



ISSN: 1500-0713

Article Title: From the Banning of Moral Education to the Creation of Social Studies in occupied Japan

Author(s): Harry Wray

Source: *Japanese Studies Review*, Vol. VII (2002), pp. 53-83

Stable URL: <https://asian.fiu.edu/projects-and-grants/japan-studies-review/journal-archive/volume-iv-2000/wray-the-banning-of-moral-education.pdf>



FROM THE BANNING OF MORAL EDUCATION TO THE CREATION
OF SOCIAL STUDIES IN OCCUPIED JAPAN, 1945-1947

Harry Wray
Nanzan University

Japan's defeat in World War II was a devastating defeat that led to self-reflection on the reasons for Japan's humiliating fate. Initially, some Japanese viewed the nation's conquest only as the result of weaknesses in technology and science. Accordingly, the conservative establishment attempted unsuccessfully to prevent any fundamental change in the *kokutai* (national polity). Ultimately, however, many Japanese concluded that the causes went to the very soul of the nationalistic, militaristic and State Shintoistic prewar and wartime educational system. It was easy in that context to realize that one subject, *shushin*, had played a key role in distorting Japanese thinking from 1910, especially from the 1930s onward.

Objectively speaking, the essence of *shushin* was not inherently bad. The original motivation for the course offering from the early Meiji Period (1868-1912) came from the thinking of Meiji leaders that Japanese parents and Shintoism and Buddhism, unlike Christianity in the west, did not teach public ethics and morality. To fill that vacuum the Meiji leaders moved to the conclusions that moral education courses should be offered for each grade of elementary schools and the best way of teaching appropriate public ethics that would strengthen national unity and love of nation, respect for order, and place a high value on harmony would be to select models exemplifying those values. They decided to provide textbooks, short narratives of famous western and Asian heroes such as Confucius, Shotoku Taishi, Benjamin Franklin, and Florence Nightingale who exemplified qualities such as honesty, respect for elders and parents, compassion, duty, diligence, justice, community consciousness, responsibility, sensitivity, cooperation, loyalty, philanthropy, etc. After the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890 and a resurgence of Japanese nationalism, the Ministry of Education decided to make each ethic or moral

mentioned in the Rescript as the sole source of morals and to provide heroic examples illustrating the value for each of the elementary school year.¹

By 1910, especially from the 1930s, the Imperial Rescript was interpreted in an increasingly narrow manner, western heroes declined, military, ultra-nationalistic, and very loyal Japanese increased. *Shushin* became a course that taught a narrow, ultra-nationalistic, militaristic, and State Shintoistic content and created self-sacrificing, obedient, passive, fanatically loyal imperial subjects out of those youngsters who finished their schooling at the elementary level.² *Shushin* taught in the Meiji Period (1868-1912) had merit, but that content taught after 1910 became indoctrination and orthodoxy.³ The American men and women who staffed the Education Division of the CIE, however, thought ethics and morality belonged exclusively to the home and churches. Schools had no business teaching morals. Japanese needed more internationalism than nationalism; more love of peace and development of the individuals' civic qualities than praise for military heroes and virtues that created docile, sheep-like subjects who followed trends blindly.

Immediately after Japan's surrender, semi-voluntary steps were taken by the first postwar Minister of Education, Maeda Tamon, and the Textbook and School Education Bureaus to transform *shushin* into new civics courses that would integrate the best aspects of pre-1932 *shushin* and

¹ Kaigo Tokiomi and Naka Arata, *Nihon kyokasho taikai kindai hen* [A Compilation of Japanese Textbooks: Modern Edition] (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1962). Harry Wray, "Change and Continuity in Images of the Kokutai and Attitudes and Roles towards the Outside World: A Content Analysis of Japanese Textbooks, 1903-1945." Ph.D. diss. (University of Hawaii, 1971).

² Harry Wray, "Militarism in Japanese Textbooks, 1903-1945," in Hilary Conroy and Alvin Coox, eds. *China-Japanese Relations: The Search for Balance* (Santa Barbara, CA: A.B.C. Clio Press, 1977).

³ Robert King Hall, *Education for a New Japan* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1949); Harold (Harry) J. Wray, "A Study in Contrasts: Japanese School Textbooks 1903 and 1941-45," *Monumenta Nipponica* 27, 2 (Spring 1973). Actually, the 1918-1922 national language and moral education textbooks reflected positive aspects of post-World War I internationalism, pacifism, and Taisho democracy. Harry Wray, "A Temporary Balance Between Internationalism and the Kokutai, 1918-1931," *Asian Forum* 5, 4, (1973).

the civics that had been taught at the fifth-year-level of middle schools from 1931. That altered thinking and Taisho Period (1912-1926) liberalism characterized Maeda, a career bureaucrat and Quaker, a former labor representative at Geneva, and chairman of the Japan Society in New York from 1935 to 1940.⁴ Through civics Maeda hoped to encourage scientific, rational and logical thinking; humanistic and international attitudes; preservation of the *kokutai*; and a determination to make a contribution to the world as a cultured, peaceful country. In a nation where willingness to act are generally achieved in a top-down fashion, Maeda's actions produced a favorable climate for political education to create citizens rather than submissive subjects. The Mombusho, however, like other government organs, was clearly aware that an Allied Occupation would require an ushering in of more democratic concepts and practices.

Ministry actions taken after 2 October 1945 revealed a determination by the Mombusho to anticipate SCAP's suspension of *shushin*, history, and geography, on 31 December 1945. Arimitsu Jiro, Textbook Bureau Chief after 15 October 1945, kept a valuable diary for this entire period. Entries on 2, 9, 11, 15, and 23 October 1945 show that Maeda spoke unequivocally of the need for civics education "within each school subject as well as a separate subject" to make a Japanese-type democracy a "possibility" through the "perfection of humanity" and the rearing of "responsible citizens" possessing a strong sense of "critical judgment."⁵

⁴ Kaigo Tokiomi, *Nihon no kyoiku: Sengo Nihon no kyoiku kaikaku* [Japanese Education: The Reform of Postwar Japanese Education] (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1969), I, pp. 43-45. Kaigo Tokiomi was the editor of this ten volume set and the writer of the section on social studies in volume I. Until SCAP documents were open these volumes provided a one-sided, but most thorough research to that time. Katsuda Shuichi, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika* [Postwar Education and Social Studies] (Tokyo: Kokudoshsha, 1972), I, pp. 20, 44; Okatsu Morikhiko, *Kyoiku katei: Sengo Nihon no kyoiku kaikaku* [Education Curriculum: Reform of Postwar Japanese Education] (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1969), VII, p. 14; Yomiuri Shimbun Sengo Shihan, *Kyoiku no ayumi* [The Path of Education] (Tokyo: Yomiuri Shimbunsha, 1982), pp. 20-39.

⁵ Arimitsu Jiro, *Arimitsu nikki* [Arimitsu's Diary] (Tokyo: Daiichi Hoki Shuppansha, 1989), pp. 801, 821, 827-30, and 838. Arimitsu was a career bureaucrat in the Ministry from 1927 through 1948.

Maeda's words and actions were echoed in the compilation section of the Mombusho's Textbook Bureau and other parts of the Ministry. Kubota Fujimaro, Youth Section Chief in the People's Education Bureau of the Mombusho, approached Katsuda Shuichi with the proposition that they organize a committee for the reform of moral education.⁶ Katsuda, a graduate of Kyoto University's philosophy department and chief secondary education compiler for morals and civics in the Textbook Bureau's First Compilation Section, concurred immediately. Meetings within the Ministry on 27 and 29 September 1945 respectively led to two decisions: one, to produce a draft on civics; second, to create a Civics Education Reform Committee (*Komin Kyoiku Sasshin Inkai*) that would include prominent private scholars to give the Mombusho direction on that subject. Katsuda and Kubota successfully recruited Toda Teizo (chairman), Watsuji Tetsuro, Inada Masatsugu, Okochi Kazuo, Tanaka Jiro, and (later) Munakata Seiya.⁷ Two points need to be made regarding the date of this committee's inception. Maeda already had called for the "complete transformation" of civics and the formation of the committee in speeches on 15-16 October. Furthermore, SCAP had also issued a directive on 22 October 1945 calling for materials to produce active citizens as rapidly as possible.⁸ These two top-down actions indicate that the Civics Education Reform Committee came into existence more as a result of Maeda and SCAP's initiative than as a result of pressure from below.

In his subsequent writings, however, Katsuda emphasized that compilers' enthusiastic response to compiling civics materials demonstrated progressive thought and pent-up dissatisfaction with moral education and

⁶ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 20.

⁷ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 20. Katsuda Shuichi and Okatsu Morihiko, "Gakusha shido yoryo no kaisei mondai" [Problems in Revising the Courses of Study], in *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi* [The Path of Social Studies Education], Umene Satoru and Okatsu Morihiko, eds. (Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1959), p. 13.

⁸ Kaigo, *Nihon no kyoiku*, I, p. 42; Kodama Mitsuo, ed. *Education in Japan* (Tokyo: Meisei University Press, 1983), p. 94. This source includes the reports of the United States Education Mission to Japan (USEMJ) and the United States Education Mission to Germany, a training manual for Civil Affairs Training Schools, and "Education in Japan," a source compiled for the orientation of the USEMJ.

their conservative superiors. Certainly it was true that Katsuda, Takeuchi Yoshitomo, Baba Shiro, and two others who joined the Mombusho from the early fall of 1946 to create social studies, Shigematsu Takayasu and Ueda Kaoru, gradually moved to the political left, Takeuchi and Katsuda a little more so. In fact, after leaving the Mombusho, Katsuda became a supporter of the radical Japan Teachers Union and a strong critic of Mombusho.⁹

Katsuda's group produced two preliminary position papers for the Civics Education Reform Committee's consideration. On December 22 and 29 respectively, the same committee produced two drafts for the compilers' guidance: "Report on Civics Education, Number 1" and "The Fundamental Direction of Civics Education, Number 2."¹⁰ The committee's thinking (similar to another committee established for the reform of history education) was a mixture of Taisho liberalism and conservatism. On the one hand, the committee demonstrated its conservatism by recommending the integration of *shushin* with history and geography, the retention of the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890, and the preservation of the *kokutai*.¹¹ These proposals reflected the limits to which the conservative establishment was prepared to go without force and a new SCAP drafted constitution of February 1946. To that extent it can be said that Katsuda and Takeuchi were dissatisfied and had moved by late December, certainly by late February, beyond the thinking of Maeda.

⁹ Proof of this climate was an unsuccessful movement to organize a Mombusho labor union in September 1945. It was almost immediately banned. However, sustained organizing activities and the favorable attitude toward labor unions of the Labor Division, Economic and Science Section, SCAP led to formal recognition of a ministry union in March 1946. Conversations with Kishi Juro from December 1983 through August 1984. Kishi served as Assistant Librarian of the Compilation Section during this period.

¹⁰ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, pp. 20, 44; Okatsu Morihiko, *Kyoiku katei; sengo Nihon no kyoiku kaikaku* [Curriculum: Reform of Postwar Japanese Education] VII, p. 14.

¹¹ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, pp. 21-29. Isoda Kazuo also finds the committee's report to be conservative. See his contribution in Hidano Tadashi and Inagaki Tadahiko, *Kyoiku katei, soron: Sengo Nihon no kyoiku kaikaku* [Curriculum, Survey: Reform of Postwar Japanese Education] (Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1971), VI, pp. 70-71.

On the other hand, the committee did espouse humanism, universal principles, logical and scientific thought, individual autonomy, political education, representative government, true understanding of world conditions, awakening of individual activity in social life, development of the individual, and the importance of unifying theory and practice. In these two drafts, however, the true essence of democracy and the manner in which it could be implemented were abstract. A dissatisfied Takeuchi and Katsuda pushed ahead with further studies and organized on 19 February 1946 a *Komin Kyoikuin Yomoku Iinkai* (Committee on Essential Points for Civics Education).¹²

The enthusiasm of those who emphasize these Japanese initiatives for political education has distorted the positive role the CIE was simultaneously playing to promote civics. For example, because Katsuda allegedly feared the above actions might violate CIE policy, he allegedly received permission from Arimitsu to explain to Herbert J. Wunderlich, Branch Chief of the Education Division's Textbook and Curriculum Section, what they were doing. However, Wunderlich told Katsuda that the existence of the civics committee and compilers' actions constituted no problem because these Ministry actions were consistent with SCAP directives.¹³

Proof that SCAP wanted the Mombusho to produce materials of a civics and social studies nature can be found in the interaction of Dyke, Henderson and Education Division staff with Mombusho personnel and SCAP directives of 22 October and 31 December 1945. The former called upon students, teachers, and educational officers to engage in "free and unrestricted discussion of issues involving political, civil, and religious liberties" and to produce materials "designed to produce an educated,

¹² Indeed, the former claimed the committee rejected his more liberal draft regarding civics. Takeuchi Yoshitomo, "'*Shakaika*' no kimaru made" [Until Social Studies Were Decided], in Katsuda Shuichi Chosakushi, *The Edited Works of Katsuda Shuichi*, p. 4; Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, p. 16; Katsuda and Okatsu, "*Gakusha shido yoryo no kaisei mondai*," in *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi*, pp. 13, 16.

¹³ Katsuda and Okatsu, "*Gakusha shido yoryo no kaisei mondai*," in *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi*, pp. 13, 16; Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, pp. 31-33.

peaceful, and responsible citizenry” as rapidly as possible.”¹⁴ Arimitsu’s record of a 23 October meeting demonstrates that Maeda interpreted the SCAP directive as support for civics by stating that it “only pushes us forward” with educational reform and civics.¹⁵ The 31 December directive specifically ordered the Mombusho to prepare substitute materials and teachers’ manuals and submit to SCAP a plan for “presenting fundamental social, economic, and political truths, relating them to the world and life of the students. These truths shall be taught through classroom discussion...and whenever possible, the discussion will be correlated with current events.”¹⁶

Two actions demonstrated CIE’s pressure and impatience with the speed of the Mombusho’s progress. One was the removal of Major Harold Henderson, first Chief of the Education and Religious Subsections, CI&E, an old Japan hand and friend of Maeda. Henderson was a mild, soft-spoken gentleman who interacted with the latter as a colleague, not as a conquered enemy. He encouraged Maeda to adapt liberal reforms by easygoing, informal consultations, even of the content of planned SCAP directives, rather than direct orders.¹⁷ These practices led CIE Chief Kenneth Dyke to replace him on 11 December 1945 with Lieutenant Colonel Donald R. Nugent. Two, Nugent brusquely demanded that Mombusho materials be offered with haste for CIE inspection.

Because the Education Division staff of CIE viewed the entire subject of *shushin* with much distaste, it welcomed efforts to replace it with a more desirable civics education. On 19 January 1946 an Education Division meeting with Nomura Buei, Chief Inspector for the Bureau of School Education, led to discussion about ways and means to acquaint teachers with new texts for civics and history.¹⁸ Eleven days later Katsuda and

¹⁴ Edward R. Beauchamp and James M. Vardaman, eds., *Japanese Education Since 1945: A Documentary Study* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1994), pp. 62-64, 74-75; Kodama, ed., *Education in Japan*, pp. 93-95.

¹⁵ Jiro, *Arimitsu nikki*, p. 836.

¹⁶ Beauchamp and Vardaman, eds. *Japanese Education Since 1945*, pp. 74-75; Kodama, ed., *Education in Japan*, pp. 103-105.

¹⁷ Jiro, *Arimitsu nikki*, p. 801.

¹⁸ CIE (C) 00266. The CIE designation refers to the cataloguing system used at the National Diet Library, National Institute for Educational Research (NIER), Meisei University, and Nagoya University for SCAP’s

Hayashi Denji, Chief of the First Compilation Section, met with Wunderlich to discuss the preparation of a teacher's guide on civics in lieu of a textbook for the morals course. That activity began in earnest when Wunderlich discussed the same issue with the Textbook Bureau Chief, Arimitsu, and Chief of the Second Compilation Section, Ishiyama Shuhei, on 2 February 1946.¹⁹ Further discussions with Katsuda and Aoki Seiichiro, chief of a newly established Research Section, on 8 February led to a CIE request that the outline submitted needed to be revised and clarified. Accordingly, Aoki, Katsuda, and Takeuchi submitted a "detailed translation of a part of the Teachers Guide" for approval on 14 February.²⁰ CIE formally ordered Katsuda and Aoki to produce separate teachers civics guides for elementary, youth, and middle school teachers. Aoki submitted his first outline for the elementary teachers guide for civics on 23 March.²¹ The aforementioned Committee on Essential Points for Civics Education completed by 30 March a draft of ten pages intended for the old middle school system that dealt with the individual and society.²²

Two drafts of the youth and middle schools teachers guide on civics by Katsuda on 3 and 23 March secured Harry Griffith's approval, but the latter advised Katsuda that these partial drafts (Part I) would not take the place of the second part of the teacher's guide.²³ Katsuda wrote that Griffith was pleased with his first draft because it seemed more like American social studies in content than civics, the first hint that the Education Division

CIE materials housed now at the National Archives 2 in College Park, MD. The original collection was located at the old National Record Center where I did my research. For that reason I have retained the old citation form and abbreviated National Record Center and SCAP documents as NRC 331. NRC/331, Boxes 5138, 5151; Trainor Papers, Box 57. The Trainor Papers were originally stored at the Hoover Archives, but microfiche copies are located now at the National Diet Library, NIER, and Meisei University.

¹⁹ NRC/331, Boxes 5138, 5151; Yomiuri, *Kyoiku no ayumi*, pp. 144-45, 388; Trainor Collection, Box 57.

²⁰ Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, p. 17; Katsuda, pp. 32, 44.

²¹ Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, p. 17; Katsuda, pp. 32, 44; NRC/331, Boxes 5138, 5151.

²² Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, p. 17; Katsuda, pp. 32, 44; NRC/331, Boxes 5138, 5151.

²³ Trainor Collection, Box 57; NRC/331 Box 5116.

might favor the former over civics.²⁴ But an objective reading of the reports of Wunderlich, Barnard, Griffith, and Monta Osborne at every stage of the elementary and secondary level teachers' guides from February to August 1946 shows that they had to be revised many times in content and pedagogy before they obtained Education Division approval. As late as 13 August, even though various portions of Part I of Katsuda's draft had undergone six months of CIE criticism, Osborne, in a memo to Chief Mark Orr, wrote that he had spent three hours going over suggestions to improve it. Among the twelve "errors" noted by Osborne the following are listed verbatim:

- 1) An intimation that the only reason for changing the morals course was Japan's defeat. [This is a curious allegation because it was not Katsuda's belief.]
- 2) An implication that the old morals course will be resumed.
- 3) A failure to make a distinction between curriculum and textbooks.
- 4) The teaching that education was a preparation for adult life.
- 5) A view that the teacher was the source of all knowledge.
- 6) The use of such phrases as "make the pupils learn, make the pupils understand."
- 7) A tendency to distinguish between abstract teaching of civics and practical exercises in civics was discovered in many parts of the document. "The undersigned attempted to infuse the viewpoint of education as experience—that if the subject being studied is the Diet, there are many types of experience through which children may be guided by the teacher, all of which should be relatively concrete and practical, even including lectures by the teacher."

²⁴ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 32; Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, p. 17.

8) Incorrect and incomplete definitions of the lecture method, the discussion method, the problem method, and the project method.²⁵

The Direct Relevance of Progressive Education Philosophy to Social Studies

The displeasure of Osborne and other Education Division staff from the elementary and secondary branches was based on their progressive education philosophy and the alleged conservatism and amateur knowledge of professional education of Mombusho personnel. Education Division staff considered the latter to be ignorant of democratic education, curriculum building, and educational practices such as a course of studies, guidance, methodology, principles, child psychology, the unit system, and evaluation. They held almost a religious conviction that they were democratic, scientific and professional, and that traditional educators were old-fashioned. They believed that the traditional curriculum was too authoritarian, teacher and textbook-centered, drill-oriented and grade-conscious, competitive, and centered on the college-bound.

From this mind set, Dr. Joseph Trainor, advisor to the Textbook and Curriculum Section of the Education Division and Deputy Chief of the Division from August 1946, and a fervent progressive educator, constantly complained that, with the exception of Aoki Seichiro and “possibly one other person” within the Mombusho, officials “had an extreme lack of knowledge of the bag of tricks of the professional educator and teacher.” Kenneth Harkness (Elementary Education and Textbook and Curriculum Branch Chief), in sheer disbelief at his inability to make textbook compilers understand the new education, complained to Nishimura Iwao, “Why don’t they learn? We keep repeating the same things to them over and over and they don’t understand.” Nishimura told him, “Your reaction is wrong. They aren’t stupid. It’s a difference in educational principles. They have been taught European, chiefly German, thought, and can’t adapt that quickly to American thought and educational practice. In addition, they can’t understand conversational English, but they can read it. Give them materials to read.” Thereafter Harkness and Osborne ordered hundreds of books, courses of study, and other educational reference materials for loan

²⁵ NRC/331, Box 5133.

to Mombusho personnel and for the establishment of the so-called “Harkness-Osborne” library within the Mombusho.²⁶

Given all the efforts in late 1945 through mid-1946 to introduce civics, why did the Education Division suddenly decide to introduce social studies? I believe there are at least six reasons:

- 1) The departure from the Education Division in late April through August 1945 of “traditional” educators or non-educators and their replacement by increased numbers of staff who were experienced adherents of progressive education’s philosophy and practices, beginning in June 1946 and reaching a peak by October-November 1946;
- 2) The report of the first United States Education Mission to Japan (USEMJ) of 30 March 1946 advocated social studies in content and methodology. Education Division staff seized upon these recommendations and implemented them as a blueprint;
- 3) The belief by Education Division personnel that teaching of social studies was far superior to civics for Japan’s democratization;
- 4) The recommendation of the USEMJ to adopt new curricula and a 6-3-3-4 educational system led to strong pressure from the Education Division staff to combine them with social studies from July 1946 as the latest and best in American education;
- 5) The willingness of Arimitsu and almost every official of the Textbook Bureau to cooperate with—even to anticipate—to the fullest extent possible every CIE request that did not cut at the very root of the Mombusho’s existence. Many of them, to the surprise of Education Division staff, looked upon the USEMJ report as a “Bible” and felt compelled to implement its recommendations. In this context, the political scientist Sodei Rinjiro, looking at the contemporary reaction of many Japanese

²⁶ Interview of Nishimura Iwao, 23 June 1984; Hidano and Inagaki, *Kyoiku katei, soron*, p. 76.

officials and Japanese people, somewhat exaggeratedly claimed Japanese were not raped, they “jumped into bed” voluntarily and happily;²⁷

6) The continued growth in democratic knowledge and the new progressive education by compilers concerned with civics and social studies. From approximately October 1945 they had read new materials, thought about them, and discussed American education with the Education Division staff and amongst themselves.

The Addition of More Experienced Educators Professing Professional Education’s Tenets and Practices

The SCAP directive of 22 October 1945 and the USEMJ Report of 30 March 1946 recommended the creation of a more democratic curriculum. The Education Division prior to the summer of 1946 lacked sufficiently qualified professional educators to take the detailed, practical steps to achieve that objective; however, between June and November 1946 the CIE was able to boast greater professional experience and specialization than before by the recruitment of sixteen new staff members, most of them progressive educators.²⁸ Harkness, Trainor and Osborne played the most significant role in the creation of social studies and made most of the major decisions on curriculum in August and September.

Ultimately, more than organizations zealous staff personnel are decisive. Harkness, Trainor and Osborne were dedicated workaholics committed to progressive education and the thorough democratization of Japanese education. They saw social studies as the key subject in the

²⁷ Correspondence with James I. Doi, 4 June 1984; interview of Nishimura Iwao, 23 June 1984; Sodei Rinjiro, “A Question of Paternity,” in *Japan Examined: Perspectives on Modern Japanese History*, Harry Wray and Hilary Conroy, eds. (Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press, 1983), p. 355.

²⁸ NRC/331, Box 5132; Mark T. Orr, “The Reformers: Japanese Education During the Allied Occupation,” Paper delivered at the Florida Japan Seminar, University of Florida, 3 May 1980; pp. 6, 25; correspondence of Mark T. Orr, 3 March 1987; interview of Gordon Bowles, 21 November 1987.

curriculum for achieving that goal. Trainor's transfer to the Education Division on 20 April 1946 from CIE's Research and Analysis Division brought into the Education Division a man with a fairly comprehensive understanding of Japanese education and the Ministry of Education, practical teaching experience and advanced degrees in educational theory and administration at the Universities of Oregon and Washington, and post-doctoral study at Teachers College, Columbia University. He considered it his mission to implement as fully as possible the USEMJ and the Japan Education Committee reports of the spring of 1946.²⁹

Furthermore, Trainor was a man of action willing to use strong pressure to achieve goals. Within days of assuming the position of advisor to the Textbook and Curriculum Branch on 20 April 1946 he initiated a study by his staff of the role they could play in the reorganization of Japan's educational system.³⁰ He learned that higher officials in the Mombusho had authorized the Textbook Bureau to establish a Research Section in the Textbook Bureau in February 1946 under Aoki Seiichiro's leadership and, even more importantly, a curriculum committee that cut across bureaus, the Mombusho Curriculum Review Committee (MCRC). Trainor immediately saw Aoki and the curriculum committee as godsend and sought immediately to channel its activities and to educate its members.³¹ When Trainor became Deputy Chief his increased status made him even more powerful vis a vis the Mombusho.

²⁹ For the crucial role that Trainor played in regard to the writing of the first stopgap history textbooks in postwar Japan see Wray, "1946 nen Zantei Rekishi Kyokasho: Kushin no tanjo (Sono ichi)" [The Agonizing Birth of the 1945 Stop-Gap History Textbooks, Part 1] *Senryo Kyoikushi kenkyu* (Tokyo: Meisei University Press, July 1984), pp. 1-30; Wray, *1946 nen Zantei Rekishi Kyokasho: Kushin no tanjo (Sono ni) Senryo Kyoikushi Kenkyu 2* (Tokyo: Meisei University Press, 1985), pp. 1-14.

³⁰ Trainor would sometimes begin a staff study or a memo by pointing to the recommendations of the USEMJ and the JEC and JERC reports. That can be seen in the 28 September 1946 rough draft on curriculum. NRC/331, Box 5133; and Joseph C. Trainor, *Educational Reform in Occupied Japan, Trainor's Memoir* (Tokyo: Meisei University Press, 1983), pp. 139, 181-82, and 189-90.

³¹ NRC/331, Box 5132; Trainor's Memoir, pp. 123-24. In his analysis of the Mombusho Trainor was very critical of the lack of coordination therein;

Another man in the trio that played a prominent role in 1946 in forging a new curriculum, courses of studies, educational ladder system, and social studies was Harkness. He was competent, honest, fair, and methodical, but a somewhat unimaginative person who could be acerbic, rude and forceful with Mombusho officials. It is true that he was not a scholar, but he had experience as a teacher and administrator and was scrupulously honest in dealing with textbook companies. Harkness served as Superintendent of Schools for a small city in South Dakota from 1937 until the outbreak of the war. He served through out the war as the Superintendent of Education at Tule Lake Camp, an internment area for *issei* and *nissei*.³²

The Relationship between USEMJ Recommendations and Social Studies

Two observations need to be made regarding USEMJ and social studies. First, the members included state superintendents of education, heads of teacher training institutions or departments of education, an officer in US Office of Education, an officer in State Office of Education of Georgia, the head of the National Education Association, and two representatives of Columbia University's Teacher's College. These educators were all exponents of progressive education. Second, the failure to advocate social studies specifically by name probably reflected the opposition of more traditional scholars who were members of the USEMJ—as distinguished from educators.³³ But a careful textual analysis of the Mission's recommendations demonstrates that it advocated social studies in content, methodology, and spirit. Specifically the mission recommended:

The extension of the study of the social sciences in the middle schools and above with an emphasis on the structure and functioning of the local

however, Nishimura was critical of Trainor's "overemphasis" on Aoki in his comments at a 23 June 1984 meeting of the Meisei University seminar on Occupation Reforms.

³² I am indebted to Professor Katagami Soji for this information. Correspondence of Kenneth Harkness with Katagami Soji, 4 October 1980. Although I interviewed Harkness, he was ninety years old and his memory had faded.

³³ Interview of Ernest Hilgard, 24 January 1980.

community...the educators of Japan must help create the same respect for those who work with tools as for those who work only with their minds...We recommend an emphasis on the contributions and problems of artisans and workers in the social studies problem at both primary and secondary levels...The school should help every individual to develop strong personal family, civic, and social loyalties. It should not exert partisan influence but help to develop an inquiring mind...The field chosen for illustration is that which is referred to as ethics and sometimes civics in Japan, and is part of social studies in the US. It embraces political science, economics, sociology and ethics, adapted to the maturity of the learner. According to their age level pupils should learn about local industry, local prefecture, and national government. In the elementary and secondary schools they will profit from visits to business establishments, banks, stores, police and fire departments and government offices; they will learn how private and public business is carried on there. They should be encouraged to ask questions and engage in discussion. Responsibilities of employers and government officials should be dwelt on, and the common rights of individuals as employers and as citizens. Questions should be raised as to the means of safeguarding these rights and ways of improving them.³⁴

Any American educator reading these sentences would immediately assume that the USEMJ recommended social studies and that they reflect vintage progressive education. Osborne believed that the USEMJ report was “to be treated as a Bible” for Japanese education reform.³⁵ Likewise, Japanese compilers all assumed that the report endorsed the teaching of social studies.³⁶

In mid-May, Mark Orr was promoted first to Acting Chief and then in June to Chief of the Education Division. Upon becoming Acting Chief, Orr

³⁴ Kodama Mitsuo, ed. *Education in Japan*, pp. 15, 18, 24, 26, 34-35; Murai, Minoru, *Zenyaku Kaisetsu, American kyoiku Shisetsudan Hokokusho* (Tokyo: Kodansha, 1979). The last three quotations can be found on pp. 50-52, 80-81.

³⁵ Interview of Monta Osborne, 28 December 1981, 29 December 1982, and 13 August 1985.

³⁶ Baba Shiro, “*Shakaika no kyoiku keikaku*” [The Education Plan of Social Studies], in *Shakaika kyoiku no Ayumi* [The Path of Social Studies Education], Umene and Okatsu, p. 145; Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 35. Trainor Papers, Box 31.

immediately ordered each staff member to write a report for their respective areas specifying how they would implement the USEMJ recommendations.³⁷ The third member of the trio that was responsible for the establishment of social studies in the Occupation was newly arrived Monta Osborne (5 June 1946). It was his long draft of mid-June that included emphasis on adopting social studies that won Orr's approval and promotion from a probationary status to Branch Chief of Secondary Education.

The Beliefs of Education Division Personnel that Social Studies were Superior to Civics for Japan's Democratization

Social Studies were considered to be the jewel of America's elementary and secondary curriculum and to be inextricably intertwined with the increasing development of American democratic ideals and practices. Civics education was viewed as too narrowly concerned with political education. Because social studies integrated civics, history, geography, sociology, anthropology, religion and ethics, economics, and psychology and focused on current societal problems, the Education Division believed this subject would be able to examine every aspect of Japanese life from a democratic viewpoint. Furthermore, the emphasis of social studies on developing critical judgment, respect for the individual, using the discussion method, and learning the democratic process and societal institutions by practical, functioning unit activities and problem-solving was seen as a way to create active, critical *citizens* with backbone rather than mere *subjects* who acquiesced to every government and social trend.

Educational Reorganization and the Relationship between a New Curriculum and Social Studies

The creation of a 6-3-3-4 educational ladder system and a new curriculum for the 1947 school year had deep significance for the creation of social studies because all three goals were promoted in tandem as if they possessed a symbiotic relationship. Throughout this period the Education

³⁷ Baba Shiro, "Shakaika no kyoiku keikaku" [The Education Plan of Social Studies], in *Shakaika kyoiku no Ayumi* [The Path of Social Studies Education], Umene and Okatsu, p. 145; Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 35. Trainor Papers, Box 31.

Division groped toward a policy by which they could introduce curriculum reform, educational reorganization—meaning centralization and the 6-3-3-4 educational ladder system, and social studies.³⁸

In the meantime, in late April and May 1946, the Ministry of Education semi-independently of the CIE, initiated modest steps to renovate the curriculum.³⁹ Both Nomura Buei, the chairman of the MCRC, and Sakamoto Hikotaro, a member of it, admitted that the MCRC plans of 10 and 15 June envisioned relatively limited reform.⁴⁰ In fact, Trainor referred to them disparagingly as “philosophical mush.”⁴¹ Because of Mombusho conservatism, in June 1946 the Educational Division decided to gain control over the MCRC by organizing the so-called “Trainor seminars,” workshops for training the MCRC, and MCRC subcommittees subsequently organized for subject areas, about which more later. By August they had made much progress in steering the MCRC toward a democratic curriculum, social studies, and a 6-3-3-4 educational ladder. By mid-September those three Education Division goals became so fixed that Arimitsu and the entire Textbook Bureau learned that no curriculum reform, textbooks, or courses of study would be accepted that did not accept the reality of a single-track 6-3-3-4 system.⁴²

³⁸ Baba Shiro, “*Shakaika no kyoiku keikaku*” [The Education Plan of Social Studies], in *Shakaika kyoiku no Ayumi* [The Path of Social Studies Education], Umene and Okatsu, p. 145; Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 35. Trainor Papers, Box 31.

³⁹ Trainor Papers, Box 57; NRC/331, Box 5132; Nomura Buei, “*Sengo Mombusho ni ita koro no omoide banashi*” [Recollections of The Time When I Was in The Mombusho], *Chuto kyoiku shiryō*, no. 3, pp. 11-12.

⁴⁰ Trainor Papers, Box 57; NRC/331, Box 5132; Nomura Buei, “*Sengo Mombusho ni ita koro no omoide banashi*” [Recollections of The Time When I Was in The Mombusho], *Chuto kyoiku shiryō*, no. 3, pp. 11-12.; Sakamoto, Hikotaro, “*Komin kyoiku to shakaika*” [Civics and Social Studies], in *Shogakko shakaika 25 nen no ayumi* [The Path of Twenty-Five Years of Elementary Social Studies] *Tokyo Shogakko shakaika kenkyukai*, *Shogakko shakaika 25 nen no ayumi* [The Path of Twenty-Five Years of Elementary Social Studies] (Tokyo: Meiji Tosho, 1973), pp. 36-39.

⁴¹ NRC/ 331, Box5132.

⁴² Interviews of Arimitsu Jiro, 3 May 1980 and 27 May 1980; NRC/ 331, Boxes 5132, 5133.

Although left of center scholars argue that these three reforms involved no force because liberal and Marxist educators at all educational levels, textbook compilers, and the Japan Education Reform Committee (JERC) endorsed them, it cannot be denied that the content, method, and the speed with which these reforms were implemented involved considerable pressure on the Mombusho. Actions of Trainor and Harkness between 9 and 18 September 1946 demonstrate that the CIE had concluded that: (a) the Japan Education Reform Committee would support their goals of creating social studies and a 6-3-4 educational ladder system, (b) the area of curriculum, courses of studies, and textbooks now would be used as one more tool against the Mombusho to force adoption of a single track 6-3-3-4 system. In retrospect, from the time of the USEMJ Report and the arrival of new Education Division staff, the creation of social studies under an American-led Occupation can be looked upon as a foreordained process.⁴³

The Continued Growth in Knowledge of Progressive Education and Social Studies by Mombusho Compilers

Scholar-compilers had an abstract knowledge of western political history and political thought, but a very limited understanding of parliamentary, social, and economic democracy, human rights and human dignity, the importance of the minority and the individual *vis-à-vis* the state and society, and the values and educational theory and practices of a democratic society. But every former Education Division staff the author interviewed stressed how eager they were to learn and to please. Wunderlich paraphrased their attitude: "Give us the book or books that will unlock your secrets and we shall comprehend and put into practice what you desire."⁴⁴

Japanese sources confirm these American judgments of the compilers. In his contributory essay to the collected works of Katsuda Shuichi, Takeuchi traced the process of scholar-compilers' gradual evolution toward an acceptance of social studies as preferable to civics for the new age. He wrote that Katsuda sought materials that achieved a balance between the

⁴³ Interviews of Arimitsu Jiro, 3 May 1980 and 27 May 1980; NRC/ 331, Box 5133.

⁴⁴ "Interview of Herbert J. Wunderlich, 9 January 1980; interview of Nishimura Iwao, 23 June 1984; Presentation of Nishimura Iwao, Meisei University Postwar Occupation Education Reform Seminar, 23 June 1984.

societal needs for progress and order and that concerned themselves with the citizens' ethics, socialist aspects, and societal contradictions. From early 1946 Katsuda's preference for European thought led him to study civics in English textbooks while Takeuchi examined morals in French classical works. Both, however, concluded that because morals in both cultures were linked to historical tradition, the use of Japanese historical tradition would only yield *shushin* ethics. Takeuchi wrote:

We couldn't build civics on that...From that time on we felt the necessity to think deeper. He [Katsuda] began to investigate the discussion method...and from April began to study extensively educational methods, while I took up the study of the project method. Katsuda concluded by early summer that there was no other solution than taking the direction of social studies. GHQ also strongly preferred that course.⁴⁵

Takeuchi's essay failed to develop adequately two points: the role that CIE literature on American education played in their education, and the significance for Katsuda of the guidance he had received from Barnard and Griffith before their departure, and, particularly, from Osborne from June 1946. Monta Osborne was an indefatigable and pragmatic, progressive educator with the ability to translate democratic ideas into practice.⁴⁶ He "loved" and respected Katsuda, but he said of him and the other social studies compilers that they knew "practically zero" about progressive education and social studies. They had to be led by the hand because "the whole concept of the course of the studies was foreign to them."⁴⁷

How New were Social Studies? Who Named it? How much Force was used to Achieve their Implementation?

Some Japanese scholars who want to emphasize indigenous roots and continuity for postwar educational reform have argued that the creation of social studies in 1946 was not new because there were prewar Japanese reform movements. But the roots were shallow.⁴⁸ Historically, Taisho

⁴⁵ Takeuchi, "'*Shakaika*' no kimaru made," pp. 3-4.

⁴⁶ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, pp. 38-39.

⁴⁷ Interview of Monta Osborne, 28 December 1981.

⁴⁸ Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, pp. 5-10; Hamada, *Sengo kyoiku to Watakushi*, p. 96.

(1912-1926) liberalism had spawned a new education movement. Kaigo and Victor Kobayashi have shown that there were a few Japanese educators who had studied Dewey, Kilpatrick, and other progressive educators' thought at Columbia and other American universities.⁴⁹ They had established a handful of progressive schools, but the prewar legacy was really minimal because the practitioners were very limited and wartime conditions from the mid-1930s eliminated these promising Taisho experiments in Japanese education.⁵⁰ Hidano minimized prewar social studies contributions and also interprets most indigenous reform from 1945 to the summer of 1947 as Japanese efforts to initiate positive plans to win American approval and to accommodate them to SCAP policy.⁵¹

On the basis of Japanese personal accounts and American records the conclusion is inescapable that American social studies was new to all but a very few Japanese. Nishimura Iwao, a member of the MCRC, remembers the reaction of contemporaries in the Mombusho to Education Division officers' conversations and the USEMJ recommendations being, "What in the world is this stuff?"⁵² Katsuda, Ueda, Baba, Aoki, and Shigematsu had never really worked with such concepts as social functions, centers of interest, understanding, and unit activities.⁵³ Katsuda acknowledged that his debt to Osborne was great because the latter was so diligent and thorough in explaining the new education and social studies.⁵⁴ He also confessed that none of the compilers understood what a course of studies was so they asked Trainor to send over to the Mombusho three or four persons to help them. He wrote:

We found we lacked experience and knowledge. The CIE wanted us to think broadly about these subjects. It seems simple, but it was very

⁴⁹ Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, pp. 120-22; Victor Nobuo Kobayashi, *John Dewey in Japanese Educational Thought* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan School of Education, 1964).

⁵⁰ Okatsu, *Kyoiku katei*, VII, p. 33; Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, I, pp. 12-22, 34.

⁵¹ Hidano and Inagaki, *Kyoiku katei*, VI, pp. 62-63.

⁵² Interview of Nishimura Iwao, 23 June 1984.

⁵³ Umene and Okatsu, *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi*, pp. 3, 16-19.

⁵⁴ Umene and Okatsu, *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi*, pp. 3, 16-19; Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, pp. 38-39.

difficult and the discussions were very harsh within Mombusho over the courses of studies, discussion method...We had no knowledge of the unit system. One of them was about the use of leisure time. At first we did not understand their merit. It required quite a bit of time to put these units together. It was not simple and we spent many sleepless nights to meet deadline after deadline.⁵⁵

To back up chronologically we should recall that after 5 June 1946 Trainor had sought to manage the MCRC by introducing bureau and section chiefs such as Aoki, Ishiyama, Nakamura, Sakamoto, and Nomura to modern educational theory and practice on a systematic basis three times a week. The "Trainor seminars," taught curriculum building, general aims of education and specific aims for individual subjects, stages of psychological development of the child, the interests and social activities of children of different ages, the purpose and content of a course of studies, textbook planning, analysis of community life, and democratic educational theory and practice. These seminars with the MCRC and subcommittees accomplished two goals. First, they wore down Japanese resistance to social studies, the 6-3-3-4 system, and a new curriculum. Second, a more favorable attitude by MCRC superiors toward the new subject moved compilers to full cooperation.

The second meeting of the Education Division with social studies compilers on 5 September 1946 demonstrated how much the American side facilitated the development of the courses of studies. In response to their previous requests for materials and guidance, Harkness prepared three sets of materials. One material supplied them with eight steps to follow in developing a social studies curriculum. Another one listed many suggestions for social studies compilers that Harkness had only partially adapted from his native South Dakota's course of study. The third item contained materials adapted from the Virginia course of study. Osborne reported that a great deal of time was spent in clarifying these materials, especially the meaning of items from the Virginia Course of Studies, namely "Major Functions of Social life," "Centers of Interest Selected for

⁵⁵ Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku* ⁵⁵ NRC/331, Box 5132. *to shakaika*, pp. 38-39; Umene and Okatsu, *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi*, p. 21.

Emphasis for Various Grade Levels,” and “Understanding Emotional Attitudes and Special Abilities.”⁵⁶

Osborne was not satisfied with Katsuda’s ability to translate abstract philosophical and sociological conceptions into meaningful and interest for school children. On 3, 4, 6, and 16 September Osborne met with Katsuda regarding the Teachers Guide for Civics. On the first date Katsuda complied with Osborne’s request by submitting Part I. Osborne noted it “incorporated a good deal of new material,” some of which was copied from reports of the American Educational Policies Commission that he had supplied Katsuda. Although Osborne wasn’t satisfied, he said Part I had “reached a degree of excellence,” that justified its publication. On the latter three dates Osborne tentatively accepted a revision of Teachers’ Guide, Part II and gave Katsuda 500 learning activities he had prepared over the previous two weeks that were to be published as Part III under the ten headings of “centers of interest” that the Civics Education Reform Committee had recommended in December and Barnard and Griffith had developed subsequently with compilers for the secondary level Teachers’ Guide on Civics. He told Katsuda to adapt them as part III of the manual.⁵⁷ Unaware of Katsuda’s indebtedness to Osborne, it is this same Part III that one of Japan’s leading scholars on social studies, Katagami Soji, described as coming close to American social studies. In fact, Osborne surprised Katsuda on 10 February 1947 by telling him that Parts I, II, and III of the Teachers Guide for Civic would be absorbed into the 1947 Social Studies Course of Studies for Secondary Education.⁵⁸ They were indebted to the Missouri Course of Studies, the Virginia Course of Studies, Osborne’s eclecticism, and Katsuda’s philosophical thinking.

On 20 September Harkness reported with considerable satisfaction that at last the historians, geographers, and civics compilers had worked together to compile a list of general objectives for social studies. They now would work out aims specific to the elementary and secondary levels by referring to the chart of pupil interests and activities completed by Aoki on 15 September. Harkness thought the quality of the objectives drafted was “mediocre,” but he admitted that a “distinct step forward in curriculum

⁵⁶ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁵⁷ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁵⁸ NRC/331, Box 5133.

work had occurred.”⁵⁹ Arimitsu and the MCRC agreed to comply with Education Division demands on 24 and 26 September 1946 respectively that the unit method be adopted, social studies compilers henceforth would first submit their materials to the Mombusho’s course of study committee, and that *all* compilers would attend *all* subsequent scheduled workshop meetings (26 September 1946). Harkness added an element of coercion by warning the compilers “we will drop in “unexpectedly and regularly. Osborne and Luanna Bowles, Secondary Education Branch, also reported it had been agreed they would now spend a half-day each day supervising the work because “the committee needs constant supervision and assistance.” Finally, the meeting established a “*modus operandi*” to insure that the course of studies would be completed by the deadline.

Even though compilers were encouraged to be eclectic and to adapt the American materials to actual Japanese conditions, the pressure of trying to initiate social studies in the new curriculum and single track 6-3-3 elementary, middle, and high school system unsuccessfully by April 1947, and then by the second semester of 1947 created much anxiety and even health problems for some compilers over the subsequent year.⁶⁰ The severe limitations of time and the difficulty of integrating history, geography, ethics, civics, economics, anthropology, and sociology into social studies kept upper level Mombusho officials too dazed to oppose Education Division goals and lower level compilers too busy to develop materials that would correspond more closely to Japanese culture. The result was a massive copying of the Virginia, California, South Dakota, and Missouri elementary and secondary courses of study.

The strongest proof for Education Division initiative in adopting social studies was an Osborne memo to Orr of 8 August 1946. In it Osborne related that Katsuda wanted to write a civics textbook, but Osborne suggested that the civics outline that Katsuda had handed to him that day should be broadened to become social studies. In my view this action is the birth date of social studies.⁶¹ Katsuda, himself, noted that Osborne told him even before the *Kyoiku Sasshin Inkai* (Japanese Education Reform Committee) had made any of its recommendations, the likelihood of a 6-3-3-4 curriculum being implemented was very strong. For that reason he said

⁵⁹ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁶⁰ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁶¹ NRC/331, Box 5132.

the compilers should set forth on the preparations of a social studies curriculum and course of studies based on the USEMJ recommendation because civics was taught only a temporary course from September 1946 to September 1947.⁶²

The Relative Commitment of Mombusho and CIE to Social Studies

SCAP records are especially clear in demonstrating that the Education Division wanted much more of a commitment to civics and social studies than higher Mombusho officials contemplated. Successive MCRC plans on curriculum show it planned a very limited role for them. Trainor strongly objected to an MCRC draft of 15 June 1946 that called for teaching civics only one hour a week.⁶³ A plan presented on 1 August, a week before the decision had been made to introduce social studies, only called for the teaching of civics from the fifth grade. But the Education Division complained that a subject so vital to learning democratic attitudes, practices, and social skills should be taught from the first grade of elementary school.

At the senior high school level there was also a weaker commitment on the Japanese side to social studies. On 12 December 1946 Nakamura suggested requiring five credits of social studies and the awarding of two credits only for any electives in social studies. The MCRC proposal only specified four hours of class time a week. Finally, that plan required the schools in the first year of the new curriculum in 1948 to make available only ten credits of the new social studies courses in the first year or two. Osborne opposed these proposals as inadequate. He suggested and received agreement on the following items: all electives would be worth five credits; ten hours would be required; each high school would be required to make available at least fifteen credits in social studies.⁶⁴

How much were the New Social Studies Courses “Made in America”?

The issue of how much the new courses of studies and textbooks were indigenous and how much they were “made in America.” was obscure and

⁶² Katsuda also noted that Osborne inserted a sentence in the teachers guide stating, “civics should be researched as a part of social studies.” Katsuda, *Sengo kyoiku to shakaika*, p. 33.

⁶³ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁶⁴ NRC/331, Box 5133.

politically partisan until the release of SCAP documents in the late 1970s. On the one hand, contemporary compilers and later left-of-center scholars who have supported a vigorous social studies program as a means to further democratize Japan have exaggerated the Japanese contribution because they wanted to emphasize that social studies were not forced on Japan and had indigenous roots. On the other hand, those who did not like the new social studies, especially conservatives, have taken the extreme position that they were completely alien and forced on Japan. From the foregoing account it should be clear that the content of the courses of studies and textbooks were largely “made in America,” but with qualifications. First, because of time considerations, the Education Division and the compilers were unable to adapt the American content to Japanese conditions as much as they desired. Second, the compilers’ cooperation in regard to the content and methodology espoused by the Americans was almost one hundred percent.⁶⁵ Osborne noted on 23 October that the secondary level compilers listed center of interest and aims for social studies reflecting the Missouri and Virginia courses of studies. He supplied them with “fifteen or twenty” more units for each of two centers of interest.⁶⁶

The most dramatic example reflecting borrowed American educational practices was the adoption of the activity unit system. Osborne said:

I guess I would have to take full responsibility, for better or worse, for having advocated the use of activity units within social studies. I did that, frankly, because from what I observed from Japanese schools, when I first went there, learning was entirely too much the nature of memorization, rote memory...I felt that the activity unit where you state your objectives and you cover the range of material that you plan to cover and then you list a couple hundred possible student activities might get them away from this rote learning. That we thought...was not a very good system of teaching. I still believe that.⁶⁷

What did the Japanese compilers themselves think about the extent of their contributions? Shigematsu frankly said that the elementary level plan was “ninety percent American and ten percent Japanese” because there was

⁶⁵ Interview of Shigematsu Takayasu, 4 April 1984; Hamada, *Sengo kyoiku to Watakushi*, pp. 97-99.

⁶⁶ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁶⁷ Interview of Monta Osborne, 28 December 1981.

not enough time, and because the compilers judged the Virginia course of study to be logical, theoretical, and skillful at introducing problem-solving,⁶⁸ In conference reports from October through November Harkness expressed surprise that the compilers were literally copying American materials. On 4 November 1946, when they handed in a list of aims and pupil activities that “followed rather closely” the Virginia plan, he told them to produce materials “more in conformity with Japanese life.”⁶⁹

Ueda admitted that many activities and materials used as a part of learning were different.⁷⁰ In his view, however, the secondary level courses of study and textbooks were less new in content and methodology than the elementary level. Katsuda claimed the secondary level compilers selectively adopted from the reference books he borrowed from Osborne. He believed that it combined the Missouri, Virginia, and other state plans, the Teachers Guide for Secondary Civics, and a synthesis of his sociological theory and Osborne’s pragmatism.⁷¹

Education Division officers wanted to be flexible in adopting social studies to fit Japanese conditions; however, they were less able to achieve that objective in practice for three reasons. First, they were sometimes blind to their own assumptions that many American values were universal and could be easily and wisely transplanted. Second, because they desired to introduce social studies in the new 6-3-3-4 system and curricula in the 1947 school year, lack of time limited compromise and adaptation. Third, compilers were keenly aware of their difficulty of grasping the new subject and the toll the task was taking on their health to meet Education Division deadlines.

In a revealing passage Trainor wrote, “The danger to avoid is that of translating American texts too literally into Japanese. The trick is to select out of American textbooks those things which are professionally educational and of general application and to omit those things which are peculiarly American. American principles could be used, but practical

⁶⁸ Hamada, *Sengo kyoiku to Watakushi*, pp. 97-99.

⁶⁹ NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁷⁰ Interview of Ueda Kaoru, 3 February 1984; Hamada, *Sengo kyoiku no choryu*, pp. 31-32; Takeuchi, “‘Shakaika’ no kimaru made,” p. 4.

⁷¹ Umene and Okatsu, *Shakaika kyoiku no ayumi*, p. 18.

illustrations must be Japanese.”⁷² In an Osborne memo to Trainor of 27 October 1946 the former candidly admitted that the Education Division had misled the Japanese side for the purpose of achieving educational reorganization and a new curriculum:

One way of getting this vast job done would be for Major Osborne and Miss Bowles to turn out completed units of study on an assembly-line basis and deliver them to the Mombusho committee for adaptation and translation. Such a procedure is considered highly inadvisable... We have been telling the Japanese that the organization of integrated social studies courses simply meant reorganization of existing materials in the fields of geography, history and civics, in an attempt to convince them of the possibility and advisability of adopting the integrated system for the school year 1947-48. Actually, integration means a great deal more. We have the job of selling integration to thousands of schoolteachers, and the major selling job must be done during this next year. If we select haphazardly paragraphs here and chapters there from existing textbooks and other materials, paste them together and call the process integration this basic selling job will not be accomplished. Take as an example a problem unit that tentatively has been selected for grade nine: “How Does School Life Present Opportunities for Practice in Cooperative Living?” A diligent search of existing materials reveals little source material for that unit. A great deal of creative work is necessary. In the case of units that bear a closer relationship to existing materials, the problem of integration is still complex. As an example of this point, take a problem which has been adopted for the seventh grade:” How Do The People of Japan Make a Living?” Existing materials are scattered, a line here and a paragraph there, through several textbooks on the subject of geography. A writing job is as necessary here as in the other cited problem. (My emphasis)⁷³

Even after the elementary and secondary compilers finished their work, the CIE wanted to be certain classroom teachers would readily understand their materials. The Education Division was very critical of the existing attitude of Mombusho officials and private scholars who seemed happiest when the written content of an order, announcement, or teachers manual was so difficult that classroom teachers could not comprehend them. Osborne made Katsuda rewrite the introduction to the course of studies at

⁷² NRC/331, Box 5132.

⁷³ NRC/331, Box 5135.

least three times by 27 March 1947 “in an attempt to get it down to the terminology that teachers will understand.”⁷⁴ He told the latter that if the style remained stilted he would have the introduction rewritten by another author. The correction of this arrogant practice was one of the permanent contributions of the CIE to Japanese education.⁷⁵ The CIE even required Mombusho to recruit classroom teachers to rewrite Mombusho materials, a process that provided another limited opportunity to adapt American materials to Japanese conditions. The General Course of Studies for Social Studies (Tentative Draft) was published on 20 March 1947 and the Courses of Studies for the Elementary School Level and Secondary Level (Tentative Draft) were published on 5 May 1947 and 22 June 1947 respectively.⁷⁶ They were presented as tentative drafts on the CIE premise that thereafter courses of studies would be written by local officials and teachers; however, Mombusho never relinquished this role and technically teachers were bound by law to follow the courses of studies published by it periodically thereafter.

The power of Education Division staff to override Mombusho superiors can also be seen from Osborne’s reaction to three units that Katsuda had submitted on 2 January 1947. Katsuda had impressed Osborne as a liberal thinker, but unit three for grade nine, entitled, “How Are We Governed?” approached government as a “semi-authoritarian institution.” Because Osborne felt Katsuda was writing that unit under constraints from a higher official or officials, he asked the latter how he reconciled that approach with a new constitution that proclaimed popular sovereignty. Katsuda “explained there was a fear [from above] that if the people are given any substantial power the Communists will gain control.” An unmoved Osborne told him to rewrite the unit.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ NRC/331, Box 5134.

⁷⁵ Conversations with Kishi Juro, December 1983 through August 1984.

⁷⁶ Katagami Soji, “*Kyoiku katei no kaikaku to shakaika no seiritsu*” [The Establishment of Social Studies and Reform of the Curricula], in *Sengo kyoiku no sogo hyoka: Sengo kyoiku kaikaku no jizo* [A Comprehensive Evaluation of Postwar Education: The Reality of Postwar Education Reform], Kanko Iinkaihen, ed. (Tokyo: Kokusho Kanko Kai, 1999), pp. 117, 132.

⁷⁷ NRC/331, Box 5133.

Mombusho's Victory over CIE Pressure to Eliminate or to Reduce Japanese History and Geography

The CIE did not always manage to pressure the Mombusho into complying with its goals. One good example was the Japanese side's desire to preserve geography and Japanese history. This was a straight out battle between traditionalists and progressive educators. Osborne, Trainor, and Harkness were committed much more strongly to eliminating history and geography as independent subjects and integrating them into social studies than the divided Japanese MCRC. At a 19 August meeting Osborne steered the MCRC away from considerations of how much curricular time should be allotted to social studies and whether separate history, civics, and geography courses should be taught from the fifth grade upward. Instead, he maintained that more priority at that point should be given to what children ought to be able to do after finishing a course and what the school might provide in the form of experiences during that course rather than to discussing time allocation for social studies and whether history, civics, and geography should be taught. At a 21 August meeting again the MCRC also argued that history and geography were being neglected by the proposed curriculum. The American side sought to overcome the objections by showing how tracing the historical development of the Japanese home using history. Geography could be integrated through obtaining understanding of the environmental factors that contributed to the development of the family and its shelter. Comparative geography could demonstrate how homes in other countries had developed. Mombusho resistance surfaced again on 23 August when Nomura argued strongly for the separation of Japanese history at the elementary and junior high level.⁷⁸ His superior, Hidaka Daishiro, Chief of the Bureau of Schools, and the history compilers, seconded him. Osborne et. al., tried to destroy Nomura's argument on three different occasions. On the first occasion, at a 23 August meeting, he suggested that they first label ten boxes with the major areas or centers of interest found in the Teachers Guide for Civics. Second, he told them to make out cards on every item of knowledge or educational experience found in the Guide and the history and geography textbooks. He then said:

⁷⁸ NRC/331, Box 5133; Nomura, "*Sengo Mombusho ni ita koro no Omoide banashi*," pp. 11-12.

Go through the collection of cards. When one is discovered which relates to Home life, toss it into the box labeled "Home Life." When one is discovered that pertains to life at school, toss it into the box labeled "School Life." At the conclusion of the experiment, it probably would be discovered that no cards remained—that all of them had found their appropriate places in the boxes, thereby proving that none of the highly revered subject matter [history, geography, and civics] would be lost.⁷⁹

Nomura and Hidaka's strong insistence that Japanese history should be separated from social studies at some stage of compulsory education carried sufficient weight to achieve a limited and grudging compromise from the Education Division. The Mombusho-Education Division committee decided as final compromises on 27 September 1945 that Japanese history would be included in the integrated social studies course in grades five and six and be taught chronologically as a separate course in grades eight and nine, but be given only one credit in grade eight and two credits in grade nine. Integrated social studies courses were to be taught from grades one through ten and at grades eight and nine. Its greater importance over Japanese history in CIE's eyes can be seen by the course being given four credits each of those two years. At grades eleven and twelve, students would be required to take only five credits from among four courses: Oriental History, Western History, Human Geography, and Current Problems. Bowles ruefully had admitted already in her 23 August conference report that the Education Division would probably have to concede. As she put it, the proponents of social studies in the US found it necessary to acquiesce in almost every state on the same issue. The new social studies curriculum was to be implemented in April 1947, but textbook and courses of studies delays meant that social studies began on 2 September 1947.

Conclusion

In historical perspective the difference between social studies and the old *shushin* course was the difference between night and day. The old *shushin* course created passive, docile, nationalistic, super-patriotic *subjects* who served the emperor blindly, and textbooks that extolled Japan's historical destiny and uniqueness. In contrast, the new social studies sought

⁷⁹ NRC/331, Box 5132.

to create critical-minded, spontaneous, creative, peace-loving, democratic and international-oriented *citizens*. It was designed to create students who understood their own society, respected the individuality of others, and adopted a logical, scientific, and objective viewpoint towards the study of all problems.

But these ideals were not achieved. Similar to the later tendency of social studies in America, they have played a role in Japan of adjusting people to their society. History, geography, ethics, economics, and government remained as independent subjects at the secondary level. The one exception that integrates them is the high school subject, *gendai shakai* (contemporary society), but its significance has been reduced by its change in the 1994 curriculum from a required to an elective subject. In addition, a new course, "life education," has replaced social studies and science in the first two years of elementary school.

Why should there have been a retreat from CIE's objectives. A fundamental axiom of the CIE section of SCAP was that officers should avoid making reforms that would be revoked after the withdrawal of the Occupation forces. Despite reservations back home by some Americans about progressive education in general and social studies in particular, the Education Division implemented a subject that Japanese conservatives and traditionalists thought infringed too much upon their culture, social behavior, and educational practices. One such practice that made social studies poorly adapted to Japanese education was the entrance examination systems for senior high school and universities. Social studies demanded problem solving, discussion, and functional activities. These practices did not lend themselves to the massive memorization of facts required by entrance examinations. Neither did emphasis upon individualism and cultivation of student assertiveness for active citizenship. Hence, when the Occupation ended, those in control of education began a process, continuing to the present day, of modifying and limiting social studies greatly to fit Japanese culture and needs. The vision and purpose of social studies were clear and idealistic; however, they did not fit the Japan of this period. Furthermore, progressive educators bias against traditional forms of education that create a foundation for learning would have lowered Japan's educational standards significantly. Now fifty years after the Occupation, Japan is ready to recognize more individuality and diversity, but it was too soon for social studies to be accepted *en toto* in the immediate postwar period.