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Education in Changing Stratification System

Hiroyuki Kondo (Osaka University)

Recent studies on the trend of social mobility suggested the stability of the relationship between origin and destination in spite of remarkable societal changes observed in the latter-half of the 20th century. Especially the IMS hypothesis, which had predicted an increase of merit-selection in company with educational development, was rejected with long-term cohort data. These findings were confirmed for the Japanese stratification system by the analyses of the SSM survey data. There is no conclusive evidence that industrialization pushes forward increasing the equality of opportunity. The object of 'stratification and mobility' studies should be reset to explain a character of social inequality in each periodical space.

From this point of view, it is worth to consider why most Japanese recently suspect that social opportunity is becoming closed and a tendency of class-reproduction is strengthening. In fact, contrary to the suspect, successors of the father’s position are still outweighed by newcomers in each occupational category, owing to continual changes of occupational distribution. Educational expansion above the compulsory level has also absorbed a large number of students who are originated from lower social standings. Therefore, it is not fair to say that our society has turned to a class society as it was before industrialization. It is no doubt that the suspect becomes a reality if such an expansion is ceased. But we have few evidences on that for the present. One may say that pessimistic prospects for an occupational or educational trend in the future induce the impression of societal immobility. Additionally a prevalent view on social inequality, which emphasizes the causes of individual side rather than social ones, amplifies that impression. It suppresses social claim to redress inequality. What has changed indeed is people’s attitude towards inequality, not an objective condition of it.

At the present in the context of economic globalization or financial stringency, politicians and some academicians propose to enlarge competition and to admit its unequal outcomes. While their proposal is in accordance with the individualistic view of social inequality, it would necessarily lead our concern to fairness of opportunity in an overly sensitive way. For unequal results must always be legitimizied by fair opportunities. However, this reminds us of serious problems to clearly define the notion of equal opportunity and to distinctly define social responsibilities from individual ones. The proposal of competition without consideration on the interdependency between opportunity and result would cause undesirable social conflict. If a universal competition is inevitable, schooling has to be reorganized to invest and/or reinvest competitive skills according to the competitor’s need in a more complete way than ever assumed. The degree to which such a function is successfully accomplished depends upon our understanding of the present stratification system, especially the condition of opportunity.
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Cultural-Historical Perspectives in the Psychology of Child Rearing

Hideo Kojima (Kyoto Gakuen University)

This article begins with the personal history of the author's four-decade long research experiences in the psychology of human development, focusing on child rearing and education.

This personal history is embedded within the changing academic Zeitgeist and socio-cultural conditions. For nearly two decades since the mid-1950s, the author, as well as the majority of developmental psychologists, assumed that the psychological phenomenon was universal across cultures and historical time. Therefore the author had not placed cultural and historical conditions as crucial factors in his theoretical models even when his research involved cross-cultural comparison.

By the mid-1970s, several disciplines interested in human development, including cultural anthropology, social history, cultural history, life-course study, and life-span developmental psychology, had begun to induce developmental researchers to seriously take social, cultural, and historical contexts of development into account. The author characterizes this developmental researchers' realization as double contextualization, i.e., contextualization of developmental phenomena, and of developmental research. The author has analyzed prescriptive child rearing manuals and descriptive documents of child rearing and family life since early modern Japan. That experience has led the author to propose several conceptual frameworks and theoretical models that emphasize the importance of intra-individual psychological processes, interpersonal interactions, and cultural-historical contexts. The major proposals are as follows.

The author's conceptual frameworks emphasize 1) interrelations among 'theory constructors' taking different social roles, and 2) a common cultural reservoir of materials to be used for the theory construction. Four important social roles are singled out because of their involvement in constructing personal theories and devising practices related to human development in general, and child rearing in particular. These are roles of the layperson involved (e.g., parents and other family members), the practitioner (e.g., teachers and school counselors), the expert advisor (e.g., authors of advice books and public commentators), and the academic researcher. It is not unusual for one person to play more than two social roles with regard to child rearing.

Take the parent's role as an example for the construction process of child rearing theories and practices. Parental theories and practices are gradually constructed, tested, modified, and verified in the actual process of raising a child. Direct social interaction with other laypersons involved (e.g., family members and peers) and with professional practitioners, as well as indirect contact with other sources of information provided by expert advisors, is involved in personal theorizing and skill development by parents. The same kind of continued personal development of theorizing and of skills in child rearing through the actual experiences of fulfilling one's social roles and through direct and indirect social interaction with others also proceeds in the other three social roles.

The author presents a model on the interrelationship between collective culture, intra-personal culture, and an individual's actions. One important component of this model is the ethnopsychological pool of ideas (abbreviated as EPI) concerning child rearing. The EPI is characterized as containing diverse, often mutually contradicting source materials from which the layperson's, the practitioner's, the expert advisor's, and the academic researcher's theories are constructed. Thus the psychology of child rearing draws on the cultural pool that has been accumulated and
reconstructed historically.

The final section deals with meaningful interaction among researchers of different disciplines related to human development. The bi-directional interaction is crucial for interdisciplinary integration within an individual researcher’s mind, which is a prerequisite for interdisciplinary team-work.
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Pedagogy of "Father" Killing (parricide)

Yasuto Miyazawa (University of the Air)

It is generally assumed that a child grows up to be an adult (especially a male) possessing his/her own identity by accomplishing "symbolic parricide." However, the question of what specific act is considered "father" killing is not so axiomatic. Nevertheless, this problem has rarely been a topic in the field of pedagogy.

1) Killing of "father" in pedagogy

Émile, a text which typifies modern educational thought, ends with Émile realizing that he was brought up to be a father. However, Rousseau later wrote the story Émile and Sophie, in which Émile was branded as a disqualified father. Can this be interpreted as an inevitable consequence for Émile being deprived of symbolic parricide? It seems that a kind of subconscious parricide motif is lurking in Rousseau's educational thought.

2) "Symbolic parricide" and Oedipus complex

(1) Ubiquity of Oedipus complex

The term "symbolic parricide," in fact, is a term that does not have an adequate foothold in scholarly works and does not appear even in a psychoanalysis dictionary of terminology. Therefore, it seems appropriate that we consider the "Oedipus complex," as the closest concept to its meaning. It is quite a stretch, however, to investigate the relationship between this concept and "symbolic parricide."

Freud considered that the eternal triangle between a boy and his parents is a universal phenomenon of the human race. In contrast, Malinowski objected to this idea by saying that it does not necessarily exist in all civilizations. He cited the Trobriand Islanders society, where fathers do not possess any repressing function. Malinowski’s claim seemed to have become an established theory, yet, beginning with works of the anthropologist M.E. Spiro, a new movement of empirical and theoretical research to support the universality of Oedipus complex arose in the 1980s.

The ensuing confusion since Malinowski’s observations has had a lasting effect on issues concerning Oedipus complex. These points are complicated each other: 1) whether to regard the conflict between a father and a son as a triadic relation in which the mother (the first nurturer of the opposite sex) is involved, or as a dyadic relation with the father as an autocrat and the son opposing him; and 2) whether to consider the conflict between them within the framework of the model of nuclear family or by using the community model, including extended relatives. One of the reasons of this confusion seems to stem from the ambiguity in Freud’s concept of the Oedipus complex. I will examine his concepts in the following.

(2) "Father" in dyadic and triadic relations

Some scholars like P. Blos in the field of psychoanalysis emphasize the importance of the dyadic relationship between a father and a child in the pre-oedipal stage. However, this position tends to underestimate the theme of parricide.

3) "Symbolic parricide" and "father" as personification of community norm

(1) "Symbolic parricide" and "killing of primal father"

Freud did not use the term "symbolic parricide" specifically.

The concept "symbolic parricide" has been discussed as a hypothesis of "the killing of primal father," which was based on Freud’s anthropological research regarding the origins of totem and taboo.

(2) "Symbolic parricide" and the killing of "the father of the nation" as in the "family romance" in a civil revolution

Freud’s hypothesis should not be regarded as a mere delusion in a primitive society. There are some similarities between the "killing of the primal father" and the execution of a king such as during the French Revolution. Referring to Lynn Hunt’s research which
examined this, I will introduce a view that suggests the possibility of "father" killing at the macro level of the modern society (nation-state) corresponding with that at the micro level (family).

Conclusion
What is discovered from this digression is that in order to delve into the theme of "symbolic parricide," it is necessary: 1) to examine the ambivalent existence of a "father" to a son in the Dialektik manner, that is as role model and as rival at the same time. 2) to understand the meaning of "father" killing according to Dialektik of psychological phenomenon of becoming even more intensely identified to the object by killing (negating) it. 3) to examine the constrasting the image of "father" at the micro level setting (family) and at the macro level setting (nation-state).
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Dare “Traditions” Compose the Aims of Education?:

Hideo Sato (Nihon University)

Since the Japan National Commission on Education submitted a Report of 17 Proposals for Changing Education to the Prime Minister, December 2000, some proposals on revisions of the Fundamental Law of Education have been raised by rightists groups in Japan.

I would like to criticize their proposals, concentrating on two of their points, 1) why GHQ/SCAP, CI&E ordered the Ministry of Education (Mombusho) to delete the term “sensitive of tradition” in his draft of the above law, and 2) why the Imperial Rescript on Education, 1890 was abolished in the aims of Japanese education in order to bring about true educational democratization under the allied occupation in Japan after W.W.II.

1) A part of the forewords of the Fundamental Law of Education, “education which aims at the creation of culture which is general as well as individualistic”, which had been drafted by 1st Sub-Committee of Japan Education Reform Committee(JERC), were suddenly altered with the addition of the wording, “sensitivity of tradition”, by the proposal of the chief of the above subcommittee, Ryoutei Hatani, one of the conservative members of JERC, on November 15, 1946. But in the General Meeting of the JERC in the afternoon of the same day, this alternation was severely criticized by some of the liberal members, for the reason that the word “tradition” had the possibility of referring to the old loyalty and filial piety to the TENNO(Japanese Emperor) Systems. As a result, in the resolution of the JERC plan for drafting the Fundamental Law of Education, submitted to the Prime Minister on November 29, 1946, the altered phrases disappeared. The official resolution of the JERC on the above Law returned to the original phrases refusing to the “sensitivity of tradition”.

After that the Ministry of Education prepared the bill of the Fundamental Law of Education to the Diet. However in the draft of January 15, 1947, the phrase “sensitivity of tradition” followed the proposal of 1st Sub-Committee of JERC. When CI&E inspected the bill, he ordered the Ministry to delete that phrase and to return to the phrases before Hatani’s alteration.

This CI&E’s decision was bonded in common with the last resolution of the JERC’s General Meeting of November 29, and was not to be considered as an undeserved interference of the Occupation powers.

2) As every person knows, the Imperial Rescript on Education 1890 had been drawn up with the view to obeying “His subjects” to the Empire of the Great Japan with sincere filial piety. Therefore this Rescript was in opposition to democratization of education and to establishing education based on the human rights. Not only the Occupation powers but many liberal Japanese people, e.g. intellectuals, teachers and awakening workers, also wanted to abolish this Rescript from the Japanese schools and educational world.

The Rescript has never been regarded as one of the traditions available to the democratization of education.

I believe that traditions have been considered as the “creation” of the observers. Therefore, obviously, the meaning and contents of traditions varies with the observers and advocates. It is not a matter to admit of any hasty decision on the traditions being common with every Japanese.

I do feel convinced that it is inadmissible to prescribe “sensitivity of tradition” in the aim of education.
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"Fundamental Law of Education" and the Constitution of Japan came into force in 1947. These have not been amended for over half the Century.

In those days, teachers were confused because they were unaccustomed to dealing with democracy.

The "Fundamental Law of Education" was in the spotlight since Nikkyoso (=Japanese Teachers' Union) objected strongly to the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty in 1951. In the same year, the Governmental Advisory Committee was established the Committee proposed to reconsider the Educational Reform the way to amend the "Fundamental Law of Education". This enabled many teachers to know the name of this law. Ever since, there was no end to the controversy for and against this law like the Constitution of Japan. The Education Minister- KIYOSE in 1955, ARAKI in 1960 proposed to amend this law, but was unsuccessful.

NAKASONE Government, in 1984, established the Ad Hoc Council on Education, under the direct control of the cabinet, with the intention of amending the "Fundamental Law of Education", but could not succeed to free itself from the limitations set by the Establishment Law of this Ad Hoc Council on Education —— "to conform Mind of Fundamental Law of Education".

Approximately 10 years later, the National Council on Educational Reform as Prime Minister Obuchi's private council, also intended to amend the "Fundamental Law of Education", but the request was finally limited to "the broad national discussion and consensus". Meanwhile, the points of amendments concerning this law have been gradually diversifying.

Some teachers that belong to the generation of the "Fundamental Law of Education", abhor this law as "the Cause" of the devastation of postwar education. They quite agree with the "Imperial Rescript on Education" that oppose the foundations of this law.

Our county is presently in the middle of an Educational Reform. Until recently, large-scale educational reforms were planned with no relation to the schools and teachers alone had to realize these plans. After the Ad Hoc Council on Education, Reform plans make speedy progress based on the top-down system.

In the same way as the Constitution of the United States of America, can we not take away from the "Fundamental Law of Education" but only add necessary amendments?

We should not deal with the "Fundamental Law of Education" as an "Untouchable Charta" because it is our duty to always reexamine this law for it to be "active".
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Molding "Citizen Nationals" as a Way to Foster National Citizens
— An Essay on Interpretation of the Fundamental Law of Education —

Atsushi Makino (Nagoya University)

The amendment to the Fundamental Law of Education is arousing a great deal of controversy. What is common, however, to all the arguments is the same framework of interpretation in pedagogy as that found in this law: a dichotomist view of world history, in which Europe and Asia are not perceived as two different but equal values but as opposites of the developed and the underdeveloped, remaining unchanged, based on Japan’s self-recognition as a part of undeveloped Asia, a victim of European aggression. There, Europe, which is the standard for values, is ranked higher in the order of values and Asia lower. This is called "twisted dichotomy."

It was in such a framework that Japan strived for Europeanization to modernize itself and, somehow, has been successful. However, this has caused the formation of a stratified structure in Asia centered around Japan. In other words, on the one hand, Asia in its entirety is resisting Europe and, on the other hand Japan, which has successfully modernized, finds other Asian countries opposing it. In such a structure, Japan has been obliged to form itself into something ambiguous and unstable, being both Asian and European at the same time.

In the field of pedagogy, this dichotomy of Europe and Asia is reflected in the personality of national citizens that this science is supposed to foster. In the first years of post-war Japan, as shown in the structure of the Fundamental Law of Education, the blueprint for pedagogy to foster national citizens was not to directly link the individual (the personality) with mankind (the universal) but using the state—a specific—as a medium, to mold its member individuals into national citizens, in such a way that the specific state of Japan leads itself to universal humanity. This blueprint however, when reflecting the historical view of "Europe and Asia" as opposing one another, has caused a split of the state into two directions. On the one hand, where the standard of values or the universal, was retained by modern Europe, the personality of the individual was identified with modern Europe and the state became something relative and dissolved in Europe. On the other hand, the supposition was that the universal was the state itself, to which the individual belonged, and that the state was thought to be something absolute because it would foster national citizens as it returned its universality to them.

The above was a contradiction between the dichotomist view of the history of "Europe and Asia," which found the standard of values or the universal, in Europe, and the image of the state and its citizens drawn by the Fundamental Law of Education, which rejected the involvement of the state in the fostering of citizens although the state was considered to be something self-evident and substantial as the very basis for the fostering of those citizens supporting the state. In other words, in the fostering of the national citizens of Japan, while taking modern Europe or the universal, as its state model, there existed a framework that expected the fostering of citizens to reform the real-world state but at the same time required the real-world state to foster such citizens. The pedagogy placed citizens before the state according to modern European values but had to foster them under a national education system operated by the real-world state. For this reason, this notion of "citizens" was not introduced by the real-world state from the inside but brought about from outside as a "Sollen," a logical objective, in such a way as to make the real-world state and its citizens reject each other, which has led to a split over the state in pedagogy.

Such a contradiction inherent in education in Japan
is also found in the logic of Risaku Mutai, a philosopher who was deeply involved in the drafting of the Fundamental Law of Education. Mutai, finding Japan as a state outdone by modern Europe, defined Japan not as a "gesellschaft" state but a community state and tried to find a way to foster national citizens in the spirit of modern Europe in such a community. In his logic, this state was a specific that mediates between individuals as its members and modern Europe as the universal. Mutai thought that this specificity prevented the personality of individuals from dissolving into the universality of modern Europe, and modern Europe from returning to personality. This also means that the fact that individual citizens are linked with modern Europe — values considered universal to humanity — ensures them as collective characters. In other words, he tried to prove that a totalitarian state, while keeping its originality as a specific, was able to communicate with other states and constitute the world by the fact that its members were being led to universal humanity through the state. Here also however, the citizen or the individual, who supported the universal principles that enabled the state as a specific to communicate with others, seemed to have been brought about from the outside rather than born from within the state.

However, Mutai tried to clarify the process by which these citizens are fostered through this link with the universal humanity in the real-world state. The answer was in the process by which people's folk culture became a national culture and the universality of the production labor in the life of the people supporting this process inside the state. Seeing how the state was formed in Japan based on its community nature, i.e. its traditional culture, Mutai focused on the universality of production labor — the way of life of the people who embodied universality in the true sense of the word while creating a community nature. He tried to find how universal citizens might be created in an existing state through a process by which such production labor mediates traditional culture with a universal national culture while embodying the specificity of such a state.

Such efforts to discover the way to foster national citizens suggests the possibility of citizens themselves being a way to form a state which is open to the world while maintaining its specificity, by using as a framework the dichotomy of "Europe and Asia" causing a split of the state as discussed above, but also transforming it from the view of world history as an order of values into a dichotomy of different but equal values. This also matches the ambiguous nature of Japan.
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"Individuality" is a key concept of Dewey's philosophy of education. It was developed through his criticism of the idea of the "heredity-environment" framework in IQ controversy in the 1920s. The purpose of this paper is to inquiry into his concept of "individuality" in this historical context. This inquiry raises objections against those radical revisionists as Clarence Karier and Walter Feinberg, who regard Dewey as the ideologue in the Progressive Era having emphasized the social control and efficiency.

First, the author shows Dewey's view on IQ controversy. Dewey realized that the "heredity-environment" debate was the reflection of the political opposition between the conservatives and the reformers. Then, he insisted that both parties, namely, the conservatives who explained the intelligence by the hereditary factor and the reformers by the environmental factor, rested their case upon just the factor that weakened their respective aims. According to Dewey, a native factor plays the reformative, reconstructive role, while an acquired factor is least susceptible of alteration. For Dewey, it is the "intelligence" as the mediator that connects both factors and brings about the release of the former and at the same time the reconstruction of the latter. Thus, Dewey opposed to the psychologists who invented and developed the intelligence tests, because they supposed the intelligence as existence, which could be explained by causal relationship and efficiently controlled on the basis of the score of IQ.

Second, the author argues Dewey's concept of "individuality" as defined from his standpoint of "intelligence". Dewey defines the "individuality" as the new mode of cognitive and practical "transaction", which emerges with the operation of "intelligence", mediating and integrating the native and acquired factor. This definition leads Dewey to the position that criticizes the psychologists again, because they place "individuality" below the "classes". They define that "individuality" can be measured by intelligence tests and showed numerically by IQ. Furthermore, Dewey argues that they implicitly suppose that IQ belongs to the "classes", which correspond to the established social strata and the division of labor. Their supposition deprives the concept of "individuality" of the reformative, reconstructive meaning. Thus, Dewey not merely criticizes the view that regards "individuality" as the differences of the score of IQ among individuals, and emphasizes on the qualitative differences of the mode of individuals' "transactions" from the spatial standpoint. Dewey's concept of "individuality" also means the temporal change of the mode of their "transactions" and the reconstruction of the established social activity.

In sum, Dewey envisioned the dynamic society always changing. This image of society was quite different from that of the static, fixed society, which the conservative psychologists envisioned. It shows that, contrary to the interpretation of Dewey's thought by radical revisionists, Dewey has politically the radical thought about the American society in the Progressive Era.
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