

PUSHING PAPER
ANALYSIS OF THE OFFICIAL MINUTES OF THE
JAPANESE TEXTBOOK AUTHORIZATION RESEARCH COUNCIL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

SOCIOLOGY

MAY 2011

By

Charles Phan Nguyen

Thesis Committee:

Sun-Ki Chai, Chairperson
Seio Nakajima
Hirohisa Saito

Keywords: Japan, Path Dependence, History Textbooks, Bureaucracy

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Kotona Motoyama and Yohei Sekiguchi for their expertise of the Japanese language and culture. They were both instrumental in helping me understand the often difficult to translate official government minutes.

ABSTRACT

The modern Japanese textbook system can be traced back to the post World War II textbook reform by the U.S. government's State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC). Their efforts to "demilitarize" and "denationalize" the textbooks through a textbook authorization and research council set the parameters by which textbooks are approved today. This initial condition of a strong centralized textbook review committee has remained for the last half century. The recent availability of the official minutes of the research council opens an opportunity to better understand how this committee operates. Using the available official minutes from 2000-2009, this paper will focus on review process of the textbooks published by Fusosha and how it was able to pass through a system initially designed to keep such books out of circulation in public education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
The Nation of Japan	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Path Dependence	5
Victims and Victimization	8
Japanese Textbook Reform	10
Saving Face	13
Textbook Review	17
3. METHODOLOGY	21
Resources Available	21
Organizing Official Records	22
4. RESULTS	24
General Overview of the Minutes	24
The FY 2002 Textbook Revision Hearing	26
Textbook Issues	27
Fair and Balanced	29
Nostalgia	31
5. ANALYSIS	33
Greater Transparency	33
Saving Face, Again	35
6. CONCLUSIONS	38
Pushing Paper	38
Further Research	40
TABLES	42
WORKS CITED	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Number Members from the Social Science Group Present at the Annual Meeting

Table 2: MEXT Members present at the Annual Meeting

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The Nation of Japan

The 2005 edition of the *New History Textbook* (新しい歴史教科書) represents many of the changing elements of Japanese nationalism today. This was the second edition of the textbook meant for junior high school students. Although it was approved by the Textbook Authorization and Research Council (教科用図書検定調査審議会) it has a very limited circulation in the public education system. (Dierkes 2010:168) Despite the low circulation, the very fact that it was approved by the council at all had sparked a newly refreshed outcry from the international and domestic community watchful over Japanese education. Although one can argue that all nations will bias their educational materials, the dialogic of textbook review and public outcry is particularly interesting for Japan. I feel that much of the literature has focused on the public outcry of these controversial textbooks, and that review process itself has been unexamined. With the shift in the ruling political party in Japan, it is only recently that greater transparency has been introduced within the Japanese Ministry of Education, Sports, Culture, Science and Technology (文部科学省 or MEXT) for such a research project to exist. Therefore, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to analyze the textbook review process.

Many claim that these allowance for the *New History Textbook* was not an innocent mistake, but rather a conscious effort by the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform (新しい歴史教科書をつくる会 or JSHTTR) to move “towards greater respect, in effect, for State Shinto, big business, duties instead of rights, and the military instead of pacifism”(Ienaga 1993:113). The JSHTTR was formed as a reactionary group to Prime Minister Miyazawa Ki’ichi’s formal apology to the Korean people in 1992; their

movement was to rally against the depiction of Japan in eternal disgrace of their past actions (Takekawa 2008:90-93). This movement by the JSHTR is captured succinctly in the final conclusion of the 2005 *New History Textbook*,

We must continue to learn, with humility, from other nations. But we must not forget that by blithely placing foreign nations on a pedestal, we risk turning into a spineless nation with no spirit of independence. A strong sense of self-awareness is more important than anything else. Without that, we cannot possibly study foreign history or cultures. The road to self-awareness begins with a thorough knowledge of our country's history and culture. That is our parting message to the readers of the New History Textbook.
(Nishio 2005:68)

If we are to imagine that junior high school students are to read this in their textbook, it is difficult to imagine how this message was able to pass through a formal council. Sven Saaler does point out that this “Neonationalist Historical Revisionism” is only a vocal minority in Japan and not widely accepted among the general public. (Saaler 2005) What is most troubling about this textbook is that it was passed despite great efforts of the Japanese teacher’s union and the international community to have a less biased educational material.

The modern public school textbook certification system draws its model from the reforms carried out during the years in which Japan was occupied by the Allied powers after World War II. The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) set up the initial policies for textbook reform. The SCAP intended to demilitarize, democratize and decentralize the Japanese textbook system (Thakur 1995). This reform was part of an effort to demilitarize the Japanese public both in terms of military power and the public’s intellectual mindset. However, the policies that were meant to embrace a peaceful and internationalized mindset are constricted by a bureaucratic system which masks the

political agendas of individuals in the system. This system discourages a “democratic approach to educational reform” by having all of the major decisions of educational reform guided by a highly centralized bureaucracy (Lincicome 1993:151). So even though there exists today greater transparency in government actions and the Textbook Authorization and Research Council still mostly consists of academics such as university professors and school principals; there is still a great amount of influence by party leaders which was true from the beginning of the textbook review system. (Nakamura 2005; Ienaga 1993:123) An understanding of how the council operates today would require a close look at the initial systems set in place by the US.

A few points of interests drive the thesis question of this research. First is to look at the history and construction of the Textbook Authorization and Research Council by SCAP and its intention to denationalize and demilitarize the education system. Second, the accounts of the council’s actions through Ienaga’s battle to submit his textbooks through the council and his claims that government had used the council as an unconstitutional form of censorship. Taking this history into account I would hope they would illustrate the curiousness of how the Fusosha published textbook was able to pass through the council in only a year (Takekawa 2008:92). The timing of the creation of this particular textbook coincides with a larger social movement of right-leaning groups growing at this time and the April 2001 succession of Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi. (Saaler 2005; Schoppa 2001) I feel that an analysis of the current system of bureaucracy and members of the council could give us a greater understanding of how this controversial textbook was able to pass through the council and their justifications of their actions despite public criticism.

My research question is to ask how the Fusosha published textbooks were able to pass through the council at this particular time. Even today, the Japanese teacher's union and the education community are highly critical of right wing political agendas and tend to have a left leaning bias. I would propose that the research council was able to take advantage of the centralized structure created by SCAP. The sociological literature on path dependency explained through the maintaining of elite power would argue that the same mechanism which was set up to protect the council from political influence are being used now as protection against criticism of their methods. However, large publishing company such as Fusosha funded by Fuji-Sankei would be able to meet the bureaucratic proceedings of the textbook review process. If this is the case, we could consider the approval of the *New History Textbook* as an opportunity taken by the growing right-leaning movement in Japan taking advantage of the longer trend undermining the initial goals of the review system. I will add to the findings by Julius Diekes on the relative stability of the textbook system in the post world war II era, with new data from the recently released official minutes. Along with this, I feel that through the explanation of path dependence we see how the structure originally set up to resist political pressure is still in place. I find that the review council is highly structured to resist exterior pressure as set up by SCAP, however now it is being used against criticisms of approving the *New History Textbook*.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Path Dependence

An examination of the organizational structure of the Textbook Authorization and Research Council must consider the larger theoretical framework of how bureaucracy protects itself from outside intervention. Although it seems that the history of the Japanese textbook system or even the education as a whole has gone through quite a bit of reformation in the last half century; there seems to be a great deal of stagnation in the end results of such reformation. Schoppa, on looking at reformation in general in Japan questions “why have the Japanese put up with stagnation for so long?” (Schoppa 2001:77) He argues that historically, the Japanese has relied on centralized state power to take on the role of reform in Japan. It is only recently that businesses were able to shake their dependence on state power by using their transnational resources. This may have been the opportunity for a publishing company like Fusosha to be able to invest in producing this textbook. He further adds that although the structure of the state power has given them stability, it has no flexibility to adapt to how the private sector in Japan has changed. Therefore I would contend that the MEXT has maintained their strong organizational ties with the private publishing companies, which in turn privileges them regardless of their political platform.

Max Weber on the character of the bureaucratic machine simply stated that “bureaucracy is among those social structures which are hardest to destroy” (Weber 1946:228). That is to mean that the social actions of bureaucracy have an efficiency which will outperform many other forms of social actions such as resistance. He further illustrates that the mechanisms of the bureaucratic processes are not guided by

individuals who work the system, but run through a longer chain of tradition and forward momentum by earlier historical influences. This in modern sociological terms is often referred to as “path dependency”. Path dependency is defined by James Mahony as “both tracing a given outcome back to a particular set of historical events, and showing how these events are themselves contingent occurrence that cannot be explained on the basis of prior historical conditions.” (2000:507) More specifically, he points out that there are three critical elements which must exist before one can say something is path dependent. First, an illustration in which early events were more important than later events; second, that early events cannot simply be explained by initial conditions; and finally, the initial conditions demonstrate repeated outcomes regardless of random events. Path dependence of the research council to favor the structure initially set up by SCAP is a way in which we can examine this organization.

Another way in which we can understand path dependency is to examine which factors can break this dependency and how these factors were not present in our case. In terms of national institutions, Marie-Laure Djelic and Sigrid Quack introduce ways in which open systems allow for new path generation through transnational interactions. Path generation is the occurrence in which new systematic outcomes are produced over time which has broken the previous path dependence of events. They explain that successful transnational path generation can be due to increasing interaction across borders, agreement among a majority of actors on common procedures and the dissolving of borders between rule makers and rule followers. (Djelic and Quack 2007:180) They were particularly interested in the German case and how path generation was successful due to these transnational factors. However, they point out that “although the Japanese

story shared a lot of features with the German one, the resulting institutional transformation in Japan was neither as significant nor as stable in the long run as it has been in Germany”. (Djelic and Quack 2007:170) They attribute continued pressure by the other European nations as a major factor which influenced the German case which Japan did not have. As I will demonstrate further in this paper, there were many factors which negated any possibility of path generation after the 1950s.

Although the initial conditions set by SCAP was to protect the political neutrality of the Japanese education system, what seems to have been created was an organization highly capable of protecting themselves from exterior influences. This was initially created to block any attempts of nationalistic or militaristic interest groups from influencing the research council, what seemed to have been created was a form of centralized elite power which has stabilized around their ability to remain isolated. Mahoney specifies that one particular form of path dependence can be explained through tracing the initial conditions of power elites. This is created through a long gradual process in which “the institution initially empowers a certain group at the expense of other groups; the advantaged group uses its additional power to expand the institution further; the expansion of the institution increases the power of the advantaged group; and the advantaged group encourages additional institutional expansion”. (Mahoney 2000:521) This is to say that the initial conditions require a persistence of particular elites above other groups of people, and more importantly the elites are able to regenerate the same elites over time. I feel that the research council was able to maintain their ability to resist exterior pressure over the years and this has adapted to resist different forms of pressure including ones not from nationalistic groups.

Victims and Victimization

One of the major arguments which would explain the preference of the Fusosha textbooks and the aggressive censorship of the Ienaga textbooks would be through the divisive use of victimization used by the centralized right leaning government (Dierkes 2003). Both Dierkes and Ienaga agree that little has been done in Japan to officially recognize their own responsibility of past military aggression (Ienaga 1993:126; Dierkes 2003:332). That the Japanese had taken a stance of international peace policy in the post war period which has focused more on the experiences of being victims of US atomic bombings and not on the Japanese own war time atrocities. This concept is further illustrated in John Dower's book *Embracing Defeat* in which he illustrated how the SCAP protected the centralized government and empirical power while at the same time isolating out particular people to take on the full responsibility of the war time atrocities (Dower 2000). In all cases they do not account for the makeup of a highly centralized and bureaucratic government which has remained even through the US occupation period. Therefore regardless of the ruling political party, the focus of analysis for MEXT decisions remains at the bureaucratic mechanisms which have remained in place.

In a 1969 study comparing US and Japanese textbooks, the major differences were found to be the motivations of the nation of Japan to engage in war leading up to World War II. In the US textbooks, Japan was described as acting in accordance to the national ideal of divine destiny in honor to the emperor. This is in stark contrast to the Japanese textbooks which explain their actions as a result of particular militaristic individuals in Japan who were using military action to gather resources from other nations (Duke 1969). This research reflects Dower's assessment of the post war

reconstruction of national memory. In this case the historical narrative of the textbook reflects the manner in which SCAP isolated particular individuals as the perpetrators of World War II war time aggression. One of the initial changes in textbook reform came from the 1950's movements against the teachers unions by the Liberal Democratic Party. In a 1955 pamphlet "The Problem of the Dreadful Textbooks" linked the Teacher's Union to the Japanese Communist Party and that the textbooks produced had a liberal slant which poisoned the minds of Japanese youth, and cost parents for needlessly expensive books. Publically at the time, the pamphlet was seen as the ravings of a mad man; however, publishers did recall the books criticized in the pamphlet, and a quiet purging of political leftist from the writing of future textbooks (Jansen 1957). The individual actions of people in the name of the nation and child education have been the dialogic of the presentation of nation which still continues today. This key incident may have been the beginning of the allowances for right wing historical writers, which will become supporting experts in the field.

Education policy has been able to remain the same since its construction during the US occupation of Japan. Although the purpose was to change the system to be more democratic, there is little evidence that the concept of democracy especially in education was truly embraced in a way which is similar to the US conception of democracy (Yamashita and Williams 2002:288). Even much of the fierce oppositions and movements to keep the centralized power in check were met with overwhelming policy decisions which weaken their protests. For example as early as the mid 1950s was the creation of the teacher evaluation system intended to leverage control over the teacher's union (Dierkes 2003:348). Which immediately after World War II, the Japanese teacher's

union was the greatest opponent to the Ministry of Education's policy decisions at the time. So although public support and the awareness of problems of the influence of party politics on the education system have continued to gain support; they have unfortunately had nominal influence on decisions within the MEXT.

I feel that beginning with how the Textbook Authorization and Research Council was initially formed by SCAP, and the continuing dialogic of masking party politics within the language of neutrality and victimization is key to understanding the how they have maintained power. Although the textbook review system was put in place to denationalize and demilitarize Japanese education; it established a highly centralized and undemocratic system of bureaucracy intended to stand above the influences of the radical right. However early events unrelated to the textbook review council seem to have made allowances for right leaning history writers to be recognized where left leaning ones were increasingly discredited. These pools of historical writers were then to be used as a part of the review system. Ienaga would argue this system was used to deflect influences from the left through the guise of neutrality or political correctness.

Japanese Textbook Reform

As a result of the number of scandals involving the bribery of textbook officials, Japan created the "National Textbook System" (国定許可証) in 1903 (Thakur 1995). Because of greater government control over the content of the textbooks they became very nationalistic and incorporated mythical stories which validated the imperial rule. This would include describing the imperial family as the direct descendents of the founding gods of Japan, and thus both sacred and worthy of absolute loyalty (Thakur

1995:263). The textbooks would also include militaristic glorifications of war, even for elementary level textbooks. For instance, in a 1941 third-grade history textbook, there was a song celebrating soldiers who were “human bombs,” who had charged the barbed wire at Shanghai with explosives strapped to themselves so they could sacrifice themselves to open the way for Japanese troops (Ienaga 1993:122). These graphic depictions of war glorified the often-horrific sacrifices of many Japanese soldiers who had left behind their families for the greater cause of serving Japan. This glorified ideal of war and duty reified the Japanese ideal of what the nation asked of all of its citizens. The romantic depiction of the sacrifices of Japanese soldiers in the past reinforced the ideas of duty in the minds of students reading the texts.

After the Japanese surrender in 1945, the occupying American forces dissolved the imperial military. At that time, Japan began to “explicitly renounce war and the possession of war potential” (Ienaga 1993:116). In 1945, the U.S. government’s State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) recognized the power of history textbooks and created article SWNCC 108, that would set an initiative for a new Japanese textbook policy (Ienaga 1993; Thakur 1995). The U.S. government, “determined to avoid another war with a resurgent Japan, believed that they must censor and guide Japan’s media until their enemy could get rid of wrong ideas and acquire better ones—[replacing] militaristic and aggressive ideas with democratic peace-loving ones” (Thakur 1995:266). This plan began with a simple censoring of the textbooks, a process which included merely blacking out contentious parts, often by the students themselves while in class. In December of 1945, the Japanese Ministry of Education put together a committee of historians to collaborate with SWNCC to put together a standard nationalized textbook.

This course of action was met with opposition by many of the Japanese historians working on the project. Toyoda Takeshi, an expert on Japanese medieval commercial history, said that “there was nothing voluntary about the new history textbooks, everything was done by MacArthur’s instruction” (Thakur 1995:267). As the first few sets of textbooks were being printed, they were met with controversy from the very beginning. In 1947, Chinese General Shang Chen complained that the textbooks had not mentioned the aggressive demands from the Japanese government on China in 1915. To these problems the U.S. representative of SWNCC William J. Sebald had responded, “the textbooks now in use are not perfect, there are now special textbook revision committees which are working on a revision of all history textbooks in use in the schools” (Thakur 1995:270). This ongoing pressure from foreign countries on Japan to produce textbooks that would satisfy an international audience maintained the legitimacy of a textbook research council to oversee all textbooks used for public schools. Already, we can see how the construction of the review council privileged particular elite power which will be handed over to a few members of the Japanese government. In doing so, the textbook research council set the initial conditions in which all textbooks intended for use in public schools had to be submitted for review.

This philosophy of mandatory textbook review set the standard for the tone of Japanese textbooks for the next several decades. Even today, it is possible to see that “the occupation reform of history textbooks left an invaluable legacy for Japanese history texts, not only in terms of content and approach but also in terms of the textbook system itself” (Thakur 1995:276). The current controversies of a more nationalistic kind of textbook in the Japanese public school system is a part of a reaction to an ongoing

controversy set up through textbook reform. So although the system of textbook review was initially created to reduce the amount of nationalism in public education, it had the unforeseen affect of establishing a highly centralized system of textbook review which would be used as a form of censorship.

Saving Face

Most of the controversy over Japanese textbooks includes many references that cover up the militaristic crimes in Japanese history. At present, the Japanese government is involved in a controversy over whether the imperial government coerced Korean women into prostitution for Japanese soldiers during World War II. There have been many personal accounts that testify that this happened; however, the LDP-led Japanese government had not recognized that the Japanese Government was involved (Yoshida 2007). This nonrecognition continues in spite of the recent U.S. House of Representatives demand for the Japanese prime minister to publicly apologize for Japan's use of "comfort women." It is important to note that the LDP have at the same time successfully removed any reference to "comfort women" in many of the junior high school-level Japanese textbooks. Nariaki Nakayama, who served as the minister of education from 2005 to 2006, proudly said, "Now few textbooks carry words like 'military comfort women' or that the women were 'forcibly taken' (to the frontline brothels). I think that's good" (Yoshida 2007). Even though this is from recent history, Ienaga would argue that Nakayama can proudly talk about the removal of key aspects of Japanese history in textbooks is because this expurgation agrees with the Japanese desire to "save face" with regard to their historical shortcomings (Ienaga 1993). This movement to "soften" the

militaristic history of Japan is done under the premise of being more politically correct and internationally sensitive. However, many historians—including prominent history textbook writer Saburo Ienaga—believe that this approach is merely a cover to create a specific nationalistic perspective for the new generation of Japanese.

Saburo Ienaga is one of the prominent history textbook writers in Japan, and has been fighting in court since the 1960s for the approval of his textbooks. He has written prolifically about the alarming rise in nationalistic textbooks in the last few decades. His textbooks on Japanese history have been rejected several times by MEXT because they did not conform to the political view of how history should be presented in schools. He has continuously fought for his constitutional right to publish his textbooks without censorship as recently as 1993. Understanding his story is a key to understanding the climate in which textbooks are processed in Japan. He argues that textbook review in Japan is an unconstitutional form of censorship which includes a restriction or removal of textbook material that does not comply with the political bias of the ruling party (Ienaga 1993:114). For Ienaga, the textbook review process has been used as a form of censorship by the government defying the democratic intentions of the process.

Saburo Ienaga argues that this is not a new development invented by the LDP; rather, it is a part of the ongoing practice by the Japanese government to define Japan as a nation through government-approved educational material. He takes key excerpts from various textbooks dating from the 1920s onward that show a militaristic and jingoist slant, glorifying war. Even in elementary school textbooks, “combat was described as a heroic undertaking in order to make a positive impression on young minds” (Ienaga 1993:119). In the 1930s and 1940s, Japanese textbooks continued to justify their

militaristic actions. Blatantly biased interpretations of Japanese atrocities included the following passage:

China has repeatedly doubted our country's sincerity and many Japanese residing there have been injured or killed. Some of our special rights in Manchuria were even threatened. We frequently urged China to reflect on its actions but day by day Chinese actions became more violent. Finally, in September 1931, Chinese troops blew up a section of the South Manchurian Railroad. Our country had no choice but to dispatch troops and drive Chinese forces out of Manchuria. These events are called the Manchurian Incident (1993:121).

Descriptions of aggressive Japanese military actions phrased in this way would make it difficult for students to understand the role that Japanese played in this “incident.” This entry puts the Chinese at fault for instigating the Manchurian Incident when it is commonly held that the explosion of the South Manchurian Railroad was a deliberate and planned operation by the officers of Japan’s Kwantung Army (Weland 1994). It was this sort of “whitewashing” which the national textbook system was created to eliminate.

Even when the Japanese government established a national textbook system in an attempt to reform textbooks to reflect a more pacifist view of history, this reform was merely was a gesture of good faith and became another tool in which to promote the political agenda (Ienaga 1993:124). Ienaga recalls how his own textbooks were challenged again and again by the publication screening. For example, in a 1981 textbook, an examiner was “objecting to the word ‘invasion’...the examiner said ‘Regarding Japan, as well, you have used the expression “military advance” at least twice. To standardize the terminology, couldn’t you repeat it again?’” (1993:126). Ienaga concludes that the publication screening for Japanese textbooks in Japan is being used as a means of censorship to agree with the political position of the ruling government (1993:132). However what is puzzling is Ienaga’s argument that the textbook research

council is to blame for the historical whitewashing. How can this be true when the construction of the council was intended to keep government involvement out of the decision process? The group acts independently of the government with members who are selected from various Universities and Public School teachers. This in its design was meant to keep the government out of textbook review, it is difficult to understand how the ruling party can exert such political pressure.

Although more than 60 years have passed since the end of World War II, today's Japanese textbooks still depict Japanese militarism in a highly censored and often untruthful manner. In the 2005 *New History Textbook* published by Fusosha, a junior-high school level textbook, the following excerpt is used to describe the Nanking "incident"—the occupation of the Chinese city of Nanking (now known as Nanjing) on December 13, 1937:

Full-Scale War with China

*In August 1937, two Japanese soldiers, one an officer, were shot to death in Shanghai (the hub of foreign interests). After this incident, the hostilities between Japan and China escalated. Japanese military officials thought Chiang Kai-shek would surrender if they captured Nanking, the Nationalist capital; they occupied that city in December. *But Chiang Kai-shek had moved his capital to the remote city of Chongqing. The conflict continued.*

*Note*At this time, many Chinese soldiers and civilians were killed or wounded by Japanese troops (the Nanking Incident). Documentary evidence has raised doubts about the actual number of victims claimed by the incident. The debate continues even today.*
(Nishio 2005:49)

The brutality and violent behavior of the advancing Japanese army has led some historians to refer to the occupation as the "Nanjing Massacre" or the "Rape of Nanking." Non-Japanese historians such as Iris Chang and David Askew agree that at least 300,000 noncombatants were killed during this time as evidence through several separate accounts

and extrapolating from photographs taken at the time (Askew 2001; Chang 1998). This careful editing of a historical account indicates that there still exists a strong influence of militarism and right wing nationalism in the textbooks. It is unbelievable that a research council comprised of Japan's top university professors and teachers would have let such broad whitewashing of an important historical fact through the review process.

Ienaga's accounts have been one of the most influential insights into how particular right leaning groups have maintained power within MEXT policy decisions. They explain some of the processes in which have been able to deny particular textbooks from selection for public education. However, the selection process itself is still not widely disclosed and until recently shrouded as official business. We can only see which books get selected and in some occasions like with Ienaga which books are denied. However, as far as the public is concerned the process itself is a black box. If we are to explain how Fusosha's book was approved by the council, one must better understand how the textbook review process actually works.

Textbook Review

The current system of textbook review is not too dissimilar to how it was first designed by SCAP. An independent publishing company will produce a textbook and submit it to the Textbook Authorization Research Council for review. The council will disseminate the textbook to the appropriate sub-group based on subject and they will fact check the textbook against experts in the field, and make general guidelines on fairness to political and religious concerns. These editorial guidelines are bounded by government-set standards which are not available to the public. The textbook will then go through an

exchange of return and revision between the council and publisher. Every four years a list of approved textbooks are distributed to the prefectural level in which the local board of education would select books from that list. (Nakamura 2005) While this process is quite straight forward there are differing opinions on whether this is truly as democratic as it seems.

The straight forward nature of the textbook review process may hide the empiricist narrative of which textbooks are approved and which are denied. Dierks' analysis of the middle school history textbooks from 1955 through 1998 had shown that the overall historical perspective had remained very stable when compared to case of German textbooks which had fluctuated over the years in accordance to international pressures. He concluded that any changes to the textbooks "were not added in response to public or political pressure in the 1980's; instead, they constituted elements of the empiricist historiography that persisted throughout the postwar period." (Dierkes 2010:155) This is to say that the highly centralized bureaucratic structure of the research council allows it to run isolated from exterior pressure. In fact, Dierkes would argue that the approval of the *New History Textbook* may be internally understood as "one of correcting 'factual mistakes' while not objecting to the overall tone and ideological interpretations of them." (Dierkes 2010:168) However, if this was the case, why was this textbook approved in 2001 and again in 2005 when Ienaga's textbooks had been repeatedly denied since the 1960's?

Although this may seem to be an independent council of professors and principles, some would argue that party politics have a way of influencing council decisions. Elite power is maintained through the fact that the council members are

selected by MEXT officials, so although they are independent university professors, the government officials have ultimate say in who gets selected. For example, “Hisao Ishiyama, a high school history textbook author and former high school teacher, says screening by education ministry officials is inevitably influenced by the sitting government of the time and this affects the council's judgments.” (Nakamura 2005) This is not surprisingly similar to the sentiment held by Ienaga in his accounts of the textbook review process. What is not addressed is how exactly government positions affect council judgments when the design seems to be built to counter this influence?

It seems that the highly centralized authority of decision making was able to be retained even after the education reform by the US forces in the 1940's. Although, the immediate postwar period changed a bit of the content of education materials, the overall structure of decision making was not disturbed so those in power were able to use the narrative of victimization to regain the preferred national narrative which had existed since the early 1900s. The minutes of the research council shows a strong desire by the council to maintain their own authority as a decision making body even in the face of outside criticism. This in conjunction with the rising power of private organizations such as the JSHTTR to create the *New History Textbook* explains how this particular textbook was created at this time. Fusoha was financed well enough to make 200 corrections as requested by the research council and follow the proper procedure set forth by the council. (Werly 2001) Unlike Ienaga, they made were able and willing to take the necessary steps to get their textbook approved through official channels. In the eyes of the council, it was a relatively unremarkable textbook which may have even had a few confirming historians to vouch for their claims. However, once accepted, any criticisms

against the council decisions were met with their highly defensive mechanisms. The minutes of the official research council meetings show an organization highly able to defend their process.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

Resources Available

Because of the politics behind the recent party shift from the LDP to the Democratic Party of Japan, the MEXT website has opened up much of their internal processes. We know that the Textbook Authorization Research Council consists of ten different sections based on subject and a general council which oversees larger administrative duties. The group 2 on social science is often one of the largest groups consisting of 29 members in FY of 2008. This is not explained in the website, but most likely is the case due to the amount of fact checking needed for this group. On the website itself, there are publically available minutes for the council dating back to fiscal year 2000. This includes a separate section on recent activities and policies of the general council.

I was able to collect the minutes available and save the webpages as a separate file retaining the full Japanese text and formatting. With the aid of a browser based kanji translator by Google, an electronic dictionary, my own familiarity with the Japanese language and the occasional aid of native Japanese speakers, I was able to translate the minutes available with a great deal of confidence in the accuracy. I took careful notes on the deliberation report of Group 2 textbook corrections addressed. These notes mostly consisted of the number of corrections addressed, the issues brought up, and the nature of concerns from Group 2. I also took notes on the “Question and Answer” sections and various speeches recorded in the minutes. I notated the general themes addressed in the speech, particularly common turns of phrases, or any particularly striking commentary in the speech.

Organizing Official Records

To best make use of the information available from the MEXT website first consisted of reading over the minutes available. I collected information on the official discussion and have a general view of how discussions of textbook issues were addressed. I organized the concerns addressed and the particular actors involved in the arguments into larger categories according to frequency. The major categories I found were concerns with how the public understood the textbook process, the ability of the council to produce “fair and balanced” textbooks, and references to the decade after World War II. I then reread the minutes with these categories in mind to see if they were repeated before and was previously missed. Because these were a complete set of records of the Textbook Authorization and Research Council minutes from 2000 through 2009, I felt the data collected could generalize well to the major actions of the council. This produced some data in which I could determine a pattern in theme between issues and actors.

I used an excel sheet to organize the members which were counted as present through the minutes. This allowed me to track how often a certain member of the council would come to the annual meeting. This also allowed me to track which MEXT representatives were present at the meeting. Although this was a publicly available document which can be found on the MEXT website, I will not disclose the names of the council members noted in the minutes so as to disconnect them from the analysis of their actions. I feel that due to the political nature of this paper, it would be wise to do so.

Most of this research is fairly rudimentary; however, because of the recent opening of official records available to the public, there has not been a thorough look at

the organizational structure of the council which has been at the center of interests for textbook review. By organizing the data available to us now, we can have a much more systematic account of the textbook review process. This would be valuable in supporting the individual accounts of Ienaga's struggle with the council.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

General Overview of the Minutes

The minutes available on the MEXT website were deceptively straightforward. Any official minutes will not fully or accurately represent the workings of a review council; however, they do provide enough information for which to gain greater understanding of how the textbook review process works. The minutes available on the MEXT website go as far back as the meeting for the 2000 fiscal year. The meeting would typically meet at least once a year and would have additional meetings if deemed necessary often for additional deliberation of textbook reports. The minutes would record the date of the meeting, the location of the meeting, the attendance list for each subcommittee and the MEXT members present. What is often not included in the official minutes archive were any reports or handouts mentioned in the minutes. The titles of the handouts would be mentioned in the minutes; however, the actual handouts themselves would not be available to the public. In 2002, a list of meeting agendas was included as an item in the official minutes. One major exception on the minutes format was on the February 28, 2008 meeting, all the council members were listed ungrouped so determining who were from Group 2 was difficult. However, we do know that in total 34 council members were present, which in comparison to other meetings in previous years was a relatively small attendance. Group 2 would typically be the largest group in attendance. (see table 1 for specific numbers for each year) Another peculiar thing was that there are no records for meetings for FY 2008. The records completely skip that year and go straight to the FY 2009 meeting. What seemed to have happened was that group 1, 3, 5, and 10 did not receive any textbooks to review and the first FY 2009 meeting in

practice was held to settle the remaining FY 2008 reports. The meetings themselves had a fairly routine procedure.

Every meeting included several representatives from MEXT to preside over the meetings. The representative from MEXT usually consisted of the Elementary and Secondary Education Director, The Deputy Minister's Secretariat, the Textbook Manager and the Textbook Director. However, on occasion the Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, a Deputy Director or an Assistant Director would be present. (See table 2 for the presence of the executive staff) Although the council members would often be addressed by their surname and family name, the MEXT representatives would only be addressed by their family name.

First the Elementary and Junior Highschool Director of Education would typically have some opening remarks. This would be followed by a briefing from each working group. Each working group would begin by addressing the number of corrections which needed to be resubmitted by the publisher. The names of the textbooks themselves were kept anonymous in the meetings and edits among several books would be lumped together according to subject. The group's report would finish with a general overview of the nature of the corrections called for and the issue in question. After the briefing, there would be time for closing remarks which may include a "Question and Answer" session between the MEXT and the group members to clarify any points brought up in the group briefings. It is also interesting to note that in the "question and answer" section, the individual speaking would not be documented, and are only referred to as the group they belong to. Next the handouts for the forthcoming fiscal year plans would be given out. Finally, if there were any additional matters such as a retirement of a member, the

member would have a chance to make a farewell speech to the council. According to the minutes, these meetings could last anywhere from one to four hours.

The FY 2002 Textbook Revision Hearing

One particularly unusual meeting was the FY 2002 meetings which began on April of 2002. Unlike every other year between FY 2000 to 2009 in which they met only once or twice, the FY 2002 had four meetings in total. In FY 2002, the council held four meetings in which they had a formal textbook revision hearing, which restructured the evaluation criteria for textbooks for FY 2003, and the report from each working group. The textbook revision hearing consisted of three independent groups to report on what they felt needed to be improved in the textbook review process. These groups included the “National Council of Prefectural Boards of Education” (全国都道府県教育委員会連合会), the “Association of Municipalities Board of Education” (全国市町村教育委員会連合会), and the “Textbook Publishers Association” (社団法人教科書協会). Each group was allowed to give a testimony on their assessment of the textbook review process.

The “National Council of Prefectural Boards of Education” began by introducing the initial goals of the “Textbook Authorization and Research Council” from 1947 which included “equal opportunity in education”, “to improve education standards”, “to maintain quality education”, and to “ensure the neutrality of education”. One of the buzz words which all three groups repeated frequently was need for “fair and balanced” (公正でバランスのとれた) textbooks. This group had two major points to suggest. First to have more copies available for review at the local level even to the point of having

enough for the PTA to have a review copy; and to have greater transparency in the publishers submitting to the council. Next the “Association of Municipalities Board of Education” presented their statement. They began with addressing the problems which they see in the shortcomings of textbooks in general. They expressed that their greatest concern over the lack of textbooks which motivated student learning. Textbooks needed to be more flexible to different learning abilities and include a greater variety in how information was presented. Again they emphasized the need for “fair and balanced” textbooks, focusing in this case the need for textbooks which “foster a peaceful nation”. Finally the Textbook Publisher’s Association had four major suggestions for the textbook review process. They would like an establishment of minimal learning standards, allowances for a deeper understanding in content, the development of more content, and making content easier to understand. Gathering from the concerns of the testimonies from the “National Council of Prefectural Boards of Education” and the “Association of Municipalities Board of Education” this hearing was most likely in reaction to the *New History Textbook* first edition published by Fusosha in 2001, which is why four meetings were held this particular year.

Textbook Issues

All throughout the minutes from FY 2000 through FY2009, the issue of the content of the history textbooks were often highlighted. The controversy of the history textbooks in the media was explicitly addressed at the FY 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2005 meetings. At FY 2001, the group 2 report expressed a concern of information being leaked to the public and that many of the members of the council felt attacked by the

media. At the FY 2005 meeting, the council chair cautioned members of the growing seriousness of the criticisms from South Korea and China and that there was a concern over a leak about the history textbooks which may be from council members. Being that this is from the years concerning the approval of both the first and second edition of the Fusosha published textbook, there is reason to believe that this was the history textbook in question on both occasions.

Throughout the minutes which were available there were quite a few items which were often brought up as points of which the group 2 frequently had to deliberate on. Early in the 2000s, there were deliberations for several years over the national flag. In the FY 2001 group 2 report, they had addressed their concern that although the law had made the *Nisshōki* as the official national flag of Japan in 1999, textbook publishers were still slow to update their textbooks accordingly.

Another issue which was reported every year were deliberations over maps in the textbooks. Often the problem was addressed as having too much of a “one sided view” (一面的な見解). In general every year there would be a textbook submitted which had a misleading representation of terrain, inaccurate information on acid rain coverage or even an inaccuracy in national borders. This particular phrasing of “one sided view” was frequently used as a point of concern in many textbooks. For example this same phrase was used in the FY 2002 group 2 deliberations on how a particular textbook presented environmental issues. In the FY 2003 report this phrase was used as a critic of a textbook’s description of the international contributions to the Japanese economic bubble. Group 2 was quite critical about any concerns of bias in the textbooks submitted to the council and acknowledged their duty to produce “fair and balanced” educational material.

Fair and Balanced

One of the popular “buzz words” mentioned in the minutes was the concept of “fair and balanced” (公正でバランスのとれた) which was brought up several times during the textbook hearing. First I should clarify a small but important distinction between English and Japanese. Commonly, the English word “fair” is translated as “公平”, which would imply an even distribution of things. Such as to “make sure everyone gets a fair amount of ice-cream at the party.” However, the minutes use the word “公正” which is often translated as something to be correct; however, given the context to which the term is used, I feel that “fair” may be a more apt term. This would correlate with how in English one could say “It’s not fair that everyone gets ice-cream except for me.” This is to say that correctness is to not advantage any particular person or idea above others. During an FY 2002 meeting, an executive council member said that the PTA and teachers had criticized the text book review process as not fair and balanced because the text book was “written in a one sided point of view” (一方的な見解だけ書いてくる。)¹ In this respect, it can be understood that their theme of “fair and balanced” would mean multiple point of views as opposed to a concept of correctness. I feel that “fair and balanced” would be a better translation than say “correct and balanced” being that “correct” loses the implication of multiple interpretations.

In FY 2002 much of the additional sessions were held over what exactly “fair and balanced” educational material really meant. In the FY 2002 session 2, a council member had expressed concerns that there were two conflicting definitions of “fair and balanced”.

¹ 公正でバランスのとれた教科書の在り方について,
http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/tosho/gijiroku/021202.htm, accessed on June 16, 2010.

The member said that “fair and balanced” should be about the accuracy of the information in relation to the larger academic understanding of the subject. The example given was the issue of categorizing double amino acids as “polypeptides” in the textbook. If one was to use updated scientific jargon, the double amino acid should be referred to as “G peptides” and not used the outdated term “polypeptide”. However, a textbook might categorize the double amino acid as both a “polypeptide” and a “G peptide” to be “fair and balanced”. The argument was to say that although in less scientific textbooks, this is the nature of many of the debates of historical accuracy and that in some cases a singular statement is more “fair and balanced”.

In the FY 2002 session 3 a council member said that “The one thing about multiple interpretations is that they are very intrusive, and will lead to misunderstandings” (今回おっしゃっている内容ですと、かなり立ち入ったいろんな複数の解釈があるようなことについて、誤った理解が導かないようになりますと、ちょっと整合性がやや不安に思うのです) . This was in defense of the multiple request to have multiple interpretations in history textbooks, which was argued to be a detriment to the efficiency of the review process. The request was simply to include multiple interpretations of historical events for the purpose of having “fair and balanced” textbooks; however the council member argued that this would confuse younger students if too many interpretations were included. Again, arguing that although there is a need for “fair and balanced” textbooks, for the sake of education, one needs to be careful about the product which is eventually produced. This became a regular part of the language in subsequent annual meeting reports. For example, in the FY 2004 group 2 report, the phrase “fair and balanced” was used on why the council suggested the

publisher provide a pros and cons of using hydroelectric, thermal and nuclear power. This phrase became the yardstick by which future deliberations on textbook edits would be made.

Nostalgia

Although the Textbook Authorization and Research Council was established soon after World War II and has been changing and updating their methods for decades, the shadow of these early beginnings loom over their actions. In the opening statement at the FY 2000 meeting, the newly appointed council chairman recalled nostalgically of education soon after the war and how this council plays an important role in providing quality education for children. In the FY 2001 meeting, a MEXT representative had addressed that by 1955, there was too much decentralization in MEXT power, that regrettably textbooks were not as accurate. In the FY 2002 second session, the 1958 standard was recalled by a MEXT representative as the other time in which such standards of education were called into question. This is to say revising the standards now would break the last half century of standards enforced by the council.

At the end of a meeting, there would sometimes be a speech presented by an incoming or retiring member of the council. These retirement speeches were often insightful into the mindset of an individual on their view of the culture within the review council. At the FY 2005 meeting the council chair was retiring and made a lengthy and telling statement of the state of textbook review. The statement began by explaining that the textbook system in Japan is supported by three pillars, the publishing company, the review council, and the public schools themselves. Each of these three parts influence

each other and the tension between them was critical to understand. One example he gave to consider was the declining birthrate of the nation. Although this may not seem like a factor in the textbook system, a declining birthrate meant a declining student body which meant a decline in sales for textbook publishers. This in turn drives up competition between publishers which will mean they will use different tactics to make up their sales. This may mean greater textbooks specialized for private cram schools which removes the textbook review council from influencing the textbooks being used by students. This was a fairly far reaching scope for drawing in the influence of a topical issue like birthrate decline to the textbook system; however, what is important is to note the tension between these three institutions were probably quite commonly shared by many council members. The retiring council member was most likely not alone in the awareness of the delicate power dynamic between these three institutions.

CHAPTER 5. ANALYSIS

Greater Transparency

Although the MEXT website has shown a keen desire to have greater transparency in their operations, I question the usefulness of the information provided. By their nature, official minutes are not going to be an accurate documentation of government action, but merely a presentation of government responsibilities. That being said, it is interesting to consider what remains withheld from the public. What are quite glaring are the particular decisions and results of the resubmissions by the publishers to the council. The group report will say how many changes were eventually approved and how many were rejected; however, the resulting correction was never revealed. In fact what I didn't find were any references to critics which were keyed specifically to the *New History Textbook*. The only time this particular textbook was ever mentioned was when they were discussing the criticism of the council of passing the textbook. This may be argued to protect the review process from bias, but it also hides accountability for the group to show what the standards for education they held the publishers to.

Although a complete list of the council members were included for each year and the attendance was clearly listed at each meeting minutes, the discrepancy in formatting made it difficult to fully understand who was who. In the full roster, the council members are listed divided only by permanent members and temporary members. In the minutes themselves they were divided by group with their titles omitted in the records. Because a few council members were part of multiple groups, it was quite difficult to tell who was who. In addition, the omission of family names or names entirely was done quite often in the minutes, and was quite difficult to determine who was talking unless they understood

the context well enough. Intentional or not, this allows for further obfuscation despite the promise of greater transparency.

Additionally, each of the meetings included a set of handouts which the members are given as a part of the meeting objectives. Often these handouts are referred to within the meetings and particular details are cited, however never fully explained in the minutes. The handouts themselves are not available in the MEXT website which is very curious because there is a section which implies that the minutes and handouts would be included in the section (最新の議事要旨・議事録・配付資料). This is another way in which although there is a promise of transparency in the review process, very little of great use is actually given in the website. In addition to the fact that the standards and conditions which must be met for textbook approval are still kept secret, this shows a great deal of isolation of the review process from the public guarded by an elite few.

The most interesting thing which was missing in the official minutes was any mention of the *New History Textbooks* at all during the 2000 or 2001 minutes. If one were to read the minutes from those years, and then the minutes from any other year, there would be little difference in how the general proceedings went. Missing was any evidence that there was political privilege to this textbook, special mention of the textbook or particularly different political presence. In all the minutes made available to the public the only particularly unusual event was the aftermath of the approval of the *New History Textbook*, in which showed the full ability of the council to resist outside pressure.

Saving Face, Again

On the surface, the minutes showed a great dedication to the creation of “fair and balanced” educational material and a critical eye against “one sided views” in textbooks. However, the council would often cite that their duty first and foremost was to construct a quality education for students. This duty was often held up as evidence against the seemingly common value towards a “fair and balanced” education. The whole argument of creating a “fair and balanced” textbook seems jeopardized if exceptions to the rule are made in favor of a simplified education. The public is less concerned by the ideals of “fair and balanced” applied to the pros and cons of geothermal power when phrases like “we must not forget that by blithely placing foreign nations on a pedestal, we risk turning into a spineless nation with no spirit of independence” are able to pass through review as a “fair and balanced” statement. This use of deliberations over the idea of “fair and balanced” creates the narrative in which the civil servants of the council are victims of an unreasonable public. Instead of questioning the ideology of the openly right-leaning language of *New History Textbook*, the council was concerned with the philosophical concept of historical accuracy. To them, there was nothing unique or notable about this particular textbook, it was framed as just another textbook with a few factual inaccuracies which were quickly addressed by the Fusosha publishing company.

It also seems that when addressed with the concerns over the public’s reaction to the Fusosha textbook, the council reaction is not about how this textbook was inappropriate. In both occasions, there was more concern over matters like the media reaction, international criticism or leaks within council members. A council member even expressed irritation of the public’s criticism of the council proceedings despite their

efforts to make “balanced” educational material. It seems that the council members had so much faith in their own review process, that outside responses were unwarranted aggression against their good deeds. The hearing itself ended up as a drawn out bureaucratic procedure in which the final solution were a few edits to the guidelines which are still not open to the public. Seeing how set up the council was to defend their own review process against outside pressure, it is difficult to imagine a political power to be able to exert any pressure in such a way without receiving the same treatment.

Finally, I find the frequent use of recalling the history of the Textbook Authorization and Research Council to be fairly divisive. Although the early years of the council proceeding were heavily criticized at the time, in these minutes they are often referred back to as the standard by which the council should remember their duties. Although a revision of textbook review was a victory for the Japanese teacher’s union, there were still complaints that the process was not perfected and that over time the system would improve. To frame this period as a nostalgic time of when the council was more idealistically true to its goals would be to discount the decades of evolution which had already occurred. Much like in the 1955 pamphlet “The Problem of the Dreadful Textbooks” which did influence the textbooks available in the public schools; the current council seems to be more concerned with “saving face” than to produce quality educational material.

This tactic of trying to “save face” casting the council as victims of an unappreciative public are ways in which they are able to maintain a centralized power in their review process. Returning to Mahoney’s elements of path dependency, we can see how the initial conditions are often privileged even in the language of how the procedure

is to be done. The later events which increasingly discredited left leaning historical writers were not the direct result of these initial conditions, but a part of an exterior movement. Finally, regardless of different attacks on the research council, they are able to maintain their power within the elite members of the council, which repeated similar outcomes of being able to resist exterior pressure. Therefore regardless of what may have changed in the educational reform after the 1940's, the council itself was able to maintain its power isolated from the public. This inadvertently set up the council to be able to resist many forms of outside pressure, however in this case it wasn't just from nationalistic groups as initially designed, but from left groups concerned over the allowance of a particular textbook.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS

Pushing Paper

The minutes of the research council are consistent with the larger trends of MEXT decision making regarding education. In as soon as the 1960's, the research council was able to settle into a highly centralized form of bureaucracy which was isolated from outside forces. This centralized form of bureaucracy is not only efficient in pushing paper through the system, but highly resilient to outside criticism. When faced with criticisms of their methods, they are able to internally deflate them through the language of victimization and ask for mercy for their human inefficiencies. This method deflects any critics of the overall authority of the council as a decision making body.

The history around the textbook review council show how path generation was denied in favor of the original conditions set up by SCAP. This was explained by Diekes of the relative stability of the post war education system, but I'm framing it within the path dependency explanation. First, because there was little transnational ability to pressure MEXT to meet international standards; they were able to maintain educational standards which were particularly "Japanese". Secondly, the procedures for textbook review were kept secret and exclusive only to council members. We still do not know the conditions and standards required for textbook approval and a great deal of the interoffice literature is withheld from the public. Finally, there is a distinct border between the rule makers and rule followers. The standards and practices of how textbooks are approved are set up by internal MEXT guidelines which are followed by reviewers and publication companies. Even the publication companies are kept ignorant of the conditions and are only told how they have violated the conditions. This shows a clear block to path

generation after the initial conditions set up by SCAP, and an allowance towards path dependency.

After the FY 2002 meetings which were held specifically to revise the textbook review process, the results seemed to only defend the procedures already in place and make minor changes to the review process. We can see that this was outside of their normal proceedings because usually, the group would only meet about once or twice a year, but in FY 2002, a total of 4 meetings were held. Given the frustrations given by council members on the public criticism of their hard work to approve textbooks, holding 4 meetings a year would not be a part of normal procedure. The extra meetings were a special and necessary process in which to quell much of the anxiety by the public of their approval process of the *New History Textbook*.

The *New History Textbook* created by the JSHTR is part of a growing right-leaning social movement taking place in Japan. Factually, the textbook did not deviate from the desired narrative of Japanese history among council members. And the Fusosha company was well staffed to be able to meet the several demands to submit their textbook. Therefore, it was approved for public use. This stability of the textbook content reflects stability towards a particular national narrative which had always existed. Ienaga was not as willing to change his own textbook in light of the council demands; therefore it was not approved for public school use. What the minutes show clearly is how resilient the research council is in deflecting outside criticisms of their authority on textbook evaluation; however, lack in the internal ability to resist professionally presented textbook which meet all the necessary bureaucratic demands.

Further Research

This was the first step into expanding the research into the Japanese Textbook Authorization and Research Council. The complexities of the decision making process within the council itself does not seem as simple as political pressure to allow certain messages and deny others. The decisions seem to be highly motivated by internal bureaucratic culture and a faith to maintain a process which works for the council members who must use it. Most of the pressure on the council seems to be exerted in the form of maintaining the integrity of the council against outside critics of its value to exist. For now, the procedure seems to catch many different inaccuracies in the textbook submitted to the council, and any changes to the procedure would only make the process less efficient.

Similar to Dierkes' argument of how the Japanese education system is quite different from the German system, I would include the model of path dependence through elite power as an explanation of this phenomenon. The minutes show how political and academic elites have been able to maintain power within the highly centralized structure of their bureaucracy. This stability was not only a product of the different political environments between the two nations, but I would argue because of how the initial conditions by the SCAP centralized the power between a minor elites. This became standard bureaucratic procedure which was highly resilient to outside influence.

Additional research would need to look into the interaction between the council, the publishers and the public schools. It seems from the minutes that they do influence each other in interesting ways and that this tension would be a key to understanding how decisions are made within the council. It is obvious that the publishing companies in the

interests of selling more books need the approval from the council, and that the approved books are selected at the local level by the public schools themselves. However, there is room to gain a greater understanding of how the publishers exert pressure on the council to pass their textbooks, and how much autonomy do the local public schools have on textbook selection. For this to happen, there needs to be an analysis of the communications between these three institutions.

TABLES

Table 1: Number Members from the Social Science Group Present at the Annual Meeting

FY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2009
Date/	1/15/2001	4/3/2001	4/9/2002	4/8/2003	3/30/2004	4/5/2005	3/30/2007	2/28/2008	4/9/2009
members from group 2 present	12	11	10	10	16	16	15	**	5
		2/18/2002	6/14/2002			3/29/2006		3/25/2008	3/20/2010
		4	6			17		17	3
			2/16/2002						
			3						
			7/31/2002						
			5						

Table 2: MEXT Members present at the Annual Meeting

FY	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2009
Date	1/5/2001	4/3/2001	4/9/2002	4/8/2003	3/30/2004	4/5/2005	3/30/2007	2/28/2008	4/9/2009
Members	ED, DM, TM, TD	M, ED, DM, TM, TD	ED, DM, TM, TD	ED, DM, TM, TD	DM, TM, TD	ED, DM, TM, TD	ED, DM, TM, AD	M, ED, DD, TM, TD	M, ED, DD, TM, TD
Date		2/18/2002	6/14/2002			3/29/2006		3/25/2008	3/20/2010
Members		ED, DM, TM, TD	DM, TM, TD			DM, TM, TD		M, TM, TD, AD, AD	DD, ED, TD
Date			6/26/2002						
Members			DM, TM, TD						
Date			7/31/2002						
Members			ED, DM, TM, TD						

Table 2 Key

ED: 初等中等教育局長 (Elementary and Secondary Education Director)

DM: 大臣官房審議官 (Deputy Minister's Secretariat)

TM: 教科書課長 (Textbook Manager)

TD: 教科書企画官 (Textbook Director)

M: 文部科学大臣 (Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology)

AD: 課長補佐 (Assistant Director)

DD: 審議官 (Deputy Director)

WORKS CITED

- Askew, David. 2001. "The Nanjing Incident: An Examination of the Civilian Population." *Sino-Japanese Studies*.
- Chang, Iris. 1998. *The Rape of Nanking: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II*. Reprint. Penguin (Non-Classics).
- Dierkes, Julian. 2010. *Postwar History Education in Japan and the Germanys*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dierkes, Julian Beatus. 2003. "Teaching portrayals of the nation: Postwar history education in Japan and the Germanys." United States -- New Jersey: Princeton University.
- Djelic, Marie-Laure, and Sigrid Quack. 2007. "Overcoming path dependency: path generation in open systems.." *Theory & Society* 36:161-186.
- Dower, John W. 2000. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Duke, Benjamin C. 1969. "The Pacific War in Japanese and American High Schools: A Comparison of the Textbook Teachings." *Comparative Education* 5:73-82.
- Ienaga, Saburo. 1993. "The Glorification of War in Japanese Education." *International Security* 18:113-133.
- Jansen, Marius B. 1957. "Education, Values and Politics in Japan." *Foreign Affairs* 35:666-678.
- Lincicome, Mark. 1993. "Nationalism, Internationalization, and the Dilemma of Educational Reform in Japan." *Comparative Education Review* 37:123-151.
- Mahoney, James. 2000. "Path dependence in historical sociology.." *Theory & Society* 29:507.
- Nakamura, Akemi. 2005. "Textbook screening - not always on same page." *The Japan Times*
http://www.lexisnexis.com.eres.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/us/Inacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1272850522770&returnToKey=20_T9243362613&parent=docview&target=results_listview_resultsNav&tokenKey=rsh-20.264006.25410478376 (Accessed May 3, 2010).
- Nishio, Kanji. 2005. *New History Textbook*. Tokyo: Fusosha.

- Saaler, Sven. 2005. *Politics, Memory and Public Opinion: The History Textbook Controversy and Japanese Society*. Munich: Iudicium.
- Schoppa, Leonard J. 2001. "Japan, the Reluctant Reformer." *Foreign Affairs* 80:76-90.
- Takekawa, Shunichi. 2008. "Nationalism, Democracy, and the Press in Japan: How Asahi and Yomiuri Frame News to Compete with each other." Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii.
- Thakur, Yoko H. 1995. "History textbook reform in Allied Occupied Japan, 1945-52.." *History of Education Quarterly* 35:261.
- Weber, Max. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Weland, James. 1994. "Misguided Intelligence: Japanese Military Intelligence Officers in the Manchurian Incident, September 1931." *The Journal of Military History* 58:445-460.
- Werly, Richard. 2001. "Japan: Ambiguous Textbooks.." *UNESCO Courier* 54:13.
- Yamashita, Hiromi, and Christopher Williams. 2002. "A Vote for Consensus: Democracy and Difference in Japan." *Comparative Education* 38:277-289.
- Yoshida, Reiji. 2007. "Sex slave history erased from texts; '93 apology next?." *The Japan Times*.