



Title	Introduction to H-NET
Author(s)	Jensen, Richard
Citation	大阪外国語大学アジア太平洋論叢. 1997, 7, p. 223-236
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/99757
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

INTRODUCTION TO H-NET

Richard Jensen*

H-Net (Humanities and Social Sciences On-Line) is an international collaboration among scholars in the humanities and social sciences to use the Internet as a communications tool. H-Net publishes 75 different newsletters, covering a wide range of topics in history, as well as some topics in related fields such as political science. Teams of editors ensure that every message is worth the attention of scholars. The lists reach 54,000 subscribers in 73 countries. Scholars communicate with each other in an informal and helpful fashion. They discuss new ideas and sources, they evaluate books and software, they exchange teaching tips and bibliographical citations. The lists have proven especially valuable to graduate students and to teachers in smaller schools.

H-Net lists are free, and are supported primarily by the voluntary effort of 230 editors from around the world. In addition, H-Net has financial support from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Japan Foundation, and from Michigan State University and other universities around the globe.

H-Net has a close relationship with Kansai Institute of Asia-Pacific

*H-Net Executive Director
<H_NET_DIR@apsu01.apsu.edu>

Studies (大阪外国語大学アジア太平洋研究会: KIAPS), which has led to the creation of H-JAPAN as an important new medium for bilingual contributions to Japanese studies. The World Wide Web site at <http://h-net2.msu.edu/~japan> contains many resources. KIAPS and H-Net are now planning a Japanese-language list. H-Net officials have presented workshops in Japan in 1996 (大阪外国語大学および早稲田大学) and will return in 1997 (1997年6月7日に愛知教育大学で開催されるアメリカ学会年次大会でのワークショップ).

H-Net was created by Richard Jensen, a professor of history at the University of Illinois, Chicago, in 1992. It is now governed by officers and a board elected by the editors. In recognition for its contribution to new methods in teaching, H-Net was awarded the prestigious "James Harvey Robinson Prize" by the American Historical Association in January, 1997.

H-Net exists to make communication among scholars faster, freer, and more sophisticated. Its mission included helping scholars learn about email, the Internet, the World Wide Web, and the other amazing technological advances that appear every few months. It helps scholars make more efficient use of their computers and of libraries. Its goal is to enhance the "Republic of Letters" that binds together scholars of every specialty in every nation.

For further information see: <http://h-net2.msu.edu/about>

H-Japan (e): Book review of __Seisaku no Sogo to Kenryoku__

Author: H-Japan Editor <j-edit@h-net.msu.edu> January 10, 1997

H-NET BOOK REVIEW

Published by H-Japan@h-net.msu.edu

Takashi MIKURIYA. __Seisaku no Sogo to Kenryoku: Nihon Seiji no Senzen to Sengo__ (Policy Integration and Power in Prewar and Postwar Japanese Politics). University of Tokyo Press, 1996. 250pp. + index 11pp. ISBN4-13-030102-0. Price: 5,150 yen

Reviewed for H-Japan by Jing ZHAO, Political Science Department of University of Wisconsin-Madison, (zhao@ps.polsci.wisc.edu)

The ambiguous book title and the chapter headings make the book difficult to read. The author claims in the preface, "Although dealing with independent themes, all four papers share a preoccupation with the analysis of power implementation with a common perspective of policy integration" (p.1). The concept of "policy integration" itself is ambiguous enough, though. Only in the postscript does the author introduce the original sources of the four chapters which help readers to understand their contents.

The first chapter, "The historical development of the issues of establishing national policy integration agencies - On the formation of the principal force of national policy and functional reform," was originally published in __Annual Modern Japanese Study, No. 1: The Gunbu (Military) during the Showa Times__ (Yamakawa Press, 1979), with a different subtitle of

"The political dynamics of the establishment of the Kikakuin (Planning Institution)." What is the relation of the Kikakuin's establishment in 1937 and "the formation of the principal force of the national policy?" The author mentions that since the integration function of political parties declined after the May 15th Incident of 1932 (p.13), the role of polity integration moved to other political collectives/groups along with the international "crisis," especially from the view of the Rikugun (Army). He argues that early from the establishment of the Cabinet Resource Bureau in 1927, to the establishment of the Cabinet Research Bureau in 1935, the main task of integration was concentrated on the innovation of a general system to mobilize national resources for the coming "general war." Then the February 26th Incident (1936) stimulated the government to merge the above two bureaus, under the influence of the Ishihara Group's plan of a "General Affairs Agency." The author does not describe how the Army, the real master of these integration processes, hurried the establishment of the Kikakuin in order to push Japan into total war against China by the July 7th Incident (1937). He points out that, although there was no consensus to bet Japan's destiny on the Army's "Mainland Policy" (p.87), Japan's national policy was completely identified with the general national mobilization for the coming Sino-Japanese War. Finally, the author roughly concludes, without further analysis, that though the Kikakuin itself played a great role in promoting war, being degraded only as an executive institution, it failed to become a principal force for total policy integration.

As the principal part of the book, this chapter offers a good case study of power in 1936-37 and the reciprocal political dynamics among the bureaucrats of the Army, the Navy, the Foreign Affairs Ministry, the Finance Ministry, the Commerce & Industry Ministry, the Resource

Bureau, the Research Bureau, et al. The recent movement of Japanese people pressing the government to open administrative information (for example, to open the wartime records of the Imperial Representative House), makes further research increasingly possible, with the existence of excellent Japanese historians such as Professor Mikuriya. Though, apparently, to fit the book title, the chapter heading and its subheading are ambiguous in contrast with the content which is rather definite and narrow. To change from a well-defined frame with a suitable subtitle to a much wider topic, the author needs to supply further details. Did other political forces, besides the bureaucracy, try to integrate national policy? Did they try to resist the Army dictatorship in the process of power integration? What was the effect of policy integration on the decline of parties?

Also, reworking the whole tone of contents seems necessary. In the micro-description of the establishment of an institution (as this article sought to do in its original publication), it is clever to avoid ideological judgments; but in a macro or middle-range analysis of a national integration policy (the author's purpose in this book), one cannot advance without making some value-laden arguments. I found no criticism of Japanese fascism. Rather, indirectly, the author exposes his ideological commitments in some places. With the expression "the Japanese Army's resistance (taiko) to the northern spread of Chinese nationalism" in the second paragraph (p.13-14), he seems to suggest that the international situation (the Washington Conference system, the rise of the Soviet Union, and the formation of a united China) inaugurated a crisis in Japan. I wonder whether the author's other work, The Formulation of the Meiji State and Local Management (University of Tokyo Press, 1980), which built on similar research approach by the author from the Meiji to the

prewar period, offers a wider perspective.

The second chapter, "Water conservancy development and prewar party politics - On the mutual development of water conservancy policy and strategical systematization," was originally published in __Annual Political Science 1984: The center-local relation of modern Japanese politics__ (Iwanami shoten, 1985), with the subtitle "The crisscrosses between parties and the bureaucracy, and within bureaucracies." Compared with the first chapter which deals with the complex issue of national integration, this chapter is concerned with a specific case of integration: the prewar party politics of water conservancy development from the Hara Cabinet (1922), through the Kato and Wakatuski Cabinets, the Tanaka Cabinet, the Hamaguchi and Wakatuski Cabinets, and finally the Inugai Cabinet (1932). The author discusses the conflict between agricultural irrigation aspect and the hydraulic power conservancy aspect in the traditional management policy, and the process toward a new integrated water policy. He assesses the mutual relations between the party cabinets and the bureaucracy, the power (un)balances within the bureaucracies of the Agriculture & Commerce Ministry (later the Agriculture & Forest Ministry), the Communication Ministry, and the Naimusho (the Interior Ministry, Japanese prefer to translate it as the Home Affairs Ministry). Through the gap of the formulation of a systematic policy and the implementation process, he concludes that the reasons for the failure of integration, i.e., sectionalism, could not be resolved under the prewar political system. As shown by the purpose of the Administrative Research Council (p.132), the policy integration of water conservancy requires a higher level of political integration, namely a real party-advantage system and a thorough reform of the bureaucracy. Though still limited by a narrower frame than the author intends, this chapter is the most

successful of the book's four chapters. The author further suggests that readers refer to his The Politics of the Capitol Planning - The reality of the formulation of the Meiji state (Yamakawa Press, 1984), which sparked the author's concern with the relation between the infrastructure and the politics.

The third chapter, "Water resource development and the postwar policy-making process - On the mutual development of water resource policy and its systematic accomplishment," was originally published in Annual Modern Japanese Study, No. 8: The formation and development of the bureaucracy (Yamakawa Press, 1986), with the subtitle "Between the Showa 20's and 30's." In the two important postwar economic recovery plans, the author argues, river development was at the center of the general plan to develop national land resources, while hydraulic power development was at the center of the electronic industrial reform plan. Hence, the water resource development issue became the focus of postwar policy-making (p.159-160). So the postwar democratization of various institutions (the Resource Committee of the Economy Stability Headquarter, the Densan Union, the Diet) became the principal political springboards for policy integration. The author illustrates the process and systematization of the postwar policy of integration by close examination of the establishment of two bills on water resource development promotion (1961) under the new LDP Diet member TANAKA Kakuei, and the New River Bill (1964) under Minister KONO Ichiro of the newly established Construction Ministry. He shows that the "postwar democracy" functioned better than prewar "planning" in the policy integration concerning water resources - a matter of historical import. Since then, the transformations of the main tasks of the two recovery plans (one from river to road development, the other from hydraulic to thermal power

development), water resource development became a less central issue. Conjunctive with the second chapter, this chapter offers a brief history of water resource development. Yomiuri Shimbun on 5 December 1996 reported that the New River Bill will be revised in next year's (1997) Diet, mainly from the respect of environmental conservation.

The fourth chapter, "Kokudo (national land resource) planning and the prewar society, the postwar society - On the space networking of national land policy and the ideological implementation" was originally published in __A History of Japanese Economy, No. 7: "Planning" and "Democratization"__ under the title "The prewar and postwar societies" (Iwanami shoten, 1989). Trying a political sociology approach, the author here uses an actor's diary to describe the mental change of the prewar and postwar societies. The diary itself may be interesting for the author's original purpose; however, it offers no new knowledge of the prewar and postwar eras, nor does it prove relevancy to the implementation of national land resource planning. Given the book title, "policy integration and power," I could not help but feel disappointed by the lack of a serious treatment of the "power implementation" of this great issue, which involves the core of Japan's postwar political structure after the transformation from resource (coal)-concentrated to finance-oriented planning. Not offering any analysis here, this chapter can only be considered a preface to a study of this issue, because the national land resource development was implemented since the 1960's, through Tanaka's "Japan Islands Reform" plan in the 1970's, Takeshita's "Furusato Sosei" plan in the 1980's, to nowadays "Capitol Move" issue. Readers are encouraged to consult the author's other studies for adequate treatment of this area. One is __NIRA Research Report: The Study of Postwar National Land Policy__, 2 Volumes (NIRA, 1995), and the other paper is "National land planning and development politics" in

__Annual Political Science 1995: The Formation Process of the Relation between Politicians and the Bureaucracy in Contemporary Japanese__ (Iwanami shoten, 1995). I wonder why the author did not include the latter in this book.

Ultimately, the author failed to integrate his independent researches into one book by changing original titles or subtitles. Selecting another longer narrative book title, subtitle and other chapter headings will improve this situation little. In addition, the author should pay more attention to editing his previous independent papers. For example, some sentences are repeated in different chapters; and the acronym "TVA" in water resources development appears dozens of times without any explanation until close to the end (p.230), which seems to be Tennessee Valley Authority. The book could have benefitted from supplemental explanations of particular historical events in order to make the work accessible to readers who are not specialists in the field of Modern Japanese History.

While the author did not succeed fully in accomplishing his stated goal, "to approach twentieth century Japanese political history, consisting of the prewar and postwar periods, with an emphasis on policy integration' by analysis of the details of power implementation" (p.1), he does suggest a new path for future research. Reading through these somewhat disjointed chapters, readers may sense the author's challenge to the canon of twentieth century Japanese politics as he develops his approach to studying the power implementation of policy integration. As a pioneering study, this book offers a thoughtful and new perspective and employs interesting empirical data (such as materials from newly opened governmental records, private diaries, and personal interviews). Everyone who is interested in power implementation processes of modern Japanese politics

should read it. This book, except perhaps Chapter 4, deserves more than one reading.

Jing ZHAO, Political Science Department at the University of Wisconsin-Madison,
(注意 : H-Japan からの転載です。)

H-USA

9 February 1997

from: Isa Duche <3969051j@mn.waseda.ac.jp>; <id@soas.ac.uk>

Book Review published by H-USA: H-USA@h-net.msu.edu

US Korea Policy in the 1950s

Reviewed by Isa Duche, for H-USA <3969051j@mn.waseda.ac.jp>;
<id@soas.ac.uk>

Jong Won Lee. Higashi Ajia reisen to kan-bei-nichi kankei (US-Korean Relations and Japan in East Asia's Cold War). Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppankai, 1996. v + 301 pp. Index. ¥5562 (hard cover)

First of all, the title of this book is a bit misleading: in fact, it deals with the United States' Korea policy from 1953 to 1960 in the context of the cold war situation and the United States' Asia policy on the whole. Japan's position in the considerations of these two countries is taken into account, but Japan does not appear as a player on its own. I must admit that I am not sufficiently familiar with the field to comment on the relevance of this book within the previous literature, but Lee claims that there has been very little research on this particular aspect. Besides, most of the used literature are primary sources, mainly unpublished US documents, e.g. from the National Security Council or Joint Strategic

Survey Committee. Thus this is probably a good source for information you would otherwise have to dig up in the archives--even for non-Japanese native speakers...

Lee's aim is to place the US Korea policy after the Korean War within the global and regional context. Although the focus is still much on the personalities of Syngman Rhee in Korea and Dwight D Eisenhower in the US, he aims at explaining their actions within the situation. On the one hand, Rhee's anti-Japanese position is often regarded as purely personal, whereas Lee tries to show the context of Japanese-Korean relations, from which at least part of this anti-Japanese sentiment was inevitable. Of course this attitude toward Japan also shaped the relationship between South Korea and the United States -- as Lee repeatedly says, the 'Japan factor' was always at the back of US-ROK relations, more or less visible. On the other hand, and that is where Lee's emphasis lies, Eisenhower's policies, after originally having been held in very low esteem, have more recently been interpreted as a realistic and rational grand strategy by the so-called Eisenhower revisionists. Lee briefly describes these historiographic movements and sides with the critics of this Eisenhower revisionism, who claim that Eisenhower's New Look strategy has not worked just as well as is now said, and that there were inconsistencies and irrational policies. He objects, however, to the method of showing irrationalities from without (e.g. from the viewpoint of Third World nations who lost faith in the US). Instead, he wants to detect discrepancies and inconsistencies within the United States' policy, putting particular emphasis not only on the decision making process, but also on the expressed aims and goals of various US decision makers. This leads to sometimes rather bothersome descriptions of who said what, but that is after all the point of this analysis: there are indeed a lot of

inconsistencies, in two dimensions: the regional policies (and policy aims) are quite different in the case of the United States's Japan and Korea policies, and in this respect Lee tends to defend Korea's anti-Japanese stance. The US policies also varied over time, as becomes particularly clear in those detailed discussions and decisions about aid and troops.

The book is greatly divided in a part dealing with the military aspects, and one dealing with the economic aspects of the cold war and the 'New Look' strategy. First, the discussions evolving around Korean security are explored. This includes mainly arguments about the size of the Korean military and the level of US troops stationed in South Korea and/or Japan. The US had actively supported a stronger South Korean military during the Korean war, and in a way also appreciated it within the New Look strategy, because it allowed for a reduction of US troops and accordingly US military spending. They objected, however, to Rhee's military build-up, fearing that it would rather destabilize the region. Rhee wanted to strengthen the South Korean military not only to counter communism, but also as a shield against Japan (and accused the US of being too pro-Japanese when they did not support this build-up); he also offered to send Korean troops to Vietnam, which was rejected. In this context, Korean antipathy against Japan plays some part, especially as the Korean side always perceived US policies to be in favour of Japan. This argument is even stronger in the economic discussions, and both aspects are clearly interwoven. The main point of the New Look policy was to save military expenditures by strengthening the economies of non-communist states; but Rhee accused the US of giving economic aid to South Korea only in order for Japan to profit from it. Japan was the major supplier for consumer goods and cheap technology for Korea, and could profit from those exports and in turn import better technology. In

this sense, Japan does feature prominently in the book, although the Japanese position is not further explored. Interestingly, the South Korean business world apparently supported this aid system and wanted to import goods from Japan, quite contrary to Rhee's boycott - this would rather support the viewpoint that Rhee's position was indeed special. A further chapter deals with the trend of the cold war later on to develop into economic rivalry between East and West rather than military antagonism. In the US-ROK relationship this leads to controversies over the general strategy, with Rhee favouring a roll-back, while the US strategy had shifted to economic rather than military aid, combined with an expansion of trade in order to develop Asian economies. For this purpose, the US insisted that better Japanese-Korean relations were necessary, but were not successful in their appeal. Lee argues that the dilemma of US policies in Asia was that, according to the regional approach of strengthening non-communist Asian nations, Japan was a central figure -- unfortunately Japan was disarmed, even under pressure unwilling to rearm, and besides hated and feared by other Asian countries. In addition, there was not as much common culture among the Asian countries as there was in Europe. All this complicated the strategy of strengthening regionalism and reducing US military engagement - which explains the inconsistencies in Eisenhower's policies.

The text has endnotes after each chapter, giving the sources and sometimes additional information. I found the amount of notes (about 3 or 4 pages per chapter) rather agreeable, although I sometimes thought they might be a bit scarce considering the mass of detail packed in the text. (This may be a rather German viewpoint, though: I think on international and particularly Japanese standards they are quite detailed). Unfortunately, there is no additional bibliography at the end of the book, and the

notes use short citation forms after the first appearance, which is a bit annoying if you are looking for just one source and have to browse through all the previous notes to get the full information. Actually, the index seems to cover the notes as well, but is not always comprehensive enough to find the first quotation. It is very detailed, though, and a very useful tool. The index also gives the Romaji for Western names, which are usually written in Kana, with Romaji added at the first mentioning. Korean names are given only in Kanji, with Japanese Furigana in the index. Here, I would suggest that the official romanization would also be useful because of the extreme variations in transliterations of Korean names (e.g. Lee, Rhee, Yi...). Apart from personal names, names of agencies as well as policy slogans or important expressions are often given in English. Along with a complete bibliography, I missed a list of abbreviations, which would be helpful, especially for those who don't read the book from the beginning, but just consult one or two chapters.

Overall, I found this a very detailed, academic book, maybe too detailed if you just want to gain an overview over the topic, but certainly useful if you are looking for specific information. For Japanese native speakers it is apparently convenient to have the mainly English language sources bundled in a Japanese text. However, even non-native speakers who don't read Japanese very fluently may find it useful, as the index allows for searching specific topics. The style is clear enough to pose no major problems, even if you have to look up some words (as I had to). There are no tables or illustrations, but the main points are usually summarized and numbered, so there is no danger of missing one by mistake.

(注意：H-USAからの転載です。)