

# A Comparative Note on Educational Reviews in Japan and the United States

Susumu Ikeda

## Part I. The Cross-fired Social Studies.

### 1.

To all human beings every educational problem is a matter of primary concern, because they possess the right to learn, which is the most fundamental factor among those which motivate and originate education, and it should not be neglected. Whether education is formal or informal doesn't concern us here. Education is a fundamental function in all human societies, and should support the people's right to learn. Human beings are able to be human only by exercising the right to learn, and yet the right is innate. Therefore an educational situation in which the peoples are prevented from exercising that right is apt to produce various kinds of complicated educational problems, and sometimes gives rise to subversive aggression against the educational system. For instance, a movement like the anti-moral education campaign which is being carried on by the Japan Teachers' Union is the case. Such a counter-movement would often, being too emotional, end fruitlessly. Since 1945 we have been experiencing an educational situation in which various kinds of conditions are tangled and very complicated. More than fifteen years have passed away since Japan surrendered. Japanese education in these years presents many interesting cases useful to a comparative study of education. Any problem involved in the situation is worth picking up as a subject with which educationists have to wrestle. Here I do not intend to discuss all of the topics concerned, but I shall touch only on some educational topics that might be able to contribute to our study.

The American educational system was introduced to Japan after the defeat. Therefore Japan and the United States possess a common educational system, but they are very different from each other in their educational situations. The situation of the former is critical, marginal and full of inferiority complex, while that of the latter is complacent and full of superiority complex. Undoubtedly the American educational situation is also complicated and has lots of controversial issues as we shall see later. Therefore nowadays the United States seems to be being driven into a more critical situation. Nevertheless her situation seen from various view-points is far less complicated and confused than in ours. In Japan foreign factors of various kinds get easily intertwined with educational factors and make even the solution of the simplest problem difficult. For instance, even a curriculum-revision became the target of criticism by some people who held that it would lead to the American

imperialism, and the rating system for teachers was also attacked as a kind of preparation for the Third World War.

In such a way every educational problem is picked up as significant of the conservative policy and then attacked fiercely by progressive leftists. Administration also is confused with political ideology. Management, control, regulation and so on which are solely responsibilities of educational administration, are at once regarded as political on the side of reactionary groups and not at all regarded as the normal processes operating for education. The very cause of such a confusion lies in the fact that the educational reform in Japan was carried on with no choice by the force of occupation policies just after the defeat. Considering the complicated situation of having been defeated, in those days there ought to have taken place various kinds of educational policies different from those of American style, nevertheless we were forced to adopt only the American style even to the extent of violating the people's right to learn. Compelling one-sided educational policy is to violate the right to learn. To have been violating this right has been making our educational situation unreasonable since the defeat. The conservatives now criticize unfavorably the educational policies made by order of the occupation authorities; on the contrary the progressives who have been attacking the American imperialism fiercely for these years support these policies. This strange confusion seems to be the result of having neglected the right to learn at the time of occupation.

Of course in prewar times we had a misfortune in that the entire educational system had been forced to be a slave to the Japanese militaristic imperialism. This was particularly true in the decade before the defeat. But this misfortune was the result of military policies, not owing to the educational system itself. It seems unreasonable that the cause of our tragedy is put down only to the educational system. The very cause of our tragedy lies in the misuse of the Tennō (Emperor) system. It is misfortune to us that the occupation policy has left the Tennō fiction as before. We should have abolished the fiction completely. In a certain sense the present Tennō is not as strong in political mechanism as in prewar time, but we should keep in mind that the name of Tennō was, is and will always be used to keep the supreme political power sacred and inviolable by the top-level conservative statesmen. The Japanese militarism made holy by the name of Tennō had deprived us of our right to learn from the Meiji era to the defeat. Therefore the educational situation was full of complex feelings also in prewar Japan. Having been so frustrated, teachers and administrators could not help becoming so perverse that they were condemned for being double-faced in their role-playing. The people also played a double game. The characteristic of being expressionless, as often shown on the face of the Japanese, seems to be the historical result of having lived in this warped situation for many years, and yet the cunning militarists had taken advantage of such a dual personality seen in the Japanese mind. They brain-washed the Japanese in the notorious school-subject named Shūshin which was centered in the Imperial Rescript called Kyōiku Chokugo. The Imperial Rescript was promulgated by the Emperor Meiji (Meiji Tennō) in 1890, and the aim was to improve

the confused moral situation at that time. It was not so ultra-nationalistic, but solely for moral education. The Imperial Rescript is said to have been the main impelling force which pushed the Japanese education to the ultra-reactionary conservatism of prewar time. It is quite true that the Rescript was misused by the reactionary conservative groups, but I do not like to think that the Rescript was strong enough to transform the Japanese people's minds fundamentally. In a sense it was used only as a political strategy to integrate modern Japan into a unified national state, and so was necessarily bad for modern Japan. The point lies in what misused the Rescript, which we should take into consideration.

Permit me to describe the Rescript briefly. At first the then Minister of Education ordered to Nakamura Keiu to make the draft of Imperial Rescript. The date of this order is uncertain, as is also the identity of the Minister who may have been either Enomoto Takeaki or Yoshikawa Kensei, but it is clear that the Rescript was motivated by Yamagata Aritomo. Inoue Kowashi worked with Motoda Eifu in making the draft only after twice rejecting the Yamagata's proposal. Inoue did not like to make the Rescript politically significant by connecting the influence of Tennō and top-level statesmen with the Rescript and he was concerned for the misuse of Tennō and the national power. Maybe he overlooked the educational value of such a thing as the Emperor's Rescript. He rejected Yamagata's proposal at first on the basis that misusing the Emperor's name in educational matters would lead to bad influence in the future generations. He had expressed such an opinion under the name of Itō Hirobumi. After he accepted Yamagata's proposal to make the draft, he seems to have had difficulty in getting a model from the German Emperor's Rescript on Education. Confucianist Motoda's close associates had, of course, rejected the Nakamura's draft as having been too much influenced by western Christian thought. In comparison with this situation it is interesting that, at mid-war time, the Imperial Rescript was rejected by the Japanese militarists on the basis that the Rescript showed the result of liberal thought which had prevailed among the elder statesmen in Meiji era.

The group of Confucian scholars took the confused moral tendencies in bad part, tho' it revealed nothing but the reflection of cross-opinions between old generations and new rising ones. While Inoue was a keen realistic statesman, most of Confucianists at the latter period were utopian idealists lacking a sense of reality. Accordingly Motoda objected to inserting such words as "always respect the constitution and observe the laws" in the last version of the Rescript. But Yoshikawa Kensei, the then Minister of Education, as originally suggested by Yamagata's group, enforced their insertion. Thus the Rescript came to play the central role in moral education aimed at building character suitable to a royal subject. It is well here to remember that the Rescript was misused as a weapon against Buddhism and Christianity, too. On the other hand, Shintō was promulgated as the national religion, tho' it was a religion only in the sociological and political sense. But, to infiltrate Shintō in the school system, there had been also announced formally that Shintō is not a religion. It seems rather to have succeeded in becoming compatible with the modern educational principle of secularization and in having brought Shintō in the Japanese public

school system through the notorious subject named Shūshin. The conservatives are said to have accomplished this aim, but could we hold so just are said?

In 1948 we Japanese were able to declare easily the invalidity of the Imperial Rescript on Education and other imperial rescripts in the Diet. Now we make nothing of the Rescript. Why? It is a very important point carefully to be deliberated. We should take note of the fact that the Rescript had endured only for about sixty years, although it was produced after about seventeen revisions during only five months. Being able to forget the Rescript easily is an important key to understanding the true mind of Japanese people. We Japanese, nay all the people in the world, are wholeheartedly peaceful and good-natured. The common people have never been warlike. To my regret, I have heard several times that the Japanese people were warlike before the war, but since the defeat they have become peaceful owing to the educational reform based upon the occupation policies. That is impossible! If we were warlike, how about the country which dared drop the notorious A-bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki? Isn't it strange that the country which used, uses and will use A-bombs denounces scathingly the past acts of the defeated nation only motivated by the psychology of war theater? The vices in the battle field are on both sides of battling nations. The vices during the wartime are pathological phenomena. The point is not crossing word with the vices in the wartime, but to abolish the war itself. Here I dare not speak ill of the victorious countries, but I merely suggest as not good that the victorious judge one-sidedly the defeated, and that such a word as warlike should not be applied to the defeated only.

Our national character of being peaceful and goodnatured has remained essentially unchanged by the temporal policies. Therefore we have been able to cherish the constant national character in the depth of our mind to this day, and we have assimilated the various kinds of educational systems since Meiji era. As we like peace, nowadays we are not always in favor of the military alliance with the great power. Because Japan appeared late on the stage of the modern world as a beginning semi-modern country, our elders could not help assimilating spontaneously various types of modern culture. They were also able to appreciate a modest attitude toward the establishment of the educational system which they decided with a free choice. The educational system in prewar time consisted of various aspects adopted from several countries. For instance, the educational systems of such countries as England, France, Germany and the United States influenced the Japanese educational system in Meiji era. Their aftereffects linger still in our system. The Rescript itself was nothing but a imitation of a German Emperor's Rescript. When we examine the educational system in Meiji era, we should study the political and educational situations in countries around Japan at that time. It would be wrong to conclude that Japan was the one and only country which showed a model of what is called absolute nationalism in those days. Nationalism is a symbol of the nineteenth century. Particularly when militarists acquired supremacy, the nation was driven to a warlike situation. Above all it is entirely misleading for the people to connect the militarism with the monarchism. Everything

connected with monarchism is an obstacle to the people's progress. In this sense it is a matter for regret that the present constitution has such an article as "The Emperor shall be the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people, deriving his position from the will of the people with whom resides sovereign power." Moreover it is declared in the very first article in the Constitution. We cannot understand the reason why the Allies Powers compromised with the then Japanese conservative top-ruling class. Although I am aware that the Tennō system is not so strong in postwar time as in prewar time, I would like to point out again that the name of Tennō as the weapon for keeping the conservative influences is as strong as in prewar time. It would be to lead astray the Japanese people to say that, as the Tennō's political power has been removed from the active political top-zone, the present Tennō's influence is so weak that the name of Tennō is not able to influence the Japanese people. Particularly the recent connection of the Tennō family with one of the big capitalists in Japan is a most important point to be taken into consideration. Wouldn't this strengthen the power of the Tennō? It seems possible. While in prewar time the Tennō family conspired with the militant party and Tennō himself was the God and the Generalissimo, nowadays the Tennō family is in collusion with the money clique. Tennō is no longer a powerless man who is revered at distance as God, but he is a rich man with human ability. This kind of Tennō's influence should not be neglected. The repercussion of old education supported by the name of Tennō, the tendency of which we could find in what is called the history education and the moral education, would make a first attack to the new education for the Japanese people in future time, I presume. But I wish my presumption would be a misunderstanding.

2.

The symbol is able to become the symbol of everything. No article in the Constitution will be able to guarantee us against the misuse of the Symbol "Tennō" by the ruling clique. The mood in the top statesmen's zone is liable to become conservative. Consequently it might be said that the educational policies derived from the "Nikkeiren" (Japan Federation of Employers Association) are apt to be reactionarily conservative. All educational reviews in favor of the conservative seem to be derived from this group. Since about the mid-century when what is called the cold war is said to have started, in many countries there have been devised various kinds of educational policies, such as revision of educational laws and rules, tie-up of industry and university, reexamination of higher education, revival of moral and history education, curriculum revision and so on, most of which are conservative in nature. For example, there were many reactionary educational organizations in the United States, such as American Education Association, American Parents Committee on Education, Church League of America, Committee on Education in Conference of American Small Business Organization, Employers' Association of Chicago, Institute For Public Service, Friends of Public Schools of America, Guardians of American Education, National Association of Pro-America, National Council for American Education.

These organizations were pressure groups to the public school system founded on the new education and also swam with McCarthyism. As such names of their publications as "How Red is the Little Red Schoolhouse?" "How Red are the Schools?" show, they were accusing the teachers of the Social Studies of being communists. The same kind of tendency, even though not so active, has been beginning to appear also in Japan just since that time. Recently there have been added such anti-communistic organizations as the following; Shin Nihon Kyōgikai (Genki Abe), Shin Nihon Bunkajin Kaigi (Masaichi Ibe), Jiyū Bunkyojin Renmei (Sakae Masuda), Nihon Bunka Kyōkai (Keisei Akimoto), Nihon Kyōiku Fubonokai (Jiro Odamura), Zenkoku Shiyūkai (Seitoku Yasuoka), Nihon Kenseikai (Ichiro Suetsugu), Nihon Yūyū Renmei (Yukio Kasahara). The name in the brackets shows the chairman. They are, of course, in favor of the Security Pact and harbor hostility against the Japan Teachers' Union. Also in Japan the Social Studies was fired at first, but unlike the case of the United States the right offensive was not so firmly organized. The initiative in the controversial issues has been taken by the left, and yet the organization of the left has been supported by the anonymous power derived from the international communistic party. Strange to say, the influence of Japan Teachers' Union (J. T. U., Nikkyōso) upon school teachers was, is and will be more powerful than that of the Ministry of Education (Monbushō). Such a state of things is quite different from that of the States. The progressives in Japan are apt to check any policy originating from the Ministry of Education, and on the strength of the right to learn they have been attacking the policies of Monbushō since about 1950. The progressive teachers seem to believe that all of those which Monbushō leads are wrong, but everything the Japan Teachers' Union says and does is right. In Japan, to stand on the side of Monbushō means to be a reactionary conservative enemy to human progress, and so to speak, the reverse McCarthyism seems to be rampant in Japan. Progressive educational policies are to be derived from the Japan Teachers' Union, and are aggressive towards the Japan Federation of Employers Association's policies. The teachers in Japan have been suppressed under the yoke of the feudalistic administration for a long time, and now that they were emancipated from the yoke, the J. T. U.'s aggressive attitude are not always unreasonable. I would like to say that the J. T. U. should not be oppressed, but should be promoted intelligently. The J. T. U. authorities also should make effort to lead their organizations rationally, and individual teacher must have a clearcut fixed purpose to educate the people and their children, but our educational purpose should be derived from inside what Japan was, is and will be, and should not be enforced from outside. It might be possible to suppose that the Nikkeiren depends on America and the J. T. U. on Red China or U. S. S. R. Such a supposition of their interdependency may not be entirely groundless now that every thing whether physical or mental, is related with each other on an international scale. Moreover each of both the Nikkeiren and the Nikkyōso appears to have the myth on each side, namely the rejecting-communism-myth on one side and the rejecting-capitalism-myth on the other side. It is interesting to note that both scribe the educational confusion in

present Japan to the occupation policies initiated particularly by the U. S. A. In addition a strange hearsay is heard on both sides: the one says that the J. T. U. was brought into being by the American occupation policy, and it is the root of educational confusions in present Japan, and also that various kinds of troubles are arising from the remnants of the occupation policy, while the other insists that the policies derived from Monbushō have been moulded in U. S. A. Such a kind of strangely complicated sense is also seen in the political stage. As for this, Mr. Reischauer points out in P. 329 of his book named "The United States and Japan" that "the pro-American conservatives cast doubts on the present constitution as an American creation, while anti-American Socialists defend the constitution as a good one regardless of its origin". I quite agree with him. The core of controversial issues in Japan lies in politics, not in conviction because of the myth. The laymen often can not see through the myth, and they are too ready to believe the outward appearances of the myth, but the myth is no more than the myth, which is not at all real. The educational reviews are often apt to fall into the outward judgements, and our educational wheels are running idle around the myth. Sorry to say, teachers, educators and educationists in Japan are possessed with the political mythes. The real purposes of education are left behind and missing in the political fictions. The educational situation looks as if there were no education, and much shouting only is reverberating in a vacuum. Although the gifted ones can make a smooth progress in the schools with no competent teachers, a great majority on common level are to suffer most. If such conditions were let alone, our education would be buried in the vandalism. The apprehensions of this unhappy situation exist not only in Japan, but also in the States. For instance, Mr. Clifton Fadiman says in P. 13 of the book named "The Case for Basic Education" that the root of the trouble in American education "lies in the circumstance that somehow the average high school graduate does not know who he is, where he is, or how he got there." He also points out in the same place that the root of the trouble "lies in the fact that naturally enough he will settle for shallow and trivial meanings." Naturally I am aware that most of American educationists are not in favor of Mr. Fadiman's opinion, and they are praising the American teenagers to the skies as being wonderful. However I can not help agreeing to what Mr. Fadiman says, because we Japanese also have been suffering from the same ineffectiveness in public schools as he points out since the opening of new school system. In our country there has been popularized the following senryū verse; "6-3 sei yakyū bakariga tsuyokunari," which means that the school boys in the Japanese primary and secondary schools have become stronger only in playing the baseball game since the enforcement of 6-3 school system. Namely as a satirical warning to the new education the common people make fun of the pupils who do nothing but playing baseball game in school grounds. Just after the war some experienced teachers and educationists criticized the new education forced by the occupation authorities as being an education which would turn the Japanese into an untaught people. Although such a criticism was based upon a misunderstanding, the hasty reform unfit for the real state of our education was surely in danger of degradation at

that time. Shortage of competent teachers, arrogance of some educationists, anarchic confusion of school administration, unbalanced finance and so on were the results. I should say that one of the main causes of educational troubles in Japan lies in the hasty reform of educational institution. Moreover, by a certain group of cunning people, one-sided criticisms were directed towards the educational institution in Japan, and more than needed, private schools were favorably and governmental schools unfavorably evaluated. Especially the latter was attacked fiercely as having been anti-democratic, bureaucratic and militaristic. Were governmental schools so weak, just as one thought, to the national power or militarism in prewar time? Were private schools so courageous and sure enough? Why are most of the Zengakuren students from governmental universities? It should be kept in our mind that the anti-governmentalism has been one of the traditions of our governmental universities since Meiji era, and private universities have not always been so progressive as believed in the United States. A careful investigation of this aspect has been neglected, I think. It seems unquestionable that the institution which Japan was compelled to adopt in haste without close investigation has brought such a confusion into the Japanese education. So far, the external conditions which have confused the educational situation have been discussed, hereafter I will pick up the Social Studies as one of the internal conditions.

### 3.

Naturally in such a confused situation the Social Studies is apt to be cross-fired from both sides of the right and the left. The right is always seeking to draw the subject to the extreme patriotism and often accuses the subject of having the socialistic or communistic contents, while the left intends to abuse the subject for propaganda or agitation for a revolution and besides denounces the governmental effort of revising the subject as being reactive. The recent controversies over moral education and the emphasis on history education are the outcomes of such criticisms directed to the Social Studies. We were not able to take the history as an independent subject in our school system just after the war. But the voice calling for a reflection upon the school curriculum lacking history education has arisen earlier than expected, from both sides of the conservative and the progressive and the history was adopted as a regular curriculum. However, because of the careless compilation of the text book of history written from the view point of historical materialism, the curriculum of history is unfortunately going to be usurped by the conservative. At first the history was treated in the context of the Social Studies unseparately. The point of effort to revise the Social Studies curriculum was to separate history from the Social Studies. As the Social Studies is a curriculum of vague character covering educational matters as a whole, it is difficult to teach history in the context of the Social Studies. Even though the world history is taken into consideration as a subject intended to give the historical culture to the younger generation, it is doubtful whether our pupils really understand the world history as a whole or not. Besides the world history course is inadequate for the



acquisition of any real understanding of our cultural tradition, heritage and national development in our own country, which are worthy of the name of history. Mr. Hayes says that "the Social Studies is vague and only serves to mask and denature what should be a very important part of liberal education—that is history," in p. 53 of "The Case for Basic Education". As long as history is included in the Social Studies, the course will be buried alive. The revival of any history education is desirable to human development regardless of ideology. But we must avoid misusing history by any means, because it has been often abused by groups of reactionary tendencies. A good example of such an abuse was the inspired view of history centered in Tennō, which tempted the Japanese people into the self-complacency. Such a reactionary tendency can be seen also on the United States, where some historians have been attacking the progressives since the cold war. There are some people who are anxious about the future of America, for fear of losing in the competition with U. S. S. R. because of the apparent neglect of true American history in school education. For instance, let us look at Mr. Root's book titled "Brain Washing in The High Schools", which examines eleven American History Textbooks. It is the author's point of view that American students are indoctrinated with a Marxian concept of the United States history. To remark in passing, eleven textbooks which Mr. Root examined are the following: Avery Craven and Walter Johnson: The United States—Experiment in Democracy, Leon H. Canfield and Howard B. Wilder: The Making of Modern American, Lewis Paul Todd and Merle Curti: America's History, Ruth Wood Gavian and William A. Hamm: The American Story, Ralph Volney Harlow: Story of America, David Saville Muzzey: A History of Our Country, Dwight L. Dumond, Edward E. Dale and Edgar B. Wesley: History of United States, Tremont P. Wirth: United States History, Harold Underwood Faulkner, Tyler Kepner, and Edward H. Merrill: History of the American Way, Henry W. Bragdon and Samuel P. McCutchen, Lilian T. Mowrer and Howard H. Cummings: The United States and World Relations. These books were published in about 1950. According to what Mr. Root says, most of American history textbooks seem to be in favor of Pro-Communism. He says in p. 18 of his "Brain Washing in the High School", that these books emphasize not the American form of constitutional republican government but a democracy that is hardly distinguishable from the modern people's democracies. He seems to dislike the Democratic Party's policies. Whether his opinion is right or not, it doesn't concern us. It is interesting that, while in Japan the left attacks the right fiercely, in America in contrast with Japan the right speaks ill of the left loudly. Unlike America, Japan is not always hostile to the Reds in spite of her being clearly a capitalistic state. Even when the conservatives are emphasizing the necessity of history education from their own standpoint of reactionary tendency, the progressives are still easily able to put them to silence; because most of the Japanese intelligentsias are sympathetic with the left, and yet the force of communism is by far stronger in Japan than in other capitalistic country. Anyhow the history education has been required as the subject intended to give the backbone to the nation, and in Japan the subject was, at the beginning, treated in a progres-

sive manner as the world history serving to the purpose of building a new nation, but now the history is going to become a reactionary subject likely to contribute toward restoring the old system, and also in America such a reactionary tendency seems to be coming back. It is a common phenomenon to both countries that the conservatives are seeking to take advantage of the history education and reject the vagueness of the Social Studies, particularly since the cold war. The vagueness of the Social Studies as a know-how subject has been pointed out in both the United States and Japan alike, and our teachers have been suffering from the Social Studies' boundlessness since the introduction of the subject. We have been informed that the Social Studies in the United States is going on smoothly. But I was surprised at the recent Report of the San Francisco Curriculum Survey Committee which says "the Social Studies has a low reputation among teachers and students alike as the least solid and least systematic of the academic subjects, and the term Social Studies should be dropped and the term Geography History, Civics, etc. should be substituted." The Report also says that "the Social Studies diverts much valuable time from the study of history and geography, which we consider a better preparation for dealing with political and economic issues than random discussions of the daily news, and it encourages wooly and superficial habits of thinking." (See CBE Bulletin Vol. 4 No. 9.) The things stated here are exactly what we want to mention as the weak points of our Social Studies. In the time of the occupation policy dominance, the Social Studies was the flower of the school curriculum in Japan, but the formal curriculum revision of the Social Studies set a precedent for the United States, and our Ministry of Education has been revising the curriculum since 1958 when this subject was formally re-established as a subject to treat separately in History, Geography, Civics and so on. Our Ministry of Education says; "Social Studies includes the studies of history, geography and civics. In elementary schools, these subjects are not taught separately. Children must acquire a basic understanding of Japanese history and geography before they leave elementary schools. In lower secondary schools children in principle should be taught geography at the 1st grade, history at the 2nd grade, and political and social studies at the 3rd grade, but teachers are permitted to integrate these subjects." The same revision is about to occur in the States. The trivialism of the Social Studies has been discussed and criticized by intelligent people, particularly like Mr. Hutchins, Mr. Maritain and Mr. Rickover. Of course I am aware that what these people hold represents solely the opinion of a minority group and is being counter-attacked by professional educationists, but it is not unaccountable that an overemphasis of the Social Studies will bring about the trivialism. Japan has picked up the Social Studies as the essence of the new education since the defeat. The educational occupation policy has forced the subject upon us as a weapon against the feudalism in Japan. While the original intention of the subject was to rear the citizenship, it has often become the subject serving to indoctrinating the revolutionary theories into the minds of our younger generation. Moreover this has been done by non-academic methods such as bull or buzz sessions. The result was, is and will be the mass production of speaking students. Now in Japan we are suffering from the bustle and confusion of mouth students

and scholars of this kind. Unless we correct immediately the know-how subjects which are lacking in contents, the pupils will be getting more and more wooly and superficial. But I am not going to say here that teaching the socialism or communism in the subject should be avoided. What I mean is that it is meaningless to indoctrinate a propaganda bill into the minds of young people only by the know-how subject form. It seems strange to me that young teachers, who do not appear to have studied the basic principles of socialism or communism before, are behaving themselves like socialists or communists and indoctrinating revolutionary theories. There would remain only speaking students and teachers.

As I passed a remark before, even in America, there was a time when the Social Studies was regarded as a "red" subject by the conservatives such as the Zoll-organization. The NEA declared that the communists should be purged off the school system, and in America the declaration was unanimously supported, but in Japan such a suggestion would be fiercely attacked by the left. Though we are a law-governed nation just as much as the United States and other countries, Japan is the only country which is tolerant to all kinds of ideologies. It may safely be said that Japan is on the border of anarchism, and yet the anarchic situation without national power and regulation has been considered as the best condition for democracy since the defeat. The anarchism, I would rather say the trick-anarchism, in which the Japanese younger generations have been indulging themselves since 1945, might as well be called one of the results of the know-how subjects' unproductivity and triviality.

In order to correct the weak points of the Social Studies the conservatives have been emphasizing mainly the moral education and the history education for the time being. Although the moral education is nothing but living training for citizenship, the lefts in Japan have been attacking the conservatives violently, regarding it as a tool subject for imperialism and war. The history education has been taken advantage of by both sides of the progressive and the conservative. But, when the educational reviews in Japan are compared with those in the States, we should always keep in mind that there is a strong Marxist undercurrent in the Japanese intelligent vein, the influence of which we can not escape from. I have heard several times during my stay in the States that, having no communistic adjacent country within a visual field, the Japanese are not aware of the communistic terrors, but I think, this idea is not true with us. I would rather like to know the reason why the Americans are so anti-communistic, while they are also not adjacent to the communistic countries. What judges communism is not the eyes, but the head. I have been discussing about the American education in contrast with the Japanese education, and not discussing how the Social Studies is operated and taught in an actual classroom. Instead, I have been arguing how it is reviewed by the public. To the alien outsiders, even if they are permitted to visit a class in order to see the teaching activities of the subject, it would be impossible to understand the subject completely. There are some study-passengers being proud of their records of personal experiences, but I think, these skim-analytical experiences seen in what are called personal experiences are of no great value to

the comparative education. Education is not so simple like that, nor should the comparative study be so easy going. No country has such a simple educational situation that may be grasped completely by a foreigners' skim-observation of a short term. We had been forced to accept an American educational system with no choice by the occupation policy based on the notorious belief that the American education is the best in the world. Besides there were added various kinds of ambitions of civilians in MG at that time. As a result of their having forced an educational reform deduced from their skim-observation of the Japanese education with no sharp penetration into the depth of Japan, there have been the rising anti-American feelings among the Japanese people, particularly among the cultured circles. The sole reason why I pick up nothing but the review here is to know how Americans criticize their educational systems. I am not so bold as to dare analyze the American education by my skim-observation, because the skim-analysis may lead me to a misapplication of the American educational system. As mentioned above I happened to discover that there were lots of criticisms on education, especially on the Social Studies. In spite of the different situations, also in Japan, there are various kinds of critical opinions on the subjects around the Social Studies. If we take into consideration that the Social Studies and other subjects in postwar Japan had taken the American Social Studies and others for complete model, it is not unnatural at all that we happen to find many points of similarity in the controversial issues on education, particularly on the Social Studies, in both countries, and we can not help focusing our attention upon how far an American educational system transplanted in Japan has developed or been transformed. Judging from what comes to the surface, our education seems to be getting better, and Article 1. of The Fundamental Law of Education declares that "education shall aim at the full development of personality, striving for the rearing of the people, sound in mind and body, who shall love truth and justice, esteem individual value, respect labour and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with the independent spirit, as builders of the peaceful state and society." What a nice sentence it is! However, betraying this beautiful statement are the cases such as the follows; there are lots of younger demonstration-like fanatics on the street; it was only four months ago when the top-leader of the Socialist Party by a fanatic right teenager who is a son of one soldier; one day in an elementary school, some schoolboys are said to have raped a woman teacher, who warned their mischief, by turn, and so on . . . . "As it is" is not "as it is recommended in the Law," and the discrepancy between "as it should be" and "as it is" cannot be helped. The more complicated the educational situation is, the more vehement the discrepancy becomes, and because of this disharmony which keeps us away from the reality and allows us to dream the ideal the educational theory conversely becomes radical monotonous and so far as to be straight-forward violently. The Japanese education is the case in point, and accordingly the educational review which criticizes an educational situation solely by an educational theory cannot escape from becoming radical and it comes to there being only an one-sided educational and no fair review.

We could have various kinds of educational movements, theories and reviews on education in prewar Japan. For example, in the time of what is called Taishō-Democracy (1910's and 20's), there were new educational movements of dazzling gorgeousness in schools, particularly in primary or secondary schools such as primary schools attached to Chiba or Akashi Normal School, Nara Women's Higher Normal School and so on, but now we can have only a few educational movements which reveal nothing but bickerings. While there are rising kaleidoscopic changes in the social situation which are to exert great influences upon the educational situation, we can find few changes in what teachers and professional educationists say. It has not been out of the teachers, but out of the citizens that there has arisen a cry for the revision of Social Studies' curriculum, and rather, by virtue of their belief that the Social Studies is the most progressive subject in the world, most teachers, educators and professional educationists treasured the subject. Therefore the philosophical view of education which they entertain is still now resting too much upon the pragmatism. The same tendency is seen in the States where there are lots of criticisms on the American public education, particularly on the Social Studies, which have been raised from among the citizen. Most American professional educationists speak ill of what Mr. Hutchins, Mr. Rickover and Mr. Maritain and so on argue on education, but we Japanese can understand very well what these people say. I would like to say that what the professional educationists say is colored by too much adherence to the formalism of the Dewey-cult. I can not help expressing my regret in that, notwithstanding their change-cult, they have remained as they were thirty years ago in their educational theory. While we can always notice some new changes in the theory of other subject areas such as sociology, politics, economics, physics and so on, we can find nothing new except educationists' jargons devised for renewing routine methods in the educational area. Anyhow, to my regret, I have been able to get nothing worthy of special report except the pragmatism-cult remaining at it was years before in the field of American professional education.

At first thought it seems difficult to compare the Japanese education with the American education, because both are quite different from each other economically or politically, but, as was stated before, it is possible and interesting to compare both educational situations. Firstly, namely in 1870's, both countries were in close contact with each other and intelligent persons who were concerned about the establishment of educational system in Japan, such as Fukuzawa Yukichi, Shinmura Jyō, Tanaka Fujimaro, Izawa Shūji, Takamine Hideo, Mori Arinori, David Murray, William Clark and so on, went and came between both countries. Needless to say, Japan was exposed to the oneway influence of America, as she was not strong enough to influence others at that time. Those who visited America for the study of advanced education in 1860's and 1870's were impressed with the new education and came back to Japan with new knowledge. Mori Arinori, one of them, stayed in America as a diplomat from December in 1870 to July 1873. He sent a questionnaire to famous Americans in the learned circles, asking their comments on the Japanese educational policies and got thirteen answers back in 1872. Then he edited these

letters in book form and published "Education in Japan" in New York, in which he suggested the notorious idea of replacing Japanese with English. As this idea was too radical, even Americans opposed it. David Murray was also one of those who sent answers to Mori. David Murray stayed in Japan five years (1873-1878) as "Superintendent of Educational Affairs in the Empire of Japan, and Advisor to the Japanese Imperial Minister of Education." He was not radical, but moderate in both his personality and his educational opinions. In his reply to Mori's questionnaire of 1872 he made the following points as important factors of an educational reform,

1. Every nation must create a system of education suited to its own wants.
2. A nation should aim at universal education.
3. Female education is as important as male education.
4. Education should be both practical and disciplinary.
5. What educational institutions are required.

Later these points became his leading principles during his stay in Japan. Tanaka Fujimaro who was advised by Murray was a liberal educational administrator at that time, and he visited Europe and America to investigate educational situations as a member of the Iwakura Mission to those countries in 1871-73, evaluating the American educational system as the most advanced one. He was a radical pro-American and a disciple of Fukuzawa. Murray avoided the radical change of Japanese education, paid his respects to the Japanese tradition and is said to have opposed Tanaka's liberal policies. The educational law of 1879 has been said to be liberal and the product of the liberal group in the then Ministry of Education lead by Tanaka Fujimaro, but the law was revised in 1880. This revised law revealed a tendency to go against the progressive influence of the Ministry of Education, and at the same time a new tendency showing pro-German influence began to arise. Especially by the change of government in 1881 the bureaucratic tendency was reinforced, and became decisive in 1886 when the then Minister of Education, Mori Arinori established the educational law.

Nowadays we often hear the assumption that, if the liberal influence on the part of the Fukuzawa group had continued without having been disturbed by the reactionary conservative, Japanese education would have been stronger and flourished, but such an assumption is nonsense. Instead of indulging in such a supposition we should consider the reason why the progressive broke down in the Meiji era. It is worth keeping in mind that David Murray advised the authorities to refer to the European educational systems as well, and create a system of education suited to Japan proper. At first sight it seems strange that, while an American adviser recommended that Japan should not refer only to the American type of education but also to the European type, the then Japanese educational authorities revealed uncompromisingly a pro-American tendency; but David Murray was an educator to the core, and Tanaka Fujimaro was nothing but a dashing bureaucrat who was dazzled by brilliant achievements produced from the frontier mind in the United States. We should think much of David Murray who recommended the improvement of Japanese education

on the basis of Japanese tradition with guidance from various kinds of educational systems in Europe and the United States. It was lucky that we could have such a well-intentioned leader as Murray at the early time of the Meiji era. It is an educational paradox that those who warned against the excessive liberalization of some Japanese returnees from abroad were Americans and none other, in contrast to the case we had during the occupation. I feel admiration for the atmosphere and the large-heartedness of the Meiji era.

4.

Sixty-five years or so later, we were defeated in the Second World War and faced the high-handedness of occupation policy. Even though it cannot be helped that, having been in the special situation of having lost the war, Japan has been handicapped in every point, the right to criticize the Japanese education seems to have been misused by the occupation policy. Who on earth could deprive any human being of his right to learn which is one of the basic human rights? Any victorious country should not have deprived the defeated nation of her basic right to learn. I recommend that you look at some passages from severe directives issued by the Supreme Commander. It was on the 22nd and 30th of October in 1945 that the directions for administration of the educational system of Japan and for investigation, screening, and certification of teachers and educational officials, some passages of which I quote here, were issued. The passages are the following ;

(I) The direction for administration of the educational system of Japan.

1. In order that the newly formed Cabinet of the Imperial Japanese Government shall be fully informed of the objectives and policies of the occupation with regard to Education, it is hereby directed that :

a. The content of all instruction will be critically examined, revised, and controlled in accordance with the following policies :

(1) Dissemination of militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology will be prohibited and all military education and drill will be discontinued.

(2) Inculcation of concepts and establishment of practices in harmony with representative government, international peace, the dignity of the individual and such fundamental human rights as the freedom of assembly speech, and religion, will be encouraged.

b. The personnel of all educational institutions will be investigated, approved or removed, reinstated, appointed, reorientated, and supervised in accordance with the following policies :

(1) Teachers and educational officials will be examined as rapidly as possible and all career military personnel, persons who have been active exponents of militarism and ultra-nationalism, and these actively antagonistic to the policies of the occupation will be removed.

(2) Teachers and educational officials who have been dismissed, suspended, or forced to resign for liberal or antimilitaristic opinions or activities, will be declared immediately eligible for and if properly qualified will be given preference in reappointment.

(3) Discrimination against any student, teacher, or educational official on grounds of race, nationality, creed, political opinion, or social position, will be prohibited, and immediate steps will be taken to correct inequities which have resulted from such discrimination.

(4) Students, teachers, and educational officials will be encouraged to evaluate critically and intelligently the content of instruction and will be permitted to engage in free and unrestricted discussion of issues involving political, civil, and religious liberties.

(5) Students, teachers, educational officials, and public will be informed of the objectives and policies of the occupation, of the theory and practises of representative government, and of the part played by militaristic leaders, their active collaborators, and those who by passive acquiescence committed the nation to war with the inevitable result of defeat, distress, and

## A Comparative Note on Educational Reviews in Japan and the United States

the present deplorable state of the Japanese people.

- c. The instrumentalities of educational processes will be critically examined, revised, and controlled in accordance with the following policies:
    - (1) Existing curricula, textbooks, teaching manuals, and instructional materials, the use of which is temporarily permitted on an emergency basis, will be examined as rapidly as possible and these portions designed to promote militaristic or ultra-nationalistic ideology will be eliminated.
    - (2) New curricula, textbooks, teaching manuals, and instructional materials designed to produce an educated, peaceful, and responsible citizenry will be prepared and will be substituted for existing materials as rapidly as possible.
    - (3) A normally operating educational system will be re-established as rapidly as possible, but where limited facilities exist preference will be given to elementary education and teacher training.
  2. The Japanese Ministry of Education will establish and maintain adequate liaison with the appropriate staff section of the Office of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, and upon request will submit reports describing in detail all action taken to comply with the provisions of this directive.
  3. All officials and subordinates of the Japanese Government affected by the terms of this directive, and all teachers and school officials, both public and private, will be held personally accountable for compliance with the spirit as well as the letter of the policies enunciated in this directive.
- (II) The direction for investigation, Screening, and Certification of Teachers and Educational Officials.
1. In order to eliminate from the educational system of Japan those militaristic and ultra-nationalistic influences which in the past have contributed to the defeat, war guilt, suffering, privation, and present deplorable state of the Japanese people; and in order to prevent the teachers and educational officials having military experience or affiliation; it is hereby directed that:
    - a. All persons who are known to be militaristic, ultra-nationalistic or antagonistic to the objectives and policies of the occupation and who are at this time actively employed in the educational system of Japan, will be removed immediately and will be barred from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan.
    - b. All other persons now actively employed in the educational system of Japan will be permitted to retain their positions at the discretion of the Ministry of Education until further notice.
    - c. All persons who are members of or who have been demobilized from the Japanese military forces since the termination of hostilities, and who are not at this time actively employed in the educational system of Japan, will be barred from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan until further notice.
  2. In order to determine which of those persons who are now actively employed in or who may in the future become candidates for employment in the educational system of Japan are unacceptable and must be removed, barred, and prohibited from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan, it is hereby directed that:
    - a. The Japanese Ministry of Education will establish suitable administrative machinery and procedures for the effective investigation, screening and certification of all present and prospective teachers and educational officials.
    - b. The Japanese Ministry of Education will submit to this Headquarters as soon as possible a comprehensive report describing all actions taken to comply with the provisions of this directive. This report will contain in addition to the following specific information;
      - (1) A precise statement as how acceptability of the individual is to be determined, together with lists of specific standards which will govern the retention, removal, appointment or re-appointment of the individual.
      - (2) A precise statement of what administrative procedures and machinery are to be established in order to accomplish the investigation, screening, and certification of personnel, together with a statement of what provisions are to be made for review of what provisions are to be made for review of appealed decisions and reconsideration of individuals previously refused certification.

As the above are the directions for educational administration, it may be necessary for the



provisions to sound so high-handed. However we should not forget that everything, whether it may be progressive or not, was carried on under the violent pressure of injunctions issued from the occupation forces. Particularly the injunction that "all persons who are known to be militaristic, ultra-nationalistic, or antagonistic to the objectives and policies of the occupation and who are at this time actively employed in the educational system of Japan, will be removed immediately and will be barred from occupying any position in the educational system of Japan," came upon the defeated nation as a dark cloud and it had a strong power to terrify teachers and officials. Some of them have been pretending the communistic attitude since the defeat in order to camouflage what they did during wartime, and some found fault with each other. It was a shameful state. But strange to say, recently an opinion has circulated that the legislations following the war were not made by the pressures of occupation forces, but they have been progressive and fair, because U. S. S. R. had been also in the Allied Committee for Japan at that time. Of course I am aware that the United States Education Mission to Japan visited Japan two times and presented useful reports to the authorities, but I am sorry to say that they did not exactly understand the nature of Japanese education preceeding the war. I can not understand why they speak badly of the past Japanese educational system. Most Americans seem possessed of an idea that all aspects of the pre-war Japanese education were entirely anti-democratic and uncivilized. The directions for Suspension of Courses in Morals (Shūshin), Japanese History, and Geography, which was issued on the 31st of December in 1945, commanded as follows ;

"Inasmuch as the Japanese Government has used education to inculcate militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideologies which have been inextricably interwoven in certain textbooks imposed upon students,

It is hereby directed that :

- a. All courses in Morals (Shūshin), Japanese History, and Geography in all educational institutions, including government, public, and private schools, for which textbooks and teachers' manuals have been published or sanctioned by the Ministry of Education shall be suspended immediately and will not be resumed until permission has been given by this headquarters.
- b. The Ministry of Education shall suspend immediately all ordinances (Hōrei), regulations, or instructions directing the manner in which the specific subjects of Morals (Shūshin), Japanese History and Geography shall be taught."

But, should our past education have been so strongly regarded with enmity by the occupation forces? I do not think so. It is not by education, but by militarism that we were led to war. As for the Supreme Tennō, most Japanese have never wholeheartedly regarded him as God and have pretended to feel a respect for Tennō only for fear of lèse-majesté. We Japanese are not so silly that we worship Tennō as a true God. The point is that the Tennō system and the educational system have been engaged as plausible means for beautifying higher politics. As for Shintō, it is anything but a religion and we look upon it as the mechanism unsuccessfully devised for excluding alien cultural influences and suppressing the opposition to the national policy ; so to speak it was like McCarthyism

in America. For example, Minoda Kyōki was a professor at Keiō University and a chairman of Genri Nihonsha, who attacked the liberalists, intending to purge them from the campus. In his opinion the liberalists were to be blamed for their anti-nationalism and defeatism. Mr. Yukitoki Takigawa, the former president of Kyōto University and a professor of criminal law at that time, is one who was attacked by Minoda. We must keep in mind that a Minoda Kyōki was a professor of Keiō University, and, if anything, the number of persons attacked by the rightists was more in governmental universities than in private ones. At any rate Shintō was only used as an excuse to fire those who criticized the war-like nationalism. The direction for Abolition Government Sponsorship, Support, Perpetuation, Control, and Dissemination of State Shintō, issued on the 15th December 1945, shows us ironically that Shintō was the means for imperialism. Look at some part of the direction, and you will find such an expression as the following; "In order to prevent *a recurrence of the perversion of Shintō theory and beliefs into militaristic and ultra-nationalistic propaganda designed to delude the Japanese people and lead them into wars of aggression*, and in order to assist the Japanese people in a rededication of their national life to building a new Japan based upon ideals of perpetual peace and democracy, it is hereby directed that": (italicized by the present writer). The direction also shows us the definition of militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology; i. e. it is defined as

"Militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology embraces those teachings, beliefs, and theories, which advocate or justify a mission on the part of Japan to extend its rule over other nations and peoples by reason of:

- (1) The doctrine that the Emperor of Japan is superior to the heads of other states because of ancestry, descent, or special origin.
- (2) The doctrine that the people of Japan are superior to the people of other lands because of ancestry, descent, or special origin.
- (3) The doctrine that the islands of Japan are superior to other lands because of divine or special origin.
- (4) Any other doctrine which tends to delude the Japanese people into embarking upon wars of aggression to glorify the use of force as an instrument for the settlement of disputes with other peoples."

I have used a rather long quotation, because, I thought, now is the time to evaluate anew the documents governing the defeated Japan, which were issued by the occupation forces. The definition in the above quotation is very suggestive to us at present when a new nationalism is bound to arise. In short, Shintō is not a true religion, but a political force parasitic on the margin of nationalism. When most Americans discuss Japan, they oversimplify her. Though it cannot be helped that an alien viewpoint often becomes short-sighted, we wish to have our culture studied well. Take, for example, the following sentence; "The entire educational system, for instance, was built upon Confucianist-Shintoist philosophy and ethics as reflected in the Imperial Rescript on Education and reinforced by German educational philosophy." This passage on page 238 of the Yearbook of Education 1954 is by Mr. Chitoshi Yanaga, a scholar at Yale University who seems to be a Japanese American

judging from his name. What is said may be partly true, but never true of the entire school system, though it may be said of the Meiji organisation. I recommend Mr. Yanaga to study the Japanese cultural history more carefully. Such an expression as "Borrowing and assimilating alien culture had become a national habit to the Japanese people. They had become eager borrowers and improvers of culture," (do p. 233) is not only short-sighted, but also impolite to Japanese culture. Having been defeated in war does not mean that our culture has fallen behind. We Japanese have our own good culture worthy of pride in its own right. Borrowing and assimilating is more or less a common characteristic of any culture, and a culture that does not borrow and assimilate would not be able to come into existence. Let us look at American culture, and we can find there nothing but borrowing and assimilating European culture. The school system in the Meiji era was a mixed composition of the French, Anglo-Saxon, German, and American type's, and not a simple composition. To begin with, the School System planned in 1872 (the so-called Gakusei) is said to have been based on the French system derived from the Napoleonic Code in its institution and composed on the line of pragmatism in its curriculum. Though a series of pre-war Japanese educational reforms have developed the Japanese school system along the line of nationalism in imitation of the German type since about 1880's the real conditions of Japanese education have been collected from various contents of world cultures. Particularly teaching materials of the natural sciences have been collected beyond ideologies and thoughts since 1860's, and we have never been prohibited from teaching the theory of evolution. The Japanese education in prewar time has never been one-sided.

Errors resulting from short-sighted investigations have been committed by the United States Education Mission to Japan. This Mission visited our country twice to investigate Japanese education and present inspection-reports to the Supreme Commander. As the mission reports have come to have a significant influence upon the post-war Japanese education, I will describe the Mission briefly. The members of the First Mission included John N. Andrews, Harold Benjamin, Gordon T. Bowles, Leon Carnovsky, Wilson Compton, George S. Counts, Roy J. Deferrari, George W. Diemer, Kermit Eby, Frank N. Freeman, Virginia C. Gildersleeve, Willard E. Givens, Ernest R. Hilgaro, Frederic G. Hochwalt, Mildred McAfee Norton, Charles S. Johnson, Isaac L. Kandel, Charles H. McCloy, F. B. Norton, T. V. Smith, David Harrison Stevens, Paul P. Stewart, Alexander J. Stoddard, George D. Stoddard (CHM), Clard Trow, Pearl A. Wanamaker, Emily Woodward (cut out prefixes from the names). The Mission declared in the report that "they have not visited Japan in the spirit of conquerors, but as experienced educators who believe that there is an unmeasured potential for freedom and for individual and social growth in every human being." What did they think about the pre-war Japanese education? Their report says; "The Japanese system of education in its organization and curricular provisions would have been due for reform in accordance with modern theories of education even if there had not been injected into it ultra-nationalism and militarism. The system was based on a nineteenth century pattern which was highly centralized, providing one type of education

for the masses and another for privileged few." This saying has become a catch word to those who intend to criticize the Japanese system of education. Is it true, as the Mission Report declares, that our past educational system so neglected the modern theories of education? I do not think so. If the Mission had examined the history of Japanese education more carefully, they would not have come to this conclusions. Unfortunately they stayed only for about twenty five days to collect educational information. Can anyone understand a country's true educational situation by such a short-term and superficial observation? In judging definitely the Japanese education they did not express their regret on having stayed too short a time as would have been reasonable to do. As the first mission report states, "the group arrived in Tokyo in two sections by plane on March 5 and 6 in 1946 and constituted itself as the United States Education Mission to Japan. The Mission has remained in Japan through the month, and during the first ten days the Mission was informed concerning the organization and chief characteristics of the educational system of Japan through a series of meetings arranged by the staff of the Civil Information and Education Section, by conferences between subcommittees of the Mission and corresponding committees of Japanese educators appointed by the Minister of Education, by visit to schools, colleges, universities and other institutions and by numerous individual conferences with Japanese of all stations and the Mission then visited Kyōto and Nara for three days to extend its conferences and to become acquainted with parts of Japan's cultural heritage that had been relatively undamaged by the war." What a simple short and pressing trip! Would it be possible to investigate the educational situation and make a diagnosis of Japanese educational system in such a short time? I can not but doubt its possibility, and I can not help calling to mind the proverb that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." The educational situation should be investigated more carefully and deliberately. To talk with this Mission the Japanese Education Committee was organized with the chairman Shigeru Nanbara, and the following member as Sadasuke Amano, Nyozeikan Hasegawa, Mantarō Kido, Sumie Kobayashi, Toyotaka Komiya, Risaku Mudai, Tarō Ochiai, Teizō Toda, Usaburō Torigai, Sōetsu Yanagi, Chokushō Ueno and Masanori Ōshima. These people are said to be the liberalists, typical of the Japanese middle class. Member of the United States Education Mission to Japan are typical of the middle class in the States, too. As the middle class people are fond of liberalistic thinking, the conclusions which they make are apt to be abstract and idealistic, and accordingly they may be indifferent to the actuality and come to unrealistic conclusions. The mission reports are excellent, when they are examined merely as educational theory, but the conclusions should have been carefully asserted, because they have power to control the country's educational destiny. We can not help being critical of the superficial quality of the investigation. Particularly we should like to point out an axiomatic view used in analyzing the pre-war Japanese education. Again as an example, look at the following sentence; "It held that at each level of instruction there is a fixed quantum of knowledge to be absorbed, and tended to disregard differences in the ability and interests of pupils. Through prescription, textbooks,

examinations and inspection, the system lessened the opportunities of teachers to exercise professional freedom. The measure of efficiency was the degree to which standardization and uniformity were secured. To acquire an understanding of Japanese education it would almost suffice to examine the regulations, the prescribed courses of study, and the textbooks and teachers' manuals published by the Department of Education or the prefectural governments." Such an opinion gives an oversimplified solution for the pre-war Japanese education. The report further says, "Thus in many respects the Japanese educational system has failed to prepare its pupils for a world of reality. It failed because these ends were inculcated without understanding on the part of learner. *An educational system, controlled by an entrenched bureaucracy recruited from a narrow group, which reduces the chances of promotion on merit*, which provides little opportunity for investigation and research, and which refuses to tolerate criticism, deprives itself automatically of the means of progress," (italicized by the present writer). In comparing the Japanese education before 1945 with the European and American education of the same time, would a difference be found? Particularly compare the words italicized in the above to the anti-rating system campaign by the J. T. U., and you will understand the complexities in our educational situation. The report has the following to say on moral education; "The course in morals as taught in the Japanese schools of late years was aimed at an obedient citizenry. This effort at order through loyalty proved so effective, upborne as it was by all pillars of society, that the means became identified with malicious ends. So the course on morals has been suspended. But a democratic system, like any other, requires an ethics to match and to perpetuate its own genius. Its appropriate virtues can be taught, and they should be taught in the schools as elsewhere. As democracy, however, represents a pluralism of values, the means to democratic ends are themselves manifold." This saying is quite true and right, but the enforcement of moral education has been attacked by the radicalists among teachers. The cause of anti-moral education campaign has come about not by chance, but by inevitability. Such a complex situation of Japanese education should have been scrutinized. And also such expressions as the following; "the Japanese language in its written form constitutes a formidable obstacle to learning, . . . Kanji should be wholly abandoned in the popular written language, . . . a phonetic system should be adopted," seems too radical for the mission report. The report further says; "Time that might be devoted to the acquisition of a vast range of useful linguistic and numerical skills, of essential knowledge about the world of physical nature and human society, is consumed in a struggle to master these characters." If that is the case, I would like to ask the Mission why the American school boys and girls are also said to be backward in arithmetic. It was in 1944 that Mr. Golden said; "No one reads books any more and the high school boys and girls no longer read any books," in p. 153 of his "Only in America." However, in Japan it was in 1946 that the adoption of some form of Rōmaji instead of Kana and Kanji, which leads to nothing but confusion in language education, was recommended by the Mission. And then the Romanized System Education Committee declared; "It is a

matter of necessity in order to effectively conduct education in the national language, improve the efficiency of social life, and to promote the cultural level of the nation, that the nation in general should acquire the practical habit of reading and writing its national language expressed by means of the Roman letters." What nonsense it is! The Mission need not have recommended such a romanization. Though in its own theory the mission report is of so high quality that it is still regarded as a standard of educational review by the Japanese progressives, its practical sense seems insensible.

5.

I have discussed the directions and the mission report at some length, because the ideas represented in these documents seem to have been served as the bulwark of Japanese progressives since the defeat. The guiding principles and objectives of the occupation are still alive in the thinking and doing of today's Japanese progressives, who, contradictory enough, seem to have been opposing to the United States ever since the so-called cold war. Look at the first of Directive, Serial No. 74 prepared by the U.S. Department of State to implement the policy adopted by the Far Eastern Commission, 27 March 1947, and you will find there written as "Education should be looked upon as the pursuit of truth, as a preparation for life in a democratic nation, and as a training for the social and political responsibilities which freedom entails. Emphasis should be placed on the dignity and worth of the individual, on independent thought and initiative, and on developing a spirit of inquiry. The interdependent character of international life should be stressed. The spirit of justice, fair play, and respect for the rights of others, particularly minorities, and the necessity for friendship based upon mutual respect for people of all races and religions, should be emphasized. Special emphasis should also be placed on the teaching of the sanctity of the pledged word in all human relations, whether between individuals or nations. Measures should be taken as rapidly as possible to achieve equality of educational opportunity for all regardless of sex or social position. The revision of the Japanese educational system should, in large measure, be undertaken by the Japanese themselves and steps should be taken to carry out such revision in accordance with the principles and objectives set forth in the directive." We can find similar sentences everywhere, for instance, in the agitation bill of communists, socialists, and trade unionists and others, and also in the Fundamental Law of Education. Such expressions can be found also in any educational review presented on the subject of mass communication. While the conservatives who side with America whole-heartedly are going to re-reform the Japanese education, the radicals who resist the American Imperialism fiercely are, on the country, in favor of leaving the matter as it is. Who could imagine such a discrepancy fifteen years ago?

On August 27, 1950, the Second United States Education Mission to Japan arrived in Tokyo. They had returned to study the progress and results of the recommendations which the first Mission had made in 1946. The second Mission Report says; "The past 5 years have been significant ones in the democratic development of Japan. A great change

is taking place. The remarkable accomplishments of General McArthur and his staff working with the Japanese people and through their established Government are rapidly developing a democratic nation. The educational program outlined by the United States Education Mission to Japan in 1946 is working out successfully. The 6-3-3-4 organization has been established in form. The school program is being carefully evaluated and changed in ways which will help develop a democratic educational program." Everything is all right! But, ten years later most of the young university students and scholars who have been educated in the schools in post-war times have supported the anti-security pact campaign and the Japan Teachers' Union has grown large enough to exercise pressure on the Ministry of Education and the conservative party and yet they have been supported strongly by the progressive intellectuals who can take advantage of mass communication. In this way the Japanese intelligence has come to lean toward Moscow and Peking; would this tendency have been expected by the Mission? Even though they could not anticipate this, they seem to have given this possibility to the Japanese. For the report says on the subject of the meetings of teachers; "While the Ministry of Education and the administrative authorities in the prefectures and cities should encourage professional meetings and give needed assistance to them, it is true that the most effective meetings of teachers are usually those which the teachers themselves organize Teachers' Associations of all kinds including teachers' unions, should be allowed this freedom of organization. No democratic principle is more crucial than the right to assemble for the extension of ideas," and on the subject of higher education; "The conservatism of Japan in higher education can be broken. In the interest of world welfare and the welfare of Japan, we think that it should be. But the Allied Powers can do little more than give the people of Japan, free of political interference, the opportunity to do this for themselves. In the spiritual leadership of its own economic, political and cultural life Japan's greatest single resource will be the men and women educated and trained in its own institutions of higher learning. For the discharge of this duty the colleges and universities of Japan have an inescapable obligation and an unprecedented opportunity." To us Japanese it is a very much blessed advice, but judging from the result, it has come to be undersirable to the aim of occupation. The goal of the United States in the educational reform of Japan was not to make Japan a champion in the socialistic political circle, but to make her a keeper of the capitalistic path. As it is, Japan has become an important country in the socialistic sphere of influence in the Far East, particularly since 1950'. Japanese education seems to have been rushing toward socialism or communism on the strength of the guiding principles of educational policy issued from the Occupation Forces, which was originally enacted to submit the Japanese to the victorious nations. Even though post-war Japanese education uses flowery words declaring the spirit of democracy on the surface, the Japanese educational reform is lacking in resolute substances. This matter should not be neglected. Both the progressives and the conservatives appear without content and unconstructive, owing to the fact that the Japanese post-war education is backboneless both ideologically and

A Comparative Note on Educational Reviews in Japan and the United States

politically. This is what is called the neutrality of education in Japan. But, is it possible to mould the desirable backbone for the coming generation in the school education, or not? If possible, how? In my opinion, it is possible by helping the younger generation to develop the human knowledge. The school education's concern is with the human knowledge alone. (To be continued)

(1961. 2. 10.)

Reference books ;

- E. O. Reischauer : The United States and Japan (1957, Harvard Univ. Press.)
- J. D. Koerner ed. : The Case for Basic Education (1959, Little Brown and Co.)
- E. M. Root : Brainwashing in the High Schools (1958, The Devin-Adair Co.)
- Council for Basic Education Bulletin Vol 4. No. 9.
- The Year Book of Education 1954.
- Monbushō : Education in Japan 1959.