

Some ideologies in newly published English textbooks in Japan

Kobayashi Masahiko

Introduction - Some premises for actual analyses -

1. Why textbooks?

First of all, the reason why textbooks worth analyzing should be made clear. The problem with textbooks is as follows. If textbooks try to inculcate the students with the kind of ideas which justify inequality of human rights pretending as if the ideas supported equality of human rights, it is nothing but swindle.¹⁾ And the swindle through textbooks is directed at young students, who are not expected to be as matured as adults. Besides, the swindle is carried out under the official educational system. Therefore, if swindle is carried out through textbooks, it is much more vicious than the ones directed to adults or the ones carried out without official systems. And as I will show later, most textbooks actually carry out swindle, at least when they deal with social issues.

2. What kind of lessons I deal with

Strictly speaking, any kinds of statements are more or less ideological. But it seems that comments about social issues are more obviously ideological than the ones about other issues. Therefore, in this thesis, I will deal with only the social issues described in English textbooks.

Besides, I will deal with newly published English textbooks which are the ones published in 2002 and 2003 in order to analyze current ideologies.

3. What is the point?

Although many lessons in English textbooks in Japan describe so many kinds of social issues, almost all such lessons have approval to inequalities in common. And it seems to me that the approval has crucial ideological problems, not slight ones. It is true that descriptions in textbooks vary, but the existence of such variation doesn't mean that they don't approve inequalities. Some approve inequalities overtly while others approve them covertly.

The covert approval is as follows. Some lessons admire those who are discriminated without criticizing those who discriminate them. Other lessons criticize those who discriminate the weaker people without criticizing the most responsible people. This is a common tendency I describe in most of this thesis. The exception is chapter 4. In that chapter, the problem is a mixture of two kinds of discrimination, which are sexual and ethnic.

Although the ideologies contained in the lessons vary, their can be classified in a certain number of sets. And the ideologies don't seem to be affected by whether they are published in 2002 or 2003. It is true that there are some interesting cases which cannot be classified. Although such lessons worth mentioning, I will analyze them as exceptions since they are quite small in number and therefore exceptional.

In short, the purpose of this thesis is to make a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of English textbooks. The purpose of CDA can be summarized in the following remarks in Wodak and Meyer (2001).

To summarize, and in contrast to some views on CDA, CDA is not concerned with evaluating what is 'right' or 'wrong'. CDA - in my view - should try to make choices at each point in the research itself, and should make these choices transparent. It should also justify theoretically why certain interpretations of discursive events seem more valid than others. (p. 65)

What is more, the following remark in Noro (2001) involves herself into getting rid of disadvantages caused by discourses, and therefore more constructive than the definition above. I hope this thesis of mine will contribute to such actual improvements as Noro (2001) says.

The purpose of CDA is to make covert ideologies clear and get rid of their disadvantages. That is exactly the reason why CDA criticizes sociolinguistics. (English mine)²⁾

1. Language

1.1. General Tendencies

Before analyzing textbooks, I think I should describe the effects of the justification of the dominant position of English through English as a media. Kasuya (2003) explains the effects as follows.

The justification of a dominant language needs to be proven by means of the dominant language itself. There is a double approval effect here. In other words, it is through the approval by means of the use of the dominant language that approves the symbol of the dominant language as a whole...

But even the authority of a justified language cannot remain in silence for ever. The symbol of the authority needs to be renewed and filled up intermittently. The dominant language needs to be justified overtly with the renewal and the filling up of its linguistic capital, particularly when the authority is threatened by other linguistic authorities. Besides the process of the renewal and the filling up must be carried out with the creation of an "illusion" that the justification is "natural" and "self-evident". (English mine)³⁾

It is true that "a double approval effect" can be applied to the justifications for not only dominant languages but also dominated

languages. But actually, most English textbooks in Japan approve only dominant languages such as English.⁴⁾

I will show this point in the course of actual analyses of some lessons. One of the typical approval is given by “Lesson 10: International Travel” in *LIVING ENCOUNTER ORAL COMMUNICATION I*. It starts with the following sentences.

The earth is getting smaller and smaller, it has become easier to go to so many places in the world and communicate with people. The role of English as a world language is increasing. (English mine)⁵⁾

And this lesson ends with the following paragraph.

Learning to speak English will help you communicate with the people you meet in other countries. What is your reason for studying English? (p.92)

Since this lesson admires English consistently, the question at the end of this lesson is nothing but a leading question. Besides, the admiration is carried out in English. Therefore, it can be said that this lesson has what Kasuya (2003) calls “a double approval effect”.

The exact same pattern is shown even in a lesson in one of the newest textbooks. “Unit 14: Why Do You Learn English?” in *EXPRESSWAYS Oral Communication II* begins as follows.

In the late 1990's, the prime minister's advisory panel proposed designating English as the second official language of Japan. The pros and cons of this controversial issue are still under heated discussion. (p.64)

And it ends as follows.

Many people in Japan, like elsewhere, need English for work. An

increasing number of Japanese companies are now requiring a certain score on an internationally recognized English examination as a condition of employment and promotion. So why should we learn English? (p. 64)

This kind of quite overt approval to English is also seen in “Lesson 1: English: A Small Beginning” in *PROMINENCE ENGLISH II* whose conclusion is as follows.

English has come a long way from its humble beginning to its present prominence as a global language. It appears that this is not likely to change any time soon. (p.10)

There are a bit more liberal cases which accept varieties of English. However, several kinds of connivance are seen in the following cases. Some lessons such as “Lesson 1: Give Your English a Try” in *Planet Blue English I* and “Lesson 13: Which ‘English’ Do You Speak?” in *Departure Oral Communication I* admire varieties in English. Although such lessons are more liberal than the monolithic view towards English, they still connive at the dominance by English since they don’t admire other languages than English. The opening remarks in “Lesson 13: Which ‘English’ do you speak?” in *Departure Oral Communication I*, essentially has the same ideology as the lessons above.

English is a world language, but it is not monolithic. It varies from country to country or region to region. Let’s perceive English as an international common language which has many “faces”.
(English mine) ⁶⁾

I have mentioned the overt admiration for English so far, including some varieties of English. Let me turn to the covert admiration next. The following lessons don’t admire the dominant position of English overtly, but they connive at the dominant position.

“Lesson 11: Not Mines, but Flowers” in *WORLD TRECK ENGLISH COURSE I* ends with the following sentences.

So don't worry about making mistakes in your English. Sometimes it can be amusing. Mistakes may make people laugh. Enjoy your funny mistakes and learn from them. Laughter is one of the best forms of international communication. (p. 62)

This opinion seems to be correct in a sense. However, since these sentences don't mention the dominant position of English at all, these sentences don't make clear why people worry about making mistakes while using English. People wouldn't worry about making mistakes while using English, if English were not as dominant as it actually is. Therefore, it can be said that the concluding remarks of this lesson ignore a cruel psychological effect (making people worry), which is caused by the dominant position of English.

Some lessons mention multilingual societies. “Lesson1: Dear Friends” in *NEW WORLD ENGLISH COURSE I*, for example, a New Zealander says “I speak two languages, Maori and English.” (p. 15) But most of such lessons don't mention historical backgrounds or social factors which have made the societies multilingual. Since such factors are colonial ones in many cases, ignoring such factors means the connivance at colonialism.

“Lesson 9: How do you say it in English?” in *Captain English Course I* describes the cases in which some people are misunderstood because of Japanese coinages from English. But coinages are almost unavoidable when languages spread, so it is not fair to describe such phenomena without mentioning that they are almost unavoidable.

Probably, the most perverse case is “Episode 16: I Want to Be a Teacher of Japanese.” in *Interact Oral Communication I*. The whole lesson is the following speech given by a Japanese student.

Hello, everyone. Last fall I went to the United States and stayed

with a host family. I also went to high school. In each class I was surprised to find people from so many different backgrounds such as Chinese-Americans and African-Americans. My classmates showed respect to each other. This was a great lesson for me.

This trip to America made me think about my future. I've decided **I would like to teach Japanese abroad**. There are three reasons for my decision. First, my wish is to help people from other countries speak Japanese. Now there are more people studying Japanese in the world. Second, my hope is to teach about Japanese culture. People from other countries know very little about it. Third, I hope I can act as a bridge between Japan and other countries. Very few Japanese people are playing this role. For these reasons I want to be a teacher of Japanese.

In order to be a good teacher, **I'm going to study both Japanese and English and learn about Japanese culture and other cultures as well.** (p. 80)

This student is going to do something quite opposite to his experience in the USA. The people he met there "showed respect to each other" no matter what their backgrounds were. If he had been impressed with such generosity, he should have decided to accept cultures of other countries instead of teaching the Japanese one. I am not criticizing teaching Japanese either in Japan or abroad. I am just saying that teaching his own language and culture is quite opposite to the deeds of the Chinese-Americans and African-Americans he met. It is true that he mentions the importance of "other cultures as well", but he thinks they are important in order only to become a good teacher of Japanese. What is more, the reason why English is important to be a good teacher of Japanese is not mentioned at all. This lesson is nothing but sheer hypocrisy.

There seems to be only one reasonable hypothesis that explains this perverse lesson. The lesson only encourages its learners to look out for interests, although it pretends to be liberal. I can't find any other

hypothesis which can admire studying Japanese unconditionally while appreciating English and foreign cultures exclusively for the purpose of becoming a good Japanese teacher. No other lessons I have ever seen is not as hypocritical as this. This lesson is quite unique in that sense.

It is true that the lessons above are different to one another to some degree. But they are all just approval for the dominance by English (or by Japanese, exceptionally though) with what Kasuya (2003) calls 'an "illusion" that the justification is "natural" and "self-evident".'

1.2. Exceptions

However, there are at least two conscientious lessons on languages. Lesson 4 in *Crown English Series I* is an exception. It contains the following expressions.

There are lots of different languages too. (p.48)

In 1896, however, English was declared the official language, and Hawaiian was no longer taught in schools...Then in the early 1970's, we began to revive our native Hawaiian culture and language. (p.49)

Imagine that English has taken the place of the Japanese language here in Japan...In Japan, too, here is a minority language, just as in Hawaii. The Ainu people have lost much of their language and culture. Today, they are trying to revive their traditions. (p. 52)

In order to make students acquire an egalitarian view, it is necessary to explain them the existence of inequality.

I guess that some people may wonder if it is necessary to imagine how we feel if our native language was replaced by another language in order to acquire an egalitarian view to language. Perhaps not so many people will say that we don't have to pay any attention to minority languages. Still I'm afraid that some may say knowing such

cruel history about languages is not necessary. However, it IS necessary.

The following is a criticism towards ŌNO Tetsuhito who studies the Ainu language in Mashiko (2002b).

I think that this is a satisfactory opinion for a member of a majority group who is concerned with problems with a minority group. Still, even no concludes “We cannot ‘enforce’ the Ainu language on the majority group of Japanese.” If so, “not to enforce the Japanese language on the Ainu people” was also a “realistic” decision. However, a historical fact tells us that “enforcing the Japanese language on the Ainu people was possible”, which means “enforcing the Ainu language on the majority Japanese people was possible, too.” (English mine) ⁷⁾

It is true that English textbooks do not have to propose actual language policies, but they have to describe linguistic issues. For that reason, it is necessary to imagine how the people in minority groups feel about the inequality concerning languages. Paying some attention without thinking about enforcement is not enough. Therefore, it is necessary to imagine how we feel if the Japanese language was replaced by the English language.

“Lesson 6: Easy Japanese” in *Genius English Course I* is the other conscientious lesson. It approves “Easy Japanese”, a simplified version of Japanese for foreigners, for its usefulness. This lesson is basically approvable for its liberal value and for the topic Easy Japanese is quite unique. However, although this lesson is basically conscientious, its conclusion is not approvable since it criticizes multilingualism.

Of course, it’s best to give information in all of the languages spoken in a community. Then we can be sure to advise everyone what to do. But that’s not always possible. During natural disasters, clear communication can make the difference between

life and death. "Easy Japanese" is a big step in this direction. (p. 74)

It must be true that not "all of the languages in a community" are available in most cases. But as Coulmas (2002) makes clear, the necessity of information in a variety of languages was noticed after the 1995 earthquake in Kobe, and the situation has been improved, slowly though.

The 1995 earthquake in Kobe, for example, made it clear to many civil administrators that there is considerable demand for information in a variety of languages (Sanada, 1996). A growing number of municipalities have since taken steps to provide interpretation and translation services in various departments and in other ways moved to recognize the existence of languages other than Japanese. The notion that a democratic society should make allowances for minorities and speakers of other languages is gaining ground, however slowly. (p. 221)

Even if the author of the lesson couldn't find this kind of notion in Coulmas (2002), she or he should be criticized for the lesson's too pessimistic conclusion which can divert learners' attention from the possibility of multilingual information in Japan.

2. Ethnic Culture and Ethnic Minority

2.1. General Tendencies

If we strictly define the term "culture", the definition will be as the one given by Mashiko (2003).

Ways of acts shared by at least two people, and the values concerning the acts. And the kind of acts of human beings which are not programmed innately are products of culture. In a broad interpretation, regional varieties and varieties in groups of

mammals and birds, and systematized communication between human beings and other species can be included. (English mine)⁸⁾

However, since this strict definition includes too many phenomena, I will only deal with ethnic culture (and ethnic minority) in this chapter. (I will deal with gender in chapter 4, which can be called another example of culture.)

Both “Lesson 2: Chili Peppers” in *Tomorrow English Course I* and “Lesson 3: Hot Peppers” in *MILESTONE English Course I* deal with the history of peppers. But neither of them mentions colonialism behind the history.

“Lesson 3: The Hamburger” in *ACORN English Course I* is another too much optimistic case without mentioning colonial backgrounds. The whole lesson is as follows.

Americans eat 35 billion hamburgers a year. You may think the hamburger is an American food. But this fast food comes from many countries.

The name “hamburger” comes from Hamburg, a city in Germany. The hamburger is made of beef, not ham. The idea of grinding meat comes from Turkey.

The pickles are from Eastern Europe.

The word ketchup comes from the Chinese name for sauce.

The bun comes from an English recipe.

Sesame seeds come from the Middle East.

So, the “American” hamburger is truly an international food.

Thank you. (p.22-23)

The examples above describe ethnic culture without mentioning people there. On the contrary, some lessons describe people’s communication such as volunteers working in “developing” countries. “LESSON 11: To Make the Earth a Better Place to Live in” in *PROVISION ENGLISH COURSE I* is a lesson on the First Japanese doctor in

“Medicins Sans Frontieres” (Doctors without Borders). “Lesson 9: The Right machine for the Job” in *SUNSHINE English Course I* advises that overseas aid need to meet actual needs of the people there.

Although what these lessons say is correct, the lessons don't mention why “developing” countries are in need of aid. Colonial backgrounds are ignored in these lessons too.

“Lesson 8: Child Labor in Asia” in *Genius English Course I* is unique in that it deal with what most other lessons don't. But, once again, colonial backgrounds are not described there. So many studies such as Nagashima (1989) explain child labor was a typical phenomenon during the Industrial Revolution in Britain. Therefore, it is clear that even if the current type of child labor seems to be a feature of some of “developing” countries, its historical backgrounds are in the “developed” countries. What is more, this lesson ends with the following paragraph.

But the campaign to stop child labor has started. FIFA has announced a new policy. FIFA's seal on soccer balls guarantees he balls are the correct weight and size. But from now on, it will also guarantee the balls are made under proper working conditions. (p. 100)

Although this campaign is a good tendency, admiring it without mentioning whether child labor doesn't exist anymore may mystify the seriousness of child labor. Whatever the problem the lesson may describe, both who are responsible for the problem and whether the problem is wholly solved or not should be made clear.

All the lessons above are more or less perverted. However, probably the most perverted case, is “Reading 2: Be Strong! Be Proud!” in *Power On English II*. The story of the lesson is as follows.⁹⁾

A Vietnamese boy had his father killed during the Vietnam War. The father told him to be strong and to be proud of his ethnicity when he was dying. Later, the boy came to the United States and was

discriminated because of his ethnicity. But since he helped even the person who discriminated him, he came to be respected at last.

It seems to be necessary to understand “shōgaisha yakuwari” (the role allotted to the handicapped) in order to understand how perverted this story is. According to Ishikawa (1992), “shōgaisha yakuwari” can be defined as follows.

Honestly speaking, the handicapped are expected to act in such ways that rouse people’s love and humanism. Being lovable is the role allotted to the handicapped. The handicapped must play this role in order to make the system work, the system in which the care of the handicapped is carried out by voluntary spirit with love and humanism - of course, this voluntary spirit is roused by the society which requires “the sign of love” of its people -. (English mine)¹⁰

It may seem that racial discrimination is criticized in the lesson titled “Be Strong! Be Proud!”. But the Vietnamese boy was accepted only after he did a good thing. The boy is allotted to the same role as “shōgaisha yakuwari”. This lesson is perverted since it doesn’t criticize the most vicious people. The ideology in this lesson will enforce minorities to overcome discrimination only through their own efforts. It puts minorities in a tough and unfair situation not because it doesn’t criticize discrimination, but because it criticizes discrimination without mentioning the most responsible people.

In other words, “Be Strong! Be Proud!” has exactly the same problem as that of history textbooks in USA. Loewen (1995) analyzes history textbooks in America as follows.

Although textbook authors no longer sugarcoat how slavery affected African Americans, they minimize white complicity in it. They present slavery virtually as uncaused, a tragedy, rather than a wrong perpetrated by some people on others....The emotion

generated by textbook description of slavery is sadness, not anger. For there's no one to be angry at. (p.145)

Just like this analysis, the lesson doesn't mention the essential points such as who killed the boy's father and why the Americans around him discriminated him only because of his ethnicity. The lesson mystifies the cause of the Vietnam War and the whole structure of the racial discrimination in the USA.

2.2. Exceptions

All these lessons are perverse more or less. On the contrary, I have found at least two conscientious lessons. "Lesson 3: Tsugaru-jamisen and the Yoshida Brothers" in *EXCEED English Series I* is a story about the Yoshida brothers (famous performers of a traditional musical instrument). The way that this lesson admires a factor of minority culture (a traditional musical instrument "Tsugaru-jamisen") is conscientious. The lesson ends with the following paragraph.

The Yoshida Brothers have adream to introduce tsugaru-jamisen to the world. Their shiamisen concerts will be held in many places outside Japan in the near future. Something truly Japanese can be 'international'. This will be proved by the brothers soon. (p. 30)

"Lesson 3: Fingers, Chopsticks, or Forks" in *Vivid English Course I* is in sharp contrast to "Lesson 3: Tsugaru-jamisen and the Yoshida Brothers", although it is the other example of the conscientious lessons. This lesson explains that the use of forks for eating meals does not have a long history in Europe as it may seem. It says that Elizabeth I of England and Louis XIV of France ate with their fingers. It also says that even in the 19th century, using forks was thought to be a sign of weakness in the British Navy. So, this lesson dismantles an image of the dominant European culture. It is in this sense that this lesson is in sharp contrast to "Tsugaru-jamisen and the Yoshida Brothers", which

admires a dominated culture.

3. Environment

Those lessons that deal with environment can be classified into two groups. Some lessons appeal to the learners to protect rare species. "Lesson 6: We All Share This World" in *PRO-VISION ENGLISH COURSE I* is one of such lessons. It explains that pandas are going to extinct. And others encourage the learners to do what they can, such as recycling. "Lesson 2: How Green Are You?" in *NEW WORLD ENGLISH COURSE I* is one of such lessons. It tells that we should do what we can do personally, such as turning off TV when we don't watch it and recycling paper.

However, just as many studies such as Higuchi (1981) and Shimizu (1994) make clear, environmental problems contain discriminative structures which make weak people suffer. The problems don't make each person suffer equally. Therefore, identifying environmental problems as protecting rare species and doing what each person can do is nothing but concealing who are the most responsible for environmental problems. (It is true that "Lesson 6: Last Chance" in *NEW STREAM I* describes how much water each region of the earth consumes and how much carbon dioxide each produces, but this rough description is far from analyses of discriminative structures.)

4. Gender

As I mentioned in "What is the point?", the problem in some lessons which deal with gender is "a mixture of two kinds of discrimination, which are sexual and ethnic."

In "Episode 12: I wish I knew the answer" in *Interact Oral Communication I*, Susan, a Westerner, asks Yuji, a Japanese, why women aren't allowed to enter sumo rings, and she says "Isn't that discrimination against women?" at last. (p. 58) It must be true that not

allowing women to enter sumo rings is discrimination against women, but the story that a Westerner mentions the discrimination while a Japanese doesn't recognize the discrimination could inculcate readers with another stereotype, which is that Japanese should overcome sexual discrimination by learning from Westerners and not from other peoples.¹¹⁾

"Lesson3: Gender Stereotypes" in *PRO-VISION ENGLISH COURSE II* criticizes gender stereotypes as follows.

Before World War I, boys wore pink while girls wore blue. Only after World War II did today's connection of the two genders with pink and blue become common. This shows that the ideas about men and women change from era to era.

Even the idea that women should stay in the home as housewives is a recent one. (p. 33-34)

Although this criticism describes a fact, it doesn't mention gender in "developing" countries. This is another kind of "developed" countries-centered view which is not as obvious as the one in Episode 12 in *Interact Oral Communication I*, since this chapter doesn't criticize traditions of "developing" countries. However, its being less obvious doesn't decrease the seriousness of the problem. This lesson still contributes to the spread of the "developed countries"-centered view.

These lessons have the same kind of problem which Nakamura (2002) criticizes as follows.

The number of relationships of men and women is as many as the number of the combinations of men and women. Under that condition, what does it mean to pick up only American cases for comparison? Does it mean that cases in Asia, Africa and Islam can't be models? (English mine)¹²⁾

5. War (Military Invasion, to be precise)

5. 1. General Tendencies

“Lesson 9: The World Is Waiting for You” in *ONE WORLD English Course I* mentions the Gulf War and refugees from Kuwait without mentioning who are responsible for the war. “Lesson 7: Under Atomic Cloud” in *Powwow ENGLISH COURSE II* describes atomic bombs without mentioning who are responsible. Some lessons such as “Lesson9: Beyond Our Limits” in *Voyager English Course II* criticize landmines without mentioning who are responsible.

In short, although war is essentially a political issue, almost all the textbooks describe it only as a tragedy, without mentioning those who are responsible for such actual vicious deeds. In other words, in most of the textbooks, war is described as it were a kind of natural disaster.

The lesson that contains the strongest version of this tendency must be lesson 3 in *NEW COSMOS ENGLISH COURSE I* which describes friendly communication between a Japanese girl in the USA and her classmates during the Second World War. It is a quotation from *Madogiwa-no Totto-chan* written by Kuroyanagi Tetsuko, a famous TV personality.

As Takezawa (1994) makes clear, the Japanese-Americans were treated in vicious ways during the second World War. So even if the TV personality herself was accepted by the American students, such a case is nothing but an exception and should not be generalized.

The following analysis in Nakamura (2002) is quite appropriate.

However, just like other “pacific teaching materials”, only teaching the tragedy of war is not sufficient to overcome the mentality which embraces “peace”. If the materials teach misery without mentioning the causes of each war and how the countries which are responsible for the wars have dealt with their deeds, learners will not be able to understand the causal relationships of wars.

They will feel just “war is tragic”. (English mine)¹³⁾

Besides, The following criticism in Loewen (1999) can also be applied to English textbooks in Japan.

Although it has many words, none say who put it up. In fact, no words tell who did anything; the key verb is in the passive voice. (p. 93)

Probably, as Honda (1984) says, the term “war” itself is inappropriate in order to make clear that war is caused by vicious people. It must be proper to use the term “invasion” instead of “war” in order to make clear who are responsible.

5. 2. An exception

Still, I have to mention that there is a much better case at least in one of the newest textbooks. “Lesson 2: A Voice from Germany” in *NEW LEGEND WNGGLISH II* consists of a speech given by an ex-German president Weizscker including the following part.

In our country, a new generation has grown up to take political responsibility. To be sure, our young people are not responsible for what happened over forty years ago. But they are responsible for the historical results.

We in the older generation owe to young people not the fulfillment of dreams but honesty. We must help younger people to understand why it is necessary to keep memories alive. We want to help them to accept historical truth soberly, not one-sidedly. From our own history we learn what human beings can do. For that reason we must not imagine that we are now quite different and have become better. There is no moral perfection. We have learned as human beings, and as human beings we remain in danger. But we are strong enough to get over such danger again

and again. (p. 141-142)

It seems that this lesson does not describe war just as a tragedy, rather it describes war as a political issue mentioning the responsibility for an actual war. For this reason, it can also be said that this lesson describes war sincerely.

However, there still exists a problem. Since this lesson doesn't explain the meaning of "the postwar responsibility" as detailed as Takahashi (2001), students may not understand the real meaning of "the postwar responsibility". It seems to me that even the ex-German president Weizscker himself didn't understand the meaning .

But as Takahashi (2001) says, the current students should notice the real meaning of "the postwar responsibility" which is even deeper than the speech above. Takahashi (2001) analyzes "the postwar responsibility" as follows.

On the other hand, the expression "the responsibility **caused** by some deeds of the preceding generation of the same group" can be understood as "the postwar responsibility". As far as the wars of aggression and war crimes caused by the Japanese Empire are concerned, the postwar Japan has to deal with a series of the war crimes as the judicial and political successor of the Japanese Empire by means of reparations, compensations, official apologies and the punishments of the people in charge of the war crimes. All these issues must be carried out by the Japanese government, however, since the government carries out the issues as the judicial and political representative of the Japanese people, the Japanese people are responsible for whether the government carries out them or not. It means that the Japanese people must take "the postwar responsibility" as sovereigns if the Japanese government takes "the post war responsibility". In this sense, it can be said that the postwar Japanese people also take "the responsibility **caused** by some deeds of the preceding generation

of the same group” almost “automatically”. (English mine)¹⁴⁾

Compared to this definition of “the postwar responsibility”, the speech seems to have underestimated the responsibility. Weizscker seems to think that all the young people have to do is to learn from history and not to make the same mistake. He doesn't seem to understand that the younger people bear responsibility not only for preventing another tragedy in the future but also for making the government deal with the war crimes in the past. For this reason, “Lesson 2: A Voice from Germany” should be evaluated as follows. Although its theme is quite sincere, the way it describes the theme is not deep enough.

6. Handicapped people

6. 1. General Tendencies

In order to understand the way that people describe handicapped people is unfair, we need to understand “shōgaisha yakuwari” (the role allotted to the handicapped). “Being lovable is the role allotted to the handicapped”, as I already said. The following remark by Matsunami (2003) makes clear the role's effect.

The function of “shōgaisha yakuwari” suits the convenience of the people without handicaps. Because they can be free from their covert mentalities such as hating the handicapped and feeling guilty because of the hatred, as far as they project this image which tells “how handicapped people should be” to actually handicapped people. When people without handicaps see the handicapped who don't suit the image, they will feel bad or feel sympathy for a moment, but they forget such people soon. Those handicapped people who act as “shōgaisha yakuwari” will be accepted and those handicapped people who don't (or can't) will be criticized or ignored. Some handicapped people give up acting

as they want since they expect how people without handicaps will think when they act as they want. In short, “shōgaisha yakuwari” is a mirror which reflects the asymmetric social relationship, since it is a projection of what people without handicaps want the handicapped to be. (English mine)¹⁵⁾

“Lesson 8: The Dreams of a Blind Gold Medalist” in *PROMINENCE ENGLISH I* is a story about a blind person who won a gold medal in the Paralympics. “Lesson 10: No One’s Perfect” in *Power On English I* consists of a book written by OTOTAKE Hirota, a famous handicapped person. In such lessons, it is clear that “shōgaisha yakuwari” is allotted to the handicapped.

“Lesson 5: Look at the Person I Am Inside” in *POLESTAR English Course I* is an interview with a girl who has cerebral palsy. In the end the girl asks

G: How would you make the world more disabled-friendly? What role do you want to play when you grow up?

T: I want to make the world aware that not all people are the same. The disabled need help. People must start caring for others. I also want the disabled to have more chances in life. I want to give them the right to work and live as normally as possible.

G: What is your greatest wish?

T: I want people to look beyond my disability and look at the person I am inside. (p. 51)

It is true that I admit that this interview is worth reading, but I will not say this story is totally admirable. This lesson describes a situation in which the girl herself needs to appeal to others to change their minds. Although such a situation should be improved by those without handicaps before the girl mentions, this lesson doesn’t describe as such. In this lesson, people’s lack of understanding towards the girl is not criticized, for the girl only asks them to change their minds. So this

lesson is problematic to some extent, even though it's much more conscientious than the ones above.

6. 2. An Exception

Still, I have to admit that "Lesson 2: I need a Sign" in *NEW English PAL II* deals with several types of signs necessary for the handicapped to walk around. It ends with the following remarks.

Signs are understood easily by people all over the world. They are a kind of international language. Don't you think it is wonderful that we can understand signs? We can communicate across language and culture. (p. 16)

This lesson is conscientious since it deals with a social system (signs) for handicapped people. Besides it is quite liberal in that it interprets such signs not as quite special but as "a kind of international language".

Therefore, it is true that not all the lessons that deal with handicapped people are rife with the ideology of "shōgaisha yakuwari". However, "Lesson 2: I need a Sign" is nothing but an exception, since all the other lessons I have seen are rife with the ideology of "shōgaisha yakuwari".

7. Conclusion -with a hypothesis concerning nationalism-

As I said in "What is the point?", it must be appropriate now, to conclude that "although many lessons in English textbooks in Japan describe so many kinds of social issues, almost all such lessons have approval to inequalities in common" (even though there are some exceptions). It must be clear that this tendency seems to be quite common in the current English textbooks.

On the other hand, I said as follows in Kobayashi (2003).

In the analysis of textbooks in the future, it will be necessary to

make clear the history of thoughts, with some comparisons of textbooks in Japan and ones in foreign countries. (English mine)¹⁶⁾

So far, however, I haven't read any English textbooks in foreign countries. Still, I have read some books on the histories of some ideologies in Japan such as nationalism and a less number of books on English textbooks. So I can show a hypothesis which can explain some backgrounds of the current tendency of English textbooks in Japan.

In my view, the current type of nationalism must be a cause of the current view towards English, which means that the ideologies analyzed in this thesis are connected to the current type of nationalism.

First, I will show that some ideologies in English textbooks in the past were connected to the old-fashioned nationalism. For example, the chapter 2 in Kataoka (1987) studies three English textbooks published in 1980. And it concludes that 33 percent of the names of nations and places are those of the United States and 18 percent of them are those of the United Kingdom. (p. 139)

In addition to this, Inamura (1986) admits that the title Jack and Betty was given in order to make its learners to feel as if they were Jack and Betty, not Japanese students studying English. (p.125) It also admits that New Prince, one of the titles of old English textbooks, was named for the birth of a prince in Japan. (p.227) So, as Nakamura (2002) says, it can be said that "tenno Makkasa neitivu supika-toyu kozo-wa nihonjin-ni totte-no ego-no imi-o kite shitekita" (the structure composed of the emperor, MacArthur and native English speakers has fixed the meaning of English for the Japanese people). (p. 48)

This kind of mixture of the admiration for Western countries and the admiration for the emperor is a typical feature of old-fashioned nationalism. Nationalism used to be closely connected to some identical and ideological core such as the emperor or the imperial household system. And such old-fashioned nationalism was a result of the inferiority complex towards Western countries. As Fukuma (2003) says, " 'nihon' -no sono tokidokino zo-wa, tsune-ni 'seyo' -ni mukerare,

'seyō' -ni yoru shōnin-o hosshiteita mono-to ieyō" (it can be said that the image of 'Japan' was always directed towards 'the Occident' and needed to be approved by the Occident'). (p. 367)

On the contrary, it must be probable that nationalism in Japan has lost its ideological core which used to be the emperor or the imperial household system. As Oguma and Ueno (2003) tells that most of the young members in "Fumi-no kai", a group of conservative activists, long for their identity and want to be admitted as "futsū-no hito" (ordinary people).

They are eager for the proof of being ordinary. (English mine)¹⁷⁾

In short, just like "silent conservative citizens", they don't have the core of their own identity. What they have in their minds is the intention to find the core. (English mine)¹⁸⁾

In other words, the new type of nationalism is a loose type of nationalism. According to the terms in Takahashi (2003), it can be called "hito-ni yasashi" (human-friendly) "chikyū-ni yasashi" (earth-friendly) nationalism (p. 109), although it just SEEMS to be human-friendly and earth-friendly.

This kind of nationalism doesn't despise or ignore "developing" countries overtly. It doesn't admire the dominance by Japan overtly either. But it approves inequality rather covertly.

Therefore, the approval to inequalities, which is seen in many of the current English textbooks, may be one of the phases of the current type of nationalism, which is eager for the core of its own identity. And the kind of nationalism may be produced by the current (not necessarily actual, sometimes imaginary) relationships between Japan and other countries.

I think I have to admit that this idea is only a hypothesis and it hasn't been proven yet, since I have searched only several books on ideologies in Japan and even fewer books on English textbooks in

Japan. Therefore I would like to study thoughts in Japan in more detail, and compare them with those in other countries. Still, however, this hypothesis seems to be plausible to some extent, since it is supported by several studies of both old-fashioned and current nationalism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Sources

- ACORN English Course I*, (2002), KEIRINKAN.
Captain English Course I, (2002), TAISHUKAN.
Crown English Series I, (2002), SANSEIDO.
Departure Oral Communication I, (2002), TAISHUKAN.
EXCEED English Series I, (2002), SANSEIDO.
EXPRESSWAYS Oral Communication II, (2003), KAIRYUDO.
Genius English Course I, (2002), TAISHUKAN.
Interact Oral Communication I, (2002), KIRIHARA SHOTEN.
LIVING ENCOUNTER ORAL COMMUNICATION I, (2002), SHUBUNKAN.
MILESTONE English Course I, (2002), KEIRINKAN.
NEW COSMOS ENGLISH COURSE I, (2002), SANYUSHA.
NEW English PAL II, (2003), KIRIHARA SHOTEN.
NEW LEGEND ENGLISH II, (2003), KAITAKUSHA.
NEW STREAM I, (2002), ZOSHINDO.
NEW WORLD ENGLISH COURSE I, (2002), SANYUSHA.
ONE WORLD English Course I, (2002), KYOIKU SHUPPAN.
Planet Blue English I, (2002), Obunsha.
POLESTAR English Course I, (2002), SUKEN SHUPPAN.
Power On English I, (2002), TOKYO SHOSEKI.
Power On English II, (2003), TOKYO SHOSEKI.
Powwow ENGLISH COURSE II, (2003), BUN-EIDO.
PROMINENCE ENGLISH I, (2002), TOKYO SHOSEKI.
PROMINENCE ENGLISH II, (2003), TOKYO SHOSEKI.
PRO-VISION ENGLISH COURSE I, (2002), KIRIHARA SHOTEN.
PRO-VISION ENGLISH COURSE II, (2003), KIRIHARA SHOTEN.
Tomorrow English Course I, (2002), KEIRINKAN.
Vivid English Course I, (2002), Daiichi Gakushusha.
Voyager English Course II, (2003), Daiichi Gakushusha.
WORLD TRECK ENGLISH COURSE I, (2002), KIRIHARA SHOTEN.

2. Secondary Sources

- Bourdieu, P.(1991) *LANGUAGE & SYMBOLIC POWER*, Harvard University

- Press.
- Coulmas, Florian. (2002) "Language Policy in Modern Japanese Education", in *LANGUAGE POLICIES IN EDUCATION*, LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES, PUBLISHERS.
- Howarth, David. (2000) *DISCOURSE*, Open University Press.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984) *A History of English Language Teaching*, Oxford University Press.
- Kaiser, Stefan. (2003) "Language and script in Japan and other East Asian countries: Between insularity and technology", in *Languages in a Globalising World*, Cambridge University Press.
- KOBAYASHI, M. (2002) "Ideologies in English textbooks in Japan - on language, culture and ethnicity -" in *SEIJO ENGLISH STUDIES No. 26*, THE ENGLISH LITERARY SOCIETY OF SEIJO.
- Loewen, J. W. (1995) *LIES MY TEACHER TOLD ME*, TOUCHSTONE.
- Loewen, J. W. (1999) *LIES ACROSS AMERICA*, TOUCHSTONE.
- Matsubara, K. (2000) *Indigenous Languages Revitalized?*, Shumpusha.
- Norton, B. (2000) *IDENTITY AND LANGUAGE LEARNING*, Pearson Education Limited.
- OKUDA, O. (1998) "On the Objects of Linguistic Research on the Ainu", in *Studies in Endangered Languages*, Hituzi Syobo.
- SAWAI, H. (1998) "The Present Situation of the Ainu Language", in *Studies in Endangered Languages*, Hituzi Syobo.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (2001) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, SAGE Publications.
- アップル、マイケル・ウォルフォード、ジェフリー・おおた=なおこ (大田直子)・くろさき=いさお (黒崎勲) (2003) 『多元化社会の公教育』同時代社。
- あま=としまろ (阿満利磨) (1994) 『国家主義を超える』講談社。
- いけだ=きよひこ (池田清彦) (1998) 『正しく生きるとはどういうことか』新潮社。
- いしかわ=じゅん (石川准) (1992) 『アイデンティティ・ゲーム』新評論。
- いしかわ=じゅん・くらもと=ともあき (石川准・倉本智明) (2002) 『障害学の主張』明石書店。
- いなむら=まつお (稲村松雄) (1986) 『教科書中心 昭和英語教育史』開隆堂。
- うえずぎ=さとし (上杉聰) 編著 (2000) 『脱戦争論』東方出版。
- おか=まり (岡真理) (1998) 『「同じ女」であるとは何を意味するのか-フェミニズムの脱構築に向けて-』(えばら=ゆみこ (江原由美子) 編『フェミニズムの主張 4-性・暴力・ネーション』勁草書房収録)。
- おぐま=えいじ (小熊英二)・うえの=ようこ (上野陽子) (2003) 『<癒し>

- のナショナリズム』慶應義塾大学出版会。
- おざき=としあき(小篠敏明)・なかむら=よしと(中村愛人)(2001)『明治・大正・昭和初期の英語教科書に関する研究』溪水社。
- かいざわ=ただし(貝澤正)(1993)『アイヌ わが人生』岩波書店。
- かすや=けいすけ(糟谷啓介)(2003)『言語と権力』(みやじま=たかし(宮島喬)・いしい=ようじろう(石井洋二郎)編『文化の権力』藤原書店収録)。
- かたおか=とくお(片岡徳雄)(1987)編著『教科書の社会的分析』福村出版。
- かとう=しゅういち(加藤周一)・ほんじんかい(凡人会)(1999)『「戦争と知識人」を読む』青木書店。
- かねこ=まさる(金子勝)・こだま=たつひこ(児玉龍彦)(2004)『逆システム学』岩波新書。
- かりや=たけひこ(苅谷剛彦)(2003)『なぜ教育論争は不毛なのか』中公新書ラクレ。
- こさかい=としあき(小坂井敏晶)(2002)『民族という虚構』東京大学出版。
- こしば=まさこ(小柴昌子)(2000)『戦争と教科書——国民総マインド・コントロールの謎——』かもがわブックレット。
- ごとう=むねと(後藤敏人)(2003)『昭和天皇と筋現代日本』吉川弘文館。
- こばやし=まさひこ(小林真彦)(2001)『英語教科書に見られる言語・文化・民族観』(『社会言語学 I』「社会言語学」刊行会)収録。
- こばやし=まさひこ(小林真彦)(2003)『最新版高校英語教科書にみるイデオロギー』(『社会言語学 III』「社会言語学」刊行会)収録。
- こやす=のぶくに(子安宣邦)(2003)『「アジア」はどう語られてきたか』藤原書店。
- さとう=くみこ(佐藤久美子)(2003)『発生が想定される東海地震の災害情報』名古屋大学大学院国際開発研究科修士論文。
- さとう=たくみ(佐藤卓己)篇(2003)『戦後世論のメディア社会学』柏書房。
- しみず=しゅうじ(清水修二)(1994)『差別としての原子力』リベルタ出版。
- シルバープラット、アートほか(2001)『メディア・リテラシーの方法』リベルタ出版。
- スティグリッツ、ジョセフ=E(2002)『世界を不幸にしたグローバリズムの正体』徳間書店。
- たかはし=てつや(高橋哲哉)(2001)『歴史／修正主義』岩波書店。
- たかはし=てつや(高橋哲哉)(2003)『「心」と戦争』晶文社。
- たけざわ=やすこ(竹沢泰子)(1994)『日系アメリカ人のエスニシティ』東京大学出版会。
- たていわ=しんや(立岩真也)(2000)『弱くある自由へ』青土社。
- たていわ=しんや(立岩真也)(2004)『自由の平等』岩波書店。
- トッド、エマニュエル(2003)『帝国以後』藤原書店。
- ながしま=しんいち(長島伸一)(1989)『大英帝国』講談社現代新書。

なかね=みつとし(中根光敏)・のむら=こうや(野村浩也)・かわぐち=かずや(河口和也)・かりや=あゆみ(狩谷あゆみ)(2003)『社会学に正解はない』松籟社。

なかむら=きくじ(中村起久二)(1992)『教科書の社会史——明治維新から敗戦まで——』岩波新書。

なかむら=けい(中村敬)(2001)「英語教科書の1世紀(1)」(『成城文芸173号』成城大学文芸学部)収録。

なかむら=けい(中村敬)(2002)「英語教科書の1世紀(2)」(『成城文芸177号』成城大学文芸学部)収録。

なかむら=けい(中村敬)(2003)「E.A.ネプリハが提起する『英語問題』の本質」(はやし=こうじ(林康次)編著『アメリカ帝国と多文化社会のあいだ』開文社出版収録)。

なかむら=まきお(中村満紀男)・あらかわ=さとし(荒川智)(2003)『障害児教育の歴史』明石書店。

のろ=かよこ(2001)「クリティカル・ディスコース・アナリシス」のろ=かよこ(野呂香代子)・やました=ひとし(山下仁)編著『「正さ」への問い』三元社。

ひぐち=けんじ(樋口健二)(1981)『闇に消される原発被曝者』三一書房。

ひらた=むねふみ(平田宗史)(1991)『教科書でつづる近代日本教育制度史』北大路書房。

ひろた=てるゆき(広田照幸)(2003)『教育には何ができないか』春秋社。

ふくま=よしあき(福岡良明)(2003)『辺境に映る日本』柏書房。

ベフ、ハルミ(1997)『増補改訂版イデオロギーとしての日本文化論』思想の科学社。

ほりべ=ひでお(堀部秀雄)(2002)『英語観を問う』溪水社。

ほんだ=かついち(本多勝一)(1984)「「戦争」というマスコミ用語にだまされてはいけない」(『事実とは何か』朝日文庫収録)。

ましこ=ひでのり(2002a)『日本人という自画像』三元社。

ましこ=ひでのり(2002b)『ことばの政治社会学』三元社。

ましこ=ひでのり(2003a)「科学の対象としての文化・再考:文化の社会学序説」(『文化科学研究14巻2号』中京大学文化科学研究所)収録。

ましこ=ひでのり(2003b)『増補新版イデオロギーとしての「日本」』三元社。

まつなみ=めぐみ(松波めぐみ)(2003)「「障害者問題を扱う人権啓発」再考——「個人-社会モデル」「障害者役割」を手がかりとして——」(『部落解放研究』151号)社団法人部落解放・人権研究所)収録。

<http://www.arsvi.com/2000/030425mm.htm>

もぎ=としひこ(茂木俊彦)(2003)『障害は個性か』大月書店。

やまだ=ゆういちろう(山田雄一郎)(2003)『言語政策としての英語教育』溪水社。

ユン=コオンチャ(尹健次)(1987)『異質との共存』岩波書店。

Note

- 1) I have to admit that, in Kobayashi (2003), I supported a kind of laissez-faire described in Ikeda (1998). It seems to me now that, just like some theses such as Tateiwa (2000, 2004) and Kaneko and Kodama (2004) describe, human rights cannot be protected without highly systematic mechanism. However, although the practicable way to protect human rights is not as simple as I imagined in Kobayashi (2003), the point made clear in Kobayashi (2003), which was that many English textbooks in Japan had approval to inequalities, seems correct even now. I will show it in this thesis.
- 2) CDAの研究目的は、潜在化しているイデオロギーを顕在化させること、その弊害を取り除くことであり、まさにその点で社会言語学批判が行われているのである。(p. 25)
- 3) 支配言語の正統性は、そもそも支配言語自体によって確立されねばならない。ここには二重の承認の作用が重なりあっている。つまり、支配言語による発話の承認を通じて、「X語」という支配言語全体の表象の正統性が承認されるのである。(中略)
しかし、いかに正統言語の権威であったとしても、永久に沈黙のドクサにとどまっているわけにはいかない。権威の表象は間歇的に更新・充填されなければならない。とくに、異なる言語的正統性が台頭し、既存の正統言語の権威をおびやかすときには、支配言語の正統性をことさらに言挙げして、言語資本の更新と充填をはからなければならない。ただし、その際には、正統性が「自然」で「自明」なものであるような「錯認」をつくりあげねばならない。(p. 156 - 157)
- 4) What is more, we need to be careful when we admire minorities. Excessively fixed views toward minorities may torment them, although admirations can also help them to be proud of themselves. Kosakai (2002) explains as follows.

The kind of society is admirable in which all the citizens can autonomously accept changes caused by being affected by other cultures and assimilation. It is getting things backwards to take some actions which prevent changes in each person's values in order to protect minorities...

We must protect minorities. But the ways to protect them should not be directed to segregation. It may be true that some ideas given by multiculturalism are useful in order to change the generally accepted misunderstanding that Japan is a homogeneous society. I admire the sincere spirit which is heading to the coexistence of multiple ethnicity and cultures. But we should not fall into the problem in the ideas ...

We cannot eliminate "foreigners", but it is not because there are limits in accepting other cultures or assimilation. Any cultural factors including lan-

guages, religions, morals and families change in the course of time. There is no essence in ethnicity or culture. We need to accept ethnicity and culture not as fixed values but as social phenomena which have always been changing through assimilations. (English mine)

出身を問わず市民全体が異文化受容や同化による変化を自発的に受け入れられるような社会が好ましい。少数派を擁護しようとするばかりに、各自の価値観が変化しないような措置を図るのでは本末転倒だと言わなければならない。(中略)

少数派は擁護されねばならない。しかしその方策は彼らを分離する方向で考えるべきではない。確かに、日本を単一民族社会だとする妄想が根強く残る現況を思えば、社会常識を変革する戦術として、多民族・多文化主義の主張が一応の有効性を持つかもしれない。複数の民族や文化の共存を真摯に願う精神は評価しよう。しかしそこに待ち受けている罅を見落としてはならない。(中略)

「異人」の消滅が不可能なのは異文化受容や同化に限界があるからではない。言語・宗教・道徳価値・家族観などを始め、どんな文化要素でも時間と共に必ず変化してゆく。民族や文化に本質はない。固定した内容としてではなく、同一化という運動により絶え間なく維持される社会現象として民族や文化を捉えなければならない。(p. 189-191)

- 5) 地球はますます小さくなり、世界のあちこちに簡単に移動ができ、また、簡単に連絡が取れるようになってきました。世界語としての英語の役割は一層高まっています。(p. 91)
- 6) 英語は国際共通語ですが、決して単一なものではありません。使われている国や地域によって、いろいろな英語があります。多様な「顔」をもつ国際共通語としての英語に触れましょう。(p. 72)
- 7) 少数民族問題にかかわる多数派の発言としては申し分ない見解だとも思う。その大野にして、「和人にアイヌ語を『強制』することはできない」と断定してしまう。それなら「アイヌ民族に日本語を『強制』することはできない」も同様に<現実主義>的な判断だったはずである。しかし、歴史的現実「アイヌ民族に日本語を『強制』することはできた」のであり、それをうらがえせば「和人にアイヌ語を『強制』することはできる」はずだ。(p.138)
- 8) 2人以上の人物が共有する行動様式、およびそれにとまなう価値観。ヒトの行動のうち、生得的にプログラミングされている様式以外は、この「文化」の産物。拡張解釈することで、ホ乳類や鳥類の地域差・集団差、ヒトとほかの種の体系化された意思疎通なども、これにふくめてもよい。(p. 19)
- 9) It is true that this lesson starts with the Vietnam War, but it mainly describes racial discrimination. Therefore, I will analyze it in chapter 2, not in chapter 5.
- 10) はっきり言おう。障害者には、愛やヒューマニズムを喚起し触発するよ

うにふるまうことが期待されている。愛らしく (lovable) あること、これが障害者役割である。障害者のケアは愛やヒューマニズムにあふれた人々の自発的な善意——もちろんこの自発性は社会が人々に「愛の証」を要求することで促されたものだ——によって行なうというシステムを回していくには、障害者は与えられたこの役割を演じなければならないのである。(p. 118)

- 11) As chapter 2 in Ama (1994) points out, it is probable that excluding women is not a consistent tendency in Japan. However, whether it is a consistent tendency or not is not the point here. The point here is the structure of the discourse in which a Westerner teaches an anti-sexist view to a Japanese.
- 12) 男女の関係性は、男女の組み合わせの数だけ存在する。そのような状況でアメリカだけを比較の対象とするのはどういうわけか。アジア、アフリカ、あるいはイスラムではとてもモデルにはなり得ないということだろうか。(p. 39)
- 13) しかし、大部分の「平和教材」がそうであるように、戦争の悲惨さを伝えるところでとまってしまっただけでは、「平和」を抱きしめる心性を乗り越えることができない。「平和」は抱きしめるだけでは実現しないのである。それぞれの戦争が何故起こったのか、そしてその始末をどのように（当事国は）つけたのか——、その点を素通りして悲惨さだけを伝えても、その戦争の因果関係は少しも学習によって内面化されない。ただただ、「戦争は悲惨」という思いだけが残る。(p. 36)
- 14) 他方、「自分に先行する世代の同胞の行為から生じた責任」という表現は、「戦後責任」という意味にも理解できる。大日本帝国が国家行為として行なった侵略戦争と其中でなされた戦争犯罪については、賠償・補償、公式謝罪、責任者処罰といった一連の戦後処理を果たすことが、大日本帝国の法的・政治的継承者である戦後日本国家に課せられる。これらの戦後処理を実際に行なうのは戦後日本政府であるが、政府はこれを国民の法的・政治的代表者として行なうのであり、政府がこれを実行するかいなか、最終的には日本国家の政治的主権者である日本国民の責任に帰着する。日本国家が「戦後責任」を負うとは、国家の主権者である日本国民が「戦後責任」を負うことにほかならない。この意味でなら、戦後世代の日本国民も、「自分に先行する世代の同胞の行為から生じた責任」すなわち「戦後責任」を、ほぼ「自動的に」負うと言うこともできるだろう。(p. 11)
- 15) 「障害者役割」は健常者に都合よく機能する。なぜならこのような「あるべき像」を障害者に投影している限りは、内心ひそかに持つ障害者嫌悪の感情や、それに伴う罪悪感（後ろめたさ）を忘れることができるからだ。その像にあてはまらない障害者の姿が偶然目に入った時は、一瞬嫌悪や同情を感じるが、すぐに忘れてしまう。障害者の側からすると、「障害者役割」に適合的なふるまいをすれば受け入れられ、そうでない時は——ある

いはそもそも健常者の期待に沿いようがない人は——非難あるいは無視される。また、健常者のまなざしを予期して、自由な言動をあきらめてしまう障害者もいる。つまり「障害者役割」とは、健常者が障害者に「こうあってほしい」と望み、それが投影されたものであるから、まさに非対称な社会関係を映し出す鏡といえる。(p.51)

- 16) 今後の教科書分析においては、外国との比較もまじえうえて、思想史的な側面から背景をあきらかにすることが必要となろう。(p. 72)
- 17) 彼らは、自分を「普通」とであると立証してもらうことに、飢えているのである。(p. 197)
- 18) つまるところ、彼らは「サイレント保守市民」と同じく、アイデンティティの核になるものを持っていない。彼らにあるのは、核を探したいという志向である。(p. 206)