooks, historical actors play important roles by providing students with a better understanding of how their ancestors lived, what types of values their ancestors had, and how their ancestors made an impact on history and contributed to the present-day condition of the nation-state. Learning about the same historical actors within textbooks helps students develop one set of shared knowledge, and this contributes to the formation of a collective cultural identity. Through history education, the state may also focus on certain historical actors and portray them as role models in order to inculcate students with a sense of patriotism and a specified set of “ideal” values. Finally, learning about historical actors can inspire people and complement the objective dates, places, and events that usually pervade history textbook content.

The article “Kanagawa and People” in *Local History and Kanagawa* illustrates historical actors as leaders who contributed to the well-being and cultural heritage of Kanagawa Prefecture. There are a total of eight “Kanagawa and People” articles, and within these articles, the lives and accomplishments of eleven historical figures are examined. The following chart specifies the chapter of *Local History and Kanagawa*, the name of the historical figure(s) discussed within the
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“Kanagawa and People” article, and the historical figure’s specific impact on local society and/or local political and cultural history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Historical Figure</th>
<th>Summary of Accomplishments/Historical Influence on Kanagawa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Government and Temples in Ancient Japan”</td>
<td>Isonokami no Yakatsugu</td>
<td>Opened the first public library in Japan at his residence in Sagaminokami (an ancient region of Kanagawa).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ōtomo no Yakamochi</td>
<td>Traveled around Sagaminokami and included and edited songs pertaining to his travels in the Manyōshū.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taira no Masabumi</td>
<td>Fought in several battles and governed Sagaminokami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minamoto no Yoriyoshi</td>
<td>Governed Sagaminokami.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Samurai Society in the Kamakura and Muromachi Periods”</td>
<td>Masako Hōjō</td>
<td>Played important roles in the establishment of the Kamakura Shogunate and the development of samurai class government rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Go Hōjō Family and Odawara”</td>
<td>Ujiyasu Hōjō</td>
<td>Famous commander who suppressed a war among eight nations in the Kanto area, upheld family customs and traditions, brought honor to his family name, and was well-skilled in wielding both the sword and the pen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Roads and Post Towns”</td>
<td>Kazan Watanabe</td>
<td>Dutch scholar, Confucian scholar, and painter who traveled through Sagamikoku (area of Kanagawa) and wrote about his travels in the Yūsō Journal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Flood Control and the Development of Rice Fields from Marshland”</td>
<td>Sontoku Ninomiya</td>
<td>Agricultural community leader who combined economic policies with morality, saved several agricultural communities from economic hardships, and impacted Japan’s development from the Meiji Restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“The Opening of Japan and the Establishment of the Modern Nation”</strong></td>
<td>James Curtis Hepburn</td>
<td>American doctor who established a medical clinic and gave free treatments to the poor, started a famous cram school, and created the first Japanese-English dictionary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Modern Industry and Transportation Development”</strong></td>
<td>Tarō Haratomi</td>
<td>Famous entrepreneur in the silk industry who excelled in business management and gave back to the prefectural community by becoming chairman of a post-Kanto earthquake reconstruction and recovery organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“War and Kanagawa”</strong></td>
<td>Ryūnosuke Akutagawa</td>
<td>Worked as an English teacher at a naval base in Yokosuka and wrote the well-known short stories “Hana” and “Mikan” while living in Yokosuka. (“Mikan” was about his life in Yokosuka.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Reconstruction after War and Kanagawa”</strong></td>
<td>Hibari Misora</td>
<td>Famous national singer and performer who sang hit songs about Kanagawa and left a large impact on music history after WWII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Rapid Economic Growth and Kanagawa Afterwards”</strong></td>
<td>Tarō Okumoto</td>
<td>Artist born in Kanagawa who was influenced heavily by Jōmon culture and created several famous artistic monuments displayed in Kanagawa and throughout Japan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the information provided in this chart, one notices four main points of interest. First, the historical figures come from a variety of backgrounds (politics, business, literature, art, music, etc.), and two of the eleven figures are female (Masako Hōjō and Hibari Misora). Second, the Kanagawa Board of Education decided to feature one foreigner (James Hepburn). Third, three of the figures (Sontoku Ninomiya, James Hepburn, and Tarō Haratomi) are portrayed as people who unselfishly gave back to the local community. Finally, “Kanagawa and People” portrays six
actors (Ōtomo no Yakamochi, Kazan Watanabe, James Curtis Hepburn, Ryūnosuke Akutagawa, Hibari Misora, and Tarō Okumoto) as people who drew inspiration from Japanese culture and/or living in Kanagawa Prefecture and used this inspiration to create literature, music, or art.\textsuperscript{271}

The historical figures presented in “Kanagawa and People” are models that expose students to the ideals of valuing Japanese/local culture, internationalism, and volunteerism/community service. By showcasing Japanese males and females and one foreigner, “Kanagawa and People” demonstrates that regardless of gender and race, anyone can contribute to the future cultural and historical well-being of Kanagawa Prefecture. The inclusion of James Hepburn also seems to slightly demystify the monolithic portrayal of Japan within \textit{Local History and Kanagawa} and signify the importance of multiculturalism and internationalism within society. Moreover, this section highlights the themes of looking beyond oneself and giving back to the local community as well. Finally, “Kanagawa and People” portrays a majority of the historical actors as individuals who cherished Japanese and local culture and contributed to its prosperity; this theme appears to attest to the importance of learning about one’s cultural identity, garnering patriotism towards this identity, and preserving this identity for future generations.

\textit{Textual Analysis Conclusion}

\textit{Local History Kanagawa} presents students with content that promotes a non-judgmental and one-sided reflection of Japanese history, a personal sense of participation with history, and the importance of learning about one’s cultural identity, and all of these aspects combine to form a textbook that aims to cultivate patriotism. By neglecting to discuss controversial events within modern Japanese history and a variety of historical perspectives, \textit{Local History Kanagawa} paints
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Japan as a nation that has done nothing wrong. The focus on the theme of victimization also adds to this image, and one can conclude that *Local History Kanagawa* whitewashes wartime events in a way that causes students to have more pride towards national and local history. Next, the sections “Let’s Pursue Field Work,” “Learning about this Historic Era by Region,” and “Let’s Investigate” scattered throughout this textbook emphasize the value of using critical thinking, fieldwork, and personal memories as ways of learning about and exploring history. Rather than fact memorization, these sections urge the reader to experience history on a personal level, and through this personal interaction with history, a more “solid” sense of cultural identity and patriotism has the potential to arise. Finally, a majority of the individuals featured within “Kanagawa and People” offer the reader historical role models who were patriotic towards Japanese and local cultural and contributed to the history, culture, and social well-being of the community.

*Fieldwork: Visiting a “Local History Kanagawa” Classroom*

Observing one “Local History Kanagawa” class demonstrated how the teacher and students contributed to a class atmosphere of learning about objective historical facts while deepening the relationship between personal memories and history. On July 12, 2011, the Kanagawa Board of Education gave me the opportunity to view a “Local History Kanagawa” class conducted at Kamakura High School, one of the twenty test schools designated by the Board of Education. Currently, Kamakura High School offers “Local History Kanagawa” as an elective on top of “Japanese History A” and “Japanese History B.” Prior to the one hour and ten minute class, I attended a short briefing that outlined the makeup of students within the class and how the class would be conducted. Unfortunately, after the class ended, the board of education required me to leave the classroom and high school campus immediately. Thus, I was not able to
interact with the history teacher and students or gain permission to contact them for follow-up
interviews. I took several notes throughout this class, however, and I feel that sharing these notes
along with my analysis will add meaning to the textual analysis of *Local History and Kanagawa*
presented earlier and strengthen my overall arguments.

The class comprised of five male students, and one student was absent the day that I
attended. Regarding the small class size, the vice principal commented that since the high school
offered “*Local History Kanagawa*” as a history elective at the beginning of the school year, a
majority of students decided to take geography or a different history class. The history teacher,
however, made it a point to explain that the small class size contributed to more time for
presentations and that the five students often contributed to lively discussions. That day, the
teacher gave three students (Fujisaki, Azegami, and Mutō) twenty minutes apiece to present on
an individually chosen topic that related to the first four chapters of *Local History and
Kanagawa* (“Stone Artifacts and Earthenware,” “Settlements Surrounded by Moats and Ancient
Burial Mounds,” “Government and Temples in Ancient Japan,” and “Samurai Society in the
Kamakura and Muromachi Periods”). Approximately ten minutes was for the presentation and
the other ten minutes was for each student and the teacher to ask the presenter questions and
provide commentary. Finally, the teacher provided each student with a worksheet to write down
main points, personal thoughts, and questions related to the presentation; to score the presenter’s
content and presentation style; and to record overall realizations and general thoughts from
today’s class.

First, Fujisaki presented on literary culture in Kamakura. Out of the three presenters,
Fujisaki’s presentation content was the most objective: he discussed famous authors and poets
during the Kamakura era of Japanese history and major themes within these works of literature.
Next, Azegami reported about the history of Manfuku Temple, a local Buddhist temple in Kamakura near his house. Azegami’s presentation included the temple’s history, discussion of the temple’s religious symbolism, several pictures, and commentary about his experience and feelings while exploring the temple. Finally, Mutō presented on Shirahata Shinto Shrine (a local shrine in Kamakura) and Minamoto no Yoshitsune. Similar to Azegami’s presentation, Mutō spoke about the history of the shrine and its relationship with the historical figure Minamoto no Yoshitsune, showed several pictures of the temple, gave a personal reflection of the temple and its natural surroundings, and recommended that everyone should visit the shrine during festival time. Aside from Fujisaki’s presentation, approximately half of Azegami’s and Mutō’s presentation time included content related to their personal memories and feelings while conducting field work.

After each presentation, the teacher called on students to provide commentary and/or ask questions, and a summarization of this Q & A and commentary period is presented in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter &amp; Presentation Title</th>
<th>Summary of Student &amp; Teacher Comments and Questions (Note: Only two out the three students made comments and asked questions.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fujisaki: “Kamakura Literary Culture” | Student Commentary: (1) Your presentation was interesting, and now I have an interest in reading stories from this time period.  
Student Questions: (2) Why do you like literature from the Kamakura period? Which authors do you especially like from this period?  
Teacher Commentary: Good overall summary. I would recommend reading other authors aside from those who you presented on to deepen your understanding of literature during the Kamakura Period. (The teacher then recommended a few authors.) |
| Azegami: “Manfuku Temple” | Student Commentary: (1) I have never traveled to that temple, |
and after hearing your personal experiences, I want to visit the temple in the near future.

Student Question: (2) Do you usually visit that temple with family during festivals and New Year’s day?

Teacher Questions: How does your experience visiting this temple compare with other temples that you have visited in the past? What kinds of festivals are held at this temple?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutō: “Shirahata Shinto Shrine and Minamoto no Yoshitsune”</th>
<th>Student Commentary: (1) Interesting presentation. I would like to attend the festival that you recommended. (2) The natural environment surrounding Shirahata Shinto Shrine sounds very beautiful. I want to visit that shrine sometime.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Commentary: I enjoyed listening to your descriptions of nature and personal reflections regarding visiting the temple. These comments and your pictures were a nice addition to your presentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though the questions and commentary were not primarily objective or academic in nature, it is important to note that these questions and commentary created a class atmosphere where the presenter needed to express his personal opinions about, feelings towards, and experiences with local history. Instead of a history classroom where students remained emotionally disconnected with history through the memorization and repetition of mere dates and events, the “Local History Kanagawa” teacher encouraged a classroom environment where students presented history in an objective (based on historical information) and subjective (based on opinions and personal memories) manner. At the end of class, the history teacher emphasized this point by telling students that it was important to continue combining “deskwork” with fieldwork and exploring their personal feelings about history.

The Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement and Kanagawa Prefecture’s Legacy

From 2006 to the present, Kanagawa Prefecture blazed a new trail in the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement by becoming the first prefecture since the end of WWII to create
prefectural guidelines for mandatory Japanese history education in high schools. This action set
the stage for debates regarding mandatory history education and its role in cultivating a student’s
cultural identity, morality, and sense of patriotism. Former superintendent of the Kanagawa
Board of Education Takaichi Hikichi and former prefectural governor Shigefumi Matsuzawa led
this initiative and based their decisions on arguments of solidifying cultural identity and
patriotism, contributing to internationalism, and developing characteristics of a “Japanese” heart
and mind. (In particular, the arguments relating to strengthening one’s cultural identity and
patriotism and contributing to internationalism seem to fall in step with the arguments that
former Prime Minster Nakasone made for general patriotic education reforms.) Furthermore,
Hikichi and Matsuzawa added local history electives to encourage further interest in Japanese
history and culture among students. Promotion of this initiative, however, has not come without
voices of protest. Viewing these history education reforms as ethnically biased and unnecessarily
burdensome for students, non-nationalists declare that these reforms will cause Kanagawa
Prefecture’s educational structure and history education guidelines to revert back to pre-WWII
conditions: centralized government control and government manipulation of student patriotism
and morality.

Examining the elective subject “Local History Kanagawa” gives insight into how local
history education aims at solidifying cultural identity and patriotism among students. The
Kanagawa Board of Education structured the textbook for this subject with content that
illustrates a one-sided perspective of modern Japanese history, combines history with personal
memory, and exemplifies the importance of patriotism and giving back to the local community.
Also, the way that one “Local History Kanagawa” teacher led the classroom setting points to the
emphasis on creating a personal bond with history through objective research and subjective
experiences in fieldwork. Overall, one receives the strong impression that “Local History Kanagawa” presents history in an interactive, moderately informative, and prideful manner.

Regarding my thoughts on the prefectural initiative itself, I would contend that certain aspects reflect back to an ethnically exclusive pre-WWII patriotic education. For instance, Hikichi’s arguments regarding using history education to promote “Japaneseness” and a “compassion heart” are two direct examples of rhetoric that link educational goals with inculcating patriotism and morality based upon ethnicity. Moreover, when I asked former Governor Matsuzawa if he could give me examples of “Japanese” values learned through national history, I received the impression that the arguments he made for valuing family, community, consensus, and Japanese innovation of foreign ideas and technology were based off of *nihonjinron* (theories based off of ethnic Japanese uniqueness) rather than a more generalized idea of Japanese citizenship. Even now, I still question whether Japanese and especially non-Japanese students living in Kanagawa Prefecture could really cultivate the “Japanese values” that Hikichi and Matsuzawa esteem through a mere national or local history course in high school.

On the other hand, there are aspects of this movement that do not link with pre-WWII patriotic education. For example, both Hikichi and Matsuzawa continue to emphasize the importance of using mandatory national history education as a way for students to share Japanese and local culture with the world and contribute to internationalism and multicultural tolerance. Also, when I interviewed two members from the Kanagawa Board of Education, they did not indicate specific history education content or objectives that were based off of a student’s ethnicity. Finally, even though the content of *Local History Kanagawa* was largely monolithic in nature, some information emphasized Kanagawa Prefecture’s ethnic diversity and internationalism. Therefore, these arguments taken as whole make it difficult to make a firm
hypothesis regarding whether or not Kanagawa Prefecture’s history education initiative is associated with the ultimate goal of returning to an ethnic and state centered pre-WWII Japanese patriotism.

Concerning the structure and content of *Local History Kanagawa*, I deem the emphasis on fieldwork exercises throughout the textbook as a refreshing and unique approach to the study of history. Through these exercises, students can explore history outside of the classroom and have the opportunity to create a more personal and possibly emotional connection with aspects of history. As a result, this could cause students to have a stronger interest in history. Furthermore, I would argue that students who do history fieldwork research have the stronger possibility of becoming more attached and patriotic for the cultural and historical artifacts and places that their ancestors discovered, built, lived in, and fought for. The feature of *Local History Kanagawa*’s content that I do not regard optimistically, however, is the extreme lack of national history information and historical perspectives. Due to an overemphasis on local history, students who read *Local History Kanagawa* will not learn about several major events in modern history and will not be exposed to various historical perspectives on controversial wartime events. This evidence contradicts a couple of the main goals that Matsuzawa and Hikichi set for Kanagawa Prefecture’s initiative—to provide students with sufficient knowledge of modern Japanese history and to expose students to a variety of historical perspectives. By neglecting to satisfy these goals, I wonder how students who take “Local History Kanagawa” will perceive wartime Japan, how they will discuss WWII events with other international students, and most importantly, how they will be able to learn from Japan’s past mistakes and use this knowledge to help the nation prosper domestically and internationally in the future.
Conclusion

Since the early 1980s, the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement in Japan has focused on government sponsored patriotic revisions of general education objectives, educational law, and history curriculum/textbook content. Thus far, this political campaign has achieved a steady degree of success. In the beginning, former Prime Minister Nakasone set the ideological foundation of this movement by advocating a sense of “healthy” nationalism, internationalism, and cultural identity among youth. This ideology contrasted with pre-WWII patriotic ideals founded on militarism, state loyalty, and emperor worship. He also devised a top-down political process for education reform and developed public arguments related to the prevention of juvenile delinquency. These devices circumvented public taboos and political/bureaucratic obstacles associated with government sponsored patriotic education reforms. Nakasone’s model allowed him to implement initial general education patriotic reforms in the late 1980s, and Prime Ministers Obuchi, Mori, Koizumi, and Abe mimicked his model to defend and pass patriotic reforms of the Fundamental Law of Education in 2006. Additionally, supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement wanted history education to cultivate national pride in youth, and as a result, they influenced the direction of the History Textbook Controversy. Although most history textbooks focused on “peace-and-justice” perspectives for a decade from the early 1980s, the combined efforts of nationally oriented politicians and members of right-wing organizations from the early 1990s caused most history textbook content to become whitewashed and unreflective of Japan’s wartime atrocities. All of these aforementioned patriotic reforms and revisions became “trophies” of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement.

From 2006 to the present, the mandatory Japanese history and elective local history initiative in Kanagawa Prefecture became an important offshoot of the Contemporary Patriotic
Education Movement. This initiative, led by former prefectural governor Shigefumi Matsuzawa and former board of education superintendent Takaichi Hikichi, added a new dimension to government sponsored history education and the promotion of patriotism among high school students. Comparing this initiative with Prime Minister Nakasone’s ideological model and political process in the early 1980s, there are striking similarities and differences. Regarding the similarities, both political processes were top-down in nature and powered through by major political actors—there was no focus on building rapport with the MOE. Furthermore, Nakasone, Matsuzawa, and Hikichi’s rhetoric defended patriotic and history education by addressing school problems and/or social ills of Japanese society. They believed that patriotic and history education should be used to mold students into “ideal Japanese” citizens for the well-being of the state at the domestic and international level. Also, these political actors emphasized that patriotic and history education should inculcate students with a “healthy” national pride (a pride that values Japanese culture and history, contributes to internationalism, and maintains respect for other cultures) and a mindset that focuses on valuing and contributing towards the well-being of society. Regarding the differences, Nakasone carried out patriotic education reforms through the formation of an ad hoc council, and Matsuzawa and Hikichi implemented their history initiative through close relationships with board of education members and local school administrators. Furthermore, Matsuzawa and Hikichi’s history initiative includes a localized sense of pride as one of their main goals.

It is important to note that the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement at the national and local level has not progressed without opposition. Throughout this movement, Japanese citizens have formed grassroots organizations and rallied against its goals. Members of these organizations perceive supporters of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement as
individuals who will cause the Japanese education system to retrogress to pre-WWII conditions. Within this thesis, the two main organizations highlighted were the Children and Textbooks Japan Network 21 and the Kanagawa Teachers Association. In particular, the efforts of CTJN21 have drastically limited the number of schools that adopt right-wing nationalistic history textbooks. Although both organizations lack a voice in the national and prefectural political process, their ability to assemble support at the local level demonstrates that they can create a rigid barrier towards the future implementation of government sponsored patriotic education.

Reflecting upon patriotic education in Japan, I do not oppose the promotion of a cultural identity and patriotism based on valuing Japanese culture/history, internationalism, and multiculturalism. Fundamentally speaking, I believe that discussions of “patriotism” in contemporary Japanese society need to move beyond negative associations with WWII militarism, imperialism, etc. Rather, discussions of a “healthy” patriotism—a feeling that encourages unity among citizens of Japan and multicultural/international understanding—must be encouraged by the government and pursued by Japanese society as a whole. In particular, this sense of patriotism will be vital for Japan’s future preservation of history and culture, promotion of multicultural tolerance among society, and adaption to the ever-changing international security environment. Considering the rapid progression of globalization and rising terrorist and international military threats, I would argue that cultivating a “healthy” sense of pride among youth in Japan needs to be pursued now more than ever before.

There are three aspects of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement that I am concerned about. First, I do not endorse supporters of this movement who advocate for a cultural identity and patriotism based upon arguments of ethnic and moral uniqueness (nihonjinron). These arguments coincide with the type of “unhealthy” patriotism that led Japan along the path
of emperor worship, imperialism, and fascism during wartime. Second, it appears that political discussions of “healthy nationalism” have progressed while its relationship with internationalism has become unclear. Although political supporters such as Nakasone, Matsuzawa, and Hikichi commented on the importance of patriotic education to support internationalism, I have yet to see the details behind solidifying this relationship. Of course, valuing and sharing one’s cultural identity with foreigners can start the processes of internationalism and multicultural tolerance/understanding, but how can these processes advance without Japanese students learning about and valuing multiculturalism as well? If this question is not concretely addressed, then the arguments used to support the inculcation of a “well-rounded” patriotism will become hollow. Finally, I view vague history education goals and whitewashed textbook content as troublesome. As I mentioned at the end of Chapter 2, the MOE’s Japanese history Course of Study objectives need to be more detailed and transparent with regard to a student’s analytical mindset, cultural identity, and multicultural tolerance. In addition to these Course of Study revisions, the Diet and/or Cabinet must hold the MOE more accountable for using these objectives as a basis for history textbook examination and approval. Moreover, national and local history textbook content should introduce war and violence of modern Japan and provide students with non-fictional literary references that explore a variety of different historical perspectives.

Specifically referring to *Local History Kanagawa*, the Kanagawa Board of Education should reconstruct this textbook in a way that provides information about the controversies and various debates associated with wartime local history. Two example topics that could be introduced are (1) Korean laborers who engaged “...in the construction of underground military
facilities of the Japanese Imperial Army in Yokosuka" and (2) Prisoners of War who were captured and held by the Japanese Navy at Ofuna Transitory Prison Camp. After including a brief summary of these topics, this textbook could have an activity that urges students to explore the history and conditions of Korean laborers and POWs in Kanagawa Prefecture further by providing a list of academic resources that include different historical perspectives. Finally, a teacher could have one or more students present on these topics. By illustrating wartime historical content in this manner, Local History Kanagawa could offer students the opportunity to research a variety of resources and form their own judgment regarding controversial events in local history.

Every country has a “dark past,” and I believe that the state has a responsibility to at least introduce this past to its citizens through history education. If the state does not educate its citizens about the nation’s “dark past,” then I would argue that these citizens have a stronger possibility of garnering an artificial patriotism—an egocentric feeling that only grasps and takes pride in the positive aspects of a nation’s history. Conversely, I would contend that citizens who understand a nation’s “light and dark past” will more likely develop a balanced patriotism—a feeling that values cultural identity, strives to learn from past mistakes, and contributes to the propagation of world peace and intercultural understanding. In the case of Japan, it will be imperative to see how government entities use history education to promote patriotism among youth and how supporters and opponents shape the future development of the Contemporary Patriotic Education Movement at the national and local level.

---

Appendix A: 1973 and 2003 Japanese History Courses of Study

Course of Study Objectives for Japanese History (1973)

1. By utilizing a broad perspective, students will understand our country’s history correctly. In particular, by considering the connection of Japanese culture with historic periods and the overall course of history, students will grasp the historical development that led to the formation of present-day Japan, deepen their awareness as Japanese citizens, and cultivate the demeanor and ability to participate in the development of a democratic nation and society.

2. Students will understand the fundamental aspects of our country’s history, cultivate a historical thought process, grasp the characteristics of various historical periods and how these periods transitioned, and consider the meaning of history.

3. Students will understand the basics of international relations and cultural exchange from our country’s history, consider the formative process of our country’s culture and status in world society, and cultivate a spirit of international cooperation.

4. Students will deepen their understanding of cultural traditions and how our ancestors endeavored to create, develop, and pass on culture; become more familiar with cultural assets and foster an appreciation for these assets; and heighten their motivation to create and develop new aspects of culture.

5. Students will utilize materials, foster the ability to understand history empirically and scientifically, consider historic events with a multifaceted mindset, and cultivate the attitude to judge fairly.
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学習指導要領における日本史の目標（2003年）

日本史 A

近現代を中心とする我が国の歴史の展開を、世界史的視野に立ち我が国を取り巻く国際環境などに関連付けて考察させることによって、歴史的思考力を培い、国民としての自覚と国際社会に主体的に生きる日本人としての資質を養う。

日本史 B

我が国の歴史の展開を、世界史的視野に立って総合的に考察させ、我が国の文化と伝統の特色についての認識を深めさせることによって、歴史的思考力を培い、国民としての自覚と国際社会に主体的に生きる日本人としての資質を養う。


Japanese History A

Utilizing a perspective based on world history and considering our country’s modern historical development and how our country connects with the international environment, students will cultivate a historical thought process, awareness as Japanese citizens, and traits as a proactive Japanese citizen living in an international society.

Japanese History B

Utilizing a perspective based on world history, students will understand the development of our country’s history comprehensively. By deepening their knowledge of our country’s cultural and traditional characteristics, students will cultivate a historic thought process, awareness as Japanese citizens, and traits as a proactive Japanese citizen living in an international society.
## Appendix B: “Learning about this Historic Era by Region” for *Local History Kanagawa* Chapter 5: Go Hōjō Family and Odawara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>地域</th>
<th>項目</th>
<th>調べよう・探究しよう</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>横浜</td>
<td>1）小矶城（港北区小矶町）</td>
<td>1）小矶城が武蔵国攻略の拠点として果たした役割を調べよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2）茅ヶ崎城（都筑区茅ヶ崎東）</td>
<td>2）茅ヶ崎城の歴史について、扇谷上杉氏に注目して調べよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>川崎</td>
<td>3）枡形山城（多摩区枡形）</td>
<td>3）稲毛三郎重成によりきずかれた枡形山城の歴史について調べよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>相模原</td>
<td>4）津久井城（緑区太井ほか）</td>
<td>4）津久井城の歴史について調べ、きずかれた背景を考えよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>横須賀</td>
<td>5）新井城（三浦市三崎町小網代）</td>
<td>5）新井城と三浦氏、北条早雲との関係について調べよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三浦</td>
<td></td>
<td>6）玉縄城が後北条氏の発展に果たした役割を考えよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>湘南</td>
<td>6）玉縄城（鎌倉市城廻し）</td>
<td>7）岡崎城の特徴や歴史上に果たした役割を考えよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>平塚</td>
<td>7）岡崎城（平塚市岡崎・伊勢原市岡崎）</td>
<td>8）発掘成果をもとに、丸山城と扇谷上杉氏や後北条氏との関係について調べよう。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>秦野</td>
<td>8）丸山城（伊勢原市下槽屋）</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Item (Place)</td>
<td>Let’s Research • Let’s Investigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokohama</td>
<td>1) Kozukue Castle (Kōhoku Ward, Kozukuechō)</td>
<td>1) Let’s research the role that Kozukue Castle played as a stronghold captured by Musashi Province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Chigasaki Castle (Tsuduki Ward, Chigaski Higashi)</td>
<td>2) Focusing on the Uesugi Ōgigayatsu Family, let’s research the history of Chigasaki Castle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawasaki</td>
<td>3) Masugata Mountain Castle (Tama Ward, Masugata)</td>
<td>3) Let’s research the history of Masugata Mountain Castle built by Saburōshigenari Inage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagamihara</td>
<td>4) Tsukui Castle (Midori Ward, Futoihoka)</td>
<td>4) Let’s research the history of Tsukui Castle and think about the background behind its construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokosuka</td>
<td>5) Arai Castle (Miura City, Misakimachikoajiro)</td>
<td>5) Let’s research the relationship between Arai Castle, the Miura Family and Hōjō Sōun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Castle or Monument</td>
<td>Research Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōnan Hiratsuka Hatano</td>
<td>6) Tamanawa Castle (Kamakura City, Shiromawari)</td>
<td>6) Let’s think about the role that Tamanawa Castle played in the historic development of the Go Hōjō Family’s reign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7) Okazaki Castle (Hiratsuka City, Okazaki • Isehara City, Okazaki)</td>
<td>7) Let’s think about the characteristics and historical role that Okazaki Castle played.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8) Maruyama Castle (Isehara City, Shimokasuya)</td>
<td>8) Based on excavation efforts, let’s research the relationship between Maruyama Castle and the Uesugi Ōgigayatsu and Go Hōjō Families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kanagawa</td>
<td>9) Kawamura Castle (Yamakitamachi, Yamakita)</td>
<td>9) Let’s research the history of Kawamura Castle and think about the castle’s role during the Go Hōjō Era and its preserved state today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10) Hōjō Irrigation Ditch (Odawara City, Itabashi)</td>
<td>10) Based on the Hōjō Irrigation Ditch, let’s research the Go Hōjō Family’s agrarian policies and territorial governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11) Sōunji Temple (Hakonemachiyumoto)</td>
<td>11) Let’s research the relationship between Sōunji Temple and the Go Hōjō Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Kanagawa</td>
<td>12) Mimasekassenba Ruins (Aikawamachi, Mimase)</td>
<td>12) Let’s research the conditions of battle between Shingen Takeda and the Go Hōjō Family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography


112


Deutsch, Karl W. Nationalism and Social Communication; an Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality. [Cambridge]: Published Jointly by the Technology of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Wiley, New York, 1953. Print.


CHAPTER VI


Kanagawa Prefecture Board of Education. "Kyōdoshi Kanagawa." Personal interview. 27 May 2011.


Kanagawaken Kyōikuiinkai Kyōikukyoku Kyōikushidōbu Kōkōkyōikushidōka. Kyōdoshi

"Kanagawaken Kyōikuiinkai No 'Arata Na Kendokuji Kyōzai' Ni Kansuru Shinkōkyō Kenkai."


Matsuzawa, Shigefumi. "Nihonshi Hisshūka to Kyōdoshi Kanagawa." Personal interview. 8 June 2011.


"Nihonshi Hisshū Maedaoshi 2012 Nendo Kara Dokuji Kyōzai Wo Kettei = Kanagawa."

"Nihonshi Hisshūka Jyunbi Chakuchaku Moderu 20kō Kyōdōshi Kingendai Ni Torikumi."


<http://repository.tufs.ac.jp/bitstream/10108/20938/1/jlc027009.pdf>.


