

TEACHING DEMOCRACY: EDUCATION REFORMS DURING
THE ALLIED OCCUPATION OF JAPAN, 1945-1952

By

MARIE ROSE REED

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
The requirement for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of History

May 2007

To the Faculty of Washington State University:

The members of the Committee appointed to examine the thesis of
MARIE ROSE REED find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Chair

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Master's Thesis was no small task and I had help along the way. I would like to thank those who helped me form a vague idea that arose in March 2006 into the most complex work I have written to date. First of all, I would like to thank my major professor and chair of my thesis committee, Dr. Noriko Kawamura. She helped me by suggesting resources that might be useful to my research, provided me with in depth background about Japanese politics and culture during and after Allied Occupation, edited my thesis several times, and most of all, was there for me when I needed someone with whom to converse about difficulties in my personal and professional life. For these reason, I cannot thank Dr. Kawamura enough.

I would also like to thank Dr. Raymond Sun for letting me attend his senior seminar class my first semester of my Master's Program. During the course of that class, I learned about collective memory and war memory, and this was influential in choosing the topic of my thesis. I also learned about historiography through him. Dr. Sun became a member of my committee for his knowledge of war memory and historiography, so I would like to thank him for being a part of my committee and helping in the final editing of this thesis.

My third committee member, Dr. David Pietz, is also deserving of thanks for his help in the final editing of this thesis as well. His comments and constructive criticism were helpful and the questions he asked me have encouraged me to think about a potential topic for a dissertation.

My colleague, Caleb Sparks also helped me in the thesis writing process. Since his thesis topic was not too far from my own, he was able to lead me to sources as well as give me tips on writing my thesis. I would like to thank Caleb for his help.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends who supported and encouraged me, made me laugh and kept me sane. If it were not for them, I do not believe I would have had the motivation to keep with my studies. Thank you all for helping me get through these two years and this thesis.

TEACHING DEMOCRACY: EDUCATION REFORMS DURING THE ALLIED
OCCUPATION OF JAPAN, 1945-1952

Abstract

By Marie Rose Reed, M.A.
Washington State University
May 2007

Chair: Noriko Kawamura

The Allied Occupation of Japan reformed many of Japan's institutions, but few scholars have looked at education reforms during the Occupation. The goal of the Occupation was to inculcate democratic values to Japanese youth through a restructuring of the school system and curriculum. Most of the Occupation's education reforms have persisted, largely unmodified. However, during the Reverse Course and Red Purge the Occupation purged a number of liberal educators. By doing so, the Ministry of Education regained much of its power and the Occupation inadvertently limited the reform of Japanese history curriculum and textbooks.

The first phase of education reforms purged militarists and ultranationalists from education, banned objectionable militarist contents and restructured the Japanese school system by extending compulsory education, making public schools coeducational, and decentralizing authority over education by limiting the power of the Ministry of Education and putting in place a new school board system. The second phase extended the rights and responsibilities of schoolteachers by redefining the role of women as educators, encouraging union participation, and encouraging teachers to create their own lesson plans tailored to the needs of the students. During this phase, educators also had a

prominent role in shaping the curriculum and writing new textbooks for courses that had been suspended by the Occupation forces. The final phase was the Reverse Course and Red Purge, which purged many communists from their careers in education and limited educators' rights to participation in political activities. The Red Purge was the final Occupation action that limited the effectiveness of the Occupation's initial reforms and would lead Japan to future problems in education, especially in the teaching of Japanese history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
ABSTRACT.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1: ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS, 1945-1947.....	8
CHAPTER 2: TEACHERS, TEXTBOOKS AND CURRICULUM, 1946-1949.....	33
CHAPTER 3: THE RED PURGE AND ITS EFFECTS, 1949-1952.....	51
CONCLUSION.....	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	75
APPENDIX	
I. THE IMPERIAL RESCRIPT ON EDUCATION (1890).....	83
II. THE POTSDAM DECLARATION (1945).....	83
III. THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF EDUCATION (1947).....	85

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my mother and father
who have lovingly supported me through
my educational endeavors.

INTRODUCTION

Since the end of World War II, relations between Japan and the United States have been colored by the Allied Occupation of Japan, which brought heavy American influence. One of the major goals of the Occupation was to make Japan a peaceful nation, as outlined in the Potsdam Declaration, the document that resulted from the Potsdam Conference which gave the terms for Japan's surrender.¹ The way to mold Japan into this ideal peace-loving nation was to demilitarize and democratize its people. A series of political, economic and social reforms were implemented in the first four years of occupation. It is argued by scholars now as well as occupation leaders then, including General Douglas MacArthur, the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) and his General Headquarters (GHQ), that in order to make the reforms more permanent, democracy must be inculcated from an early age, when a child starts his or her schooling. The United States, through the education reforms during the Allied Occupation of Japan, influenced Japan both directly and indirectly to establish the educational system, personnel, and curriculum it has today.

It is through education, both formal and informal, where children develop into full-fledged members of society. What children are taught affects their participation in society. If children are taught that all people are created equal and to question authority, they are more likely to treat all people with dignity and respect, and will question authority if something does not seem right. However, if children are taught that they are better than other people and that to question authority means to be put in prison, then they are more likely to conduct themselves in a manner which illustrates their authority over

¹ See Appendix II for full text.

other people and will not question the government's authority even when that government's actions goes against individual convictions. During the Allied Occupation of Japan, it is the first situation GHQ/SCAP wanted to promote and the second situation it wanted to prevent. In order to promote equality, human dignity, and freedom of speech, as well as "love for peace" and democracy, GHQ/SCAP had to develop a new education system in Japan that would be hospitable to such ideas. In order to do this, GHQ/SCAP had to commit to a number of education reforms, including administrative, personnel, curriculum and textbook reforms. However, in order to maintain democracy in light of the expansion of an alternate political system, Communism, GHQ/SCAP also had to balance its reforms to ensure Japan's future as an American ally.

Education reforms took place in three stages; the first set of reforms began in 1945 and ended in 1947, the second set started in 1946 and continued though 1949, and the final set of reforms began in 1949 and ended at the end of Occupation in 1952. The most profound education reforms from 1945 to 1947 were administrative in nature. The Civil Information and Education Bureau (CI&E), under GHQ/SCAP, was formed to deal with social, cultural and educational reforms. By March of 1946, the First United States Education Mission to Japan (USEMJ) had sent their recommendations to GHQ/SCAP for further reforms. GHQ/SCAP suspended courses in ethics, geography and history until new textbooks could be written and teachers could be properly trained for democratic ideals and teachers were screened. This was to prevent ultra-nationalistic and militaristic leanings from entering the classroom since, until Japanese surrender, ethics, history and geography had been used in tandem to inculcate militaristic and ultra-nationalistic values. In ethics, Japanese students were taught to revere the Emperor and obey his word without

question. According to the Japanese government propaganda, Emperor Hirohito wanted to wage war against other Asian nations; therefore, students were obliged to comply. In history, teachers taught their students the mythical origins of Japan which elevated Japan above all other nations. Furthermore, Japan's racial homogeneity was emphasized, giving rise to Japanese racial superiority over other Asian nations. Finally, geography classes emphasized the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, essentially Japan's empire. Students were taught that all countries within the Co-Prosperity Sphere were under Japan's command, but it was Japan's mission to protect these countries from Western imperialism. These three courses together were a deadly combination of ultra-nationalism and militarism, therefore GHQ/SCAP had to suspend the courses to promote democracy successfully.

Other reforms included the decentralization of education, which brought administrative decisions to prefectures, municipalities and villages, leaving the Japanese Ministry of Education at the national level only as an advisor to these local school boards. During the prewar and wartime education system, the Ministry of Education had full control of schools, teacher education, curriculum and textbooks. The Fundamental Law of Education and School Education Law were also enacted by the Japanese government through GHQ/SCAP, setting forth the 6-3-3-4 structure for schools,² making public schools co-educational, equal opportunity, tuition-free and compulsory for nine years.

The second period of reforms, from 1946 to 1949, dealt with reinstating teachers and formulating a new curriculum and new textbooks to make up for the deficit caused

² 6-3-3-4 division means six years of elementary education, three years of middle school, three years of high school and four years of college

by American firebombing, as well as purging of ultra-nationalism and militarism. Teachers were reeducated and were encouraged to join unions to promote reforms from the bottom up. They also became the governors of the classroom since it became their responsibility to create their own lesson plans. GHQ/SCAP encouraged the development of a social studies curriculum to replace courses in ethics, Japanese history and geography as separate entities, and to encourage critical thinking and democratic ideals. New curriculum and textbooks were the key components to get geography and Japanese history reinstated as courses with teachers playing an important role in writing the new textbooks. The Ministry of Education, along with CI&E, approved the textbooks, but it was the educators' right and responsibility to write the textbooks. Textbook writing was no longer in the hands of the Ministry of Education.

The final period of reforms, from 1949 to 1952, was the Red Purge, which affected the education reforms already in place by limiting the power of unions and the rights of teachers to democratic participation. It was these reforms that prevented Japan from being as progressive educationally as it could have been, as liberal educators lost power and the Ministry of Education, which was not supposed to regain its central authority, regained much of its power. The Ministry of Education passed more legislation that limited the power of teachers' unions, limited teachers' political participation and gave the Ministry the sole power to censor and authorize textbooks.

Despite the belief that education was the foundation for a democratized Japan, there is considerably less scholarship done on education reforms than on political and economic reforms. Some secondary sources which focus on education reforms specifically during the Allied Occupation of Japan include Gary Tsuchimochi's

Education Reform in Postwar Japan, which discusses the U.S. Education Mission to Japan and its Japanese counterpart, the Japanese Education Commission (JEC), and Toshio Nishi's *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan, 1945-1952*. Since these works are fairly recent, Tsuchimochi and Nishi are able to synthesize the sources that have become available in both the United States and Japan after both governments have allowed certain documents to be released. Also, being able to access Japanese documents, these works give the researcher insight into not only the American side of education reforms, but also the Japanese side. Before works like that of Tsuchimochi and Nishi were available, many of the texts solely on education reforms were actually primary source documents in the form of memoirs of Joseph C. Trainor and Jacob Van Staaveren and the collections of documents from CI&E and USEMJ. These are definitely good starting points for research on education reforms, but they often times do not explain the consequences of the reforms. Tsuchimochi and Nishi are able to discuss the consequences as are other books that discuss education reforms in Japan starting in Meiji Japan (1860) and continuing through the present, such as Marie H. Roesgaard's *Moving Mountains: Japanese Education Reform* and Teruhisa Horio's *Educational Thought and Ideology in Modern Japan: State Authority and Intellectual Freedom*. However, many scholars choose to cover only briefly education reforms in their inclusive studies of the Allied Occupation of Japan. Unfortunately, many of these scholars tend to gloss over the reforms, doing little to explain the implications behind education reforms, just that they happened. John W. Dower and Takemae Eiji, however, do discuss the implications behind education reforms, even though their respective

works, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* and *The Allied Occupation of Japan* are comprehensive studies of Allied Occupation.

It is not clear why few English language historical works on the Allied Occupation of Japan cover education reforms in depth. One possible reason, which Dower suggests, is that there was very little controversy over education reforms because the Japanese educators were eager for change.³ Another possible reason for the lack of coverage on education reforms is because many of the reforms have persisted, though there are some, such as curriculum and decentralization, that have changed from the Occupation's original implementation. A third possible reason for scholars not including much information on education reforms, especially American scholars, is how incomplete the reforms actually were, especially in the face of the Red Purge. It was the American Occupiers who instituted the Red Purge, which did not have much dissent from the conservative Japanese government, while liberal Japanese educators continued to see their rights being limited and their textbooks being censored after the Occupation ended. Had GHQ/SCAP enforced the decentralization reforms and had not been so frantic in purging any sort of "Red" influence, it could be possible that the face of present day Japanese education would be different from what it is today.

Many sources focus on how SCAP and CI&E, dominated by Americans, suggested and implemented reforms through the Japanese government, but there is some evidence from Tsuchimochi, Nishi, Takemae, and Dower that the Japanese Ministry of Education, JEC and the Japanese Education Reform Commission (JERC) played a

³ John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. (W.W. Norton and Company: New York, 1999), 247.

significant role in developing the reforms in the first place. It is important to address the Japanese role in education reforms because while there is an understandable belief that American occupiers dominated the creation and implementation of education reforms, the Japanese leaders should be credited with their role in the creation and implementation of policy. Also, the Japanese role in education reforms can help to further understand the success and failures of Occupation policy.⁴

⁴ I should note that when I talk about liberal or progressive educators, I mean that they are politically liberal or are inclusive in their national histories. Unfortunately, there is presently a group in Japan called the Liberal View of History Study Group, which promotes Japanese neonationalism and patriotism. This group is not to be confused with true liberal and progressive educators. Aaron Gerow, “Consuming Asia, Consuming Japan: The New Neonationalist Revisionism in Japan”, *Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany and the United States*. Ed. Laura Hein and Mark Selden. (Armonk , N.Y. : M.E. Sharpe, 2000), 85.

CHAPTER 1: ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS, 1945-1947

Before MacArthur

On August 15, 1945, Japan accepted the Potsdam Declaration and agreed to its unconditional surrender. By agreeing to the Potsdam Declaration, Japan permitted the country's occupation by the Allied powers until "a new order could be established and Japan's war-making capacity destroyed...The occupation was to be withdrawn when the Japanese people had established 'a peacefully inclined and responsible government.'"⁵ The Potsdam Declaration also called for the disarmament of Imperial forces, the trial of war criminals, and the encouragement by the Japanese government to promote democratic freedoms and human rights to the people of Japan. The final Article of the Potsdam Declaration called for the 'prompt and utter destruction' of Japan if its people failed to comply.⁶ With terms such as these as well as Japan's embarrassment of being occupied by foreigners for the first time since the nation's birth, the Japanese understood that the best way to proceed would be to comply. The Suzuki cabinet stepped down and the new "liberal" Naruhiko cabinet took its place. Though the Occupation cabinets were called "liberal", they were still politically conservative. The primary concern for Japanese politicians was to appoint prime ministers who were pro-American and pro-British. The third Occupation Prime Minister, Yoshida Shigeru, admits that he became prime minister upon request of Prince Konoe Fumimaro because Yoshida was seen to be pro-American and pro-British.⁷

⁵ Potsdam Conference, *Potsdam Declaration*, Art 7 & 12, July 26, 1945.

⁶ *Potsdam Declaration*. Art. 13.

In reaction to the Potsdam Declaration, the Ministry of Education replaced its minister, Ota Kozo with the more liberal Maeda Tamon. Despite being classified as a liberal, Maeda Tamon's primary goal was to retain the Imperial Rescript on Education proclaimed in 1890 by the Emperor Meiji.⁸ The Imperial Rescript on Education inculcated neo-Confucian values, which called for obeisance to one's parents as well as the notion that the Emperor is the father of all Japan, and, therefore, had to be respected, revered, and obeyed by all. The Ministry of Education began to screen its teachers for ultra-nationalistic and militaristic leanings as well as purging its textbooks of these teachings through a process of "blacking over" or *suminuru*, where students would take their writing brushes, dip them in ink and cover offending passages with the ink until the passages were no longer readable. If the student could still read the passage when held up to the light, then the student would re-ink the passage.⁹ Therefore, some of the censorship SCAP had intended to implement was accomplished before MacArthur established his General Headquarters in Tokyo on October 2, 1945.

⁷ There were several cabinet changes in the first year of Occupation. The first Occupation Prime Minister was Naruhiko Higashikani, who served from August 15th to October, 1945. Kijuro Shidehara replaced Naruhiko, and served until May 1946. The most famous Occupation Prime Minister, Yoshida Shigeru, began his term in May 1946, *The Yoshida Memoirs: the Story of Japan in Crisis*, Translated by Yoshida Kenichi, (The Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1962), 13.

⁸ Toshio Nishi, *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan, 1945-1952*. (Hoover Institution Press: Stanford, California, 1982), 147. See Appendix I for full text of the Imperial Rescript of Education.

⁹ John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. (W.W. Norton and Company: New York, 1999), 247. Yoko H. Thakur, "History Textbook Reform in Allied Occupied Japan, 1945-52." *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 35, Iss. 3. (Autumn, 1995), 265.

Though it does seem like the Japanese government was willing to take the initiative to become peaceful and responsible, much of the cabinet's actions were reactions to the threats of the Potsdam Declaration, as well as the Japanese government's desire for the Allied forces to leave as soon as possible. In fact, when MacArthur established his GHQ in the Daiichi Building near the Imperial Palace in Tokyo, Yoshida and his cabinet semi-jokingly took the acronym GHQ to mean "Go Home Quickly."

Another consideration for compliance amongst the general populace was the fact that many Japanese were tired from the war efforts and starvation because of low agricultural production yields due to drought and lack of available laborers. Much of Japan's agricultural foodstuffs went to support the troops abroad, leaving little for those who remained in the country. While Japanese compliance with the Occupation seemed to promise food from the Americans, rations were still limited, especially when over five million Japanese returned home from the war.¹⁰ Throughout most reforms, there was no negative reaction from the Japanese populace. Generally, the Japanese were fond of their American "liberators," but it is difficult to tell if there were negative reactions since such negative response against the occupation or GHQ/SCAP was strictly censored from all media.¹¹ The only source that might be able to convey negative reactions would be personal diaries.

Democracy, American Style

¹⁰ Yoshikuni Igarashi, *Bodies of Memory: narratives of war in postwar Japanese culture, 1945-1970*. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000), 53.

¹¹ Dower, 410.

In order to remake Japan as a peaceful, democratic nation, General MacArthur thought it was necessary not only to dismantle the Japanese war machine, but also to demilitarize and democratize the Japanese mind. In a War Department orientation film entitled *Our Job in Japan*, it was explained to occupation forces that the Japanese people were “trained to play follow the leader” and that after these leaders are gone, the 70 million Japanese minds “could make trouble or make sense. We [the American occupiers] have decided to make sure they make sense.” In order to “make sense,” the Occupation forces had to demilitarize the Japanese war machine and democratize the Japanese people, or at the very least, teach the Japanese to think as individuals and not to allow an autocratic, militaristic government to force the Japanese people into a situation that threatened global security. The film promised that once the occupation forces left, the Japanese leaders would be allowed to choose any form of government they wanted “so long as it was peaceful.”¹² Despite this promise, GHQ/SCAP did not completely honor it as many of the occupation reforms were based on the American way of life, including American-style democracy. Even though there are conflicting values between what was promised in *Our Job in Japan* and the actual occupation reforms, it is understandable why American democracy was favored over other forms of government and other forms of democracy. When it came to democracy, Americans believed it was the only political system that promoted peace and could make a nation like Japan more peace loving. Other systems prior to the end of World War II, such as fascism, monarchism, authoritarianism, even communism, proved to be belligerent. Americans at

¹² Information and Education Division of the War Department, *Our Job in Japan*. (Army Pictorial Service Signal Corp, 1945).

the time did not realize that democratic governments could be belligerent as well. During the Potsdam Conference, American-style democracy was heavily promoted.

In order to secure Japan's future as a peace-loving nation, it was important for education at all levels to inculcate the values of democracy. This notion started at the Potsdam Conference:

The Potsdam conferees recognized the primary importance of education as a means of establishing and strengthening democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Only democratically educated Japanese people would be able to stimulate and defend political progress and build a frame of mind conducive to peaceful cooperation with other nations.¹³

The policy of teaching democracy to the Japanese was to be carried out among all ages and through many means such as publications, radio, films, seminars and traditional schooling. While teaching democracy to all Japanese people was important, the primary focus was to inculcate democratic values among the youth of Japan, for they would be the future of Japan and were considered instrumental in the perpetuation of democratic values. According to the Far Eastern Commission, the Allied advisory body overseeing the administration in Japan, education of the youth was essential as a "pursuit of truth and as preparation for life in a democratic nation," as well as to foster individualism and encourage independent thought, initiative and scholastic inquiry.¹⁴ With the Potsdam

¹³ Department of State, United States of America, *Occupation of Japan: Policy and Progress*, Publication No. 2671, Far Eastern Series No. 17, 1946, 33.

¹⁴ Robert Fearey, *The Occupation of Japan: The Second Phase: 1948-1950*. (The MacMillan Company: New York, 1950), 34.

Declaration in hand, MacArthur and his bevy of American Occupation forces set off to democratize the Japanese mind through education.

General MacArthur did try to involve the Japanese people when convenient. He wanted the Japanese to commit to democratic reforms on their own accord, not through pressure. Pressure from GHQ/SCAP would weaken the effectiveness of the reforms and lessen the Japanese understanding of democracy; the Japanese would have had less opportunity to nurture democracy on their own and they would not have a good example of what democracy was.

He [MacArthur] thought the postwar reforms in Japan should be carried out by the will of the Japanese themselves. Accordingly, he thought that minimal enforcement by GHQ/SCAP was desirable, based on his strong convictions that the idea of democracy should be nurtured from within the Japanese people rather than imposed externally by force.¹⁵

GHQ/SCAP did have a lot of interaction with and input from Japanese leaders. Even though many of the education reforms were developed and approved through GHQ/SCAP, there is evidence that many of the ideas for reforms came from Japanese educators themselves, such as the 6-3-3-4 reform and the initial “blackening over” of textbooks, as many educators did not require much convincing to reform Japanese education.¹⁶ Despite Japanese educators taking the initiative in making efforts towards democratization, the Japanese had never really had a democracy before. Therefore, oftentimes the Japanese educators ideas for reform fell short of MacArthur’s

¹⁵ Tsuchimochi, 91.

¹⁶ Dower, 365.

expectations, leading GHQ/SCAP to show the Japanese how to democratize. The Japanese educators wanted democracy, but did not know how far they would have to go in order to achieve the idyllic American-style democracy.¹⁷ This paradox of MacArthur ideally wanting the Japanese to take the initiative, but in reality forcing such broad reforms has led both Japanese and American scholars to question the overall effectiveness of instituting an American-style democracy in Japan.

Despite the call for a peaceful and democratized Japan, there were mixed feelings in relation to SCAP's measures for inculcating American democracy in Japan. While some Japanese people welcomed democracy and democratic education, many were ambivalent because they just wanted food to feed their starving families.¹⁸ Japanese educators and intellectuals, who were most directly affected by having to teach democracy, encountered problems because they did not know exactly what democracy was or how to teach it. Some teachers would ask their students what they wanted to learn about each day because that was their understanding of democracy.¹⁹ It is understandable that the inability to teach democracy effectively was unsettling as it could lead to chaos in the classroom. As the prime minister during and after the Occupation, the conservative Yoshida Shigeru, expressed in his memoirs, "Democracy and education are concepts which anyone can express in words, but when it came to the question of how to set about educating young Japanese as the future citizens of their country, teachers

¹⁷ I would like to suggest that an American style democracy was idyllic to the Americans.

¹⁸ Igarashi, 53.

¹⁹ Dower, 249-250.

were without what may be termed any guiding spirit to inspire them in their task.”²⁰ American scholars looking back on the Occupation of Japan tend to be critical of the idea of unilaterally “teaching” democracy as well. As John Curtis Perry points out, the American occupiers failed to take into consideration positive aspects of Confucian tradition in Japan.

Perhaps the idea that democracy could be taught was naïve. But, the Japanese, because of their Confucian heritage, shared the American notion of moral improvement, the implanting of virtue, could be accomplished through formal training. Unfortunately, Americans were largely ignorant of Confucianism, knowing little of the Japanese intellectual experience... Americans therefore missed the opportunity of exploiting similarities between whatever they now brought to the Japanese and the latter’s own Sino-Japanese intellectual heritage.²¹

Aside from disregarding the utility of the foundation of Japanese education, there was also criticism about GHQ/SCAP trying to teach democracy, but not leading by example. Harry Emerson Wildes writes, “We required that schools be free to teach the truth, but we forbade them to teach history or geography lest ultranationalistic propaganda be encouraged.”²² Furthermore, democracy includes freedom of speech, but Japanese people were not allowed to criticize GHQ/SCAP or the occupation. While democracy was deemed to be the most peaceful and non-belligerent political system, no one really had the right to say that democracy was the best political system for the

²⁰ Yoshida, 170.

²¹ John Curtis Perry, *Beneath the Eagle’s Wings: Americans in Occupied Japan*, (Dodd, Mead & Company: New York, 1980), 132.

²² Harry Emerson Wildes, *Typhoon in Tokyo: Occupation and its Aftermath*, (MacMillian Company: New York. 1954), 14.

Japanese people, as it proved to have numerous sudden ideological changes that shocked many in the Japanese populace as well as the Diet. Even though there is the “promise” that the Japanese leaders would have options for the creation and formulation of their government, the only true option was American-style democracy.

However, the Potsdam Declaration required that the Japanese would comply with occupation requests. The controversy over democratizing Japan aside, it is important to look at how GHQ/SCAP tried to administer education reforms to develop a democratic way of life in Japan.

Administrative Groups

In order to administer education reforms effectively, the Special Staffs Section of the War Department created CI&E on September 22, 1945. CI&E was transferred to GHQ/SCAP control on October 2, 1945. The head of the Education Division of CI&E was Donald Nugent. He and the rest of the Education Division were to work with the Japanese Ministry of Education to carry out education reforms among 42,000 schools, 19,000,000 students and 650,000 teachers. When the CI&E Education division was formed, there were only nineteen members. By February of 1946, the Education Division consisted of fourteen U.S. Army, Navy and Marine Corps officers, four enlisted men, and eleven civilian personnel.²³

²³ Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. *Missions and Accomplishments in the Civil Information and Education Section*. Civil Information and Education Section (Tokyo: 1 January 1950), 11. Nishi, 143. Civil Information & Education Section. *Education In Japan*, Ed. Mitsuo Kodama, (Meisei University Press: Tokyo, 1983), 57.

Initially, MacArthur's only directives from Washington were to carry out the basic reforms of replacing militarist and ultra-nationalist teachings with democratic values. Much of what was accomplished through the beginning of 1946 was "negative reforms," or reforms that dismantled the wartime Japanese education system. Though the Japanese government took the initiative to dismantle their own wartime education system, CI&E still had much work to do. CI&E had the Ministry of Education continue screening teachers for militaristic or ultra-nationalistic ties, leaving a severe teacher shortage. Textbooks were censored further, leaving a gap in the quality of education and by the end of 1945, courses in ethics, geography and history were suspended because there was too much to censor and propaganda was too likely to reappear in these courses.²⁴ Education in Japan, as seen by both sides, was in a dire situation after the purge of militaristic and ultra-nationalistic content, but the reforms were necessary to reeducate and reorient the Japanese in preparation for education in democracy.

CI&E could not do much in the way of "constructive reforms," or reforms to replace the textbooks, courses and teachers, partially because many of the people involved in the Education Division were not professional educators. In fact, members of CI&E in Japan were under less restrictive requirements to participate in the formulation of education reforms than their counterparts in West Germany. Many of those in the Education Division of CI&E were placed for their knowledge of the Japanese language, not for their accomplishments as educators or scholars of Japan. The chief of the Education Division, Donald Nugent admitted that even he was placed in his position for

²⁴ Richard Finn, *Winners in Peace: MacArthur, Yoshida and Postwar Japan*, (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1980), 60.

his knowledge of the Japanese language, not his knowledge of Japan.²⁵ The situation was becoming difficult as SCAP was trying to implement reforms and reopen schools as quickly as possible, because though many of the negative reforms came during summer recess in Japan, there was little to replace what was taken away. In order to make up for this deficiency, SCAP ordered a directive on January 9, 1946 calling for the formation of an Education Mission from the United States, as well as a committee of Japanese educators.²⁶

MacArthur made a request to the War Department to form a group of twenty or more American educators to study Japan for a month and provide recommendations for reforms to CI&E and the Japanese Ministry of Education.²⁷ George D. Stoddard became the chairman of the twenty-seven American educators who made up the United States Education Mission to Japan (USEMJ). USEMJ was divided into four subcommittees: Education for Democracy in Japan, Psychology and Re-education of Japan, Administrative Reorganization of the Japanese Education System, and Higher Education and the Rehabilitation of Japan. Before USEMJ arrived in Japan, CI&E published a booklet called *Education in Japan* and prepared lectures that paralleled the topics of each

²⁵ Richard Finn, 60. Masako Shibata. *Japan and Germany under the U.S. Occupation: A Comparative Analysis of Post-war Education Reforms*, (Lexington Books: Lanham, MD, 2005), 70-71.

²⁶ General Headquarters Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. "Committee of Japanese Educators." *Directives of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers*. Tokyo, 9 January 1946.

²⁷ United States Education Mission to Japan, *Report of the United States Education Mission to Japan*, (Tokyo, : 30, March, 1946): iv. Hereafter cited as USEMJ.

subcommittee.²⁸ The Ministry of Education was also encouraged to provide USEMJ with information on Japanese education. After a little over three weeks in Japan, USEMJ submitted to MacArthur a 46-page report, mostly written by Stoddard, on their findings and recommendations for continued education reforms in Japan. On April 6, 1946, the USEMJ report was published with MacArthur's praises;

The report and recommendations submitted to me by the United States Education Mission to Japan cover the whole scope of the education methods and principles very thoroughly and their analysis and representation of views reveal the high character and intelligence of the Committee members.

It is a document of ideals high in the democratic tradition. In origin, their ideals are universal. Likewise universal are the ends envisaged by the mission... Some of the recommendations regarding education principles and language reform are so far reaching that they can only serve as a guide for long-range study and future planning.²⁹

MacArthur's positive comments were very influential. By praising the committee members and proclaiming that the report was "high in democratic tradition," MacArthur expressed that the USEMJ report's recommendations were eventually to become Japanese educational law. Most recommendations did become law, though USEMJ was merely suggesting the reforms. The USEMJ report became "the Bible" for education reforms among CI&E and the Ministry of Education. The USEMJ report contains recommendations for curricula in primary and secondary schools, language reform,

²⁸ Tsuchimochi, 64-65.

²⁹ Gen. Douglas MacArthur, "General MacArthur's Statement," *Report of the United States Education Mission to Japan*. Tokyo: 6 April, 1946.

administration of schools, teacher instruction, adult education and higher education.³⁰ One of the important aspects of the USEMJ report was that it defined the purpose of democratic education: “A system of education for life in a democracy will rest upon the recognition of the worth and dignity of the individual. It will be so organized as to provide educational opportunity in accordance with the abilities and aptitudes of each person.”³¹ The recommendations thereafter concentrated on organizing Japanese education in such a way to attain these democratic ends.

In order to encourage constructive reform, the Education Division invited the Ministry of Education to form a committee to work with USEMJ in order so that the Japanese would be able to have a role in bringing democracy to Japan. The resulting committee became the Japanese Education Committee (JEC), a group of twenty-nine Japanese liberal educators who knew that simple superficial changes to the Japanese education system would not work.³² JEC, headed by Nambara Shigeru of the University

³⁰ Though language reform is not discussed in this paper, it is important to note that language reform, mostly in terms of written language, was highly recommended at all levels of the Occupation administration. The USEMJ believed that spending too much of the school day to memorize Japanese written characters meant less time to be devoted to proper democratic education. Furthermore, with complex characters it was believed that schoolchildren, by the time they finished their compulsory education, would not be able to be fully literate citizens, reducing the goals for a participatory and democratic Japan. It was recommended to reduce the number of Kanji (or Chinese characters), then to move the written language to all Kana (or syllabic characters) and finally to Romaji (Roman characters). CI&E did get language reform to the extent that some Kanji was simplified and language found in newspapers, magazines, journals and many books was written as it was spoken. However, one may wonder if the language reform was more for the benefit of the American occupiers rather than the Japanese. USEMJ, 14-16.

³¹ USEMJ, 5.

³² Joseph Trainor, *Education Reform in Occupied Japan: Trainor's Memoir*. (Hino-shi, Tokyo, Japan: Meisei University Press, 1983), 104.

of Tokyo, played a role in informing USEMJ on the history of Japanese education, and even provided recommendations regarding what they wanted to see happen in Japanese education. Twenty-four of the committee members had been to the United States or Europe before the war and several were educated abroad. JEC was divided into four subcommittees that paralleled those of USEMJ. While there is still little known about how much JEC was able to contribute to the discussion of reforms, it is known that JEC submitted its own report to the Ministry of Education after USEMJ left. This caused a bit of an uproar between GHQ/SCAP and the Ministry of Education, as the JEC report was not cleared through GHQ/SCAP first. Furthermore, the JEC report continued to suggest that the Imperial Rescript on Education should be spared, but modernized.³³

Despite the problem with the JEC report, in August of 1946, CI&E recommended that a committee be formed to help carry out the reforms recommended by USEMJ and JEC. This committee became the Japanese Education Reform Council (JERC), a council that was independent of the Ministry of Education. Several members of JEC became members of JERC.³⁴ CI&E believed that with JERC being made up of liberal educators, the Council would balance out the more conservative Ministry of Education and help push education reforms through the Japanese Diet. Nambara was the vice chair, then chair of JERC, and his fellow council members were eager to implement change. JERC

³³ Tsuchimochi, 94-95, 104-107.

³⁴ Shibata, 75.

is most noted for drafting the Fundamental Law of Education (1947) and the School Education Law (1947) but continued to meet and draft reforms until 1951.³⁵

In Joseph Trainor's memoirs, he credits JERC with accomplishing the most out of any organization during the Occupation. When JERC disbanded on November 8, 1951, it released a statement saying, "Since its foundation the Japan Education Reform Council has contributed not a small part to the establishment of the fundamental policy of reforming the education of Japan, and has achieved at least its original mission." To this, Trainor says, "This was indeed a masterpiece of understatement."³⁶ Throughout Trainor's section on the JERC in his memoir, he focuses on the autonomy and initiative of the Japanese educators on JERC who drafted and presented numerous reforms to the Japanese Ministry of Education and CI&E. Despite this display of initiative, there is debate over how much of JERC policies were their own in nature. Much of what JERC drafted as official policy was based on the recommendations from USEMJ, including tuition-free public schools, the 6-3-3-4 school system, coeducation, and decentralization of education.

Old and New Education Legislation

The Japanese Education Committee tried to reassure the Ministry of Education that the concept of the Imperial Rescript on Education would be preserved. From the Japanese point of view, it was important to maintain some sort of version of the Imperial Rescript on Education, for it not only defined a strong purpose for education, it helped

³⁵ Richard Finn, 133.

³⁶ Trainor, 119.

perpetuate *kokutai* (national polity), reverence to the Emperor, and Japanese identity.³⁷ However, the preservation of the Imperial Rescript was not to happen. According to MacArthur, education should teach that a democratic government is meant to serve the people, not to have the people serve it and, in the eyes of GHQ/SCAP, the Imperial Rescript on Education in any form would have perpetuated the people's duty to the government.³⁸ By 1947, the Imperial Rescript on Education was permanently discontinued when the Fundamental Law of Education replaced it.

The Fundamental Law of Education and its partner, the School Education Law were drafted by JERC and introduced in 1947 in accompaniment to the new Japanese Constitution.³⁹ Based on the recommendations of the USEMJ report, the Fundamental Law of Education set forth new principles of education in a democratized Japan while the School Education Law elaborated on administrative reforms, including the decentralization of education. The Fundamental Law of Education called for education to develop individuals who love truth and peace and can contribute to a peaceful state and society. In order for this to happen, education must respect academic freedom, provide equal opportunity for citizens to receive education based on their abilities, enforce nine years of compulsory education for both boys and girls, recognize coeducation, provide public schooling, and provide fair treatment for teachers. The School Education Law elaborated on the concepts of coeducation, compulsory education and tuition-free public

³⁷ Harry J. Wray, "The fall of moral education and the rise and decline of civics education and social studies in occupied and independent Japan," *Japan Forum* 12, no. 1, (2000): 17-19.

³⁸ Richard Finn, 40.

³⁹ Richard Finn, 133.

schools as well as described the implementation of a 6-3-3-4 single-track for education and powers prescribed for local school administrations.⁴⁰ All of the reforms implemented through the Fundamental Law of Education and the School Education Law were to provide a strong foundation for inculcating democratic values among Japanese youth, in many ways symbolically through the concept of equal education for all.

Compulsory Education

Compulsory education was nothing new to Japan. Decades before Occupation forces arrived, Japan had policies that required students, both boys and girls, to attend school for six years. Ninety-nine percent of the Japanese population was literate.⁴¹ However, USEMJ recommended that compulsory education be extended to nine years or when the student reached age sixteen, with expectations that compulsory education would continue through high school.⁴² USEMJ gave no definite reason why compulsory education should be extended, but it can be inferred that having three more years of education leading into adulthood would create more responsible and democratic citizens.

While the Americans and the Japanese believed that it was desirable to have the extra three years of compulsory education in order to create a more democratic citizenry, there were two problems with the requirement set forth in the Fundamental Law of Education. The first problem dealt with farming families: adding an extra three years after the customary six years of compulsory education put more strain on these farming

⁴⁰ *Fundamental Law of Education, 1947*, for full text, see Appendix II.

⁴¹ Richard Finn, 59.

⁴² USEMJ, 18.

families who were now required to put their children in school for nine years while trying to maintain their farm without having to hire outside labor.⁴³ The second problem was that many school buildings were destroyed during American fire bombings. The Japanese government needed to rebuild these schools, but now with all students going to school for three extra years, new buildings would have to be built with money the Japanese government did not have.⁴⁴ These problems were eventually solved, as farm families would get access to machines to help with the farming duties, and the Japanese government was able to procure funds to build new schools.

6-3-3-4 System

Because of the change in the compulsory education, USEMJ recommended changing the school structure to a 6-3-3-4 system, or six years of elementary school, three years of middle school, three years of high school and four years of college. The 6-3-3-4 system would ease problems that arose due to the extension of compulsory education. Originally, the Japanese university-track school structure was 6-5-3-3 or six years of elementary education, five years of middle school, three years of high school and three years of college. USEMJ and JEC decided that it would be best to implement a 6-3-3-4 education structure so that if a student opted not to continue beyond compulsory

⁴³ Dallas Finn, "Reform and Japan's Lower Schools," *Far Eastern Survey* 20, no. 19. (November 1951): 196-197. Often times, scholars claim that the 6-3-3-4 system was designed after the American system, even though in the United States there is both the 6-3-3-4 system and the 8-4-4 system.

⁴⁴ Dallas Finn, 196.

requirements, the student would not end his or her school career in the middle of a five-year school.⁴⁵

Trainor actually credits the 6-3-3-4 reform to JEC, who, along with other educators independent of JEC, presented the recommendation to USEMJ.⁴⁶ Yoshida Shigeru supports this claim by explaining that there were two attempts in the history of modern Japan to change the school system to a 6-3-3-4 system: once during Meiji Japan when Dairoku Kikuchi of the Imperial University of Tokyo recommended the system, and once during the Pacific War when a private entity recommended the system to Prince Konoye.⁴⁷ While USEMJ lay out the 6-3-3-4 plan in its report, there is evidence that it was the direction Japanese educators wanted to go.

The second part of the 6-3-3-4 reform was to make it the only option open to students. The old Japanese school structure had a university track and a vocational track, modeling itself after European school systems. The problem was that having the two tracks could, and did, lead to elitism where only students who started out on the university track could go to college. By having everyone on equal footing through the first nine years, students could then choose whether to try to go onto college or to go to a vocational school. Ideally, USEMJ, as well as JERC wanted to see more Japanese students attend college because this was more democratic and students would have

⁴⁵ Eiji Takemae, *The Allied Occupation of Japan*, (Continuum International Publishing Group: New York, 2002), 365.

⁴⁶ Trainor, 113-114.

⁴⁷ Yoshida, 168.

greater flexibility in curriculum.⁴⁸ While Japanese educators recommended the 6-3-3-4 plan in previous attempts, it is unclear whether they had intended it to be a single-track system.

Looking back, some Japanese educators believe that an 8-4-4 system, eight years of primary education then four years of high school and four years of college, would have been better for farming families because then USEMJ and JEC could have suggested only two extra years of compulsory education instead of three, giving the farming families an extra hand for an extra year.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the 6-3-3-4 system would require the construction of more school buildings, whereas the 8-4-4 system could have saved the Japanese government some money in that aspect because there would have been fewer buildings to construct, though some buildings would have to be remodeled to accommodate the number of students that would be present on campus. Then again, with the five-year middle schools divided, schools already had to be built or remodeled for three-year middle schools and three-year high schools.

Tuition-Free Public Schools

Tuition-free public schools were another important aspect to democratic education that coincided with compulsory education. Of course, if students had to go to school for nine years, it would be less of a burden on the families if they did not have to

⁴⁸ Edward R. Beauchamp, "The Development of Japanese Educational Policy, 1945-1985," *History of Education Quarterly* 27, no.3 (1987): 304.

⁴⁹ Dallas Finn, 196-197. Often times, scholars claim that the 6-3-3-4 system was designed after the American system, even though in the United States there is both the 6-3-3-4 system and the 8-4-4 system.

pay for these years. However, there were other aspects behind having the government pay for public schooling, such as preventing government-sponsored elitism where only the more affluent families would be able to pay for their child's education. While parents were entitled to pay for private schooling, the Japanese government would not have a say over who could continue their education in public schools. Tuition-free public schools were necessary to uphold the idea of equal opportunity education.

Despite the high ideals of tuition-free public education, there was one important factor that caused the Japanese government to be hesitant in implementing this reform, as well as the new 6-3-3-4 system and the nine years of compulsory education. The Japanese government did not have the money to implement the reforms. On top of the expenses for building new schools, the Japanese government was now required to pay for public schooling. Yoshida Shigeru wished to implement the reforms gradually as he did not want to burden the Japanese people financially. However, pressure from public opinion and "educationalists" required the reforms to be implemented immediately, or as soon as possible.⁵⁰

Coeducation

Coeducation was implemented to provide greater opportunity to Japanese women who had been trained to be subservient to men through education. Coeducation was important also for the inculcation of democratic values in that the worth and dignity of the individual would be recognized. USEMJ include men, women, boys and girls in its

⁵⁰ Yoshida, 169.

definition of individual.⁵¹ However, coeducation was also used to acquaint the Japanese with the idea that boys and girls, men and women should be considered equal and deserve equal rights. By having boys and girls together in class, it was insured that they would receive an equal education.⁵² Furthermore, after giving women the right to vote and hold government offices, it was essential that girls and women were prepared for their responsibilities to Japan to ensure that democratic values were upheld in the choices they made when they voted and when they participated in government. Before the reforms, “[g]irls were restricted to their own schools, including a few universities, with a limited curriculum after the period of compulsory education.”⁵³ Coeducation was the only reform that helped save the Japanese government money. This is because there was no need to either build new buildings for gender-specific schools or write separate textbooks to coincide with the curriculum in such schools.⁵⁴

Decentralization of Education

Decentralization of education was the final major administrative reform recommended by USEMJ. USEMJ believed that the power of the Ministry of Education should be reduced to ensure academic freedom and prevent state-authored ideologies, such as militarism and ultra-nationalism, from entering the classroom again.

⁵¹ USEMJ, 5.

⁵² Horio Teruhisa. *Educational thought and ideology in modern Japan : state authority and intellectual freedom*. Edited and translated by Steven Platzer. (Tokyo : University of Tokyo Press, 1988), 177

⁵³ Richard Finn, 59.

⁵⁴ Dallas Finn, 197.

The Ministry of Education has been the seat of power for those who controlled the minds of Japan. In order to prevent the possible misuse of the power of this office as heretofore constituted, we propose that its administrative controls be reduced. This means that many present controls affecting curricula, methods, materials of institution and personnel shall be transferred to prefectural and local school administrative units.⁵⁵

The Ministry of Education was to be reduced to a national-level consultation organization to help prefectural and local school boards as well as have the power to appropriate funds. The prefectural governments would be in charge of standardizing its prefecture's education by setting minimum requirements for school curriculum, providing teacher training and certification, and approving textbooks and schools. The municipal government would be in charge of schools at the local level by asking for funds to build or renovate schools, basing education on the needs of the citizens at the local level, and encouraging parents and teachers to be involved in child welfare. USEMJ believed that "[if] schools are to become effective instruments of a strong democracy, they must be kept close to the people. It is essential that teachers, school principals, and the local heads of school systems be free from domination and control by higher ranking school officials."⁵⁶ This concept of decentralization was not only because of the perceived influence the Ministry of Education had in inculcating militarism and ultra-nationalism, but also because of the American belief, *à la* Jefferson-Jacksonian ideology, that a weak

⁵⁵ USEMJ, 19.

⁵⁶ USEMJ, 20-21.

central government is important to democracy and individual liberties.⁵⁷ JERC concurred with the importance of relieving the Ministry of Education of many of its duties. Actually, JERC wanted to dissolve the Ministry of Education completely and replace it with a Ministry of Arts and Sciences, which would have limited power. However, Occupation authorities did not have enough faith in the Japanese populace to allow the complete dissolution of the Ministry of Education.⁵⁸

There were problems with decentralizing the education administration. Putting the authority of education into the hands of local governments was a tall order to ask of the Japanese as they were just being reintroduced to direct political participation. “[D]espite the efforts of CI[&]E and local Civil Affairs teams, school board candidates were scarce, no one had ever heard of most of them and the rate of voting abstention was high.”⁵⁹ Exercising democratic responsibilities to this degree was a new concept to the Japanese. It did not help that CI&E had little faith in the Japanese ability to exercise these responsibilities. Problems with local school board elections were exacerbated by the fact that the prefectures did not advertise the Board of Education Law before it was passed. The Board of Education Law was supposed to have passed in 1947 along with the Fundamental Law of Education and the School Education Law, but was held up in the Diet until July 1958. It was only then the prefectures started educating the Japanese on

⁵⁷ Harry J. Wray, “Decentralization of Education in the Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945-1953,” *The Occupation of Japan Education and Social Reforms*, Proceedings of a Symposium at Webb Center, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. October 16-18, 1980, 148.

⁵⁸ Shibata, 84.

⁵⁹ Dallas Finn, 195.

the concept of having school boards.⁶⁰ Teachers and principals were discouraged from applying for the school board position since it was a full-time position, so educators had to resign from their job, but school board positions were not paid.⁶¹ With these complications and having always received orders from the central government, local and prefectural governments were much more comfortable receiving instruction from the Ministry of Education than to take the initiative to commit to democratization through decentralization.

Another major problem had to do with funding: how government money was allocated. It was the central Japanese government that held access to all of the money for education, so the local governments had no monetary means of their own. The Ministry of Education was willing to pay for personnel, but not for new school buildings. Though Parent-Teachers Associations assisted the local schools in acquiring funds for new buildings, when it came down to what the local schools could afford, more money went to building new schools than funding the local school boards.⁶² The fund factor is another problem that kept local school boards, and even local teacher's unions, from running autonomously as GHQ/SCAP had hoped. By allowing the central government to maintain control over the allocation of funds, GHQ/SCAP unwittingly prevented the full decentralization of education. However, considering Japan's grave economic situation at the time, GHQ/SCAP had to maintain the central government's ability to allocate funds.

⁶⁰ Karl Francis Drlica, *The Teacher's Union is a Typical Prefecture in Occupied Japan*. June 1952, 99-100

⁶¹ Drlica, 101.

⁶² Drlica, 89

Since the forming of local school boards was not as important as providing places for students to attend school, decentralization became an afterthought.

The final major problem with decentralizing education and weakening the power of the Ministry of Education was that GHQ/SCAP needed the Ministry of Education to implement all of the new reforms. Despite the Ministry of Education's role in inculcating militarism and ultra-nationalism, the Ministry of Education initiated many of the early negative reforms. As the Ministry seemed eager to help the Occupation democratize Japan, GHQ/SCAP developed a sense of trust and used the Ministry to carry out education reforms. By the time all of the education reforms were implemented, full decentralization was an afterthought and the Ministry of Education maintained much of its power.⁶³ Though there was a system of school boards in place, these school boards were still influenced by the Ministry of Education, though the hand of the Ministry seemed to be more invisible. The Ministry of Education still maintained the rights to appropriation of funds, and would have an integral part in approving textbooks. The inability to decentralize the authority of education would have far-reaching implications in relation to teachers' rights and responsibilities in education.

The democratization of Japanese education required many administrative reforms, many of which seemed collaborative in nature in order to accommodate General MacArthur's belief that democracy cannot be forced upon a nation and its people, but has to be carried out by the "will of the people." There is conflicting evidence over Japanese initiative and autonomy. While Joseph Trainor believes that the Japanese themselves

⁶³ Harry J. Wray, "Decentralization," 146.

developed and implemented many of the education reforms, Toshio Nishi believes that Japanese autonomy in education was only a façade. It seems that it was a bit of both, because while JERC drafted and proposed new education reforms, these reforms were originally in USEMJ's report, and the policies had to be approved by CI&E. If the reform were not sufficiently democratic, JERC would have to rewrite the policy. This was in order to ensure the inculcation of democracy. However, there is a possibility that CI&E did not have to pass down many revisions. According to John Dower, educators outside the Ministry of Education were the most liberal and most willing to promote peace and democracy. "No one repainted their signs more frenetically than the educators, and no doubt this was accompanied by audible curses within the sanctity of the ministry's walls." ⁶⁴ Educators were willing, but the Ministry of Education was not. This relationship would continue to color education reforms through the Occupation. While the administrative reforms suggested by USEMJ would remain and play their role as a symbol of democracy, the freedoms and responsibilities of teachers, which were to help perpetuate democracy, were jeopardized as the Ministry of Education maintained much authority over teachers and curriculum.

⁶⁴ Dower, 247.

CHAPTER 2: TEACHERS, TEXTBOOKS AND CURRICULUM, 1946-1949

Teachers were an important element of education reforms. It was professional educators who helped draft the Fundamental Law of Education and the School Education Law, and it was the teachers who would help inculcate the new ideas of peace and democracy to the youth of Japan. With the Ministry of Education having less authority over textbooks and curriculum, it was up to the teachers to create a new classroom environment to promote democratic values, which included writing textbooks and creating a new curriculum.

Screening and Purging

On October 30, 1945 CI&E ordered the screening and purge of Japanese educators. This screening was conducted through the Ministry of Education to eliminate militaristic and ultra-nationalistic influences which “contributed to the defeat, war guilt, suffering, privation and present deplorable state of the Japanese people” from Japanese education.⁶⁵ Oddly enough, the Ministry of Education itself was not screened for militaristic and ultra-nationalistic leanings.⁶⁶ CI&E knew the Ministry was conservative, as exemplified by CI&E making the liberal JERC an autonomous body; however CI&E needed to maintain the Ministry and its members because the Ministry knew the Japanese

⁶⁵ General Headquarters Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, “Investigation, Screening and Certification of Teachers and Educational Officials” *Directives of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers*. (Tokyo: 30 October 1945).

⁶⁶ Roesgaard, 67.

bureaucracy and therefore could implement education reforms.⁶⁷ Furthermore, CI&E was less worried about the Ministry itself because those who had been in control of the Ministry of Education stepped down before the Occupation began, passing leadership to the more liberal Maeda Tamon.⁶⁸ The combination of the change to a more liberal regime and understanding the Japanese bureaucracy saved the Ministry of Education from screening. CI&E merely scrutinized the Ministry's actions and tried to use a system of checks and balances, as well as decentralization, to reduce the Ministry's power.

Teachers were screened for ties to militarist or ultra-nationalistic organizations. Principals were purged almost automatically since they possessed more administrative duties. Furthermore, at the beginning of the Occupation, those who were involved with the Japanese Imperial Army were not allowed to become or return to their positions as teachers. The screening caused over 120,000 teachers to leave their profession, mostly voluntarily. With 120,000 teachers leaving their positions, and 19,000,000 Japanese students to teach, there was a severe shortage of teachers. However, liberals who were incarcerated during Japan's war years were released and allowed to return to their positions in education, including several known Communist leaders.⁶⁹ After USEMJ visited Japan, it recommended that screening be continued for fear that not all militarists and ultra-nationalists had been purged from education. Interestingly enough, the Ministry of Education used teachers' unions to help in the screening process. However,

⁶⁷ Wray, "Decentralization", 163.

⁶⁸ Nishi, 147.

⁶⁹ Nishi, 169-170. Wildes, 269.

by using teachers' unions, some prefectures took their screening jobs lackadaisically, so the screening was not completely effective.⁷⁰ Screening finally ended in 1948 after 650,000 teachers had been screened.

New Responsibilities for Educators

Despite the recommendation to continue screening, USEMJ was not in Japan to continue to purge right-wing educators. USEMJ set forth new rights and responsibilities for teachers who, before the Occupation, were underpaid and underappreciated. USEMJ recommended that teachers' salaries be raised to be proportionate to the type of work they do. A raise in salary aimed at attracting more qualified teachers to schools. Previously, teachers had to supplement their income with help from their families, so it was ideal that teachers be paid more for their work.⁷¹

USEMJ also set forth new guidelines for educating teachers. One of USEMJ's concerns was over teachers' requirement to adhere strictly to the curriculum set forth by the Ministry of Education:

We have seen that the effects of the old regime are manifest in the teaching practices. Teachers have been told exactly what to teach and how to teach it. Teaching has been, by and large formal and stereotyped. To prevent any deviation from the prescribed content and form, inspectors have been charged with the duty of seeing that printed instructions were followed to the letter. Such a system has the effect of putting teaching in a straitjacket.⁷²

⁷⁰ Drlica, 74.

⁷¹ USEMJ, 21. Fearey, 39.

⁷² USEMJ, 23.

USEMJ believed that if the Ministry of Education continued to enforce a nationally standardized curriculum, then classroom decorum would not be hospitable to new democratic values. To replace the formulated curriculum devised by the Ministry of Education, teachers were encouraged to take initiative in deciding what was appropriate for the classroom such as creating their own lesson plans, deciding on what books with which to teach, opening up class discussion or breaking the class down into small groups for social participation essential to democracy, emphasizing individuals' needs and so on.⁷³ In certain aspects, due to the recommendations of USEMJ, a teacher's workload increased because they became responsible for the content and structure of the classroom. Whether or not USEMJ's recommendations to increase teachers' salaries was based on its coinciding recommendations which increased teachers' responsibilities, or was merely coincidental is difficult to tell, but it is easy to see that with greater freedom for teachers came greater responsibilities.

As noted above, not many teachers knew how to educate in order to promote democratic values, yet USEMJ pushed for such teaching. Teachers were told to "encourage freedom and self-expression," so many teachers did not discipline unruly students, nor teach anything of substance effectively.⁷⁴ To make up for this deficiency and to make democracy comprehensible to teachers, USEMJ recommended that teachers be reeducated to better understand democracy and their purpose within a democracy. Emergency reeducation was recommended to acquaint teachers with new teaching

⁷³ USEMJ, 23-24.

⁷⁴ Dallas Finn, 198.

methods that promoted democracy.⁷⁵ Norman Graebner, who was an American educator brought to Japan in 1946 to educate teachers and adults about democracy, recalls “They [Japanese teachers] knew surprisingly little about democracy.” He was honored to help educate teachers about democracy and how to run a classroom in a democratic manner. His work helped educators in Yokohama, near Tokyo, understand their purpose better.⁷⁶ Little by little, Japanese teachers began to understand what democracy was and how to effectively teach it in the classroom. USEMJ gave guidelines for normal schools and suggested what courses teachers should take to become teachers. USEMJ recommended teacher in-service training to help continue improving education methods and encouraging sharing ideas about how to teach democracy in the classroom.⁷⁷ However, part of teaching democracy requires experiencing and participating in democracy. Democratic reforms in the whole of Japan led to new experiences, and new faces, in Japanese education.

New Faces of Education

One of the results of the new Japanese commitment to democracy was the changing role of women. In education, having a woman employed in education was not a new concept, however the demographic began to change. Before the democratic reforms, women who became teachers typically taught primary school and never married,

⁷⁵ USEMJ, 26.

⁷⁶ Norman A. Graebner, *A Twentieth-Century Odyssey: Memoir of a Life in Academe*. (Regina Books: Claremont, California, 2002), 104-105.

⁷⁷ USEMJ, 26-30.

following a similar vein as post-bellum American women educators. Even though Japan needed to employ women as teachers, since men were going off to war, being a woman and a teacher was a social stigma. While these women taught the virtues of being a “good wife, wise mother”, they could not be the “good wife, wise mother” themselves. The women who did marry did not return to teaching, and the women who remained as teachers resigned themselves to spinsterhood. Teachers were already underpaid, but women teachers were paid less than men. Under Japanese militarism, women educators were restricted from social and political participation and were not permitted to express themselves.⁷⁸ Women educators had little freedom inside and outside the classroom, but in order to promote a more perfect democracy, MacArthur and Stoddard both agreed that they needed to elevate the position of women educators.

Under the Occupation, SCAP brought in several women to help reeducate women teachers, such as Dr. Lulu Holmes and Helen Hosp. Hosp actually trained seventeen women to become deans of schools and impressed upon them the idea of equality among the sexes. Hosp also emphasized the importance of having a personality while in a leadership position and encouraged her trainees to develop their own sense of self-expression.⁷⁹ It was a long process, but Hosp’s seventeen deans broke out of the mold of “Old Miss” and became professional women with a new sense of identity and significantly fewer restrictions on their lives. These women, in turn, developed programs

⁷⁸ Donald Roden, “From ‘Old Miss’ to New Professional: A Portrait of Women Educators under the Allied Occupation of Japan, 1945-1952,” *History of Education Quarterly*, Vol. 23 No. 4 (Winter 1983), 471-472.

⁷⁹ Roden, 479-480.

to help other women educators break the mold, bringing a new face to education: the professional and passionate woman educator.

Freedom for women was not the only new face to education. Another new face was the unionized liberal educator. Though liberal educators existed before the end of the war, they were not allowed to demonstrate their political and ideological leanings, lest they be imprisoned. The overnight transformation from militarism to democracy gave many teachers the feeling of freedom and empowerment in the new system. These teachers wanted to repent for having to teach the militarist doctrine and for the loss of their students to the war. Instead of subservience, they greeted the Ministry of Education with a confrontational stance and “embraced the ideals of peace and democracy with fervor.”⁸⁰ Much of the teachers’ power came from unions.

CI&E encouraged the development of and participation in teachers’ unions to provide mutual aid and professional advancement, and to allow teachers to collectively procure higher salaries and more food, work with local government authorities and to participate in the democratic process.⁸¹ Unions were not entirely new to Japan, but their powers were reduced, and then eliminated during the 1920s, since unions and leftists were generally anti-militarist.⁸² However, unions made a comeback during the Occupation because GHQ/SCAP wanted to encourage grassroots movements—

⁸⁰ Dower, 250.

⁸¹ Kodama, 80.

⁸² Conrad Totman. *A History of Japan*, Blackwell Publishers; Malden, Massachusetts, 2000. 408-409.

revolutions from below— because Americans believed that grassroots movements were essential to democracy.⁸³

Many prefectures had their own teachers unions, like the one in Miyagi. In Miyagi, teachers outlined the goals they wanted to accomplish through collective bargaining, such as making teachers' positions secure, increase income, abolish discrimination between men and women educators, attain equal opportunity in education, and revive the school lunch program. In order to help achieve these goals, they wanted to join together with other unions to have a national union, since there was strength in numbers.⁸⁴ Though unions remained on the municipal and prefectural levels, they move towards a collective, centralized union. The national-level unions, such as the Japan Teachers' Union, would lend political support to prefectural and municipal unions. This seems to mimic what would happen with school boards, since the Ministry of Education would remain as the guiding influence in Japanese education, funneling its influence down to the prefectural and municipal school boards. While the principle of decentralization persisted, the American essence of grassroots democracy waned as unions and school boards alike answered to their national-level counterparts, not necessarily the reverse.

The Japanese Teachers' Union membership included teachers from all over the nation. The primary goals of the JTU during Allied Occupation was to “seek improvement of the status and welfare of the teachers, [and] to promote an enlightened

⁸³ Wildes, 152.

⁸⁴ Drlica, 63

educational policy.” The JTU was a proponent of local control over school systems as well as egalitarian education and the abolition of Japan’s examination system.⁸⁵

The JTU, however, was also very radical. Closely affiliated with the Japanese Socialist Party, the JTU negotiated better terms to help with its members’ economic situation. The JTU began to commit to militant action “based on the ideas of class struggle.” Discussions between the JTU and reactionaries within the government would often end in violent outbursts on both sides, even over minor details such as details of educational policy.⁸⁶ The radical and militant JTU came under fire from the conservative Prime Minister Yoshida, despite the Allied Occupation’s encouragement of unions:

Democracy is founded on understanding and magnanimity. But these teachers’ unions, like so many other similar bodies in post-war Japan, made a point of never understanding any views but their own, and insisting only on what they considered their own rights. Thus we found ourselves faced with a state of near anarchy in a field which could not be left to the mercies of time and the teachers’ unions.⁸⁷

While unions were good for encouraging democracy in education, as well as enlightened curriculum, it was not beneficial for the conservative Japanese government whose job was to try to maintain peace and order during the Occupation, but at the same time, encourage democracy. This balancing act would eventually fall to one side, with the Occupation’s approval.

⁸⁵ Kawai Kazuo. *Japan 's American Interlude*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 199. Roesgaard, 47.

⁸⁶ Dower, 250. Kawai, 199-200. Richard Finn, 61.

⁸⁷ Yoshida, 171.

Curriculum Woes

December 31 is usually the day the Japanese clean their houses in preparation for the New Year. GHQ/SCAP did some house cleaning as well on December 31, 1945, suspending courses in morals, Japanese history and geography. The reason for the suspension was two-fold: the first reason was to be in accordance with directive AG 000.3 which ordered the abolition of government sponsorship of “State Shinto and Doctrine”; the second reason was because militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideologies were “inextricably interwoven” with courses in morals, Japanese history and geography. These courses were not to be resumed until suitable substitutions or revisions could be made and plans for reintroducing the new curriculum and textbooks were approved.⁸⁸

To get to the point of reintroducing morals, Japanese history and geography took a lot of effort from CI&E and the Ministry of Education. Actually, “morals” was never reintroduced officially to school curriculum because of its Confucian-based value system and its direct relation to teaching Japanese citizens that they are to serve the State and Emperor, not the State and Emperor serving their citizens.⁸⁹ Because of the nature of “morals”, Maeda Tamon, the Minister of Education, tried to get CI&E to approve curriculum for “civics education”, which would have been similar to teaching morals,

⁸⁸ General Headquarters Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. “Suspension of courses in Morals (*Shushin*), Japanese History, and Geography.” (Tokyo: 31 December 1945).

⁸⁹ Mitoji Nishimoto, “Educational Change in Japan After the War,” *Journal of Educational Sociology*. Vol 26, Iss 1 (September 1952), 24. Shibata, 81-82. Dallas Finn, 197.

with a few changes to allow for a “Japanese democracy.”⁹⁰ After many debates as well as pre-war textbook revisions used to illustrate that moral or civic education did not necessarily promote militarism or ultra-nationalism, CI&E decided it was best to reintroduce civics not as a class of its own.⁹¹ Furthermore, CI&E had originally planned not to reintroduce Japanese history and geography singularly, but combined into a single subject: social studies.

Japanese social studies was to mimic its American counterpart by integrating economics, ethics, civics, national history, geography, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and politics.⁹² Social studies brought some new positive ideas that would promote and perpetuate democratic ideals. Social studies was designed to teach “good citizenship,” by combining class discussion and individual projects with occasional field trips to local public and private entities.⁹³ According to Joseph Trainor, “The introduction of the course in Social Studies provided an opportunity to substitute materials related to problems and topics meaningful to students.”⁹⁴ One of the other main reasons for CI&E’s desire to utilize an integrated course, such as social studies, was to break the Japanese of playing “follow the leader”, and to provide a classroom decorum for students to develop critical thinking, judging and problem-solving skills and to

⁹⁰ Harry Wray, “The fall of moral education and the rise and fall of civics education and social studies in occupied and independent Japan.” *Japan Forum*, Vol 12, Iss 1. 2000. 17.

⁹¹ Shibata, 82.

⁹² Shibata, 82. Wray, “Social studies”, 24. Nishimoto, 24. Dallas Finn, 198.

⁹³ Kawai, 193. Dallas Finn, 198.

⁹⁴ Trainor, 127.

nurture individual differences.⁹⁵ The concept of integrated social studies and its role as a means to learn how to live and thrive in a democracy was truly noble; however, there were some difficulties with implementation.

Much learning is done by example and much teaching is done through experience. Unfortunately for Japanese teachers during the Occupation, they did not grow up in a free-thinking democracy, therefore when they were encouraged to instill these values in their social studies classes, it was difficult for them to follow through. Teaching social studies effectively “requires flexible and imaginative leadership”, however the Occupation teachers had “been taught to memorize but not to think analytically or spontaneously.” In other words, it was difficult, sometimes even a strain, for teachers to encourage their students to work individually or even formulate their own opinions since the teachers themselves did not experience these privileges and responsibilities themselves when they were students.⁹⁶ Though there were reeducation programs to help teachers develop lesson plans suitable for promoting democracy in the classroom, it did not really seem to be enough to pursue courses in social studies for all nine years of compulsory education.

In meetings in 1946 between CI&E and the Ministry of Education, the topic of social studies remained a hotly debated issue. The Japanese educators were not comfortable teaching social studies, mostly because they had grown up with Japanese values of harmony and national unity, not with the values they were trying to instill such as individuality and political reform through civic action. The Ministry of Education

⁹⁵ Wray, “Social Studies,” 24.

⁹⁶ Dallas Finn, 198.

preferred to teach history and geography as separate subjects, not combined into one course of social studies. Eventually, the Ministry of Education won a limited victory over CI&E, allowing only history to be taught separately. Though social studies was “born” on August 5, 1946, it did not live too long after the Occupation, seeing its decline begin during the Red Purge and reverse course reforms.⁹⁷

Though social studies became a failed experiment, GHQ/SCAP was satisfied in acquiescing to the Ministry of Education’s wishes to keep geography and history as individual courses. On June 29, 1946, geography courses were reintroduced to Japanese schools and October 12, 1946 saw the reintroduction of Japanese history, both on the condition that the schools used textbooks approved and sanctioned by the Ministry of Education and SCAP.⁹⁸ Though these two courses were supposed to be integrated into social studies, they prevailed as individual subjects because CI&E and the Ministry of Education encouraged educators to write new textbooks. It is the liberal educators who would have a profound effect on how teachers taught Japanese history.

Teachers and Textbooks

Prior to Occupation, the Ministry of Education had a state monopoly over textbooks, publishing, printing, sanctioning and distributing all the textbooks for

⁹⁷ Wray, “Social Studies”, 31-32.

⁹⁸ General Headquarters Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. “Reopening of School Courses in Geography.” (Tokyo: 29 June 1946) and “Reopening of School Courses in Japanese History.” (Tokyo: 12 October 1946).

Japanese schools.⁹⁹ They had their own Bureau of Textbooks, where lower bureaucrats would write textbooks for Japan's schools.¹⁰⁰ Because GHQ/SCAP sought to decentralize the Japanese government, USEMJ called upon the liberal educators to write new textbooks, which would be approved and selected by prefectural committees.¹⁰¹ However, the transfer of power from national to local levels never occurred, as it was the Ministry of Education, in conjunction with CI&E, that approved the textbooks, even during Occupation, in order to prevent the inclusion of "objectionable and undemocratic passages" as well as to help quell the paper shortage.¹⁰²

However, before educators participated in writing the new textbooks, the United States imported and translated American textbooks for Japanese use since the development, writing, and approval of new textbooks was time consuming. Japanese schools needed textbooks as soon as possible, although many schools still had to use their "blackened-over" textbooks or hastily made pamphlets that fell apart easily.¹⁰³ CI&E and the Ministry of Education quickly approved new textbooks for subjects such as science and mathematics, partially because these were not prone to militaristic or ultra-nationalistic propaganda, partially because Maeda Tamon cited Japanese failure in World

⁹⁹ Civil Information and Education Section, Education Division, *Education in Japan*, Tokyo, February 15, 1946. 32-33.

¹⁰⁰ Trainor, 88.

¹⁰¹ USEMJ, 11-12.

¹⁰² Ienaga Saburo, "Glorification of War in Japanese Education, *International Security*, Vol 18, Iss 3, (Winter 1993-1994), 123.

¹⁰³ Trainor, 129-130. Takemae, 362-363.

War II was due to insufficient science education.¹⁰⁴ Other subjects, such as geography, were more scrutinized but one subject has received the most attention from the Japanese and Americans alike.

Japanese history was probably the most important and most controversial subject for which teachers wrote textbooks. Out of the suspended trio of courses, geography was most easily revised to be more scientific and respectful of other nations, denouncing the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere; morals, as a school course, was abandoned completely since teaching “morals” in school did not coincide with American belief that public schools should be secular. History was a little more complicated because it was a subject laden with religious myths and proclamation of Japanese superiority, but it could be transformed into a more objective, fact-based subject that was respectful to other nations. A few of the first histories Japanese educators wrote during Occupation continued to reflect the history found in *Kokutai no hongii*, an ultra-nationalistic history which details Japan’s creation by the gods Izanagi and Izanami and Japan’s founding by the sun goddess, Amaterasu. This history also claims that the emperor is divine since he is a direct descendant of Amaterasu.¹⁰⁵ Japanese educators could not use this legend as accurate history, partially because such legends cannot be factually proven, but also because these legends inculcate the idea that Japan is the “Land of the Gods”, which not only maintains the divinity of the emperor, but also deems the Japanese superior and therefore gives permission to subjugate other nations. Educators had to be careful to present Japanese national history in an air of truthfulness, based more on archeological

¹⁰⁴ Dower, 494.

¹⁰⁵ Trainor, 87-88. Thakur, 263.

and anthropological evidence than the myths that were created to highlight Japanese uniqueness.¹⁰⁶ The new history was to be based on historical facts, incorporate cultural, social, and economic history, and foster students' critical thinking.¹⁰⁷ However, even in being truthful, there were times that mentioning a war hero or emperor in a positive light, such as Toyotomi Hideyoshi, was censored from the text.¹⁰⁸

The first post-war history textbook approved by the Ministry of Education and CI&E was *Kuni no ayumi (Our Nation's Progress)*¹⁰⁹ in 1946. Approval of *Kuni no ayumi* was time consuming since it had to be translated into English for CI&E correction and approval, then translated back into Japanese with corrections.¹¹⁰ According to Ienaga Saburo, a Japanese educator most noted for the lawsuits his filed against the Ministry of Education for its censorship practices after Occupation, *Kuni no Ayumi* was compiled in less than a month. In this haste, Ienaga believed that *Kuni no ayumi* was not very well constructed and he admitted to being ashamed of having been part of the project.¹¹¹ CI&E, apparently, only cared that the textbooks were written in a clear, concise, engaging, intelligible manner, not necessarily caring about the quality of

¹⁰⁶ Wray, "Social Studies," 19.

¹⁰⁷ Thakur, 269.

¹⁰⁸ Nishi, 183.

¹⁰⁹ Also known as *Path of Our Nation* or *The Progress of the Country*, among other translations.

¹¹⁰ Thakur, 269.

¹¹¹ Ienaga Saburo, *Japan's Past, Japan's Future: One Historian's Odyssey*. 129-130.

research conducted in compiling the new textbooks.¹¹² However, since *Kuni no ayumi* did not contain militaristic or ultra-nationalistic passages, it was a success for CI&E and the Ministry of Education.

Kuni no ayumi was the first privately written history textbook, and became the model for which many new history textbooks to be written. It would also begin a pattern of post-war Japanese history which would continue to incite ire from liberal Japanese historians as well as Japan's neighbors. *Kuni no ayumi* discussed Japan's annexation of Korea, presenting the situation as an event in mutual cooperation rather than Korean subjugation.¹¹³ The Allied Council for Japan also pointed out that the Twenty-one Demands made on China in 1915 were not mentioned. Furthermore, Communist Inoue Kiyoshi believed that *Kuni no ayumi* was too far entrenched in the imperial institution and did not sufficiently support the values of democracy.¹¹⁴ Textbook authors had a difficult time negotiating the conflicting values of history textbooks, with some passages being stricken from texts for glorifying Japanese war heroes and emperors, and other passages that offended Japan's neighbors remaining. Despite the criticisms, *Kuni no ayumi* was used in Japanese schools until 1949, and the Ministry of Education continued to use *Kuni no ayumi* as the prototype for history textbooks after the Allies left Japan.¹¹⁵

Though the Ministry of Education used *Kuni no ayumi* as the prototype for history textbooks, there was a period of further liberalization of history, which included

¹¹² Takemae, 364.

¹¹³ Takemae, 453.

¹¹⁴ Thakur, 270-271.

¹¹⁵ Thakur, 271.

discussion of Japanese wartime atrocities during the Asia-Pacific War. Before the Occupation left, educators like Ienaga Saburo, began to include the allegations and findings from all aspects of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (the Tokyo Trial).¹¹⁶ According to Ienaga, the Japanese were calling the war “The Greater East Asian War,” but on December 15, 1945, the GHQ/SCAP prohibited this terminology, replacing it with “The Pacific War,” placing the emphasis on Japan’s war with the United States rather than Japan’s war with the rest of Asia.¹¹⁷ As the Tokyo Trial progressed and the picture of Japan’s wartime efforts began to become complete, liberal educators began to write histories to detail all of Japan’s wartime atrocities– such as the Nanjing Massacre, the Bataan Death March and Unit 731, the biological weapons testing facility in Harbin, Manchuria– not just the war between Japan and the United States. Conservative Japanese politicians were worried about the inclusion of these other incidents because the conservative leaders believed that these incidents would not necessarily instill thoughts of national pride; instead they would make students question their loyalty to Japan and their trust in Japanese authority.¹¹⁸ At the time, the Ministry of Education could not say anything against the inclusion of Japanese wartime atrocities, but after the Occupation left, the Ministry once again held full authority over textbook approval, and reverted back to the initial Tokyo Trial view of history, which emphasized the war between Japan and the United States.

¹¹⁶ Ienaga Saburo, *The Pacific War, 1931-1945: a critical perspective on Japan's role in World War II*. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), 251.

¹¹⁷ Ienaga, 249.

¹¹⁸ Gerow, 74.

If the Ministry of Education was to be decentralized over time, why did it have so much authority over textbook approval during and after the Occupation? GHQ/SCAP did try to loosen the authority of the Ministry of Education over textbook approval by forming a private entity to approve textbooks, the Textbook Authorization Research Committee. However, GHQ/SCAP gave the Ministry of Education authority until the local committees were formed and the transfer of power never occurred.¹¹⁹ It was GHQ/SCAP, against recommendations from USEMJ, which empowered the Ministry of Education to approve textbooks.¹²⁰ However, there were several reasons for GHQ/SCAP utilizing the Ministry of Education. As mentioned above, part of the reason was due to the paper shortage and the need to prevent undemocratic passages. According to Kazuo Kawai, when the Ministry of Education had no control over textbook approval, some publishers used “questionable tactics to get inferior books adopted by ignorant or corrupt local school boards.”¹²¹ Though GHQ/SCAP wanted education to be decentralized, there were difficulties with local school boards and elections, as noted in Chapter 1, but now there were problems in judging the quality of textbooks as well. Therefore, it was necessary for the Occupation to utilize the Ministry’s judgment in approving textbooks. It seems no matter how hard GHQ/SCAP tried to decentralize the Japanese education system, something would arise to force the Americans to rely on the Ministry of Education’s power, as well as the knowledge of the Japanese bureaucracy and the way of

¹¹⁹ Thakur, 272.

¹²⁰ Nishi, 183.

¹²¹ Kawai, 194.

thinking in order to overcome problems that could be corrected only through the Ministry of Education's expertise.

CHAPTER 3: REVERSE COURSE, THE RED PURGE AND THEIR EFFECTS, 1949-1952

The education reforms under the American Occupation were making progress at transforming Japan into a peace-loving, democratic institution, and much of this had to do with the liberal Japanese educators. The liberal Japanese Education Reform Committee helped write and pass legislative documents to promote democratic reforms. Teachers' unions were helping teachers earn higher wages, maintain employment and raise their standards of living, as well as improve the quality of education for Japanese students. Progressive educators were writing and revising textbooks, pulling Japan away from militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideals and replacing these ideals with pacifist, democratic and internationalist ones. However, had the Occupation not purged the militarists and ultra-nationalists, the liberal educators would not have been as effective in creating a liberal institution. The conservative Japanese politicians, such as Yoshida Shigeru, would not have allowed Japanese education to go so far to the left. How can one make such an assertion? The year of 1949 proved that "The Occupation giveth and the Occupation taketh away."

Seeing Red

The year 1949 saw some dramatic world events that shocked Americans. In 1949, the United Soviet Socialist Republic tested its first atomic bomb. In China, the American-supported Nationalist government was losing to the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in a civil war, and by October 1949, the Nationalists fled to the island of Taiwan as the CCP entered Beijing to proclaim a new China for the Communists. In Southeast

Asia, the French and pro-French Vietnamese were fighting a losing battle with Communist Ho Chi Minh and his Viet Minh. The realization that Communism was sweeping Asia made it all the more important for Occupation officials to secure an ally in Asia as a stronghold for American-style democracy and capitalism. Since the United States was already in Japan trying to democratize the country, Japan was an ideal democratic and capitalist ally. However, in order to secure Japan as an ally in Asia, the Occupation had to compromise on some of its earlier reforms in order to prevent Japan from becoming communist.

Under the looming threat of communism, the American people and the political opponents of the Truman administration began to criticize the Allied Occupation's reforms since they seemed to be sympathetic to communists. The reform that broke up the zaibatsu was meant to demilitarize and democratize Japan, since the Tokyo Trial view of history implicates the *zaibatsu* (literally, "family-owned financial cliques") as an entity that promoted the war with the United States. However, Americans believed that the zaibatsu-busting hurt the Japanese economy and was a product of communist ideology. Americans saw other reforms, such as land reform, as "communistic." In order to rectify the situation, GHQ/SCAP began the "reverse course" in 1948 to re-center Japanese political and economic policies. It was within the context of the reverse course that the Red Purge began.

The Threat of Communism

Initially, GHQ/SCAP and other American observers did not feel excessively threatened by communism in Japan. GHQ/SCAP was not worried about the

establishment of the Japanese Communist Party (JCP) in spite of the fact that the JCP was very vocal politically and actually pronounced its opposition to the Occupation, calling the Occupation “the colonization of Japan.”¹²² Moreover, the JCP protested against GHQ/SCAP’s policy of retaining the Japanese Emperor as Japan’s national figurehead and symbol of solidarity. Though generally the JCP was opposed to retaining the emperor-system, the JCP believed that the decision whether or not Japan should retain the Emperor should occur only after the Japanese democracy had matured, and should not be decided upon by the American occupiers.¹²³ In spite of these protests, GHQ/SCAP did not feel threatened.¹²⁴

One of the reasons for GHQ/SCAP lack of concern over the protests of the Japanese Communist Party was that the JCP was a relatively small party. In 1946, there were 8,132 registered members and at its peak in 1949, there were 93,935 members.¹²⁵ Out of a population of over 70 million at the time, 93,935 registered JCP members was not all that many. The small percentage of JCP members within the Japanese population is part of the reason GHQ/SCAP did not find the JCP to be exceptionally threatening.

¹²² Takamae, 478. There were neo-colonial aspects to the American Occupation, as illustrated in Dower, 204-212 and Takamae, 73.

¹²³ Wildes, 278.

¹²⁴ At the beginning of the Allied Occupation, there was a lot of censorship, especially censorship of anti-Occupation sentiments. By 1947, GHQ/SCAP lifted many of the restrictions on speech and publications.

¹²⁵ Wildes, 290.

However, for the JCP it was not the number of JCP members that was important, but “how to win over the people.”¹²⁶

The Japanese Communist Party was nationalistic and patriotic, but it called for revolution through peaceful political action. The JCP had numerous political motivations, but it was more important to the JCP that it helped to unite all democratically minded people to overcome the economic crisis.¹²⁷ The most urgent problem in the economic crisis was the food shortage. In order to protest for more food in 1947, the JCP called for “food before a constitution” (*Kempo yori meshi da*).¹²⁸ Not only did this appeal to the masses, but it also spoke to the conditions with which everyday Japanese had to deal. This was part of the JCP’s plan to win over the people.

In order to spread the ideas of Japanese Communism, it was important to educate the public. One of the ways was through mass education in the form of publications. One of the largest communist publications was *Akahata* (*Red Flag*). In fact, CI&E freely rationed paper to *Akahata* and other communist publications.¹²⁹ By rationing paper to communist publications, allowing the communists to print their political agendas, CI&E demonstrated a nonchalant attitude towards the Japanese communists. Perhaps, it was more important to encourage the practice of free speech than it was to limit the JCP mass education movement.

¹²⁶ Dower, 271. Wildes, 278.

¹²⁷ Wildes, 278.

¹²⁸ Dower, 270.

¹²⁹ Wildes, 279.

The Japanese Communist Party did more than educate the masses through printed publications. One of the best methods for informing the Japanese about the wonders of Communism was through traditional education. The head of the JCP, Nosaka Sanzo toured prefectures to educate teachers on the benefits of Communism. With these tours, the JCP was able to attract teachers, who, in turn, passed down Communist ideology to students. Because of educational decentralization, Communists and “radical Socialists” could take the opportunity to inculcate Communist ideology in the curriculum of social science courses.¹³⁰ This was an effective way to spread the ideas of Communism.

The final key component of the Japanese Communist Party’s mass education movement was through labor movements. Labor movements were important to the JCP, since the proletariat was the basis for communism according to Marxist ideology. JCP organized movements that called for more food from the United States to support Japanese labor. However, not all labor unions protesting for more food were JCP-sponsored. Some, like *Sodomei* (All Japan General Federation of Trade Unions) were socialist. Others, like *Sanbetsu* (National Congress of Industrial Unions) were not communist in origin, but were penetrated by communists as time went on. Communist supporters infiltrated movements that were originally neutral or anti-communist.¹³¹ For Japanese conservatives and American Occupiers, it really seemed that the JCP had its hand in all movements that in anyway would promote communism. This was the same for teachers’ and student unions. The political affiliation of the Japanese Teacher’s Union (JTU) was always in question, though the JTU was closer to socialism than it was

¹³⁰ Van Staavern, 257.

¹³¹ Dower, 268.

to communism. *Zengakuren* (All Japan Federation of Student Self-Government Associations) had 300,000 members and was considered to be tied closely to communists, though not all students who were part of *Zengakuren* were communists themselves. There were labor, teacher, and student unions that were officially communist, yet with only 93,935 registered communists by 1949, one wonders if many of the Japanese socialist or leftist movements were not mistakenly- or deliberately- called communist since some of the leftist organizations' values were similar to those of the communists.

Politically, the mass education movement was effective. While the Japanese Communist Party did not increase its membership substantially through the mass education movement, it did begin to win over the people. As a result of the mass education movement, by 1949, the JCP held 36 seats out of 466 in the Japanese House of Representatives.¹³² Despite the fact that only 0.2% of the adult Japanese population were official JCP members, the JCP held 7.7% of the Japanese House of Representatives.¹³³

Even at the height of the JCP mass education movement in 1949, less than one percent of the adult Japanese population was registered communists, illustrating the immaturity of the JCP movement. Regardless, Joseph Trainor points out that while the JCP promoted communism through peaceful means and was considerably

¹³² Nishi, 243.

¹³³ The percentage of population is an estimate based off of an approximation of 48 million Japanese people eligible to vote.

underdeveloped, history shows that even the immature JCP was a potential threat to a stable Japanese government.

There lies in this immaturity of the Japanese Communist Party no necessary diminution of its threat. Communist movements have demonstrated in many parts of the world, in country after country, that they do not need to rise to power through the orderly processes of government and election machineries. They are quite capable of accomplishing coups which can bring them to the top, from which point the communization of the nation and its various activities is rapidly and ruthlessly brought about.¹³⁴

While much of the JCP's support came from unions and intellectuals, it was not out of the question that the JCP could organize a coup d'état. The call for peaceful action through political means could have been a front, and this idea was unsettling to those witnessing the rise of JCP-sponsored political and labor movements.

Despite the threat of communist infiltration in Japanese education and government, GHQ/SCAP did not take action against the communists until their political movements endangered the physical security of the Japanese people. GHQ/SCAP professed "neutrality and lack of desire to interfere with internal affairs," and therefore did little to acquiesce to the conservative Japanese government's requests.¹³⁵ However, the peaceful demonstration of communism ended in February 1949 when Japanese communists attacked the Tokyo Municipal Assembly in protestation of the layoff of "surplus city employees". Then, communists reportedly seized a police station, and

¹³⁴ Trainor, 331.

¹³⁵ Wildes, 279.

caused havoc on several trains in the Tokyo area.¹³⁶ This violence caused GHQ/SCAP to rethink its position of noninterference, as the outbreak of violence spoke to Trainor's and other occupiers' fears of a coup d'état. Long before the outbreak of Communist violence, however, the Japanese government tirelessly requested permission to censor and purge the communists.

The Pendulum Effect

GHQ/SCAP was not too concerned with Japanese communists for quite some time, but it was the conservative Japanese government that saw communism as a threat to Japan and were found waving their hands and flailing about while those at GHQ/SCAP let "communist legislation" pass through the Japanese Diet.¹³⁷ Communism was a major concern for the conservative Japanese government and their efforts to preserve the status quo and their roles as the leaders of Japan. Communism promotes a political system that calls for "strong assembly and weak executive."¹³⁸ Additionally, it seemed to the conservatives that communist educators were also teaching that national loyalty and patriotism were wrong, which is ironic since the JCP itself was nationalistic and patriotic.¹³⁹ Besides, educators at the time were still fearful of being associated with militarism and ultra-nationalism, so it was safer to err of the side of anti-nationalism

¹³⁶ Both accounts Wildes, 292.

¹³⁷ Wildes, 269.

¹³⁸ Drlica, 111.

¹³⁹ Yoshida, 172.

rather than ultra-nationalism. Possibly, the reason why the conservative government called communists “anti-nationalistic” was because the JCP wanted to abolish the Emperor-system and *kokutai*. The conservative Japanese government believed that the Emperor-system and *kokutai* were the foundations for national loyalty and patriotism and to abolish these ideas meant also to abolish national loyalty and patriotism. With maintaining the status quo and national loyalty on the line, the conservative Japanese leaders either had to speak louder or the Japanese communists had to make a serious error in order to get the American occupiers to take seriously the conservative Japanese government’s point of view.

Despite the fact that the Japanese government was seriously concerned over the rise of communism in Japan, the American occupiers were not. GHQ/SCAP had already experienced difficulties in getting the Japanese government to make progressive steps toward democracy, therefore by letting the peaceful Japanese communists influence the populace, GHQ/SCAP could have been trying to make a statement to the Diet. Furthermore, GHQ/SCAP wanted to inculcate the ideas of democracy through allowing freedom of speech and assembly of liberal and leftist groups, including within the ranks of education.

Japanese educators, like the head of the JERC, Nambara Shigeru, wanted to repent for the role they played in inculcating militarism and ultra-nationalism. Though they did not have a choice, lest they be imprisoned, the guilt weighed on them heavily. In order to repent, many educators aligned with liberal forces. Some turned to communism, others became socialists and progressives.¹⁴⁰ The Japan Teachers’ Union supported the

Japanese Socialist Party¹⁴¹ and education, in general, became a liberal institution. Japanese educators did not want future generations to suffer what those in their generation had to endure through militarism: a peace-loving democracy was ideal. The question, however, was “What sort of democracy?” Would it be the American-style democracy that was being pushed, or would it be a democracy through Communism or Socialism?

Democracy through communism seemed to be ideal through the eyes of the Japanese communists and their followers, because communism was perceived to be the exact opposite of militarism, ultra-nationalism and *kokutai*, the foundations that brought Japan to war in the first place. Communism would eliminate elitism and worker disenfranchisement, and would promote “proletarian dictatorship.”¹⁴² Japanese communists wanted to abolish the emperor-system and called for the end of Allied Occupation, dubbing it the “colonization of Japan.”¹⁴³ More and more educators became attracted to communism. Some were genuinely attracted to the doctrine, while others became communists because their fellow educators and unions pushed for communism. Inculcation of communist ideas was most evident at the university level, however the

¹⁴⁰ Dower 487-490.

¹⁴¹ According to John Dower, the JTU supported the Japanese Communist Party first, but other sources say the JTU supported the Japanese Socialist Party since the JTU’s inception. The reason why JTU was labeled Communist is because it was occasionally led by professed Communists and sometimes its policies paralleled those of the JCP. Dower, 250, Trainor 339.

¹⁴² “Proletarian dictatorship” is communist rhetoric use to emphasize the relationship between the people and the government, ideally putting the common citizen in charge of the government. This rhetoric was used also by the JCP.

¹⁴³ Trainor, 338.

conservative Japanese were concerned that communist doctrine would be pushed at a much younger age when young students would not know how to think for themselves and would be most susceptible to accepting the ideas taught at school.¹⁴⁴ For conservative Prime Minister, Yoshida Shigeru, the major problem came down to loyalty, as the communist-leaning educators seemingly became more loyal to their unions rather than their schools.¹⁴⁵ But, what was worse was that these educators were also teaching “that it was undemocratic to entertain feelings of loyalty to one’s own country.”¹⁴⁶

Though the Japanese communist agenda seemed threatening, for Occupation officials, it was more important to endorse the freedoms of speech, expression and assembly, at the cost of having a non-communist government in Japan.¹⁴⁷ Back in 1945, GHQ/SCAP promised the Japanese that they would be able to run their own government how they wanted so long as it was peaceful. However, the Occupation’s nonchalant attitude toward communism quickly changed in 1949, as the United States needed to secure a stronghold for American-style democracy in Asia as well as to quell the violent actions taken by more extreme radicals. The constant push from the conservative Japanese government to silence the communists also had an effect on the GHQ/SCAP’s decision to end its relaxed attitude towards communism.

¹⁴⁴ Baron Evert Joost Lewe van Aduard. *Japan, from Surrender to Peace*. The Hague, M. Nijhoff, 1953, 276-277.

¹⁴⁵ Yoshida, 175.

¹⁴⁶ Yoshida, 12.

¹⁴⁷ Wildes, 279.

In the period before 1949, GHQ/SCAP endorsed a number of reforms to make Japan an American-style democracy, like the school structural reforms, coeducation, encouraging the formation of teachers unions, school boards, and social studies education. However, with communists influencing educators, the tenets of American-style democracy were being broken because educators were not teaching their students about American democracy, but communism. While all of the pre-1949 reforms helped teachers inculcate democracy, it was ultimately up to these same teachers to inculcate the values they wanted to inculcate. While many did teach democracy, others taught communism. Americans were worried about this, especially in the midst of a rise in communist influence on the Asian mainland. To prevent the inculcation of communist values to Japanese students, GHQ/SCAP committed to another set of purges: The Red Purge. Though the purge focused on all aspects of the civil service sector, the largest targets were the unions, especially at the local level. Local JTU units were scrutinized and to deflect this scrutiny, they pointed fingers at *Zengakuren* for its ties to the JCP.¹⁴⁸ Unions and workplaces that did not want to be associated with communism screened their members and employees. By the end of 1950, 20,997 Japanese were purged from their positions in the public and private sectors, including 1010 educators, with 246 purged within 24 hours of when the purge began.¹⁴⁹ In a stroke of irony, GHQ/SCAP also had a “depurge,” releasing ultra-nationalists and militarists back onto the Japanese civil service scene.¹⁵⁰ In another stroke of irony, the Occupation used the same law that purged

¹⁴⁸ Takemae, 481, Drlica, 110.

¹⁴⁹ Takemae, 484, Van Staaveren, 259. Wildes, 294.

militarists and ultranationalists to purge the Communists. Some are skeptical of the legality of using the initial purge parameters for the Red Purge, since the law was only intended to purge militarists and ultranationalists.¹⁵¹ While the purge really seemed minor, it actually had a profound effect since those communists purged from civil service did not have the same power to oppose the Japanese government. For communists and radical socialists, it was important to oppose the Japanese government since they believed it was reactionary.¹⁵² However, since the communists no longer had their positions and therefore did not have the base of power to launch their political attacks on the Japanese government, it allowed for the Japanese government to retain control.

However, despite this pendulum effect and the threat of communism, GHQ/SCAP did not allow the Japanese government to outlaw the Japanese Communist Party. In fact, though it is very small, the JCP still exists in Japan today. The reasons for GHQ/SCAP not permitting the outlawing of the JCP are speculative, but according to Takemae, after the Red Purge, GHQ/SCAP did not find the JCP a serious threat to Japan's national security.¹⁵³ Americans solicited the power of Japanese conservatives during the reverse course, thereby lessening the power of the JCP, and making Japanese communism much less threatening. Perhaps, though GHQ/SCAP did not want Japan to be communist, it also knew in the back of its mind that the leftists would keep alive the ideas of

¹⁵⁰ Dower, 272.

¹⁵¹ Takemae, 485.

¹⁵² Van Staavern, 257.

¹⁵³ Takemae, 484.

democratization and demilitarization. According to Dower, the JCP and JSP continue to promote these ideas today.¹⁵⁴ Ideally, the Reverse Course and Red Purge were meant to balance Japan's political authority. However, conservative Japanese politicians gained a lot of momentum because of the Reverse Course.

It is interesting that GHQ/SCAP was slow to do anything about the rise of communism in Japan, and even after the Red Purge, it did not want to completely outlaw communism. It was important for GHQ/SCAP to curb communist influence. Before the Red Purge, Americans in the United States criticized GHQ/SCAP for the Occupation's communist-like reforms and allowing the Japanese Communist Party to exist. However, it was important for GHQ/SCAP to not restrict Japanese Communists too much since it was still trying to teach the values of freedom of speech and assembly. Besides, GHQ/SCAP must not have believed communism was that much of a threat to Japan's national security, since the Red Purge was actually rather limited. However, despite the seemingly lax measures that GHQ/SCAP took to curb communism, the Red Purge actually had a profound impact on Japanese education.

The Effects on Education Personnel

For some, the Red Purge began before 1949. On July 22, 1948 GHQ/SCAP gave orders to the Japanese Diet to amend the National Public Service Law, revoking civil service workers, including teachers and the JTU, their right to strike.¹⁵⁵ Then, 1,010 teachers were fired from their jobs in 1949, further deteriorating their already difficult

¹⁵⁴ Dower, 273.

¹⁵⁵ Van Staavern, 257.

livelihood. However, it was in 1953, after the Occupation ended, that the Japanese government passed a law that prevented educators from participating in political activities, aside from voting.¹⁵⁶

The Ministry of Education abolished school board elections, as well. Instead, municipal and prefectural leaders appointed members to their respective school boards.¹⁵⁷ The Ministry of Education would oversee the school boards, pass legislation and appropriate funds, becoming more than just an advisor to the education system. Though the prefectural and municipal school boards would remain intact, they had less power over the educational needs of their students than the American Occupation had initially designed. Direct popular election of school boards was to increase political participation as well as to keep the power of the Ministry of Education in check. However, by rescinding direct popular election of school boards, Japanese citizens lacked the capability to perform checks on the Ministry of Education.

The Effects on Curriculum and History Textbooks

Despite the fact that over one thousand teachers were purged from their jobs and many ultra-nationalists and militarists were allowed to reenter their positions, the effects on the content of education were not immediate. It was 1953, shortly after the Occupation left, when the Ministry of Education officially reestablished itself as the sole screener of textbooks, though it still allowed for private parties to write textbooks. In

¹⁵⁶ Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. *Development of Education in Japan, National Report of Japan* . (August 2004).

¹⁵⁷ Van Staavern, 260.

1954, the Ministry passed legislation that ensured that the contents of textbooks would be politically neutral. However, in 1956, educators like Ienaga Saburo began to have their textbooks censored for the textbooks' inclusion of Japanese wartime atrocities mostly in Asia because their inclusion was not "patriotic."¹⁵⁸ The Ministry of Education wanted to limit Japanese history of the Pacific War to the Tokyo Trial view, which emphasizes the war between Japan and the United States.¹⁵⁹ The Tokyo Trial primarily prosecuted those responsible for starting the war with the United States, therefore it was important for the Ministry of Education, at the very least, to maintain the Tokyo Trial view of history in order to maintain a positive relationship with the United States. It would have been a political outrage if the Japanese denied the attack on Pearl Harbor and the war with the United States.

Another piece of legislation passed in 1963, in which the Ministry of Education revoked the teachers' right to select textbooks for their class. It became part of the prefecture's responsibility to select the appropriate textbooks.¹⁶⁰ By revoking the teachers' right to select textbooks and giving that power to the municipal and prefectural school boards, the Ministry of Education continued to tighten its grip on education.

¹⁵⁸ Nozaki Yoshiko and Inokuchi Hiromitsu, "Japanese Education, Nationalism, and Ienaga Saburo's Textbook Lawsuits," *Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany, and the United States*. Ed. Laura Hein and Mark Selden. Armonk, N.Y. : M.E. Sharpe, 2000, 104-105

¹⁵⁹ Ienaga, *Pacific War*, 251. The Tokyo Trial View of history's emphasizes the responsibility of ultranationalists, militarists and *zaibatsu* for leading Japan to the Pacific War. Furthermore, it exonerates the Emperor of war crimes. However, for my purposes, I am focusing on the component that emphasizing Japan's war with the United States over Japan's war in Asia.

¹⁶⁰ Nozaki Yoshiko and Inokuchi Hiromitsu, 105.

Prefectures were much easier to control, since there were fewer prefectures than there were individual teachers. Even though it does seem like the Ministry of Education was asserting its control for its own sake, removing the teachers' right to select textbooks had a pragmatic purpose: standardization. By having a limit to the number of textbooks in use, the prefectural and national governments could control what should be written in textbooks more effectively.

Education in social studies education also gradually disappeared from Japanese schools, since the Ministry of Education was much more comfortable with the old courses on geography and history than the multi-disciplinary course of social studies. Most of the reasoning behind the decline in social studies education was because liberal educators and the JTU were proponents of the course because of the emphasis on individuality and critical thinking, whereas the Ministry of Education wanted to maintain collectivist ethics and loyalty to the state.¹⁶¹ These political opponents had different values for education, but it was the Ministry that held the power. However, to use an earlier argument, the Ministry's desire to resort back to rote memorization of facts helped the standardization of education, which benefited the prefectural and national governments.¹⁶²

Aside from standardization, there is not much else besides the Ministry of Education's will-to-power to justify the post-Occupation education reforms. Though the Ministry of Education is responsible for the limits it placed on the content of education, it

¹⁶¹ Wray, "Social Studies" 34.

¹⁶² The reason I am emphasizing the idea of standardization is because that is a criticism of American education, that it is not standard throughout the country. For Japanese politicians, this was not acceptable. Wray, "Social Studies", 34.

is the Allied Occupation that is responsible for allowing the Ministry of Education to regain so much of its power because the Occupation purged those affiliated with Communism. Had the Occupation allowed for a stronger leftist opposition to the conservative Ministry of Education, then it would have been less likely that the Ministry regained as much power as it did.

Failures

The failure of Occupation reforms in liberalizing the content and personnel of education was due to several factors. Funding was an important factor in preventing full decentralization of the Japanese education system. Local governments did not have enough money to complete the rebuilding projects themselves; they tried to get the local PTAs to help raise the funds for this. Local school boards had to rely on allocations from the central government, therefore the Ministry of Education still had the power to allocate funds to prefectures and schools that followed the Ministry's guidance. With the Ministry of Education having the money, it made it next to impossible to decentralize the education system short of redistributing the wealth of the government, which was too close to communist doctrine for either the Allied Occupation or the conservative Japanese government.

GHQ/SCAP's reliance on the Ministry of Education for all problems dealing with education put an end to the goal of decentralization. While GHQ/SCAP could justify its reliance on the Ministry of Education because those involved in the Ministry knew and understood the Japanese bureaucracy and the Japanese people were seemingly too inexperienced with direct political participation to effectively change the face of Japanese

politics, the decision to rely on the Ministry of Education had far-reaching effects. The Ministry of Education was able to maintain authority over the educators and over the textbooks, which still were written by outside organizations, but approved only through the Ministry of Education.

Finally, the Red Purge forced educators who were closely linked to the Japanese Communist Party out of their jobs while replacing them with conservative educators. New legislation prevented teachers at all levels from taking a political position inside the classroom or to openly participate in political activities outside the classroom. Though teachers' unions could inwardly endorse certain candidates, they could no longer vocally rally behind the candidates they believed were best suited for the job, which also diminished the ability for teachers to educate the public about candidates, issues and other political elements that affected the education system as well as Japan as a whole. Liberal educators became further scrutinized for their work, especially in the realm of history where issues of Japanese actions in war situations were not to be addressed, or were to be downplayed as much as possible.

The necessity of the Red Purge is debatable, as it did have a serious effect on GHQ/SCAP's decentralization reform, which, in turn, had a profound impact on the content of Japanese social science education. While at the time, the Red Purge and subsequent reforms were necessary from the points of view of the Occupation and the conservative Japanese government, there would be far-reaching effects that would affect Japan's relationships with its Asian neighbors in the future. There is insufficient evidence to speculate just how powerful the Japanese Communist Party would have become had it not lost its foundation in education and been repressed. It is unlikely that

the JCP could have won the hearts of the majority of the Japanese, but GHQ/SCAP was not going to take the chance. However, had GHQ/SCAP ignored the Communist threat in Japan, the leftist parties of the JCP and JSP, could have provided a system of checks and balances politically, by having a two-party coalition which would have opposed the hegemonic conservative party. These checks and balances, while they would have been a headache for the conservatives, would have prevented the Ministry of Education from restricting education on the Asia-Pacific War.

The failure to change content of Japanese education is the result of two factors. The first factor is the Ministry of Education's will-to-power: the Ministry of Education did not want to dissolve its own position of authority, therefore it made itself as useful as possible in as many situations as possible. The second factor in the failure is GHQ/SCAP's lack of patience with the Japanese people and its lack of creativity in using the resources it had, such as willing and intelligent educators who understood democracy, to overcome some of the difficulties that were presented by trying to impose an American-style democracy.

CONCLUSION

After Japan surrendered and ended the Second World War, the Allied Occupation began to implement reforms to demilitarize and democratize the Japanese people. The Occupation implemented reforms in education to inculcate democratic ideals to the Japanese people, especially through the youth since the Japanese youth were the ones most likely to perpetuate the ideas of democracy. The Occupation implemented reforms in three phases, though the final phase, the Red Purge, was a phase that GHQ/SCAP had not planned.

The first phase of education reforms changed the structure of the Japanese school system significantly. The Civil Information and Education section, under the recommendations of the first United States Education Mission to Japan, introduced the single-track 6-3-3-4 school structure which did away with state-sponsored elitism; co-education, which brought boys and girls together in the classroom as equals; nine years of tuition-free compulsory education, to help students become well-equipped for their civic duties in a democracy; and a new hierarchy of school boards, meant to decentralize educational authority. These reforms were practical as well as symbolic in helping to inculcate the ideas of democracy. For the Japanese youth, it was democracy through immersion as they began the 1948 school year under the new school system. The school structure reforms have become a permanent part of the Japanese public school system and remain largely unmodified. During this initial phase of the Occupation, CI&E began to screen educators, textbooks and school courses for ultranationalist and militarist connections.

During the second phase of the education reforms the Occupation continued to screen for ultranationalists and militarists to purge them from the education system, thus helping to prevent the inculcation of ultranationalistic and militaristic values to Japanese youth. Furthermore, CI&E continued to screen textbooks for ultranationalistic and militaristic values, resulting in GHQ/SCAP suspending courses in ethics, geography and Japanese history. After the screening and purging, CI&E started to reeducate the remaining teachers in order to help them understand democracy and give the teachers ideas to help inculcate democratic values in the classroom. CI&E then put the responsibility of selecting textbooks and creating lesson plans onto the individual teacher. With the new responsibilities, CI&E also encouraged Japanese educators to join unions to have a collective voice to bargain for better wages and benefits to raise the Japanese teachers' standard of living.

During the second part of this phase, the Occupation and the Japanese liberal educators started to revise curriculum and textbooks. CI&E put forth the idea of combining civics with geography and Japanese history to create a multi-disciplinary course called "social studies." This challenged Japanese educators and caused worry among the Ministry of Education. Within a few months of introducing social studies, GHQ/SCAP allowed Japanese educators to teach geography and history as separate courses, though social studies remained an option in elementary education. Japanese history was reintroduced to school curriculum after groups of liberal educators wrote new textbooks, such as *Kuni no ayumi*. While the new textbooks were written by private entities, CI&E and the Ministry of Education screened these new textbooks. Originally, the Ministry of Education was not meant to maintain its role as a textbook screener. But,

today, private entities still write the textbooks and the Ministry of Education continues to screen the textbooks.

The final phase of education reforms was the Red Purge, which was part of the Occupation's Reverse Course program that reversed some of the Occupation's earlier reforms. Because of the rise of communism in Asia, the Occupation needed to secure Japan as an ally, and quell criticism from people and politicians back in the United States who believed that the Occupation's reforms had communist overtones. Though Japanese communists did not initially threaten GHQ/SCAP, constant pressure from the conservative Japanese government as well as the rise of violent activities attributed to communists ended GHQ/SCAP's nonchalant attitude towards Japanese communists. The result was the Red Purge, which purged communists from influential positions. In education, the purge resulted 1,010 teachers losing their jobs. Since education is the means through which values are inculcated, it was important for GHQ/SCAP to purge communists from education. However, GHQ/SCAP took the Red Purge one step further by reintroducing right-wing educators to the new Japanese school system. Furthermore, the conservative Ministry of Education was able to capitalize on the removal of left-wing educators by seizing control of the education system once again and reducing the power of unions and liberals. As a consequence, many of the personnel and curriculum reforms did not remain in place after the Occupation ended.

In the scope of school structural reforms, the Allied Occupation was a success. The Japanese government has kept the postwar school structure in place largely

unmodified. This has had a positive effect, as Japanese students are able to receive an equal education. Because of tuition-free single-track education, there is no more state-sponsored elitism and co-education has helped close the gap in equality among the sexes. These reforms have helped maintain the values of democracy both practically and symbolically.

However, though the Occupation reforms to the Japanese school structure have remained largely unmodified and continues to help inculcate democracy through equality, the Occupation ultimately changed neither the content nor the face of education. When the Occupation and the liberal educators had begun to make changes, the effects of the Red Purge had unintended consequences. Because of the Red Purge, many of the curricula, textbook and personnel reforms that would have liberalized the content of education were reversed directly or indirectly.

The Ministry of Education rescinded the courses in social studies, which were meant to help Japanese students develop critical thinking skills and sense of individuality¹⁶³ and civic duty, resorting to the old ways of rote memorization. Because of the Ministry of Education's reliance on rote memorization, Japanese students do not develop critical thinking skills as well as their non-Asian counterparts.¹⁶⁴ While rote memorization seems to be the educational norm in most Asian schools, one could wonder what the situation would have been had Occupation reforms continued to influence the Ministry of Education to change its outlook on social studies education.

¹⁶³ Since 1989, the Japanese Ministry of Education has been working on legislation to promote the individual in education. Shibata, 155.

¹⁶⁴ Wray, "Social Studies",34.

The other major problem with Japanese education directly affects Japanese international relations. Japan's Asian neighbors are concerned, even angered over the Japanese education system. The reason mostly has to do with Japanese history textbooks' alleged failure to accurately describe, or oftentimes even mention Japanese wartime atrocities such as the Nanjing Massacre, the use of Asian comfort women, Unit 731, the Bataan Death March, among many other incidents, which Japan's Asian neighbors want the Japanese to recognize.¹⁶⁵ The controversy over Japanese history textbooks remains very heated through the beginning of the 21st century.

While it is not absolutely certain, it is very likely that had the Ministry of Education's authority been sufficiently reduced and kept in check by liberal education organizations, whether they were unions or something like the Japanese Education Reform Committee, the issues of Japanese wartime atrocities would be more broadly addressed in history textbooks. Ienaga Saburo, throughout his lifetime, repeatedly tried to include the issue of Japanese war crimes in order to promote a peaceful Japan by reminding the Japanese what their nation has done and what it had to overcome.¹⁶⁶ There were many other educators who wanted to include the issues of the Asia-Pacific War, but were repeatedly told to revise their manuscripts.¹⁶⁷ It should not be denied that GHQ/SCAP had some role to play in this since not only did it prohibit the term "Greater

¹⁶⁵ Kimijima Kazuhiko, "The Continuing Legacy of Japanese Colonialism: The Japan-South Korea Joint Study Group on History Textbooks," translated by Inokuchi Hiromitsu, *Censoring History: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany, and the United States*. Ed. Laura Hein and Mark Selden. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2000, 125.

¹⁶⁶ Ienaga, *The Pacific War*, 251

¹⁶⁷ Ienaga, *The Pacific War*, 251, Nozaki Yoshiko and Inokuchi Hiromitsu, 95.

East Asia War” and limit the scope of the Tokyo Trial to the war between Japan and the United States, it had the opportunity to completely abolish the Ministry of Education and utilize non-communist liberal educators in reforming the content of Japanese education. However, during the Red Purge, GHQ/SCAP disturbed the balance between the conservative Ministry of Education and the liberal educators by purging the leftists and allowing right-wing educators to reenter the system. Not only did the Red Purge limit the effectiveness of teaching democratic values by accepting differences in political opinion, this had the unintended consequence of affecting how Japanese history was taught in the post-Occupation period. Through the Red Purge, the Ministry of Education was easily able to rescind the content reforms that they did not find fitting to maintaining the status quo.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Bisson, T. A. *Prospects for Democracy in Japan . Published Under the Auspices of the International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations*. New York: Macmillan, 1949.

Civil Information and Education Section. *Education in Japan / CIE (15 February 1946)*
Ed. Kodama Mitsuo. Hino-shi, Tokyo , Japan : Meisei University Press, 1983

_____. *Mission and Accomplishments of the Occupation in the Civil Information and Education Fields*. Tokyo: 1950.

Department of State, United States of America. *Activities of the Far Eastern Commission*, Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1947

_____. *Occupation of Japan: Policy and Progress*, Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1947.

_____. *What We Are Doing In Japan - And Why*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing office, 1946

Division of Special Records, Japanese Government. *Documents concerning the allied occupation and control of Japan*. Tokyo: 1949

Graebner, Norman A. *A Twentieth Century Odyssey: Memoir of a Life in Academe*. Claremont, CA: Regina Books, 2002.

Information and Education Division of the War Department. *Our Job in Japan*. Army Pictorial Service Signal Corp, 1945.

International Military Tribunal for the Far East. *Record of proceedings of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East; Tokyo, Japan*. Tokyo: The Tribunal, 1946-1948

Martin, Edwin M. *The Results of the Allied Occupation of Japan, an interim report. Submitted by the American Institute of Pacific Relations as a document for the Tenth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, to be held at Stratford-upon-Avon , England , Sept. 1947*. New York, American Institute of Pacific Relations, 1947.

Trainor, Joseph C. *Educational reform in occupied Japan: Trainor's memoir*. Hino-shi, Tokyo, Japan: Meisei University Press, 1983

Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers. *Catalog of administrative directives (SCAPIN-A's) to the Japanese Government*. Tokyo , 1947-51

_____. *Directives of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers*. Tokyo : 1945

_____. *Scapins; Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers' instructions to the Japanese Government, from 4 September 1945 to 8 March 1952, not including administrative instructions designated as Scapin-A.* Tokyo : 1952

United States Education Mission to Japan. *Report of the United States Education Mission to Japan : submitted to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, Tokyo , March 30, 1946.* Washington: United States Government Print. Office, 1946

_____. *Report of the Second United States Education Mission to Japan, submitted to the Supreme commander for the Allied Powers, Tokyo, 22 September, 1950*

Van Staaveren, Jacob. *An American in Japan, 1945–1948: A Civilian View of the Occupation.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994.

Williams, Justin. *Japan's Political Revolution Under MacArthur: A Participant's Account.* Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1979

Secondary Sources

Ando, Nisuke. *Surrender, Occupation, And Private Property In International Law: An Evaluation Of US Practice In Japan.* Oxford, England: Clarendon Press and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Baerwald, Hans H. *The Purge Of Japanese Leaders Under The Occupation.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1977.

Bakke, E. Wight. *Revolutionary Democracy; Challenge and Testing in Japan.* Hamden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1968.

Ball, W. Macmahon. *Japan, Enemy Or Ally?* New York, Pub. under the joint auspices of the International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations, and the Australian Institute of International Affairs, J. Day Co., 1949.

Braw, Monica. *The Atomic Bomb Suppressed: American Censorship In Occupied Japan.* Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe Inc., 1991.

Buckley, Roger. *Occupation Diplomacy: Britain, The United States, And Japan, 1945-1952.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Cavaleri, David P. *Easier Said Than Done Making The Transition Between Combat Operations And Stability Operations.* Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute Press, 2005.

Chang, Iris. *The Rape of Nanking: the Forgotten Holocaust of World War II.* New York: BasicBooks, 1997

- Cohen, Theodore. *Remaking Japan: The American Occupation As New Deal*. Ed. Herbert Passin. New York : Free Press, 1987.
- Dower, John W. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co./New Press, 1999.
- _____. *War Without Mercy: race and power in the Pacific war*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986
- Fearey, Robert A. *The Occupation of Japan, Second Phase: 1948-50*. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Feis, Herbert. *Contest Over Japan*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1967.
- Finn, Richard. *Winners in Peace: MacArthur, Yoshida and Postwar Japan*, Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1980.
- Gibbs, Michael H. *Struggle and Purpose in Postwar Japanese Unionism*. Berkeley, California: Institute of East Asian Studies, 2000.
- Gibney, Frank, *Japan, The Fragile Superpower*. New York: Norton, 1975.
- Haring, Douglas Gilbert. *Blood on the Rising Sun*. Philadelphia: Macrae Smith, 1943.
- Harries, Meirion and Susie Harries, *Sheathing The Sword: The Demilitarisation Of Japan*. London: H. Hamilton, 1987.
- Higgins, Raymond A. *From Hiroshima With Love: The Allied Military Governor's Remarkable Story Of The Rebuilding Of Japan*. Central Point, Or.: Hellgate Press, 1997.
- Horio, Teruhisa. *Educational thought and ideology in modern Japan: state authority and intellectual freedom*. Edited and translated by Steven Platzer. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1988.
- Ienaga, Saburo. *Japan's Past, Japan's Future*. Translated by Richard H. Minear. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001.
- _____. *The Pacific War, 1931-1945: a critical perspective on Japan's role in World War II*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Igarashi, Yoshikuni. *Bodies of Memory: narratives of war in postwar Japanese culture, 1945-1970*. Princeton , N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Lewe van Aduard, Evert Joost, Baron. *Japan, from surrender to peace*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1953.

- Kawai, Kazuo. *Japan 's American Interlude*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Kelley, Frank Raymond and Cornelius Ryan. *Star-Spangled Mikado*. New York: McBride, 1947.
- Koshiro, Yukiko. *Trans-Pacific Racisms and the U.S. Occupation of Japan*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Kumazawa Makoto. *Portraits of the Japanese Workplace: Labor Movements, Workers, and Managers*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1996.
- Kume, Ikuo. *Disparaged Success: Labor Politics in Postwar Japan*. Ithaca, N.Y. : Cornell University Press, 1999.
- Mears, Helen. *Mirror for Americans, Japan*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1948.
- Montgomery, John Dickey. *Forced To Be Free; The Artificial Revolution In Germany And Japan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Moore, Ray A. *Partners for democracy: crafting the new Japanese state under MacArthur*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Murakami, Hyoe. *Japan, The Years Of Trial, 1919-52*. Tokyo: Japan Culture Institute, 1982.
- Nishi, Toshio. *Unconditional Democracy: Education and Politics in Occupied Japan, 1945-1952*. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, 1982.
- Norman, E. Herbert. *Origins of the Modern Japanese State: selected writings of E. H. Norman*. edited, with an intro. on "E. H. Norman, Japan, and the uses of history," by John W. Dower. New York : Pantheon Books, 1975.
- Oppler, Alfred Christian. *Legal Reform In Occupied Japan: A Participant Looks Back*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Passin, Herbert. *Encounter With Japan*. Kodansha International ; New York, N.Y. 1982.
- Perry, John Curtis. *Beneath the Eagle's Wings: Americans in Occupied Japan*. Dodd, Mead & Company: New York, 1980.
- Roesgaard, Marie H. *Moving Mountains: Japanese Education Reform*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998.
- Rosenzweig, Beate. *Erziehung zur Demokratie? : amerikanische Besatzungs- und Schulreform in Deutschland und Japan*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1998.

- Sarantakes, Nicholas Evan. *Keystone : The American Occupation Of Okinawa And U.S.-Japanese Relations*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University, 2000.
- Schaller, Michael. *The American Occupation Of Japan : The Origins Of The Cold War In Asia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Schonberger, Howard B. *Aftermath of War: Americans and the Remaking of Japan, 1945-1952*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1989.
- Sheldon, Walter J. *The Honorable Conquerors; the Occupation of Japan 1945-1952*. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Shibata, Masako. *Japan and Germany under the U.S. occupation: a comparative analysis of post-war education reform*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005.
- Takemae, Eiji. *The Allied Occupation of Japan*; translated by Robert Ricketts and Sebastian Swann. New York: Continuum, 2003.
- Tsuchimochi, Gary H. *Education reform in Postwar Japan: the 1946 U.S. Education Mission*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1993.
- Weinstein, Martin E. *Japan: The Risen Sun*. New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1970.
- Wildes, Harry Emerson. *Typhoon in Tokyo; the Occupation and its Aftermath*. New York: Macmillan, 1954.
- Woodard, William P. *The Allied Occupation Of Japan 1945-1952 and Japanese Religions*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Yoshida, Shigeru. *The Yoshida Memoirs: the Story of Japan in Crisis*, Translated by Yoshida Kenichi. Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
- Censoring history: Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany , and the United States* . Ed. Laura Hein and Mark Selden. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2000.
- The Confusion Era : Art And Culture Of Japan During The Allied Occupation, 1945-1952* Ed. Mark Sandler. Washington, D.C.: Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution in association with the University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1997.
- Dear General MacArthur: Letters From The Japanese During The American Occupation*. Ed. John Junkerman ; Trans. Shizue Matsuda ; Foreword By John W. Dower Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2001.
- Democratizing Japan: the allied occupation*. Eds Robert E. Ward and Sakamoto

Yoshikazu. Honolulu : University of Hawaii Press, 1987.

Erinnerungskulturen: Deutschland, Italien und Japan seit 1945. Ed. Christoph Cornelissen, Lutz Klinkhammer and Wolfgang Schwentker. Frankfurt am Main : Fischer Taschenbuch, 2004.

The humanities and the dynamics of inclusion since World War II. Ed. David A. Hollinger. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Textbooks

McClain, James. *Japan: A Modern History.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. 2002.

Totman, Conrad. *A History of Japan.* Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Postwar Japan: 1945 to the Present. Ed. Jon Livingston, Joe Moore, and Felicia Oldfather. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.

Articles

Ballantine, Joseph W. "The New Japan : An American View." *Far Eastern Survey* 17, no. 24. (December 22, 1948). 286-288.

Ballou, Richard Boyd. "American Education and the New Japan ." *The Journal of Higher Education* 23, no. 5. (May, 1952) 229-236

Beauchamp, Edward R. "The Development of Japanese Educational Policy, 1945-1985." *History of Education Quarterly.* Vol. 27. No. 3. (Autumn of 1987) 299-324.

Borton, Hugh. "Past Limitations and the Future of Democracy in Japan ." *Political Science Quarterly* 70, no. 3. (Sept.1955) 410-420

Braibanti, Ralph J.D. "Occupation Controls in Japan ." *Far Eastern Survey* 18, no. 17. (September 22, 1948) 215-219.

Duke, Benjamin C. "The Japanese Supreme Court and the Governance of Education." *Pacific Affairs* 53, no. 1. (Spring 1980), 69-88.

Finn, Dallas. "Reform and Japan 's Lower Schools ." *Far Eastern Survey* 20, no. 19. (November 7, 1951). 193-199.

Fishel, Wesley R. "Japan Under MacArthur: Retrospect and Prospect." *The Western Political Quarterly* 4, no. 2. (June 1951), 210-225.

Ienaga, Saburo. "The Glorification of War in Japanese Education." *International Security* 18, no. 3. (Winter 1993-1994), 113-133

Moore, Ray A. "Comment: Reflections on the Occupation of Japan." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 38, no. 4. (August, 1979), 721-734

_____. "The Occupation of Japan as History, Some Recent Research." *Monumenta Nipponica* 36, no. 3 (Autumn, 1981), 317-328

Nishimoto, Mitoji. "Education Change in Japan After the War." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 26, no. 1. (September 1952), 16-26.

Park, Yung H. "'Big Business' and Education Policy in Japan ." *Asian Survey* 22, no. 3. (March, 1982), 315-336.

Quigley, Harold S. "Evaluating the Japanese Occupation." *Far Eastern Survey* 20, no. 17. (October 10, 1951), 176-178.

Thakur, Yoko H. "History Textbook Reform in Allied Occupied Japan , 1945-1952". *History of Education Quarterly*, 35 no. 3. (Autumn 1995), 261-178.

Williams, Justin. "Completing Japan 's Political Reorientation, 1947-1952: Crucial Phase of the Allied Occupation." *American Historical Review*. 57, no. 5. (June,1968), 1454-1469.

Wray, Harry. "The fall of moral education and the rise and fall of civics education and social studies in occupied and independent Japan." *Japan Forum*, Vol 12, Iss 1. 2000. 17.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. *Development of Education in Japan, National Report of Japan* . (August 2004).

Other Sources

Drlica, Karl Francis. *The Teachers' Union in a Typical Prefecture in Occupied Japan*. (Master's thesis, Oregon State University, 1952).

Nishi, Toshio. *Politics of freedom: American occupation of Japan 1945-1952*. (PhD Dissertation, University of Washington, 1976).

Stone, Karl Thomas, *The Origins of Reverse Course in Occupied Japan, 1945-1948*. (Master's thesis, Washington State University, 1999).

The Occupation of Japan : educational and social reform, the proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the MacArthur Memorial, Old Dominion University, the MacArthur Memorial Foundation, October 16-18, 1980, Gatling Printing and Pub. Co.: edited by Thomas W. Burkman. Norfolk, VA 1982.

APPENDIX I

Imperial Rescript on Education of the Emperor Meiji (October 30, 1890)

Know ye, Our subjects:

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character of Our Empire, and herein also lies the source of Our education.

Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers; furthermore advance public good and promote common interests; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth.

So shall ye not only be Our good and faithful subjects, but render illustrious the best traditions of your forefathers. The Way here set forth is indeed the teaching bequeathed by Our Imperial Ancestors, to be observed alike by Their Descendants and the subjects, infallible for all ages and true in all places. It is Our wish to lay it to heart in all reverence, in common with you, Our subjects, that we may thus attain to the same virtue.

The 30th day of the 10th month of the 23rd year of Meiji. (October 30, 1890)

APPENDIX II

Potsdam Declaration (July 26, 1945)

(1) We-the President of the United States, the President of the National Government of the Republic of China, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, representing the hundreds of millions of our countrymen, have conferred and agree that Japan shall be given an opportunity to end this war.

(2) The prodigious land, sea and air forces of the United States, the British Empire and of China, many times reinforced by their armies and air fleets from the west, are poised to strike the final blows upon Japan. This military power is sustained and inspired by the determination of all the Allied Nations to prosecute the war against Japan until she ceases to resist.

(3) The result of the futile and senseless German resistance to the might of the aroused free peoples of the world stands forth in awful clarity as an example to the people of Japan. The might that now converges on Japan is immeasurably greater than that which, when applied to the resisting Nazis, necessarily laid waste to the lands, the industry and

the method of life of the whole German people. The full application of our military power, backed by our resolve, will mean the inevitable and complete destruction of the Japanese armed forces and just as inevitably the utter devastation of the Japanese homeland.

(4) The time has come for Japan to decide whether she will continue to be controlled by those self-willed militaristic advisers whose unintelligent calculations have brought the Empire of Japan to the threshold of annihilation, or whether she will follow the path of reason.

(5) Following are our terms. We will not deviate from them. There are no alternatives. We shall brook no delay.

(6) There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world.

(7) Until such a new order is established and until there is convincing proof that Japan's war-making power is destroyed, points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies shall be occupied to secure the achievement of the basic objectives we are here setting forth.

(8) The terms of the Cairo Declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku and such minor islands as we determine.

(9) The Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with the opportunity to lead peaceful and productive lives.

(10) We do not intend that the Japanese shall be enslaved as a race or destroyed as a nation, but stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners. The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.

(11) Japan shall be permitted to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reparations in kind, but not those which would enable her to re-arm for war. To this end, access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials shall be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world trade relations shall be permitted.

(12) The occupying forces of the Allies shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as these objectives have been accomplished and there has been established in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people a peacefully inclined and responsible government.

(13) We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction.

APPENDIX III

The Fundamental Law of Education (March 31, 1947)

Having established the Constitution of Japan, we have shown our resolution to contribute to the world and welfare of humanity by building a democratic and cultural state. The realization of this idea shall depend fundamentally on the power of education.

We shall esteem individual dignity and endeavor to bring up the people who love truth and peace, while education aimed at the creation of culture, general and rich in individuality, shall be spread far and wide.

We hereby enact this Law, in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution of Japan, with a view to clarifying the aim of education and establishing the aim of education and establishing the foundation of education for new Japan.

Article 1. Aim of Education

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 labor and have a deep sense of responsibility, and be imbued with the independent spirit, as builders of peaceful state and society.

Article 2. Educational principle

The aim of education shall realized on all occasions and in all places. In order to achieve the aim, we shall endeavor to contribute to the creation and development of culture by mutual esteem and cooperation, respecting academic freedom, having a regard to actual life and cultivating a spontaneous spirit.

Article 3. Equal Opportunity of Education.

The people shall all be given equal opportunities of receiving education according to their ability, and they shall not be subject to educational discrimination on account of race, creed, sex, social status, economic position, or family origin. The state and local public corporations shall take measures to give financial assistance to those who have, in spite of their ability, difficulty in receiving education for economic reasons.

Article 4. Compulsory Education

The people shall be obligated to have boys and girls under their protection receive nine years' general education.

No tuition fee shall be charged for general education in schools established by the state and local bodies.

Article 5. Coeducation

Men and women shall esteem and cooperate with each other.

Coeducation, therefore, shall be recognized in education.

Article 6. School education

The schools prescribed by law shall be of public nature and, besides the state and local bodies, only the juridical persons prescribed by shall be entitled to establish such schools.

Teachers of the schools prescribed by law shall be servants of the whole community. They shall be conscious of their mission and endeavor to discharge their duties. For this purpose, the status of teachers shall be respected and their fair and appropriate treatment shall be secured.

Article 7. Social Education

The state and local bodies shall encourage home education and education carried out in places of work or elsewhere in society.

The state and local bodies shall endeavor to attain the aim of education by the establishment of such institutions and as libraries, museums, citizens' public halls, et cetera, by the utilization of school institutions, and by other appropriate methods.

Article 8. Political Education

The political knowledge necessary for intelligent citizenship shall be valued in education. The schools prescribed by law shall refrain from political education or other political activities for against any political party.

Article 9. Religious Education

The attitude of religious tolerance and the position of religion in the social life shall be valued in education.

The schools established by the state and local public bodies shall refrain from religious education or the activities for specified religion.

Article 10. School Administration

Education shall not be subject to improper control, but shall be directly responsible to the whole people.

School administration shall, on the basics of this realization, aim at the adjustment and establishment of the various conditions required for the pursuit of the aim of education.

Article 11. Additional Rule

In case of necessity appropriate laws shall be enacted to carry the foregoing stipulations into effect.

Supplementary Provision:

This present law shall come into force as from the date of its promulgation.