

ASPECTS OF JAPAN'S RECENT RELATIONS WITH ASIA

Dr John Weste, University of Durham:

'Britain, Japan and South-East Asia in the 1950s:
Anglo-Japanese Economic Relations in the De-colonising Empire'

Mutsumi Hirano, London School of Economics:

'Revisiting the 1980s Textbook Issue in Japan: Reactions in China,
South Korea and other Asian Countries'

Professor Kenji Tozawa, Ehime University:

'Japan and India: Religion-based Parties coming into Government
in the 1990s'

Discussion Paper
No. IS/00/403
November 2000

The Suntory Centre
Suntory and Toyota International Centres
for Economics and Related Disciplines
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
Tel.: 020-7405 7686

Preface

A symposium was held in the Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD) on 27 October 2000 in order to discuss some aspects of Japan's many-sided relations with Asia during the last fifty years.

The speakers were Dr John Weste, Department of East Asian Studies, University of Durham; Miss Mutsumi Hirano, Ph.D. candidate, Department of International Relations, London School of Economics; and Professor Kenji Tozawa, a visitor at STICERD during the session 1999-2000 and secretary of the Indo-Japanese Friendship Society. The Centres are grateful to them for agreeing to the publication of their papers.

November 2000

Abstracts

(Weste paper): deals with Japan's return to trading with the countries of Southeast Asia in the early 1950s and the responses of the United States and British governments.

(Hirano paper): provides an overall picture of the Japanese history textbook disputes with China and South Korea in 1982 and 1986, and the repercussions of these diplomatic rows in Asia and beyond. The paper also sheds light on the internal discussion of these topics in the Japanese Diet and in government circles.

(Tozawa paper): deals with the phenomenon of religious-based parties in India and Japan joining coalition governments in the 1990s. In India, the religious-based party, Bharatiya Janata party, formed (with allies) the government in 1998. In Japan the religious-based party, Komeito, joined the coalition government led by the Liberal-Democratic party in 1999.

Keywords: history; international relations; export trade (Japan); Japan; Malaya; Singapore; Great Britain; China; South Korea; Asia; India; United States; Indian National Congress; Bharatiya Janata party; Komeito; Soka Gakkai; Liberal-Democratic party; religion; Buddhism; Hinduism; religion-based party; coalition government.

© by the authors. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Britain, Japan and South-East Asia in the 1950s Anglo-Japanese Economic Relations in the De-colonising Empire

John Weste

In October 1948, for the benefit of the annual Conservative Party conference, Winston Churchill spoke assuredly of the 'Three Circles' upon which Britain's future as a world power was based: British links with the circle of Commonwealth and Empire; the circle of the English-speaking dominions, Great Britain and the United States; and the circle of a United Europe purportedly reinforcing British might in the remaining two. Indeed, if one were to envision the three interlocking circles, it would become immediately apparent that Britain was 'the only country which has a great part in every one of them'.¹ While not equal to the Superpowers, the United Kingdom's global interests would at least partially compensate for diminished capabilities. With Churchill's return to power in 1951, this concept was installed as the basis of the Conservative government's foreign policy and even used in the publicity of diplomatic missions.² Equally, given this almost celestial self-appointment as 'the very point of junction'³ it was inevitable that the impact of Japanese economic resurgence and trade would also have to be faced in each circle.

The relationship between the British and Japanese home islands themselves was thus embedded in the needs and direction of the recovering Japanese economy over the 1950s, in British connexions with Empire and Commonwealth (English-speaking or otherwise), and in the crucial relationship with the United States. The 1950s saw the return of Japanese sovereignty, the Cold War entrenched in East and South-East Asia, and the subsequent increased American involvement in the region. In the Far East, Britain attempted to utilise Washington's financial might in the regional struggle against communism and to prolong London's indirect political influence over the de-colonising South-East Asian members of the Commonwealth. The question of Japan's future economic security, social stability and continued alliance with the capitalist bloc was intimately linked to all these concerns, in which the stance of the United Kingdom was of crucial importance. The purpose of the present paper is to look more closely at Anglo-Japanese economic relations in the context of these broader considerations.

British perceptions of the challenges, threats or even the opportunities posed by the Japanese economy transcend any one period of modern Anglo-Japanese relations. Images of cheap labour and sweatshops were evoked by inter-war Lancashire in response to the perceived unfairness of Japanese competition. Similarly, opinions in the late 1960s, and especially the 1970s and 1980s, saw the sweat shops of the 1930s merged with the war-time Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere to depict a new economic animal: a Japan at war with the West with the *sarariman* (salaryman) as the modern-day incarnation of the Imperial Japanese Army.⁴ Such perceptions have their resonances in the 1950s as well, and doubtless played a part in the history of 1950s economic and trading relations between Great Britain, the sterling area and Japan. It is vital, however, to locate these relations in a more strategic context.

For much of the 1950s, the existence of British imperial possessions and the Commonwealth in South-East Asia was held to be indispensable to a continued global role for Britain in an international environment dominated by the two superpowers. Although post-war American pre-eminence, the Cold War, anti-colonialism and relative British decline ultimately ensured the failure of such policies, this was not at all clear in the early 1950s. Whilst aware of complexities and potential damage from Japanese trade, UK officials saw a guided Japanese economic return to the South-East Asian region as a means of promoting local economic development. In turn, this measure would more tightly link both Japan and British possessions to the capitalist bloc in the crusade against communism. This decision was made in full knowledge of the long history of Anglo-Japanese trade friction.

In this sense, the division between the priorities of the British government and those of British exporters, many of whom were involved with textiles, is clear. The government steadfastly insisted the textile sector stoically accept its diminished position in the order of international trade. As a result, British business was often puce with rage over official policy regarding Japan. Its representatives, such as the Chairman of the Cotton Board, Sir Raymond Streat, regularly reached back to pre-war times to find evidence to support their views regarding a renewed Japanese trading threat to Great Britain. However, while war-time imagery and Japanese atrocities could stir up a useful hysteria, and doubtlessly reinforced many

perceptions with regard to Japan, they were not an essential component of the business case against expanded Japanese trade. Furthermore, despite the aforementioned division, business was not entirely without successes in seeking to apply political pressure to define the form of Anglo-Japanese trading relations. For example, pressure from the British textile sector was important in stimulating London's opposition to Japan's entry into GATT until 1955; even then, the United Kingdom still saw fit to deny Japan most-favoured-nation status.

Also of significance to British policy was Japan's close relationship with the United States in the context of the Cold War, as well as London's own treasured version of an American alliance. The United Kingdom could not but pay a great deal of attention to American policy for East and South-East Asia. The British Embassy in Washington, sensitive to American criticism of the sterling bloc and colonial policy, was witness to many complaints that the UK was squeezing Japan out of South-East Asia. The feared effect was a Japanese return to pre-war patterns of trade with Northeast Asia, a region controlled by communist powers.⁵ Concern over the interests of the more powerful American partner was always apparent. Of equal importance, however, was the simple fact that British trading actions vis-à-vis Japan and South-East Asia were held to be of vital significance to American policy success.

American officials in occupied Japan, such as Kenneth Morrow of SCAP's (Supreme Commander of Allied Powers)⁶ Economic and Scientific Section, vigorously promoted South-East Asia as a key source of raw materials for Japanese manufacturers and a logical market for the resultant products. Anything less would harm Japanese potential as the 'Workshop of Asia'. The 1950s also saw the initial interest of certain Japanese businessmen and bureaucrats in developing a South-East Asian supply base and market. It is apparent that Japan's reparations programme informed this early concern for South-East Asian economic development, but the anticipated economic and political returns of co-operating with United States anti-communist policy in the Far East were no doubt also a factor.

However important, inevitably the South-East Asian connexion did not represent the sum total of Anglo-Japanese economic relations, particularly in the context of the retreat from empire in the latter half of the 1950s. As the decade progressed, Anglo-

Japanese trade expanded to cover a broad variety of goods, ranging from glassware, iron and steel to nuclear technology and jet engines. Nonetheless, in the earlier part of the 1950s, the priorities in the Anglo-Japanese bilateral relation were in many ways set by the South-East Asian and colonial dimension. Furthermore, the balance of UK-Japanese economic relations in the 1950s, particularly in the arena of South-East Asia, neatly demonstrates the many complications Britain faced in re-establishing its international standing, power and prestige. The 1941-45 Far Eastern military conflict had ensured America's succession as the dominant Western power in East Asia as well as the on-going search of indigenous peoples for independence from the ties of empire. It will be shown how, increasingly over the 1950s, within the de-colonising empire in South-East Asia the pattern of Anglo-Japanese business and trading relations confirmed these realities politically and economically.

i) Anglo-Japanese Trading Relations and South-East Asia

Numerous studies have examined the US-Japanese relationship in the context of the Cold War in Asia.⁷ Their focus lies on American support for the 'Workshop of Asia' and its sponsorship of a Japanese economy re-directed away from Northeast to South-East Asia as a source of raw materials and a market for Japan's manufactures. This approach, however, neglects the fact that Britain retained considerable economic and political influence in South-East Asia, and not merely within the formal empire. Recent scholarship emphasises the vitality of British policy initiatives and regional planning to combat the Cold War in Asia. American weight behind Japan was crucial, but equally so was London's attitude towards a re-invigorated Japanese economic presence in South East Asia.⁸ As the British Embassy in Thailand correctly observed to the foreign secretary, Anthony Eden, Japan's attempts to develop its export market in South-East Asia relied much upon British co-operation.⁹

The revival of Japanese interest in promoting an economic return to South-East Asia following defeat and occupation was both rapid and logical. The region represented a valuable source of non-dollar imports. Further, the developing Cold War in Asia (symbolised by the 1949 communist victory in China and the June 1950 outbreak of the Korean War), when combined with the gradual removal of Allied restrictions following the 1951 San Francisco Peace Treaty with Japan, provided additional motivation for a Japanese economic expansion southwards.

In 1953, the career bureaucrat and Keidanren¹⁰ vice president, Uemura Kôgorô, publicly lambasted the Japanese government for failing to conclude treaties of navigation and commerce with South-East Asian governments. He regarded the region as resource-rich and its development essential to ensure Japan the supply of cheap raw materials crucial to lowering the costs of manufactured goods.¹¹ Other Keidanren officials followed suit and demanded the settlement of reparation payments as a further means of spearheading Japanese economic penetration of the region. Payments, desirably with goods and services, would raise the level of the region's economy, which in turn would lead to new markets for Japanese goods and demands for investment. One response of the Japanese government came in June 1953 with the formation of the South-East Asia Council within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. At its head sat Hara Yasusaburô, a long-time exponent of expanded trade with South-East Asia and president of Nippon Kayaku.¹² Depending upon the method, Hara reasoned that reparations payments would, from an economic perspective, 'create a favourable relationship of inseparability [thus] opening a permanent market for Japanese goods'.¹³ Quite simply: 'We shall be able to turn misfortune into fortune'.¹⁴

Other Japanese paid attention to the matter of aid. Clearly, any assistance Japan could offer in the short term was limited as domestic reconstruction absorbed the bulk of Japan's scarce resources. Nonetheless, Fukushima Masao, a member of the Keidanren secretariat, argued that technical and economic aid would stimulate South-East Asian economic development and heighten the region's purchasing power. In the process, Japan might create competitors in the field of cotton yarn exports, for example, but Fukushima considered the long-term gains to be worth the risk.¹⁵ Finally, it is worth noting the military context of Japan's economic interests in South-East Asia. Former president of Mitsubishi Heavy Industries and chairman of the Keidanren-connected Defence Production Committee, Gôko Kiyoshi, anticipated American off-shore procurement and mutual security assistance to fund \$10 million worth of military sales to Indo-China alone.¹⁶ In March 1956, Keidanren dispatched a Goodwill Mission to South-East Asia with the hidden aim of exploring the potential market for Japanese munitions.¹⁷ One direct result of this Goodwill Mission was the September 1956 formation of Japan Technical Co-operation Co. Ltd which oversaw the dispatch of several teams of Japanese technicians under the command of

former Rear Admiral Shimizu Fumio to repair South Vietnamese naval dockyards and military facilities.¹⁸

However Japan approached the region, though, the legacy of bitterness and anti-Japanese sentiment caused by the disastrous occupation of much of the area in the Second World War could not be avoided. Fukushima called for sensitivity: desire for raw materials should not blind the Japanese to alternative South-East Asian visions of development. Co-operation was the key: 'I desire that we be more humble and prudent'.¹⁹ Tôshiba president, Ishizaka Taizô, was more blunt in calling for Japan to 'reject egoism: we must not fail twice'.²⁰

Purged of egoism or otherwise, by the mid-1950s Japanese failure in South-East Asia was appearing most unlikely. From the late-1940s onwards, Japan had entered into trade agreements with Burma and began exchanging manufactured goods, such as rolling stock, for rice with Thailand.²¹ Within British territories, too, Japan's presence was soon felt. In 1948, Japanese imports from Malaya and Singapore amounted to approximately £2.5 million, and exports to the same territories were around £1.65 million. By 1951 the growth fuelled by the Korean War had been phenomenal, and the equivalent figures were roughly £19.6 million and £30.46 million respectively.²² Over January to May 1954, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development surveyed Malaya, with an eye to advising on economic development, and concluded that, given Malayan iron-ore mining's dependency upon exports for survival, Japan constituted the logical market. In 1954 Malayan iron-ore production totalled 1,212,780 tons, of which 1,039,430 was exported to Japan. Bauxite mining at Telok Ramunia, Johore, provided a similar example, where again the bulk of the monthly production of 20,000 tons was shipped to Japan.²³

By 1952, Japan's trade with the whole of South-East Asia accounted for fifteen percent of exports as compared to twelve percent in 1937. The same year imports from South-East Asia accounted for eleven percent of Japan's total imports by value, which represented a slight increase over the 1937 figure of ten percent. Demonstrative of such trends, Japan participated in international bodies such as the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), the International Rice Commission and the Food and Agriculture Organisation with a view to further

promoting regional economic influence. In October 1954, Japan was granted membership in the Colombo Plan sponsoring South and South-East Asian economic development.²⁴

Japan's rapid economic return to South-East Asia, and its powerful American support, provoked mixed reactions on the part of the British government, bureaucracy and commercial interests. A gallimaufry of responses was employed from cautious encouragement, suspicion, and resignation, to the September 1952 anti-Japanese campaign of the *Daily Express*.²⁵ While an absolute distinction is impossible, in general British manufacturing concerns and some local colonial administrators identified Japan as a rival and dangerous economic competitor to be compelled and repelled with high tariffs, strict controls and quotas. Despite such fears, Westminster and Whitehall tended to support Japanese economic recovery and the economic push into South-East Asia, albeit with care and often distaste.

This response is not necessarily a puzzling one. Certainly, Japan's almost casual military humiliation of Britain in South-East Asia, coupled with the brutal treatment of POWs, created a bitter legacy that, as Japanese imperial visits show, remains to this day. Further, in the late 1940s and early 1950s, Britain's South-East Asian territories and dependencies were viewed as crucial to United Kingdom economic recovery, and to the UK's global strategic interests. Nonetheless, British officials were not necessarily intent upon selling-out British interests to the Japanese, or, for that matter, to the United States. Instead, they felt that, if properly harnessed, Japanese economic strength could contribute to an improvement in regional living conditions, and hence help fulfil British plans for regional security and the defeat of communism. In addition, Tokyo's economic contribution, whether wanted or otherwise, soon proved essential given the difficulties London faced in persuading UK financial and business concerns to provide for South-East Asian development.²⁶ In this context, Japanese return to South-East Asia reflects the process of British de-colonisation and the growth of more attractive non-imperial markets for UK enterprises, as much as any desire to co-operate with the United States in the Cold War.

Non-metropolitan views were made clear at least as early October 1949 when R. F. Hollyer of the British Embassy, Washington, informed the Foreign Office with

cautious optimism of increased potential for multilateral co-operation and American aid to South-East Asia. Less buoyantly, however, he recorded American reference to South-East Asia as a market and supplier of raw materials to Japan and called for vigilance 'over the extent to which the Americans seek to expose South-East Asia to Japanese penetration'.²⁷ Local British officials in Malaya made similar observations. Malayan iron ore was an imperial resource with never again 'any question of its export...to Japan'.²⁸ In 1953, General Sir Gerald Templer, high commissioner to the Federation of Malaya, portrayed Japanese economic interests as a revival of the Co-prosperity Sphere under different garb; a claim others were destined to repeat.²⁹

UK enterprises also moved quickly to warn against Japanese economic activities. Fears of unscrupulous business practices, such as dumping, prevailed, only to be reinforced by the January 1954 Anglo-Japanese Payments and Trade Agreement, which removed most colonial restrictions on imports of Japanese products. Lancashire, home of Britain's textile industries, protested tonitruously and, as the *Economist* observed, 'when trade with Japan is under discussion all kinds of emotion are bound to be unleashed'.³⁰ To many, it was certainly preferable to give full rein to passion rather than Japan. Few forgot that the Japanese share of textiles imported into Malaya had risen mortifyingly quickly from 24% in 1929 to 48% in 1933.³¹ As early as September 1946, Lancashire had begun warning of the threat posed by Japan and, over the late 1940s and early 1950s, continually implored the British government to impose quota and import restrictions on the Japanese.³² These concerns were frequently channelled through Sir Raymond Streat, chairman of the Cotton Board 1940 to 1957, whose diaries demonstrate the extent to which Japan dominated the minds of British cotton and textile interests.

Streat, and many of his contemporaries, did not seek to deny Japan a right to exist and trade. They readily acknowledged that Japan, like Great Britain, had to export to survive and that like it or not 'Japan existed and would exist, with all its talents and its terrifyingly large population - still increasing'.³³ An outlet was necessary. China was considered the rational market, but discounted through communist victory. At the very least that implied 'acute discomforts for somebody' exacerbated by American failure to understand the problems 'posed by the proposition of Japan in a free world'.³⁴ Streat sought to curtail Japan, and buy time for Lancashire's programme of domestic investment and modernisation, which he believed could

easily be undone through low-wage Japanese competition. It was imperative to convince the 'capitalist and entrepreneur in the East that if he enlarged his bid for world trade to unreasonable proportions he would meet with such counter-action (import quotas or prohibitions) as to make his bid highly unprofitable'.³⁵

It is crucial to remember that Streat was not protesting simply against unfair Japanese trading practices, but against the sum total of potential Japanese trade in textiles (and other sectors too, such as shipping), regardless of its fairness. At an October 1954 meeting in London between Streat and Japan's conservative prime minister, Yoshida Shigeru (to whom Streat referred as 'His squeaky little Excellency'), economic matters inevitably dominated the conversation. Yoshida observed that if Japan were to remain a bastion against the spread of communism, economic strength was essential. Unfair competition should be combated and solved, but fair competition was, quite simply, 'fair'. In reply, Streat merely conceded the difficulties of competition were great, but in his diaries added 'I left out the adjective [that is, fair] but I doubt if he observed the implication of the omission'.³⁶

In order to push forward the views of Lancashire, Streat vigorously lobbied not only the British and American governments, but also the Supreme Commander of Allied Powers (SCAP), General Douglas MacArthur directly. In this context, he represents a further dimension to UK-Japan economic and political relations beyond that of bureaucrats and politicians. In May 1950, Streat headed a joint Anglo-American Cotton Mission to Japan to assess his rivals in more detail and impress his concerns upon MacArthur.³⁷

MacArthur, initially suspicious of the joint mission, met Raymond Streat and Sir Alvary Gascoigne, head of the British Liaison Mission to Japan, on 8 May 1950. Perhaps forewarned of the General's legendary ego, Streat slotted his own concerns within the larger framework of MacArthur's profound impact on twentieth century history which might well 'give a new moral and spiritual force to the eastern half of the world's population'.³⁸ Acknowledging the need for economic growth to maintain Japan's viability, Streat nonetheless spoke against exports for exports' sake and explained that exporting goods rampantly would only attract hostility, lead to increased tariff barriers and thus detract from long-term economic growth. The purpose of his visit, therefore, was to ascertain the extent to which such principles

were understood and accepted, and how far Japanese intentions conformed to policies of 'mutual respect and toleration'.³⁹ MacArthur offered little. He did promise to eradicate unfair trade should it appear, but as to Sir Raymond's greater concern of the total volume of trade, rather than its fairness, no concessions were to be made. As Streat quoted MacArthur in early 1949, 'Japan must either export to pay her way or the US taxpayer must keep Japan at his expense: what I want is more Jap goods sold anyhow they can be sold'.⁴⁰

Other than discomfiting guided tours of Japanese mills which proved to be all too modern and efficiently managed, Streat gained little from his mission in terms of concrete assurances and promises to limit Japanese trade. This was not unexpected and matched his suspicions of limited sympathy for cotton in Whitehall and the press.⁴¹ In such beliefs Streat was, of course, almost entirely correct.

London was, naturally, mindful of American policy for occupied Japan and the ramifications such policy held for economic relations between the Sterling Area and Japan. Inevitably, South-East Asian members of the Empire and Commonwealth figured in such calculations as Britain worked to balance the American alliance with its Commonwealth interests. The occupation of Japan began in August 1945. Although termed an Allied occupation, American interests usually over-ruled those of the allies who held limited and indirect powers to guide its course.⁴² SCAP's initial aims were to demilitarise and democratise Japanese society and the economy. The Imperial Army and Navy were abolished, war-crime trials conducted and a purge of pre-war and war-time leaders enacted. Further, land was re-distributed, plans were drawn up to break the dominant industrial groupings, and a reparations programme was introduced to dismantle Japan's industrial might and shift it abroad to aid the industrialisation of the victims of Japanese war-time aggression. Not only would Japan's capacity to wage aggressive war be removed for all time, but so would the militarist and economic forces which promoted it in the first instance. However, over 1948 and 1949, there appeared a gradual and irregular shift in the occupation as SCAP moved from reform to re-construction. This change is known as the 'reverse course' as the United States worked to re-develop the Japanese economy and prepare for Japan's return to the international order as an American capitalist ally.⁴³ Urgency was accentuated by successful communist revolution in China and the Korean War; *zaibatsu* dissolution was watered down and reparation payments

ceased. Special procurement orders (*tokuju*) on behalf of United Nations forces fighting on the Korean peninsula from June 1950 to July 1953 led to Japan's first post-war economic boom as orders and dollars flooded in.

Korean War procurement visibly demonstrated Japan's industrial capacity and its value as the key Asian ally in the Washington-led capitalist bloc. SCAP, and other American agencies, turned their attention to enlisting further Japanese economic might in the struggle against communism. South-East Asian markets and resources were essential to this process and the need to link the region with the Japanese economy was strongly emphasised. In October 1951, Kenneth Morrow, chief of SCAP's Economic and Scientific Section's (ESS) Programs and Statistics Division, drew up a report outlining how Japan 'as the most important workshop of the Far East [could] make its optimum contribution to the Free World'.⁴⁴ Japan's own economic growth would improve conditions throughout South-East Asia by increased productivity, production and the level of trade with Japan.⁴⁵ In this manner, Japan could contribute to the regional economic battle against communism 'as the principal processing nation in the area'.⁴⁶ The goal of Japanese economic development was clear given the extant model of Northeast Asia: 'in the years before World War II nearly one fifth of Japan's exports to Korea and China were in the form of equipment and machinery necessary to produce raw materials contributory to Japan's own development. This same kind of development must be repeated, this time in another part of the Far East'.⁴⁷ To this end, joint SCAP-Japanese missions toured through South and South-East Asia to promote Japanese access to raw material supplies and markets. A SCAP-prepared report of April 1950 proudly explained that Japan held the 'capacity to produce all types of the capital goods and equipment required...without impairment of her domestic economy'. Eagerly, the report projected Japanese exports to South-East Asia to exceed \$710 million by 1955.⁴⁸

Open American calls for a regional linking of the Japanese and South-East Asian economies continued over the 1950s.⁴⁹ Inevitably, Great Britain's interests, as witnessed by Sir Raymond Streat amongst many others, would suffer. However, it is unnecessarily simplistic to dismiss Britain as a desiccated imperial power too bereft of vision and will to design and implement policy for Japan and South-East Asia. In many instances, a controlled Japanese economic resurgence in South-East Asia

complemented British planning; American backing for these aims could be supportive as well as destructive.

Official British policy sought to eradicate Japan's ability to mobilise industrially for war but equally, as Sir Stafford Cripps, president of the Board of Trade, stated in October 1946, Japan must be left 'internationally solvent'. The alternative was the need for 'permanent foreign support', which was clearly beyond the United Kingdom's resources.⁵⁰ Japan was held to be incapable of withstanding anything matching British economic policy for occupied Germany and any attempt to apply it would devastate the country, leading to impoverishment, unemployment and unrest. By way of contrast to initial SCAP and Washington planning for the Japanese economy, Great Britain actually appeared quite generous.⁵¹ Enlightened self-interest was clearly important, but concern that Japan not be economically crippled remained. In May 1948, Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin spoke out against leaving Japan and its 'ninety millions of people...in a cesspool of poverty', a view that was supported by Sir Esler Dening, later head of the UK Liaison Mission in Japan.⁵²

British industry feared it, too, was heading for the cesspool and continued to press, via the Board of Trade, for the imposition of quotas and restraints upon Japan. Raymond Streat rejoined that Britain could not have full employment, social security and exports if Japan were free of restraints.⁵³ In July 1948, a Lancashire delegation insisted upon seeing Bevin to demand that Japanese spindles be restricted to 3.5 million, fewer than one-third the pre-war number. Bevin declined to see the delegation and made clear his views in a letter to Harold Wilson, president of the Board of Trade and important ally to Lancashire. Restrictions were beyond unacceptable; they were a 'reversal of the policy towards Japanese industry hitherto advocated. On the grounds of economic principle, political possibility and administrative expediency, H.M. Government have always maintained that no proposal for restricting the development of Japanese consumption goods industries should be put forward'.⁵⁴

Without doubt, the 'reverse course' and the extent to which the United States was willing to remove Japan's economic fetters concerned the British government.⁵⁵ Nonetheless, it held firmly to the line that British industry would have to embrace

competition and survive through higher efficiency and more 'derring-do' in international markets.

To explain the refusal to entertain industrial demands for protection, one cannot deny the overriding importance of the Anglo-American alliance to British policy. Over-antagonising the Americans could promote an outright assault on the sterling area and Britain's regional position to ensure Japanese economic penetration. Not only humiliating, such a step would have threatened Britain's own recovery given Malaya's status as the major dollar earner of the sterling area. Further, it was increasingly apparent over 1949 that initial American hostility to the survival of the sterling area and British colonialism in Asia had waned and would even be reversed in the face of the United Kingdom's imminent economic collapse. Washington understood the link between imperial and Commonwealth trade and the post-war recovery of the United Kingdom and hence its ability to resist communism in Western Europe. While the protectionist arrangements of the 1930s were rejected, America would nonetheless come to the assistance of Great Britain and the sterling area.⁵⁶ Washington agreed to assist London in re-establishing the pre-war system of triangular trade whereby UK dollar deficits were partially balanced by surpluses in trade with Malaya and Malayan surpluses with the United States.⁵⁷

Growing American support for the sterling area aside, it is also true that by the end of the 1940s, Britain had independently come to acknowledge that domination of South-East Asia was no longer possible. Nonetheless, political and economic influence could be maximised through general intra-regional co-operation and economic growth. Such development would lead to new British markets and guarantee raw material supplies, with the huge dollar-earnings of Malayan natural rubber being the prime example. The corollary was the economic and social stability deemed essential if the region were to be successfully inoculated against the dangerous allures of communism. Inevitably, the problems were enormous. The colonial attitudes of European allies, namely the Netherlands and France, were regarded as more obstructive than enlightened. More importantly, Britain blatantly lacked the resources necessary to implement grandiose policies of aid and trade development.⁵⁸ Attracting American interest and cash was of paramount importance. Though perhaps less emphatically, to many Japanese involvement was also desirable and more than likely inevitable, even if occasionally repugnant.

The 1949-50 sterling area trade agreement, itself a great expansion upon the 1948 agreement, emphasised this point through permitting \$400 million of Japanese-sterling area trade.⁵⁹ Similarly, Malcolm MacDonald, the Commissioner-General of the United Kingdom in South-East Asia 1948-55, strongly promoted these aims of expanded Anglo-Japanese trade in his capacity as commissioner-general and chairman of the Far Eastern Defence Co-ordination Committee. Other UK officials, such as Esler Dening, provided support from within Japan.

The 1949 defeat of the Kuomintang in China confirmed in MacDonald's mind the dangers posed by the spread of communism in Asia, and in May that year he returned to London to partake of an inter-departmental meeting with representatives from the Foreign, Colonial and Commonwealth Offices. MacDonald spoke emphatically on the danger of communist contagion. Success in China was but the beginning; he predicted most of Indo-china would fall within six months, then Thailand and Burma. With the buffers gone, Malaya and India would be left to face directly the communist threat. As a counter-measure, MacDonald proposed a regional political, economic and defence policy to convince South-East Asians of their own and Britain's ability to resist.⁶⁰ Allowing Japan a role could be deftly used to the advantage of the United Kingdom in its international relations with American, Japan and South-East Asia.

MacDonald's several visits to Japan and the annual regional conferences held at Bukit Serene and then Mallaig,⁶¹ make clear his concern for improved Japanese relations and trade. Japanese technical ability, consumer and capital goods, and even influence, were most likely a potential boon to the development and stability of South-East Asia. Japan's return, therefore, 'should be viewed with friendly understanding'.⁶² The gains for all were likely to be great. Japan must at all costs be kept within the capitalist camp and helped to avoid the economic and social decay, in addition to rising nationalism, born out of international isolation. By all accounts, MacDonald believed communism to be Japan's greatest peril and stated there was a real danger that Tokyo would succumb to this threatening ideology by the early 1960s. This would be an untenable 'blow to our [British] security in the Pacific and in Asia' in light of Japan's 'strategic land area...the potential industrial power of this populous nation and...its energetic, efficient and aggressive military capacities'.⁶³

The Foreign Office concurred in that Japan was a particularly important anti-communist bastion to the UK and a possible threat to British Far Eastern colonial and economic assets should the communists take hold. That Japan be prosperous was of cardinal importance and it should be made plain to Tokyo that co-operation would be made worth its while.⁶⁴ So important was retaining Japan for the free world that not only was a Japanese economic presence in South-East Asia made acceptable, it also became axiomatic that Japan should be pressed and aided to purchase even more in the region. Malayan iron ore and rubber were good examples.⁶⁵ After all, one definite means of redressing the South-East Asian imbalance of trade with Japan was to increase the overall volume of trade and promote Japanese purchases in the region.

Although they were not necessarily being asked, East Asians themselves were also expected to gain under this system. The expansion of trade would maintain the Japanese standard of living in addition to that of the poorer sections of the populations in South-East Asia who needed cheap consumer goods.⁶⁶ Exposing their populations to the immediate gains derived from free trade within the capitalist bloc was the most effective means of denying communist propaganda a foothold in the region. MacDonald argued that economic suasion was a far more subtle means of winning hearts and minds than the Americans' ready turn towards military solutions. An over-bearing Western military presence only made easier communist appeals to nationalism.⁶⁷

Finally, MacDonald argued that expanded regional trade with Japan was also to the greater benefit of British trade as a whole. Firstly, British territories would remain free of communism and thus open to British interests. Secondly, trade with Japan would increase the region's standard of living, the purchasing power of the rather large populations, and therefore stimulate further the expansion of international trade from which Britain could not but gain.⁶⁸ This vision would not be without its short-term costs to British industry, but echoing Whitehall and Westminster, MacDonald advised that manufacturers would do better to maintain quality, study special regional needs and improve upon delivery dates, than to demand protection.⁶⁹ Others added their voices to MacDonald's. The British Embassy in Thailand also supported a Japanese economic return to South-East Asia as valuable, and argued that the 'long-term benefits of this prosperity will be reflected in

the long-term benefits to British trade'.⁷⁰ The Treasury, too, sought to maximise trade between the colonial empire and Japan as, without doing so, Britain could 'hardly hope to induce her not to switch trade to the dollar area'.⁷¹

Positive encouragement from MacDonald aside, to a very real degree Japanese imports into South-East Asia were needed to replace British exports. The United Kingdom's ill-affordable Korean War-led rearmament programme directed industrial production away from exportable consumer goods. Lancashire might have complained about Japanese textiles penetrating the Malayan market, but was frequently unable to fulfil local demand in any case. Equally, the costs of informal influence proved high, and over the early 1950s doubts arose as to Great Britain's ability to sustain the necessary effort into the future. Public funds soon proved insufficient to meet the needs of colonial investment programmes. Alternative private sources of capital failed to materialise in sufficient quantity as the City found more profitable avenues in Western Europe and North America than in grand plans for Empire and Commonwealth development. The Treasury, unconvinced of the economic grounds for colonial development, also in its way declined to prime the pump. For example, it proved highly unwilling to surrender 'double taxation' under which a UK company gained relief neither from UK income tax nor colonial government levies.⁷² Tellingly, from conception the Colombo Plan, regardless of its Commonwealth origins and symbolic value as evidence of United Kingdom commitment to colonial development, was reliant upon the United States for funds. From 1950-61, American aid to South-East Asia through the Colombo Plan totalled \$8.3 billion in comparison to the UK sum of just £250 million over the same period.⁷³ In this context, de-colonisation and relative British decline also helped ease acceptance of the Japanese economic presence in South-East Asia.

British sentiment towards Japan might thus appear rather benign, even indulgent. Malaya, Britain's dollar basket of the early Cold War, was apparently sufficiently juicy to share, textile and shipping industries could go on unprotected and Whitehall was imbued with the spirit of MacDonald's 'friendly understanding'.⁷⁴ Inevitably, there is a need for caution. Despite a remarkable generosity, Britain maintained significant fears as to the depth and longevity of a potential Japanese economic assault on UK interests. The 1949 Dodge Plan for Japanese economic stabilisation is generally held to have pegged the yen at a slightly lower value than what was

then held to be the most appropriate rate, with the aim of boosting Japan's Asian and Pacific exports. While not nearly so apparent at the time, Britain and Australia were both, nonetheless, sufficiently concerned to defy intense American pressure and refused to agree to most-favoured-nation trading arrangements for Japan.⁷⁵ Indicative of long-term British fears, once more against powerful US pressure, London opposed Japanese admission to GATT until 1955. The Foreign Office was sufficiently wary of domestic opposition and feared that calls for protection would only increase as the Japanese economy grew. Further, the Commonwealth connexion preyed upon Whitehall's mind. New Zealand, Australia, South Africa and other colonies discriminated against Japan to the United Kingdom's advantage; if Great Britain scaled down its economic discrimination against the Japanese, it could tempt others to do likewise to even greater UK detriment.⁷⁶

In South-East Asia, too, Britain sought to temper an open-armed embrace with a narrower doorway. MacDonald might well have viewed Japan as being worth some 'calculated risks'⁷⁷, but he always qualified his remarks. The British were not 'going to be "mugs"' and negotiate unfavourable agreements; nor would the Japanese be permitted to 'advance their selfish interests to our own prejudice'.⁷⁸

Britain accepted a renewed Japanese presence, but on the proviso the 'process is gradual'.⁷⁹ Graduality was often relatively easy to enforce. For example, when Japan's Kokan Mining Company requested permission to recommence activities at Malaya's Temangan Mine, it was advised by British representatives that having UK and Malayan partners would increase their chances. Further, Commonwealth partners were to have a controlling interest, Japanese employees were not to exceed 100 (indicative of the mistrust in which the Japanese were held, to great relief 'any subversive activities...could be controlled by normal Special Branch methods' and a one-third minimum of technicians had to hold a Commonwealth nationality).⁸⁰ Other means were also available: visas could be restricted and in the case of Singapore commercial travellers were limited to one month; Malaya would admit no-one who had been resident prior to or during the War⁸¹ (Tokyo's first nominated vice consul to Singapore, Oda Masakazu, was also rejected on these grounds⁸²), and even the Raffles Hotel refused to accept bookings for Japanese consular officials in search of lodgings and offices on the 'grounds that their staff would object strongly.'⁸³ In South-East Asia, Britain was 'at home' to the Japanese,

but equally determined to retain the rights and will to exercise control over the nature of the visit.

The world of the mid - to late - 1950s, however, was much changed even when compared to a mere five years previous. Weaponry and political developments rendered many colonial bases far less strategically useful than imagined. The Commonwealth shrank and became increasingly incohesive and impotent. Burma left in 1948, and the Federation of Malaya gained internal self-government in 1955, as did Singapore in 1959. Increasingly, South-East Asians wrested control over economic decision-making from the British. The United Kingdom also looked to the United States and an incrementally uniting Western Europe as the key sources of economic prosperity and military security.

ii) Conclusion

The story of 1950s Anglo-Japanese trade and economic relations is not merely a story of balance sheets and figures. The perceptions and imageries held and employed by the British as the post-war economic relationship re-developed reveal much of how Great Britain viewed Japan and, even more, its own position in the new world order.

Churchill's placing of Britain at the very juncture of the 'Three Circles' itself speaks volumes on an elite unwilling to conceive of a less than central role in international affairs. This is not to say that awareness of overwhelming American power, projected both globally and within Japan, had not seeped into British consciousness. The 1956 Suez Crisis ensured that no British prime minister would again directly defy the wishes of the United States. Nevertheless, Britain could still seek to mediate and balance the two superpowers. Experience with a global empire, supposed diplomatic prowess, and lengthy familiarity with the Far East was meant to count for something. As the ditty has Lord Halifax whispering to Lord Keynes, 'it's true they have the money bags, but we have all the brains'.⁸⁴

As a self-appointed tutor and mediator, Britain's first task was to 'encourage the Japanese in their present tendency to look to Great Britain as the greatest stabilising influence in international affairs'.⁸⁵ This mission held as true for trade as for anything else. Through proper guidance, the Japanese could be educated out of their wicked

inter-war commercial habits and learn to partake responsibly in the international economy. Trade malpractices were intolerable, but entering into honest arrangements could help teach the Japanese to appreciate the obligations as well the benefits of international co-operation and provide instruction in the suitable standards of behaviour becoming to an important member of the Free World.⁸⁶ Benevolence could ease this process; not only would Japanese participation in South-East Asian trade be of monetary value, but Britain could encourage it before Japan had time 'to reassume the garb of the truculent and embittered outcast'.⁸⁷

War-time bitterness also influenced British images of Japan with a resultant negative effect on economic relations. Stereotypes were reinforced and no doubt, sub-consciously or otherwise, guided policy makers and businessmen in their commercial dealings with Japan. Writing in 1950, Erick Pollock, a partner in Matheson & Co., felt as though the British were 'still at war', with negative attitudes towards the Japanese giving Britain the air of a vindictive nation, to its long-term economic cost.⁸⁸ Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden spoke for many when he confessed 'it is not easy to like the Japanese, but clearly they count for a great deal and will count for more'.⁸⁹ Malcolm MacDonald, a man who saw himself as a good friend of the Japanese and keen to involve them in South-East Asian economic development, readily lapsed into stereotypes to support policy recommendations. Again, the 'Japanese are an unsatisfactory people', whose desire economically, if not politically, to dominate the Far East had been tempered merely by the enormity of defeat.⁹⁰ Japanese characteristics had not changed and, in fact, one of the key reasons for their apparent susceptibility to communism was a liking for authoritarian rule (by the Right or Left, it mattered little lest the Japanese appear fussy), and the possession of a dictatorially authoritarian nature.⁹¹ With such honesty apparently being the basis of friendship, MacDonald added, 'as friends of both the Americans and the Japanese we can make a considerable contribution to the solution of the problem between the Western democracies and Japan'.⁹²

Trading and economic relations between Great Britain, the Commonwealth and Empire and Japan over the 1950s thus succinctly demonstrate the problems facing the United Kingdom as it sought to affirm its position in the post-war economic and political order. The manner of Japan's economic return to South-East Asia tells heavily of Britain's limited ability to defy the United States and its unwillingness to

sacrifice the American alliance. The protectionist calls of British manufacturers were generally discounted and colonial economic links gradually withered. However, the retreat was neither chaotic nor immediate. British policy makers did envision a Japanese economic role in the region that flattered their own long-term interests in a managed withdrawal. To an extent, Whitehall and Westminster were able to limit and define the nature of Japanese economic activities in South-East Asia. Moreover, other markets and possibilities attracted British industry and finance away from empire and thus inevitably made room for Japanese involvement. Even so, British political influence was clearly eroded in East Asia and daily, the oscillations of the 'Three Circles' grew more difficult to synchronise.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank archivists and staff at Palace Green Library, University of Durham (Malcolm MacDonald Papers) and the Public Record Office, London.

Endnotes

¹ Winston Churchill, *Europe Unite: Speeches 1947 and 1948* (London: Cassell, 1950), p. 417.

² On Churchill's 'Three Circles' concept, see Joseph Frankel, *British Foreign Policy 1945-1973* (London: OUP, 1975), pp. 157-60.

³ Churchill, *Europe*, p. 418.

⁴ Endymion Wilkinson, *Japan versus Europe: A History of Misunderstanding* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1983), pp. 68-77.

⁵ Public Record Office, London (hereafter PRO), FO 371/105386 'British Embassy Washington to John Boyd, Information Office, Foreign Office,' 30 November 1953.

⁶ Supreme Commander for Allied Powers. This title refers both to General Douglas MacArthur who directed the Allied occupation of Japan until his dismissal in 1951, and also to the bureaucratic organisation as a whole which oversaw occupied Japan 1945-52.

⁷ See, for example William Borden, *The Pacific Alliance: United States foreign economic policy and Japanese trade recovery, 1947-1955* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984); John Dower, *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience, 1898-1954* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979); John Dower, 'Occupied Japan and the Cold War in Asia' in *Japan in War and Peace: Selected Essays* (New York: New Press, 1993).

⁸ See, for example: Tilman Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation in South-East Asia, 1945-49* (London: Routledge, 1995); Nicholas White, 'Britain and the return of Japanese economic interests to South East Asia after the Second World War', in *South East Asia Research*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1998, pp. 281-307.

⁹ FO 371/99439, British Embassy, Bangkok to Anthony Eden, FO, 23 December 1951.

¹⁰ *Keizai dantai rengôkai* (Federation of Economic Organisations). Pressure group representing the interests of Japan's heavy and chemical industrial sector formed in August 1946. See Chitoshi Yanaga, *Big Business in Japanese Politics* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1968), *passim*.

¹¹ Uemura Kôgorô, 'Nankan Nihon keizai no dakaisaku' in *Jitsugyô no Sekai*, Vol. 50, No. 8, 1953, pp. 24-5.

¹² Nippon Kayaku manufactured gunpowder, but changed production to fertilisers after Japanese defeat in 1945.

¹³ Hara Yasusaburô, 'Baishô mondai to Tônan Ajia shokoku no dôkô' in *Keidanren Geppô*, No. 3, 1953, p. 7.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* p. 7.

¹⁵ Fukushima Masao, "'Tônan Ajia kaihatsu" to iu koto no kangaekata' in *Keidanren Geppô*, No. 3, 1953, pp. 2-4.

¹⁶ 'MSA enjô to bôei seisan' in *Keizai Ôrai*, August 1953, pp. 12-3.

¹⁷ Kondô Kan'ichi & Osanai Hiroshi (eds), *Sengo sangyôshi e no shôgen*, Vol. III, (Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha, 1973), pp. 251-3.

¹⁸ (Asano) Keidanren Jimukyoku, 'Nihon Gijutsu Kyôryoku Kabushikikaisha no setsuritsu keika ni tsuite', in *Keidanren Geppô*, No. 9, 1956, pp. 45-7; Senga Tetsuya, 'Betonamukoku to no gijutsu kyôryoku keiyaku teiketsu no keii', in *Keidanren Geppô*, No. 1, 1958, pp. 57-9; Keidanren, *Bôeiseisan linkai Tokuhô*, No. 58, 25-5-58, 'Bôei sangyô seibi ni kansuru kenkyû hôshin o kettei', pp. 1-4.

¹⁹ Fukushima, 'Tônan Ajia kaihatsu', p. 5.

²⁰ Cited in Masada Ken'ichirô (ed.), *Kindai Nihon no Tônan Ajiakan*, (Tokyo: Ajia Keizai Kenkyûjo, 1978), p. 135.

²¹ Andrew Rotter, *The Path to Vietnam: Origins of the American Commitment to South-East Asia*, (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 130-1.

²² Malcolm MacDonald Papers, University of Durham (hereafter, MMC), 19/7/13, 'Press Release on Third Visit to Tokyo', 8 July 1952. The actual figures are given in Malay dollars (Malay \$19,700,000; \$13,200,000; \$157,000,000; \$243,700,000 respectively). As of 1906, the pound sterling-Malay/Straits dollar exchange rate was

set at the constant level of 2s. 4d. to the dollar, that is nearly 12p., or one-eighth of a pound.

²³ International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, *The Economic Development of Malaya* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1955), pp. 352-3.

²⁴ White, 'Britain', p. 283. On the Colombo Plan, see: Porter, 'Colombo Plan', Note by Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and other Ministers, 20 December 1951, CAB 129/48 in A.N.Porter & A. Stockwell (eds), *British Imperial Policy and Decolonisation 1938-64, Vol. 2, 1951-64* (London: Macmillan, 1989), pp. 115-26; Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation*, pp. 200-16.

²⁵ Marguerite Dupree, (ed.), *Lancashire and Whitehall: The Diary of Sir Raymond Streat*, Vol. 2, 1939-57 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987), pp. 646-50.

²⁶ Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation*; Nicholas Tarling, *The Fall of Imperial Britain in South-East Asia* (Kuala Lumpur and London: Oxford University Press, 1993); White, 'Britain', p. 286.

²⁷ Cited in Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation*, p. 206.

²⁸ White, 'Britain', p. 287.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 287.

³⁰ Cited in Dupree (ed.), *Lancashire and Whitehall*, p. 699.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

³² Gordon Daniels, 'Britain's view of post-war Japan, 1945-9' in Ian Nish (ed.), *Anglo-Japanese Alienation, 1919-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 273-4.

³³ Dupree (ed.), *Lancashire and Whitehall*, p. 737.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 737.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 552.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 730-1.

³⁷ British members included Raymond Streat (Chairman), Cuthbert Clegg (President of the British Employers Confederation), Haygarth Jackson (Cotton Board member and textile employer), Ernest Thornton (trade unionist and Labour MP for Farnsworth 1952-70), Air Vice-Marshal Bouchier (Federation of British Industries representative, Japan) and Cotton Board staff, James Broatch, T. D. F. Powell, R. Robson and Miss Morris. (*Ibid.*, p. 540).

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 541. Once removed from MacArthur's presence, Streat's opinion of the man altered rapidly. By the time of the General's dismissal in 1951, Streat held that

his 'philosophy, his experience and his egotism make him too narrow to wield all the influence he has been wielding' (p. 578) and by December 1954, MacArthur's ideas were decidedly more 'infantile' than profound (p. 736).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 541.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 581.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 711; Daniels, 'Britain's view of post-war Japan', pp. 274-5.

⁴² For example, through the Allied Council of Japan (ACJ) and the Far Eastern Commission. On the British role in the occupation, see: Roger Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy: Britain, the United States and Japan 1945-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).

⁴³ On the occupation of Japan, see, for example: Michael Schaller, *The American Occupation of Japan: The Origins of the Cold War in Asia* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985). The 'reverse course' is a generally accepted term in discussing the occupation of Japan, however, debate still remains as to what exactly constitutes the 'reverse course' and even as to the date at which it can be said to have commenced.

⁴⁴ GHQ/SCAP Records, RG 331, Box No. 6194, Folder No. (1) 004.03, Jan 1951 - Nov 1951, ESS Programs and Statistics Division, 12 October 1951, *Administration of Japan's Industrial Mobilization*, p. 2.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* p. 2.

⁴⁶ GHQ/SCAP Records RG 331, Box No. 7498, Folder No. (1), *Japan's Industrial Potential, Volume II*, October 1951, p.1.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁴⁸ GHQ/SCAP Records (RG 331, Box No. 6714, Folder No. 5), 'South East Asia, 1951 - Japan's export potential with specific reference to the economic development of the countries of South and South-East Asia', p. 1.

⁴⁹ See, for example, Borden, *The Pacific Alliance*.

⁵⁰ Cited in Daniels, 'Britain's view of post-war Japan', pp. 260-61.

⁵¹ Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy*, pp. 123-5.

⁵² Cited in Daniels, 'Britain's view of post-war Japan', pp. 262-3. As Japan was not a sovereign nation it was unable to officially be accredited with embassies, hence the designation 'Liaison Mission'. On Denning, see Roger Buckley, 'In Proper Perspective: Sir Esler Denning (1897-1977) and Anglo-Japanese Relations 1951-1957' in Hugh Cortazzi & Gordon Daniels (eds), *Britain and Japan 1859-1991: Themes and Personalities* (London: Routledge, 1991), pp. 271-6.

-
- ⁵³ Dupree, *Lancashire and Whitehall*, p. 441; Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy*, p. 168.
- ⁵⁴ Cited in Dupree, *Lancashire and Whitehall*, pp. 460-1.
- ⁵⁵ For example, in 1948 the Draper Mission, led by William Draper, a former Wall Street banker and then under-secretary of the Army in charge of German and Japanese occupation policy, slashed reparations, watered down zaibatsu-dissolution plans and called for an 8/900 percent increase in Japanese exports. Borden, *Pacific Alliance*, pp. 77-83. On British concerns, see Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy*, p. 163-70.
- ⁵⁶ White, 'Britain', p. 295.
- ⁵⁷ Rotter, *The Path to Vietnam*, p. 141 and Chapter 7, *passim*.
- ⁵⁸ Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation*, pp. 195-9.
- ⁵⁹ Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy*, p. 169; Rotter, *The Path to Vietnam*, p. 129.
- ⁶⁰ Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation*, p. 190.
- ⁶¹ Bukit Serene was MacDonald's first official residence in Malaya with Mallaig being the second upon Bukit Serene's return to the local sultan. The major annual conferences, held annually over the period of MacDonald's appointment, to review South-East Asian affairs and British policy for the region took their names from the respective residence.
- ⁶² MMC, 18/4/15, 'Bukit Serene Conference 1951 – Japan', 28 November 1951.
- ⁶³ MMC, 33/2/85-7, MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.
- ⁶⁴ FO 371/110435, 'Foreign Office minute on draft paper on policy affecting commercial relations with Japan', July 1954.
- ⁶⁵ MMC, 33/2/89, *Ibid.*; MMC 18/7/13, 'Mallaig Conference 12 December 1953 - Japanese Economic Expansion'.
- ⁶⁶ MMC, 33/2/89, MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952; MMC, 18/5/13, 'Bukit Serene Conference 1952 – Trade', 9 December 1952. On East Asian resentment and suspicion of such goals see: Borden, *The Pacific Alliance*, p. 79. The Nationalist Chinese, for example, objected to Chinese gold looted by the Japanese being used by the US to promote Japan's emergence at the centre of the East Asian economy. General Romulo of the Philippines likewise feared Japan was being built up to again dominate the Far East.
- ⁶⁷ MMC, 33/2/86, MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952. On this point at least, MacDonald would have enjoyed Japanese support. In preparing for a doomed November 1954 visit to Washington to request a Marshall Plan for Asia, Yoshida Shigeru and his advisers also observed

that 'the test of fighting communism lies as much, if not more, in the political and economic fields as in the military'. Cited in John Dower, *Empire and Aftermath: Yoshida Shigeru and the Japanese Experience* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 473.

⁶⁸ MMC, 33/2/90, MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.

⁶⁹ MMC, 18/5/13-14, 'Bukit Serene Conference - Trade, 9 December 1952'; MMC 18/5/17, 'Bukit Serene Conference - Japan, 9 December 1952'.

⁷⁰ FO 371/99439, British Embassy, Bangkok to Anthony Eden, FO, 23 December 1951.

⁷¹ Cited in White, 'Britain', p. 296.

⁷² Porter and Stockwell (eds), *British Imperial Policy*, pp. 25-32.

⁷³ Remme, *Britain and Regional Cooperation*, pp. 214-5.

⁷⁴ MMC, 18/4/15, 'Bukit Serene Conference 1951 – Japan', 28 November 1951.

⁷⁵ Buckley, *Occupation Diplomacy*, p. 193.

⁷⁶ FO 371/110436, 'Problems Affecting UK Relations with Japan - Memorandum: Commercial Policy of the United Kingdom Towards Japan', 1954. On Japan and GATT, see G.C.Allen, *The Japanese Economy*, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981), p. 168.

⁷⁷ MMC, 33/2/92, MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.

⁷⁸ MMC, 33/2/85 and MMC, 33/2/92, *Ibid*.

⁷⁹ MMC, 18/4/15, 'Bukit Serene Conference 1951 – Japan', 28 November 1951. Underlined in the original.

⁸⁰ FO 371/107003, 'Secretary for Defence, Defence Department, KL, Federation of Malaya - Japanese Iron Mining – Malaya', 5 September 1953. Even here, while the Board of Trade did not welcome any scheme which increased Japanese competitiveness through access to cheaper raw materials, it accepted the development as inevitable and offered no objections as long as there was no unfair depression of price. FO 371/107003, 'S. H. Levine (Board of Trade) to R. W. Selby (Foreign Office)', 12 December 1953. The Kokan Mining Company was represented in Malaya by Metal Exports Inc, an American firm based in Japan. It was soon apparent that Metal Exports was merely a front and full control rested with Kokan, itself closely linked to Japanese steel combines. On British attempts to limit the Japanese in South-East Asia, especially with regards to iron ore and banking, see also: White, 'Britain', pp. 299-304.

⁸¹ MMC 19/1/49-50, 'Entry of Japanese Nationals into the Malayan/Borneo Territories'.

⁸² MMC 19/7/16-17 'Consular Appointments', 25 July 1952.

⁸³ MMC, 19/7/21, 7 October 1952.

⁸⁴ Michael Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-1952* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), back cover.

⁸⁵ MMC 18/8/30 'Mallaig Conference 1955', 5 March 1955. The United States, incidentally, was also in need of British guidance as 'over and over again in Asia they do the right thing in the wrong way...we must do all we can to 'educate' the Americans so that they make a more subtle understanding and wise approach to the Japanese'. MMC, 33/2/86 MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.

⁸⁶ MMC 18/5/17 'Bukit Serene Conference – Japan', 8 December 1952.

⁸⁷ FO 371/99439 Japan's Trade Relations with South-East Asia 'British Embassy, Bangkok to Anthony Eden, Foreign Office', 23 December 1951.

⁸⁸ FO 371/83844 'Anglo-Japanese Relations', 9 March 1950.

⁸⁹ MMC 22/10/24 'Anthony Eden to Malcolm MacDonald', 23 May 1952.

⁹⁰ MMC 33/2/92 MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.

⁹¹ MMC 33/2/84 MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.

⁹² MMC 33/2/86 MacDonald report to Anthony Eden, foreign secretary, 'Note on Japan', 26 July 1952.

Revisiting the 1980's Textbook Issue in Japan: Reactions in China, South Korea and Other Asian Countries

Mutsumi Hirano

The issue of history continues to be important in Japan's relations with Asian countries.¹ In this context, this paper aims to provide an overall picture of the Japanese history textbook disputes with China and South Korea in 1982 and 1986, and the repercussions of these diplomatic rows in Asia and beyond.² The paper also sheds light on governmental dialogue and transnational aspects of the textbook issue.³ The main cause of the disputes concerned the content of Japanese history textbooks, specifically, accounts of Japan's colonial rule and aggression in Asia before and during the Second World War. The disputes also highlighted the standard practice of textbook authorisation in the country known as 'textbook screening'. According to this practice, the Ministry of Education of Japan (MOE) examines in detail all textbooks of elementary and secondary schools; only textbooks approved by the Ministry are permitted for use in either public or private schools.⁴ The screening system arguably serves the purpose of censorship since the MOE can demand that textbook authors rewrite the text or part of it before approval is accorded. Below, the paper will review the 1982 and 1986 disputes and then describe public and regional reactions.

1. The First Textbook Dispute in 1982

The *New York Times* branded the 1982 textbook dispute as 'the worst diplomatic quarrels' in Japan's relations with China and South Korea in a long time.⁵ It was triggered by the Japanese media, namely television programmes aired on the evening of 25 June and newspapers of the next day. According to their reports, the Education Ministry rewrote historical accounts in textbooks in the process of textbook authorisation. Despite the news media's initial 'misreport', the crucial fact is that the MOE did give textbook authors either compulsory instructions or recommendations (which are practically difficult to distinguish from each other in some cases) so that the term 'aggression', which would have been used otherwise, might be avoided.⁶ The official Chinese news agency Xinhua's initial coverage (26 June) was cautious,⁷ followed by more explicit criticism in the Communist Party newspaper *Renmin Ribao* (*People's Daily*) on 30 June.⁸

At this stage, however, the MOE hardly anticipated that the results of textbook certification would develop into a full-fledged diplomatic row. In fact, for about a month, the Japanese government's response was non-existent, despite the fact that the media in both China and South Korea were giving the issue intensive coverage.⁹ Education Minister Ogawa Heiji simply asserted that textbook screening was fair and impartial and that it was an internal affair.¹⁰ In the meantime, outspoken Japanese Cabinet members' comments sparked a controversy at home and abroad.¹¹

Diplomatic exchanges

The focus of Chinese and South Korean criticism shifted later onto Japan's responsibility for its colonial rule and aggression in Asia-Pacific. The starting (and ever-consistent) point of both governments' protests was that the Education Ministry, and ultimately the Japanese government, was responsible for the glossing-over of historical facts in school textbooks and that these wrong accounts had to be corrected. The Tokyo government slowly responded to the situation this dispute created, first with a mixture of stopgap measures and a wait-and-see attitude, and finally by hammering out domestic procedures aimed at settling the dispute.¹²

The Chinese Foreign Ministry first protested that the textbook screening in question was not conducted in accordance with the spirit of the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement of 1972 (26 July).¹³ The main points of the Japanese government's reply (28 July) were:

The Japanese government's view on the past war, as clearly stated in the preamble of the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement, has not changed.

It is that Japan had inflicted serious damage on Chinese people during the war, and that it is keenly aware of its responsibility for the damage and deeply reproaches itself; and

This view should be reflected in Japanese education and the Japanese government will humbly listen to the Chinese government's claim.¹⁴

However, Beijing unequivocally referred to the controversial contents in the textbooks as 'errors', labelling as 'preposterous' the deletion of accounts of the heinous deeds during the occupation of China.¹⁵ The Chinese message was clear:

In censoring the textbooks for primary and secondary schools, the Japanese Ministry of Education tampered with the history of the Japanese militarist aggression against China by changing 'invasion of north China' to 'advance into north China'.... What is more, it even attributed the Nanjing atrocities during the war to 'the stubborn resistance of the Chinese troops, which inflicted heavy losses on the Japanese army, who were enraged and, as a

result, killed many Chinese soldiers and civilians'. This is an obvious distortion of the historical facts and is therefore unacceptable.¹⁶

Although Seoul's initial response appeared rather restrained,¹⁷ its Education Ministry disclosed instructions that Korean historians examine Japanese textbooks closely, and that countermeasures would be taken after the investigation.¹⁸ A Foreign Ministry source also indicated that South Korea would offer detailed programmes to 'help' Japan to rectify its historical accounts and to improve mutual understanding between the two peoples.¹⁹ Its officials stressed that 'the ultimate goal was to have Japan correct its errors' in the textbooks.²⁰ But the MOE's communication with South Korea (30 July) does not seem to indicate any progress.

The MOE makes efforts so that textbook contents may be appropriate, and will pay attention to South Korean interests and humbly listen to its domestic debate.

The Japanese government's involvement in textbook screening is limited to the extent that it gives advice. The final decision on accounts in textbooks is left to private authors and publishers.

Textbook screening takes into account the remorse of the past relations and the spirit of bilateral friendship. This policy will remain intact in school education and textbook screening.²¹

A few days later, Seoul's first formal protest was conveyed to Japanese Ambassador Maeda Toshikazu in the form of a memorandum (3 August). The Main Points of the South Korean Memorandum:

It is very regrettable that neither the Japanese government's response of 30 July nor the Japanese Ministry of Education's explanation offered any concrete suggestion about the correction of the Japanese textbooks, which the South Korean government demanded.

The Japanese government's attitude further agitated Korean public opinion and feeling, and it is seriously concerned that the situation, if continued, would adversely affect friendly South Korean-Japanese relations.

The South Korean government strongly demands that the Japanese government take swift and concrete corrective measures.²²

At last, Japanese government officials began to realise the extent of foreign antagonism which seemed to flare up everywhere.²³ In Taiwan, Hongkong, North Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, Vietnam and elsewhere, either the government, the press or civilian groups voiced their condemnation of the controversial textbooks. After the official South Korean protest,

Prime Minister Suzuki, for the first time, expressed his concern over the dispute—but this was mixed with surprise—given Japan's postwar efforts to become a peace-loving nation.²⁴ At the second protest, the Chinese government reiterated their previous points (5 August).²⁵

In early August, the Japanese government attempted to dispatch a special delegation to China and South Korea in order to make inquiries into their views on this issue. But Seoul rejected the Japanese mission on the grounds that Tokyo's attempt at soliciting understanding from Seoul, without any indication of immediate corrections, would be unproductive.²⁶ Yet, if this issue remained unsettled, anti-Japanese feelings threatened to sweep both neighbours, and even Prime Minister Suzuki's visit to China was in jeopardy along with talks with South Korea over loan issues. Its parliament passed a resolution urging Japan to make swift corrections.²⁷ The South Korean Education Minister, Rhee Kyu-do, also announced a modification of the history curriculum for their junior and senior high schools for the next academic year, with a view to teaching students more about Japan's invasion (6 August).²⁸

Prime Minister Suzuki finally decided to accept Chinese and South Korean demands in principle and agreed to the amendment of the controversial accounts in some form (7 August). However, his very first official comment since the onset of the dispute was hardly concrete and substantive (8 August).²⁹ A fuller statement was made by Foreign Minister Sakurauchi Yoshio (12 August), which seems to have been prepared for announcement prior to Liberation Day of 15 August in South Korea, where anti-Japanese feelings had been growing.³⁰ In fact, the Seoul government had earlier pressured Japan to clarify its commitment to the amendment of the textbooks before this particular day.³¹

In parallel, Prime Minister Suzuki, Foreign and Education Ministers were considering a two-step approach based on the report of an earlier mission to Beijing.³² The two-step approach (13 August) was basically aimed at separating the issue of diplomatic relations from the issue of the textbook screening system. In practical terms, this meant that: 1) the Japanese government would clarify its responsibility for the war and express its remorse over past conduct in the form of a statement by the Prime Minister and 2) it would persuade China and South Korea to leave the correction of the textbooks to Japan.³³

Furthermore, two members of the Liberal Democratic Party flew to Seoul in a last-minute attempt to assuage public anger (22 August), as university students were about to return from their summer vacations.³⁴ It was essential for the Japanese government, regardless of the effectiveness of the mission, to be seen as cooperating with South Korean authorities, which were themselves seeking to stem the momentum of direct public action.³⁵

About the same time, Chief Cabinet Secretary Miyazawa Kiichi confirmed the Japanese government's intention to make necessary amendments to the textbooks but he stopped short of saying that it would do so along the lines suggested by foreign governments (21 August).³⁶ This confirmation was soon followed by the Prime Minister's announcement at a press conference (23 August). However, his statement included a very controversial point which undermined the very purpose of his statement:

...judgement on its prewar conduct should wait until historians of the future generation make their judgement. But it is a fact that the war is internationally criticised and acknowledged as 'aggression', and the Japanese government should acknowledge this fact fully.³⁷

The Japanese government finally announced some corrective measures in the form of the Miyazawa Statement (26 August). The Chief Cabinet Secretary expressed his confidence in it, commenting that this statement, coupled with the MOE's explanation, would remove any ambiguity over the government's stance.³⁸

A Summary of the Miyazawa Statement:

The Japanese government and people, keenly aware of the sufferings and damage which Japan inflicted on the peoples of Asian countries including South Korea and China, have followed the path of a peace-loving nation, determined not to repeat the past deeds.

There is no change in the understanding of the South Korean-Japanese Joint Communiqué of 1965 and the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement of 1972.

The spirit of these statements should be reflected in school education and in textbook screening in Japan.

The Japanese government will listen to overseas criticisms about Japanese textbooks and it will be responsible for correcting textbooks which were criticised by South Korea, China and so on.

Japan will endeavour to promote mutual understanding and friendly and cooperative relations with neighbouring countries, while contributing to peace and stability in Asia and the world.³⁹

Towards a settlement of the dispute

Beijing's response was a virtual rejection of the Miyazawa Statement. By contrast, Seoul accepted it in principle,⁴⁰ although dissatisfied with the timing of the corrections. According to diplomatic sources in Seoul, South Korea was more inclined to put its relations with Japan back on track and continue efforts to settle the textbook row in order to avoid exciting its public opinion further.⁴¹

The Main Points of the South Korean Government's Statement

The South Korean government considers that the promise made by the Japanese government to correct accounts in Japanese textbooks is an affirmative response to its repeated demands and to Korean public opinion on this matter.

As for the timing of the corrections, it falls far short of expectations, especially that controversial accounts in the approved textbooks will not be corrected until 1985.

However, the South Korean government notes the fact that the Japanese government has promised to take interim steps in classroom instructions so that the issues and criticisms raised by the Korean public may be reflected.

The government will continue diplomatic efforts to see to it that the Japanese government's promise will be put into practice at an early date.

The government believes that a correct understanding of the history of Korean-Japanese relations is fundamental to the establishment of friendly and cooperative bilateral relations on the principles of reciprocity, equality and mutual respect.⁴²

However, this official view was far from that of Korean public opinion which demanded an immediate settlement of the dispute.⁴³ In fact, Seoul's initial acceptance of 'an affirmative response' appeared as if it would be held back for another week until Tokyo announced the next step (6 September).⁴⁴ In early September, First Assistant Foreign Minister Gong Ro-myung disclosed that South Korea would make more specific requests for amendments concerning the 'comfort women', the suppression of Korean independence movements and the ban on the Korean language.⁴⁵ The Seoul government was drafting a list of corrections on the basis of research conducted by the Korean National History Compilation Committee (the final version of the list was sent to Tokyo on 27 September). The study pointed out 167 inaccurate accounts in Japanese textbooks covering ancient to modern history.⁴⁶ According to a South Korean Foreign Ministry official, Seoul requested the

correction of 39 items.⁴⁷ It also proposed joint research efforts between the two countries in order to correct biased views.⁴⁸ In response to the South Korean list, Education Minister Ogawa stated that the Japanese government would make its own decisions about textbooks.⁴⁹ Eventually, the MOE conceded that it would amend the accounts of four out of the 13 events on the list which were designated for immediate correction.⁵⁰

For its part, the Chinese government's strong dissatisfaction with the Miyazawa Statement was immediately conveyed at a meeting between Vice-Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian and Japanese Ambassador Katori Yasue (28 August).

The Chinese Government's Reply to the Miyazawa Statement (Excerpts)

Having studied the content of the statement, the Chinese government maintains that though the Japanese government said it would listen fully to criticisms and be responsible for correcting the relevant passages in the textbooks, yet it did not put forward any satisfying clear-cut and concrete measures to make corrections. The Japanese government's attitude falls far short of the demands of the Chinese side. It is rather disappointing. The Chinese people cannot agree and the Chinese people also cannot accept it.

We do not agree that the Japanese government need not take resolute measures to correct the textbook mistakes on the excuse of defending the textbook screening system.

The Chinese government once again urges the Japanese government to take concrete, effective measures and correct as quickly as possible the mistakes in screening the textbooks by the Ministry of Education so as to reach a satisfying solution of the matter. That would be conducive to the development of Sino-Japanese relations.⁵¹

In response to the Chinese rejection of the Miyazawa Statement and the renewed South Korean push for immediate corrections, the Japanese government announced a reworked implementation plan which included a timetable for enacting changes and guidelines for informing all schools of the corrections (6 September). Two days later, Chinese Vice-Foreign Minister Wu announced a reply:

Though there are still some ambiguous, unsatisfactory points about the concrete measures proposed by the Japanese side this time to correct the mistakes, it is a step forward compared with previous explanations.

We will judge whether the Japanese side conscientiously corrects the mistakes in the textbooks by its concrete actions and their effects. We reserve our right to comment on this matter. We hope the Japanese government will continue its efforts, respect historical facts and keep its word in the interests of the continued development of Sino-Japanese relations.⁵²

The Japanese government's new arrangements were finally accepted by both the Chinese and South Korean governments on 9 September. For the first time, Vice-Foreign Minister Wu signalled an end to the controversy, though 'a temporary close'.⁵³ On the same day, the Japanese Chief Cabinet Secretary stated that a diplomatic end to the dispute was achieved.⁵⁴

Domestic arrangements in Japan

On 14 September, the MOE initiated the first meeting of the Textbook Authorisation Research Council (TARC) in order to examine the existing screening standards concerning history textbooks and other relevant matters. Eventually, the scope of consultation to the TARC was narrowed down to the following three points:

History textbooks only: If the implications of the textbook issue are considered, junior high school textbooks for civics studies, geography and the Japanese language will also have to be examined along with history textbooks. But, only history textbooks will be examined;

Asian countries only: Accounts concerning not only China and South Korea but also other Asian countries will be reviewed. National feelings of other Asian countries will be hurt if the range of accounts to be examined is limited to the two countries. But a review of all countries in the world is too far-reaching. Therefore, a review will include historical accounts on Asian neighbours where Japan's war conduct directly inflicted damage; and

Modern and contemporary periods only: Especially accounts dealing with modern and contemporary periods will be examined.⁵⁵

Although these points appeared to suggest that fairly concrete measures would result, the Council's final proposal to the MOE (16 November) failed to recommend any amendments to procedural matters or to provide any specific examples of necessary corrections.⁵⁶

A Summary of the Final Proposal

History textbooks must be written from objective and fair standpoints as far as circumstances permit. With regard to modern and contemporary history, there is much to be done in the sorting of historical materials and the accumulating of research achievements. Furthermore, the interpretation of individual events and phenomena is not necessarily settled; hence, it needs careful consideration.

Needless to say, Japan, as a peace-loving country, should consider a spirit of international understanding and international cooperation. In particular, it is necessary to take into account the national feelings of each country in describing Japan's relations with neighbouring Asian countries such as South Korea and China because of its unfortunate relations with them in the past.

This consideration should be respected even further than previously in textbook screening.⁵⁷

Furthermore, a final statement announced by the Education Minister (24 November) fell far short of identifying detailed amendments to be made in the future, and it was even less substantive than the above proposal.⁵⁸ The statement was virtually a review of the dispute.⁵⁹

However, with the statement, the MOE completed its domestic arrangements relating to the 1982 dispute. As a result of all these intergovernmental exchanges, the Japanese textbook screening standards were modified *under foreign pressure* for the first time since the introduction of the new education system after the war. To be precise, a new clause stipulating the spirit of international understanding and international cooperation was added to those already existing screening standards. It was completely different from the old criteria in that it took foreign relations into consideration.⁶⁰ At least, an institutional foothold was established and a South Korean Foreign Ministry source evaluated the new textbook screening standard in a positive manner.⁶¹ However, the most important point—the individual cases of corrections—was left out in all official statements. None of the resulting corrective arrangements were intended to be binding; individual changes were left to the discretion of textbook authors and teachers at school.⁶² Ironically, this autonomy was what Japanese educationalists had long sought. It seems clear that the Japanese authorities dealt with the dispute by hiding behind the technicalities of the screening system at its earlier stage, and closed it by again using the same tactic. Very few government officials seriously examined the background factors of the dispute.

2. The Second Textbook Dispute in 1986

After the first dispute, most highlighted words such as ‘invasion’ were approved by the MOE without any comments in textbook authorisation. However, the South Korean Education Ministry expressed strong dissatisfaction with the results of the 1983 textbook screening and indicated that it was considering a further step.⁶³ The next year, Xinhua News Agency reported that, while there had been improvements, the text which resulted from the screening remained unsatisfactory.⁶⁴ The Japanese Foreign Ministry itself noted Chinese criticisms of the 1984 screening.⁶⁵ It was reported that the MOE obviously did not touch particular words which had drawn attention in 1982, but, on the whole, examined the text more strictly than before.⁶⁶

As expected by some observers, a second textbook dispute arose. When it was revealed that a new Japanese history textbook had been passed despite the inclusion of a number of explanations contrary to historical facts, the initial reaction in China as well as in South Korea was that 'the Japanese have done it again'. Their accusations were essentially the same as those made in 1982, though their protests were relatively low-key. This seems to be partly because the diplomatic framework for handling this issue was laid out in the first dispute. This time, the focus was on the domestic arrangements for the correction of one particular high school history textbook, *Shimpen Nihonshi* (New Edition: Japanese History). It was compiled by a right-wing group called '*Nihon o Mamoru Kokumin Kaigi*' (the National Conference for the Defence of Japan).⁶⁷ The Japanese government was forced to deal directly with this private group.

To an extent, the 1986 dispute was a result of the first controversy, because the National Conference planned to compile its own history textbook in the wake of the 1982 dispute. At their meeting in Tokyo in late October in 1982, the group agreed that the writing of textbooks was too important a project to be entrusted to left-oriented scholars, as had been the case in the past. They decided to take on the task of producing textbooks for Japanese people as they saw fit, instead of complaining about teaching materials written by other scholars.⁶⁸ In March 1984, the National Conference asked a former Chief Textbook Examiner of the MOE to supervise and edit a Japanese history textbook for high schools.⁶⁹

When the Second Division of the TARC (in charge of social studies) examined the first draft of the textbook in question in late January 1986, the decision to approve was split and only 'a conditional pass' was given at this stage. The arrangement for reexamination itself was exceptional. When the authors and editors of the textbook received the results of the examination (20 March), there were a total of 420 either compulsory or recommended corrections to be made. After a lengthy discussion which took place between the MOE and the authors, the Social Studies Division approved the changes made in the final draft (30 May). Individual MOE textbook examiners were anxious about how neighbouring countries would react to the approval of the textbook.

Their concerns proved right. A leading Korean newspaper took up the history textbook compiled by the overtly nationalist group (30 May). Its editorial said that

Japan should not forget the past and should prevent Japanese arrogance from developing once again into imperialism.⁷⁰ One after another Chinese and Korean newspaper articles appeared, which denounced the textbook (for example, *Korean Herald*, from 1 June onwards and *China Daily*, from 5 June onwards).

A South Korean Foreign Ministry official announced that they were launching an investigation into the accounts relating to Korea in the textbook (6 June). The Foreign Ministry said that it would 'carefully watch' Japan's reaction (7 June).⁷¹ However, South Korea did not lodge any official protest this time. Its diplomats confined their strong expressions of anger to private channels.⁷² In the meantime, Seoul's senior officials' comments were given extensive press coverage.⁷³ The Education Ministry reiterated its concerns over long-standing points of controversy concerning Japanese colonialists' recruitment of Koreans for forced labour, the imposition of Japanese names, the compulsory worship of Shinto and the expropriation of Korean farmland, none of which were mentioned in the textbook. The Ministry also accused the textbook writers of justifying the annexation of Korea in 1910.⁷⁴

For their part, the Chinese authorities launched an official protest (4 June), though their reactions were more restrained than in 1982, and the Chinese press remained surprisingly quiet over the issue.⁷⁵ Raising questions about the descriptions of the Nanjing Massacre and other incidents, Ma Yuzhen (a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman) said at a weekly news briefing:

Both in the past and at present, we have always been, and will continue to be in the future, opposed to any statements and actions that distort historical facts and prettify the war of aggression.⁷⁶

In their second protest, the Chinese Foreign Ministry took a harder line and demanded that Japan swiftly rectify the proposed high school textbook that 'grossly distorts' the facts regarding the Sino-Japanese War of 1937-45 (7 June).⁷⁷ Xinhua News Agency pointed out that not a word was mentioned of the aggressive policies of the Japanese militarists in the textbook.⁷⁸ According to the *China Daily*, the textbook interpreted what Japan had done in the early 20th century as necessary in order to 'liberate Asia from the rule of European and American powers and to build a Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere'.⁷⁹

In response to this Chinese protest, Education Minister Kaifu Toshiki stated that the MOE had examined teaching materials in view of friendly neighbourly relations and

that the final results of the screening to be announced in early July should be awaited (10 June).⁸⁰ However, because its basic stand on the textbook issue had not changed since the previous dispute, the Japanese government merely repeated to China the same explanation of the textbook screening system, and conveyed that the new screening standard was applied.⁸¹

During the course of these exchanges, Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro decisively intervened in the dispute. He told the MOE to reexamine the controversial textbook on at least two occasions, following Chinese demands that Japan observe the Miyazawa Statement. Consequently, the MOE instructed the National Conference to make corrections four times *after* the official approval was given (30 May), until the final corrections were accepted (5 July).⁸² On the whole, the Japanese government coped more deftly with the row under Nakasone's leadership than had been the case previously. The MOE was also more cooperative this time, although only after coming under foreign pressure.

The Foreign Ministry remained suspicious of the partial amendment to the nationalistic tone of the textbook despite extraordinary measures taken by the MOE. The MOFA raised its concerns that the problems surrounding the textbook issue would recur in the future.⁸³ Some quarters in the Ministry voiced concern that the situation would be far worse than the 1982 case, if the final results of the screening were found not to be in accordance with the Miyazawa Statement. In addition, Prime Minister Nakasone's comments on the issue raised foreign expectations. The MOFA applied informal pressure on the MOE stating that Japan had to avoid being questioned about its foreign policy stance.⁸⁴ Despite its alleged 'wait and see attitude', the Foreign Ministry reportedly asked or pressed the group to withdraw the publication of the textbook in late June in order not to undermine Japan's diplomatic efforts in the postwar period.⁸⁵

The Japanese Government's Domestic Arrangements during the 1986 Dispute

6 June: Prime Minister Nakasone instructs Education Minister Kaifu to handle the issue carefully based on the Miyazawa Statement.

Between 8 June and 10 June: The MOE asks the authors of the textbook to make corrections (e.g. to change the explanation of An Jung-gun from 'a ruffian' to 'a leader' and to restore the word 'massacre' to the account of the Nanjing Atrocities). The MOE solicits the textbook authors to pretend that

these corrections had been instructed before the official approval on 30 May and to keep this matter secret.

13 June: The Prime Minister again instructs the Education Minister to consider the matter carefully.

18 June: The Prime Minister instructs Chief Cabinet Secretary Gotoda to handle the situation. The MOE makes the second request for corrections of the accounts related to China and Korea

27 June: The MOE makes the third request for corrections. It indicates clear examples pointed out by the Chinese newspaper *People's Daily* and the Korean Education Ministry (e.g. as to China, the Manchurian Incident, the Sino-Japanese War, the Nanjing Massacre; as to South Korea, the March First Demonstration against Japanese rule, the killings of Korean residents in Japan after the Great Earthquake in the Kanto Area, and the Kokato Incident).

2 July: The MOE asks the twenty members of the Social Studies Division of the TARC to approve the corrections.

3 July: The Chairman of the Steering Committee of the National Conference agrees to about 30 corrections such as the account of changing foreigners' indigenous names to Japanese names. The MOE makes the fourth demand for corrections, including the issue of the Emperor.

4 July:-A negotiation over remaining arrangements is held between the MOE and the editor of the textbook (former Chief Textbook Examiner of the MOE) who, for the first time, appears in public on this issue. As a result, the negotiation is completed.

7 July: The MOE reports the final corrections to the TARC and seeks its approval. The MOE gives a final approval to the textbook.

After the final approval of the controversial textbook (7 July), the MOE explained that the Education Minister was entitled to take measures outside the regular procedures in a special situation involving foreign countries.⁸⁶ A government source revealed that Foreign and Education Ministers and the Chief Cabinet Secretary agreed to reject the textbook if the group did not follow the MOE's instructions.⁸⁷ The Prime Minister also conceded that corrections were being made to comply with the views of Cabinet Ministers including himself. He explained that, in the case of textbooks dealing with sensitive aspects of international relations, the Japanese government had to abide by its promise to respect the spirit of the joint statements with China and South Korea, as stipulated in the Miyazawa Statement.⁸⁸

The Japanese government's contact with China and South Korea, after an extraordinary postponement of approval, revealed that its continental neighbours

remained unhappy. When Japanese Ambassador to South Korea Mikanagi Kiyohisa informed the Seoul government of the final results (7 July), the South Korean Foreign Ministry replied that the revisions were not complete, although acknowledging Japan's efforts. According to a South Korean official, the textbook made no mention of Japanese colonial policies which aimed at erasing the features of traditional Korean culture.⁸⁹ Kwon Byong-hyun (Director-General for Asian Affairs of the Foreign Ministry) noted that the explanations about the detailed processes leading to the annexation of Korea by Japan in 1910 fell far short of being satisfactory.⁹⁰ Foreign Minister Lee Won-kyung and Culture and Information Minister Lee Won-hong stated that Seoul would continue to pressure Tokyo to remove accounts which glossed over historical facts.⁹¹

Beijing also regarded the final version of the textbook as inadequate.⁹² According to a Foreign Ministry spokesman, the textbook lacked the recognition of the basic facts about Japanese militarists' actions in neighbouring countries and of their responsibility for these deeds.⁹³ Vice-Foreign Minister Liu Shuqing also conveyed to the Japanese Ambassador to China, Nakae Yosuke, that the textbook did not have 'a sound keynote'.⁹⁴

By this time, presumably in order to avoid further diplomatic embarrassment and international attention, the Japanese Foreign Ministry attempted to close the book on this issue.⁹⁵ Chief Cabinet Secretary Gotoda Masaharu commented that the screening of textbooks was a domestic matter and that the MOE had made sincere efforts to observe the 1982 statement (17 July).⁹⁶ In the meantime, the second textbook row practically disappeared from the news agenda despite no clear indication from either Beijing or Seoul that it had been resolved.

In the end, the second textbook row was left unresolved. Despite the seemingly sophisticated handling of the dispute, Japanese officials failed to address the fundamental question of why the MOE had approved the controversial textbook in the first place. This problem could not be solved by dismissing one Education Minister, who rekindled the dispute shortly thereafter by making controversial remarks about the annexation of Korea, and by making amendments to one particular textbook.

3. Public Reactions in China, South Korea and Japan during the 1982 and 1986 Disputes

One of the distinctive characteristics of the 1982 and 1986 disputes is that they were not confined to the intergovernmental level. Both Beijing and Seoul underlined their nationals' indignation, and the physical and mental suffering which they had experienced at the hands of the Japanese and which continues today. However, it is difficult to conclude anything specific about Chinese, Korean or Japanese public reactions from their governments' formal statements. Therefore, this section will focus on the repercussions among ordinary people in these three countries and illustrate the transnational nature of the issue.

Given tight government control over news and civic activities in China and South Korea, some inference must be made between the government's use of the press and the officially sanctioned freedom of public speech and activities.⁹⁷ However, it was not merely diplomatic manoeuvring that both governments sought to emphasise the concerns of their people, which might otherwise have been ignored by the Tokyo government. On this occasion, both Chinese and South Korean governments' publicity exercises were firmly backed by public support. As a Dietman rightly pointed out, the political settlement of the textbook row with Beijing and Seoul *governments* would not satisfy the *people* of both countries, nor the Japanese.⁹⁸

Official Chinese newspapers introduced public views in the form of letters to the editor. These included stories of personal ordeals and witnesses to the brutality of Japanese troops as well as critical comments by school teachers and historians. Yet one cannot deny the impression that opinions quoted were somewhat reworked versions of the Communist Party's statements. It is difficult to assess the genuine extent and depth of public debate beyond the official lines; but it can be said that the Beijing government gave vent to Chinese people's 'strong resentment' against the change from 'aggression' to 'advance', as Xia Yan (Vice-President of the China-Japan Friendship Association) expressed.⁹⁹ In Chinese academic circles, which severely reproached the Japanese education authorities, Xu Deheng (a Chinese sociologist) said that the MOE was 'blaming the victims'.¹⁰⁰ Another academic, Wan Feng (Vice-Chairman of the Chinese Society of Japanese History) contended that 'this clumsy trick' would not deceive either the Chinese or the Japanese people.¹⁰¹ Other individuals like Bai Xiqing (President of the Chinese Medical Association) publicly spoke of the bacteriological experiments conducted in Harbin and other provinces in Northeast China by the Unit 731 of the Japanese Army between 1940 and 1944.¹⁰²

South Korean citizens, with their long-standing antagonism towards their former rulers, were a powerful voice of support for their government's escalating protests.¹⁰³ Among those who launched protest rallies across the country were groups of South Korean survivors who had witnessed Japanese troops' savagery. Anti-Japanese demonstrations erupted almost daily in the capital from the onset of the 1982 dispute.¹⁰⁴ Taxi drivers, restaurants, department stores and shops refused Japanese customers and citizens called for the boycott of Japanese imports.¹⁰⁵ Korean employees of Japanese banks in Seoul were particularly in a delicate position; they held a rally in response to criticisms that they worked for Japanese companies.¹⁰⁶

Some of South Korean Public Protests and Campaigns in 1982

Civic organisations' rallies

The Korea Independence Fighters' Association
 The Korean Federation of Education Association
 The Korean Nuclear Bomb Victim's Association
 The Korean Senior Citizens Association¹⁰⁷

Student rallies and demonstrations

Korea University (9 September), Seoul National University (15 September), Yonsei University (21 September) and Seogang University (27 September)¹⁰⁸

In Japan

The Korean Residents Union in Japan (Mindan) (29 July)¹⁰⁹

In the 1982 dispute, the press and major political parties and organisations in South Korea took a tougher stance towards Japan than the government did.¹¹⁰ Foreign diplomatic sources analysed that Seoul's turnaround from a wait-and-see attitude to a hardline stance was due to ever-mounting Korean public anger against Tokyo's 'smoke-screen tactics'.¹¹¹

Korean scholars had plenty of ammunition to aim at the textbook issue. Regarding the 'legacy' of Japan's rule over Korea, Lee Jin-hee (a Korean historian living in Japan) maintained that, because Japanese history textbooks were laced with a colonial view of history, Japanese people tended to believe Korea to be 'a weak country', which frequently suffered foreign invasions, 'a trivial people', 'a country underdeveloped and barbarous' and 'a miserable country'.¹¹² According to Shing Yong-ha (professor at Seoul National University), Japan's views about Korean independence movements and the independent state of Korea after National Liberation defied the Korean people's feelings.¹¹³ Similarly, Kim Hak-joon (professor at the same university) drew attention to Japan's self-proclaimed spiritual and cultural

superiority over Korea. In his view, the rewriting of textbooks resulted from what he called 'Japanese vanity'; Japan applied 'civilised' systems imported from Europe to itself, while detaching itself from 'backwardness' of the rest of Asia. He asserted that the Japanese had camouflaged the real aim of their rule over Korea by developing a type of Asian 'white men's burden'.¹¹⁴

Finally, non-governmental reactions in Japan must be mentioned. As is obvious from the onset of the first dispute, leading Japanese newspapers were sympathetic towards Beijing and Seoul. For example, *The Korea Times* reported that the Japanese news media, generally displaying pacifist inclinations and critical attitudes towards conservative bureaucracy, extensively covered the rewriting of history in textbooks.¹¹⁵

Among political circles, reactions were mixed. The Japan Socialist Party (JSP) and the Japan Communist Party (JCP) were virtual mouthpieces of domestic protest movements against the government. Their persistent inquiries into the textbook disputes and related issues are extensively recorded in Diet committee proceedings. Individual Dietmen, including LDP members, also opposed the government. On the other hand, the Japanese side of the Korea-Japan Parliamentarians League appeared more interested in avoiding an escalation in diplomatic tension than in actually pressuring their government to take positive steps.

Japanese citizens too raised their voice against the MOE and the government. Numerous Japanese individuals expressed their views in newspaper readers' columns; others sent a message directly to Chinese and South Korean journals and news media. For example, Irokawa Daikichi (professor at Tokyo Keizai University and historian) commented that whitewashing the militaristic past and romanticising it in films would influence young people and make them 'more susceptible to rightist arguments'.¹¹⁶ Among civilian groups which demonstrated their concern over the textbook issue were Christian associations and six Sino-Japanese friendship organisations.¹¹⁷ For example, Utsunomiya Tokuma (Chairman of the Japan-China Friendship Association) accused the Japanese government of listening to right-wing opinion and of attempting to hinder Japan's efforts at self-reproach over the invasion of China.¹¹⁸ Another voice from a Sino-Japanese organisation was Kunitomo Shuntaro (Chairman of the Liaison Council for Repatriates from China) who tried to address the causal connection between the war of aggression, crimes of killing and

the education provided to young Japanese at that time.¹¹⁹ Other opponents of the MOE and the government included academics, teachers' organisations,¹²⁰ publishers' unions, the Society of Asian Women and Citizens' Society on the Textbook Problem, the producer and the director of the film 'The Game Yet to Finish'.¹²¹

Furthermore, the Okinawans protested at the deletion of forced collective suicides during the Pacific War. A coalition of nine labour, teachers, women and youth organizations launched a protest campaign, urging the government to describe accurately the battle in Okinawa.¹²² Indigenous people in Hokkaido, the Ainu, opposed the deletion of explanations about their deprived rights to hunt, fish and use forests and forced cultural assimilation.¹²³ These *intrastate* aspects of the textbook issue were also debated in Diet committees on many occasions.¹²⁴

However, Japanese citizens' protest rallies were, on the whole, confined to specific groups. The very first Japanese public rally was held rather late during the first dispute (21 August 1982) and its scale was minimal. Organised by eight civilian groups, 300 to 400 citizens and students gathered near the MOE building in protest.¹²⁵ Organised counter-rallies, i.e. in support of the Ministry of Education, were also virtually negligible, except for veterans' gatherings. In fact, South Korean Education Minister Rhee Kyu-do, while acknowledging the criticisms raised against the government by Japanese intellectuals and citizens, commented that their actions alone could not influence the majority of their country men, and that it was necessary to exert external pressure to force a correction of inaccurate historical accounts.¹²⁶

In sum, it is undeniable that, in parallel with the diplomatic exchanges which took place between China and South Korea, and Japan, there were transnational forces representing the voice of ordinary people, although the extent and thrust of these forces greatly differed between the former aggressor and its victims.

4. The Repercussions of the Textbook Issue in the Regional Context

Although China and South Korea were the major players in the 1982 and 1986 disputes, they were not unique in their interest in the textbook issue. It caused widespread repercussions in Asia and beyond, across political and ideological divides; reactions to the disputes varied from the vociferous to almost the negligible. This section will deal with these diverse ramifications of the textbook issue.

According to news sources used in this study, Taiwan, North Korea, Hongkong, the ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), Vietnam, the Soviet Union and the United States all signalled varying degrees of vigilance to Tokyo in the wake of the first dispute. The uneven press coverage of the disputes and strict press control by some governments, in addition to the fact that this paper used only English and Japanese sources, make it difficult to assess the actual extent and intensity of reactions in these countries.¹²⁷ Subject to this constraint, the paper will present an overview of the reactions of governments, the public and the news media in neighbouring countries.

A Comparison of Government, Public and News Media Reactions to the 1982 Dispute

	Government	The public	The news media
Taiwan	+++++	+++	+++
North Korea	+++	n.a.	+
Vietnam	+++	n.a.	+
The Soviet Union	+++	n.a.	+
Thailand	++	++	++
Malaysia	+	n.a.	+
Singapore	+	+	++++
Philippines	+	n.a.	+
Indonesia	+	+	++
Hongkong	-	+++++	+++++
The United States	-	++	+
Britain	-	-	+

Note: Strong reactions (+++++); weak reactions (+); no or few reactions (-); information not available in the sources used in this paper (n.a.)

Government reactions

While the Japanese government appeared to be surrounded by a flood of public condemnation, only the Taipei government, apart from China and South Korea, launched a formal protest, calling for 'proper' actions by Tokyo on the textbooks in question.¹²⁸ Although North Korea, the Soviet Union and Vietnam made provocative statements through their official press, they seem to have had no official contact with the Japanese government.¹²⁹ With regard to the 1986 dispute, official reactions on

record are few, apart from those of Taiwan, North Korea and Vietnam.¹³⁰ A summary of government reactions below includes some officials' comments which were not necessarily made in their official capacity.

The repercussions of the textbook issue crossed political and ideological divides; North and South Korea, China, Taiwan, the Soviet Union and Vietnam were all interested parties. Political rivalry among them did surface briefly though, as seen in Hanoi's initial comment of 'a Washington-Tokyo-Peking axis'¹³¹ and in an exchange of accusations between the official Soviet news agency Tass and the Chinese *People's Daily*.¹³² However, Pyongyang paid attention to many concerned voices in Asia including the Korean, Chinese and Japanese peoples.¹³³ Arch-rivals Pyongyang and Seoul came to take the same side in condemning Tokyo.¹³⁴ Few acrimonious exchanges occurred between China and Taiwan on this issue. In fact, it was inconceivable that any party would support the Japanese government's stand on this occasion. Rather, any political or ideological rivalry that emerged centred on the manner in which criticisms were made, all of which essentially carried the same message.

Second, the ASEAN governments did not take particular action, with the exception of Thailand. Bangkok made an official inquiry into the Japanese textbooks in 1982, although its response came rather late, and it finally decided not to lodge any official protest against Tokyo. As for the other four members at that time, only a few officials' comments are on record. For example, according to the Associated Press, the late President Ferdinand Marcos, who fought a guerrilla war against the Japanese Imperial Army, took exception to the United States.¹³⁵ A leading newspaper, the *Manila Times* posited that the Philippines did not pay particular attention to the 1982 dispute because of Marcos' concern with possible friction with the Japanese government and financial circles.¹³⁶ Another comment worthy of note was one made by the Malaysian Prime Minister, Mahathir Mohamad. He denied that the textbook dispute would affect his 'Look East' policy, yet he could not help but mention the dispute involving the economic giant in the region. It is possible that both Manila and Kuala Lumpur refrained from making explicit official accusations against Japan because of economic considerations.

There also existed widespread uncertainty, if not articulated concern, over the military build-up in Japan. *The Straits Times* (of Singapore) echoed the point as follows:

A new generation of Japanese is growing up and inheriting a powerful economic machine with a formidable military capability. The mistakes of their forebears must be learnt and understood, before the rest of Asia can feel at ease with a re-armed Japan.¹³⁷

Other Asian states' uncertainty mainly centred around US-Japanese relations. They may have thought that the US-Japanese security treaty would stop Japan from arming, but Tokyo seemed to be going beyond this framework.¹³⁸ This led Indonesian President Suharto to express concern about the US pressure on Japan to increase its military capability,¹³⁹ while Prime Minister Mahathir mentioned nervousness over the limits of Japan's 'self-defence'.¹⁴⁰

Yet it must be noted that each country also tried to capitalise on this occasion to make opportunistic claims. Like Moscow and Pyongyang, Hanoi reproached the MOE's textbook authorisation, but their main focus was on the US global strategy and the militarisation of Japan.¹⁴¹ The communist camp's apprehension about this Western ally on the Pacific rim was not new in the Cold War situation. But Vietnam also accused China of endorsing US-Japanese relations, although this accusation was later dropped. The Kremlin, for its own national interests, made a point of including the Kurile Islands in discussions, though it failed to indicate how the territorial dispute related specifically to the textbook case.¹⁴²

Finally, possibly prompted by the 1982 dispute, at least two governments took a step (or a counter-measure) to revise their own history syllabuses. For instance, Taipei instructed its schools to teach students more about Japanese atrocities which took place in the war against China (5 August).¹⁴³ Singapore's Education Minister also announced a complete overhaul of the history syllabus for secondary schools in which the Japanese occupation was to be one of the main focuses (22 August).¹⁴⁴

Public reactions

Like government reactions, the pattern of those of the public varied greatly from one country to another. During the 1982 dispute, the activities of Hongkong citizens far exceeded those in other areas and countries, although some demonstrations were held in the US and Taiwan.¹⁴⁵ During the 1986 controversy, some protest activities

were observed in Thailand, Hongkong and the Philippines, but few were reported in the newspapers.¹⁴⁶

In Hongkong, students, teachers and university faculty staff played a central part in organising large-scale demonstrations and signing campaigns in the summer of 1982. The Federation of Students and the Professional Teachers' Union held a rally to commemorate the 51st anniversary of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria (19 September).¹⁴⁷ That day participants handed the Japanese consulate a petition with over 400,000 signatures, with the rally marking the climax of a two-month long campaign by students.¹⁴⁸ Public protests even showed signs of violence when a home-made bomb exploded at a Japanese department store, and another was discovered. The Taiwanese people remained relatively quiet about the textbook revisions for some time in sharp contrast to the furious tone of newspapers there. But protest campaigns spread gradually from a group of college professors and students to citizens.

On the other side of the Pacific, activities against the revisionist textbooks centred around a group called 'Alliance Against Japanese Distortion of History', which was founded by American citizens of Asian origin in September 1982. Although its activities out in the streets were on a much smaller scale than those organised by Hongkong students, the group examined various background factors of the textbook issue. It criticised Chinese and South Korean governments for settling the 1982 dispute for economic reasons and the White House for placing pressure on Japan to rearm against possible Soviet expansion.¹⁴⁹ The Alliance also lodged another Asian-Americans' protest at the time of Prime Minister Nakasone's visit to the US in January 1983.¹⁵⁰

By contrast, public gatherings were almost non-existent in most of the ASEAN countries. The only organised campaign seems to have been that of the Chinese Journalists Welfare Association in Thailand, which sent a protest letter to the Japanese Embassy in Bangkok. This scarcity of civic reactions among the ASEAN members can be explained by a few factors. One would be that, because few passages in the Japanese textbooks were directly offensive to them, anti-Japanese sentiments were not aroused to the same extent as in China and South Korea. Another may be that the local press did not pick up this issue and the people had little knowledge of it. In effect, after the peak of the first row, *The Indonesia Times*

pointed out that most Indonesians were unaware of the textbook issue except for what they read in the Western press; it also points to 'a love-hate relationship', based on the older generation's admiration of Japan and their suffering under its occupation.¹⁵¹ A Singaporean parliamentarian also spoke of similar mixed attitudes towards the former aggressor. On the one hand, the older people would feel uneasy when Singaporean leaders often spoke of 'learn from Japan', on the other hand, they would remain silent because they accepted their economic relationship with Japan.¹⁵²

The news media's reactions

Government and public reactions provide only a partial picture of the repercussions the textbook issue caused in other countries. This may be complemented by the news media's reportage. Below are some findings based on a geographical comparison of media reactions.

First, a discernible gap existed between non-Asian and Asian newspapers in terms of the number of articles concerning the 1982 dispute, despite the almost simultaneous appearance of the first article in the week when the Chinese government made its official complaint. (During the 1986 dispute, there was no discernible quantitative gap between them since the total number was much smaller). During the peak three months from July to September 1982, *The Times* published 11 articles; *Financial Times*, 6; *New York Times*, 17; and *The Washington Post*, 13. On the other hand, the 34 Asian newspapers under survey (except Chinese and South Korean newspapers) carried 36 articles on average during the same period.¹⁵³

Second, notwithstanding the previous point, a wide discrepancy was observed among Asian newspapers as well, ranging from those with more than 200 articles (Hongkong and Singapore) to those with no more than 20 during the same three months. Where either governmental or non-governmental actors protested at Japan, the average number of articles per paper reached 52. By country, Indonesian, Malaysian, Thai and Philippine newspapers in general carried fewer articles than Hongkong or Singaporean papers.

A third point is that, while Asian newspapers dealt with the controversial accounts in the Japanese textbooks in detail, the Western news media tended to bring into focus major symbolic cases such as the 'invasion/advance' into China. For example, the Korean Central News Agency of North Korea gave concrete details regarding the

colonial enslavement policy and looting by Japanese imperialists, the infringement of Korea's diplomatic and administrative rights (or the Koreans' acceptance of a 'treaty' as described in Japanese teaching materials) and the confiscation of land (or 'confirmation of land ownership').¹⁵⁴

It is also important to note that the tone of criticism in the press was not the same across the Asian region. For example, Thai and Indonesian accusations were, on the whole, somewhat reserved, compared with the expressions of outright indignation seen in the Hongkong and Singaporean press. An editorial in the *Bangkok Post* said that an 'often admirable nation', having been an economic miracle, 'is coming under well-deserved attack for a campaign to make its citizens forget what came before all this hard-won success'.¹⁵⁵ In the case of *Bulletin Today* (later *Manila Bulletin*), most articles were based on the Western press sources and they simply reported the developments of the official disputes involving China and South Korea.

Not unexpectedly, a number of articles compared the 'two postwar periods' of West Germany and Japan in terms of education, foreign policies and their attitudes towards the past and regional countries. They pointed out different approaches to the issue of history the two countries adopted.¹⁵⁶

Finally, the local Asian media launched protest campaigns in various ways. Particularly, the Hongkong press played an active role in raising public awareness of the textbook issue, by broadcasting documentary films. Hong Kong Television Broadcast (TVB), with the largest audience there, had on air a 90 minute film including interviews with survivors of the Nanjing Massacre in mid-August in 1982. Documentary films such as 'The Cruel War' and 'A Record of Blood' (American and British films which featured the Nanjing Massacre and the Marco Polo Bridge incident) also drew public attention.¹⁵⁷

In conclusion, this paper has dealt with the impact of the textbook issue on Japan's neighbours. Despite diverse repercussions—from formal government protests to private comments by officials, from large-scale mass demonstrations to subdued protests, and from local newspapers' incessant coverage to occasional references, it was shown that the textbook issue, crossing political or ideological divides, tapped into the long-subsumed but unhealed indignation and grievances of many Asian

societies. Apart from latent political calculations on the part of governments, many people in the region raised their voice in a genuine manner.

On the other hand, Japanese attitudes towards the textbook issue revealed that the country was trapped in its past. With ambiguity and hesitancy over Japan's role before and during the Second World War on the part of the government, Japanese society has drifted in much of the postwar period, with diverse views and interpretations of what actually happened. Certainly, the Japanese people could not help touching upon earlier generations' experiences of the war. But, Japanese society as a whole did not embark on a serious introspection of its recent past until the 1990s.

List of Abbreviations

AAB	Asian Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan
AFP	Agence France-Presse
AP	The Associated Press
AS	<i>Asahi Shimbun</i> (Japan)
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AUD	Audit Committee*
BP	<i>Bangkok Post</i>
CD	<i>China Daily</i>
D	the Diet (the Japanese parliament)
DSP	Democratic Socialist Party (Japan)
E	the evening edition of Japanese newspapers
ED	Education Committee*
FA	Foreign Affairs Committee*
FT	<i>Financial Times</i>
HC	the House of Councillors (the Upper House) (Japan)
HR	the House of Representatives (the Lower House) (Japan)
IT	<i>The Indonesia Times</i>
JCP	Japan Communist Party
JSP	Japan Socialist Party
KBS	Korean Broadcasting System (South Korea)
KH	<i>The Korea Herald</i> (South Korea)
KNHCC	Korean National History Compilation Committee (South Korea)
KNI	Kantorberita Nasional Indonesia
KT	<i>The Korea Times</i> (South Korea)
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party (Japan)
M	the morning edition of Japanese newspapers
MD	<i>Malaysian Digest</i>
MOE	Ministry of Education (Japan)
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Japan)
NYT	<i>New York Times</i>
RTN	Reuters News
SEC	Security Committee*
ST	<i>The Straits Times</i> (Singapore)
SWB	BBC Summary of World Broadcast
TARC	Textbook Authorisation Research Council (Japan)
TIM	<i>The Times</i>
TWP	<i>The Washington Post</i>
UPI	United Press International
XHNA	Xinhua News Agency (China)

*A committee of the Japanese Diet (parliament)

Endnotes

Below, the details of Diet committees are presented as follows: 'D-96-HR, FA, ...'. This means the 96th Diet Session, the House of Representatives, the Foreign Affairs Committee, followed by the date and the page(s).

- 1 For example, refer to Chinese Premier Zhu Ronji's visit to Japan (in mid-October 2000) and Pyongyang-Tokyo talks on the establishment of diplomatic relations (in late October 2000).
- 2 In this paper, Asia is defined as a region covering North and South Korea, China, Hongkong, Macao, Taiwan, ASEAN member countries in the 1980s (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Brunei (since January 1984)), Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Burma. The Indian sub-continent and Oceanic countries are excluded.
- 3 The textbook issue ('*Kyokasho Mondai*' in Japanese) is often used in a broader sense, to mean the repercussions which the disputes caused and the whole subject concerning controversial accounts of historical events in textbooks, than just as a reference to the diplomatic disputes of 1982 and 1986.
- 4 As to the actual planning and preparation of curriculum, see, for example, Tokyo Metropolitan Government (Liaison and Protocol Section, Bureau of General Affairs) (ed.), *Education in Tokyo*, Tokyo, 1979, pp.107-09.
- 5 NYT, 27.8.82
- 6 AS,26.6.82, p.1. With regard to the controversial 'misinformation', it seems that the Japanese media's original coverage of the textbook screening in 1982 did not accurately reflect the ways in which it proceeded that year. Some accounts, but *not all of them*, were rewritten in the process of textbook screening. Yet, *after* the Ministry's explanation about this process, the Japanese government virtually dismissed the issue of 'misinformation'. The reason seems to be that both Beijing and Seoul began to question Tokyo's foreign policy stance and that overseas anti-Japanese sentiments were growing in many Asian countries. Furthermore, this paper adds the following points: 1) the South Korean press already pointed out inaccurate accounts in Japanese textbooks in 1981, and this was debated at the Education Committee in October of that year; 2) the Korean National History Compilation Committee itself examined Japanese textbooks in 1982 (see Note 18 below); and 3) regardless of the process of textbook screening, its results were not agreeable to either China or South Korea. See D-95-HC, ED, 27.10.81, pp.3-6; D-96-HC, ED, 29.7.82, pp.4, 7 and 12; D-96-HR, ED, 30.7.82, pp.3-6; D-96-HR, ED, 4.8.82, p.2; D-96-HR, FA, 9.8.82, p.2; D-96-HC, SEC, 10.8.82, p.12; D-96-HR, AUD, 10.8.82, pp.4-5; D-96-HC, FA, 19.8.82, p.23; and D-96-HR, AUD, 21.9.82, pp.13-4 and 20.
- 7 XHNA, 28.6.82, p.18
- 8 Asian Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (ed.), *Chugoku Geppo* (China Monthly), July 1982, p.9

- 9 In 1982, the official Xinhua News Agency filed 212 reports on the textbook issue from 28 June to 30 September when the issue was most intensely debated. The *China Daily* carried 118 articles from 1 July to 30 September; *The Korea Herald*, 278 (including letters to the editor) from 20 July to 29 September; and *The Korea Times*, 232 (including letters to the editor) from 18 July to 29 September.
- 10 Despite the claim that textbooks are an 'internal affair' by some Japanese politicians, International Society for Educational Information or ISEI (established in 1958 and affiliated to the Japanese Foreign Ministry) gathers foreign textbooks and examines accounts of Japan in these textbooks. The main aim of this activity is to provide foreign countries with accurate information about the country.
- 11 For these controversial comments made at a Cabinet meeting (27 July), see AS, E.27.7.82, p.2.
- 12 Caroline Rose, 'The Textbook Issue: Domestic Sources of Japan's Foreign Policy', *Japan Forum*, vol.11, no.2, 1999, pp.211-12
- 13 XHNA. 28.7.82, pp.4-5 and KT, 28.7.82, p.1. The Sino-Japanese Joint Statement said: 'The Japanese side is keenly conscious of the responsibility of the serious damage that Japan caused in the past to the Chinese people through war, and deeply reproaches itself'. Public Information and Cultural Affairs Bureau, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (ed.), *Nitchu Kankei Shiryoshu* (A Collection of Documents on Sino-Japanese Relations), Tokyo, 1982, p.195.
- 14 This meeting was held between Xiao Xiangqian (Director of the First Department of Asian Affairs of the Chinese Foreign Ministry) and Watanabe Koji (a minister at the Japanese Embassy in Beijing) on 28 July. AS, M.29.7.82, p.1
- 15 KT, 27.7.82, p.1.
- 16 XHNA, 28.7.82, pp.4-5
- 17 In fact, South Korean Education Ministry officials commented, before their investigation of the Japanese textbooks, that Seoul would not make demands on Tokyo for corrections even if they found the textbooks problematic. KH, 23.7.82, p.8
- 18 KH, 23.7.82, p.8. The South Korean Education Ministry said after the examination that it would be desirable that academics or private organisations make arrangements for corrections. On 5 August 1982, the Korean National History Compilation Committee (KNHCC) said that 16 Japanese textbooks to be used from April 1983 contained distortions or wrong accounts of 24 historical facts relating to Korea, 15 of which concern modern history. KH, 6.8.82, p.3
- 19 KT, 1.8.82, p.1

- 20 KT, 29.7.82, p.1
- 21 Lee Sang-jin (a Korean minister to Tokyo) and Suzuki Isao (Director of Elementary and Secondary Education Bureau of the MOE) were at this meeting. AS, M.31.7.82, p.3 *The Korea Herald* criticised in an editorial that the Japanese government treated China and South Korea differently in dealing with the textbook dispute, pointing out that '[k]owtowing to the big and bullying before the small are part and parcel of Japanese duplicity derived from its inferiority complex'. KH, 31.7.82, p.2
- 22 KH, 4.8.82, p.1
- 23 Kenneth B. Pyle, 'Japan Besieged: The Textbook Controversy', *Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol.9, no.2, 1983, pp.297-300
- 24 AS, M.5.8.82, p.1
- 25 A meeting was held between Vice-Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian and Japanese Ambassador to China Katori Yasue. XHNA, 5.8.82, pp.4-5
- 26 KH, 7.8.82, p.1 and KT, 7.8.82, p.1
- 27 AS, M.8.8.82, p.1
- 28 Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (Institute of Developing Economies) (ed.), '1982 Nen no Kankoku (South Korea in 1982)', in Ajia Chuto no Doko Nempo (Annual Report of the Developments in Asia and the Middle East), 1983, pp.39 and 43
- 29 AS, M.9.8.82, p.1
- 30 AS, M.13.8.82, p.1
- 31 KH, 6.8.82, p.1. As to his interview with the Korean Broadcasting System (KBS) (13 August), see AS, E.13.8.82, p.1.
- 32 The main two points of the report were as follows: China's demand for the correction of the textbooks remains unchanged; and China acknowledges Japan's sovereignty over its textbook screening system. AS, M.14.8.82, p.1. For a similar South Korean comment, see KH, 31.7.82, p.1.
- 33 For this mission, the head of Information and Cultural Affairs Bureau of the Foreign Ministry and the head of Science and International Affairs Bureau of the Education Ministry flew to Beijing.
- 34 These two members were Mitsuzuka Hiroshi (Chairman of the Textbook Problem Subcommittee) and Mori Yoshiro (Vice-Chairman of the Education System Research Council).
- 35 AS, M.22.8.82, p.2
- 36 AS, E.21.8.82, p.1

- 37 AS, M.24.8.82, p.1
- 38 AS, E.26.8.82, p.1
- 39 Policy Division, the Minister's Secretariat of the Ministry of Education of Japan (ed.), *Monbusho Nempo* (Annual Report of the Education Ministry), no.110, 1982, p.141-42, and KH, 28.8.82, pp.3 and 6. The rest of the statement dealt with administrative arrangements to be made, i.e. consultation with the TARC and a timetable for implementing corrective measures in classrooms.
- 40 AS, E.27.8.82, p.1 and KT, 31.8.82, p.1
- 41 KT, 28.8.82, p.1
- 42 KH, 28.8.82, pp.3 and 6
- 43 AS, M.28.8.82, p.2
- 44 TWP, 10.9.82
- 45 KT, 4.9.82, p.1
- 46 KH, 14.9.82, p.8
- 47 KH, 28.9.82, p.8 and KT, 28.9.82, p.1. The thirteen historical events in modern and contemporary times which were given priority are: 1) Japan's invasion in South Korea, 2) the deprivation of sovereignty, 3) South Korean soldiers' insurrections against Japan, 4) Ann Jung-ong's heroic deed (the assassination of Ito Hirobumi), 5) the annexation of Korea, 6) Japan's militaristic rule, 7) the expropriation of land, 8) the 1st of March Independence Movement, 9) Kanto Great Earthquake, 10) the compulsory assimilation of Japanese culture (visits to shrines, the use of Japanese language and the change of names), 11) forced labour, 12) independence movements against Japan, 13) Japan's long-term colonial rule. The other 26 points were preserved for further research, including Korean-Japanese relations in ancient times. AS, M.28.9.82, p.1
- 48 However, it was in March 1991 that the first meeting of joint research between South Korean and Japanese historians was held in Tokyo. The second meeting was held in Seoul in September 1991 and the third one in Tokyo in March 1992.
- 49 AS, E.28.9.82, p.1
- 50 Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (ed.), '1982 Nen no Kankoku', 1983, p.42
- 51 XHNA, 31.8.82, p.5
- 52 XHNA, 10.9.82, p.3
- 53 XHNA, 10.9.82, pp.3-4

- 54 AS, M.1.9.82, p.3 and M.10.9.82, p.1
- 55 AS, M.15.9.82, p.2
- 56 See AS, M.17.11.82, p.1.
- 57 Administrative procedures such as the timing of amendment are omitted here. Policy Division, the MOE (ed.), *Monbusho Nempo*, no.110, 1982, p.120
- 58 According to Education Minister Ogawa, his statement itself did not aim at complementing the content of textbooks which would be used before correction; it meant that school education as a whole should foster the spirit of international cooperation further. He evaded specific transitory corrective measures which were to be taken prior to the next partial amendment. AS, E.24.11.82, p.14. Although some Dietmen suggested that corrections should be made with the immediate issuance of errata, the MOE strongly opposed this idea, insisting that the historical accounts in question were not errors. D-96-HR, ED, 27.8.82, pp.11 and19
- 59 Policy Division, the MOE (ed.), *Monbusho Nempo*, no.110, 1982, p.141
- 60 AS, M.15.9.82, p.1
- 61 Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (ed.), '1982 Nen no Kankoku', 1983, p.42
- 62 Education Committee members already pointed out immediately after the Miyazawa Statement that the MOE's implementation plan for corrections was not binding. D-96-HR, ED, 27.8.82, pp.11and19
- 63 AS, M.9.7.83, p.3. Later, the South Korean Foreign Minister instructed to investigate Japanese history textbooks. See AS, M. 22.1.86, p.3 and M.26.1.82, p.3.
- 64 AS, M.2.7.84, p.3
- 65 The *People's Daily* (5 July 1984), quoted in AAB (ed.), *Chugoku Geppo*, July 1984, p.9
- 66 AS, M.14.6.84, p.3 and M.1.7.84, p.1. On the legal front, in January 1984, Prof. Ienaga filed the third textbook lawsuit, demanding that the government approve his accounts of the Nanjing Massacre, Unit 731, the collective suicide in Okinawa and the Koreans' protest at Japan during the Sino-Japanese War. In March 1986, the Tokyo High Court turned down all of Prof. Ienaga's claims in the second instance of the first textbook lawsuit. This decision permitted the state to intervene in education where its intervention is considered necessary and rational. See Morikawa Kinju, *Kyokasho to Saiban*, (Textbooks and Lawsuits), Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1990, pp.155-203.
- 67 As to the group's membership, see AS, E.10.7.86, p.3 and as to other co-authors, see AS, M.8.7.86, p.4.

- 68 The meeting was held on 30 October 1982. Kobori Keiichiro, *Sekai Nippo*, 4 June 1987
- 69 In its organ '*Nihon no Ibuki* (Japan's Breathing)' of 15 April 1984, the group announced that their priority would be to compile a Japanese history textbook for high schools for the time being. It was part of their campaign to create an ideological tide for the amendment of the Japanese Constitution. The editor of the new textbook had been in contact with the president of the publisher 'Hara Shobo', and solicited him to make an application for textbook screening.
- 70 AS, E, 10.7.86, p.3
- 71 KH, 7.6.86, p.1
- 72 FT, 17.7.86, p.6 and NYT, 7.10.86, p.13
- 73 With regard to the 1986 dispute, *The Korea Herald* had 78 articles from 1 June to 23 September, including those dealing with the dismissal of the Education Minister.
- 74 KH, 18.6.86, p.8
- 75 With regard to the 1986 dispute, the *China Daily* carried 26 articles from 5 June to 24 September, including those dealing with the dismissal of the Education Minister. The weekly edition of Xinhua reported the dispute three times.
- 76 CD, 5.6.86, p.1
- 77 For Chinese criticisms, see the *People's Daily* (10 and 22 June and 7 July 1986), quoted in AAB (ed.), *Chugoku Geppo*, June 1986, pp.6-7 and July 1986, p.7.
- 78 CD, 18.7.86, p.4
- 79 CD, 10.6.86, p.1
- 80 AS, E.10.6.86, p.1
- 81 AS, M.12.6.86, p.2
- 82 AS, M.1.7.86, p.1
- 83 AS, M.22.6.86, p.2
- 84 AS, M.22.6.86, p.2
- 85 According to a member of the National Conference, an official at the Japanese Embassy in Beijing explained to the president of the textbook publisher, who was on a business trip there, about Chinese sentiments towards the textbook and indirectly urged him to withdraw the textbook. This was denied by another MOFA official, who, however, did acknowledge that there was a meeting

between an MOFA official and the president of the publisher. See AS, E.4.7.86, p.1.

- 86 AS, M.8.7.86, p.3
- 87 AS, M.2.7.86, p.1
- 88 AS, M.19.6.86, p.1
- 89 KH, 8.7.86, p.1
- 90 KH, 11.7.86, p.3
- 91 KH, 12.7.86, p.1
- 92 KH, 18.7.86, p.3
- 93 XHNA, 24.7.86, p.14
- 94 XHNA, 24.7.86, p.14
- 95 AS, M.14.7.86, p.2
- 96 AS, E.17.7.86, p.2
- 97 The publication of views unacceptable to the Chinese authorities is hardly possible. To a lesser extent, this is also true of South Korea where the media were under close government guidance at the time, although formal censorship ended in January 1982. AP, 28.8.82
- 98 D-96-HR, ED, 27.8.82, p.7
- 99 XHNA, 24.7.82, p.3
- 100 XHNA, 3.8.82, p.5. For comments made by Chinese educationalists and academics, see *Beijing Review*, vol.25, no.31, 1982, p.10 and AAB (ed.), *Chugoku Geppo*, July 1982, p.14 and August 1982, pp.22-4.
- 101 XHNA, 4.8.82, pp.4-5
- 102 XHNA, 14.8.82, p.14
- 103 KT, 31.7.82, p.2
- 104 AP, 13.8.82 and 14.8.82. The South Korean authorities must have approved these demonstrations, since unauthorised public gatherings were inconceivable at the time. For example, riot police were immediately called in to break up unauthorised student demonstrations criticising the Seoul government's attitude towards Japan and the United States' pressure on Japan. See AP, 28.8.82.
- 105 KT, 13.8.82, p.8 and AP, 13.8.82 and 14.8.82

- 106 AS, M.13.8.82, p.3
- 107 KT, 30.7.82, p.8, 10.8.82, p.8 and 11.8.82, p.8
- 108 Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (ed.), '1982 Nen no Kankoku', 1983, p.40
- 109 KT, 30.7.82, p.1
- 110 South Korean newspapers carried shocking pictures of an independence fighter with both arms severed, and of another being executed with a chopper as well as those depicting the destruction of historical sites and the rounding up of Korean women for brothels for Japanese troops. AP, 13.8.82 and FT, 25.8.82, p.3
- 111 KT, 31.7.82, p.2 and 5.8.82, p.1
- 112 KH, 31.7.82, pp.1 and 8
- 113 KT, 31.7.82, p.8
- 114 KH, 31.7.82, p.3. His paper was presented at a public hearing at the Seoul Sejong Cultural Centre.
- 115 KT, 28.7.82, p.1. A brief summary of Japanese newspapers' coverage of the 1982 dispute and criticisms by Japanese citizens' groups is given in AAB (ed.), *Chugoku Geppo*, August 1982, pp.12-3.
- 116 KT, 17.8.82, p.2
- 117 IT, 23.8.82, p.7 and AS, M, 22.8.82, p.22
- 118 KT, 1.8.82, p.1
- 119 XHNA, 11.8.82, pp.9-10
- 120 At a meeting with Education Minister Ogawa (23 July 1982), Makieda Motofumi (Chairman of the Japan Teachers' Union) was reported to have called for the correction of controversial texts. KT, 25.7.82, p.1.
- 121 XHNA, 6.8.82, pp.9-10 and 9.9.82, p.6
- 122 BP, 3.8.82, p.5
- 123 AS, M.25.8.82, p.22. On 24 August, an association called Utari in Hokkaido demanded the MOE to correct the textbook accounts.
- 124 D-96-HR, FA, 30.7.82, pp.6-8; D-96-HR, ED, 27.8.82, p.15; and D-96-HC, AUD, 14.9.82, p.12
- 125 KH, 22.8.82, p.1

- 126 AS, M.9.8.82, p.6. This comment is excerpts from his reply at the South Korean National Assembly's Education and Public Relations Committee on 5 August.
- 127 Research materials used in this paper are leading newspapers in the region as well as those in the United Kingdom and the United States, partly supplemented by news summaries of the BBC, the Associated Press and Reuters News. This paper examined the news sources from June to December in 1982 and from June to September in 1986 when the two textbook disputes were at the peak. As to *The Times*, *Financial Times*, *The Washington Post* and *New York Times*, a period between June 1982 and December 1995 is covered.
- 128 Beijing (UPI,AP), BP, 2.8.82 and Taipei (AP,KNI), IT, 5.8.82. Japan severed diplomatic ties with Taiwan in 1972 when it normalised its relations with China. With North Korea, Japan has had no diplomatic relations since World War II.
- 129 It is not clear whether there was some form of exchanges between Pyongyang and Tokyo governments, for example, through informal channels such as North Korean residents in Japan.
- 130 Beijing (UPI), BP, 10.7.86
- 131 Seoul (AP,KNI), IT, 9.9.82
- 132 The Associated Press quoted the *People's Daily* as saying that: 'a recent commentary on the subject [the textbook dispute] by the official Soviet news agency Tass did not criticise the Japanese Ministry, but instead called the *People's Daily* "childish"'. Tass asserted that China did not learn a historical lesson from unequal relations Japanese imperialists had established with it. The *People's Daily* counterargued that the Chinese had not forgotten the imperialists' attitude towards them, and reminded that "those who establish their relations with China on an unequal basis include the Soviet Union itself". ...as soon as you have an opportunity, you seek to take the stance of an authority and lecture people. This is a reflection of such unequal relations. ... Before you attack China, you should look in a mirror'. AP, 31.7.82
- 133 Beijing (AFP,AP), ST, 8.8.82 and Pyongyang (*Rodong Sinmun*), BP, 28.8.82
- 134 TWP, 28.7.82. According to *The Straits Times*, Reuters reported South Korean President Chun Doo-hwan renewed his proposal for talks with North Korean leader, Kim Il-sung on possible reunification. President Chun did not directly mention the textbook row, but did recollect colonial rule under Japan.
- 135 AP, 6.9.82
- 136 Quoted in AS, M.14.6.86, p.3
- 137 ST, 10.9.86

- 138 AS, M.8.8.82, p.3
- 139 Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (ed.), '1982 Nen no Indoneshia (Indonesia in 1982)', 1983, p.383
- 140 Prime Minister Mahathir also mentioned a grey area between military and non-military products and thus his concern over Japan's arms exports to Southeast Asia. MD,31.1.83, vol.14, nos.1 and 2, p.2
- 141 IT, 9.9.82
- 142 TIM, 27.8.82
- 143 Taipei (Reuters, 5.8.82), ST, 6.8.82
- 144 ST, 22.8.82
- 145 As for North Korea, some criticisms against the Japanese history textbooks came from academic circles in late July and early August, and protest letters of workers were publicised in various newspapers in mid-August. See Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (ed.), '1982 Nen no Chosen Minshushugi Jinmin Kyowakoku (North Korea in 1982)', 1983, p.76.
- 146 NYT, 10.7.86
- 147 Hongkong (Reuters,AP), BP, 19.9.82
- 148 Hongkong (AP,KNI), IT, 20.9.82
- 149 AP, 17.9.82 and NYT, 19.9.82
- 150 AP, 18.1.83
- 151 IT, 7.10.82
- 152 ST, 9.8.82
- 153 These figures are based on those provided by Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (Institute of Developing Economies), 'Asian Newspapers on the "Textbook Issue": Index to Articles July-September 1982', *Ajia Keizai Shiryo Geppo* (Asian Economic Data Monthly), vol.24, nos.11 and 12, 1982
- 154 A comment quoted in SWB, 26.10.94
- 155 BP, 10.8.82
- 156 However, because of limited space, this paper does not touch on this comparative aspect.
- 157 Hongkong, 3.9.82, ST, 4.9.82

References

- Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (Institute of Developing Economies) (ed.), *Ajia Chuto no Doko Nempo* (Annual Report of the Developments in Asia and the Middle East), 1980-1986
- Ajia Keizai Kenkyusho (Institute of Developing Economies), 'Asian Newspapers on the "Textbook Issue": Index to Articles July-September 1982', *Ajia Keizai Shiryo Geppo* (Asian Economic Data Monthly), vol.24, nos.11 and 12, 1982
- Asai, Motofumi, *Nihon Gaiko: Hansei to Tenkan* (Japan's Foreign Policy: Self-reflection and Changing Course), Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1989
- Asian Affairs Bureau, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (ed.), *Chugoku Geppo* (China Monthly), Tokyo, July 1982-December 1987 (inclusive)
- Benfell, Steve T., 'Meet the New Japan, Same as the Old Japan: The History and Politics of Postwar National Identity', USJP Occasional Paper 98-03, Harvard University, 1998
- Bridges, Brian, *Japan and Korea in the 1990s: From Antagonism to Adjustment*, Aldershot, Edward Elgar, 1993
- Buruma, Ian, *The Wages of Guilt: Memories of War in Germany and Japan*, London, Jonathan Cape, 1994
- Dore, Ronald, 'Textbook Censorship in Japan: the Ienaga Case', *Pacific Affairs*, vol.43, no.4, 1970/1971, pp.548-56
- Gluck, Carol, 'Reinventions of the Past: Japan at the End of the Century', The Richard Storry Memorial Lecture, St. Antony's College Oxford, October 1994
- Hammond, Ellen H., 'Politics of the War and Public History: Japan's Own Museum Controversy', *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*, 1995, vol.27, no.2, pp.56-9
- Hosoya, Chihiro, *Nihon Gaiko no Kiseki* (the Path of Japan's Foreign Policy), Tokyo, Nihon Hoso Shuppan Kyokai, 1993
- Ienaga, Saburo, 'The Glorification of War in Japanese Education', *International Security*, vol.18, no.3, 1993-1994, pp.113-33
- Kersten, Rikki, 'Neo-nationalism and the "Liberal School of History"', *Japan Forum*, vol.11, no.2, 1999, pp.191-203
- Kibata, Yoichi, 'History Textbooks: Continuing Controversies', *Economic and Political Weekly*, October 30, 1999, pp.3108-109
- Ministry of Education, *Monbu Jiho* (Education Updates), May, October and December 1982; January, March, June and July 1983; April 1984; May 1986; and April, August and September 1987

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Gaiko Seisho: Waga Gaiko no Kinkyō* (Diplomatic Bluebook), the fiscal years 1973 and 1979-1990 (inclusive)

Mendl, Wolf, *Japan's Asia Policy: Regional Security and Global Interests*, London and New York, Routledge, 1995

Morikawa, Kinju, *Kyokasho to Saiban*, (Textbooks and Lawsuits), Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1990

Morris, I.I., *Nationalism and the Right Wing in Japan: A Study of Post-war Trends*, London and New York, Oxford University Press, 1960

National League for Support of the School Textbook Screening Suits, 'Truth in Textbooks, Freedom in Education and Peace for Children: The 27 Year Struggle of the Ienaga Textbook Lawsuits', Tokyo, 1992

Nikkan Rekishi Kyokasho Kenkyukai (South Korean-Japanese History Textbooks Research Association), 'Dai Sankai Nikkan Godo Rekishi Kenkyukai (The 3rd Joint Meeting for South Korean-Japanese History Textbooks Research)', September 1992

Policy Division, the Minister's Secretariat of the Ministry of Education of Japan (ed.), *Monbusho Nempo* (Annual Report of the Education Ministry), no.110, 1982

Public Information and Cultural Affairs Bureau, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan (ed.), *Nitchu Kankei Shiryoshu* (A Collection of Documents on Sino-Japanese Relations), Tokyo, 1982

Pyle, Kenneth B., 'Japan Besieged: The Textbook Controversy', *Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol.9, no.2, 1983, pp.297-300

Rose, Caroline, 'The Textbook Issue: Domestic Sources of Japan's Foreign Policy', *Japan Forum*, vol.11, no.2, 1999

Rose, Caroline, *Interpreting History in Sino-Japanese Relations: A Case Study in Political Decision-Making*, London, Routledge, 1998

Smith, Anthony D., *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1995

Takasaki, Souji, 'Rekishi Kyokasho to Kokusai Rikai (History Textbooks and International Understanding)', Iwanami Booklet no.231, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1991

Tanaka, Akihiko, *Nitchu Kankei 1945-1990* (Sino-Japanese Relations 1945-1990), Tokyo, Tokyo University Press, 1991

Tanaka, Hiroshi, 'Kyokasho Mondai to Ajia: Nihon no Kyoiku ni Miru Kokusai Kankaku to Rekishi Kankaku (The Textbook Issue and Asia: International Awareness and Historical Awareness in Japanese Education)', *Chugoku Kenkyu Geppo* (Chinese Research Monthly), no.422, April 1983, pp.11-9

Tawara, Yoshifumi, *Kyokasho Kogeki no Shinso* (The Depths of Criticisms over Textbooks), Tokyo, Gakushunotomoshu, 1997

Tokyo Metropolitan Government (Liaison and Protocol Section, Bureau of General Affairs) (ed.), *Education in Japan*, Tokyo, 1979

Wakamiya, Yoshitomi, *The Postwar Conservative View of Asia: How the Political Right Has Delayed Japan's Coming to Terms with its History of Aggression in Asia*, Tokyo, LTCB International Library Foundation, 1999

Yamazumi, Masami, 'State Control and the Evolution of Ultrationalistic Textbooks', in James J. Shields, Jr. (ed.), *Japanese Schooling*, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989, pp.234-42

Yamazumi, Masami, *Nihon Kyoiku Shoshi* (A Concise History of Japanese Education), Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1987

Yayama, Taro, 'The Newspapers Conduct a Mad Rhapsody over the Textbook Issue', *Journal of Japanese Studies*, vol.9, no.2, 1983, pp.301-16

Japan and India : Religion-based Parties Coming into Government in the 1990s

Kenji Tozawa

Introduction

At a glance India, which is a sub-continent and multilingual, multi-religious, multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, and has around 600 million voters and Japan, which is homogeneous, uni-lingual, less religion conscious, and consists of 4 main islands and has only 70 million voters hardly share the same political agenda.

But, if we examine with some criteria, there are reasons to compare India with Japan. First, it must be pointed out that most Japanese people think of India as the origin of the eastern spiritual world. Japanese are now economy-oriented people, so they don't look as though they depend on Buddhism, but undoubtedly their way of thinking is influenced by Buddhist thought. Secondly, the two countries were politically remote in the age of the cold war. But when the cold war ended in the 1990s, the Japanese business community turned their eyes to the Indian market due to Indian economic liberalisation. Still the two countries are not so deeply linked in regard to human resources, trade in commodities and money flow.

Under such circumstances I want to set up two criteria to consider. It has to be noted that the two countries had a long history of the so-called 'one dominant party system' and both countries were recently faced with a drastic change from that regime. Where is the party system going after the 'one dominant party system'? Will a 'two party system' be introduced, or some other system? It seems that the answer has become rather clear. Coalition governments appeared as alternative systems in both India and in Japan in the 1990s. Why and how did it take place in each country? The first criterion of the party system or the power structure can be one of the interesting themes by which to compare both countries.

Apart from the formation of coalition governments in the 1990s there appeared a conspicuous phenomenon in the political arena. In both countries after the demise of the 'one dominant party system' the religion-based political parties joined the coalition governments taking advantage of the situation. In India the religion-based Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) expanded in a short time at the end of 1980s, and gained power at

the end of the decade as a leading party in a coalition government. Meanwhile another religion-based party, Komeito, sneaked into power, joining the coalition government with the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) at the end of 1990s, though at that time it was not really growing. India and Japan have never had coalition governments with religion-based political parties, because after World War II they declared themselves to be secular countries and were very reluctant to admit religious groups' participation in political activities. Where are these religion-based parties going? What are the roles of religion-based parties, or the roles of religion in politics? This is the second criterion by which to examine politics in India and Japan.

As a matter of fact how the collapse of the 'one dominant party system' and the participation of religion-based parties in governments took place is quite different in each country. I shall show the differences of the historical process and analyse the political situation comparing the two countries.

1 Religion –based Political Movements

1-1 Historical Background of Komeito

Komeito was founded in 1964 following 8 years preparatory period as a separate part of the Sokagakkai (SG), which was a religious lay organization of Nichiren Shoshu Buddhism. At the beginning the SG proclaimed that the aim of Komeito was to achieve a society where policies were based on Buddhist philosophy. The SG called this idea Obutsu Myogo [fusion of Buddhism and politics]. The SG produced various ideas or at least technical words such as Buddhist Democracy, Humanity Socialism and Global Nationalism. This organisation sent 3 politicians to the Upper House [Sangiin] in 1956, 6 in 1959 and 9 in 1962. Establishing the party officially, 25 MPs were sent to the Lower House [Shugiin] for the first time in 1967. Thus Komeito could expect a quick expansion of the number of politicians in the Diet and the local assemblies and councils.

Unfortunately their desires and wishes were not materialised. Before materialising or sophisticating the ideas they produced, they were faced with many serious problems. In a way their campaign methods were pretty harsh; ordinary campaigners did not observe the legal regulations. That was partly because they were totally amateur in politics. Some leaders were arrested for violation of the Public Offices Election Law in 1957. Apart from this kind of incident the case of the violation of freedom of speech

and the press gave a special shock to the Japanese public.

In December 1969 Hirosato Fujiwara was about to publish a book, which was full of blunt criticisms against the SG and Komeito. The SG leaders tried to stop him publishing this book. They asked a powerful politician, Kakuei Tanaka, to influence Fujiwara. In spite of the interference Fujiwara did publish the book and sued the SG in court for violation of freedom of the press. It brought a great social problem in Japan. All the mass media severely condemned the SG for violation of human rights. The Communist Party of Japan raised the issue of the oneness of Komeito and the SG as an example of the wrong relationship between politics and religion, and tried to summon the president of the SG Daisaku Ikeda to the Lower House. Actually the SG had suppressed a book written by Daizo Kumabe in the previous year. It seemed all parts of society accused it of this violation. As a result the SG was forced to change the basic principle. Till then the SG leaders firmly believed the SG was Komeito, Komeito was the SG, both were inseparable. But now they had to accept the idea of the separation of church and state. Ikeda officially apologised at the general meeting in 1970 that the prevention of the publication was regretted, and since many people criticized that the SG was aiming for the National Ordination Platform Kokuritsukaidan, namely the establishment of a national religion, he said the SG would not use this term. Further he declared that the leaders would clearly separate Komeito from the SG, and never seek out Obutsu Myogo. (*The Seikyo Shinbun* [the SG's news paper], 4 May 1970.)

It seems that to the SG there were three choices at that time. First, it could insist that it would never discard the idea of Obutsu Myogo. That meant the SG would aim at establishing a Buddhist society in Japan by converting at least a third of Japanese people to Nichiren Buddhism and by using political influence. But it was almost impossible for the SG to convert even a third of Japanese people. Secondly, the SG could express its wish to have a share of political power. As a matter of fact it did so. It explained in their new programme, which was published following the speech of the president in 1970. Komeito declared that it would become a national party. It meant that it would be an ordinary political party, which tried to gain power or to resort to manoeuvres or to join a coalition government. The third choice would be to stay in a position as a sort of political night watchman. In this case Komeito could be reduced to

be a party of the Upper House only, or it could keep members in the Lower House but not intend to be a part of any government. If the SG had adopted the third choice, the SG members could have avoided tough campaigns to support Komeito, and Komeito could have kept *the raison d'être* of securing religious causes. But the third choice was clearly thrown away and the SG took a step forward again for political power after 1970. In terms of the relationship between politics and religion as in Komeito, the year of 1970 was the real turning-point in its history.

There was a serious problem in Komeito. It was the matter of *raison d'être*. The SG was a religious body and had produced Komeito in order to achieve its religious goals through the political party system. But now Komeito proclaimed that it wanted to be a national party not bound by one religious body but supported by a broad constituency. Then to the SG was Komeito really necessary? Did the SG members have to cast votes all the time for Komeito candidates only? In fact as Table 1 shows, Komeito increased the seats it held in both houses even after 1970.

Table 1

Seats of Komeito in the Lower House

	1967	69	72	76	79	80	83	86	90	93	96	2000
Komeito	25	47	29	56	58	34	59	57	46	52	(156)	31

(In 1996 Komeito was merged into New Frontier Party.)

Seats and Votes of Komeito in the Upper House

	1956	59	62	65	68	71	74	77	80	83	86	89	92	95	98
Komeito's	3	9	15	20	24	23	24	24	27	26	25	20	24	11	22
Seats &	3	6	9	11	13	10	14	14	17	16	15	10	14		11
Votes(mi)	1.0	2.5	4.1	5.1	6.7	5.6	6.4	7.2	6.7	7.3	7.4	6.1	6.4		7.7

[source: *Asahi Shinbun*]

It seems very important to me that only because the SG kept religious purposes and goals in its political campaigns, its members followed the directions to vote for Komeito believing them to be religious guidance or mandate.

Komeito changed policies easily and frequently. For instance at one time they insisted on dissolving the Japan-United States Security Treaty step-by-step, and then they

(In 1977 and 1980 the BJS was merged into the Janata Party. In 1998 and 1999 the figures in parentheses were the seats of the BJP and allied parties.)

[sources: Figures are derived from Graham, Puri, Ahuja & Paul, *Frontline*, *The Hindu*.]

That was partly because the reputation of the BJS was that of fanatical Hindu Fundamentalism or the cause of troubles Hindu Communalism. So the political turmoil in 1975 was rather convenient to the BJS to get the opportunity to cooperate with other parties. In June 1975 the BJS and other parties formed a Janata front [people's front] to fight the Assembly of Gujarat State. A little later Prime Minister Indira Gandhi proclaimed a national State of Emergency and suspended the right of Habeas Corpus in June to fight all institutions hostile to the Congress Government. When she made clear in January 1977 that a general election would be held in March two months later, four parties including the BJS immediately unified into the Janata Party. The Janata Party achieved a great victory at the 1977 General Election, but it dramatically lost power after three years at the next poll. Apart from the success of Indira Gandhi's populist movement to regain power, the ruling party had a great problem within the coalition. It was related to the background of the BJS, namely the issue of dual membership. The former BJS members were also members of the RSS, and some group within the Morarji Desai Government raised this issue objecting to the dual membership of the former BJS members. The disunity became clear and the conflict got sharp. At the 1980 General Election the Janata Party contested 431 and secured only 31 seats, while it had secured 295 seats contesting 405 in 1977. Under such circumstances the BJP was founded in 1980 supported by the RSS; and Atal Behari Vajpayee was selected as the first president.

The BJP started its history with at least two difficult problems the same as the BJS. The BJS already recognized one problem, which was the image of communalism and the character of exclusiveness. So they introduced a new principle called 'Integral Humanism' in 1965 for the purpose of 'downplaying the communal image of the Jana Sangh in favour of a softer spiritual, non-aggressive image stressing equality, "Indianization" and social harmony.' (Hansen & Jaffrelot, p.293.) But when Vajpayee delivered his presidential speech at Bandra in 1980, he expounded Gandhian socialism rejecting both western capitalism and Soviet planning, though later changed the tone of the policy to adjust to the integral humanism principle. There were two different guidelines inside the BJP from the beginning.

But the RSS and another religious group, the VHP (Vishwa Hindu Parishad) did want to keep the communal strength, so they replaced Vajpayee with a hard-liner Lal Krishna Advani in May 1984. As a result, however, they secured only two seats at the 1984 General Election. Since the elections were held immediately after the assassination of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, it was understandable that the voters as a whole had strong sympathy with the late Mrs. Gandhi. If the BJP wanted to be seen as an alternative, it was obvious that it had to add something to their principles. But even after this defeat they did not change their principles. They instead enthusiastically expounded 'Hindutva [Hindu first]' in the latter half of the 1980s knowing they had a difficult problem on principle. Partly their guideline was appropriate at that time, because the slogan 'Hindutva' could invite the votes from wide range cutting across caste lines. But naturally the Muslim votes and the votes of Dalits did not come to Hindutva, for they were not supposed to get the benefits from 'Hindutva'.

The other difficulty was related to economic policy. The BJP succeeded to the BJS Programme insisting on Swadeshi, and in the context of Integral Humanism it stressed the policy of decentralisation of power. Actually some sort of Swadeshi was the official economic policy of India, led by the Congress Governments till the middle of the 1980s. But Rajiv Gandhi started the liberalization of Indian economy, and Narasimha Rao substantially deregulated and liberated the Indian economy in 1991. If the BJP wanted to take over the strong central government, it had to cope with the new economic policy and the policy of decentralisation. This question will become serious when the BJP is about to hold political power.

2 From One Dominant Party System to Coalition Government

2-1 Political Change in Japan after 1993

In India and Japan really drastic political changes took place coincidentally in the 1990s. The two criteria can be applied to explain the features of those changes. To reiterate, they are 'the change of party system' and 'the religion-based parties' participation in governments'. The coming of religion-based parties into power in both countries can be understood in the context of the change of party system.

In Japan the LDP enjoyed the 'one dominant party system' for nearly 40 years from its foundation in 1955. The opposition parties had almost no chance to get a majority

even if they could unite. This party system was named the '55 Regime', expected by many to last forever. It was unhealthy because it offered no prospect of a change of government, but it could be said to be healthy in the sense that inside the LDP factions there were alternative forms of government. Here a faction meant a party within a party. Very few people anticipated the fall of the LDP.

But in 1988 the Recruit Incident was exposed by *the Asahi Shinbun*. As a case of corruption it did not surprise people, since corruption was one of the features of Japanese politics. But the Recruit Incident had characteristics different from other corruptions. The Recruit leaders scattered the unopened stocks to many politicians. In fact it contaminated a large number of figures, not only big politicians but also efficient bureaucrats and even the opposition politicians. This incident and the scandals in politics and economy that followed made Japanese people feel something had to be done. Under the Kaifu government (1989-91) the pressure of 'Political Reform' was so strong that Prime Minister Kaifu resigned as a candidate for the LDP President seeing the bills of political reform dropped at the Diet by the objections from his own party. The LDP politicians were not against the concept of political reform, but they did not agree to each bill.

But when a small group led by Ichiro Ozawa divided the LDP in 1992 under the Miyazawa government and consequently Miyazawa dissolved the Lower House in June 1993, a great political change was inevitable. On 4 July a General Election was held and the LDP lost heavily, though it secured 223 (majority 256 more) and kept the position of the biggest party. After 1955 the LDP sat as an opposition party for the first time, and a new government led by Morihiro Hosokawa, Chairman of the fourth biggest group in the ruling party, was formed by the coalition of 8 parties. This was the beginning of the great political change. Many people especially political scientists expected the change of the party system from the 'one dominant party system' to a 'two party system', or at least that there should now be a change of administration between the LDP and coalition governments.

What has happened in Japanese politics since 1993 is (as Table 3 shows) not what scholars expected. I should say it was totally messy as a political reform. But to examine the contents of the reform is not the intention of this paper. It should be noted that as a result of the reform the confrontation between the coalition group and the

LDP ultimately did not emerge.

Table 3

Formation of Governments in Japan after 1993

6 August 1993 Hosokawa Government

- Coalition government (8 parties): Nihon Shinto (35), JSP (70), Shinseito (55), Komeito (51), Minshato (15). Shinto Sakigake (13), Shaminren (4). Independents (30) 273
- Opposition: LDP (223), CPJ (15) 238

29 June 1994 Murayama Government

- Coalition government :LDP(230), SDPJ (70), Sakigake (13) 313
- Opposition: Shinseito (55), Komeito (51), Minshato (15), Nihon Shinto (40), Independents (22), CPJ (15) 198

(Shaminren merged into Nihon Shinto)

7 November 1996 Hashimoto Government

- Coalition government: LDP (239), SDPJ (15), Sakigake (2) 256
- Opposition: New Frontier (156), Democratic (52), CPJ (26), Others (10) 244

5 October 1999 Obuchi Government

- Coalition government: LDP (239), Liberal (42), Komeito (37) 318
- Opposition: Democratic (52), SDPJ (15), CPJ (26), Others (89) 182

25 June, 2000 Mori Government

- Coalition government: LDP (233), Komeito (31), Conservative (7), 271
- Opposition: Democratic (127), Liberal (22), SDPJ (19), CPJ (20), Others(21) 209

(Key: LDP: Liberal Democratic Party, JSP: Japanese Social Party, CPJ: Communist Party of Japan, SDPJ: Social Democratic Party of Japan out of JSP) [source: *Asahi Shinbun*]

What really has happened is that the LDP did not lose power except during the short period of two governments. Actually the LDP was the opposition party for 11 months between August 1993 and June 1994. Then did no significant changes take place? Of course there were important changes. The political reform, which was realised by the Hosokawa government in January 1994, did give a big change to the electoral system. But the most important change was, it seems to me, the way in which the LDP was restored to political power. In Table 3 if you look at the Murayama Government, the coalition government was supported by 223 members of the LDP, 70 members of the SDPJ and 13 members of Sakigake. Prime Minister Murayama was Chairman of the

SDPJ, which held only 70 seats. Besides the SDPJ had been a main opponent to the LDP for a long time. There was little chance of Murayama becoming Prime Minister in the normal political process. But in order to recapture power the LDP adopted an 'ultra C' strategy which meant forming a coalition with a party of absolutely opposite political thought. Furthermore the LDP decided to name Murayama as Prime Minister, as part of flirting with the SDPJ. The methods of the LDP were a symptom of a new era of Japanese politics. It may be said that blatant Machiavellianism will be acceptable in the new era of politics.

One of the conspicuous phenomena of this new trend was the change of the JSP. Until this time they had clearly been against the Japan-United States Security Treaty, and had insisted that the Self Defense Forces were unconstitutional. But they now abruptly and awkwardly accepted both the treaty and the Self Defense Forces as constitutional. In a sense they sacrificed the traditional principles of their party in return for joining the government. No wonder they got just 15 seats at the next poll in 1996. This is what has become of the one time leading opposition party.

How did Komeito survive this political turbulence? As I wrote earlier, Komeito was hit by serious crises. First they had to decide to which side they belonged. Because Komeito was trying to be against the LDP at least as a gesture, it was not so difficult for it to decide which way they should go when the LDP government collapsed in 1993. They accordingly decided to join the coalition government. But, when the Hata Government was formed as the second coalition government in April 1994, some groups within the coalition government tried to downgrade the JSP and as a result the JSP and Sakigake left the coalition. Komeito stayed in the coalition at that time.

The true crisis came to Komeito when Ozawa and other leaders tried to establish a big 'mosaic party' called the New Frontier Party [Shinshintō]. This proposal was irresistible for it inspired the two party system. But there was still an inherent problem for Komeito. Originally the purpose of Komeito was quite different from any other political party. When it was accused of the violation of human rights in 1970, it decided to be a national party, and if possible to cooperate with other parties. But in reality it kept the religious causes secretly until the 1990s. Now it was faced with the dissolution of the party.

Komeito did something odd at this time. They divided their small party into two and let members of the Lower House belong to the new party, and let some members at the Upper House belong to Komei (a slightly different name) out of the new party. As Table 1 shows at the election of the Upper House in 1995, 11 members remained as members of Komei. It may be said that basically Komeito merged into the New Frontier Party, which might have the possibility of alternating in power with the LDP. But, in spite of a great deal of effort, the New Frontier Party turned out to be dissolved in 1997. Komeito was re-established immediately without any confusion. In fact it was the actual proof that Komeito could exist or be extinguished at the SG's will. Komeito adopted the astonishing policy after reorganizing the party. To the great surprise of the Japanese people Komeito changed direction and formed a coalition government with the Liberal Party led by Ozawa and the LDP itself in October 1999. In the case of the JSP, after hot discussions they conceded to the requests from the LDP to sustain the government and changed their fundamental policies abruptly. But in Komeito's case when it formed the coalition government with its longstanding opponent the LDP, it seemed no heated discussion occurred in the party. It looked as if the question of the differences of basic policies no longer matters. In June 2000 after the General Election, Komeito again joined the LDP-led coalition government with the Conservative Party. So coalition governments appeared many times after 1993, but many of them were not against the LDP but were LDP-led coalition governments. In this drifting political situation, Komeito once formed a coalition government with anti-LDP parties, then divided the party into two, and then reunited to form coalition governments with the LDP.

This is what has happened in the Japanese political arena since 1993. It was the beginning of a new era, but not the era of a two party system or coalition governments, but the era of anything-can-happen.

2-2 The Congress in Decline in India

The rule of the Indian National Congress Party, in other words the 'one dominant party system' in India, was ending at the 1989 General Election. The Congress Party led by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi lost heavily at the poll as Table 4 shows.

77
Table 4

Seats of Congress in Lok Sabha

	1952	57	62	67	71	77	80	84	89	91	96	98	99
Congress	364	371	361	283	342	154	353	415	197	232	140	145	113
												(169)	(135)

(In 1998 and 99 the figures in parentheses are the numbers for the Congress and its Allies.) [sources: Figures are derived from Joshi & Hebsur, Kumar, *Frontline*, *The Hindu*.]

In December 1989 a coalition government was formed for the second time in modern Indian history. The structure of the government was that the National Front which consisted of the Janata Dal and the left parties formed the cabinet and the BJP supported it from outside, keeping the Congress Party as the Opposition Party. Whether the Janata Dal learned any lessons from history or not, it lasted for less than a year. India got involved with the great social and political turmoil related to the caste system. Prime Minister V. P. Singh of the coalition government made clear the policy of implementing the Mandal Commission's Report which caused an agitation by students who set fire to themselves in resisting the government.

The BJP was in a dilemma. If they agreed to the Mandal Report, they would lose the votes from the forward caste's people, and if they opposed it, they would lose support from a vast number of backward Hindu people. In this situation 'The Ayodhya campaign was the only remedy and the temple was the only issue which could match the multi-dimensional challenge of Mandalism.' (Ahuja and Paul, p.72.)

The BJP withdrew support from the government and eventually V.P. Singh resigned. Here the Congress manoeuvred Chandra Shekhar into leaving the Janata Dal and forming an extreme minority government by giving its tentative support. The Chandra Shekhar Government continued for 4 months under the virtual control of Rajiv Gandhi between November 1990 and March 1991. Chandra Shekhar conceded to the demands of Congress one after another but, when the Congress kept condemning the government, he was determined to resign and recommended the president to call a General Election.

The role and tactics of the Congress were exactly the same as those of the LDP towards the Murayama SDPJ Government. As a big party the LDP and the Congress

tried to control the government from behind the scenes. While Murayama's SDJP was reduced to a mere bubble party in return for joining the coalition government, Chandra Shekhar, the leader of a tiny party, proposed holding an election because he did not want to be exploited in government.

The BJP expounded Hindutva loudly and repeatedly during the 1991 General Election campaign. But for the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi, the result 120 to the BJP, 232 to the Congress might have been different. In this result the leader of the Congress, Narasimha Rao, was inaugurated as Prime Minister, and his government survived for 5 years in spite of a stream of troubles. In a sense Rao's government can be seen as the moratorium government. The decline of the Congress was hard to stop, and people were looking for an alternative. The assassination of Rajiv Gandhi reminded the voters again of the great sympathy felt towards the Gandhi family and the result did not show a sharp decline for the Congress. But the BJP was growing to be an alternative. The decline of the Congress was to become apparent from the 1996 General Election onward.

While the Congress was losing credibility because of the corruption, the criminal conspiracy and the resisting riots, the BJP was preparing for the next government. But it was faced with two problems. One was how to keep its religious purpose and the other was how to adapt Swadeshi to the new economic policy.

The BJP resorted to the slogan of Hindutva in the 1989 and 1991 General Election campaigns. When the Ayodhya incident with 1200 deaths in Hindu-Muslim Riots broke out, the BJP government of Uttar Pradesh could do nothing, which invoked presidential administration. In the elections of local assemblies in 1993 the BJP showed signs of a retreat losing the votes of Muslim and Dalits and other people worried about Hindu Fundamentalism. The BJP had to realize that, as long as they could ignore the vote-bank of Muslims and STs and SCs, they could inspire the high spirit of Hindutva. But if they needed the votes of all the corners of society, a new trend must come. Thus the BJP changed the tone in the Manifesto of 1996 from that of 1991. After the 1996 General Election it is evident that the BJP started to attract those who did not support them before.

The other problem was how to adjust Swadeshi to economic liberalisation. Actually

the conflict could be found within their own camp. The RSS embarked on a campaign for Swadeshi immediately after the Rao government took up economic liberalisation. It claimed that the commercialism and consumerism induced by the multinational companies undermined Hindu culture and spoiled the base of the Indian economy, which was accepted by the older generation with applause. But as the BJP developed, there came so-called newcomers belonging to the middle class and usually involved with business who did not show a keen interest in Swadeshi. They were primarily concerned with the necessity of economic liberalisation. Besides inside the BJP there were politicians of insight like L.K. Advani who understood the necessity both to protect the Indian economy and to adjust the Indian native economy to the global economy.

After the inner struggle the BJP adopted the 'RSS-corrective' in 1991. On the one hand they modified their pro-liberalisation policy to take account of Swadeshi adjusting to the RSS-corrective; on the other hand they re-interpreted the claims of the RSS insisting on the need for a new Indian model of a self-confident, hard-working modern nation that can deal with the world in terms of equality in the spirit of Swadeshi. The two streams in economics, Swadeshi [protectionism] and free economy, haunted these BJP throughout the Rao Government. (Hansen & Jaffrelot, pp.291-314.)

Narasimha Rao could not stop the Congress sliding down. In the poll of 1996 the Congress secured 161 and the BJP gained 141 seats. Though the coalition government emerged in 1989, coalition governments became common from 1996 on as Table 5 shows.

Table 5

Formations of Governments in India after 1989

Vishwanath Pratap Singh Government in 1989

- Coalition government: National Front (JD Janata Dal, and others 142), Left(50), BJP(86)
- Opposition: Congress (197), Others (68)

Narasimha Rao Congress Government in 1991

- Congress (232), Congress Allies (10)
- Opposition: BJP (120), JD (56), Left (55), Others (70)

H. D. Deve Gowda Government in 1996

- Coalition government: United Front (180)(JD43, LF44, Others93)
Allied with Congress (136)
- Opposition: BJP (161), Others (66)

Atal Behari Vajpayee Government in 1998

- Coalition government: BJP (178), Allies (72)
- Opposition: Congress (145), Allied (24), UF (96), Others (26)

Atal Behari Vajpayee Government in 1999

- Coalition government: BJP (180), Allies (118)
- Opposition: Congress (113), Allies (22), Others (110)

[sources: Ahuja & Paul, Hansen & Jaffrelot, *The Hindu*]

After the elections in May 1996 Prime Minister Rao resigned and Atal Behari Vajpayee tried to form a minority government with allied parties. Vajpayee made a nominal list of ministers but after 13 days his bid to form a cabinet was crushed at the Lok Sabha where a motion of nonconfidence was carried.

Eventually an unexpected person, H. D. Deve Gowda, was selected as Prime Minister of the government of the United Front (National Front and Left Front). Deve Gowda's own party, JD, held only 43 seats and altogether 14 parties made up a coalition of 180 seats, supported strongly by Narasimha Rao and his party. At this time there were three segments in Indian politics, the BJP and the Congress and the UF. Since the UF consisted of many factions, those small parties might be drawn to either camp. So theoretically there was a chance of forming a two party system at that time in India. But the outcome did not go according to plan as laid by theories of political science.

Sitaram Kesri, President of the Congress after Narasimha Rao, resorted to cheap manoeuvres often, which pulled down the Deve Gowda government in 1997 and again made I. K. Gujral, next Prime Minister from the UF, decide to dissolve the Lok Sabha within a year.

At the 1998 General Election the BJP expanded to 178 and secured 74 seats from the allied parties. It can be said that, since the UF and the Congress were disputing and competing with each other, the BJP earned a windfall benefit. Vajpayee formed a coalition government with 12 other parties. But consequently the BJP-led government

was burdened by allies, especially the AIADMK (All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam) led by Ms. Jayalalitha. This local party from Tamil Nadu put the government under intense pressure, so Prime Minister Vajpayee had no alternative but to go to the poll after the withdrawal of the AIADMK in 1999. The result of the 1999 General Election was by and large the same as that of 1998. The decline of the Congress did not stop in spite of desperate endeavours by its new leader, Sonia Gandhi. The BJP and its 23 allies got 298 seats, and the Congress and its allies were reduced to 135. The AIADMK that brought about the election was reduced to 8 from 18.

After two general elections the BJP has built up its influence at the Lok Sabha and the local assemblies as well. Now the formation of a coalition government seems to become possible for the BJP and its tiny but many allied parties. If the BJP keeps expanding, it will be possible for it to form an exclusive BJP government in the future. But it may better to say that the BJP and its allies vs. the Congress and its allies could become the basic structure of Indian politics, while the left parties, CPI and CPI (M), would remain in the same positions. The National Front consisting of Janata Dal and other local parties could form a possible vote bank to add to the influence of either camp.

In regard to the efforts by the BJP to modify its fierce slogans, Hindutva and Swadeshi, the BJP set out a new interpretation in its Manifesto of National Democratic Alliance (1999) as follows:

‘Genuine Secularism; We are committed to establishing a civilised, humane and just civil order, that which does not discriminate on grounds of caste, religion, class, colour, race and sex. We will truly and genuinely uphold and practise the concept of secularism consistent with the Indian tradition of ‘Sarva panth samadara’(equal respect to all faith) and on the basis of equality of all.

We will, therefore, strive to develop national consensus on all major issues confronting the nation by involving the opposition parties and all sections of society in dialogue. We will also try for a consensus mode of governance as far as practicable.’ (Bhambhri, pp. 171-86.)

There is no longer any sign here of Hindutva or Swadeshi. It seems that the voters in India are persuaded by the standpoint of the BJP-led National Democratic Alliance. Though the influence of the Congress with new leaders is not at an end, it can't be

denied that today the BJP, a religion-based political party, has definitely come right into the centre of the Indian political scene.

3 Conclusion

In terms of the party system we can see similarities between India and Japan. Both countries used to be ruled by the 'one dominant party system', the Congress in India and the LDP in Japan. Both countries are democratic countries where the change of power is taken for granted, but because of the 'one dominant party system' the change of power has hardly taken place. It has only materialised recently. Both countries went into the age of coalition governments in the 1990s.

As to religion-based parties, with the declaration of secularism and the separation between politics and religion, the BJP grew up to grasp political power in India, and in Japan Komeito joined coalition governments in the 1990s. The principles of both parties were faced with the difficult questions of how they were to adjust to a new age, the age of coalitions.

The similarities in both countries are up to this point. Differences can be seen in each country. Komeito has lost its *raison d'être* in two ways. When it clearly declared that Komeito would be a national party in 1970, it discarded its cause of Obutsu Myogo (establishing society based on Buddhist philosophy). Of course it expounded policies based on new principles, but then what was the basic difference between Komeito and other parties? Was it necessary to establish a new party? The SG members could have insisted on their wishes inside some established political party. After all they did not give up their religious causes. They introduced secular policies as basic ones only to avoid social pressures. They kept the spirit of Obutsu Myogo secretly in the organisation, and it worked well since the unity of the SG was perfect and the direction of its political activities was conveyed as 'religious guidance'.

Komeito was faced with the second crisis of its *raison d'être* when it joined the Hosokawa coalition government in 1993, and especially when it dissolved the party to merge with the New Frontier Party in 1994. From the viewpoint of the party system it was the only occasion to establish a two party system in Japan. But from the religious standpoint of Komeito it was almost impossible to seek out its religious causes within the new anti-LDP party. But after this party was extinguished in 1997, Komeito was

revitalized. Did Komeito regain its religious causes? It seems not. It probed the political situation for a new coalition, and in 1999 Komeito joined the LDP Coalition Government. Again it could survive as part of the power struggle, but it could not achieve its religious targets inside the coalition government.

In 2000 the coalition government consists of LDP, Komeito and the Conservative Party, and the opposition consists of the Democratic Party, the Liberal Party, the SDPJ and the CPJ. Komeito and the SG can boast of holding the casting vote in Japanese politics, because even the LDP nowadays flirts with them. But it can also be said that Komeito and the SG are important for the LDP only because they have a great vote bank. Whatever direction Japanese politics is going, religious causes cannot be achieved if the present coalition government continues as it is.

Meanwhile the BJP made the most of religious causes. It could expand because of its religious character. The Congress tried to attract people of all castes by Nehruvian Socialism, while the BJP provoked people to a high state of tension by Hindutva. As the organization went on expanding, the BJP was faced with various problems on its way. Among them I picked up two questions to consider. First in terms of collecting votes Hindu Fundamentalism could be useful to cross over between castes, but it could not embrace Muslims and Dalits. If the BJP really wanted political power, it had to soften the slogan, Hindutva. Secondly, since the international community was changing rapidly, the BJP had to adjust the Indian economy to the global economy if it wanted to form an effective government. The BJP overrode the request of the RSS to be more religious and to insist on Swadeshi (protectionism), because it was supported not just by the RSS but by voters of a wide range. The BJP introduced economic liberalisation with special caution. Consequently the BJP did not use the words of either Hindutva or Swadeshi in its Manifesto of the National Democratic Alliance (1999).

This is important when compared with Komeito, which could never override the demands of the SG because Komeito totally depended on the SG. So, when Komeito could not meet its religious objects, its *raison d'être* was lost.

India and Japan are democratic countries. In democratic countries changes of governments are taken for granted. In democracy there is no harm having a close

relationship between politics and religion. Fanaticism, Totalitarianism, communal riots are of course not desirable or acceptable. But, if religious groups can adjust their goals to those of a democratic society with diversified values, the separation of church and state or the separation between religion and politics will not need academic attention in India and Japan. On the one hand the BJP and the RSS, and, on the other, Komeito and the SG, will show us the answer in the near future.

Abbreviations:

BJP: Bharatiya Janata Party

Congress: Indian National Congress Party

RSS: Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh

LDP: Liberal Democratic Party

SG: Sokagakkai [Value Creation Society]

References

1. Ikeda Daisaku, *Seiji to Shukyo* [Politics and religion], Ootori Shoin, 1964.
2. Dan Isao, *Sokagakkai • Komeito no kenkyu* [A study of Sokagakkai • Komeito], Banseisha, 1980.
3. Akahata Reporters (eds.), *Kuroi Tsuru eno sabaki: Sokagakkai no hanzai* [A trial for the black crane: the crime of Sokagakkai], Shin-nihon Shuppansha, 1985.
4. Dan Isao, *Meiso suru Komeito no uchimaku* [The inside story of the drifting Komeito], Seinenshokan, 1989.
5. Ozawa Ichiro, *Nihon kaizo keikaku* [A Plan for the Reform of Japan], Kodansha, 1993.
6. Kitaoka Shinichi, *Seito seiji no saisei* [The revitalization of party politics], Chuo Koronsha, 1994.
7. Tozawa Kenji, 'Indo jinminto (BJP) no genjo to kadai' [The Situation and tasks of the BJP], in *Ehime Law Journal*, Vol.26, No.1, 1994.
8. Nozaki Isao and Takase Hiroi, *Nihon ni okeru seiji to shukyo: Sokagakkai Komeito no mezasu mono* [Politics and religion in Japan: the aim of Sokagakkai Komeito], Zaikaitshushinsha, 1995.

9. Yamaguchi Jiro, *Nihon seiji no kadai* [Tasks of Japanese politics], Iwanami Shoten, 1997.
10. Tozawa Kenji (1998), 'BJP (indo jinminto) seiken tanjo to indo no seiji' [The birth of the BJP-led Government and Indian Politics], in *A Journal of China Studies and International Affairs*, Vol.27, No.11, 1998.
11. Furukawa Toshiaki, *Sinjiketo toshite no Sokagakkai Komeito* [Sokagakkai Komeito as a Syndicate], Daisanshokan, 1999.
12. Furukawa Toshiaki, *Sisutemu toshite no Sokagakkai Komeito* [Sokagakkai Komeito as a System], Daisanshokan, 1999.
13. BJS, *Bharatiya Jana Sangh Party Documents*, 2 vols. (New Delhi: BJS, 1973).
14. Geeta Puri, *Bharatiya Jana Sangh: Organisation and Ideology, Delhi: A Case Study* (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1980).
15. Ram Joshi and R.K. Hebsur (eds.), *Congress in Indian Politics: A Centenary Perspective* (London and Bombay: Sangam Books, 1987).
16. Gail Lee Bernstein & Haruhiro Fukui (eds.), *Japan and the World: Essays on Japanese History and Politics in Honour of Ishida Takeshi* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988).
17. B. D. Graham, *Hindu Nationalism and Indian Politics: The Origins and Development of the Bharatiya Janata Party* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).
18. K Jayaprasad, *RSS and Hindu Nationalism: Inroads in a Leftist Stronghold* (New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publication, 1991).
19. M. L. Ahuja and Sharda Paul, *1989-1991 General Elections in India (including November 1991 By-Elections)* (New Delhi: Associated Publishing House, 1992).
20. Yogendra K. Malik and V. B. Singh, *Hindu Nationalists in India: The Rise of the Bharatiya Janata Party* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1994).
21. Ramesh Kumar, *Congress and Congressism in Indian Politics* (New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publication, 1994).
22. Gurdas M. Ahuja, *BJP and the Indian Politics: Policies and Programmes Of the Bharatiya Janata Party* (New Delhi: Ram Company, 1994).
23. Jon Woronoff, *The Japanese Social Crisis* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997).
24. Purnendra Jain & Takashi Inoguchi (eds.), *Japanese Politics Today: Beyond Karaoke Democracy?* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997).
25. Thomas Blom Hansen and Christophe Jaffrelot (eds.), *The BJP and the Compulsions of Politics in India* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998).

26. Janardan Thakur, *Faces: Forty in the Fray* (Mumbai: Business Publications, 1999).
27. C. P. Bhambhri, *BJP-led Government and Elections 1999* (Delhi: Shipra Publications, 2000).
28. Meghnad Desai, 'Communalism, Secularism and the Dilemma of Indian Nationhood', in Michael Leifer (ed.), *Asian Nationalism* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).